Cyclopaedia of biblical, theological and ecclesiastical ...

John McClintock, James Strong

CYCLOPÆDIA

OF

BIBLICAL,

THEOLOGICAL, AND ECCLESIASTICAL

LITERATURE.

PREPARED BY

THE REV. JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D.,

AND

JAMES STRONG, S.T.D.

VOL. IV.—**H, I, J.**

NEW YORK:

HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,

FRANKLIN SQUARE.

1891.

LIST OF WOOD-CUTS IN VOL. IV.

CYCLOPÆDIA

OF

BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL, AND ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE.

H.

Haag (Hague) **Apologetical Society**, a scientific society in Holland, founded in 1785 for the purpose of calling forth scientific works in defence of the Christian religion. It annually offers a prize of 400 florins for the best work on a topic proposed. (A. J. S.)

Haähash'teri (Heb. with the art. [which the A. V. has mistaken for part of the name] *ha-Achashtari'*, הָאֲחַשְׁתָּרִי, i. e. *the Achastarite*, prob. of foreign [? Persian] origin; according to Fürst, an adj. from the word *achastar*, i. e. *courier* [compare אֲחַשְׁתְּרָנִים, "camels," Esth. viii, 10, 14]; according to Gesenius, *mule-driver;* Sept. ὁ Ἀσθηρά v. r. Ἀασθήρ, etc., Vulg. *Ahasthari*), the last mentioned of the four sons of Naarah, second of the two wives of Ashur, the founder of Tekoa, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 6). B.C. post 1618.

Ha-ammonai. See Chephar-haammonai.

Haan, Carolus de, was born at Arnheim Aug. 16, 1530. Becoming acquainted with the Reformation, he resolved to leave the Roman Catholic Church and his legal studies, and repaired to Geneva, where he studied theology under Calvin and Beza. In 1560 he became a minister of the Reformed Church at Deventer. Driven from thence by persecution, he was invited to Ham by William, duke of Cleves, and exercised his ministry there for sixteen years, until persecution again compelled him to depart. Count Jan of Nassau, stadtholder of Guelderland, and his son, Lodewijk Willem, stadtholder of Friesland, then secured his services to effect a reformation of the Church in their respective provinces. He afterwards returned to Deventer, but was again compelled to leave it in 1587, when it fell into the hands of the Spaniards. He repaired the same year to Leyden, where he was temporarily appointed professor extraordinary of theology. This position he held for four years. He was then called to Oldenbroek, where he exercised his ministry till he had passed the age of eighty. He died at Leyden Jan. 28, 1616. He wrote an exposition of the Revelation of St. John in Latin, and a work in Dutch against the Anabaptists. See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, i. (J. P. W.)

Ha-araloth. See Gibeah-haaraloth.

Haas, Gerardus de, D.D., was born in 1736. After completing his theological studies at Utrecht, and receiving the doctorate in theology in 1761, he was settled successively at Amersfoort, Middelburg, and Amsterdam. His works are chiefly exegetical and dogmatic. The most important of them are, *Aanmerkingen over het zevende Boek der Godspraaken van Jesaia* (Utr. 1773):—*Het vijfde en drie volgende hoofdstukken uit Paulus brief aan de Romeinen verklaard* (Amst. 1789-93, 3 parts):—*Verhandeling over de toekomende wereld* (Amst. 1798):—*Over de Openbaring van Johannes* (Amst. 1807, 3 parts). He also completed the commentary of Prof. Nahnis on the Epistle to the Philippians. It was published at Amsterdam in 1783 in 3 vols. See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, i. (J. P. W.)

Haba'iah (Heb. *Chabayah'*, חֲבַיָּה or חֳבָיָה, *protected* by *Jehovah;* Sept. Ὀβαΐα and Ἐβαια), a priest whose descendants returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel, but were degraded from the priestly office on account of not being able to trace their genealogy (Ezra ii, 6; Neh. vii, 63). B.C. ante 459.

Hab'akkuk [many *Habak'kuk*] (Heb. *Chabakkuk'*, חֲבַקּוּק, *embrace;* Sept. Ἀμβακούμ, Vulg. *Habacuc;* Jerome, *Præf. in Hab.* translates περίληψις, and Suidas πατὴρ ἐγέρσεως; other Græcized and Latinized forms are Ἀββακούμ, Ἀμβακούκ, *Ambacum, Abacuc*, etc.), the eighth in order of the twelve minor prophets (q. v.) of the Old Testament.

1. As to the name, besides the above forms, the Greeks, not only the Sept. translators, but the fathers of the Church, probably to make it more sonorous, corrupt it into Ἀραβακούκ, Ἀραβακούρω, or, as Jerome writes, Ἀβακούρω, and only one Greek copy, found in the library of Alcalá, in Spain, has Ἀββακούκ, which seems to be a recent correction made to suit the Hebrew text. The Heb. word may denote, as observed by Jerome, as well a "favorite" as a "struggler." Abarbanel thinks that in the latter sense it has allusion to the patriotic zeal of the prophet fervently contending for the welfare of his country: but other prophets did the same; and in the former and less distant signification, the name would be one like Theophilus, "a friend of God," which his parents may have given him for a good omen. Luther took the name in the active sense, and applied it to the labors and writings of the man, thus: "Habakkuk had a proper name for his office; for it signifies a man of heart, one who is hearty towards another and takes him into his arms. This is what he does in his prophecy; he comforts his people and lifts them up, as one would do with a weeping child or man, bidding him be quiet and content, because, please God, it would yet be better with him." But all this is speculation. See Keil and Delitzsch, *Comment.* ad cap. i, 1.

2. Of the facts of this prophet's birth-place, parentage, and life we have only apocryphal and conflicting accounts (see Delitzsch, *De Habacuci vita et ætate*, Lips. 1842, 1844). The Rabbinical tradition that Habakkuk was the son of the Shunammite woman whom Elisha restored to life is repeated by Abarbanel in his commentary, and has no other foundation than a fanciful etymology of the prophet's name, based on the expression in 2 Kings iv, 16. Equally unfounded is the tradition that he was the sentinel set by Isaiah to watch for the destruction of Babylon (comp. Isa. xxi, 16 with Hab. ii, 1). In the title of the history of Bel and the Dragon, as found in the Sept. version in Origen's *Tetrapla*, the author is called "Habakkuk, the son of Joshua, of the tribe of Levi." Some have supposed this apocryphal writer to be identical with the prophet (Jerome, *Procem. in Dan.*). The psalm in ch. iii and its title are thought to favor the opinion that Habakkuk was a Levite (De-

litzsch, *Habakuk*, p. iii). Pseudo-Epiphanius (ii, 240, *De Vitis Prophetarum*) and Dorotheus (*Chron. Pasch.* p. 150) say that he was of Βηθζοκήρ or Βηθιτουχάρ (v. r. Βηδζοκήρ, Βιδζεχάρ) (*Bethacat*, Isid. Hispal. c. 47), of the tribe of Simeon. This may have been the same as Bethzacharias, where Judas Maccabæus was defeated by Antiochus Eupator (1 Macc. vi, 32, 33). The same authors relate that when Jerusalem was sacked by Nebuchadnezzar, Habakkuk fled to Ostracine, and remained there till after the Chaldæans had left the city, when he returned to his own country, and died at his farm two years before the return from Babylon, B.C. 538. It was during his residence in Judæa that he is said to have carried food to Daniel in the den of lions at Babylon. This legend is given in the history of Bel and the Dragon, and is repeated by Eusebius, Bar Hebræus, and Eutychius. It is quoted from Joseph ben-Gorion (*B. J.* xi, 3) by Abarbanel (*Comm. on Hab.*), and seriously refuted by him on chronological grounds. The scene of the event was shown to mediæval travellers on the road from Jerusalem to Bethlehem (*Early Travels in Palestine*, p. 29). Habakkuk is said to have been buried at Ceila, in the tribe of Judah, eight miles east of Eleutheropolis (Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, s. v.); where, in the days of Zebenus, bishop of Eleutheropolis, according to Nicephorus (*H. E.* xii, 48) and Sozomen (*H. E.* vii, 28), the remains of the prophets Habakkuk and Micah were both discovered. See KEILAH. Rabbinical tradition, however, places his tomb at Chukkok, of the tribe of Naphthali, now called Jakuk. See HUKKOK.

BOOK OF HABAKKUK.—A full and trustworthy account of the life of this prophet would explain his imagery, and many of the events to which he alludes; but since we have no information on which we can depend, nothing remains but to determine from the book itself its historical basis and its age.

1. The Rabbinical traditions agree in placing Habakkuk with Joel and Nahum in the reign of Manasseh (comp. *Seder Olam Rabba* and *Zuta*, and *Tsemach David*). This date is adopted by Kimchi and Abarbanel among the Rabbis, and by Witsius and others among modern writers. The general corruption and lawlessness which prevailed in the reign of Manasseh are supposed to be referred to in Hab. i, 2–4. Kalinsky conjectures that Habakkuk may have been one of the prophets mentioned in 2 Kings xxi, 10. Carpzov (*Introd. ad libr. canon. V. T.* p. 79, 410) and Jahn (*Introd. in libros sacros V. T.* ii, § 120) refer our prophet to the reign of Manasseh, thus placing him thirty odd years earlier; but at that time the Chaldæans had not as yet given just ground for apprehension, and it would have been injudicious in Habakkuk prematurely to fill the minds of the people with fear of them. Some additional support to our statement of the age of this book is derived from the tradition, reported in the apocryphal appendix to Daniel and by the Pseudo-Epiphanius, that Habakkuk lived to see the Babylonian exile. Syncellus (*Chronographia*, p. 214, 230, 240) makes him contemporary with Ezekiel, and extends the period of his prophecy from the time of Manasseh to that of Daniel and Joshua, the son of Josedech. The *Chronicon Paschale* places him later, first mentioning him in the beginning of the reign of Josiah (Olymp. 32), as contemporary with Zephaniah and Nahum; and again in the beginning of the reign of Cyrus (Olymp. 42), as contemporary with Daniel and Ezekiel in Persia, with Haggai and Zechariah in Judæa, and with Baruch in Egypt. Davidson (Horne's *Introd.* ii, 968), following Keil, decides in favor of the early part of the reign of Josiah. Calmet, Jäger, Ewald, Rosenmüller, Maurer, and Hitzig agree in assigning the commencement of Habakkuk's prophecy to the reign of Jehoiakim, though they are divided as to the exact period to which it is to be referred. Ranitz (*Introductio in Hab. Vatic.* p. 24, 59), Stirkel (*Prolog. ad interpr. tertii cap. Hab.* p. 22, 27), and De Wette (*Lehrbuch der Historischkritischen Einleit.* Berlin, 1840, p. 338) justly place the age of Habakkuk before the invasion of Judæa by the Chaldæans. Knobel (*Der Prophetism. de Hebr.*) and Meier (*Gesch. d. poet. nat. Liter. d. Hebr.*) are in favor of the commencement of the Chaldæan æra, after the battle of Carchemish (B.C. 606), when Judæa was first threatened by the victors. Some interpreters are of opinion that ch. ii was written in the reign of Jehoiachin, the son of Jehoiakim (2 Kings xxiv, 6), after Jerusalem had been besieged and conquered by Nebuchadnezzar, the king made a prisoner, and, with many thousands of his subjects, carried away to Babylon; none remaining in Jerusalem save the poorest class of the people (2 Kings xxiv, 14). But of all this nothing is said of the book of Habakkuk, nor even so much as hinted at; and what is stated of the violence and injustice of the Chaldæans does not imply that the Jews had already experienced it. It is also a supposition equally gratuitous, according to which some interpreters refer ch. iii to the period of the last siege of Jerusalem, when Zedekiah was taken, his sons slain, his eyes put out, the walls of the city broken down, and the Temple burned (2 Kings xxv, 1–10). There is not the slightest allusion to any of these incidents in the third chapter of Habakkuk.

But the question of the date of Habakkuk's prophecy has been discussed in the most exhaustive manner by Delitzsch (*Der Prophet Habakuk*, Einl. § 3), and, though his arguments are rather ingenious than convincing, they are well deserving of consideration as based upon internal evidence. The conclusion at which he arrives is that Habakkuk delivered his prophecy about the twelfth or thirteenth year of Josiah (B.C. 630 or 629), for reasons of which the following is a summary. In Hab. i, 5 the expression "in your days" shows that the fulfilment of the prophecy would take place in the lifetime of those to whom it was addressed. The same phrase in Jer. xvi, 9 embraces a period of at most twenty years, while in Ezek. xii, 25 it denotes about six years, and therefore, reckoning backwards from the Chaldæan invasion, the date above assigned would involve no violation of probability, though the argument does not amount to a proof. From the similarity of Hab. ii, 10 and Zeph. i, 7, Delitzsch infers that the latter is an imitation, the former being the original. He supports this conclusion by many collateral arguments. Now Zephaniah, according to the superscription of his prophecy, lived in the time of Josiah, and from iii, 5 he is supposed to have prophesied after the worship of Jehovah was restored, that is, after the twelfth year of that king's reign. It is thought that he wrote about B.C. 624. Between this period, therefore, and the twelfth year of Josiah (B.C. 630), Delitzsch places Habakkuk. But Jeremiah began to prophesy in the thirteenth year of Josiah, and many passages are borrowed by him from Habakkuk (compare Hab. ii, 13 with Jer. li, 58, etc.). The latter, therefore, must have written about B.C. 630 or 629. This view receives some confirmation from the position of his prophecy in the O.-T. Canon.

On the other hand, while it is evident, from the constant use of the *future* tense in speaking of the Chaldæan desolations (i, 5, 6, 12), that the prophet must have written before the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar, which rendered Jehoiakim tributary to the king of Babylon (2 Kings xxiv, 1), B.C. 606, yet it is equally clear from ch. ii, 3 that the prophecy did not long precede the fulfilment; and as there seem to be no references to the reigns of Josiah or Jehoahaz (B.C. 609), and as the notices of the corruption of the period agree with the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim, we cannot be far astray in assigning B.C. 608 as the approximate date of this book.

2. Instead of looking upon the prophecy as an organic whole, Rosenmüller divided it into three parts corresponding to the chapters, and assigned the first chapter to the reign of Jehoiakim, the second to that of Jehoiachin, and the third to that of Zedekiah, when Jerusalem was besieged for the third time by Nebuchadnezzar. Kalinsky (*Vatic. Chabac. et Nah.*) makes four divisions,

and refers the prophecy not to Nebuchadnezzar, but to Esarhaddon. But in such an arbitrary arrangement the true character of the composition as a perfectly developed poem is entirely lost sight of.

The prophet commences by announcing his office and important mission (i, 1). He bewails the corruption and social disorganization by which he is surrounded, and cries to Jehovah for help (i, 2-4). Next follows the reply of the Deity, threatening swift vengeance (i, 5-11). The prophet, transferring himself to the near future foreshadowed in the divine threatenings, sees the rapacity and boastful impiety of the Chaldæan hosts, but, confident that God has only employed them as the instruments of correction, assumes (ii, 1) an attitude of hopeful expectancy, and waits to see the issue. He receives the divine command to write in an enduring form the vision of God's retributive justice as revealed to his prophetic eye (ii, 2, 3). The doom of the Chaldæans is first foretold in general terms (ii, 4-6), and the announcement is followed by a series of denunciations pronounced upon them by the nations who had suffered from their oppression (ii, 6-20). The strophical arrangement of these "woes" is a remarkable feature of the prophecy. They are distributed in strophes of three verses each, characterized by a certain regularity of structure. The first four commence with a "Woe!" and close with a verse beginning with כִּי (for). The first verse of each of these contains the character of the sin, the second the development of the woe, while the third is confirmatory of the woe denounced. The fifth strophe differs from the others in form in having a verse introductory to the woe. The prominent vices of the Chaldæans' character, as delineated in i, 5-11, are made the subjects of separate denunciations: their insatiable ambition (ii, 6-8), their covetousness (ii, 9-11), cruelty ii, 12-14), drunkenness (ii, 15-17), and idolatry (ii, 18-20). The whole concludes with the magnificent psalm in chap. iii, "Habakkuk's Pindaric ode" (Ewald), a composition unrivalled for boldness of conception, sublimity of thought, and majesty of diction. This constitutes, in Delitzsch's opinion, "the second grand division of the entire prophecy, as the subjective reflex of the two subdivisions of the first, and the lyrical recapitulation of the whole." It is the echo of the feelings aroused in the prophet's mind by the divine answers to his appeals; fear in anticipation of the threatened judgments, and thankfulness and joy at the promised retribution. But, though intimately connected with the former part of the prophecy, it is in itself a perfect whole, as is sufficiently evident from its lyrical character, and the musical arrangement by which it was adapted for use in the Temple service.

3. The style of this prophet has always been much admired. Lowth (*De Poesi Hebræor.* p. 287) says: "Poeticus est Habaccuci stylus; sed maxime in oda, quæ inter absolutissimas in eo genere merito numerari potest." Eichhorn, De Wette, and Rosenmüller are loud in their praise of Habakkuk's style; the first giving a detailed and animated analysis of the construction of his prophecies (*Einleitung in das A. Test.* iii, 333). He equals the most eminent prophets of the Old Testament —Joel, Amos, Nahum, Isaiah; and the ode in ch. iii may be placed in competition with Psa. xviii and lxviii for originality and sublimity. His figures are all great, happily chosen, and properly drawn out. His denunciations are terrible, his derision bitter, his consolation cheering. Instances occur of borrowed ideas (iii, 19; comp. Psa. xviii, 34: ii, 6; comp. Isa. xiv, 7: ii, 14; comp. Isa. xi, 9); but he makes them his own in drawing them out in his peculiar manner. With all the boldness and fervor of his imagination, his language is pure and his verse melodious. Eichhorn, indeed, gives a considerable number of words which he considers to be peculiar to this prophet, and supposes him to have formed new words or altered existing ones, to sound more energetic or feeble, as the sentiments to be expressed might require; but his list needs sifting, as De Wette observes (*Einleitung*, p. 339); and קִיקָלוֹן, ii, 16, is the only unexceptionable instance.

4. The ancient catalogues of canonical books of the Old Testament do not, indeed, mention Habakkuk by name; but they must have counted him in the twelve minor prophets, whose numbers would otherwise not be full. In the New Testament some expressions of his are introduced, but his name is not added (Rom. i, 17; Gal. iii, 11; Heb. x, 38; comp. Hab. ii, 4; Acts xiii, 40, 41; comp. Hab. i, 5).

5. Express commentaries on the whole of this book separately are the following, of which the most important are designated by an asterisk [*] prefixed: Theophylact, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* iv); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Works*, ix, 404): Tanchum of Jerusalem, *Commentaire* (ed. Munk, Paris, 1843, 8vo); Abarbanel, *Commentarius* (ed. Sprecher, Traj. 1722. Helmst. 1790, 8vo); Luther, *Auslegung* (Vitemb. 1526, 4to; Erf. eod. 8vo; in Latin, Argent. 1528, 8vo); Capito, *Enarrationes* (Argent. 1526, 8vo); Chytræus, *Lectiones* (in *Opp.* p. 364); Grynæus, *Hypomnemata* (Basil. 1582, 8vo); De Guevara, *Commentarius* [Rom. Cath.] (Madrid, 1585, 4to; 1593, fol.; Aug. Vind. 1603; Antw. 1609, 4to); Agellius, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1597, 8vo); Tossan, *Paraphrasis* (Francf. 1599, 8vo); Garthius, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1605, 8vo): Tarnovius, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1623, 8vo); Cocceius, *Analysis* (in *Opp.* xi, 657); Marbury, *Commentarie* (Lond. 1650, 4to), *De Padilla, *Commentaria* [Rom. Cath.] (Madrid, 1657, 2 vols. 4to; Sulzb. 1674, 4to, Rome, 1702, fol.); Hafenreffer, *Commentarius* [including Nahum] (Stuttg. 1663, 8vo); *Van Til, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1700, 4to); Biermann, *De Prophezie van H.* (Utr. 1713, 4to); Esch, *Erklärung* (Wesel, 1714, 4to); Abicht, *Adnotationes* (Vitemb. 1732, 4to); Jansen, *Analecta* (in *Pentateuch*, etc.); *Scheltinga, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1747, 4to); *Kalinsky, *Illustratio* [including Nahum] (Vratislav, 1748, 4to); Chrysander, *Anmerk.* (Rint. and Lpz. 1752, 4to); Monrad, *Anmerk.* (from the Danish, Göttingen, 1759, 8vo); Anon. *Traduction* (Paris, 1775, 12mo); Perschke, *Versio*, etc. (Francf. et. Lips. 1777, 8vo); Ludwig, *Erläuterung* (Frkft. 1779, 8vo); Faber, *Commentatio* (Onold. 1779, 2 vols. 4to); Wahl, *Anmerkung*, etc. (Hanover, 1790, 8vo), Kofod, *Commentarius* (Hafn. 1792, 8vo); Tingstäd, *Animadversiones* (Upsal. 1795, 8vo); Hänlein, *Interpretatio* (Erlang. 1795, 8vo); Bather, *Application* (in *Sermons*, i, 188); Plum, *Observationes* [including Obad.] (Götting. 1796, 8vo); Conz, *Erläuterung* (in Stäudlen's *Beiträge*), Horst, *Anmerkungen* (Gotha, 1798, 8vo); Dahl, *Observationes* (Neustr. 1798, 8vo); Wolfssohn, *Anmerk.* (Bresl. 1806, 8vo); Euchel, *Erläut.* (Copenh. 1815, 8vo); Justi, *Erläut.* (Lpz. 1820, 8vo); Wolff, *Commentar* (Darmst. 1822, 8vo); Schröder, *Anmerk.* [including Joel, Nahum, etc.] (Hildesh. 1827, 8vo); Deutsch, תַּרְגּוּם, etc. (Bresl. 1837, 8vo), *Bäumlein, *Commentarius* (Heilbronn, 1840, 8vo); *Delitzsch, *Auslegung* (Lpz. 1843, 8vo); Von Gumpach, *Erklärung* (Munch. 1860, 8vo); Robinson, *Homilies* (Lond. 1865, 8vo). See PROPHETS, MINOR.

The following are on chap. iii exclusively: Barhrdt, *De equitatione Dei* [ver. 15] (Lips. 1749, 4to); Feder, *Canticum Hab.* (Würzb. 1774, 8vo); Perschke, *Commentarius* (Francf. 1777, 4to); Busing, *De fulgoribus Dei* [ver. 3, 4] (Bremen, 1778, 4to); Nachtigal, *Erklär.* (in Henke's *Magazine*, iv, 180-190); Schröder, *Dissertatio* (Gröningen, 1781, 4to); Schnurrer, *Dissertatio* (Tübing. 1786, 4to); Mörner, *Hymnus Hab.* (Ups. 1794, 4to); Heidenheim, תַּרְגּוּם, etc. (Rodelh. 1800, 1826, 8vo); Anton, *Expositio* (Görl. 1810, 4to); Steiger, *Anmerkungen* (in Schwarz, *Jahrb.* 1824, p. 136); Stickel, *Prolusio* (Neust. 1827, 8vo); Reissmann, *De Cant. Hab.* (Krauth. 1831, 8vo); Strong, *Prayer of Hab.* (in the *Meth. Quar. Rev.* Jan. 1861, p. 73). See COMMENTARY.

Habazini'ah (Hebrew *Chabatstsinyah'*, חֲבַצִּנְיָה, perh. *lamp of Jehovah*, according to Fürst, *collection of Jehovah;* Sept. Χαβασίν), the father of one Jeremiah and grandfather of the chief Rechabite Jaazaniah, which last the prophet Jeremiah tested with the offer of wine

in the Temple (Jer. xxxv, 3). B.C. considerably ante 589.

Hab'bacuc (Ἀμβακούμ; Vulg. *Habacuc*), the form in which the name of the prophet HABAKKUK (q. v.) is given in the Apocrypha (Bel, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39).

Habergeon, an old English word for *breastplate*, appears in the Auth. Vers. as the rendering of two Heb. terms: שִׁרְיָה, *shiryah'* (Job xli, 26, where it is named by *zeugma* with offensive weapons), or שִׁרְיוֹן, *shiryon'* (2 Chron. xxvi, 14; Neh. iv, 16), a *coat of mail* (as rendered in 1 Sam. xvii, 5, 38); and תַּחְרָא, *tachara'* (Exod. xxviii, 32; xxxix, 23), a military garment, properly of linen strongly and thickly woven, and furnished around the neck and breast with a mailed covering (see Herod. ii, 182; iii, 47; and comp. the λινοθώρηξ of Homer, *Il.* ii, 529, 830). (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Lorica.) See ARMOR.

Ancient Egyptian Linen Corslet (from the tomb of Rameses III at Thebes).

Haberkorn, PETER, a German divine, born at Butzbach in 1604. After filling various other posts, he was made professor of theology at Giessen, and died there, April, 1676. He was distinguished as a polemic, especially against the Romanists and Syncretists (q. v.). He wrote (1) *Vindicatio Luth. fidei*:—(2) *Heptas disputationum Anti-Wallemburgicarum* (1650, 1652, 2 vols. 8vo).—Tholuck, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 438, 439.

Habert, ISAAC, doctor of the Sorbonne, the first Parisian theologian who wrote against Jansenius. He was a native of Paris, studied at the Sorbonne, was appointed canon of the cathedral of Paris, and in 1645 bishop of Vabres. He filled this post for twenty-three years, was reputed a very pious man, and died at Pont de Salars, near Rodez, in 1668. In 1641 he accused Jansenius of holding heretical doctrines on forty points, and thereby provoked Antoine Arnauld to answer him in his *Apologie*, in which he sought to prove the identity of the doctrines of Jansenius and St. Augustine. Habert nevertheless remained a declared enemy of Jansenius, and to him is ascribed the authorship of the letter sent to pope Innocent X in 1651, and signed by eighty-five bishops, praying him to decide the question finally. The most noteworthy of his works are: *De gratia ex partibus græcis* (1646):—*De consensu hierarchiæ et monarchiæ* (Paris, 1640):—*De cathedra seu primatu S. Petri* (Paris, 1645). He translated also into Latin the ceremonial of the Eastern Church, under the title *Liber pontificalis, Græce et Latine c. not.* (Paris, 1643, fol.).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 439; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 13.

Habesh. See ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

Habit. See DRESS.

Habit, "a power and ability of doing anything, acquired by frequent repetition of the same action. 'Man,' says Dr. Paley, 'is a bundle of habits. There are habits of industry, attention, vigilance, advertency; of a prompt obedience to the judgment occurring, or of yielding to the first impulse of passion; of extending our views to the future, or of resting upon the present; of apprehending, methodizing, reasoning; of indolence and dilatoriness; of vanity, self-conceit, melancholy, partiality; of fretfulness, suspicion, captiousness, censoriousness; of pride, ambition, covetousness; of overreaching, intriguing, projecting; in a word, there is not a quality or function, either of body or mind, which does not feel the influence of this great law of animated nature.'" "If the term *attachment* seems too good to be applied to habits, let us, if you please, call them ties. Habits, in fact, are ties, chains. We contract them unawares, often without feeling any pleasure in them; but we cannot break them without pain. It costs us something to cease to be what we have always been, to cease doing what we have always done. Life itself, in its least attractive form, the life least deserving of the name, is dear to us from the mere habit of living. The most intimate attachments, and, still more, the most incontestable duties, have often given way before the power of habit. To have the loins girt about, then, is not merely to distrust our attachments; it is to prevent our habits from striking their roots too deep within. Nothing, therefore, which is habitual should be regarded as trivial. The most invisible ties are not the weakest, and, at all events, their number renders them indestructible. We must remember that a cable is composed of threads. It is impossible to dispense with habits; a life without habits is a life without a rule. But in regard to these, as in regard to everything else, it is necessary to say with the apostle, 'All things are lawful unto me, but I will not be brought under the power of any'" (Vinet, *Gospel Studies*, p. 310). See Fellowes, *Body of Theology*, i, 58; Paley, *Moral Philosophy*, i, 48; Kames, *Elem. of Criticism*, ch. xiv; Jortin, *Sermons*, vol. iii; Reid, *Active Powers of Man*; Müller, *On the Christian Doctrine of Sin* (see Index).

Habitation (represented by several Heb. and Gr. words). God is metaphorically called the habitation of his people (Psa. lxxi, 3), in him they find the most delightful rest, safety, and comfort (Psa. xci, 9). Justice and judgment are the habitation of God's throne (Psa. lxxxix, 14), all his acts being founded on justice and judgment (Psa. cxvii, 2). The land of Canaan, the city of Jerusalem, the tabernacle and Temple, are spoken of as the habitation of God; there he does or did signally show himself present (Psa. cxxxii, 5, 13; Eph. ii, 22). Eternity is represented as his habitation (Isa. lvii, 15). He "inhabited the praises of Israel," a bold metaphor, implying that Jehovah is the object of, and kindly accepts the praises of his people (Psa. xxii, 3). See DWELLING.

Habits. See VESTMENTS.

Ha'bor (Heb. *Chabor'*, חָבוֹר, if of Shemitic origin, from חָבַר, to *join*, meaning the *united* stream; if of Persic derivation, from *khûbpâr* = εὐκρημνος, with *beautiful* banks [Fürst, *Lex.* s. v.]; Sept. Ἀβώρ and Χαβώρ), a river, and apparently also a district of Assyria, to which considerable interest is attached in connection with the first captivity. We read in 1 Chron. v, 26, that Tilgath-pilneser carried away "the Reubenites, and the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, and brought them unto

Halah, and *Habor*, and Hara, and to the river Gozan." About seventeen years later, Shalmaneser, the successor of the former monarch, "took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah, and in *Habor*, the river of Gozan" (A.V., "*by* the river Gozan," 2 Kings xvii, 6; xviii, 11). There are two rivers still bearing this name, and geographers are not agreed as to which is here referred to. See CAPTIVITY.

1. A river called *Khabûr* rises in the central highlands of Kurdistan, flows in a south-westerly direction, and falls into the Tigris about seventy miles above Mosul (Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 56; Schultens, *Index Geogr. in vitam Saladini*, s. v.). Many suppose this to be the Habor of Scripture for the following reasons: 1. It is within Assyria proper, which Ptolemy says was bounded on the west by the Tigris (vi, 1). 2. It is affirmed that the Assyrian monarch would place his captives in a central part of his kingdom, such as this is, and not in the outskirts (Keil on 2 Kings xvii, 4-6). 3. Habor is termed "a river of Gozan" (חָבוֹר נְהַר גּוֹזָן); and *Gozan* is supposed to signify "pasture," and to be identical with the word *Zozan*, now applied by the Nestorians to the pasture-lands in the highlands of Assyria, where the Khabûr takes its rise (Grant, *The Nestorian Christians*, p. 124). 4. Ptolemy mentions a mountain called *Chabor* (Χαβώρας) which divides Assyria from Media (vi, 1); and Bochart says the river Chabor has its source in that mountain (*Opera*, i, 194, 242, 362). Some have supposed that the modern Nestorians are the descendants of the captive Jews (Grant, *l. c.*). See GOZAN.

2. The other and much more celebrated river, *Khabûr*, is that famous affluent of the Euphrates, which is called *Aborrhas* (Ἀβόῤῥας) by Strabo (xvi, 1, 27) and Procopius (*Bell. Pers.* ii, 5); *Aburas* (Ἀβούρας) by Isidore of Charax (p. 4); *Abora* (Ἀβώρα) by Zosimus (iii, 12); and *Chaboras* by Ptolemy (Χαβώρας, v, 18) and Pliny (*H. N.* xxx, 3). "It rises about lat. 36° 40′, long. 40°; flows only a little south of east to its junction near Kaukab with the Jerujer or river of Nisibis, which comes down from Mons Masius. Both of these branches are formed by the union of a number of streams. Neither of them is fordable for some distance above their junction; and below it they constitute a river of such magnitude as to be navigable for a considerable distance by steamers. The course of the Khabûr below Kaukab is tortuous [through rich meads covered with flowers, having a general direction about S.S.W. to its junction with the Euphrates at Karkesia, the ancient Circesium]. The entire length of the stream is not less than 200 miles" (Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, i, 236; see Ainsworth, *Travels in the Track of the Ten Thousand*, p. 79; Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 304). Ritter (*Erdkünde*, x, 248), Gesenius (*Thesaurus*), Layard, Rawlinson, and others, maintain that this is the ancient *Habor*. There can be no doubt that Assyria proper was confined to the country lying along the banks of the Upper Tigris, and stretching eastward to Media. But its territory gradually expanded so as to include Babylonia (Herodotus, iii, 92), Mesopotamia (Pliny, *H. N.* vi, 26), and even the country westward to the confines of Cilicia and Phœnicia (Strabo, xvi). At the time of the captivity the power of Assyria was at its height. The Jewish captives were as secure on the banks of the western as of the eastern Habor. The ruins of Assyrian towns are scattered over the whole of northern Mesopotamia. "On the banks of the lower Khabûr are the remains of a royal palace, besides many other traces of the tract through which it runs having been permanently occupied by the Assyrian people. Even near Seruj, in the country between Haran and the Euphrates, some evidence has been found not only of conquest, but of occupation" (Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, i, 247; see Chesney, *Euphrates Expedition*, i, 114; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 275, 279-300, 312). There can be no doubt that the Khabûr was in Assyria, and near the centre of the kingdom, at the time of the captivity. Further, Ptolemy mentions a province in Mesopotamia called *Gauzanitis* (v, 18). It lay around the Khabûr, and was doubtless identical with *Gozan*, hence the phrase "Habor, the river of Gozan" (2 Kings xvii, 6). Chalcitis, which appears to be identical with Halah, mentioned in the same passage, adjoined Gauzanitis. It is a remarkable fact that down as late as the 12th century there were large Jewish communities on the banks of the Khabûr (Benjamin of Tudela, in *Early Travels in Pal.* p. 92 sq.). The district along the banks probably took its name from the river, as would seem from a comparison with 1 Chron. v, 26. Ptolemy mentions a town called *Chabor* (v, 18). The Khabûr occurs under that name in an Assyrian inscription of the 9th century before our æra (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 354) See CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS.

It seems doubtful whether Habor was identical with the river Chebar (כְּבָר), on which Ezekiel saw his visions. The latter was perhaps farther south in Babylonia (Ezek. i, 3, etc.). See CHEBAR.

Haccerem. See BETH-HAC-CEREM.

Hachali'ah (Heb. *Chakalyah'*, חֲכַלְיָה; according to Gesenius, whose eyes *Jehovah enlivens;* according to Fürst, *ornament of Jehovah;* Sept. Ἀχαλία v. r. Χελκία), the father of Nehemiah, the governor after the captivity (Neh. i, 1; x, 2). B.C. ante 447.

Hach'ilah (Heb. *Chakilah'*, חֲכִילָה, according to Gesenius, *darksome;* according to Fürst, *drought;* Sept. Ἐχελά v. r. Χελμάθ), the descriptive name of a well-wooded hill (גִּבְעָה) near ("on the south of," "before," "by the way of") the wilderness ("Jeshimon") of Ziph, where David lay hid, and where Saul pitched his tent at the information of the Ziphites (1 Sam. xxiii, 19; xxvi, 1, 3). This is doubtless the *Tell Zif* reported by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, ii, 190, 191) as "a round eminence situated in the plain, a hundred feet or more in height," with a level plot on the top, apparently once inclosed by a wall, and containing several cisterns; lying a short distance west of the site of the town of Ziph. See ZIPH. The identification proposed by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 113) with "the village *Beth-Chachal*, 2½ miles west of Hebron," is unsupported and out of place.

Hach'moni (Heb. *Chakmoni'*, חַכְמֹנִי, *wise;* Sept. Ἀχαμανί v. r. Ἀχαμί, Vulg. *Hachamoni*), a man only known as the father (or ancestor; comp. 1 Chron. xxvii, 2) of Jashobeam, the chief of David's warriors (1 Chron. xi, 11, where *son of Hachmoni* is rendered "HACHMONITE," for which the parallel passage, 2 Sam. xxiii, 8, has "TACHMONITE"); and also of Jehiel, the companion of the princes in the royal household (1 Chron. xxvii, 32). B.C. considerably ante 1046. Hachmon or Hachmoni was no doubt the founder of a family to which these men belonged: the actual father of Jashobeam was Zabdiel (1 Chron. xxvii, 2), and he is also said to have belonged to the Korhites (1 Chron. xii, 6); possibly the Levites descended from Korah. But the name Hachmon nowhere appears in the genealogies of the Levites. See Kennicott, *Diss.* p. 72, 82, who calls attention to the fact that names given in Chronicles with *Ben* are in Samuel given without the *Ben*, but with the definite article. A less probable view is that which makes this term a title of office, q. d. *counsellor*. See JASHOBEAM.

Hach'monite (1 Chron. xi. 16). See HACHMONI.

Hacket, John, an English prelate, distinguished for his talents in controversy, was born at London in 1592. He studied at Westminster School, and entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1608. He took orders in 1618, and soon after became chaplain of the bishop of Lincoln. At the beginning of the Civil War he was one of the divines chosen to prepare a report on Church reforms, to be presented by a committee of the House of Lords. This plan failed from the opposition of the bishops. Hacket was a zealous partisan of Charles, and

his house became the head-quarters of the Royalists in his neighborhood. This brought him into trouble, and he was even imprisoned for a short time. After the Restoration he was made bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, and he caused the cathedral of Lichfield, which had been much injured during the war, to be repaired, mostly at his own expense. He died at Lichfield in 1670. Hacket was a Calvinist; yet his writings abound, says Coleridge, "in fantastic rags and lappets of Popish monkery." He wrote also *A Sermon preached before the King March* 22, 1660:—*A Century of Sermons upon several remarkable Subjects* (published by Thos. Plume, with a life of the author, 1675, fol.):—*The Life of Archbishop Williams* (1693, fol.). See *Biogr. Britannica;* Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. ii; *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. lxvi; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, v, 471; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 752; Coleridge, *Works* (New York edition), v, 123.

Hacket, William, an English enthusiast and fanatic of the 16th century. He was at first the servant of a gentleman named Hussey, but married a rich widow, whose fortune he soon spent in dissipation. He next appears at York and in Lincolnshire, giving himself out as a prophet, and announcing the downfall of the papacy; that England would suffer from famine, pestilence, and war unless the consistorial discipline were established. He was whipped and driven out of the county, but continued his prophecies elsewhere. According to Bayle, he was a very ready and grandiloquent speaker, so that many among the people thought he had received a special gift of the Holy Ghost. He affected to place great reliance on his prayers, and asserted that if all England were to pray for rain there should fall none if he prayed for dry weather. Edmund Coppinger and Henry Arthington became associated with him, the former under the name of *Prophet of Mercy*, the latter *Prophet of Judgment.* They proclaimed Hacket the true king of the world, and next in power to Jesus Christ. On Jan. 16, 1591, he sent his disciples through the streets of London crying that Jesus had arrived, was stopping at a certain hotel in the town, and that this time none should undertake anything against him. They ended with the cry, *Repent, England, repent!* They were finally arrested and put in prison. Coppinger let himself die of starvation; Arthington published a recantation and was forgiven. As for Hacket, he persisted to the last, and was condemned to death as guilty of impiety and rebellion, and hung in London in July, 1591. Even on the scaffold he prayed God for a miracle to confound his enemies. See Henry Fitz-Simon, *Britannomachia Ministrorum*, lib. ii, cap. vi, p. 202, 206; Camden, *Annales*, an. 1591, pars iv, p. 618–623; Bayle, *Dict. hist. et crit.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 31.

Hackley, CHARLES W., D.D., a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and late professor of mathematics and astronomy in Columbia College, New York, was born March 9, 1808, in Herkimer County, N. York, and died in the city of New York Jan. 10, 1861. Prof. Hackley graduated at the Military Academy, West Point, in 1829, and was assistant professor of mathematics there until 1832, when he engaged in the study of law, but subsequently abandoned it for theology, and was ordained in 1835. He was professor of mathemat- in the University of New York until 1838, then became president of Jefferson College, Mississippi, and subsequently rector of St. Peter's Protestant Episcopal Church, Auburn, N. Y. He was elected professor in Columbia College in 1843, and continued in that post until his death. He was the author of several excellent mathematical works, and a contributor to scientific periodicals and weekly and daily journals.—*American Annual Cyclopædia*, 1861, p. 362; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 753. (J. W. M.)

Hackspan, THEODOR, an eminent Lutheran theologian and Orientalist, was born in 1607 at Weimar, and died at Altorf Jan. 19, 1659. He was educated at Jena, where he studied philosophy, and then went to Altorf, to profit by the instructions of the able Orientalist Schwenter, and thence to Helmstadt, where he studied theology under the famous Calixtus. In 1636 he returned to Altorf, and for many years filled the chair of Hebrew in its university, where he was the first to publicly teach the Oriental languages. In 1654 he was appointed professor of theology in that institution, retaining at the same time the chair of Oriental languages. His close application to study and to the duties of his professorships so impaired his health that he died in the fifty-second year of his age. Hackspan is said to have been the best scholar of his day in Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic. The liberality of Jodocus Schmidmaier, an advocate of Nuremberg, who established in his own house a press, with supplies of types in the different languages, enabled him to publish most of his learned works. Among these we name *Tractatus de usu Librorum Rabbinicorum:*—*Sylloge Disputationum theologicarum et philologicarum:* — *Interpres Errabundus:*—*Disputationes de locutionibus sacris* (Altorf, 1648):—*Observationes Arabico-Syriacæ in quædam loca Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (ibid. 1639):—*De Angelorum dæmonumque nominibus* (ibid. 1641):—*Fides et Leges Mohhammedis*, etc. (ibid. 1646):—*Miscellaneorum Sacrorum Libri duo* (ibid. 1660):—*Exercitatio de Cabbala Judaica* (ibid. 1660):—*Notæ philologico-theologicæ in varia et difficilia Scripturæ loca* (ibid. 1664, 3 vols.).—Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* viii, 169; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 34. (J. W. M.)

Ha'dad, a name which occurs with considerable confusion of form in the Heb. The proper orthography seems to be הֲדַד, *Hadad'* (according to Gesenius from an Arab. root signifying to *break* forth into shouts; but Fürst makes it = שַׁדַּי, *Almighty*), which appears in Gen. xxxvi, 35, 36; 1 Chron. i, 46, 47, 50, 51 (in all which passages it is rendered by the Sept. Ἀδάδ, and Vulg. *Adad*), and in 1 Kings xi, 14–25 (where the Sept. has Ἀδάρ, Vulg. *Adad*). The other forms are חֲדַד, *Chadad'* (1 Chron. i, 30; Sept. Χοδάδ, Vulg. *Hadad*), הֲדַר, *Hadar'* (Gen. xxvi, 39; Sept. Ἀράδ, Vulg. *Adar*, Engl. "Hadar"), חֲדַר, *Chadar'* (Gen. xxv, 15; Sept Χοδάν, Vulg. and Engl. *Hadar*), and אֲדַד, *Adad'* (1 Kings xi, 17; Sept. Ἀδάρ, Vulg. *Adad*). It was the name of a Syrian idol, and was thence transferred to the king, as the highest of earthly authorities, in the forms Hadad, Ben-hadad ("worshipper of Hadad"), and Hadad-ezer ("assisted by Hadad," Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 218). The title appears to have been an official one, like Pharaoh; and perhaps it is so used by Nicolaus Damascenus, as quoted by Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 5, 2), in reference to the Syrian king who aided Hadadezer (2 Sam. viii, 5). Josephus appears to have used the name in the same sense, where he substitutes it for Benhadad (*Ant.* ix, 8, 7, compared with 2 Kings xiii, 24). See also HADAD-RIMMON.

1. ADAD (q. v.) is the indigenous name of the chief deity of the Syrians, the *sun*, according to Macrobius (*Saturnal.* i, 23). Moreover, Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xxxvii, 11, 71), speaking of remarkable stones named after parts of the body, mentions some called "Adadunephros, ejusdem oculus ac digitus dei;" and adds, "et hic colitur a Syris." He is also called Ἄδωδος βασιλεὺς θεῶν by Philo Byblius (in Eusebii *Præpar. Evan.* i, 10). The passage of Hesychius which Harduin adduces in his note to Pliny concerning the worship of this god by the Phrygians, Jablonski declares to be inadmissible (*De Ling. Lycaonica*, p. 64).

This Syrian deity claims some notice here, because his name is most probably an element in the names of the Syrian kings Benhadad and Hadadezer. Moreover, several of the older commentators have endeavored to find this deity in Isa. lxvi, 17; either by altering the text there to suit the *name* given by Macrobius, or by

adapting the name he gives to his *interpretation* and to the reading of the Hebrew, so as to make that extract bear testimony to a god *Achad* (q. v.). Michaelis has argued at some length against both these views; and the modern commentators, such as Gesenius, Hitzig, Böttcher (in *Proben Altest. Schrifterklär.*), and Ewald, do not admit the name of any deity in that passage.

2. HADAR (q. v.), one of the sons of Ishmael (Gen. xxv, 15; 1 Chron. i, 30). His descendants probably occupied the western coast of the Persian Gulf, where the names *Attæi* (Ptol. vi, 7, § 15), *Attene*, and *Chateni* (Plin. vi, 32) bear affinity to the original name. See ARABIA.

3. HADAD, king of Edom, the son of Bedad, and successor of Husham: he established his court at Avith, and defeated the Midianites in the intervening territory of Moab (Gen. xxxvi, 35; 1 Chron. i, 46). This is the only one of the ancient kings of Edom whose exploits are recorded by Moses. B.C. ante 1618. See AVITH.

4. HADAD, another king of Edom, successor of Baal-Hanon: he established his palace at Pai, and his wife's name was Mehetebel (1 Chron. i, 50). He is called HADAR in Gen. xxxvi, 39. From the fact that with him the list of these Edomitish kings closes, it may be conjectured (Turner's *Companion to Genesis*, p. 326) that he lived about the time of the Exode, and in that case he may be the identical king of Edom who refused a passage to the Israelites (Numb. xx, 14). B.C. prob. 1619; certainly ante 1093. See PAI.

5. ADAD, a king of Syria, who reigned in Damascus at the time that David attacked and defeated Hadadezer, king of Zobah, whom he marched to assist, and in whose defeat he shared. B.C. cir. 1040. This fact is recorded in 2 Sam. viii, 5, but the name of the king is not given. It is supplied, however, by Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 5, 2), who reports, after Nicolas of Damascus, that he carried succors to Hadadezer as far as the Euphrates, where David defeated them both; and adds other particulars respecting his fame.

6. HADAD, a young prince of the royal race of Edom, who, when his country was conquered by David, contrived, in the heat of the massacre committed by Joab, to escape with some of his father's servants, or, rather, was carried off by them into the land of Midian. B.C. cir. 1040. Thence Hadad went into the desert of Paran ("Midian," ver. 18), and eventually proceeded to Egypt (1 Kings xi, 14 sq.: in ver. 17 the name is given in the mutilated form אֲדַד). He was there most favorably received by the king, who assigned him an estate and establishment suited to his rank, and even gave him in marriage the sister of his own consort, by whom he had a son, who was brought up in the palace with the sons of Pharaoh. Hadad remained in Egypt till after the death of David and Joab, when, although dissuaded by Pharaoh, he returned to his own country in the hope of recovering his father's throne (1 Kings xi, 21, 22). B.C. cir. 1012. The Scripture does not record the result of this attempt further than by mentioning him as one of the troublers of Solomon's reign, which implies some measure of success (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.). After relating these facts the text goes on to mention another enemy of Solomon, named Rezin, and then adds (ver. 25) that this was "besides the mischief that Hadad did; and he abhorred Israel, and reigned over Syria." Our version seems to make this apply to Rezin; but the Sept. refers it to Hadad, reading אדום, *Edom*, instead of ארם, *Aram* or *Syria*, and the sense would certainly be improved by this reading, inasmuch as it supplies an apparent omission; for without it we only know that Hadad left Egypt for Edom, and *not* how he succeeded there, or how he was able to trouble Solomon. The history of Hadad is certainly very obscure. Adopting the Sept. reading, some conclude that Pharaoh used his interest with Solomon to allow Hadad to reign as a tributary prince, and that he ultimately asserted his independence. Josephus, however, seems to have read the Hebrew as our version does, "Syria," not "Edom." He says (*Ant.* viii, 7, 6) that Hadad, on his arrival in Edom, found the territory too strongly garrisoned by Solomon's troops to afford any hope of success. He therefore proceeded with a party of adherents to Syria, where he was well received by Rezin, then at the head of a band of robbers, and with his assistance seized upon a part of Syria and reigned there. If this be correct, it must have been a different part of Syria from that in which Rezin himself reigned, for it is certain, from ver. 24, that he (Rezin) did reign in Damascus. Carrières supposes that Hadad reigned in Syria after the death of Rezin; and it might reconcile apparent discrepancies to suppose that two kingdoms were established (there were more previously), both of which, after the death of Rezin, were consolidated under Hadad. That Hadad was really king of Syria seems to be rather corroborated by the fact that every subsequent king of Syria is, in the Scripture, called Ben-Hadad, "son of Hadad," and in Josephus simply Hadad, which seems to denote that the founder of the dynasty was called by this name. We may observe that, whether we read Aram or Edom, it must be understood as applying to Hadad, not to Rezin (*Pictorial Bible*, on 2 Kings xi, 14).—Kitto. The identity of name suggests a common origin between the Edomitish and Syrian dynasties. Josephus, in the outset of his account, appears to call this Hadad by the name of *Ader*. In any case, however, the preceding must be regarded as distinct persons from each other (see Hengstenberg, *Pentateuch*, ii, 288), the last probably being the son, or, rather, grandson of No. 5. See SYRIA.

Hadad-e'zer (Heb. *id.*, הֲדַדְעֶזֶר, *Adad* is his *help* [see HADAD, No. 1], Sept. Ἀδραεζερ in 2 Sam. viii, but Ἀδαρέζερ v. r. Ἀδαδέζερ in 1 Kings xi, 23; Vulg. *Adarezer* in both passages), less correctly HADARE'ZER (Heb. *id.*, הֲדַרְעֶזֶר [see under HADAD; yet some MSS. have *Hadadezer* throughout]; 2 Sam. x, 16, 19; 1 Chron. xviii, 3–10; xix, 16, 19; Sept. Ἀδραζάρ v. r. Ἀδρααζάρ, Vulg. still *Adarezer*), king of the Aramitish state Zobah, a powerful opponent of David. He was defeated by the Israelites in his first campaign, while on his way to "establish his dominion" (B.C. cir. 1035) in the neighborhood of the Euphrates, with a great loss of men, war-chariots, and horses, and was despoiled of many of his towns (2 Sam. viii, 3; 1 Chron. xviii, 3), and driven with the remnant of his force to the other side of the river (xix, 16). The golden weapons (שְׁלָטִים, A.V. "shields of gold") captured on this occasion, a thousand in number, were taken by David to Jerusalem (xviii, 7), and dedicated to Jehovah. The foreign arms were preserved in the Temple, and were long known as king David's (1 Chron. xxiii, 9; Cant. iv, 4). A diversion highly serviceable to him was made by a king of Damascene-Syria [see HADAD, 5], who compelled David to turn his arms against him (2 Sam. x, 6–14; 1 Chron. xix, 6–14). The breathing-time thus afforded Hadadezer was turned by him to such good account that he was able to accept the subsidies of Hanun, king of the Ammonites, and to take a leading part in the confederacy formed by that monarch against David. B.C. cir. 1034. The first army brought into the field was beaten and put to flight by Abishai and Joab; but Hadadezer, not yet discouraged, went into the countries east of the Euphrates, and got together the forces of all his allies and tributaries, which he placed under the command of Shobach, his general. The army was a large one, as is evident from the numbers of the slain; and it was especially strong in horse-soldiers (1 Chron. xix, 18). They crossed the Euphrates, joined the other Syrians, and encamped at a place called Helam (q. v.). To confront so formidable an array, David took the field in person, and in one great victory so completely broke the power of

Hadadezer, that all the small tributary princes seized the opportunity of throwing off his yoke, of abandoning the Ammonites to their fate, and of submitting quietly to David, whose power was thus extended to the Euphrates (2 Sam. x, 15–19; 2 Chron. xix, 15–19).

But one of Hadarezer's more immediate retainers, REZON ben-Eliadah, made his escape from the army, and, gathering round him some fugitives like himself, formed them into one of those marauding, ravaging "bands" (גְּדוּד) which found a congenial refuge in the thinly peopled districts between the Jordan and the Euphrates (2 Kings v, 2; 1 Chron. v, 18-22). Making their way to Damascus, they possessed themselves of the city. B.C. cir. 980. Rezon became king, and at once began to avenge the loss of his countrymen by the course of "mischief" to Israel which he pursued down to the end of Solomon's reign, and which is summed up in the emphatic words, "He was an adversary (a 'Satan') to Israel" . . . . "he abhorred Israel" (1 Kings xi, 23–25).

Ha'dad-rim'mon (Heb. *Hadad'-Rimmon'*, הֲדַד־רִמּוֹן, the names of two Syrian idols; Sept. *κοπετὸς ῥοῶνος*, Vulg. *Adadremmon*), the name of a place in the valley of Megiddo, alluded to in Zech. xii, 11 as a type of the future penitence of the Jews; probably by a proverbial expression from the lamentation for Josiah, who was mortally wounded not far from this spot (2 Chron. xxxv, 22-25). (There is a treatise by Wichmanshausen, *De planctu Hadadr.* in the *Nov. Thes. Theol.-phil.* i, 1101; exegetical remarks on the same text have also been written in Dutch by Vermast [Gonda, 1792, 1794], in German by Mauritii [Rost. 1764, 1772], and in Latin by Froriep [Erf. 1776].) According to Jerome (*Comment. on Zech.* l. c. and *Hos.* i), it was afterwards called *Maximianopolis* (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 891), which, according to the *Jerus. Itin.*, lay 17 Rom. miles from Cæsarea, and 10 from Esdraelon; being situated, according to Dr. Robinson (new ed. of *Researches*, iii, 118), a little south of Megiddo (now Lejjun) (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1844, p. 220). The name has been thought to be derived from the worship of the idol Hadad-rimmon (Hitzig *on Isa.* xvii, 9; Movers, *Phön.* p. 297); but, according to the Targum of Jonathan (followed by Jarchi), it is an ellipsis for *Hadad*, son of Tab-*rimmon*, the alleged opponent of Ahab at Ramoth-Gilead. As it contains the names of two principal Syrian deities, it may have been an old Syrian stronghold, and hence Josiah may here have made his last stand in defence of the plain of Esdraelon. Such a site, therefore, does not ill agree with the position of the modern *Rummaneh*, a village "at the foot of the Megiddo hills, in a notch or valley about 1½ hour S. of tell Metzellim" (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 333; comp. *Narrative*, i, 355; De Saulcy, *Dead Sea*, ii, 311). Schwarz's attempt (*Palest.* p. 159) to identify Hadad-Rimmon with Gath-Rimmon of Josh. xxi, 25, as the Kefar Uthni of the Talmud (*Gittin*, fol. 76, a), and a present Kafer Guth, said by him to be located about 24 miles from Lejjun, beyond Sepphoris, is without foundation.

Ha'dar, a various reading of two Heb. names. See also ETS-HADAR.

1. CHADAR' (חֲדַר, perhaps *chamber*; Sept. *Χοδδάν*; Vulg. *Hadar*), a son of Ishmael (Gen. xxv, 15); written in 1 Chron. i, 30, *Chadad'* (חֲדַד, *Χουδάν*, *Hadad*); but Gesenius supposes the former to be the true reading of the name. It has not been identified, in a satisfactory way, with the appellation of any tribe or place in Arabia, or on the Syrian frontier; but names identical with, or very closely resembling it, are not uncommon in those parts, and may contain traces of the Ishmaelitish tribe sprung from Hadar. The mountain *Hadad*, belonging to Teymà [see TEMA], on the borders of the Syrian desert, north of el-Medîneh, is perhaps the most likely to be correctly identified with the ancient dwellings of this tribe; it stands among a group of names of the sons of Ishmael, containing Dumah, Kedar, and Tema. See HADAD, 2.

2. HADAR' (הֲדַר, perh. *ornament*; Sept. *Ἀράδ* v. r. *Ἀράθ*; Vulg. *Adar*), one of the Edomitish kings, successor of Baal-Hanan ben-Achbor (Gen. xxxvi, 39); and, if we may so understand the statement of ver. 31, about contemporary with Saul. The name of his city, and the name and genealogy of his wife, are given. In the parallel list in 1 Chron. i, he appears as HADAD. We know from another source (1 Kings xi, 14, etc.) that Hadad was one of the names of the royal family of Edom. Indeed, it occurs in this very list (Gen. xxxvi, 35). See HADAD, 4.

Hadare'zer, the form of the name of the town mentioned in the account of David's Syrian campaign, as given in 2 Sam. x, and in all its occurrences in the Heb. text (as well as in both MSS. of the Sept. and in Josephus), except 2 Sam. viii, 3–12; 1 Kings xi, 23, where it is more correctly called HADADEZER (q. v.).

Hadas. See MYRTLE.

Had'ashah (Heb. *Chadashah'*, חֲדָשָׁה, *new*; Sept. *Ἀδασά* v. r. *Ἀδασάν*), a city in the valley of Judah, mentioned in the second group between Zenan and Migdal-gad (Josh. xv, 37). It has generally been thought (Winer, *Realw.* s. v.) to be the same with the *Adasa* (*Ἀδασά*) of Josephus (*Ant.* xii, 10, 5) and the Apocrypha (1 Macc. vii, 40, 45), and likewise of the *Onomasticon* (s. v.), which, however, must have lain rather in the mountains of Ephraim, apparently near the modern village *Surda*. See ADASA. Schwarz (*Phys. Descript. of Pal.* p. 103) inclines to identify it with a little village *el-Chadas*, stated by him to lie between Migdal and Ashkelon, the *el-Jora* of Van de Velde's *Map*. According to the Mishna (*Erub.* v, 6), it anciently contained 50 houses only (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 701). See JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

Hadas'sah (Heb. *Hadassah'*, הֲדַסָּה, *myrtle*; comp. the Gr. names *Myrto*, etc.; Sept. omits, Vulg. *Edissa*), the earlier Jewish name of ESTHER (Esth. ii, 7). Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 366) suggests that it is identical with *Ἄτοσσα*, the name of the daughter of Cyrus (Herod. iii. 133, 134).

Hadat'tah (Heb. *Chadattah'*, חֲדַתָּה, a Chaldaizing form = *new*; Sept. omits, Vulg. *nova*), according to the A.V. one of the towns of Judah in the extreme south—"Hazor, Hadattah, and Kerioth, and Hezron," etc. (Josh. xv, 25); but the Masoretic accents of the Hebrew connect the word with that preceding it, as if it were Hazor-chadattah, i. e. New Hazor, in distinction from the place of the same name in ver. 23. This reading is expressly sanctioned by Eusebius and Jerome, who speak (*Onomast.* s. v. Asor) of "New Hazor" as lying in their day to the east of and near Ascalon. (See also Reland, *Palæst.* p. 708.) But Ascalon, as Robinson has pointed out (*Researches*, new ed. ii, 34, note), is in the Shefelah, and not in the south, and would, if named in Joshua at all, be included in the second division of the list, beginning at ver. 33, instead of where it is, not far from Kedesh. Still the total (29) in ver. 32 requires as much abbreviation in the enumerated list of cities in this group as possible. See HAZOR-HADATTAH.

Haddah. See EN-HADDAH.

Haddock, CHAS. B., D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in Salisbury, N. H., in the summer of 1796. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1816. Immediately after graduating, he entered Andover Theological Seminary, where he remained two years. He was then compelled to desist from his studies, and made a journey to the South. He returned in 1819 invigorated in health, and was at once chosen the first professor of rhetoric in Dartmouth College, which position he held till 1838, when he was chosen professor of intellectual philosophy. In 1850 he received the appointment of charge d'affaires at the court of Portugal, which

he held till 1855. He spent the remainder of his life at West Lebanon. For about twelve years he preached at White River Village, Vt., and for several years he supplied the pulpit at the upper and lower churches of Norwich, Vt. For a year or two he preached at West Lebanon, and for the last two years and a half of his life he preached at Queechy village, Vt. He died at West Lebanon, N. H., Jan. 15, 1861. As a preacher he was always acceptable, and never more so than during the last year of his life.—*Congregational Quarterly*, 1861, p. 213.

Hadès, a Greek word (*ᾅδης*, derived, according to the best established and most generally received etymology, from privative *α* and *ἰδεῖν*, hence often written *ἀΐδης*), means strictly *what is out of sight*, or possibly, if applied to a person, *what puts out of sight*. In earlier Greek this last was, if not its only, at least its prevailing application; in Homer it occurs only as the personal designation of Pluto, the lord of the invisible world, and who was probably so designated—not from being himself invisible, for that belonged to him in common with the heathen gods generally—but from his power to render mortals invisible—the invisible-making deity (see Crusius, *Homeric Lexicon*, s. v.). The Greeks, however, in process of time abandoned this use of *hades*, and when the Greek Scriptures were written the word was scarcely ever applied except to the place of the departed. In the classical writers, therefore, it is used to denote *Orcus*, or the infernal regions. In the Greek version of the Old Testament it is the common rendering for the Heb. שְׁאוֹל, *sheôl*, though in the form there often appears a remnant of the original personified application; for example, in Gen. xxxvii, 35, "I will go down to my son," *εἰς ᾅδου*, i. e. into the abodes or house of hades (*δόμους* or *οἶκον* being understood). This elliptical form was common both in the classics and in Scripture, even after *hades* was never thought of but as a region or place of abode.

1. The appropriation of *hades* by the Greek interpreters as an equivalent for *sheol* may undoubtedly be taken as evidence that there was a close agreement in the ideas conveyed by the two terms as currently understood by the Greeks and Hebrews respectively—a substantial, but not an entire agreement; for in this, as well as in other terms which related to subjects bearing on things spiritual and divine, the different religions of Jew and Gentile necessarily exercised a modifying influence; so that even when the same term was employed, and with reference generally to the same thing, shades of difference could not but exist in respect to the ideas understood to be indicated by them. Two or three points stand prominently out in the views entertained by the ancients respecting *hades:* first, that it was the *common* receptacle of departed spirits, of good as well as bad; second, that it was divided into two compartments, the one containing an Elysium of bliss for the good, the other a Tartarus of sorrow and punishment for the wicked; and, thirdly, that in respect to its locality, it lay under ground, in the mid-regions of the earth. So far as these points are concerned, there is no material difference between the Greek *hades* and the Hebrew *sheol*. This, too, was viewed as the common receptacle of the departed: patriarchs and righteous men spoke of going into it at their decease, and the most ungodly and worthless characters are represented as finding in it their proper home (Gen. xlii, 38; Psa. cxxxix, 8; Hos. xiii, 14; Isa. xiv, 9, etc.). A twofold division also in the state of the departed, corresponding to the different positions they occupied, and the courses they pursued on earth, is clearly implied in the revelations of Scripture on the subject, though with the Hebrews less prominently exhibited, and without any of the fantastic and puerile inventions of heathen mythology. Yet the fact of a real distinction in the state of the departed, corresponding to their spiritual conditions on earth, is in various passages not obscurely indicated. Divine retribution is represented as pursuing the wicked after they have left this world—pursuing them even into the lowest realms of *sheol* (Deut. xxxii, 22; Amos ix, 2); and the bitterest shame and humiliation are described as awaiting there the most prosperous of this world's inhabitants, if they have abused their prosperity to the dishonor of God and the injury of their fellow-men (Psa. xlix, 14. Isa. xiv). On the other hand, the righteous had hope in his death; he could rest assured that, in the viewless regions of *sheol*, as well as amid the changing vicissitudes of earth, the right hand of God would sustain him; even there he would enter into peace, walking still, as it were, in his uprightness (Prov. xiv, 32; Psa. cxxxix, 8; Isa. lvii, 2). That *sheol*, like *hades*, was conceived of as a lower region in comparison with the present world, is so manifest from the whole language of Scripture on the subject, that it is unnecessary to point to particular examples; in respect to the good as well as the bad, the passage into *sheol* was contemplated as a descent; and the name was sometimes used as a synonym for the very lowest depths (Deut. xxxii, 22; Job xi, 7-9). This is not, however, to be understood as affirming anything of the actual locality of disembodied spirits; for there can be no doubt that the language here, as in other cases, was derived from the mere appearances of things; and as the body at death was committed to the lower parts of the earth, so the soul was conceived of as also going downwards. But that this was not designed to mark the local boundaries of the region of departed spirits may certainly be inferred from other expressions used regarding them—as that God took them to himself; or that he would give them to see the path of life; that he would make them dwell in his house forever; or, more generally still, that the spirit of a man goeth upwards (Gen. v, 24; Psa. xvi, 11; xxiii, 6; Eccles. iii, 21; xii, 7). During the old dispensations there was still no express revelation from heaven respecting the precise condition or external relationships of departed spirits; the time had not yet come for such specific intimations; and the language employed was consequently of a somewhat vague and vacillating nature, such as spontaneously arose from common feelings and impressions. For the same reason, the ideas entertained even by God's people upon the subject were predominantly sombre and gloomy. *Sheol* wore no inviting aspect to their view, no more than *hades* to the superstitious heathen; the very men who believed that God would accompany them thither and keep them from evil, contemplated the state as one of darkness and silence, and shrunk from it with instinctive horror, or gave hearty thanks when they found themselves for a time delivered from it (Psa. vi, 5; xxx, 3, 9; Job iii, 13 sq.; Isa. xxxviii, 18). The reason was that they had only general assurances, but no specific light on the subject; and their comfort rather lay in overleaping the gulf of *sheol*, and fixing their thoughts on the better resurrection some time to come, than in anything they could definitely promise themselves between death and the resurrection-morn.

In this lay one important point of difference between the Jewish and the heathen *hades*, originated by the diverse spirit of the two religions, that to the believing Hebrew alone the sojourn in *sheol* appeared that only of a temporary and intermediate existence. The heathen had no prospect beyond its shadowy realms; its bars for him were eternal; and the idea of a resurrection was utterly strange alike to his religion and his philosophy. But it was in connection with the prospect of a resurrection from the dead that all hope formed itself in the breasts of the true people of God. As this alone could effect the reversion of the evil brought in by sin, and really destroy the destroyer, so nothing less was announced in that first promise which gave assurance of the crushing of the tempter; and though as to its nature but dimly apprehended by the eye of faith, it still necessarily formed, as to the reality, the great object of desire and expectation. Hence it is said of the

patriarchs that they looked for a better country, which is a heavenly one; and of those who in later times resisted unto blood for the truth of God, that they did it to obtain a better resurrection (Heb. xi, 16, 35). Hence, too, the spirit of prophecy confidently proclaimed the arrival of a time when the dead should arise and sing, when *sheol* itself should be destroyed, and many of its inmates be brought forth to the possession of everlasting life (Isa. xxvi, 19; Hos. xiii, 14; Dan. xii, 2). Yet again, in apostolic times, Paul represents this as emphatically the promise made by God to the fathers, to the realization of which his countrymen as with one heart were hoping to come (Acts xxvi, 7); and Josephus, in like manner, testifies of all but the small Sadducæan faction of them, that they believed in a resurrection to honor and blessing for those who had lived righteously in this life (*Ant.* xviii, 1, 3). This hope necessarily cast a gleam of light across the darkness of *hades* for the Israelite, which was altogether unknown to the Greek. Closely connected with it was another difference also of considerable moment, viz., that the Hebrew *sheol* was not, like the Gentile *hades*, viewed as an altogether separate and independent region, withdrawn from the primal fountain of life, and subject to another dominion than the world of sense and time. Pluto was ever regarded by the heathen as the rival of the king of earth and heaven; the two domains were essentially antagonistic. But to the more enlightened Hebrew there was but one Lord of the living and the dead; the chambers of *sheol* were as much open to his eye and subject to his control as the bodies and habitations of men on earth; so that to go into the realms of the deceased was but to pass from one department to another of the same all-embracing sway of Jehovah. See SHEOL.

2. Such was the general state of belief and expectation regarding *hades* or *sheol* in Old-Testament times. With the introduction of the Gospel a new light breaks in, which shoots its rays also through the realms of the departed, and relieves the gloom in which they had still appeared shrouded to the view of the faithful. The term *hades*, however, is of comparatively rare occurrence in New-Testament scripture; in our Lord's own discourses it is found only thrice, and on two of the occasions it is used in a somewhat rhetorical manner, by way of contrast with the region of life and blessing. He said of Capernaum, that from being exalted unto heaven it should be brought down to *hades* (Matt. xi, 23)—that is, plainly, from the highest point of fancied or of real elevation to the lowest abasement. Of that spiritual kingdom, also, or church, which he was going to establish on earth, he affirmed that "the gates of *hades* should not prevail against it" (Matt. xvi, 18), which is all one with saying that it should be perpetual. *Hades* is contemplated as a kind of realm or kingdom, accustomed, like earthly kingdoms in the East, to hold its council-chamber at the gates; and whatever measures might there be taken, whatever plots devised, they should never succeed in overturning the foundations of Christ's kingdom, or effectually marring its interests. In both these passages *hades* is placed by our Lord in an antagonistic relation to his cause among men, although, from the manner in which the word is employed, no very definite conclusions could be drawn from them as to the nature and position of *hades* itself. But in another passage—the only one in which any indication is given by our Lord of the state of its inhabitants—it is most distinctly and closely associated with the doom and misery of the lost: "In *hades*," it is said of the rich man in the parable, "he lifted up his eyes, being in torments" (Luke xvi, 23). The soul of Lazarus is, no doubt, also represented as being so far within the bounds of the same region that he could be descried and spoken with by the sufferer. Still, he was represented as sharing no common fate with the other, but as occupying a region shut off from all intercommunion with that assigned to the wicked, and, so far from being held in a sort of dungeon-confinement, as reposing in Abraham's bosom, in an abode where angels visit. With this also agrees what our Lord said of his own temporary sojourn among the dead, when on the eve of his departing thither—"To-day," said he, in his reply to the prayer of the penitent malefactor, "shalt thou be with me in paradise" (Luke xxiii, 43). But paradise was the proper region of life and blessing, not of gloom and forgetfulness; originally it was the home and heritage of man as created in the image of God; and when Christ now named the place whither he was going with a redeemed sinner paradise, it bespoke that already there was an undoing of the evil of sin, that for all who are Christ's there is an actual recovery immediately after death, and as regards the better part of their natures, of what was lost by the disobedience and ruin of the fall. See PARADISE.

But was not Christ himself in *hades?* Did not the apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost apply to him the words of David in Psa. xvi, in which it was said, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption," and argue apparently that the soul of Christ must have indeed gone to *hades*, but only could not be allowed to continue there (Acts ii, 27-31)? Even so, however, it would but concern the application of a name; for if the language of the apostle must be understood as implying that our Lord's soul was in *hades* between death and the resurrection, it still was *hades* as having a paradise within its bosom; so that, knowing from his own lips what sort of a receptacle it afforded to the disembodied spirit of Jesus, we need care little about the mere name by which, in a general way, it might be designated. But the apostle Peter, it must be remembered, does not call it *hades;* he merely quotes an Old-Testament passage, in which *hades* is mentioned, as a passage that had its verification in Christ; and the language of course in this, as in other prophetical passages, was spoken from an Old-Testament point of view, and must be read in the light which the revelations of the Gospel have cast over the state and prospects of the soul. We may even, however, go farther; for the Psalmist himself does not strictly affirm the soul of the Holy One to have gone to *hades;* his words precisely rendered are, "Thou wilt not leave (or abandon) my soul to *hades*"—that is, give it up as a prey to the power or domain of the nether world. It is rather a negative than a positive assertion regarding our Lord's connection with *hades* that is contained in the passage, and nothing can fairly be argued from it as to the local habitation or actual state of his disembodied spirit. See INTERMEDIATE STATE.

The only other passages in the New Testament in which mention is made of *hades* are in Revelation—ch. i, 18, where the glorified Redeemer declares that he has the keys of death and of *hades;* ch. vi, 8, where death is symbolized as a rider, smiting all around him with weapons of destruction, and *hades* following to receive the souls of the slain; ch. xx, 13, 14, where death and *hades* are both represented as giving up the dead that were in them, and afterwards as being themselves cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death. In every one of these passages *hades* stands in a dark and forbidding connection with death—very unlike that association with paradise and Abraham's bosom in which our Lord exhibited the receptacle of his own and his people's souls to the eye of faith; and not only so, but in one of them it is expressly as an ally of death in the execution of judgment that *hades* is represented, while in another it appears as an accursed thing, consigned to the lake of fire. In short, it seems as if in the progress of God's dispensations a separation had come to be made between elements that originally were mingled together—as if, from the time that Christ brought life and immortality to light, the distinction in the next world as well as this was broadened between the saved and the lost; so that *hades* was henceforth appropriated, both in the name and in the reality, to those who were to be reserved in darkness and misery to the judgment of the great day, and other names, with other and brighter

ideas, were employed to designate the intermediate resting-place of the redeemed. It was meet that it should be so; for by the personal work and mediation of Christ the whole Church of God rose to a higher condition; old things passed away, all things became new; and it is but reasonable to suppose that the change in some degree extended to the occupants of the intermediate state—the saved becoming more enlarged in the possession of bliss and glory, the lost more sunk in anguish and despair. See DEATH.

3. Such being the nature of the scriptural representation on the subject, one must not only condemn the fables that sprung up amid the dark ages about the limbus or antechamber of hell, and the purgatorial fires, through which it was supposed even redeemed souls had to complete their ripening for glory, but also reject the form in which the Church has embodied its belief respecting the personal history of Christ, when it said "descended into hell." This, it is well known, was a later addition to what has been called the Apostles' Creed, made when the Church was far on its way to the gloom and superstition of the Dark Ages. Though the words are capable of a rational and scriptural explanation, yet they do not present the place and character of our Lord's existence in the intermediate state as these are exhibited by himself; they suggest something painful, rather than, as it should be, blessed and triumphant; and, if taken in their natural sense, they would rob believers of that sure hope of an immediate transition into mansions of glory, which, as his followers and participants of his risen life, it is their privilege to entertain. See HELL.

4. There are two other terms so often associated in Scripture with *hades* as to render their signification in some measure synonymous.

(1.) *Abyss* (ἄβυσσος = ἄβυθος, *without bottom*). The Sept. uses this word to represent three different Hebrew words: 1. מְצוּלָה, *a depth* or *deep* place (Job xli, 23); or צֻלָה, the *deep*, the sea (Isa. xliv, 27). 2. רַחַב, *breadth*, a broad place (Job xxxvi, 16). 3. תְּהוֹם, a *mass of waters*, the sea (Gen. viii, 2, etc.), the chaotic mass of waters (Gen. i, 2; Psa. civ, 6), the subterraneous waters, "the deep that lieth under" (Gen. xlix, 25), "the deep that coucheth beneath" (Deut. xxxiii, 13). In the N. T. it is used always with the article, to designate the abode of the dead, *hades*, especially that part of it which is also the abode of devils and the place of woe (Rom. x, 7; Luke viii, 31; Rev. ix, 1, 2, 11; xi, 7; xvii, 8; xx, 1, 3). In the Revelation the word is always translated in the A. Vers. "bottomless pit," by Luther "Abgrund." In ix, 1, mention is made of "the key of the bottomless pit" (ἡ κλεὶς τοῦ φρέατος τῆς ἀβ., *the key of the pit of the abyss*), where *hades* is represented as a boundless depth, which is entered by means of a shaft covered by a door, and secured by a lock (Alford, Stuart, Ewald, De Wette, Düsterdieck). In ver. 11 mention is made of "the angel of the abyss," by whom some suppose is intended Satan or one of his angels. See ABYSS.

(2.) *Abaddon* (ἀβαδδών, from the Heb. אֲבַדּוֹן, *destruction*, the place of the dead, Job xxvi, 6; Prov. xv, 11), the name given in Rev. ix, 11 to "the angel of the abyss," and explained by the writer as equivalent to the Greek ἀπολλύων, *destroyer*. The term may be understood either as a personification of the idea of destruction, or as denoting the being supposed to preside over the regions of the dead, the angel of death. The Rabbins frequently use this term to denote the lowest regions of *sheol* or *hades* (*Erubin*, fol. xix, 1; *Sohar Num.* fol. 74; *Sohar Chadash*, fol. 22; comp. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Jud.* ii, 324 sq.); and the addition, "angel of the abyss," seems to favor the supposition that the president or king of this place is alluded to here. But it may be doubted whether the angelology of the Rabbins finds any sanction from the N. T., and it accords better with the general character of the passage to suppose a personification here of the idea of destruction, so that the symbol may find many realizations in the history of the Church: as there are many Antichrists, so doubtless are there many Apollyons. The identification of Abaddon with the Asmodæus of the Apocrypha and the Talmud rests upon no solid basis. See ABADDON.

5. A full view of the extensive literature of this subject more appropriately belongs to other heads; we here notice only a few treatises specially bearing upon the opposite states of the dead: *Jour. Sac. Lit.* October, 1852, p. 35 sq., April, 1853, p. 56 sq.; July, 1853, p. 413 sq.; Bickersteth, *Hades and Heaven* (Lond. 1865). See HEAVEN.

Ha'did (Heb. *Chadid'*, חָדִיד, *pointed*, perh. from its situation on some craggy eminence, Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 446; Sept. Ἀδώδ in Neh. xi, 31, elsewhere unites with preced. word, Λοδαδίδ; Vulgate *Hadid*), a place in the tribe of Benjamin, in the vicinity of Lod and Ono, whose inhabitants returned from the captivity to their old seat under Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 33, where some copies read חָרִיד, HARID; Neh. vii, 37; xi, 34). It is probably the same with one of the cities called ADIDA (q. v.) by Josephus (*War*, iv, 9, 1), but not that of the Apocrypha (1 Macc. xii, 38; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 15, 2). In the time of Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Adithaim), a town called *Aditha* (Ἀδαθά) existed to the east of Diospolis (Lydda). According to Schwarz (*Phys. Description of Palestine*, p. 134), it was identical with the present "village *el-Chadida*, situated 5 Eng. miles east of Lud, on the summit of a round mountain:" probably the same with that seen by Dr. Robinson, and called by him "*el-Haditheh*, a large village just at the mouth of a wady, as it issues from the hills east of Ludd into the plain" (new edit. of *Researches*, iii, 143, note). This district, although within the territory of Dan, belonged to Benjamin. The same place is described by the old Jewish traveller ha-Parchi as being "on the summit of a round hill," and identified by him, no doubt correctly, with Hadid (Zunz, in Asher's *Benj. of Tudela*, ii, 439).

Hadj (*Hadgi, Haj*, Arab.), *pilgrimage*, especially to Mecca. The name *hadj* is also given to the body of pilgrims to Mecca; and the word is defined to mean "aspiration." Every Mohammedan, male or female, is bound, once at least in his lifetime, to make the *hadj* to Mecca. Some Mohammedan authorities, however, hold that a substitute may be employed; while lunatics, slaves, and minors are free from the obligation. The solemnities at Mecca are held in the twelfth month of the Mohammedan year; and the male pilgrims, arriving at certain points near Mecca, put on the sacred habits and prepare their minds for the ceremonies. Arriving at Mecca, each pilgrim walks seven times around the Kaabah; next he visits Mount Arafat, twelve miles from Mecca, for prayer and instruction. The next night is spent in devotion at Mogdalipha, and the next day the pilgrim visits a sacred monument at the spot where Mohammed went to pray. The ceremonies end with sacrifices. Every returning pilgrim is styled Hadgi (Haji) thereafter.

Had'laï (Heb. *Chadlay'*, חַדְלַי, *resting;* Sept. Ἀδδὶ v. r. Ἐλδαΐ, Vulg. *Adali*), the father of Amasa, which latter was one of the Ephraimites who opposed the enslavement of the captives of Judah in the civil war between Pekah and Ahaz (2 Chron. xxviii, 12). B.C. ante 738.

Hado'ram (Heb. *Hadoram'*, הֲדוֹרָם, "defectively" הֲדֹרָם in Chron.; Fürst suggests [*Heb. Lex.* s. v.] = הָדוֹר רָם, *Hador* [i. e. *Ador*, the fire-god; see HADRAMMELECH] is *exalted;* the Sam. at Gen. x, 27 has *Adoram;* Sept. in Gen. x, 27, Ὀδοῤῥά, Vulg. *Aduram;* in 1 Chron. i, 21, Κεδουράν; in 1 Chron. xviii, 10, Ἀδουράμ; in 2 Chron. x, 18, Ἀδωράμ; Vulg. in all these last, *Adoram*), the name of three men.

1. ADORAM, the fifth son of Joktan, and progenitor of a tribe of the same name in Arabia Felix (Gen. x, 27; 1 Chron. i, 21). B.C. post 2414. Bochart (*Phaleg*, ii, 20) compares the *Dirmati* or *Drimati* on the Persian Gulf (Plin. vi, 32), and the promontory Κορόδαμον (Ras el-Had) of Ptol. vi, 7, 11. Michaelis (*Spicileg.* ii, 162) despairs of all identification of the tribe in question. Schulthess (*Parad.* p. 83) and Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* s. v.) think that the *Adramitæ* are meant, whom Ptolemy (Ἀδραμῖται, *Geog.* vi, 7) places on the southern shores of Arabia, between the Homeritæ (Hamyarites) and the Sochalitæ, an account with which Pliny ("*Atramitæ*," *Hist. Nat.* vi, 28, 32; xii, 14, 30) substantially agrees.—Winer, i, 453. Fresnel cites an Arab author who identifies Hadoram with *Jurhum* (4ᵐᵉ *Lettre*, *Journ. Asiatique*, iii série, vi, 220); but this is highly improbable; nor is the suggestion of *Hadhûrà*, by Caussin (*Essai* i, 30), more likely, the latter being one of the aboriginal tribes of Arabia, such as 'Ad, Thamûd, etc. See ARABIA.

2. HADORAM, son of Toi, king of Hamath, sent by his father (with valuable presents in the form of articles of antique manufacture [Josephus], in gold, silver, and brass) to congratulate David on his victory over their common enemy Hadarezer, king of Syria (1 Chron. xviii, 10). B.C. cir. 1034. In the parallel narrative of 2 Sam. viii, the name is given as JORAM; but this being a contraction of Jehoram, which contains the name of Jehovah, is peculiarly an Israelitish appellation. By Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 5, 4) he is called Ἀδώραμος.

3. ADONIRAM (q. v.), as he is elsewhere more fully called (1 Kings iv, 6; v, 14; Josephus constantly Ἀδώραμος) the son of Abda, the treasurer of taxes under Solomon, and who was stoned to death by the people of the northern tribes when sent by Rehoboam to exact the usual dues (2 Chron. x, 18).

Ha'drach (Heb. *Chadrak'*, חַדְרָךְ, signif. unknown, but possibly connected with *Hadar*—see HADORAM; Sept. Σεδράχ, Vulg. *Hadrach*), apparently the name of a country, and (as we may gather from the parallel member of the sole and obscure passage where it occurs) near or identical with Damascus (Zech. ix, 1). The meaning seems to be, "The utterance of the word of Jehovah respecting the land of Hadrach; and Damascus is the place upon which it rests." On the locality in question, great division of opinion exists. Adrichomius says, "Adrach, or Hadrach, *alias* Adra . . . is a city of Cœlesyria, about twenty-five miles from Bostra, and from it the adjacent region takes the name of Land of Hadrach. This was the land which formed the subject of Zechariah's prophecy" (*Theatrum Terræ Sanctæ*, p. 75). Rabbi Jose, a Damascene, according to Jarchi, declared he knew a place of this name east of Damascus; and Michaelis says (*Supplem.* p. 677), "To this I may add what I learned, in the year 1768, from Joseph Abbassi, a noble Arab of the country beyond Jordan. I inquired whether he knew a city called *Hadrakh* . . . He replied that there was a city of that name, which, though now small, had been the capital of a large region called the *land of Hadrakh*," etc. The two names, however, are entirely different (הדרך, *Hadrach;* Arab. *Edhr'a*), and there is no historical evidence that Edhr'a ever was the capital of a large territory. See EDREI. Yet corroborative of the existence of the place in question are the explicit statements of Cyril and Theodoret in commenting on the above passage. But to these it is objected that no modern traveller has heard of such a place in this region; Gesenius especially (*Thesaur. Heb.* p. 449) urges that the name could not have become extinct. Yet no other explanation of the word Hadrach hitherto offered is at all satisfactory (see Winer's *Realw.* s. v.). Movers suggests that Hadrach may be the name of one of the old deities (compare *Adores*, Justin, xxxvi, 2, and ATERGATIS) of Damascus (*Die Phönizier*, i, 478); and Bleek conjectures that reference is made to a king of that city (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1852, ii, 258). Henderson (*Comment.* ad loc.) supposes it to be only a corruption of חדד, the common names of the kings of Syria. See HADAR. Jarchi and Kimchi say, "Rabbi Juda interpreted it as an allegorical expression relating to the Messiah, Who is *harsh* (חד) to the heathen, and *gentle* (רך) to Israel." Jerome's interpretation is somewhat similar: "Et est ordo verborum; assumptio verbi Domini, *acuti* in peccatores, *mollis* in justos. Adrach quippe hoc resonat ex duobus integris nomen compositum: AD (חד) *acutum*, RACH (רך) *molle, tenerumque* significans" (*Comment. in Zach.* ad loc.). Hengstenberg (*Christol.* iii, 372) adopts the same etymology and meaning, but regards the word as a symbolical appellation of the Persian empire, whose overthrow by Alexander Zechariah here foretells. He says the prophet does not mention the real name, because, as he lived during the supremacy of Persia, such a reference would have exposed him to danger. See ZECHARIAH, BOOK OF.

Looking at the passage in what appears to be its plain and natural meaning, no scholar can deny that, according to the usual construction, the proper name following אֶרֶץ is the name of the "land" itself, or of the nation inhabiting the land, and the analogy presented by all the other names in the section is sufficient proof that this must be the case here (Hengstenberg, iii, 375). All the other names mentioned are well known—Damascus, Hamath, Tyre, Zidon, Gaza, etc.; it is natural to infer that *Hadrach* is also the name of a place known to the prophet. Its position is not accurately defined. The words of the passage do not connect it more closely with Damascus than with Hamath. It is remarkable that no such name is elsewhere found in ancient writers. The translators of the Sept. were ignorant of it. So was Jerome. No such place is now known. Yet this does not prove that there never was such a name. Many ancient names have disappeared, as it seems to be the case with this (see Alphens, *Diss. de terra Chadrach*, Tr. ad Rhen. 1723; also in Ugolino, vii). See DAMASCUS.

Hadrian, POPE. See ADRIAN.

Hadrianus, P. ÆMILIUS, the 14th Roman emperor (from A.D. 117–138), was a relative and the ward of Trajan, and married Julia Sabina, the granddaughter of Marciana. sister of that emperor. In regard to the place of his birth, the statement of Spartianus (*De vita Hadriani*, i) that he was born at Rome Jan. 24, A.D. 76, is generally regarded as the more reliable, though others name Italica in Spain, where his ancestors had settled in the time of Scipio (see Eutropius, viii, 6, and Eusebius, *Chronicon*, No. 2155, p. 166, ed. Scaliger). Aided by the preference of Trajan's wife, Plotina, and showing himself capable in the positions intrusted to him, he rose rapidly, and on the death of Trajan succeeded to the empire, having been either really adopted as his successor by that emperor, or palmed off as such by Plotina and her party. For a statement of the conflicting opinions on this point, see Spartianus (*De vita Hadriani*, iv) and Dion Cassius (lxix, 1). When Hadrian assumed the reins of government (A.D. 117), he found the quiet of the empire threatened at several points, but, adopting a general policy of peace, he succeeded in preventing outbreaks and invasions in nearly every instance. In furtherance of this peaceful policy, he withdrew the legions from the conquests of his predecessor beyond the Tigris and Euphrates, and would have also abandoned Dacia had not populous Roman colonies existed there.

Impelled by curiosity, or, more probably, by a desire to see for himself the condition of the empire, he journeyed extensively through it, leaving everywhere monuments of his munificence in temples, aqueducts, and other useful or ornamental works. He made many improvements in the laws, and the *Edictum perpetuum Hadriani* (a codification of prætorial edicts made by his orders) marked an æra in the historical development of

the Roman law. Hadrian, though a voluptuary in private life, was a patron of the arts and of learning; was fond of the society of artists, poets, scholars, philosophers, etc., and even aspired to rank among them; but his inferior taste, his jealousy, his overweening vanity, and his impatience of rivalry and contradiction led him often to acts of cruel injustice towards the learned men he gathered about him.

His conduct towards the Christians was marked by a sense of justice. The proconsul of Asia Minor having complained to Hadrian that the people at their festivals demanded the execution of Christians, he issued a rescript forbidding such executions, and requiring that all complaints against the Christians should be made in legal form. Though this edict failed to secure immunity to Christians from persecution, since the fourth persecution occurred during his reign, Hadrian was not classed by Melito, Tertullian, or Eusebius among their persecutors, and his reign is regarded as in general favorable to the progress of Christianity. Ælius Lampridius (*Alexander Severus*, 43), indeed, mentions a report that Hadrian purposed to erect temples to Christ, as one of the gods, but was deterred by the priests, who declared that all would become Christians if he did so. This story is, however, generally regarded as unworthy of credit. The tolerant spirit or indifference of Hadrian towards religious opinions and practices disapproved of and even ridiculed by him is shown by his letter to Servianus, preserved in Vopiscus (*Severus*, 8), and by the fact that though a zealous worshipper of the *Sacra* of his native country, hè also adopted the Egyptian *Cultus*.

The peace of his reign was broken by one serious war. Among the Jews a spirit of discontent had been kept alive ever since the capture of Jerusalem by Titus. Wishing to eradicate this spirit by the destruction of the Jewish nationality, Hadrian issued an edict forbidding the practice of circumcision, and determined to erect on the ruins of Jerusalem a new Roman city, to be called after himself, Ælia Capitolina. Consequently a furious revolt of the Jews broke out under the lead of Bar Cochba, a pretended messiah, and it was only after having suffered great losses, and having almost exterminated the Jewish nation (500,000 Jews are said to have perished), that the imperial armies succeeded in crushing the revolt, although the able general, Julius Severus, had been called from the distant shores of Britain to lead them. Ælia Capitolina rose over the ruins of the Holy City, but the Jew was forbidden, on the pain of death, to enter it, and from that time the race was dispersed through the world. Antoninus Pius annulled the prohibition of circumcision. Hadrian died at Baiæ July 10, 138; but his last days had been marked by such outrageous cruelties that Antoninus, his successor, with difficulty secured the customary honors to his memory.—Spartianus, *De vita Hadriani* (in *Scriptores Historiæ Augustæ*, Teubner's edit.); Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* ii, 319 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* i, 301 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 446; Sharpe, *History of Egypt*, xv, 14–31. (J. W. M.)

Hæmorrhage. See Issue.

Hæm'orrhoids (טְחוֹרִים, *techorim'*, prob. *tumores ani*, i. e. *the piles*, so called as *protruded* [the root is טָחַר, to *stretch*] from the fundament, or from the *straining* or tenesmus with flow of blood, which the Masorites have everywhere inserted in the margin for the textual [but apparently more vulgar and less proper] word עֳפָלִים, *ophalim'*, lit. *hills*, spoken also in the Arab. of a "*tumor* in ano virorum vel in pudendis mulierum" [see Schroeder, *Orig. Heb.* iv, 54; Schultens, *ad Meidanii Prov.* p. 23]; Sept. and Vulg. understand a *sore in the secret parts*), a painful disease with which the Philistines were afflicted by God as a punishment for detaining the sacred ark at Ashdod after they had captured it in battle (2 Sam. v, 6). The word also occurs among the physical curses denounced upon the Israelites by Moses in case of apostasy (Deut. xxviii, 27). Interpreters are not agreed on the exact signification of the original terms, nor on the nature of the disease, although most think that those painful tumors in the fundament are meant which sometimes turn into ulcers, i. e. *the piles* (Psa. lxxviii, 66). Others regard it as the name of the fundament itself, *podex* (Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 382; see Fuller in *Miscel. Sac.* v, 3; Kanne, *Die Goldene Aerse der Philist.* Nurimb. 1820). The Sept. and Vulg. add to ver. 9 that the Philistines made seats of skins, upon which to sit with more ease, by reason of their indisposition. Herodotus seems to have had some knowledge of this history, but has assigned another cause (i, 105). He says the Scythians, having plundered the temple of Venus at Askalon, a celebrated city of the Philistines, the goddess, who was worshipped there, afflicted them with a peculiar disease (θήλεια νόσος). The Philistines, perhaps, thus related the story; but it evidently passed for truth that this disease was ancient, and had been sent among them by some avenging deity. To remedy this suffering, and to remove the ravages committed by rats, which wasted their country, the Philistines were advised by their priests and soothsayers to return the ark of God with the following offerings (1 Sam. vi, 1–18): five figures of a golden emerod, that is, of the part afflicted, and five golden rats; hereby acknowledging that this plague was the effect of divine justice. This advice was followed; and Josephus (*Ant.* vi, 1, 1, δυσεντερία; Aquila, τὸ τῆς φαγεδαίνης ἕλκος) and others believed that the five cities of the Philistines made each a statue, which they consecrated to God as votive offerings for their deliverance. This, however, seems to have originated from the figures of the rats. The heathen frequently offered to their gods figures representing those parts of the body which had been diseased (see Frey, *De more simulacra membrorum consecrandi*, Altd. 1746); and such kinds of *ex votis* are still frequent in Catholic countries, being consecrated in honor of some saint who is supposed to have wrought the cure: they are images of wax or of metal, exhibiting those parts of the body in which the disease was seated. The Scholiast on Aristophanes (*Acharn.* 231) mentions a similar plague (followed by a similar subsequent propitiation to that mentioned in Scripture), as sent upon the Athenians by Bacchus. The opinion mentioned by Winer (s. v. Philister), as advanced by Lichtenstein (in Eichhorn's *Biblioth.* vi, 405-467), that the plague of emerods and that of mice are one and the same, the former being caused by an insect (*solpuga*) as large as a field-mouse, is hardly worth serious attention. Kitto thinks that they were rather *talismans* specially formed under astrological calculations for the purpose of obviating the effects of the disease (*Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.). The words of 1 Sam. v, 12, "The men that *died not* were smitten with emerods," show that the disease was not necessarily fatal. It is clear from its parallelism with "botch" and other diseases in Deut. xxviii, 27, that עֳפָלִים is a disease, not a part of the body (see Beyer, *De hæmorrhoidibus ex lege Mosaica*, Lips. 1792). Now 1 Sam. v, 11 speaks of the images of the emerods after they were actually made and placed in the ark. It thus appears probable that the former word means the disease and the latter the part affected, which must necessarily have been included in the actually existing image, and have struck the eye as *the essential* thing represented, to which the disease was an incident. As some morbid swelling, then, seems the most probable nature of the disease, so no more probable conjecture has been advanced than that *hæmorrhoidal tumors* or bleeding piles, known to the Romans as *mariscæ* (Juv. ii, 13), are intended. These are very common in Syria at present, Oriental habits of want of exercise and improper food, producing derangement of the liver, constipation, etc., being such as to cause them. See Disease.

Haemstede, Adriaan van, one of the first preach-

ers of the Reformed faith in the Netherlands, was probably born about the year 1525 in Schouwen. The parents of Adriaan seem to have been among the earliest in Zealand to embrace the Reformed faith. He understood several modern languages, and wrote in both Latin and Dutch. His Dutch style is remarkable for perspicuity and strength. Adriaan was in 1557 ministering to the Reformed church in Antwerp, and his labors there were eminently successful. Deeply sympathizing with the persecuted Protestants in France, he wrote in Latin a letter to Henry the Second of France, in which he remonstrates with him and pleads with him to exercise clemency. This letter is dated Dec. 1, 1557, and is thus in advance of the measures set on foot by Calvin and Beza in behalf of these persecuted followers of Christ. Van Haemstede in this letter suggests a conference such as was held at Poissy in 1562. Van der Heiden, sent at his request by the church at Emden to assist him at Antwerp, having arrived, he took occasion to leave for a time (Feb. 1558). During his absence dark clouds gathered, and soon after his return the storm burst. Van der Heiden, whose place of preaching had been betrayed by a woman, escaped. Van Haemstede remained, though a price was set upon his head, and certain death awaited him if captured. His two faithful helpers, Gillis and Antoine Verdikt, were both burned at Brussels. He left Antwerp probably in March, 1559, and sought refuge in Ost Friesland. Subsequently he labored for a short time at Groningen, and was thence sent to England to take charge of a Reformed church in London. He espoused the cause of the better class of Anabaptists, so far as to maintain that they should not be punished for their doctrinal error respecting the humanity of Christ, since they acknowledged his divinity, and depended on him for salvation. This view was in direct conflict with the views and practice of Cranmer and Ridley, who had in 1551 condemned to the flames Joris van Parre, a Netherlander of irreproachable morals, simply on account of his doctrinal belief. As the church which Haemstede served was at this time under the supervision of Edmund Grindal, bishop of London, he was called to account for his views, and, adhering to them, was banished from the kingdom. On his return to Holland he was deprived of all his property. Emden, too, refused to receive him. He bore his trials and privations in a truly Christian manner. At the earnest request of many of the London congregation, he finally went thither again. The bishop of London demanded a recantation. He refused. Again he was banished. With a heavy heart he returned to Friesland, where he soon after died. His death occurred in 1562. In his views of religious liberty he was far in advance of his age, and fell a victim to the reigning spirit of intolerance. He was the author of the first Book of Martyrs published in the Netherlands. It is conjectured that it was first published at Antwerp during the persecution, and issued in sheets as it was prepared. The original edition, which is extremely rare, is in small quarto, bearing the author's name, but not the place of its publication. It met with great favor, and for two centuries it was the manual of thousands, having passed through many successive editions. See an able and interesting monograph of Rev. Joh. ab Utrecht Dresselhuis in the vith vol. of Kist and Rayaard's *Archief voor Kerkelijke Geschiedenis, inzonderheid van Nederland* (Leyd. 1835); Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, D. ii. (J. P. W.)

Haendel. See Handel.

Hæretici. See Heretic.

Hæretico comburendo, a writ which, in England, "anciently lay against a heretic, who, having once been convicted of heresy by his bishop, and having abjured it, afterwards falling into it again, or into some other, is thereupon committed to the secular power. This writ is thought by some to be as ancient as the common law itself; however, the conviction of heresy by the common law was not in any petty ecclesiastical court, but before the archbishop himself, in a provincial synod, and the delinquent was delivered up to the king, to do with him as he pleased; so that the crown had a control over the spiritual power; but by 2 Henry IV, cap. 15, the diocesan alone, without the intervention of a synod, might convict of heretical tenets; and unless the convict abjured his opinions, or if, after abjuration, he relapsed, the sheriff was bound, *ex officio*, if required by the bishop, to commit the unhappy victim to the flames, without waiting for the consent of the crown. This writ remained in force, and was actually executed on two Anabaptists in the seventh of Elizabeth, and on two Arians in the ninth of James I. Sir Edward Coke was of opinion that this writ did not lie in his time; but it is now formally taken away by statute 29 Car. II, cap. 9. But this statute does not extend to take away or abridge the jurisdiction of Protestant archbishops, or bishops, or any other judges of any ecclesiastical courts, in cases of atheism, blasphemy, heresy, or schism; but they may prove and punish the same, according to his majesty's ecclesiastical laws, by excommunication, deprivation, degradation, and other ecclesiastical censures, not extending to death, in such sort, and no other, as they might have done before the making of this act."—Buck, *Theological Dictionary*, s. v.

Haevernick. See Hävernick.

Hafenreffer, Matthias (also *Haffenreffer*), a Lutheran theologian, was born June 24, 1561, at Lorch, in Würtemberg, and died Oct. 22, 1619 at Tübingen. He studied philosophy and theology at the last-named place, and in 1590 was made court-preacher and counsellor of the Consistory at Stuttgart; in 1592 became professor of theology, and in 1617 chancellor and provost at Tübingen. To a profound and comprehensive learning, he united a sweet and peace-loving disposition, which led him to keep aloof for the most part from the theological strifes of his age, and to find his pleasures in directing and stimulating the studies of his pupils, to whose affectionate appreciation of him Val. Andreä and others bear testimony. His chief work, *Loci theologici certa methodo ac ratione in tres libros tributi* (Tübingen, 1600; an improved and enlarged ed. 1603), published at the request of Frederick, duke of Würtemberg, for the use of prince John Frederick, was regarded as a model not only of Lutheran orthodoxy, but also of clearness and definiteness in conception, and expression and simplicity in style. It was the text-book of theology at Tübingen up to the end of the 17th century, supplanting Heerbrand's *Compendium*, which had long been of almost symbolical authority there. By royal decree it was, in 1612, made the official text-book of dogmatics in the University of Upsala and other Swedish institutions of learning. Charles XII is said to have almost known it by heart. Hafenreffer wrote also some controversial works against the Romanists and Calvinists, and a work entitled *Templum Ezechielis* (Tübingen, 1613, fol.).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 469. (J. W. M.)

Haffner, Isaac, a French Protestant minister and distinguished humanist, was born at Strasburg in 1751. After studying at Paris and visiting several of the German universities, he was ordained, and soon acquired great reputation as a preacher in Strasburg. He became subsequently dean of the theological faculty of that city, and died there May 27, 1831. He had been instrumental in restoring in part the old university of Strasburg under the title of *Protestant Theological Academy*, which was afterwards changed to *Protestant Seminary*. At the inauguration he delivered an address, printed under the title *Des Secours que l'étude des langues, de l'histoire, de la philosophie et de la littérature offre à la theologie* (Strasb. 1803, 8vo); he wrote also *De l'Education littéraire, ou essai sur l'organisation d'un établissement pour les hautes sciences* (Strasb. 1792, 8vo). Discourses delivered on the anniversary of his 50th year in the ministry were published under the title *Jubilé d'Haffner* (French and German, Strasb. 1831, 8vo). See

Oberlin, *Almanach d'Alsace;* M. Henrion, *Annales biographiques* (1831, 1854), vol. ii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxiii, 80.

Haft (נִצָּב, *nitstsab'*, *firm*), the *handle* of a weapon, e. g. of a dagger (Judg. iii, 22). See KNIFE.

Haftorah (also *Haftaroth*) is the name applied to fifty-four portions or sections of the Pentateuch selected by the Jews for Sabbath reading in the synagogue, under Antiochus Epiphanes, who forbid them reading the law. Previous to his time the Pentateuch was divided into *sidras*. In Palestine the number of sections required three years for the public reading of the whole Pentateuch, but in Babylonia, the reading, arranged as above referred to, was done in one year.—Fürst, *Kulturgeschichte*, i, 60; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebr. Lit.* p. 201. See HAPHTARAH. (J. H. W.)

Ha'gab (Heb. *Chagab'*, חָגָב, a *locust;* Sept. Ἀγάβ), one of the Nethinim whose descendants returned from Babylon under Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 46). B.C. ante 536. See HAGABA.

Hag'aba (Heb. *Chagaba'*, חֲגָבָא, a *locust*, a Chaldaizing form; Sept. Ἀγαβά v. r. Ἀγγαβά, Vulg. *Hagaba*, Neh. vii, 48) or HAG'ABAH (Heb. *Chagabah'*, חֲגָבָה, *id.;* Sept. Ἀγαβά, Vulg. *Hagaba*, Ezra ii, 45), one of the Nethinim whose descendants returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel. B.C. ante 536. See AGABUS; HAGAB.

Hagany, JOHN B., D.D., an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the city of Wilmington, Delaware, August 26, 1808, of Methodist parentage, and entered the itinerant ministry in 1831. His ministry was from the first very successful. During his long career of thirty-four years he filled many of the most important stations of his Church in the Middle States, among them Pottsville, Pa.; St. George's, Ebenezer, and Trinity churches, Philadelphia; the Vestry Street, Mulberry Street, St. Paul's, and Bedford Street churches, New York City; Sands Street, Brooklyn, and Thirtieth Street, New York, where he closed his labors with his life, June 28, 1865.

Dr. Hagany was an eloquent preacher. He had a sweet-toned voice, a calm rather than a fervid temperament, a quick, tender sympathy, by which he was readily affected himself, and could readily affect others to tears. His memory was retentive, and enabled him to command instantly all his resources. In the early Methodist literature, and the English classics of the 17th century, he was unusually well read, and his citations from his favorite authors pleasantly spiced his conversation. Withal there was a vein of humor running through his speaking and writing which gave a flavor to both. His literary remains consist chiefly of essays contributed to religious and other periodicals. One of these, on John Wesley, furnished to Harper's *Magazine*, is one of the most striking characterizations of the great reformer extant. On the last Sunday of his life, June 25th, he preached to his congregation from the text, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his." Not having finished his discourse, he announced that he would conclude it the next time he preached. On the evening of that day he was too unwell to go into the pulpit. On Wednesday afternoon he was sitting in his chair, reading from the sermons of Rev. Jonathan Seed, an old favorite of John Wesley. Meeting in Seed with a passage which greatly pleased him, he called his wife, and began reading it aloud to her. While reading he was seized with a spasm of pain in the chest; the book was dropped, he leaned his head upon his hand, his arm upon the table before him, and in a few minutes it was all over. He had nearly completed his fifty-seventh year, and the thirty-fourth of his ministry. (G. R. C.)

Ha'gar (Heb. *Hagar'*, הָגָר, *flight*, apparently from her abandonment of her mistress; but according to others, a *stranger*, from her foreign birth [comp. HAGARENE]; Sept. and N. T. Ἄγαρ), a native of Egypt, and servant of Abraham (Gen. xxi, 9, 10), perhaps one of the female slaves presented to Abraham by Pharaoh during his visit to Egypt (Gen. xii, 16), although she properly belonged to Sarah (Gen. xvi, 1). The long-continued sterility of Sarah suggested to her the idea (not uncommon in the East) of becoming a mother by proxy through her handmaid, whom, with that view, she gave to Abraham as a secondary wife (Gen. xv). B.C. 2078. See ABRAHAM; ADOPTION; CONCUBINE. This honor was too great and unexpected for the weak and ill-regulated mind of Hagar; and no sooner did she find herself likely to become the mother of her master's heir than she openly indulged in triumph over her less favored mistress. The feelings of Sarah were severely wounded, and she broke out to her husband in loud complaints of the servant's petulance. Abraham, whose meek and prudent behavior is strikingly contrasted with the violence of his wife, left her with unfettered power, as mistress of his household, to take what steps she pleased to obtain the required redress. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.) In all Oriental states where concubinage is legalized, the principal wife has authority over the rest; the secondary one, if a slave, retains her former condition unchanged, and society thus presents the strange anomaly of a woman being at once the menial of her master and the partner of his bed. This permission, however, was necessary in an Eastern household, but it is worthy of remark that it is now very rarely given; nor can we think, from the unchangeableness of Eastern customs, and the strongly-marked national character of those peoples, that it was usual anciently to allow a wife to deal hardly with a slave in Hagar's position. Left with this authority over her dotal maid-servant, Sarah was neither reluctant nor sparing in making the minion reap the fruits of her insolence; but whether she actually inflicted blows (Augustine, *Epist.* xlviii), or merely threw out menaces to that effect, cannot be determined from the verb עִנָּה (to "*afflict*"), there employed. Sensible, at length, of the hopelessness of getting the better of her mistress, Hagar determined on flight; and having seemingly formed the purpose of returning to her relations in Egypt, she took the direction of that country, which led her to what was afterwards called Shur, through a long tract of sandy uninhabited country, lying on the west of Arabia Petræa, to the extent of 150 miles between Palestine and Egypt. Here she was sitting by a fountain to replenish her skin-bottle or recruit her wearied limbs, when the angel of the Lord appeared, and in the kindliest manner remonstrated with her on the course she was pursuing, and encouraged her to return by the promise that she would ere long have a son, whom Providence destined to become a great man, and whose wild and irregular features of character would be indelibly impressed on the mighty nation that should spring from him. Obedient to the heavenly visitor, and having distinguished the place by the name of Beer-lahai-roi (q. v.), "the well of the visible God," Hagar retraced her steps to the tent of Abraham, where in due time she had a son; and, having probably narrated this remarkable interview to Abraham, that patriarch, as directed by the angel, called the name of the child Ishmael, "God hath heard" (Gen. xvi). B.C. 2078. Fourteen years after the birth of Ishmael the appearance of the long-promised heir entirely changed the relations of the family, though nothing materially affecting Ishmael took place till the weaning of Isaac, which, as is generally thought, was at the end of his third year. B.C. 2061. Ishmael was then fully capable of understanding his altered relations to the inheritance; and when the newly-weaned child, clad, according to custom, with the sacred symbolic robe, which was the badge of the birthright, was formally installed heir of the tribe (see *Biblioth. Bibl.* vol. i; Vicasi, *Annot.* p. 32; Bush on Gen. xxvii, 15), he inconsiderately gave vent to his disap-

pointed feelings by an act of mockery (Gen. xxi, 9—the Hebrew word צָחַק, though properly signifying "to laugh," is frequently used to express strong derision, as in Gen. xix, 14; Neh. ii, 19; iv, 1; Ezek. xxiii, 32; accompanied, as is probable on some of the occasions referred to in these passages, with violent gestures, which might very justly be interpreted as persecution, Gal. iv, 29). The procedure of Abraham in awarding the inheritance to Isaac was guided by the special command of God, and, moreover, was in harmony with the immemorial practice of the East, where the son of a slave or secondary wife is always supplanted by that of a free woman, even if born long after. This insulting conduct of Ishmael gave offence to Sarah, such that she insisted upon his expulsion from the family, together with his mother as conniving at it. So harsh a measure was extremely painful to Abraham; but his scruples were removed by the divine direction to follow Sarah's advice (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.), "for," adds the Targum of Jonathan, "she is a prophetess" (compare Gal. iv, 30). Accordingly, "Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread, and a bottle of water (and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder), and the child, and sent her away" (Gen. xxi, 14). B.C. 2061. In spite of instructions, the two exiles missed their way. Overcome by fatigue and thirst, the strength of the young Ishmael first gave way, and his mother laid him down in complete exhaustion under one of the stunted shrubs of this arid region, in the hope of his obtaining some momentary relief from smelling the damp in the shade, while she withdrew to a little distance, unable to witness his lingering sufferings, and there "she lifted up her voice and wept.". In this distress, the angel of the Lord appeared with a comforting promise of her son's future greatness, and directed her to a fountain, which, concealed by the brushwood, had escaped her notice, and from which she now revived the almost lifeless Ishmael. This well, according to the tradition of the Arabs (who pay great honor to the memory of Hagar, and maintain that she was Abraham's lawful wife), is Zemzem, near Mecca. (See Weil's *Bibl. Legends*, p. 82.) Of the subsequent history of Hagar we have no account beyond what is involved in that of Ishmael, who established himself in the wilderness of Paran, in the neighborhood of Sinai, was married by his mother to a countrywoman of her own, and maintained both himself and his family by the produce of his bow (Gen. xxi, 20, 21). See ISHMAEL. In Gal. iv, 24, the apostle Paul, in an allegory, makes Hagar (τὸ Ἄγαρ) represent the Jewish Church, which was in bondage to the ceremonial law, as Sarah represents the true Church of Christ, which is free from this bondage. (See Bloomfield's *Note*, ad loc.) Some commentators, however, have discovered an alliteration in the name here with the Arab. word for *stone* (*hajar*). According to Mohammedan tradition, Hagar (*Hajir*) was buried at Mecca! (D'Herbelot, *Bib. Or.* s. v. Hagiar). Mr. Rowlands, in travelling through the desert of Beersheba, discovered some wells and a stone mansion, which he declares the Arabs still designate as those of Hagar! (Williams, *Holy City*, i, 465 sq.). See ABRAHAM.

Hagaréne or **Hag'arite** [commonly *Ha'garite*] (Heb. *Hagri'*, הַגְרִי, *fugitive* [compare *Hagar*, from the same root as the Arab. *Hegirah*, i. e. *flight*]; but, according to Fürst, s. v., a patrial from some ancestor Hagar, otherwise unknown; 1 Chron. xi, 38, Sept. Ἀγαραΐ, Vulg. *Agarai*, A. V. "Haggeri;" xxvii, 31, Ἀγαρίτης, *Agarius*, "Haggerite;" in the plur. *Hagrim'*, הַגְרִים, Psa. lxxxiii, 6, Ἀγαρηνοί, *Agareni*, "Hagarenes;" fully *Hagriim'*, הַגְרִאִים, 1 Chron. v, 10, 19, 20, Sept. in ver. 10 πάροικοι, in ver. 19, 20 Ἀγαραῖοι, Vulg. *Aagarei*, A. V. "Hagarites;" Baruch iii, 23, υἱοὶ Ἄγαρ, *filii Agar*, "Agarenes"), occurs apparently as the national or local designation of two individuals, and also of a tribe or region, probably the same Arab people who appear at different periods of the sacred history as foreigners to the Hebrews. See ARABIA.

I. Of *individuals* it is twice used in connection with the royal staff in the time of David (q. v.).

1. In 1 Chron. xi, 38 of MIBHAR (q. v.), one of David's mighty men, who is described as בֶּן־הַגְרִי, υἱὸς Ἀγαρί, *filius Agarai*, "the son of Haggeri," or, better (as the margin has it), "the Haggerite," whose father's name is not given. This hero differs from some of his colleagues, "Zelek the Ammonite" (ver. 39), for instance; or "Ithmah the Moabite" (ver. 46), in that, while they were foreigners, he was only the son of a foreigner—a domiciled settler perhaps. See HAGGERI.

2. In 1 Chron. xxvii, 31 of JAZIZ (q. v.), another of David's retainers, who was "over his flocks." This man was himself a "Hagarite," ὁ Ἀγαρίτης, *Agareus*. A comparison of the next paragraph (II) will show how well qualified for his office this man was likely to be from his extraction from a pastoral race. ("A Hagarite had charge of David's flocks, and an Ishmaelite of his herds, because the animals were pastured in districts where these nomadic people were accustomed to feed their cattle" [or, rather, because their experience made them skilful in such employments], Bertheau *on Chronicles* [Clarke's ed.], ii, 320.) One of the effects of the great victory over the Hagarites of Gilead and the East was probably that individuals of their nation entered the service of the victorious Israelites, either voluntarily or by coercion, as freemen or as slaves. Jaziz was no doubt among the former, a man of eminence and intelligence among his countrymen, on which account he attracted the attention of his royal master, who seems to have liberally employed distinguished and meritorious foreigners in his service. See HAGGERITE.

II. Of a *people* three times who appear in hostile relation to the Hebrew nation.

1. Our first passage treats of a great war, which in the reign of king Saul was waged between the trans-Jordanic tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh on the one side, and their formidable neighbors, the Hagarites, aided by the kindred tribes of "Jetur, and Nephish, and Nodab," on the other. (*Kindred* tribes, we say, on the evidence of Gen. xxv, 15. The Arab tribes derived from Hagar and Ishmael, like the earlier stocks descended from Cush and Joktan, were at the same time generally known by the common patronymic of Ishmaelites or Hagarenes. Some regard the three specific names of Jetur, Nephish, and Nodab, not as distinct from, but in apposition with Hagarites; as if the Hagarites with whom the two tribes and a half successfully fought were the clans of Jetur, Nephish, and Nodab. See Forster's *Geog. of Arabia*, i, 186–189.) The result of this war was extremely favorable to the eastern Israelites: many of the enemy were taken and many slain in the conflict (ver. 21, 22); the victorious two tribes and a half took possession of the country, and retained it until the captivity (ver. 22). The booty captured on this occasion was enormous: "of camels 50,000, and of sheep 250,000, and of asses 2000" (ver. 21). Rosenmüller (*Bibl. Geogr.* [tr. by Morren], iii, 140), following the Sept. and Luther, unnecessarily reduces the number of camels to 5000. When it is remembered that the wealth of a Bedouin chief, both in those and these times, consisted of cattle, the amount of the booty taken in the Hagarite war, though great, was not excessive. Job's stock is described as "7000 sheep, 3000 camels, 500 yoke of oxen, and 500 she-asses" (i, 3). Mesha, king of Moab, paid to the king of Israel a tribute of 100,000 lambs and 100,000 rams (2 Kings iii, 4). In further illustration of this wealth of cattle, we may quote a passage from Stanley's *Jewish Church*, i, 215, 216: "Still the countless flocks and herds may be seen [in this very region conquered from the Hagarites], droves of cattle moving on like troops of soldiers, descending at sunset to drink of the springs—literally, in the language of the prophet, 'rams and lambs, and goats and bullocks, all of them fatlings of Bashan.'" By this conquest, which was still

more firmly ratified in the subsequent reign of David, the promise, which was given as early as Abraham's time (Gen. xv, 18) and renewed to Moses (Deut. i, 7) and to Joshua (i, 4), began to receive that accomplishment which was consummated by the glorious Solomon (1 Kings iv, 21). The large tract of country which thus accrued to Israel stretched from the indefinite frontier of the pastoral tribes, to whom were formerly assigned the kingdoms of Sihon and Og, to the Euphrates. A comparison of 1 Chron. v, 9-20 with Gen. xxv, 12-18, seems to show that this line of country, which (as the history informs us) extended eastward of Gilead and Bashan in the direction of the Euphrates, was substantially the same as that which Moses describes as peopled by the sons of Ishmael, whom Hagar bore to Abraham. "They dwelt," says Moses, "from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt as thou goest towards Assyria"—in other words, across the country from the junction of the Euphrates with the Tigris to the isthmus of Suez; and this is the spacious tract which we assign to the Hagarites or Hagarenes. The booty taken from the Hagarites and their allies proves that much of this territory was well adapted to pasturage, and therefore valuable to the nomadic habits of the conquerors (Numb. xxxii, 1). The brilliancy of the conquest, moreover, exhibits the military prowess of these shepherds. Living amid races whose love of plunder is still illustrated in the predatory Bedouins of Eastern Palestine, they were obliged to erect fortresses for the protection of their pastures (Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, art. xxiii), a precaution which seems to have been resorted to from the first. The sons of Ishmael are enumerated, Gen. xxv, 16, "by their towns and by their *castles;*" and some such defensive erections were no doubt meant by the children of Reuben and Gad in Numb. xxxii, 16, 17. See ISHMAELITES.

2. Though these eastern Israelites became lords paramount of this vast tract of country, it is not necessary to suppose that they exclusively occupied the entire region, nor that the Hagarites and their kindred, though subdued, were driven out; for it was probably in the same neighborhood that "the Hagarenes" of our second passage were living when they joined in the great confederacy against Israel with, among others, Edom, and Moab, and Ammon, and Amalek (Psa. lxxxiii, 6 [Heb. 7; Sept. lxxii, 6]). When this combination took place is of little importance here; Mr. Thrupp (*Psalms*, ii, 60, 61) gives reasons for assigning it to the reigns of Jehoash and of his son Jeroboam II. The psalm was probably written on the triumph of Jehoshaphat over the trans-Jordanic Bedouins (2 Chron. xx). See PSALMS. The nations, however, which constituted the confederacy with the Hagarenes, seem to confirm our opinion that *these* were still residing in the district, where in the reign of Saul they had been subjugated by their Israelitish neighbors. Rosenmüller (*Bibl. Geogr.* [trans.] iii, 141) and Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 365) suggest that the Hagarenes when vanquished migrated to the south-east, because on the Persian Gulf there was the province of Hagar or *Hajar.* This is the district which the Arabian geographers have carefully and prominently described (compare De Sacy's *Chrestomathie Arabe*, ii, 123; Abulfeda [by Reinaud], ii, 1, 137, who quotes Jakut's *Moshtarek* for some of his information; and Rommel's Commentary on Abulfeda, *De Prov. Hagiar, sive Bahhrain*, p. 87, 88, 89, D'Herbelot, s. v. Hagr). We will not deny that this province probably derived its name and early inhabitants from *Hagar* and her son Ishmael (or, as Rabbi D. Kimchi would prefer, from Hagar, through some son by another father than Abraham); but we are not of opinion that these Hagarenes of the Persian Gulf, whose pursuits were so different, were identical with the Hagarenes of the Psalm before us, or with the Hagarites of 1 Chron., whom we have identified with them. Nothing *pastoral* is related of this maritime tribe; Rommel quotes from two Arabian geographers, Taifashi and Bakiu, who both describe these Hagarenes of the coast as much employed in pearl-fishing and such pursuits. Niebuhr (*Travels in Arabia* [Engl. tr.], ii, 151, 152) confirms their statement. Gesenius is also inexact in identifying these *maritime* Hagarenes with the Ἀγραῖοι of Ptolemy, v, 19, 2, and Eratosthenes, in Strabo, xvi, 767, and Pliny, vi, 28. If the tribes indicated in these classical authors be the same (which is doubtful), they are much more correctly identified by an older writer, Dr. T. Jackson (*Works* [ed. Oxon.], i, 220), who says: "The seat of such as the Scripture calls *Hagarens* was in the desert Arabia, betwixt Gilead and Euphrates (1 Chron. v, 9, 10). This people were called by the heathen Ἀγραῖοι, Agræi, rightly placed by Ptolemy in the desert Arabia, and by Strabo in that very place which the Scripture makes the eastern bounds of Ishmael's posterity, to wit, next unto the inhabitants of Havilah." Amid the difficulty of identification, some modern geographers have *distributed* the classical Agræi in various localities. Thus, in Forster's maps of Arabia, they occupy both the district between Gilead and the Euphrates in the north, and also the western shores of the Persian Gulf. The fact seems to be that many districts in Arabia were called by the generic appellation of *Hagarite* or *Hagarene*, no doubt after Hagar; as Keturah, another of Abraham's concubines, occasioned the rather vaguely-used name of Ketureans for other tribes of the Arabian peninsula (Forster, *Geog. of Arabia*, ii, 7). In the very section of Abulfeda which we have above quoted, that geographer (after the author of the *Moshtarek*) reminds us that the name *Hajar* (Hagar) is as extensive in meaning in Arabia as *Sham* (Syria) and *Irak* elsewhere; in like manner Rommel, within a page or two, describes a Hagar in the remote province of Yemen; this, although an unquestionably different place (Reinaud, ii, 1-137, note), is yet confounded with the maritime Hajar. In proof of the uncertainty of the situation of places in Arabia of like name, we may mention that, while Abulfeda, Edrisi, Giauhari, and Golius distinguish between the Hagarenes of the north-east coast and those of the remote south-west district which we have just mentioned, Nassir Edin, Olugbeig, and Büsching confound them as identical. Winer, *Realw.* s. v. Hagariter, mentions yet another *Chajar*, which, though slightly different in form, might be written much like our word in Hebrew חגרא, and is actually identical with it in the Syriac (Assemanni, *Biblioth. Orient.* III, ii, 753). This place was in the province of Hejaz, on the Red Sea, on the main route between Damascus and Mecca. Such being the uncertainty connected with the sites of these Arab tribes, we the less hesitate to place the Hagarenes of the Psalm in the neighborhood of Edom, Moab, and Ammon, in the situation which was in Saul's time occupied by the Hagarites, "near the main road which led" [or, more correctly, in the belt of country which stretched] "from the head of the Red Sea to the Euphrates" (Smith's *Dict. of Geog.* s. v. Agræi; see also Bochart, *Phaleg* [edit. Villemandy], IV, ii, 225). The mention both of Ishmaelites and Hagarenes in this Psalm has led to the opinion that they are separate nations here meant. The verse, however, is in the midst of a poetic *parallelism*, in which the clauses are *synonymous* and not antithetic (comp. ver. 5-11), so that if "Edom and the Ishmaelites" is not absolutely identical in geographical signification with "Moab and the Hagarenes," there is at least a poetical identity between these two groups which forbids our separating them widely from each other in any sense (for the *dispersed* condition of the Hagarenes, see also Fuller, *Misc. Sacr.* ii, 12).

Combinations marked the unrelenting hostility of their neighbors towards the Jews to a very late period. One of these is mentioned in 1 Macc. v, as dispersed by Judas Maccabæus. "The children of Bæan" (*υἱοὶ Βαιάν*) of ver. 4 have been by Hitzig conjectured to be the same as our Hagarenes; there is, however, no other ground for this opinion than their vicinity to Edom and Ammon, and the difficulty of making them fit in with

any other tribe as conveniently as with that which is the subject of this article (see J. Olshausen, *die Psalmen*, p. 345).

3. In the passage from Baruch iii, 23 there are attributed to "the Agarenes" qualities of wisdom for which the Arabian nation has long been celebrated, skill in proverbial philosophy (comp. Freytag, *Arab. Prov.* tom. iii, præf.); in this accomplishment they have associated with them "the merchants of Meran and of Theman." This is not the place to discuss the site of Meran, which some have placed on the Persian Gulf, and others on the Red Sea; it is enough to observe that their mercantile habits gave them a shrewdness in practical knowledge which rendered them worthy of comparison with "the merchants of Theman" or Edom. Forster makes these *Themanese* to be inhabitants of the maritime Bahrain, and therefore *Hagarenes* (i, 303); but in this he is flagrantly inconsistent with his own good canon (i, 291): "The name of the son of Eliphaz and of his descendants [the Edomites] is uniformly written Tema*n* in the original Hebrew, and that of the son of Ishmael and his family [the Hagarenes or Ishmaelites] as uniformly Tema [without the *n*]." The wisdom of these Themanese merchants is expressly mentioned in Jer. xlix, 7, and Obadiah, ver. 8. The Hagarenes of this passage we would place among the inhabitants of the shores of the Persian Gulf, where (see 1) Gesenius and others placed "the Hagarites" after their conquest by the trans-Jordanic Israelites. The clause, "That seek wisdom on earth" [that is, "who acquire experience and intelligence from intercourse with mankind"] (the Sept. *οἱ ἐκζητοῦντες τὴν σύνεσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, is surely corrupt, because meaningless: by the help of the Vulgate and the Syriac it has been conjectured by some [by Hävernick and Fritzsche, ad loc., for instance] that instead of *οἱ ἐπὶ* we should read *τὴν ἐπὶ*, q. d. "the wisdom [or common sense] which is cognizant of the earth —its men and manners;" an attainment which mercantile persons acquire better than all else), seems to best fall in with the habits of a seafaring and mercantile race (see Fritzsche, *das Buch Baruch*, p. 192; and Hävernick, whose words he quotes: "Hagareni terram quasi perlustrantes dicuntur, quippe mercatores longe celeberrimi antiquissimis jamjam temporibus").

Hagenau, Conference of, a theological conference called by the German emperor in 1539 in order to bring about a reunion between Protestants and Roman Catholics. Having originally been convoked to Worms, it was transferred to Hagenau in consequence of an epidemic prevailing in the former city. It lasted from June 12 to July 16, 1540. As it was not deemed safe to send Luther without a special protection, and as Melancthon fell sick during the journey, the Protestants were represented by Brenz, Osiander, Capito, Cruciger, and Myconius; and the Roman Catholics by Eck, Faber, and Cochlæus. The conference led to no definite results. It was agreed that an equal number of representatives, chosen by the two parties, should meet at Worms, and resume the negotiations for a union.—Herzog, xix, 589. (A. J. S.)

Hag'erite [or *Ha'gerite*] (Heb. with the art. *ha-Hagri'*, הַהַגְרִי, *the Hagrite;* Sept. ὁ Ἀγαρίτης, Vulg. *Agareus*), a designation of Jaziz (q. v.), one of David's agricultural officers (1 Chron. xxvii, 31). See HAGARITE.

Haggadah (Heb. *anecdote, legend*), in the Talmud and with the Rabbis the name for traditional stories, legends, etc. used in the interpretation and elucidation of the law and the prophets. Many of the *haggudoth* in the Talmud are absurd and preposterous, and they are not held by the best Rabbins as authoritative. Maimonides says of them: "Beware that you take not these words of the hachimim (wise) literally, for this would be degrading to the sacred doctrine, and sometimes to contradict it. Seek rather the hidden sense; and if you cannot find the kernel, let the shell alone, and confess 'I cannot understand this'" (*Perush Hammishnayoth*).—Fürst, *Kulturgeschichte d. Juden.* i, 74; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebr. Lit.* p. 182; Jost, *Gesch. d. Juden.* i, 178; ii, 313. The Haggadah frequently refers to the Halachah (*rule, norm*), the oral law of tradition, brief sentences established by the authority of the Sanhedrim, in which the law was interpreted and applied to individual cases, and which were designated as the "sentences of the elders." See MIDRASH. (J. H. W.)

Hag'gaï (Heb. *Chaggay'*, חַגַּי, *festive;* Sept. and Joseph. Ἀγγαῖος; Jerome and Vulg. *Aggœus* or *Haggœus*), the tenth in order of the twelve minor prophets, and the first of the three who, after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian exile, prophesied in Palestine. Of the place and year of his birth, his descent, and the leading incidents of his life, nothing is known which can be relied on (see Oehler, in Herzog's *Encykl.* v, 471 sq.). The more fabulous traditions of Jewish writers, who pass him for an assessor of the *Synagoga Magna*, and enlarge on his literary avocations, have been collected by Carpzov (*Introductio in V. T.* iii, 426). Some interpreters, indeed, taking in its literal sense the expression מַלְאַךְ יְהוָֹה (*malak Yehôvâh*) in i, 13, have imagined that he was an angel in human shape (Jerome, *Comm.* ad loc.). Some ancient writers assert that he was born in Babylon, and while yet a young man came to Jerusalem, when Cyrus, in the year B.C. 536, allowed the Jews to return to their country (2 Chron. xxxiv, 23; Ezra i, 1); the new colony consisting chiefly of people belonging to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, with a few from other tribes. According to the same tradition, he was buried with honor near the sepulchres of the priests (Isidor. Hispal. c. 49; Pseudo-Dorotheus, in *Chron. Pasch.* 151, d). It has hence been conjectured that he was of priestly rank. Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, according to the Jewish writers, were the men who were with Daniel when he saw the vision related in Dan. x, 7, and were after the captivity members of the Great Synagogue, which consisted of 120 elders (*Cozri*, iii, 65). The Seder Olam Zuta places their death in the 52d year of the Medes and Persians, while the extravagance of another tradition makes Haggai survive till the entry of Alexander the Great into Jerusalem, and even till the time of our Saviour (Carpzov, *Introd.*). In the Roman martyrology Hosea and Haggai are joined in the catalogue of saints (*Acta Sanctor.* 4 Julii). See EZRA.

This much appears from Haggai's prophecies (ch. i, 1, etc.), that he flourished during the reign of the Persian monarch Darius Hystaspis, who ascended the throne B.C. 521. It is probable that he was one of the exiles who returned with Zerubbabel and Jeshua: and Ewald (*die Proph. d. Alt. B.*) is even tempted to infer from ii, 3, that he may have been one of the few survivors who had seen the first Temple in its splendor (Bleek, *Einleit.* p. 549). The rebuilding of the Temple, which was commenced in the reign of Cyrus (B.C. 535), was suspended during the reigns of his successors, Cambyses and Pseudo-Smerdis, in consequence of the determined hostility of the Samaritans. On the accession of Darius Hystaspis (B.C. 521), the prophets Haggai and Zechariah urged the renewal of the undertaking, and obtained the permission and assistance of the king (Ezra v, 1; vi, 14; Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 4). Animated by the high courage (*magni spiritus*, Jerome) of these devoted men, the people prosecuted the work with vigor, and the Temple was completed and dedicated in the sixth year of Darius (B.C. 516). See TEMPLE.

The names of Haggai and Zechariah are associated in the Sept. in the titles of Psa. cxxxvii, cxlv–cxlviii; in the Vulgate in those of Psa. cxi, cxlv; and in the Peshito Syriac in those of Psa. cxxv, cxxvi, cxlv, cxlvi, cxlvii, cxlviii. It may be that tradition assigned to these prophets the arrangement of the above-mentioned psalms for use in the Temple service, just as Psa. lxiv is in the Vulgate attributed to Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and

the name of the former is inscribed at the head of Psa. cxxxvi in the Sept. According to Pseudo-Epiphanius (*De Vitis Proph.*), Haggai was the first who chanted the Hallelujah in the second Temple: "wherefore," he adds, "we say 'Hallelujah, which is the hymn of Haggai and Zechariah.'" Haggai is mentioned in the Apocrypha as AGGEUS, in 1 Esdr. vi, 1; vii, 3; 2 Esdr. i, 40; and is alluded to in Ecclus. xlix, 11 (comp. Hag. ii, 23), and Heb. xii, 26 (Hag. ii, 6). See ZECHARIAH.

HAGGAI, PROPHECY OF. These vaticinations are comprised in a book of two chapters, and consist of discourses so brief and summary as to have led some German theologians to suspect that they have not come down to us in their original complete form, but are only an epitome (Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das A. T.* iii, § 598; Jahn, *Introductio in libros sacros Vet. Fœd.* edit. 2, Viennæ, 1814, § 156).

Their object generally is to urge the rebuilding of the Temple, which had, indeed, been commenced as early as B.C. 535 (Ezra iii, 10), but was afterwards discontinued, the Samaritans having obtained an edict from the Persian king (Ezra iv, 7) which forbade further procedure, and influential Jews pretending that the time for rebuilding the Temple had not arrived, since the seventy years predicted by Jeremiah applied to the Temple also (Zech. i, 2). As on the death of Pseudo-Smerdis (the "ARTAXERXES" of Ezra iv, see ver. 24), and the consequent termination of his interdict, the Jews still continued to wait for the end of the seventy years, and were only engaged in building splendid houses for themselves, Haggai began to prophesy in the second year of Darius, B.C. 520.

His first discourse (ch. i), delivered on the first day of the sixth month of the year mentioned, denounced the listlessness of the Jews, who dwelt in their "panelled houses," while the temple of the Lord was roofless and desolate. The displeasure of God was manifest in the failure of all their efforts for their own gratification. The heavens were "stayed from dew," and the earth was "stayed from her fruit." They had neglected that which should have been their first care, and reaped the due wages of their selfishness (i, 4-11). The words of the prophet sank deep into the hearts of the people and their leaders. They acknowledged the voice of God speaking by his servant, and obeyed the command. Their obedience was rewarded with the assurance of God's presence (i, 13), and twenty-four days afterwards the building was resumed. The second discourse (ii, 1-9), delivered on the twenty-first day of the seventh month, shows that a month had scarcely elapsed when the work seems to have slackened, and the enthusiasm of the people abated. The prophet, ever ready to rekindle their zeal, encouraged the flagging spirits of the chiefs with the renewed assurance of God's presence, and the fresh promise that, stately and magnificent as was the Temple of their wisest king, the glory of the latter house should be greater than the glory of the former (ii, 3-9). The third discourse (ii, 10-19), delivered on the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, refers to a period when building materials had been collected, and the workmen had begun to put them together. Yet the people were still comparatively inactive, and after two months we thus find him again censuring their sluggishness, which rendered worthless all their ceremonial observances. But the rebuke was accompanied by a repetition of the promise (ii, 19). The fourth and last discourse (ii, 20-23), delivered also on the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, is exclusively addressed to Zerubbabel, the political chief of the new Jewish colony, who, it appears, had asked for an explanation regarding the great political revolutions which Haggai had predicted in his second discourse: it comforts the governor by assuring him they would not take place very soon, and not in his lifetime. As Zerubbabel was prince of Judah, the representative of the royal family of David, and, as such, the lineal ancestor of the Messiah, this closing prediction foreshadows the establishment of the Messianic kingdom (see Hengstenberg, *Christology*, iii, 243 sq.) upon the overthrow of the thrones of the nations (ii, 23).

The style of the discourses of Haggai is suitable to their contents: it is pathetic when he exhorts, it is vehement when he reproves, it is somewhat elevated when he treats of future events, and it is not altogether destitute of a poetical coloring, though a prophet of a higher order would have depicted the splendor of the second Temple in brighter hues. The language labors under a poverty of terms, as may be observed in the constant repetition of the same expressions, which Eichhorn (*Einleitung*, § 599) attributes to an attempt at ornament, rendering the writer disposed to recur frequently to a favorite expression.

The prophetical discourses of Haggai are referred to in the Old and New Testament (Ezra v, 1; vi, 14; Heb. xii, 20; comp. Hagg. ii, 7, 8, 22). In most of the ancient catalogues of the canonical books of the Old Testament Haggai is not, indeed, mentioned by name; but, as they specify the twelve minor prophets, he must have been included among them, as otherwise their number would not be full. Josephus, mentioning Haggai and Zechariah (*Ant.* xi, 4, 5), calls them *δύο προφῆται*. (See generally Bertholdt, *Einleitung*, iv, 169; Davidson, in Horne's *Introduc.* new ed. ii, 972 sq.; Hasse, *Gesch. der A. B.* p. 203 sq.; Smith, *Scripture Testimony*, i, 283 sq.)

Special commentaries on the whole of this prophecy exclusively have been written by Rupertus Titiensis, *In Aggæum* (in *Opp.* i); Melanchthon, *Argumentum* (in *Opp.* ii); Ecke, *Commentarius* (Saling. 1538, 8vo); Wicelius, *Enarratio* (Mog. 1541); Varenius, *Exercitationes* (Rost. 1548, 1550, 4to); Draconis, *Explicatio* (Lub. 1549, fol.); Mercer, *Scholia* (Paris, 1557, 4to); Pilkington, *Exposition* (London, 1560, 8vo); Brocardus, *Interpretatio* [includ. some other books] (L. B. 1580, 8vo); Grynæus, *Commentarius* (Gen. 1581, 8vo; translated into English, Lond. 1586, 12mo); Reinbeck, *Exercitationes* (Brunsw. 1592, 4to); Balwin, *Commentarius* (including Zech. and Mal.] (Vitemb. 1610, 8vo); Tarnovius, *Commentarius* (Rostock, 1624, 4to); Willius, *Commentarius* [including Zech. and Mal.] (Brem. 1638, 8vo); Raynolds, *Interpretation* (Lond. 1649, 4to); Pfeffinger, *Notæ* (Argent. 1703, 4to); Woken, *Adnotationes* (Lips. 1719, 4to); Kall, *Dissertationes* (s. l. 1771-3, 4to); Hessler, *Illustratio* (Lund. 1799, 4to); Scheibel, *Observationes* (Vratisl. 1822, 4to); Moore, *Notes*, etc. [including Zech. and Mal.] (N. Y. 1856, 8vo); Köhler, *Erklärung* (Erlangen, 1860, 8vo); Aben-Ezra's annotations on Haggai have been translated by Abicht (in his *Selectæ Rabb.* Lips. 1705), Lund (Upsal. 1706), and Chytræus (ib. eod.); Abarbanel's by Scherzer (Lpz. 1633, 1705) and Mundin (Jena, 1719); Kimchi's by Nol (Par. 1557). Expositions of particular passages are those of Stäudlin [on ii, 1-9] (Tüb. 1784), Benzel [on ii, 9] (in his *Syntagm. Dissertt.* ii, 116 sq.), Sartorius [on ii, 7] (Tüb. 1756), Vesschuir [on ii, 6-9] (in his *Diss. Phil.* No. 6), Essèn [on ii, 23] (Vitemb. 1759). See PROPHETS, MINOR.

Hag'geri (Heb. *Hagri'*, הַגְרִי, *a Hagarite*; Sept. *Ἀταραΐ* v. r. *Ἀγρί*, Vulg. *Agarai*). "Mibhar, son of Haggeri," was one of the mighty men of David's guard, according to the catalogue of 1 Chron. xi, 38. The parallel passage—2 Sam. xxiii, 36—has "Bani the Gadite" (הַגָּדִי). This Kennicott thinks was the original, from which "Haggeri" has been corrupted (*Dissert.* p. 214). The Targum has *Bar Gedâ* (בַּר גְּדָא). See HAGARENE.

Haggerty, JOHN, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Prince George County, Md., Feb. 18, 1747. He was converted under the ministry of John King about 1771. He began to preach among his neighbors the same year, and continued to labor diligently for the Church, under the direction of Strawbridge, Rankin, and King, till he entered the regular itinerancy in the "year 1779." He preached both in

English and German. He was instrumental in the conversion of not a few men of ability, who became ornaments of the ministry. He located, owing to the sickness of his wife, in 1792, and settled in Baltimore, where he continued to preach with great acceptance. He was one of the original elders of the Church, and died in the faith Sept. 4, 1823, aged seventy-six years.—Stevens, *History of the M. E. Church*, ii. 66, 496; iii, 144, 146.

Hag'gi (Heb. *Chaggi'*, חַגִּי, *festive;* Sept. Ἀγγίς), the second of the seven sons of the patriarch Gad (Gen. xlvi, 16), and progenitor of the family of HAGGITES (Numb. xxvi, 15; Sept. Ἀγγί). B.C. prob. ante 1784.

Haggi'ah (Heb. *Chaggiyah'*, חַגִּיָּה, *festival of Jehovah:* Sept. Ἀγγια), a Levite of the family of Merari, apparently the son of Shimea and father of Asaiah, which last seems to have been contemporary with David (1 Chron. vi, 30 [Heb. 15]). B.C. ante 1043.

Hag'gite (Heb. only as a collect. with the art. *ha-Chaggi'*, הַחַגִּי [for הַחַגִּיִּי]; Sept. ὁ Ἀγγί, Vulg. *Aggitæ*, A. V. "the Haggites"), the family title of the descendants of the son of Gad of the same [Heb.] name (Numb. xxvi, 15). See HAGGI.

Hag'gith (Heb. *Chaggith'*, חַגִּית; Sept. Ἀγγίθ v. r. Φεγγίθ, but Ἀγγειθ in 1 Chron. ii, 3; Josephus Ἀγγίθη, *Ant.* vii, 14, 4), a wife of David, only known as the mother of Adonijah (2 Sam. iii, 4; 1 Kings i, 5, 11; ii, 13; 1 Chron. iii, 2); but apparently married to David after his accession to the throne. B.C. 1053. See DAVID. "Her son was, like Absalom, renowned for his handsome presence. In the first and last of the above passages Haggith is fourth in order of mention among the wives, Adonijah being also fourth among the sons. His birth happened at Hebron (2 Sam. iii, 2, 5) shortly after that of Absalom (1 Kings i, 6, where it will be observed that the words 'his mother' are inserted by the translators)" (Smith, s. v.). The Heb. name is merely the fem. of the adj. that appears in the names HAGGI, etc., and seems to be indicative of *festivity* in the religious sense [see FESTIVAL]: Fürst renders it "born at the Feast of Tabernacles" (*Heb. Lex.* s. v.), and Mr. Grove (in Smith, *ut sup.*) regards it as = "a dancer," from the primitive sense of the root חָגַג.

Ha'gia (Ἁγία or Ἀγιά, Vulg. *Aggia*), given in the Apocrypha (1 Esd. v, 34) as the name of one of the "servants of Solomon" whose "sons" returned to Jerusalem after the exile; instead of HATTIL (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra ii, 57; Neh. vii, 59).

Hagidgad. See HOR-HA-GIDGAD.

Hagiogrăpha, Ἁγιόγραφα (*Holy Writings*), a term first found in Epiphanius (*Panarium*, p. 58), who used it, as well as γραφεῖα, to denote the third division of the Scriptures, called by the Jews כְּתוּבִים, or the *Writings*, consisting of *five books* [see MEGILLOTH], viz. the three *poems* (אמת); Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms, and the two books of Chronicles.

These divisions are found in the Talmud (*Baba Bathra*, fol. 1, ed. Amsterdam), where the sacred books are classified under the *Law*, the *Prophets*, and the *Writings* (*Ketubim*). The last are thus enumerated (*l. c.*): Ruth, the book (*sepher*) of Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes (*Koheleth*), the Song of Songs, Lamentations, Daniel, and the books (*megilloth*) of Esther, Ezra, and Chronicles. The Jewish writers, however, do not uniformly follow this arrangement, as they sometimes place the Psalms or the book of Job first among the hagiographa. Jerome gives the arrangement followed by the Jews in his time. He observes that they divided the Scriptures into five books of Moses, eight prophetical books (viz. 1. Joshua; 2. Judges and Ruth; 3. Samuel; 4. Kings; 5. Isaiah; 6. Jeremiah; 7. Ezekiel; 8. The twelve prophets), and nine *Hagiographa*, viz. 1. Job; 2. David, five parts; 3. Solomon, three parts; 4. Koheleth, 5. Canticles; 6. Daniel, 7. Chronicles; 8. Esdras, two books [viz. Ezra and Nehemiah]; 9. Esther. "Some, however," he adds, "place Ruth and Lamentations among the Hagiographa rather than among the prophetical books." We find a different arrangement in Josephus, who reckons thirteen prophetical books, and four containing hymns and moral precepts (*Apion*, i, 8), from which it would appear that after the time of Josephus the Jews comprised many books among the prophets which had previously belonged to the Hagiographa. It has, however, been considered as more probable that Josephus had no authority from manuscripts for his classification.

The earliest notice which we find of these divisions is that contained in the prologue to the book of Ecclesiasticus, written B.C. cir. 140, the author of which refers to the Law, the Prophets, and the *other books;* by which last were most probably meant the Hagiographa. Philo also speaks of the Laws, the Prophets, the Hymns, and the other books, but without classifying them. In the New Testament we find three corresponding divisions mentioned, viz. the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms; which last book has been supposed to have given its name to the third division, from the circumstance of its then being the first in the catalogue (Luke xxiv, 44). Hävernick, however (*Handbuch*, p. 78), supposes that Luke calls the Hagiographa by the name of Psalms, rather on account of the poetical character of several of its parts. The "book of the Prophets" is referred to in the New Testament as a distinct volume (Acts vii, 42, where the passage indicated is Amos v, 25, 26). It is well known that the second class was divided by the Jews into the early Prophets, viz. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; and the later Prophets, viz. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel (called the major prophets), and the book of the twelve (minor) prophets.

When this division of books was first introduced it is now impossible to ascertain. Probably it commenced after the return from the exile, with the first formation of the canon. Still more difficult is it to ascertain the principle on which the classification was formed. The rabbinical writers maintain that the authors of the *Ketubim* enjoyed only the lowest degree of inspiration, as they received no immediate communication from the deity, like that made to Moses, to whom God spoke face to face; and that they did not receive their knowledge through the medium of visions and dreams, as was the case with the prophets or the writers of the second class; but still that they felt the Divine Spirit resting on them and inspiring them with suggestions. This is the view maintained by Abarbanel (*Præf. in Proph. priores*, fol. 20, 1), Kimchi (*Præf. in Psalm.*), Maimonides (*More Nebochim*, ii, 45, p. 317), and Elias Levita (*Tisbi*); which last writer defines the word כתוב to mean *a work written by divine inspiration.* The placing of Ruth among the Hagiographa, and especially the separation of Lamentations from Jeremiah, seems, however, to be irreconcilable with this hypothesis; nor is it easy to assign a satisfactory reason why the historical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings should be placed among the *Prophets*, and the book of Chronicles among the *Hagiographa.* The reasons generally assigned for this, as well as for placing in the third class the books of Psalms, Daniel, and Job, are so fanciful and unsatisfactory as to have led Christian writers to form other and more definite classifications. It will suffice to mention the reason assigned by Rabbi Kimchi for excluding Daniel from the book of Prophets, viz. that he has not equalled the other prophets in his visions and dreams. Others assign the late date of the book of Daniel as the reason for the insertion of it, as well as of some historical books, in the Hagiographa, inasmuch as the collection of the prophets was closed at the date of the composition of this book (De Wette, § 255). Bertholdt, who is of this opinion (*Einleitung*, i, 70 sq.), thinks that the word *Ketubim* means "books newly introduced into the canon" (p. 81). Hengstenberg (*Authentie des Daniel*, etc., p. 25 sq.) follows the ancient opinions of the Rabbins, and

maintains that the book of Daniel was placed in the Hagiographa in consequence of the lower degree of inspiration attached to it; but herein he is opposed by Hävernick (*Handbuch*, p. 62). De Wette (§ 13) supposes that the first two divisions (the *Law* and the *Prophets*) were closed a little after the time of Nehemiah (compare 2 Macc. ii, 13, 14), and that perhaps at the end of the Persian period the Jews commenced the formation of the *Hagiographa*, which long remained "changeable and open." The collection of the Psalms was not yet completed when the two first parts were formed. See KETHUBIM.

It has been concluded from Matt. xxiii, 35, and Luke xi, 51, compared with Luke xxiv, 14, that as the Psalms were the first, so were Chronicles the last book in the Hagiographa (Carpzov, *Introd.* iv, 25). If, when Jesus spoke of the righteous blood shed from the blood of Abel (Gen. iv, 8) to that of Zechariah, he referred, as most commentators suppose, to Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiv, 20, 21), there appears a peculiar appositeness in the appeal to the first and the last books in the canon. The book of Chronicles still holds the last place in the Hebrew Bibles, which are all arranged according to the threefold division. The late date of Chronicles may in some measure account for its separation from the book of Kings; and this ground holds good whether we fix the era of the chronicler, with Zunz, at about B.C. 260, or, with Movers, we conceive him to have been a younger contemporary of Nehemiah, and to have written about B.C. 400 (*Kritische Untersuchung über de Biblische Chronik*, Bonn, 1834). The circumstance of the existence of a few acknowledged later additions, such as 1 Chron. iii, 19-24, does not militate against this hypothesis, as these may have been supplied by the last editor. See CHRONICLES, BOOKS OF. De Wette conceives that the genealogy in this passage comes down only to the third generation after Nehemiah. See CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

The word *Hagiographa* is once used by Jerome in a peculiar sense. Speaking of Tobit, he asserts that the Jews, cutting off this book from the catalogue of the divine Scriptures, place it among those books which they call *Hagiographa*. Again, of Judith he says, "By the Jews it is read among the Hagiographa, whose authority is not sufficient to confirm debated points;" but, as in the latter instance, the greater number of MSS. read *Apocrypha*, which is doubtless the true reading, it is highly probable that the word Hagiographa, used in reference to the book of Tobit, has arisen from the mistake of a transcriber. The two words were in the Middle Ages frequently used as synonymous. See DEUTERO-CANONICAL. "Hagiographa" has also been used by Christian writers as synonymous with Holy Scripture.

The Alexandrian translators have not been guided by the threefold division in their arrangement of the books of Scripture. The different MSS. of the Sept. also vary in this respect. In the Vatican Codex (which the printed editions chiefly follow) Tobit and Judith are placed between Nehemiah and Esther. Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus follow Canticles. Baruch and Lamentations follow Jeremiah, and the Old Testament concludes with the four books of Maccabees. Luther (who introduced into the Bible a peculiar arrangement, which in the *Old* Testament has been followed in the English Authorized Version) was the first who separated the canonical from the other books. Not only do the Alexandrian translators, the fathers, and Luther differ from the Jews in the order of succession of the sacred books, but among the Jews themselves the Talmudists and Masorites, and the German and Spanish MSS. follow each a different arrangement. See BIBLE.

Hagiolatry. See SAINTS, WORSHIP OF.

Hahiroth. See PI-HA-HIROTH.

Hahn, August, a distinguished German Protestant theologian, Orientalist, and opponent of rationalism, was born at Grossosterhausen, near Querfurt, in Prussian Saxony, March 27, 1792. His father died before he was nine years old, but his pastor, Stössen, generously instructed the orphan with his own son, and secured his admission to the gymnasium at Eisleben. In 1810 Hahn entered the University of Leipsic, where, he tells us (Preface to *Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens*, 2d ed.), he lost his early faith and peace, the fruits of a pious mother's teachings, and became imbued with the prevailing rationalism. After a three-years' course, in which, besides adding to his stock of classic and theological learning, he had studied Oriental languages and literature, especially Syriac and Arabic, he engaged in teaching. In 1817 he entered the newly-established theological school at Wittenberg, where, under happier religious influences and inspirations, he regained his lost faith and peace, and was henceforth active in seeking to impart them to other minds and hearts. In 1819 he was appointed professor extraordinary, and in 1821 ordinary professor of theology in the University of Königsberg, and during his occupancy of that post published *Bardesanes, Gnosticus, Syrorum primus hymnologus* (Leipsic, 1819), a work which earned for him the doctorate of theology. This was followed by several other publications in patristic literature, viz. *De gnosi Marcionis* (1820):—*Antitheses Marcionis*, etc. (1823):—*Das Evangelium Marcions*, etc. (1823):—*De Canone Marcionis* (1824):—*Chrestomathia Syriaca, s. S. Ephræmi*, etc. (in conjunction with Seiffert) (1825); besides treatises in several periodicals. Being called in 1826 to the professorship of theology in the University of Leipsic, Hahn was thrown into the midst of theological controversy, and gave expression to his antagonism to the Rationalists in his treatise *De Rationalismi, qui dicitur, Vera Indole et qua cum Naturalismo contineatur ratione* (Leipsic, 1827), in which he asserts the necessity of supranatural revelation, and the inability of man by nature to attain "certain and complete knowledge of religious truths," and aims to show historically that rationalism had always been regarded by the Church as hostile to Christianity, and that it was the offspring of naturalism and deism. He developed this antagonism still further in his *Offene Erklärung an die evangelische Kirche zunächst in Sachsen und Preussen* (1827), wherein he maintains that Rationalists cannot be considered as Christian teachers, and ought in conscience to withdraw from the evangelical Church. His efforts in favor of evangelical orthodoxy were continued in his *Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens* (1828; 2d ed. 1857), and *Sendschreiben an Bretschneider über die Lage des Christenthums in unserer Zeit und das Verhältniss christlicher Theologie zur Wissenschaft überhaupt* (1832). The last work especially led to his call to Breslau in 1833 as professor, and his appointment as consistorial counsellor, a position of great importance in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs. In 1844 he was made general superintendent for Silesia, which post he filled until his death, May 13, 1863, and in which he was able to exert considerable influence in behalf of the evangelical party among the clergy. The most important of his writings not already mentioned are, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der apostol.-catholischen Kirche* (1842):—*Theologisch-kirchliche Annalen* (Breslau, 1842-44):—*Das Bekenntniss der evangelischen Kirche und die ordinatorische Verpflichtung ihrer Diener* (1847):—*Das Bekenntniss der evangelischen Kirche in seinem Verhältnisse zu dem der römischen und griechischen* (1853):—*Predigten und Reden unter den Bewegungen in Kirche und Staat seit dem J.* 1830 (1852). See obituary notice of Hahn in the *Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung* for 1863, No. 75-77, and an autobiographical sketch of his life up to 1830 in Dietzsch's *Homilet. Journal*, 1830, vol. ii, pt. i; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 593 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 164; *New Amer. Cyclop.* viii, 634. (J. W. M.)

Hahn, Heinrich August, eldest son of August Hahn, was born at Königsberg June 19, 1821, and died Dec. 1, 1861, at Greifswald. After having studied at Breslau and Berlin, he devoted himself to Old-Testa-

ment exegesis and theology. He was tutor (*privat-docent*) at Breslau in 1845, went thence in 1846 to Königsberg as professor *ad interim* on the death of Hävernick, and in 1851 became professor extraordinary, and in 1860 ordinary professor at Greifswald, succeeding Kosegarten. He edited Hävernick's *Vorlesungen über die Theologie des A. Testaments* (1848). His chief works are, a dissertation *De Spe immortalitatis sub Vet. Testam.* etc.; *Veteris testam. sententia de Natura hominis* (1846):—*Commentar über das Buch Hiob* (1850):—*Übersetzung und Erklärung des Hohen Liedes* (1852):—*Erklärung von Jesaia Kapitel* 40–46 (forming vol. iii of Drechsler's commentary on Isaiah, 1857):—*Commentar über das Predigerbuch Salomo's* (1860). His works evince the care and fidelity which characterized the man, but his criticisms are sometimes marked by great boldness. He was a man of mild temper and great purity of character. See *Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung* for 1862, No. 26; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 597. (J. W. M.)

Hahn, Michael, a German theosophist, was born Feb. 2, 1758, at Altdorf, near Böblingen, Würtemberg. The son of a peasant, he was from early youth under the influence of profound religious convictions, and devoted himself, in retirement, to the study of the Bible, and of the works of prominent theosophists, as Behmen and Oetinger. He claimed to receive from God special revelations, and wrote down their contents. As a speaker in the meetings of the Pietists he attracted large crowds, was several times summoned before the consistory to defend himself against the charge of heresy, but was finally allowed to spend the last twenty-four years of his life without further annoyance upon an estate of the duchess Francisca of Würtemberg. There he died in great peace in 1819. The followers of Hahn, called the *Michelians*, constitute an organized communion which has never separated from the State Church, but the members of which annually meet for consultation, and, in particular, for making provision for the poor. The celebrated colony of *Kornthal* (q. v.), near Stuttgard, was organized under the direct influence of Hahn. The works of Hahn, which contain a complete speculative theosophy, have been published at Tübingen in 12 vols. (1819 sq.). Several of his hymns were received by Albert Knapp into the hymn-book which he prepared for the use of the State Church. Like many of the Würtemberg Pietists, Hahn believed in the final restoration of all things.—Haug, *Die Sekte der Michelianer*, in *Studien der evang. Geistlichkeit Würtembergs*, vol. xi; Illgen, *Hist. theolog. Zeitschrift*, 1841; Römer, *Kirchl. Geschichte Würtembergs;* Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* v, 472. (A. J. S.)

Ha'ï (Gen. xii, 8; xiii, 3). See AI.

Hail. See BEN-HAIL.

Hail! (χαῖρε, *rejoice*, as often rendered; "farewell" also), a salutation, importing a wish for the welfare of the person addressed (Luke i, 28; in mockery, Matt. xxvii, 29, etc.). It is now seldom used among us, but was customary among our Saxon ancestors, and imported as much as "Joy to you," or "Health to you;" including in the term health all kinds of prosperity.—Calmet, s. v. See GREETING.

Hail (בָּרָד, *barad'*, χάλαζα), or congealed rain, is the symbol of the divine vengeance upon kingdoms and nations, the enemies of God and of his people. As a hail-storm is generally accompanied by lightning, and seems to be produced by a certain electrical state of the atmosphere, so we find in Scripture *hail and fire*, i. e. lightning, mentioned together (Exod. ix, 23; compare Job xxxviii, 22, 23; Psa. cv, 32; lxxviii, 48; cxlviii, 8; xviii, 13). See PLAGUES OF EGYPT. That hail, though uncommon, is not absolutely unknown in Egypt, we have the testimony of Mansleben and Manconys, who had heard it thunder during their stay at Alexandria, the former on the 1st of January, and the latter on the 17th and 18th of the same month; on the same day it also *hailed* there. Perry also remarks that it hails, though seldom, in January and February at Cairo. Pococke even saw hail mingled with rain fall at Fium in February (compare Exod. ix, 34). Korte also saw hail fall. Jomard says, "I have several times seen even hail at Alexandria." Volney mentions a hail-storm which he saw crossing over Mount Sinai into that country, some of whose frozen stones he gathered; "and so," he says, "I drank iced water in Egypt." Hail was also the means made use of by God for defeating an army of the kings of Canaan (Josh. x, 11). In this passage it is said, "The Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them"—i. e. hail-stones of an extraordinary size, and capable of doing dreadful execution in their fall from heaven. Some commentators are of opinion that the miracle consisted of real stones, from the circumstance that stones only are mentioned in the preceding clause; but this is evidently erroneous, for there are many instances on record of hail-stones of enormous size and weight falling in different countries, so as to do immense injury, and to destroy the lives of animals and men. In Palestine and the neighboring regions, hail-stones are frequent and severe in the mountainous districts and along the coasts; but in the plains and deserts hail scarcely ever falls. In the elevated region of Northern Persia the hail-stones are frequently so violent as to destroy the cattle in the fields; and in Com. Porter's *Letters from Constantinople and its Environs* (i, 44) there is an interesting account of a terrific hail-storm that occurred on the Bosphorus in the summer of 1831, which fully bears out the above and other Scripture representations. Many of the lumps picked up after the storm weighed three quarters of a pound. In Isa. xxviii, 2, which denounces the approaching destruction by Shalmaneser, the same images are employed. Hail is mentioned as a divine judgment by the prophet Haggai (ii, 17). The destruction of the Assyrian army is pointed out in Isa. xxx, 30. Ezekiel (xiii, 11) represents the wall daubed with untempered mortar as being destroyed by great hail-stones. Also in his prophecy against Gog (xxxviii, 22) he employs the same symbol (compare Rev. xx, 9). The hail and fire mingled with blood, mentioned in Rev. viii, 7, are supposed to denote the commotions of nations. The great hail, in Rev. xi, 19, denotes great and heavy judgments on the enemies of true religion; and the grievous storm, in xvi, 21, represents something similar, and far more severe. So Horace (*Odes*, i, 2); comp. Virgil (*Æn.* iv, 120, 161; ix, 669) and Livy (ii, 62, and xxvi, 11).

HAIL-STONE (אֶבֶן בָּרָד, *e'ben barad'*, *a stone of hail*). See above.

Haime, JOHN, a soldier in the English army, and one of Mr. Wesley's preachers. He was born at Shaftesbury, Dorsetshire, in 1710, and was bred a gardener, and afterwards a button-maker. From early life he lived in great wickedness, and in constant agony of conviction. In 1739 he enlisted in a regiment of dragoons, and some time after he was converted; but, being very ignorant, he alternately lost and regained his hope, but constantly labored to save others. At last he heard and conversed with Mr. Wesley, much to his comfort. The regiment was sent to Flanders in 1743, from which time till Feb. 1745, he was in despair and great agony. At that time, while marching into Germany, his evidence of pardon returned, and, encouraged by Mr. Wesley's letters, he began to preach in the army. At the battle of Dettingen he showed great gallantry. In May, 1744, the army went to Brussels, and here his labors were the means of a great and remarkable revival in the army and city. Part of the time Haime had six preachers under him, although the regular chaplains opposed him. But the duke of Cumberland and general Ponsonby were his friends and patrons, and his piety of life, and the valor of his "Methodists" in every battle, commanded universal admiration and respect. On the 6th of April, 1746, he fell into despair, and from

that date he lived for twenty years "in agony of soul;" yet all the time, in Germany, England, Ireland, he ceased not with all the energy of despair to labor, preaching often 20 or 30 times a week, and seeing thousands of souls converted under his efforts, while his own soul was filled with anguish and darkness. At the end of this time he once more obtained the evidence of acceptance with God. He died Aug. 18, 1784, at Whitchurch, in Hampshire.—Jackson, *Lives of Early Methodist Preachers*, i, 147; Stevens, *History of Methodism*, vol. ii.

Hair (properly שֵׂעָר, *seär'*, θρίξ) is frequently mentioned in Scripture, chiefly with reference to the head. In scarcely anything has the caprice of fashion been more strikingly displayed than in the various forms which the taste of different countries and ages has prescribed for disposing of this natural covering of the head. See HEAD.

1. Of the more ancient nations, the Egyptians appear to have been the most uniform in their habits regarding it, and, in some respects also, the most peculiar. We learn from Herodotus (ii, 36, iii, 12) that they let the hair of their head and beard grow only when they were in mourning, and that they shaved it at other times. Even in the case of young children they were wont to shave the head, leaving only a few locks on the front, sides, and back, as an emblem of youth. In the case of royal children, those on the sides were covered and inclosed in a bag, which hung down conspicuously as a badge of princely rank (Wilkinson, ii, 327, 328). "So particular were they," says Wilkinson, "on this point, that to have neglected it was a subject of reproach and ridicule; and whenever they intended to convey the idea of a man of low condition, or a slovenly person, the artists represented him with a beard" (*Ancient Egyptians*, iii, 357). Slaves also, when brought from foreign countries, having beards on them at their arrival, "were obliged to conform to the cleanly habits of their masters; their beards and heads were shaved, and they adopted a close cap." This universal practice among the Egyptians explains the incidental notice in the life of Joseph, that before going in to Pharaoh he shaved himself (Gen. xli, 14); in most other places he would have combed his hair and trimmed his beard, but on no account have shaved it. The practice was carried there to such a length probably from the tendency of the climate to generate the fleas and other vermin which nestle in the hair; and hence also the priests, who were to be the highest embodiments of cleanliness, were wont to shave their whole bodies every third day (Herod. ii, 37). It is singular, however, and seems to indicate that notions of cleanliness did not alone regulate the practice, that the women still wore their natural hair, long and plaited, often reaching down in the form of strings to the bottom of the shoulder-blades. Many of the female mummies have been found with their hair thus plaited, and in good preservation. The modern ladies of Egypt come but little behind their sisters of olden time in this respect (see Lane's *Modern Egyptians*, i, 60). Yet what was remarkable in the inhabitants of a hot climate, while they removed their natural hair, they were accustomed to wear wigs, which were so constructed that "they far surpassed," says Wilkinson, "the comfort and coolness of the modern turban, the reticulated texture of the ground-work on which the hair was fastened allowing the heat of the head to escape, while the hair effectually protected it from the sun" (*Anc. Egypt.* iii, 354). Josephus (*Life*, § 11) notices an instance of false hair (περιθετὴ κόμη) being used for the purpose of disguise. Among the Medes the wig was worn by the upper classes (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* i, 3, 2). See HEAD-DRESS.

Egyptian Manner of wearing the Hair. (From statues of an officer of rank and his wife or sister, 19th dynasty. British Museum.)

Head-dress of an ancient Egyptian Lady. (From a mummy-case.)

2. The precisely opposite practice, as regards men, would seem to have prevailed among the ancient Assyrians, and, indeed, among the Asiatics generally. In the Assyrian sculptures the hair always appears long, combed closely down upon the head, and shedding itself in a mass of curls on the shoulders. "The beard also was allowed to grow to its full length, and, descending low on the breast, was divided into two or three rows of curls. The mustache was also carefully trimmed and curled at the ends" (Layard's *Nineveh*, ii, 327). Herodotus likewise testifies that the Babylonians wore their hair long (i, 195). The very long hair, however, that appears in the figures on the monuments is supposed to have been partly false, a sort of head-dress to add to the effect of the natural hair. The excessive pains bestowed by the ancient nations in arranging the hair and beard appears almost foppish in contrast with their stern, martial character (Layard's *Nineveh*, ii, 254). See BEARD. The practice of the modern Arabs in regard to the length of their hair varies; generally the men allow it to grow its natural length, the tresses hanging down to the breast, and sometimes to the waist, affording substantial protection to the head and neck against the violence of the sun's rays (Burckhardt's *Notes*, i, 49; Wellsted's *Travels*, i, 33, 53, 73).

Assyrian Manner of wearing the Hair. (From sculpture in British Museum.)

3. Among the ancient Greeks, the general admiration of long hair, whether in men or women, is evidenced by the expression καρηκομόωντες Ἀχαιοί ("well-combed Greeks"), so often occurring in Homer; and by the saying, which passed current among the people, that hair was the cheapest of ornaments; and in the representations of their divinities, especially Bacchus and Apollo, whose long locks were a symbol of perpetual youth. But the practice varied. While the Spartans in earlier times wore the hair long, and men as well as women were wont to have it tied in a knot over the crown of the head, at a later period they were accustomed to wear it short. Among the Athenians, also, it is understood the later practice varied somewhat from

Grecian Manner of wearing the Hair. (Hope's *Costumes*.)

the earlier, though the information is less specific. The Romans passed through similar changes: in more ancient times the hair of the head and beard was allowed to grow; but about three centuries before the Christian æra barbers began to be introduced, and men usually wore the hair short. Shaving was also customary, and a long beard was regarded as a mark of slovenliness. An instance even occurs of a man, M. Livius, who had been banished for a time, being ordered by the censors to have his beard shaved before he entered the senate (Livy, xxvii, 34). See DIADEM.

This later practice must have been quite general in the Gospel age, so far as the head is concerned, among the countries which witnessed the labors of the apostle Paul, since, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, he refers to it as an acknowledged and nearly universal fact. "Doth not even nature itself teach you," he asked, "that if a man have long hair, it is a shame to him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given her for a covering" (1 Cor. xi, 14, 15). The only person among the more ancient Israelites who is expressly mentioned as having done in ordinary life what is here designated a shame, is Absalom; but the manner in which the sacred historian notices the extravagant regard he paid to the cultivation of his hair not obscurely intimates that it was esteemed a piece of foppish effeminacy (2 Sam. xiv, 26). To the Corinthians the letter of Paul was intended to administer a timely reproof for allowing themselves to fall in with a style of manners which, by confounding the distinctions of the sexes, threatened a baneful influence on good morals; and that not only the Christian converts in that city, but the primitive Church generally, were led by this admonition to adopt simpler habits, is evident from the remarkable fact that a criminal, who came to trial under the assumed character of a Christian, was proved to the satisfaction of the judge to be an impostor by the luxuriant and frizzled appearance of his hair (Tertullian, *Apol.;* Fleury, *Les Mœurs des Chrétiennes*). See SHAVING. With regard to women, the possession of long and luxuriant hair is allowed by Paul to be an essential attribute of the sex—a graceful and modest covering provided by nature; and yet the same apostle elsewhere (1 Tim. ii, 9) concurs with Peter (1 Pet. iii, 9) in launching severe invectives against the ladies of his day for the pride and passionate fondness they displayed in the elaborate decorations of their head-dress. See PLAITING THE HAIR. As the hair was pre-eminently the "instrument of their pride" (Ezek. xvi, 39, margin), all the resources of ingenuity and art were exhausted to set it off to advantage and load it with the most dazzling finery; and many, when they died, caused their longest locks to be cut off, and placed separately in an urn, to be deposited in their tomb as the most precious and valued relics. In the daily use of cosmetics, they bestowed the most astonishing pains in arranging their long hair, sometimes twisting it round on the crown of the head, where, and at the temples, by the aid of gum, which they knew as well as the modern belles, they wrought it into a variety of elegant and fanciful devices—figures of coronets, harps, wreaths, diadems, emblems of public temples and conquered cities, being formed by the mimic skill of the ancient friseur; or else plaiting it into an incredible number of tresses, which hung down the back, and which, when necessary, were lengthened by ribbons so as to reach to the ground, and were kept at full stretch by the weight of various wreaths of pearls and gold fastened at intervals down to the extremity. From some Syrian coins in his possession Hartmann (*Die Hebräerinn am Putztische*) has given this description of the style of the Hebrew coiffure; and many ancient busts and portraits which have been discovered exhibit so close a resemblance to those of Eastern ladies in the present day as to show that the same elaborate and gorgeous disposition of their hair has been the pride of Oriental females in every age. (See below.) From the great value attached to a profuse head of hair arose a variety of superstitious and emblematic observances, such as shaving parts of the head, or cropping it in a particular form; parents dedicating the hair of infants (Tertullian, *De Anima*) to the gods; young women theirs at their marriage; warriors after a successful campaign; sailors after deliverance from a storm; hanging it up on consecrated trees, or depositing it in temples; burying it in the tomb of friends, as Achilles did at the funeral of Patroclus; besides shaving, cutting off, or plucking it out, as some people did; or allowing it to grow in sordid negligence, as was the practice with others, according as the calamity that befell them was common or extraordinary, and their grief was mild or violent. See CUTTINGS IN THE FLESH.

4. The Hebrews were fully alive to the importance of the hair as an element of personal beauty, whether as seen in the "curled locks, black as a raven," of youth (Cant. v, 11), or in the "crown of glory" that encircled the head of old age (Prov. xvi, 31). Yet, while they encouraged the growth of hair, they observed the natural distinction between the sexes by allowing the women to wear it long (Luke vii, 38; John xi, 2; 1 Cor. xi, 6 sq.), while the men restrained theirs by frequent clippings to a moderate length. This difference between the Hebrews and the surrounding nations, especially the Egyptians, arose, no doubt, partly from natural taste, but partly also from legal enactments, and to some extent from certain national usages of wide extent.

(*a.*) Clipping the hair in a certain manner, and offering the locks, was in early times connected with religious worship: many of the Arabians practised a peculiar tonsure in honor of their god Orotal (Herod. iii, 8), and hence the Hebrews were forbidden to "round the corners (פֵּאָה, lit. the *extremity*) of their heads" (Lev. xix, 27), meaning the locks along the forehead and temples, and behind the ears. (See Alteneck, *Coma Hebræorum*, Viteb. 1695.) This tonsure is described in the Sept. by a peculiar expression, σισόη (=the classical σκάφιον), probably derived from the Hebrew צִיצִית (comp. Bochart, *Canaan*, i, 6, p. 379). That the practice of the Arabians was well known to the Hebrews appears from the expression קְצוּצֵי פֵאָה, *rounded as to the locks*, by which they are described (Jer. ix, 26; xxv, 23; xlix, 32; see marginal translation of the A. V.). The prohibition against cutting off the hair on the death of a relative (Deut. xiv, 1) was probably grounded on a similar reason. See CORNER.

(*b.*) In addition to these regulations, the Hebrews dreaded baldness, as it was frequently the result of leprosy (Lev. xiii, 40 sq.), and hence formed one of the disqualifications for the priesthood (Lev. xxi, 20, Sept.). See BALDNESS. The rule imposed upon the priests, and probably followed by the rest of the community, was that the hair should be *polled* (כָּסַם, Ezek. xliv, 20), neither being shaved, nor allowed to grow too long (Lev. xxi, 5; Ezek. l. c.). What was the precise length usually worn we have no means of ascertaining; but from various expressions, such as פָּרַע רֹאשׁ, lit. to *let loose* the head or the hair (=*solvere crines*, Virgil, *Æn.* iii, 65; xi, 35; *demissos lugentis more capillos*, Ovid, *Ep.* x, 137) by unbinding the head-band and letting it go dishevelled (Lev. x, 6, A. V. "*uncover* your heads"), which was done in mourning (compare Ezek. xxiv, 17); and again גָּלָה אֹזֶן, to *uncover* the ear previous to making any communication of importance (1 Sam. xx, 2, 12; xxii, 8; A. V., margin), as though the hair fell over the ear, we may conclude that men wore their hair somewhat longer than is usual with us. The word פֶּרַע, used as=hair (Numb. vi, 5; Ezek. xliv, 20), is especially indicative of its *free growth* (see Knobel, *Comm.* on Lev. xxi, 10). In 2 Kings i, 8, "a hairy man;" literally, "a lord of hair," seems rather to refer to the flowing locks of Elijah (q. v.). This might be doubtful, even with the support of the Sept. and Josephus—ἀν-

θρωπον δασύν—and of the Targum Jonathan—גְּבַר סַעְרָן—the same word used for Esau in Gen. xxvii, 11. But its application to the hair of the head is corroborated by the word used by the children of Bethel when mocking Elisha (q. v.). "Bald-head" is a peculiar term (קֵרֵחַ), applied only to want of hair at the back of the head; and the taunt was called forth by the difference between the bare shoulders of the new prophet and the shaggy locks of the old one. Long hair was admired in the case of young men; it is especially noticed in the description of Absalom's person (2 Sam. xiv, 26), the inconceivable weight of whose hair, as given in the text (200 shekels), has led to a variety of explanations (comp. Harmer's *Observations*, iv, 321), the more probable being that the numeral כ (20) has been turned into ר (200): Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 8, 5) adds that it was cut every eighth day. The hair was also worn long by the body-guard of Solomon, according to the same authority (*Ant.* viii, 7, 3, μηκίστας καθειμένοι χαίτας). The care requisite to keep the hair in order in such cases must have been very great, and hence the practice of wearing long hair was unusual, and only resorted to as an act of religious observance, in which case it was a "sign of humiliation and self-denial, and of a certain religious slovenliness" (Lightfoot, *Exercit.* on 1 Cor. xi, 14), and was practised by the Nazarites (Numb. vi, 5; Judg. xiii, 5; xvi, 17; 1 Sam. i, 11), and occasionally by others in token of special mercies (Acts xviii, 18); it was not unusual among the Egyptians when on a journey (Diod. i, 18). See NAZARITE.

(c.) In times of affliction the hair was altogether cut off (Isa. iii, 17, 24; xv, 2; xxii, 12; Jer. vii, 29; xlviii, 37; Amos viii, 10; Josephus, *War*, ii, 15, 1), the practice of the Hebrews being in this respect the reverse of that of the Egyptians, who let their hair grow long in time of mourning (Herod. ii, 36), shaving their heads when the term was over (Gen. xli, 14); but resembling that of the Greeks, as frequently noticed by classical writers (e. g. Soph. *Aj.* 1174; Eurip. *Electr.* 143, 241). Tearing the hair (Ezra ix, 3), and letting it go dishevelled, as already noticed, were similar tokens of grief. Job is even represented as having shaved his head, to make himself bald, in the day of his calamity (i, 20); probably more, however, as a symbol of desolation than as an ordinary badge of mourning; for it is in that respect that baldness is commonly spoken of in Scripture (Isa. iii, 24; xv, 2, etc.). The call in Jer. vii, 29 to cut off the hair—"Cut off thine hair, O Jerusalem, and cast it away; and take up a lamentation on high places"—is addressed to Jerusalem under the symbol of a woman, and indicates nothing as to the usual practice of men in times of trouble and distress. In *their* case, we may rather suppose, the custom would be to let the hair grow in the season of mourning, and to neglect the person. But the practice would naturally differ with the occasion and with the feelings of the individual. See MOURNING.

The usual and favorite color of the hair was black (Cant. v, 11), as is indicated in the comparisons to a "flock of goats" and the "tents of Kedar" (Cant. iv, 1; i, 5): a similar hue is probably intended by the *purple* of Cant. vii, 5, the term being broadly used (as the Greek πορφύρεος in a similar application = μέλας, Anacreon, 28). A fictitious hue was occasionally obtained by sprinkling gold-dust on the hair (Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 7, 3). It does not appear that dyes were ordinarily used; the "carmel" of Cant. vii, 5 has been understood as = כַּרְמִיל (A. V. "crimson," margin) without good reason, though the similarity of the words may have suggested the subsequent reference to purple. Herod is said to have dyed his gray hair for the purpose of concealing his age (*Ant.* xvi, 8, 1); but the practice may have been borrowed from the Greeks or Romans, among whom it was common (Aristoph. *Eccles.* 736; Martial, *Ep.* iii, 43; Propert. ii, 18, 24, 26): from Matt. v, 36, we may infer that it was not usual among the Hebrews. The approach of age was marked by a *sprinkling* (זָרַק, Hos. vii, 9; comp. a similar use of *spargere*, Propert. iii, 4, 24) of gray hairs, which soon overspread the whole head (Gen. xlii, 38; xliv, 29; 1 Kings ii, 6, 9; Prov. xvi, 31; xx, 29). The reference to the *almond* in Eccl. xii, 5, has been explained of the white blossoms of that tree, as emblematic of old age: it may be observed, however, that the color of the flower is *pink* rather than white, and that the verb in that passage, according to high authorities (Gesen. and Hitzig), does not bear the sense of blossoming at all. See ALMOND. Pure white hair was deemed characteristic of the divine majesty (Dan. vii, 9; Rev. i, 14). See GRAY.

The chief beauty of the hair consisted in curls, whether of a natural or artificial character. The Hebrew terms are highly expressive: to omit the word צַמָּה—rendered "locks" in Cant. iv, 1, 3; vi, 7; and Isa. xlvii, 2; but more probably meaning a *veil*—we have תַּלְתַּלִּים (Cant. v, 11), properly pendulous flexible boughs (according to the Sept., ἐλάται, the shoots of the palm-tree) which supplied an image of the *coma pendula;* צִיצִת (Ezek. viii, 3), a similar image borrowed from the curve of a blossom; עֲנָק (Cant. iv, 9), a lock falling over the shoulders like a chain of ear-pendant (*in uno crine colli tui*, Vulgate better, perhaps, than the A. V., "with one chain of thy neck"); רְהָטִים (Cant. vii, 5, A. V. "galleries"), properly the channels by which water was brought to the flocks, which supplied an image either of the *coma fluens*, or of the regularity in which the locks were arranged; דַּלָּה (Cant. vii, 5), again an expression for *coma pendula*, borrowed from the threads hanging down from an unfinished woof; and, lastly, מַעֲשֵׂה מִקְשָׁה (Isa. iii, 24, A. V. "well set hair"), properly *plaited work*, i. e. gracefully curved locks. With regard to the mode of dressing the hair we have no very precise information; the terms used are of a general character, as of Jezebel (2 Kings ix, 30), תֵּיטֶב, i. e. she *adorned* her head; of Judith (x, 3), διέταξε, i. e. *arranged* (the A. V. has "braided," and the Vulg. *discriminavit*, here used in a technical sense in the reference to the *discriminale* or hair-pin); of Herod (Joseph. *Ant.* xiv, 9, 4), κεκοσμημένος τῇ συνθέσει τῆς κόμης, and of those who adopted feminine fashions (*War*, iv, 9, 10), κόμας συνθετιζόμενοι. The terms used in the N. Test. (πλέγμασιν, 1 Tim. ii, 9; ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν, 1 Pet. iii, 3) are also of a general character; Schleusner (*Lex.* s. v.) understands them of *curling* rather than plaiting. The arrangement of Samson's hair into seven locks, or more properly *braids* (מַחְלְפוֹת, from חָלַף, *to interchange;* Sept. σειραί; Judg. xvi, 13, 19), involves the practice of plaiting, which was also familiar to the Egyptians (Wilkinson, ii, 335) and Greeks (Homer, *Il.* xiv, 176). The locks were probably kept in their place by a fillet, as in Egypt (Wilkinson, *l. c.*).

Ancient Egyptian Ladies with their hair bound by fillets.

Ornaments were worked into the hair, as practised by the modern Egyptians, who "add to each braid three black silk cords with little ornaments of gold" (Lane, i, 71): the Sept. understands the term שְׂבִיסִים (Isa. iii, 18, A. V. "cauls") as applying to such ornaments (ἐμπλόκια); Schröder (*Vest. Mul. Heb.* cap. 2) approves of this, and conjectures that they were *sun-shaped*, i. e. circular, as distinct from the "round tires like the moon," i. e. the crescent-shaped ornaments used for necklaces. The Arabian women attach small bells to the tresses of their hair (Niebuhr, *Trav.* i, 133). Other terms, sometimes understood as applying to the hair, are of doubtful signification, e. g. חֲרִיטִים (Isa. iii, 22; *acus;* "crisping-pins"), more probably *purses*, as in 2 Kings v, 23; קִשֻּׁרִים (Isa. iii, 20, "head-bands"), *bridal girdles*, according to Schröder and other authorities; פְּאֵרִים (Isa. iii, 20, Vulg. *discriminalia*, i. e. pins used for keeping the hair parted; comp. Jerome *in Rufin.* iii, cap. ult.), more probably *turbans*. Combs and hair-pins are mentioned in the Talmud; the Egyptian combs were made of wood and double, one side having large, and the other small teeth (Wilkinson, ii, 343); from the ornamental devices worked on them we may infer that they were worn in the hair. See each of the above terms in its place. In the Talmud frequent references are made to women who were professional hair-dressers for their own sex, and the name applied to whom was גודלת (probably from גדל, to *twine* or plait), "femina gnara alere crines" (Maimon. *in Tr. Shabbath*, x, 6; comp. also Wagenseil, *Sota*, p. 137; Jahn, *Archæol.* pt. i, vol. ii, p. 114).

The Hebrews, like other nations of antiquity, anointed the hair profusely with ointments, which were genally compounded of various aromatic ingredients (Ruth iii, 3; 2 Sam. xiv, 2; Psa. xxiii, 5; xlv, 7; xcii, 10; Eccl. ix, 8; Isa. iii, 24); more especially on occasion of festivities or hospitality (Matt. vi, 17; xxvi, 7; Luke vii, 46; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xix, 4, 1, *χρισάμενος μύροις τὴν κεφαλήν, ὡς ἀπὸ συνουσίας*). It is, perhaps, in reference to the glossy appearance so imparted to it that the hair is described as purple (Cant. vii, 5). See OINTMENT.

It appears to have been the custom of the Jews in our Saviour's time to swear by the hair (Matt. v, 36), much as the Egyptian women still swear by the side-lock, and the men by their beards (Lane, i, 52, 71, notes). See OATH.

Hair was employed by the Hebrews as an image of what was *least valuable* in man's person (1 Sam. xiv, 45; 2 Sam. xiv, 11; 1 Kings i, 52; Matt. x, 30; Luke xii, 7; xxi, 18; Acts xxvii, 34); as well as of what was *innumerable* (Psa. xl, 12; lxix, 4), or particularly *fine* (Judg. xx, 16). In Isa. vii, 20, it represents the various productions of the field, trees, crops, etc.; like *ὄρος κεκομημένον ὕλῃ* of Callim. *Dian.* 41, or the *humus comans* of Stat. *Theb.* v, 502. White hair, or the hoary head, is the symbol of the respect due to age (Lev. xix, 22; Prov. xvi, 31). Hence we find in Dan. vii, 9, God takes upon him the title of "Ancient of Days" (comp. Rev. i, 14), the gray locks there represented being the symbol of authority and honor. The shaving of the head, on the contrary, signifies affliction, poverty, and disgrace. Thus "cutting off the hair" is a figure used to denote the entire destruction of a people by the righteous retributions of Providence (Isa. vii, 20). "Gray hairs here and there on Ephraim" portended the decline and fall of the kingdom of Israel (Hos. vii, 9). "Hair like women's" forms part of the description of the Apocalyptic locusts (Rev. ix, 8), and is added to complete the idea of fierceness of the anti-Christian troop of cavalry, bristling with shaggy hair (comp. "rough caterpillars," i. e. hairy locusts, Jer. li, 27); long and undressed hair in later times being regarded as an image of barbaric rudeness (Hengstenberg, ad loc. Rev.).

Hakewill, GEORGE, an English theologian and philosopher, was born at Exeter in 1579. He studied at Exeter and at Alban Hall, Oxford, where he graduated, and entered the Church in 1611. He became successively chaplain of prince Charles (afterwards Charles I) and archdeacon of Surrey. His opposition to the prince's plan of marriage with the Infanta of Spain caused him to lose his chaplaincy. During the Civil War he kept aloof from parties, and in 1648 he was one of the first in accepting the rule requiring all members of the University of Oxford to sign a promise of obedience to Parliament. He died in 1649. Besides a large number of sermons and occasional pamphlets, he wrote *An Apology, or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God in the Government of the World* (in four books, 1627, fol.; augmented edit. 1635), a work written with great strength and clearness, if not always in good taste. See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. ii; Prince, *Worthies of Devon;* Gorton, *General Biog. Dict.;* Rose, *New Gen. Biogr. Dict.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxiii, 123; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.

Hakim Ben-Allah or **Ben-Hashem**, surnamed MOKANNA (*the veiled*) and SAGENDE NAH (*moon-maker*), the founder of an Arabian sect, flourished in the latter half of the 8th century. He began his career as a common soldier, rose to a captaincy, but subsequently became the leader of a band of his own. Having lost one of his eyes by the shot of an arrow, he constantly wore a veil to conceal his ugliness, as unbelievers assert, but, according to the belief of his disciples, to prevent the dazzling brightness of his divinely illuminated countenance from overpowering the beholder. Hakim is said to have been an adept in legerdemain and natural magic, so as to be able to produce grand and startling effects of light and color, in virtue of which he laid claim to miraculous powers, and asserted that he was a god in human form, having been incarnated in the bodies of Adam, Noah, and other celebrated men, and, last of all, in that of Abu Moslem, prince of Khorassan. On one occasion, to the "delight and bewilderment of his soldiers," he is said for a whole week to have caused to issue from a deep well a moon or moons of such surpassing brilliancy as to obscure the real moon. Many flocked to his standard, and he seized several strong places near Nekshib and Kish. The sultan Mahadi marched against him, and finally captured his last stronghold; but Hakim, "having first poisoned his soldiers with the wine of a banquet," had destroyed his body by means of a burning acid, so that only a few hairs remained, in order that his disciples might believe that he had "ascended to heaven alive." Remnants of the sect still exist on the shores of the Oxus, having for outward badge a white garb in memory of that worn by their founder, and in contrast to the black color adopted by the caliphs of the house of Abbas. The life of Hakim has been the subject of many romances, of which "the best known and most brilliant" is the story of "The Veiled Prophet of Khorassan" in Moore's *Lalla Rookh.*—Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, i, 82; D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orientale*, s. v. Mocanna. (J. W. M.)

Hak'katan, or rather KATAN (Heb. *Katan'*, קָטָן, with the article הַקָּטָן, *the little* or *junior;* Sept. Ἀκκατάν, Vulg. *Eccetan*), a descendant (or native) of Azgad and father of Johanan, which last returned with 110 male retainers from Babylon with Ezra (Ezra viii, 12). B.C. ante 459.

Hakkore. See EN-HAK-KORE.

Hak'koz (1 Chron. xxiv, 10). See KOZ.

Haku'pha (*Chakupha'*, חֲקוּפָא, *crooked;* but, according to Fürst, *incitement*, a Chaldaizing form; Sept. Ἀκουφά and Ἀχιφά), one of the Nethinim whose descendants returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 51; Neh. vii, 53). B.C. ante 536.

Ha'lah (Hebrew *Chalach'*, חֲלַח, signif. unknown; Sept. Ἐλαέ and Ἀλαέ, Vulg. *Hala:* but in 1 Chron. v.

26, Sept. Χαλά, Vulg. *Lahela*), a city or district of Media, upon the river Gozan, to which, among other places, the captives of Israel were transplanted by the Assyrian kings (2 Kings xvii, 6; xviii, 11; 1 Chron. v, 26). Many, after Bochart (*Geog. Sacra*, iii, 14, p. 220), have conceived this Halah or Chalach to be the same with the CALAH or Kelach of Gen. x, 11, the *Calacine* (Καλακινή) which Ptolemy places to the north of Assyria (vi, 1), the *Calachene* (Καλαχηνή) of Strabo (xi, 530), in the plain of the Tigris around Nineveh. But this is probably a different place, the modern Kalah-Shergat. Major Rennell, identifying the Gozan with the Kizzil-Ozan, indicates as lying along its banks a district of some extent, and of great beauty and fertility, called *Chalchal*, having within it a remarkably strong position of the same name, situated on one of the hills adjoining to the mountains which separate it from the province of Ghilan (*Geog. of Herod.* p. 396). The Talmud understands *Cholwan*, five days' journey from Bagdad (Fürst, *Lex.* s. v.). Ptolemy, however, mentions (v, 18) another province in Mesopotamia of a similar name, namely, *Chalcitis* (Χαλκῖτις), which he places between Anthemusia (compare Strabo, xvi, 1, § 27) and Gauzonitis (Gozan); and this appears to be the true Halah of the Bible. It lay along the banks of the Upper Khabûr, extending from its source at Ras el-Ain to its junction with the Jerujer, as the name is thought to remain in the modern *Gla*, a large mound on this river, above its junction with the Jerujer (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 312, note). Halah, Habor, and Gozan were situated close together on the left bank of the Euphrates (Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, i, 246).

Halacha. See HAGGADAH; MIDRASH.

Ha'lak (Heb. *Chalak'*, חָלָק, *smooth*; Sept. Ἀαλάκ and Χελχά), the name (or, rather, epithet) of a hill (הָהָר הֶחָלָק, both with the art. = *the bare mount*) near the territory of Seir, at the southern extremity of Canaan, among the conquests of Joshua (Josh. xi, 17; xii, 7): so called, doubtless, from its bald appearance, making it a *landmark* in that direction. Hence it is used by Joshua, as Beersheba was used by later writers, to mark the southern limit of the country—"So Joshua took all that land . . . from *the Mount Halak*, that goeth up to Seir, even unto Baal-gad, in the valley of Lebanon, under Mount Hermon." The situation of the mountain is thus pretty definitely indicated. It adjoins Edom, and lay on the southern border of Palestine; it must, consequently, have been in, or very near, the great valley of the Arabah. The expression, "that goeth up to Seir" (הָעֹלֶה שֵׂעִיר), is worthy of note. Seir is the mountainous province of Edom [see SEIR]; and Mount Halak would seem to have been connected with it, as if running up towards it, or joining it to a lower district. About ten miles south of the Dead Sea a line of *naked* white cliffs, varying in height from 50 to 150 feet, runs completely across the Arabah. As seen from the north, the cliffs resemble a ridge of hills (and in this aspect the word הַר might perhaps be applied to them), shutting in the deep valley, and connecting the mountain chain on the west with the mountains of Seir on the east. It is possibly this ridge which is referred to in Numb. xxiv, 3, 4, and Josh. xv, 2, 3, under the name "Ascent of Akrabbim," and as marking the south-eastern border of Judah; and it might well be called *the bald mountain, which ascends to Seir*. It was also a natural landmark for the southern boundary for Palestine, as it is near Kedesh-barnea on the one side, and the northern ridge of Edom on the other. To this ridge, bounding the land in the valley on the south, is appropriately opposed on the north, "Baal-gad, in *the valley of Lebanon*" (Keil on *Joshua* xi, 17). The cliffs, and the scenery of the surrounding region, are minutely described by Robinson (*Bib. Res.* ii, 113, 116, 120). Still, the peculiar term, "the bald mountain," seems to require some more distinctive eminence, perhaps in this general range. Schwarz thinks it may be identified with *Jebel Madura*, on the south frontier of Judah, between the south end of the Dead Sea and wady Gaian (*Palestine*, p. 29); marked on Robinson's map a little south of the famous pass Nukb es-Sufah.

Haldane, James Alexander, brother of the following, was born at Dundee July 14, 1768. Having imbibed the family passion for the sea, he was appointed captain of the Melville Castle in 1793. The vessel, however, did not sail for four months, and during that interval a great change took place in captain Haldane's character. He became serious and thoughtful on the subject of religion, and, having determined to follow the example of his brother, who had already relinquished the seafaring life, he disposed of his command for £9000, and his share in the property of the ship and stores for £6000 more. With this fortune of £15,000 he retired with his wife to Scotland in 1794, and gave himself up to those religious inquiries which now engrossed his chief concern. Several years elapsed before his views were established; but at length he attained to a knowledge of the truth as well as peace in believing. Mr. James Haldane, having plenty of time at command, occupied himself with many plans of Christian usefulness; among which the opening of Sabbath-schools, and itinerant preaching, at first in the villages around Edinburgh, and afterwards in the other large towns of Scotland, were the chief. His principal coadjutor in these labors of love was John Campbell, the African traveller. In company with that zealous Christian, Mr. Haldane made successive tours throughout all Scotland as far as Orkney, and those who were awakened by their preaching were, through the liberality of Mr. Robert Haldane, accommodated with suitable places of worship. Mr. James eventually accepted the office of stated pastor in the Tabernacle, Leith Walk, Edinburgh, and in that capacity he exercised, without any emolument, all the public and private duties of a minister with unbroken fidelity and zeal for a period of fifty years. Although he vacillated on some points of Church government, he and his brother remained steadfast in their adherence to the general principles of the Scotch Baptists. He died in Edinburgh Feb. 8, 1851. Besides a number of controversial tracts, he published *A View of the social Worship of the first Christians* (Ebinb. 1805, 12mo):—*Man's Responsibility and the Extent of the Atonement* (Edinb. 1842, 12mo):—*Exposition of Galatians* (Edinb. 1848, 12mo):—*Inspiration of the Scriptures* (Edinb. 1845, 12mo).—Jamieson, *Religious Biography*, p. 242; Rich, *Biog. Dict.* s. v. Haldane; *Lives of the Brothers Haldane* (1852, 8vo); Belcher, *Memoir of Robert and James Alexander Haldane*, etc. (Amer. Tract Soc.); *New Englander*, April, 1861, p. 269. See INDEPENDENTS, III.

Haldane, Robert, an eminent Christian philanthropist, was born in London (of Scotch parents) Feb. 28, 1764, and inherited a large property. His early manhood was spent in the navy; he was afterwards an enthusiastic Democrat in politics, and welcomed the French Revolution. After this excitement subsided he was converted, and resolved on dedicating his life to missionary labors. India was the chosen field, and, having secured the promised co-operation of Messrs. Innes, Ewing, and Bogue, of Gosport, to whom he guaranteed adequate stipends, he applied to the Indian government to sanction his enterprise. The East India Company directors, after much deliberation, resolved that the superstitions of Hindostan should not be disturbed. Mr. Haldane now determined to employ his resources in spreading the Gospel at home, and, in conjunction with Rowland Hill and other eminent evangelists, he was instrumental in awakening an extensive revival of religion throughout Scotland. The General Assembly (1800) forbade field-preaching, and discouraged the revival. Mr. Haldane therefore seceded from the Established Church, and at his own expense erected places of worship, under the name of Tabernacles, in all

the large towns of Scotland, and educated 300 young men under Dr. Bogue at Gosport, Mr. Ewing at Glasgow, and Mr. Innes at Dundee. He also organized a theological school at Paris. His attention was subsequently directed to the evangelization of Africa. To commence this undertaking, he procured thirty young children from Sierra Leone to receive a Christian education at his expense, and gave a bond for £7000 for their board and education, which, however, the friends of emancipation in London undertook to defray. This is only one specimen of his munificence. His personal labors in awakening a religious spirit in the south of France were successful beyond his own most sanguine expectations; and both at Geneva and Montauban he sowed the seeds of truth, which are bearing good fruit to this day in the Protestant churches of France. Mr. Haldane took a prominent part in the management of the Continental Society and the Bible Society of Edinburgh; and in the painful controversy relative to the circulation of the Apocrypha by the British and Foreign Bible Society, which led to the establishment of the latter. He was the author of *The Evidence and Authority of divine Revelation* (3d ed. 1839, 2 vols. 12mo):—*An Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans* (Lond. 1839, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Verbal Inspiration* (6th ed. 1853, 12mo); and various controversial pamphlets. He died Dec. 12, 1842.—Jamieson, *Religious Biography*, p. 240; Rich, *Biogr. Dictionary;* Darling, *Lives of the Brothers Haldane* (Lond. 1852, 8vo); Belcher, *Memoir of Robert and James Alexander Haldane* (Amer. Tract. Soc.).

Halde, Du. See DU HALDE.

Hale, John, a Congregational minister, was born June 3, 1636, in Charlestown, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1657, and was ordained first pastor of the newly-formed Church at Beverley, Sept. 20, 1667, where he remained until his death, May 15, 1700. He published an *Election Sermon* (1684), and *A modest Inquiry into the Nature of Witchcraft, and how Persons guilty of that Crime may be convicted, and the Means used for their Discovery discussed, both negatively and affirmatively, according to Scripture and Experience* (18mo, 1697).—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 168.

Hale, Sir Matthew, was born at Alderley, Gloucestershire, Nov. 1, 1609, admitted at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, in 1626, and at Lincoln's Inn in 1629. In 1653 (under the Commonwealth) he was made one of the judges of the Common Bench, and in 1671 he was elected to be chief justice of the King's Bench. He died Dec. 25, 1676. He was a learned lawyer, an upright judge, a pious Christian. The only spot upon his memory as a criminal judge is the notorious fact of his having condemned two wretched women for witchcraft, at the assizes at Bury St. Edmund's, in the year 1665. Hale, in the course of the trial, avowed himself a believer in witchcraft, and the jury found the prisoners guilty, notwithstanding many impartial by-standers declared that they disbelieved the charge. No reprieve was granted, and the prisoners were executed. Hale was a voluminous writer. Of his legal publications we make no mention here; besides them he wrote *An Abstract of the Christian Religion:—A Discourse of Religion:—Contemplations, Moral and Divine:—The Knowledge of Christ crucified* (new ed. Glasg. 1828, 12mo). These and other minor pieces are gathered in his *Works, Moral and Religious*, edited by the Rev. T. Thirlwall, M.A. (London, 1805, 2 vols. 8vo). See Burnet, *Life of Sir M. Hale* (London, 1682, 12mo; also prefixed to his *Works*, above named); Baxter, *Notes on the Life and Death of Sir M. Hale* (Lond. 1682, 12mo; reprinted, with Hale's *Thoughts on Religion*, Lond. 1805, 12mo); Campbell, *Lives of the Chief Justices; English Cyclopædia;* Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.

Hales, JOHN, of Eton, usually called the "ever-memorable," an eminent English scholar and divine. was born in Bath, 1584, and educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In 1606 he was elected fellow of Merton College, and was employed by Sir H. Savile in the preparation of his fine edition of Chrysostom, published in 1613. His attainments in Greek gained him the professorship of that language at Oxford in 1612, and in 1613 he was ordained and become fellow of Eton. In 1618 he accompanied Sir D. Carleton to the Hague as his chaplain, and attended him to the Synod of Dort (q. v.). He went to that celebrated body a Calvinist, and left it an Arminian, as is shown by a letter of Farindon (q. v.), prefixed to Hales's Golden Remains, in which he says· "At the well-pressing of John iii, 16 by Episcopius there, *I bid John Calvin good-night, as he has often told me*" (see Jackson, *Life of Farindon*, p. xlix). In 1636 he wrote for Chillingworth a tract on *Schism*, in which he rebuked the claims of high Episcopacy. Laud sought to gain over the great Greek scholar, and offered him any preferment he pleased. In 1639 he was made canon of Windsor, but was deprived in 1642. Refusing to subscribe to the "covenant," he was compelled to wander from place to place, and at last he had to sell his library for bread. He died May 19, 1656. No man of his time had greater reputation for scholarship and piety. Bishop Pearson speaks of him as a "man of as great a sharpness, quickness, and subtilty of wit as ever this or perhaps any nation bred . . . . a man of vast and illimited knowledge, of a severe and profound judgment." He wrote unwillingly, and published but a few tracts in his lifetime; but after his death a number of his sermons and miscellaneous pieces were collected under the title of *Golden Remains of the Ever-memorable John Hales* (London, 1659, 8vo; best ed. 1673, 4to); his *Letters concerning the Synod of Dort* are published in the edition of 1673. An edition of his *Whole Works* (with the language *modernized*) was published by lord Hailes in 1765 (3 vols. 12mo). See Des Maizeaux, *Life of Hales* (Lond. 1719, 8vo); *General Biog. Dictionary;* Jackson, *Life of Farindon* (prefixed to Farindon's Sermons, vol. i); Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ii, 124; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 476–7; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.

Haliburton. See HALYBURTON.

Half-communion, the withholding the cup from the laity in the Lord's Supper. "This practice of the Church of Rome was first authorized by Innocent III, and then made obligatory by the Council of Constance; and one motive for the innovation appears to have been to exalt the priesthood by giving them some exclusive privilege even in communion at the Lord's table. Transubstantiation and half-communion, or communion in one kind only, are ingeniously linked together. Romanists believe that Christ, whole and entire, his soul, body, and divinity, is contained in either species, and in the smallest particle of each. Hence they infer that, whether the communicant receive the bread or the wine, he enjoys the full benefit of the sacrament. Therefore, to support the monstrous dogma, the sacrament is divided in two: transubstantiation justifies communion in one kind, and communion in one kind proves the truth of transubstantiation. In thus denying the cup to the laity, the institution of Christ is mutilated, the express law of the Gospel perverted, and the practice of the apostles abandoned. The withholding the cup was one of the grievances which induced the Hussites to resist the usurpations of the Church of Rome" (Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.). See LORD'S SUPPER.

Half-way Covenant, a scheme adopted by the Congregational churches of New England in order to extend the privileges of church membership and infant baptism beyond the pale of actual communicants at the Lord's table. Stoddard, of Northampton, vindicated it, and Jonathan Edwards opposed it. This struggle caused Edwards's removal from Northampton. It is now abandoned by the orthodox Congregationalists.—Hurst, *Rationalism*, p. 538; Upham, *Ratio Disciplinæ*, xxi. See CONGREGATIONALISTS; EDWARDS, JONATHAN.

Hal'hul (Heb. *Chalchul'*, חַלְחוּל, etymol. doubtful, but, according to Fürst, full of *hollows;* Sept. Ἀλούλ v.

r. Αἰλουά), a town in the highlands of Judah, mentioned in the fourth group of six north of Hebron (Keil, *Josh.* p. 387), among them Beth-zur and Gedor (Josh. xv, 58). Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Elul) says it existed in his time near Hebron as a small village ("vilula") by the name of *Alula*. Dr. Robinson found it in the modern *Hulhul*, a short distance north of Hebron, consisting of a ruined mosque (called Neby Yunas or "Prophet Jonah") upon a long hill, surrounded by the remains of ancient walls and foundations (*Researches*, i, 319). During his last visit to Palestine he visited it again, and describes it as situated high on the eastern brow of the ridge, the head town of the district, inhabited by an incivil people; the environs are thrifty and well cultivated. The old mosque is a poor structure, but has a minaret (new ed. of *Researches*, iii, 281). Schwarz also identifies it with this village on a mount, 5 Eng. miles north-east of Hebron" (*Palestine*, p. 107). So likewise De Saulcy (*Dead Sea*, i, 451). The hill is quite a conspicuous one, half a mile to the left of the road from Jerusalem to Hebron, the village somewhat at its eastern foot, while opposite it, on the other side of the road, is Beit-sûr, the modern representative of Beth-zur, and a little further to the north is Jedûr, the ancient Gedor. In a Jewish tradition quoted by Hottinger (*Cippi Hebraici*, p. 38), and reported by an old Hebrew traveller (Jo. Chel, 1334; see Carmody, *Itin. Hebrew*, p. 242), it is said to be the burial-place of Gad, David's seer (2 Sam. xxiv, 11). Hence it was for a time a place of Jewish pilgrimage (Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, i, 384). See also the citations of Zunz in Asher's *Benj. of Tudela* (ii, 437, note). See CHELLUS.

Ha'li (Heb. *Chali'*. חֲלִי, *necklace;* Sept. Ἀλί v. r. Ἀλέφ and Ὀολεί), a town on the border of the tribe of Asher, mentioned between Helkath and Beten (Josh. xix, 25). Schwarz thinks it may be the *Chalon* (Cyamon) of Judith vii, 3, opposite Esdraelon, and therefore near the range of Carmel (*Palest.* p. 191); but the reading of that passage is doubtful (see Arnald, *Comment.* ad loc.), and such an identification would place Hali far remote from the associated localities, which seem to indicate a position on the eastern boundary, at some distance from its northern extremity. Accordingly Van de Velde suggests (*Memoir*, p. 318) that "perhaps the site of this city may be recognised in that of *Alia*, a place where the rock-hewn foundations of a large city are seen, on the south-east side of the village of M'alia, rather more than five hours north-east of Akka; the tell of M'alia would seem to have formed the acropolis of the ancient city."

Halicarnas'sus (Ἁλικάρνασσος), in Caria of Asia Minor, a city of great renown, as being the birthplace of Herodotus and of the later historian Dionysius, and as embellished by the mausoleum erected by Artemisia, but of no Biblical interest except as the residence of a Jewish population in the periods between the Old and New Testament histories. In 1 Macc. xv, 23, this city is specified as containing such a population. The decree in Josephus (*Ant.* xiv, 10, 23), where the Romans direct that the Jews of Halicarnassus shall be allowed their national usage of proseuchæ, or prayer-chapels by the sea-side (τὰς προσευχὰς ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τῇ θαλάσσῃ κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος), is interesting when compared with Acts xvi, 13. This city was celebrated for its harbor and for the strength of its fortifications; but, having made a vigorous and protracted defense against Alexander the Great, he was so much enraged that, upon gaining at length possession of it, he destroyed it by fire—a calamity from which it never recovered. A plan of the site is given in Ross, *Reisen auf den Griech. Inseln*, i, 30 (copied in Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.). The sculptures of the mausoleum are the subject of a paper by Mr. Newton in the *Classical Museum*, and many of them are now in the British Museum (see also his full work, *Discoveries at Halicarnassus*, etc., Lond. 1862-3). The modern name of the place is *Budrum*.

Hall occurs in the A. V. of the N. T. three times; twice (Matt. xxvii, 27; Mark xv, 16) in reference to the πραιτώριον, *prætorium*, or residence of the Roman governor at Jerusalem, which was either the palace built by the elder Herod, or the tower of Antonia; his usual abode was at Cæsarea (Acts xxiii, 23). Mark adds to the word αὐλή, as he is wont in other cases, an explanatory phrase, ὅ ἐστι πραιτώριον (Vulg. *atrium prætorii*). In Luke xxii, 55, αὐλή means the open court or quadrangle belonging to the high-priest's house, such as was common to Oriental dwellings. It has the same meaning in Matt. xxvi, 69, and Mark xiv, 66, and in both passages is incorrectly rendered "palace" in the A. V., as the adverbs ἔξω and κάτω plainly distinguish the αὐλή from the οἶκος to which it was attached (Luke xxii, 54). So in Luke xi, 21. In John x, 1, 16, it means a "sheep-fold," and in Rev. xi, 2, the outer "*court*" of the Temple. The αὐλή was entered from the street by a προαύλιον or *vestibule* (Mark xiv, 68), through a πυλών or *portal* (Matt. xxvi, 71), in which was a θύρα or *wicket* (John xviii, 16; Acts xii, 13).—Kitto, s. v. Αὐλή is the equivalent for חָצֵר, an inclosed or fortified space (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 512), in many places in the O. T. where the Vulg. and A. Vers. have respectively *villa* or *viculus*, "village," or *atrium*, "court," chiefly of the tabernacle or Temple. See COURT. The hall or court of a house or palace would probably be an inclosed but uncovered space, *impluvium*, on a lower level than the apartments of the lowest floor which looked into it. See HOUSE.

Hall, Charles, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Williamsport, Pa., June 23, 1799, and graduated at Hamilton College in 1824 with great distinction. He passed his theological studies at Princeton, was licensed in 1827, and appointed soon after assistant secretary to the Home Missionary Society. In 1852 he went to Europe for his health, visited most of that continent, and returned after a short absence to his accustomed duties. He died Oct. 31, 1853. He edited for several years *The Home Missionary;* and published *A Tract on Plans and Motives for the Extension of Sabbath Schools* (1828):—*The Daily Verse Expositor* (1832):—*A Plan for systematic Benevolence;* and *A Sermon on the World's Conversion* (1841).—Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 730.

Hall, Gordon, a Congregational minister and missionary to India. He was born in Granville (now Tolland), Mass., April 8, 1781, and graduated from Williams College in 1808 with the first honors of his class. At college he had formed the acquaintance of Samuel J. Mills and James Richards, afterwards missionaries. He commenced the study of theology under Ebenezer Porter, afterwards president of Andover Theological Seminary, was licensed to preach in 1809, and supplied for a time a church at Woodbury. But from the time of his acquaintance with Mills it seems he had purposed to become a missionary. In 1810 he went to Andover, was ordained at Salem Feb. 6, 1812, and sailed on the 18th from Philadelphia with Nott and Rice, arriving in Calcutta on the 17th of June. The East India Company refused them the privilege of laboring or remaining in its territory, and Messrs. Hall and Nott embarked for Bombay, where they arrived Feb. 11, 1813. Orders from the governor general followed, commanding them to be sent to England; but by the courage and wisdom of Mr. Hall's memorials, the governor was influenced to repeal his order, and Mr. Hall remained. He labored zealously and with great success until March 20, 1826, when he was suddenly cut off by cholera. Mr. Hall possessed fine abilities, ardent piety, great courage and self-sacrifice. His indomitable spirit, and the ability of his appeals to the governor general, did much to open the way for the success of Christianity in India.—*American Missionary Memorial*, p. 41. (G. L. T.)

Hall, Joseph, D.D., bishop of Norwich, was born at Ashby-de-la-Zouch July 1, 1574, and educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge. While rector of Halsted,

in Suffolk, he composed his "*Contemplations*," which procured him the patronage of prince Henry and the rectory of Waltham. In 1616 he went to Paris as chaplain to the English ambassador. On his return he was appointed by king James to the deanery of Worcester (1617), and in the following year he accompanied his royal master into Scotland, when that monarch made a progress into the northern part of his kingdom to prosecute his imprudent scheme of erecting Episcopacy on the ruins of Presbyterianism. None of the unpopularity, however, of that measure fell upon Hall, whose character and principles secured him the esteem and respect of the most eminent Scotchmen of the day. He was commanded to go over into Holland to attend the Synod of Dort in 1618; but the protracted meetings of that convocation made sad inroads on his health, and after two months he returned with an impaired constitution to England. In 1627 he was raised to the see of Exeter, and afterwards, without any solicitation, to that of Norwich in 1641. Amid all the ecclesiastical tyranny of Laud, bishop Hall preserved his moderation. The bishop, however, had his season of trial. When the popular outcry "No bishops" was raised, and an armed mob marched against the House of Lords, Hall, with eleven of the lords spiritual, joined in protesting against the measures which were passed in their absence; and this document having been made a ground of impeachment, he, with his protesting brethren, were consigned to the Tower. He was released in June following on giving bail for £5000. He continued for a year to exercise his episcopal functions in Norwich; but the popular tide again set in, his house was attacked, his property sequestrated, himself insulted, and in meek resignation he retired into a small place called Higham, in Norfolk, where he spent the remainder of his days in acts of piety and charity, and at length died Sept. 8, 1656, in the eighty-second year of his age. Bishop Hall was a "man of very devotional habits, to fortify which he made a most rigid distribution of his time, having set hours for prayer, for reading divinity, for general literature and composition; and so intense was his ardor in the pursuit of intellectual and spiritual improvement, that for a time he observed the strictest abstemiousness, taking for a while only one meal a day." For his depth of thought and elegance of language he has been called "the Christian Seneca." His writings consist, besides the "Contemplations," of sermons, polemical and practical theology, and correspondence; the best edition is *Works, with some account of his life and writings* (edited by Peter Hall, Oxford, 1837, 12 vols. 8vo). Many editions of the *Contemplations* have appeared. See Hughes, *Life of Bishop Hall;* Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, v, 514; Rich, *Cyclop. of Biography*, s. v.; Jamieson, *Religious Biography*, p. 245; Wordsworth, *Eccles. Biography*, iv, 255.

Hall, Peter, an English divine and theological writer. was born in 1803. He studied first at Winchester College, and entered Brazenose College, Oxford, in 1820. He was ordained in 1828, and became successively curate of St. Edmund's, Salisbury; rector of Millston, Wilts, in 1834; minister of Tavistock chapel, Drury Lane, London, in 1836; and of Long Acre chapel in 1841. In 1843 he removed to Bath, and became minister of St. Thomas's chapel, Walcot. He died in 1849. Hall wrote *Reliquiæ liturgicæ: Documents connected with the Liturgy of the Church of England* (Bath, 1847, 5 vols. 18mo):—*Fragmenta liturgica: Documents illustrative of the Liturgy of the Church of England* (Bath, 1848, 7 vols. 18mo); and a number of *Sermons*. Mr. Hall published a new English edition of that valuable work, *The Harmony of the Protestant Confessions* (1841, 8vo), the two previous English editions of which (Camb. 1586, 12mo; London, 1643, 4to) had become very scarce. He also edited the best edition of the works of his ancestor, bishop Hall (Oxford, 1837, 12 vols.); and wrote *Congregational Reform, four Sermons with notes* (London, 1835, 12mo).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliog.* i, 1373; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 764; *Gentleman's Magazine*, November, 1849.

Hall, Richard, an English Romanist writer, was born about 1540. He studied at first at Christ College, Cambridge, but was obliged to leave it in 1572 on account of being a Roman Catholic. He then went to Douay, and afterwards to Italy. Having returned to Douay, he became professor of theology in the English college of that city. He became successively canon of St. Gery of Cambray, then of the cathedral of St. Omer, and finally official of the diocese. He died in 1604. He published several works of controversy, such as *De primariis Causis Tumultuum Belgicorum* (Douay, 1581):—*De quinque partita Conscientia* (Douay, 1598, 4to). But he is especially known for his *Life of Bishop Fisher*, the original MSS. of which was kept by the English Benedictines in their convent of Deeuward, in Lorraine. A copy of it fell into the hands of Thomas Bailey, son of Bailey or Baily, bishop of Bangor, who sold it to a publisher: the work appeared under the name of Bailey (London, 1655, 8vo; Lond. 1739. 12mo). See Chalmers, *General Biog. Dict.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 149.

Hall, Robert, one of the most eloquent of modern preachers, was born at Arnsby, Leicestershire, May 2, 1764. His father, who was also a Baptist minister of good repute, early remarked his talent, and gave him every opportunity for its development. It is said that "Edwards *On the Will* and Butler's *Analogy* were the chosen companions of his childhood, being perused and reperused with intense interest before he was nine years old. At eleven his master, Mr. Simmons, declared himself unable any longer to keep pace with his pupil!" In 1773 he was placed under the instruction of the learned and pious John Ryland, of Northampton. At fifteen he became a student in the Baptist College at Bristol, and at eighteen he entered King's College, Aberdeen, where he took the degree of M.A. Here he "enjoyed the instruction of Drs. Gerard, Ogilvie, Beattie, and Campbell, and also formed that intimate friendship with Sir James Mackintosh which continued through life. Mr. Hall was the first scholar in his class through his collegiate course." In 1785 he was chosen as colleague with Dr. Caleb Evans in the ministry at Broadmead Chapel, Bristol, and adjunct professor in the Baptist Academy there. Here he attained great popularity. His father died in 1791; and the same year a difference with Dr. Evans led to his removing from Bristol, and accepting an invitation to become pastor of the Baptist congregation at Cambridge on the departure of the Rev. Robert Robinson, who had adopted Unitarian views, to be successor to Dr. Priestley at Birmingham. Hall had already acquired considerable celebrity as a preacher, but it was not till now that he appeared as an author: and the impulse that sent him to the press was rather political than theological. His first publication (unless we are to reckon some anonymous contributions to a Bristol newspaper in 1786-87) was a pamphlet entitled *Christianity consistent with a Love of Freedom, being an Answer to a Sermon by the Rev. John Clayton* (8vo, 1791). Like most of the ardent and generous minds of that day, he was strongly excited and carried away by the hopes and promises of the French Revolution. In 1793 he published another liberal pamphlet, entitled *An Apology for the Freedom of the Press, and for general Liberty*, which brought him much reputation. The impression that had been made upon him, however, by the irreligious character of the French revolutionary movement was indicated in his next publication, *Modern Infidelity considered with respect to its Influence on Society, a Sermon* (8vo, 1800). It was the publication of this able and eloquent sermon which first brought Hall into general notice. From this time whatever he produced attracted immediate attention. "In 1802 appeared his *Reflections on War*. The threatened invasion of Bonaparte in 1803 brought him again before

the public in the discourse entitled *Sentiments suitable to the present Crisis*, which raised Mr. Hall's reputation for large views and powerful eloquence to the highest pitch. In November, 1804, owing chiefly to a disease of the spine, attended by want of sufficient exercise and rest, the exquisitely toned mind of Mr. Hall lost its balance, and he who had so long been the theme of universal admiration became the subject of as extensive a sympathy. He was placed under the care of Dr. Arnold, of Leicester, where, by the divine blessing, his health was restored in about two months. But similar causes produced a relapse about twelve months afterwards, from which he was soon restored, though it was deemed essential to the permanent establishment of his health that he should resign his pastoral charge and remove from Cambridge. Two shocks of so humiliating a calamity within the compass of a year deeply impressed Mr. Hall's mind. His own decided persuasion was that he never before experienced a thorough transformation of character; and there can be no question that from this period his spirit was habitually more humble, dependent, and truly devotional. It became his custom to renew every birthday, by a solemn act, the dedication of himself to God, on evangelical principles, and in the most earnest sincerity of heart. In 1807 he became pastor of the Baptist church in Leicester, where he soon after married, and where he labored most successfully for nearly twenty years. At no period was he more happy, active, and useful. The church, when he left it, was larger than the whole congregation when he took the charge of it. But his influence was not confined to the limits of his parish. He took an active part in all the noble charities of the age, and by his sermons, speeches, and writings exerted a wide influence on society, not only in England, but on the continent of Europe, in America, and in India. His review of *Zeal without Innovation*, his tracts on the *Terms of Communion*, and his sermons on the *Advantages of Knowledge to the lower Classes*, on the *Discouragements and Supports of the Christian Ministry*, on the *Character of a Christian Missionary*, on the *Death of the Princess Charlotte* and of *Rev. Dr. Ryland*, with several others, were given to the public while residing here. Here also, in 1823, he delivered his admirable course of lectures on the *Socinian Controversy*, partially preserved in his *Works*. At last, in 1826, he removed to the pastoral care of his old congregation at Broadmead, Bristol, and here he remained till his death, which took place at Bristol on the 21st of Feb., 1831. Besides occasional contributions to various dissenting periodical publications, Hall published various tracts and sermons in the last twenty years of his life, which, along with those already mentioned, have since his death been collected under the title of *The Works of Robert Hall, M.A., with a brief Memoir of his Life by Dr. Gregory, and Observations on his Character as a Preacher by John Foster*, published under the superintendence of Olinthus Gregory, LL.D., professor of mathematics in the Royal Military Academy (London, 1831-32, 6 vols. 8vo; 11th ed. 1853). It was intended that the Life should have been written by Sir James Mackintosh, but he died (in May, 1832) before beginning it. Dr. Gregory's Memoir, from which we have abstracted the materials of this article, was afterwards published in a separate form. See GREGORY, OLINTHUS. The first volume of Hall's *Works* contains sermons, charges, and circular letters (or addresses in the name of the governing body of the Baptist Church); the second, a tract entitled *On Terms of Communion* (1815, in 2 parts), and another entitled *The essential Difference between Christian Baptism and the Baptism of John* (a defence of what is called the practice of free communion, which produced a powerful effect in liberalizing the practice of the Baptist community) (1816 and 1818, in 2 parts); the third, political and miscellaneous tracts, extending from 1791 to 1826, and also the Bristol newspaper contributions of 1786-87; the fourth, reviews and miscellaneous pieces; the fifth, notes of sermons and letters. The sixth, besides Dr. Gregory's memoir, contains Mr. Foster's observations, and notes taken down by friends of twenty-one sermons. The American reprint (New York, Harper and Brothers, 4 vols. 8vo) contains, besides what is given in the English edition, a number of additional sermons, with anecdotes, etc., by Rev. Joseph Belcher.

Robert Hall was one of the greatest preachers of his age. His "excellence did not so much consist in the predominance of one of his powers as in the exquisite proportion and harmony of them all. The richness, variety, and extent of his knowledge were not so remarkable as his absolute mastery over it. There is not the least appearance of straining after greatness in his most magnificent excursions, but he rises to the loftiest heights with the most childlike ease. His style as a writer is one of the clearest and simplest—the least encumbered with its own beauty—of any which ever has been written. His noblest passages do but make truth visible in the form of beauty, and 'clothe upon' abstract ideas till they become palpable in exquisite shapes. 'Whoever wishes to see the English language in its perfection,' says Dugald Stewart, 'must read the writings of Rev. Robert Hall. He combines the beauties of Johnson, Addison, and Burke, without their imperfections.'" He is distinguished, however, rather for expression and exposition than for invention; he was an orator rather than a great thinker. But *as* an orator he will rank in literature with Bossuet and Massillon. For critical estimates of him by Mackintosh and other eminent men, see *Life of Hall*, by Gregory, prefixed to his *Works;* also *Eclectic Magazine*, vii, 1; *North British Review*, iv, 454; *North American Review*, lxiv, 384; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, iv, 516; *Quarterly Review* (Lond.), xlvii, 100; *English Cyclopædia;* Jamieson, *Religious Biography*, p. 246.

Hallel (הַלֵּל, Gr. ὕμνος), the designation of a particular part of the hymnal service, chanted in the Temple and in the family on certain festivals.

1. *Origin of the name, contents of the service, etc.* The name *hallel'*, הַלֵּל, which signifies *praise*, is κατ' ἐξοχόν, given to this distinct portion of the hymnal service because it consists of Psalms cxiii–cxviii, which are Psalms of *praise*, and because this group of Psalms begins with *Hallelujah*, הַלְלוּיָהּ. It is also called הַלֵּל הַמִּצְרִי, *the Egyptian Hallel*, because it was chanted in the Temple whilst the Passover lambs, which were first enjoined in Egypt, were being slain. There is another *Hallel* called הַלֵּל הַגָּדוֹל, *the Great Hallel* (so called because of the reiterated response after every verse, "For thy mercy endureth forever," in Psa. cxxxvi, which is part of this *Hallel*), which, according to R. Jehudah (*Pesachim*, 118) and Maimonides, comprises Psalms cxviii–cxxxvi (*Jod Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Chamez u. Maza*, viii, 10). Others, however, though agreeing that this Hallel ends with Psalm cxxxvi, maintain that it begins with Psalm cxx or Psalm cxxxv, 4 (*Pesachim*, 118).

2. *Time and manner in which it was chanted.*—This hymnal service, or Egyptian Hallel, was chanted at the sacrifice of the first and second Pesach, after the daily sacrifice on the first day of Passover (Mishna, *Pesachim*, v, 7), after the morning sacrifice on the Feast of Pentecost, the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles (Mishna, *Succa*, iv, 8), and the eight days of the Feast of Dedication (Mishna, *Taanith*, v, 5), making in all twenty days in the year. "On twelve days out of the twenty, viz., at the sacrifice of the first and second Pesach, of the first day of Pesach, of the Feast of Pentecost, and of the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles, the flute was played before the altar when *the Hallel* was chanted" (Mishna, *Pesachim*, ii, 3), whilst after the morning sacrifice during the eight days of the Feast of Dedication *the Hallel* was chanted without this accompaniment of the flute. The manner in which these hymns of praise were offered must have been very imposing and impressive. The

Levites who could be spared from assisting at the slaying of the sacrifices took their stand before the altar, and chanted *the Hallel* verse by verse; the people responsively repeated every verse, or burst forth in solemn and intoned *Hallelujahs* at every pause, whilst the slaves of the priests, the Levites, and the respectable lay people assisted in playing the flute (comp. *Pesachim*, 64, a; *Erachim*, 10, a, b; and *Tosipha* on Cap. i; *Sota*, 27, b; *Taanith*, 28, a, b). No representatives of the people (אנשי מעמד) were required to be present at the Temple at the morning sacrifices on the days when the Hallel was chanted (Mishna, *Taanith*, iv, 4). See SACRIFICE.

The Egyptian *Hallel* was also chanted in private families at the celebration of the Passover on the first evening of this feast. On this occasion *the Hallel* was divided into two parts; the part comprising Psa. cxiii and cxiv was chanted during the partaking of the second cup, whilst the second part, comprising Psa. cxv and cxvi, was chanted over the fourth and finishing cup (רביעי גומר עליו את ההלל, Mishna, *Pesachim*, x, 7); and it is generally supposed that the singing of the hymn by our Saviour and his disciples at the conclusion of the Passover supper (Matt. xxvi, 30; Mark xiv, 26) refers to the last part of this Hallel. (Dean Alford [*Greek Testament*, ad loc.] strangely confounds this Hallel with *the Great Hallel.*) In Babylon there was an ancient custom, which can be traced as far back as the 2d century of the Christian æra, to recite this Hallel on every festival of the new moon (*Taanith*, 28, a), omitting, however, Psa. cxv, 1-11, and cxvi, 1-11.

The great Hallel (הלל הגדול) was recited on the first evening at the Passover supper by those who wished to have *a fifth cup*, i. e. one above the enjoined number (Maimonides, *Jod Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Chamez u. Maza*, viii, 10). It was also recited on occasions of great joy, as an expression of thanksgiving to God for special mercies (Mishna, *Taanith*, iii, 9).

3. *Present use of the Hymnal Service.*—The Jews to the present day recite the Egyptian Hallel at the morning prayer immediately after *the Eighteen Benedictions* (שמונה עשרה) on all the festivals of the year except *New Year* and *the Day of Atonement*, omitting Psa. cxv, 1-11, and cxvi, 1-11, on the last six days of the Feast of Passover, and on the new moon. Before the Hallel is recited they pronounce the following benediction: "Blessed art thou, Lord our God, King of the world, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and enjoined upon us to recite the Hallel!" At the Passover supper, on the first two evenings of the festival, both the Egyptian Hallel and the Great Hallel are now recited; the former is still divided in the same manner as it was in the days of our Saviour.

4. *Institution of this Hymnal Service.*—It is now impossible to ascertain precisely when this service was first instituted. Some of the Talmudists affirm that it was instituted by Moses, others say that Joshua introduced it, others derive it from Deborah, David, Hezekiah, or Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah (*Pesachim*, 117, a). From 2 Chron. xxxv, 15, we see that the practice of the Levites chanting the Hallel while the Paschal lambs were in the act of being slain was already in vogue in the days of Josiah, and it is not at all improbable that it was customary to do so at a much earlier period.

5. *Literature.*—Maimonides, *Jod Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Chamez u. Maza*, sections vii and viii, vol. i, p. 263-265; Buxtorf, *Lexicon Chaldaicum Talmudicum et Rabbinicum*, s. v. הלל, col. 613-616; and Bartoloccii, *Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica*, ii, 227-243, have important treatises upon this subject, but their information is most uncritically put together, and no distinction is made between earlier and later practices. A thoroughly masterly and critical investigation is that of Krochmal, *More Neboche Ha-Seman* (Leopoli, 1851), p. 135 sq.; comp. also Edelmann's edition of *the Siddur* with Landshuth's *Critical Annotations* (Königsberg, 1845), p. 423 sq.; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Nordhausen, 1857), ii, 169 sq.

Hallelu'jah (Heb. *hallelu'-yah'*, הַלְלוּ־יָהּ, *Praise ye Jah*, i. e. *Jehovah!*) or (in its Greek form) ALLELU'IAH (Ἀλληλούϊα), a word which stands at the beginning of many of the Psalms. See Müller, *De notione Hallelujah* (Cygn. 1690); Wernsdorf, *De formula Hallelujah* (Viteb. 1763). From its frequent occurrence in this position it grew into a formula of praise, and was chanted as such on solemn days of rejoicing. (See *Critica Biblica*, ii, 448.) This is intimated by the apocryphal book of Tobit (xiii, 18) when speaking of the rebuilding of Jerusalem, "And all her (Jerusalem's) streets shall sing Alleluia" (comp. Rev. xix, 1, 3, 4, 6). This expression of joy and praise was transferred from the synagogue to the church, and is still occasionally heard in devotional psalmody.—Kitto. The Hebrew terms are frequently rendered "Praise ye the Lord;" and so in the margin of Psa. civ, 35; cv, 45; cvi; cxi, 1; cxii, 1; cxiii, 1 (comp. Psa. cxiii, 9; cxv, 18; cxvi, 19; cxvii, 2). The Psalms from cxiii to cxviii were called by the Jews the Hallel, and were sung on the first of the month, at the Feast of Dedication, and the Feast of Tabernacles, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of the Passover. See HOSANNA. On the last occasion Psa. cxiii and cxiv, according to the school of Hillel (the former only according to the school of Shammai), were sung before the feast, and the remainder at its termination, after drinking the last cup. The hymn (Matt. xxvi, 30) sung by Christ and his disciples after the last supper is supposed to have been a part of this Hallel, which seems to have varied according to the feast. See HALLEL. The literal meaning of "hallelujah" sufficiently indicates the character of the Psalms in which it occurs, as hymns of praise and thanksgiving. They are all found in the last book of the collection, and bear marks of being intended for use in the Temple service, the words "praise ye Jehovah" being taken up by the full chorus of Levites. See PSALMS. In the great hymn of triumph in heaven over the destruction of Babylon, the apostle in vision heard the multitude in chorus like the voice of mighty thunderings burst forth "Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth," responding to the voice which came out of the throne, saying, "Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great" (Rev. xix, 1-6). In this, as in the offering of incense (Rev. viii), there is evident allusion to the service of the Temple, as the apostle had often witnessed it in its fading grandeur. See REVELATION, BOOK OF.

HALLELUJAH, a doxology used frequently in the ancient Church, and derived from the Old Testament. The singing Hallelujah sometimes means the repetition of the word, in imitation of the heavenly host (see Rev. xix); at other times it has reference to one of the psalms beginning with Hallelujah. In the early Christian Church "the more common acceptation of 'hallelujah' is for the singing of the word itself in special parts of divine service, as a sort of mutual call to each other to praise the Lord." In some churches the Hallelujah was sung only on Easter day and the fifty days of Pentecost; in others it was used more generally. Augustine says it was not used in time of Lent (Augustine, *Epist.* 119, 178). In the fourth Council of Toledo it is mentioned under the name *Laudes*, and appointed to be sung after the reading of the Gospel (*Concil. Tolet.* iv, can. 10, 11). It was occasionally sung at funerals: St. Jerome speaks of it as being sung at the funeral of Fabiola, and says the people made the golden roof of the church shake with echoing forth the Hallelujah (*Contra Vigilant.* cap. 1, and *Epist.* xxx, cap. 4). The ancient Church retained the Hebrew word, as also did the Church of England in its first Liturgy; though now it is translated "Praise ye the Lord," to which the people reply, "The Lord's name be praised." See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xiv, ch. ii, § 4; Procter,

On Common Prayer, p. 212; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. xv, § 9.

Haller, Albrecht von, one of the greatest of modern physiologists, was born in Berne Oct. 16, 1708, and displayed, even in childhood, the most extraordinary talents. He studied medicine first at Tübingen, and afterwards at Leyden, under Boerhaave. After extensive travels he became professor of anatomy, surgery, and botany at Göttingen in 1736, and remained there until 1753, when he returned to Berne. There he resided, honored by his fellow-citizens, for nearly a quarter of a century; continued to benefit science by his literary labors; filled several important offices in the state, and adorned the Gospel by his life. He died in October, 1777. A great part of the modern science of physiology is due to the labors and genius of Haller. But his place in our pages is due to his steady religious life, to his constant recognition, in his works, of the great truths of Christianity, and especially to his religious writings, viz. *Briefe über die wichtigsten Wahrheiten der Offenbarung* (Berne, 1772); *Briefe zur Vertheidigung der Offenbarung* (Berne, 1775-77, 3 parts), consisting of letters to his daughter on the truth and excellence of Christianity. See Zimmermann, *Leben Hallers* (Zürich, 1755, 8vo); *Biographie de Haller* (Paris, 1846, 2d edit.).

Haller, Berthold, one of the Reformers of Berne, was born at Aldingen, Würtemberg, in 1492. At Pforzheim he had Melancthon for a fellow-student, and graduated bachelor at Cologne in 1512. After teaching some time at Rottweil he went to Berne, invited by Rubellus in 1513 (1518?). He became assistant to Dr. Wyttenbach in St. Vincent's church, and in his society, his knowledge of the Scriptures and his religious character were greatly cultivated. About 1520 he made the acquaintance of Zwingle, who was always afterwards his faithful friend and counsellor. Shortly after he succeeded Wyttenbach as cathedral preacher, and soon began to expound Matthew, instead of following the usual Church lessons only. His eloquence and zeal made him extremely popular. When the strife began in 1522 Haller was a member of the commission, and distinguished himself in the conference by his opposition to the bishop of Lausanne. His hold upon the popular mind was so great that in the subsequent years of strife he held his place as preacher in spite of all opposition, and contributed greatly, not so much by his learning as by his personal force of character, to the establishment of the Reformation in Berne. Even with the Anabaptists, on their appearance in Berne, he obtained great influence. In 1525 he courageously abandoned the Mass. In the Grand Council he defended himself so vigorously that he was still kept in office as preacher, though he lost his canonship. In 1527 a number of Reformers were elected to the "Grand Council." The venerable Francis Kolb, full of fire and energy, was now in Berne, ready to aid and stimulate the more prudent Haller. The "M ndates" of 1523 and 1526, the former for, the latter against the Reformation, were submitted to the people, and they decided for the first. In the "Conference" of 1528, at Berne, Haller took the leading part, aided by Zwingle, Œcolampadius, and Bucer. It was finally decreed by the Conference that the Mass should be abolished. In 1529 he married. His labors for the Reformation extended to Solothurn, and to other parts of Switzerland; but his chief activity lay in Berne, where he held his pre-eminence as preacher and Reformer until his death, Feb. 25, 1536. He left no writings. See Kirchhofer, *Haller oder die Reform. v. Bern* (Zurich, 1828); Kuhn, *Die Reformatoren Berns* (Berne, 1828); D'Aubigne, *History of Reformation*, ii, 349; iii, 336; iv, 296, 308; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 479.

Haller, Karl Ludwig von, was born at Berne Aug. 1, 1768. In 1795 he became secretary of the city council, and in 1800 emigrated to Germany. In 1806 he returned, and became professor of history and statistics at Berne. In 1814 he became member of the city council, and in 1818 made a journey through Italy and to Rome. Having secretly become a member of the Romish Church in 1820, he joined it openly in 1821, and was discharged from his office. He then went to Paris in 1824, and was employed in the ministry of foreign affairs. Having lost that situation in consequence of the Revolution of July, 1830, he finally went to Solothurn, where he was in 1834 appointed member of the lesser council. Here he was at the head of the Ultramontane party, and died May 20, 1854. Haller was an ultra-conservative in politics, and was drawn into the Church of Rome by his fanatical hatred of all liberal reforms. His chief work, entitled *Restauration der Staatswissenschaften* (Winterthur, 1816-1834, 6 vols.), was written with the design to annihilate all revolutionary principles in politics. Even many Roman Catholic writers expressed a decided dissent from the antiliberal doctrines of this work. The most important among his other works are, *Lettre à sa famille pour lui déclarer son retour à l'église catholique* (Par. 1821; in German by Paulus, Stuttgard, 1821; by Studer, Berne, 1821):—*Theorie der geistl. Staaten u. Gesellschaften* (Winterthur, 1822):—*Die Freimaurerei u. ihr Einfluss auf d. Schweiz* (Schaffhausen, 1840):—*Gesch. der kirchl. Revolut. des Cantons Bern* (Lucerne, 1839, 4th ed.). See Tzschirner, *der Uebertritt des Herrn von H. z. katholischen Kirche* (Lpz. 1821); Krug, *Apologie der protestantischen Kirche* (Lpz. 1821); Escher, *Ueber die Philosophie des Staatsrechts mit bes. Bezieh. auf d. Haller'sche Restauration* (Zurich, 1825); Scherer (ultramontane), *Die Restauration der Staatswissensch.* (Lucerne, 1845).

Hallet, Joseph, an English Nonconformist, was born at Exeter in 1692, ordained in 1713, and succeeded his father as co-pastor with Mr. Pierce over the Independent congregation at Exeter in 1722. Here he discharged his pastoral duties faithfully until his death in 1744. As a writer, he was marked by industry, learning, and critical sagacity. He wrote a number of controversial tracts on the Evidences of Christianity in reply to Tindal and Chubb, and on the Trinity. Besides these, he published *A free and impartial Study of the Holy Scriptures recommended*, being notes on peculiar texts of Scripture (Lond. 1729-36, 3 vols. 8vo):—*A Paraphrase and Notes on the three last Chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1733, 4to). In theology he was a semi-Arian. See Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters*, ii, 179, 222; Jones, *Christian Biography*.

Hallifax, Samuel, bishop of St. Asaph, was born at Mansfield, Derbyshire, in 1733. He studied at Jesus College, Cambridge, and at Trinity Hall, and became successively rector of Chaddington, Buckinghamshire, in 1765; professor of Arabic at Cambridge in 1768; professor of jurisprudence in 1770; chaplain of George III in 1774; master of Doctors' Commons in 1775; rector of Warsop, Nottinghamshire, in 1778, and bishop of Gloucester in 1781. He was transferred to the see of St. Asaph in 1787, and died in 1790. He wrote *An Analysis of the Roman Civil Law compared with the Laws of England* (1774, 8vo):—*Twelve Sermons on the Prophecies concerning the Christian Religion, and in particular concerning the Church of Papal Rome, preached in Lincoln's Inn Chapel at Bishop Warburton's Lecture* (1776, 8vo):—*An Analysis of Butler's Analogy*:—*Discourses on Justification* (Camb. 1762, 8vo). See Rose, *New General Biog. Dict.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 197; *British Critic*, vol. xxvii.

Hallo'hesh or, rather, Lochesh (Heb. *Lochesh'*, לוֹחֵשׁ, with the article הַלּוֹחֵשׁ, *hal-lochesh'*, *the whisperer*; Sept. Ἀλλωῆς and Ἀλωῆς, Vulg. *Alohes*), the father of Shallum, which latter assisted Nehemiah in repairing the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 12, where the name is Anglicized "Halohesh"). He was one of the popular chiefs that subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 24). B.C. cir. 410.

Hallow (קָדַשׁ, in Piel; ἁγνιάζω), to render *sacred*, set apart, consecrate (Exod. xxviii, 38; xxix, 1; Lev.

xxii, 2; Numb. v, 10). The English word is from the Saxon, and is properly *to make holy;* hence hallowed persons, things, places, rites, etc.; hence also the name, power, dignity of God is hallowed, that is, reverenced as holy (Matt. vi, 9). See HOLY.

Halo'hesh (Neh. iii, 12). See HALLOHESH.

Halt (צֶלַע, χωλός), *lame* on the feet or legs (Gen. xxxii, 31; Psa. xxxviii, 17; Jer. xx, 10; Mic. iv, 6; vii, 1; Zeph. iii, 19). Many persons who were halt were cured by our Lord. See LAME. To halt between two opinions (פָּסַח, 1 Kings xviii, 21), should, perhaps, be to stagger from one to the other repeatedly; but some say it is an allusion to birds, who hop from spray to spray, forwards and backwards, as the contrary influence of supposed convictions vibrated the mind in alternate affirmation and doubtfulness.

Halyburton, THOMAS, professor of divinity in the University of St. Andrew's, was born at Duplin, near Perth, Dec. 25, 1674. He was in early youth the subject of frequent but ineffectual religious convictions. In 1689 he began to be perplexed respecting the evidences of revealed religion, till, after having experienced some relief from Robert Bruce's *Fulfilling of the Scriptures,* he received further aid from Mr. Donaldson, an excellent old minister who came to preach at Perth, and paid a visit to his mother. He inquired of his young friend if he sought a blessing from God on his learning, remarking at the same time, with an austere look, "Sirrah, unsanctified learning has done much mischief to the Kirk of God." This led him to seek divine direction in extraordinary difficulties; but this exercise, he acknowledges, left him still afar off from God. He studied at St. Andrew's, and became domestic chaplain in a nobleman's family in 1696. His mind, long disquieted about the evidences of Christianity, was finally settled, and he wrote an *Inquiry into the Principles of modern Deists,* which is still valued. In 1698 he was thoroughly converted; in 1700 he became minister of Ceres parish. In 1711 he was made professor of divinity at St. Andrew's, and died Sept. 23, 1712. He was an excellent scholar, and a very pious man. A sketch of his life is given in his *Works,* edited by Robert Burns, D.D. (London, 1835, 8vo), which volume contains the following, among other writings, viz. *The great Concern of Salvation:—Natural Religion insufficient:—Essay on the Nature of Faith:—Inquiry on Justification,* and *Sermons.* Halyburton's *Memoirs,* with an introductory Essay by the Rev. Dr. Young (Glasg. 1824, 12mo), has been often reprinted, both in Great Britain and America.

Ham (Heb. *Cham,* חָם, *hot* [see below]; Sept. Χάμ [Josephus Χάμας, *Ant.* i, 4, 1], Vulg. *Cham*), the name of a man and also of two regions.

1. The youngest son of Noah (Gen. v, 32; comp. ix, 24). B.C. post 2613. Having provoked the wrath of his father by an act of indecency towards him, the latter cursed him and his descendants to be slaves to his brothers and their descendants (ix, 25). B.C. cir. 2514. To judge, however, from the narrative, Noah directed his curse only against Canaan (the fourth son of Ham) and his race, thus excluding from it the descendants of Ham's three other sons, Cush, Mizraim, and Phut (Gen. x, 6). How that curse was accomplished is taught by the history of the Jews, by whom the Canaanites were subsequently exterminated. The general opinion is that all the southern nations derive their origin from Ham (to which the Hebrew root חָמַם, *to be hot,* not unlike the Greek Αἰθίοπες, lends some force). This meaning seems to be confirmed by that of the Egyptian word KEM (Egypt), which is believed to be the Egyptian equivalent of Ham, and which, as an adjective, signifies "black," probably implying warmth as well as blackness. See EGYPT. If the Hebrew and Egyptian words be the same, Ham must mean the swarthy or sun-burnt, like Αἰθίοψ, which has been derived from the Coptic name of Ethiopia, *ethops,* but which we should be inclined to trace to *thops,* "a boundary," unless the Sahidic *esops* may be derived from Kish (Cush). It is observable that the names of Noah and his sons appear to have had prophetic significations. This is stated in the case of Noah (Gen. v, 29), and implied in that of Japheth (ix, 27), and it can scarcely be doubted that the same must be concluded as to Shem. Ham may therefore have been so named as progenitor of the sunburnt Egyptians and Cushites. *Cush* is supposed to have been the progenitor of the nations of East and South Asia, more especially of South Arabia, and also of Ethiopia; *Mizraim,* of the African nations, including the Philistines and some other tribes which Greek fable and tradition connect with Egypt; *Phut,* likewise of some African nations; and *Canaan,* of the inhabitants of Palestine and Phœnicia. On the Arabian traditions concerning Ham, see D'Herbelot (*Bibl. Orient.* s. v.). See NOAH.

A. *Ham's Place in his Family. Idolatry connected with his Name.*—Like his brothers, he was married at the time of the Deluge, and with his wife was saved from the general destruction in the ark which his father had prepared at God's command. He was thus, with his family, a connecting link between the antediluvian population and those who survived the Flood. The salient fact of his impiety and dishonor to his father had also caused him to be regarded as the transmitter and representative in the renovated world of the worst features of idolatry and profaneness, which had grown to so fatal a consummation among the antediluvians. Lactantius mentions this ancient tradition of Ham's idolatrous degeneracy: "Ille [Cham] profugus in ejus terræ parte consedit, quæ nunc Arabia nominatur; eaque terra de nomine suo Chanaan dicta est, et postea ejus Chanaæi. Hæc fuit prima gens quæ Deum ignoravit, quoniam princeps ejus [Cham] et conditor *cultum Dei a patre non accepit, maledictus ab eo; itaque ignorantiam divinitatis minoribus suis reliquit*" (*De orig. erroris,* ii, 13; *De falsa Relig.* 23). See other authors quoted in Beyer's *Addit. ad* Seldeni *Syntag. de Diis Syris* (Ugolino, *Thes.* xxiii, 288). This tradition was rife also among the Jews. R. Manasse says, "Moreover Ham, the son of Noah, was the first to invent idols," etc. The Tyrian idols called חמנים, *Chamanim,* are supposed by Kircher to have their designation from the degenerate son of Noah (see Spencer, *De legg. Hebr.* [ed. Pfaff.] p. 470–482). The old commentators, full of classical associations, saw in Noah and his sons the counterpart of Κρόνος, or Saturn, and his three divine sons, of whom they identified Jupiter or Ζεύς with Ham, especially, as the name suggested, the African *Jupiter Ammon* (Ἀμμοῦν [or, more correctly, Ἀμοῦν, so Gaisford and Bähr] γὰρ Αἰγύπτιοι καλέουσι τὸν Δία, Herod. *Euterp.* 42; Plutarch explains Ἀμοῦν by the better known form Ἀμμων, *Is. et Osir.* ix. In Jer. xlvi, 25, "the multitude of No" is אָמוֹן מִנֹּא, *Amon of No;* so in Nahum iii, 8, "Populous No" is *No-Amon,* נֹא אָמוֹן. For the identification of Jupiter Ammon with Ham, see J. Conr. Dannhauer's *Politica Biblica,* ii, 1; Is. Vossius, *De Idol.* lib. ii, cap. 7). This identification is, however, extremely doubtful; eminent critics of modern times reject it; among them Ewald (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel,* i, 375 [note]), who says, "Mit dem ägyptischen Gotte Amôn oder Hammôn ihn zusammenzubringen *hat man keinen Grund,*" u. s. w.). One of the reasons which leads Bochart (*Phaleg,* i, 1, ed. Villemand, p. 7) to identify Ham with Jupiter or Zeus is derived from the *meaning* of the names. חם (from the root חָמַם, *to be hot*) combines the ideas *hot* and *swarthy* (comp. Αἰθίοψ); accordingly, St. Jerome, who renders our word by *calidus,* and Simon (*Onomast.* p. 103) by *niger,* are not incompatible. In like manner, Ζεύς is derived a *fervendo,* according to the author of the *Etymol. Magn.,* παρὰ τὴν ζέσιν, θερμότατος γὰρ ὁ ἀήρ, ἢ παρὰ τὸ ζέω, *to seethe,* or *boil, fervere.* Cyril of Alexandria uses θερμασίαν as synonymous (l. ii, *Glaphyr. in Genes.*). Another reason of identifica-

tion, according to Bochart, is the fanciful one of comparative age. Zeus was the youngest of three brothers, and *so was Ham* in the opinion of this author. He is not alone in this view of the subject. Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 3) expressly calls Ham *the youngest* of Noah's sons, ὁ νεώτατος τῶν παίδων. Gesenius (*Thes.* p. 489) calls him "filius natu tertius et minimus;" similarly Fürst (*Hebr. Wörterb.* i, 408), Knobel (*die Gen. erkl.* p. 101), Delitzsch (*Comment. über die Gen.* p. 280), and Kalisch (*Gen.* p. 229), which last lays down the rule in explanation of the בְּנוֹ הַקָּטָן applied to Ham in Gen. ix, 24, "If there are more than two sons, בן גדול is the eldest, בן קטן the youngest son," and he aptly compares 1 Sam. xvii, 13, 14. The Sept., it is true, like the A.V., renders by the comparative—ὁ νεώτερος, "his younger son." But, throughout, *Shem* is the term of comparison, the central point of blessing from whom all else diverge. Hence not only is Ham הַקָּטָן, ὁ νεώτερος, in comparison with Shem, but Japhet is relatively to the same הַגָּדוֹל, ὁ μείζων (see Gen. x, 21). That this is the proper meaning of this latter passage, which treats of the age of Japhet, the eldest son of Noah, we are convinced by the consideration just adduced, and our conviction is supported by the Sept. translators, Symmachus, Rashi (who says, "From the words of the text I do not clearly know whether *the elder* applies to Shem or to Japhet. But, as we are afterwards informed that Shem was 100 years old, and begat Arphaxad two years after the Deluge [xi, 10], it follows that *Japhet was the elder*, for Noah was 500 years old when he began to have children, and the Deluge took place in his 600th year. His eldest son must consequently have been 100 years old at the time of the Flood, whereas we are expressly informed that *Shem* did not arrive at that age until two years after the Deluge"), Aben-Ezra, Luther, Junius, and Tremellius, Piscator, Mercerus, Arius, Montanus, Clericus, Dathius, J. D. Michaelis, and Mendelssohn (who gives a powerful reason for his opinion: "The tonic accents make it clear that the word הגדול, *the elder*, applies to *Yapheth;* wherever the words of the text are obscure and equivocal, great respect and attention must be paid to the tonic accents, as their author understood the true meaning of the text better than we do." De Sola, Lindenthal, and Raphall's *Trans. of Genesis*, p. 43). In consistency with this seniority of Japheth, his name and genealogy are first given in the *Toledoth Beni Noah* of Gen. x. Shem's name stands *first* when the three brothers are mentioned together, probably because the special blessing (afterwards to be more fully developed in his great descendant Abraham) was bestowed on him by God. But this prerogative by no means affords any proof that Shem was the *eldest* of Noah's sons. The obvious instances of Seth, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, Joseph, Ephraim, Moses, David, and Solomon (besides this of Shem), give sufficient ground for observing that primogeniture was far from always securing the privileges of *birthright and blessing*, and other distinctions (comp. Gen. xxv, 23; xlviii, 14, 18, 19, and 1 Sam. xvi, 6–12).

B. *Descendants of Ham, and their locality.*—The loose distribution which assigns *ancient Asia* to Shem, and *ancient Africa* to Ham, requires much modification; for although the Shemites had but little connection with Africa, the descendants of Ham had, on the contrary, wide settlements in Asia, not only on the shores of Syria, the Mediterranean, and in the Arabian peninsula, but (as we learn from linguistic discoveries, which minutely corroborate the letter of the Mosaic statements, and refute the assertions of modern Rationalism) in the plains of Mesopotamia. One of the most prominent facts alleged in Gen. x is the foundation of the earliest monarchy by the grandson of Ham *in Babylonia*. "Cush [the eldest son of Ham] begat Nimrod . . . the beginning of whose kingdom was Babel [Babylon], and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar" (vers. 6, 8, 10). Here we have a primitive Babylonian empire distinctly declared to have been Hamitic through Cush. For the complete vindication of this statement of Genesis from the opposite statements of Bunsen, Niebuhr, Heeren, and others, we must refer the reader to Rawlinson's *Five great Monarchies*, vol. i, chap. iii, compared with his *Historical Evidences*, etc. (Bampton Lectures), p. 18, 68, 355–357. The idea of an "*Asiatic Cush*" was declared by Bunsen to be "an imagination of interpreters, the child of despair" (*Phil. of Univ. History*, i, 191). But in 1858, Sir H. Rawlinson, having obtained a number of Babylonian documents more ancient than any previously discovered, was able to declare authoritatively that the early inhabitants of South Babylonia were of a cognate race with the primitive colonists both of Arabia and of the African Ethiopia (Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, i, 442). He found their vocabulary to be undoubtedly Cushite or Ethiopian, belonging to that stock of tongues which in the sequel were everywhere more or less mixed up with the Shemitic languages, but of which we have the purest modern specimens in the Mahra of southern Arabia and the Galla of Abyssinia (*ibid.*, note 9). He found, also, that the traditions both of Babylon and Assyria pointed to a connection in very early times between Ethiopia, Southern Arabia, and the cities on the lower Euphrates. We have here evidence both of the widely-spread settlements of the children of Ham *in Asia* as well as Africa, and (what is now especially valuable) of the truth of the 10th chapter of Genesis as an ethnographical document of the highest importance. Some writers push the settlements of Ham still more towards the east; Feldhoff (*Die Völkertafel der Genesis*, p. 69), speaking generally of them, makes them spread, not simply to the south and south-west of the plains of Shinar, but east and south-east also; he accordingly locates some of the family of Cush in the neighborhood of the Paropamisus chain [the Hindû Kûsh], which he goes so far as to call the centre whence the Cushites emanated, and he peoples the greater part of Hindûstan, Birmah, and China with the posterity of the children of Cush (see under their names in this art.). Dr. Prichard (*Analysis of the Egyptian Mythology*) compares the philosophy and the superstitions of the ancient Egyptians with those of the Hindûs, and finds "so many phenom-

"These are the sons of HAM,
after their families (לְמִשְׁפְּחֹתָם, *or clans*), after their tongues (לִלְשֹׁנֹתָם),
in their countries (בְּאַרְצֹתָם), [and] in their nations" (בְּגוֹיֵהֶם), Gen. x, 20.

HAM.

I. CUSH.
1. Seba; 2. Havilah; 3. Sabtah; 4. Raamah; 5. Sabtechah; 6. NIMROD.
(Raamah:) Sheba; Dedan.

II. MIZRAIM.
1. Ludim; 2. Anamim; 3. Lehabim; 4. Naphtuhim; 5. Pathrusim; 6. Casluhim; 7. Caphtorim.
(Casluhim:) Philistim.

III. PHUT.

IV. CANAAN.
1. Sidon; 2. Heth; 3. Jebusite; 4. Amorite; 5. Girgasite; 6. Hivite; 7. Arkite; 8. Sinite; 9. Arvadite; 10. Zemarite; 11. Hamathite.

ena of striking congruity" between these nations that he is induced to conclude that they were descended from a common origin. Nor ought we here to omit that the Arminian historian Abulfaragius among the countries assigned to the sons of Ham expressly includes both *Scindia* and *India*, by which he means such parts of Hindûstan as lie west and east of the river Indus (Greg. Abul-Pharagii, *Hist. Dynast.* [ed. Pocock, Oxon. 1673], Dyn. i, p. 17).

The sons of Ham are stated to have been "Cush," and Mizraim, and Phut, and Caanan" (Gen. x, 6; comp. 1 Chron. i, 8). It is remarkable that a dual form (Mizraim) should occur in the first generation, indicating a country, and not a person or a tribe, and we are therefore inclined to suppose that the gentile noun in the plural מִצְרִים, differing alone in the pointing from מִצְרַיִם, originally stood here, which would be quite consistent with the plural forms of the names of the Mizraite tribes which follow, and analogous to the singular forms of the names of the Canaanite tribes, except the Sidonians, who are mentioned, not as a nation, but under the name of their forefather Sidon.

The name of Ham alone, of the three sons of Noah, if our identification be correct, is known to have been given to a country. Egypt is recognised as the "land of Ham" in the Bible (Psa. lxxviii, 51; cv, 23; cvi, 22), and this, though it does not prove the identity of the Egyptian name with that of the patriarch, certainly favors it, and establishes the historical fact that Egypt, settled by the descendants of Ham, was peculiarly his territory. The name Mizraim we believe to confirm this. The restriction of Ham to Egypt, unlike the case, if we may reason inferentially, of his brethren, may be accounted for by the very early civilization of this part of the Hamitic territory, while much of the rest was comparatively barbarous. Egypt may also have been the first settlement of the Hamites whence colonies went forth, as we know was the case with the Philistines. See CAPHTOR.

I. CUSH (Josephus Χοῦσος) "reigned over the Ethiopians" [*African* Cushites]; Jerome (in *Quæst. Hebr. in Genes.*), "Both the *Arabian Ethiopia*, which was the parent country, and the *African*, its colony" [Abyssinia = Cush in the Vulg. and Syr.]; but these gradations (confining Cush first to the western shore of the Red Sea, and then extending the nation to the Arabian Peninsula) require further extension; modern discoveries tally with this most ancient ethnographical record in placing Cush on the Euphrates and the Persian Gulf. When Rosenmüller (*Scholia in Ges.* ad loc.) claims Josephus for an *Asiatic* Cush as well as an *African* one, he exceeds the testimony of the historian, who says no more than that "the *Ethiopians* of his day called *themselves* Cushites, and not only they, but all the Asiatics also, *gave them* that name" (*Ant.* i, 6, 2). But Josephus does not specify what Ethiopians he means: the form of his statement leads to the opposite conclusion rather, that the Ethiopians were *Africans merely*, excluded from all the Asiatics [ὑπὸ ἑαυτῶν τε καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ πάντων], the ἑαυτῶν referring to the Αἰθίοπες just mentioned. (For a better interpretation of Josephus here, see Volney, *Système Geogr. des Hébreux*, in *Œuvres*, v, 224.) The earlist empire, that of Nimrod, was Cushite, literally and properly, not *per catachresin*, as Heeren, Bunsen, and others would have it. Sir W. Jones (*On the Origin and Families of Nations*, in *Works*, iii, 202) shows an appreciation of the wide extent of the *Cushite* race in primæval times, which is much more consistent with the discoveries of recent times than the speculations of the neocritical school prove to be: "The children of Ham," he says, "founded in Iran (the country of the lower Euphrates) the monarchy of the first Chaldæans, invented letters, etc." (compare Rosenmüller, as above quoted). According to Volney, the term *Ethiopian*, coextensive with *Cush*, included even the Hindûs; he seems, however, to mean the southern Arabians, who were, it is certain, sometimes called Indians (in *Menologio Græco*, part ii, p. 197. "Felix Arabia *India* vocatur . . . ubi *felix* vocatur India Arabica, ut ab Æthiopica et Gangetica distinguatur," Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* III, ii, 569), especially the Yemenese; Jones, indeed, on the ground of Sanscrit affinities ("*Cus* or *Cush* being among the sons of Brahma, i. e. among the progenitors of the Hindûs, and at the head of an ancient pedigree preserved in the *Ramayan*"), goes so far as to say, "We can hardly doubt that the Cush of Moses and Valmic was an ancestor of the Indian race." Jones, however, might have relied too strongly on the forged Purana of Wilford (*Asiatic Researches*, iii, 432); still, it is certain that Oriental tradition largely (though in its usual exaggerated tone) confirms the Mosaic statements about the sons of Noah and their settlements. "In the *Rozit ul-Suffah* it is written that God bestowed on Ham nine sons," the two which are mentioned at the head of the list (*Hind, Sind*, with which comp. Abulfaragius as quoted in one of our notices above), expressly connected the *Hindûs* with Ham, although not through *Cush*, who occurs as the sixth among the Hamite brethren. See the entire extract from the *Khelassut ul-Akhbar* of Khondemir in Rosenmüller (*Bibl. Geogr.* Append. to ch. iii, vol. i, p. 109 [*Bibl. Cab.*]). Bohlen (*Genesis*, ad loc.), who has a long but indistinct notice of Cush, with his Sanscrit predilections, is for extending Cush "as far as the dark India," claiming for his view the sanction of Rosenm., Winer, and Schumann. When Job (xxviii, 19) speaks of "*the topaz of Ethiopia*" (פִּטְדַת־כּוּשׁ), Bohlen finds a *Sanscrit* word in פטדת, and consequently a link between *India* and *Cush* (כּוּשׁ, *Ethiopia*). He refers to the Syriac, Chaldæan, and Saadias versions as having *India* for Cush, and (after Braun, *De Vest. Sacerd.* i, 115) assigns Rabbinical authority for it. Assemani, who is by Bohlen referred to in a futile hope of extracting evidence for the identification of Cush and India (of the Hindûs), has an admirable dissertation on the people of Arabia (*Bibl. Or.* III, ii, 552 sq.); one element of the Arab population he derives from Cush (see below). We thus conclude that the children of Ham, in the line of Cush, had very extensive settlements *in Asia*, as far as the Euphrates and Persian Gulf at least, and probably including the district of the Indus; while *in Africa* they both spread widely in Abyssinia, and had settlements apparently among their kinsmen, the Egyptians: this we feel warranted in assuming on the testimony of the Arabian geographers; e. g. Abulfeda (in his section on *Egypt*, tables, p. 110 in the original, p. 151 trans. by Reinaud) mentions a *Cush*, or rather *Kus*, as the most important city in Egypt after the capital Fosthaht: its port on the Red Sea was Cosseyr, and it was a place of great resort by the Mohammedans of the west on pilgrimage. "The sons of Cush, where they once got possession, were never totally ejected. If they were at any time driven away, they returned after a time and recovered their ground, for which reason I make no doubt but many of them in process of time returned to Chaldæa, and mixed with those of their family who resided there. Hence arose the tradition that the Babylonians not only conquered Egypt, but that the learning of the Egyptians came originally from Chaldæa; and the like account from the Egyptians, that people from their country had conquered Babylon, and that the wisdom of the Chaldæans was derived from them" (Bryant, *On Ancient Egypt*, in *Works*, vi, 250). See CUSH.

1. *Seba* (Josephus Σάβας) is "universally admitted by critics to be the ancient name for the Egyptian [Nubian] *Meroë*" (Bohlen). This is too large a statement; Bochart denies that it could be Meroë, on the assumption that this city did not exist before Cambyses, relying on the statement of Diodorus and Lucius Ampelius. Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 10), however, more accurately says that Saba "was a royal city of Ethiopia [Nubia], *which Cambyses afterwards named Meroë*, after the name of his sister." Bochart would have Seba to be *Saba-Ma-*

rab in Arabia, confounding our Seba (סְבָא) with Sheba (שְׁבָא). Meroë, with the district around it, was no doubt settled by our Seba. (See Gesen. s. v., who quotes Burckhardt, Rüppell, and Hoskins; so Corn. a Lap., Rosenm., and Kalisch; Patrick agrees with Bochart; Volney [who differs from Bochart] yet identifies Seba with the modern Arabian *Sabbea;* Heeren throws his authority into the scale for the Ethiopian Meroë; so Knobel.) It supports this opinion that Seba is mentioned in conjunction with *the other Nile lands* (Ethiopia and Egypt) in Isa. xliii, 3, and xlv, 14. (The *Sheba* of Arabia, and our Ethiopian *Seba,* as representing opposite shores of the Red Sea, are contrasted in Psa. lxxii, 10.) See Feldhoff (*Völkertafel*, p. 71), who, however, discovers *many Sebas* both in Africa (even to the south-west coast of that continent) and in Asia (on the Persian Gulf), a circumstance from which he derives the idea that, in this grandson of their patriarch, the Hamites displayed the energy of their race by widely-extended settlements. See SEBA.

2. *Havilah* (Josephus Εὐίλας), not to be confounded (as he is by Rosenm., and apparently by Patrick, after Bochart) with the son of Joktan, who is mentioned in ver. 29. Joseph. and Jerome, as quoted by Corn. a Lap., were not far wrong in making the *Gætulians* (the people in the central part of North Africa, between the modern Niger and the Red Sea) to be descended from the Cushite Havilah. Kiepert (*Bibel-Atlas*, fol. I) rightly puts our Havilah in *East Abyssinia*, by the Straits of *Bâb el-Mandeb.* Gesen., who takes this view, refers to Pliny, vi, 28, and Ptolemy, iv, 7, for the *Avalitæ*, now Zeilah, and adds that Saadias repeatedly renders חוילה by Zeilah. Bohlen at first identifies the two Havilahs, but afterwards so far corrects himself as to admit, very properly, that there was probably on the west coast of the Red Sea a Havilah as well as on the east of it—"just in the same way as there was one *Seba* on the coast of Arabia, and another opposite to it in Ethiopia." There is no such difficulty as Kalisch (*Genesis*, Pref. p. 93) supposes in believing that occasionally *kindred people should have like names.* It is not more incredible that there should be a Havilah both in the family of Ham and in that of Shem (Gen. x, ver. 7, comp. with ver. 29) than that there were Enochs and Lamechs among the posterities of both Cain and Seth (compare Gen. iv, 17, 18, with ver. 18, 25). Kalisch's cumbrous theory of a vast extent of country from the Persian Gulf running to the south-west and crossing the Red Sea, of the general name of Havilah (possessed at one end by the son of Joktan, and at the other by the son of Cush), removes no difficulty, and, indeed, is unnecessary. There is no "apparent discrepancy" (of which he speaks, p. 249) in the Mosaic statement of two Havilahs of distinct races, nor any violation of consistency when fairly judged by the nature of the case. Michaelis and Feldhoff strangely flounder about in their opposite conjectures: the former supposes our Havilah to be the land of the *Chvalisci*, on the Caspian, the latter places it in China Proper, about Pekin (!). See HAVILAH.

3. *Sabtah* (Joseph. Σαβάθα, Σαβάθας) is by Josephus, with great probability, located immediately north of the preceding, in the district east of Meroë, between the Astabaras (Tacazze), a tributary of the Nile, and the Red Sea, the country of the *Astabari*, as the Greeks called them (Σαβαθηνοὶ ὀνομάζονται δὲ 'Αστάβαροι παρ' Ἕλλησιν, *Ant.* i, 6, 2). Kalisch quite agrees in this opinion, and Gesenius substantially, when he places Sabtah on the south-west coast of the Red Sea, where was the Ethiopian city Σαβάτ. (See Strabo, xvi, p. 770 [ed. Casaub.], and Ptolemy, iv, 10.) Rosenm., Bohlen, and Knobel, with less propriety, place it in Arabia, with whom agree Delitsch and Keil, while Feldhoff, with his usual extravagance, identifies it with Thibet. See SABTAH.

4. *Raamah* (Josephus 'Ρέγμα, 'Ρέγμος) and his two sons Sheba (Σαβᾶς) and Dedan ('Ιουδάδας) are separated by Josephus and Jerome, who place the last-mentioned in *West Æthiopia* (Αἰθιοπικὸν ἔθνος τῶν 'Εσπερίων, which Jerome translates *Gens Æthiopiæ in occidentali plaga*). Ezekiel, however, in xxvii, 20, 22, mentions these three names together in connection with *Arabia.* According to Niebuhr, who, in his map of Yemen, has a province called *Subiê*, and the town of *Sabbea* (in long. 43° 30′, lat. 18°), the country south of *Sabiê* abounds with traces of the name and family of Cush. Without doubt, we have here veritable Cushite settlers in Arabia (Assemani, *Bibl. Oriental.* III, ii, 554). All the commentators whom we have named (with the exception of Feldhoff) agree in the Arabian locality of these grandsons and son of Cush. A belt of country stretching from the Red Sea, opposite the Ethiopian Havilah, to the south of the Persian Gulf, across *Arabia*, comprises the settlements of Raamah and his two sons. The city called 'Ρέγμα, or 'Ρῆγμα, by Ptolemy (vi, 7), within this tract, closely resembles *Raamah*, as it is written in the original (רַעְמָה); so does the island *Dâden*, in the Persian Gulf, resemble the name of one of the sons, *Dedan.* See DEDAN.

5. *Sabtechah* (Joseph. Σαβακαθά, Σαβακάθας) is by Kalisch thought to have settled in *Ethiopia*, and the *form* of the word favors the opinion, the other compounds of *Sab* being apparently of Ethiopic or Cushite origin. "Its obvious resemblance to the Ethiopian name *Subatok*, discovered on Egyptian monuments (comp. the king סוא, in 2 Kings xvii, 4, and the *Sebechus* of Manetho), renders its position in Arabia, or at the Persian Gulf, improbable; but *Samydace*, in Gedrosia (as Bochart supposes), or *Tabochosta*, in Persia (as Bohlen suggests), or *Satakos*, are out of the question. The Targum of Jonathan renders it here זינגאי (*Zingi*), which is the Arabic name for the African district *Zanguebar*, and which is not inappropriate here" (Kalisch). See SABTECHAH.

6. *Nimrod* (Joseph. Νεβρώδης), the mighty founder of the earliest imperial power, is the *grandest* name, not only among the children of Ham, but in primæval history. He seems to have been deified under the title of *Bilu-Nipru*, or Bel-Nimrod, which may be translated "the god of the chase," or "the great hunter." (The Greek forms Νεβρώδ and Νεβρώθ serve to connect *Nipru* with נִמְרֹד. The native root is thought to be *napar*, "to pursue," or "cause to flee," Rawlinson, p. 196.) He is noticed here in his place, in passing, because around his name and exploits has gathered a mass of Eastern tradition from all sources, which entirely corroborates the statement of Moses, that the primitive empire of the Chaldæans was *Cushite*, and that its people were closely connected with Egypt, and Canaan, and Ethiopia. Rawlinson (*Five Great Mon.*, chap. iii) has collected much of this tradition, and shown that the hints of Herodotus as to the existence of an *Asiatic* Ethiopia as well as an *African* one (iii, 94; vii, 70), and that the traditional belief which Moses of Chorene, the Armenian historian, has, for instance, that *Nimrod is in fact Belus*, and grandson of Cush by Mizraim (a statement substantially agreeing with that of the Bible), have been too strongly confirmed by all recent researches (among the cuneiform inscriptions) in comparative philology to be set aside by criticism based on the mere conjectures of ingenious men. It would appear that Nimrod not only built cities, and conquered extensive territories, "subduing or expelling the various tribes by which the country was previously occupied" (Rawlinson, p. 195; comp. Gen. x, 10–12 [marginal version]), but established a dynasty of some eleven or twelve monarchs. By-and-by (about 1500 B.C.; see Rawlinson, p. 223) the ancient Chaldæans, the stock of Cush and people of Nimrod, sank into obscurity, crushed by a foreign Shemitic stock, destined after some seven or eight centuries of submission to revive to a second tenure of imperial power, which culminated in grandeur under the magnificent Nebuchadnezzar. See NIMROD.

II. MIZRAIM (Joseph. Μεσραΐν, Μεστραῖμος), that is, the father of *Egypt*, is the second son of Cush. Of this *dual* form of a man's name we have other instances in *Ephraim* and *Shaharaim* (1 Chron. viii, 8). We simply call the reader's attention to the fact, vouched for in this genealogy of the Hamites, of *the nearness of kindred between Nimrod and Mizraim.* This point is of great value in the study of ancient Eastern history, and will reconcile many difficulties which would otherwise be insoluble. "For the last 3000 years it is to the Shemitic and Indo-European races that the world has been mainly indebted for its advancement; but it was otherwise in the first ages. *Egypt and Babylon*, Mizraim and Nimrod, both descendants of Ham, led the way and acted as the pioneers of mankind in the various untrodden fields of art, literature, and science. Alphabetic writing, astronomy, history, chronology, architecture, plastic art, sculpture, navigation, agriculture, and textile industry, seem, all of them, to have had their origin in one or other of these two countries" (Rawlinson, p. 75).

If, as some suppose, Mizraim in the lists of Gen. x, and 1 Chron. i, stands for Mizrim, we should take the singular Mazor to be the name of the progenitor of the Egyptian tribes. It is remarkable that Mazor appears to be identical in signification with Ham, so that it may be but another name of the patriarch. See EGYPT. In this case the mention of Mizraim (or Mizrim) would be geographical, and not indicative of a Mazor, son of Ham.

The Mizraites, like the descendants of Ham, occupy a territory wider than that bearing the name of Mizraim. We may, however, suppose that Mizraim included all the first settlements, and that in remote times other tribes besides the Philistines migrated, or extended their territories. This we may infer to have been the case with the Lehabim (Lubim) or Libyans, for Manetho speaks of them as in the remotest period of Egyptian history subject to the Pharaohs. He tells us that under the first king of the third dynasty, of Memphites, Necherophes, or Necherochis, "the Libyans revolted from the Egyptians, but, on account of a wonderful increase of the moon, submitted through fear" (Cory's *Anc. Frag.* 2d edit. p. 100, 101). It is unlikely that at this very early time the Memphite kingdom ruled far, if at all, beyond the western boundary of Egypt. See MIZRAIM.

Land of Ham.—By this and similar poetic terms the Psalmist designates *Egypt* in Psa. cv, 23 ("Jacob sojourned in *the land of Ham*," בְּאֶרֶץ חָם, here parallel and synonymous with מִצְרַיִם, with which compare ver. 27, and cvi, 22, 23), and in Psa. lxxviii, 51 (where "*the tabernacles of Ham*," אָהֳלֵי־חָם, is again parallel with מִצְרַיִם). What in these passages is the *poetical* name of Egypt in Hebrew, was among the Egyptians themselves probably the domestic and usual designation of their country (Gesenius). According to Gesenius, this name of *Ham* ("Coptic *Chemi*," for which Lepsius, however, substitutes another word, *Hem* [Memph.] or *Hhem* [Thebaic]) is derived from the swarthy complexion of the people (what Gesenius calls *Coptic* Lepsius designates by the now more usual term *Memphitic:* Gesenius adds the *Sahidic* [Lepsius's *Thebaic*] form of "our word *Keme* [from *kem*, black]; but Lepsius denies that the name of Egypt, *Ham* [חָם], has "any direct connection" with this word, he substitutes the root *hĕm*, or *hēm* [Memphitic], which is softened into *hhĕm*, or *hhēm*, in the sister dialect of Thebes; the meaning of which is *to be hot* [Tattam, *Lex. Ægypt.* Lat. p. 653, 671]. Chemi, however, and *Khem*, are, no doubt, the constantly used terms for the name of the country [see Tattam, p. 155, 560, and Uhlemann, *Copt. Gr. et Lex.* p. 154]), while Lepsius says, "not from the color of its inhabitants, which was red, but from that of its soil, which formed a strong contrast with the adjacent countries." (Comp. Herodotus's *μελάγγαιον*, ii, 12, and Plutarch's *Αἴγυπτον ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα μελάγγειον οὖσαν . . . Χημία καλοῦσι*, *De Isid. et Osir.* [Reiske] vii, 437.) In the hieroglyphic language the name occurs as KM. The inscription of it, as it frequently occurs on the Rosetta stone, is pronounced by Champollion, Akerblad, and Spohn, *Chmé* (Gesen. *Thes.* p. 489). The name by which Egypt is commonly called in Hebrew, מִצְרַיִם (מָצוֹר should probably be translated *Egypt* in 2 Kings xix, 24; Isa. xix, 6; xxxvii, 25; and Micah vii, 12; Gesen. and Fürst, s. v.), was not used by the Egyptians (Bähr, *Herodot.* note, ad l. c.), but *by Asiatics* it appears to have been much used of the land of the Nile, as is evident from the cuneiform inscriptions. The Median form of the name was *Mitzariya;* the Babylonian, *Mizir;* the Assyrian, *Muzri.* The Arabic name of the present capital of Egypt is *El Mazr*, and the country also is *Misr* (Sir H. Rawlinson, *Jour. R. As. Soc.* vol. xiv, pt. i, p. 18; Lepsius, in Herzog, s. v. Egypt). Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 2) renders the Hebrew name of Egypt by Μέστρη, and of the people by Μεστραῖοι. Whether, however, we regard the native name from the father, or the Asiatic from the son, they both vouch for the *Hamitic* character of Egypt, which probably differed from all the other settlements of this race in having Ham himself as the actual ἀρχηγός of the nation, among whom also he perhaps lived and died. This circumstance would afford sufficient reason both why the nation itself should regard the father as their *eponymus* rather than the son, who only succeeded him in the work of settlement, and why, moreover, foreigners with no other interest than simply to distinguish one Hamitic colony from another should have preferred for that purpose the name of the son, which would both designate this particular nation, and at the same time distinguish it from such as were kindred to it.

On the sons of Mizraim we must be brief. Josephus noticed the different fortune which had attended the names of the sons from that of the grandsons of Ham, especially in the family of Mizraim; for while "time had not hurt" the former, of the latter he says (*Ant.* i, 6, 2), "*we know nothing but their names.*" Jerome (who in these points mostly gives us only the echo of Josephus) says similarly: "Cæteræ sex gentes ignotæ sunt nobis . . . quia usque ad oblivionem præteritorum nominum pervenere." They both, indeed, except two names from the obscurity which had oppressed the other six, *Labim and Philistim*, and give them "a local habitation with their name." What this is we shall notice soon; meanwhile we briefly state such identifications of the others as have occurred to commentators. Josephus, it will be observed, renders all these *plural* Hebrew names by *singular* forms. These plurals seem to indicate *clans speaking their own languages* (comp. ver. 20, which surmounts our table), centered around their patriarch, from whom, of course, they derived their *gentile* name: thus, *Ludim* from Lud; *Pathrusim* from Pathros, etc. (Feldhoff, p. 94). Lenormant notices the fact of so many *nations* emerging from Egypt, and spreading over Africa (*L'Asie Occidentale*, p. 244), for he understands these names to be of peoples, not individuals; so Michaelis, *Spicileg.* p. 254, who quotes Aben-Ezra for the same opinion. Aben-Ezra, however, does not herein represent the general opinion of the Jewish doctors. The relative משם . . . אשר misled him; he thought it necessarily implied *locality*, and not a *personal* antecedent. Mendelssohn declares him wrong in this view, and refers to Gen. xlix, 24. "It is probable," he adds, "that *Ludim* and the other names were those of *men*, who gave their names to their descendants. Such was the opinion of Rashi, etc.," who takes the same view as the old Jewish historian.

1. *Ludim* (Josephus Λουδιεὶμος) is not to be confounded with Shem's son *Lud* (ver. 22), the progenitor of the Lydians. The Ludim are often mentioned in Scripture (Isa. lxvi, 19; Jer. xlvi, 9; Ezek. xxvii, 10; xxx, 5) as a warlike nation, skilled in the use of spear and bow, and seem to have been employed (much as the Swiss have been) as mercenary troops (Gesen. *Jesaias*, iii, 311). Bochart (who placed Cush in Arabia) reserved

Ethiopia for these Ludim; one of his reasons being based on their use of the bow, as he learns of Herodotus, Strabo, Heliodorus, and Diodorus Siculus. But the people of North Africa were equally dexterous with this implement of war; we have therefore no difficulty in connecting the Ludim with the country through which the river *Lud* or *Laud* ran (Pliny, v, 2), in the province of *Tingitania* (Tangier); so Bohlen, Delitzsch, and Feldhoff, which last writer finds other names of cognate origin in North Africa, e. g. the tribe called *Ludaya*, inhabiting one of the oases, and the district of *Ludamar*, in Nigritia. Kalisch suggests the Egyptian *Letopolis* or *Letus*, and Clarke the *Mareotis* of Egypt; while Keil supposes the Berber tribe *Lewâtah;* and Lenormant (*L'Asie Occid.* p. 244) the *Nubians;* they think a proximity to Egypt would be most compatible with the fact that the *Ludim* were Egyptian auxiliaries (Jer. xlvi, 9). See LUDIM.

2. *Anamim* (Josephus Ἐνενίμος) are, with unusual unanimity, placed by the commentators in Egypt. Calmet represents the older opinion, quoting Jonathan's Targ. for the *Mareotis.* Knobel (with whom agree Delitzsch, Keil, and Feldhoff) places them in the Delta, the Sept. rendering Ἐνεμετιείμ suggesting to him *Sanemhit*, the Egyptian word for *north country.* The word occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament. See AMAMIM.

3. *Lehabim* (Josephus Λαβιείμ, Λαβίμος) is, with absolute unanimity, including even Jerome and Josephus (who says, Λ. *τοῦ κατοικήσαντος ἐν Λιβύῃ καὶ τὴν χώραν ἀφ' αὐτοῦ καλέσαντος*), identified with the shorter word לוּבִים, *Lubim*, in 2 Chron. xii, 3; xvi, 8; and again in Nahum iii, 9; Dan. xi, 43. They are there the Libyans; Bochart limits the word to the *Liby-ægyptii*, on the west frontier of Egypt; so Knobel. The Hebrew word has been connected (by Bochart) with לֶהָבָה, and the plur. of לַהַב, which means *flame;* Rashi supposing that they are so called "because their faces were inflamed with the sun's heat" (Isa. xiii, 8), from their residence so near the torrid zone. Hitzig's idea that the Lehabim may be *Nubians* is also held by Lenormant (*L'Asie Occid.* p. 244). The opinion of the latter is based upon the general principle entertained by him, that, as Cush peopled *Ethiopia*, and Phut *Libya*, and Canaan *Phœnicia*, so to Mizraim must be appropriated Egypt, or (at least) the vicinity of that country. There is some force in this view, although the application of it in the case of Lehabim need not confine his choice to Nubia. *Libya*, with which the name is associated by most writers since Josephus, is contiguous to Egypt, on its western frontier, and would answer the conditions as well as Nubia. See LEHABIM.

4. *Naphtuhim* (Josephus Νέδεμος), according to Bochart and Rosenmüller, should be identified with *Nephtys*, in the north of Egypt; Bohlen suggests the *Nobatæ*, in Libya; Corn. a Lap. the *Numidians;* Patrick (after Grotius) *Nepata*, in Ethiopia; but none of these opinions appear to us so probable as that of Knobel, who thus vindicates for the Memphitic, or Middle Egyptians, the claim to be the *Naphtuhim.* Memphis was the chief seat of the worship of *Phthah*, an Egyptian deity. If the *plural* possessive particle *na*=*οἱ τοῦ* (Uhlemann, sec. 14, 1) be prefixed, we get the word *na-Ptahh, the people of Phthah, οἱ τοῦ Φθάτ*, just as the Moabites are designated *the people of Chemosh* (Numb. xxi, 29; Jer. xlviii, 46), and the Hebrews *the people of Jehovah* (Ezek. xxxvi, 20). See NAPHTUHIM.

5. *Pathrusim* (Josephus Φεθρωσίμος) are undoubtedly the people of *Upper Egypt*, or the Thebaid, of which the capital, Thebes, is mentioned, under the name of *No* and *No-Amon*, in Nahum iii, 8; Ezek. xxx, 14-16; and Jer. xlvi, 25. *Pathros* is an Egyptian name, signifying the *South* country (*pet-res*), which may possibly include Nubia also; in Isa. xi, 11, and probably Jer. xliv, 15, Pathros is mentioned as distinct from, though in close connection with, Egypt. By Greek and Roman writers the Thebaid is called *Nomus Phaturites* (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 9; Ptol. iv, 5, 69). So Bochart, Bohlen, Delitzsch, Kalisch, Keil, Knobel. Brugsch's suggestion that our word comes from *Pa-Hathor*, that is, the Nome of *Hathor*, an Egyptian deity of the nether world, is an improbable one. See PATHRUSIM.

6. *Casluhim* (Josephus Χεσλοῖμος). In addition to what is said under the article CASLUHIM, it may be observed that the Coptic (Basmuric) name of the district called Casiotis, which Rosenmüller writes *Chadsaieloihe*, is compounded of *çes*, a "mount," and *lokh*, "to burn," and well indicates a rugged and arid country, out of which a colony may be supposed to have emigrated to a land called so nearly after their own home. (Comp. פַּסְלוּחִ, and *Cheslokh*, and Κολχίς, with the metathesis which Gesenius suggests.) This proximity to south-west Palestine of their original abode also exactly corresponds to the relation between these Casluhim and the next mentioned people, expressed in the parenthetical clause, "Out of whom came Philistim" (Gen. x, 14); i. e. the Philistines were a colony of the Casluhim, probably drafted off into the neighboring province in consequence of the poverty of their parental home, the very cause which we may suppose impelled some of the Casluhim themselves to seek a more favorable settlement on the south-east shore of the Black Sea, in Colchis.

Philistim (Josephus Φυλιστινός), who, according to Josephus, suggested to the Greeks the name of *Palestine.* We here advert to the various readings of the Hebrew text suggested by Michaelis (*Spicileg.* p. 278), who, after Rashi and Masius, would transpose the sentence thus: וְאֶת־כַּסְ' וְאֶת־כַּפְ' אֲשֶׁר יָצְאוּ מִשָּׁם פְּלִ', that is, "And Casluhim, and Capthorim (out of whom came Philistim"). This transposition makes *Caphtorim* the origin of the Philistines, according to Amos ix, 7, and perhaps Deut. ii, 23; Jer. xlvii, 4. Rosenmüller, Gesenius, and Bohlen assent to this change, but there is no authority for it either in MSS., Targums, or Versions; and another rendering of the passage, "Out of whom came Philistim and Caphtorim," is equally without foundation. In the Hebrew text, as well as the Targums and the Sept., *Philistim* alone appears as a subject, all the other proper names (including the last, *Caphtorim*) have the objective sign אֶת, יָת, and τούς. This is decisive. See PHILISTINES.

7. *Capthorim* (Josephus Χεφθόριμος by Onkelos is rendered קַפּוּטְקָאֵי, "*Cappadocians;*" in the Peshito also "*Cappadocians.*" So the other Targums, and (according to Calmet) "veteres omnes ac recentiores stant pro Cappadocibus." See CAPHTHOR. In support of the opinion advanced concerning the Caphthorim in this article, it may be observed that in the Mishna (*Cethuboth* [Surenh.], iii, 103), the very word of the Targum, קפוטקיא, *Cappadocia*, repeatedly occurs; and (what escaped the notice of Bochart) Maimonides, an excellent authority in Egyptian topography, and Bartenora, both in their notes explain this *Caphutkaja* to be *Caphtor*, and identify it with *Damietta*, in the north of Egypt, in the immediate vicinity of that *Casiotis* where we placed the primitive Casluhim. It may be added, as some support to our own opinion, that Benjamin of Tudela says (Asher, p. 158; ed. Bohn, p. 121, 123), "Damietta is Caphtor in Scripture."

III. PHUT (Josephus Φούτης), the third son of Ham, is thus noticed by Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 2): "Phut was the founder of *Libya;* he called the inhabitants Phutites, after himself; there is a river in the country of the Moors which bears that name; whence it is that we may see the greatest part of the Grecian historiographers mention that river and the adjoining country by the appellation of Phut; but its present name has been given it from one of the sons of Mizraim, who was called Libys [the progenitor of the *Lehabim*]." Jerome of course adopts this view, which has also been endorsed by Bochart, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Bohlen, De-

litzsch, Keil, and Kalisch. The versions corroborate it also, for in Jer. xlvi, 9 [Sept. xxvi, 9], פּוּט (*Phut*) is rendered "Libyans" in the A.V., *Libyes* in the Vulg., and Λίβυες in the Sept. Similarly the פּוּט of Ezek. xxx, 5, is "Libya" in the A.V., *Libyes* in the Vulg., and Λίβυες in the Sept. (so xxxviii, 5). Like some of their kindred races, the children of Phut are celebrated in the Scriptures "as a warlike, well-armed tribe, sought as allies, and dreaded as enemies" (Kalisch). *Phut* means a *bow;* and the nation seems to have been skilled in archery, according to the statements of the Bible. We may add, in confirmation of the preceding view of the locality of Phut, that the Coptic name of Libya, nearest to Egypt, was *Phaiat.* The supposition of Hitzig that Phut was Πούτεα, west of Libya, on the north coast of Africa, and of Kalisch that it might have been *Buto,* the capital of the Delta, on the south shore of the Butic lake, are unlikely to find much acceptance by the side of the universal choice of all the chief writers, which we have indicated above. (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 1, has mentioned the river, referred to by Josephus, as the *Fut* [or *Phuth*], and Ptolemy, in like manner, as the Φθούθ, iv, 1, 3; comp. Michaelis, *Spicileg.* i, 160.) It must be admitted that Josephus and those who have followed him are vague in their identification. Libya was of vast extent; as, however, it extended to the Egyptian frontier, it will, perhaps, best fulfil all the conditions of the case, keeping in view the military connection which seems to have existed between Phut and Egypt, if we deposit the posterity of Phut in Eastern Libya contiguous to Egypt, not pressing too exactly the statement of Josephus, who probably meant no more, by his reference to the country of the Moors and the river *Phut,* than the readily allowed fact that in the vast and unexplored regions of Africa might be found traces, in certain local names, of this ancient son of Ham. The only objection to this extent of Libya is that this part of the country has already been assigned to *the Lehabim* (see above). To us, however, it seems sufficient to obviate this difficulty to hold that while the Lehabim impinged on the border of Upper Egypt, the children of Phut were contiguous to Lower Egypt, and extended westward along the north coast of Africa, and into the very interior of the continent. *Phut* was no doubt of much greater extent than the Lehabim, who were only a branch of Mizraim; for it will be observed that in the case of Phut, unlike his brothers, he is mentioned *alone* without children. Their settlements are included in the general name of their father Phut, without the subdivisions into which the districts colonized by his brothers' children were arranged. The designation, therefore, of *Phut* is generic; of *Ludim, Lehabim,* etc., specific, and in territory limited.

IV. Canaan (Josephus Χανάανος) was the youngest of the sons of Ham, and there is less obscurity concerning his descendants. "Canaan, the fourth son of Ham," says Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 2), "inhabited the country now called Judæa (τὴν νῦν καλουμένην Ἰουδαίαν. In the time of Josephus, it must be recollected, this included the entire country which we loosely call *the Holy Land*), and called it after his own name, Canaan." This country is more distinctly described than any other in Holy Scripture, and in the record of Ham's family in Gen. x, its boundary is sketched (see ver. 19), excluding the district east of the Jordan. The name *Canaan,* however, is sometimes used in a more *limited* sense than is indicated here and elsewhere. Thus, in Numb. xiii, 29, "the Canaanites" are said to "dwell by the sea and by the coast of the Jordan" (i. e. obviously in the lowlands, both maritime and inland), in opposition to the Hittites and others who occupy the highlands. This limitation probably indicates the settlements of *Canaan only*—as a separate tribe, apart from those of his sons—afterwards to be enumerated (compare, for a similar limitation of a more extensive name, Cæsar, *De Bell. Gall.* i, 1, where *Gallia* has both a specific and a generic sense; comp. also the specific as well as generic meaning of *Angle* or *Engle* in the Saxon Chronicle [Gibson, p. 13; Thorpe, i, 21] "of Angle comon . . . East Engla, Middel Angla"). On the much-vexed questions of the curse of Noah (who was the object of it, and what was the extent) we can here only touch. See Noah. What we have already discovered, however, of the power, energy, and widely-spread dominion of the sons of Ham, whom we have hitherto mentioned, offers some guidance to the solution of at least the latter question. The remarkable enterprise of the Cushite hero, Nimrod; his establishment of imperial power, as an advance on patriarchal government; the strength of the Egypt of Mizraim, and its long domination over the house of Israel; and the evidence which now and then appears that even Phut (who is the most obscure in his fortunes of all the Hamitic race) maintained a relation to the descendants of Shem which was far from servile or subject—all clearly tend *to limit* the application of Noah's maledictory prophecy to the precise terms in which it was indited: "Cursed be *Canaan;* a servant of servants shall *he* [not Cush, not Mizraim, not Phut; but *he*] be to his brethren" (Gen. ix, 25); "that is," says Aben-Ezra, "to Cush, Mizraim, and Phut, his father's sons"—with remarkable inattention to the context: "Blessed be the Lord God of *Shem,* and Canaan shall be *his* servant. God shall enlarge Japhet . . . and Canaan shall he *his* servant" (ver. 26, 27). If we, then, confine the imprecation to *Canaan,* we can without difficulty trace its accomplishment in the subjugation of the tribes which issued from *him,* to the children of Israel from the time of Joshua to that of David. Here would be verified Canaan's servile relation to *Shem;* and when imperial Rome finally wrested "the sceptre from Judah," and ("dwelling in the tents of Shem") occupied the East and whatever remnants of Canaan were left in it, would not this accomplish that further prediction that Japhet, too, should be lord of Canaan, and *that* (as it would seem to be tacitly implied) mediately, through his occupancy of "the tents of Shem?"

1. *Sidon* (Josephus Σιδὼν δ' ὑφ' Ἑλλήνων καὶ νῦν καλεῖται, *Ant.* i, 6, 2) founded the ancient metropolis of Phœnicia, the renowned city called after his own name, and the mother-city of the still more celebrated Tyre: on the commercial enterprise of these cities, which reached even to the south of Britain, see Sidon; Tyre.

2. *Heth* (Josephus Χετταῖος) was the father of the well-known Hittites, who lived in the south of Palestine around Hebron and Beersheba; in the former of which places the family sepulchre of Abraham was purchased of them (Gen. xxiii, 3). Esau married "two daughters of Heth," who gave great sorrow to their husband's mother (Gen. xxvii, 46).

3. The *Jebusite* (Josephus Ἰεβουσαῖος) had his chief residence in and around Jerusalem, which bore the name of the patriarch of the tribe, the son of Canaan, *Jebus.* The Jebusites lost their stronghold only in the time of David.

4. The *Amorite* (Josephus Ἀμοῤῥαῖος) seems to have been the largest and most powerful of the tribes of Canaan. (The name "*Amorites*" frequently denotes the inhabitants of the entire country.) This tribe occupied portions of territory on both sides of the Jordan, but its strongest hold was in "the hill country" of Judah, as it was afterwards called.

5. The *Girgasite* (Josephus Γεργεσαῖος) cannot be for certain identified. (Origen conjectured that the Girgasites might be the *Gergesenes* of Matt. viii, 18.)

6. The *Hivite* (Josephus Εὐαῖος?) lived partly in the neighborhood of Shechem, and partly at the foot of Hermon and Lebanon.

7. The *Arkite* (Josephus adds for once a locality—Ἀρουκαῖος δὲ [ἔσχεν] Ἄρκην τὴν ἐν τῷ Λιβάνῳ, *Ant.* i, 6, 2) lived in the Phœnician city of *Arcè,* north of Tripolis. Under the emperors of Rome it bore the name of *Cæsarea* (Libani). It was long celebrated in the time of the Crusades. Its ruins are still extant at *Tell Arka* (Burckhardt, *Syria,* p. 162).

8. The *Sinite* (Josephus Σειναῖος) probably dwelt near his brother, the Arkite, on the mountain fortress of Σινᾶς, mentioned by Strabo (xv, 755) and by Jerome.

9. The *Arvadite* (Josephus Ἀρουδαῖος) is mentioned by Josephus as occupying an island which was very celebrated in Phœnician history. (Strabo describes it in xvi, 753.) "The men of *Arvad*" are celebrated by Ezek. xxvii, 8, 11. See ARVAD.

10. The *Zemarite* (Josephus Σαμαραῖος) inhabited the town of *Simyra* (Σίμυρα, mentioned by Strabo), near the river Eleutherus, at the western extremity of the mountains of Lebanon; extensive ruins of this city are found at the present day bearing the name of *Sumrah*.

11. The *Hamathite* (Josephus Ἀμάθιος). "The entering in of *Hamath*" indicates the extreme northern frontier of the Holy Land, as "the river of Egypt" does its southernmost limit (1 Kings viii, 65 sq.).

In the verse following the enumeration of these names, the sacred writer says, "Afterwards were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad." This seems to indicate subsequent conquests made by them previous to their own subjugation by the Israelites. "To show the great goodness of God towards Israel," says the Jewish commentator Mendelssohn, "Moses records in Gen. x the original narrow limits of the land possessed by the Canaanites, which they were permitted to extend by conquest from the neighboring nations, and *that* (as in the case of the Amorite Sihon, Numb. xxi, 26) up to the very time when Israel was ready to take possession of the whole. To prepare his readers for the great increase of the Canaanitish dominions, the sacred historian (in this early chapter, where he mentions their original boundaries) takes care to state that subsequently to their primitive occupation of the land, 'the families of the Canaanites spread abroad,' until their boundaries became such as are described in Numbers xxxiv." The Hamathites alone of those identified were settled in early times wholly beyond the land of Canaan. Perhaps there was a primeval extension of the Canaanitish tribes after their first establishment in the land called after their ancestor. One of their most important extensions was to the north-east, where was a great branch of the Hittite nation in the valley of the Orontes, constantly mentioned in the wars of the Pharaohs, and in those of the kings of Assyria. Two passages which have occasioned much controversy may here be noticed. In the account of Abraham's entrance into Palestine it is said, "And the Canaanite [was] then in the land" (Gen. xii, 6); and as to a somewhat later time, that of the separation of Abraham and Lot, we read that "the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelt then in the land" (xiii, 7). These passages have been supposed either to be late glosses, or to indicate that the Pentateuch was written at a late period. A comparison of all the passages referring to the primitive history of Palestine and Idumæa shows that there was an earlier population expelled by the Hamitic and Abrahamite settlers. This population was important in the time of the war of Chedorlaomer; but at the Exodus, more than four hundred years afterwards, there was but a remnant of it. It is most natural, therefore, to infer that the two passages under consideration mean that the Canaanitish settlers were already in the land, not that they were still there.

C. *General Characteristics.*—Such were Ham and his family, notwithstanding the stigma which adhered to that section of them which came into the nearest relation to the Israelites afterwards; they were the most energetic of the descendants of Noah in the early ages of the postdiluvian world—at least we have a fuller description of their enterprise than of their brethren's as displayed in the primitive ages. The development of empire among the Euphratean Cushites was a step much in advance of the rest of mankind in political organization; nor was the grandson of Ham less conspicuous *as a conqueror.* The only coherent interpretation of the important passage which is contained in Gen. x, 10–12, is that which is adopted in the margin of the A V. After Nimrod had laid the foundation of his empire ("the *beginning* of his kingdom," רֵאשִׁית מַמְלַכְתּוֹ, the territory of which it was at first composed—comp. Hos. ix, 10, "as the first ripe in the fig-tree בְּרֵאשִׁיתָהּ at her first time," that is, when the tree first begins to bear —Gesen.) in his native Shinar, not satisfied with the splendid acquisitions which he took at first, no doubt, from his own kinsmen, he invaded the north-eastern countries, where the children of Shem were for the first time disturbed in their patriarchal simplicity: "Out of that land [even Shinar, Nimrod] went forth to Asshur [or Assyria], and builded Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah, and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah; the same is a great city," i. e. the combination of the forementioned four formed, with their interjacent spaces, the "great city." (The objection to this rendering is based by Rosenmüller [*Schol.* ad loc.), after other commentators, on the absence of the ה "local" appended to אַשּׁוּר [which they say ought to be אַשּׁוּרָה to produce the meaning *to Assyria*]. The ה "local" is, however, far from indispensable for the sense we require, which has been advocated by authorities of great value well versed in Hebrew construction; Knobel [who himself holds our view] mentions Onkelos, Targ. Jonath., Bochart, Clericus, De Wette, Tuch, Baumgarten, Delitzsch, as supporting it. He might have added Josephus, who makes Nimrod the builder of Babylon [*Ant.* i, 4], and Kalisch, and Keil. To make the passage Gen. x, 10–12 descriptive of the Shemitic Asshur, is to do violence to the passage itself and its context. Asshur, morever, is mentioned in his proper place in ver. 22, without, however, the least indication of an intention of describing him as the founder of a rival empire to that of Nimrod. Gesenius admits the probability of our view, without any objection of grammatical structure. [See, for instances of the accus. noun (without the suffix of "local" ה) after verbs of motion, Numb. xxxiv, 4; Gen. xxxiii, 18; 2 Chron. xx, 36. Compare Gesenius, *Gram.* p. 130, 172, and Nordheimer's *Gram.* sec. 841].) This is the opinion of Knobel, answering to the theory which has connected the ruins of Khorsabad, Koyunjik, Nimrûd, and Keremlis together as the remains of a vast quadrilateral city, popularly called Nineveh. (For a different view of the whole subject the reader is referred to Mr. Rawlinson's recent volume on *The Five Great Monarchies*, i, 311-315.) But the genius which moulded imperial power at first, did not avail to retain it long; the sceptre, before many ages, passed to the race of Shem (for the *Shemitic* character of the Arabian tribes who crushed the primitive Cushite power of Babylon, see Rawlinson, *Great Empires*, i, 222, 223. The Arabian Hamites of Yemen seem also to have merged, probably by conquest, into a Joktanite population of Shemitic descent [see for these Gen. x, 25-29, and Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* III, ii, 553, 544]), except in Africa, where Mizraim's descendants had a longer tenure of the Egyptian monarchy. It is well to bear in mind (and the more so, inasmuch as a different theory has here greatly obscured plain historic truth) that in the primeval Cushite empire of Babylon considerable progress was made in the arts of civilized society (an early allusion to which is made in Josh. vii, 21; and a later in Dan. i, 4: see Rawlinson, *First Monarchy*, chap. v).

In the genealogical record of the race of Ham (Gen. x) reference is made to the "*tongues*" (or dialects) which they spoke (ver. 20). Comparative philology, which is so rich in illustrations of the unity of the Indo-Germanic languages, has done next to nothing to elucidate the linguistic relations of the families of Ham. Philologers are not agreed as to a Hamitic class of languages. Recently Bunsen has applied the term "Hamitism," or, as he writes it, Chamitism, to the Egyptian language, or, rather, family. He places it at the head of the "Shemitic stock," to which he considers it as but

partially belonging, and thus describes it: "Chamitism, or ante-historical Shemitism: the Chamitic deposit in Egypt; its daughter, the Demotic Egyptian; and its end the Coptic" (*Outlines*, i, 183). Sir H. Rawlinson has applied the term Cushite to the primitive language of Babylonia, and the same term has been used for the ancient language of the southern coast of Arabia. This terminology depends in every instance upon the race of the nation speaking the language, and not upon any theory of a Hamitic class. There is evidence which, at the first view, would incline us to consider that the term Shemitic, as applied to the Syro-Arabic class, should be changed to Hamitic; but, on a more careful examination, it becomes evident that any absolute classification of languages into groups corresponding to the three great Noachian families is not tenable. The Biblical evidence seems, at first sight, in favor of Hebrew being classed as a Hamitic rather than a Shemitic form of speech. It is called in the Bible "the language of Canaan," שְׂפַת כְּנַעַן (Isa. xix, 18), although those speaking it are elsewhere said to speak יְהוּדִית, *Judaice* (2 Kings xviii, 26, 28; Isa. xxxvi, 11, 13; Neh. xiii, 24). But the one term, as Gesenius remarks (*Gramm.* Introd.), indicates the country where the language was spoken; the other as evidently indicates a people by whom it was spoken: thus the question of its being a Hamitic or a Shemitic language is not touched; for the circumstance that it was the language of Canaan is agreeable with its being either indigenous (and therefore either Canaanite or Rephaite), or adopted (and therefore perhaps Shemitic). The names of Canaanitish persons and places, as Gesenius has observed (*l. c.*), conclusively show that the Canaanites spoke what we call Hebrew. Elsewhere we might find evidence of the use of a so-called Shemitic language by nations either partly or wholly of Hamitic origin. This evidence would favor the theory that Hebrew was Hamitic; but, on the other hand, we should be unable to dissociate Shemitic languages from Shemitic peoples. The Egyptian language would also offer great difficulties, unless it were held to be but partly of Hamitic origin, since it is mainly of an entirely different class from the Shemitic. It is mainly Nigritian, but it also contains Shemitic elements. It is the opinion of the latest philologers that the groundwork is Nigritian, and that the Shemitic part is a layer added to a complete Nigritian language. The two elements are mixed, but not fused. Some Iranian scholars hold that the two elements are mixed, and that the ancient Egyptian represents the transition from Turanian to Shemitic. The only solution of the difficulty seems to be that what we call Shemitic is early Noachian. (See Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies*, First Mon. ch. iv; Lenormant, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'Asie occidentale*, 1er Appendice; Meier, *Heb. Wurzel. w. b.* 3te Anhang; Gesenius, *Sketch of the Hebr. Lang.* (prefixed to his *Grammar*); Bunsen, *Egypt's Place*, etc., vol. i, Append. 1; Wiseman, *Lectures on Science and Revealed Religion*, p. 445, 2d ed.; Max Müller, *Science of Language*, p. 269.) See SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.

Theories more or less specious have been formed to account for these affinities to the Hebrew from so many points of the Hamitic nations. None of these theories rise above the degree of precarious hypothesis, nor could it be expected that they should in the imperfection of our present knowledge. It is, indeed, satisfactory to observe that the tendency of linguistic inquiries is to establish the fact avouched in the Pentateuch of the original unity of human speech. The most conspicuous achievement of comparative philology hitherto has been to prove the affinity of the members of that large class of languages which extend from the Eastern Sanscrit to the Western Welsh; parallel with this is the comparison among themselves of the various members of the Shemitic class of languages, which has demonstrated their essential identity; but greater still will be the work of establishing, on certain principles, the natural relationship of tongues of *different* classes. Among *these*, divergences must needs be wider; but when occasional affinities *crop out* they will be proportionately valuable as evidences of a more ancient and profound agreement. It seems to us that the facts, which have thus far transpired, indicative of affinity between the languages of the Hamitic and Shemitic races, go some way to show the probability of the historical and genealogical record of which we have been treating, that the tribes to whom the said languages were vernacular were really of near kindred and often associated in abode, either by conquest or amicable settlement, with one another.

An inquiry into the history of the Hamitic nations presents considerable difficulties, since it cannot be determined in the cases of the most important of those commonly held to be Hamite that they were purely of that stock. It is certain that the three most illustrious Hamitic nations—the Cushites, the Phœnicians, and the Egyptians—were greatly mixed with foreign peoples. In Babylonia the Hamitic element seems to have been absorbed by the Shemitic, but not in the earliest times. There are some common characteristics, however, which appear to connect the different branches of the Hamitic family, and to distinguish them from the children of Japheth and Shem. Their architecture has a solid grandeur that we look for in vain elsewhere. Egypt, Babylonia, and Southern Arabia alike afford proofs of this, and the few remaining monuments of the Phœnicians are of the same class. What is very important as indicating the purely Hamitic character of the monuments to which we refer is that the earliest in Egypt are the most characteristic, while the earlier in Babylonia do not yield in this respect to the later. The national mind seems in all these cases to have marked these material forms. The early history of each of the chief Hamitic nations shows great power of organizing an extensive kingdom, of acquiring material greatness, and checking the inroads of neighboring nomadic peoples. The Philistines afford a remarkable instance of these qualities. In every case, however, the more energetic sons of Shem or Japheth have at last fallen upon the rich Hamitic territories and despoiled them. Egypt, favored by a position fenced round with nearly impassable barriers—on the north an almost havenless coast, on the east and west sterile deserts—held its freedom far longer than the rest; yet even in the days of Solomon the throne was filled by foreigners, who, if Hamites, were Shemitic enough in their belief to revolutionize the religion of the country. In Babylonia the Medes had already captured Nimrod's city more than 2000 years before the Christian æra. The Hamites of Southern Arabia were so early overthrown by the Joktanites that the scanty remains of their history are alone known to us through tradition. Yet the story of the magnificence of the ancient kings of Yemen is so perfectly in accordance with all we know of the Hamites that it is almost enough of itself to prove what other evidence has so well established. The history of the Canaanites is similar; and if that of the Phœnicians be an exception, it must be recollected that they became a merchant class, as Ezekiel's famous description of Tyre shows (chap. xxvii). In speaking of Hamitic characteristics we do not intend it to be inferred that they were necessarily altogether of Hamitic origin, and not at least partly borrowed.

Among other points of general interest, the reader will not fail to observe the relations in which the different sections of the Hamitic race stand to each other; e. g. it is important to bear in mind that *the Philistines were not Canaanites*, as is often assumed through an oversight of the fact that the former were descended from the second and the latter from the fourth son of Ham. The *Toledoth Beni Noah* of Genesis is a precious document in many respects, as has often been acknowledged (see Rawlinson, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 68); but in no respect does it bear a higher value than as an introduction, provided by the sacred writer himself, to the

subsequent history of the Hebrew nation in its relations to the rest of mankind. The intelligent reader of Scripture will experience much help in his study of that history, and indeed of prophecy also, by a constant recurrence to the particulars of this authoritative ethnological record.

We conclude with an extract from Mr. Rawlinson's *Five Great Monarchies*, which describes, in a favorable though hardly exaggerated light, some of the obligations under which the primitive race of Ham has laid the world: "Not possessed of many natural advantages, the Chaldæan people yet exhibited a fertility of invention, a genius, and an energy which place them high in the scale of nations, and more especially in the list of those descended from the Hamitic stock. For the last 3000 years the world has been mainly indebted for its advancement to the Shemitic and Indo-European races; *but it was otherwise in the first ages.* Egypt and Babylon, Mizraim and Nimrod—both descendants of Ham—led the way and acted as pioneers of mankind in the various untrodden fields of art, literature, and science. Alphabetic writing, astronomy, history, chronology, architecture, plastic art, sculpture, navigation, agriculture, textile industry—seem, all of them, to have had their origin in one or other of these two countries. The beginnings may often have been humble enough. We may laugh at the rude picture-writing, the uncouth brick pyramid, the coarse fabric, the homely and ill-shapen instruments, as they present themselves to our notice in the remains of these ancient nations, but they are really worthier of our admiration than of our ridicule. The first inventors of any art are among the greatest benefactors of their race . . . and mankind at the present day lies under infinite obligations to the genius and industry of these early ages" (p. 75, 76).

2. "They of Ham" [or *Cham*] (מִן־חָם; Sept. Ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Χάμ; Vulg. *de stirpe Cham*) are mentioned in 1 Chron. iv, 40—in one of those historical fragments for which the early chapters of these Chronicles are so valuable, as illustrating the private enterprise and valor of certain sections of the Hebrew nation. On the present occasion a considerable portion of the tribe of Simeon, consisting of thirteen princes and their clansmen, in the reign of Hezekiah, sought to extend their territories (which from the beginning seem to have been too narrow for their numbers) by migrating "to the entrance of *Gedor*, even unto the east side of the valley, to seek pasture for their flocks." Finding here a quiet, and, as it would seem, a secure and defenceless population of Hamites (the meaning of 1 Chron. iv, 40 receives illustration from Judg. xviii, 7, 28), the Simeonites attacked them with a vigor that reminds us of the times of Joshua, and took permanent possession of the district, which was well adapted for pastoral purposes. The Gedor here mentioned cannot be the Gedor (q. v.) of Josh. xv, 58. There is strong ground, however, for supposing that it may be the Gederah (q. v.) of ver. 36; or, if we follow the Sept. rendering, Γέραρα, and read גרר for גדר, it would be the well-known Gerar. This last would, of course, if the name could be relied on, fit extremely well; in its vicinity the patriarchs of old had sojourned and fed their flocks and herds (see Gen. xx, 1, 14, 15; xxvi, 1, 6, 14, and especially ver. 17-20). Bertheau (*die B. der Chronik*) on this passage, and Ewald (*Gesch. des Volkes Israel* [ed. 2], i, 322), accept the reading of the Sept., and place the Simeonite conquest in the valley of Gerar (in Williams, *Holy City* [2d ed.], i, 463-468, there is a note, contributed by the Rev. J. Rowlands, on *the Southern Border of Palestine*, and containing an account of his supposed discovery of the ancient Gerar [called *Khirbet el-Gerar*, the ruins of Gerar]; see also Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 314). In the determination of the ultimate question with which this article is concerned, it matters but little which of these two localities we accept as the residence of those children of Ham whom the Simeonites dispossessed. Both are within the precincts of the land of the Philistines: the latter, perhaps, may be regarded as on the border of the district which we assigned in the preceding article to the *Casluhim*; in either case "they of Ham," of whom we are writing, in 1 Chron. iv, 40, must be regarded as descended from Ham through his second son Mizraim.

3. Ham (Heb. *id.* הָם, with *hê*, prob. meaning a *multitude*; Fürst [*Lex.* s. v.] compares the Lat. *Turba* and *Copia* as names of places; the Sept. and Vulg. translate [ἅμα] αὐτοῖς, [*cum*] *eis*), in Gen. xiv, 5, if a proper name at all, was probably the principal town of a people whose name occurs but once in the O. T., "*the Zuzims*" (as rendered in the A. V.). If these were "*the Zamzummims*" of Deut. ii, 20 (as has been conjectured by Rashi, Calmet, Patrick, etc., among the older writers, and Gesenius, Rosenmüller, Ewald [*Volkes Israel*, i, 308], Delitzsch, Knobel, and Keil among the moderns), we have some clew to the site; for it appears from the entire passage in Deut. that the Zamzummim were the original occupants of the country of the Ammonites. Tuch and others have accordingly supposed that our Ham, where the Zuzim were defeated by Chedorlaomer on his second invasion, was the primitive name of *Rabbath* A*mmon*, afterwards *Philadelphia* (Jerome and Eusebius, *Onomast.* s. v. Amman), the capital of the Ammonitish territory. It is still called [the ruins of] *'Ammân*, according to Robinson (*Researches*, iii, 168). There is some doubt, however, whether the word in Gen. xiv, 5 be anything more than a pronoun. The Masoretic reading of the clause, indeed, is וְאֶת־הַזּוּזִים בְּהָם, the last word of which is pointed, בְּהָם (A.V. "In Ham"), as if there were three battles, and one of them had been fought at a place so called; and it perhaps makes for this reading that, according to Kennicott, seven *Samaritan* MSS. read בחם (with *Heth*), which can produce no other meaning than *in Ham*, or *Cham* with the aspirate. Yet the other (that is, the *pronominal*) reading must have been recognised in ancient *Hebrew* MSS. even as early as the time of the Sept. translators, who render the phrase "together with them;" as if there were but two conflicts, in the former of which the great Eastern invader "smote the Rephaim in Ashteroth-Karnaim, and the Zuzim [which the Sept. makes an appellative—ἔθνη ἰσχυρά, "*strong nations*"] *along with them*," as their allies. Jerome's *Quæst. Hebr. Opera* (ed. Bened., Ven. 1767, III, ii, 327) proves that the Hebrew MSS. extant in his day varied in their readings of this passage. This reading he seems to have preferred, בָּהֶם, for in his own version [Vulgate] he renders the word like the Sept. Onkelos, however, regarded the reading evidently as a proper name, for he has translated it by בְּהֶמְתָא, "*in Hemta*," and so has the Pseudo-Jonathan's Targum; while the Jerusalem has בְּהוֹן, "*with them.*" Saadias, again, has the proper name, "*in Hama.*" Hillerus, whom Rosenmüller quotes, identifies this *Ham* with the famous Ammonitish capital *Rabbah* (2 Sam. xi, 1; 1 Chron. xx, 1); "the two names," he says, "are synonymous—Rabbah meaning *populous*, as in Lament. i, 1, where Jerusalem is, רַבָּתִי־עָם, '*the city* [that was] *full* of people,' while the more ancient name of the same city, הָם, has the same signification as the collective word הָמוֹן, that is, *a multitude.*" See Gilead, 1.

Hamaker, Heinrich Arens, a Dutch Orientalist, was born at Amsterdam Feb. 25, 1789; became professor of Oriental languages in the Academy of Franeker in 1815, assistant professor in 1817, and in 1822 professor ordinarius of the same in the University of Leyden, where he died Oct. 10, 1835. He was a man of great erudition, and was regarded as one of the first Oriental scholars of Holland. His works are not free from marks of negligence, due probably to hasty composition and

the great variety of subjects treated. Among them may be named *Oratio de religione Muhammedica, magno virtutis bellicæ apud orientalis incitamento* (Leyd. 1817-18, 4to):—*Specimen Catalogi Codicum MSS. Orientalium Bibliothecæ Academiæ Lugduno-Batavæ* (Leyden, 1820, 4to; with valuable notes from Oriental MSS.—a new ed. by Dozy [Leyd. 1848-52, 2 vols. 8vo] contains bibliographical notes left in MS. by Hamaker):—*Incerti Auctoris Liber de Expugnatione Memphidis et Alexandriæ*, etc. (Leyden, 1825, 4to):—*Miscellanea Phœnicia* (Leyden, 1828):—*Commentatio in libro de Vita et Morte Prophetarum, etc.* (Amst. 1833, 4to):—*Miscellanea Samaritana*, a posthumous work edited by Weyers. He published also various papers in *Annalen* of the universities of Göttingen (1816-17) and Leyden (1823-24); in the *Bibliotheca Nova* of Leyden, *Magazin voor Wetenschappen* of Van der Kampen, and in the *Journal Asiatique* of Paris. Others have been posthumously published in the *Orientalia* (Leyden), vol. i and ii.—Pierer, s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 209; De Sacy, in *Jour. des Savants*, 1820, 1827, 1829, 1834. (J. W. M.)

Ha'man (Heb. *Haman'*, הָמָן, perh. from the Pers. *homam, magnificent*, or the Sanscr. *heman*, the planet *Mercury;* Sept. Ἀμάν), a favorite and chief minister or vizier of the king of Persia, whose history is involved in that of Esther and Mordecai (Esther iii, 1 sq.), B.C. 473. See AHASUERUS. He is called an Agagite; and as Agag was a kind of title of the kings of the Amalekites [see AGAG], it is supposed that Haman was descended from the royal family of that nation (see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 20). He or his parents probably found their way to Persia as captives or hostages; and that the foreign origin of Haman was no bar to his advancement at court is a circumstance quite in union with the most ancient and still subsisting usages of the East. Joseph, Daniel, and Mordecai afford other examples of the same kind. After the failure of his attempt to cut off all the Jews in the Persian empire, he was hanged on the gallows which he had erected for Mordecai. Most probably he is the same Aman who is mentioned as the oppressor of Achiacharus (Tobit xiv, 10). The Targum and Josephus (*Ant.* xi, 6, 5) interpret the description of him—the Agagite—as signifying that he was of Amalekitish descent; but he is called a Macedonian by the Sept. in Esth. ix, 24 (comp. iii, 1), and a Persian by Sulpicius Severus. Prideaux (*Connexion*, anno 453) computes the sum which he offered to pay into the royal treasury at more than £2,000,000 sterling. Modern Jews are said to be in the habit of designating any Christian enemy by his name (Eisenmenger, *Ent. Jud.* i, 721). The circumstantial details of the height which he attained, and of his sudden downfall, afford, like all the rest of the book of Esther, a most faithful picture of the customs of an Oriental court and government, and furnish invaluable materials for a comparison between the regal usages of ancient and modern times. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.). See ESTHER, BOOK OF.

Hamann, JOHANN GEORG, an eminent German writer and poet, was born at Königsberg, in Prussia, on the 27th of August, 1730. His early education was miscellaneous, and to it he attributed the want of taste and elegance of his style. At last, when about sixteen years old, his father decided on sending him to the high-school. He there acquired a knowledge of Latin and of ancient literature. For a while he felt inclined to study theology, but an impediment in his speech, and want of memory incident upon a sickness he had while at school, made him give it up. Law, for which his parents destined him, was distasteful to him, and he applied himself diligently to the study of antiquity, the fine arts, and modern literature. In 1751 he closed his course of study at Königsberg with a philosophical dissertation entitled *De somno et somniis*, and turned his attention to teaching. After teaching for about eighteen months in Courland he returned to Riga, where he became a friend of John Christopher, son of a rich merchant named Berens, at whose house he met all the celebrities of the day, and for whom, some years afterwards, he made a journey through Hamburg, Bremen, and Amsterdam, going so far as London to transact business. Before he set out on this journey, however, he lost his mother, which event deeply affected him. While in London he consulted a distinguished physician, hoping to have the obstruction in his speech removed; disappointed in that hope, he spent some months in dissipation; and then, deep in debt, and disheartened, he retired to an obscure part of London, procured a Bible, and applied himself diligently to its study. His eyes were opened, and he beheld his past life in its true colors, of which he gives evidence in his *Gedanken über meinen Lebenslauf* (Thoughts on my Life). He then returned to Riga, where he resided with his friend Berens until family circumstances led to an estrangement between them, and in 1759 he returned to his parents' house. There he wrote his *Sokratische Denkwürdigkeiten*, which were severely criticised at their first appearance by the majority of the literati of the day, but which gained him the esteem and respect of such men as Claudius, Herder, and Moser, to which we must afterwards add Lavater, Jacobi, and Goethe. His writings did not suffice for his support, and he had to take other employment, first as copyist, afterwards as clerk in a public office. On the slender income derived from these two sources Hamann married in 1763; but, unfortunately, this marriage cost him many of his friends, and shortly afterwards he lost his situation. In 1754 he took a journey to Switzerland in the hope of meeting his friend Moser, who was to obtain him employment; but, not meeting with him, we next find him again filling a small subaltern position. In 1767, his father having died, he inherited some property; but having at the same time to assume the charge of an infirm brother, his worldly position was not much improved thereby. Shortly afterwards, however, he obtained another situation, and in 1777 was appointed to a good position in the custom-house. From that period date his finest epistolary and miscellaneous writings, among which we find his admirable *Golgotha and Scheblimini*—"Seat thee at my right." His prospects now brightened; one of his admirers, Francis Buchholz, offered him a handsome fortune, with $1000 towards the education of each of his four children, on the condition of his adopting him. The well-known princess Galitzin having in 1784 become acquainted with his writings, was brought over by them to a positive Christian belief. In 1787 he came to Münster with his adopted son Buchholz, and became acquainted with the princess; from thence he went to Pempelfort to the philosopher Jacobi, with whom he remained a short time. He intended to return there once more, but was prevented by his death, which occurred on the 20th of June, 1788. He was, by order of the princess Galitzin, interred in her garden, from whence, in 1851, his remains were transferred to the cathedral at Münster.

Among the great men of his country, Hamann is worthy of a place alongside of Copernicus, Kant, Herder, and kindred intellects. Although he cannot be called a classical German writer—his weird, irregular style forbids it—yet can he be classed among the patriarchs of the modern school, the uniting link between the old and the new German literatures. "Hamann is one of those men of whom it is difficult to give an estimate correct and satisfactory in all respects. Our estimation of his character cannot be blended with our general opinion of the age, as may be done with many other men, because he stood rugged and alone, like a rocky island in the midst of the waves of the surrounding ocean. As we cannot wholly praise or blame that age, we shall not admire, much less censure, all in Hamann" (Hagenbach, *German Rationalism*, tr. by Gage, p. 268). Herder says: "The kernel of Hamann's writings contains many germs of great truths, as well as new observations, and an evidence of remarkable erudition; the shell thereof is a

laboriously woven web of pithy expressions, of hints, and flowers of rhetoric." "His understanding," says F. H. Jacobi, "was penetrating like lightning, and his soul was of more than natural greatness." Most of his writings are collected in Roth's edition of his works (Berlin, 1821-43, 8 vols.). See A. W. Müller's work, entitled J. G. Hamann, *Christliche Bekenntnisse und Zeugnisse* (Münster, 1826).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 486; *Biographie v. Joh. Geo. Hamann*, by Charles Carvacchi (Münster, 1855); Hegel, *Werke*, xvii, 38; Vilmar, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*; Gildemeister, *Hamann's Leben und Schriften* (1864-6, 4 vols.); Saintes, *History of Rationalism*, ch. viii.

Ha'math (Heb. *Chamath'*, חֲמָת, *fortress;* Sept. Ἐμάθ, Αἰμάθ, and Ἡμάθ), a large and important city, capital of one of the smaller kingdoms of Syria, of the same name, on the Orontes, at the northern boundary of the Holy Land. Thus it is said (Numb. xiii, 21) that the spies "went up and searched the land, from the wilderness of Zin unto Rehob, as men come to Hamath." Gesenius is probably right in deriving the word from the Arabic root *Chama*, "to defend;" with this agrees the modern name of the city *Hamah*. The city was at the foot of Hermon (Josh. xiii, 5; Judg. iii, 3), towards Damascus (Zech. ix, 2; Jer. xlix, 20; Ezek. xlvii, 16). The kingdom of Hamath, or, at least, the southern or central parts of it, appear to have nearly corresponded with what was afterwards denominated *Cœle-Syria* (q. v.). It is more fully called *Hamath the Great* in Amos vi, 2, or HAMATH-ZOBAH in 2 Chron. viii, 3. The country or district around is called "the land of Hamath" (2 Kings xxiii, 33; xxv, 21).

Hamath is one of the oldest cities in the world. We read in Gen. x, 18 that the youngest or last son of Canaan was the "Hamathite" (q. v.)—apparently so called because he and his family founded and colonized Hamath. It was a place of note, and the capital of a principality, when the Israelites conquered Palestine; and its name is mentioned in almost every passage in which the northern border of Canaan is defined (Numb. xiii, 22; xxxiv, 8; 1 Kings viii, 65; 2 Kings xiv, 25, etc.). Toi was king of Hamath at the time when David conquered the Syrians of Zobah, and it appears that he had reason to rejoice in the humiliation of a dangerous neighbor, as he sent his own son Joram to congratulate the victor (2 Sam. viii, 9, 10), and (apparently) to put Hamath under his protection. Hamath was conquered by Solomon (2 Chron. viii, 3), and its whole territory appears to have remained subject to the Israelites during his prosperous reign (ver. 4-6). The "store-cities" which Solomon "built in Hamath" (2 Chron. viii, 4) were perhaps for staples of trade, the importance of the Orontes valley as a line of traffic always being great. On the death of Solomon and the separation of the two kingdoms, Hamath seems to have regained its independence. In the Assyrian inscriptions of the time of Ahab (B.C. 900) it appears as a separate power, in alliance with the Syrians of Damascus, the Hittites, and the Phœnicians. About three quarters of a century later Jeroboam the second "recovered Hamath" (2 Kings xiv, 28); he seems to have dismantled the place, whence the prophet Amos, who wrote in his reign (Amos i, 1), couples "Hamath the Great" with Gath, as an instance of desolation (ib. vi, 2). At this period the kingdom of Hamath included the valley of the Orontes, from the source of that river to near Antioch (2 Kings xxiii, 33; xxv. 21). It bordered Damascus on the south, Zobah on the east and north, and Phœnicia on the west (1 Chron. xviii, 3; Ezek. xlvii, 17; xlviii, 1; Zech. ix, 2). In the time of Hezekiah, the town, along with its territory, was conquered by the Assyrians (2 Kings xvii, 24; xviii, 34, xix, 13; Isa. x, 9; xi, 11), and afterwards by the Chaldæans (Jer. xxxix, 2, 5). It is mentioned on the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.). It must have been then a large and influential kingdom, for Amos speaks emphatically of "Hamath the Great" (vi, 2); and when Rabshakeh, the Assyrian general, endeavored to terrify king Hezekiah into unconditional surrender, he said, "Have the gods of the nations delivered them which my fathers have destroyed, as Gozan, and Haran, and Rezeph? Where is the king of Hamath, and the king of Arphad, and the king of the city of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah?" (Isa. xxxvii, 12-14; 2 Kings xviii, 34 sq.). See ASHIMA. The frequent use of the phrase, "the entering in of Hamath," also shows that this kingdom was the most important in Northern Syria (Judg. iii, 3). Hamath remained under the Assyrian rule till the time of Alexander the Great, when it fell into the hands of the Greeks. The Greeks introduced their noble language as well as their government into Syria, and they even gave Greek names to some of the old cities; among these was Hamath, which was called *Epiphania* (Ἐπιφάνεια), in honor of Antiochus Epiphanes (Cyril, *Comment. ad Amos*).

This change of name gave rise to considerable doubts and difficulties among geographers regarding the identity of Hamath. Jerome affirms that there were two cities of that name—*Great Hamath*, identical with Antioch, and another Hamath called Epiphania (*Comment. ad Amos*, vi). The Targums in Numb. xiii, 22 render Hamath *Antukia* (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 120). Eusebius calls it "a city of Damascus," and affirms that it is not the same as Epiphania; but Jerome states, after a careful investigation, "reperi Æmath urbem Cœles Syriæ appellari, quæ nunc Græco sermone Epiphania dicitur" (*Onomast.* s. v. Æmath and Emath). Theodoret says that *Great Hamath* was *Emesa*, and the other Hamath *Epiphania* (*Comment. ad Jerem.* iv). Josephus is more accurate when he tells us that Hamath "was still called in his day by the inhabitants Ἀμάθη, although the Macedonians called it Epiphania" (*Ant.* i, 6, 2). There is reason to believe that the ancient name Hamath was always retained and used by the Aramaic-speaking population; and, therefore, when Greek power declined, and the Greek language was forgotten, the ancient name in its Arabic form *Hamâh* became universal (so חֲמָה in Ezek. xlvii, 16, first occurrence). There is no ground whatever for Reland's theory (*Palæst.* p. 121) that the Hamath spoken of in connection with the northern border of Palestine was not Epiphania, but some other city much further south. The identification of Riblah and Zedad places the true site of Hamath beyond the possibility of doubt (Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 355, 354).

Epiphania remained a flourishing city during the Roman rule in Syria (Ptolemy, v, 15; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 19). It early became, and still continues, the seat of a bishop of the Eastern Church (*Caroli a san. Paulo, Geogr. Sac.* p. 288). It was taken by the Mohammedans soon after Damascus. On the death of the great Saladin, Hamath was ruled for a long period by his descendants, the Eiyubites. Abulfeda, the celebrated Arab historian and geographer of the 14th century, was a member of this family and ruler of Hamah (Bohadin, *Vita Saladini;* Schulten's *Index Geographicus*, s. v. Hamata). He correctly states (*Tab. Syriæ*, p. 108) that this city is mentioned in the books of the Israelites. He adds: "It is reckoned one of the most pleasant towns of Syria. The Orontes flows round the greater part of the city on the east and north. It boasts a lofty and well-built citadel. Within the town are many dams and water-machines, by means of which the water is led off by canals to irrigate the gardens and supply private houses. It is remarked of this city and of Schiazar that they abound more in water-machines than any other cities in Syria."

This description still, in a great degree, applies. Hamath is a picturesque town, of considerable circumference, and with wide and convenient streets. In Burckhardt's time the attached district contained 120 inhabited villages, and 70 or 80 that lay waste. It is now a town of 30,000 inhabitants, of whom about 2500 are Greek Christians, a few Syrians, some Jews, and the

Map of the Vicinity of Hamath.

rest Moslems. It is beautifully situated in the narrow and rich valley of the Orontes, thirty-two miles north of Emesa, and thirty-six south of the ruins of Assamea (*Antonini Itinerarium*, edit. Wesseling, p. 188). Four bridges span the rapid river, and a number of huge wheels turned by the current, like those at Verona, raise the water into rude aqueducts, which convey it to the houses and mosques. There are no remains of antiquity now visible. The mound on which the castle stood is in the centre of the city, but every trace of the castle itself has disappeared. The houses are built of sun-dried bricks and timber. Though plain and poor externally, some of them have splendid interiors. They are built on the rising banks of the Orontes, and on both sides of it, the bottom level being planted with fruit-trees, which flourish in the utmost luxuriance. The western part of the district forms the granary of Northern Syria, though the harvest never yields more than a tenfold return, chiefly on account of the immense numbers of mice, which sometimes completely destroy the crops. The inhabitants carry on a considerable trade in silks and woollen and cotton stuffs with the Bedawin. A number of noble but decayed Moslem families reside in Hamah, attracted thither by its beauty, salubrity, and cheapness (Pococke, *Travels*, ii, pt. i, p. 143 sq.; Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 146 sq.; *Handbook for Syria and Palestine*, ii, 620; Richter, *Wallfahrten*, p. 231; comp. Rosenmüller's *Bib. Geogr.* ii, 243-246; *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1848, p. 680 sq.; Robinson's *Res.* new ed. iii, 551, 568).

"*The* ENTRANCE OF HAMATH," or "*entering into Hamath*" (בּוֹא חֲמָת; Sept. εἰσπορευομένων εἰς Αἰμάθ, Vulg. *introitum Emath*), is a phrase often used in the O. T. as a geographical name. It is of considerable importance to identify it, as it is one of the chief landmarks on the northern border of the land of Israel. There can be no doubt that the sacred writers apply the phrase to some well-known "pass" or "opening" into the kingdom of Hamath (Numb. xxxiv, 8; Josh. xiii, 5). The kingdom of Hamath embraced the great plain lying along both banks of the Orontes, from the fountain near Riblah on the south to Apamea on the north, and from Lebanon on the west to the desert on the east. To this plain there are two remarkable "entrances"—one from the south, through the valley of Cœle-Syria, between the parallel ranges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon; the other from the west, between the northern end of Lebanon and the Nusairîyeh Mountains. The former is the natural "entrance" from Central Palestine, the latter from the sea-coast. The former is on the extreme south of the kingdom of Hamath, the latter on its western border.

Until within the last few years sacred geographers have almost universally maintained that the southern opening is the "entrance of Hamath." Reland supposed that the entrance described in Numb. xxxiv, 8, 10, did not extend further north than the parallel of Sidon. Consequently, he holds that the southern extremity of the valley of Cœle-Syria, at the base of Hermon, is the "entrance" of Hamath (*Palæstina*, p. 118 sq.). Kitto set forth this view in greater detail (*Pictorial Bible*); and he would identify the "entrance of Hamath" with the expression used in Numb. xiii, 21, "as men come to Hamath." Of late, however, some writers regard the latter as only intended to define the position of Beth-rehob, which was situated on the road leading from Central Palestine to Hamath—"as men come to Hamath;" that is, in the great valley of Cœle-Syria. Van de Velde appears to locate the "entrance of Hamath" at the northern end of the valley of Cœle-Syria (*Travels*, ii, 470); and Stanley adopts the same view (*Sinai and Palest.* p. 399). Dr. Keith would place the "entrance of Hamath" at that sublime gorge through which the Orontes flows from Antioch to the sea (*Land of Israel*, p. 112 sq.). A careful survey of the whole region, and a study of the passages of Scripture on the spot, however, leads Porter to conclude that the "entrance of Hamath" must be the opening towards the west, between Lebanon and the Nusairîyeh Mountains. The reasons are as follow: 1. That opening forms a distinct and natural northern boundary for the land of Israel, such as is evidently required by the following passages: 1 Kings viii, 65; 2 Kings xiv, 25; 1 Chron. xiii, 5; Amos vi, 14. 2. The "entrance of Hamath" is spoken of as being from the western border or sea-board; for Moses says, after describing the western border, "This shall be your north border, *from the great sea* ye shall point out for you Mount Hor; from Mount Hor ye shall point out unto the entrance of Hamath" (Numb. xxxiv, 7, 8). Compare this with Ezek. xlvii, 20, "the west side shall be the great sea from the (southern) border, *till a man come over against Hamath;*" and ver. 16, where the "way of Hethlon as men go to Zedad" is mentioned, and is manifestly identical with the "entrance of Hamath," and can be none other than the opening here alluded to. 3. The "entrance of Hamath" must have been to the north of the entire ridges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon (Josh. xiii, 5; Judg. iii, 3); but the opening from Cœle-Syria into the plain of Hamath is not so. 4. The territory of Hamath was included in the "Promised Land," as described both by Moses and Ezekiel (Numb. xxxiv, 8-11; Ezek. xlvii, 15-20; xlviii, 1). The "entrance of

Hamath" is one of the marks of its *northern* border; but the opening from Cœle-Syria is on the extreme *south* of the territory of Hamath, and could not, therefore, be identical with the "entrance of Hamath." 5. The "entrance to Hamath" was on the eastern border of Palestine, but *north of Riblah* (Numb. xxxiv, 10, 11), which is still extant between Hums and the northern point of Anti-Lebanon. See RIBLAH. 6. This position agrees with those of the other names associated on the northerly and easterly boundaries, e. g. Mount Hor, Hazar-Enan, etc. (see Porter's *Damascus*, ii, 354 sq.; also Robinson, *Biblical Res.* iii, 568). These arguments, however, will be found, on a closer inspection, to be incorrect (see Keil and Delitzsch, *Comment. on Pentat.* iii, 255 sq.). The only real force in any of them is that derived from the supposed identity of Zedad (q. v.) and Siphron (q. v.); and this is counterbalanced by the facts (1) that this district never was actually occupied by the Israelites, and (2) that the more definite description of the boundary of Asher and Naphtali in Josh. xix, 24-39 does not extend so far to the north. Hence we incline to the older views on this question. See TRIBE.

Ha'mathite (Hebrew *Chamathi'*, with the article הַחֲמָתִי; Sept. ὁ Ἀμαθί), a designation (Gen. x, 18; 1 Chron. i, 16) of the last named of the families descended from Canaan (q. v.); doubtless as having settled (founded) the city HAMATH (q. v.). The Hamathites were thus a Hamitic race, but there is no reason to suppose with Kenrick (*Phœnicia*, p. 60) that they were ever in any sense Phœnicians. We must regard them as closely akin to the Hittites (q. v.), on whom they bordered, and with whom they were generally in alliance. See CANAANITE.

Ha'math-Zo'bah (Heb. *Chamath' Tsobah'*, חֲמַת צוֹבָה, i. e. *Hamath of Zobah*; Sept. Αἰμὰθ Σωβά v. r. Βαισωβά, Vulg. *Emath Suba*), a place on the borders of Palestine, said to have been attacked and conquered by Solomon (2 Chron. viii, 3). It has been conjectured to be the same as HAMATH (q. v.), here regarded as included in Aram-Zobah—a geographical expression which has usually a narrower meaning. The conjunction of the two names here probably indicates nothing more than that the whole country round Hamath was brought by Solomon under the power of Judah. The possessions of David extended to Hamath, and included Zobah (1 Chron. xviii, 3), and Solomon probably added Hamath also to his empire; certain it is that he had possessions in that district, and that part of it, at least, was included in his dominion (1 Kings ix, 19). See ZOBAH.

Hambroeck, ANTON, a Protestant missionary, surnamed the "Dutch Regulus," was born in the early part of the 17th century. He went as missionary to the East Indies, and settled in the island of Formosa, then the most important establishment of the Dutch in the China Sea. He converted a large number of natives, and the mission was prospering, when the celebrated Chinese pirate Coxinga, driven away by the Tartars, landed in Formosa, and set siege to Taï-Ouan with an army of 25,000 men, April 30, 1661. Hambroeck, his wife, and two of his children, were made prisoners, and the former was sent by Coxinga as envoy to the commander of the town, Frederick Coyet, to advise him to surrender. Instead of this, he advised him to defend the city to the last, and then returned to the camp of Coxinga, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Coyet, and the prayers of his two daughters, still in Taï-Ouan, saying that he "would not permit heathen to say that the fear of death had induced a Christian to violate his oath." Coxinga, enraged at his courage, caused him to be beheaded on his return (in 1661), together with the other Dutch prisoners, some 500 in number. Coyet was nevertheless obliged to capitulate in Jan. 1662. See Du Bois, *Vies des Gouverneurs Hollandais* (La Haye, 1763, 4to), p. 210; *Recueil des Voyages qui ont servi à l'établissement et aux progrez de la Compagnie des Indes orientales* (Rouen, 1725, 10 vols. 8vo), vol. x; Raynal, *Hist. philosophique des deux Indes* (Lond. 1792, 17 vols. 8vo), ii, 26, 27; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 217.

Hamelmann, HERMANN, a German Protestant theologian and historian, was born at Osnabrück in 1525. He was brought up in the Roman Catholic Church, and became curate of Camern. Having subsequently embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, he lost his position, and went to Wittemberg, where he lived some time in intimacy with Melancthon. He afterwards preached the Protestant doctrines at Bielefeld and Lemgo, and in the counties of Waldeck, Lippe, Spiegelberg, and Pyrmont, and in Holland. He acquired great renown as a preacher, and prince William of Orange called him to Antwerp, to participate in the preparation of a new ecclesiastical discipline. In 1569 duke Julius of Brunswick appointed him first superintendent of Gandersheim, and his aid was requested by the counts John and Otho of Oldenburg, to introduce the Reformation in their states. He spent the last years of his life in this occupation, acting as general superintendent of the Protestant churches of Oldenburg, Elmenhorst, and Jever. He died at Oldenburg June 26, 1595. His theological and historical works are valuable for the history of the Reformation. Among them are *De Traditionibus veris falsisque* (Frankfort, 1555):—*De Eucharistia et controversiis inter Pontificos et Lutheranos hoc de articulo agitatis* (Frankf. 1556):—*De conjugio sacerdot. brevis interlocutorius a suffraganeo et diacono* (Dortmund, 2d ed. 1582):—*Historia ecclesiastica renati Evangel.* (Altenburg, 1586). See *Historische Nachricht über d. Leben, Bedienungen u. Schriften Ham.* (Quedlinburg, 1720); Burmann, *Syllog. Epist.* i, 430; Rotermund, *Gelehrtes Hannover*, vol. ii, p. xliv; Jöcher, *Allg. Gelehrten Lexikon*, ii, 1340.

Hamital. See HAMUTAL.

Hamilton, James, D.D., an eminent Presbyterian minister, was born in Strathblane, Scotland, in 1814. He commenced his ministry at Abernyte, Scotland, and after a short time was called to Edinburgh. In 1841 he was called to be pastor of the National Scotch Church, Regent's Square, London, and was soon known as one of the most eloquent and powerful ministers of the metropolis. He died in London November 24, 1867. Dr. Hamilton's labors as a minister were very successful, and he was equally eminent in the field of authorship, especially in the field of experimental and practical religion. Of his *Life in Earnest*, scores of editions have appeared in England (sixty-fifth thousand, Lond. 1852) and America; and his *Mount of Olives* (sixty-fifth thousand, London, 1853) has been almost as widely circulated. "He was not only one of the most popular religious writers of the day, and master of one of the most fascinating styles in which Christian truth and feeling were ever clothed, but he was also no ordinary theologian in the proper scientific sense of that term," though he never wrote any theological work in scientific form. A complete edition of his works in six volumes is now (1869) publishing in London, as follows: vol. i, *Life in Earnest; Mount of Olives; A Morning beside the Lake of Galilee; Happy Home*:—vol. ii, *Light for the Path; Emblems from Eden; The Parable of the Prodigal Son; The Church in the House; Dew of Hermon; Thankfulness*:—vol. iii, *The Royal Preacher; Lessons from the Great Biography*:—vol. iv, *Notes on Job and Proverbs; Reviews, Essays, and Fugitive Pieces*:—vols. v and vi, *Selections from unpublished Sermons and MSS.* See *Brit. and For. Evang. Review*, Jan. 1869, art. v.

Hamilton, Patrick, the first Scotch reformer, nephew to James, earl of Arran, was born in 1503, and was educated at St. Andrew's, after which he went to Germany, where he imbibed the opinions of Luther, and became professor at Marburg. On his return home he was made abbot of Ferne, in the shire of Ross, where he promulgated the doctrines of the Reformation with so much zeal as to excite the wrath of the clergy, who caused him to be apprehended and sent to Beaton, archbishop

of St. Andrew's. After a long examination he was burnt at the stake, opposite St. Salvador's College, Mar. 1, 1527, in his 24th year. At the place of execution he gave his servant his garments, saying, "These are the last things you can receive of me, nor have I anything now to leave you but the example of my death, which I pray you to bear in mind; for though it be bitter to the flesh, and fearful before men, yet it is the entrance into eternal life, which none shall inherit who deny Jesus Christ before this wicked generation." The fire burning slowly, his sufferings were long and dreadful, but his patience and piety were only more fully displayed thereby, insomuch that many were led to inquire into his principles, and to abjure the errors of popery. "The smoke of Mr. Patrick Hamilton," said a papist, "infected as many as it blew upon." His writings called Patrick's *Places* may be found in Richmond's *Fathers of the English Church*, i, 475. See Robertson, *History of Scotland*, bk. ii; Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, bk. viii; Burnet, *History of the Reformation*, i, 490 sq.; Hetherington, *History of the Church of Scotland*, i, 36 sq.

Hamilton, Richard Winter, D.D., an English Independent minister, was born in London July 6, 1794, and died in 1848. His mother had been a member of one of John Wesley's societies, and is mentioned (as Miss Hesketh) in Wesley's *Journal*. At sixteen he entered the theological college at Hoxton, and even while he was a student his talent for preaching and the remarkable exuberance of his style attracted great attention. Soon after leaving the college (1812 or 1813) he was called to the charge of an Independent congregation at Leeds, and he held this position during the remainder of his life. He attained great eminence as a preacher, and still greater as a platform speaker. With great excellences he combined grave defects: he was deficient in taste, and his style was often extravagant and pompous; but there was a wide sweep in his thoughts, and he was sometimes eloquent even to sublimity. During his life he was a diligent student. He was president of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Leeds, and contributed for it many valuable papers, some of which were published in his *Nugæ Literariæ* (1841, sm. 8vo). His other writings are, *The little Sanctuary* (domestic prayers and offices; Lond. 1838, 8vo): *Sermons*, first series (1837, 8vo; republished by Carlton and Lanahan, N. York, 1869); second series, 1846, 8vo: —*The Institutions of popular Education* (2d ed. 1846, post 8vo):—*The revealed Doctrine of Rewards and Punishments* (Lond. 1847, 8vo; N. Y., Carlton and Lanahan, 1869, 12mo):—*Horæ et Vindiciæ Sabbaticæ* (1848, 12mo): *Missions, their Authority, Scope, and Encouragement*, a prize essay, second after Harris's *Mammon* (2d ed. 1846, post 8vo):—*Pastoral Appeals on Personal, Domestic, and Social Devotion* (2d ed. 1848; also Carlton and Lanahan, N. York, 1869, 12mo); besides occasional sermons, etc. There is a poor biography of him by Stowell (1850, 8vo). (J. B. L.)

Hamilton, Samuel, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Monongahela Co., Va., Dec. 17, 1791, and removed to Ohio in 1806; was converted in 1812; entered the Ohio Conference in 1815; and died May 4, 1853. He was a pioneer of Western Methodism, and a widely known and excellent minister. As a preacher, presiding elder, and delegate to General Conference, he was in all respects "a workman that needed not to be ashamed." He was "shrewd, sarcastic, and eloquent," and his labors were abundantly successful among all classes of society.—*Min. of Conferences*, v, 268; Wakeley, *Heroes of Methodism*, p. 337. (G. L. T.)

Hamilton, Sir William, a recent Scotch philosopher, who will probably be regarded as the most subtle logician and the most acute metaphysician produced in Britain since Duns Scotus and William of Ockham. (He must not be confounded with his scarcely less distinguished contemporary, Sir William Rowan Hamilton, the Irish mathematician.) He is included, and included himself, among the adherents of the Scotch school of psychology, but he is not of them, having remodelled, interpreted, expanded, and transmuted their doctrines in such a manner as to elevate their character and entirely change their nature. His potent influence is manifested in nearly all the current speculation of the British Isles. After having created by the labors of his life and by the fascination of his example a new class of inquirers, his mind still dominates over those who reject, as well as over those who accept his principles.

Life.—Sir William Hamilton was born at Glasgow March 8, 1780, eight years before the decease of Reid; he died at Edinburgh on May 6, 1856. He thus lived through the whole of the revolution which convulsed the governments, societies, industries, and opinions of modern Europe, and prepared the new earth which is yet to be revealed. He was the son of Dr. William Hamilton, professor of anatomy at Glasgow; but he came of a long-descended line. He claimed a hereditary baronetcy, and deduced his lineage from the ducal and almost royal house of Hamilton and Chastelherault. The illustration of his birth was obscured by the splendor of his intellectual career. He received his early education in his native city. From the University of Glasgow he passed to Baliol College, Oxford, and distinguished himself by his attainments in both classics and mathematics. Here he gained his acquaintance with the writings of Aristotle, which have never been disregarded in this ancient seat of learning. In the competition for graduating honors, he professed his readiness to be examined on most of the recognised Greek and Latin classics, including many of the works of Plato and Aristotle, and of the writings of the Neo-Platonists and the peripatetic scholiasts. He had, moreover, already obtained some knowledge of Averröes and Avicenna; of the Latin fathers and the great schoolmen; of Cardan, Agricola, Laurentius Valla, and the Scaligers; and had formed a less questionable intimacy with Des Cartes, Leibnitz, and other luminaries of the Cartesian school.

The erudition of Hamilton commenced early, and was extended throughout his life. It was vast, curious, and recondite. It produces amazement by the continual array of forgotten names and unexplored authors—*omne ignotum pro mirabili.* But it is needlessly ostentatious and frequently deceptive. It is received without challenge, from the inaccessibility of the authorities alleged, and the disinclination to verify citations from unfamiliar works. Hare has shown that the imputations against Luther rest on invalid quotations taken at second-hand. It is alleged that, in his attack on mathematical studies, he has employed mangled extracts without regarding the context. His references to Aristotle, and his representations of the doctrines of the Stagyrite, are unreliable, being fragmentary, distorted, or misapprehended, from ignorance of the tenor of his writings. There is too much reason for believing that Hamilton's familiarity with "many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore" was derived from the diligent consultation of indexes, and the hasty appreciation of passages thus indicated.

The young philosopher had been designed for the legal profession. He removed to Edinburgh in 1812 to prosecute his juridical studies, and was called to the Scotch bar in 1813. In 1820, on the death of Dr. Thomas Brown, he was a candidate for the chair of moral philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. John Wilson, the poet, and editor of *Blackwood's Magazine*, was a Tory, and, as such, was preferred by the Tory town council, which constituted the electoral body. In the course of the ensuing year, the defeated candidate, rich in brains and various accomplishments, but poor in purse, was appointed by the Faculty of Advocates to the chair of history. His lectures on this great branch of knowledge, which is philosophy in its concrete and dynamical aspects, are reported to have been vigorous, original, learned, and acute. This period of Sir William's life exemplified his indefatigable industry, patient research,

versatility of talent, and zealous solicitude for truth. George Combe had attracted much attention in Edinburgh to Phrenology—a suspicious province of speculation lying along the indistinct boundary between intellectual and physical science. The profession of Hamilton's father, and his own youthful associations, may have cherished in him some aptitudes for anatomical and physiological inquiries. He now engaged in such pursuits with the earnest pertinacity that had been displayed by Des Cartes when tracing the mechanism of vision and endeavoring to discover in the pineal gland the domicile of the mind. With saw and scalpel, and tape and balance, he divided skulls, dissected, measured, and weighed their contents. The conclusions thus reached were communicated to the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 1826 and 1827, and dissipated the pretensions of Phrenology by demonstrating the falsity of the facts alleged as its foundation. These researches also rectified some physiological misapprehensions, and enabled Sir William to make those delicate observations on the composition and action of the nerves which are introduced into his notes on Reid.

In 1829, his friend, professor Napier, requested from him a philosophical article to inaugurate his literary reign as editor of the *Edinburgh Review*. The paper furnished in compliance with his request was the first, and still remains the most satisfactory exposition of Hamilton's metaphysical views. It purported to be a notice of Victor Cousin's eclecticism, but it presented in broken outlines "the Philosophy of the Conditioned." No such tractate had appeared in Britain for centuries. It recalled the ancient glories of the 13th and 14th centuries. It united the speculative subtlety of Berkeley with the dialectical skill of the schoolmen. It attracted universal admiration at home and abroad, and was promptly translated into foreign languages. It placed its author at once among the sovereigns of thought, and restored the British Isles to their place among the combatants in the shadowy arena of abstract disputation. This remarkable production was followed by others scarcely less remarkable, and similarly distinguished by comprehensive erudition, logical perspicacity, analytical precision, breadth of reasoning, and profundity of thought. Thus his claims were immeasurably superior to those of any other aspirant when the professorship of logic and metaphysics in the university became vacant in 1836. He was not elected, however, to this position without hesitancy, and the hesitancy was removed chiefly by the earnest testimonials of Victor Cousin, and professor Brandis, of Bonn.

In his new domain Sir William commenced the rehabilitation of logical studies, and the restoration of the prince of philosophers to the throne from which he had been removed by more than two centuries of ignorant and uninquiring clamor. So far, indeed, as originality appertains to his own logical and metaphysical speculations, it is obtained by recurrence to the instructions or to the hints of "the master of the wise." He held his chair for twenty years, till his death. To the discharge of his academical duties are due the lectures on logic and on metaphysics. They afford a very imperfect exhibition of either his abilities or his philosophy. They were the first-fruits of his service, hurriedly prepared to satisfy immediate requirements, and precariously modified at irregular times. They never received final elaboration or systematic revision, and were published posthumously from such sketches and loose notes as had been preserved. Throughout the period of their recurrent delivery, their development was restrained and distorted by the traditions, associations, and expectations of the school. He could not renounce allegiance to Reid, or proclaim an independent authority, or render liege-homage to Aristotle. Hence there is throughout his career a continual effort to reconcile by ingenious *tours-de-force* his own more profound and comprehensive views with the narrow, shallow, and timid utterances of the *common-sense* brotherhood. There is nothing in the history of philosophy more grotesque, more inconclusive, and better calculated to mislead, than the array of the hundred and six witnesses to the universality of the philosophy of common sense. What these deponents unanimously attest is not the truth of Reid's characteristic dogmas, but the necessity of admitting indemonstrable principles—a thesis which may be, and has been associated with many dissimilar systems. Sir William would have been swift to expose this fallacy had such an *ignoratio elenchi* been detected in any victim of his critical lash.

Though the lectures of Sir William Hamilton give an imperfect idea of his services and teaching, he efficiently promoted the cause of genuine philosophy by the spirit and breadth of his instructions, by his wonderful display of learning, by the penetration and precision of his distinctions, by attracting earnest attention to the highest walks of speculation, and by training up a generation of enthusiastic inquirers in a branch of knowledge which had been misconceived and degraded by disregard of its loftiest developments. He was untiring in encouraging and guiding the studies of his pupils; he was exacting in his demands upon their powers; but he was remarkably successful in securing their confidence and their affection; and he deepened his influence by the affability of his demeanor and by his impressive bearing. "Sir William," says one of his reviewers, "enjoyed physical advantages almost as uncommon as his intellectual attainments. . . . His frame was large and commanding; his head was cast in a classic mould; his face was handsome and expressive; his voice possessed great compass and mellifluous sweetness." With such a fortunate combination of natural endowments and cultivated acquirements, he was well adapted to become the "*magnus Apollo*" of a new sect of adorers. System, however, was foreign to his nature: the pursuit of truth was more than truth. He never evinced any desire to be the founder of a school: he may have been conscious that such a desire would have been futile, since he built on the substructions of Aristotle, or repainted with his own colors and devices the ruinous walls of the peripatetic temple.

The years of Sir William's scholastic duty were illustrated by other and more important productions than his lectures—productions which reveal more decisively the depth of his genius, and supply the best means for ascertaining the complexion and constitution of his philosophy. It seems to be expected of a Scotch professor that he should produce a book either as a title to office or in vindication of his appointment. In accordance with this custom, if not in compliance with it, Sir William signalized his induction into his chair by an edition of Reid's works, accompanied with observations and illustrative discussions. The manner in which this task was executed is characteristic of his habits. The notes were written as the text passed through the press; the supplementary disputations were added some years afterwards: they were never completed; the last that he published "breaks off in the middle," like the celebrated canto of Hudibras; and the "copious indices subjoined," which had been announced in the title-page, remains an announcement—to eternity. Sir William has nowhere given any systematic view of his doctrine, either in detail or in summary. He has left behind him elaborate essays on a few cardinal topics; many fragmentary notices of others; and numerous suggestive, but undeveloped hints. His relics are like the fossil remains of the mighty monsters of remote geological periods: here a tibia, there a maxilla; here a huge vertebra, there a ponderous scapula; here a tusk, there a claw; but nowhere is found the complete form, or even the entire skeleton. Still, from the fragments preserved, the philosophy of Hamilton may be reconstructed. The incompleteness of his labors may be ascribed in part to the polemical character of his procedure; in part to the absence of distinct originality; in part to the vast and unmanageable extent of his information, to the variety

of his meditations, and to the fastidiousness of his judgment, which sought unattainable fulness and perfection in all the details; but much must be attributed to a more mournful cause—to the paralysis which crushed his strength and deprived him of the use of his right hand for the last ten years of his life, compelling him to avail himself of the assistance of his wife and family for his correspondence and literary labors.

During his later years Sir William was chiefly occupied with the extension and application of his logical innovations. These were expounded to his class as early as 1840, and announced to the world in 1846. They provoked a bitter controversy with professor De Morgan. It is unnecessary to enter into the examination of a dispute in which the parties are satisfied neither with themselves nor with each other, and in which the language is so tortuous, rugged, and peculiar as to be almost equally unintelligible in both.

Some critics have commended the style of Sir William Hamilton as "unequalled for conciseness, precision, and force"—as "a model of philosophical clearness, conciseness, and energy" (*non cuicumque datum est habere nasum*). Mr. De Morgan characterized the Hamiltonian style as *bombinans*, whatever that may mean; and of one expression he says that it is "hard to make sense or English of it." The censure may be applied to both the combatants in this unseemly controversy. Sir William's dialect may be clear, precise, significant, when it has been mastered; but it is not English. It is a concrete of his own compounding, requiring special study just as much as any archaic *patois*. Berkeley and Hume, Stewart and Spencer, have shown that it is possible to write philosophically, and yet maintain a pure, transparent, natural English idiom. This Sir William rarely does.

Writings.—The published works of Hamilton embrace the lectures on logic and on metaphysics; an edition of Reid, never completed; an edition of the works of Dugald Stewart; and a volume of *Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform* (1852; 2d edit. enlarged, 1853; reprinted by Harper and Brothers, N. York). There is little evidence of any taste for literature, properly so called, in the volume. The only essay connected even remotely with polite letters is that on the authorship of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, which is, in some respects, his most curious contribution to periodical literature. A wide chasm separates this from the instructive and entertaining papers *On the Revolutions of Medicine*, and on *Mathematics not Philosophy*. Both of these readily consort with the laborious and learned investigation of the history, condition, objects, and possible ameliorations of university education. The remainder of the "Discussions" is devoted to logic and metaphysics. The former science is illustrated by the essay on *Logic* contributed to the *Edinburgh Review* in April, 1833; and that on *Syllogism, its kinds, canons, notations*, etc., contained in the appendix. The peculiar views of the author are further expounded in the *Prospectus of an Essay on the New Analytic of Logical Forms*, and in the *Prize Essay* of Thomas Spencer Baynes on the same subject, to which should be added the appendix to the lectures on logic.

The principal metaphysical papers in the Discussions are those on *The Philosophy of the Conditioned;* on *The Philosophy of Perception*, and *On Idealism*, with the appendix *On the Conditions of the Thinkable.* In the editorial labors on Reid, besides many important notes elucidating, rectifying, developing, or altering the statements in the text, which merit careful consideration, should be specially studied Note A, *On the Philosophy of Common Sense;* Note B, *On Presentative and Representative Knowledge;* and Note D, *Distinction of the Primary and Secondary Qualities of Body*, which has an intimate relation to the theory of immediate or presentative perception.

Philosophy.—Logic, metaphysics, and ethics are comprised under the general designation of philosophy. The last of these divisions is untouched by Sir William Hamilton. In the other two he has pushed his inquiries far beyond any of his British contemporaries, and with much more brilliant success. In both he evinced signal acuteness; in both he rendered good service: and in both he deemed himself an inventor and reformer, and not merely an innovator.

The character of his metaphysical doctrine is manifested by the designation which he bestowed upon it—The Philosophy of the Conditioned. It is critical in its procedure; it is mainly negative in its results. In these respects it resembles the philosophy of Kant, to which it approximates in many of its developments. It is a crusade against all theories reposing on the absolute and the unconditioned. It sets out with affirming the essential relativity of all knowledge; it concludes with the restriction of philosophy to the determination of the conditions of thought. In this there is nothing new but the mode of exposition. It was a familiar aphorism of the schoolmen, founded upon the teachings of Aristotle, that all thought was bounded by the limits of the thinking mind—"*omne perceptum est secundum modum percipientis*"—"*omne scitum est in sciente secundum modum scientis*"—"*species cogniti est in cognoscente.*" From this position Hamilton deduces the invalidity of all conceptions pretending to be absolute, and hence denies the possibility of any positive conception of the infinite. Herein he merely repeats Aristotle, but with less moderation in his doctrine. This thesis has been violently opposed, and usually misapprehended. It was assailed by Calderwood, *Philosophy of the Infinite*, who confounds the negation of the Infinite in thought with the negation of the infinity of God. It has been accepted and applied by Mansel to theology in his *Limits of Religious Thought.* The next step is to a purely negative exposition of causality, as resulting from "mental impotence" to conceive an absolute commencement. Sir William recognises that this interpretation conflicts with the idea of a great First Cause, and he propounds a very ingenious apology for his doctrine. He similarly follows out his fundamental tenet to other applications, and arrives uniformly at negative conclusions.

The tenet, however, is not presented as an axiom, but receives interpretation, if not demonstration. It is the inevitable consequence of the dualism of our knowledge—a thesis contained in Aristotle. Every act of consciousness "gives a knowledge of the ego in relation and contrast to the non-ego, and a knowledge of the non-ego in relation and contrast to the ego. The ego and non-ego are thus given, in an original synthesis, as conjoined in the unity of knowledge, and in an original antithesis, as opposed in the contrariety of existence." This "natural dualism" is accepted by professor Ferrier as the beginning of an antagonistic scheme of philosophy. With Hamilton it is made to rest upon the basis of immediate perception, and thus he is led to the affirmation of direct or presentative perception in opposition to the older theory of indirect or representative perception. This brings him into accordance with the school of Reid—though Reid and his school would scarcely have understood, and certainly could not have appreciated his delicate distinctions; and it must be acknowledged that it is a coarse and materialistic conception of species, images, and impressions which requires any deadly opposition between presentative and representative perception. To one cultivating such divisions and differences, the treatise of Roger Bacon, *De Multiplicatione Specierum*—the most marvellous result of mediæval science—would be utterly unintelligible.

On Sir William Hamilton's principles, the only object of philosophy is the determination of the limits and requirements of thought, or, as he phrases it, "the Conditions of the Thinkable." On this subject he has left an admirable and most suggestive paper; but his whole scheme of speculation is without any basis for certainty, without any witness of "the Spirit bearing witness to our spirit." It is thus built upon the void; and, like the eclecticism of Cousin, and the transcendentalism of He-

gel and Schelling, which it was specially designed to oppose, it tends, however unconsciously, to practical scepticism. "Such (φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσιν)," says Sir William, "are the hints of an undeveloped philosophy, which, I am confident, is founded upon truth." Doubtless this philosophy is undeveloped, and doubtless it is founded upon truth; but the foundation may not be homogeneous or sufficient, and the superstructure may not be composed of the same materials as the substruction. The most dangerous error is that which proceeds from mutilated, distorted, or alloyed truth.

"The views of Sir William Hamilton are before us, in certain parts, in his own exposition;" they invite and require rigorous examination. "That they have already been much discussed, and have exerted a powerful influence on speculation, is a good omen for philosophy. We have, especially, his treatment of three great problems in philosophy. First, there is the theory of the two kinds of human knowledge, Immediate and Mediate. Secondly, there is a special application of this theory to the construction of a theory of External Perception. Thirdly, there is an exhaustive system of Metaphysics Proper, or Ontology, in his 'Philosophy of the Conditioned' and 'Conditions of the Thinkable'—a vast and noble idea, traced out for us in nothing but a tantalizing fragment. His Logical system is to be gathered from the sources already mentioned. They will probably convey no distinct notion of the system, unless to readers who are familiar with the German methods of logical analysis since Kant. The leading points may be said to be four; and it is perhaps possible to make these intelligible very briefly to persons acquainted with the outlines of the science in its received forms. 1. Hamilton insists on having, in all propositions through common terms which are set forth for logical scrutiny, a sign of quantity prefixed to predicate as well as to subject. The point, though merely one of form, is curiously suggestive of difficulties, and hence of solutions. 2. Instead of recognising only four forms of propositions, the A, E, I, O of the old logicians, he insists on admitting all the eight forms which are possible. (See Thomson and Solly.) 3. He widens the range of the syllogism by admitting all moods which can validly be constructed by any combination of any of his eight kinds of propositions. 4. The Port-Royal doctrine of the inverse ratio of the extension and comprehension of terms is worked out by him in reference to the syllogism. This application of the doctrine has certainly not been anticipated by any logician; and, when elaborated to its results, it throws many new lights on the characters and mutual relations of the syllogistic figures." The value of these innovations has not been definitely settled, nor has it been ascertained whether they were overlooked by Aristotle, misapprehended by him, or deliberately rejected from his Analytics.

Authorities. — An earnest discussion of Hamilton's doctrines may be found in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* for 1857; a sketch of his metaphysical views is given in the *Princeton Review* for 1855. One of the most unfortunate features in the literary history of Sir William was his attack on the reputation of Luther, which was fully answered by Hare in his *Vindication of Luther*. Hare convicts Hamilton of using second-hand knowledge as if he had studied the original sources. See *N. Brit. Rev.* Nov. 1848, Feb. 1853, July, 1859; *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April, 1856; *Gentleman's Magazine*, June, 1856; *North American Review*, Oct. 1845, p. 485-9; Jan. 1853, art. iii; *British Quarterly Review*, xvi, 479; Wight, *Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton* (N. Y. 1855); Mill, *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* (Lond. 1865)—reviewed in the *Westminster Review*, Jan. 1866, and elaborately answered by H. L. Mansel, *The Philosophy of the Conditioned* (Lond. 1866); De Morgan, *Formal Logic* (London, 1847); Bowen, *A Treatise on Logic* (Cambridge, 1864). The *Life of Sir William Hamilton*, by J. Veitch (1869), which had been long expected, has been recently published. (G. F. H.)

Hamline, Leonidas Lent, D.D., LL.D., a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Burlington, Conn., May 10, 1797. His early education was obtained with some view to the Christian ministry; but, arriving at manhood, he studied law, and was admitted to the bar in Lancaster, Ohio. He married in Zanesville, Ohio, and settled there to practice his profession. The death of a little daughter in 1828 led him to seriously consider his own moral state, and he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church in the autumn of 1828. Soon after he was licensed to exhort, then (1829) to preach. In 1832 he was received on trial in the Ohio Conference, and appointed to Granville Circuit. In 1833 he travelled Athens Circuit, and in 1834 and 1835 he was stationed at Wesley Chapel, Cincinnati. In 1836 he was elected assistant editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, with the Rev. Dr. Charles Elliott. When the *Ladies' Repository* was established in January, 1841, Hamline was assigned to the work of editing that journal. He remained in this position until, in 1844, he was elected one of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This office he filled with great usefulness for eight years, when ill health compelled him to resign it to the General Conference of 1852. His name was reattached to the list of members of the Ohio Conference, and he was granted a superannuated relation. In 1857 he removed to Mount Pleasant, Iowa, his former confidential friendship with Dr. Elliott, who resided in that place, leading to this change. In an account of his life which bishop Hamline wrote for his family, he thus refers to the years from 1852 to 1860: "For eight years I have been superannuated, and God has 'tried me *as silver is tried*;' but he has often sweetened those trials by his presence in a marvellous manner. And now day by day my fellowship is with the Father, and with his son Jesus Christ. Though almost helpless, and dependent on my devoted, affectionate wife for personal attentions, which her exemplary patience never wearies in bestowing on me (thanks be to thy name, O God, for such a gift!), yet I am far more contented and cheerful than in the best days of my youth." He was taken severely ill Jan. 25, 1865. On the 10th of February, having called his family in to pray with them once more, "he uttered remarkable expressions of adoration of the Saviour on the throne in special reference to his humiliation, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, exaltation, etc. He prayed for his family, the Church, for his own Conference (the Ohio), the missions, the country, the world. All the forenoon he expressed much thankfulness for everything. He then had occasion to drink, and his painful thirst reminded him of the exclamation on the cross when the Saviour said, 'I thirst.' He then burst into tears, and broke out again in praise. He then spoke of his present state as a fresh baptism into Christ, into his glorious name, and exclaimed, '*O wondrous, wondrous, wondrous love!*' When Mrs. Hamline raised the window-shade at sunset he exclaimed, 'O beautiful sky! beautiful heaven!'" He died on the 23d of March. Of the character and attainments of bishop Hamline, Dr. Elliott says, "My pen is wholly incompetent to draw out in its full extent an adequate portrait of his high and holy character, whether it regards his natural talents or his extensive attainments; but especially the sanctity and purity of his religious life. As a preacher, he was in the first rank in all respects that regard the finished pulpit orator. His style as a writer would compare favorably with the best writers in the English language. He had no superior for logic, argument, or oratory. He was the subject of much bodily affliction, and yet, amid excruciating pains, he retained the full exercise of his intellectual powers to the very last hour of his life. The leading characteristic of him in his sufferings was his complete patience and resignation to the will of God." His principal writings (chiefly sermons) are given in the *Works of L. L. Hamline, D.D.*, edited by the Rev. F. G. Hibbard, D.D. (N. York, 1869, 8vo).—See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1866; *Meth. Quart.*

Rev. October, 1866; Palmer, *Life and Letters of Leonidas L. Hamline, D.D.* (N.Y. 1866, 12mo).

Hammahlekoth. See SELA-HAM-MAHLEKOTH.

Hamman, or rather CHAMMAN (חַמָּן, only in the plur. *hammanim'*), signifies *images*, idols of some kind for idolatrous worship (and so the Sept. and Vulg. understand it). It is rendered "images" in Lev. xxvi, 30; 2 Chron. xiv, 5; xxxiv, 7; Isa. xvii, 8; xxvii, 9; Ezek. vi, 4, 6; but in the margin almost invariably "*sun images*." In these passages *Hammanim* is several times joined with *Asherim*—statues of Astarte; while from 2 Chron. xxxiv, 4, it appears further that the *Hammanim* stood upon the altars of Baal. See ASHERAH; BAAL. Kimchi, and the Arabic of Erpenius, long ago explained the word by *suns, images of the sun;* and both this interpretation and the thing itself are now clearly illustrated by ten Punic cippi with inscriptions, consecrated to *Baal Hamman*, i. e. to *Baal the solar, Baal the sun.* (See the whole subject discussed in Gesenius's *Thes. Heb.* p. 489-491.) The form *chamman, solar*, is from חַמָּה, *cham'mah*, the sun; and the plural *Hammanim*, in the Old Testament, is put elliptically for *Baalim Hammanim*, and is found in the same context as elsewhere *Baalim*, images of Baal.

Ham'math (Heb. *Chammath'*, חַמַּת, *warm* springs; Sept. Ἀμάθ v. r. [by incorporation of the following name] Ὠμαθαδακέθ, Vulg. *Emath*), one of the "fenced cities" of Naphtali, mentioned between Zer and Rakkath (Josh. xix, 35); generally thought to be the hot spring referred to by Josephus (*War*, iv, 1, 3) under the name *Ammaus* (Ἀμμαοῦς), near Tiberias (*Ant.* xviii, 2, 3); which latter is, no doubt, the same with the famous warm baths still found on the shore a little south of Tiberias, and called *Hummam Tubariyeh* ("Bath of Tiberias"); properly *Hammath-rakkath* (? the *Yamim* of Gen. xxxvi, 24). See EMMAUS. They have been fully described by Robinson (*Researches*, iii, 258 sq.; see also Hackett's *Script. Illust.* p. 315). Pliny, speaking of the Sea of Galilee, says, "Ab occidente Tiberiade, aquis calidis salubri" (*Hist. Nat.* v, 15). Spacious baths were built over the principal spring by Ibrahim Pasha; but, like everything else in Palestine, they are falling to ruin. Ancient ruins are strewn around it, and can be traced along the shore for a considerable distance; these were recognised by Irby and Mangles (p. 89, *b*) as the remains of Vespasian's camp (Josephus, *War*, i, 4, 3). There are also three smaller warm springs at this place. The water has a temperature of 144° Fahr.; the taste is extremely salt and bitter, and a strong smell of sulphur is emitted. The whole surrounding district has a volcanic aspect. The warm fountains, the rocks of trap and lava, and the frequent earthquakes, prove that the elements of destruction are still at work beneath the surface. It is said that at the time of the great earthquake of 1837 the quantity of water issuing from the springs was greatly increased, and the temperature much higher than ordinarily (Porter, *Handbook for S. and P.* ii, 423; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 66; Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, ii, 397; Reland, *Palæst.* p. 302, 703). This spot is also mentioned in the Talmud (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 182) as being situated one mile from Tiberias (Lightfoot, *Opp.* ii, 224). The HAMMOTH-DOR of Josh. xxi, 32 is probably the same place. See HEMATH; HAMMON.

The *Hamath of Gadara*, however, located by the Talmudists (see Lightfoot, *ib.*) at the mouth of the Jordan, is a different place (see also Zunz, *Appendix* to Benj. of Tudela, ii, 403); doubtless the AMATHA (q. v.) of Josephus (*Ant.* x, 5, 2), and the modern *Amateh* on the Yarmuk (Van de Velde, *Map*).

Hammed'atha (Heb. *Hammedatha'*, הַמְּדָתָא; Sept. Ἀμάδαθος, Vulg. *Amadathus*, but both sometimes omit), father of the infamous Haman (q. v.), and commonly designated as "the Agagite" (Esth. iii, 1, 10; viii, 5; ix, 24), though also without that title (ix, 10). By Gesenius (*Lex.* 1855, p. 539) the name is taken to be *Medatha*, preceded by the definite article: but Fürst (*Lex.* s. v.), with more probability, identifies it with the Zendic *haômôdata*, i. e. "given by Hom," one of the Izeds. For other explanations, see Simonis (*Onomasticon*, p. 586), who derives it from a Persian word meaning "double." For the termination, compare ARIDATHA. B.C. ante 474.

Ham'melech (Heb. *ham-Me'lek*, הַמֶּלֶךְ, which is merely מֶלֶךְ, *me'lek, king*, with the article prefixed; Sept. translates ὁ βασιλεύς, Vulg. *Amelech*), the father of Jerahmeel, which latter was one of those commanded by Jehoiakim to arrest Jeremiah and Baruch (Jer. xxxvi, 26). B.C. ante 605. It is doubtful whether this was the same with the Hammelech, father of Malchiah, into whose dungeon Jeremiah was afterwards cast (Jer. xxxviii, 6). B.C. ante 589. Others, however, regard the word in both cases as an appellative, referring in the first passage to Jehoiakim, and in the latter to Zedekiah. Compare HAMMOLEKETH.

Ham-menuchoth. See MANAHETHITE.

Hammer, an indispensable tool designated by several Heb. terms: 1. *Pattish'* (פַּטִּישׁ, connected etymologically with πατάσσω, *to strike*), which was used by the gold-beater (Isa. xli, 7, Sept. σφῦρα) to overlay with silver and "smooth" the surface of the image, as well as by the quarryman (Jer. xxiii, 29, Sept. πέλυξ); metaphorically of Babylon as a destructive agent (Jer. l, 23, Sept. σφῦρα). This seems to have been the heaviest instrument of the kind for hard blows. 2. *Makkabah'* (מַקָּבָה), properly a tool for *hollowing*, hence a stonecutter's mallet (1 Kings vi, 7), and generally any workman's hammer (Judg. iv, 21 [where the form is מַקֶּבֶת, *makke'beth*]; Isa. xliv, 12; Jer. x, 4). In Isaiah the Sept. uses τέρετρον, a *gimlet*, in all the rest σφῦρα; Vulg. *malleus*. See MACCABÆUS. 3. *Halmûth'* (הַלְמוּת), used only in Judg. v, 26; Sept. σφῦρα, Vulg. *mallei* [q. d. הלמות]; and then with the addition of the word "workmen's" by way of explanation, as this is a poetical word, used instead of the preceding more prosaic term. The pins of the tent of the Bedouin are generally of wood, and are driven into the ground by a mallet, which is probably the "hammer" referred to in this passage (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 149). Dr. Hackett observes (Amer. ed. of Smith's *Dict.* s. v.) that "it is spoken of as 'the hammer,' being the one kept for that purpose;" but the Hebrew term used in Judg. v, 26 (to which he refers) is without the art., which is employed, however, with that found in Judg. iv, 21. See NAIL. 4. A kind of hammer, named *mappets'* (מַפֵּץ), Jer. li, 20 (A.V. "battle-axe"), or *mephits'* (מֵפִיץ), Prov. xxv, 18 (A.V. "maul"), was used as a weapon of war. 5. Only in the plur. (כֵּילַפּוֹת, *keylappôth'*, Sept. λαξευτήρια, Vulg. *asciæ*), a poetic term equivalent to the preceding (Psa. lxxiv, 6). See HANDICRAFT.

Hämmerlin or **Hammerlein**, FELIX (Lat. *Malleolus*), a Swiss theologian, was born at Zurich in 1389. He studied canon law at Erfurt, was in 1421 appointed canon of Zofingen, and in 1422 provost of Solothurn. With the income of these offices he bought a large library, and applied himself earnestly to study. He subsequently took part in the Council of Basle, where he showed great zeal for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, and thus made himself a number of enemies. An attempt was made to assassinate him in 1439, but he escaped, though not without being dangerously wounded. The xxxth chapter of his *De Nobilitate*, in which he abused the confederate cantons which had waged war on Zurich in 1443, made him an object of hatred to a large party of his countrymen. A number of these, having gone to Zurich on the occasion of the Carnival of 1454, seized Hämmerlin, dragged him to Constance, and had him thrown into prison. As he refused to retract anything he had said or written, he was condemn-

ed to imprisonment for life in a convent. He was accordingly placed in a convent of barefooted monks at Lucerne, where he died some time after 1457, a victim to his zeal for justice and truth. He wrote *Variæ Oblectationis Opuscula et Tractatus* (Basle, 1497, fol.), containing a number of treatises on exorcism, on monkish discipline, against the Beghards, etc. He is very severe in these writings against the prevailing corruptions of the clergy and the convents. He also left some MSS., which are preserved in the collegiate library of Zurich. See Bodmer u. Breitinger, *Helvetische Bibliothek* (Zurich, 1735). Hottinger, *Schola Tigurina*, p. 24; Niceron, *Mémoires*, vol. xxviii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 268: Reber, *Felix Hemmerlin* (Zurich, 1846).

Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph von, a German Orientalist of great celebrity, was born July 9, 1774, at Gratz, in Styria, and died in Vienna Nov. 24, 1856. His family name was Hammer, and he is frequently referred to under that name, or as Von Hammer; but having inherited in 1837 the estates of the counts of Purgstall, he added that name to his own, and was made a baron. He entered at an early age the Oriental Academy at Vienna, and acquired a knowledge of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish. Being subsequently employed in various diplomatic posts in the East, he greatly extended his acquaintance with Oriental languages and literature. He wrote and spoke ten foreign languages, viz. the three above named, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, English, and Russian; but his works show rather varied and extensive research and learning than profound mastery of his subjects. They are by no means free from errors, though his careful reference to authorities makes correction of mistakes comparatively easy. His writings, including contributions to journals and scientific associations, would make more than 100 octavo volumes, and, on the whole, are regarded as among the most valuable contributions of the present century to Oriental history and literature. They are noticed here because of the information they give as to the religious history and condition of Oriental nations. The most important of his works in this respect are *Encyclopædische Uebersicht der Wissenschaften des Orients* (Lpz. 1804, 2 vols. in 1, 8vo), a work based on seven Oriental works, especially the bibliographical dictionary of Hadgi Khalfa:—*Ancient Alphabets and Hieroglyphic Characters explained, with an Account of the Egyptian Priests, their Classes, initiation, and Sacrifices* (translated from the Arabic of Ahwad bin-Abubakr bin-Wahshih, London, 1806, small 4to):—*Fundgruben des Orients*, etc., *ou Mines de l'Orient exploitées* (Vienna, 1809-18, 6 vols. in 3, fol., of which Hammer-Purgstall was the chief editor):—*Morgenländisches Kleeblatt* (Persian and Arab hymns, etc.; Vienna, 1818, 4to):—*Geschichte der schönen Redekünste Persiens* (Vienna, 1818, 4to):—*Mysterium Baphometis revelatum* (Vienna, 1818, fol.; also in vol. vi of *Mines de l'Orient:* the author herein seeks to prove from emblems on monuments once belonging to the Templars that their order was guilty of the crimes charged to it. Raynouard [*Journal des Savants*, 1819] refuted this opinion, but Hammer-Purgstall defended it with new arguments in a paper in the *Memoirs of the Academy of Vienna*, 1855):—*Geschichte der Assassinen* (Paris, 1833, 8vo, and an English ed. by Wood, *History of the Assassins*, Lond. 1835, 8vo. The author makes curious comparisons between the Assassins, the Templars, the Freemasons, and the Jesuits): —*Geschichte des Osmanischen Reichs* (best ed. Pesth, 1827-35, 10 vols. 8vo; French translations by Dochez, Paris, 1844, 3 vols. 8vo, and by Hellert, with notes and an Atlas, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, Paris, 1835-43, 18 vols. 8vo):—*Geschichte der Osmanischen Dichtkunst* (Pesth, 1836-38, 10 vols. 8vo—a completer history of Turkish poetry than any existing, even in Turkey itself):—the celebrated treatise on morals by Ghazali, under the title of *O Kind! die berühmte ethische Abhandlung Ghasalis* (Vienna, 1838, 12mo):—*Zeitwarte des Gebetes*, a prayer-book in Arabic and German (Vienna, 1844, 8vo):—*Literatur-Geschichte der Araber* (Vienna, 1856, 7 vols. 4to: this work, as first published, ends with the Bagdad caliphate, and contains about 10,000 biographical and bibliographical notices):—*Das Arabische Hohe Lied der Liebe*, etc., with commentary, and an introduction relative to mysticism among the Arabs (Vienna, 1854, 8vo). Hammer left an autobiography (*Denkwürdigkeiten aus meinem Leben*) and other writings in MS., which have been published, or are publishing, under the direction of Auer, director of the imperial printing-press of Vienna.—*New American Cyclopædia*, viii, 690; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 259 sq.; Pierer, s. v.; K. Schlottman, *Joseph von H.-Purgstall, ein kritischer Beitrag zur Geschichte neuerer deutscher Wissenschaft* (Zurich, 1857, [73 p.] 8vo). (J. W. M.)

Hammol'eketh (Heb. *ham-Mole'keth*, הַמֹּלֶכֶת, which is the art. prefixed to מֹלֶכֶת, *mole'keth*, fem. part. = "the Queen;" Sept. ἡ Μαλεχέθ, Vulg. translates *regina*), a woman introduced in the genealogies of Manasseh as daughter of Machir and sister of Gilead (1 Chron. vii, 17, 18), and as having among her three children Abi-ezer, from whose family sprang the great judge Gideon. B.C. prob. between 1874 and 1658. The Targum translates the name by דִּ מְלָכַת, *who reigned.* The Jewish tradition, as preserved by Kimchi in his commentary on the passage, is that "she used to reign over a portion of the land which belonged to Gilead," and that for that reason her lineage has been preserved.—Smith, s. v. See Hammelech.

Ham'mon (Heb. *Chammon'*, חַמּוֹן, *warm;* Sept. Ἀμών and Χαμών), the name of two places.

1. A town in the tribe of Asher, mentioned between Rehob and Kanah (Josh. xix, 28). Dr. Robinson quotes the suggestion of Schultz as possible, that it may be the ruined town *Hamul*, at the head of a wady of the same name which comes down to the Mediterranean just north of En-Nakurah, somewhat south of Tyre (new ed. of *Researches*, iii, 66). Schwarz thinks it is identical with a village *Hamani*, situated, according to him, two miles south by east of Tyre (*Palest.* p. 192); probably the place marked on Zimmerman's and Van de Velde's *Maps* as *Hunnaweh*. The scriptural text, however, would seem to indicate a position on the northern boundary, about midway between Naphtali (at Rehob) and Sidon. Hence Knobel (*Erklär.* ad loc.) connects it with the village *Hammana*, on a wady of the same name east of Beyrût, where there is now a Maronite monastery (Seetzen, i, 260); but this, again, is too far north (Keil, in Keil and Delitzsch, ad loc.). Van de Velde (*Memoir* and *Map*) adopts the first of the above sites, which, although neither the name nor the situation exactly agrees, is perhaps the best hitherto suggested.

2. A Levitical city of Naphtali, assigned, with its suburbs, to the descendants of Gershom (1 Chron. vi, 76). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 183) not improbably conjectures that it is the same with Hammath (Josh. xix, 35). Compare Hammoth-dor (Josh. xxi, 32).

Hammond, Henry, D.D., a learned divine of the English Church, was born Aug. 18, 1605, at Chertsey, Surrey. He was sent at an early age to Eton, whence he removed to Magdalen College, Oxford, and became a fellow of that society in 1625. In 1633 the earl of Leicester presented him to the rectory of Penshurst, Kent, where he resided till 1643, when he was made archdeacon of Chichester. "By birth and education a confirmed Royalist, he retired to Oxford soon after the civil war broke out, continued to reside there while that city was held by the king, and attended the king's commissioners to Uxbridge, where he disputed with Vines, a Presbyterian minister. He was appointed canon of Christchurch and public orator in 1645, and attended Charles I as his chaplain from the time when he fell into the hands of the army until the end of 1647, when the king's attendants were sent away from him. Hammond then returned to Oxford, and was chosen subdean of Christchurch, from which situation he was ex-

pelled in March, 1648, by the parliamentary visitors, and placed for some time in confinement. On his release he repaired to Westwood, Worcestershire, the seat of Sir John Packwood, where the remainder of his life was spent in literary labor, 'doing much good to the day of his death, in which time he had the disposal of great charities reposed in his hands, as being the most zealous promoter of almsgiving that lived in England since the change of religion.' . . . He died after long suffering from a complication of disorders, April 25, 1660. It is said that Charles II intended for him the bishopric of Worcester. Hammond was a man of great learning, as well in the classics and general philology as in doctrinal and school divinity, and possessed great natural ability" (Jones, *Christ. Biogr.* p. 210). Of his writings the following are some of the most important: *Practical Catechism* (1644):—*Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament* (Lond. 1653, 8vo; often reprinted; last edition 1845, 4 vols. 8vo). It was translated into Latin by Leclerc (Amster. 1698), with observations and criticisms. Dr. Johnson was very fond of Hammond's *Annotations*, and recommended them strongly. The theology of the work is Arminian. *Paraphrase and Annotations upon the Psalms* (1659, fol.; new ed. 1850, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Discourses on God's Grace and Decrees* (1660, 8vo), taking the Arminian view:—*Annotations on the Proverbs* (1683, fol.):—*Sermons* (1644, fol.). These, with many valuable writings on the Romish controversy, may be found in Fulman's *Collected Works of Dr. Hammond* (3d ed., London, 1774, 4 vols. fol.), of which the 1st vol. contains his Life by Dr. Fell. The *Life* was reprinted in 1849, and may be found in Wordsworth, *Eccles. Biography*, iv, 313. See also Hook, *Eccl. Biography*, v, 534. Hammond's miscellaneous theological writings are reprinted in the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology* (Oxford 1847–51, 4 vols. 8vo).

Ham'moth-dor (Heb. *Chammoth'-Dor*, חַמֹּת דֹּאר, prob. for חַמַּת־דּוֹר, *Hammath of Dor*, but the reason of the latter part of the name is not clear; Sept. Ἀμαθδώρ, Vulg. *Hamoth Dor*), a Levitical and refuge city of Naphtali (Josh. xxi, 32); probably the same elsewhere called simply HAMMATH (Josh. xix, 35).

Hamon. See BAAL-HAMON; HAMON-GOG.

Hamon, JEAN, a distinguished French moralist, was born at Cherbourg in 1618. He was a graduate physician of the University of Paris. He had already established a great reputation, and was offered a good charge by his pupil, M. de Harlay (afterwards president of the Parliament); but, by the advice of his spiritual director, Singlin, he sold all his goods, gave the proceeds to the poor, and became a hermit of Port Royal in 1651. He nevertheless continued practicing medicine, visiting the poor in the neighborhood of Port Royal, and administering to them both spiritual advice and remedies. The *Nécrologe de Port Royal* says: "After a life as carefully guarded as though each day was to be the last, he ended it joyfully by a peaceful death, as he had wished, and entered into eternal life," Feb. 22, 1687. He wrote *Divers Traités de Piété* (Paris, 1675, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Sur la Prière et les Devoirs des Pasteurs* (Par. 1689, 2 vols. 12mo):—*La Pratique de la Prière continuelle* (Paris, 1702, 12mo):—*Explication du Cantique des Cantiques*, with an introduction by Nicole (Paris, 1708, 4 vols. 12mo):—*Instructions pour les Religieuses de Port Royal* (1727 and 1730, 2 vols.):—*Instructions sur les Sacraments, sur le Jubile*, etc. (Paris, 1734, 12mo):—*Explication de l'Oraison Dominicale* (Par. 1735), besides other practical and controversial writings. See *Nécrologe de Port Royal* (Amst. 1723, 4to); Thomas Dufossé, *Histoire de Port Royal; Mémoires de Fontaine;* Dupin, *Hist. Ecclés. du 17me siècle;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 272.

Hamo'nah (Heb. *Hamonah'*, הֲמוֹנָה, *multitude;* Sept. translates Πολυάνδριον, Vulg. *Amon*), a name figuratively assigned to the sepulchral "city" of the valley in which the slaughter and burial of the forces of Gog are prophetically announced to take place (Ezek. xxxix, 16), emblematical of the multitude of graves (compare Joel iii, 14). See HAMON-GOG.

Ha'mon-gog (Heb. *Hamôn'-Gôg*, הֲמוֹן גּוֹג, *multitude of Gog;* fully with גֵּיא, *valley*, prefixed; Sept. τὸ Γαῒ τὸ πολυάνδριον τοῦ Γώγ, Vulg. *Vallis multitudinis Gog*), the name prophetically ascribed to the valley in which the corpses of the slaughtered army of Gog are described as to be buried (Ezek. xxxix, 11, 15); represented as situated to the east of the Dead Sea, on the thoroughfare of commerce with Arabia (comp. the route of the Ishmaelites to whom Joseph was sold, Gen. xvii, 25), probably the present Haj road between Damascus and Mecca, but scarcely referring to any particular spot. (See Hävernick, *Commentar*, ad loc.; Stuart's *Comment. on the Apocalypse*, ii, 367.) See GOG.

Ha'mor (Heb. *Chamor'*, חֲמוֹר, a *he-ass;* Sept. Ἐμμώρ, N. T. Ἐμμόρ), a Hivite, from whom (or his sons) Jacob purchased the plot of ground in which Joseph was afterwards buried (Gen. xxxiii, 19; Josh. xxiv, 32; Acts vii, 15; in which last passage the name is Anglicized EMMOR), and whose son Shechem seduced Dinah (Gen. xxxiv, 2). B.C. cir. 1905. As the latter appears to have founded the city of Shechem (q. v.), Hamor is also named as the representative of its inhabitants (Judg. ix, 28) in the time of Abimelech (q.v.). His character and influence are indicated by his title ("prince" of the Hivite tribe in that vicinity), and his judicious behavior in the case of his son; but neither of these saved him from the indiscriminate massacre by Dinah's brothers. See JACOB.

Hampden, RENN DICKSON, D.D., bishop of Hereford, England, a descendant of John Hampden, was born A.D. 1792, in the island of Barbadoes, where his family had settled in 1670. He entered Oriel College, Oxford, as a commoner, in 1810, and subsequently was admitted a fellow, appointed a tutor, and, in 1829 and 1831, was public examiner in classics. He delivered the Bampton lecture in 1832, choosing for his subject *The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its relation to Christian Theology* (3d edit. Lond. 1848, 8vo), and in 1833 was appointed principal of St. Mary's Hall. In 1834 he was elected White's professor of moral philosophy (Oxford), and published a pamphlet entitled *Observations on Religious Dissent.* The opinions expressed in this work and in his Bampton lecture were made the grounds of opposition to his confirmation in 1836 as regius professor of divinity (Oxford), to which Lord Melbourne, then premier, had appointed him. The controversy over this appointment, which assumed the character of a violent struggle, and is known as the *First Hampden Case*, appears to have been based on political feelings as well as theological grounds. His principal opponents were Tories and High-Churchmen, among whom were Dr. Pusey and J. H. Newman, now a Roman Catholic. A remonstrance against the appointment was sent to the archbishop of Canterbury, to be presented to the crown. A declaration, condemning Hampden's "mode of viewing the doctrines of the Bible and the Articles of the Church" was numerously signed by residents of the university, and an effort was made in the House of Convocation to pass a statute expressing want of confidence in his views, which was only frustrated by the interposition of the proctors. The struggle was renewed in the *Second Hampden Case*, occasioned by Hampden's appointment to the see of Hereford by lord John Russell in 1847. Thirteen of the bishops remonstrated against the appointment, "appealing to the former controversy, and urging the inexpediency of placing over the clergy one whose opinions were rendered suspicious by the decision of a body like the University of Oxford." Hampden's friends replied that a change had taken place in the minds of the members of the Convocation of the University, reducing the proportions of 474 to 94 in 1836, to 330 to 219 in 1842, on the proposition to repeal the

expression of censure; and further, that many who censured Hampden "objected to the university as an arbiter of doctrine in the case of Tract xc, and of Mr. Ward's *Ideal of the Church*." The opposition, as in the former case, arose mainly from political opponents and from Tractarians. The government refused to yield, and Dr. Hampden was installed as bishop of Hereford, and thenceforth devoted himself to his episcopal duties, the attacks upon him gradually ceasing. He died April 23, 1868. His position was that of a moderate churchman, and the expression of his views at this day could hardly provoke so fierce an opposition as in 1836. A list of the most important pamphlets relating to the Hampden cases is given by Allibone, s. v. *Hampden*. Besides the works mentioned above, Dr. Hampden's most important writings are, *Philosophical Evidence of Christianity*, etc. (1827, 8vo):—*Lectures on Moral Philosophy* (8vo):—*Parochial Sermons* (1836, 8vo):—*Lecture on Tradition* (1841, 8vo): —*Sermons before the University of Oxford* (1836–1847): —a Review of the writings of Thomas Aquinas in the *Encycl. Metropolitana*, which led Hallam to characterize Hampden "as the only Englishman who, since the revival of letters, has penetrated into the wilderness of scholasticism;" and the articles on *Socrates*, *Plato*, and *Aristotle*, in the *Encycl. Britannica*. See *English Review*, viii, 430; ix, 229; *Blackw. Mag.* No. 246 (April, 1836); *Brit. and For. Rev.* xv, 169; *N. Brit. Review*, viii, 286; *Edin. Rev.* lxiii, 225; *Fraser's Mag.* xxxvii, 105; *Eclec. Rev.* 4th series, xxiii, 221; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 780; Chambers's *Cyclop. of English Literature*, ii, 733 (Philada. 1867); Rose, in *Church Hist. from Thirteenth Century to Present Time*, in crown 8vo edition of *Encycl. Metropolitana*, p. 385. (J. W. M.)

Hampden Cases. See HAMPDEN, R. D.

Hampton-Court Conference. See CONFERENCE.

Hamran. See HEMDAN.

Hamu'ël (Heb. *Chammuel'*, חַמּוּאֵל, *heat* [? *anger or light*] *of God;* Sept. Ἀμουήλ, Vulg. *Hamuel*), the son of Mishma and (apparently) father of Zacchur, of the tribe of Simeon (1 Chron. iv, 26). B.C. ante 1046.

Ha'mul (Heb. *Chamul'*, חָמוּל, *spared;* Sept. Ἰεμουήλ), the second of the two sons of Pharez, son of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 5). He could not have been born, however, before the migration of Jacob into Egypt (as appears to be stated in Gen. xlvi, 12), since Pharez was not at that time grown up (Gen. xxxviii, 1). His descendants were called HAMULITES (Numb. xxvi, 21). B.C. between 1870 and 1856.

Ha'mulite (Heb. *Chamuli'*, חָמוּלִי, Sept. Ἰεμουηλί), a descendant of HAMUL (q. v.), the grandson of Judah (Numb. xxvi, 21).

Hamu'tal (Heb. *Chamutal'*, חֲמוּטַל, *kinsman of the dew;* Sept. Ἀμιτάλ, but in Jer. lii, 1 Ἀμιτάαλ, Vulgate *Amital;* but the Heb. text has חֲמִיטַל, *Chamital'* [of the same import], in 2 Kings xxiv, 18; Jer. lii, 1), the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah, wife of king Josiah and mother of king Jehoahaz (2 Kings xxiii, 31), also of king Zedekiah (2 Kings xxiv, 18; Jer. lii, 1). B.C. 632–619.

Hanam'eël (Heb. *Chanamel'*, חֲנַמְאֵל, perh. i. q. *Hananeel;* Sept. Ἀναμεήλ, Vulg. *Hanameel*), son of Shallum and cousin of Jeremiah, to whom, before the siege of Jerusalem, he sold a field which he possessed in Anathoth, a town of the Levites (Jer. xxxii, 6–12). If this field belonged to Hanameel as a Levite, the sale of it would imply that an ancient law had fallen into disuse (Lev. xxv, 34); but it is possible that it may have been the property of Hanameel in right of his mother. Compare the case of Barnabas, who was also a Levite; and the note of Grotius on Acts iv, 37. Henderson (on Jer. xxxii, 7) supposes that a portion of the Levitical estates might be sold within the tribe. Fairbairn (s. v.) suggests that as this was a typical act, the ordinary civil rules do not apply to it. The transaction, however, was conducted with all the forms of legal transfer, at the special instance of Jehovah, and was intended to evince the certainty of restoration from the approaching exile by showing that possessions which could be established by documents would yet be of future value to the possessor (Jer. xxxii, 13–15). B.C. 589.

Ha'nan (Heb. *Chanan'*, חָנָן, *merciful*, or perh. rather an abbreviation of יוֹחָנָן, later *John* [see ANANIAS; HANANI, etc.]; Sept. Ἀνάν, but in Jer. xxxv, 4 Ἀνανίας), the name of at least seven men. See also BAAL-HANAN; BEN-HANAN; ELON-BETH-HANAN.

1. One of the sons (or descendants) of Shashak, a chief of the tribe of Benjamin resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 23). B.C. apparently between 1612 and 1093.

2. Son of Maachah, and one of David's heroes (1 Chron. xi, 43). B.C. 1046.

3. Father of Igdaliah, "a man of God;" in the chamber of his sons Jeremiah tested the fidelity of the Rechabites (Jer. xxxv, 4). B.C. ante 606.

4. The last named of the six sons of Azel the Benjamite (1 Chron. viii, 38; ix, 44). B.C. cir. 588.

5. One of the Nethinim whose family returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 46; Neh. vii, 49). B.C. ante 536.

6. One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh. viii, 7; comp. ix, 4, 5). He also subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 10). From Neh. xiii, 13, it appears that he was the son of Zaccur, and, on account of his integrity, he was one of those appointed to distribute the Levitical revenues among his brethren. B.C. cir. 410.

7. One of the chiefs of the people who subscribed the solemn covenant drawn up by Nehemiah (Neh. x, 22). In ver. 26 his name appears to be repeated in the same list. B.C. cir. 410.

Hanan'eël (Heb. *Chananel'*, חֲנַנְאֵל, which *God has graciously given;* Sept. Ἀναμεήλ, Vulgate *Hananeel*), a tower (מִגְדָּל) of Jerusalem, situated on the exterior wall beyond the tower of Meah in going from the Sheep-gate towards the Fish-gate (Neh. iii, 1; xii, 39). It is also mentioned in Jer. xxxi, 38; Zech. xiv, 10. Its position appears to have been at the north-eastern corner of the present mosque inclosure (see Strong's *Harmony and Expos.*, Append. ii, p. 19). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 251) also locates it in this vicinity, but absurdly identifies it with the tower of Hippicus. See JERUSALEM. Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* s. v.) suggests that it may have been so called from the name of its founder or builder.

Hana'ni (Heb *Chanani'*, חֲנָנִי, God *has gratified me*, or an abbreviation of the name *Hananiah;* Sept. Ἀνανί, but Ἀνανία in Ezra x, 10, and Ἀνανίας in Neh. vii, 2; Vulg. *Hanani*), the name of at least three men.

1. One of the sons of Heman, who (with his eleven kinsmen) had charge of the eighteenth division of Levitical musicians in the appointments of David (1 Chron. xxv, 4, 25). B.C. 1014.

2. A prophet who was sent to rebuke king Asa for his want of faith in subsidizing the king of Syria against the rival king Baasha, whereas he should rather have seized the occasion to triumph over both (2 Chron. xvi, 1–10). In punishment for this defection from the true God, he was threatened with a troublous residue to his reign. See ASA. Enraged at the prophet's boldness, the king seized and thrust him into prison, from which, however, he appears to have been soon released. B.C. 928. This Hanani is probably the same with the father of the prophet Jehu, who denounced king Baasha (1 Kings xvi, 7), also king Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xix, 2; comp. xx, 34).

3. Apparently a brother of Nehemiah, who went from Jerusalem to Shushan, being sent most probably by Ezra, and brought that information respecting the miserable condition of the returned Jews which led to the mission of Nehemiah (Neh. i, 2). Hanani came back to Judæa,

probably along with his brother, and, together with one Hananiah, was appointed to take charge of the gates of Jerusalem, and see that they were opened in the morning and closed in the evening at the appointed time (Neh. vii, 2). The circumstances of the time and place rendered this an important and responsible duty, not unattended with danger. B.C. 446.

Hanani'ah (Heb. [and Chald.] *Chananyah'*, חֲנַנְיָה, also [1 Chron. xxv, 23; 2 Chron. xxvi, 11; Jer. xxxvi, 12] in the prolonged form *Chananya'hu*, חֲנַנְיָהוּ, whom *Jehovah has* graciously *given*, comp. *Ananias*, etc.; Sept. Ἀνανία or Ἀνανίας, Vulg. *Hanania*), the name of a number of men. See also ANANIAH; ANNAS, etc.

1. A "son" of Shashak, and chief of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. viii, 24). B.C. apparently between 1612 and 1093.

2. One of the sons of Heman, who (with eleven of his kinsmen) was appointed by David to superintend the sixteenth division (blowers on horns) of Levitical musicians (1 Chron. xxv, 4, 23). B.C. 1014.

3. One of king Uzziah's chief military officers (2 Chron. xxvi, 11). B.C. 803.

4. The father of Shelemiah and grandfather of Irijah, which last was the guard of the gate of Benjamin who arrested Jeremiah (Jer. xxxvii, 13). B.C. considerably ante 589.

5. Father of Zedekiah, which latter was one of the "princes" to whom Michaiah reported Baruch's reading of Jeremiah's roll (Jer. xxxvi, 12). B.C. ante 605.

6. Son of Azur, a false prophet of Gibeon, who, by opposing his prophecies to those of Jeremiah, brought upon himself the terrible sentence, "Thou shalt die *this year*, because thou hast taught rebellion against the Lord." He died accordingly (Jer. xxviii, 1 sq.). B.C. 595. Hananiah publicly prophesied in the Temple that within two years Jeconiah and all his fellow-captives, with the vessels of the Lord's house which Nebuchadnezzar had taken away to Babylon, should be brought back to Jerusalem (Jer. xxviii): an indication that treacherous negotiations were already secretly opened with Pharaoh-Hophra (who had just succeeded Psammis on the Egyptian throne), and that strong hopes were entertained of the destruction of the Babylonian power by him. The preceding chapter (xxvii, 3) shows further that a league was already in progress between Judah and the neighboring nations of Edom, Ammon, Moab, Tyre, and Zidon, for the purpose of organizing resistance to Nebuchadnezzar, in combination, no doubt, with the projected movements of Pharaoh-Hophra. Hananiah corroborated his prophecy by taking off from the neck of Jeremiah the yoke which he wore by divine command (Jer. xxvii) in token of the subjection of Judæa and the neighboring countries to the Babylonian empire), and breaking it, adding, "Thus saith Jehovah, Even so will I break the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, from the neck of all nations within the space of two full years." But Jeremiah was bid to go and tell Hananiah that for the wooden yokes which he had broken he should make yokes of iron, so firm was the dominion of Babylon destined to be for seventy years. The prophet Jeremiah added this rebuke and prediction of Hananiah's death, the fulfilment of which closes the history of this false prophet. The history of Hananiah is of great interest, as throwing much light upon the Jewish politics of that eventful time, divided as parties were into the partisans of Babylon on one hand, and Egypt on the other. It also exhibits the machinery of false prophecies, by which the irreligious party sought to promote their own policy, in a very distinct form. At the same time, too, that it explains in general the sort of political calculation on which such false prophecies were hazarded, it supplies an important clew in particular by which to judge of the date of Pharaoh-Hophra's (or Apries's) accession to the Egyptian throne, and the commencement of his ineffectual effort to restore the power of Egypt (which had been prostrate since Necho's overthrow, Jer. xlvi, 2) upon the ruins of the Babylonian empire. The leaning to Egypt indicated by Hananiah's prophecy as having begun in the fourth of Zedekiah, had in the sixth of his reign issued in open defection from Nebuchadnezzar, and in the guilt of perjury, which cost Zedekiah his crown and his life, as we learn from Ezek. xvii, 12-20; the date being fixed by a comparison of Ezek. viii, 1 with xx, 1. The temporary success of the intrigue, which is described in Jer. xxxvii, was speedily followed by the return of the Chaldæans and the destruction of the city, according to the prediction of Jeremiah. This history of Hananiah also illustrates the manner in which the false prophets hindered the mission, and obstructed the beneficent effects of the ministry of the true prophets, and affords a remarkable example of the way in which they prophesied smooth things, and said peace when there was no peace (compare 1 Kings xxii, 11, 24, 25). See JEREMIAH.

7. The original name of one of Daniel's youthful companions and one of the "three Hebrew children;" better known by his Babylonian name SHADRACH (Dan. i; vi, 7).

8. Son of Zerubbabel, and father of Rephaiah; one of the paternal ancestors of Christ (1 Chron. iii, 19, 21). (See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 16, 17.) B.C. post 536. He is possibly the same with No 10. See GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

9. One of the "sons" of Bebai, an Israelite who renounced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezra x, 28). B.C. 459.

10. The "ruler of the palace" (שַׂר הַבִּירָה), and the person who was associated with Nehemiah's brother Hanani in the charge of the gates of Jerusalem. See HANANI. The high eulogy is bestowed upon him that "he was a faithful man, and feared God above many" (Neh. vii, 2). His office seems to have been one of authority and trust, and perhaps the same as that of Eliakim, who was "over the house" in the reign of Hezekiah. See ELIAKIM. The arrangements for guarding the gates of Jerusalem were intrusted to him with Hanani, the Tirshatha's brother. Prideaux thinks that the appointment of Hanani and Hananiah indicates that at this time Nehemiah returned to Persia, but without sufficient ground. Nehemiah seems to have been continuously at Jerusalem for some time after the completion of the wall (vii, 5, 65; viii, 9; x, 1). If, too, the term הַבִּירָה means, as Gesenius supposes, and as the use of it in Neh. ii, 8, makes not improbable, not the palace, but the fortress of the Temple, called by Josephus βάρις, there is still less reason to imagine Nehemiah's absence. In this case Hananiah would be a priest, perhaps of the same family as the preceding. The rendering, moreover, of Neh. vii, 2, 3, should probably be, "And I enjoined (or gave orders to) Hanani . . . and Hananiah, the captains of the fortress . . . *concerning* Jerusalem, and said, Let not the gates," etc. There is no authority for rendering עַל by "over"—"He gave such an one charge *over* Jerusalem." The passages quoted by Gesenius are not one of them to the point.

11. The son of "one of the apothecaries" (or makers of the sacred ointments and incense, Exod. xxx, 22-38), who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 8); possibly the same with No. 9. B.C. 446.

12. A son of Shelemiah, and one of the priests who repaired those parts of the wall of Jerusalem opposite their houses (Neh. iii, 30). B.C. 446.

13. A priest, apparently son of Jeremiah, after the captivity (Neh. xii, 12); probably the same with one of those who celebrated the completion of the walls of Jerusalem (ver. 41). B.C. 446.

Hanby, THOMAS, an English Wesleyan preacher, was born at Carlisle Dec. 16, 1733; was left an orphan at seven, and bound to a trade at twelve. He had little education, but had serious thoughts from infancy, and was confirmed at thirteen. Some time after, through

Methodist influence, he was converted. In 1754 he began to preach, and, during his first year of work, was often in danger of violent death from mobs. In 1755 he was admitted into the itinerancy. He afterwards preached in most of the cities of the kingdom. He died at Nottingham Dec. 29, 1796. Mr. Hanby's labors tended greatly to the spread of vital religion among some of the most abandoned and violent districts of England. See Jackson, *Lives of Early Methodist Preachers*, i, 274. (G. L. T.)

Hancock, Thomas, a patron of Harvard College. He left most of his property to his nephew, governor Hancock, but yet bequeathed £1000 for the foundation of a professorship of the Hebrew and other Oriental languages at Harvard; £1000 to the Society for propagating the Gospel among the Indians, and £600 to the town of Boston for the establishment of a hospital for the insane. He died at Boston August 1, 1764.—*Ann. Register*, 1764.

Hand (יָד, *yâd*, the *open* palm; כַּף, *kaph*, the *hollow* of the partly-closed hand; Greek χείρ; יָמִין, *yamin'*, the *right* hand, δεξιά; שְׂמֹאל, *semôl'*, the *left* hand, *ἀριστερά, εὐώνυμον*), the principal organ of feeling, rightly denominated by Galen the instrument of instruments, since this member is wonderfully adapted to the purposes for which it was designed, and serves to illustrate the wisdom and providence of the great Creator (*The Hand, its Mechanism and vital Endowments, as evincing Design*, by Sir Charles Bell). Considering the multiplex efficacy of the human hand, the control which it has given man, the conquest over the external world which it has enabled him to achieve, and the pleasing and useful revolutions and improvements which it has brought about, we are not surprised to read the glowing eulogy in which Cicero (*De Nat. Deor.* ii, 60) has indulged on the subject, nor to find how important is the part which the hand performs in the records of divine revelation. The hand itself serves to distinguish man from other terrestrial beings. Of the two hands, the right has a preference derived from natural endowment. See Left-handed.

Hands are the symbols of human action; pure hands are pure actions; unjust hands are deeds of injustice; hands full of blood, actions stained with cruelty, and the like (Psa. xc, 17; Job ix, 30; 1 Tim. ii, 8; Isa. i, 15). Washing of the hands was the symbol of innocence (Psa. xxvi, 6; lxxiii, 13). Of this Pilate furnishes an example (Matt. xxvii, 24). It was the custom of the Jews to wash their hands before and after meat (see Mark vii, 3; Matt. vi, 2; Luke xi, 38). Washing of hands was a symbol of *expiation*, as might be shown by numerous references; and of *sanctification*, as appears from several passages (1 Cor. vi, 11: Isa. l, 16; Psa. xxiv, 3, 4). See Washing of Hands. Paul, in 1 Tim. ii, 8, says, "I will therefore that men pray everywhere, *lifting up holy hands*," etc. (see Job xi, 13, 14). The elevation or extension of the right hand was also the ancient method of voting in popular assemblies, as indicated by the Greek term χειροτονέω (Acts xiv, 23; 2 Cor. viii, 19). In Psa. lxxvii, 2, for "sore," the margin of our version has "hand;" and the correct sense is, "My hands in the night were spread out, and ceased not."

To smite the hands together over the head was a gesture of despairing grief (2 Sam. xiii, 19; Jer. ii, 37). The expression in Jer. ii, 37, "Thy hands upon thy head," may be explained by the act of Tamar in laying her hand on her head as a sign of her degradation and sorrow (2 Sam. xiii, 19). The expression "Though hand join in hand" in Prov. xi, 21, is simply "hand to hand," and signifies through all ages and generations, *ever*: "through all generations the wicked shall not go unpunished."

To the *right* hand signified to the *south*, the southern quarter, as the *left* hand signified the *north* (Job xxiii, 9: 1 Sam. xxiii, 19; 2 Sam. xxiv, 5). The term *hand* is sometimes used for a monument, a trophy of victory (1 Sam. xv, 12); a sepulchral monument, "Absalom's Place," literally Absalom's Hand (2 Sam. xviii, 18; see Erdmann, *Monumentum Absalomi*, Helmst. 1740). So in Isa. lvi, 5, "to them will I give a place within my walls—a monument (or portion) and a name" (Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 568).

To give the right hand was a pledge of fidelity, and was considered as confirming a promise or bargain (2 Kings x, 15; Ezra x, 19); spoken of the vanquished giving their hands as a pledge of submission and fidelity to the victors (Ezek. xvii, 18; Jer. l, 15; Lam. v, 6); so to strike hands as a pledge of suretiship (Prov. xvii, 18; xxii, 26; 2 Chron. xxx, 8, margin). The right hand was lifted up in swearing or taking an oath (Gen. xiv, 22; Deut. xxxii, 40; Ezek. xx, 28; Psa. cxliv, 11; Isa. lxii, 8); similar is the Arabic oath, "By the right hand of Allah." (See Taylor's *Fragments*, No. 278.)

Hand in general is the symbol of power and strength, and the *right hand* more particularly so. To hold by the right hand is the symbol of protection and favor (Psa. xviii, 35). To stand or be at one's right hand is to aid or assist any one (Psa. xvi, 8; cix, 31; cx, 5; cxxi, 5); so also "man of thy right hand," i. e. whom thou sustainest, aidest (Psa. lxxx, 17); "my hand is with any one," i. e. I aid him, am on his side (1 Sam. xxii, 17; 2 Sam. xxiii, 12; 2 Kings xxiii, 19); and to take or hold the right hand, i. e. to sustain, to aid (Psa. lxxiii, 23; Isa. xli, 13; xlv, 1). So the right hand of *fellowship* (Gal. ii, 9) signifies a communication of the same power and authority. To lean upon the hand of another is a mark of familiarity and superiority (2 Kings v, 18; vii, 17). To give the hand, as to a master, is the token of submission and future obedience. Thus, in 2 Chron. xxx, 8, the words in the original, "Give the hand unto the Lord," signify, Yield yourselves unto the Lord. The like phrase is used in Psa. lxviii, 31; Lam. v, 6. "Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress, so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God" (Psa. cxxiii, 2), which refers to the watchful readiness of a servant to obey the least sign of command (Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.). To kiss the hand is an act of homage (1 Kings xix, 18; Job xxxi, 27). To pour water on any one's hands signifies to serve him (2 Kings iii, 11). To "seal up the hand" (Job xxxvii, 7) is to place one in charge of any special business, for which he will be held accountable. Marks in the hands or wrists were the tokens of servitude, the heathens being wont to imprint marks upon the hands of servants, and on such as devoted themselves to some false deity. Thus in Zech. xiii, 6, the man, when challenged for the scars visible on his hands, would deny that they had proceeded from an idolatrous cause, and pretend that they were the effects of the wounds he had given himself for the loss of his friends. The right hand stretched out is the symbol of immediate exertion of power (Exod. xv, 12); sometimes the exercise of mercy (Isa. lxv, 2; Prov. i, 24).

The hand of God is spoken of as the instrument of power, and to it is ascribed that which strictly belongs to God himself (Job xxvii, 11; Psa. xxxi, 16; xcv, 4; Isa. lxii, 3; Prov. xxi, 1; Acts iv, 28; 1 Pet. v, 6). So the hand of the Lord being upon or with any one denotes divine aid or favor (Ezra vii, 6, 28; viii, 18, 22, 13; Neh. ii, 8; Isa. i, 25; Luke i, 66; Acts xi, 21); further, the hand of the Lord is upon or against thee, denotes punishment (Exod. ix, 3; Deut. ii, 15; Judg. ii, 15; 1 Sam. vii, 13; xii, 15; Ezek. xiii, 9; Amos i, 8; Acts xiii, 11). In Job xxxiii, 7, "my *hand* shall not be heavy upon thee," the original term is אֶכֶף, *ekeph*; and the passage signifies "my *dignity* shall not weigh heavy upon thee" (Gesenius, s. v.). The hand of God upon a prophet signifies the immediate operation of his Holy Spirit on the soul or body of the prophet, as in 1 Kings xviii, 46; 2 Kings iii, 15; Ezek. i, 3; iii, 22; viii, 1. As the *hand*, so also the *finger* of God denotes his power or Spirit (see Luke xi, 20, and comp. Matt. xii, 28). Thus

our Saviour cast out devils or dæmons by his bare command, whereas the Jews cast them out only by the invocation of the name of God. So in Exod. viii, 19, the *finger of God* is a work which none but God could perform. See ARM.

The hands of the high-priest were laid on the head of the scape-goat when the sins of the people were publicly confessed (Lev. xvi, 21). Witnesses laid their hands on the head of the accused person, as it were to signify that they charged upon him the guilt of his blood, and freed themselves from it (Deut. xiii, 9; xvii, 7). The Hebrews, when presenting their sin-offerings at the tabernacle, confessed their sins while they laid their hands upon the victim (Lev. i, 4). To "fill one's hands," is to take possession of the priesthood, to perform the functions of that office; because in this ceremony those parts of the victim which were to be offered were put into the hand of the new-made priest (Judg. xvii, 5, 12; Lev. xvi, 32; 1 Kings xiii, 33). Jacob laid his hands on Ephraim and Manasseh when he gave them his last blessing (Gen. xlviii, 14). The high-priest stretched out his hands to the people as often as he recited the solemn form of blessing (Lev. ix, 22). Our Saviour laid his hands upon the children that were presented to him and blessed them (Mark x, 16). (See Tiemeroth, *De* χειροθεσίᾳ *et* χειρολογίᾳ, Erford. 1754.)

Imposition of hands formed at an early period a part of the ceremonial observed on the appointment and consecration of persons to high and holy undertakings. In Numb. xxvii, 19, Jehovah is represented as thus speaking to Moses, "Take thee Joshua, the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him, and set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation, and give him a charge in their sight," etc.: where it is obvious that the laying on of hands did neither originate nor communicate divine gifts; for Joshua had "the spirit" before he received imposition of hands; but it was merely an instrumental sign for marking him out individually, and setting him apart, in sight of the congregation, to his arduous work. Similar appears to be the import of the observance in the primitive Church of Christ (Acts viii, 15-17; 1 Tim. iv, 14; 2 Tim. i, 6). A corruption of this doctrine was that the laying on of hands gave of itself divine powers, and on this account Simon, the magician (Acts viii, 18), offered money, saying, "Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands he may receive the Holy Ghost," intending probably to carry on a gainful trade by communicating the gift to others. See IMPOSITION OF HANDS.

The phrase "sitting at the right hand of God," as applied to the Saviour, is derived from the fact that with earthly princes a position on the right hand of the throne was accounted the chief place of honor, dignity, and power: "upon thy right hand did stand the queen" (Psa. xlv, 9; comp. 1 Kings ii, 19; Psa. lxxx, 17). The immediate passage out of which sprang the phraseology employed by Jesus may be found in Psa. cx, 1: "Jehovah said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Accordingly the Saviour declares before Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi, 64; Mark xiv, 62), "Ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven;" where the meaning obviously is that the Jews of that day should have manifest proof that Jesus held the most eminent place in the divine favor, and that his present humiliation would be succeeded by glory, majesty, and power (Luke xxiv, 26; 1 Tim. iii, 16). So when it is said (Mark xvi, 19; Rom. viii, 34; Col. iii, 1; 1 Pet. iii, 22; Heb. i, 3; viii, 1) that Jesus "sits at the right hand of God," "at the right hand of the Majesty on high," we are obviously to understand the assertion to be that, as his Father, so he worketh always (John v, 17) for the advancement of the kingdom of heaven, and the salvation of the world.

In Col. ii, 13, 14, "the law of commandments contained in ordinances" (Ephes. ii, 15) is designated "the *handwriting* of ordinances that was against us," which Jesus blotted out, and took away, nailing it to his cross; phraseology which indicates the abolition, on the part of the Saviour, of the Mosaic law (Wolfius, *Curæ Philolog. in N. T.* iii, 16).

Hand-breadth (Heb. טֶפַח, *te'phach*, or טֹפַח, *to'phach*), the *palm*, used as a measure of four fingers, equal to about four inches (Exod. xxv, 25; xxxvii, 12; 1 Kings vii, 26; 2 Chron. iv, 5; Ezek. xl, 5, 43; Jer. lii, 21). In Psa. xxxix, 5, the expression "Thou hast made my days palm-breadths," signifies *very short*.

Händel, GEORG FRIEDRICH, one of the greatest of musical composers and musicians, was born at Halle, in the Prussian province of Saxony, Feb. 24, 1684. He manifested in early youth an extraordinary passion for music, and at the age of seven was a good player on the piano and the organ. At the age of nine he began to compose for the Church service, and continued doing so every week until he was thirteen. In 1698 he was sent to Berlin, where he enjoyed the instruction of Attilio. An offer by the elector of Brandenburg was declined by his father. On the death of the latter in 1703, he went to Hamburg, where he played a violin in the orchestra of the opera, and composed his first opera, *Almira*. He next visited Italy, where he wrote operas for Florence, Venice, and Rome. On his return from Rome he was, in 1709, appointed chapel-master by the elector of Hanover. In 1710 he paid a short visit to England, and in 1712 he took up his permanent abode in that country. He composed, in honor of the peace of Utrecht, his celebrated *Te Deum* and *Jubilate*, and numerous operas. A Royal Academy was established (1720) and placed under his management, but his violent temper involved him in many troubles; an opposition house was started, and soon both failed, with a loss to Händel of £10,000. Soon after he quitted the stage altogether, in order to devote himself wholly to the composition of oratorios. His oratorio *Esther* had appeared as early as 1720; in 1732 it was produced at the Haymarket Theatre ten nights in succession. In 1733 he produced at Oxford the oratorio *Athalia;* in 1736, *Alexander's Feast;* in 1738, *Israel in Egypt* and *L'allegro ed il penseroso.* On the 12th of April, 1741, the *Messiah*, the most sublime of his compositions, was produced for the first time in London, where it met, however, with no favor; while in Dublin, on the other hand, it was received with the greatest applause. Händel remained in Dublin for nine months, and met there with a generous support. On his return to London he composed his *Samson*, and for the benefit of the Foundling Hospital again produced the *Messiah*, which now secured to him a general admiration; and, being repeated annually, brought to the Foundling Hospital, from 1749 to 1777, £10,300. In 1751 Händel became blind, but he still continued to compose and to play on the piano. He died, as he wished, on Good Friday, April 13, 1759, "in hopes," he said, "of meeting his good God, his sweet Lord and Saviour, on the day of his resurrection." Among his works, which are in the queen's library, are 50 operas—8 German, 26 Italian, 16 English; 20 oratorios, a great quantity of Church music, cantatas, songs, and instrumental pieces. He was a wonderful musician, and his compositions are often full of grandeur and sublimity. His operas are seldom performed, but his oratorios hold the same place in music that in the English drama is accorded to the plays of Shakspeare; and the Händel festivals, lasting several days, in which they are performed by thousands of singers and musicians, are the grandest musical exhibitions of our times. See V. Schölcher, *The Life of Händel* (London, 1857); Chrysander, *G. F. Händel* (Lpz. 1858); Gervinus, *Händel und Shakspeare* (Lpz. 1868); *Contemporary Review*, April, 1869, p. 503. (A. J. S.)

Handful, a representative in the A. Vers. of several Heb. terms and phrases: prop. מְלֹא כַף, the *fill of* the *hand* (1 Kings xvii, 12), or מִלֵּא כַף, to *fill* the *hand*

("take a handful," Lev. ix, 17); also קֹמֶץ, a *fist*-full (Lev. ii, 2; v, 12; vi, 15; but *sheaf* in Gen. xli. 47), or קָמַץ, to *press*, sc. the fist full ("take a handful," Numb. v, 26); and שֹׁעַל, the *hollow* palm itself (Isa. xl, 12), hence its fill (1 Kings xx, 10; Ezek. xiii, 19); less prop. חָפְנַיִם (Exod. ix, 8), the *two fists* (as rendered Prov. xxx, 4; elsewhere "hands") improp. עָמִיר (Jer. ix, 22), and צֶבֶת (Ruth ii, 16), which denotes a *sheaf* (as the former is elsewhere rendered), the one as *standing* uncut, and the other as cut and *housed;* falsely פִּסָּה, *abundance* (Psa. lxxii, 16).

Handicraft, a general term (not occurring, however, in the Bible) for any manufacture. See ARTIFICER. Although the extent cannot be ascertained to which those arts were carried whose invention is ascribed to Tubal-Cain (Gen. iv, 22), it is probable that this was proportionate to the nomadic or settled habits of the antediluvian races. Among nomad races, as the Bedouin Arabs, or the tribes of Northern and Central Asia and of America, the wants of life, as well as the arts which supply them, are few; and it is only among the city dwellers that both of them are multiplied and make progress. The following particulars may be gathered respecting the various handicrafts mentioned in the Scriptures. See CRAFTSMAN.

1. The preparation of *iron* for use either in war, in agriculture, or for domestic purposes, was doubtless one of the earliest applications of labor; and, together with iron, working in brass, or, rather, copper alloyed with tin, bronze (נְחֹשֶׁת, Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 875), is mentioned in the same passage as practiced in antediluvian times (Gen. iv, 22). The use of this last is usually considered as an art of higher antiquity even than that of iron (Hesiod, *Works and Days*, p. 150; Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* ii, 152, abridgment), and there can be no doubt that metal, whether iron or bronze, must have been largely used, either in material or in tools, for the construction of the ark (Gen. vi, 14, 16). Whether the weapons for war or chase used by the early warriors of Syria and Assyria, or the arrow-heads of the archer Ishmael, were of bronze or iron, cannot be ascertained; but we know that iron was used for warlike purposes by the Assyrians (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 194); and, on the other hand, that stone-tipped arrows, as was the case also in Mexico, were used in the earlier times by the Egyptians, as well as the Persians and Greeks, and that stone or flint knives continued to be used by them, and by the inhabitants of the desert, and also by the Jews, for religious purposes, after the introduction of iron into general use (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 353, 354; ii, 163; Prescott, *Mexico*, i, 118; Exod. iv, 25; Josh. v, 2; 1st Egypt. room, Brit. Mus. case 36, 37). In the construction of the tabernacle, copper, but no iron, appears to have been used, though the utility of iron was at the same period well known to the Jews, both from their own use of it and from their Egyptian education, while the Canaanitish inhabitants of Palestine and Syria were in full possession of its use both for warlike and domestic purposes (Exod. xx, 25; xxv, 3; xxvii, 19; Numb. xxxv, 16; Deut. iii, 11; iv, 20; viii, 9; Josh. viii, 31; xvii, 16, 18). After the establishment of the Jews in Canaan, the occupation of a smith (חָרָשׁ) became recognised as a distinct employment (1 Sam. xiii, 19). The designer of a higher order appears to have been called specially חֹשֵׁב (Gesenius, p. 531; Exod. xxxv, 30, 35; 2 Chron. xxvi, 15; Saalschütz, *Arch. Hebr.* c. 14, § 16). The smith's work (including workers in the precious metals) and its results are often mentioned in Scripture (2 Sam. xii, 31; 1 Kings vi, 7; 2 Chron. xxvi, 14; Isa. xliv, 12; liv, 16). Among the captives taken to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar were 1000 "craftsmen" and smiths, who were probably of the superior kind (2 Kings xxiv, 16; Jer. xxix, 2). See CHARASHIM.

The worker in *gold and silver* (צוֹרֵף; ἀργυροκόπος; χωνευτής, *argentarius, aurifex*) must have found employment both among the Hebrews and the neighboring nations in very early times, as appears from the ornaments sent by Abraham to Rebekah (Gen. xxiv, 22, 53; xxxv, 4; xxxviii, 18; Deut. vii, 25). But, whatever skill the Hebrews possessed, it is quite clear that they must have learned much from Egypt and its "iron-furnaces," both in metal-work and in the arts of setting and polishing precious stones; arts which were turned to account both in the construction of the Tabernacle and the making of the priests' ornaments, and also in the casting of the golden calf as well as its destruction by Moses, probably, as suggested by Goguet, by a method which he had learnt in Egypt (Gen. xli, 42; Exod. iii, 22; xii, 35; xxxi, 4, 5; xxxii, 2, 4, 20, 24; xxxvii, 17, 24; xxxviii, 4, 8, 24, 24, 25; xxxix, 6, 39; Neh. iii, 8; Isa. xliv, 12). Various processes of the goldsmiths' work, including operations in the raw material, are illustrated by Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* ii, 136, 152, 162). See GOLDSMITH, etc.

After the conquest, frequent notices are found both of moulded and wrought metal, including soldering, which last had long been known in Egypt; but the Phœnicians appear to have possessed greater skill than the Jews in these arts, at least in Solomon's time (Judg. viii, 24, 27; xvii, 4; 1 Kings vii, 13, 45, 46; Isa. xli, 7; Wisd. xv, 4; Ecclus. xxxviii, 28; Bar. vi, 50, 55, 57; Wilkinson, ii, 162). See ZAREPHATH. Even in the desert, mention is made of beating gold into plates, cutting it into wire, and also of setting precious stones in gold (Exod. xxxix, 3, 6, etc.; Beckmann, *Hist. of Inv.* ii, 414; Gesenius, p. 1229). See METAL.

Among the tools of the smith are mentioned tongs (מֶלְקָחַיִם, λαβίς, *forceps*, Gesenius, p. 761; Isa. vi, 6), hammer (פַּטִּישׁ, σφυρά, *malleus*, Gesen. p. 1101), anvil (פַּעַם, Gesenius, p. 1118), bellows (מַפֻּחַ, φυσητήρ, *sufflatorium*, Gesenius, p. 896; Isa. xli, 7; Jer. vi, 29; Ecclus. xxxviii, 28; Wilkinson, ii, 316). See each word.

In the N. T., Alexander "the coppersmith" (ὁ χαλκεύς) of Ephesus is mentioned, where also was carried on that trade in "silver shrines" (ναοὶ ἀργυροῖ) which was represented by Demetrius the silversmith (ἀργυροκόπος) as being in danger from the spread of Christianity (Acts xix, 24, 28; 2 Tim. iv, 14). See COPPERSMITH.

2. The work of the *carpenter* (חָרַשׁ עֵצִים, τέκτων, *artifex lignarius*) is often mentioned in Scripture (e. g. Gen. vi, 14; Exod. xxxvii; Isa. xliv, 13). In the palace built by David for himself, the workmen employed were chiefly Phœnicians sent by Hiram (2 Sam. v, 11; 1 Chron. xiv, 1), as most probably were those, or at least the principal of those who were employed by Solomon in his works (1 Kings v, 6). But in the repairs of the Temple, executed under Joash, king of Judah, and also in the rebuilding under Zerubbabel, no mention is made of foreign workmen, though in the latter case the timber is expressly said to have been brought by sea to Joppa by Zidonians (2 Kings xi, 11; 2 Chron. xxiv, 12; Ezra iii, 7). That the Jewish carpenters must have been able to carve with some skill is evident from Isa. xli, 7; xliv, 13, in which last passage some of the im-

Carpenters. (Wilkinson.)

r, drills a hole in the seat of a chair, *s*; *t*, *t*, legs of chair; *u*, *u*, adzes; *v*, a square; *w*, man planing or polishing the leg of a chair.

Tools of an Egyptian Carpenter. (Wilkinson.)
Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4. Chisels and drills; 5. Part of drill; 6. Nut of wood belonging to drill; 7, 8. Saws; 9. Horn of oil; 10. Mallet; 11. Basket of nails; 12. Basket which held the tools.

plements used in the trade are mentioned: the rule (שֶׂרֶד, *μέτρον*, *norma*, possibly a chalk pencil, Gesenius, p. 1337), measuring-line (קַו, Gesenius, p. 1201), compass (מְחוּגָה, *παραγραφίς*, *circinus*, Gesenius, p. 450), plane, or smoothing instrument (מַקְצוּעָה, *κόλλα*, *runcina* (Gesen. p. 1223, 1338), axe (גַּרְזֶן, Gesen. p. 302, or קַרְדֹּם, Gesen. p. 1236, *ἀξίνη*, *securis*). See each of these words.

The process of the work, and the tools used by Egyptian carpenters, and also coopers and wheelwrights, are displayed in Egyptian monuments and relics; the former, including dovetailing, veneering, drilling, glueing, varnishing, and inlaying, may be seen in Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* ii, 111–119. Of the latter, many specimens, including saws, hatchets, knives, awls, nails, a hone, and a drill, also turned objects in bone, exist in the British Museum, 1st Egypt. room, case 42–43, Nos. 6046–6188. See also Wilkinson, ii, p. 113, fig. 395. See CARPENTER.

In the N. T. the occupation of a carpenter (*τέκτων*) is mentioned in connection with Joseph, the husband of the Virgin Mary, and ascribed to our Lord himself by way of reproach (Mark vi, 3; Matt. xiii, 55; and Just. Mart. *dial. Tryph.* c. 88).

3. The masons (גֹּדְרִים, 2 Kings xii, 12 [18], *wall-builders*, Gesenius, p. 269) employed by David and Solomon, at least the chief of them, were Phœnicians, as is implied also in the word גִּבְלִים, men of Gebal, Jebail, Byblus (Gesen. p. 258; 1 Kings v, 18; Ezek. xxvii, 9; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 179). Other terms employed are חָרָשֵׁי אֶבֶן קִיר, *workers of wall-stone* (2 Sam. v, 11; 1 Chron. xxii, 15); חֹצְבִים, *stone-cutters* or *hewers* (1 Chron. xxii, 2, 15, "workers of stone;" Ezra iii, 7, etc.). The בֹּנִים (2 Kings xii, 12) were probably *master*-masons ("builders," ver. 11). Among their implements are mentioned the saw (מְגֵרָה, *πρίων*), the plumb-line (אֲנָךְ, Gesen. p. 215), the measuring-reed (קָנֶה, *κάλαμος*, *calamus*, Gesen. p. 1221). As they also prepared the stones by *hewing* (1 Chron. xxii, 2), they must have used the chisel and the mallet (מַקֶּבֶת, 1 Kings vi, 7), though no mention of the former occurs in Scripture. They used also the measuring-line (קַו, Job xxxviii, 5; Zech. i, 16) and the axe (גַּרְזֶן, 1 Kings vi, 7). See each word. Some of these, and also the chisel and mallet, are represented on Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, 313, 314), or preserved in the British Museum (1st Egypt. room, No. 6114, 6038). The large stones used in Solomon's Temple are said by Josephus to have been fitted together exactly without either mortar or cramps, but the foundation stones to have been fastened with lead (Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 3, 2; xv, 11, 3). For ordinary building, mortar, שִׂיד (Gesen. p. 1326), was used; sometimes, perhaps, bitumen, as was the case at Babylon (Gen. xi, 3). The lime, clay, and straw of which mortar is generally composed in the East requires to be very carefully mixed and united so as to resist wet (Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 27; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 206). The wall "daubed with untempered mortar" of Ezekiel (xiii, 10) was perhaps a sort of cob-wall of mud or clay without lime (תָּפֵל, Gesenius, p. 1516), which would give way under heavy rain. The use of whitewash on tombs is remarked by our Lord (Matt. xxiii, 27; see also Mishn. *Maaser Sheni*, v, 1). Houses infected

Masons. (Wilkinson.)
1, levelling, and 2, squaring a stone.

with leprosy were required by the law to be replastered (Lev. xiv, 40-45). For kindred works in earth and clay, see BRICK, POTTER; GLASS, etc.

4. Akin to the craft of the carpenter is that of ship and boat building, which must have been exercised to some extent for the fishing-vessels on the lake of Gennesaret (Matt. viii, 23; ix, 1; John xxi, 3, 8). Solomon built at Ezion-Geber ships for his foreign trade, which were manned by Phœnician crews, an experiment which Jehoshaphat endeavored in vain to renew (1 Kings ix, 26, 27; xxii, 48; 2 Chron. xx, 36, 37). The shipmen were חֹבֵל, *a sailor* (Jonah i, 6; Ezek. xxvii, 8, 27-29; ναύτης, Acts xxvii, 30; Rev. xviii, 17); רַב הַחֹבֵל, *shipmaster* (Jonah i, 6; ναύκληρος, Acts xxvii, 11); מַלָּח, *mariner* (Ezek. xxvii, 9, etc.; Jonah i, 5). See SHIP.

5. The perfumes used in the religious services, and in later times in the funeral rites of monarchs, imply knowledge and practice in the art of the "apothecaries" (רַקָּחִים, μυρεψοί, *pigmentarii*), who appear to have formed a guild or association (Exod. xxx, 25, 35; Neh. iii, 8; 2 Chron. xvi, 14; Eccles. vii, 1; x, 1; Ecclus. xxxviii, 8). See PERFUME.

6. The arts of spinning and weaving both wool and linen were carried on in early times, as they still are usually among the Bedouins, by women. The women spun and wove goat's hair and flax for the Tabernacle, as in later times their skill was employed in like manner for idolatrous purposes. One of the excellences attributed to the good housewife is her skill and industry in these arts (Exod. xxxv, 25, 26; Lev. xix, 19; Deut. xxii, 11; 2 Kings xxiii, 7; Ezek. xvi, 16; Prov. xxxi, 13, 24; Burckhardt, *Notes on Bed.* i, 65; comp. Homer, *Il.* i, 123; *Od.* i, 356; ii, 104). The loom, with its beam (מָנוֹר, μεσάντιον, *liciatorium*, 1 Sam. xvii, 7; Gesen. p. 883), pin (יָתֵד, πάσσαλος, *clavus*, Judg. xvi, 14; Gesen. p. 643), and shuttle (אֶרֶג, δρομεύς, Job vii, 6; Gesen. p. 146) was, perhaps, introduced later, but as early as David's time (1 Sam. xvii, 7), and worked by men, as was the case in Egypt, contrary to the practice of other nations. This trade also appears to have been practised hereditarily (1 Chron. iv, 21; Herod. ii, 35; Sophocles, *Ed. Col.* 339). See WEAVING.

Together with weaving we read also of embroidery, in which gold and silver threads were interwoven with the body of the stuff, sometimes in figure patterns, or with precious stones set in the needlework (Exod. xxvi, 1; xxviii, 4; xxxix, 6-13). See EMBROIDERY.

7. Besides these arts, those of dyeing and of dressing cloth were practiced in Palestine [see FULLER, etc.], and those also of tanning and dressing leather (Josh. ii, 15-18; 2 Kings i, 8; Matt. iii, 4; Acts ix, 43; Mishna, *Megill.* iii, 2). Shoemakers, barbers, and tailors are mentioned in the Mishna (*Pesach*, iv, 6): the barber (גַּלָּב, κουρεύς, Gesenius, p. 283), or his occupation, by Ezekiel (v, 1; Lev. xiv, 8: Numb. vi, 5; Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 11, 5; *War*, i, 27, 5; Mishna, *Shabb.* i, 2); and the tailor (i, 3), plasterers, glaziers, and glass vessels, painters and goldworkers, are mentioned in Mishna (*Chel.* viii, 9; xxix, 3, 4; xxx, 1).

The art of setting and engraving precious stones was known to the Israelites from a very early period (Exod. xxviii, 9 sq.). See GEM. Works in alabaster were also common among them (בָּתֵּי הַנֶּפֶשׁ, smelling-boxes, or boxes of perfume; comp. Matt. xxvi, 7, etc.). See ALABASTER. They also adorned their houses and vessels with ivory (1 Kings xxii, 39; Amos iii, 15; vi, 4; Cant. v, 14). See IVORY.

Tent-makers (σκηνοποιοί) are noticed in the Acts (xviii, 3), and frequent allusion is made to the trade of the potters. See each word.

8. Bakers (אֹפִים, Gesen. p. 136) are noticed in Scripture as carrying on their trade (Jer. xxxvii, 21; Hos. vii, 4; Mishna, *Chel.* xv, 2); and the well-known valley Tyropœon probably derived its name from the occupation of the cheese-makers, its inhabitants (Josephus, *War*, v, 4, 1). Butchers, not Jewish, are spoken of in 1 Cor. x, 25.

Trade in all its branches was much developed after the Captivity; and for a father to teach his son a trade was reckoned not only honorable, but indispensable (Mishna, *Pirke Ab.* ii, 2; *Kiddush.* iv, 14). Some trades, however, were regarded as less honorable (Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* § 84).

Some, if not all, trades had special localities, as was the case formerly in European and is now in Eastern cities (Jer. xxxvii, 21; 1 Cor. x, 25; Josephus, *War*, v, 4, 1, and 8, 1; Mishna, *Becor.* v, 1; Russell, *Aleppo*, i, 20; Chardin, *Voyages*, vii, 274, 394; Lane, *Mod. Eg.* ii, 145). See BAZAAR.

One feature, distinguishing Jewish from other workmen, deserves peculiar notice, viz. that they were not slaves, nor were their trades necessarily hereditary, as was and is so often the case among other, especially heathen nations (Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* c. v, § 81-84; Saalschütz, *Hebr. Arch.* c. 14). See MECHANIC.

Handkerchief or NAPKIN (σουδάριον; Vulg. *sudarium*) occurs in Luke xix, 20; John xi, 44; xx, 7; Acts xix, 12. The Greek word is adopted from the Latin, and properly signifies a *sweat-cloth*, or pocket-handkerchief, but in the Greek and Syriac languages it denotes *chiefly* napkin, wrapper, etc. In the first of the above passages (Luke xix, 20) it means a *wrapper*, in which the "wicked servant" had laid up the pound intrusted to him by his master. For references to the custom of laying up money, etc., in σουδάρια, both in classical and rabbinical writers, see Wetstein's *N. T.* on Luke xix, 20. In the second instance (John xi, 44) it appears as a *kerchief*, or cloth attached to the head of a corpse. It was perhaps brought round the forehead and under the chin. In many Egyptian mummies it does not *cover the face*. In ancient times, among the Greeks, it *did* (Nicolaus, *De Græcor. Luctu*, c. iii, § 6, Thiel. 1697). Maimonides, in his comparatively recent times, describes the *whole face* as being covered, and gives a reason for the custom (Tract *Efel*, c. 4). The next instance is that of the σουδάριον which had been "about the head" of our Lord, but which, after his resurrection, was found rolled up, as if deliberately, and put in a place separately from the linen clothes. The last instance of the Biblical use of the word (and the only one in which it is rendered "handkerchief") occurs in the account of "the special miracles" wrought by the hands of Paul (Acts xix, 11); "so that σουδάρια (handkerchiefs, napkins, wrappers, shawls, etc.) were brought from his body to the sick; and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them." The Ephesians had not unnaturally inferred that the apostle's miraculous power could be communicated by such a mode of contact; and certainly cures thus received by parties at a distance, among a people famed for their addictedness to "curious arts," i. e. magical skill, etc., would serve to convince them of the truth of the Gospel by a mode well suited to interest their minds. The apostle is not *recorded* to have expressed any *opinion* respecting the *reality* of this *intermediate means* of those miracles. He had doubtless sufficiently explained that these and all the other miracles "wrought by his hands," i. e. by his means, were really wrought by God (ver. 11) in attestation of the mission of Jesus. If he himself did *not* entertain exactly the same ideas upon the subject as they did, he may be considered as conceding to, or, rather, not disturbing unnecessarily, popular notions, rendered harmless by his previous explanation, and affording a very convenient medium for achieving much higher purposes. If the connection between the *secondary* cause and the effect was *real*, it reminds us of our Saviour's expression, "I perceive that virtue has gone out of me" (Mark v, 30); which is, however, regarded by many critics as a popular mode of saying that he

knew that a miracle had been wrought by his power and efficacy—a mode of speaking in *unison* at least with the belief of the woman that she should be healed if she could but touch the hem of his garment unperceived by him, and perhaps even conceded to, in accordance with the miracles wrought through the medium of contact related in the Old Testament (1 Kings xvii, 21; 2 Kings iv, 29, etc.), and in order, by a superior display, in regard both to speed and extensiveness, to demonstrate his supremacy by a mode through which the Jews were best prepared to perceive it (Luke vi, 19; see Schwarz, *ad* Olear. *de Stylo N. T.* p. 129; Soler. *De Pileo*, p. 17; Pierson, *ad Mœr.* p. 348; Lydii *Flor. Spars. ad Pass. J. C.* p. 5; Drusius, *Quæstt. Heb.* c. 2; Rosenmüller and Kuinöl on the passages). See KERCHIEF; NAPKIN; HOLY HANDKERCHIEF.

Handle (as a noun) occurs but once (Cant. v, 5) in the plural (כַּפּוֹת, *kappôth'*, lit. *hands*), for the *thumb-pieces* or *knobs* of the bolt or latch to a door (compare יָדוֹת, *arms* of a throne, etc., 1 Kings x, 19). See LOCK.

Handmaid or HANDMAIDEN (שִׁפְחָה, *shiphchah'*, or אָמָה, *amah'*, Gen. xvi, 1, etc.; Ruth iii, 9, etc.; δούλη, Luke i, 48), a *maid-servant* (as both Heb. terms are often translated; the latter being rendered "handmaid" only in a metaphorical or self-deprecatory sense). We find on the paintings in the tombs of Egypt various representations of female domestics employed in waiting on their mistresses, sometimes at the bath, at others at the toilette, and likewise in bringing in refreshments and handing them round to visitors. An upper servant or slave had the office of handing the wine, and a black woman sometimes followed, in an inferior capacity, to receive an empty cup when the wine had been poured into the goblet. The same black slave also carried the fruits and other refreshments; and the peculiar mode of holding a plate with the hand reversed, so generally adopted by women from Africa, is characteristically shown in the Theban paintings (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 142 sq., abridgm.). See BANQUET. It appears most probable that Hagar was given to Sarai as her personal attendant while she was in the house of Pharaoh, and that she was permitted to retain her when she departed. Jewish tradition reports that Hagar was a daughter (by a concubine, as some say) of Pharaoh, who, seeing the wonders wrought on account of Sarai, said, "It is better that my daughter should be a handmaid in this household than a mistress in another," and therefore gave her to Sarai. She was, no doubt, a female slave, and one of those maid-servants whom Abram had brought from Egypt. These females among the Jews, as they still are in the East, are entirely under the control of the mistress of the family. See SLAVE; HAGAR.

A white and a black female Slave waiting upon an ancient Egyptian Lady at a party.

Hand-mill. See MILL.

Hand-staff (מַקֵּל, *makkel'*, a *rod* or *staff* as usually rendered), a spear or *javelin* (Ezek. xxxix, 9). See ARMOR.

Hands, Imposition of. See IMPOSITION OF HANDS; ORDINATION.

Handschuh, JOHN FREDERICK, was the fifth of the earlier ministers sent from Halle to America to labor among the German population, and to build up the Redeemer's kingdom in this Western hemisphere. He was born of honorable and pious parentage in Halle Jan. 14, 1714. He was educated at the university, and set apart to the work of the ministry in 1744. He commenced his duties in the large and laborious parish of Graba, and labored with great success. But when he heard of the spiritual destitution of his brethren in America, and read their earnest appeals, his sympathies were strongly awakened, and he earnestly desired to go to their relief. He landed in Philadelphia April 5, 1748, and was welcomed at the Trappe by Dr. Muhlenberg with the salutation, "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy." He was placed at Lancaster, Pa., where he labored for several years with great success. The congregation increased, and under his direction a flourishing school was established and sustained. "Our school," he says, "consists of English, Irish, and Germans, Lutherans and Reformed; and so anxious are the people to have their children instructed, that it is impossible to receive all who apply for admission." He subsequently took charge of the churches at New Providence and Hanover, and thence was transferred to Germantown, Pa., and subsequently to Philadelphia, where he died Oct. 9, 1764. (M. L. S.)

Ha'nès (Hebrew *Chânês'*, חָנֵס, doubtless of Egyptian etymology), a place in Egypt only mentioned in Isa. xxx, 4: "For his princes were at Zoan, and his messengers came to Hanes." The Septuagint renders the latter clause καὶ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ πονηροί, "And his ambassadors *worthless*." The copy from which this translation was made may have read חנם ייגעו instead of חנס יגיעו; and it is worthy of note that the reading חנם is still found in a number of ancient MSS. (De Rossi, *Variæ Lectiones Vet. Test.* iii, 29), and is approved by Lowth and J. D. Michaelis. The old Latin version follows the Sept., "Nuncii pessimi;" but Jerome translates from a text similar to our own, rendering the clause as follows: "Et nuncii tui usque ad *Hanes* pervenerunt" (Sabbatier, *Biblior. Sacrorum Latin. Verss.*, ad loc.). Jerome adds, in his commentary on the verse, "Intelligimus ultimam juxta Ethiopas et Blemmyas esse Ægypti civitatem." Vitringa would identify Hanes with the *Anusis* (Ἄνυσις) of Herodotus (ii, 137; compare Champollion, *L'Egypte*, i, 309; Quatremere, *Mémoires*, i, 500), which he, with Gesenius and others, supposes to be the same as *Heracleopolis* (*City of Hercules*) of Strabo (xvii, 812), the ruins of which are now called *Anâsieh* (Edrisi, *Afric.* p. 512). The Coptic name was *Hnes* or *Ehnes*, and it was one of the ancient royal cities of Egypt. Anâsieh stands on a high mound some distance west of the Nile, near the parallel of Benisuêf. The great objection to this theory is the distance of Anâsieh from Zoan, which stood in the eastern part of the Delta, near the sea. Gesenius remarks, as a kind of apology for the identification of Hanes with Heracleopolis Magna, that the latter was formerly a royal city. It is true that in Manetho's list the 9th and 10th dynasties are said to have been of Heracleopolite kings; but it has lately been suggested, on strong grounds, by Sir Gardner Wilkinson, that this is a mistake in the case of the 9th dynasty for Hermonthites (Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 348). If this supposition be correct as to the 9th dynasty, it must also be so as to the 10th; but the circumstance of Heracleopolis being a royal city or not, a thousand years before Isaiah's time, is obviously of no consequence here.

The prophecy is a reproof of the Jews for trusting in Egypt; and, according to the Masoretic text, mention is made of an embassy, perhaps from Hoshea, or else from Ahaz, or possibly Hezekiah, to a Pharaoh. As the king whose assistance is asked is called Pharaoh, he is probably not an Ethiopian of the 25th dynasty, for the kings of that line are mentioned by name—So, Tirhakah—but a sovereign of the 23d dynasty, which, according to Manetho, was of Tanite kings. It is supposed that the last king of the latter dynasty, Manetho's Zet, is the Sethos of Herodotus, the king in whose time Sennacherib's army perished, and who appears to have been mentioned under the title of Pharaoh by Rabshakeh (Isa. xxxvi, 6; 2 Kings xviii, 21), though it is just possible that Tirhakah may have been intended. If the reference be to an embassy to Zet, Zoan was probably his capital, and in any case then the most important city of the eastern part of Lower Egypt. Hanes was most probably in its neighborhood; and we are disposed to think that the Chald. Paraphr. is right in identifying it with *Tahpanhes* (תַּחְפַּנְחֵס, or תַּחְפְּנֵחֵס, once written, if the *Kethib* be correct, in the form תַּחְפְּנֵס, *Daphnæ*), a fortified town on the eastern frontier. Grotius considers Hanes a contraction of this name (*Commentar.* ad loc.). With this may be connected the remark of De Rossi—"Codex meus 380 notat ad Marg. esse תחפנחס, Jer. ii, 16" (*Var. Lect.*, l. c.). On the whole, this seems to be the most probable theory, as Tahpanhes was situated in the eastern part of the Delta, and was one of the royal cities about the time of Isaiah. See TAHPANHES.

Hanging (as a punishment, הוֹקִיעַ, to *impale* with dislocation of the limbs, Numb. xxv, 4; 2 Sam. xxi, 6, 9: תָּלָה, to *suspend*, as among the Hebrews, Deut. xxi, 22; the Egyptians, Gen. xl, 19; and the Persians, Esth. vii, 10; v, 14; κρεμάννυμι). See CRUCIFIXION. Hanging on a tree or gibbet appears to have been a mark of infamy, inflicted on the dead bodies of criminals, rather than a punishment, as modern nations employ it. The person suspended was considered as a *curse*, *an abomination* in the sight of God, and as receiving this token of infamy at his hand. The body, nevertheless, was to be taken down and buried on the same day. The hanging mentioned in 2 Sam. xxi, 6, was the work of the Gibeonites, and not of the Hebrews. Posthumous suspension of this kind, for the purpose of conferring ignominy, differs materially from the crucifixion that was practiced by the Romans, although the Jews gave such an extent to the law in Deut. xxi, 22, 23, as to include the last-named punishment (John xix, 31; Acts v, 30; Gal. iii, 13; 1 Pet. ii, 24). The more recent Jews attributed the origin of the punishment of strangulation to Moses, and supposed it to have been meant by the phrase, "He shall die the death," but without cause. See PUNISHMENT.

Impalement of Prisoners before the Walls. From the Assyrian Monuments.

HANGING (as a curtain) is the rendering of three Heb. terms, two of them having reference to the furniture of the tabernacle and Temple.

1. The "hanging" (מָסָךְ, *masak'*; Sept. ἐπίσπαστρον, Vulg. *tentorium*) was a curtain or *covering* (as the word radically means, and as it is sometimes rendered) to close an entrance. It was made of variegated stuff wrought with needlework (compare Esth. i, 5), and (in one instance, at least) was hung on five pillars of acacia wood. The term is applied to a series of curtains suspended before the successive openings of entrance into the tabernacle and its parts. Of these, the first hung before the entrance to the court of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvii, 16; xxxviii, 18; Numb. iv, 26); the second before the door of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvi, 36, 37; xxxix, 38); and the third before the entrance to the Most Holy Place, called more fully פָּרֹכֶת הַמָּסָךְ ("vail of the covering," Exod. xxxv, 12; xxxix, 34; xl, 21). See CURTAIN.

2. The "hangings" (קְלָעִים, *kelaïm'*; Sept. ἱστία, Vulg. *tentoria*) were used for covering the walls of the tabernacle, just as tapestry was in modern times (Exod. xxvii, 9; xxxv, 17; xxxviii, 9; Numb. iii, 26; iv, 26). The rendering in the Sept. implies that they were made of the same substance as the sails of a ship, i. e. as explained by Rashi) "meshy, not woven:" this opinion is, however, incorrect, as the material of which they were constructed was "fine twined linen." The hangings were carried only five cubits high, or half the height of the walls of the court (Exod. xxvii, 18; compare xxvi, 16). They were fastened to pillars which ran along the sides of the court (xxvii, 18). See TABERNACLE.

3. The "hangings" (בָּתִּים, *bottim'*. 2 Kings xxiii, 7, margin *houses*, which is the literal rendering) are of doubtful import. Ewald conjectures that the reading should be בְּגָדִים, *clothes*, and supposes the reference to be to dresses for the images of Astarte; but this is both gratuitous and superfluous. The *bottim* which these women wove were probably cloths for tents used as portable sanctuaries. See IDOLATRY.

Han'iël (1 Chron. vii, 39). See HANNIEL.

Hanmer, MEREDITH, an English Church historian, was born at Porkington, Shropshire, in 1543. He became chaplain of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and afterwards rector of St. Leonard, at Shoreditch. Here he sold the brass ornaments which decorated the graves of the church, which so displeased his parishioners that he was obliged to resign about 1693. He then went to Ireland, where he was finally made treasurer of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Dublin. He died in 1604, not without suspicion of suicide. He was a skilful Greek scholar, and well acquainted with Church history. He wrote *Translation of the ancient ecclesiastical Histories of the first six hundred Years after Christ, originally written by Eusebius, Socrates, and Evagrius* (1576; reprinted in 1585 with the addition of *The Lives of the Prophets and Apostles by Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre*):—*The Ephemeris of the Saints of Ireland; and the Chronicle of Ireland* (Dublin, 1633, fol.):—*A Chronography* (Lond. 1585, fol.). See Fuller, *Worthies;* Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.* vol. i.

Han'nah (Heb. *Channah'*, חַנָּה, *graciousness*: Sept. Ἄννα; comp. ANNA, a name known to the Phœnicians [Gesen. *Mon. Phœn.* p. 400], and attributed by Virgil to Dido's sister), wife of a Levite named Elkanah, and mother of Samuel (1 Sam. i, ii). She was very dear to her husband, but, being childless, was much aggrieved by the insults of Elkanah's other wife, Peninnah, who was blessed with children. The family lived at Ramathaim-zophim, and, as the law required, there was a yearly journey to offer sacrifices at the sole altar of Jehovah, which was then at Shiloh. Women were not bound to attend; but pious females free from the cares of a family often did so, especially when the husband was a Levite. Every time that Hannah went there childless she declined to take part in the festivities which followed the sacrifices, being then, as it seems, peculiarly exposed to the taunts of her rival. At length, on one of these visits to Shiloh, while she prayed before returning home, she vowed to devote to the Almighty the son which she so earnestly desired (Numb. xxx, 1 sq.). It seems to have been the custom to pronounce all vows at the holy place in a loud voice, under the immediate notice of the priest (Deut. xxiii, 23; Psa. lxvi, 14); but Hannah prayed in a low tone, so that her lips only were seen to move. This attracted the attention of the high-priest, Eli, who suspected that she

had taken too much wine at the recent feast. From this suspicion Hannah easily vindicated herself, and returned home with a lightened heart. Before the end of that year Hannah became the rejoicing mother of a son, to whom the name of Samuel was given, and who was from his birth placed under the obligations of that condition of Nazariteship to which his mother had devoted him. B.C. 1142. Hannah went no more to Shiloh till her child was old enough to dispense with her maternal services, when she took him up with her to leave him there, as it appears was the custom when one already a Levite was placed under the additional obligations of Nazariteship. When he was presented in due form to the high-priest, the mother took occasion to remind him of the former transaction: "For this child," she said, "I prayed, and the Lord hath given me my petition which I asked of him" (1 Sam. i, 27). Hannah's gladness afterwards found vent in an exulting chant, which furnishes a remarkable specimen of the early lyric poetry of the Hebrews (see Schlosser, *Canticum Hannæ*, Erlangen, 1801), and of which many of the ideas and images were in after times repeated by the Virgin Mary on a somewhat similar occasion (Luke i, 46 sq.; comp. also Psa. cxiii). It is specially remarkable as containing the first designation of the Messiah under that name. In the Targum it has been subjected to a process of magniloquent dilution, for which it would be difficult to find a parallel even in the pompous vagaries of that paraphrase (Eichhorn, *Einl.* ii, 68). After this Hannah failed not to visit Shiloh every year, bringing a new dress for her son, who remained under the eye and near the person of the high-priest. See SAMUEL. That great personage took kind notice of Hannah on these occasions, and bestowed his blessing upon her and her husband. The Lord repaid her abundantly for that which she had, to use her own expression, "lent to him;" for she had three sons and two daughters after Samuel (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.*).

Hannah, JOHN, D.D., an eminent Wesleyan minister, was born at Lincoln, Eng., Nov. 3, 1792. After receiving a Christian education, he entered the Wesleyan ministry in 1814 at Bruton, Somersetshire. From 1815 to 1817, inclusive, he was on the Gainsborough Circuit; 1818 to 1820, Lincoln; 1821 to 1823, Nottingham; 1824 to 1826, Leeds; 1827 to 1829, third Manchester Circuit; 1830 to 1832, Huddersfield; 1833, Liverpool; and in 1834 he became theological tutor at the Wesleyan Training Institution at Hoxton. In 1842 he was removed to the college at Didsbury, where he remained as theological tutor till he became a supernumerary at the Conference of 1867. In the year that he was removed to Didsbury he was elected president of the Conference (London), and he was again president in 1851, when the Conference met at Newcastle upon Tyne. He was Conference secretary in the years 1840, 1841, 1849, 1850, and 1854 to 1858. On two occasions he represented the Wesleyan Conference, once with the Rev. R. Reece, and the second time with Dr. J. F. Jobson, at the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. His full term of service as a Methodist minister extended without interruption from 1814 to 1867—*fifty-three years.* After becoming supernumerary in 1867 he continued to reside at Didsbury, under an arrangement liberally devised by Mr. Heald and other prominent Wesleyan laymen. He died in Didsbury from congestion of the lungs, after a brief illness, Dec. 29, 1867. "For about thirty-three years he was a chief instructor of the young Wesleyan ministry, sending out such men as Arthur, Hunt, Calvert, etc.; men who have attested his salutary power throughout the United Kingdom, and in the hardest mission fields of the Church. Nearly three hundred preachers were trained by him. His influence over the connection through these men has been beyond all estimation. As a preacher he was exceedingly interesting and effective —not remarkably 'fanciful,' seldom rising into declamation, but full of entertaining and impressive thought, and a certain sweet grace, or, rather, graciousness and unction, which charmed all devout listeners. He was singularly pertinent, and often surprisingly beautiful in Scripture citation; his discourses were mosaics of the finest gems of the sacred writings. He was a fond student of the sterling old Anglican divines; he delighted, in his vacation excursions, to make pilgrimages to their old churches and graves, and his sermons abounded in the golden thoughts of Hooker, South, and like thinkers. He was constitutionally a modest man, in early life nervously timid of responsibility, but, whether in the pulpit or on the platform, always acquitted himself with ability; and often his sensitive spirit kindled into a divine glow that rapt himself and his audience with holy enthusiasm. For fifty-three years his labors for Methodism had no interruption; they were unobtrusive, steady, quietly energetic, and immeasurably useful. With Thomas Jackson, he was one of the last of that second and mighty rank of Wesleyan preachers, headed by Bunting, Watson, and Newton, who, when Wesley's immediate companions were rapidly disappearing, caught the Methodistic standard from their trembling hands, and bore it forward abreast of the advancing times, and planted it, especially by the missionary enterprise, in the ends of the earth. He was, withal, a model of Christian manners—a perfect Christian gentleman; not in the sense deprecated by Wesley in his old Minutes, but in the sense that Wesley himself so completely exemplified. His amiability and modesty disarmed envy. No prominent man passed through the severe internal controversies of Wesleyan Methodism with less crimination from antagonists. The whole connection spontaneously recognised him as unimpeachable, amid whatever rumors or clamors. All instinctively turned towards him as an example of serenity, purity, and assurance, in whatever doubtful exigency. The influence of Dr. Hannah's character, aside from his talents, on the large ministry which he educated, has been one of the greatest blessings Wesleyan Methodism has enjoyed in this generation."—*Methodist* (newspaper), Jan. 25, 1868; *Annual American Cyclopædia* for 1867, p. 601; *Wesleyan Minutes*, 1868, p. 14.

Han'nathon (Heb. *Channathon'*, חַנָּתוֹן, graciously *regarded;* Sept. 'Αννα϶ών, v. 'Ἐννα϶ώ϶ and 'Αμώ϶), a place on the northern boundary of Zebulon, apparently about midway between the Sea of Galilee and the valley of Jiphthah-El (Josh. xix, 14); probably among the range of Jebel Jermik, not far from el-Mughar.

Han'niël (Heb. *Channiel'*, חַנִּיאֵל. *grace of God;* Sept. 'Ανιήλ, Vulg. *Hanniel* and *Haniel*), the name of two men.

1. Son of Ephod and phylarch of the tribe of Manasseh, appointed by Moses at the divine nomination as one of the commissioners to divide the promised land (Numb. xxxiv, 23). B.C. 1618.

2. One of the sons of Ulla and chief of the tribe of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 39, where the name is less correctly Anglicized "Haniel"). B.C. ante 720.

Ha'noch (Gen. xxv, 4; xlvi, 9; Exod. vi, 14; Numb. xxvi, 5; 1 Chron. v, 3). See ENOCH 3, 4.

Ha'nochite (Heb. *Chanoki'*, חֲנֹכִי; Sept. 'Ενώχ, Vulg. *Henochitæ*, Eng. Vers. "Hanochites"), a descendant of ENOCH or Hanoch, the son of Reuben (Numb. xxvi, 5).

Hans Sachs. See SACHS.

Ha'nun (Heb. *Chanun'*, חָנוּן, *favored*), the name of three men.

1. (Sept. 'Αννών and 'Ανάν.) The son and successor of Nahash, king of the Ammonites (2 Sam. x, 1–4; 1 Chron. xix, 2–6). David, who had in his troubles been befriended by Nahash, sent, with the kindest intentions, an embassy to condole with Hanun on the death of his father, and to congratulate him on his own accession. B.C. cir. 1035. The rash young king, however, was led to misapprehend the motives of this embassy,

and to treat with gross and inexpiable indignity the honorable personages whom David had charged with this mission. Their beards were *half* shaven, and their robes cut short by the middle, and they were dismissed in this shameful trim, which can be appreciated only by those who consider how reverently the beard has always been regarded by the Orientals. See BEARD. When the news of this affront was brought to David, he sent word to the ambassadors to remain at Jericho till the growth of their beards enabled them to appear with decency in the metropolis. He vowed vengeance upon Hanun for the insult; and the vehemence with which the matter was taken up forms an instance, interesting from its antiquity, of the respect expected to be paid to the person and character of ambassadors. Hanun himself looked for nothing less than war as the consequence of his conduct; and he subsidized Hadarezer and other Syrian princes to assist him with their armies. The power of the Syrians was broken in two campaigns, and the Ammonites were left to their fate, which was severe even beyond the usual severities of war in that remote age. B.C. cir. 1034. See AMMONITE; DAVID.

2. (Sept. Ἀνούν.) A person who repaired (in connection with the inhabitants of Zanoah) the Valley-gate of Jerusalem after the Captivity (Neh. iii, 13). B.C. 446.

3. (Sept. Ἀνώμ.) A son ("the sixth") of Zalaph, who likewise repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 30). B.C. 446.

Hanway, JONAS, an English philanthropist, was born at Portsmouth in 1712. He established himself as a merchant at St. Petersburg, and became connected, through his Russian dealings, with the trade into Persia. Business having led him into that country, he published in 1753 *A historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea, with a Journal of Travels from London through Russia into Persia* (4 vols. 4to), "a work of no pretension to literary elegance, but containing much information on the commercial subjects of which he speaks, and on the history and manners of Persia. The latter part of his life was employed in supporting, by his pen and personal exertions, a great variety of charitable and philanthropic schemes; and he gained so high and honorable a name that a deputation of the chief merchants of London made it their request to government that some substantial mark of public favor should be conferred on him. He was, in consequence, made a commissioner of the navy. The Marine Society and the Magdalen Charity, both still in existence, owe their establishment mainly to him; he was also one of the great promoters of Sunday-schools. He died in 1786." He published also *The Importance of the Lord's Supper* (London, 1782, 12mo):—*Reflections on Life and Religion* (Lond. 1761), 2 vols. 8vo). See Pugh, *Remarkable Occurrences in the Life of Jonas Hanway* (London, 1787, 8vo); *English Cyclopædia*; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 782.

Haphra'im (Hebrew *Chaphara'yim*, חֲפָרַיִם, *two pits*: Sept. Ἀφεραΐμ, Vulg. *Hapharaim*), a place near the border of Issachar, mentioned between Shunem and Shihon (Josh. xix, 19). Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. Αἰφαραιίμ) appears to place it six Roman miles north of Legio: the Apocrypha also possibly speaks of the same place as APHÆREMA (Ἀφαίρεμα, 1 Macc. xi, 34; compare x, 30, 38). Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 166) was unable to find it. Kiepert (*Wandkarte von Palästina*, 1857) locates it near the river Kishon, apparently at *Tell eth-Thorah* (Robinson's *Researches*, new ed. iii, 115). Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, i, 502) imagines it may be the modern *Shefa Amer* (the *Shefa Omar* of Robinson, *Researches*, new ed. iii 103, "on a ridge overlooking the plain" of Megiddo), which, he says, "in old Arabic authors is written *Shephr-am*." See ISSACHAR.

Haphtarah, pl. HAPHTARÔTH (הַפְטָרָה, *dismission*, הַפְטָרוֹת). This expression, which is found in foot-notes and at the end of many editions of the Hebrew Bible, denotes the different lessons from the prophets read in the synagogue every Sabbath and festival of the year. As these lessons have been read from time immemorial in conjunction with sections from the law, and as it is to both "*the reading of the law and the prophets*" that reference is made in the N. T. (Acts xiii, 15, etc.), we propose to discuss both together in the present article.

1. *Classification of the Lessons, their Titles, Signification, etc.*—There are two classes of lessons indicated in the Hebrew Bible: the one consists of *fifty-four* sections, into which the entire law or Pentateuch (תורה) is divided, and is called *Parshioth* (פרשיות, plur. of פרשה, from פרש, *to separate*); and the other consists of a corresponding number of sections selected from different parts of the prophets, to be read in conjunction with the former, and denominated *Haphtaroth.* As the signification of this term is much disputed, and is intimately connected with the view about the origin of these prophetic lessons, we must defer the discussion of it to section 4. The division of the Pentateuch into *fifty-four* sections is to provide a lesson for each Sabbath of those years which, according to Jewish chronology, have fifty-four Sabbaths (see sec. 2), and to read through *the whole* Pentateuch, with large portions of the different prophets, in the course of every year. It must be observed, however, that this annual cycle was not universally adopted by the ancient Jews. There were some who had a triennial cycle (comp. *Megilla*, 29, b). These divided the Pentateuch into *one hundred and fifty-three* or *fifty-five* sections, so as to read through the law in Sabbatic lessons once in three years. This was still done by some Jews in the days of Maimonides (compare *Jad Ha-Chazaka Hilchoth Tephilla*, xiii, 1), and Benjamin of Tudela tells us that he found the Syrian Jews followed this practice in Memphis (ed. Asher, i, 148). The sections of the triennial division are called by the Masorites *Sedarim* or *Sedaroth* (סדרים, סדרות), as may be seen in the Masoretic note at the end of Exodus: "Here endeth the book of Exodus . . . it hath eleven *Parshioth* (פרשיות, i. e. according to the annual division), twenty-nine *Sedaroth* (סדרות, i. e. according to the triennial division), and forty chapters (פרקים)." Besides the Sabbatic lessons, special portions of the law and prophets are also read on every festival and fast of the year. It must be noticed, moreover, that the Jews, who have for some centuries almost universally followed the annual division of the law, denominate the Sabbatic section *Sidra* (סידרא), the name which the Masorites give to each portion of the triennial division, and that every one of the fifty-four sections has a special title, which it derives from the first or second word with which it commences, and by which it is quoted in the Jewish writings. To render the following description more intelligible, as well as to enable the student of Hebrew exegesis to identify the quotations from the Pentateuch, we subjoin on the two following pages chronological tables of the Sabbatical Festival and Fast Lessons from the Law and Prophets, and their titles. (See Clarke's *Commentary*, s. f. Deuteronomy.)

2. "*The Reading of the Law and Prophets*" *as indicated in the Hebrew Bible, and practiced by the Jews at the present day.*—As has already been remarked, this division into *fifty-four* sections is to provide a special lesson for every Sabbath of those years which have fifty-four Sabbaths. Thus the intercalary year, in which New Year falls on a Thursday, and the months Marcheshvan and Kislev have twenty-nine days, has fifty-four Sabbaths which require special lessons. But as ordinary years have not so many Sabbaths, and those years in which New Year falls on a Monday, and the months Marcheshvan and Kislev have thirty days, or New Year falls on

I. TABLE OF SABBATIC LESSONS.

No.	Masoretic Title of the Lesson.	Portion of the Law.	The Prophets.
1	בראשית	Gen. i, 1—vi, 8.	Isa. xlii, 5—xliii, 10, or* to Isa. xlii, 21.
2	נח	vi, 9—xi, 32.	Isa. liv, 1—lv, 5, or to liv, 10.
3	לך לך	xii, 1—xvii, 27.	Isa. xl, 27—xli, 16.
4	וירא	xviii, 1—xxii, 24.	2 Kings iv, 1-37, or to ver. 23.
5	חיי שרה	xxiii, 1—xxv, 18.	1 Kings i, 1-31.
6	תלדות	xxv, 19—xxviii, 9.	Malachi i, 1—ii, 7.
7	ויצא	xxviii, 10—xxxii, 3.	Hos. xi, 7—xii, 12, or to ver. 13.
8	וישלח	xxxii, 4—xxxvi, 43.	Hos. xii, 13—xiv, 10, or Obad. 1-21.
9	וישב	xxxvii, 1—xl, 23.	Amos ii, 6—iii, 8.
10	מקץ	xli, 1—xliv, 17.	1 Kings iii, 15—iv, 1.
11	ויגש	xliv, 18—xlvii, 27.	Ezek. xxxvii, 15-28.
12	ויחי	xlvii, 28—l, 26.	1 Kings ii, 1-12.
13	שמות	Exod. i, 1—vi, 1.	Isa. xxvii, 6—xxviii, 13; xxix, 22, 23, or Jer. i, 1—ii, 3.
14	וארא	vi, 2—ix, 35.	Ezek. xxviii, 25—xxix, 21.
15	בא	x, 1—xiii, 16.	Jer. xlvi, 13-28.
16	בשלח	xiii, 17—xvii, 16.	Judg. iv, 4—v, 31, or v, 1-31.
17	יתרו	xviii, 1—xx, 23.	Isa. vi, 1—vii, 6; ix, 5, 6, or vi, 1-13.
18	משפטים	xxi, 1—xxiv, 18.	Jer. xxxiv, 8-22; xxxiii, 25-26.
19	תרומה	xxv, 1—xxvii, 19.	1 Kings v, 26—vi, 13.
20	תצוה	xxvii, 20—xxx, 10.	Ezek. xliii, 10-27.
21	כי תשא	xxx, 11—xxxiv, 35.	1 Kings xviii, 1-39, or xviii, 20-39.
22	ויקהל	xxxv, 1—xxxviii, 20.	1 Kings vii, 40-50, or vii, 13-26.
23	פקודי	xxxviii, 21—xl, 38.	1 Kings vii, 51—viii, 21, or vii, 40-50.
24	ויקרא	Levit. i, 1—v, 26.	Isa. xliii, 21—xliv, 23.
25	צו	vi, 1—viii, 36.	Jer. vii, 21—viii, 3; ix, 22, 23.
26	שמיני	ix, 1—xi, 47.	2 Sam. vi, 1—vii, 17, or vi, 1-19.
27	תזריע	xii, 1—xiii, 59.	2 Kings iv, 42—v, 19.
28	מצורע	xiv, 1—xv, 33.	2 Kings vii, 3-20.
29	אחרי מות	xvi, 1—xviii, 30.	Ezek. xxii, 1-19.
30	קדושים	xix, 1—xx, 27.	Amos ix, 7-15, or Ezek. xx, 2-20.
31	אמור	xxi, 1—xxiv, 23.	Ezek. xliv, 15-31.
32	בהר	xxv, 1—xxvi, 2.	Jer. xxxii, 6-27.
33	בחקתי	xxvi, 2—xxvii, 34.	Jer. xvi, 19—xvii, 14.
34	במדבר	Numb. i, 1—iv, 20.	Hos. ii, 1-22.
35	נשא	iv, 21—vii, 89.	Judg. xiii, 2-25.
36	בהעלותך	viii, 1—xii, 16.	Zech. ii, 14—iv, 7.
37	שלח לך	xiii, 1—xv, 41.	Josh. ii, 1-24.
38	קרח	xvi, 1—xviii, 32.	2 Sam. xi, 14—xii, 22.
39	חקת	xix, 1—xxii, 1.	Judg. xi, 1-33.
40	בלק	xxii, 2—xxv, 9.	Micah v, 6—vi, 8.
41	פנחס	xxv, 10—xxx, 1.	1 Kings xviii, 46—xix, 21 if it is before Tammuz 17, after this date Jer. i, 1—ii, 3.
42	מטות	xxx, 2—xxxii, 42.	Jer. i, 1—ii, 3.
43	מסעי	xxxiii, 1—xxxvi, 13.	Jer. ii, 4-28.
44	דברים	Deut. i, 1—iii, 22.	Isa. i, 1-27.
45	ואתחנן	iii, 23—vii, 11.	Isa. xl, 1-26.
46	עקב	vii, 12—xi, 25.	Isa. xlix, 14—li, 3.
47	ראה	xi, 26—xvi, 17.	Isa. liv, 11—lv, 5.
48	שופטים	xvi, 18—xxi, 9.	Isa. li, 12—lii, 12.
49	כי תצא	xxi, 10—xxv, 19.	Isa. liv, 1-10.
50	כי תבוא	xxvi, 1—xxix, 8.	Isa. lx, 1-22.
51	נצבים	xxix, 9—xxx, 20.	Isa. lxi, 10—lxiii, 9.
52	וילך	xxxi, 1-30.	Isa. lv, 6—lvi, 8.
53	האזינו	xxxii, 1-52.	2 Sam. xxii, 1-51 in some places. Ezek. xvii, 22—xviii, 32.
54	וזאת הברכה	xxxiii, 1—xxxiv, 12.	

* The first reference always shows the *Haphtarah* according to the German and Polish Jews (אשכנזים); the second, introduced by the disjunctive particle OR, is according to the Portuguese Jews (ספרדים).

a Saturday, and the said months are regular, i. e. Marchesvan having twenty-nine days and Kislev thirty, have only forty-seven Sabbaths—*fourteen* of the fifty-four sections, viz. 22 and 23, 27 and 28, 29 and 30, 32 and 33, 39 and 40, 42 and 43, 50 and 51, have been appointed to be read in pairs either wholly or in part, according to the varying number of Sabbaths in the current year. Thus the whole Pentateuch is read through every year. The first of these weekly sections is read on the first Sabbath after the Feast of Tabernacles, which is in the month of Tisri, and begins the civil year, and the last is read on the concluding day of this festival, Tisri 23, which is called *The Rejoicing of the Law* (שמחת תורה), a day of rejoicing, because on it the law is read through. See TABERNACLES, FEAST OF. According to the triennial division, the reading of the law seems to have been as follows: Gen. i, 1-Exod. xiii, 16, comprising *history* from the creation of the world to the Exodus, was read in the first year; Exod. xiii, 17-Num. vi, 27, embracing *the laws* of both Sinai and the tabernacle, formed the lessons for the Sabbaths of the second year; and Numb. vii, 1-Deut. xxxiv, 12, containing both *history* (i. e. the history of thirty-nine years' wanderings in the wilderness) and *law* (i. e. the repetition of the Mosaic law), constituted the Sabbatic lessons for the third year (compare *Megilla*, 29, b, and *Volkslehrer*, ii, 209).

3. *The manner of reading the Law and the Prophets.*—Every Sabbatic lesson from the law (קריאת התורה) is divided into seven sections (evidently designed to correspond to the seven days of the week), which, in the days of our Saviour and afterwards, were read by seven different persons (שבעה קרואים), who were called upon for this purpose by the congregation or its chief Mishna, *Megilla*, iv, 2; Maimonides, *Jad Ha-Chazaka*) *Hilchoth Tephilla*, xii, 7). Great care is taken that the

II. Table of Festival and Fast Lessons.

Feasts and Fasts.	The Law.	The Prophets.
New Moon.		
If it falls on a Sabbath is read	Numb. xxviii, 9-15 (*Maphtir*).	Isa. lxvi, 1-24.
On a Sunday	Numb. xxviii, 8-15.	1 Sam. xx, 18-42.
Feast of Dedication. Day i.	Numb. vii, 1-17.	
Day ii.	Numb. vii, 18-23.	
Day iii.	Numb. vii, 24-29.	
Day iv.	Numb. vii, 30-35.	
Day v.	Numb. vii, 36-41.	
Day vi.	Numb. vii, 42-47.	
Day vii.	Numb. vii, 48-53.	
Day viii.	Numb. vii, 54—viii, 4.	
Sabbath i.	....	Zech. ii, 14—iv, 7.
Sabbath ii.	....	1 Kings vii, 40-50.
Feast of Purim.	Exod. xvii, 8-16.	The Book of Esther.
Sabbath Parsheth Sachor.	Deut. xxv, 17-19 (*Maphtir*).	1 Sam. xv, 2-34, or xv, 1-34.
Sabbath Parsheth Para.	Numb. xix, 1-22 (*Maphtir*).	Ezek. xxxvi, 16-38, or to ver. 36.
Sabbath Parsheth Ha-Chodesh	Exod. xii, 1-20.	Ezek. xlv, 16—xlvi, 18, or xlv, 18—xlvi, 15.
Sabbath Ha-Gadol.	....	Mal. iii, 4-24.
Feast of Passover. Day i.	Exod. xii, 21-51; Numb. xxviii, 16-25 (*Maphtir*).	Josh. iii, 5-7; v, 2-15; vi, 27, or v, 2-15.
Day ii.	Levit. xxii, 26—xxiii, 44; Numb. xxviii, 16-25 (*Maphtir*).	2 Kings xxiii, 1-9; 21-25.
Chol Moed, Day i.	Exod. xiii, 1-16; Numb. xxviii, 19-25.	
Day ii.	Exod. xxii-xxiii, 19; Numb. xxviii, 19-25.	
(If it falls on a Sunday the preceding lesson is read.) Day iii.		
(If on a Monday, the preceding lesson.)		
On a Wednesday or Thursday.	Exod. xxiv, 1-26; Numb. xxviii, 19-25.	
Day iv.	Numb. ix, 1-14; xxviii, 19-25.	
Sabbath Chol Moed.	Exod. xxxiii, 12—xxxiv, 26; Numb. xxviii, 19-25.	Ezek. xxxvi, 37—xxxvii, 17, or xxxvii, 1-14. The Song of Songs.
Day vii.	Exod. xiii, 17—xv, 26; Numb. xxviii, 19-25 (*Maphtir*).	2 Sam. xxii, 1-51.
If Sabbath, Day viii.	Deut. xiv, 22—xvi, 17; Numb. xxviii, 19-25 (*Maphtir*).	Isa. x, 32—xii, 6.
Week day, "	Deut. xv, 19—xvi, 17; Numb. xxviii, 19-25 (*Maphtir*).	Isa. x, 32—xii, 6.
Feast of Pentecost. Day i.	Exod. xix, 1—xx, 26; Numb. xxviii, 26-31 (*Maphtir*).	Ezek. i, 1-28; iii, 12.
If Sabbath, Day ii.	Deut. xiv, 22—xvi, 17.	Habak. ii, 20—iii, 19, or iii, 1-19; Esther.
Week day, "	Deut. xv, 19—xvi, 17; Numb. xxviii, 26-31 (*Maphtir*).	Habak. ii, 20—iii, 19, or iii, 1-19.
Fast of the Ninth of Ab. Morning.	Deut. iv, 25-40.	Jer. viii, 13—ix, 23; Lamentations.
Noon.	....	Isa. lv, 6—lvi, 8.
New Year. Day i.	Gen. xxi, 1-34; Numb. xxix, 1-6 (*Maphtir*).	1 Sam. i, 1—ii, 10.
Day ii.	Gen. xxii, 1-24; Numb. xxix, 1-6 (*Maphtir*).	Jer. xxxi, 2-20.
Day of Atonement. Morning.	Levit. xvi, 1-34; Numb. xxix, 7-11 (*Maphtir*).	Isa. lvii, 14—lviii, 14.
Noon.	Levit. xviii, 1-30.	Jonah.
Feast of Tabernacles. Day i.	Levit. xxii, 26—xxiii, 44; Numb. xxix, 12-16 (*Maphtir*).	Zech. xiv, 1-21.
Day ii.	Levit. xxii, 26—xxiii, 44; Numb. xxix, 12-16 (*Maphtir*).	1 Kings viii, 2-21.
Chol Moed, Day i.	Numb. xxix, 17-25; 17-22 is repeated.	
Day ii.	Numb. xxix, 20-28; 20-25 is repeated.	
Day iii.	Numb. xxix, 23-31; 23-28 is repeated.	
Day iv.	Numb. xxix, 26-34; 26-31 is repeated.	
Sabbath Chol Moed.	Exod. xxxiii, 12—xxxiv, 26; Numb. xxix, 17-22, if it is the first day of Chol Moed; Numb. xxix, 23-28, if the third; Numb. xxix, 26-31, if the fourth day (*Maphtir*).	Ezek. xxxviii, 18—xxxix, 16; Ecclesiastes.
Shemini Azereth, If Sabbath.	Deut. xiv, 22—xvi, 17.	
Week day.	Deut. xv, 19—xvi, 17; Numb. xxix, 35—xxx, 1 (*Maphtir*).	1 Kings viii, 54-66; Ecclesiastes.
Simchath Tora.	Deut. xxxiii, 1—xxxiv, 12; Gen. i, 1—ii, 3; Numb. xxix, 35—xxx, 1 (*Maphtir*).	Josh. i, 1-18.
Sabbath Shuba.	....	Hos. xiv, 2-9; Joel ii, 15-27.
Fast Days generally.	Exod. xxxii, 11-14; xxxiv, 1-10.	Isa. lv, 6—lvii, 8.
Mondays and Thursdays all the year round.	The first section of the Sabbatic lesson from the law.	

whole nation should be represented at this reading of the law and prophets. Hence a *Cohen* (כהן) or priest is called to the reading of the first portion, a *Levi* (לוי) to the second, and an *Israel* (ישראל) to the third; and after the three great divisions of the nation have thus been duly represented, the remaining four portions are assigned to four others with less care. "Every one thus called to the reading of the law must unroll the scroll, and, having found the place where he is to begin to read, pronounces the following benediction—'Bless ye the Lord, who is ever blessed;' to which the congregation respond, 'Blessed be the Lord, who is blessed for evermore.' Whereupon he again pronounces the following benediction—'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast chosen us from among all nations, and hast given us thy law. Blessed art thou, O Lord, giver of the law;' to which all the congregation respond 'Amen.' He then reads the seventh portion of the lesson, and when he has finished, rolls up the scroll, and pronounces again the following benediction—'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast given us thy law, the law of truth, and hast planted among us everlasting life. Blessed art thou, O Lord, giver of the law'" (Maimonides, *ibid.* xii, 5). The other six, who are called in rotation to the reading of

the other six portions, have to go through the same formularies. Then the *maphtir* (מפטיר), or the one who finishes up by the reading of the *Haphtarah*, or the lesson from the prophets, is called. Having read the few concluding verses of the lesson from the law, and passed through the same formularies as the other seven, he reads the appointed section from the prophets. "Before reading it, he pronounces the following benediction—'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast chosen good prophets, and delighted in their words, which were spoken in truth. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast chosen the law, thy servant Moses, thy people Israel, and thy true and righteous prophets.' and after reading, 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, Rock of all ages, righteous in all generations, the faithful God who promises and performs, who decrees and accomplishes, for all thy words are faithful and just. Faithful art thou, Lord our God, and faithful are thy words, and not one of thy words shall return in vain, for thou art a faithful King. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the God who art faithful in all thy words.' 'Have mercy upon Zion, for it is the dwelling of our life, and save speedily in our days the afflicted souls. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who wilt make Zion rejoice in her children. Cause us to rejoice, O Lord our God, in Elijah thy servant, and in the kingdom of the house of David thine anointed. May he speedily come and gladden our hearts. Let no stranger sit on his throne, and let others no longer inherit his glory, for thou hast sworn unto him by thy holy name that his light shall not be extinguished forever and ever. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the shield of David.' 'For the law, the divine service, the prophets, and for "this day of rest" [or of memorial], this goodly day of holy convocation which thou hast given to us, O Lord, for sanctification and rest [on the Sabbath], for honor and glory; for all this, O Lord our King, we thank and praise thee. Let thy name be praised in the mouth of every living creature forever and ever. Thy word, O our King, is true, and will abide forever. Blessed art thou, King of the whole earth, who hast sanctified the Sabbath, and Israel, and the day of memorial'" (Maimonides, *ibid.*). After the Babylonian captivity, when the Hebrew language became an unknown tongue to the common people, an interpreter (מתורגמן, תורגמן) stood at the desk by the side of those who read the lessons, and paraphrased the section from the law into Chaldee verse by verse, the reader pausing at every verse, whilst the lesson from the prophets he paraphrased three verses at a time (Mishna, *Megilla*, iv, 4); and Lightfoot is of opinion that St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xiv, 22, refers to this circumstance (*Horæ Hebraicæ* in loco). The lesson from the law was on these occasions rendered into Chaldee quite literally, owing to the fear which both the interpreters and the congregation had lest a free explanation of it might misrepresent its sense, whilst greater freedom was exercised with the lesson from the prophets. Hence loose paraphrases and lengthy expositions were tolerated and looked for both from the professional interpreter and those of the congregation who were called up to read, and who felt that they could do it with edification to the audience. The Sabbatic lesson from the law was, as we have seen, divided into seven sections or chapters, each of which had at least three verses, according to the verses of those days, so that the whole consisted of at least twenty-one such verses. The lesson from the prophets was not portioned out to seven different individuals, but has also at least twenty-one verses (Mishna, *Megilla*, iv, 4; Maimonides, *Jod Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Tephilla*, xii, 13). The lesson from the law for the Day of Atonement is divided into six chapters, for festivals into five, for new moon into four, and for Mondays and Thursdays into three chapters or sections. The number of persons called up to the reading of the law always corresponds to the number of sections. For Mondays and Thursdays, new moon, and the week days of the festivals (חול מועד), there are no corresponding lessons from the prophets (Mishna, *Megilla*, iv, 1-3).

4. *The Origin of this Institution.*—The origin of this custom may easily be traced. The Bible emphatically and repeatedly enjoins upon every Israelite to study its contents (Deut. iv, 9; xxxii, 46), Moses himself ordered that the whole law should be read publicly at the end of every Sabbatic year (xxxi, 10-12), whilst Joshua urges that it should be studied day and night (i, 8; comp. also Psa. i, 2 sq.). Now the desire to carry out this injunction literally, and yet the utter impossibility of doing it on the part of those who had to work for daily bread all the week, and who could not afford to buy the necessarily expensive scrolls, gave rise to this institution. On the Sabbath and festivals all were relieved from their labor, and could attend places of worship where the inspired writings were deposited, and where care could be taken that no private interpretation should be palmed upon the Word of God. Hence both James (Acts xv, 21) and Josephus (*Contra Apion*, ii, 17) speak of it as a very ancient custom, and the Talmud tells us that the division of each Sabbatic lesson into seven sections was introduced in honor of the Persian king (*Megilla*, 23), which shows that this custom obtained anterior to the Persian rule. Indeed Maimonides positively asserts that Moses himself ordained the hebdomal reading of the law (*Hilchoth Tephilla*, xii, 1). Equally natural is the division of the law into Sabbatic sections, as the whole of it could not be read at once. The only difficulty is to ascertain positively whether the annual or the triennial division was the more ancient one. A triennial division is mentioned in *Megilla* 29, b, as current in Palestine; with this agree the reference to 155 sections of the law in the *Midrash*, *Esther* 116, b, and the Masoretic division of the Pentateuch into 154 *Sedarim*. But, on the other hand, R. Simeon b. Eleazar, *a Palestinian*, declared that Moses instituted the reading of Lev. xxvi before the Feast of Pentecost, and Deut. xxviii before New Year, which most unquestionably presuppose *the annual division* of the Pentateuch into 54 *Parshioth*. This is, moreover, confirmed by the statement (*Ibid.* 31, a) that the section וזאת הברכה (Deut. xxxiii, 1-xxxiv, 12) was read on *the ninth day* of the Feast of Tabernacles, thus terminating *the annual* cycle, as well as by the fact that the annual festival of the rejoicing of the law (שמחת תורה) which commemorates the annual finishing of the perusal of the Pentateuch [see TABERNACLES, FEAST OF] was an ancient institution. We must therefore conclude that the annual cycle which is now prevalent among the Jews was the generally adopted one, at least since the Maccabæan times, whilst the triennial, though the older, was the exception. Usage, however, probably varied, for we find that our Saviour (Luke iv, 16-21), in accordance with this custom, on invitation read and expounded, apparently on a Sabbath in January, a passage (Isa. lxi, 1, 2), not contained at all in the present scheme of *Haphtaroth*.

It is far more difficult to trace the origin of *the Haphtarah*, or the lesson from the prophets, and its signification. A very ancient tradition tells us that the Syrians had interdicted the reading of the law, and carried away the scrolls containing it, and that appropriate sections from the prophets were therefore chosen to replace the Pentateuch (Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vor.* p. 5), whilst Elias Levita traces the origin of the *Haphtarah* to persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes. In his *Lex.* (s. v. פטר) he says, "The wicked Antiochus, king of Greece, prohibited the Jews to read the law publicly. They therefore selected sections from the prophets of the same import as the Sabbatic lessons . . . and though this prohibition has now ceased, this custom has not been left off, and to this day we read a section from the prophets after the reading of the law;" and we see no reason to reject this account. The objection of Vitringa, Frankel, Herzfeld, etc., that Antiochus, who wanted to exterminate Judaism, would not wage war against

the Pentateuch *exclusively*, but would equally destroy the prophetic books, and that this implies a knowledge on the part of the soldiers of the distinction between the Pentateuch and the other inspired writings, is obviated by the fact that there was an external difference between the rolls of the Pentateuch and the other sacred books, that the Jews claimed *the Pentateuch* as their law and rule of faith, and that this was the reason why it especially was destroyed. (The law has two rollers, i. e. has a roller attached to each of the two ends of the vellum on which it is written, and every weekly portion when read on the Sabbath is unrolled from the right roller and rolled on the left; so that when the law is opened on the next Sabbath the portion appointed for that day is at once found. Whereas the prophetic books have only one roller, and the lesson from the prophets has to be sought out on every occasion [compare *Baba Bathra*, 14 a].) This is corroborated by 1 Macc. i, 56, where *the law only* is said to have been burned. Accordingly הפטרה, from פטר, *to liberate, to free*, signifies the *liberating lesson*, the portion from the prophets which is read instead of the portion from the law that could not be read, and which liberates from the injunction of reading the Pentateuch. For the other opinions about the signification of *Haphtarah*, we refer to the literature quoted below.

5. *Literature*.—Maimonides, *Jod Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Tephilla*; Bartolocci, *Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica*, ii, 593 sq.; Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, cap. i; Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig, 1841), p. 48 sq.; Rapaport, *Erech Millin*, p. 66 sq.; *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, i, 352; xi, 222; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, ii, 209; *Der Israelitische Volkslehrer*, ii, 205; *Ben Chananja*, v, 125.

Ha'ra (Heb. *Hara'*, הָרָא), a province of Assyria. We read that Tiglath-pilneser "brought the Reubenites, Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh unto Halah, and Habor, and *Hara*, and to the river Gozan" (1 Chron. v, 26). The parallel passage in 2 Kings xviii, 11, omits Hara, and adds "in the cities of the Medes." Bochart consequently supposes that Hara was either a part of Media, or another name for that country. He shows that Herodotus (vii, 62) and other ancient writers call the Medes *Arians*, and their country *Aria*. He further supposes that the name Hara, which signifies *mountainous*, may have been given to that northern section of Media subsequently called by the Arabs *El-gebal* ("the mountains," see Bochart, *Opp.* i, 194). The words *Aria* and *Hara*, however, are totally different both in meaning and origin. The Medes were a branch of the great Arian family who came originally from India, and who took their name, according to Muller (*Science of Language*, p. 237 sq., 2d ed.), from the Sanscrit word *Arya*, which means *noble*, "of a good family." Its etymological meaning seems to be "one who tills the ground;" and it is thus allied to the Latin *arare* (see also Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, i, 401).

Hara is joined with Hala, Habor, and the river Gozan. These were all situated in Western Assyria, between the Tigris and Euphrates, and along the banks of the Khabûr. We may safely conclude, therefore, that Hara could not have been far distant from that region. It is somewhat remarkable that the name is not given in either the Sept. or Peshito version. Some have hence imagined that the word was interpolated after these versions were made. This, however, is a rash criticism, as it exists in all Hebrew MSS., and also in Jerome's version (see Robinson's *Calmet*, s. v. Gozan; Grant's *Nestorian Christians*, p. 120). The conjecture that Hara and Haran are identical cannot be sustained, though the situation of the latter might suit the requirements of the Biblical narrative, and its Greek classical name *Carrhæ* resembles Hara. See HARAN. The Hebrew words הרא and חרן are radically different. Hara may perhaps have been a local name applied to the mountainous region north of Gozan, called by Strabo and Ptolemy *Mons Masius*, and now *Karja Baghlar* (Strabo, xvi, 23; Ptolemy, v, 18, 2).—Kitto, s. v.

Har'adah (Heb. with the article *ha-Charadah'*, הַחֲרָדָה, *the fright*; Sept. Χαραδάθ), the twenty-fifth station of the Israelites in the desert (Numb. xxxiii, 24); perhaps at the head of the wadys north-east of Jebel Araif en-Nakah, on the western brow of the high plateau east of Ain el-Mazen. See EXODE.

Haram. See HOUSE.

Ha'ran appears in the Eng. Bible as the name of a place and also of three men, which, however, are represented by two essentially different Hebrew words. See also BETH-HARAN.

1. HARAN (Heb. *Haran'*, הָרָן, *mountaineer;* Sept. Ἀῤῥάν), probably the eldest son of Terah, brother of Abraham and Nahor, and father of Lot, Milcah, and Iscah. He died in his native place before his father Terah (an event that may in some degree have prepared the family to leave Ur), which, from the manner in which it is mentioned, appears to have been a much rarer case in those days than at the present (Gen. xi, 27 sq.). B.C. 2223-ante 2088.—Kitto. His sepulchre was still shown there when Josephus wrote his history (*Ant.* i, 6, 5). The ancient Jewish tradition is that Haran was burnt in the furnace of Nimrod for his wavering conduct during the fiery trial of Abraham. (See the Targum Ps.-Jonathan; Jerome's *Quæst. in Genesim*, and the notes thereto in the edition of Migne). This tradition seems to have originated in a translation of the word Ur, which in Hebrew signifies "fire." See ABRAHAM.

2. CHARAN (Heb. *Charan'*, חָרָן, probably from the Arabic, *parched;* Sept. Χαῤῥάν, also Josephus, *Ant.* i, 16, N. T., Acts vii, 2, where it is Anglicized "Charran"), the name of the place where Abraham, after he had been called from Ur of the Chaldees, tarried till his father Terah died, when he proceeded to the land of Canaan (Gen. xi, 31, 38; Acts vii, 4). The elder branch of the family still remained at Haran, which led to the interesting journeys thither described in the patriarchal history (see Hauck, *De profectionibus Abrahami e Charris* [Lips. 1754, 1776])—first, that of Abraham's servant to obtain a wife for Isaac (Gen. xxiv); and, next, that of Jacob when he fled to evade the wrath of Esau (Gen. xxviii, 10). It is said to be in Mesopotamia (Gen. xxiv, 10), or, more definitely, in Padan-Aram xxv, 20), which is the "cultivated district at the foot of the hills" (Stanley, *Syr. and Pal.* p. 129, note), a name well applying to the beautiful stretch of country which lies below Mount Masius, between the Khabûr and the Euphrates. See PADAN-ARAM. Haran is enumerated among the towns which had been taken by the predecessors of Sennacherib, king of Assyria (1 Kings xix, 12; Isa. xxxvii, 12), and it is also mentioned by Ezekiel (xxvii, 23) among the places which traded with Tyre. It is alluded to in the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.). Jerome thus describes Haran: "Charran, a city of Mesopotamia beyond Edessa, which to this day is called *Charra*, where the Roman army was cut off, and Crassus, its leader, taken" (*Onomast.* s. v. Charran). Guided by these descriptions and statements, which certainly appear sufficiently clear and full, sacred geographers have almost universally identified Haran with the *Carræ* (Κάῤῥαι) of classical writers (Herodian. iv, 13, 7; Ptol. v, 18, 12; Strabo, xvi, 747), and the *Harrân* of the Arabs (Schultens, *Index Geogr. in Vitam Saladini*, s. v.). The plain bordering on this town (Ammian. Marc. xxiii, 3) is celebrated in history as the scene of a battle in which the Roman army was defeated by the Parthians, and the triumvir Crassus killed (Plin. v, 21; Dio Cass. xl, 25; Lucan. i, 104). Abulfeda (*Tab. Syriæ*, p. 164) speaks of Haran as formerly a great city, which lay in an arid and barren tract of country in the province of Diar Modhar. About the time of the Christian æra it ap-

pears to have been included in the kingdom of Edessa (Mos. Chor. ii, 32), which was ruled by Agbarus. Afterwards it passed with that kingdom under the dominion of the Romans, and appears as a Roman city in the wars of Caracalla (Mos. Chor. ii, 72) and Julian (Jo. Malal. p. 329). It is remarkable that the people of Harrân retained to a late time the Chaldæan language and the worship of Chaldæan deities (Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* i, 327; Chwolson's *Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, ii, 39).

About midway in the district above designated is a town still called *Harrân*, which really seems never to have changed its appellation, and beyond any reasonable doubt is the Haran or Charran of Scripture (Bochart's *Phaleg*, i, 14; Ewald's *Geschichte*, i, 384). It is only peopled by a few families of wandering Arabs, who are led thither by a plentiful supply of water from several small streams. Its situation is fixed by major Rennell as being twenty-nine miles from Orfah, and occupying a flat and sandy plain. It lies (according to D'Anville) in 36° 40′ N. lat., and 39° 2′ 45″ E. long. (See Niebuhr, *Travels*, ii, 410; Ritter, *Erdk.* x, 244; xi, 291; Cellar. *Notit.* ii, 726; Mannert, v, 2, 280; Michaelis, *Suppl.* 930.) Harrân stands on the banks of a small river called Belik, which flows into the Euphrates about fifty miles south of the town. From it a number of leading roads radiate to the great fords of the Tigris and Euphrates; and it thus formed an important station on the line of commerce between Central and Western Asia. This may explain why Terah came to it, and why it was mentioned among the places which supplied the marts of Tyre (Ezek. xxvii, 23). Crassus was probably marching along this great route when he was attacked by the Parthians. Dr. Beke, in his *Origines Biblicæ* (p. 122 sq.), made the somewhat startling statement that Haran must have been near Damascus, and that Aram-Naharaim is the country between the Abana and Pharpar. After lying dormant for a quarter of a century, this theory was again revived in 1860. The Rev. J. L. Porter visited and described a small village in the plain, four hours east of Damascus, called Harrân el-Awamîd ("Harrân of the columns"). The description having met the eye of Dr. Beke (in *Five Years in Damascus*, i, 376), he at once concluded that this village was the site of the real "city of Nahor." He has since visited Harrân el-Awamîd, and travelled from it to Gilead, and is more confirmed in his view, though he appears to stand alone. His arguments have not been sufficient to set aside the powerful evidence in favor of Harran in Mesopotamia. The student may see the whole subject discussed in the *Athenæum* for Nov. 23, 30; Dec. 7, 1861; Feb. 1, 15; March 1, 22, 29; April 6, 19; and May 24, 1862; also in Stanley's *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, i, 447 sq.

3. Charan (Heb. same as last, meaning here *noble*, according to Fürst; Sept. Ἀῤῥάν v. r. Ἀράμ). The son of Caleb of Judah by his concubine Ephah, and father of Gazez (1 Chron. ii, 46). B.C. between 1618 and 1083.

4. Haran (Heb. same as No. 1; Sept. Ἀράν v. r. Δάν). One of the three sons of Shimei, a Levite of the family of Gershon, appointed by David to superintend the offices at the tabernacle (1 Chron. xxiii, 9). B.C. 1014.

Ha'rarite, the (Heb. always [except in 2 Sam. xxiii, 11] with the art. *ha-Harari,'* הַהֲרָרִי), a distinctive epithet of three members of David's body-guard; probably as natives of the *mountains* (הַר, plur. constr. הֲרָרֵי) of Judah or Ephraim; but according to Fürst from some town of the name of *Har* (הַר). See David.

1. "Shammah [q. v.], the son of Agee" (2 Sam. xxiii, 11 [Sept. ὁ Ἀραρί v. r. Ἀρουχαῖος, Vulg. *de Arari*, A. V. "the Hararite"], 33 [ὁ Ἀρωρίτης v. r. Ἀρωδίτης, *Arorites*], which latter verse shows that it was a designation of the son and not of the father), a different person from "Shammoth the Harorite" [q. v.] (1 Chron. xi, 27), or "Shammah the Harodite" [q. v.] (2 Sam. xxiii, 25). See Agee.

2. "Jonathan [q. v.], the son of Shage" (1 Chron. xi, 34, Sept. ὁ Ἀραρί, Vulg. *Ararites*), mentioned in the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii, 32) without any such distinction. See Shage.

3. "Ahiam [q. v.], the son of Sacar" (1 Chron. xi, 35, Sept. ὁ Ἀραρί v. r. Ἀχάρ, Vulg. *Ararites*), or, in the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii, 33), less accurately, "Ahiam, [the] son of *Sharar* [q. v.] the *Ararite*" (Heb. with the art. *ha-Arari'*, הָאֲרָרִי, Sept. ὁ Ἀραδίτης v. r. Ἀραΐ, etc., Vulg. *Arorites*, A. V. "the Hararite"). See Sacar.

Haraseth. See Kir-Haraseth.

Harbaugh, Henry, a prominent minister and writer of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born Oct. 28, 1817, near Waynesborough, Pa. He was descended from a German family, whose name was Herbach, and which had come to this country in 1736 from Switzerland. His father was an elder in the German Reformed Church at Waynesborough. In early youth he manifested a desire to study for the ministry, but his father was unwilling to allow him to do so. He therefore found employment first with a carpenter, and subsequently with a mill-owner. After a time he became teacher in a primary school. The money saved in these positions enabled him to enter in 1840 Marshall College, Mercersburg, which was at that time under the direction of Dr. Nevin. Both the students' societies of Mercersburg College desired to have him a member. "We have many praying members," the Goetheans represented to him; "the others have no religion." For Harbaugh this was a reason to join the other society, that they might have one to do the praying for them. His financial means did not allow him to finish his course in the college and the Theological Seminary. He spent two years in the former and one in the latter, and, having passed his examination, became in 1843 pastor of the congregation in Lewisburg. In 1850 he accepted a call from the congregation in Lancaster, which he left again in 1860 for Lebanon. In 1863 he was elected by the Synod professor of theology in the Seminary of Mercersburg, in the place of Prof. B. C. Wolff. In this position he remained until his death, which occurred Dec. 28, 1867. Harbaugh was an indefatigable worker, and it was overexertion that brought on the disease of the brain by which he was carried off. The loss of his wife and a child in 1847 directed his thoughts to a special consideration of the state after death, and thus called for his works on *Heaven, or the Sainted Dead:—The Heavenly Home:—The Heavenly Recognition:—Future Life* (3 vols.). Besides these, he wrote *The Golden Censer*, a collection of "hymns and chants" for Sabbath-schools:—*A Child's Catechism:—The Glory of Woman:*—a volume of *Poems:—Union with the Church:—Youth in Earnest—Life of Th. D. Fischer:*—and a *Life of Michael Schlatter*, one of the founders of the German Reformed Church in America in the last century. His most important work is the one on *The Fathers of the German Reformed Church in America* (2 vols.). At the time of his death he was editor of the *Mercersburg Review*, and also a regular contributor to the columns of the *Reformed Church Messenger*, which latter relation he sustained during the last six years. He was likewise the originator of the *Guardian*, and its editor for seventeen years, to the close of 1866, during four of which it was published under the direction of the Board of Publication of the German Reformed Church. In addition to this, he furnished the reading matter for the several almanacs published by this board, and edited the *Child's Treasury* for the first year and a half after it came under the direct control of the Church Board. Dr. Harbaugh also contributed a number of biographical articles to this Cyclopædia. While, for the works thus far mentioned, he used the English language, he is also the author of several excellent poems in the German-Pennsylvanian dialect. In fact, the poems of Harbaugh belong among the best that have ever been written in this dialect. In his theological views Harbaugh

was one of the foremost representatives of the school which emphasizes the efficiency of the sacraments, and the priestly character of the ministry. In the *Order of Worship* of the German Reformed Church, which was published in 1866, the burial service was from the pen of Harbaugh. (A. J. S.)

Harbo'na (Heb. *Charbona'*, חַרְבוֹנָא, prob. Pers. for *ass-driver;* Sept. Ὀαρεβωά v. r. Θαῤῥά), one of the seven eunuchs of king Ahasuerus or Xerxes, commanded by him to exhibit the beauty of Vashti (Esth. i, 10). He was probably the same with the one called HARBONAH (Heb. *Charbonah,'* חַרְבוֹנָה, *id.;* Sept. changes to Βουγαθάν), who suggested to the king the idea of hanging Haman on his own gallows (chap. vii, 9). B.C. 483–473.

Harbo'nah (Esth. vii, 9). See HARBONA.

Hardenberg, Albrecht, an eminent divine, was born at Hardenberg, in Overyssel, 1510. While studying theology at Louvain, he imbibed the reformed theology, and became a friend and follower of Melancthon, who sent him to Cologne. The disturbances there drove him to Oldenburg, where, and in Knyphausen, he labored until his death in 1574. He is noted in Church History for his attempt, in 1556, to introduce into the republic of Bremen Calvin's doctrine respecting the Lord's Supper. For the controversy to which this gave rise, see Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, s. v.; also Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xvi, sec. iii, pt. ii, ch. ii; Planck, *Hist. Prot. Theol.* vol. v.

Hardenberg, Jacobus Rutsen, D.D., an eminent minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Rosendale, N. Y., in 1737. His early opportunities of education were limited, but by persevering industry he became a very creditable scholar. He was ordained by the "Coetus" in 1757, and in the long strife between that party and the "Conferenties" in the Dutch Church, he sided with the former. His talents and reputation gave him great influence in the final settlement of these disputes. In 1758 he became pastor of the church at Raritan, N. J. Queen's College (now Rutgers') obtained its charter in 1770. It languished during the Revolution, but was resuscitated, with Dr. Hardenberg at its head as president, in 1786. He died Oct. 30, 1790.—Sprague, *Annals*, ix, 28. See REFORMED (DUTCH) CHURCH.

Harding, Stephen, a religious reformer of the 12th century, was of a noble English family. After making a pilgrimage to Rome, he entered the Benedictine convent of St. Claude de Joux. He subsequently was chosen abbot of the monastery of Bèze, with a view to the reformation of its discipline. From Bèze he was transferred to Citeaux, of which monastery he was elected abbot in 1109, on the death of Alberic. In 1119 he drew up, conjointly with St. Bernard (of Clairvaux) and other members of the brotherhood, the constitution of the Cistercian order, entitled *Carta Caritatis*. He remained at the head of the order until his death in 1134. See CISTERCIANS. (A. J. S.)

Harding, Thomas, Jesuit, was born at Comb-Martin, in Devonshire, in 1512, "and was educated at Barnstaple and Winchester, whence he was removed to New College, Oxford, of which he became fellow in 1536. In 1542 he was chosen Hebrew professor of the university by Henry VIII; but no sooner had Edward VI ascended the throne, than Harding became a zealous Protestant. He seemed, indeed, merely to be restrained by prudence from proceeding to great extremes. In the country zealous Protestants were edified by his instructions. At Oxford, he himself received instruction from Peter Martyr. From St. Mary's pulpit he derided the Tridentine fathers as *illiterate, paltry papists*, and inveighed against Romish peculiarities." On the accession of queen Mary he became again a papist, and was made chaplain and confessor to Gardiner, bishop of Winchester. In 1555 he was made treasurer of the cathedral of Salisbury. "When Elizabeth came to the crown he could not muster face for a new recantation, and being deprived of his preferment, fled to Louvain, and became, says Wood, "the target of Popery" in a warm controversy with bishop Jewel, against whom, between 1554 and 1567, he wrote seven pieces." He died in 1572. See *Life of Jewel; Zürich Letters;* Burnet, *Reformation*, i, 271; Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. i; Dodd, *Church Hist.;* Prince, *Worthies of Devon;* Chalmers, *General Biog. Dict.;* Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vol. v.

Hardouin (HARDUINUS), JEAN, a Jesuit, one of the most learned, but most eccentric members of his order, was born A.D. 1646, at Quimper, in Brittany. His paradoxes on ancient history are well known, and had their origin chiefly in the vanity which prompted him to obtain celebrity at any cost. He endeavored to prove that the Æneid ascribed to Virgil, and the odes attributed to Horace, were really composed by some monks during the Middle Ages! He edited an edition of the Councils to the year 1714 (12 vols. fol.), which is much esteemed. See CONCILIA. This may appear singular, considering that Hardouin looked upon all councils preceding that of Trent as supposititious. Father Brun, of the Oratory, knowing the opinions of the Jesuit on that point, asked him one day, "How did it happen that you published an edition of the Councils?" Hardouin answered, "Only God and I know that." He died at the College of St. Louis, Paris, Sept. 3, 1729. His most noted work is his *Chronologiæ ex Nummis Antiquis restitutæ Prolusio de Nummis Herodiadum* (Paris, 1693, 4to), in which he labors to show that, with few exceptions, the writings ascribed to the ancients are wholly spurious. He wrote also *Chronologia Vet. Testamenti* (Paris, 1697, 4to):—*Commentarius in Nov. Test.* (Amst. 1741, fol.):—*De situ Paradisi Terrestris Disquisitio* (in his edit. of Pliny):—*Plinii Historia Naturalis* (in the Delphin classics):—*Opera selecta* (1709, fol.). His *Opera Omnia* (Amsterdam, 1733, fol.) contains some curious pieces, among which are his *Pseudo-Virgilius, Pseudo-Horatius*, and especially his *Athei detecti*, against Jansenius, Arnauld, Nicole, Pascal, Quesnel, Des Cartes, etc. A posthumous work of his, *Prolegomena ad Censuram Scriptorum Veterum* (1766, 8vo), contains his full theory of the production of the classics by the monks of the Middle Ages. See P. Oudin, *Éloges de quelques auteurs français;* Moreri, *Grand Dict. histor.;* Dupin, *Bibl. des auteurs ecclés.* xix, 109; *Journ. des Savants*, June, 1726, p. 226; March, 1727, p. 328; January–April, 1728, p. 579; La Croze, *Dissert. hist. sur divers sujets*, p. 231; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 357.

Hardt, HERMANN VON DER. See HERMANN.

Hardwick, CHARLES, a minister of the Church of England, was born at Slingsby, Yorkshire, September 22, 1821. At fifteen years of age he became pupil assistant teacher in Thornton Grammar-school, and in 1838 he was made assistant tutor in the academy at Malton. In 1840 he entered the University of Cambridge (Catharine's Hall), graduating in 1844 as first senior optime. In 1845 he obtained a fellowship in Catharine's Hall; in 1851 he was appointed Cambridge preacher at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall; and in 1853, professor of divinity in Queen's College, Birmingham, which office he held only for a few months. In 1855 he was made lecturer in divinity in King's College, Cambridge, and "Christian Advocate." In fulfilling the latter office, he prepared a work (incomplete, but yet of great value to the new science of Comparative Theology), under the title *Christ and other Masters; an Historical Inquiry into some of the chief Parallelisms and Contrasts between Christianity and the Religious Systems of the Ancient World* (London and Cambridge, 2d edit. 1853, 2 vols. fcp. 8vo). During a summer tour he was killed by a fall in the Pyrenees, Aug. 18, 1859. His literary activity was very great, and it was accompanied by thorough scholarship and accuracy. Besides editing a number of works for the University press and for the Percy Society, he pub-

lished the following, which are likely to hold a durable place in theological literature, viz., *A History of the Thirty-nine Articles* (Cambridge, 1851; 2d ed. revised, 1859; reprinted in Philadelphia, 12mo):—*Twenty Sermons for Town Congregations* (1853, cr. 8vo):—*A History of the Christian Church, Middle Age* (Cambridge, 1853, fcp. 8vo):—*A History of the Christian Church during the Reformation* (Cambridge, 1856, fcp. 8vo).—*Sketch prefixed to second edition of Christ and other Masters* (1863).

Hardy, Nathaniel, D.D., an English divine, was born in London in 1618; was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and became rector of St. Dionis Back, London. He was a decided Royalist, and yet remained a popular preacher during the Commonwealth. In 1660 he became archdeacon of Lewes and dean of Rochester. He died in 1670. His publications are, *The first Epistle of John unfolded and applied* (Lond. 1656, 4to):—*Sermons on solemn Occasions* (London, 1658, 4to):—*Sermon on the Fire of London* (Lond. 1666, 4to).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1394.

Hardy, Robert Spence, an English Methodist missionary, was born at Preston, Lancashire, July 1, 1803, and was trained in the house of his grandfather, a printer and bookseller in York. In 1825 he was admitted to the British Conference, and appointed missionary to Ceylon, in which field he labored with great zeal for twenty-three years. In 1862 he was appointed superintendent of the South Ceylon Mission. To the ordinary labors of a missionary Mr. Hardy added an amount of literary activity sufficient to have occupied the whole life of an ordinary man. It is not too much to say that he and his colleague Gogerly (q. v.) have thrown more light upon the Buddhism of Ceylon, and upon Pali literature, than all other English writers. His culture, in the course of his studies, became very wide; he read Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, Portuguese, and Singhalese; and his acquaintance with the Pali and Sanscrit was not only large, but accurate. Towards the end of his life he returned to England, and served as minister on several important circuits. He died at Headingley, Yorkshire, April 16, 1868. At the time of his mortal seizure he was engaged upon a work entitled *Christianity and Buddhism compared.* His most important publications are *Eastern Monachism, an Account of the Origin, Laws, Discipline, Sacred Writings, etc. of the Order of Mendicants founded by Gotama Buddha* (London, 1850, 8vo):—*A Manual of Buddhism in its Modern Development, translated from Singhalese MSS.* (Lond. 1853, 8vo):—*The Legends and Theories of the Buddhists compared with History and Science* (1867, cr. 8vo).—*Wesleyan Minutes*, 1868, p. 25.

Hardy, Samuel, an English divine, was born in 1720, and educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he became fellow. He was for many years rector of Blakenham, Suffolk, and died in 1793. He published *Nature and Ends of the Eucharist* (London, 1784, 8vo):—*Principal Prophecies of the O. and N. Test. compared and explained* (London, 1770, 8vo):—*Novum Test. Græcum cum scholiis theologicis*, etc. (3d ed. Lond. 1820, 2 vols. 8vo), the annotations in which are chiefly taken from Poole's Synopsis.—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1395.

Hare (אַרְנֶבֶת, *arne'beth;* according to Bochart [*Hieroz.* i, 994], from אָרָה, to *crop*, and נִיב, *fruit;* Arab. *arneb* and Syr. *arnebo*, a *hare;* Sept. χοιρογρύλλιος and δασύπους, Vulg. *lepus* and *chærogryllus*, both versions interchanging it with "coney") occurs in Lev. xi, 6, and Deut. xiv, 7, and in both instances it is prohibited from being used as food because it chews the cud, although it has not the hoof divided. But the hare belongs to an order of mammals totally distinct from the ruminantia, which are all, without exception, bisulca, the camel's hoof alone offering a partial modification (Ehrenberg, *Mammalia*, pt. ii). The stomach of rodents is single, and the motion of the mouth, excepting when they masticate some small portion of food reserved in the hollow of the cheek, is more that of the lips, when in a state of repose the animals are engaged in working the incisor teeth upon each other. This practice is a necessary condition of existence, for the friction keeps them fit for the purpose of nibbling, and prevents their growing beyond a proper length. As hares do not subsist on hard substances, like most of the genera of the order, but on tender shoots and grasses, they have more cause, and therefore a more constant craving, to abrade their teeth; and this they do in a manner which, combined with the slight trituration of the occasional contents of the cheeks, even modern writers, not zoologists, have mistaken for real rumination.

Hare of Mount Sinai.

Physiological investigation having fully determined these questions, it follows that, both with regard to the shaphan ("coney") and the hare, we should understand the original in the above passages, rendered "chewing the cud," as merely implying a second mastication, more or less complete, and not necessarily that faculty of true ruminants which derives its name from a power to draw up aliment after deglutition, when worked into a ball, from the first stomach into the mouth, and there to submit it to a second grinding process. The act of "chewing the cud" and "re-chewing" being considered identical by the Hebrews, the sacred lawgiver, not being occupied with the doctrines of science, no doubt used the expression in the sense in which it was then understood (compare Michaelis, *Anmerk.* ad loc.). It may be added that a similar opinion, and con-

Hare of Mount Lebanon.

sequent rejection of the hare as food, pervaded many nations of antiquity, who derived their origin, or their doctrines, from a Shemitic source; and that, among others, it existed among the British Celtæ, probably even before they had any intercourse with Phœnician merchants. Thus the Turks and Armenians abstain from its flesh (Tavernier, *Travels*, iii, 154), also the Arabians (Russell's *Aleppo*, ii, 20), and even the Greeks and

Romans avoided it (Hermann, *ad Lucian. conscrib. hist.* p. 135; P. Castellan. *De carnis esu*, iii, 5, in Gronov. *Thesaur.* ix) on sanitary grounds (Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* iv, 5; Pliny, *H. N.* xxviii, 79); but the Bedawin, who have a peculiar mode of dressing it, are fond of its flesh.

There are two distinct species of hare in Syria: one, *Lepus Syriacus*, or Syrian hare, nearly equal in size to the common European, having the fur ochry buff; and *Lepus Sinaiticus*, or hare of the desert, smaller and brownish. They reside in the localities indicated by their trivial names, and are distinguished from the common hare by a greater length of ears, and a black tail with white fringe. There is found in Egypt, and higher up the Nile, a third species, represented in the outline paintings on ancient monuments, but not colored with that delicacy of tint required for distinguishing it from the others, excepting that it appears to be marked with the black speckles which characterize the existing species. The ancient Egyptians coursed it with greyhounds as we do, and sometimes captured it alive and kept it in cages. "Hares are so plentiful in the

Ancient Egyptian carrying Hares. From the Monuments.

environs of Aleppo," says Dr. Russell (ii, 158), "that it was no uncommon thing to see the gentlemen who went out a sporting twice a week return with four or five brace hung in triumph at the girths of the servants' horses." Hares are hunted in Syria with greyhound and falcon.

Hare, Augustus William (brother of Julius Charles, see below), was born in 1794, graduated at Oxford, became fellow of New College, and in 1829 rector of Alton Barnes, Wiltshire. In conjunction with his brother, he wrote *Guesses at Truth* (3d ed. Lond. 1847, 2 vols. 18mo). He also published *Sermons to a Country Congregation* (London, 4th ed. 1839, 7th ed. 1851; New York, 1839, 8vo), which are models of clear and practical discourse from the pulpit. He died in 1834 at Rome.

Hare, Edward, an English Methodist minister, was born at Hull Sept. 19, 1774, and received his early education under Milner, author of the *Church History*. Having a turn for the sea, he became a sailor, and in 1793, while a ship-boy, was converted, and began to hold religious services among the sailors. During the French war he was twice taken prisoner; and after his second liberation, in 1796, he abandoned the sea. He was admitted into the itinerant ministry of the Wesleyan Church in 1798, and for twenty years was an acceptable and faithful minister of the Gospel. His last station was Leeds. He died of consumption at Exeter in the spring of 1818. Hare was a clear and forcible writer, and produced several valuable apologetical and controversial works on Methodist doctrine. Perhaps the most important of these are *A Treatise on the Scriptural Doctrine of Justification* (2d ed., with Preface by T. Jackson, London, 1839, 12mo; also reprinted in New York, 12mo). See also *Sermons published from his Manuscripts, with a Memoir of Hare by Joseph Benson* (London, 1821).—*Wesleyan Minutes*, 1818; *Life of Dr. Jabez Bunting*, ch. xiv.

Hare, Francis, bishop of Chichester, was born at London about 1665. He studied at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge; and, having been employed as tutor to lord Blandford, son of the duke of Marlborough, the latter caused him to be appointed general chaplain of the army. In consequence of services rendered to the Whig party, he was successively made dean of Worcester in 1708, of St. Paul's in 1726, bishop of St. Asaph in 1731, and transferred in the same year to the see of Chichester. He died in 1740. He wrote a work on *The Difficulties and Discouragements attending the Study of the Scriptures in the Way of private Judgment*, which was condemned for its tendency to scepticism. He is chiefly famous for his *Book of Psalms, in the Hebrew, put into the original poetical Metre* (Psalmorum Liber in Versiculos metrice Divisus, Lond. 1736, 8vo), an attempt, now deemed hopeless, to reduce Hebrew poetry to metre, in which he was defended by Dr. Edwards, and assailed by Dr. Lowth. His *Works* were published in 4 vols. 8vo (Lond. 1746), containing, besides the writings above named, a number of *Sermons*. See Chalmers, *General Biog. Dict.*; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 785.

Hare, Julius Charles, one of the brightest ornaments of the Church of England in the present century, was born Sept. 13, 1795, at Hurstmonceux, Sussex, his father being lord of the manor. After a brilliant preparation at the Charter House, he went to Cambridge in 1812, where he graduated B.A. 1816, M.A. 1819, and became fellow of Trinity. He was instituted to the rectory of Hurstmonceux (the advowson of which was in his own family) in 1832; was collated to a prebend at Chichester in 1851; was appointed archdeacon of Lewes by bishop Otter in 1840; and nominated one of her majesty's chaplains in 1853. He died at the rectory, Jan. 23, 1855.

In 1827 he published the first edition of *Guesses at Truth*, but his name was first distinguished in the literary world as one of the translators of Niebuhr's *History of Rome*, in conjunction with Mr. Connop Thirlwall, the present bishop of St. David's. Their version was made from the second German edition, which materially differed from the first, and it was first published in the year 1828. It extends to the first and second volumes only of the standard English edition; the third and fourth were translated by Dr. William Smith and Dr. Leonard Schmitz. In 1829 Mr. Hare published, at Cambridge, *A Vindication of Niebuhr's History of Rome from the Charges of the Quarterly Review*. Archdeacon Hare's published works extend over a period of nearly thirty years. The most important of them are, *The Children of Light:* a Sermon for Advent (Cambridge, 1828, 8vo):—*Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge* (Feb. 1839):—*The Victory of Faith, and other Sermons* (Cambridge, 1840, 8vo):—*The Better Prospects of the Church: a Charge* (1840):—*Sermons preached at Hurstmonceux Church* (1841, 8vo; 2d vol. 1849):—*The Unity of the Church: a Sermon preached before the Chichester Diocesan Association* (1845, 8vo):—*The Mission of the Comforter, and other Sermons, with Notes* (1846, 2 vols. 8vo; Amer. edit. Boston, 1854, 12mo):—*The Means of Unity: a Charge, with Notes, especially on the Institution of the Anglican Bishopric at Jerusalem* (1847, 8vo):—*A Letter on the Agitation excited by the Appointment of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford* (1848, 8vo):—*Life and Writings of John Sterling* (1848, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Guesses at Truth, by two Brothers* (3d edit. 1848, 2 vols. 18mo):—*The Contest with Rome, especially in reply to Dr. Newman* (Lond. 1852, 8vo):—*Vindication of Luther* (Lond. 1854, 8vo). This last is a book of vigorous controversy, and refutes, both on critical and moral grounds, the charges brought against the memory of Luther by Hallam, Newman, Ward, and Sir William Hamilton. These writers are handled by Hare with great, but not unjust severity. There are two admirable articles on Hare, giving a candid and judicious criticism of his career as philosopher, controversialist, and theologian, in

the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, April and July, 1856; reproduced by the author, Rev. J. H. Rigg, in his *Modern Anglican Theology* (London, 1858, 12mo). See also *Gentleman's Magazine*, April, 1855; *Quarterly Review* (London), July, 1855; *Blackwood's Magazine*, xliii, 287; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 785.

Harel (Heb. with the art. *ha-Harel'*, הַהַרְאֵל, *the mount of God;* Sept. τὸ ἀριήλ, Vulg. *Ariel*, Engl. Vers. "the altar," marg. "Harel"), a figurative name for the altar of burnt-offering (Ezek. xliii, 15, first clause), called (in the last clause and in ver. 16) ARIEL (Engl. Version also "altar"). "Junius explains it of the ἰσχάρα or hearth of the altar of burnt-offering, covered by the network on which the sacrifices were placed over the burning wood. This explanation Gesenius adopts, and brings forward as a parallel the Arab. *ireh*, 'a hearth or fireplace,' akin to the Heb. אוּר, *ûr*, 'light, flame.' Fürst (*Handw.* s. v.) derives it from an unused root חָרָא, *hârâ*, 'to glow, burn,' with the termination *-el;* but the only authority for the root is its presumed existence in the word *Harel.* Ewald (*Die Propheten des A. B.* ii, 373) identifies Harel and Ariel, and refers them both to a root אָרָה, *ârâh*, akin to אוּר, *ûr*"

Harem. See HOUSE; POLYGAMY.

Haren, JEAN DE, a Belgian theologian, was born at Valenciennes about 1540. While yet a youth he went to Geneva, where he was well received by Calvin. He was present at the death-bed of the reformer (1564), and was for eighteen years a Protestant minister in several cities. He finally joined the Roman Catholic Church at Antwerp, March 3, 1586, and preached at Venloo, Cologne, Aix-la-Chapelle, Nancy, etc. He returned to Calvinism in 1610, and died about 1620. He wrote *Brief Discours des causes justes et équitables qui ont meues M. Jean Haren, jadis ministre, de quitter la religion prétendue réformée, pour se ranger au giron de l'Eglise catholique*, etc. (Anvers, 1587, 12mo):—thirteen *Catéchèses contre Calvin et les calvinistes* (Nancy, 1599, 12mo):—*Profession catholique de Jean Haren* (Nancy, 1599, 12mo):—*Epître et Demande chrestienne de Jean Haren à Ambroise Wille, ministre des estrangers walons retirez en la ville d'Aix-la-Chapelle* (Nancy, 1599, 12mo). See Calmet, *Bibl. de Lorraine*, p. 479; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 380.

Ha'reph (Heb. *Chareph'*, חָרֵף, *plucking* off; Sept. Ἀρεί v. r. Ἀρίμ), the "father" of Beth-Gader, and "son" of Caleb of Judah by one of his legitimate wives (1 Chron. ii, 51). B.C. cir. 1612. The patronymic "Haruphite" (q. v.) seems to connect this with HARIPH.

Hareseth. See KIR-HARESETH.

Haresh. See KIR-HARESH.

Haresha. See TEL-HARESHA.

Ha'reth (Heb. *Che'reth*, חֶרֶת, the form חָרֶת, *Châ'reth*, is on account of the pause-accent; prob. i. q. חֹרֶשׁ, a *thicket;* Sept. Χαρήθ v. r. [ἐν] πόλει [apparently reading עִיר; so Josephus, *Ant.* vi, 12, 4], Vulg. *Haret*), a wood (יַעַר) in the mountains of Judah, where David hid himself from Saul, at the instance of the prophet Gad (1 Sam. xxii, 5); probably situated among the hills west of Socho. See FOREST.

Harhaï'ah (Heb. *Charhayah'*, חַרְהֲיָה, *zeal of Jehovah;* Sept. Ἀραχίας), the father of Uzziel "of the goldsmiths," which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the Captivity (Neh. iii, 8). B.C. ante 446.

Har'has (2 Kings xxii, 14). See HASRAH.

Har'hur (Heb. *Charchur'*, חַרְחוּר, *fever*, as in Deut. xxviii, 22; Sept. Ἀρούρ), one of the Nethinim whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 51; Neh. vii, 53). B.C. 536.

Harid. See HADID.

Ha'rim (Heb. *Charim'*, חָרִם, for חָרִים, i. q. חָרוּם, *flat*-nosed; Sept. Ἠράμ, but with many v. rr. especially Χαρήμ in 1 Chron. xxiv, 8, Ἠρίμ in Ezra ii, 39, Ἰράμ in Neh. x, 5, and Ἀρί in Neh. xii, 15), the name of several men, mostly about the time of the Captivity.

1. The head of the second "course" of priests as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 8). B.C. 1014.

2. Apparently an Israelite, whose descendants, to the number of 320 males, or 1017 in all, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 32, 39; Neh. vii, 35, 42. But as among these some are enumerated (Ezra x, 21) as priests in the corresponding lists of those who renounced their Gentile wives, and others (Ezra x, 31) as ordinary Israelites, it may be doubted whether Harim was not rather a place whose inhabitants are here spoken of, like others in the same list. Accordingly, Schwarz identifies it with a village *Charim*, situated, according to him, on a bay of the sea eight Eng. miles north-east of Jaffa (*Palest.* p. 142). He probably means *el-Haram*-Ali-Ibn-Aleim (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 46), but his explanation of the compound name is not at all satisfactory. A better supposition, perhaps, is that Harim in these latter passages stands patronymically as a representation of the family, q. d. *Bene-Harim.* See ELAM.

3. The father of Malchijah, which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 11). B.C. ante 446. Perhaps identical with No. 2.

4. One of the priests that returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 3, where the name is given as REHUM; but compare ver. 15, where his son Adna is named). B.C. 536. Perhaps the same as No. 3.

5. One of those named first among the signers of the sacred covenant of Nehemiah (Neh. x, 5). B.C. cir. 410. Perhaps i. q. No. 3.

6. Another, a chief of the people, in the same list (ver. 27). B.C. cir. 410. Perhaps to be explained like No. 2.

Har'iph (Heb. *Chariph'*, חָרִיף, *autumnal* rain; Sept. Ἀρείμ, Ἀρίφ), the name apparently of two men.

1. An Israelite whose descendants (or possibly a place whose inhabitants), to the number of 112, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii, 24). In Ezra ii, 18, the name is written in the synonymous form JORAH. B.C. ante 536. Perhaps identical with the HAREPH of 1 Chron. ii, 51. See HARUPHITE.

2. One of the chief of the people who subscribed the covenant of fidelity to Jehovah with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 19). B.C. cir. 410. Perhaps the name is here only a patronymic contraction for *Ben-Hariph.* See HARIM.

Harlay-Chanvallon, FRANCIS DE, archbishop of Rouen and afterwards of Paris, was born in the latter city Aug. 14, 1625. He studied at the College of Navarre, and was immediately appointed abbot of Jumièges by his uncle, the archbishop of Rouen, whom he succeeded in office, Dec. 28, 1651. The looseness of his morals ill fitted him for such a position; yet, connecting himself with cardinal Mazarin, he managed to indulge his evil propensities without losing his credit. He represented the clergy at the coronation of Louis XIV in 1654, and is said to have officiated at the marriage of this king with madame de Maintenon. His name, his fortune, and the flatteries he showered upon the king caused him to be made archbishop of Paris Jan. 3, 1671, and he received numerous other marks of the royal favor. He died at Conflans, where he possessed a fine estate, Aug. 6, 1695. A ready eloquence was joined in him to great ambition, the utmost want of principles, and great intolerance. At Dieppe, where he was master as temporal lord, he obliged the Protestants to come to the cathedral and listen to the sermons he delivered as spiritual lord. He was one of the prime movers of the revocation of the edict of Nantes. Although a member of the French Academy, and very fond of making speeches, none of his discourses were published. He published, however, the *Synodicon Parisiense*, an ac-

count of all the synods held by his predecessors. See Legendre, *Vie de Harlay* (Par. 1720, 4to); Sévigné, *Lettres* (1818), x, 121, 128); Bausset, *Hist. de Fénelon* (2d ed.), i, 51, 55; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 403.

Harlot, WHORE, etc., are terms used somewhat promiscuously in the Auth. Vers. for several Heb. words of widely different import.

1. Properly זוֹנָה (*zonah'*, participle from זָנָה, *to play the harlot*, Sept. πόρνη, Vulg. *meretrix*, both these latter terms referring to prostitution for *mercenary* motives), which occurs frequently, and is often rendered in our version by the first of the above English words, as in Gen. xxxiv, 31, etc., and sometimes, without apparent reason for the change, by the second, as in Prov. xxiii, 27, and elsewhere. In Gen. xxxviii, 15, the word is זוֹנָה, "harlot," which, however, becomes changed to קְדֵשָׁה, "harlot," in vers. 21, 22, which means, literally, a *consecrated* woman, a female (perhaps priestess) devoted to prostitution in honor of some *heathen* idol. The distinction shows that Judah supposed Tamar to be a *heathen:* the facts, therefore, do not prove that prostitution was then practised between *Hebrews*.

That this condition of persons existed in the earliest states of society is clear from Gen. xxxviii, 15. From that account it would appear that the "veil" was at that time peculiar to harlots. Judah thought Tamar to be such "*because* she had covered her face." Mr. Buckingham remarks, in reference to this passage, that "the Turcoman women go unveiled to this day" (*Travels in Mesopotamia*, i, 77). It is contended by Jahn and others that in ancient times all females wore the veil (*Bibl. Archæol.* p. 127). Possibly some peculiarity in the size of the veil, or the mode of wearing it, may have been (Prov. vii, 10) the distinctive dress of the harlot at that period (see New Translation, by the Rev. A. De Sola, etc., p. 116, 248–9). The priests and the high-priest were forbidden to take a wife that was (*had been*, Lev. xxi, 14) a harlot. Josephus extends the law to all the Hebrews, and seems to ground it on the prohibition against oblations arising from prostitution, Deut. xxiii, 18 (*Ant.* iv, 8, 23). The celebrated case of Rahab has been much debated. She is, indeed, called by the word usually signifying harlot (Josh. ii, 1; vi, 17; Sept. πόρνη; Vulg. *meretrix;* and in Heb. xi, 31; James ii, 25); but it has been attempted to show that the word may mean an innkeeper. See RAHAB. If, however, there were such persons, considering what we know of Canaanitish morals (Lev. xviii, 27), we may conclude that they would, if women, have been of this class. The next instance introduces the epithet of "strange woman." It is the case of Jephthah's mother (Judg. xi, 2), who is *also* called a harlot (πόρνη; *meretrix*); but the epithet אִשָּׁה אַחֶרֶת (*achereth*), "*strange* woman," merely denotes *foreign extraction.* Josephus says ξένος περὶ τὴν μητέρα, "a stranger by the mother's side." The masterly description in Prov. vii, 6, etc. may possibly be that of an abandoned *married* woman (ver. 19, 20), or of the solicitations of a courtesan, "fair speech," under such a pretension. The mixture of religious observances (ver. 14) seems illustrated by the fact that "the gods are actually worshipped in many Oriental brothels, and fragments of the offerings distributed among the frequenters" (Dr. A. Clarke's *Comment.* ad loc.). The representation given by Solomon is no doubt *founded* upon facts, and therefore shows that in his time prostitutes plied their trade in the "streets" (Prov. vii, 12; ix, 14, etc.; Jer. iii, 2; Ezek. xvi, 24, 25, 31). As regards the fashions involved in the practice, similar outward marks seem to have attended its earliest forms to those which we trace in the classical writers, e. g. a distinctive dress and a seat by the way-side (Gen. xxxviii, 14; compare Ezek. xvi, 16, 25; Bar. vi, 43; Petron. Arb. *Sat.* xvi; Juv. vi, 118 foll.; Dougtaei *Analect. Sacr.* Exc. xxiv). Public singing in the streets occurs also (Isa. xxiii, 16; Ecclus. ix, 4). Those who thus published their infamy were of the worst repute; others had houses of resort, and both classes seem to have been known among the Jews (Prov. vii, 8-12; xxiii, 28; Ecclus. ix, 7, 8); the two women, 1 Kings iii, 16, lived as Greek hetæræ sometimes did, in a house together (Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Roman Ant.* s. v. Hetæra). The baneful fascination ascribed to them in Prov. vii, 21–23, may be compared with what Chardin says of similar effects among the young nobility of Persia (*Voyages en Perse*, i, 163, ed. 1711), as also may Luke xv, 30, for the sums lavished on them (*ib.* 162). In earlier times the price of a kid is mentioned (Gen. xxxviii), and great wealth doubtless sometimes accrued to them (Ezek. xvi, 33, 39; xxiii, 26). But lust, as distinct from gain, appears as the inducement in Prov. vii, 14, 15 (see Dougtaei *Anal. Sacr.* ad loc.), where the victim is further allured by a promised sacrificial banquet (comp. Ter. *Eun.* iii, 3). The "harlots" are classed with "publicans," as those who lay under the ban of society in the N. T. (Matt. xxi, 32). No doubt they multiplied with the increase of polygamy, and consequently lowered the estimate of marriage. The corrupt practices imported by Gentile converts into the Church occasion most of the other passages in which allusions to the subject there occur, 1 Cor. v, 1, 9, 11; 2 Cor. xii, 21; 1 Thess. iv, 3; 1 Tim. i, 10. The decree, Acts xv, 29, has occasioned doubts as to the meaning of πορνεία there, chiefly from its context, which may be seen discussed at length in Deyling's *Observ. Sacr.* ii, 470, sq.; Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* i, 468; Spencer and Hammond, ad loc. The simplest sense, however, seems the most probable. The children of such persons were held in contempt, and could not exercise privileges nor inherit (John viii, 41; Deut. xxiii, 2; Judg. xi, 1, 2). The term "bastard" is not, however, applied to any illegitimate offspring born out of wedlock, but is restricted by the Rabbins to the issue of any connection within the degrees prohibited by the law. A *mamzêr*, according to the Mishna (*Yebamoth*, iv, 13), is one, says R. Akiba, who is born of relations between whom marriage is forbidden. Simeon the Temanite says it is every one whose parents are liable to the punishment of "cutting off" by the hands of Heaven; R. Joshua, every one whose parents are liable to death by the house of judgment, as, for instance, the offspring of adultery. On the general subject, Michaelis's *Laws of Moses*, bk. v, art. 268; Selden, *De Ux. Hebr.* i, 16; iii. 12; and *De Jur. Natur.* v, 4, together with Schöttgen, and the authorities there quoted, may be consulted.

The words וְהַזֹּנוֹת רָחָצוּ, A.V. "and they washed his armor" (1 Kings xxii, 38), should be, "and the harlots washed," which is not only the natural rendering, but in accordance with the Sept. and Josephus.

Since the Hebrews regarded Jehovah as the husband of his people, by virtue of the covenant he had made with them (Jer. iii, 1), therefore to *commit fornication* is a very common metaphor in the Scriptures to denote defection on their part from that covenant, and especially by the practice of idolatry. See FORNICATION. Hence the degeneracy of Jerusalem is illustrated by the symbol of a harlot (Isa. i, 21), and even that of heathen cities, as of Nineveh (Nah. iii, 4). Under this figure the prophet Ezekiel delivers the tremendous invectives contained in chaps. xvi, xxiii. In the prophecy of Hosea the illustration is carried to a startling extent. The prophet seems commanded by the Lord to take "a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms" (i, 2), and "to love an adulteress" (iii, 1). It has, indeed, been much disputed whether these transactions were real, or passed in vision only; but the idea itself, and the diversified applications of it throughout the prophecy, render it one of the most effective portions of Scripture. See HOSEA.

2. קְדֵשָׁה (*kedeshah'*, from קָדַשׁ, *to consecrate*, occurs Gen. xxxviii, 15, 21, 22; Deut. xxiii, 17; Hos. iv, 14). It has already been observed that the proper meaning of the word is *consecrated prostitute.* The very early

allusion to such persons, in the *first* of these passages, agrees with the accounts of them in ancient heathen writers. Herodotus refers to the "abominable custom of the Babylonians, who compelled every native female to attend the temple of Venus once in her life, and to prostitute herself in honor of the goddess" (i, 199; Baruch, vi, 43). Strabo calls prostitutes, who, it is well known, were at Athens dedicated to Venus, ἱερόδουλοι γυναῖκες, "consecrated servants," "votaries" (*Geog.* viii, 378; Grotius, *Annotat. on Baruch;* Beloe's *Herodotus*, Notes, i, 272, Lond. 1806). The transaction related in Numb. xv, 1-15 (compare Psa. cvi, 28) seems connected with idolatry. The prohibition in Deut. xxiii, 17, "there shall be no קְדֵשָׁה, 'whore,' of the daughters of Israel," is intended to exclude such *devotees* from the worship of Jehovah (see other allusions, Job xxxvi, 14; 1 Kings xiv, 24; xv, 12). The law forbids (Lev. xix, 29) the father's compelling his daughter to sin, but does not mention it as a voluntary mode of life on her part without his complicity. It could, indeed, hardly be so. The provision of Lev. xxi, 9, regarding the priest's daughter, may have arisen from the fact of his home being less guarded, owing to his absence when ministering, as well as from the scandal to sanctity so involved. Perhaps such abominations might, if not thus severely marked, lead the way to the excesses of Gentile ritualistic fornication, to which, indeed, when so near the sanctuary, they might be viewed as approximating (Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, art. 268). Yet it seems to be assumed that the harlot class would exist, and the prohibition of Deut. xxiii, 18, forbidding offerings from the wages of such sin, is perhaps due to the contagion of heathen example, in whose worship practices abounded which the Israelites were taught to abhor. The term there especially refers to the impure worship of the Syrian Astarte (Numb. xxv, 1; comp. Herod. i, 199; Justin, xviii, 5; Strabo, viii, 378; xii, 559; Val. Max. ii, 6, 15; August. *De Civ. Dei*, iv, 4), whose votaries, as idolatry progressed, would be recruited from the daughters of Israel; hence the common mention of both these sins in the Prophets, the one, indeed, being a metaphor of the other (Isa. i, 21; lvii, 8; Jer. ii, 20; comp. Exod. xxxiv, 15, 16; Jer. iii, 1, 2, 6; Ezek. xvi, xxiii; Hos. i, 2; ii, 4, 5; iv, 11, 13, 14, 15; v, 3). The latter class would grow up with the growth of great cities and of foreign intercourse, and hardly could enter into the view of the Mosaic institutes.

3. נָכְרִיָּה (*nokriyah'*, from נָכַר, to *ignore*), "the *strange* woman" (1 Kings xi, 1; Prov. v, 20; vi, 24; vii, 5; xxiii, 27; Sept. ἀλλοτρία; Vulg. *aliena, extranea*). It seems probable that some of the Hebrews in later times interpreted the prohibition against fornication (Deut. xxii, 41) as limited to females of their own nation, and that the "strange women" in question were Canaanites and other Gentiles (Josh. xxiii, 13). In the case of Solomon they are specified as Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites. The passages referred to discover the character of these females. To the same class belongs זָרָה (*zarah'*, from זוּר, to *turn* in as a visitor), "the *strange* woman" (Prov. v, 3, 20; xxii, 14; xxiii, 33; γύνη πόρνη, ἀλλοτρία; *meretrix, aliena, extranea*): it is sometimes found in full, אִשָּׁה זָרָה (Prov. ii, 16; vii, 5). To the same class of females likewise belongs אֵשֶׁת כְּסִילוּת (*kesiluth'*, *folly*), "the *foolish* woman," i. e. by a common association of ideas in the Shemitic dialects, *sinful* (Psa. xiv, 1). The description in Prov. ix, 14, etc. illustrates the character of the female so designated. To this may be added אֵשֶׁת רָע (*ra, wrong*), "the *evil* woman" (Prov. v, 24).

In the New Testament πόρνη occurs in Matt. xxi, 31, 32; Luke xv, 30; 1 Cor. vi, 15, 16; Heb. xi, 31; James ii, 25. In none of these passages does it *necessarily* imply prostitution for gain. The likeliest is Luke xv, 30. It is used symbolically for a city in Rev. xvii, 1, 5, 15, 16; xix, 2, where the term and all the attendant imagery are derived from the Old Testament. It may be observed in regard to Tyre, which (Isa. xxiii, 15, 17) is represented as "committing fornication with all the kingdoms of the world upon the face of the earth," that these words, as indeed seems likely from those which follow, may relate to the various arts which she had employed to induce *merchants* to trade with her (Patrick, ad loc.). So the Sept. understood it, ἔσται ἐμπόριον πάσαις ταῖς βασιλείαις τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς. Schleusner observes that the same words in Rev. xviii, 3 *may* also relate to *commercial dealings*. (Fesselii *Adversar. Sacr.* ii, 27, 1, 2 [Witteb. 1650]; Frisch, *De muliere peregrina ap. Hebr.* [Lips. 1744]). Compare PROSTITUTE.

Harmer, THOMAS, a learned dissenting divine of England, was born in Norwich in 1715, and became minister of a dissenting congregation at Wattesfield, Suffolk. He was much esteemed in the literary world for his attainments in Oriental literature and for his skill in antiquities. Availing himself of some MSS. of the celebrated Sir John Chardin, who had travelled into Persia and other Eastern countries, Harmer seized the idea of applying the information thus obtained to the illustration of many portions of the prophetical writings, and of the evangelists also. The first volume of the *Observations on various Passages of Scripture* appeared in 1764; in 1776 the work again made its appearance in two volumes octavo, and in 1787 were published two additional volumes; a fourth edition, in four volumes, was called for in a short time afterwards, and a fifth edition was edited by Adam Clarke (Lond. 1816, 4 vols. 8vo), with considerable additions and corrections, to which is prefixed a life of the author. Mr. Harmer also published *Outlines of a new Commentary on Solomon's Song* (Lond. 1768, 8vo); and a posthumous volume has appeared, entitled *The Miscellaneous Works of the Rev. Thomas Harmer*, with an introductory memoir by William Youngman (Lond. 1823, 8vo). Mr. Harmer died in 1788.—Jones, *Christian Biography;* Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 400.

Harmonists or **Harmonites**. See RAPPISTS.

Harmony, as a technical name of a Biblical work, is applied to books the object of which is to arrange the Scriptures in chronological order, so that the mutual agreement of the several parts may be rendered apparent, and the true succession of events clearly understood. With this view various scholars have compiled harmonies of the Old Testament, of the New, and of particular portions of both. Harmonies of the Old Testament exhibit the books disposed in chronological order, as is done by Lightfoot in his *Chronicle of the Times, and the Order of the Texts of the Old Testament*, and by Townsend in his *Old Testament arranged in historical and chronological Order.* Harmonies of the New Testament present the gospels and epistles distributed in like order, the latter being interspersed among the Acts of the Apostles. In this way Townsend has proceeded in his valuable work entitled *The New Testament arranged in chronological and historical Order.* Books, however, of this kind are so few in number that the term *harmony* is almost appropriated by usage to the *gospels.* It is this part of the New Testament which has chiefly occupied the attention of those inquirers whose object is to arrange the Scriptures in their true order. The memoirs of our Lord written by the four evangelists have chiefly occupied the thoughts of those who wish to show that they all agree, and mutually authenticate one another. Accordingly, such compositions are exceedingly numerous. The four gospels narrate the principal events connected with our Lord's abode on earth, from his birth to his ascension. There must therefore be a general resemblance between them, though that of John contains little in common with the others, being apparently supplementary to them. Yet there are considerable diversities, both in the order in which facts are narrated, and in the facts themselves. Hence

the difficulty of weaving the accounts of the four into a continuous and chronological history. Those portions of the gospels that relate to the *resurrection* of the Saviour have always presented the greatest obstacles to the compilers of harmonies, and it must be candidly admitted that the accounts of this remarkable event are not easily reconciled. Yet the labors of West and Townson, especially the latter, have served to remove the apparent contradictions. In addition to them may be mentioned Cranfield and Hales, who have endeavored to improve upon the attempts of their predecessors. See GOSPELS.

In connection with harmonies the term *diatessaron* frequently occurs. It denotes a continued narrative selected out of the four gospels, in which all repetitions of the same or similar words are avoided. It is thus the *result* of a harmony, since the latter, properly speaking, exhibits the entire texts of the four evangelists arranged in corresponding columns. In popular language the two are often used synonymously. See DIATESSARON.

The following questions relative to harmonies demand attention; and in treating them, we avail ourselves chiefly of the art. on the subject in Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v.

1. Have *all* or *any* of the evangelists observed chronological arrangement in their narratives? It was the opinion of Osiander and his followers that all the evangelists record the facts of the Saviour's history in their true order. When, therefore, the same transactions are placed in a different order by the writers, they were supposed to have happened more than once. It was assumed that they took place as often as they were differently arranged. This principle is too improbable to require refutation. Instead of endeavoring to solve difficulties, it boldly meets them with a clumsy expedient. Improbable, however, as the hypothesis is, it has been adopted by Macknight. It is our decided conviction that *all* the evangelists have not adhered to chronological arrangement.

The question then arises, have *all neglected* the order of time? Newcome and many others espouse this view. "Chronological order," says this writer, "is not precisely observed by any of the evangelists; John and Mark observe it most, and Matthew neglects it most." Bishop Marsh supposes that Matthew probably adhered to the order of time, because he was for the most part an eye-witness of the facts. The others, he thinks, neglected the succession of events. The reason assigned by the learned prelate in favor of Matthew's order is of no weight as long as the *inspiration* of Mark, Luke, and John is maintained. If they were infallibly directed in their compositions, they were in a condition equally favorable to *chronological* narration.

A close inspection of Matthew's Gospel will show that he did not intend to mark the true succession of events. He gives us no definite expressions to assist in arranging his materials in their proper order. Very frequently he passes from one occurrence to another without any note of time; sometimes he employs a *τότε*, sometimes *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις*, *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ*, or *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ*. Rarely is he so minute as to use *μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ* (xvii, 1). In short, time and place seem to have been subordinated to the grand object which he had in view, viz. the lively exhibition of Jesus in his person, works, and discourses. In pursuing this design, he has often brought together similar facts and addresses. Although, therefore, Kaiser founds upon the phrases we have adduced a conclusion the very reverse of ours, yet we believe that Matthew did not propose to follow chronological order. The contrary is obviously implied.

Mark, again, is still more indefinite than Matthew. Even the *general* expressions found in the first gospel are wanting in his. The facts themselves, not their true succession, were the object of his attention. Chronological order is not observed in his gospel, except in so far as that gospel agrees with Luke's. Yet Cartwright, in his *Harmony*, published about 1630, makes the arrangement of Mark his rule for method.

With regard to Luke, it is probable that he intended to arrange everything in its true place, because at the beginning of his work he employs the term *καθεξῆς*. This word is often referred to *succession of events*, without involving *time;* but it seems clearly to imply *chronological* succession (compare Acts xi, 4). Although, therefore, Grotius and many others oppose the latter view, we cannot but coincide with Beza when he says: "In harmonia Evangelistarum scribenda, rectiorem ordinem servari putem si in iis quæ habent communia, reliqui ad Lucam potius accommodentur, quam Lucas ad cæteros" (comp. also Olshausen, *Die Echtheit der vier Canon. Evang.* etc., i, 82–3, 3d ed.). We may therefore conclude that this evangelist usually follows the chronological order, especially when such passages as iii, 1 and iii, 23 are considered, where exact notices of time occur. But as the gospel advances, those expressions which relate to time are as indeterminate as Matthew's and Mark's. Frequently does he pass from one transaction to another without any note of time; and again, he has *μετὰ ταῦτα, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν*. In consequence of this vagueness, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to make out a complete harmony of the gospels according to the order of Luke, because we have no precise data to guide us in inserting the particulars related by Matthew and Mark in their proper places in the third gospel. All that can be determined with any degree of probability is that Luke's order seems to have been adopted as the true, chronological one. Whether the writer has deviated from it in any case may admit of doubt. We are inclined to believe that in *all minute particulars* chronological arrangement is not observed. The *general body* of facts and events seems to partake of this character, not *every special circumstance* noticed by the evangelist. But we are reminded that the *assignment of dates* is distinct from *chronological arrangement*. A writer may narrate all his facts in the order in which they occurred, without specifying the particular time at which they happened; or, on the other hand, he may mark the dates without arranging his narrative in chronological order. But attention to one of these will naturally give rise to a certain opinion with regard to the other. The more indeterminate the notification of time, the less probable is it that time was an element kept before the mind of the writer. If there be a few dates assigned with exactness, it is a *presumption* that the true arrangement is observed in other parts where no dates occur. In the succession of events Luke and Mark generally agree.

With regard to John's Gospel, it has little in common with the rest except the last two chapters. It is obvious, however, that his arrangement is chronological. He carefully marks, in general, whether one, two, or three days happened between certain events. His gospel is therefore of great use in compiling a synopsis.

It thus appears that no one gospel taken singly is sufficient to form a guide for the Gospel harmonist; nor is he justified in selecting any one evangelist as a general guide, modifying that single narrative only as absolutely demanded by the statements of the other three. He must place them all together, and select from among them as the exigencies in each particular case may require. Of course he will take definite *notes of time* as a peremptory direction wherever they occur, and in the absence of these he will naturally follow the *order* of the majority of the Gospel narratives. Nor in this matter is he at liberty, as Stier has too often done (*Words of Jesus*, Am. ed., i, 31), to prefer one evangelist's authority to another, e. g. Matthew or John to Mark or Luke, on the ground that the former were *apostles* and the latter not, for they are all equally inspired. Again, the same liberty or discretion that is called for in arranging the order and date of the *acts* and journeys of our Lord must be exercised in adjusting his *words* and teachings; that is, the simple juxtaposi-

tion of passages is not absolute evidence of coincidence in time and immediate connection in utterance without some express intimation to that effect; so that incoherence, where palpable, or want of unanimity in this particular among the Gospel reports or summaries themselves, requires the harmonizer to exercise the same judgment in the adjustment as in other particulars. (See the *Meth. Quart. Review*, Jan. 1854, p. 79.) With these points premised and duly observed, there is no greater difficulty in adjusting the four accounts of our Lord's life and labors with a reasonable degree of certainty than there would be in harmonizing into one consistent account the separate and independent depositions of as many honest witnesses in any case of law. The only real questions of serious dispute in fact, aside from the main one presently to be mentioned, are those of a purely chronological character affecting the general date of Christ's ministry *as a whole*, and the particular *spot* where certain incidents or discourses transpired; the *relative* order and position of nearly everything is but little disturbed by the various theories or views as to even these points. Hence is evident the rashness of those who assert, like Stier (Pref. to Matt. and Mark, in *Words of Jesus*), that the construction of a Harmony of the Gospels is impracticable; for in the very same work he forthwith proceeds to construct and publish one himself!

2. What was the duration of our Lord's ministry? This is a question upon which the opinions of the learned have been much divided, and which cannot be settled with conclusive certainty. In order to resolve it, it is necessary to mark the different Passovers which Christ attended. Looking to the gospels by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, we should infer that he was present at no more than two: the first at the time of his baptism, the second immediately before his crucifixion. But in John's gospel *three* Passovers *at least* are named during the period of our Lord's ministry (ii, 13; vi, 4; xi, 55). It is true that some writers have endeavored to adapt the gospel of John to the other three by reducing the Passovers mentioned in the former to *two*. So Priestley, Vossius, and Mann. In order to accomplish this, it was conjectured that πάσχα, in ch. vi, 4, is an interpolation, and then that ἑορτή denotes some other Jewish festival. Bishop Pearce went so far as to conjecture that the *entire verse* has been interpolated. For these rash speculations there is no authority. The received reading must here be followed (Lücke's *Commentar über Johannes*, 3d ed. ii, 104). In addition to these passages, it has been thought by many that another Passover is referred to in v, 1, where, although πάσχα does not *occur*, ἡ ἑορτή is supposed to denote the same feast. But this is a subject of dispute. Irenæus is the oldest authority for explaining it of the Passover. Cyril and Chrysostom, however, referred it to the Feast of *Pentecost*, an opinion approved of by Erasmus, Calvin, and Beza; but Luther, Chemnitz, Calovius, Scaliger, Grotius, and Lightfoot returned to the ancient view of Irenæus. Keppler seems to have been the first who conjectured that it meant the Feast of *Purim* immediately preceding the second Passover. He was followed by Petau, Lamy, D'Outrein, etc. Cocceius, followed by Kaiser, referred it to the *Feast of Tabernacles;* while Keppler and Petau intimated that it *may possibly* have been the *Feast of Dedication*. Bengel defended the opinion of Chrysostom; while Hug, with much plausibility, endeavors to show that it alludes to the feast of *Purim* immediately before the Passover. The latter view is adopted by Tholuck, Olshausen, and Clausen, though Greswell maintains that the Passover is meant. It would occupy too much space to adduce the various considerations that have been urged for and against the two leading opinions, viz. the *Passover* and the *Feast of Purim*. The true meaning of ἑορτή (for Lachmann has rightly omitted the article from before it; see Tischendorf, *Nov. Test.* 7th ed. ad loc.) is still indeterminate (see especially Alford, *Gr. Test.* ad loc.). To us it appears most probable that the most ancient hypothesis is correct, although the circumstances urged against it are neither few nor feeble. The following arguments, however, seem to determine the question in favor of the *Passover:* 1. Had any less noted festival been meant, it would, as in other cases (see chap. vii, 2; x, 22), have been specified; but in the present case not even the article was required to distinguish it; whereas John in one instance only (vi, 4) uses πάσχα to qualify a following ἑορτή, when the latter is thus defined by τῶν Ἰουδαίων. 2. The ensuing Sabbath (δευτερόπρωτος of Luke vi, 1) can only be that which was second after the offering of the wave-sheaf, and first after the Passover-week, and, however interpreted, shows that a Passover had just preceded, for the harvest was just ripe. See PASSOVER.

Sir Isaac Newton and Macknight suppose that *five* Passovers intervened between our Lord's baptism and crucifixion. This assumption rests on no foundation. Perhaps the term ἑορτή in John vii, 2 may have given rise to it, although ἑορτή is explained in that passage by σκηνοπηγία.

During the first three centuries it was commonly believed that Christ's ministry lasted but one year, or one year and a few months (Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.* iv, 218). Such was the opinion of Clemens Alexandrinus (*Stromata*, i, 21; vi, 11) and Origen (*de Principiis*, iv, 5). Eusebius thought that it continued for above three years, which hypothesis became general. The ancient hypothesis, which confined the time to one year, was revived by Mann and Priestley; but Newcome, with more judgment, defended the common view, and refuted Priestley's arguments. The one-year view has found few late advocates except Jarvis (*Introd. to History of Church*) and Browne (*Ordo Sæclorum*). It has been well remarked by bishop Marsh that the Gospel of John presents almost insuperable obstacles to the opinion of those who confine Christ's ministry to one year. If John mentions but *three* Passovers, its duration must have exceeded two years; but if he mentions *four*, it must have been longer than three years. In interweaving the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke with that of John, the intervals between the Passovers are filled up by various transactions. Were the number of these feasts determinate and precise, there would be a general agreement in the filling up of the times between them; but in consequence of the uncertainty attaching to the subject, Harmonies are found materially to differ in their modes of arrangement. One thing is evident, that the moderns, in their endeavors after a chronological disposition of the gospels, adopt a far more rational course than the ancients. The latter strangely supposed that the first six chapters of John's Gospel relate to a period of Christ's ministry prior to that with which the other three evangelists begin their accounts of the miracles. Thus John *alone* was supposed to narrate the events belonging to the earlier part of his ministry, while Matthew, Mark, and Luke related the transactions of the last year.

The most ancient Harmony of the Gospels of which we have any account was composed by Tatian of Syria in the 2d century, but it is now lost (see H. A. Daniel's *Tatianus der Apologet.* Halle, 1837, 8vo). In the 3d century, Ammonius was the author of a Harmony supposed to be still extant. Eusebius of Cæsarea also composed a Harmony of the Gospels about A.D. 315. In it he divided the Gospel history into ten canons or tables, according as different facts are related by one or more of the evangelists. These ancient Harmonies, however, differ in character from such as belong to modern times. They are *summaries* of the life of Christ, or *indexes* to the four gospels, rather than a chronological arrangement of different facts, accompanied by a reconciliation of apparent contradictions. (See Scrivener, *Introd. to N. T.* p. 50.) In modern times, Andreas Osiander published his *Harmony of the Gospels* in 1537. He adopted the principle that the evangelists constantly wrote in chronological order. Cornelius Jansenius's *Concordia*

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF DIFFERENT HARMONIES

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF DIFFERENT HARMONIES.—*(Continued.)*

Probable Order.	EVENT. (IN ITS PRINCIPAL FEATURES.)	Lightfoot, 1655. (*Chronicle.*)	Doddridge, 1739. (*Expositor.*)	Macknight, 1756. (*Harmony.*)	Newcome, 1778. (*Harmony.*)	Townsend, 1821. (*Arrangement.*)	Greswell, 1830. (*Harmonia.*)	Jarvis, 1844. (*Introduction.*)	Robinson, 1845. (*Harmony.*)	Tischendorf, 1851. (*Synopsis.*)
‡58	Jairus's daughter raised	58	58	..	58	58	58	58	58	58
‡59	Blind men, etc., cured	59	59	..	59	59	59	59	59	..
‖60	Second rejection at Nazareth	50	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
‖61	Mission of the apostles	*61	*61	‡61†	*61	*61	*61	*61	*61	61
‖62	John beheaded	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62
‖63	Five thousand fed	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63
‖64	Walking on the water	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
‖65	Discussion in the synagogue	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65
..		..	67	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
‡66	Third passover	66	66	†66	66	66	..	66	66	..
‡67	Pharisees confuted	67	..	67	67	67	67	67	67	67
‖68	Syro-Phœnician woman	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68
‖69	Four thousand fed	69	69	69	69	69	69	69	69	69
‡70	A sign demanded	70	†70	70	*70	70	70	†70	†70	70
‖71	Blind man cured	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
‖72	Passion predicted	72	72	72	72	72	72	72	72	72
‖73	Transfiguration.	73	73	73	73	73	73	73	73	73
‖74	Dæmoniac cured	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74
‖75	Passion again predicted	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
‖76	Tax-money provided	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
‖77	Exhortations to kindness	77	77	77	77	77	†77	77	77	†77
..		79	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
78	Mission of the seventy	*78	*78	..	*78	*78	..	*78	*78	..
79	Departure from Galilee	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	79	†79
..		..	..	93	..	..	..	..	..	..
‡80	Festival of tabernacles	80	80	80	80	80	80	..	80	80
‡81	Adulteress pardoned	81	81	81	81	81	81	..	81	81
‡82	Violence offered to Christ	82	82	82	82	82	82	..	82	82
..		..	..	87	87	..	..	..	..	87
..		..	..	88	88	..	..	..	..	88
..		..	..	*79	..	..	..	..	..	..
..		..	..	78	..	..	..	..	..	78
83	Return of the seventy	83	83	83	83	83	..	..	..	83
‡84	Love to one's neighbor	84	84	84	84	84	..	84	84	84
‡85	Visit at Bethany	85	85	85	..	85	..	85	85	85
86	The Lord's Prayer	†86	†86	..	†86	†86	..	†86	†86	86
..		..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	59
..		..	..	..	..	..	..	..	83	..
87	Blind man cured	87	..	..	..	..	87	..	87	..
88	Investigation by the Sanhedrim	88	..	..	..	..	88	..	88	..
89	Festival of dedication	89	..	89	..	..	89	..	89	..
90	Teaching at the Jordan	..	..	90	..	..	99	..	90	..
91	Lazarus raised	..	..	..	..	..	91	..	91	..
92	Resolution of the Sanhedrim	..	..	..	..	..	92	..	92	..
93	Teaching at Ephraim, etc.	..	..	..	..	..	93	..	93	..
..		..	..	†86	..	..	..	..	..	..
..		..	*52	52	..	*52	..	*52	..	52
‡94	Infirm woman cured	94	94	94	94	94	..	94	94	94
..		..	..	..	..	79	..	..	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	89	..	..	..	89
..		..	..	..	..	87	..	..	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	88	..	..	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	90	..	..	..	90
95	Sets out for Jerusalem	..	95	95	95	..	*95†	..	95	95
..		..	..	..	..	..	*78	..	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	..	83	83	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	..	84	..	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	..	85	..	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	..	86	..	..	..
96	Warning against Herod	96	96	96	96	..	..	96	96	96
..		93	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
‖97	Discourse at a Pharisee's	97	97	97	97	97	†97	97	97	97
..		..	..	..	..	..	*52	..	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	..	94	..	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	..	96	..	..	..
‖98	The tower built, war made, etc.	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98
‖99	The prodigal son, etc.	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99	99
‖100	The faithless steward	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
..		..	..	..	..	104	..	..	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	105	..	..	..	..
‖101	Dives and Lazarus	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101	101
..		..	79	..	79	..	†79	*79	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	..	..	80	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	..	..	81	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	..	..	82	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	..	..	87	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	..	..	88	..	..
..		..	..	91	..	..	..	..	..	91
..		..	..	92	..	..	..	..	..	92
..		..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	93
..		*95	..	..	..	95	..	..	..	..
..		..	..	..	..	96	..	..	..	..
‖102	Messiah already come	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	*102
‖103	Unjust judge, publican	103	103	103	103	103	103	103	103	103
..		..	..	..	85	..	..	..	..	..
..		..	89	..	89	..	..	..	..	..
..		..	87	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..		..	88	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..		90	90	..	90	..	..	..	..	..

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF DIFFERENT HARMONIES.—(*Continued.*)

Probable Order.	EVENT. (IN ITS PRINCIPAL FEATURES.)	Lightfoot, 1655. (*Chronicle.*)	Doddridge, 1739. (*Expositor.*)	Macknight, 1756. (*Harmony.*)	Newcome, 1778. (*Harmony.*)	Townsend, 1821. (*Arrangement.*)	Greswell, 1830. (*Harmonia.*)	Jarvis, 1844. (*Introduction.*)	Robinson, 1845. (*Harmony.*)	Tischendorf, 1851. (*Synopsis.*)
..	....	..	..	..	91	..	..	..	..	..
..	....	..	..	..	92	.	..	..	..	..
..	....	..	..	..	93	..	..	..	..	..
‡104	Doctrine of divorce	104	104	104	104	..	104	104	104	104
‡105	Children received	105	105	105	105	..	105	105	105	105
‖106	Rich young man	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106	106
..	....	..	91	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
.	....	..	92	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	....	..	93	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	....	..	..	..	..	..	..	95	..	..
‖107	Passion again predicted	107	107	107	107	107	107	107	107	107
‖108	Ambition of James and John	108	108	108	108	108	108	108	108	108
‖109	Bartimæus cured	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109	109
‖110	Visit with Zacchæus	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
..	....	..	..	..	..	..	..	89	..	..
..	....	..	..	..	..	..	..	90	..	..
..	....	*91	..	..	..	91	..	91	..	..
..	....	92	..	..	..	92	..	92	..	..
..	....	..	..	..	..	93	..	93	..	..
111	Feast at Bethany	†111	111	†111	..	111	111	*111†	..	111
‖112	Entrance into Jerusalem	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112	112
..	....	122	..	..	122	..	*122	122	..	..
..	....	114	..	114	114	..	114	..	114	114
113	Traders again expelled	113	113	113	113	113	113	†113	113	113
..	....	..	122	122	..	122	..	..	..	..
‡114	The barren fig-tree cursed	..	114	..	..	114	..	114	..	.
‖115	His authority demanded	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115
‖116	The tribute question	116	116	116	116	116	116	116	116	116
‖117	The resurrection question	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117	117
‖118	The greatest commandment	118	118	118	118	118	118	118	118	118
‖119	Messiah's paternity	119	119	119	119	119	119	119	119	119
‖120	Hierarchy denounced	120	120	120	120	120	*120†	120	120	120
‖121	The widow's gift	121	121	121	121	121	121	121	121	121
122	Interview with the Greeks	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	122	122
‖123	Destruction of Jerusalem, etc.	*123	*123	*123	123	*123	*123	*123	*123	123
‖124	Plots against Jesus	*124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124
..	....	..	..	..	111	..	..	..	*111	..
‖125	Preparation for Passover	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125
‖126	Incidents of the meal	*126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126	126
‖127	Agony, etc., in Gethsemane	127	127	127	127	127	127	127	127	127
128	Examination before Annas	*128	..	..	128	..	128	128	*128	*128
‖129	Arraignment before the Sanhedrim	129	*129	*129	129	*129	129	129	*129	129
..	....	133	..	..	..	133	133	..	..	133
‖130	Accusation before Pilate	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130
..	....	..	..	133	..	..	..	..	..	..
‖131	Taken before Herod	131	131	131	131	131	131	131	131	131
‖132	Sentence from Pilate	132	132	132	132	132	132	132	132	132
133	Suicide of Judas	..	..	..	133	..	..	133	133	..
‖134	Crucifixion incidents	134	134	134	134	134	134	134	134	134
‖135	Burial of Jesus	135	135	135	135	135	135	135	135	135
..	....	..	133	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	....	..	..	137	..	..	..	..	..	..
‖136	Sepulchre guarded	136	136	136	136	136	136	136	136	136
‡137	Preparation for embalming	137	137	..	137	137	137	137	137	137
‖138	Release from the tomb	138	138	138	138	138	138	138	138	138
..	....	..	..	†141	141	141	..	141	..	141
..	....	*142	*142	142	142	142	142	142	..	142
..	....	141	141	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	....	..	..	..	..	140	..	..	..	..
139	Appearance to the women	*139	139	139	*139	*139	*139†	*139	139	*139
..	....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	141	..
..	....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	142	..
140	Report of the watch	140	140	140	140	..	140	140	140	140
‡141	Peter and John at the sepulchre	..	..	..	..	..	141	..	..	..
142	Appearance to Mary	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
‖143	Appearance at Emmaus	*143	143	143	143	143	143	143	143	143
‖144	Seen by ten apostles	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144
‖145	Seen by eleven apostles	145	145	145	145	145	145	145	145	145
‖146	Seen by seven apostles	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
‡147	Appearance to all the disciples	147	147	147	147	147	†147	147	147	147
‖148	Ascension	148	148	148	148	148	148	148	148	148
‖149	Conclusion	149	149	149	149	149	149	149	149	149

Evangelica was published in 1549. Martin Chemnitz's *Harmony* was first published in 1593, and afterwards, with the continuations of Leyser and Gerhard, in 1628. Chemnitz stands at the head of that class of harmonists who maintain that in one or more of the four gospels chronological order has been neglected, while Osiander is at the head of those harmonists who maintain that all the gospels are arranged in chronological order. Other harmonies were published by Stephens (1553), Calvin (1553), Calixt (1624), Cartwright (1627), Cluster (1628), Lightfoot (1654), Cradock (1668), Calov (1680), Sandhagen (1684), Bunting (1689), Lamy (1689), Le Clerc (1699), Toinard (1707), Whiston (1702), Burmann (1712), Rus (1727-8-30), Bengel (1736), Hauber (1737), Büsching (1766), Doddridge (1739 and 40), Pilkington (1747), Macknight (1756), Bertling (1767), Griesbach (1776, 97, 1809, 22), Newcome (1778), Priestley (1777 in Greek, and 1780 in English), Michaelis (1788, in his *Introduction*), White (1799), Keller (1802), Mutschelle (1806), Sebastiani (1806), Planck (1809), De Wette and Lücke (1818), Hess (1822), Matthaei (1826), Kaiser (1828), Rödiger (1829), Clausen (1829), Greswell (1830), Chapman (1836), Carpenter (1838), Reichel (1840), Gehringer (1842), Overbeck (1843), Robinson (Greek, 1845; English, 1846),

Anger (1851), Tischendorf (1851), Strong (English, 1852; Greek, 1854), Stroud (1853), Douglas (1859). Other similar works are mentioned in Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vol. iv, ed. Harles; Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, vol. iv; Michaelis, *Introd.* vol. iii, ed. Marsh; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, § 27; Danz, *Wörterb. d. Theol. Lit.* s. v.; Darling, *Cyclopœd. Bibliograph.* col. 119, 136, 761. See *Brit. and For. Review*, Oct. 1856; *Jour. Sac. Liter.* 1852, p. 60 sq.; Wieseler, *Chron. Synopsis of Gospels* (tr. by Venables, Lond. 1864, 8vo). See JESUS CHRIST.

Harms, Claus, a German revivalist, was born at Fahrstedt, in Holstein, May 25, 1778. He showed at an early age signs of a deep and devotional piety. He made rapid progress at school, and at eighteen entered the University of Kiel. Young and ardent, the skeptical spirit of the time could not but have some effect on him; its influence, however, was counteracted by Schleiermacher's *Reden üb. d. Religion*, which brought him back to the simple faith of childhood, from whence he never afterwards strayed. In 1802 he passed his examination in theology, and in 1806 was appointed deacon in Lunden. The fame of his talent as a preacher, and of his devotion to pastoral labor, soon spread abroad. His first publication was *Winter-Postille* (Kiel, 1808), which was followed by *Summer-Postille* (Kiel, 1809). Two *Catechisms*, published by Harms soon afterwards, ran through many editions. In 1816 he was appointed archdeacon of St. Nicholas at Kiel. In this position he was at first highly esteemed, and afterwards bitterly opposed on account of his so-called pietism. The opposition against him culminated at the occasion of the jubilee of the Reformation held in 1817. It became daily more apparent to him that the Church in Germany was steadily receding from the principles of the Reformation and of the Holy Scriptures. He therefore gave out that he was prepared at any time to sustain, demonstrate, and defend Luther's 95 theses, with 95 additional ones of his own, against any one who chose to dispute with him. His first point, "When our Lord Jesus Christ says 'repent,' he means that we shall conform to *his* precepts, not that his precepts shall be conformed to us, as is done in our days to suit the public mind," was striking at the very root of the then wide-spread religious indifference. The discussions which ensued gave rise to a vast number of publications, many of which were very bitter. The effect, on the whole, was a deep awakening in the Church. The theological faculty of Kiel, which, with the exception of the celebrated Kleuker and Twesten, had bitterly opposed Harms, was in after years almost exclusively brought over to his side. His publications after this (showing his theological views more fully) include the following, viz., *Predigten* (1820, 1822, 1824, 1827, 1838, 1852):—*Religionshandlungen der Lutherischen Kirche* (1839):—*Christliche Glaube* (1830–1834):—*Vaterunser* (1838):—*d. Bergrede d. Herrn* (1841):—*d. Offenbarung Johannis* (1844):—*Reden an Theologie-studirende* (3 vols.: i, *d. Prediger*; ii, *d. Priester*; iii, *d. Pastor*, Kiel, 1830-34). Many beautiful hymns by Harms may be found in the *Gesänge f. d. gemeinschaftliche u. f. d. einsame Andacht* (1828). In 1841, on the 25th anniversary of his entering on his pastoral duties at Kiel, a great jubilee was held there, and a fund having been formed to defray his travelling expenses, he was named "Oberconsistorialrath." His eyesigth failed him a few years after, but he still continued writing, and published a revised edition of his works (1851). He died peacefully Feb. 1, 1855. See Harms's *Selbst-biographie* (Jena, 1818); Reuter's *Repertorium* (1849); Baumgarten, *Ein Denkmal f. C. Harms* (1855); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 567.

Harms, Louis, usually known as *Pastor Harms*, one of the most eminent among the Lutheran pastors in Germany. He was born in Herrmansburg, in the kingdom of Hanover, about the year 1809. His father was pastor of the church in Herrmansburg before him, and was remarkable for the strict discipline of his family. As a boy, Louis excelled all his comrades in wrestling, boxing, and other athletic sports. He prepared for the university at the gymnasium of Celle, completing the course in two years. From 1827 till 1830 he studied at the University of Gottingen with signal ardor and success. He was repelled from theology at this time partly on account of the state of the science, partly owing to difficulties in his own mind, devoting himself to mathematics, astronomy, philosophy, and the languages, including the Spanish, Sanscrit, and Chaldee. To the last he was an enthusiastic student of Tacitus. His conversion, which probably occurred soon after leaving the university, was of a very thorough character. "I have never in my life," said he, "known what fear was; but when I came to the knowledge of my sins, then I quaked before the wrath of God, so that my limbs trembled." A Christian hope soon took complete and ever-increasing possession of his mind, and in 1844 we find him engaged in preaching at Herrmansburg, beginning his labors as an assistant to his father.

With the settlement of this young minister, a mighty influence began to go forth from the little German village, which soon changed the aspect of the country around him, and before his own death it was felt all over the world. The minds of the people had been benumbed by Rationalism or by a dead orthodoxy, which vanished like a cloud before the apostolic ardor of Harms. All in the neighborhood became at once regular attendants at church, devout observers of the Sabbath, and strict in maintaining family prayer. Young Harms soon found himself to be virtually the pastor of a region ten miles square, containing seven villages, which in an incredibly short time he brought into a state of working religious activity.

And now, having regulated affairs immediately around him, this extraordinary man began to feel the care of the whole world upon his mind. He felt responsible even for Africa and the East Indies. But how to bring the moral force of his little German village to bear upon the continent of Africa was the problem. The result formed one of the most remarkable feats of spiritual enterprise ever recorded. Harms first worked through the North German Missionary Society. But he soon became dissatisfied, and resolved to have a mission which should carry out his own ideas and be under his own control. He proposed to select pious and intelligent young men from the peasantry around him, who were already masters of some trade, give them a theological training of four years in length, and then send them forth, ordained as missionaries, to the heathen. Twelve young men presented themselves at once, but Harms had not the means of educating them. His best friends hinted to him that he was a little out of his senses. He then, to use his own expression, "knocked on the dear Lord in prayer." His mind had been powerfully impressed by the words of a courtier, spoken to duke George of Saxony, who had lain on his death-bed hesitating whether to flee for salvation to the Saviour or to the pope. "Your grace," said the courtier, "Straightforward is the best runner." In a few moments the purpose of Harms was formed so completely that no doubt ever again occurred to him. His plan of action was struck out at once. Without ever asking a single man, he prayed to God for money. Funds poured in upon him. He built a large edifice for his missionary college. More students came than he could accommodate. He prayed for more money. It came to him from Germany, Russia, England, America, and Australia. He erected another building. The fact of his not asking any money at all became the most efficient advertisement of his cause which could be made. He called his mission school "Swimming Iron." Soon the first class of missionary candidates graduated and were ready for Africa, but the pastor had no means of sending them there. "Straightforward is the best runner," said Harms; again he prayed to God for counsel, and decided to build a ship. The project was rather original, as Herrmansburg

was sixty miles from the sea, and most of the people had never seen a ship. Again Harms prayed for the necessary money. Funds came as usual, and the ship was built and launched. As the day of sailing approached, the simple Herrmansburgers brought to the vessel fruits and flowers, grain and meats, ploughs, harrows, hoes, and a Christmas-tree, that the missionaries might have the means of celebrating that festival upon the seas. The day of sailing, Oct. 18, 1853, was held as a gala by the simple people; but soon news came that the ship was lost. "What shall we do?" said the people. "Humble ourselves, and build a new ship," said the minister. The report proved untrue, and that vessel is still plying her missionary voyages between Hamburg and Africa. Harms's preachers have also penetrated to Australia, the East Indies, and our Western States.

In 1854 Harms felt the need of diffusing missionary intelligence among his own countrymen, and arousing a more universal interest in the cause. He desired to establish a journal devoted to missions, but his friends did not see how it could be published. "Let us have a printing-press upon the heath," said Harms. At once he asked God for the money, and it reached him as usual. The missionary journal was soon established, and in a few years it attained a circulation of fourteen thousand copies, only two periodicals in all Germany having a larger edition. It still abounds with racy letters from the missionaries, and the stirring essays of Harms formed its chief attraction until his death. He also established a missionary festival, held annually in June in the open air on Lüneberger Heath. On some years this festival was attended by six thousand people, including strangers from all parts of Europe. "How enchanting," said he, "are such Christian popular festivals, under the open sky, with God's dear Word, and accounts of his kingdom and prayer, and loud-sounding hymns and tones of the trumpet."

The peculiar character and enormous amount of Pastor Harms's work can be better understood from the account of a traveller from our own country who spent a Sabbath with him in the autumn of 1863. The description which follows may be considered a specimen of his usual Sabbath-day's work. After speaking of his church edifice, which was nine hundred and seventy-five years old, and which Harms refused to have pulled down, considering its antiquity a means of influence, the writer proceeds: "Strangers were obliged to take seats at half past nine on Sabbath morning, in order to secure them; service commenced at half past ten. When the pastor entered, the vast audience rose with as much awe as if he were an apostle. His form was bent, his face pale and indescribably solemn. He appeared utterly exhausted, and leaned against the altar for support. In a low, tremulous tone, he chanted a prayer. Without looking at the Bible, he then recited a psalm, commenting upon every verse. He then read the same psalm from the Bible, by the inflections of his voice gathering up and impressing his previous comments. He next administered the ordinance of baptism to those infants who had been born since the previous Sabbath, and addressed the sponsors. After announcing his text, he gave a rich exposition of it; a prayer followed, and he preached his sermon, which was very impressive and direct, though the voice of the preacher was often shrill. After another prayer, he administered the Lord's Supper to about two hundred persons, one tenth of his church partaking of the ordinance every Sabbath day. The female communicants were dressed appropriately for the occasion. The people were dismissed after a service of three hours and forty minutes in length. After an hour's intermission the audience assembled again. The pastor recited a chapter from the New Testament, commenting upon each verse, and then read from the book as before. After singing by the congregation, he catechised the audience, walking up and down the aisle, questioning children and adults. The audience seemed transformed into a vast Bible-class. This service of three hours' length closed with singing and prayer. At seven in the evening two hundred villagers assembled in the hall of the parsonage, and he preached to them in Low German, after which he held a missionary concert, reading letters from his missionaries, dated from Africa, Australia, and the United States. He seemed to have his hand upon all parts of the earth. Evidently the congregation felt responsible for the whole world. At the close of the service he shook hands with each one of the people in turn, saying, "May the Redeemer bless you." At ten in the evening the neighbors assembled at the parsonage to join with the pastor in family prayer. He recited from the Bible, commenting as before, and offered a prayer which was rich in devotion, but distressing to listen to, so great was his fatigue."

Besides these enormous labors on each Sabbath, Pastor Harms wrote incessantly for his missionary magazine, published a large number of books, and sent about three thousand letters a year, mostly to his missionaries. His method of keeping his missionary accounts was to take what money he got and pay what he owed; nor was he ever troubled, though the expense of his missions was about forty thousand dollars a year. He records a hundred instances of the exact amount of money reaching him at just the time he wanted it. For four hours every day he held a levee for his parishioners, who consulted him freely, not only about religious subjects, but upon everything which interested them—the state of their health or the tillage of their land. So crowded were these levees, that often a stranger waited four days for his turn to see the pastor. The independence of Pastor Harms was singularly manifested. The king of Hanover, at one time, knowing that his eminent subject was in the city, sent a high officer of government, with one of the state carriages, to invite him to the palace. "Give my regards to the king," said Harms; "I would obey his order, if duty allowed; but I must go home and attend to my parish." The officer was indignant as he delivered the message; but the king said, "Harms is the man for me." Though a rigid monarchist, the pastor often preached against the government, and prepared his people to resist it. He often entered into sharp conflict with the government officers, especially in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, and was reported by them sixty-five times, but escaped unhurt. With characteristic boldness, he warned the churches not to endure unbelieving ministers in the pulpit, although the ministers held their places from the king. He defied the democracy as well as the court, and publicly advised them, if they were discontented, to go to Africa in a body. He was vehemently opposed to the popular amusements, declaring that men "*acted* themselves into hell from the theatre, and danced themselves into hell from the ballroom." The Calvinistic doctrines and the Congregational polity were objects of his marked aversion. He declared that the Baptists who postponed the baptism of their children were robbers and murderers of those children's souls. Nor would he ever insure his seminary buildings, thinking that God would protect them, and he had an idea that insurance against accident involved a certain defiance of Jehovah. When he catechised the congregation, and children failed in the exercise, he would sometimes punish them in public. He required his missionary students to perform a daily task of manual labor, not only for economical reasons, but also "that they might be kept humble, and not be ashamed of their work, any more than Paul was of his tent-making." As he never asked from any one but God, he had a violent antipathy to beggars, and none were ever found in his parish. Almost adored by his people as a species of rural pope, he maintained the utmost care and watchfulness to preserve his own humility while breathing the atmosphere of their homage. He yielded not a particle of his activity to the very last. When he could no longer ascend his pulpit, he preached standing at the altar; when he could not preach standing, he preached sitting; when he could no longer sit,

he prayed that God would take him away as a burden. He died on the 14th of November, 1866, at the age of fifty-seven, and was buried amid the tears of his people on his beloved Lüneberger Heath.

It is difficult to form a just estimate of this remarkable man. The keynote of Harms's character was his union with God. Yet so rare is any high degree of this quality, that its possession makes the man's character stand original and alone, and it seems as though "one of the prophets had risen again." Another world had laid hold with a strong grasp upon his mind, so real was it to him that he appeared to walk not by faith, but by sight. He lived among us like a being of another race detained here in the body, and acted with a moral insight and directness which no human standard can comprehend. Yet this wonderful spirituality was often marred by bigotry; sometimes it bordered upon the superstitious; at times his apostolic fervor was tinged with self-will, and we are astonished at the alternate breadth and narrowness of his mind. He made his most opposite powers assist each other; to carry out the moral intention of an angel, he brought a worldly wisdom which no one could surpass; in comprehension of detail and fertility of expedients he could have taught the ablest men of business. His spirituality acted upon the world through an all-consuming, almost morbid activity. He saw nothing before him but a succession of duties, yet his mind found an unconscious delight in the extent and variety of its own efforts, and his zeal was doubtless enhanced by the continual joy of attempt and success. It is hard to acquit him of a species of suicide; in spite of every warning of nature, he overworked himself incessantly, and pressed on to the heavens whither he was tending long before he could be spared by the world below. His amazing spirituality, the closeness to another sphere with which he lived, would have elevated him beyond our sight; but the eccentricities which slightly marred so grand a character showed that he was human, and lowered him to a point nearer the sympathy of mankind. To the last, the world must stand astonished at the moral power of a man who could make a little country church in a remote part of Germany girdle the earth with its influence, and Harms alone is an answer to the Saviour's question, "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" At intervals God gives such a one to the Church, to show to the world the spiritual power of one soul which is really in earnest. Harms has lived, and Germany, Africa, and the East Indies have felt the consequence. He was one of those blocks from whom, in earlier ages, the Catholic Church would have hewn her saints and her martyrs; he was a Protestant Loyola; had he left the world a few centuries before, he would assuredly have been canonized as a Dominic or St. Francis; his remains would have performed miracles without end; romantic tradition would have sprung from and twined around his memory; orders of priests and stately cathedrals would have borne his name; and thousands of devotees might to-day be worshipping at his shrine. (W. E. P.)

Harne'pher (Heb. *Charne'pher*, חַרְנֶפֶר, perhaps *snorer;* Sept. Ἀρναφάρ, Vulg. *Harnapher*), one of the sons of Zophah, a chief of the tribe of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 36). B.C. between 1612 and 1053.

Harness occurs in several senses in the Eng. Vers. as the rendering of different Heb. words.

1. אָסַר (*asar'*, prop. to *bind*, as it is generally rendered) is sometimes applied to the act of fastening animals to a cart or vehicle, e. g. *yoking* kine (1 Sam. vi, 7, 10, "tie") or horses (Jer. xlvi, 4, "harness"), *gearing* a chariot (Gen. xlvi, 29; Exod. xiv, 6; 2 Kings ix, 21, "make ready"), or absolutely (1 Kings xviii, 44; 2 Kings ix, 21, "prepare"). From the monuments we see that the harness of the Egyptian war-chariots was composed of leather, and the trappings were richly decorated, being stained with a great variety of colors, and studded with gold and silver. See CHARIOT.

2. In the old English sense for *armor* (נֶשֶׁק or נֵשֶׁק, *ne'shek*, warlike *accoutrements*, elsewhere "armor," "weapons," etc.), 2 Chron. ix, 24. See ARMOR.

3. In a like sense for שִׁרְיָן (*shiryan'*, 1 Kings xxii, 34; 2 Chron. xviii, 33), a coat of *mail* ("breastplate," Isa. lix, 17). See ARMOR.

4. "Harnessed" (חֲמֻשִׁים, *chamushim'*, from חָמַשׁ, in the sense of being *fierce* for battle) is the expression used to represent the equipped condition of the Israelites as they passed out of Egypt (Exod. xiii, 18; "armed," Josh. i, 14; iv, 12; Judg. vii, 11), and seems to denote their orderly and intrepid disposal as if to meet a foe (the ancient versions interpret generally *full-armed*). (See Gesenius, *Lex.* s. v.)

Ha'rod (Heb. *Charod'*, חֲרוֹד; Sept. Ἀρώδ v. r. Ἀράδ), a brook or place (עַיִן, a spring or *fountain*, "well," Sept. πηγή) not far from Jezreel and Mount Gilboa ("Gilead," Judg. vii, 3), by (עַל) which Gideon and his great army encamped on the morning of the day which ended in the rout of the Midianites (Judg. vii, 1), and where the trial of the people by their mode of drinking apparently took place. See GIDEON. The name means "*palpitation*," and it has been suggested that it originated in consequence of the alarm and terror of most of the men who were here tested by Gideon (ver. 3, 5); but this supposition seems very far-fetched, and the name more probably arose from some peculiarity in the outflow of the stream, or from some person or circumstance otherwise unknown. The word, slightly altered, recurs in the proclamation to the host—"Whosoever is fearful and trembling (חָרֵד, *chared'*), let him return" (ver. 3); but it does not follow that the name Charod was, as Prof. Stanley proposes, bestowed on account of the trembling, for the mention of the trembling may have been suggested by the previously existing name of the fountain: either would suit the paronomastic vein in which these ancient records so delight. The word *chared* (A.V. "was afraid") recurs in the description of another event which took place in this neighborhood, possibly at this very spot—Saul's last encounter with the Philistines—when he "was afraid, and his heart trembled greatly" at the sight of their fierce hosts (1 Sam. xxviii, 5). It was situated south of the hill Moreh, where the Midianites were encamped in the valley of Jezreel (ver. 1), and on the brow of the hills overlooking that plain on the south (ver. 8). As the camps were not far distant from each other (compare ver. 10-15), it must have been in a narrow part of the valley, and probably near its head (for the invaders came from the east, chap. vi, 3, and fled down the eastern defiles, chap. vii, 22). Hence the position of the present *Ain Jalud*, south of Jezreel, is very probably that of the fountain in question (Stanley's *Sinai and Palest.* p. 334-336). This spring, which gives rise to a small stream flowing eastward down the wady of the same name, is evidently the representative of the ancient name *Gilead* applied to this spot [see GILEAD, 2], and has thus supplanted the other name Harod. Indeed it is probable that the latter was rather the name of a town in the neighborhood, since we find mention of its inhabitants (2 Sam. xxiii, 25). See HARODITE. "The valley of Jezreel" referred to is an eastern arm of the great plain of Esdraelon, bounded on the south by Gilboa, and on the north by a parallel ridge called the "hill of Moreh" (q. v.). It is about three miles wide. See JEZREEL. The Midianites were encamped along the base of Moreh, and probably near the town of Shunem. On the south side of the valley, at the base of Gilboa, and nearly opposite Shunem, is the fountain of Ain Jalud. It is about a mile east of Jezreel, and hence it was also called the "fountain of Jezreel." The water bursts out from a rude grotto in a wall of conglomerate rock, which here forms the base of Gilboa. It first flows into a large but shallow pond, and then winds away through the rich green vale past the ruins of Bethshean to the Jordan. The

side of Gilboa rises over the fountain steep and rugged. Some have thought it strange that the Midianites should not have seized on this fountain: but, as many of the Israelites probably lurked in the mountain, the Midianites may have deemed it more prudent to encamp in the open plain to the north, where there are also fountains. The Jerusalem Itinerary seems to indicate that the name *Ain Julud* (q. d. "Fountain of Goliath") arose from an ancient tradition that the adjoining valley was the site of David's victory over the giant (ed. Wesseling, p. 586). The fountain was a noted camping-ground for both Christians and Saracens during the Crusades. William of Tyre calls it *Tubania* (*Gesta Dei per Francos*, p. 1037; Bohadin, *Vita Saladini*, p. 53). The valley of Jezreel still forms a favorite haunt of the wild Bedawin, who periodically cross from the east side of the Jordan, as in Judg. vi, 5: "They came up with their cattle and their tents, and they came as grasshoppers for multitude; both they and their camels were without number" (Porter, *Handbook for Syr. and Pal.* ii, 355; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 324).

Ha'rodite (Heb. *Charodi'*, חֲרֹדִי, Sept. 'Αροδὶ), an epithet of Shammah and Elika, two of David's heroes (2 Sam. xxiii, 25), probably from their being natives of HAROD, a place near the fountain of the same name (Judg. vii, 1). See HARORITE.

Haro'ëh (1 Chron. ii, 52). See REAIAH.

Ha'rorite (Heb. *Charori'*, חֲרוֹרִי, prob. by erroneous transcription for חֲרוֹדִי, *Harodite*; Sept. has Θαδί, Vulg. *Arorites*), an epithet of Shammoth, one of David's heroes (1 Chron. xi, 27); for which the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii, 25) more correctly reads HARODITE (q. v).

Har'osheth (Heb. *Charo'sheth*) OF THE GENTILES (חֲרֹשֶׁת הַגּוֹיִם, *workmanship of the nations*, i. e. city of handicrafts; Sept. 'Αρισὼθ τῶν ἐθνῶν, Vulg. *Haroseth gentium*), a city supposed to have been situated near Hazor, in the northern parts of Canaan, afterwards called Upper Galilee, or Galilee of the Gentiles, from the mixed races inhabiting it. See GALILEE. Harosheth is said to have been the residence of Sisera, the general of the armies of Jabin, king of Canaan, who reigned in Hazor (Judg. iv, 2). Here the army and chariots of Jabin were marshalled under the great captain before they invaded Israel, and defiled from the northern mountains into the broad battle-field of Esdraelon (ver. 13). After the terrible defeat and slaughter on the banks of the Kishon, to this place the fugitives of the army returned, a shattered and panic-stricken remnant. Barak and his victorious troops followed them into the fastnesses of their own mountains, to the very gates of Harosheth (ver. 16). The city is not again mentioned in the Bible, nor is it referred to by Josephus, Jerome, or any ancient writer. It was at the extreme of Jabin's territory, opposite the Kishon (ver. 13), and also at a good distance from Tabor (ver. 14). It is supposed to have stood on the west coast of the lake Merom (el-Hulêh), from which the Jordan issues forth in one unbroken stream, and in the portion of the tribe of Naphtali. Jabin's capital, Hazor, one of the fenced cities assigned to the children of Naphtali (Josh. xix, 36), lay to the north-west of it. Probably from intermarriage with the conquered Canaanites, the name of Sisera afterwards became a family name (Ezra ii, 53). Neither is it irrelevant to allude to this coincidence in connection with the moral effects of this decisive victory: for Hazor, once "the head of all those kingdoms" (Josh. xi, 6, 10), had been taken and burnt by Joshua; its king, Jabin I, put to the sword; and the whole confederation of the Canaanites of the north broken and slaughtered in the celebrated battle of the waters of Merom (Josh. xi, 5-14)—the first time that "chariots and horses" appear in array against the invading host, and are so summarily disposed of, according to divine command, under Joshua, but which subsequently the children of Joseph feared to face in the valley of Jezreel (Josh. xvii, 16-18), and before which Judah actually failed in the Philistine plain (Judg. i, 19). Herein was the great difficulty of subduing plains, similar to that of the Jordan, beside which Harosheth stood. It was not till the Israelites had asked for and obtained a king that they began "to multiply chariots and horses" to themselves, contrary to the express words of the law (Deut. xvii, 16), as it were to fight the enemy with his own weapons. (The first instance occurs 2 Sam. viii, 4; comp. 1 Chron. xviii, 4; next in the histories of Absalom, 2 Sam. xv, 1, and of Adonijah, 1 Kings i, 5; while the climax was reached under Solomon, 1 Kings iv, 26.) Then it was that the Hebrews' decadence set in! They were strong in faith when they hamstrung the horses and burned with fire the chariots of the kings of Hazor, of Madon, of Shimron, and of Achshaph (Josh. xi, 1). Yet so rapidly did they decline when their illustrious leader was no more that the city of Hazor had risen from its ruins; and, in contrast with the kings of Mesopotamia and Moab (Judg. iii), who were both foreign potentates, another Jabin, the territory of whose ancestors had been assigned to the tribe of Naphtali, claimed the distinction of being the first to revolt against and shake off the dominion of Israel in his newly acquired inheritance. But the victory won by Deborah and Barak was well worthy of the song of triumph which it inspired (Judg. v), and of the proverbial celebrity which ever afterwards attached to it (Psa. lxxxiii, 9, 10; a passage which shows that the fugitives were overtaken as far as Endor). The whole territory was gradually won back, to be held permanently, as it would seem (Judg. iv, 24); at all events, we hear nothing more of Hazor, Harosheth, or the Canaanites of the north in the succeeding wars. The etymology of the name *Harosheth*, q. d. "wood-*cuttings*," joined with the above facts, may justify us in locating the city on the upland plains of Naphtali, probably on one of those ruin-crowned eminences still existing, from which the mother of Sisera, looking out from her latticed window, could see far along that road by which she expected to see her son return in triumph (Judg. v, 28). Deborah, in her beautiful ode, doubtless depicted the true features of the scene. Remnants of the old forests of oak and terebinth still wave here over the ruins of the ancient cities, and travellers may see the black tents of the Arabs—fit representatives of the Kenites (iv, 17)—pitched beneath their shade (Porter, *Handbook for Syr. and Palest.* ii, 442 sq.; Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i, 359). Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 184) thinks it identical with the village *Girsh*, situated on a high mount one English mile west (on Zimmerman's *Map* north-west) of Jacob's bridge across the Jordan, and nearly destroyed by an earthquake in 1837. Dr. Thomson, however, who gives a vivid description of the geographical features of Barak's victory (*Land and Book*, ii, 142 sq.), regards the site as that of the present village *Harothieh* (a name, according to him, giving the exact Arabic form of the Hebrew), an enormous double mound or *tell* along the Kishon, about eight miles from Megiddo, covered with the remains of old walls and buildings.

Harp is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the following terms in the original: usually כִּנּוֹר, *kinnor'* (whence the Greek κινύρα), the *lyre* or *cythara* (invariably rendered "harp"), N. Test. κιθάρα (1 Cor. xiv, 7; Rev. v, 8; xiv, 2; xv, 2), whence the verb κιθαρίζω (1 Cor. xiv, 7; Rev. xiv, 2), and the compound noun κιθαρῳδός ("harper," Rev. xiv, 2; xviii, 22); elsewhere only of the Chald. קִיתָרֹס, *kitharos'* (text of Dan. iii, 5, 7, 10, 15), or קַתְרוֹס, *kathros'* (margin), from the latter Greek term. See MUSIC.

The "harp" was David's favorite instrument, on which he was a proficient (see Dreschler, *De cithara David*, Lips. 1712; also in Ugolino, xxxii). It probably did not essentially differ from the modern Arabic *cithere* (Niebuhr, *Trav.* i, 177, pl. 26; *Descript. de l'Egypte*, xvii, 365, pl. BB, fig. 12, 13). See DAVID.

Modern Egyptian performer on the *Ood* or Lute. (From Lane.)

Gesenius inclines to the opinion that כִּנּוֹר is derived from כָּנַר, *kanar'*, "an unused onomatopoetic root which means to give forth a tremulous and stridulous sound, like that of a string when touched." The *kinnor* was the national instrument of the Hebrews, and was well known throughout Asia. There can be little doubt that it was the earliest instrument with which man was ac-

Ancient Egyptian Lyres. 1, in the Leyden Collection; 2, in the Berlin Collection.

quainted, as the writer of the Pentateuch assigns its invention, together with that of the עוּגָב, *ugâb'*, incorrectly translated "organ" in the A.V., to the antediluvian period (Gen. iv, 21). Kalisch (*Hist. and Crit. Com. on the Old Test.*) considers *kinnor* to stand for the whole class of stringed instruments (*neginoth*), as *ugab*, says he, "is the type of all wind instruments." Writers who connect the κινύρα with κινυρός (*wailing*), κινύρομαι (to *lament*), conjecture that this instrument was only employed by the Greeks on occasions of sorrow and distress. If this were the case with the Greeks, it was far different with the Hebrews, amongst whom the *kinnor* served as an accompaniment to songs of cheerfulness and mirth, as well as of praise and thanksgiving to the supreme Being (Gen. xxxi, 27; 1 Sam. xvi, 23; 2 Chron. xx, 28; Psa. xxxiii, 2), and was very rarely used, if ever, in times of private or national affliction. The Jewish bard finds no employment for the *kinnor* during the Babylonian captivity, but describes it as put aside or suspended on

Other Forms of Ancient Egyptian Harps.

the willows (Psa. cxxxvii, 2); and in like manner Job's harp "is changed into mourning" (xxx, 31) while the hand of grief pressed heavily upon him. The passage "my bowels shall sound like a harp for Moab" (Isa. xvi, 11) has impressed some Biblical critics with the idea that the *kinnor* had a lugubrious sound; but this is an error, since ככנור יהמו refers to the *vibration of the chords*, and not to the sound of the instrument (Gesen. and Hitzig, in *Comment.*).

Touching the shape of the *kinnor*, a great difference of opinion prevails. The author of *Shilte Haggibborim* (c. 6) describes it as resembling the modern harp; Pfeiffer gives it the form of a guitar; and St. Jerome declares that it resembled in shape the Greek letter *delta* (quoted by Joel Brill in the preface to Mendelssohn's *Psalms*). Josephus records (*Ant.* vii, 12, 3) that the *kinnor* had ten strings (compare Theodoret, *Quæst.* 34 on 1 Kings), and that it was played on with the plectrum; others assign to it twenty-four; and in the *Shilte Haggibborim* it is said to have had forty-seven. Josephus's statement, however, ought not to be received as conclusive, as it is in open contradiction to what is set forth in the 1st book of Samuel (xvi, 23; xviii, 10), that David played on the *kinnor* with his *hand*. As it is reasonable to suppose that there was a smaller and a larger *kinnor*, inasmuch as it was sometimes played by the Israelites whilst walking (1 Sam. x, 5), the opinion of Munk—"On jouait peut-être des deux manières, suivant les dimensions de l'instrument"—is well entitled to consideration. The Talmud (*Berachoth*) has preserved a curious tradition, to the effect that over the bed of David, facing the north, a *kinnor* was suspended, and that when at midnight the north wind touched the chords they vibrated, and produced musical sounds.

Various Ancient Egyptian figures of Lyres. 1, 2, played without, and 3, 4, with the plectrum; 4 is supposed to be the Hebrew lyre.

The כנור על השמינית—"harp on the Sheminith" (1 Chron. xv, 21)—was so called from its eight strings. Many learned writers, including the author of *Shilte Haggibborim*, identify the word "sheminith" with the *octave*; but it would indeed be rash to conclude that the

Ancient grand Egyptian Harps.

ancient Hebrews understood the octave in precisely the sense in which it is employed in modern times. See SHEMINITH. The skill of the Jews on the *kinnor* appears to have reached its highest point of perfection in the age of David, the effect of whose performances, as well as of those by the members of the "schools of the prophets," are described as truly marvellous (compare 1 Sam. x, 5; xvi, 23; and xix, 20).

Two instruments of the lyre species are delineated on a bass-relief of the Assyrian monuments, representing the return of a monarch celebrated by a procession of musicians (Layard, *Nineveh and Bab.* p. 388 sq.). The

Ancient Assyrian Lute and Harp.

ancient Babylonian instrument is probably that represented in a single instance on the Assyrian monuments at Khorsabad, depicting three short-bearded performers on the lyre ushered into the great chamber by two eunuchs. The musicians are clad in a short tunic held fast by a girdle, and their hair is drawn back, and terminates above the shoulders in a single row of curls. They proceed with measured step, singing and twanging their lyres, which are suspended by a broad band passing over the right shoulder. The instrument itself somewhat resembles the Greek lyre: it has a square body and upright sides, the latter being connected by a cross-bar, to which are fixed strings that seem to have been rather numerous, for we can count eight at least, and in the part that is corroded away there is room for three or four more. Exactly similar instruments are now seen in Nubia and Dongola; and the mode of playing is that the right hand holds a short plectrum to strike the intervals, while the left is used to stop and twang the cords (Bonomi's *Nineveh*, p. 187).

Ancient Assyrian Lyre.

Harps or guitars are constantly, in the Holy Scriptures, instruments of joy. They are mentioned in very ancient times as musical instruments, used both by Jews and Gentiles, and their employment in the Temple worship frequently occurs. Moses has named their original inventor in Gen. iv, 21, viz. Jubal; and in Gen. xxxi, 27, Laban says to Jacob, "Why did you not tell me, that I might have sent you away with mirth and songs, with tabret and with *harp?*" Even in that very ancient writing, the book of Job (xxi, 12), that patriarch, speaking of the prosperity of the wicked, says, "They take the timbrel and harp, and rejoice at the sound of the organ." So, when complaining of his own condition (xxx, 31), he says, "My harp also is turned into mourning, and my organ to the voice of them that weep." Isaiah speaks of the harp under the same character, as an instrument of joy (xxiv, 8). Divine subjects used to be brought forward with the accompaniments of the harp (Psa. xlix, 5), and the high praises of God were so celebrated (Psa. xxxiii, 2; lxiii, 4; lvii, 8; see also Psa. lxxi, 22, 23; xcii, 4, 5, 6; xcviii, 5; cxlvii, 7; cl, 3). That harps are used to celebrate the praises of heroes is well known. Harps, in Solomon's day, were made of the almug-tree, as our translators have it (1 Kings x, 11, 12). They were often gilded, and hence called golden harps (Rev. v, 8). A harp of *eight* strings is mentioned (1 Chron. xv, 21), called in our version "harp on the Sheminith." But amongst the Greeks it had, for the most part, seven strings. Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 12) describes a harp of ten strings. The distinct sounds uttered by these strings or chords are alluded to by Paul in 1 Cor. xiv, 7. Its soothing effect was exemplified in calming down the furious spirit of Saul (1 Sam. xvi, 17, 24; xviii, 9; xix, 9). The spirit of prophecy appears to have been excited by instrumental music of this kind (2 Kings iii, 15). Harpers held the instrument in the hand, or placed it on a pillar, or sat down by a river side (Ovid, *Fasti*, ii, 115). Sometimes they suspended them from trees, to which there is an allusion in Psa. cxxxvii, 1, 2. The harp was used in processions and public triumphs, in worship and the offices of religion, and was sometimes accompanied with dancing (Psa. cxlix, 3). They were also used after successful battles (see 2 Chron. xx, 28; 1 Macc. xiii, 51). Isaiah alludes to this custom (xxx, 32). So in the victory of the Lamb (Rev. xiv, 1, 2): "I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps;" the Church in heaven being represented as composing a grand chorus, in celebration of the triumphs of the Redeemer. At solemn feasts, and especially of the nuptial kind, harps were employed. To this the prophet Isaiah alludes (v, 11, 12). The use of harps in worship has already been adverted to, and that the heathen employed them on such occasions appears from Dan. iii, 5, 7, 15. "Harps of God" (Rev. xv, 2) are either a Hebraism to show their excellence, as the addition *of God* often signifies (the most excellent things in their kind being in the Scriptures said to be of God), as a prince of God (Gen. xxiii, 6, in the original), the mountains of God (Psa. xxxvi, 6, in the original), cedars of God (Psa. lxxx, 11, in the original), and the like; or else they mean harps given as from God; or harps of God may be harps used in the service of God, in opposition to harps common and profane (1 Chron. xvi, 42; 2 Chron. vii, 6).

Harphius, HENRI, a Flemish mystic, was born at Erp (whence he is sometimes called also ERPIUS or ERPEN), in Brabant, towards the beginning of the 15th century. He entered the order of St. Francis, in which he soon became distinguished for his learning, particularly in mystical theology. He attained the highest dignities of the order, and succeeded in restoring the discipline in several convents of gray friars where it had been relaxed. He died at Mechlin Feb. 22, 1478. The Franciscans count him among the blessed, yet Bossuet seems to have considered him only as an enthusiast and visionary. He wrote *Le Directoire des Contemplatifs* (first published in Low Dutch, then in Latin by Blomeven, under the title *Directorium aureum Contemplativorum* (Cologne, 1513, 8vo. Antw. 1513, 12mo); there are generally three other works of Harphius published with it: *Tractatus de Effusione Cordis:—Modus legendi rosarium Virginis Mariæ:—Remedia contra Distractiones.* The *Directorium aureum* was republished with commentaries and corrections (Paris, without date, 12mo; Cologne, 1527, 12mo; 1611, 16mo; 1645, fol.; Antwerp, 1536, 12mo; Cologne, 1555, fol.; Rome, 1585, 4to; Brescia, 1601, 4to; translated into French by Mme. E. B., Paris, 1552, 16mo):—*Sermones*, etc., with *Trois Parties de la Pénitence* and *Triple Avènement de Jésus Christ* (these works, written at first in Flemish, were translated into Latin, Nuremberg, 1481, 4to; Spire, 1484, 4to):—*Speculum aureum decem Præceptorum Dei*, etc. (Mayence, 1474, 4to):—*Speculum Perfectionis* (Venice, 1524, 12mo; transl. into Italian, 1546, 12mo):—*Explicatio succincta et perspicua Novem Rupium* (of Suso), written first in Low Dutch, then transl. into Latin by Surius, and inserted in the *Opera omnia* of Henry Suso (Cologne, 1533, 1555, 1588, and 1615, 12mo; Naples, 1658, 12mo):—*De Mortificatione pravorum Affectuum* (Cologne, 1604, 16mo):—*Cantici Canticorum mystica Explicatio* (Cologne, 1564, fol.). See Trithemius, *De Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (col. 817); Bellarmin, *De Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, p. 415; Wadding, *Script. Ordinis Minorum*, p. 164; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclésiastique*, vol. xvi, lib. lxxix, p. 5; Quétif and Echard, *Script. Ordinis Prædicatorum*, ii, 558; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxiii, 439; Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. xv.

Harpsfeld or **Harpsfield**, John, was born about 1510, and died in London in 1578. He was educated at Winchester School and New College, Oxford, whereof he was admitted fellow in 1534. He became chaplain to bishop Bonner, whose bitter persecuting spirit he shared, and was collated to St. Martin's, Ludgate, in 1554, but resigned in 1558, on being presented to the living of Layndon in Essex. Shortly before the death of queen Mary he was made dean of Norwich, but on the accession of Elizabeth was deprived of that post, and committed to the Fleet Prison until he gave security for his good behavior. His published works are *Concio ad Clerum* (London, 1553, 8vo):—*Homilies* (London, 1554-56; he wrote 9 of Bonner's Homilies):—*Supputatio temporum a diluvio ad a. D.* 1559 (London, 1560). He wrote also some *Disputations* and *Epistles* to be found in Fox's *Acts and Monuments.*—Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* viii, 212; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 442; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 788; Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* i. (J. W. M.)

Harpsfield, Nicholas, an English Roman Catholic historian, and brother of the preceding, was also educated at Winchester School and New College, Oxford, where he was admitted fellow in 1536, and bachelor of laws in 1543. He was made principal of Whitehall in 1544, regius professor of Greek in 1546, archdeacon of Canterbury and prebendary of St. Paul's in 1554. He also received the living of Layndon, but resigned it to his brother John in 1558. He was a very zealous Roman Catholic, and, on the accession of Elizabeth, refusing to acknowledge her supremacy, he was deprived of his preferments and imprisoned, or at least kept under restraint until his death in 1583. During his imprisonment (receiving every needed help from his custodian, bishop Parker) he composed his *Historia Anglicana Ecclesiastica* (Douay, 1622, fol.). To this there is appended, according to Nutt's catalogue (1837), a treatise entitled *Brevis Narratio de Divortio Henrici VIII . . . . ab E. Campiana*, which may be the "*Treatise concerning Marriage*" mentioned by Wood (see Appendix to Butler's *Hist. of Reformation*). His other works are *Historia hæresis Wickliffianæ* (published with *Hist. Ang.*):—*Chronicon a Diluvio Noe ad annum* 1559; and a very bitter attack upon the Protestant ecclesiastical historians, Fox in particular, which was conveyed secretly to the Netherlands, and published by his friend Alan Cope under his own name, to screen the real author from punishment at the hands of Elizabeth—the title in full is *Alani Copi Dialogi vi contra Summi Pontificatus, Monasticæ Vitæ Sanctorum, S. Imaginum oppugnatores et pseudo-Martyres: in quibus* Centurionum Magdeburgensium, Auctorum *Apologiæ Anglicanæ, Pseudo-Martyrologicorum nostri temporis, maximè vero* Joh. Foxi *et aliorum, variæ fraudes, putidæ calumniæ et insignia mendacia, deteguntur* (Antwerp, Plautin, 1556, 4to). He left also many MSS.—Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* viii, 212; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 442; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 788. (J. W. M.)

Harris, Howell, an eminent Welsh evangelist, was born at Trevecca in 1714. In 1735 he went to Oxford to study for the Church, but disgust at the infidelity and immorality which prevailed there drove him away. Returning to Wales, he began to exhort the neglected poor in their cottages, and was so successful that in a few months he formed several societies among them, thus affording another of those providential coincidences which mark the religious history of the times. Thirty of these organizations were sustained by him at the time of Whitefield's arrival in Wales in 1739, and in three years more they numbered three hundred. He lived and died a Churchman, but received little sympathy from the established clergy, and, until the visits of the Methodist founders, pursued his evangelical labors almost alone, apparently without anticipating that they would result in a wide-spread evangelical dissent. In 1715 there were only thirty Dissenting chapels in the principality, and in 1736 only six in all north Wales; in 1860 there were 2000. Harris was a lay preacher; he applied repeatedly for ordination, but was denied it by the bishops on account of his irregular modes of labor. Whitefield passed from Kingswood to Cardiff, and there saw him for the first time. Their souls met and blended like two flames, and "set the whole principality in a blaze." For years the laborious layman travelled, and preached twice or three times every day. "He is full of the Holy Ghost," wrote Whitefield; "blessed be God, there seems a noble spirit gone out into Wales." Wesley speaks of him as "a powerful orator" (*Journal*, 1756). He was repeatedly assaulted by mobs, and suffered many forms of persecution from the magistrates, clergy, and people, but his courage and zeal never failed. At last his health declined, and he returned to Trevecca, where he organized a Christian household, built a chapel, and arranged his grounds with great taste. Wesley calls it "one of the most beautiful places in Wales" (*Journal*, 1763, p. 156). In the French war, when England was threatened with invasion, he thought it his duty to take a commission in the army, which he held for three years, preaching wherever he went with his regiment. He died in great peace, July 21, 1773. See Jackson, *Christian Biography*, xii, 168; Stevens, *History of Methodism*, i, 118; ii, 86.

Harris, John, D.D., F.R.S., an English divine, was born about 1667. He studied at St. John's College, Cambridge, and became successively rector of St. Mildred's, London; perpetual curate of Stroud, prebendary of Rochester, and fellow, secretary, and vice-president of the Royal Society. He died in 1719. Dr. Harris was the first compiler of a dictionary of arts and sciences in England (1708, 2 vols. fol.), and was a careful and able editor; but he was improvident, and died completely destitute. He wrote *A Refutation of the atheistical Objections against the Being and Attributes of God* (London, 1698, 4to):—*Sermon, John xvi*, 2:—*The Wickedness of the Pretence of Treason and Rebellion for God's sake* (Nov. 5th) (London, 1715, 8vo); and compiled a *Collection of Voyages and Travels* (Lond. 1702; revised by Campbell, 1744, 2 vols. fol.).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1403; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 790.

Harris, John, D.D., an eminent Independent minister and scholar, was born at Ugborough, in Devonshire, March 8, 1802, and was admitted a student at the Hoxton Academy for the education of ministers belonging to the Independent denomination in 1821. In 1827 he settled at Epsom as a minister amongst the Independents. His first literary work, entitled *The Great Teacher*, was favorably received; but he became most widely known as the successful competitor for a prize of one hundred guineas, offered by Dr. Conquest for the best essay on the subject of "Covetousness." Mr. Harris's essay was entitled *Mammon*, and had a large sale, upwards of thirty thousand copies having been sold in a few years. He subsequently obtained two other prizes for essays—one entitled "Britannia on the Condition and Claims of Sailors;" the other on Missions, with the title *The Great Commission*. "On account of the reputation brought by these works, he received the degree of D.D. from Amherst College, and was also invited to fill the post of president in lady Huntingdon's Theological College at Cheshunt. Here he remained till the union of the three Independent colleges of Highbury, Homerton, and Coward in New College, when he accepted the office of principal, and conducted several of the theological courses in that institution. He filled this position with efficiency, and by his industry and amiable character contributed to the success which has attended this establishment. Whilst at Cheshunt, Dr. Harris published the first of a series of works, in which his object was to illustrate the history of man from a theological point of view. The first volume was entitled *The Pre-Adamite Earth* (1847). In it he displayed a great amount of learning, and especially an acquaintance with the nat-

ural sciences, which he brought to bear on his theological views. The second volume of the series was entitled *Man Primeval* (1849), in which the intellectual, moral, and religious character of man is discussed. A third volume, entitled *Patriarchy, or the Family*, appeared in 1854. Two other volumes were to have completed the series, and to have been devoted to the 'State,' or the political condition of man, and the 'Church,' or his religious relations; but the plan was cut short by the death of Dr. Harris, Dec. 21, 1856." These writings evince careful study and a broad range of thought. Dr. Harris's practical writings have had an immense circulation both in England and America. See Fish, *Pulpit Eloquence* (1857); Gilfillan, *Modern Masterpieces of Pulpit Oratory;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 455; *British Quarterly Review*, v, 387; *N. American Review*, lxx, 391; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 791.

Harris, Robert, D.D., a pious and learned Puritan divine, was born in Gloucestershire, 1578, and was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford. He afterwards took orders, and obtained the living of Hanwell, near Banbury, Oxfordshire, where he was extremely useful in confirming the people's minds in the Protestant faith. On the commencement of the Civil War he removed to London, and became a member of the Assembly of Divines, but appears to have taken no active part in their proceedings. He officiated at the church of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate Street, until 1648, when he was appointed president of Trinity College, which office he retained until his death in 1658. His works include *The Way to True Happiness*, in twenty-four sermons on the Beatitudes; and *A Treatise on the New Covenant*, which, with other writings, were published in his *Works, revised and collected* (Lond. 1654, fol.).—Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* v, 546.

Harris, Samuel, D.D., "was born in the county of Middlesex about the year 1683. He was educated in Merchant Taylor's school, of which he was head boy in 1697, and was admitted a pensioner of Peter House, Cambridge, May 15, 1700. Upon the foundation of the chair of Modern History in the University of Cambridge by George I in 1724, Harris was appointed the first professor. He died Dec. 21, 1733. He was the author of, 1. *Scripture knowledge promoted by catechizing* (London, 1712, 8vo):—2. *A Commentary on the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, with an appendix of Queries concerning Divers Ancient Religious Traditions and Practices, and the sense of many texts of Scripture which seem to allude to or express them* (Lond. 1735 [not 1739, as frequently stated], 4to). In some copies this work has a different title-page, namely, *Observations, Critical and Miscellaneous, on several remarkable Texts of the Old Testament, to which is added a Commentary*, etc. Prefixed are three dissertations, 1. On a Gnozer or Advocate; 2. On a Dour or Generation; and, 3. On the ancient method of propounding important points by way of question. This work was published shortly after the death of the author by his widow. It exhibits much curious learning, and is several times referred to by Doddridge in his lectures." —Kitto, *Cyclopædia*, ii, 236.

Harris, Thaddeus Mason, D.D., a Unitarian divine, was born in Charlestown, Mass., in 1768, graduated A.B. at Harvard in 1787, and became pastor at Dorchester in 1793. He was librarian of Harvard College from 1791 to 1793, and afterwards librarian of the Massachusetts Historical Society till his death in 1842. His most important publication is a *Natural History of the Bible* (1793, 12mo; again in Boston, 1821, 8vo; also published in London, with additions, under the title *Dictionary of the Natural History of the Bible*, 1824; new ed. by Conder, 1833, 12mo). This work received great praise for its accuracy and utility (see Horne, *Bibliographical Appendix*). Dr. Harris also published *Memorials of the first Church in Dorchester* (Boston, 1830, 8vo):—*Discourses on Freemasonry* (Charlestown, 5801 [1801], 8vo). See Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 792.

Harris, Walter, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in Lebanon, Conn., in 1761. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1787, was ordained pastor at Dunbarton Aug. 26, 1789, and died Dec. 25, 1843. Dr. Harris published *An Address before the Pastoral Convention of New Hampshire* (1834), and a number of occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 277.

Harris, William, D.D., an eminent English dissenting divine, is supposed to have been born at London about 1675. He became pastor of a church at Crutched Friars, London, in 1698. He was also for some thirty years one of the preachers of a Friday evening lecture at the Weigh-house, and succeeded Mr. Tong as lecturer at Salter's Hall. He died in 1740. "He was a concise, clear, and nervous writer; his works evince a strong sense joined to a lively imagination, and regulated with judgment." He was one of the continuators of Matthew Henry's Commentary (those on Philippians and Colossians). Besides a number of occasional sermons, he wrote *Funeral Discourses, in two Parts: (I) Consolations on the Death of our Friends; (II) Preparations for our own Death* (Lond. 1736, 8vo):—*The Life and Character of Dr. Thomas Manton* (London, 1725, 8vo):—*A practical Illustration of the Book of Esther* (London, 1737, 8vo), etc.—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1406; Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters*, ii, 372.

Harris, William, D.D., a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Springfield, Mass., and passed A.B. at Harvard College in 1786. He was first licensed as a minister in the Congregational Church, but, on perusing a compend of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, his mind and feelings were drawn to the Protestant Episcopal Church, in which he was shortly after ordained. He then took charge of St. Michael's Church, Marblehead, and in 1802 became rector of St. Mark's, New York. In 1811 he was chosen president of Columbia College. In 1816 he resigned his rectorship, and attended thereafter exclusively to the presidency of the college. He died Oct. 18, 1829. He published several occasional sermons. —Sprague, *Annals*, v, 383.

Harrison, WILLIAM HENRY, D.D., was born Jan. 12, 1819, in Frederick County, Md. He entered the preparatory department of Pennsylvania College in 1838, and was graduated in 1843 with the *valedictory* of his class. He early developed a taste for literary research; and, while others were often engaged in recreation and amusement, he was in his room busily engaged in the investigation of some question of interest, and in the acquisition of knowledge. The one thing in which, perhaps, he excelled all others was the moral influence which he exercised over his companions. His very presence, even when he kept silent, was felt. Immediately after his graduation in college he commenced his theological studies in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg. On their completion in 1845 he was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Maryland. He was elected assistant professor of ancient languages in Pennsylvania College, and served for a season as general agent of the Parent Education Society. The following year he accepted a call to the English Lutheran Church of Cincinnati, as he felt that he could be more useful and efficient in the pastoral work. Here he labored with great success till his death. His labors were unwearied and abundant. His life was regarded as a sacrifice to the cause of humanity and religion. He died of Asiatic cholera during the prevalence of the epidemic in Cincinnati, Nov. 3, 1866, and, although comparatively a young man, he was at the time of his death the senior pastor of the city. He was a good scholar, a sound theologian, and a clear, practical, and instructive preacher. He received the doctorate from Wittenberg College in 1861. (M. L. S.)

Harrow is the rendering in the Eng. Vers. of the following Hebrew words: חָרִיץ, *charits'* (lit. a *cutting*, hence a *slice* of curdled milk, "cheese," 1 Sam. xvii, 18),

a *tribulum* or threshing (q. v.) *sledge* (2 Sam. xii, 31; 1 Chron. xx, 3); elsewhere only the verb שָׂדַד, *sadad'* (lit. to *level* off), to *harrow* a field (Job xxxix, 10; "break the clods," Isa. xxviii, 4; Hos. x, 11). See Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* iii, 39, vi, 397. The form of the ancient Hebrew harrow, if any instrument properly corresponding to this term existed, is unknown. Probably it was, as still in Egypt (Niebuhr, *Trav.* i, 151), merely a board, which was dragged over the fields to level the lumps. Among the Romans it consisted of a hurtle (*crates*) of rods with teeth (Pliny, xviii, 43; comp. Virg. *Georg.* i, 94). See generally Ugolini, *Comm. de re rustica vett. Hebr.* v, 21 (in his *Thesaur.* xxix, p. 332 sq.); Paulsen, *Ackerb.* p. 96. "In modern Palestine, oxen are sometimes turned in to trample the clods, and in some parts of Asia a bush of thorns is dragged over the surface; but all these processes, if used, occur (not after, but) before the seed is committed to the soil." See AGRICULTURE.

Modern Egyptian *Khonfud*, or clod-crushing machine after ploughing.

Harsa. See TEL-HARSA.

Har'sha (Heb. *Charsha'*, חַרְשָׁא, a Chaldaizing form, *worker* or *enchanter*; Sept. 'Αρσά and 'Αδασάν), one of the Nethinim whose descendants (or rather, perhaps, a place whose inhabitants) returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 52; Neh. vii, 54). B. C. ante 536. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 116) thinks it may be identical with the ruins called by the Arabs *Charsha* (on Zimmerman's *map*, *Khuras*), situated south of wady Sur, about half way between Beit-Jibrin (Eleutheropolis) on the W., and Jedur (Gedor) on the E.

Harsnet, SAMUEL, archbishop of York, was born at Colchester in 1561; was educated as a sizer at King's College, Cambridge; and was subsequently elected fellow of Pembroke Hall. In 1580 he took the degree of B.A., and in 1584 that of M.A. He then applied himself to theology, in which he soon made his mark by a sermon preached in 1584 at St. Paul's Cross (first printed at the end of three of Dr. Stewart's sermons in 1658), in which he boldly attacked the doctrine of unconditional predestination, then to some extent prevailing in the Church of England. He became successively proctor of the university in 1592, vicar of Chigwell, in Essex, in 1595, and archdeacon of Essex in 1602, but resigned all these offices on being appointed rector of Shenfield, in Essex, and of St. Margaret's, New Fish Street, London, in 1604. He became master of Pembroke College in 1605, and bishop of Chichester in 1609. He was translated to Norwich in 1619. While in the latter see, the Dissenters prevailing in the House of Commons, he was accused before the last Parliament of James I of several misdemeanors, and of Romanist tendencies. He made a defense, in which, among other points, he says "that popery is a fire that never will be quiet; he had preached a thousand sermons, and nothing of popery can be imputed to him out of any of them. That there were divers obstacles to keep him from popery: among them, the usurpation of the pope of Rome; their religion dyed in blood; their juggling and feigned miracles, of which he wrote a book against them, and their equivocations." He concluded by proclaiming that in his view the Church of England came nearest to the primitive Church, and that its principles were not derived from Wickliff, Huss, or Luther, but from the four first centuries after Christ. This defense was considered valid, and in 1628 Dr. Harsnet was translated to the archbishopric of York. He died in May, 1631. Among his works we notice *A Discovery of the fraudulent Practices of John Darrell, Bachelor of Arts*, etc. (Lond. 1599, 4to):—*Declaration of egregious Popish Impostures*, etc. (Lond. 1603, 4to), against an exorcist named Edmonds, alias Weston, a Jesuit. See Collier, *Eccles. History;* Strype, *Memorials; Biog. Brit.;* Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, v, 546 sq.

Hart (אַיָּל, *ayal'*, always masc., but in Psa. xlii, 1, joined with a fem. noun to denote a *hind*), a *stag* or male deer, but used by the Hebrews also to denote all the various species of deer and antelopes, which resemble large rams. See DEER. The hart is reckoned among the clean animals (Deut. xii, 15; xiv, 5; xv, 22), and seems, from the passages quoted, as well as from 1 Kings iv, 23, to have been commonly killed for food. Its activity furnishes an apt comparison in Isa. xxxv, 6, though in this respect the hind was more commonly selected by the sacred writers. The proper name Ajalon is derived from *ayal*, and implies that harts were numerous in the neighborhood. See GOAT. The Heb. masc. noun *ayâl*, which is always rendered ἔλαφος by the Sept., denotes, there can be no doubt, some species of *Cervidæ* (deer tribe), either the *Dama vulgaris*, fallow-deer, or the *Cervus Barbarus*, the Barbary deer, the southern representative of the European stag (*C. elaphus*), which occurs in Tunis and the coast of Barbary. We have, however, no evidence that the Barbary deer ever inhabited Palestine, though it may have done so in primitive times.

Cervus Barbarus.

Hasselquist (*Trav.* p. 211) observed the fallow-deer on Mount Tabor. Sir G. Wilkinson says (*Anc. Egypt.* i, 227, abridgm.), "The stag with branching horns figured at Beni Hassan is also unknown in the valley of the Nile, but it is still seen in the vicinity of the natron lakes, as about Tunis, though not in the desert between the river and the Red Sea." This is doubtless the *Cervus Barbarus.* See STAG.

Most of the deer tribe are careful to conceal their calves after birth for a time. May there not be some allusion to this circumstance in Job xxxix, 1, "Canst thou mark when the hinds do calve?" etc. Perhaps, as the Sept. uniformly renders *ayâl* by ἔλαφος, we may incline to the belief that the *Cervus Barbarus* is the deer denoted. The feminine noun אַיָּלָה, *ayâlâh*, occurs frequently in the O. T. See HIND.

Hart, Levi, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born April 10, 1738, at Southington, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1760, studied under Dr. Bellamy, was licensed June 2, 1761, and was ordained pastor at Griswold, Conn., Nov. 4, 1762, where he labored until his death, Oct. 27, 1808. During his long career as pastor he trained many young men for the ministry. In 1784 he was made a member of Dartmouth College Corporation, and of Yale in 1791. He published several occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 590.

Hart, Oliver, a Baptist minister, was born in Warminster, Pa., July 5, 1723, joined the Baptist Church in 1741, was licensed to preach in 1746, and was ordained in 1749. In that year he became pastor of the Baptist church in Charleston, S. C., and remained in that office thirty years, with eminent success both as preacher and pastor. In the Revolution he espoused the Whig cause with great ardor, and had to flee from Charleston in 1780 to avoid falling into the hands of the British. He settled as pastor of the Baptist Church at Hopewell, N. J., where he died Dec. 31, 1795. He published a *Discourse on the Death of W. Tennent:—Dancing Exploded:—The Christian Temple:—A Gospel Church portrayed.*—Benedict, *Hist. of the Baptists*, vol. ii; Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 47.

Hartley, DAVID, an English practitioner of medicine, and a philosopher of considerable, but transitory reputation. The Scotch school of metaphysics borrowed much from his conclusions; and the long-prevalent theory of Beauty, which was elaborated in Alison's *Principles of Taste*, derived from them its cardinal doctrines. Dr. Hartley occupies a notable position in the history of speculation on other grounds. He presented a curious example of the partial conciliation of Des Cartes, Newton, and Locke; he inaugurated the impulse which transmuted the system of the last of these great men into the materialism of the French *Encyclopædia;* he preceded Bonnet, of Geneva, in applying physiological observation to psychological discussion, and thus became the precursor of Cabanis and Broussais, of Moleschott and Huxley. He was contemporary with Collier, and Berkeley, and Hume, and Reid. While the two first were undermining the philosophy of Locke by questioning the credibility of the senses, and Hume was achieving a similar result by impugning the evidences of consciousness, to be imperfectly refuted by Reid's exaggeration of the reliability of external perception, Hartley was still further invalidating the authority of Locke by proposing a purely mechanical explanation of the processes of thought. He is thus even more noteworthy for his relations to the revolutions of opinion in the 18th century than for the positive additions he is supposed to have made to the science of the human mind. He was one of the dominant spirits of that agitation of the intellectual waters which heralded and produced the political convulsions of the last century. At the same time, he is the link between widely separated dogmas: furnishing a bond between Des Cartes and Stewart; connecting Locke with Condillac and French sensationalism; reviving neglected positions of Aristotle, and prefiguring many of the latest manifestations of scientific materialism.

Life.—The biography of Dr. Hartley is singularly devoid of salient incidents and of general interest. He belonged to that numerous class of very worthy men who run their eminently useful career without experiencing or occasioning violent excitement of any kind. But for his philosophical productions, his epitaph might have been *Vivens moriensque fefellit.* He was the son of a respectable clergyman, and was born Aug. 30, 1705, at Armley, Yorkshire, of which parish his father was vicar. He completed his education at Jesus College, Cambridge, and was designed for the paternal vocation. But he was induced to divert his attention to medicine, in consequence of scruples about subscribing the XXXIX Articles, for religious opinion within the bosom of the Anglican Church was much divided at the time by the recent issues of the "Bangorian Controversy." His experience was frequently repeated in other cases in the ensuing years. He retained, however, the fervent but simple piety appropriate to his meditated profession, and never withdrew his interest from the subjects which attract the intelligent theologian. He informs us that the seeds of his own doctrine began to germinate when he was twenty-five years of age, though their elaboration was not completed till he was more than forty. His views were given to the world in 1749, in a work entitled *Observations on Man, his Frame, his Duties, his Expectations.* He survived its publication about eight years, and died at Bath Aug. 28, 1757, when within a fortnight of completing his fifty-third year. His life had been expended in the diligent and kindly pursuit of his calling at Newark, Bury St. Edmund's, London, and Bath.

Mackintosh and Coleridge, while presenting diverse views of Hartley's doctrine, are lavish of encomiums upon his virtues and purity of character. A very brief and very dry biography was composed by his son, with filial regard and quaint delineation. A few fragments from this recondite production will present the philosopher "in the habit and manner as he lived." "His person was of middle size, and well proportioned. His complexion fair, his features regular and handsome. His countenance open, ingenuous, and animated. He was peculiarly neat in person and attire. He lived in personal intimacy with the learned men of his age," among whom are enumerated Law, bishop of Carlisle; Butler, bishop of Durham; Warburton, bishop of Gloucester; Hoadley, successively bishop of Bangor, Hereford, and Winchester; Pope and Young; Dr. Jortin and Dr. Byrom; Hawkins, Browne, and Hooke, the forgotten historian of Rome. The list is sufficiently heterogeneous. "His mind was formed to benevolence and universal philanthropy. His genius was penetrating and active, his industry indefatigable, his philosophical observations and attentions unremitting. His natural temper was gay, cheerful, and sociable. He was addicted to no vice in any part of his life, neither to pride, nor to sensuality, nor intemperance, nor ostentation, nor envy, nor to any sordid self-interest; but his heart was replete with every contrary virtue."

Philosophy. — Hartley neither proclaimed nor produced any scheme of speculation, nor did he pretend that his views were characterized by any marked degree of originality. He investigated and endeavored to explain certain phenomena of the human mind, and to discover the machinery of thought. He has bequeathed a doctrine which has been in part generally adopted, and which has been frequently exaggerated by admirers who have repudiated, ignored, or been ignorant of the characteristic ground-work on which it had been erected. The source and filiation of his tenets have been indicated by him with what Sir James Mackintosh conceives to have been extravagant generosity. Hartley's acknowledgments are, however, made in ignorance of his much larger, but more remote obligations to Aristotle. "About eighteen years ago," says he, in

the preface of his work, "I was informed that the Rev. Mr. Gay, then living, asserted the possibility of deducing all our intellectual pleasures and pains from association. This put me upon considering the power of association. By degrees many disquisitions foreign to the doctrine of association, or, at least, not immediately connected with it, intermixed themselves." "I think, however, that I cannot be called a system maker, since I did not first form a system, and then suit the facts to it, but was carried on by a train of thoughts from one thing to another, frequently without any express design, or even any previous suspicion of the consequences that might arise." Assuredly this is neither a systematic nor a philosophical method of procedure. But this easy disagation of thought explains the instability, want of consistency, and partial incoherence of Hartley's speculations. It also explains the facility and unsuspected inconsequence with which a portion of the doctrine has been separated from its accompaniments for special acceptance and development.

The characteristic tenets of Hartley have been very clearly and concisely stated by Morell. "The objects of the external world affect in some manner the extreme ends of the nerves, which spread from the brain as a centre to every part of the body. This affection produces a vibration, which is continued along the nerve by the agency of an elastic ether until it reaches the brain, where it produces the phenomenon we term sensation. When a sensation has been experienced several times, the vibratory movement from which it arises acquires the tendency to repeat itself spontaneously, even when the external object is not present. These repetitions, or *relics* of sensation, are *ideas*, which in their turn possess the property of recalling each other by virtue of mutual association among themselves. . . . The subordinate effects of these principles are easy to be imagined. If all our ideas are but relics of sensations, and all excited spontaneously by the laws of association, it is abundantly evident that the power of the will must be a nonentity, that man can really have no control of his own mind, that he is the creature of irresistible necessity. Hartley was accordingly a firm necessarian. Another natural effect of the theory of vibrations is materialism." The pernicious consequences of their dogmas are perspicaciously displayed by Coleridge, who had at one time been so devoted to their teachings that he bestowed the name of their author upon his son, Hartley Coleridge.

In this speculation there are three distinct but intimately connected doctrines. 1. The theory of the association of ideas. 2. The physiological and physical mode of accounting for this association and for perception by the vibrations of an elastic ether through the medullary substance of the nerves. 3. The assertion of the necessity of human actions. The last of these connects itself with the optimism of Leibnitz and the fatalism of Spinoza, through King's *Origin of Evil*. The second dogma was early abandoned, at least in the form in which it was presented by this author. It was not entirely novel, but it was the most original portion of Hartley's labors, and through it he mainly influenced the development of the French philosophy. It was suggested by one of the queries in Newton's *Optics*, and may be traced through the animal spirits of Locke and Des Cartes, and the vortices and elastic ether of Des Cartes to the earlier philosophers, and up to Epicurus and Leucippus. It may merit renewed consideration if the physiological psychology now in prospect should gain acceptance. The doctrine of Association is regarded as being peculiarly Hartley's own. It was not altogether novel: he himself ascribes its first suggestion to Gay. It is presupposed in many suggestions of Locke, and is descended from a more remote and illustrious ancestry, which runs back to the Stagyrite—the reputed fountain of so much error, the father of so much wisdom. It received, however, such an ingenious and extensive development from Hartley that Sir James Mackintosh rightly disregards the claims of Gay, but wrongly neglects earlier obligations. It is largely incorporated into recent schemes of metaphysics, ethics, and æsthetics, but severed from the mechanical hypothesis which gave it its chief originality and its distinctive complexion. In this mutilated form it possesses unquestionable truth; but still it is only an imperfect explanation of a limited class of mental and moral phenomena, and is easily pressed, as it has often been pushed, to absurd and hazardous conclusions. Coleridge has forcibly signalized its dangers, and has declared that, wherever it deviates from the simpler exposition of Aristotle, it declines into error and immoral courses.

Literature.—Hartley, *Observations on Man, his Frame, his Duty, his Expectations*, with Notes and Additions by Herman Andrew Pistorius (Lond. 1791, 3 vols. 8vo). An abridgment of the original edition had been published by Dr. Priestley (Lond. 1775), with the omission of the doctrine of vibrations and vibratiuncules. It is from this mutilated presentment that the theory of Association has been principally derived. Hume, *Inquiry concerning the Human Understanding*, sec. ii–vii; Reid, *On the Intellectual Powers*, Essay ii, ch. iii, ed. Hamilton—unfortunately, Sir William never supplied the notes to Reid, which he indicates by numbers; Mackintosh, *On the Progress of Ethical Philosophy;* Dugald Stewart, *On the Progress of Metaphysical, Ethical, and Political Philosophy* (*Philosophical Essays, Works*, edit. Sir W. Hamilton); Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, ch. v–vii; Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy*. (G. F. H.)

Hartlib, Samuel, an English writer of the 17th century, was born of Polish Protestant parents. He came to England about 1640, took an active part in the theological questions of the day, and endeavored to bring about a union of the different churches. He afterwards devoted himself to the improvement of agriculture, etc. Having spent all his fortune in these attempts, he received from Cromwell a pension of £300, which was suppressed at the Restoration. He spent the latter part of his life in retirement, and perhaps in want. The exact time of his death is unknown. He wrote *A Relation of that which hath been lately attempted to procure Ecclesiastical Peace among Protestants* (Lond. 1641):—*Considerations concerning England's Reformation in Church and State* (1647, 4to):—*Twisse's doubting conscience resolved* (1652, 8vo); some works on Husbandry, etc. Milton addressed his *Essay on Education* to Hartlib. See *Gentleman's Magazine*, lxxii; *Censura literaria*, vol. iii; Chalmers, *General Biographical Dictionary*.

Hartmann, Anton Theodor, a German Protestant theologian and Orientalist, was born at Düsseldorf June 25, 1774. He studied at Osnabruck, Dortmund, and Göttingen. After being successively co-rector of the gymnasium of Sœst in 1797, rector of the gymnasium of Herford in 1799, and professor in that of Oldenburg in 1804, he was appointed professor of theology in the University of Rostock in 1811. He died at Rostock April 21, 1838. He is especially known for his works on antiquities, and on Hebrew and Arabic literature, the principal of which are *Aufklärung ü. Asien f. Bibelforscher* (Oldenburg, 1806–7, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Die Hebräerin am Putztische u. als Braut* (Amst. 1809–1810, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Supplementa ad J. Buxtorfii et W. Gesenii Lexic.* (Rostock, 1813, 4to):—*Thesauri Linguæ Hebraicæ e Michna augendi* (Rostock, 1825–1826, 3 parts, 4to):—*Linguistische Einleitung in d. Studium der Bücher des A. T.* (Rostock, 1818, 8vo):—*Hist. Krit. Forschungen über die Bildung, d. Zeitalter u. Plan d. fünf Bücher Moses* (Rostock et Gustrow, 1831, 8vo):—*Die enge Verbindung d. A. T. mit d. N.* (Hamb. 1831, 8vo):—*Blicke in d. Geist d. Urchristenthums* (Dusseldorf, 1802, 8vo). See Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 474.

Hartwig, John Christopher, came to America as chaplain to a German regiment in the service of England during the first French war, as it is called. He

was a member of the first Lutheran synod held in this country in 1748. His first regular charge combined several congregations in Hunterdon Co., N. J. He labored for a brief period in Pennsylvania, but the larger portion of his ministry was spent in the state of New York. He died in 1796. The manner of his death furnishes a remarkable instance of the power of the imagination. Forty years before, the impression from a dream on his birthday, that he would live just forty years longer, had become so strong that he felt persuaded the dream would be fulfilled, and his life protracted to the close of his eightieth year. On the day preceding its completion he came to the residence of the Hon. J. R. Livingston, and announced that he had come to his house to die. In the evening he conducted the family devotions, and the next morning arose in apparent health. He breakfasted with the family, and entered freely into conversation until the approach of the hour, as he supposed, for his departure, 11 o'clock A.M. A few minutes before the time, he requested permission to retire. Mr. Livingston, unobserved by him, followed, and noticed that he was undressing. Just as the clock tolled the hour, he was in the act of removing the stock from the neck; at that moment he fell back and expired. Notwithstanding his eccentricities, he possessed many noble qualities, and his name will ever be associated with the institution in Otsego Co., N. Y., which bears his name, and of which he may be said to be the founder. The tract of land he received for his services as chaplain he bequeathed principally for the establishment of a theological and missionary institution for the instruction of pious young men for the Lutheran ministry, and for the education of Indians in the Christian religion as missionaries among their own tribes. (M. L. S.)

Ha'rum (Heb. *Harûm'*, הָרֻם, *elevated;* Sept. Ἰαρείμ), the father of Aharhel, the "families" of which latter are enumerated among the posterity of Coz, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 8). B.C. post 1612.

Haru'maph (Heb. *Charumaph'*, חֲרוּמַף, *snub-nosed;* Sept. Ἐρωμάφ v. r. Ἐρωμάϑ), "father" of Jedaiah, which latter was one of the priests who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 10). B.C. ante 446.

Ha'ruphite (Heb. *Charuphi'*, חֲרוּפִי, with the art.; for which the Masoretic margin more correctly reads חֲרִיפִי, *Hariphite;* Sept. Ἀρουφί v. r. Χαριφιήλ, Vulg. *Haruphites*), an epithet of Shephatiah, one of the brave adventurers who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 5): so called, probably, as being a native of HARIPH. "Josabad the Gederathite," of the preceding verse, was probably from the same place; and as he was so called from being a resident of Gedor (q. v.), it would seem that the epithet "Haruphite" was an equivalent one, as a descendant from Hareph (q. v.), the founder of Geder (1 Chron. ii, 51).

Ha'ruz (Heb. *Charuts'*, חָרוּץ, *eager*, as in Prov. xii, 27, etc.; Sept. Ἀροῦς), a citizen of Jotbah, and father of Meshullemeth, who became the wife of king Manasseh, and mother of king Amon (2 Kings xxi, 19). B.C. ante 664.

Harvard, JOHN, founder of Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., was born in England, studied at Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he became A.M. in 1635, and entered into the ministry among the Dissenters. Emigrating to America, he became pastor of a Congregational society at Charlestown, Mass., where he preached but a short time, and died Sept. 14, 1638. In his will he left a legacy of nearly £800 to the high-school of Cambridge. This bequest laid the foundation of the college, to which the trustees gave the name of its benefactor.

Harvest (קָצִיר, *katsir'*, i. e. *reaping;* ϑερισμός), the season of gathering grain or fruits. In general, this fell, as now in Palestine, in the middle of April or Abib (John iv, 35), although in many parts, e. g. at Jericho (whose inhabitants were the first to present the first-fruits, Mishna, *Pesach*, iv, 8), it began as early as March (Shaw, *Trav.* p. 291). (See Gerdes, *De tempore messis Hebræorum*, Utrecht, 1720.) Dr. Robinson says: "On the 4th and 5th of June, the people of Hebron were just beginning to gather their wheat; on the 11th and 12th, the threshing-floors on the Mount of Olives were in full operation. We had already seen the harvest in the same state of progress on the plains of Gaza on the 19th of May; while at Jericho, on the 12th of May, the threshing-floors had nearly completed their work" (*Bib. Res.* ii, 99, 100). On the sixteenth day of the first month, Abib or Nisan (Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 10, 5), a handful of ripe ears was offered before the Lord as the first-fruits; after which it was lawful to put the sickle to the corn (Lev. xxiii, 9–14). (See Schramm, *De manipulo hordeaceo*, Frckft. a. O. 1706.) The harvest is described as beginning with the barley, and with the festival of the Passover (Lev. xxiii, 9–14; 2 Sam. xxi, 9, 10; Ruth ii, 23), and ending with the wheat (Gen. xxx, 14; Exod. xxxiv, 22), and with the festival of Pentecost (Exod. xxiii, 16). (See Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 684.) In the most ancient times the corn was plucked up by the roots. When the sickle was used, the wheat was either cropped off under the ear, or cut close to the ground; in the former case, the straw was afterwards plucked up for use; in the latter, the stubble was left and burnt on the ground for

Ancient Egyptian Harvest scene. (From Wilkinson.)

Fig. 1. The steward. 2, 3. Reapers. 5. A woman gleaner. 6, carrying the wheat in the usual rope net. 7. The *tritura*. 9. Winnowers. 11. The scribe. 13, 14, carrying the grain to the granary in sacks.

manure (Isa. xvii, 5; Job xxiv, 24). The sheaves were collected into a heap, or removed to the threshing-floor (Gen. xxxvii, 7; Lev. xxiii, 10-15; Ruth ii, 7-15; Job xxiv, 10, Jer. ix, 22; Mic. iv, 12; Amos ii, 13). In Palestine at the present day, the grain is not bound into sheaves, but is gathered into two large bundles, which are carried home on either side of the backs of animals (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 323). The reapers were the owners and their children, and men and women servants (Ruth ii, 4, 8, 21, 23; John iv, 36; James v, 4). Refreshments were provided for them, especially drink, of which the gleaners were often allowed to partake (Ruth ii, 9); so in the Egyptian scenes we see reapers drinking, and the gleaners applying to share the draught. The time of harvest was a season of very great enjoyment, especially when the crops had been plentiful (Psa. cxxvi, 1-6; Isa. ix, 3). The harvest in Scripture is likewise put for a time of *destruction* (Hos. vi, 11), according to Newcome; but, according to Horsley, for a time of *mercy*. Of the former sense there is an example in Jer. li, 33, plainly referring to the judgments of God upon Babylon. So in the oracle concerning Damascus (Isa. xvii, 5), as Lowth observes, the king of Assyria shall sweep away the whole body of the people, as the reaper strips off the whole crop of corn, and the remnant shall be no more in proportion than the scattered ears left to the gleaner. In Joel iii, 13, the last words explain the figurative language which precedes: they are ripe for excision. The same comparison is used in Rev. xiv, 14; xv, 18, where the person referred to as executing vengeance is Jesus Christ himself, though angels assist in the execution. But *harvest* is also used in a good sense, as in Matt. ix, 37; Luke x, 2; John iv, 35. So in Jer. viii, 20, "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved;" i. e. the time in which we expected to be saved is past. The *harvest*, in agricultural reckoning, is considered to be the *end* of the season, being the time appointed for gathering in the fruits of the earth, and finishing the labors of the year. So, in Matt. xiii, 39, our Lord says, "The harvest is the *end* of the world, and the reapers are the angels." In Matt. ix, 36, our Lord, seeing multitudes coming to hear him, remarks, "The harvest truly is plenteous;" i. e. many are willing to receive instruction. See AGRICULTURE.

Harwood, EDWARD, a learned Unitarian minister, was born in 1729 in Lancashire. In 1754 he became master of a school at Congleton, in Cheshire, from whence he removed in 1765 to Bristol, where he was ordained over a Presbyterian congregation. In 1768 he obtained his degree of D.D. from Edinburgh, through the interest of Dr. Chandler, whose daughter he married. His character, however, was so immoral that his congregation dismissed him; on which he came to London, where he supported himself by teaching the classics and correcting the press. He died poor in 1794. His principal works are, 1. *A View of the various editions of the Greek and Roman Classics* (London, 4th edit., 1791, 12mo):—2. *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Lond. 1773-81, 2 vols. 8vo):—3. An edition of the *Greek Testament* (2 vols. 8vo):—4. A *Liberal Translation of the New Testament* into polite English (or, in other words, a burlesque of the sacred Scriptures) (Lond. 1768, 2 vols. 8vo):—5. *The New Testament, collated with the most approved MSS., with select Notes* (1776, 2 vols. 12mo). See *Gentleman's Mag.* vols. lxii-lxiv; Watt, *Bibl. Britannica.*

Hascall, DANIEL, a Baptist minister, was born at Bennington, Vt., Feb. 24, 1782, graduated at Middlebury College in 1806, and afterwards studied theology while engaged as a teacher in Pittsfield, Mass. In 1808 he became pastor of the Baptist church in Elizabethtown, Essex Co., N. Y., where he was ordained Sept. 7th, and in 1813 he accepted a call from the Baptist Church of Hamilton, N. Y. In 1815 he began to receive pupils in theology, and after establishing the Baptist Education Society of New York in 1817, his little school was in 1820 transformed into the "Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution" (now Madison University), which was opened under his charge, and to which he afterwards exclusively devoted himself, dissolving his pastoral connection in 1828. He however left it in 1835, and gave his attention to an academy which, two years before, had been started mainly through his agency in Florence, Oneida Co., N. Y. In 1848 he resumed his ministerial labors as pastor of the Baptist Church in Lebanon, N. Y. He died June 28, 1852. Mr. Hascall's publications were, *Elements of Theology*, designed for family reading and Bible-classes; a smaller work of the same kind for Sabbath-schools; *Caution against False Philosophy*, a sermon (1817); and a pamphlet entitled *Definitions of the Greek Bapto, Baptizo*, etc. (1818).—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 547.

Hasadi'ah (Heb. *Chasadyah'*, חֲסַדְיָה, *favored by Jehovah;* Sept. Ἀσαδία), one of the five sons of Pedaiah (not of Zerubbabel, who was a sixth), of the descendants of David (1 Chron. iii, 20); probably the same otherwise called JUSHAB-HESED in the same verse (see Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 17). B.C. cir. 536.

Hasenkamp, the family name of several German theologians.

JOHANN GERHARD was born in Wechte, Prussia, June 12, 1736. Having become a student at the Academy of Lingen, 1753-55, he distinguished himself by an eager thirst for knowledge, and by great earnestness of religious activity. For preaching without license he was several times arrested. After eleven years' suspension he was made rector of the Gymnasium in Duisburg in 1766, and soon after married, and settled down earnestly to his work of restoring the fallen fortunes of the gymnasium. His religious tendencies always inclined him to favor pietism, and to urge the necessity of deep Christian experience. He therefore sympathized fully with Collenbusch (q. v.) and Oetinger (q. v.). He was again suspended as a "mystic" and disturber, but was soon restored by the higher Church authorities at Berlin. He died July 10, 1771. His autobiography, extending to 1766, and continued by his son, was published in the journal *Wahrheit z. Gottseligkeit* (vol. ii, 5, 6, 1836). He also published *Predigten n. d. Geschmack der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (Frankfort, 1772). His other writings are of little importance.

FRIEDRICH ARNOLD, his half-brother, born Jan. 11, 1747, succeeded Johann as rector of Duisburg, and married his widow. Following in the footsteps of his brother, he shared his religious opinions and feelings, and wrote several pamphlets in exposition of the views of the so-called "mystical" school of Stilling and Lavater. He also wrote against Semler and other rationalists, who fared badly under his fiery attacks. See his *U. die verdunkelnde Aufklärung* (Duisb. 1789):—*Briefe über Propheten* (Duisb. 1791), etc. He died in 1795.

JOHANN HEINRICH, another brother, was born Sept. 19, 1750. After helping his parents until he was sixteen years old, he began his studies, was from 1776 to 1779 rector at Emmerich, and, having been appointed pastor of a small congregation near Altona, remained there during the last thirty-five years of his life. The loneliness of his life in the solitude of his remote parish influenced his character, yet he is the most genial of the three brothers, as is seen in his *Christliche Schriften* (Munster, 1816-19, 2 vols.). He died July 17, 1814.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.;* Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s. v. (J. N. P.)

Hasenu'ah, or rather SENUAH (סְנוּאָה, a *bristling* [Gesen.] or *hated* [Fürst], with the art. הַסְּנוּאָה, *has-Senuah'*), the name of two Benjamites (but the name has the fem. termination).

1. (Sept. Ἀσανουά, Eng. Vers. "Hasenuah.") Father of Hodaviah and ancestor of Sallu, which last was a chief resident of Jerusalem, apparently after the Captivity (1 Chron. ix, 7). B.C. ante 536.

2. (Sept. Ἀσανά, Eng. Vers. "Senuah.") **Father of**

Judah, which latter was "second over the city," after the return from Babylon (Neh. xi, 9). B.C. cir. 440.

Hashabi'ah (Heb. *Chashabyah'*, חֲשַׁבְיָה [and in 1 Chron. xxv, 3; xxvi, 20; 2 Chron. xxxv, 9, the prolonged form *Chushabya'hu*, חֲשַׁבְיָהוּ], *regarded* by *Jehovah*; Sept. Ἀσεβί, Ἀσώβ, Ἀσεβίας, Ἀσαβία, etc.), the name of at least nine descendants of Levi.

1. Son of Amaziah and father of Malluch, of the family of Merari (1 Chron. vi, 45). B.C. long ante 1014.

2. A son of Jeduthun, appointed by David over the twelfth course of Levitical singers (1 Chron. xxv, 3, 19). B.C. 1014.

3. Son of Kemuel, of Hebron, appointed by David at the head of the officers to take charge of the sacred revenue west of the Jordan (1 Chron. xxvi, 30; xxvii, 17). B.C. 1014.

4. One of the chief Levites who made voluntary offerings of victims for the renewal of the Temple services under Josiah (2 Chron. xxxv, 9). B.C. 623.

5. Son of Bunni and father of Azrikam, of the family of Merari (1 Chron. ix, 14; Neh. xi, 15). B.C. considerably ante 440.

6. Son of Mattaniah and father of Bani, Levites (Neh. xi, 22). B.C. ante 440.

7. One of the chief priests intrusted by Ezra with the bullion and other valuables for the sacred vessels at Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 24). He is probably the same whose father Hilkiah is mentioned in Neh. xii, 21. B.C. 536.

8. A descendant of Merari, who complied with Ezra's summons for persons to perform the proper Levitical functions at Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 19). B.C. 536.

9. A chief of the Levites (Neh. xii, 24), "ruler of the half part of Keilah," who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (iii, 17), and subscribed the covenant of fidelity to Jehovah (x, 11). B.C. 446-410.

Hashab'nah (Heb. *Chashabnah'*, חֲשַׁבְנָה, prob. for חֲשַׁבְיָה, *Hashabiah;* Sept. Ἑσαβανά, Vulg. *Hasebna*), one of the chief of the people who subscribed Nehemiah's covenant (Neh. x, 25). B.C. cir. 410.

Hashabni'ah (Heb. *Chashabneyah'*, חֲשַׁבְנְיָה, i. q. חֲשַׁבְנָה, *Hashabnah;* Sept. Ἀσβανία, Σεβανι), the name of two men about the time of the return from Babylon.

1. Father of Hattush, which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 10). B.C. ante 446.

2. One of the Levites appointed by Ezra to interpret the law to the people (Neh. ix, 5). B.C. cir. 410.

Hashbad'ana (Heb. *Chashbaddanah'*, חַשְׁבַּדָּנָה, for חָשַׁב בַּדָּנָה, *consideration in judging*, perh. q. d. *considerate judge;* Sept. Ἀσαβαδμά, Vulg. *Hasbadana*), one of those who stood at Ezra's left hand while he read the law to the people (Neh. viii, 4). B.C. cir. 410.

Hash-Baz. See MAHER-SHALAL-HASH-BAZ.

Ha'shem (Heb. *Hashem'*, הָשֵׁם, perh. i. q. חָשֻׁם, *fat;* Sept Ἀσάμ, Vulg. *Asem*), a native of Gizoh, and ancestor of two of David's heroes (1 Chron. xi, 34; the JASHEN (q. v.) of 2 Sam. xxiii, 32). B.C. ante 1014.

Hashishim. See ASSASSINS.

Hashmannim (Hebrew *Chashmannim'*, חַשְׁמַנִּים; Sept. πρέσβεις, Vulg. *legati*), a plur. form occurring only in the Heb. of Psa. lxviii, 31: "*Hashmannim* [A. Vers. "princes"] shall come out of Egypt, Cush shall make her hands to hasten to God." The word has usually been derived from the Arabic *Mashmin*, *rich*, hence influential or noble; but a derivation from the civil name of Hermopolis Magna in the Heptanomis, preserved in the modern Arabic *Ashmunyen*, "the two Ashmûns," seems more reasonable. The ancient Egyptian name is *Ha-shmen* or *Hashmûn*, "the abode of eight;" the sound of the signs for eight, however, we take alone from the Coptic, and Brugsch reads them *Sesennu* (*Geog. Inschr.* i, 219, 220), but hardly on conclusive grounds. If we suppose that Hashmannim is a proper name and signifies *Hermopolites*, the mention might be explained by the circumstance that Hermopolis Magna was the great city of the Egyptian Hermes, Thoth, the god of wisdom; and the meaning might therefore be that even the *wisest* Egyptians should come to the Temple, as well as the distant Cushites.—Smith, s. v. We may add that the name *Hasmonean*, which was given to the Maccabees or Jewish princes in the interval between the O. and N. T., was, it is supposed, derived from Hashmannim (Hengstenberg, *Psalms*, ii, 369).

Hashmo'nah (Heb. *Chashmonah'*, חַשְׁמֹנָה, *fatness;* Sept. Ἀσσεμωνᾶ, v. r. Ἀσελμωνᾶ and Σελμωνᾶ), the thirtieth station of the Israelites during their wandering, situated not far from Mount Hor (Moseroth), in the direction of the desert (Numb. xxxiii, 29, 30); apparently near the intersection of wady el-Jerafeh with wady el-Jeib, in the Arabah. See EXODE.

Ha'shub (Heb. *Chashshub'*, חַשּׁוּב, *intelligent;* Sept. Ἀσούβ, in Neh. xi, 15 Ἀσσούβ, in 1 Chron. ix, 14 Ἀσώβ; Vulg. *Hasub*, in 1 Chron. ix, 14 *Hassub*), the name of two or three men about the time of the return from Babylon.

1. A Levite of the family of Merari, son of Azrikam and father of Shemaiah, which last was one of those resident in the "villages of the Netophathites," and having general oversight over the Temple (Neh. xi, 15; 1 Chron. ix, 14, in which latter passage the name is more accurately Anglicized "Hasshub"). B.C. ante 440.

2. A person who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem opposite his house (Neh. iii, 21); perhaps the same with the foregoing. B.C. 446.

3. "Son" of Pahath-Moab, and one of those who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 11). B.C. 446. He is probably the same with one of the chief Israelites who joined in the sacred covenant of Nehemiah (Neh. x, 23) B.C. cir. 410.

Hashu'bah (Heb. *Chashubah'*, חֲשֻׁבָה, *esteemed*, a Chaldaizing form for חָשׁוּב; Sept. Ἀσεβά, Vulg. *Hasaban*), one of the five sons (exclusive of Zerubbabel) of Pedaïah, the descendant of David (1 Chron. iii, 20); not of Zerubbabel, as at first appears (see Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 17). B.C. cir. 536.

Ha'shum (Heb. *Chashum'*, חָשֻׁם, *opulent;* Sept. Ἀσούμ, Ἀσήμ, Ἡσαμί, Ὡσάμ, Ἡσάμ), the name apparently of two or three men about the time of the Captivity.

1. An Israelite whose posterity (or rather, perhaps, a place whose inhabitants), to the number of 223 males, or 328 in all, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 19; Neh. vii, 22); some of whom afterwards divorced their Gentile wives (Ezra x, 33). The associated names seem to indicate a locality in the northwestern part of the territory of Benjamin. B.C. ante 536.

2. One of those who stood at Ezra's left hand while he was reading the law to the people (Neh. viii, 4); probably the same with one of the chief of the people who subscribed Nehemiah's covenant (Neh. x, 18). B.C. cir. 410.

Hashu'pha (Neh. vii, 46). See HASUPHA.

Haskell, DANIEL, a Congregational minister, was born at Preston, Conn., June, 1784. He graduated at Yale College, 1802; was installed pastor in Burlington, Vt., April 10, 1810, where he remained until 1821, when he was made president of the University of Vermont. He resigned this office in 1824, and died Aug. 9, 1848. Mr. Haskell published an ordination sermon (1814); with the assistance of J. C. Smith, *A Gazetteer of the United States* (1843, 8vo); *Chronological View of the World* (1845, 12mo); and a few occasional discourses. He also edited McCulloch's Geographical Dictionary, published by the Harpers (1843-44).—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 526.

Hasmonæans. See ASMONÆAN.

Haspeya (חספיא), a river and town of Palestine,

near Lebanon, mentioned in the Talmud (*Demay*, ii); according to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 65), identical with the modern Arabic *Koroni*, near the source of the Jordan; evidently the modern *Hasbeia*, an important place in that region (Robinson, *Researches*, new ed. iii, 380).

Has'rah (Heb. *Chasrah'*, חַסְרָה, *poverty;* Sept. Ἐσσερί v. r. Ἀράς, Vulg. *Hasra*), the father (or mother) of Tikbath, and grandfather of Shallum, which last was husband of Huldah the prophetess (2 Chron. xxxiv, 22). The parallel passage (2 Kings xxii, 14) gives the name, prob. by transposition, in the form HARHAS (חַרְחַס, Sept. Ἀράς, Vulg. *Araas*). Hasrah is said to have been "keeper of the wardrobe," perhaps the sacerdotal vestments; if, indeed, that epithet does not rather refer to Shallum. B.C. considerably ante 623.

Hassan. See ASSASSINS.

Hasse, FRIEDRICH RUDOLF, a German theologian, was born at Dresden June 29, 1808. After studying at Leipzic and Berlin, he established himself, in 1834, at the university of the latter city as *privatdocent;* in 1836 he became extraordinary professor of Church History at the University of Greifswald, and in 1841 ordinary professor at the University of Bonn. Subsequently he was also appointed consistorial councillor. He died in 1862. His principal work is the excellent monograph *Anselm von Canterbury* (Leips. 1843–52, 2 vols.), one of the best works of this class, and which had the merit of causing a more scientific treatment of the history of scholasticism. His *Geschichte des alten Bundes* (Leips. 1863) is a course of lectures, and, as such, is meritorious. His *Kirchengeschichte* was published after his death by Köhler (Leips. 1864, 3 vols.). See Krafft, *F. R. Hasse* (Bonn, 1865); *Studien u. Kritkien*, 1867, p. 823.

Hassena'ah (Neh. iii, 3). See SENAAH.

Has'shub (1 Chron. ix, 14). See HASHUB.

Hasu'pha (Heb. *Chasupha'*, חֲשׂוּפָא, *uncovered;* Sept. Ἀσουφά, Ἀσειφά; Vulg. *Harupha*), one of the Nethinim whose descendants returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 43; Neh. vii, 46, in which latter passage the name is less correctly Anglicized "*Hashupha*"). B.C. ante 536.

Hat is the rendering of the Eng. Bible for the Chald. כַּרְבְּלָא (*karbela'*, according to Gesenius from כַּרְבֵּל, to *gird* or clothe, as in 1 Chron. xv, 27), a *mantle* or *pallium* (Dan. iii, 21; marg. "turbans"). See DRESS.

Ha'tach (Heb. *Hathak'*, הֲתָךְ, perhaps from Persic, *verity;* Sept. Ἀχραθαῖος, Vulg. *Athach*), one of the eunuchs in the palace of Xerxes, appointed to wait on Esther, whom she employed in her communications with Mordecai (Esth. iv, 5, 6, 9, 10). B.C. 474.

Hatchment, a word corrupted from *achievement*, and signifying, in heraldry, the armorial bearings of any person fully emblazoned with shield, crest, supporters, etc. The word is used in England for the escutcheon hung up over a door after a funeral, and often in the church. Heraldry is thus supposed to have been formerly connected with religion. The coat was said to be assumed with religious feeling, and at length restored to the sanctuary, in token of thankful acknowledgment to Almighty God.—Farrar, *Eccles. Dictionary*, s. v.

Hate (properly שָׂנֵא, μισέω), to regard with a passion contrary to love (Jer. xliv, 4). God's hatred is towards all sinful thoughts and ways. It is a feeling of which all holy beings are conscious in view of sin, and is wholly unlike the hatred which is mentioned in the Scriptures among the works of the flesh (Gal. v, 20). See ANGER. When the Hebrews compared a stronger affection with a weaker one, they called the first *love*, and the other *hatred*, meaning to love in a less degree —"Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated" (Rom. ix, 13); i. e. on Jacob have I bestowed privileges and blessings such as are the proofs of affection; I have treated him as one treats a friend whom he loves; but from Esau have I withheld these privileges and blessings, and therefore treated him as one is wont to treat those whom he dislikes. That this refers to the bestowment of temporal blessings, and the withholding of them, is clear, not only from this passage, but from comparing Mal. i, 2, 3; Gen. xxv, 23; xxvii, 27–29, 37–40. Indeed, as to *hated*, its meaning here is rather *privative* than *positive*. So, "If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated" (Deut. xxi, 15); i. e. less beloved. When our Saviour says that he who would follow him must *hate* father and mother, he means that even these dearest earthly friends must be loved in a subordinate degree; so, in the same sense, the follower of Christ is to hate his own life, or be willing to sacrifice it for the love and service of the Redeemer (Gen. xxix, 30; Deut. xxi, 16; Prov. xiii, 24; Matt. vi, 24; x, 37; Luke xiv, 26; xvi, 13; John xii, 25). See LOVE.

Ha'thath (Heb. *Chathath'*, חֲתַת, *terror*, as in Job vi, 21; Sept. Ἀϑάϑ), son of Othniel and grandson of Kenaz, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 13), consequently also grand-nephew and grandson of Caleb, son of Jephunneh (see ver. 15, and comp. Judg. i, 13). B.C. post 1612.

Hat'ipha [many *Hati'pha*] (Hebrew *Chatipha'*, חֲטִיפָא, *captured;* Sept. Ἀτιφά, Ἀτειφά), one of the Nethinim whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 54; Neh. vii, 56). B.C. ante 536.

Hat'ita [some *Hati'ta*] (Heb. *Chatita'*, חֲטִיטָא, *exploration;* Sept. Ἀτιτά), one of the "porters" (i. e. Levitical Temple-*janitors*) whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 42; Neh. vii, 45). B.C. ante 536.

Hatsi ham-Menuchôth (חֲצִי הַמְּנֻחוֹת, *Chatsi'*, etc., *midst of the resting-places;* Sept. Ἐσεὶ Ἀμμανίϑ, Vulg. *dimidium requietionum*, Eng. Vers. "half of the Manahethites," marg. "half of the Menuchites," or "Hatsiham-Menuchoth"), one of the two sons of Shobal, the "father" of Kirjath-Jearim (1 Chron. ii, 52); whence the patronymic for his descendants, HATSI-HAM-MANACHTHITES (חֲצִי הַמְּנַחְתִּי, Sept. ἥμισυ τῆς Μανάϑ, Vulg. *dimidium requietionis*, Eng. Vers. "half of the Manahethites," or "half of the Menuchites"), in verse 54. B.C. between 1612 and 1093. See MENUCHITE.

Hat-Temarim. See IR-HAT-TEMARIM.

Hat-Taavah. See KIBROTH-HAT-TAAVAH.

Hat-Ticon. See HAZAR-HAT-TICON.

Hattem, PONTIAN VAN. See HATTEMISTS.

Hattemists, a Dutch sect, named from Pontianus van Hattem, a minister in Zealand towards the close of the 18th century, who imbibed the sentiments of Spinoza, and was degraded from the pastoral office. He wrote a treatise on the Heidelberg Catechism. The Verschorists (q. v.) and Hattemists resemble each other, though Van Hattem tried in vain to unite the Verschorists with his own followers. "The founders of these sects followed the doctrine of absolute decrees into its farthest logical results; they denied the difference between moral good and evil, and the corruption of human nature; from whence they further concluded that the whole of religion consisted, not in acting, but in suffering; and that all the precepts of Jesus Christ are reducible to this one—that we bear with cheerfulness and patience the events that happen to us through the divine will, and make it our constant and only study to maintain a perfect tranquillity of mind. Thus far they agreed; but the Hattemists further affirmed that Christ made no expiation for the sins of men by his death, but had only suggested to us, by his mediation, that there was nothing in us that could offend the Deity: this, they say, was Christ's manner of justifying his servants, and presenting them blameless before the tribunal of God. It was one of their distinguishing tenets that God does not punish men *for* their sins, but *by* their sins."—See Mosheim, *Ch. History*,

cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. ii, ch. ii; Buck, *Theological Dictionary*, s. v.; Paquot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des Pays-Bas*, ix, 96–98; Hoefer, *Nouvelle Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 539.

Hat'til (Heb. *Chattil'*, חַטִּיל, *waving*; Sept. Ἀττίλ, Ἐττήλ), one of the descendants of "Solomon's servants" (i. e. perh. Gibeonitish Temple slaves), whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 57; Neh. vii, 59.) B.C. ante 536.

Hatto, bishop of Basel, was born 763, made bishop in 805, and abbot of Reichenau in 806. He was employed by Charlemagne in an embassy to the Greek emperor Nicephorus, to settle the boundaries of both empires. Having, in 823, laid aside his titles and dignities, he died in 836 as a simple monk at Reichenau. Two of his works have descended to us: *De visione Wettini* (Visions of *his disciple* Wettin on those suffering in Purgatory and on the Glory of Saints, done into verses by Walafrid Strabo, and printed in Mabillon, *Acta S. Bened.* iv, 1, 273); 25 *capita* (*D'Acheri*, i, 584).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, s. v.; Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Liter.* ii, 471. (J. N. P.)

Hatto or **Otho I**, tenth archbishop of Mentz. The time and place of his birth are unknown. In 888 he succeeded Rudolf as abbot of Reichenau, then one of the richest monasteries in Germany. He was in such favor with king Arnulf—thanks to his skill and utter want of principle—that he is said to have held at the same time eleven other abbeys. In 891 he was elected archbishop of Mentz: here he built a church to St. George, having obtained the head and another part of the body of the saint from pope Formosus! In August, 895, he presided at the Council of Tribur, where the emperor and 22 bishops were present. They voted 58 canons, mostly for the repression of crime. The 8th canon gives an idea of the power Rome held even at that period over the German churches: *Honoremus sanctam romanam et apostolicam sedem, ut quæ nobis sacerdotalis mater est dignitatis, debeat esse magistra ecclesiasticæ rationis quare. . . . . licet vix ferendum ab illa sancta sede imponatur jugum, conferamus et pia devotione toleremus.* After Louis's death, in October, 911, Hatto was retained in the council of his successor, Conrad. Having departed on a journey to Rome, March 13, 913, he died a few days after of fever, according to one account; but, according to others, he was killed at the battle of Heresburg in January, 913.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 539 sq.; Mabillon, *Acta Sanct. Ord. Bened.* vii, 118. (J. N. P.)

Hatto or **Otho II**, surnamed *Bonose*, 15th archbishop of Mentz. He was abbot of Fulda, and, at the death of archbishop William of Saxony, March 2, 968, was appointed his successor by Emperor Otho I. Hatto died in 969. The *Magdeburg Centuries* state that he was eaten alive by rats as a punishment for his avarice, and because he had, during a famine, compared the poor to these animals; and he is the subject of the well-known legend of the *Rat Tower* on the Rhine.—See *Gallia Christiana*, v, col. 456; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 541. (J. N. P.)

Hat'tush (Heb. *Chattush'*, חַטּוּשׁ, prob. *assembled* [Furst, *contender*]; Sept. Ἀττούς, but Χεττούς in 1 Chron. iii, 22, and v. r. Λαττούς in Ezra viii, 2), the name of several men about or after the time of the return from Babylon.

1. A priest who returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 2). B.C. 536.

2. A descendant of David who accompanied Ezra to Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 2). B.C. 459. See No. 5.

3. Son of Hashabniah, and one of those who rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 10). B.C. 446. He was possibly the same with No. 2.

4. One of the priests who united in the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 4). B.C. cir. 410.

5. One of the sons of Shemaïah, among the posterity of Zerubbabel (1 Chron. iii, 22), and contemporary with the Nagge of Luke iii, 25 (see Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 17). B.C. somewhat post 406. By some he is identified with No. 2 above, reading Ezra viii, 2 (after the (Sept.) thus: "of the sons of David: Hattush, of the sons of Shechaniah." This, however, is not only forbidden by other chronological notices [see DARIUS; ZERUBBABEL], but rests on the too slender support for the genuineness of the text itself in question; where, as in ver. 5, we may suppose that a name is missing, or that the name Shechaniah itself has crept in from the latter verse, since it appears nowhere else as that of a family head. See SHECHANIAH.

Haugeans (Haugeanere). Hans Nielsen Hauge was born in Norway April 3, 1771. He had strong religious impressions in youth, which produced a gloomy state of mind. But in 1795 he passed through a change which filled him with joy. Ever after, amid all vicissitudes, he was a cheerful Christian. He soon began to preach, and made a powerful impression on the public mind. He travelled extensively in Norway and Denmark, wrote many tracts, and in 1804 established a printing-office in Christiansand to disseminate his sentiments. He obtained many followers, but finally, through the influence of the clergy, was punished with a heavy fine and imprisonment. After this he lived in retirement till his death in 1824. In doctrine, Hauge differed from evangelical Protestants in general in but few points: e. g. he held that the ministry is a common duty, and that specially ordained and separated ministers are unnecessary; also that Church creeds and Confessions are of no great account. He properly placed great stress upon faith and its effects, but it was in a one-sided way. Nevertheless, his labors contributed largely to the revival of evangelical religion. The party called Haugeans is still numerous in Norway: they contend against the laxness of Church discipline and against Rationalism, and have much influence with the people. See Hase, *Church Hist.* p. 547; Gregoire, *Hist. des Sectes Relig.* t. v.; Stäudlin and Tschirner, *Archiv. f. Kirchengeschichte*, ii, 354; Hagenbach, *Hist. of the Church in 18th and 19th Centuries*, transl. by Hurst, ii, 389; *Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1849, p. 749 sq.

Hau'ran (Heb. *Chavran'*, חַוְרָן; Sept. Αὐρανῖτις and Ὡρανῖτις, the *Auranitis* of Josephus and others, the *Hauran* of the Arabs, so called prob. from the multitude of *caves*, חוּר, found there, which even at the present day serve as dwellings for the inhabitants), a tract or region of Syria, south of Damascus, east of Gaulonitis (Golan) and Bashan, and west of Trachonitis, extending from the Jabbok to the territory of Damascene-Syria; mentioned only in Ezek. xlvii, 16, 18, in defining the north-eastern border of the Promised Land. It was probably of small extent originally, but received extensive additions from the Romans under the name of *Auranitis*. Josephus frequently mentions Auranitis in connection with Trachonitis, Batanæa, and Gaulonitis, which with it constituted the ancient kingdom of Bashan (*War*, i, 20, 4; ii, 17, 4). It formed part of that Τραχωνίτιδος χώρα referred to by Luke (iii, 1) as subject to Philip the tetrarch (comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xvii, 11, 4). It is bounded on the west by Gaulonitis, on the north by the wild and rocky district of Trachonitis, on the east by the mountainous region of Batanæa, and on the south by the great plain of Moab (Jer. xlviii, 21). Some Arab geographers have described the *Haurân* as much more extensive than here stated (Bohaed. *Vit. Sal.* ed. Schult. p. 70; Abulfed. *Tab. Syr.* s. v.); and at the present day the name is applied *by those at a distance* to the whole country east of Jaulân; but the inhabitants themselves define it as above. It is represented by Burckhardt (*Travels in Syria*, p. 51, 211, 285, 291) as a volcanic region, composed of porous tufa, pumice, and basalt, with the remains of a crater on the tell Shoba, which is on its eastern border. It produces, however, crops of corn, and has many patches of luxuriant herbage, which are frequented in summer

by the Arab tribes for pasturage. The surface is perfectly flat, and not a stone is to be seen save on the few low volcanic *tells* that rise up here and there like islands in a sea. It contains upwards of a hundred towns and villages, most of them now deserted, though not ruined. The buildings in many of these are remarkable, the walls are of great thickness, and the roofs and doors are of stone, evidently of remote antiquity (see Porter's *Five Years in Damascus*, vol. ii). According to E. Smith (in Robinson's *Researches*, iii, Append. p. 150–157), the modern province of Hauran is regarded by the natives as consisting of three parts, called *en-Nukrah*, *el-Lejah*, and *el-Jebel*. The first of these terms designates the *plain* of Hauran as above defined, extending through its whole length, from wady el-Ajam on the north to the desert on the south. On the west of it is Jeidur, Jaulan, and Jebel Ajlun; and on the east the Lejah and Jebel Hauran. It has a gentle undulating surface, is arable throughout, and, in general, very fertile. With the rest of Hauran, it is the granary of Damascus. The soil belongs to the government, and nothing but grain is cultivated. Hardly a tree appears anywhere. The region still abounds in caves, which the old inhabitants excavated partly to serve as cisterns for the collection of water, and partly for granaries in which to secure their grain from plunderers. Eshmiskin is considered the capital of the whole Hauran, being the residence of the chief of all its sheiks. The inhabitants of this district are chiefly Muslems, who in manners and dress resemble the Bedawîn, but there is a sprinkling also of professed Christians, and latterly of the Druses (Murray's *Handbook*, p. 499). The second division, or el-Lejah, lying east of the Nukrah and north of the mountains, has an elevation about the same as that of the Nukrah, but it is said to be almost a complete labyrinth of passages among rocks. The Lejah is the resort of several small tribes of Bedawîn, who make it their home, and who continually issue forth from their rocky fastnesses on predatory excursions, and attack, plunder, or destroy, as suits their purpose. They have had the same character from a very remote period. The third division is the *mountain* of Hauran, and appears from the north-west, as an isolated range, with the conical peak called Kelb and Kuleib Hauran (*the dog*), which is probably an extinct volcano, near its southern extremity. But from the neighborhood of Busrah it is discovered that a lower continuation extends southward as far as the eye can see. On this lower range stands the castle of Sulkhad, distinctly seen from Busrah. This mountain is perhaps the Alsadamus of Ptolemy. (See Lightfoot, *Op.* i, 316; ii, 474; Reland, *Palæst.* p. 190; *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* July, 1854; Graham, in *Journ. Roy. Geol. Soc.* 1858, p. 254; Porter, *Handbook*, ii, 507; Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i, 213.)

Hauranne. See DUVERGIER.

Hausmann, NICOLAUS, an intimate friend of Luther, and the reformer of the city of Zwickau and the duchy of Anhalt, was born in 1479 at Freiberg. He became at first preacher at Schneeberg, subsequently at Zwickau, where he had many and severe controversies with the adherents of Thomas Münzer. In 1532 he was appointed pastor of Dessau, having been warmly recommended by Luther. In 1538 he accepted a call as superintendent to his native town Freiberg, but while preaching his first sermon (Nov. 6) he was struck with apoplexy, which caused his immediate death. Luther deeply bemoaned his death, and praised him as a man of profound piety. Two opinions of Hausmann on the reformation in Zwickau have been published by Preller (*Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, 1852). See O. G. Schmidt, *Nic. Hausmann, der Freund Luthers* (Lpz. 1860). (A. J. S.)

Hautefage, JEAN, a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Puy Morin, near Toulouse, in 1735. He was educated by the Jesuits, but left them, and became a Jansenist. Having been ordained priest, he became vicar in a country church of the diocese of Toulouse, but his opinions being suspected, he was suspended. In 1766 he became subrector of the college of Auxerre, and canon of that city, but his Jansenistic views caused him to be again persecuted, and in 1773 he was condemned to be whipped, branded, and sent to hard labor for life. He fled, and was declared innocent by Parliament Jan. 25, 1776. During his exile Hautefage had travelled through Southern Europe in company with another abbot, Duparc de Bellegarde, preaching his doctrines everywhere. While at Lausanne in 1775 and the following years, they published *Œuvres d'Antoine Arnauld* (42 vols. 4to). After his return to Paris, Hautefage published an abridgment of the *Institution et Instruction chrétiennes* (1785, 12mo), and the 3d part of the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques*, 1761–1790 (1791, 4to). During the Revolution, and until his death, Feb. 18, 1816, he devoted himself to teaching. See Silvy, *Eloge de M. l'abbé Hautefage* (Paris, 1816, 8vo); Barbier, *Dict. des Anonymes;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 574.

Havelock, HENRY, an eminent English soldier and Christian, was born at Bishop Wearmouth, April 5, 1795. He was educated under the Rev. J. Bradley, curate of Dartford, Kent, until 1804, when he was sent to the Charterhouse. In 1814 he became a pupil of Chitty, the great special pleader of the day, to study law; but in the following year he followed his brother William into the army, and was appointed to the Rifle Brigade, then the 95th. After serving in England, Ireland, and Scotland, Havelock embarked for India in 1823. To serve in that part of the world was his own choice, for which he had qualified himself by studying Hindostanee and Persian before leaving England. During the voyage a great change passed on his religious views, and on arriving with his regiment in India, he determined to devote his attention to the spiritual welfare of his men, and to assemble them together, as opportunity afforded, for reading the Scriptures and devotional exercises, which he continued to do throughout the whole of his after career. In 1841 he was appointed Persian interpreter to general Elphinstone, and took part in the memorable defence of Jellalabad. On the completion of the works, Havelock suggested to general Sale to assemble the garrison and give thanks to Almighty God, who had enabled them to complete the fortifications necessary for their protection. "The suggestion was approved, and the command given. 'Let us pray,' said a well-known voice. It was Havelock's. 'Let us pray!' and down before the presence of the great God those soldiers reverently bowed, one and all of them, whilst at the impulse of a devout and grateful heart he poured forth supplication and praise in the name of the Great High-Priest." This incident is an illustration of Havelock's religious life during the whole of his military career. In the great Indian rebellion of 1857 he distinguished himself by a series of the most brilliant achievements in the annals of warfare; but still he was distinguished most by his personal piety, which shone resplendently amid the horrors of war. He died of dysentery at Alumbagh, Nov. 25, 1857, one day before the announcement of his elevation to the baronetcy under the title "Havelock of Lucknow," which was inherited by his eldest son, Henry Marshman Havelock (born 1830). He wrote, *History of the Ava Campaigns* (London, 1827):—*Memoir of the Afghan Campaign* (Lond. 1841). See Brock, *Biographical Sketch of Havelock* (Lond. 1858, 12mo); Marshman, *Memoirs of Sir Henry Havelock* (Lond. 1868).

Haven (חוֹף, *chôph*, Gen. xliv, 13, a sea-*side* or "coast," as elsewhere rendered; מָחוֹז, *machôz'*, a *refuge*, hence a harbor, Psa. cvii, 30; λιμήν, Acts xxvii, 12). The Phœnician part of the coast of Palestine had several fine harbors [see PHŒNICIA], and some such were also in possession of the Hebrews: such were Cæsarea and Joppa (q. v. severally), which were especially made use of for coastwise communication (1 Macc. xiv, 5, 34; Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 9, 6). The port (מְבוֹא יָם) of Tyre

(q. v.) was the most famous on the whole Mediterranean shore (Ezek. xxvii, 3). A harbor is called אַסְקָא in Chaldee, also in Samaritan. See NAVIGATION.

The Cretan harbor called *Fair Havens* (q. v.), Καλοὶ Λιμένες, is incidentally mentioned in the N. T. (Acts xxvii, 8). See CRETE.

Havens, JAMES, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Mason Co., Ky., December 25, 1793. At eighteen he received license to preach, and in 1820 he entered the travelling ministry in the Ohio Conference. He served twelve years in circuits, and twenty-four as presiding elder. Possessing a strong constitution and vigorous intellect, he taxed them both to the utmost in remedying the defects of his early education, and in making "full proof of his ministry." He became one of the most powerful preachers of his time, and contributed perhaps as much as any other man to build up the Church in the West, especially in Indiana, where the last forty years of his life were spent. He died in November, 1864.—*Minutes of Conferences*, 1865, p. 190.

Hävernick, HEINRICH ANDREAS CHRISTOPH, a German theologian, was born at Kröplin, in Mecklenburg, in 1805. He studied at Halle, and was one of the two students whose notes on the theological lectures of Wegscheider and Gesenius were used to institute a trial against those prominent champions of Rationalism. At the University of Berlin he closely attached himself to Hengstenberg. In 1834 he established himself as *privatdocent* at Rostock, and in 1841 he became ordinary professor of theology at Königsberg. He died in 1845 at New Strelitz. The exegetical works of Hävernick are counted among the most learned of the orthodox school. The most important of them are *Commentar. über das Buch Daniel* (Hamburg, 1832):—*Mélanges de theologie reformée* (Geneva, 1833 sq.):—*Handbuch der hist.-krit. Einleitung in das A. T.* (Erlangen, 1836–39, 2 vols.; 2d ed. by Keil, 1849–54):—*Neue Krit. Untersuchungen ü. das Buch Daniel* (Hamb. 1838):—*Commentar zum Buche Ezekiel; Vorlesungen ü. d. Theologie des A. T.* (ed. by Hahn, Frankf. 1848; 2d ed. by Schultz, Frankf. 1863). Translations: *Gen. Introd. to O. T.* (Edinb. 1852); *Introd. to the Pentateuch* (Edinb. 1850).

Hav'ilah (Heb. *Chavilah'*, חֲוִילָה, signif. unknown; Sept. Εὐιλά, but Εὐειλά in Gen. x, 29, Εὐιλάτ in Gen. ii, 11, and Εὐί in 1 Chron. i, 29; Vulg. *Heuila*, but *Heuilath* in Gen. ii, 11), the name of two or three regions; perhaps also of two men (B.C. cir. 2400).

1. A land rich in gold, bdellium, and shoham, mentioned in Gen. ii, 11, as flowed around (or through) by the river Pishon, in the geographical description of Paradise. Some identify this Havilah with one of those following; but others take it to be the *Chwala*, on the Caspian Sea, whence that sea itself is said to have derived the Russian name of *Chwalinskoy more* (Sea of Chwala); and others suppose it a general name for India, in which case the river Pison, mentioned as surrounding it, would be identified with the Ganges, or even the Indus. Others again, who regard the Pishon as the Phasis, make Havilah to be *Colchis*, for which some think there is the distinctive name in Scripture of the "Casluhim" (q. v.). In Gen. ii, 11, 12, it is further described as the land where the best gold was found, and which was, besides, rich in the treasures of the *bedolach* and the stone *shoham*. That the name is derived from some natural peculiarity is evident from the presence of the article with all the terms. Whatever may be the true meaning of *bedolach*, be it carbuncle, crystal, bdellium, ebony, pepper, cloves, beryl, pearl, diamond, or emerald, all critics detect its presence, under one or other of these forms, in the country which they select as the Havilah most appropriate to their own theory. As little difficulty is presented by the *shoham*: call it onyx, sardonyx, emerald, sapphire, beryl, or sardius, it would be hard indeed if some of these precious stones could not be found in any conceivable locality to support even the most far-fetched and improbable conjecture. That Havilah is that part of India through which the Ganges flows, and, more generally, the eastern region of the earth; that it is to be found in Susiana (Hopkinson), in Ava (Buttmann), or in the Ural region (Raumer), are conclusions necessarily following upon the assumptions with regard to the Pison. Hartmann, Reland, and Rosenmüller are in favor of Colchis, the scene of the legend of the Golden Fleece. The Phasis was said to flow over golden sands, and gold was carried down by the mountain-torrents (Strabo xi, 2, § 19). The crystal (*bedolach*) of Scythia was renowned (Solinus, c. xx), and the emeralds (*shoham*) of this country were as far superior to other emeralds as the latter were to other precious stones (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxxvii, 17), all which seems to prove that Havilah was Colchis. Rosenmüller argues, with much force, *if* the Phasis be the Pison, the land of Havilah *must* be Colchis, supposing that by this country the Hebrews had the idea of a Pontic or Northern India. In like manner Leclerc, having previously determined that the Pison must be the Chrysorrhoas, finds Havilah not far from Cœle-Syria. Hasse (*Entdeck.* p. 49, 50, quoted by Rosenmüller) compares Havilah with the Ὑλαία of Herodotus (iv, 9); in the neighborhood of the Arimaspians, and the dragon which guarded the land of gold. Discussions about the site of Havilah will be found in all the chief Biblical commentators ancient and modern, as well as in Hottinger (*Enneas Dissert.*), Huet (*De Lit. Parad.*), Bochart (*Phaleg*, ii, 28), Michaelis (*Spicilegium*, p. 202; *Supplem.* p. 685), Schultess (*Paradies*, p. 105), Niebuhr and many other writers. The clearest and best account of any may be derived from Kalisch (*Genesis*, p. 93, 249, 287, etc.), who also gives a long list of those who have examined the subject (p. 109-102).—Smith, s. v.; Kitto, s. v. The Paradisaic Havilah cannot well be identified with either of those mentioned below, since they were evidently in or near Arabia; and the associated regions in the Edenic account are all in the neighborhood of Armenia or Ararat, near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates. The most consistent conclusion, therefore, is that which locates the Havilah in question at the north-eastern corner of Asia Minor, i. e. substantially *Colchis*. See PISON.

2. A district in Arabia Felix, deriving its name from the second son of Cush (Gen. x, 7); or, according to others, from the second son of Joktan (Gen. x, 29; compare xxv, 18). Since in the other places where the word occurs it is always used to designate a country, some doubt whether *persons* of this name ever existed; the more so as other names of countries (Ophir, Mizraim, Canaan, Sidon), and the collective names of tribes (Kittim, Dodanim), are freely introduced into the genealogy, which is undoubtedly arranged with *partial* reference to geographical distribution, as well as direct descent [see SHEBA; DEDAN, etc.] (see Kalisch, *Genesis*, p. 287). On this supposition it is not difficult to account for the fact that the people of Havilah appear as descendants *both* of the Hamites and of the Shemites. If they were originally of Shemitic extraction (and on this point we have no data which could enable us to decide), we must suppose that by peaceful emigration or hostile invasion they overflowed into the territory occupied by Hamites, or adopted the name and habits of their neighbors in consequence of commerce or intermarriage, and are therefore mentioned twice over by reason of their local position in two distinct regions. It would depend on circumstances whether an invading or encroaching tribe *gave* its name to or *derived* its name from the tribe it dispossessed, so that whether Havilah was originally Cushite or Joktanite must be a matter of mere conjecture; but by admitting some such principle as the one mentioned we remove from the book of Genesis a number of apparent perplexities (Kalisch, *Gen.* p. 454). See UR. To regard the repetition of the name as due to carelessness or error is a method of ex-

planation which does not deserve the name of criticism. See HAM.

Assuming, then, that the districts indicated in Gen. x, 7, 29, were conterminous, if not in reality identical, we have to fix on their geographical position. Various derivations of the word have been suggested, but the most probable one, from חוֹל, *sand* (Bochart, *Phaleg*, ii, 29), is too vague to give us any assistance. Looking for preciser indications, we find in Gen. xxv, 18 that the descendants of Ishmael "dwelt *from Havilah unto Shur* that is before Egypt as thou goest towards Assyria;" and in 1 Sam. xv, 7 we read that Saul "smote the Amalekites *from Havilah until thou comest to Shur* that is over against Egypt." Without entering into the question why the Amalekites are represented as possessing the country which formerly belonged to the Ishmaelites, it is clear that these verses fix the general position of Havilah as a country lying somewhere to the southward and eastward of Palestine. Further than this, the Cushite Havilah in Gen. x, 7 is mentioned in connection with Seba, Sabtah, and Raamah; and the Joktanite Havilah (Gen. x, 29) in connection with Ophir, Jobab, etc. Now, as all these places lay on or between the Arabian and Persian gulfs, we may infer, with tolerable certainty, that Havilah "in both instances designates the same country, extending at least from the Persian to the Arabian Gulf, and on account of its vast extent easily divided into two distinct parts" (Kalisch, *Gen.* p. 93). See SHUR.

The only method of fixing more nearly the centres of these two divisions of Havilah is to look for some trace of the name yet existing. But, although Oriental names linger with great vitality in the regions where they have arisen, yet the frequent transference of names, caused by trade or by political revolutions, renders such indication very uncertain (Von Bohlen, on *Gen.* x, 7). We shall therefore content ourselves with mentioning that Strabo, quoting Eratosthenes, places the Χαυλοταῖοι near the Nabathœi, north of the Arabian Gulf (Strabo, xvi, 4), and that Ptolemy (iv, 7) mentions the Αὐαλῖται, on the African coast, near Bab-el-Mandeb, the modern Zeylah (comp. Plin. vi, 28; Gesen. *Thes.* i, 452). Niebuhr also finds two Khâwlans in Yemen, one a town between Sanaa and Mecca, the other a district some miles to the south-east of Sanaa (*Beschr. Arab.* p. 270, 280; see further, Büschung, *Erdbeschr.* V, i, 601; Michaelis, *Spicileg.* i, 189; ii, 202; Forster, *Geog. of Arab.* i, 40, 41, etc.). These names may very possibly be traces of the great Biblical country of Havilah. See ETHNOLOGY.

The district of Khâwlan lies between the city of Sana and the Hijaz, i. e. in the north-western portion of the Yemen. It took its name, according to the Arabs, from Khâwlan, a descendant of Kahtan [see JOKTAN] (*Marâsid.* s. v.), or, as some say, of Kahlan, brother of Himyer (Caussin, *Essai*, i, 113, and Tab. ii). This genealogy says little more than that the name was Joktanite; and the difference between Kahtan and Kahlan may be neglected, both being descendants of the first Joktanite settler, and the whole of these early traditions pointing to a Joktanite settlement, without perhaps a distinct preservation of Joktan's name, and certainly none of a correct genealogy from him downwards.

Khâwlan is a fertile territory, embracing a large part of myrrhiferous Arabia, mountainous, with plenty of water, and supporting a large population. It is a tract of Arabia better known to both ancients and moderns than the rest of the Yemen, and the eastern and central provinces. It adjoins Nejran (the district and town of that name), mentioned in the account of the expedition of Ælius Gallus, and the scene of great persecutions of the Christians by Dhu-Nuwas, the last of the Tubbaas before the Abyssinian conquest of Arabia, in the year 523 of our æra (compare Caussin, *Essai*, i, 121 sq.).

Ha'voth-Ja'ïr (Heb. *Chavvoth' Yaïr'* חַוֹּת יָאִיר, *hamlets of Jair* [i. e. the *enlightener*]; Sept. ἐπαύλεις and κῶμαι Ἰαΐρ, Θαυώθ, etc.; Vulg. *vicus*, or *viculus*, or *Havoth Jair*, etc.), the name of a settlement or district east of the Jordan. The word *Charvah*, which occurs in the Bible in this connection only, is perhaps best explained by the similar term in modern Arabic, which denotes a small *collection* of huts or hovels in a country place (see the citations in Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 451; and Stanley, *Sinai and Pal.* App. § 84), such as constitutes an Arab village or small town. See TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

(1.) The earliest notice of the Havoth-jair is in Numb. xxxii, 41, in the account of the settlement of the trans-Jordanic country, where Jair, son of Manasseh, is stated to have taken some villages (A. V. "the small towns;" but there is no article in the Hebrew) of Gilead, which was allotted to his tribe, and to have named them after himself, Havvoth-jair. (2.) In Deut. iii, 14 it is said that Jair "took all the tract of Argob unto the boundary of the Geshurite and the Maacathite, and called them [i. e. the places of that region] after his own name, Bashan-havoth-jair." (3.) In the records of Manasseh in Josh. xiii, 30, and 1 Chron. ii, 23 (A. V., in both "towns of Jair"), the Havvoth-jair are reckoned with other districts as making up sixty "cities" (עָרִים). In 1 Kings iv, 13 they are named as part of the commissariat district of Ben-geber, next in order to the "sixty great cities" of Argob, as the Eng. Vers. has it; but probably the latter designation is only added for definiteness, and refers to the same region. (4.) No less doubtful is the number of the Havvoth-jair. In 1 Chron. ii, 22 they are specified as twenty-three, but in Judg. x. 4, as thirty. See JAIR.

From these statements some have inferred that there were two separate districts called Chavvoth-Yair (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 483), one in Gilead, and the other in Bashan (Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 270). But in order to reconcile the different passages where they are spoken of, it is only necessary to suppose that having first been captured by the original Jair when they were mere nomade hamlets, and but 23 in number, they were afterwards occupied and increased to 30 by the judge Jair, and that they were usually regarded as part of the sixty considerable places comprised within the general tract of Bashan, including Gilead. See ARGOB.

Haweis, THOMAS, an English theologian, was born at Truro (Cornwall) in 1734. He was first apprenticed to a druggist, but afterwards studied at Christ College, Cambridge, and took the degree of B.L. He soon after entered the Church, and became assistant of Madan, chaplain of Lock Hospital. The latter afterwards gave him the rectorship of All-Saints' (Northamptonshire); and the countess of Huntingdon gave him also the direction of several chapels she had erected, and of her seminary for theological students. He became director of the London Missionary Society at its foundation, and died Feb. 11, 1820. He published several books of practical, but not of scientific value; among them are *History of the Church* (Lond. 1800, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Life of the Rev. William Romaine* (Lond. 1798, 8vo):—*State of the Evangelical Religion throughout the World* (8vo):—*The Evangelical Expositor, a Comment on the Bible* (Lond. 1765, 2 vols. fol.: of little value):—*New Translation of the New Testament* (Lond. 1795, 8vo):—*Communicant's Companion* (Lond. 1763, 12mo; often reprinted):—*Fifteen Sermons* (new ed. Oxford, 1835, 12mo). See Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 624.

Hawes, JOEL, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in Medway, Mass., Dec. 22, 1789. His parents were poor, and his early opportunities of education were therefore limited. After his conversion in 1807, he gave all the time he could spare from his trade to study, and in 1809 he entered Brown University. During his college course he supported himself chiefly by work during term time, and by teaching school in vacation. He graduated A.B. with honor in 1813. After completing the theological

course at Andover (1818), he was settled as pastor of the First Congregational Church of Hartford, in which he remained until 1862, when the Rev. G. H. Gould was installed as pastor. Dr. Hawes, however, remained as *pastor emeritus*, preaching frequently, as his strength would admit. He died at Gilead, Conn., June 5, 1867. His long pastorate at Hartford was eminently successful: more than 1500 persons joined the Church under his ministry. The great Christian enterprises, such as the Foreign Mission cause, Home Missions, Bible and Tract Distribution, the Christian Press, Education for the Ministry, lay near his heart, and occupied a very large share of his time and labors. His writings were chiefly practical, and include *Lectures to Young Men* (1828, which had an immense circulation both in America and in Great Britain):—*Tribute to the Pilgrims* (1830):—*Memoir of Normand Smith* (1839):—*Letters on Universalism* (18mo): *Character everything for the Young* (1843):—*The Religion of the East* (1845):—*An Offering for Home Missionaries* (a volume of sermons, of which he gave 800 copies to the Home Missionary Society for distribution).—*Independent*, June 13, 1867; *Congregationalist*, June, 1867.

Hawk (נֵץ, *nêts*, from its swift *flight;* Sept. ἱέραξ; Vulg. *accipiter*), an English name in an altered form of the old word *fawk* or *falk*, and in natural history representing several genera of raptorial birds; as does the Arabic *naz*, and no doubt, also, the Hebrew *nets*, a term expressive of strong and rapid flight, and therefore highly appropriate to the hawk: the similarity of the Latin name *nisus* is worthy of notice. The hawk is noticed as an unclean bird (Lev. xi, 16; Deut. xiv, 15), and as "stretching her wings toward the south" (Job xxxix, 26)—an expression which has been variously understood as referring either to the migratory habits of the bird, one species alone being an exception to the general rule in this respect (Pliny, x, 9); or to its moulting, and seeking the warmth of the sun's rays in consequence (Bochart, *Hieroz.* iii, 9); or, lastly, to the opinion prevalent in ancient times, that it was the only bird whose keen eye could bear the direct rays of the sun (Ælian, *H. A.* x, 14). The hawk, though not migratory in all countries, is so in the south of Europe and in parts of Asia. It was common in Syria and the surrounding countries. In Egypt one species was regarded as sacred, and frequently appears on the ancient monuments. Western Asia and Lower Egypt, and consequently the intermediate territory of Syria and Palestine, are the habitation or transitory residence of a considerable number of species of the order *Raptores*, which, even including the shortest-winged, have great powers of flight, are remarkably enterprising, live to a great age, are migratory, or followers upon birds of passage, or remain in a region so abundantly stocked with pigeon and turtle-dove as Palestine, and affording such variety of ground to hunt their particular prey, abounding as it does in mountain and forest, plain, desert, marsh, river, and sea-coast. See NIGHT-HAWK.

Falcons, or the "noble" birds of prey used for hawking, have for many ages been objects of great interest, and still continue to be imported from distant countries. The *Falco communis*, or peregrine falcon, is so generally diffused as to occur even in New Holland and South America. As a type of the genus, we may add that it has the two foremost quill-feathers of almost equal length, and that when the wings are closed they nearly reach the end of the tail. On each side of the crooked point of the bill there is an angle or prominent tooth, and from the nostrils backwards a black streak passes beneath the eye and forms a patch on each side of the throat, giving the bird and its congeners a whiskered and menacing aspect. Next we may place *Falco Aroeris*, the sacred hawk of Egypt, in reality the same as, or a mere variety of the peregrine. Innumerable representations of it occur in Egyptian monuments, in the character of *Hor-hat*, or bird of victory; also an emblem of Re, the Sun, and numerous other divinities (Sir J. G. Wilkinson's *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, 2d series). The hobby, *Falco subbuteo*, is no doubt a second or third species of sacred hawk, having similar whiskers. Both this bird and the tractable merlin, *Falco æsalon*, are used in the falconry of the inferior Moslem land-owners of Asiatic Turkey. Besides these, the kestril, *Falco tinnunculus*, occurs in Syria, and *Falco tinnunculoides*, or lesser kestril, in Egypt; and it is probable that both species visit these two territories according to the seasons. To these we may add the gerfalcon, *Falco gyrfalco*, which is one third larger than the peregrine: it is imported from Tartary, and sold at Constantinople, Aleppo, and Damascus. The great birds fly at antelopes, bustards, cranes, etc.; and of the genus *Astur*, with shorter wings than true falcons, the goshawk, *Falco palumbarius*, and the falcon gentil, *Falco gentilis*, are either imported, or taken in their nests, and used to fly at lower and aquatic game. It is among the above that the seven species of hunting hawks enumerated by Dr. Russell must be sought; though, from the circumstance that the Arabic names of the birds alone were known to him, it is difficult to assign their scientific denominations. The smaller and less powerful hawks of the genus *Nisus* are mostly in use on account of the sport they afford, being less fatiguing, as they are employed to fly at pigeons, partridges, quails, pterocles, katta, and other species of ganga. There are various other raptorial birds, not here enumerated, found in Syria, Arabia, and Egypt. See EAGLE; GLEDE; KITE; OSPREY; VULTURE.

Peregrine Falcon.

The generic character of the Heb. word *nets* appears from the expression in Deut. and Lev. "after his kind," as including various species of the *Falconidæ*, with more especial allusion, perhaps, to the small diurnal birds, such as the kestrel (*Falco tinninculus*), the hobby (*Hypotriorchis subbuteo*), the gregarious lesser kestril (*Tinnunculus cenchris*), common about the ruins in the plain districts of Palestine, all of which were probably known to the ancient Hebrews. With respect to the passage in Job (l. c.), which appears to allude to the migratory habits of hawks, it is curious to observe that of the ten or twelve lesser raptors of Palestine, nearly all are summer migrants. The kestrel remains all the year, but *T. cenchris*, *Micronisus gabar*, *Hyp. eleonoræ*, and *F. melanopterus*, are all migrants from the south. Besides the above-named smaller hawks, the two magnificent species, *F. sacer* and *F. lanarius*, are summer visitors to Palestine. These two species of falcons, and perhaps the hobby and goshawk (*Astur palumbarius*), are employed by the Arabs in Syria and Palestine for the purpose of taking partridges, sand-grouse, quails, herons, gazelles, hares, etc. Dr. Russell (*Nat. Hist. of Aleppo*, ii, 196, 2d ed.) has given the Arabic names of several falcons, but it is probable that some at least of these names apply rather to the different sexes than to distinct species. See a graphic description of the sport of falconry, as pursued by the Arabs of N. Africa, in the *Ibis*, i, 284. No representation of such a sport occurs on the monuments of ancient Egypt (see Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 221), neither is there any definite allusion to falconry in the Bible.

Falco Sacer.

With regard, however, to the negative evidence supplied by the monuments of Egypt, we must be careful ere we draw a conclusion, for the camel is not represented, though we have Biblical evidence to show that this animal was used by the Egyptians as early as the time of Abraham; still, as instances of various modes of capturing fish, game, and wild animals are not unfrequent on the monuments, it seems probable that the art was not known to the Egyptians. Nothing definite can be learnt from the passage in 1 Sam. xxvi, 20, which speaks of "a partridge hunted on the mountains," as this may allude to the method of taking these birds by "throw-sticks," etc. See PARTRIDGE. The hind or hart "panting after the water-brooks" (Psa. xlii, 1) may appear at first sight to refer to the mode at present adopted in the East of taking gazelles, deer, and bustards with the united aid of falcon and greyhound; but, as Hengstenberg (*Comment. on Psa.* l. c.) has argued, it seems pretty clear that the exhaustion spoken of is to be understood as arising, not from pursuit, but from some prevailing drought, as in Psa. lxiii, 1, "My soul thirsteth for thee *in a dry land.*" (See also Joel i, 20.) The poetical version of Brady and Tate,

"As pants the hart for cooling streams
When heated in the chase,"

has therefore somewhat prejudged the matter. For the question as to whether falconry was known to the ancient Greeks, see Beckmann, *History of Inventions* (i, 198-205, Bohn's ed.). See FALCON.

Hawker, ROBERT, D.D., an English divine, was born at Exeter, England, in 1753, and educated at Magdalen College, Oxford. He obtained the vicarage of Charles, Plymouth, which he held until his death in 1827, with the respect and love of his people. In doctrine he was a Calvinist, with a strong Antinomian tendency. His writings are, *The Poor Man's Commentary on O. and N. T.* (last edit. Lond. 3 vols. 4to):—*Sermons, Meditations, Lectures*, etc., included in his *Works, with a Memoir of his Life*, by the Rev. J. Williams, D.D. (Lond. 1831, 10 vols. 8vo). See Burt, *Observ. on Dr. Hawker's Theology;* Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters* (Lond. 1839), p. 344.

Hawkins, WILLIAM, an English clergyman, was born in 1722, and was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford, where he became fellow, and was made professor of poetry in 1751. He was afterwards successively prebendary of Wells, rector of Casterton, and vicar of Whitchurch, Dorsetshire. He died in 1801. He published *Discourses on Scripture Mysteries*, Bampton Lectures for 1787 (Oxford, 1787, 8vo); and a number of occasional sermons.—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1422; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 804.

Hawks, Cicero Stephen, D.D., a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Newbern, N. C., in 1812. He passed A.B. at the University of North Carolina in 1830, and studied law, but never practised. In 1834 he was ordained deacon, and in 1835 priest, in the Protestant Episcopal Church. His first parish was Trinity Church, Saugerties, N. Y. (1836); in 1837 he removed to Buffalo, N. Y., and shortly afterwards to Christ Church, St. Louis, Mo. In 1844 he was consecrated bishop of the diocese of Missouri, in which office he labored diligently and successfully until his health gave way. He died at St. Louis April 19, 1868.

Hawks, Francis Lister, D.D., an eminent minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Newbern, N. C., June 10, 1798. He passed A.B. at the University of North Carolina in 1815; afterwards studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1819. In 1823 he was elected to the Legislature of N. C., and soon became distinguished for eloquence. After a few years of very successful practice as a lawyer, he determined to enter the ministry, and became a student under Dr. Green, of Hillsboro' (afterwards bishop Green). In 1827 he was ordained deacon; and in 1829 became assistant to Dr. Croswell, rector of Trinity Church, New Haven, Conn. In the same year he was called to be assistant to bishop White, then rector of St. James's Church, Philadelphia. In 1830 he was elected professor of divinity in Washington College (now Trinity), Hartford, Conn.; in 1831 he became rector of St. Stephen's, New York, and at once was recognised as among the chief pulpit orators of the city. In the same year he was called to the rectorship of St. Thomas's Church, N. Y. In 1835 he was elected missionary bishop of the South-west, but declined the appointment. In the same year the General Convention appointed him to collect documents on the history of the Church, and to act as conservator of the same. He spent several months in England in 1836, and returned with eighteen folio volumes of manuscript, illustrative of the planting and early history of the Protestant Episcopal Church. From these materials he prepared his *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States* (vol. i, Virginia, 1836; vol. ii, Maryland, 1839). It is greatly to be regretted that Dr. Hawks did not continue this valuable work. In 1837, in connection with the Rev. C. S. Henry, he established the New York *Review*, a quarterly journal of very high character, of which ten volumes were published. In 1839 he founded a school called St. Thomas's Hall, at Flushing, L. I., and made heavy outlays upon the buildings, grounds, etc., which involved him in serious financial embarrassments, ending in the ruin of the school in 1843. He was charged with extravagance, if not with dishonesty; but no one now believes the latter charge. However, he resigned his charge of St. Thomas's Church, and removed to Mississippi, where he established a school at Holly Springs. In 1844 he was elected bishop of Mississippi; objections were made on account of his troubles in connection with St. Thomas's Hall, but his vindication was so complete that the Convention adopted a resolution declaring his innocence. Nevertheless, he declined the bishopric, and accepted the rectorship of Christ Church, New Orleans, where he remained for five years, during part of which time he served as president of the University of Louisiana. In 1849 he accepted the rectorship of the Church of the Mediator, New York, which was afterwards merged in Calvary parish, of which he remained rector until 1862. His friends raised $30,000 to clear his church of debt, and adjust certain old claims from St. Thomas's Hall; they also settled upon him a liberal salary. Here he regained his old pre-eminence as a preacher, and at the same time devoted himself to active literary labors. In 1852 he was elected bishop of Rhode Island, but declined the office. In 1862, owing to differences of opinion between him and his parish concerning the Civil War, he resigned the rectorship of Calvary; and, after a short stay in Baltimore, he was called to take charge of the new par-

ish of Our Saviour in New York. His last public labor was a service at the laying of the corner-stone of the new church, Sept. 4, 1866; on the 26th of that month he died. Dr. Hawks's writings include, besides *Law Reports*, the following: *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States* (1836-39, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Commentary on the Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States* (1841, 8vo):—*Egypt and its Monuments* (N. Y. 1849, 8vo):—*Auricular Confession* (1849, 12mo):—*Documentary History of the Prot. E. Church, containing Documents concerning the Church in Connecticut* (edited in connection with W. S. Perry, N. Y. 1863-4, 2 vols. 8vo); besides several historical and juvenile books. He also contributed largely to the *New York Review*, the *Church Record*, and other periodicals.—*Amer. Quarterly Church Review*, 1867, art. 1; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 804.

Hawley, GIDEON, a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 5, 1727 (O. S.), in Bridgeport, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1749, and, having entered the ministry, went to Stockbridge in 1752 as missionary to the Indians. In May, 1753, in company with Timothy Woodbridge, he started through the wilderness, and reached the Susquehanna at Onohoghgwage, where he planted a mission, but was compelled to leave it by the French War, May, 1756. Having returned to Boston, he went as chaplain under colonel Gridley to Crown Point; and April 10, 1758, was installed pastor over the Indians at Marshpee, where he remained until his death, Oct. 3, 1807.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 495.

Hay (חָצִיר, *chatsir'*, *grass*, Job viii, 12; xl, 15; Psa. civ, 14; *leeks*, Numb. xi, 15; also a *court-yard*, Isa. xxxiv, 13; xxxv, 7; Greek χόρτος, *fodder*, i. e. *grass* or herbage, Matt. vi, 30, etc., or growing *grain*, Matt. xiii, 26, etc.). We are not to suppose that this word, as used in the Bible, denotes dried grass, as it does with us. The management of grass by the Hebrews, as food for cattle, was entirely different from ours. Indeed, hay was not in use, straw being used as provender. The grass was cut green, as it was wanted; and the phrase *mown-grass* (Psa. lxxii, 6) would be more properly rendered *grass that has just been fed off*. So in Prov. xxvii, 25, the word translated *hay* means the first shoots of the grass; and the whole passage might better be rendered, "The grass appeareth, and the green herb showeth itself, and the plants of the mountains are gathered." In Isa. xv, 6, *hay* is put for *grass*. In summer, when the plains are parched with drought, and every green herb is dried up, the nomades proceed northwards, or into the mountains, or to the banks of rivers; and in winter and spring, when the rains have reclothed the plains with verdure, and filled the water-courses, they return. See GRASS; LEEK; FUEL; MOWING.

Haydn, JOSEPH, one of the greatest composers of Church music in modern times, was born March 31, 1732, at Rohran, in Austria. The son of parents who were very fond of music, he showed from his earliest youth a remarkable talent for the art. He studied first with a relative in Haimburg; and, from his eighth to his sixteenth year, he was in the choir of St. Stephen's Cathedral at Vienna. After this, for a time, he supported himself by giving private instruction. The first six piano-sonatas of Em. Bach fell into his hands by accident, and filled him with enthusiasm. The celebrated Italian singer Porpora, whom he accompanied on the piano in musical circles, introduced him into the highest classes of society. Encouraged from all sides, he wrote several quartettes (which, however, did not escape censure) and trios, and his first opera, *Der hinkende Teufel*, for which he received 24 ducats. In 1759 he received from count Morzin an appointment as musical director, and soon after contracted a marriage, which, however, remained without children, and was, in general, not a happy one. In 1760 he was appointed by prince Esterhazy as chapel-master, which position allowed him for thirty years to give free play to his musical genius. During this time, which was mostly spent at Eisenstadt, Hungary, or (during winter months) in Vienna, he composed most of his symphonies, many quartettes, trios, etc., 163 compositions for the baryton (the favorite instrument of the prince), eighteen operas, the oratorio *Il Ritorno di Tobia* (1774), fifteen masses and other ecclesiastical works, music for Göethe's "Götz von Berlichingen," and the composition of the "Seven Words," which in 1795 was ordered from Cadiz as an instrumental composition to be played between the lessons of the Seven Words. Dismissed from his position after the death of prince Esterhazy (1790), but retaining his title and his salary, he went as concert director to London, where he attained the zenith of his artistic career. During his two stays in London (1790-92 and 1794-95) he wrote the operas *Orfeo* and *Eurydice*, his 12 so-called English symphonies, quartettes, and other works. He was constantly employed as leader in concerts and societies, and was overwhelmed with marks of love and affection. After returning to Vienna, he composed, in 1797, his great oratorio *The Creation*, which was finished in April, 1798, and produced for the first time on March 19, 1799, in Vienna, and soon after in all the large cities of Europe, with immense applause. It remains to this day the greatest of sacred oratorios, except Händel's *Messiah*. In the mean while he finished his last oratorio, *The four Seasons* (text by Van Swieten after Thomson), which was produced for the first time April 24, 1801. He died May 31, 1809. According to a list of his works, prepared by Haydn himself, they comprise 118 symphonies, 83 quartettes, 24 trios, 19 operas, 5 oratorios, 163 compositions for the baryton, 24 concerts for different instruments, 15 masses, 44 piano sonatas, 42 German and Italian hymns, 39 canons, 10 Church compositions, 13 songs in three or four parts, the harmony and the accompaniment for 365 old Scotch airs, and several smaller pieces. In the library of the Esterhazy family at Eisenstadt, many unpublished manuscripts are said to be still extant. See Framery, *Notice sur J. H.* (Paris, 1810); Pohl, *Mozart und Haydn in London* (Vienna, 1867, 2 vols.). (A. J. S.)

Haymo, **Haimon**, **Haimo**, or **Aimo**, a theologian of the 9th century, the place of whose birth (about A.D. 778) is uncertain. In his youth he embraced the rule of St. Benedict in the abbey of Fulda; afterwards he studied under Alcuin, at St. Martin of Tours, with Rabanus Maurus. He then appears successively as teacher at Fulda, as abbot of Hirschfeld, in the diocese of Mentz, and finally bishop of Halberstadt (Saxony) in 841. He was present at the Council of Mentz in 847, and died March 23 (or 26), 853. His writings, which are chiefly compilations from the fathers, enjoyed great reputation; they consist of, *Glossæ continuæ super Psalterium* (Colon. 1523, 8vo; 1561, 8vo):—*In Cantica Canticorum* (Colon. 1519, fol.; Worms, 1631, 8vo, etc.):—*Glossæ in Isaiam* (Colon. and Paris, 1531, 8vo):—*Glossæ in Jeremiam, Ezechielem, et Danielem* (so scarce that some doubt their having been printed at all):—*In duodecim Prophetas minores* (Colon. 1519, et al.):—*Homiliæ super Evangelia totius anni* (Colon. 1531; Paris, 1533; Antw. 1559):—*In Epistolas S. Pauli* (now generally supposed, however, to be by St. Remy of Auxerre):—*Super Apocalypsim Explanatio* (Colon. and Paris, 1531, 8vo):—*De Corpore et Sanguine Christi* (D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, i, 42):—*De varietate librorum tres libri* (Paris and Colon. 1531, 8vo):—*Breviarium Historiæ ecclesiasticæ* (Colon. 1531, 8vo; often reprinted). Other works have been ascribed to him by Johannes Trithemius, but it is not certain that they were by him; and, at any rate, they are now lost. His writings are collected in Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, vols. cxvi, cxvii, cxviii. See Lelong, *Bibl. Sacra*; Trithemius, *De eccles. Script.*; *Hist. littér. de la France*, v, 111-126; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxiii, 121; Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Literature*, ii, 506; Mosheim, *Ch. History*, cent. ix, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 50.

Haynes, LEMUEL, a Congregational minister of New England, a mulatto. He was born at West Hartford, Conn., July 18, 1753, and was educated in the family of Mr. Rose, of Granville, Mass. In 1774 he enlisted in the Continental army, and in 1775 was in the expedition against Ticonderoga. Soon after this he commenced study with the Rev. Daniel Ferrand, and on Nov. 7, 1780, his credentials as a minister were granted. Soon afterwards he received a call to take charge of the Granville church. Here he labored five years with great acceptability. In 1783 he married Miss Elizabeth Babbit, a white lady of good intellect and sincere piety. Soon after this he was ordained, and went to Farmington, Conn., and thence to Vermont, and spent thirty years as pastor of a Congregational church at Rutland, whence be removed to Manchester, where he was involved in a very singular and noted trial for murder, not as accomplice, but as a defender of the accused. In 1822 he was called to the charge of the church in Granville, N. Y., an offshoot of the former in Massachusetts. Here he remained till his death in September, 1834. Mr. Haynes was characterized from early life by a swift and subtle intellect, and a restless thirst for knowledge. He read Greek and Latin with critical accuracy. His wit was proverbial and refined. In Vermont he was very successful in opposing infidelity. Many anecdotes of his shrewd and sensible wit are on record. — Sherman, *New England Divines*, p. 267; Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 176.

Hayti, a name sometimes given to the second largest island in the West Indies. The more usual name is *San Domingo*, under which head all that is common to the whole island will be treated. Hayti proper is the western and French-speaking part of the island, which in 1808 was organized as a separate commonwealth under president Christophe, who in 1811 had himself crowned as hereditary emperor under the name of Henry I. In 1822 the French and the Spanish portions of the island were again united into one republic under general Boyer. This union lasted until 1844, when not only the Spanish portion became again an independent state, but the French part split into two, which were harassed by almost uninterrupted conflicts between the blacks and the mulattoes. The brief and beneficent administration of general Richer (1846 47) was followed by that of general Faustin Soulouque, who undertook an unfortunate campaign against the Dominicans, and in August, 1849, proclaimed himself emperor, under the name of Faustin I. He was in 1858 overthrown by general Geffrard, who, as president, introduced many reforms, and was, in turn, overthrown in February, 1867, by Salnave, under whose administration the country was disturbed by uninterrupted civil wars, until his overthrow and execution, January, 1870.

The area of the republic is estimated at 10,205 square miles, the population at about 570,000. Nominally nearly the entire population belongs to the Roman Catholic Church; but, even according to Roman Catholic writers, many of the population are even to-day more pagan than Christian. The frightful religious and moral condition of the people is attributed by Roman Catholic writers to the habit of the French government of not establishing regular bishoprics, but of leaving the administration of ecclesiastical affairs in the hands of apostolical prefects, who had neither the influence nor the power of bishops, were more dependent upon the colonial government, and could not defend the interests of the Church and of religion against the secular power and the planters, who were chiefly intent on making the most out of slave labor. The care of the parishes was, before the beginning of the French rule, almost exclusively in the hands of the Capuchins and Dominicans. In 1703 the Capuchins left their parishes, and were succeeded by the Jesuits, who took charge of the districts from Samana to the Atrabonite, while the Dominicans assumed the administration of those from the Atrabonite to Cape Tiburon. Secular priests were left only in the churches of Vache Island. When the Jesuits were expelled in 1763, they were again followed by the Capuchins. During the war of independence nearly all the churches were closed, and the celebration of divine service was almost wholly suspended; but, the war being ended, the Constitution of 1807 declared the Catholic Church the only form of religion recognised by the government, and Christophe, by a decree issued in 1811, announced the establishment of one archbishopric and three bishoprics. The pope was asked to sanction this arrangement, but, owing to the death of Christophe, which occurred soon after, and to other causes, the plan was never carried out. In 1822, when the whole island was under one government, the archbishop of San Domingo appointed for the western part two vicars general, of whom the one resided at Cape Hayti, and the other at Port-au-Prince. In 1827 Pope Leo XII again conferred upon the archbishop of San Domingo the jurisdiction over the whole island; but the religious condition of the people grew worse and worse. There was an almost absolute want of priests, and the few who were to be found were mostly worthless characters, who had for immoral conduct been expelled from other dioceses. In 1842, bishop Rosati, of St. Louis, was commissioned by pope Gregory XVI to visit Hayti, and, as apostolical delegate, to conclude a Concordat with president Boyer; but this step also was thwarted by the overthrow of his administration (1843). The emperor Soulouque protected and endowed the Roman Catholic Church, but at the same time introduced religious toleration, and thus enabled Protestant missionaries to organize a few missions. In 1852 pope Pius IX sent bishop Spaccapietra to Hayti to make another effort to conclude a Concordat. The mission was again unsuccessful; and in an allocution of Dec. 19, 1853, the pope complained that the emperor and his government had a false idea concerning the Church, and that, as a great portion of the clergy were unwilling to adopt a strict rule of life, the bishop was compelled to leave the country. Negotiations with president Geffrard were more successful, and on Sept. 16, 1861, a Concordat was promulgated. According to it, one archbishopric (Port-au-Prince) and four bishoprics (Les Cayes, Cape Hayti, Gonaives, and Port de Paix) were established in 1862; the archbishop (a Frenchman, Testard du Cosquer) was appointed in 1863, but none of the four episcopal sees had been filled up to January, 1870. The number of parishes is 49. For public education very little has as yet been done. There were in 1868 about 150 public schools, with about 13,000 pupils.

The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States sustained in 1889 a bishop at Port-au-Prince, and 15 clergymen, filling 17 mission stations, with a total of 382 communicants, 189 day scholars, and 124 Sunday-school scholars. The contributions for the year were $317 55.

The English Wesleyans, who were the first Protestant body to establish a Protestant mission in Hayti, had in 1868 6 circuits, 6 chapels, 4 other preaching-places, 210 members, and about 890 regular attendants, but in 1889 only 4 preachers.—Neher, *Kirchl. Geogr. und Statistik*, vol. iii, 1869. (A. J. S.)

Ha'zaël (Heb. *Chazaël'*, חֲזָאֵל, also חֲזָהאֵל, whom *God beholds*, i. e. cares for; Sept. Ἀζαήλ, Vulg. *Hazael*, but *Azael* in Amos i, 4; hence Latin *Azelus*, Justin. xxxvi, 2), an officer of Benhadad, king of Syria, whose eventual accession to the throne of that kingdom was revealed to Elijah (1 Kings xix, 15), B.C. cir. 907; and who, when Elisha was at Damascus, was sent by his master, who was then ill, to consult the prophet respecting his recovery (2 Kings viii, 8). B.C. cir. 884. He was followed by forty camels bearing presents from the king. The answer was, that he *might* certainly recover. "Howbeit," added the prophet, "the Lord hath showed me that he shall surely die." He then looked steadfastly at Hazael till he became confused, on which the man

of God wept; and when Hazael respectfully inquired the cause of this outburst, Elisha replied by describing the vivid picture then present to his mind of all the evils which the man now before him would inflict upon Israel. Hazael exclaimed, "But what is thy servant, the [not *a*] dog, that he should do this great thing?" The prophet explained that it was as king of Syria he should do it. Hazael then returned, and delivered to his master that portion of the prophetic response which was intended for him. But the very next day this man, cool and calculating in his cruel ambition, took a thick cloth, and, having dipped it in water, spread it over the face of the king, who, in his feebleness, and probably in his sleep, was smothered by its weight, and died what seemed to his people a natural death (2 Kings viii, 15). We are not to imagine that such a project as this was conceived and executed in a day, or that it was suggested by the words of Elisha. His discomposure at the earnest gaze of the prophet, and other circumstances, show that Hazael at that moment regarded Elisha as one to whom his secret purposes were known. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.). He was soon engaged in hostilities with Ahaziah, king of Judah, and Jehoram, king of Israel, for the possession of the city of Ramoth-gilead (2 Kings viii, 28). The Assyrian inscriptions show that about this time a bloody and destructive war was waged between the Assyrians on the one side, and the Syrians, Hittites, Hamathites, and Phœnicians on the other. See CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS. Benhadad (q. v.) had recently suffered several severe defeats at the hands of the Assyrian king, and upon the accession of Hazael the war was speedily renewed. Hazael took up a position in the fastnesses of the Anti-Libanus, but was there attacked by the Assyrians, who defeated him with great loss, killing 16,000 of his warriors, and capturing more than 1100 chariots. Three years later the Assyrians once more entered Syria in force; but on this occasion Hazael submitted, and helped to furnish the invaders with supplies. After this, internal troubles appear to have occupied the attention of the Assyrians, who made no more expeditions into these parts for about a century. The Syrians rapidly recovered their losses, and towards the close of the reign of Jehu, Hazael led them against the Israelites (B.C. cir. 860), whom he "smote in all their coasts" (2 Kings x, 32), thus accomplishing the prophecy of Elisha (2 Kings viii, 12). His main attack fell upon the eastern provinces, where he ravaged "all the land of Gilead, the Gadites, and the Reubenites, and the Manassites, from Aroer, which is by the river Arnon, even Gilead and Bashan" (2 Kings x, 33). After this he seems to have held the kingdom of Israel in a species of subjection (2 Kings xiii, 3-7, and 22), and towards the close of his life he even threatened the kingdom of Judah. Having taken Gath (2 Kings xii, 17; comp. Amos vi, 2), he proceeded to attack Jerusalem, defeated the Jews in an engagement (2 Chron. xxiv, 24), and was about to assault the city, when Joash induced him to retire by presenting him with "all the gold that was found in the treasures of the house of the Lord, and in the king's house" (2 Kings xii, 18). This able and successful, but unprincipled usurper left the throne at his death to his son Benhadad (2 Kings xiii, 24). B.C. cir. 835. Such was the prosperity and influence of his reign that the phrase "house of Hazael" occurs in prophetical denunciation (Amos i, 4) as a designation of the kingdom of Damascene Syria. See DAMASCUS.

Hazaï'ah (Heb. *Chazayah'*, חֲזָיָה, whom *Jehovah beholds*; Sept. Ὀζία), son of Adaïah and father of Colhozeh, a descendant of Pharez (Neh. xi, 5). B.C. considerably ante 536.

Hazar- (also HAZOR-) is frequently prefixed to geographical names, in order to indicate their dependence as *villages* (חָצֵר, *chatser'*, a *hamlet*; see VILLAGE) upon some town or other noted spot, or in order to distinguish them from it; e. g. those following. "The word *Hazar*, when joined to places situated in the desert or on the outskirts of the inhabited country, as it frequently is, probably denoted a piece of ground surrounded by a rude but strong fence, where tents could be pitched, and cattle kept in safety from marauders. Such places are very common at the present day in the outlying districts of Palestine. In other cases Hazar may denote a 'castle' or 'fortified town'" Comp. HAZER.

Haz'ar-ad'dar (Heb. *Chatsar'-Addar'*, חֲצַר אַדָּר, *village of Addar;* Sept. ἔπαυλις Ἀράδ, v. r. Ἀδδαρά and Σάραδα), a place on the southern boundary of Palestine, between Kadesh-Barnea and Azmon (Numb. xxxiv, 4); elsewhere called simply ADAR (Josh. xv, 3). See HAZERIM. It probably lay in the desert west of Kadesh-Barnea (q. v.), perhaps at the junction of wadys El-Fukreh and El-Madurah, east of Jebel Madurah. See TRIBE. Rev. J. Rowlands thought he discovered both this locality and that of the adjoining Azmon in the fountains which he calls *Adeirat* and *Aseimet*, west of wady el-Arish (Williams, *Holy City*, i, 467); but the names are more correctly Kudeirat and Kusaimet, and the locality is too far west.

Ha'zar-e'nan (Heb. *Chatsar'-Eynan'*, חֲצַר עֵינָן, *village of fountains*, also [in Ezek. xlvii, 17] HA'ZAR-E'NON, *Chatsar'-Eynon'*, חֲצַר עֵינוֹן, *id.;* Sept. Ἀσερναΐν or ἡ αὐλὴ τοῦ Αἰνάν), a place on the boundary of Palestine, apparently at the north-eastern corner, between Ziphron and Shepham (Numb. xxxiv, 9, 10), not far from the district of Hamath, in Damascene Syria (Ezek. xlvii, 17; xlviii, 1). Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 20, note) thinks it identical with the village *Deir-Hanon*, in the valley of the Fijeh or Amana, near Damascus; but there is no probability that this was included within the limits of Canaan. "Porter would identify Hazar-enan with *Kuryetein*='the two cities,' a village more than sixty miles east-north-east of Damascus, the chief ground for the identification apparently being the presence at Kuryetein of 'large fountains,' the only ones in that 'vast region,' a circumstance with which the name of Hazar-enan well agrees (*Damascus*, i, 252; ii, 358). The great distance from Damascus and the body of Palestine is the main impediment to the reception of this identification" (Smith). We must therefore seek for Hazar-enan somewhere in the well-watered tract at the north-western foot of Mount Hermon, perhaps the present *Hasbeya*, near which are four springs (Ain Kunieb, A. Tinta, A. Ata, and A. Hersha). See HASPEYA.

Ha'zar-gad'dah (Heb. *Chatsar'-Gaddah'*, חֲצַר גַּדָּה, *village of fortune;* Sept. Ἀσεργαδδά v. r. Σερεΐμ), a city on the southern border of Judah, mentioned between Moladah and Heshmon (Josh. xv, 27). Modern writers (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 707), following the suggestion of Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v.; who, as suggested by Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 100, has probably confounded this place with En-Gedi), have sought for it near the Dead Sea; but the associated names appear to locate it nearer midway towards the Mediterranean. See HAZERIM. Mr. Grove suggests (Smith, *Dict.* s. v.) that it is possibly the modern ruined site marked as *Jurrah* on Van de Velde's *Map*, west of el-Melh (Moladah), "by the change so frequent in the East (?) of D. to R." See JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

Ha'zar-hat'ticon (Hebrew *Chatsar' hat-Tikôn'*, חֲצַר הַתִּיכוֹן, *hamlet of the midway*, q. d. *middle village;* Sept. confusedly Εὐσὰν καὶ τοῦ Εὐνὰν v. r. αὐλὴ τοῦ Σαυνάν, Vulg. *domus Tichon*), a place on the northern boundary of Palestine, near Hamath, and in the confines of Hauran (Ezek. xlvii, 16); apparently, therefore, on the northern brow of Mount Hermon, which may have given origin to the name as a point of division between Cœle-Syria and Damascene Syria. It is possibly only an epithet of the HAZOR (q. v.) of Naphtali.

Hazarma'veth (Hebrew CHATSAR-MA'VETH,

חֲצַרְמָוֶת, *court of death;* Sept. Σαρμώθ and Ἀραμώθ, Vulg. *Asarmoth*), the name of the third son of Joktan, or, rather, of a district of Arabia Felix settled by him (Gen. x, 26; 1 Chron. i, 20); supposed to be preserved in the modern province of *Hadramaut*, situated on the Indian Ocean, and abounding in frankincense, myrrh, and aloe; but (as intimated in the ominous name) noted for the insalubrity of the climate (Abulfeda, *Arabia*, p. 45; Niebuhr, *Beschrieb. der Arab.* p. 283; Ritter, *Erdk.* XI, iii, 609). It was known also to the classical writers (Χατραμωτεῖται, xvi, 768; Χατραμμῖται or Χατραμωνῖται, Ptol. vi, 7, 25: *Atramitæ*, Dion. *Perieg.* 957; Χατραμωτίτης, Steph. Byz. p. 755). This identification of the locality rests not only on the occurrence of the name, but is supported by the proved fact that Joktan settled in the Yemen, along the south coast of Arabia, by the physical characteristics of the inhabitants of this region, and by the identification of the names of several others of the sons of Joktan. The province of Hadramaut is situated east of the *modern* Yemen (anciently, as shown in the article ARABIA, the limits of the latter province embraced almost the whole of the south of the peninsula), extending to the districts of Shihr and Mahreh. Its capital is Shibam, a very ancient city, of which the native writers give curious accounts, and its chief ports are Mirbat, Zafari [see SEPHAR], and Kishîm, whence a great trade was carried on in ancient times with India and Africa. Hadramaut itself is generally cultivated, in contrast with the contiguous sandy deserts (called El-Ahkaf, where lived the gigantic race of Ad), is partly mountainous, with watered valleys, and is still celebrated for its frankincense (El-Idrîsi, ed. Jomard, i, 54; Niebuhr, *Descrip.* p 245), exporting also gum-arabic, myrrh, dragon's blood, and aloes, the latter, however, being chiefly from Socotra, which is under the rule of the sheik of Keshîm (Niebuhr, l. c. sq.). The early kings of Hadramaut were Joktanites, distinct from the descendants of Yaarub, the progenitor of the Joktanite Arabs generally; and it is hence to be inferred that they were separately descended from Hazarmaveth. They maintained their independence against the powerful kings of Himyer until the latter were subdued at the Abyssinian invasion (Ibn-Khaldûn, *ap.* Caussin, *Essai*, i, 135 sq.). The modern people, although mixed with other races, are strongly characterized by fierce, fanatical, and restless dispositions. They are enterprising merchants, well known for their trading and travelling propensities.

Ha'zar-shu'al (Hebrew *Chatsar'-Shual'*, חֲצַר שׁוּעָל, *village of* the *jackal;* Sept. Ἀσαρσουλά, Ἐσερσουάλ and Ἀσερσωάλ), a city on the southern border of Judah (Josh. xv, 28; Neh. xi, 26, where it is mentioned between Beth-palet and Beer-sheba), afterwards included in the territory of Simeon (Josh. xix, 3; 1 Chron. iv, 28, where it is mentioned between Moladah and Balah); hence probably midway between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. See HAZERIM. Van de Velde, on his *Map*, conjectures the site to be that of the ruins *Saweh*, which he locates nearly half way between Beer-sheba and Moladah. But see SHEMA.

Ha'zar-su'sah (Hebrew *Chatsar'-Susah'*, חֲצַר סוּסָה, *village of* the *horse*, Josh. xix, 5; Sept. Ἀσερσουσίμ, Vulg. *Hasersusa*), or HA'ZAR-SU'SIM (*Chatsar'-Susim'*, חֲצַר סוּסִים, *village of horses*, 1 Chron. iv, 31; Sept. ἥμισυ Σωσίμ, Vulg. *Hasersusim*), a city of the tribe of Simeon, mentioned between Beth-marcaboth and Beth-lebaoth or Beth-birei; doubtless, as thought by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 124), the same as SANSANNAH, in the south border of Judah (Josh. xv, 31), one of Solomon's "chariot-cities" (2 Chron. i, 14). See HAZERIM. It is true that "neither it nor its companion, BETH-MARCABOTH, the 'house of chariots,' is named in the list of the towns of Judah in chap. xv, but they are included in those of Simeon in 1 Chron. iv, 31, with the express statement that they existed before and up to the time of David" (Smith). Stanley suggests, "In *Bethmarkaboth*, 'the house of chariots,' and *Hazar-susim*, 'the village of horses,' we recognise the dépôts and stations for the horses and chariots, such as those which in Solomon's time went to and fro between Egypt and Palestine" (*Sin. and Pal.* p. 160). "It is doubtful whether there was any such communication between those countries as early as the time of Joshua; but may not the rich grassy plains around Beersheba (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* i, 203) have been used at certain seasons by the ancient tribes of Southern Palestine for pasturing their war and chariot horses, just as the grassy plains of Jaulân are used at the present day by the Druse chiefs of Lebanon, and the Turkish cavalry and artillery at Damascus?" (Kitto). "Still it is somewhat difficult to ascribe to so early a date the names of places situated, as these were, in the Bedouin country, where a chariot must have been unknown, and where even horses seem carefully excluded from the possessions of the inhabitants—'camels, sheep, oxen, and asses' (1 Sam. xxvii, 9)."

Haz'azon-ta'mar (2 Chron. xx, 2). See HAZEZON-TAMAR.

Hazel (לוּז, *lûz*, of doubtful etymology [see LUZ]; Sept. καρυΐνη, Vulgate *amygdalinus*), apparently a nut-bearing tree, which occurs in Gen. xxx, 37, where it indicates one of the kinds of rod from which Jacob peeled the bark, and which he placed in the water-troughs of the cattle. Authorities are divided between the *hazel* or *walnut* and the *almond*-tree, as representing the *lûz;* in favor of the former we have Kimchi, Jarchi, Luther, and others; while the Vulgate, Saadias, and Gesenius adopt the latter view. The rendering in the Sept. is equally applicable to either. On the one hand is adduced the fact that in the Arabic we have *louz*, which is indeed the same word, and denotes the almond. Thus Abu'l-Fadli, as quoted by Celsius (*Hierobot.* i, 254), says, "*Louz* est arbor nota, et magna, foliis mollibus. Species duæ, hortensis et silvestris. Hortensis quoque duæ sunt species, dulcis et amara;" where reference is evidently made to the sweet and bitter almond. Other Arab authors also describe the almond under the name of *louz.* But this name was well known to the Hebrews as indicating the almond; for R. Saadias, in Ab. Esra's *Comment.*, as quoted by Celsius (p. 253), remarks: "Lus est amygdalus, quia ita eam appellant Arabes; nam hæ duæ linguæ, et Syriaca, ejusdem sunt familiæ." It is also alleged that there is another word in the Hebrew language, *egôz* (אֱגוֹז), which is applicable to the hazel or

Amygdalus Communis.

walnut. See NUT. The strongest argument on the other side arises from the circumstance of another word, *shâkêd* (שָׁקֵד), having reference to the almond; it is supposed, however, that the latter applies to the *fruit* exclusively, and the word under discussion to the tree; Rosenmüller identifies the *shaked* with the cultivated, and *lûz* with the wild almond-tree. See FRUIT.

The almond is diffused by culture from China to Spain, and is found to bear fruit well on both sides of the Mediterranean; but there is no region where it thrives better than Syria, or where it is so truly at home. Accordingly, when Jacob was sending a present of those productions of Canaan which were likely to be acceptable to an Egyptian grandee, "the best fruits of the land," besides balm, and myrrh, and honey, he bade his sons take "nuts and almonds" (Gen. xliii, 11); and the original name of that place so endeared to his memory as Bethel, originally called Luz, was probably derived from some well-known tree of this species. To this day "Jordan almonds" is the recognised market-name for the best samples of this fruit, in common with Tafilat dates, Eleme figs, etc. The name, however, is little more than a tradition. The best "Jordan almonds" come from Malaga. See ALMOND.

Hazelelpo'ni, or rather ZELELPONI (צְלֶלְפּוֹנִי, *shade* looking *upon me* [or *protection of* the *presence*, sc. God: Fürst], with the article, הַצְּלֶלְפּוֹנִי, *hats-Tselelponi'*, strictly, perhaps, rather an epithet, the *Zelelponite*, q. d. *overshadowed;* Sept. Ἐσηλελφών, Vulg. *Aselelphuni*), the sister of Jezreel and others, of the descendants of Hezron, son of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 3). B.C. cir. 1612.

Hazelius, ERNEST LEWIS, D.D., was born in Neusalz, Prussia, Sept. 6, 1777. He was descended from a long line of Lutheran ministers. His theological studies were pursued at Niesky, a Moravian institution under the superintendence of bishop Anders. In 1800 he was appointed teacher of the classics in the Moravian Seminary at Nazareth, Pa. The position he accepted in opposition to the wishes of his friends, and at once embarked for America. In this institution he labored with efficiency for eight years, and was advanced to be head-teacher and professor of theology. Differing from his brethren in their views of church government and discipline, he concluded to change his ecclesiastical relations, and to unite with the Lutheran Church, in whose service his fathers had so long lived and labored. In 1809 he removed to Philadelphia, and for a time had charge of a private classical school. For several years he labored as a pastor in New Jersey, and in 1815 was elected professor of theology in Hartwick Seminary, and principal of the classical department. In 1830 he was chosen professor of Biblical and Oriental literature, and of the German language, in the seminary at Gettysburg, Pa.; and in 1834 he accepted the appointment of professor in the theological seminary of the Synod of South Carolina. All these positions he filled with ability and great satisfaction to the Church. He died Feb. 20, 1853. As a scholar he occupied a high rank. The doctorate he received simultaneously from Union and Columbia Colleges, N.Y. His attainments in literature were varied and extensive. He published *Life of Luther* (1813):—*Materials for Catechisation* (1823):—*Augsburg Confession, with Annotations:—History of the Christian Church* (1842):—*Hist. of the American Lutheran Church* (1842):—*Life of J. H. Stilling* (1831). (M. L. S.)

Ha'zer (חָצֵר, *Chatsêr'*, from חָצַר, to *surround* or inclose), a word which is of not unfrequent occurrence in the Bible in the sense of a "court" or quadrangle to a palace or other building, but which topographically seems generally employed for the "villages" of people in a roving and unsettled life, the semi-permanent collections of dwellings described by travellers among the modern Arabs as consisting of rough stone walls covered with the tent-cloths, and thus holding a middle position between the tent of the wanderer—so transitory as to furnish an image of the sudden termination of life (Isa. xxxviii, 12)—and the settled, permanent town. See TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

As a proper name it appears in the A.V.: 1. In the plural, HAZERIM, and HAZEROTH, for which see below. 2. In the slightly different form of HAZOR. 3. In composition with other words, giving a special designation to the particular "village" intended. When thus in union with another word the name is HAZAR (q. v.). It should not be overlooked that the places so named are all in the wilderness itself, or else quite on the confines of civilized country.

Haz'erim [many *Haze'rim*] (Hebrew *Chatserim'*, חֲצֵרִים, *villages;* Sept. Ἀσηρώθ, Vulg. *Haserim*), the name of a place, or perh. rather a general designation of the temporary villages in which the nomade AVITES resided, especially between Gaza and "the river of Egypt" or el-Arish (Deut. ii, 23). Schwarz suggests (*Palestine*, p. 93) that these "Hazerim" may be a general designation of the many towns by the name of HAZOR and HAZAR found in this region; if so, these probably all lay near each other; and it is a singular fact that the sites of at least two of them, Hazar-gaddah and Hazar-susah, seem to have been immediately adjoining one another.

Haz'eroth [many *Haze'roth*] (Heb. *Chatseroth'*, חֲצֵרוֹת, *villages;* Sept. Ἀσηρώθ, but Αὐλών in Deut. i, 1), the sixteenth station of the Israelites, their third after leaving Sinai, and either four or five days' march from that mountain towards Canaan (Numb. xi, 35; xii, 16; xxxiii, 17, 18; Deut. i, 1; comp. Numb. x, 33). It was also the first place after Sinai where the camp remained for a number of days. Here Aaron and Miriam attempted to excite a rebellion against Moses; and here the guilty Miriam was smitten with leprosy (Numb. xii). Burckhardt suggested (*Travels*, p. 495) that it is to be found in *Ain el-Hudhera*, near the usual route from Sinai to the eastern arm of the Red Sea; an identification that has generally been acquiesced in by subsequent travellers. It is described by Dr. Robinson as a fountain of tolerably good water, the only perennial one in that region, with several low palm-trees around it; he also remarks that the identification of this spot with Hazeroth is important as showing the route of the Israelites from Sinai to the Arabah, which, if it passed through this place, must have continued down the valley to the Red Sea, and could not have diverged through the high western plateau of the wilderness (*Researches*, i, 223). See EXODE. "Its distance from Sinai accords with the Scripture narrative, and would seem to warrant us in identifying it with Hazeroth. There is some difficulty, however, in the position. The country around the fountain is exceedingly rugged, and the approaches to it difficult. It does not seem a suitable place for a large camp. Dr. Wilson mentions an undulating plain about fifteen miles north of Sinai, and running 'a long way to the eastward,' called *el-Hadherah;* and here he would locate Hazeroth (*Lands of the Bible*, i, 256). Stanley thinks that the fountain called *el-'Ain*, some distance north of the fountain of Hudherah, ought rather to be regarded as the site of Hazeroth, because 'Ain is the most important spring in this region, 'and must therefore have attracted around it any nomadic settlements, such as are implied in the name Hazeroth, and such as that of Israel might have been' (*Sinai and Pal.* p. 82). The approach to 'Ain is easy; the glens around it possess some good pastures; and the road from it to the Ælanitic Gulf, along whose shore the Israelites appear to have marched, is open through the sublime ravine of Wetir. Still, those familiar with the East know with what tenacity old names cling to old sites; and it seems in the highest degree probable that the old name Hazeroth is retained in Hudherah. But probably the name may have been given to a wide district (Porter, *Handbook for Sinai and Pal.* i, 37 sq.)." Schwarz, however (*Palest.* p. 212), regards the site as that of *Ain*

el-Kudeirah, a large fountain of sweet running water at some distance beyond the ridge which bounds the western edge of the interior plateau of the desert et-Tih (Robinson's *Researches*, i, 280); a position far too northward.

Haz'ezon-ta'mar (Hebrew *Chatsatson'-Tamar'*, חַצְצֹן תָּמָר, Gen. xiv, 7; Sept. Ἀσασονθαμάρ), or HAZ'AZON-TA'MAR (Heb. [precisely the converse of the rendering in the A. V.] *Chatsetson'-Tamar'*, חַצְצוֹן תָּמָר, 2 Chron. xx, 2; Sept. Ἀσασὰν Θαμάρ), the name under which, at a very early period in the history of Palestine, and in a document believed by many to be the oldest of all these early records, we first hear of the place which afterwards became EN-GEDI (q. v.). The Amorites were dwelling at Hazazon-Tamar when the four kings made their incursion, and fought their successful battle with the five (Gen. xiv, 7). The name occurs only once again—in the records of the reign of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xx, 2)—when he is warned of the approach of the horde of Ammonites, Moabites, Mehunim, and men of Mount Seir, whom he afterwards so completely destroyed, and who were no doubt pursuing thus far exactly the same route as the Assyrians had done a thousand years before them. Here the explanation, "which is En-gedi," is added. The existence of the earlier appellation, after En-gedi had been so long in use, is a remarkable instance of the tenacity of these old Oriental names, of which more modern instances are frequent. See ACCHO; BETHSAIDA, etc. Schwarz, however, unnecessarily supposes (*Palest.* p. 21) the two passages to refer to different localities, the earlier of which he assigns (on Talmudical evidence) to ZOAR (q. v.).

Hazazon-tamar is interpreted in Hebrew to mean the "*pruning* or felling *of* the *palm*" (Gesen. *Thes.* p. 512), or perhaps better, "*a row of palm*-trees" (Fürst, *Lex.* s. v.). Jerome (*Quæst. in Gen.*) renders it *urbs palmarum.* This interpretation of the name is borne out by the ancient reputation of the palms of En-gedi (Ecclus. xxiv, 14, and the citations from Pliny, given under that name). The Samaritan Version has פליג כדי=the *Valley of Cadi*, possibly a corruption of En-gedi. The Targums have *En-gedi.* Perhaps this was the "city of palm-trees" (*Ir hat-temarim*) out of which the Kenites, the tribe of Moses's father-in-law, went up into the wilderness of Judah, after the conquest of the country (Judg. i, 16). If this were so, the allusion of Balaam to the Kenite (Numb. xxiv, 21) is at once explained. Standing as he was on one of the lofty points of the highlands opposite Jericho, the western shore of the Dead Sea as far as En-gedi would be before him, and the cliff, in the clefts of which the Kenites had fixed their secure "nest," would be a prominent object in the view. This has been alluded to by Prof. Stanley (*Sinai and Pal.* p. 225, n. 4). De Saulcy (*Narrative*, i, 149) and Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 109) think that a trace of the ancient name is preserved in the tract and wady *el-Husasah* (Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 243, 244), a little north of Ain-Jidy.

Ha'ziel (Heb. *Chaziel'*, חֲזִיאֵל, *vision of God;* Sept. Ἀζιὴλ v. r. Ἰειήλ), a "son" of the Gershonite Shimei, and chief of the family of Laadan (1 Chron. xxiii, 9). B.C. 1014.

Ha'zo (Heb. *Chazo'*, חֲזוֹ, perhaps for חָזוּת, *vision;* Sept. Ἀζαῦ, Vulg. *Azau*), one of the sons of Nahor by Milcah (Gen. xxii, 22). B.C. cir. 2040. The only clew to the locality settled by him is to be found in the identification of Chesed, and the other sons of Nahor; and hence he must, in all likelihood, be placed in Ur of the Chaldees, or the adjacent countries. Bunsen (*Bibelwerk*, I, ii, 49) suggests *Chazene* by the Euphrates (Stephan. Byzant.), in Mesopotamia, or the Chazene (Χαζηνή) in Assyria (Strabo, xvi, p. 736).

Ha'zor (Heb. *Chatsor'*, חָצוֹר, *village* [see HAZER-]; Sept. Ἀσώρ, but ἡ αὐλή in Jer. xlix, 28, 30, 33), the name of several places. See also EN-HAZOR; BAAL-HAZOR; HAZOR-HADATTAH; HAZERIM.

1. A city near the waters of lake Merom (Huleh), the seat of Jabin, a powerful Canaanitish king, as appears from the summons sent by him to all the neighboring kings to assist him against the Israelites (Josh. xi, 1-5). He and his confederates were, however, defeated and slain by Joshua, and the city burned to the ground (Josh. xi, 10-13; Josephus, *Ant.* v, 5, 1): being the only one of those northern cities which was burned by Joshua, doubtless because it was too strong and important to leave standing in his rear. It was the principal city of the whole of North Palestine, "the head of all those kingdoms" (Josh. x, 10; see Jerome, *Onomast.* s. v. Asor). Like the other strong places of that part, it stood on an eminence (תֵּל, Josh. xi, 13, A. V. "strength"), but the district around must have been on the whole flat, and suitable for the manœuvres of the "very many" chariots and horses which formed part of the forces of the king of Hazor and his confederates (Josh. xi, 4, 6, 9; Judg. iv, 3). But by the time of Deborah and Barak the Canaanites had recovered part of the territory then lost, had rebuilt Hazor, and were ruled by a king with the ancient royal name of Jabin, under whose power the Israelites were, in punishment for their sins, reduced. From this yoke they were delivered by Deborah and Barak, after which Hazor remained in quiet possession of the Israelites, and belonged to the tribe of Naphtali (Josh. xix, 36; Judg. iv, 2; 1 Sam. xii, 9). Solomon did not overlook so important a post, and the fortification of Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer, the points of defence for the entrance from Syria and Assyria, the plain of Esdraelon, and the great maritime lowland respectively, was one of the chief pretexts for his levy of taxes (1 Kings ix, 15). Later still it is mentioned in the list of the towns and districts whose inhabitants were carried off to Assyria by Tiglath-Pileser (2 Kings xv, 29; Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 11, 1). We encounter it once more in 1 Macc. xi, 67, where Jonathan, after encamping for the night at the "water of Gennesar," advances to the "plain of Asor" (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 5, 7; the Greek text of the Maccabees has prefixed an *n* from the preceding word πεδίον; A. V. "Nasor") to meet Demetrius, who was in possession of Kadesh (xi, 63; Josephus as above). See NASOR. Raumer queries whether it may not have been the ancient town of *Naason*, which king Baldwin IV passed on his way from Tiberias to Saphet (Will. Tyr. p. 1014); and his reason for this conjecture is that the Vulgate gives Naason for the *Asor* (Ἀσώρ) of Tobit i, 1 (Raumer, *Palästina*, p. 114, n.). See ASOR.

The name Hazor still lingers in several places around the upper valley of the Jordan (Robinson, *B. R.* iii, 63, 81, 401). There is one *Hazûry* on a commanding site above Cæsarea Philippi, and close to the great castle of Subeibeh. Here Keith (*Land of Israel*, p. 374) and Stanley (*Sin. and Pal.* p. 389) would place the ancient capital of Canaan. But the territory of Naphtali hardly extended so far eastward. Another *Hasûr* is in the plain, a few miles west of the site of Dan; but neither does this site quite accord with the Scripture notices (Porter's *Damascus*, i, 304; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 318). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 91) thinks a village which he calls *Azur*, between Banias and Meshdel (el-Mejel), may be the ancient Hazor; he probably refers to the *Ain el-Hazury* marked on Zimmerman's *Map* a little north-east of Banias, which, however, is too far east. There is a place marked as *Azur* on Zimmerman's *Map*, a little north-east of Kedes (Kadesh), which unquestionably lay in Naphtali; but M. De Saulcy (*Narrat.* ii, 406) denies that this can have been the Hazor of Jabin (which he distinguishes from the Hazor of Solomon), and in a long argument (p. 400-405) he contends that it was situated on the site of some extensive ruins, which he reports at a place called indefinitely *el-Khan*, on the hills skirting the north-easterly shore of the lake

el-Huleh, in the direction of Banias. Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 318) likewise thinks the Hazor of Joshua different from that of Judges (although both were ruled by a Jabin, evidently a hereditary title), and inclines to regard En-Hazor (Josh. xix, 37) as identical with the latter, and with a ruined *Hazur* in the middle of Galilee (about two hours from Bint Jebeil); while he seems to acquiesce in the identification of the eastern Hazor with a *Hazur* (Porter, *Damascus*, i, 304) or *Kasr Antar* (Seetzen), or, as he himself calls it, *Tell Haze*, covered with remains, and jutting out from Merj Ayun towards the Huleh plain. The Hazor of Josh. xix, 36, he believes to be *Tell Hazur*, south-east of Ramah. All this, however, is vague and confused. Mr. Thomson, who visited this region in 1843, believed Hazor may be identified with the present castle of *Hunin*, north of the Huleh (*Biblioth. Sacra*, 1846, p. 202). The editor (Dr. Robinson), however, thinks the arguments adduced more plausible than sound (*ib.* p. 212), and advocates the opinion of Rev. E. Smith, that *Tell Khureibeh*, at the south end of the plain of Kedes, is better entitled to be regarded as the site of Hazor (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1847, p. 403). Accordingly, in the new ed. of his *Researches*, after noticing and rejecting several other sites proposed (iii, 63, 81, 402), he at length fixes upon this as best agreeing with the ancient notices of this city (*ib.* p. 365). There are, as the name *Khureibeh*, "ruins," implies, some ancient ruins on the tell, but they are those of a village. There are still other ruins of an ancient town which occupy a commanding site on the south bank of wady Hendâj, overlooking the valley and lake of Merom, and about six miles south of Kedesh, which is a not improbable site for the ancient Hazor (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* iii, 363, 365); and the plain beneath it, stretching to the shore of the lake, might take the name of the city *Asur*, as Josephus seems to indicate (*l. c.*). Ritter (*Erdk.* xv, 260) accepts the *Hazury* proposed by Burckhardt (*Trav.* p. 44); apparently the inconsiderable ruin on the rocky declivity above Banias (Robinson, *Res.* new ed. iii, 402). Captain Wilson prefers the isolated *Tell Harah*, covered with ruins, about two miles south-east of Kedesh (*Jour. Sac. Lit.* 1866, p. 245). But none of these last cited places retain the ancient name. Finally, Dr. Thomson is confident (*Land and Book*, i, 439) that the true spot is *Hazere* (the above *Hazur* of Van de Velde, east of a more northern Ramah), in the centre of the mountainous region overhanging lake Huleh on the north-west, containing numerous ancient remains, and locally connected by tradition with the Israelitish victory; although Dr. Robinson (incorrectly) objects to this site (*Bib. Res.* new ed. iii, 63) that it is too far from the lake, and within the territory of Asher.

2. A city in the south of Judah (but probably not one of those assigned to Simeon, since it is not named in the list, Josh. xix, 1-9), mentioned between Kedesh (Kadesh-Barnea) and Ithnan (Josh. xv, 23, where the Vat. MS. of the Sept. unites with the following name, Ἀσοριωνάν, Alex. MS. omits, Vulg. *Asor*). We may reasonably conjecture that this was the central town of that name, the other Hazors of the same connection (Hazor-Hadattah, and Kerioth-Hezron or Hazor-Amam) being probably so called for distinction' sake; and in that case we may perhaps locate it at a ruined site marked on Van de Velde's *Map* as *Tayibeh* (the *et-Taiyib* of Robinson, *Res.* iii, Appendix, p. 114), on a tell around the south-west base of which runs the wady ed-Dheib, emptying into the Dead Sea. See Nos. 3 and 4.

3. Hazor-Hadattah (for so the Heb. חָצוֹר חֲדַתָּה, i. e. *New Hazor*, should be understood; since there is no copula between the words, and the sense in verse 32 requires this condensation; Sept. omits, Vulg. *Asor nova*), a city in the south of Judah (but not the extreme Simeonite portion), mentioned between Bealoth and Kerioth (Josh. xv, 25); probably, as suggested in Keil and Delitzsch's *Commentary*, ad loc. (Edinb. ed. p. 160), the ruined site *el-Hudhairah* of Robinson's *Researches* (iii, Append. p. 114), south of Hebron, in the immediate vicinity of el-Beyudh (the Beiyudh of Van de Velde's *Map*, about half way between Kerioth and Arad). See Nos. 2. and 4.

4. Hazor-Amam (to be so joined for the same reasons as in No. 2), probably identified with Kerioth-Herzon (in the Heb. the four names stand קְרִיּוֹת חֶצְרוֹן הִיא חָצוֹר אֲמָם, *villages of Chetsron which* is *Chatsor-Amam*; Sept. αἱ πόλεις Ἀσερών [v. r. Ἀσερώμ], αὕτη ἐστὶ Ἀσώρ, καὶ Ἀμάμ [v. r. Ἀσερωμάμ]; Vulg. *Carioth, Hesron, hæc est Asor, Amam*), a town in the south of Judah (but apparently not in the Simeonite territory), mentioned between Bealoth and Shema (Josh. xv, 24-26); no doubt (if thus combined) the modern *el-Khureyetein*, as suggested by Robinson (*Researches*, iii, Append. p. 114). See Kerioth.

5. (Vat. MS. of Sept. omits; Vulg. *Asor.*) A city inhabited by the Benjamites after the Captivity, mentioned between Ananiah and Ramah (Neh. xi, 33); possibly the modern *Gazur*, a short distance east of Jaffa (for others of the associated names, although likewise within the ancient territory of Dan, are also assigned to Benjamin), since Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Asor) mention a Hazor in the vicinity of Ascalon, although they assign it to Judah, and confound it with those in the south of that tribe (Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 370, note). From the places mentioned with it, as Anathoth, Nob, Ramah, etc., it would seem to have lain north of Jerusalem, and at no great distance therefrom. Schwarz thinks it is called *Chasor* (חסר) in the Talmudical writers (*Palest.* p. 162). Robinson suggests the identity of Hazor and the modern *Tell Asur*, a ruin on a little hill about six miles north of Bethel (*Bib. Res.* ii, 264, note). This, however, appears to be too far from Ramah. Tobler mentions a ruin called *Khurbet Arsur*, near Ramah, a little to the west, the situation of which would answer better to Hazor (*Topogr.* ii, 400; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 319). The place in question is probably the same with the Baal-hazor (q. v.) of 2 Sam. xiii, 23.

6. A region of Arabia, spoken of as an important place, in the vicinity of Kedar, in the prophetic denunciations of desolation upon both by Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xlix, 28-33). It can hardly be *Petra*, as supposed by Vitringa (*on Isa.*, i, p. 624), nor the *Asor* placed by Eusebius 8 miles west of Philadelphia (Hitzig, *Jesaias*, p. 196), but probably is a designation of the confines of Arabia with south-eastern Palestine, inhabited by nomade tribes dwelling in mere encampments. See Hazar.

Hazzurim. See Helkath-hazzurim.

Head (properly רֹאשׁ, *rosh*, κεφαλή), the topmost part of the human body.

I. *Anatomically* considered, the general character of the human head is such as to establish the identity of the human race, and to distinguish man from every other animal. At the same time, different families of mankind are marked by peculiarities of construction in the head, which, though in individual cases, and when extremes are compared together, they run one into the other, to the entire loss of distinctive lines, yet are in the general broadly contrasted one with the other. These peculiarities in the structure of the skull give rise to and are connected with other peculiarities of feature and general contour of face. In the union of cranial peculiarities with those of the face, certain clear marks are presented, by which physiologists have been able to range the individuals of our race into a few great classes, and in so doing to afford an unintentional corroboration of the information which the Scriptures afford regarding the origin and dispersion of mankind. Camper, one of the most learned and clear-minded physicians of the 18th century, has the credit of being the first who drew attention to the classification of the human features, and endeavored, by means of what he termed the facial angle, to furnish a method for distinguishing different nations and races of men, which, be-

ing himself an eminent limner, he designed for application chiefly in the art of drawing, and which, though far from producing strictly definite and scientific results, yet affords views that are not without interest, and approximations that at least prepared the way for something better (see a collection of Camper's pieces entitled *Œuvres qui ont pour Objet l'Histoire Naturelle, la Physiologie, et l'Anatomie comparée*, Paris, 1803). It is, however, to the celebrated J. F. Blumenbach, whose merits in the entire sphere of natural history are so transcendent, that we are mainly indebted for the accurate and satisfactory classifications in regard to cranial structure which now prevail. Camper had observed that the breadth of the head differs in different nations; that the heads of Asiatics (the Kalmucs) have the greatest breadth; that those of Europeans have a middle degree of breadth; and that the skulls of the African negroes are the narrowest of all. This circumstance was by Blumenbach made the foundation of his arrangement and description of skulls. By comparing different forms of the human cranium together, that eminent physiologist was led to recognise three great types, to which all others could be referred—the Caucasian, Mongolian, and Ethiopic. These three differ more widely from each other than any other that can be found; but to these three, Blumenbach, in his classification of skulls, and of the races of men to which they belong, added two others, in many respects intermediate between the three forms already mentioned. In this way five classes are established, corresponding with five great families. 1.

Forms of Skulls of different races: 1, Ethiopian; 2, Mongolian; 3, Caucasian; 4, Malay; 5, American Savage.

The Caucasian family, comprising the nations of Europe, some of the Western Asiatics, etc., have the head of the most symmetrical shape, almost round, the forehead of moderate extent, the cheek-bones rather narrow, without any projection, but a direction downwards from the molar process of the frontal bone; the alveolar edge well rounded; the front teeth of each jaw placed perpendicularly; the face of oval shape, straight, features moderately prominent; forehead arched; nose narrow, slightly arched; mouth small; chin full and round. 2. The second is the Mongolian variety. 3. Ethiopian. 4. Malay and South Sea Islanders. 5. American. The description of their peculiarities may be found in Prichard's *Researches into the Physical History of Man*, 2d ed. i, 167 sq. The reader may also consult Lawrence's *Lectures on the Natural History of Man;* J. Muller's *Handbuch der Physiologie.* But the most recent, if not the best work on the subject before us is Prichard's *Natural History of Man* (1843), a work which comprises and reviews, in the spirit of a sound philosophy, all that has hitherto been written and discovered on the origin, physical structure, and propagation over the earth of the race of man. In this invaluable work full details may be found of the methods of studying the human head of which we have spoken, and of some others, not less interesting in themselves, nor less valuable in their results (see particularly p. 116 sq.).

II. *Scriptural References.*—This part of the human body has generally been considered as the abode of intelligence, while the heart, or the parts placed near it, have been accounted the place where the affections lie (Gen. iii, 15; Psa. iii, 3; Eccles. ii, 14). The head and the heart are sometimes taken for the entire person (Isa. i, 5). Even the head alone, as being the chief member, frequently stands for the man (Prov. x, 6). The head also denotes sovereignty (1 Cor. xi, 3). Covering the head, and cutting off the hair, were signs of mourning and tokens of distress, which were enhanced by throwing ashes on the head, together with sackcloth (Amos viii, 10; Job i, 20; Lev. xxi, 5; Deut. xiv, 1; 2 Sam. xiii, 10; Esth. iv, 1); while anointing the head was practised on festive occasions, and considered an emblem of felicity (Eccles. ix, 8; Psa. xxiii, 5; Luke vii, 46). See ANOINT. It was not unusual to swear by the head (Matt. v, 36).—Kitto, s. v. The phrase *to lift up the head* of any one, is to exalt him (Psa. iii, 3; cx, 7); and *to return* or *give back upon one's head*, is to be requited, recompensed (Psa. vii, 16; Joel iii, 4; Ezek. ix, 10; xi, 21; xvi, 43; xvii, 19; xxii, 31). So, *your blood be on your own heads* (Acts xviii, 6); the guilt of your destruction rests upon yourselves (2 Sam. i, 16; 1 Kings ii, 33, 37). The term *head* is used to signify *the chief*, one to whom others are subordinate; the *prince* of a people or state (Judg. x, 18; xi, 8; 1 Sam. xv, 17; Psa. xviii, 43; Isa. vii, 8, 9); of a family, the head, chief, patriarch (Exod. vi, 14; Numb. vii, 2; 1 Chron. v, 24); of a husband in relation to a wife (Gen. iii, 16; 1 Cor. xi, 3; Eph. v, 23). So of Christ the *head* in relation to his Church, which is his body, and its members his members (1 Cor. xii, 27; xi, 3; Eph. i, 22; iv, 15; v, 23; Col. i, 18; ii, 10, 19); of God in relation to Christ (1 Cor. xi, 3). *Head* is also used for what is *highest, uppermost:* the *top, summit* of a mountain (Gen. viii, 5; Exod. xvii, 9, 10; xix, 20). The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established at the *head* of the mountains, and shall be higher than the hills, i. e. it shall be a *prince* among the mountains (Isa. ii, 2). Four *heads* of rivers, i. e. four rivers into which the waters divide themselves (Gen. ii, 10). *Head* stone of the corner (Psa. cxviii, 22), either the highest, forming the top or coping of the corner; or lowest, which forms the foundation of the building. See CORNER.

III. *Hair of the Head* (פֶּרַע) was by the Hebrews worn thick and full as an ornament of the person (comp. Ezek. viii, 3; Jer. vii, 29); a bald head, besides exposing one to the suspicion of leprosy (Lev. xiii, 43 sq.), was always a cause of mortification (2 Kings ii, 23; Isa. iii, 17, 24; comp. Sueton. *Cæs.* 45; *Domit.* 18; Homer, *Iliad*, ii, 219; Hariri, 10, p. 99, ed. Sacy); among the priestly order it therefore amounted to a positive disqualification (Lev. xxi, 20; Mishna, *Bechoroth*, vii, 2); among the Egyptians, on the contrary, the hair was regularly shorn (Gen. xli, 14), and only allowed to go uncut in seasons of mourning (Herod. ii, 36). Hair so long as to descend to the shoulders, however, seems only in early times to have been the habit, in the male sex, with youth (2 Sam. xiv, 26; Joseph. *Ant.* viii, 7, 3; Horace, *Od.* ii, 5, 21; iii, 20, 14). Men cropped it from time to time with shears (תַּעַר, מוֹרָה; comp. Ezek. xliv, 20, and the *κόμη μικρά* of the Babylonians, Strabo xvi, 746). See, however, NAZARITE. Among the late Jews long hair in men was esteemed a weakness (1 Cor. xi, 14:

comp. Plutarch, *Quæst. Rom.* xiv; Clem. Alex. *Pæd.* iii, 106; Epiphan. *Hær.* lxviii, 6; Jerome *ad Ezech.* xliv); but it was otherwise in Sparta (Aristot. *Rhet.* i, 9; Herod. i, 82; Xenoph. *Lac.* xi, 3; comp. Aristoph. *An.* 1287 sq.); and to the priests any curtailment of it was forbidden (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 118; for the long hair on the Persepolitan remains, see Niebuhr, *Trav.* ii, 128; and for that of the Asiatic priests in general, see Movers, *Phönic.* i, 682: on the Assyrian monuments it is always, in the case of natives at least, represented as long and elaborately curled; see Layard, passim). Only in cases of religious vows did males suffer it to grow uncut (Acts xviii, 18; see Kuinöl, ad loc.). Females, on the contrary, set great value upon the hair (1 Cor. l. c.; compare Cant. iv, 1; Luke vii, 38; John xi, 2 [Rev. ix, 8]; Philostr. *Ep.* 26; Plutarch, *De vit. ære al.* iii; Harmer, iii, 319; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* vi, 108; Kype, *Observv.* ii, 220). There were various modes of putting up the hair (Ezek. xliv, 20; comp. Herod. iv, 175, 191); and it was a statute that men should not cut off the earlocks (פְּאַת הַזָּקָן, Lev. xix, 27; A. V. "round the corners of the head"). Women, especially, were wont to curl the hair (Isa. iii, 24; see Gesen. ad loc.; comp. Serv. *ad Æn.* xii, 98), and to braid it (2 Kings ix, 30; Judith x, 3; 1 Pet. iii, 3; 1 Tim. ii, 9; comp. Joseph. *War*, iv, 9, 10; Homer, *Il.* i, 330; xiv, 175; Harmer, ii, 381: to go with dishevelled hair [*passis crinibus*] was a mark of grief, 3 Macc. i, 9; comp. Luke vii, 38; Lightfoot, *Opp.* p. 1081; but rustic maidens often let the hair fall in loose tresses [דַּלָּה, Cant. vii, 6; comp. Anacr. xxix, 7], merely bound with a ribbon), or even to interweave it with gems or other finery (*Iliad*, xvii, 52), and in later times to ornament it most elaborately (see Lightfoot, *Opp.* p. 498; Hartmann, *Hebr.* ii, 208 sq.). See HEAD-DRESS. Even men sometimes appeared with curls (Joseph. *Ant.* xiv, 9, 4; comp. *War*, iv, 9, 10; Philo, *Opp.* ii, 479; Plutarch, *Lycurg.* 22), which, however, was generally disapproved (Philo, *Opp.* ii, 306, 479; Cicero, *Sext.* 8; Artemid. ii, 6; Martial, ii, 36; Phocyl. *Sentent.* 194 sq.; Clement Alexand. *Pæd.* iii, p. 101). *Combs* are nowhere mentioned in the O. T. (other nations knew them, Ovid, *Fast.* i, 405; Petron. *Sat.* 126; Apul. *Asin.* ii, p. 213; comp. *Iliad*, xiv, 176), although they, as well as hair-pins, are referred to in the Talmud (Hartmann, p. 224 sq.). Hair-powder was unknown to the ancients. On the other hand, they used to anoint the hair with costly oils (Psa. xxiii, 5; cxxxiii, 2; Matt. vi, 17; Luke vii, 46; Joseph. *Ant.* xix, 4, 1; as also non-Jewish nations, Plutarch, *Præcepta conjug.* 29; Horace, *Od.* ii, 11, 16; iii, 29, 2; Ovid, *Ars Am.* i, 505; Tibul. i, 751; Suetonius, *Cæs.* 67; Apul. *Metam.* ii, 30, Bip.), and gave it a brilliant lustre by a mixture of gold-dust in these unguents (Joseph. *Ant.* viii, 7, 3; comp. Lamprid. *Commod.* 17), as the hair of Orientals is generally black (Cant. iv, 1; v, 11: David's rufous hair is named as peculiar, 1 Sam. xvi, 12). A common method of dressing the hair among many ancient nations (Pliny, xv, 24; xxiii, 32, 46; xxvi, 93; xxviii, 51; Athen. xii, 542; Val. Max. ii, 1, 5; Diod. Sic. v, 28; but not among the Greeks, Plutarch, *Apophl. reg.* p. 19, Tauchn.), and one highly esteemed by modern Orientals, namely, to stain it reddish-yellow by means of *henna* [see CAMPHIRE], although perhaps not unknown to the Hebrewesses (see Cant. vii, 5), as an imitation of the generally prized golden-hued locks (*flavi crines*) of antiquity (*Iliad*, i, 197; ii, 642; Virg. *Æn.* iv, 549; Ovid, *Fast.* ii, 763; Stat. Achil. i, 162; Petron. *Sat.* 105; Apul. *Metam.* ii, 25, Bip.; see Brouckhus. *ad Tibull.* i, 6, 8), was a practice that does not appear to have anciently prevailed in the East; and modern Arabs are only accustomed to dye the hair when gray (Niebuhr, *Trav.* i, 303). False hair has been incorrectly inferred from the Mishna (*Shabb.* vi, 5), although used among the Medians (comp. Xenoph. *Cyr.* i, 3, 2, *κόμαι πρόσθετοι*), and occasionally by old men (Ovid, *Ars Am.* iii, 16), or for some special purpose (Polyb. iii, 78; Petron. *Sat.* 110; Juven. *Sat.* vi, 120: Josephus condemns its use, *περιθετὴ κόμη*, *Life*, 11); but wigs, although common in ancient Egypt (see Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* ii, 325, 326, 329), are unknown in the modern East (see Nikolai, *Ueb. d. falschen Haare u. Perücken in alt. u. n. Zeit.* Berl. 1801; Heindorf, on Horat. *Satir.* p. 183; Beroald, on Apul. *Met.* p. 244; Fabric. *Bibliogr. Antiq.* p. 847). See generally Schwebel, *De vett. in capillis ornandis studio* (Onold. 1768). On the treatment of the hair in mourning, see GRIEF. See Junius, *De coma*, c. animad. Gruteri (Amst. 1708); Salmasius, *De cæsarie viror. et coma mulier.* (L. B. 1644); Henning, *De capillis vett.* (Magdeb. 1678). Compare HAIR.

Head-band (only in pl. קִשֻּׁרִים, *kishshurim'*, from קָשַׁר, *to gird*), rather a *girdle* or belt, probably for the waist, as a female ornament (Isa. iii, 20; "attire," Jer. ii, 32). See HEAD-DRESS.

Headdi. See HEDDA.

Head-dress. The Hebrews do not appear to have regarded a covering for the head as an essential article of every-day dress. See HEAD-BAND. The earliest notice we have of such a thing is in connection with the sacerdotal vestments, and in this case it is described as an ornamental appendage "for glory and for beauty" (Exod. xxviii, 40). See MITRE. The absence of any allusion to a head-dress in passages where we should expect to meet with it, as in the trial of jealousy (Numb. v, 18), and the regulations regarding the leper (Lev. xiii, 45), in both of which the "uncovering of the head" refers undoubtedly to the *hair*, leads to the inference that it was not ordinarily worn in the Mosaic age; and this is confirmed by the practice, frequently alluded to, of covering the head with the mantle. Even in after times it seems to have been reserved especially for purposes of ornament: thus the *tsaniph'* (צָנִיף) is noticed as being worn by the nobles (Job xxix, 14), ladies (Isa. iii, 23), and kings (Isa. lxii, 3), while the *peër'* (פְּאֵר) was an article of holiday dress (Isa. lxi, 3, Auth. Vers. "beauty;" Ezek. xxiv, 17, 23), and was worn at weddings (Isa. lxi, 10): the use of the *μίτρα* was restricted to similar occasions (Judith xvi, 8; Bar. v, 2). The former of these terms undoubtedly describes a kind of *turban*: its primary sense (צָנַף, "to roll around") expresses the folds of linen *wound round* the head, and its form probably resembled that of the high-priest's *mitsne'pheth* (a word derived from the same root, and identical in meaning, for in Zech. iii, 5, *tsaniph* = *mitsnepheth*), as described by Josephus (*Ant.* iii, 7, 3). The renderings of the term in the A. V., "hood" (Isa. iii, 23), "diadem" (Job xxix, 14; Isa. lxii, 3), "mitre" (Zech. iii, 5), do not convey the right idea of its meaning. The other term, *peër*, primarily means an *ornament*, and is so rendered in the A. V. (Isa. lxi, 10; see also verse 3, "beauty"), and is specifically applied to the head-dress from its ornamental character. See DIADEM. It is uncertain what the term properly describes: the modern turban consists of two parts, the *käük*, a stiff, round cap occasionally rising to a considerable height, and the *shash*, a long piece of muslin wound about it (Russell, *Aleppo*, i, 104): Josephus's account of the high-priest's head-dress implies a similar construction, for he says that it was made of thick bands of linen doubled round many times, and sewn together, the whole covered by a piece of fine linen to conceal the seams. Saalschütz (*Archæol.* i, 27, note) suggests that the *tsaniph* and the *peër* represent the *shash* and the *käük*, the latter rising high above the other, and so the most prominent and striking feature. In favor of this explanation it may be remarked that the *peër* is more particularly connected with the *migbaah*, the high cap of the ordinary priests, in Exod. xxxix, 28, while the *tsaniph*, as we have seen, resembled the high-priest's mitre, in which the cap was concealed by the linen folds. The objection, however, to this explanation is that the etymological force of *peër* is not brought out: may not that term have applied to the jewels and other ornaments with which the turban is frequently decorated (Russell, i, 106). The

Head-dresses of Arabian and Turkish Females.

Modern Egyptian Head-dresses. (From Lane.)

term used for putting on either the *tsaniph* or the *peër* is חָבַשׁ, "to bind round" (Exod. xxix, 9; Lev. viii, 13): hence the words in Ezek. xvi, 10, "I girded thee about with fine linen," are to be understood of the turban; and by the use of the same term Jonah (ii, 5) represents the weeds wrapped as a turban round his head. The turban, as now worn in the East, varies very much in shape (Russell's *Aleppo*, i, 102). It appears that frequently the robes supplied the place of a head-dress, being so ample that they might be thrown over the head at pleasure: the *radid* and the *tsäiph*, at all events, were so used [see DRESS], and the veil served a similar purpose. See VEIL. The ordinary head-dress of the Bedouin consists of the *keffiyeh*, a square handkerchief, generally of red and yellow cotton, or cotton and silk, folded so that three of the corners hang down over the back and shoulders, leaving the face exposed, and bound round the head by a cord (Burckhardt, *Notes*, i, 48). It is not improbable that a similar covering was used by the Hebrews on certain occasions: the "kerchief" in Ezek. xiii, 18 has been so understood by some writers (Harmer, *Observations*, ii, 393), though the word more probably refers to a species of veil; and the σιμικίνθιον

Various Forms of the modern Turban.

Bedouin Head-dress, or *Keffiyeh.*

(Acts xix, 12, A. Vers. "apron"), as explained by Suidas (τὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς φόρημα), was applicable to the purposes of a head-dress. See HANDKERCHIEF. Neither of these cases, however, supplies positive evidence on the point, and the general absence of allusions leads to the inference that the head was usually uncovered, as is still the case in many parts of Arabia (Wellsted, *Travels*, i, 73). The introduction of the Greek hat (πέτασος) by Jason, as an article of dress adapted to the *gymnasium*, was regarded as a national dishonor (2 Macc. iv, 12): in shape and material the *petasus* very much resembled the common felt hats of this country (Smith, *Dict. of Ant.* s. v. Pileus). See BONNET.

The monuments and paintings in the tombs of Egypt supply us with numerous forms of head-dresses; and there is no doubt that many of these were the prevailing costume at the period when the Israelites sojourned there. Among the ruins of Persepolis are found numerous sculptures which give the shape of various cov-

Ancient Egyptian regal Head-dresses: 1, with the simple fillet; 2, arranged in parallel braids; 3, reticulated, with the diadem.

erings for the head used by men. The care bestowed

Ancient Persian Head-dresses.

upon this part of the toilet among the Assyrians and Babylonians is abundantly illustrated in the volumes of Botta and Layard. "The Assyrian head-dress is de-

Ancient Assyrian Head-dresses: 1, 2. Foreign Captives; 3, Royal; 4, Persepolitan, on the Head the symbolic Figure of Cyrus; 5, Sacred.

scribed in Ezek. xxiii, 15, under the terms סְרוּחֵי טְבוּלִים, 'exceeding in dyed attire;' it is doubtful, however, whether *tebûlim* describes the colored material of the head-dress (*tiaræ* a coloribus quibus *tinctæ* sint); another sense has been assigned to it more appropriate

to the description of a turban (*fasciis obvolvit*, Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 542). The associated term *seruchey* expresses the flowing character of the Eastern head-dress, as it falls down over the back (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 308). The word rendered 'hats' in Dan. iii, 21 (כַּרְבְּלָא) properly applies to a *cloak*."

The שְׁבִיסִים, *shebisim'* (Isa. iii, 18), rendered in our version "cauls," or, as in the margin, "networks," were most probably some kind of reticulated head-dresses, and so the word is understood in the Talmud. See CAUL.

A very peculiar kind of head-dress worn in some parts of Palestine, especially by the Druses of Mount Lebanon, and thought to be referred to by the קֶרֶן, *ke'-ren*, or "horn" of 1 Sam. ii, 1, is the *tantûra*. It is made of gold or silver, frequently of other metal either gilt or silver-plated, and sometimes of mere wood. The more costly ones are highly ornamented, and occasion-

The *Tantura*.

ally set with jewels; but the length and position of them is that upon which the traveller looks with the greatest interest, as illustrating and explaining a familiar expression of Scripture. The young, the rich, and the vain wear the *tantura* of great length, standing straight up from the top of the forehead; whereas the humble, the poor, and the aged place it upon the side of the head, much shorter, and spreading at the end like a trumpet. See HORN.

For other forms of royal head-dresses, see CROWN. For military ones, see HELMET.

Head of the Church, a title which properly belongs only to Christ (Ephes. v, 23), as the *Supreme Governor* of the whole *body* of the faithful. It is applied to the sovereign of Great Britain as the ruler of the temporalities of the Church. "Some have imagined (the members of the Romish Church, for instance) that the Christian world is 'permanently,' and from generation to generation, subject to some one spiritual ruler (whether an individual man or a Church), the delegate, representative, and vicegerent of Christ, whose authority should be binding on the conscience of all, and decisive on every point of faith." But, had such been our Lord's design, he could not possibly have failed, when promising his disciples "another Comforter, who should abide with them forever," to refer them to the man or body of men who should, in perpetual succession, be the depository of this divine consolation and supremacy. It is also incredible, had such been our Lord's purpose, that he himself should be perpetually spoken of and alluded to as the Head of his Church, without any reference to any supreme head on earth as fully representing him, and bearing universal rule in his name. It is clear, therefore, that the Christian Church universal has no spiritual head on earth (Eden, *Churchman's Dictionary*, s. v.). See POPE; PAPACY; PRIMACY.

Heal (properly רָפָא, θεραπεύω) is used in Scripture in the wider sense of *curing* in general, as applied to diseases, and even to inanimate objects. It occurs also in the special sense of restoring from apostasy. See DISEASE; CURE.

Heap. The Hebrew word גָּדִישׁ, *gadish'*, rendered "tomb" in Job xxi, 32, and "heap" in the margin, properly signifies *a stack, a heap,* hence *a tomb, tumulus,* a sepulchral mound that was made by a pile of earth or stones. The ancient *tumuli* were heaps of earth or stone, and probably such a pile was usually made over a grave as a monument. Travellers in the East have often seen heaps of stones covering over or marking the place of graves. The Hebrew phrase גַּל אֲבָנִים גָּדוֹל, *gal abanim' gadol'*, rendered "a great heap of stones," refers to the heaps or tumuli which were raised over those whose death was either infamous or attended with some very remarkable circumstances. Such was the monument raised over the grave of Achan (Josh. vii, 26); and over that of the king of Ai (Josh. viii, 29). The burying of Absalom was distinguished by a similar erection, as a monument of his disgrace to future ages (2 Sam. xviii, 17). The same word גַּל, *gal*, is commonly used in reference to the *heaps* or *ruins* of walls and cities (Job viii, 17; Isa. xxv, 2; li, 37; Jer. ix, 10). Modern travellers abundantly testify to the accurate fulfilment of Scripture prophecy in relation to the sites of numerous ancient cities, particularly of such as were doomed to become desolate *heaps* (Bastow). See PILLAR; STONE. Other Heb. terms translated *heap* are: חֹמֶר, *cho'mer*, a *pile* (Exod. viii, 14, elsewhere a HOMER, as a measure); מְעִי, *meï'*, a *heap* of rubbish (Isa. xvii, 1); נֵד, *ned*, a *mound* (Isa. xvii, 11; poet. of waves, Exod. xv, 8; Josh. iii, 13, 16; Psa. xxxiii, 7; lxxviii, 13); עֲרֵמָה, *aremah'*, a *pile* (e. g. of rubbish, Neh. iii, 34; of grain, Cant. vii, 3; of sheaves, Ruth iii, 7; Neh. xiii, 15; Hag. ii, 16, etc.); תֵּל, *tel*, a *hill* (Josh. xi, 13; espec. a mound of rubbish, Deut. xii, 17; Josh. viii, 28; Jer. xlix, 2, etc.); with others of a more miscellaneous signification. See MOUND.

Hearers (*audientes*), a name given to a class of catechumens in the early Church who were admitted to hear sermons and scriptures read in the church, but were not allowed to share in the prayers. The Apostolical Constitutions (lib. viii, c. 5) orders the deacon to dismiss them with the words *Ne quis audientium, ne quis infidelium* ("Let none of the hearers, let none of the unbelievers, be present"), before the proper liturgy began. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. viii, ch. 4; bk. x, ch. 2; bk. xviii, ch. 1.

Hearse or **Herse** (from Lat. *herpix*, Low Lat. *hercia*, French *herze, a harrow*). The Low Latin *hercia* also signified a candelabrum, shaped like a harrow, which was placed at the head of a grave, a coffin, or a cenotaph. In the Middle Ages the name *herse* was applied to a canopy (in Italian, *catafalco*), which was placed over the coffins of the distinguished dead, while they were kept in the church previous to interment. Herses were also frequently prepared to receive the bodies of the dead in churches, at stations along the route, where they were being borne to a distance for final interment. Herses were often made with great magnificence. They were frequently adorned with illustrations of the last judgment, and other subjects taken from the Scriptures. Candles were set in sockets in great numbers, and were kept burning as long as the corpse remained in the herse. The name *herse* was also applied to a frame of wood or of metal that was placed over some of the reclining statues which were so frequently put over the tombs of distinguished persons. Over this herse a pall was frequently hung. The modern use of the word *hearse* is confined to a frame-work or a wagon to bear

Herse.

the dead to the grave. The hearse varies greatly in form and ornamentation in different countries.—Diez, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bonn, 1861); Parker, *Dict. of Architecture* (Oxford, 1850); Migne, *Dictionnaire des Origines* (Paris, 1864). (G. F. C.)

Heart, in the Biblical sense (καρδία; לֵב or לֵבָב, often exchanged for קֶרֶב, in a more extended sense, as in Psa. xxxix, 3, 4; cix, 22; 1 Sam. xxv, 37, the whole region of the chest, with its contents; see Delitzsch, *System of Biblical Psychology*, § 12, 13. According to Hupfeld, חֵלֶב, in Psa. xvii, 10, and lxxiii, 7, means simply *the heart*, which is not very likely).

1. In the Biblical point of view, human life, in all its operations, is centred in the heart. The heart is the central organ of the physical circulation; hence the necessity for strengthening the body as a support for the heart (סָעַד לֵב, Gen. xviii, 5; Judges xix, 5; Psa. civ, 15); and the exhaustion of physical power is called a drying up of the heart (Psa. cii, 5; xxii, 15, etc.). So, also, is the heart the centre of spiritual activity; for all spiritual aims, whether belonging to the intellectual, moral, or pathological spheres, are elaborated in the heart, and again carried out by the heart. In fact, the whole life of the soul, in the lower and sensual, as well as in the higher spheres, has its origin in the heart (Prov. iv, 23, "For out of it are the issues of life"). In order to follow this train of thought, and to establish in a clearer light the Biblical view of the heart, it will be best to consider the relation the heart bears to the soul (ψυχή, נֶפֶשׁ). This is one of the difficult questions in Biblical psychology; Olshausen (in the *Abh. de naturæ humanæ trichotomia, opusc. theol.* p. 159) says, "Omnium longe difficillimum est accurate definire quidnam discrimen in N. T. inter ψυχήν et καρδίαν intercedat." Nevertheless, the task is facilitated by the fact that there is essential agreement on this point in the anthropologies of the Old and New Testament.

(1) We first note that, while, as before said, the heart is the centre of all the functions of the soul's life, the terms "heart" and "soul" are often used interchangeably in Scripture. Thus, in Deut. vi, 5 (compare Matt. xxii, 37; Mark xii, 30, 33; Luke x, 27), and xxvi, 16, we are commanded to love God and obey his commandments with all our heart and all our soul (compare 1 Chron. xxviii, 9); the union of the faithful, in Acts iv, 12, is designated as ἦν ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία. (In these passages, as in others, for instance, Deut. xi, 18; xxx, 2; Jer. xxxii, 41, there is, moreover, to be noticed that the heart is always named first.) Thus the indecision and division of the inner life can be designated either by δίψυχος (James i, 8) or by καρδία δισσή. It is said of both ἁγνίζειν καρδίας (James iv, 8) and ἁγνίζειν ψυχάς (1 Pet. i, 22); also שָׁפַךְ נַפְשׁוֹ (Psa. xlii, 5; comp. Job xxx, 16) and שָׁפַךְ לִבּוֹ (Lam. ii, 10; Psa. lxii, 9), the self-impelling to the love of God applies as well to the soul (Psa. ciii) as to the קְרָבִים, of which the heart is the centre, etc. But in the majority of passages, where either the heart or the soul are separately spoken of, the term "heart" can either not be exchanged at all for the term "soul," or else only with some modification in the meaning.

(2) Note also the following fundamental distinction: The *soul* is the bearer of the personality (i. e. of the *ego*, the proper self) of man, in virtue of the indwelling *spirit* (Prov. xx, 27; 1 Cor. ii, 11), but yet is not itself the *person* of man; the heart, on the contrary (the חַדְרֵי בֶטֶן, Prov. xx, 27), is the place where the process of self-consciousness is developed, in which the soul finds itself, and thus becomes conscious of its actions and impressions as its own ("in corde actiones animæ humanæ ad ipsam redeunt," as is concisely and correctly said by Roos in his *Fundam. psychol. ex s. scr.*, 1769, p. 99). Accordingly the soul, not the heart, is spoken of when the

whole human being as such, and his physical or spiritual welfare or perdition are meant. This is seen on comparing such passages as Job xxxiii, 18, 22, 28; Psa. xciv, 17; and the expressions of the N. T. *περιποίησις ψυχῆς* (Heb. x, 39); *ἀπολέσαι τὴν ψυχήν* (Mark viii, 35; comp. Matt. x, 39; James i, 21); *σωτηρία ψυχῶν* (1 Pet. i, 9); *ἀνάπαυσιν εὑρίσκειν ταῖς ψυχαῖς* (Matt. xi, 29). The soul being the subject of salvation (Matt. xvi, 26), it is said, in regard to the carnal desires, which endanger its salvation, that they *war against the soul, στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς* (1 Pet. ii, 11; comp. Prov. vi, 26). In all these passages it were impossible to substitute לֵב or *καρδία*, for נֶפֶשׁ or *ψυχή*; nor can we make the *ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ψυχῶν* (1 Pet. ii, 25) equivalent to the *καρδιογνώστης* (Acts i, 24); nor could we substitute "heart" for "soul" with regard to the oath in 2 Cor. i, 23); neither can לִבּוֹ be said of the עֲפַר יוֹרֵד (Psa. xxii, 30), instead of נַפְשׁוֹ לֹא חִיָּה, for חָיָה לֵבָב (Psa. xxii, 27; lxix, 33) has an essentially different meaning from הָיְתָה נַפְשִׁי (comp. Jer. xxxviii, 17, 20). When Nabal lost consciousness in consequence of fear, his soul still dwelt in him (see Acts xx, 10); but yet, according to 1 Sam. xxv, 37, his heart died within him. When fear suspends consciousness the heart fails (Gen. xlii, 26). On the other hand, יָצְאָה נַפְשִׁי (Cant. v, 6), which commentators combine with יָצָא לֵב, has an entirely different meaning, namely, that the very self of the lover draws the beloved after it. Moreover, when expressing inward contemplation, some feeling or action taking place within man, the elaboration of a plan or resolution, we find almost invariably the heart named, and not the soul (Roos, *Fundam. psychol.*: "Dum ipsa [anima] sibi aliquid ostendit ac proponit, ad cor suum loqui dicitur; dum suarum actionum sibi conscia est et illarum innocentiam vel turpitudinem ipsa sentit, id ad cor refertur. Anima humana ut *ψυχή* suavia appetit, ut spiritus scrutatur, etc., sed quatenus cor habet, ipsa novit, se hoc agere et ideas reflexas habet"). To this head belong the expressions עִם לֵבָב יָדַע (Deut. viii, 5); הֵשִׁיב אֶל־לִבּוֹ (Isa. xliv, 19, etc.); אָמַר אֶל־לִבּוֹ (this is even applied to God, Gen. viii, 21); הָיָה כִּלְבִי, מַשְׂכִּיּוֹת לֵבָב, שִׂים עַל לֵב, בִּלְבָבִי, עִם לִבִּי (Psa. lxxiii, 7); מַעַרְכֵי לֵב (Prov. xvi, 1) (for the particulars of these, see a lexicon); among the expressions of the N. T. *θέσθαι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ* (Luke i, 66); *ἐνθυμεῖσθαι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις* (Matt. ix, 4); *διαλογίζεσθαι ἐν καρδίαις* (Luke iii, 15; Mark ii, 8; comp. Luke xxiv, 28); *βουλαὶ τῶν καρδιῶν* (1 Cor. iv, 5, etc.).

(3) But the heart is not merely the organ of pure inward self-consciousness, but also of all the functions of perception in general, so that לֵב, in a restricted sense, acquires the signification of mind or understanding; for instance, אַנְשֵׁי לֵבָב, *viri cordati* (Job xxxiv, 10); סָכָל = אֵין לֵב (Jer. ii, 21; comp. Prov. xvii, 16); also of God כַּבִּיר כֹּחַ לֵב (Job xxxvi, 5); רֹחַב לֵב (1 Kings v, 9). The passage Psa. cxix, 32, and the very variously interpreted passage 2 Kings v, 26, are also to be understood in that manner. The Sept., therefore, often translates לֵב simply by *νοῦς* (Exod. vii, 23; Isa. x, 7, etc.). On the close connection between these two views, see Beck, *Christl. Lehrwissenschaft* (i, 233). There are, of course, exceptions. The soul is also presented as the subject of perception (Prov. xix, 2; Psa. cxxxix, 14); the thoughts which influence man are also called the language and thoughts of the soul (Lam. iii, 20, 24; 1 Sam. xx, 4). The soul is the seat of imagination (Esth. iv, 13), the place where counsel is taken (Psa. xiii, 2 sq.). Yet such passages are comparatively few (comp. Delitzsch, § xii), and even in them the soul sometimes appears to be mentioned, as in the last-named passage, only in consequence of the necessity of a second expression in the parallelisms.

(4) On the other hand, the disposition of mind and passion are as often attributed to the soul as to the heart, according as they are considered either as pervading the whole personality of man, or a disposition governing the whole inner nature of man. It is said in Matt. xxvi, 38, *περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου*; John xii, 27, *ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται*; while in John xvi, 6, it says *ἡ λύπη πεπλήρωκεν ὑμῶν τὴν καρδίαν* (comp. Rom. ix, 2); xvi, 1, *μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία*; 2 Cor. ii, 4, *θλίψις καὶ συνοχὴ καρδίας*, etc. We find also grief and care, fear and terror, joy and confidence, etc., attributed indifferently to the heart or to the soul in the O. T. (see Deut. xxviii, 65; Prov. xii, 25; Eccles. xi, 10; Jer. xv, 16; 1 Sam. ii, 1; Psa. xxviii, 7; Exod. xxiii, 9 (where Luther translates נֶפֶשׁ by *heart*); Psa. vi, 4; xlii, 6, 7; Isa. lxi, 10; Psa. lxii, 2; cxxxi, 2; cxvi, 7). Custom has here established arbitrary distinctions between the different expressions: thus מָרַר and its derivatives are generally connected with נֶפֶשׁ, and שָׂמַח and its derivatives with לֵב. The passage Prov. xiv, 10 is of especial interest in this respect. On the contrary, we find נֶפֶשׁ instead of לֵב when speaking of those functions in which the subject is apprehended as acting on an object. A remarkable passage in this sense is found in Jer. iv, 19: the soul hears the noise of war, and the heart is pained and grieved by it (in an entirely different sense we find לֵב שֹׁמֵעַ, 1 Kings iii, 9). Here we must, however, notice that, as Delitzsch (p. 162) very correctly remarks, in the conception of נֶפֶשׁ, *ψυχή*, the idea of desire is evidently prevalent over all others. All the impulses by which human actions are governed (see Exod. xxxv, 5, 22, 29), the disposition of mind which regulates them, the wishes, desires, etc., originate in the heart (comp. Ezek. xi, 21; xx, 16; xxxiii, 31; Deut. xi, 16; Job xxxi, 7, 9, 27; Psa. lxvi, 18; Prov. vi, 25; Matt. v, 28); but as soon as the disposition of the will turns to an outward manifestation of the desires, the נֶפֶשׁ, *ψυχή*, comes into play. Yet the root אָוָה and its derivatives are almost exclusively connected with נֶפֶשׁ (only in Psa. xxi, 3 do we find תַּאֲוַת לֵב; comp. *ἐπιθυμίαι τῶν καρδιῶν*, Rom. i, 24; see other passages, like Psa. lxxxiv, 3; cxix, 20, 81; Isa. xxvi, 8, 9; Jer. xxii, 7). We even find נֶפֶשׁ used sometimes to signify the *desire* itself, as particularly in Eccl. vi, 7, 9. Thus we can explain הִרְחִיב נֶפֶשׁ (Isa. v, 14; Hab. ii, 5; Prov. xiii, 2) and רְחַב נֶפֶשׁ (Prov. xxviii, 25); the latter is distinct from רְחַב לֵב (Psa. ci, 5), which Ewald erroneously translates by "covetous heart," while in Prov. xxi, 4 it signifies the advancing certainty.

2. From the foregoing explanations we can deduce the ethical and religious signification of the word *heart*. (1) As the heart is the home of the personal life, the workshop where all personal appropriation and elaboration of spiritual things have their seat, it follows that the moral and religious development of man—in fact, his whole moral personality, is also centred in it. Only that which has entered the heart constitutes a possession, having a moral worth, while only that which comes from the heart is a moral product. From the nature and contents of the heart, by a law of natural connection—similar to that which exists between the tree and its fruits (Matt. xii, 33 sq.)—results the individual's course of life as a whole; and from them all his personal acts derive their character and moral signification. Hence *ἐκ καρδίας* is applied to whatever is of a real moral nature in contradistinction from mere outward appearance (Rom. vi, 17; comp. Matt. xv, 8; 1 Tim. i, 5). Even in speaking of God we find it said, in order to express the distinction between what is essential to his nature and the appearance as perceived by man, "He doth not מִלִּבּוֹ *willingly* afflict" (Lam. iii, 23). That the divine judgment on man will be directed by what he is, not by what he may appear to be, is described as a looking upon his heart (1 Sam. xvi, 7; Jer. xx, 12); a knowing or trying of the heart (1 Kings

viii, 39; Luke xvi, 15; Prov. xvii, 3; Psa. vii, 10; xvii, 3; Jer. xi, 20). Therefore also man is designated according to his heart in all that relates to habitual moral qualities; thus we read of a wise heart (1 Kings v, 12; Prov. x, 8, etc.), a pure heart (Psa. xli, 12; Matt. v, 8; 1 Tim. i, 5; 2 Tim. ii, 22), an upright and righteous heart (Gen. xx, 5, 6; Psa. xi, 2; lxxviii, 72; ci, 2), a single heart (Eph. v, 5; Col. iii, 22), a pious and good heart (Luke viii, 15), a lowly heart (Matt. xi, 29), etc. In all these places it would be difficult to introduce נֶפֶשׁ or ψυχή.

(2) We must also observe that the original divine rule of conduct for man was implanted in his heart, and therefore the heart is the seat of the συνείδησις, or *conscience*, which has a mission to proclaim that rule (Rom. ii, 15). All subsequent divine revelations were also directed to the heart (Deut. vi, 6); so the law demands that God should be loved with the whole heart, and then, as though by radiation from this centre, with the whole soul (comp. Deut. xi, 18; Psa. cxix, 11, etc.). The teaching of wisdom also enters the heart, and from thence spreads its healing and vivifying influence through the whole organism (Prov. iv, 21-23). The prophetic consolations must speak to the heart (Isa. xl, 2), in contradistinction from such consolations as do not reach the bottom of human nature; thus also, in Matt. xiii, 9; Luke viii, 15, we find the heart described as the ground on which the seed of the divine Word is to be sowed. That which becomes assimilated to the heart constitutes the θησαυρὸς τῆς καρδίας (Matt. xii, 35). This, however, may not only be ἀγαθός, but also πονηρός; for the human heart is not only a recipient of divine principles of life, but also of evil.

(3) In opposition to the superficial doctrine which makes man in regard to morals an indifferent being, Scripture presents to us the doctrine of the natural wickedness of the human heart, the יֵצֶר לֵב (Gen. viii, 21), or, more completely, יֵצֶר מַחְשְׁבוֹת לֵב (vi, 5; compare 1 Chron. xxviii, 9), and considers sin as having penetrated the centre of life, from whence it contaminates its whole course. "How can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh" (Matt. xii, 34; comp. Eccles. viii, 11; Psa. lxxiii, 7); and those things which come out of the heart defile the man (Matt. xv, 18). The heart is described as "deceitful (or, more properly, עָקֹב, *crooked*, the opposite of יָשָׁר, *straight*) above all things, and desperately wicked" (אָנוּשׁ) (Jer. xvii, 9); so that God alone can thoroughly sound the depths of its wickedness (compare 1 John iii, 20). Hence the prayer in Psa. cxxxix, 23. In this natural state of unsusceptibility for good the heart is called uncircumcised, עָרֵל (Numb. xxvi, 41; compare Deut. x, 16; Ezek. xliv, 9). Man, frightened at the manifestation of divine holiness, may take within himself the resolution of fulfilling the divine commands (Deut. v, 24); yet the divine voice complains (v, 29), "Oh that there were such a heart in them that they would fear me!" etc. Therefore the whole Revelation has for its object to change the heart of man; and its whole aim is to destroy, by virtue of its divine efficacy, the unsusceptibility ("stupiditas, qua centrum animæ laborat," as Roos expresses it, p. 153) and the antagonism of the heart, and to substitute for them the fear of God in the heart (Jer. xxxii, 40), so that the law may be admitted (Jer. xxxi, 33). This is the effect of the operations of the Holy Spirit, whose workings, as shown in the O. T., point to the regeneration of the heart in redemption (Ezek. xxxvi, 26 sq.; xi, 19), transforming the prophets into new creatures by means of a change of heart (1 Sam. x, 6, 9), and implanting a willingness to obey God's law in the pious (Psa. li, 12-14).

(4) On the part of man, the process of salvation begins in the heart by the faith awakened by the testimony of revelation; which, as giving a new direction to the inner life, belongs entirely to the sphere of the heart, and is described as a fastening (according to the original meaning of הֶאֱמִין), a strengthening (האמיץ, Psa. xxvii, 14; xxxi, 24), a supporting of the heart (comp. particularly Psa. cxii, 7) on the ground which is God himself, the צוּר לֵבָב (Psa. lxxiii, 26). The N. T. says in the same manner: καρδίᾳ πιστεύεται (Rom. x, 9, 10), πιστεύειν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας; faith is a μὴ διακρίνεσθαι ἐν καρδίᾳ (Mark xxi, 23). God purifies the heart by faith in Christ (Acts xv, 9), for by the sprinkling of the blood of atonement the heart is rid of the bad conscience (Heb. x, 22; compare 1 John iii, 19-21), and the love of God is shed in it by the Holy Ghost (Rom. v, 5). The same spirit also seals in the heart the assurance of being a child of God (2 Cor. i, 22); the heart becomes the abode of Christ (Eph. iii, 16), is preserved in Christ (Col. iii, 15; Phil. iv, 7), and strengthened in sanctification (1 Thes. iii, 13, etc.).

When, on the contrary, man rejects the testimony of revelation, the heart becomes hardened, turns to stone (הִקְשָׁה, Psa. xcvi, 8; Prov. xxviii, 14; אִמֵּץ, 2 Chron. xxxvi, 13; חִזֵּק, Exod. iv, 21; כִּבֵּד, 1 Sam. vi, 6), for which we find it also said that the heart is shut (Isa. xliv, 18), made fat (Isa. vi, 10; compare Psa. cxix, 70). In the N. Test. we find πωρώσις καρδίας (Mark iii, 5; Eph. iv, 18); σκληροκαρδία (Matt. xix, 8, etc.). The most important passage in this respect is Isa. vi, 10, where we find it particularly stated how the unsusceptible heart renders one unable to see the work of God, to hear his Word, and how this inability reacts on the heart, and renders its state incurable.

3. Finally, the question of the position the heart, as centre of the spiritual life of the soul, holds in regard to the heart, considered as the centre of the organic (physical) life, cannot be fully treated except in a thorough investigation of the relations between the body and soul in general. We will only remark here that the Scriptures not only draw a parallel between the body and the soul, by virtue of which the bodily actions are considered as symbols of the spiritual, but also establish the position that the soul, which is the bearer of the personality, is the same which directs also the life and actions; and thus the bodily organs, in their higher functions, become its adjuncts. Now, in view of the well-known fact that emotions and sufferings affect the physical economy—for example, that the pulsations of the heart are affected by them—no one will consider it a mere figure of speech when the Psalmist says, "My heart was hot within me" (Psa. xxxix, 3), or Jeremiah speaks of "a burning fire shut up in his bones" (Jer. xx, 9; comp. iv. 19; xxiii, 9).

But there is one point worthy of special attention in Biblical anthropology, namely, the specific relation the Bible establishes between certain parts of the bodily organism and particular actions (see what Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, § 12, 13, deduces from the Biblical signification of the רַחֲמִים, the *liver*, the *kidneys*), and then the part attributed to the heart in knowledge and will, considered aside from the head and brain. It is well known that all antiquity agreed with the Biblical views in these respects. In regard to Homer's doctrine, see Nägelsbach's *Homer. Theologie*, p. 332 sq. We may also on this point recall the expressions *cordatus, recordari, vecors, excors*, etc. (see especially Cicero, *Tusc.* i, 9, 18, and Plato, *Phæd.* c. 45, and the commentators on these passages). As Delitzsch correctly observes, the spiritual signification of the heart cannot be traced back to it from the *mere* fact of its being the central organ of the circulation. The manner in which that writer has made use of the phenomena of somnambulism to explain this is deserving of due notice, yet physiology has thus far been unable to throw any light on the subject.—Oehler, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 15 sq.

4. The heart expresses the middle of anything: "Tyre is in the heart," in the midst, "of the sea" (Ezek. xxvii, 4). "We will not fear, though the mountains be carried into the heart of the sea" (Psa. xlvi, 2). "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's

belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt. xii, 40). Moses, speaking to the Israelites, says, "And the mountain burnt with fire, unto the heart of heaven;" the flame rose as high as the clouds.

To "say in one's heart" is a Hebrew expression for *thinking* (Psa. x, 6; xiv, 1). See SOUL.

5. Of special religious importance are the following practical uses of the word:

Hardness of heart is "that state in which a sinner is inclined to and actually goes on in rebellion against God. This state evidences itself by light views of the evil of sin; partial acknowledgment and confession of it; frequent commission of it; pride and conceit; ingratitude; unconcern about the Word and ordinances of God; inattention to divine providences; stifling convictions of conscience; shunning reproof; presumption, and general ignorance of divine things."

Keeping the heart is "a duty enjoined in the sacred Scriptures. It consists, says Flavel, in the diligent and constant use and improvement of all holy means and duties to preserve the soul from sin, and maintain communion with God; and this, he properly observes, supposes a previous work of sanctification, which hath set the heart right by giving it a new bent and inclination. 1. It includes frequent observation of the frame of the heart (Psa. lxxvii, 6). 2. Deep humiliation for heart evils and disorders (2 Chron. xxxii, 26). 3. Earnest supplication for heart purifying and rectifying grace (Psa. xix, 12). 4. A constant holy jealousy over our hearts (Prov. xxvii, 14). 5. It includes the realizing of God's presence with us, and setting him before us (Psa. xvi, 8; Gen. xvii, 1). This is, 1. The hardest work; heart work is hard work indeed. 2. Constant work (Exod. xvii, 12). 3. The most important work (Prov. xxiii, 26). *This is a duty which should be attended to if we consider it in connection with*, 1. The honor of God (Isa. lxvi, 3). 2. The sincerity of our profession (2 Kings x, 31; Ezek. xxxii, 31, 32). 3. The beauty of our conversation (Prov. xii, 26; Psa. xlv, 1). 4. The comfort of our souls (2 Cor. xiii, 5). 5. The improvement of our graces (Psa. lxiii, 5, 6). 6. The stability of our souls in the hour of temptation (1 Cor. xvi, 13). The *seasons in which we should more particularly keep our hearts are*, 1. The time of our prosperity (Deut. vi, 10, 12). 2. Under afflictions (Heb. vii, 5, 6). 3. The time of Sion's troubles (Psa. xlvi, 1, 4). 4. In the time of great and threatening danger (Isa. xxvi, 20, 21). 5. Under great wants (Phil. iv, 6, 7). 6. In the time of duty (Lev. x, 3). 7. Under injuries received (Rom. xii, 17, etc.). 8. In the critical hour of temptation (Matt. xxvi, 41). 9. Under dark and doubting seasons (Heb. xii, 8; Isa. l, 10). 10. In time of opposition and suffering (1 Pet. iv, 12, 13). 11. The time of sickness and death (Jer. xlix, 11). *The means to be made use of to keep our hearts* are, 1. Watchfulness (Mark xiii, 37). 2. Examination (Prov. iv, 26). 3. Prayer (Luke xviii, 1). 4. Reading God's Word (John v, 39). 5. Dependence on divine grace (Psa. lxxxvi, 11). See Flavel, *On Keeping the Heart;* Jamieson, *Sermons on the Heart*."

Hearth is the representative in the Eng. Version of several Heb. words. אָח, *ach* (Sept. ἐσχάρα, Vulg. *arula*), a large *pot*, like a brazier (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 69), a portable *furnace* in which fire was kept in the king's winter apartment (Jer. xxxvi, 22, 23). At the present day the Orientals sometimes make use of such stoves instead of fireplaces for warming rooms; they are called in Persian and Turkish *tannur*. They have the form of a large pitcher, and are placed in a cavity sunk in the middle of the apartment. When the fire has done burning, a frame like a table is placed over the pot, and the whole is then covered with a carpet; and those who wish to warm themselves sit upon the floor, and thrust their feet and legs, and even the lower part of their bodies, under the carpet. כִּיּוֹר, *kiyôr'*, a fire-pan or small *basin* for holding fire (Zech. xii, 6; elsewhere for roasting in, 1 Sam. ii, 14; or generally for washing, "laver," Exod. xxx, 18, etc.). מוֹקֵד, *mokêd'*, a *burning* (as rendered in Isa. xxiii, 14), hence a *fagot* as fuel ("hearth," Psa. cii, 4); and from the same root יָקוּד, *yakûd'* (literally *kindled*), a burning mass upon a hearth (Isa. xxx, 14). The Heb. word עֻגּוֹת, *uggoth'*; Sept. ἐγκρυφίαι, refers to cakes baked in the ashes (Gen. xviii, 6). These cakes serve in the East at the present day for ordinary food, especially upon journeys and in haste. By the hearth we are to understand, according to the present usage in the East, that a fire is made in the middle of the room, and, when the bread is ready for baking, a corner of the hearth is swept, the bread is laid upon it, and covered with ashes and embers; in a quarter of an hour they turn it. Sometimes they use convex plates of iron (Arabic *tajen*, whence the Gr. τήγανον), which are most common in Persia and among the nomadic tribes, as being the easiest way of baking and done with the least expense, for the bread is extremely thin and soon prepared. See BREAD. This iron plate is either laid on, or supported on legs above the vessel sunk in the ground, which forms the oven. See OVEN. (Burckhardt, *Notes on Bed.* i, 58; P. della Valle, *Viaggi*, i, 436; Harmer, *Obs.* i, 477, and note; Rauwolff, *Travels*, ap. Ray, ii, 163; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 231; Niebuhr, *Descr. de l'Arabie*, p. 45; Schleusner, *Lex. Vet. Test.* s. v. τήγανον; Gesenius, s. v. עֻגָּה, p. 997). See FIRE.

He-Ass, חֲמוֹר, *chamôr'* (Gen. xii, 16; elsewhere simply "ass"), the general designation of the donkey (Exod. xiii, 13, etc.) for carrying burdens (Exod. xlii, 26) and ploughing (Isa. xxx, 24), being regarded as a patient (Gen. xlix, 14) and contented animal for riding in time of peace (2 Sam. xix, 27; Zech. ix, 9); different from the proud (Eccles. x, 9) and warlike horse (Isa. xx, 16). As a beast of burden, it was eaten only in times of famine (2 Kings vi, 25). See ASS'S HEAD.

The prohibition of the use of horses to Israel caused the ass to be held in higher estimation than it holds in our times. It was, at least down to the days of Solomon, the principal beast of burden. But we must not attribute this election wholly to the absence or scarcity of the horse, for in Western Asia the ass is still largely used for the saddle. Though inferior in dignity to the horse, he is still, in his native regions, a very superior animal to the poor, weather-beaten, stunted, half-starved beast of our commons. Chardin and others describe the Arabian ass as a really elegant creature. The coat is smooth and clean, the carriage is erect and proud; the limbs are clean, well-formed, and muscular, and are well thrown out in walking or galloping. Asses of this Arab breed are used exclusively for the saddle, and are imported into Syria and Persia, where they are highly valued, especially by the mollahs or lawyers, the sheiks or religious teachers, and elderly persons of the opulent classes. They are fed and dressed with the same care as horses, the head-gear is highly ornamented, and the saddle is covered with a fine carpet. They are active, spirited, and yet sufficiently docile. Other breeds are equally useful in the more humble labors of ploughing and carrying burdens. White asses, distinguished not only by their color, but by their stature and symmetry, are frequently seen in Western Asia, and are always more highly esteemed than those of more ordinary hue. The editor of the *Pictorial Bible* says that these "are usually in every respect the finest of their species, and their owners certainly take more pride in them than in any other of their asses. They sell at a much higher price; and those hackney ass-men who make a livelihood by hiring out their asses to persons who want a ride, always expect better pay for the white ass than for any of the others." After describing their more highly ornamented trappings, he observes, "But, above all, their white hides are fantastically streaked and spot-

Modern Egyptians mounted on Asses.

ted with the red stains of the henna plant, a barbarous kind of ornament which the Western Asiatics are fond of applying to their own beards, and to the manes and tails of their white horses." See HORSE.

The constitution of the ass is formed for a dry, rugged region, a rocky wilderness. Its hoofs are long, hollow beneath, with very sharp edges, a peculiarity which makes it sure-footed in ascending and descending steep mountain passes, where the flat hoof of the horse would be insecure. It prefers aromatic, dry, prickly herbs to the most succulent and tender grass; is fond of rolling in the dry dust; suffers but little from thirst or heat; drinks seldom and little; and seems to have no sensible perspiration, its skin being hard, tough, and insensitive. All these characters suit the arid, rocky wildernesses of Persia and Western Asia, the native country of this valuable animal. See ASS.

Heat (usually חֹם, *chôm*, חַמָּה, *chammah'*, or חֵמָה, *chemah'*), besides its ordinary meaning, has several peculiar uses in Scripture. In Isa. xlix, 10, and Rev. vii, 16, there is a reference to the burning wind of the desert, the *simoom* or *samiel*, described by travellers as exceedingly pestilential and fatal. It is highly probable that this was the instrument with which God destroyed the army of Sennacherib (2 Kings xix, 7, 35). Its effects are evidently alluded to in Psa. ciii, 15, 16, and in Jer. iv, 11. Thevenot mentions such a wind, which in 1658 suffocated 20,000 men in one night, and another which in 1655 suffocated 4000 persons. It sometimes burns up the corn when near its maturity, and hence the image of "corn blasted before it be grown up," used in 2 Kings xix, 26. Its effect is not only to render the air extremely hot and scorching, but to fill it with poisonous and suffocating vapors. The most violent storms that Judæa was subject to came from the deserts of Arabia. "Out of the *south* cometh the whirlwind," says Job (xxxvii, 9); "And there came a great wind from *the wilderness*" (Job i, 19). Zech. ix, 14: "And Jehovah shall appear over them, and his arrow shall go forth as the lightning; and the Lord Jehovah shall sound the trumpet, and shall march in the whirlwinds of *the south*." The 91st Psalm, which speaks of divine protection, describes the plague as arrows, and in those winds there are observed flashes of fire. In Numb. xiii, 3, the place in which the plague was inflicted upon the Israelites is for that reason called *Taberah*, i. e. a burning. A plague is called דֶּבֶר, *deber'*, as a desert is called מִדְבָּר, *midbar'*, because those winds came from the desert, and are real plagues. This *hot wind*, when used as a symbol, signifies the fire of *persecution*, or else some prodigious wars which destroy men. For *wind* signifies *war;* and *scorching heat* signifies persecution and *destruction*. So in Matt. xiii, 6, 21, and Luke viii, 6-13, *heat* is tribulation, temptation, or persecution; and in 1 Pet. iv, 12, *burning* tends to temptation. A gentle heat of the sun, according to the Oriental interpreters, signifies the favor and bounty of the prince; but great heat denotes punishment. Hence the burning of the heavens is a portent explained in Livy (iii, 5) of slaughter. Thus in Psa. cxxi, 6: "The sun shall not smite thee by day, nor the moon by night," is in the next place explained thus: "Jehovah shall preserve thee from all evil; he shall preserve thy soul." See FIRE.

Heath (עַרְעָר, *arar'*, Jer. xvii, 6; Sept. ἀγριομυρίκη, Vulg. *myricæ;* or עֲרוֹעֵר, *aroër'*, Jer. xlviii, 6; Sept. ὄνος ἄγριος, perh. by reading עָרוֹד, a wild ass; Vulg. *myricæ*) has been variously translated, as *myrica, tamarisk; tamarin*, which is an Indian tree, the tamarind; *retama*, that is, the broom; and also, as in the French and English versions, *bruiere, heath*, which is, perhaps, the most incorrect of all, though Hasselquist mentions finding heath near Jericho, in Syria. Gesenius, however, renders it *ruins* in the latter of the above passages (as in Isa. xvii, 2), and *needy* in the former (as in Psa. cii, 18). As far as the context is concerned, some of the plants named, as the *retam* and *tamarisk*, would answer very well [see TAMARISK]; but the Arabic name, *arar*, is applied to a totally different plant, a species of juniper, as has been clearly shown by Celsius (*Hierobot.* ii, 195), who states that Arias Montanus is the only one who has so translated the Hebrew in the first of the passages in question (Jer. xvii, 6): "For he shall be like the *heath* in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh, but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, in a salt land, and not inhabited." Both the Heb. words are from the root עָרַר, "to be *naked*," in allusion to the *bare* nature of the rocks on which the juniper often grows (comp. Psa. cii, 17, תְּפִלַּת הָעַרְעָר, "the prayer of the destitute," or ill-clad). Several species of juniper are no doubt found in Syria and Palestine. See CEDAR; JUNIPER. Dr. Robinson met with some in proceeding from Hebron to wady Musa, near the romantic pass of Nemela: "On the rocks above we found the juniper-tree, Arabic *ar'ar;* its berries have the appearance and taste of the common juniper, except that there is more of the aroma of the pine. These trees were ten or fifteen feet in height, and hung upon the rocks even to the summits of the cliffs and needles" (*Bibl. Researches*, ii, 506). In proceeding S.E. he states: "Large trees of the juniper become quite common in the wadys and on the rocks." It is mentioned in the same situations by other travellers, and is no doubt common enough, particularly in wild, uncultivated, and often inaccessible situations, and is thus suitable to Jer. xlviii, 6: "Flee, save your lives, and be like the *heath* in the wilderness." This appears to be the *Juniperus Sabina*, or savin, with small scale-like leaves, which are pressed close to the stem, and which is described as being a gloomy-looking bush inhabiting the most sterile soil (see *English Cyclop. N. Hist.* iii, 311); a character which is obviously well suited to the *naked* or *destitute* tree spoken of by the prophet. Rosenmüller's explanation of the Hebrew word, which is also adopted by Maurer, "qui destitutus versatur" (*Schol. ad Jer.* xvii, 6), is very unsatisfactory. Not to mention the *tameness* of the comparison, it is evidently contradicted by the antithesis in ver. 8: "Cursed is he that trusteth in man . . . he shall be like the juniper that grows on the bare rocks of the desert: Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord . . . he shall be as a tree planted by the waters." The contrast between the shrub of the arid desert and the tree growing by the waters is very striking; but Rosenmüller's interpretation appears to us to spoil the whole. Even more unsatisfactory is Michaelis (*Supp. Lex. Heb.* p. 1971), who thinks "Guinea-hens" (*Numida meleagris*) are intended! Gesenius (*Thes.* p. 1073 4) understands these two Heb. terms to denote

"parietinæ, ædificia eversa" (ruins); but it is more in accordance with the scriptural passages to suppose that some tree is intended, which explanation, moreover, has the sanction of the Sept. and Vulgate, and of the modern use of a kindred Arabic word.—Smith. Modern travellers do not mention the species; but those which have been named as growing in Palestine are the Phœnician juniper, the common savin, and the brown-berried juniper. The first of these is a tree of about twenty feet high, growing with its branches in a pyramidal form. Rosenmüller states that "Forskal found it frequently in the sandy heaths about Suez. The caravans use it for fuel." The species best known in America are the common red cedar (*Jun. Virginiana*) and the Bermuda cedar, from which the wood of lead-pencils is manufactured. They all have long, narrow, prickly leaves, and bear a soft, pulpy berry, from which a carminative oil is extracted. The wood is light, highly odorous, and very durable. See JUNIPER.

Heath, Asa, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Hillsdale, N. Y., July 31, 1776. His parents were Congregationalists. At thirteen he was converted, under the ministry of the Rev. F. Garrettson (q. v.). He began to preach in 1797 on Cambridge Circuit, N. York, under the direction of the Rev. Sylvester Hutchinson. In 1798 he was stationed at Pomfret, Conn., with Daniel Ostrander. In 1799 he was sent to the province of Maine, and stationed on the Kennebec Circuit, embracing all the territory from Waterville to the Canada line, making more than two hundred miles travel to reach all the appointments. In 1800 Portland was his field of labor; 1801, Readfield; 1802, Falmouth; 1804–5, Scarboro'; in 1806 he located in consequence of bodily infirmities. In 1818 he re-entered the traveling connection, and was appointed presiding elder of Portland district, which position he occupied for three years; 1821, Scarboro'; 1822, Kennebec; in 1823 he again located, and removed to Monmouth, Me.; in 1827 he re-entered the travelling ministry again, and held an effective relation to the Conference fifteen years. In 1842 he became superannuate, and this relation continued until Sept. 1, 1860, when he died in peace. As a preacher, he was sound in doctrine, clear in exposition, simple yet forcible in illustration, and impressive in delivery.—*Zion's Herald*, Oct. 5, 1860.

Heathcote, RALPH, D.D., an English divine, was born in 1721, and died May 28, 1795. He was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge; took orders, and in 1748 was made vicar of Barkby, near Leicester; assistant preacher of Lincoln's Inn in 1753; succeeded his father as vicar of Silebv in 1765; became rector of Sawtry-all-Saints, Huntingdonshire, in 1766; a prebend in the collegiate church in Southwell in 1768; and in 1788 vicar-general of Southwell Church. Besides works on other subjects, he wrote *Cursory Animadversions upon the Middletonian Controversy in general* (1752):—*Remarks upon Dr. Chapman's Charge* (1752):—*Letter to Rev. T. Fothergill* (1753):—*Sketch of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy* (1785, 8vo):—*The Use of Reason asserted in Matters of Religion* (1755, 8vo; and a defence of the same, in 1756, 8vo):—*Discourse on the Being of God, against Atheists, in two Sermons* (being the only ones of his twenty-four Boyle sermons which he published, 1763, 4to). Dr. Heathcote wrote several articles for the first edition of the *General Biographical Dictionary*, and assisted Nichols in editing a new edition of the same, published in 1784, 12 vols. 8vo.—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 814; Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* viii, 241; *Gentleman's Magazine*, lxv, lxvi, lxxi. (J. W. M.)

Heathen. The Hebrew word גּוֹי, *goy* (plur. גּוֹיִם, *gôyim*), together with its Greek equivalent ἔθνος (ἔθνη), has been somewhat arbitrarily rendered "nations," "gentiles," and "heathen" in the A. V. It will be interesting to trace the manner in which a term, primarily and essentially general in its signification, acquired that more restricted sense which was afterwards attached to it. Its development is parallel with that of the Hebrew people, and its meaning at any period may be taken as significant of their relative position with regard to the surrounding nations.

1. While as yet the Jewish nation had no political existence, *gôyim* denoted generally the nations of the world, especially including the immediate descendants of Abraham (Gen. xviii, 18; compare Gal. iii, 16). The latter, as they grew in numbers and importance, were distinguished in a most marked manner from the nations by whom they were surrounded, and were provided with a code of laws and a religious ritual which made the distinction still more peculiar. They were essentially a separate people (Lev. xx, 23); separate in habits, morals, and religion, and bound to maintain their separate character by denunciations of the most terrible judgments (Lev. xxvi, 14-38; Deut. xxviii). On their march through the desert they encountered the most obstinate resistance from Amalek, "chief of the *gôyim*" (Numb. xxiv, 20), in whose sight the deliverance from Egypt was achieved (Lev. xxvi, 45). During the conquest of Canaan, and the subsequent wars of extermination which the Israelites for several generations carried on against their enemies, the seven nations of the Canaanites, Amorites, Hittites, Hivites, Jebusites, Perizzites, and Girgashites (Exod. xxxiv, 24), together with the remnants of them who were left to prove Israel (Josh. xxiii, 13; Judg. iii, 1; Psa. lxxviii, 55), and teach them war (Judg. iii, 2), received the especial appellation of *gôyim*. With these the Israelites were forbidden to associate (Josh. xxiii, 7); intermarriages were prohibited (Josh. xxiii, 12; 1 Kings xi, 2); and, as a warning against disobedience, the fate of the nations of Canaan was constantly kept before their eyes (Lev. xviii, 24, 25; Deut. xviii, 12). They are ever associated with the worship of false gods and the foul practices of idolaters (Lev. xviii, xx), and these constituted their chief distinctions, as *gôyim*, from the worshippers of the one God, the people of Jehovah (Numb. xv, 41; Deut. xxviii, 10). This distinction was maintained in its full force during the early times of the monarchy (2 Sam. vii, 23; 1 Kings xi, 4–8; xiv, 24; Psa. cvi, 35). It was from among the *gôyim*, the degraded tribes who submitted to their arms, that the Israelites were permitted to purchase their bond-servants (Lev. xxv, 44, 45), and this special enactment seems to have had the effect of giving to a national tradition the force and sanction of a law (comp. Gen. xxi, 15). In later times this regulation was strictly adhered to. To the words of Eccles. ii, 7, "I bought men-servants and maid-servants," the Targum adds, "of the children of Ham, and the rest of the foreign nations." Not only were the Israelites forbidden to intermarry with these *gôyim*, but the latter were virtually excluded from the possibility of becoming naturalized. An Ammonite or Moabite was shut out from the congregation of Jehovah even to the tenth generation (Deut. xxiii, 3), while an Edomite or Egyptian was admitted in the third (verses 7, 8). The necessity of maintaining a separation so broadly marked is ever more and more manifest as we follow the Israelites through their history, and observe their constantly recurring tendency to idolatry. Offence and punishment followed each other with all the regularity of cause and effect (Judg. ii, 12; iii, 6–8, etc.).

2. But, even in early Jewish times, the term *gôyim* received by anticipation a significance of wider range than the national experience (Lev. xxvi, 33, 38; Deut. xxx, 1), and, as the latter was gradually developed during the prosperous times of the monarchy, the *gôyim* were the surrounding nations generally, with whom the Israelites were brought into contact by the extension of their commerce, and whose idolatrous practices they readily adopted (Ezek. xxiii, 30; Amos v, 26). Later still, it is applied to the Babylonians who took Jerusalem (Neh. v, 8; Psa. lxxix, 1, 6, 10), to the destroyers of Moab (Isa. xvi, 8), and to the several nations among whom the Jews were scattered during the Captivity

(Psa. cvi, 47; Jer. xlvi, 28; Lam. i, 3, etc.), the practice of idolatry still being their characteristic distinction (Isa. xxxvi, 18; Jer. x, 2, 3; xiv, 22). This signification it retained after the return from Babylon, though it was used in a more limited sense as denoting the mixed race of colonists who settled in Palestine during the Captivity (Neh. v, 17), and who are described as fearing Jehovah while serving their own gods (2 Kings xvii, 29-33; Ezra vi, 21).

Tracing the synonymous term ἔθνη through the apocryphal writings, we find that it is applied to the nations around Palestine (1 Macc. i, 11), including the Syrians and Philistines of the army of Gorgias (1 Macc. iii, 41, iv, 7, 11, 14), as well as the people of Ptolemais, Tyre, and Sidon (1 Macc. v, 9, 10, 15). They were image-worshippers (1 Macc. iii, 48; Wisd. xv, 15), whose customs and fashions the Jews seem still to have had an unconquerable propensity to imitate, but on whom they were bound by national tradition to take vengeance (1 Macc. ii, 68; 1 Esdr. viii, 85). Following the customs of the *gôyim* at this period denoted the neglect or concealment of circumcision (1 Macc. i, 15), disregard of sacrifices, profanation of the Sabbath, eating of swine's flesh and meat offered to idols (2 Macc. vi, 6-9, 18; xv, 1, 2), and adoption of the Greek national games (2 Macc. iv, 12, 14). In all points Judaism and heathenism are strongly contrasted. The "barbarous multitude" in 2 Macc. ii, 21 are opposed to those who played the man for Judaism, and the distinction now becomes an ecclesiastical one (comp. Matt. xviii, 17). In 2 Esdr. iii, 33, 34, the "gentes" are defined as those "qui habitant in sæculo" (comp. Matt. vi, 32; Luke xii, 30).

As the Greek influence became more extensively felt in Asia Minor, and the Greek language was generally used, Hellenism and heathenism became convertible terms, and a Greek was synonymous with a foreigner of any nation. This is singularly evident in the Syriac of 2 Macc. v, 9, 10, 13; comp. John vii, 35; 1 Cor. x, 32; 2 Macc. xi, 2.

In the N. T., again, we find various shades of meaning attached to ἔθνη. In its narrowest sense it is opposed to "those of the circumcision" (Acts x, 45; comp. Esth. xiv, 15, where ἀλλότριος=ἀπερίτμητος), and is contrasted with Israel, the people of Jehovah (Luke ii, 32), thus representing the Hebrew גּוֹיִם at one stage of its history. But, like *gôyim*, it also denotes the people of the earth generally (Acts xxii, 26; Gal. iii, 14). In Matt. vi, 7, ἐθνικός is applied to an idolater.

But, in addition to its significance as an ethnographical term, *gôyim* had a moral sense which must not be overlooked. In Psa. ix, 5, 15, 17 (comp. Ezek. vii, 21) the word stands in parallelism with רָשָׁע, *râshâ'*, the wicked, as distinguished by his moral obliquity (see Hupfeld on Psa. i, 1); and in verse 17 the people thus designated are described as "forgetters of God," that know not Jehovah (Jer. x, 25). Again, in Psa. lix, 5, it is to some extent commensurate in meaning with בֹּגְדֵי אָוֶן, "iniquitous transgressors;" and in these passages, as well as in Psa. x, 15, it has a deeper significance than that of a merely national distinction, although the latter idea is never entirely lost sight of.

In later Jewish literature a technical definition of the word is laid down which is certainly not of universal application. Elias Levita (quoted by Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, i, 665) explains the sing. *gôy* as denoting one who is not of Israelitish birth. This can only have reference to its after signification; in the O. T. the singular is never used of an individual, but is a collective term, applied equally to the Israelites (Josh. iii, 17) as to the nations of Canaan (Lev. xx, 23), and denotes simply a body politic. Another distinction, equally unsupported, is made between גּוֹיִם, *gôyim*, and אֻמִּים, *ummim*, the former being defined as the nations who had served Israel, while the latter were those who had not (*Jalkut Chadash*, fol. 20, note 20; Eisenmenger, i, 667). Abarbanel, on Joel iii, 2, applies the former to both Christians and Turks, or Ishmaelites, while in *Sepher Juchasin* (fol. 148, col. 2) the Christians alone are distinguished by this appellation. Eisenmenger gives some curious examples of the disabilities under which a *gôy* labored. One who kept Sabbaths was judged deserving of death (ii, 206), and the study of the law was prohibited to him under the same penalty, but on the latter point the doctors are at issue (ii, 209). See GENTILE.

3. In modern use, the word heathen (probably a corruption of ἐθνικός, *ethnicus*, of which it is a translation; or derived from *heath*, that is, people who live in the wilderness, as *pagan* from *pagus*, a village) is applied to all nations that are strangers to revealed religion, that is to say, to all except Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans. It is nearly synonymous with *Gentiles* (q. v.) and *Pagans* (q. v.). At the time of the Crusades the Moslems were also called heathen; but as they receive the doctrine of the one God from the O. T., they are not properly so called. On the relation of the heathen to Judaism, see above, and also the article GENTILES. See also the same article (vol. iii, p. 789) for their relation to Christianity at its origin. We add the following statements:

"The old Oriental forms of heathenism, the religion of the Chinese (Confucius, about 550 B.C.), the Brahminism, and the later Buddhism of the Hindoos (perhaps 1000 B.C.), the religion of the Persians (Zoroaster, 700 B.C.), and the Egyptians ('the religion of enigma'), have only a remote and indirect concern with the introduction of Christianity. But they form to some extent the historical basis of the Western religions; and the Persian dualism, especially, was not without influence on the earlier sects (the Gnostic and the Manichæan) of the Christian Church. The flower of paganism appears in the two great nations of classic antiquity, Greece and Rome. With the language, morality, literature, and religion of these nations the apostles came directly into contact, and through the whole first age the Church moves on the basis of these nationalities. These, together with the Jews, were the chosen nations of the ancient world, and shared the earth among them. The Jews were chosen for things eternal, to keep the sanctuary of the true religion. The Greeks prepared the elements of natural culture, of science and art, for the use of the Church. The Romans developed the idea of law, and organized the civilized world in a universal empire, ready to serve the spiritual universality of the Gospel. Both Greeks and Romans were unconscious servants of Jesus Christ, 'the unknown God.' These three nations, by nature at bitter enmity among themselves, joined hands in the superscription on the cross, where the holy name and the royal title of the Redeemer stood written, by the command of the heathen Pilate, 'in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin'" (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, i, 44).

4. As to the *religion* of heathenism, it is "a wild growth on the soil of fallen human nature, a darkening of the original consciousness of God, a deification of the rational and irrational creature, and a corresponding corruption of the moral sense, giving the sanction of religion to natural and unnatural vices. Even the religion of Greece, which, as an artistic product of the imagination, has been justly styled the religion of beauty, is deformed by this moral distortion. It utterly lacks the true conception of sin, and consequently the true conception of holiness. It regards sin not as a perverseness of will and an offence against the gods, but as a folly of the understanding, and an offence against men, often even proceeding from the gods themselves; for 'infatuation is a daughter of Jove.' Then these gods themselves are mere men, in whom Homer and the popular faith saw and worshipped the weaknesses and vices of the Grecian character, as well as its virtues, in immensely magnified forms. They have bodies and senses, like mortals, only in colossal proportions. They eat and drink, though only nectar and ambrosia. They are lim-

ited, like men, to time and space. Though sometimes honored with the attributes of omnipotence and omniscience, yet they are subject to an iron fate, fall under delusion, and reproach each other with folly. Their heavenly happiness is disturbed by all the troubles of earthly life. Jupiter threatens his fellows with blows and death, and makes Olympus tremble when he shakes his dark locks in anger. The gentle Venus bleeds from a spear-wound on her finger. Mars is felled with a stone by Diomedes. Neptune and Apollo have to serve for hire, and are cheated. The gods are involved by their marriages in perpetual jealousies and quarrels. Though called holy and just, they are full of envy and wrath, hatred and lust, and provoke each other to lying and cruelty, perjury and adultery. Notwithstanding this essential apostasy from truth and holiness, heathenism was religion, a groping after 'the unknown God.' By its superstition it betrayed the need of faith. Its polytheism rested on a dim monotheistic background; it subjected all the gods to Jupiter, and Jupiter himself to a mysterious fate. It had at bottom the feeling of dependence on higher powers, and reverence for divine things. It preserved the memory of a golden age and of a fall. It had the voice of conscience and a sense, obscure though it was, of guilt. It felt the need of reconciliation with deity, and sought that reconciliation by prayer, penance, and sacrifice. Many of its religious traditions and usages were faint echoes of the primal religion; and its mythological dreams of the mingling of the gods with men, of demigods, of Prometheus delivered by Hercules from his helpless sufferings, were unconscious prophecies and fleshy anticipations of Christian truths. This alone explains the great readiness with which heathens embraced the Gospel, to the shame of the Jews. These elements of truth, morality, and piety in heathenism may be ascribed to three sources. In the first place, man, even in his fallen state, retains some traces of the divine image, a consciousness of God, however weak, conscience, and a deep longing for union with the Godhead, for truth and for righteousness. In this view we may, with Tertullian, call the beautiful and true sentences of the classics, of a Socrates, a Plato, an Aristotle, of Pindar, Sophocles, Plutarch, Cicero, Virgil, Seneca, 'the testimonies of a soul constitutionally Christian,' of a nature predestined to Christianity. Secondly, some account must be made of traditions and recollections, however faint, coming down from the general primal revelations to Adam and Noah. But the third and most important source of the heathen anticipations of truth is the all-ruling providence of God, who has never left himself without a witness. Particularly must we consider the influence of the divine Logos before his incarnation, the tutor of mankind, the original light of reason, shining in the darkness and lighting every man, the sower scattering in the soil of heathendom the seeds of truth, beauty, and virtue" (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, § 12).

The question of the *salvation* of the heathen has been a subject of much discussion. "The great body of the Jews, from the earliest ages, denied salvation to the heathen on the principle *extra ecclesiam non dari salutem*. But this is entirely opposed both to the Old Testament and to the spirit of Christianity. Even Mohammed did not go to this degree of exclusiveness. Nor did the more ancient Grecian fathers deny salvation to the heathen, although they philosophized about it after their manner. E. g. Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria held that the Λόγος exerted an agency upon the heathen by means of reason, and that the heathen philosophers were called, justified, and saved by philosophy. But afterwards, especially after the 3d century, when the false Jewish notions respecting the Church were introduced into the West, and the maxim was adopted, *Extra ecclesiam non dari salutem* (which was the case after the age of Augustine), they then began to deny the salvation of the heathen, though there were always some who judged more favorably. Thus Zwingle, Curio, and others believed that God would pardon the heathen on account of Christ, although in this life they had no knowledge of his merits. See the historical account in Beykert's Diss. *De salute gentium* (Strasburg, 1777), and a short statement of the opinions of others in Morus, p. 128, 129, where he justly recommends to our imitation the exemplary modesty of the apostles when speaking on this point. The whole subject was investigated anew on occasion of the violent attack which Hofstede, a preacher in Holland, made upon the *Bélisaire* of Marmontel. This gave rise to Eberhard's *Apologie de Socrätes.* Compare also Töllner, *Beweis dass Gott die Menschen auch durch seine Offenbarung in der Naturzur Seligkeit führe*" (Knapp, *Christian Theology*, § 121). "The truth seems to be this, that none of the heathens will be condemned for not believing the Gospel, but they are liable to condemnation for the breach of God's natural law; nevertheless, if there be any of them in whom there is a prevailing love to the Divine Being, there seems reason to believe that, for the *sake* of Christ, though to them unknown, they may be accepted by God; and so much the rather, as the ancient Jews, and even the apostles, during the time of our Saviour's abode on earth, seem to have had but little notion of those doctrines which those who deny the salvability of the heathen are most apt to imagine to be fundamental. Comp. Rom. ii, 10, 26; Acts x, 34, 35; Matt. viii, 11, 12; 1 John ii, 2" (Doddridge, *Lectures on Divinity*, lect. 172). The question is very ably treated in an article on "The true Theory of Missions" in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1858. The writer states that the extreme evangelical theory, which assumes the certain damnation of all who have not learned the name and faith of Christ, is "the accepted theory of the Romish Church, and of a part of the Protestant Church, perhaps of the majority of the latter." He adds in a note the following: "The Presbyterian Confession of Faith (chap. x, § 4) uses language of remarkable boldness on this point, saying, 'Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved; *much less* can men not professing the Christian religion be saved in any other way whatever, *be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature* and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may is very pernicious and to be detested.' This is sufficiently positive, especially as it contradicts both our Saviour and the apostle Paul. It represents heathen who live according to their light as '*much less*' able to be saved than men who hear the Gospel and reject it, thus directly contradicting our Saviour, who declared that those who rejected his words would receive a heavier condemnation than even the depraved, unrepentant inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, or Tyre and Sidon (Matt. xi, 20-24). The 'Confession of Faith' declares the salvation of conscientious heathen to be 'much less' possible than that of unbelieving hearers of the Gospel; while Christ asserts that even the most flagrant sinners of the heathen shall find it 'more tolerable' in the day of judgment than such unbelievers. Equally at variance with the 'Confession of Faith' is the declaration of Paul in Rom. ii, 14, 26, 27, in which he shows how those 'having not the law may be a law unto themselves,' and how their 'uncircumcision shall be counted for circumcision.'" . . . "The facts of human history and the declarations of the Bible alike declare that mercy is a prominent attribute of the divine character, and that this world is for some reason, known or unknown, under its care. We cannot, therefore, resist the conviction—it is an affirmation of the moral sense of all men—that, guilty though the human race may be, and deserving of destruction, yet every man lives under a dispensation of mercy, and has an opportunity for salvation. To assert gravely, then, that the heathen who have never heard of Christ are shut out from

all possible hope of pardon, and are not in a salvable position in their present circumstances, is to offend the moral sense of the thoughtful men as well as that of the common multitude. It is worse than denying that an atonement has been made for all mankind, and restricting it to the elect alone; for that doctrine, however theoretically untrue, is saved from much of its practical evil by our inability to point out the elect in advance, so that our hopes are not cut off for any particular man. But this theory points to actual masses of men, to the entire population of whole countries, and dooms them to a necessary perdition with no present hope of pardon; and it extends this judgment backwards to generations in the past who are represented as having had no share in that mercy which we have such reason to believe to be universal in its offers. Such a theory practically denies the divine grace by suspending its exercise, so far as the heathen (the majority of the human race) are concerned, upon the action of those already enlightened. It declares that there is no possible mercy for the heathen unless *Christians* choose to carry the Gospel to them. Does it seem rational, or in harmony with the universality and freedom of God's grace, that the only possibility of salvation for the mass of mankind should be suspended, not on anything within their control, but on the conduct of men on the opposite side of the globe? By such representations the minds of men are shocked, and a reaction takes place, which is unfavorable not only to the cause of missions, but to evangelical religion as well. They are led to think of evangelical religion as a severe, gloomy, remorseless system, which represents God as without mercy, or which confines that mercy within an exceedingly narrow compass. By describing the salvation of pagans as absolutely impossible, an influence is exerted in favor of universalism and infidelity." The writer further asserts that no passage in the Bible asserts this theory, nor does any doctrine of the Bible imply it. John Wesley's views on this subject are given in his sermon on *Living without God*, from which we extract the following: "I have no authority from the Word of God to 'judge those that are without,' nor do I conceive that any man has a right to sentence all the heathen and Mohammedan world to damnation" (*Works*, N. Y. ed. ii, 485). Again, the *Minutes* of Aug. 8, 1770, declare that "he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, according to the light he has, is accepted of God." For this Wesley was attacked by Shirley and others, and defended by Fletcher, in his *First Check to Antinomianism* (New York edit.), i, 41. See, besides the works above cited, Watson, *Theolog. Institutes*, ii, 445; Whately, *Future State*, p. 207; Constant, *De la Religion* (Bruxelles, 1824); Rougemont, *Le Peuple Primitif* (Paris, 1855-57, 3 vols. 8vo); Pressensé, *Hist. des Trois Premiers Siècles de l'église*, vol. i; translated under the title *The Religions before Christ* (Edinb. 1862, 8vo); Sepp, *Das Heidenthum* (Regensb. 1853, 3 vols.); Maurice, *Religions of the World* (Boston, 1854, 18mo); Trench, *Hulsean Lectures* for 1846 (Philadel. 1850, 12mo); Wuttke, *Gesch. des Heidenthums*, etc. (Bresl. 1853, 8vo); Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters* (1855, 2 vols. 8vo); Schaff, *Apostol. Church*, p. 139 sq.; Scholten, *Gesch. d. Religion u. Philosophie* (Elberf. 1868, 8vo); Pfleiderer, *Die Religion, ihr Wesen und ihre Geschichte* (Leipsic, 1869, 2 vols. 8vo); Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ*, trans. by Darnell (Lond. 1862, 2 vols. 8vo); *N. British Review*, December, 1867, art. i; Baring-Gould, *Origin and Development of Religious Belief* (Lond. 1869-70, 2 vols. 8vo).

Heathenism. See PAGANISM.

Heaven. There is, says Daubuz, a threefold world, and therefore a threefold heaven—the *invisible*, the *visible*, and the *political* among men, which last may be either *civil* or *ecclesiastical.* We shall consider these in the inverse order.

A. *Terrestrially and Figuratively regarded.*—Wherever the *scene* of a prophetic vision is laid, *heaven* signifies symbolically the ruling power or government; that is, the whole assembly of the ruling powers, which, in respect to the *subjects* on *earth*, are a political heaven, being over and ruling the subjects, as the natural heaven stands over and rules the earth. Thus, according to the subject, is the term to be limited; and therefore Artemidorus, writing in the times of the Roman emperors, makes Italy to be the heaven: "As heaven," says he, "is the abode of gods, so is Italy of kings." The Chinese call their monarch *Tiencu*, the son of heaven, meaning thereby the most powerful monarch. And thus, in Matt. xxiv, 30, *heaven* is synonymous to *powers and glory;* and when Jesus says, "The powers of the heaven shall be shaken," it is easy to conceive that he meant that the kingdoms of the world should be overthrown to submit to his kingdom. Any government is a world; and therefore, in Isa. li, 15, 16, heaven and earth signify *a political universe*, a kingdom or polity. In Isa. lxv, 17, a new heaven and a new earth signify a new government, new kingdom, new people. See HEAVEN AND EARTH.

B. *Physically treated.*—I. *Definitions and Distinctions.*—The ancient Hebrews, for want of a single term like the *κόσμος* and the *mundus* of the Greeks and the Latins. used the phrase *heaven and earth* (as in Gen. i, 1; Jer. xxiii. 24; and Acts xvii, 24, where "*H. and E.*" = "the world and all things therein") to indicate *the universe*, or (as Barrow, *Sermons on the Creed, Works* [Oxford ed.], iv, 556, expresses it) "those two regions, superior and inferior, into which the whole system of things is divided, together with all the beings that do reside in them, or do belong unto them, or are comprehended by them" (compare Pearson, *On the Creed*, who, on art. i ["Maker of H. and E."], adduces the Rabbinical names of a *triple* division of the universe, making the sea, יָם, distinct from the יִשּׁוּב, *ἡ οἰκουμένη*. Compare also the Nicene Creed, where another division occurs of the universe into "*things visible and invisible*"). Deducting from this aggregate the idea expressed by "earth" [see EARTH; GEOGRAPHY], we get a residue of signification which exactly embraces "heaven." Barrow (l. c.) well defines it as "all the superior region encompassing the globe of the earth, and from it on all sides extended to a distance inconceivably vast and spacious, with all its parts, and furniture, and inhabitants—not only such things in it as are visible and material, but also those which are immaterial and invisible (Col. i, 16)."

1. Wetstein (in a learned note on 2 Cor. xii, 2) and Eisenmenger (*Entdecktes Judenthum*, i, 460) state the *Rabbinical* opinion as asserting *seven heavens.* For the substance of Wetstein's note, see Stanley, *Corinthians*, l. c. This number arises confessedly from the mystic value of the numeral *seven;* "omnis *septenarius* dilectus est in sæculum—in superis." According to Rabbi Abia, there were six antechambers, as it were, or steps to the seventh heaven, which was the "*ταμεῖον* in quo Rex habitat"—the very presence-chamber of the divine King himself. Compare Origen, *Contra Celsum*, vi, 289, and Clemens Alex. *Stromata*, iv, 636; v, 692. In the last of these passages the prophet Zephaniah is mentioned, after some apocryphal tradition, to have been caught up into "the *fifth* heaven, the dwelling-place of the angels, in a glory sevenfold greater than the brightness of the sun." In the Rabbinical point of view, the superb throne of king Solomon, with the six steps leading up to it, was a symbol of the highest heaven with the throne of the Eternal, above the six inferior heavens (1 Kings x, 18-20). These gradations of the celestial regions are probably meant in Amos ix, 6, where, however, the entire creation is beautifully described by "*the stories* [or steps] of the heaven," for the empyreal heaven; "*the troop* [or globular aggregate, the *terra firma;* see A. Lapide, ad loc.] of the earth," and "the waters of the sea" [including the atmosphere, whence the waters are "poured out upon the face of the earth"]. As for the *threefold* division of the celestial regions mentioned in the text, Meyer thinks it to be a fiction of the learned Grotius, on the ground of the Rabbinical *seven* heavens. But

this censure is premature; for (1) it is very doubtful whether this *hebdomadal* division is as old as Paul's time; (2) it is certain that the Rabbinical doctors are not unanimous about the number seven. Rabbi Judah (*Chagiga*, fol. xii, 2, and *Aboth Nathan*, 37) says there are "two heavens," after Deut. x, 14. This agrees with Grotius's statement, if we combine his *nubiferum* (רקיע) and *astriferum* (שמים) into one region of *physical heavens* (as indeed Moses does himself in Gen. i, 14, 15, 17, 20), and reserve his *angeliferum* for the שמי השמים, "the heaven of heavens," the supernal region of spiritual beings, Milton's "Empyréan" (*P. L.* vii, *sub fin.*). See bishop Pearson's note, *On the Creed* (ed. Chevallier), p. 91. The learned note of De Wette on 2 Cor. xii, 2 is also worth consulting. (3) The Targum on 2 Chron. vi, 18 (as quoted by Dr. Gill, *Comment.* 2 Corinth. l. c.), expressly mentions the triple distinction of *supreme, middle*, and *lower* heavens. Indeed, there is an accumulation of the threefold classification. Thus, in *Tseror Hammor*, fol. i, 4, and iii, 2, 3, and lxxxii, 2, three worlds are mentioned. The doctors of the Cabbala also hold the opinion of *three* worlds, *Zohar*, Numb. fol. lxvi, 3. And of the highest world there is further a *tripartite* division, of *angels*, עוֹלָם הַמַּלְאָכִים; of *souls*, נְפָשׁוֹת; and of *spirits*, עוֹלָם הָרוּחִים. See Buxtorf's *Lex. Rabbin.* col. 1620, who refers to D. Kimchi on Psa. xix, 9. Paul, besides the well-known 2 Cor. xii, 2, refers again, only less pointedly, to a *plurality* of heavens, as in Eph. iv, 10. See Olshausen (ed. Clark) on the former passage.

2. Accordingly, Barrow (p. 558, with whom compare Grotius and Drusius on 2 Cor. xii, 2) ascribes to the Jews the notion that there are *three heavens: Cœlum nubiferum*, or the firmament; *Cœlum astriferum*, the starry heavens; *Cœlum angeliferum*, or "the heaven of heavens," where the angels reside, "the third heaven" of Paul. This same notion prevails in the fathers. Thus St. Gregory of Nyssa (*Hexaem.* i, 42) describes the first of these heavens as *the limited space of the denser* air (τὸν ὅρον τοῦ παχυμερεστέρου ἀέρος), *within which range the clouds, the winds, and the birds;* the second is the region *in which wander the planets and the stars* (ἐν ᾧ δὲ πλανῆται τῶν ἀστέρων διαπορεύονται), hence aptly called by Hesychius κατηστρισμένον τόπον, *locum stelliferum;* while the third is *the very summit of the visible creation* (τὸ οὖν ἀκρότατον τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ κόσμου), *Paul's third heaven, higher than the aerial and stellar world, cognizable* [not by the eye, but] *by the mind alone* (ἐν στασίμῳ καὶ νοητῇ φύσει γενόμενος), which Damascene calls *the heaven of heavens, the prime heaven beyond all others* (οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὁ πρῶτος οὐρανός, *Orthod. Fid.* lib. ii, c. vi, p. 83); or, according to St. Basil (*In Jesaiam, visione* ii, tom. i, 813), *the throne of God* (θρόνος Θεοῦ), and to Justin Martyr (*Quæst. et Resp. ad Græcos, ad ult. Quæst.* p. 236), *the house and throne of God* (οἶκος καὶ θρόνος τοῦ Θεοῦ).

II. *Scripture Passages arranged according to these Distinctions.*—This latter division of the celestial regions is very convenient and quite Biblical. (I.) Under the first head, *cœlum nubiferum*, the following phrases naturally fall—(*a*) "Fowl," or "fowls of the heaven, of the air," see Gen. ii, 19; vii, 3, 23; ix, 2; Deut. iv, 17; xxviii, 26; 1 Kings xxi, 24; Job xii, 7; xxviii, 21; xxxv, 11; Psa. viii, 8; lxxix, 2; civ, 12; Jer. vii, 33 et passim; Ezek. xxix, 5 et passim; Dan. ii, 38; Hos. ii, 18; iv, 3; vii, 12; Zeph. i, 3; Mark iv, 3 (τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ); Luke viii, 5; ix, 58; xiii, 19; Acts x, 12; xi, 6—in all which passages the same original words in the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek Scriptures (שְׁמַיִן, שָׁמַיִם, οὐρανοί) are with equal propriety rendered indifferently "*air*" and "*heaven*"—similarly we read of "the path of the eagle *in the air*" (Prov. xxx, 19); of "the eagles of *heaven*" (Lam. iv, 19); of "the stork of the *heaven*" (Jer. viii, 7); and of "birds of *heaven*" in general (Eccl. x, 20; Jer. iv, 25). In addition to these zoological terms, we have meteorological facts included under the same original words; e. g. (*b*) "*The dew of heaven*" (Gen. xxvii, 28, 39; Deut. xxxiii, 28; Dan. iv, 15 et passim; Hag. i, 10; Zech. viii, 12): (*c*) "*The clouds of heaven*" (1 Kings xviii, 45; Psa. cxlvii, 8; Dan. vii, 13; Matt. xxiv, 30; xxvi, 64; Mark xiv, 62): (*d*) *The frost of heaven* (Job xxxviii, 29): (*e*) *The winds of heaven* (1 Kings xviii, 55; Psa. lxxviii, 26; Dan. viii, 8; xi, 4; Zech. ii, 6; vi, 5 [see margin]; Matt. xxiv, 31; Mark xiii, 27): (*f*) *The rain of heaven* (Gen. viii, 2; Deut. xi, 11; xxviii, 12; Jer. xiv, 22; Acts xiv, 17 [οὐρανόθεν ὑετούς]; Jas. v, 18; Rev. xviii, 6): (*g*) *Lightning, with thunder* (Job xxxvii, 3, 4; Luke xvii, 24). (II.) *Cœlum astriferum.* The vast spaces of which astronomy takes cognizance are frequently referred to: e. g. (*a*) in the phrase "*host of heaven,*" in Deut. xvii, 3; Jer. viii, 2; Matt. xxiv, 29 [δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν]; a sense which is obviously not to be confounded with another signification of the same phrase, as in Luke ii, 13 [see ANGELS]: (*b*) *Lights of heaven* (Gen. i, 14, 15, 16; Ezek. xxxii, 8): (*c*) *Stars of heaven* (Gen. xxii, 17; xxvi, 4; Exod. xxxii, 13; Deut. i, 10; x, 22; xxviii, 62; Judg. v, 20; Neh. ix, 23; Isa. xiii, 10; Nah. iii, 16; Heb. xi, 12). (III.) *Cœlum angeliferum.* It would exceed our limits if we were to collect the descriptive phrases which revelation has given us of heaven in its sublimest sense; we content ourselves with indicating one or two of the most obvious: (*a*) *The heaven of heavens* (Deut. x, 14; 1 Kings viii, 27; 2 Chron. ii, 6, 18; Neh. ix, 6; Psa. cxv, 16; cxlviii, 4: (*b*) *The third heavens* (2 Cor. xii, 2): (*c*) *The high and lofty* [*place*] (Isa. xlvii, 15): (*d*) *The highest* (Matt. xxi, 9; Mark xi, 10; Luke ii, 14, compared with Psa. clxviii, 1). This heavenly sublimity was graciously brought down to Jewish apprehension in the sacred symbol of their Tabernacle and Temple, which they reverenced (especially in the *adytum* of "the Holy of Holies") as "the place where God's honor dwelt" (Psa. xxvi, 8), and amidst the sculptured types of his celestial retinue, in the cherubim of the mercy-seat (2 Kings xix, 15; Psa. lxxx, 1: Isa. xxxvii, 16).

III. *Meaning of the Terms used in the Original.*—1. By far the most frequent designation of *heaven* in the Hebrew Scriptures is שָׁמַיִם, *shama'yim*, which the older lexicographers [see Cocceius, *Lex.* s. v.] regarded as the *dual*, but which Gesenius and Fürst have restored to the dignity, which St. Jerome gave it, of the *plural* of an obsolete noun, שָׁמַי as (גּוֹיִם *plur.* of גּוֹי and מַיִם from מַי). According to these recent scholars, the idea expressed by the word is *height, elevation* (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1453; Fürst, *Hebr. Wört.* ii, 467). In this respect of its essential meaning it resembles the Greek οὐρανός [from the radical ὀρ, denoting *height*] (Pott, *Etymol. Forsch.* i, 123, ed. 1). Pott's rendering of this root ὀρ, by "sich *erheben*," reminds us of our own beautiful word *heaven*, which thus enters into brotherhood of signification with the grand idea of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek. Professor Bosworth, in his Anglo-Sax. Dict., under the verb *hebban*, to raise or elevate, gives the kindred words of the whole Teutonic family, and deduces therefrom the noun *heofon* or *heofen*, in the sense of *heaven.* And although the primary notion of the Latin *cœlum* (akin to κοῖλος and our *hollow*) is the less sublime one of a covered or vaulted space, yet the loftier sense of *elevation* has prevailed, both in the original (see White and Riddle, s. v. Cœlum) and in the derived languages (comp. French *ciel*, and the English word *ceiling*).

2. Closely allied in meaning, though unconnected in origin with שָׁמַיִם, is the oft-recurring מָרוֹם, *marôm'.* This word is never Englished *heaven*, but "*heights,*" or "*high place,*" or "*high places.*" There can, however, be no doubt of its celestial signification (and that in the grandest degree) in such passages as Psa. lxviii, 18 [Hebr. 19]; xciii, 4; cii, 19 [or in the Hebr. Bib. 20, where מִמְּרוֹם קָדְשׁוֹ is equal to the מִשָּׁמַיִם of the parallel clause]; similarly, Job xxxi, 2; Isa. lvii, 15; Jer. xxv, 30. Dr. Kalisch (*Genesis*, Introd. p. 21) says,

"It was a common belief among all ancient nations that at the summit of the shadow of the earth, or on the top of the highest mountain of the earth, which reaches with its crest into heaven . . . the gods have their palace or hall of assembly," and he instances "the Babylonian *Albordsh*, the chief abode of Ormuzd, among the heights of the Caucasus; and the Hindoo *Meru;* and the Chinese *Kulkun* (or Kaen-lun); and the Greek *Olympus* (and Atlas); and the Arabian *Caf;* and the Parsee *Tireh.*" He, however, while strongly and indeed most properly censuring the identification of Mount *Meru* with Mount *Moriah* (which had hastily been conjectured from "the accidental resemblance of the names"), deems it *improbable* that the Israelites should have entertained, like other ancient nations, the notion of *local height* for the abode of him whose "glory the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain;" and this he supposes on the ground that such a notion "*rests essentially on polytheistic ideas.*" Surely the learned commentator is premature in both these statements. (1.) No such improbability, *in fact*, unhappily, can be predicated of the Israelites, who in ancient times (notwithstanding the divine prohibitions) exhibited a constant tendency to the ritual of their בָּמוֹת, or "*high places.*" Gesenius makes a more correct statement when he says [*Hebr. Lex.* by Robinson, p. 138], "The Hebrews, like most other ancient nations, supposed that sacred rites performed on *high places* were particularly acceptable to the Deity. Hence they were accustomed to offer sacrifices upon mountains and hills, both to idols and to God himself (1 Sam. ix, 12 sq.; 1 Chron. xiii, 29 sq.; 1 Kings iii, 4; 2 Kings xii, 2, 3; Isa. xlv, 7); and also to build there *chapels, fanes, tabernacles* (בֵּית הַבָּמוֹת, 1 Kings xiii, 32; 2 Kings xvii, 29), with their priests and other ministers of the sacred rites (כֹּהֲנֵי הַבָּמוֹת, 1 Kings xii, 32; 2 Kings xvii, 32). So tenacious of this ancient custom were not only the ten tribes, but also all the Jews, that, even after the building of Solomon's Temple, in spite of the express law of Deut. xii, they continued to erect such chapels on the mountains around Jerusalem." (2.) Neither from the character of Jehovah, as the God of Israel, can the improbability be maintained, as if it were of the essence of *polytheism* only to localize Deity on mountain heights. "The high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy," in the proclamation which he is pleased to make of his own style, does not limit his abode to celestial sublimities; in one of the finest passages of even Isaiah's poetry, God claims as one of the stations of his glory the shrine of "a contrite and humble spirit" (Isa. lvii, 15). His loftiest attributes, therefore, are not compromised, nor is the amplitude of his omnipresence compressed by an earthly residence. Accordingly, the same Jehovah who "walketh on *the high places*, בָּמוֹת, of the earth" (Amos iv, 13); who "treadeth on *the fastnesses*, בָּמוֹת, of the sea" (Job ix, 8); and "who ascendeth above *the heights*, בָּמוֹת, of the clouds," was pleased to consecrate Zion as his dwelling-place (Psa. lxxxvii, 2), and his rest (Psa. cxxxii, 13, 14). Hence we find the same word, מָרוֹם, which is often descriptive of the sublimest heaven, used of Zion, which Ezekiel calls "the mountain of the height of Israel," הַר מְרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל (xvii, 23; xx, 40; xxxiv, 14).

3. גַּלְגַּל, *galgal'*. This word, which literally meaning a *wheel*, admirably expresses *rotatory movement*, is actually rendered "*heaven*" in the A. V. of Psa. lxxvii, 18: "The voice of thy thunder was in the heaven," בַּגַּלְגַּל [Sept. ἐν τῷ τροχῷ; Vulg. *in rotâ*]. Luther's version agrees with the A. Vers. *in Himmel;* and Dathe renders *per orbem*, which is ambiguous, being as expressive, to say the least, of the globe of the earth as of the circle of heaven. The Targum (in Walton, vol. iii) on the passage gives בגלגלא (*in rota*), which is as indeterminate as the original, as the Syriac also seems to be. De Wette (and after him Justus Olshausen, *Die Ps. erklärt*, l. c.) renders the phrase "in the whirlwind." Maurer, who disapproves of this rendering, explains the phrase "rotated." But, amidst the uncertainty of the versions, we are disposed to think that it was not without good reason that our translators, in departing from the previous version (see Psalter, ad loc., which has, "the voice of thy thunder was heard *round about*"), deliberately rendered the passage *in the heaven*, as if the גלגל were the correlative of תֵּבֵל, both being poetic words, and both together equalled *the heaven and the earth.* In Jas. iii, 6, the remarkable phrase, τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως, *the course, circuit, or wheel of nature*, is akin to our גלגל. (The Syriac renders the τροχόν by the same word, which occurs in the psalm as the equivalent of גַּלְגַּל, Schaaf's *Lex. Syr.*; and of the same indefiniteness of signification.) That the general sense "*heaven*" best expresses the force of Psa. lxxvii, 18, is rendered probable, moreover, by the description which Josephus gives (*Ant.* ii, 16, 3) of the destruction of Pharaoh's host in the Red Sea, the subject of that part of the psalm, "Showers of rain descended *from heaven*, ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, with dreadful thunders and lightning, and flashes of fire; thunderbolts were darted upon them, nor were there any indications of God's wrath upon men wanting on that dark and dismal night."

4. As the words we have reviewed indicate *the height and rotation* of the heavens, so the two we have yet to examine exhibit another characteristic of equal prominence, *the breadth and expanse* of the celestial regions. These are שַׁחַק, *shach'ak* (generally used in the *plural*) and רָקִיעַ. They occur *together* in Job xxxvii, 18: "Hast thou with him *spread out* (תַּרְקִיעַ) *the sky or expanse* of heaven?"—(לִשְׁחָקִים, where ל is the sign of the objective). We must examine them separately. The root שָׁחַק is explained by Gesenius to *grind to powder*, and then to *expand by rubbing or beating.* Meier (*Hebr. Wurzel-w.-b.* p. 446) compares it with the Arabic *shachaka, to make fine, to attenuate* (whence the noun *shachim, a thin cloud*). With him agrees Fürst (*Hebr.-w.-b.* ii, 433). The Heb. subst. is therefore well adapted to designate the skyey region of heaven with its cloud-dust, whether fine or dense. Accordingly, the meaning of the word in its various passages curiously oscillates between *sky* and *cloud*. When Moses, in Deut. xxxiii, 26, lauds Jehovah's "riding in his excellence on *the sky;*" and when, in 2 Sam. xxii, 12, and repeated in Psa. xviii, 11 (12), David speaks of "the thick clouds of *the skies;*" when Job (xxxvii, 18) asks, "Hast thou with him spread out *the sky?*" when the Psalmist (Psa. lxxvii, 17 [18]) speaks of "*the skies* sending out a sound," and the prophet (Isa. xlv, 8), figuratively, of their "pouring down righteousness;" when, finally, Jeremiah (li, 9), by a frequently occurring simile [comp. Rev. xviii, 5, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῆς αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἄχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ], describes the judgment of Babylon as "lifted up even to *the skies,*" in every instance our word שְׁחָקִים in the *plural* is employed. The same word in the same form is translated "*clouds*" in Job xxxv, 5; xxxvi, 28; xxxvii, 21; xxxviii, 37; in Psa. xxxvi, 5 (6); lvii, 10 (11); lxviii, 34 (35) [margin, "*heavens*"]; lxxviii, 23; in Prov. iii, 20; viii, 28. The prevalent sense of this word, we thus see, is a *meteorological* one, and falls under our first head of *cœlum nubiferum:* its connection with the other two heads is much slighter. It bears probably an *astronomical sense* in Psa. lxxxix, 37 (38), where "the faithful witness in heaven" seems to be in apposition to the sun and the moon (Bellarmine, ad loc.), although some suppose the expression to mean *the rainbow*, "the witness" of God's covenant with Noah; Gen. ix, 13 sq. (see J. Olshausen, ad loc.). This is perhaps the only instance of its falling under the class *cœlum astriferum;* nor have we a much more frequent reference to the higher sense of the *cœlum angeliferum* (Psa. lxxxix, 6 containing the only explicit allusion to this sense); unless, with Gese-

nius, *Thes.* s. v., we refer Psa. lxviii, 35 also to it. More probably in Deut. xxxiii, 26 (where it is parallel with שָׁמַיִם, and in the highly poetical passages of Isa. xlv, 8, and Jer. li, 9, our word שְׁחָקִים may be best regarded as designating the empyreal heavens.

5. We have already noticed the connection between שְׁחָקִים and our only remaining word רָקִיעַ, *raki'a*, from their being associated by the sacred writer in the same sentence (Job xxxvii, 18); it tends to corroborate this connection that, on comparing Gen. i, 6 (and seven other passages in the same chapter) with Deut. xxxiii, 26, we find רָקִיעַ of the former sentence, and שְׁחָקִים of the latter, both rendered by the Sept. *στερέωμα* and *firmamentum* in the Vulg., whence the word "*firmament*" passed into our A. V. This word is now a well-understood term in astronomy, synonymous with sky or else the general heavens, undivested by the discoveries of science of the special signification which it bore in the ancient astronomy. See FIRMAMENT. For a clear exposition of all the Scripture passages which bear on the subject, we may refer the reader to professor Dawson's *Archaia*, especially chap. viii, and to Dr. M'Caul on *The Mosaic Record of Creation* (or, what is substantially the same treatise in a more accessible form, his *Notes on the First Chapter of Genesis*, sec. ix, p. 32–44). We must be content here, in reference to our term רָקִיעַ, to observe that, when we regard its origin (from the root רָקַע, *to spread out* or *expand* by beating; Gesen. s. v.; Fuller, *Misc. Sacr.* i, 6; Fürst, *Hebr.-w.-b.* s. v.), and its connection with, and illustration by, such words as שְׁחָקִים, *clouds*, and the verbs טָפַח (Isa. xlviii, 13, "My right hand *hath spread out* the heavens") and נָטָה (Isa. xl, 22, "*Who stretcheth out* the heavens like a curtain" [literally, *like fineness*], "and *spreadeth them out* as a tent"), we are astonished at certain rationalistic attempts to control the meaning of an intelligible term, which fits in easily and consistently with the nature of things, by a few poetical metaphors, that are themselves capable of a consistent sense when held subordinate to the plainer passages of prose. The fuller expression is רְקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם (Gen. i, 14 sq.). That Moses understood it to mean a *solid* expanse is clear from his representing it as the barrier between the upper and lower waters (Gen. i, 6 sq.), i. e. as separating the reservoir of the celestial ocean (Psa. civ, 3; xxix, 3) from the waters of the earth, or those on which the earth was supposed to float (Psa. cxxxvi, 6). Through its open lattices (אֲרֻבּוֹת, Gen. vii, 11; 2 Kings vii, 2, 19; compare *κόσκινον*, Aristophanes, *Nub.* 373) or doors (דַּלְתֵי, Psa. lxxviii, 23) the dew, and snow, and hail are poured upon the earth (Job xxxviii, 22, 37, where we have the curious expression "bottles of heaven," "utres cœli"). This firm vault, which Job describes as being "strong as a molten looking-glass" (xxxvii, 18), is transparent, like pellucid sapphire, and splendid as crystal (Dan. xii, 3; Exod. xxiv, 10; Ezek. i, 22; Rev. iv, 6), over which rests the throne of God (Isa. lxvi, 1; Ezek. i, 26), and which is opened for the descent of angels, or for prophetic visions (Gen. xxviii, 17; Ezek. i, 1: Acts vii, 56; x, 11). In it, like gems or golden lamps, the stars are fixed to give light to the earth, and regulate the seasons (Gen. i, 14–19); and the whole magnificent, immeasurable structure (Jer. xxxi, 37) is supported by the mountains as its pillars, or strong foundations (Psa. xviii, 7; 2 Sam. xxii, 8; Job xxiv, 11). Similarly the Greeks believed in an *οὐρανὸς πολύχαλκος* (Hom. *Il.* v, 504), or *σιδήρεος* (Hom. *Od.* xv, 328), or *ἀδάμαστος* (Orph. *Hymn. ad Cœlum*), which the philosophers called *στερέμνιον* or *κρυσταλλοειδές* (Empedocles, *ap. Plut. de Phil. plac.* ii, 11; Artemid. *ap.* Sen. *Nat. Quæst.* vii, 13; quoted by Gesenius, s. v.). It is clear that very many of the above notions were metaphors resulting from the simple primitive conception, and that later writers among the Hebrews had arrived at more scientific views, although, of course, they retained much of the old phraseology, and are fluctuating and undecided in their terms. Elsewhere, for instance, the heavens are likened to a curtain (Psa. civ, 2; Isa. xl, 22). See COSMOGONY.

IV. *Metaphorical Application of the Visible Heavens.*—A door opened in heaven is the beginning of a new revelation. To ascend up into heaven signifies to be in full power. Thus is the symbol to be understood in Isa. xiv, 13, 14, where the king of Babylon says, "I will ascend into heaven; I will exalt my throne above the stars of God." To descend from heaven signifies, symbolically, to act by a commission from heaven. Thus our Saviour uses the word "descending" (John i, 51) in speaking of the angels acting by divine commission, at the command of the Son of man. To fall from heaven signifies to lose power and authority, to be deprived of the power to govern, to revolt or apostatize.

The *heaven opened.* The natural heaven, being the symbol of the governing part of the political world, a new face in the natural, represents a new face in the political. Or the heaven may be said to be *opened* when the day appears, and consequently *shut* when night comes on, as appears from Virgil (*Æn.* x, 1), "The gates of heaven unfold," etc. Thus the Scripture, in a poetical manner, speaks of the *doors* of heaven (Psa. lxxviii, 23); of the heaven *being shut* (1 Kings viii, 35); and in Ezek. i, 1, the heaven is said to be *opened.*

Midst of heaven may be the air, or the region between heaven and earth; or the middle station between the corrupted earth and the throne of God in heaven. In this sense, the air is the proper place where God's threatenings and judgments should be denounced. Thus, in 1 Chron. xxi, 16, it is said that David saw the angel of the Lord stand between the earth and the heaven as he was just going to destroy Jerusalem with the pestilence. The angel's hovering there was to show that there was room to pray for mercy, just as God was going to inflict the punishment: it had not as yet done any execution.

C. *Spiritual and Everlasting Sense*, i. e. the state and place of blessedness in the life to come. Of the nature of this blessedness it is not possible that we should form any adequate conception, and, consequently, that any precise information respecting it should be given to us. Man, indeed, usually conceives the joys of heaven to be the same as, or at least to resemble, the pleasures of this world; and each one hopes to obtain with certainty, and to enjoy in full measure beyond the grave, that which he holds most dear upon earth—those favorite employments or particular delights which he ardently longs for here, but which he can seldom or never enjoy in this world, or in the enjoyment of which he is never fully satisfied. But one who reflects soberly on the subject will readily see that the happiness of heaven must be a very different thing from earthly happiness. In this world the highest pleasures of which our nature is capable satiate by their continuance, and soon lose the power of giving positive enjoyment. This alone is sufficient to show that the bliss of the future world must be of an entirely different kind from what is called earthly joy and happiness, if we are to be there *truly* happy, and happy *forever.* But since we can have no distinct conception of those joys which never have been and never will be experienced by us here in their full extent, we have, of course, no words in human language to express them, and cannot therefore expect any clear description of them even in the holy Scriptures. Hence the Bible describes this happiness sometimes in general terms, designating its greatness (as in Rom. viii, 18–22; 2 Cor. iv, 17, 18), and sometimes by various figurative images and modes of speech, borrowed from everything which we know to be attractive and desirable.

The greater part of these images were already common among the Jewish contemporaries of Christ; but Christ and his apostles employed them in a purer sense than the great multitude of the Jews. The Orientals

are rich in such figures. They were employed by Mohammed, who carried them, as his manner was, to an extravagant excess, but who at the same time said expressly that they were mere figures, although many of his followers afterwards understood them literally, as has been often done in a similar way by many Christians.

The following are the principal terms, both literal and figurative, which are applied in Scripture to the condition of future happiness.

a. Among the *literal* appellations we find *ζωή*, *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, which, according to Hebrew usage, signify "a happy life," or "eternal well-being," and are the words rendered "life," "eternal life," and "life everlasting" in the A. Vers. (e. g. Matt. vii, 14; xix, 16, 29; xxv, 46): *δόξα*, *δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, "glory," "the glory of God" (Rom. ii, 7, 10; v, 2); and *εἰρηνη*, "peace" (Rom. ii, 10). Also *αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης*, "an eternal weight of glory" (2 Cor. iv, 17); and *σωτηρία*, *σωτηρία αἰώνιος*, "salvation," "eternal salvation" (Heb. v, 9), etc.

b. Among the *figurative* representations we may place the word "heaven" itself. The abode of departed spirits, to us who live upon the earth, and while we remain here, is invisible and inaccessible, beyond the bounds of the visible world, and entirely separated from it. There they live in the highest well-being, and in a nearer connection with God and Christ than here below. This place and state cannot be designated by any more fit and brief expression than that which is found in almost every language, namely, "heaven"—a word in its primary and material signification denoting the region of the skies, or the visible heavens. This word, in Heb. שָׁמַיִם, in Gr. *οὐρανός*, is therefore frequently employed by the sacred writers, as above exemplified. It is there that the highest sanctuary or temple of God is situated, i. e. it is there that the omnipresent God most gloriously reveals himself. This, too, is the abode of God's highest spiritual creation. Thither Christ was transported: he calls it the house of his Father, and says that he has therein prepared an abode for his followers (John xiv, 2).

This place, this "heaven," was never conceived of in ancient times, as it has been by some modern writers, as a particular planet or world, but as the wide expanse of heaven, high above the atmosphere or starry heavens; hence it is sometimes called the *third* heaven, as being neither the atmosphere nor the starry heavens.

Another figurative name is "Paradise," taken from the abode of our first parents in their state of innocence, and transferred to the abode of the blessed (Luke xxiii, 43; 2 Cor. xii, 4; Rev. ii, 7; xxii, 2).

Again, this place is called "the heavenly Jerusalem" (Gal. iv, 26; Heb. xii, 22; Rev. iii, 12), because the earthly Jerusalem was the capital city of the Jews, the royal residence, and the seat of divine worship; the "kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xxv, 1; Jas. ii, 5); the "heavenly kingdom" (2 Tim. iv, 18); the "eternal kingdom" (2 Pet. i, 11). It is also called an "eternal inheritance" (1 Pet. i, 4; Heb. ix, 15), meaning the possession and full enjoyment of happiness, typified by the residence of the ancient Hebrews in Palestine. The blessed are said "to sit down at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," that is, to be a sharer with the saints of old in the joys of salvation; "to be in Abraham's bosom" (Luke xvi, 22; Matt. viii, 11), that is, to sit near or next to Abraham [see BOSOM]; "to reign with Christ" (2 Tim. ii, 11), i. e. to be distinguished, honored, and happy as he is—to enjoy regal felicities; to enjoy "a Sabbath," or "rest" (Heb. iv, 10, 11), indicating the happiness of pious Christians *both* in this life and in the life to come.

All that we can with certainty know or infer from Scripture or reason respecting the blessedness of the life to come may be arranged under the following particulars: I. We shall hereafter be entirely freed from the sufferings and adversities of this life. II. Our future blessedness will involve a continuance of the real happiness of this life.

I. The entire exemption from suffering, and all that causes suffering here, is expressed in Scripture by words which denote rest, repose, refreshment, after performing labor and enduring affliction. But all the terms which are employed to express this condition define (in the original) the promised "rest" as rest after labor, and exemption from toil and grief, and not the absence of employment, not inactivity or indolence (2 Thess. i, 7; Heb. iv, 9, 11; Rev. xiv, 13; compare vii, 17). This deliverance from the evils of our present life includes,

1. Deliverance from this earthly body, the seat of the lower principles of our nature and of our sinful corruption, and the source of so many evils and sufferings (2 Cor. vi, 1, 2; 1 Cor. xv, 42–50).

2. Entire separation from the society of wicked and evil-disposed persons, who in various ways injure the righteous man and embitter his life on earth (2 Tim. iv, 18). It is hence accounted a part of the felicity even of Christ himself in heaven to be "separate from sinners" (Heb. vii, 26).

3. Upon this earth everything is inconstant and subject to perpetual change, and nothing is capable of completely satisfying our expectations and desires. But in the world to come it will be different. The bliss of the saints will continue without interruption or change, without fear of termination, and without satiety (Luke xx, 36; 2 Cor. iv, 16, 18; 1 Pet. i, 4; v, 10; 1 John iii, 2 sq.).

II. Besides being exempt from all earthly trials, and having a continuance of that happiness which we had begun to enjoy even here, we have good reason to expect hereafter other rewards and joys, which stand in no natural or necessary connection with the present life; for our entire felicity would be extremely defective and scanty were it to be confined merely to that which we carry with us from the present world, to that peace and joy of soul which result from reflecting on what we may have done which is good and pleasing in the sight of God, since even the best men will always discover great imperfections in all that they have done. Our felicity would also be incomplete were we compelled to stop short with that meagre and elementary knowledge which we take with us from this world—that knowledge so broken up into fragments, and yielding so little fruit, and which, poor as it is, many good men, from lack of opportunity, and without any fault on their part, never here acquire. Besides the natural rewards of goodness, there must therefore be others which are *positive*, and dependent on the will of the supreme Legislator.

On this point almost all philosophers are, for the above reasons, agreed—even those who will admit of no *positive punishments* in the world to come. But, for want of accurate knowledge of the state of things in the future world, we can say nothing definite and certain as to the nature of the positive rewards. In the doctrine of the New Testament, however, positive rewards are considered most obviously as belonging to our future felicity, and as constituting a principal part of it; for it always represents the joys of heaven as resulting strictly from *the favor of God*, and as being *undeserved* by those on whom they are bestowed. Hence there must be something more added to the natural good consequences of our actions here performed. But on this subject we know nothing more in general than this, that God will so appoint and order our circumstances, and make such arrangements, that the principal faculties of our souls, reason and affection, will be heightened and developed, so that we shall continually obtain more pure and distinct knowledge of the truth, and make continual advances in holiness.

We may remark that in this life God has very wisely allotted various capacities, powers, and talents, in different ways and degrees, to different men, according to the various ends for which he designs them, and the business on which he employs them. Now there is not the least reason to suppose that God will abolish this variety in the future world; it will rather continue

there in all its extent. We must suppose, then, that there will be, even in the heavenly world, a diversity of tastes, of labors, and of employments, and that to one person this, to another that field, in the boundless kingdom of truth and of useful occupation, will be assigned for his cultivation, according to his peculiar powers, qualifications, and tastes. A presentiment of this truth is contained in the idea, which was widely diffused throughout the ancient world, viz. that the *manès* will continue to prosecute in the future life the employments to which they had been here accustomed. At least such arrangements will doubtless be made by God in the future life that each individual will there develop more and more the germs implanted within him by the hand of the Creator; and will be able, more fully than he ever could do here, to satisfy the wants of his intellectual nature, and thus to make continual progress in the knowledge of everything worthy of being known, of which he could only learn the simplest elements in this world; and he will be able to do this in such a way that the increase of knowledge will not be detrimental to piety, as it often proves on earth, but rather promotive of it. To the sincere and ardent searcher after truth it is a rejoicing and consoling thought that he will be able hereafter to perfect that knowledge which here has so many deficiencies (1 Cor. xiii, 9).

But there is danger of going too far on this point, and of falling into strange misconceptions. Various as the tastes and wants of men in the future world will doubtless be, they will still be in many respects different from what they are here, because the whole sphere of action, and the objects by which we shall there be surrounded, will be different. We shall there have a changed and more perfect body, and by this single circumstance shall be freed at once from many of the wants and inclinations which have their seat in the earthly body. This will also contribute much to rectify, enlarge, and perfect our knowledge. Many things which seem to us very important and essential during this our state of infancy upon earth will hereafter doubtless appear in a different light: we shall look upon them as trifles and children's play, and employ ourselves in more important occupations, the utility and interest of which we have never before imagined.

Some theologians have supposed that the saints in heaven may be taught by *immediate divine revelations* (lumen gloriæ), especially those who may enter the abodes of the blessed without knowledge, or with only a small measure of it; e. g. children and others who have died in ignorance, for which they themselves were not to blame. On this subject nothing is definitely taught in the Scriptures, but both Scripture and reason warrant us in believing that provision will be made for all such persons in the world to come. A principal part of our future happiness will consist, according to the Christian doctrine, in the enlarging and correcting of our knowledge respecting God, his nature, attributes, and works, and in the salutary application of this knowledge to our own moral benefit, to the increase of our faith, love, and obedience. There has been some controversy among theologians with regard to the *vision of God* (visio Dei intuitiva, sensitiva, beatifica, comprehensiva). The question is whether the saints will hereafter behold God with the eyes of the mind, i. e. merely know him with the understanding.

But in the Scriptures God is always represented as a being invisible by the bodily eye (ἀόρατος), as, indeed, every spirit is. The texts of Scripture which speak of *seeing God* have been misunderstood: they signify, sometimes, *the more distinct knowledge of God*, as we speak of knowing by seeing, of seeing with the eyes of the mind (John i, 18; 1 John iii, 2; iv, 12; comp. v, 20; 1 Tim. vi, 16); and Paul uses βλέπειν and γινώσκειν as synonymous (1 Cor. xiii, 12, 13; comp. v, 10). Again, they express the idea of *felicity*, the enjoyment of God's favor, the being thought worthy of his friendship, etc. Still more frequently are both of these meanings comprehended under the phrase *to see God*. The image is taken from Oriental princes, to see whose face and to be in whose presence was esteemed a great favor (Matt. v, 8; Heb. vii, 14). "Without holiness, οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν Κύριον." The opposite of this is to be removed from God and from his face. But Christ is always represented as one who will be *personally visible* to us, and whose personal, familiar intercourse and guidance we shall enjoy. Herein Christ himself places a chief part of the joy of the saints (John xiv, xvii, etc.); and the apostles often describe the blessedness of the pious by the phrase *being with Christ*. To his guidance has God intrusted the human race, in heaven and on earth. And Paul says (2 Cor. iv, 6), we see "the brightness of the divine glory in the face of Christ;" he is "the visible representative of the invisible God" (Col. i, 15).

According to the representations contained in the holy Scriptures, the saints will dwell together in the future world, and form, as it were, a kingdom or state of God (Luke xvi; xx, 38; Rom. viii, 10; Rev. vii, 9; Heb. xii, 22). They will there partake of a common felicity. Their enjoyment will doubtless be very much heightened by friendship, and by their confiding intercourse with each other. We must, however, separate all earthly imperfections from our conceptions of this heavenly society. But that we shall there recognise our former friends, and shall be again associated with them, was uniformly believed by all antiquity. And when we call to mind the affectionate manner in which Christ soothed his disciples by the assurance that they should hereafter see him again, should be with him, and enjoy personal intercourse and friendship with him in that place to which he was going (John xiv, 3; comp. 1 Pet. i, 8), we may gather just grounds for this belief. Paul, indeed, says expressly that we shall be with Christ, in company with our friends who died before us (ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς, 1 Thess. iv, 17); and this presupposes that we shall recognise them, and have intercourse with them, as with Christ himself. See ETERNAL LIFE.

HEAVEN AND EARTH is an expression for the whole creation (Gen. i, 1). In prophetic language the phase often signifies the political state or condition of persons of different ranks in this world. The heaven of the political world is the sovereignty thereof, whose host and stars are the powers that rule, namely, kings, princes, counsellors, and magistrates. The earth is the peasantry, plebeians, or common race of men, who possess no power, but are ruled by superiors. Of such a heaven and earth we may understand mention to be made in Hagg. ii, 6; vii, 21, 22, and referred to in Heb. xii, 26. Such modes of speaking were used in Oriental poetry and philosophy, which made a heaven and earth in everything, that is, a superior and inferior in every part of nature; and we learn from Maimonides, quoted by Mede, that the Arabians in his time, when they would express that a man was fallen into some great calamity, said, "His heaven has fallen to the earth," meaning his superiority or prosperity is much diminished. "To look for new heavens and a new earth" (2 Pet. iii, 13) may mean to look for a new order of the present world.

Heave-offering (תְּרוּמָה, *terumah'*, from רוּם, to be *high;* Sept. usually ἀφαίρεμα), a term including all that the Israelites voluntarily (Exod. xxv, 2 sq.; xxxv, 24; xxxvi, 3) or according to a precept (Exod. xxx, 15; Lev. vii, 14; Numb. xv, 19 sq.; xviii, 27 sq.; xxi, 29 sq.; comp. Ezek. xlv, 13) contributed of their own property to Jehovah (not as an offering in the usual sense, but) as a present (Isa. xl, 20), to be applied to the regular cultus, i. e. for the establishment and maintenance of the sanctuary and its accessories (Exod. xxv, 2 sq.; xxx, 13 sq.; xxv, 5 sq., 21, 24; xxvi, 3, 6; Ezra viii, 25, etc.), or for the support of the priests (Exod. xxix, 28; Numb. xviii, 8 sq.; v, 9). Prescribed contributions were, in addition to the annual temple-tax [see TEMPLE], chiefly that share of the booty taken in war which be-

longed to the priests (Numb. xxi, 29 sq.), the yearly first-fruits (Numb. xv, 19 sq.; comp. 2 Sam. i, 21), and the tenths which the Levites were required to make over to the priests out of the natural tithes paid to them (Numb. xviii, 25 sq.; what the Levites retained for their own use not being thus styled). The term תְּרוּמָה seems to stand in a narrower sense in Neh. x, 37; xii, 44; xiii, 3 [see FIRSTLING], and the Talmudists so call only the agricultural first-fruits appropriate to human use, together with the Levitical tenths (see the tract *Terumoth* in the Mishna, i, 6). Heave-offerings are coupled with first-fruits in Ezek. xx, 40, and with tithes in Mal. iii, 8. In Ezek. xlv, 1; xlviii, 8 sq., 12, 20 sq., the same word is applied to that portion of the Holy Land which is represented as set apart for the maintenance of the sanctuary and the priests. For the care of all such contributions, as well as for voluntary offerings and tithes in general, a special class of officers was (from the time of king Hezekiah) detailed, of whom a higher priest had the superintendence (2 Chron. xxi, 11, 12, 14; Neh. xii, 44; xiii, 5). Heave-offerings could be used or consumed only by the priests and their children (Numb. xviii, 19; Lev. xxii, 10). Later regulations are detailed in the Talmudical tract *Terumoth*. Compare WAVE-OFFERING.

Heave-shoulder (שׁוֹק הַתְּרוּמָה, Sept. βραχίων ἀφαιρέματος) is the name applied to the (right) shoulder that fell to the priests in the presentation of animals as a thank-offering (Lev. vii, 34; Numb. vi, 20; xviii, 18), which could be eaten only by such of their families as were in a ceremonially clean state (Lev. x, 14). See OFFERING.

Hebard, ELIJAH, a Methodist Episcopal minister. He was born at Coxsackie, N. Y., Sept. 8, 1788; was converted at thirteen; entered the New York Conference in May, 1811; in 1819 was appointed to New Haven; in 1820 and 21 to New York; in 1834 was transferred to Genesee Conference, and stationed at Rochester; was presiding elder on Ontario District in 1837-40; in 1846 he superannuated; and died at Geneva, N. Y., Jan. 25, 1858. He was a diligent student, a sound theologian, and a good scholar in Greek and Hebrew.—*Minutes of Conferences*, vii, 205.

He'ber, the name of seven men, with a difference of orthography in the original. See also EBER.

1. EBER (Heb. *E'ber*, עֵבֶר, one of the *other side*, i. e. of the river, q. d. immigrant; Sept. Ἔβερ and Ἕβερ, Vulg. *Heber*), son of Salah, who became the father of Peleg at the age of 34 years, and died at the age of 464 (Gen. x, 24; xi, 14; 1 Chron. i, 25). His name occurs in the genealogy of Christ (Luke iii, 35, Ἐβέρ, "Heber"). B.C. 2448-1984. There is a degree of interest connected with him from the notion, which the Jews themselves entertain, that the name of Hebrews, applied to them, was derived from this alleged ancestor of Abraham. No historical ground appears why this name should be derived from him rather than from any other personage that occurs in the catalogue of Shem's descendants; but there are so much stronger objections to every other hypothesis, that this, perhaps, is still the most probable of any which have yet been started. (See Gesenius, *Geschichte der Heb. Sprache und Schrift*, p. 11.) Hence "*the children of Eber*" (בְּנֵי עֵבֶר, Gen. x, 21), and simply in poetry *Eber* (עֵבֶר, Numb. xxiv, 24; Sept. Ἑβραῖοι, Vulg. *Hebræi*), i. q. HEBREWS (עִבְרִים). Several other persons of this (Heb.) name occur, but no others are anywhere Anglicized "Heber."

2. "EBER" (same Heb. word as above; Sept. Ἰωβήδ, Vulg. *Heber*), the last-named of the seven chiefs of the Gadites in Bashan (1 Chron. v, 13, where the name is Anglicized "Heber"). B.C. between 1612 and 1093.

3. EBER (same Hebrew word as above; Sept. Ὠβήδ, Vulg. *Heber*), apparently one of the sons of Shashak, and a chief of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. viii, 22, where the name is Anglicized "Heber"). B.C. ante 598.

4. "HEBER" (*Che'ber*, חֶבֶר, *community*, as in Hos. vi, 9; Prov. xxi, 9; or a *spell*, as in Deut. xviii, 11; Isa. xlvii, 9, 12; Sept. Χόβορ, Χοβέρ, Χάβερ), son of Beriah, and grandson of Asher (Gen. xlvi, 17; 1 Chron. vii, 31, 32). B.C. apparently ante 1873. His descendants are called HEBERITES (Heb. *Chebri'*, חֶבְרִי, Sept. Χοβερί, Numb. xxvi, 45, where the name of the progenitor is written חֵבֶר).

5. "HEBER" (same Heb. word as last, Sept. Χάβερ, Vulg. *Haber*), "a descendant of Hobab, which latter was son of Jethro, and brother of the wife of Moses. His wife was the Jael who slew Sisera (B.C. 1409), and he is called Heber the Kenite (Judg. iv, 11, 17; v, 24), which seems to have been a name for the whole family (Judg. i, 16). Heber appears to have lived separate from the rest of the Kenites, leading a patriarchal life amid his tents and flocks. He must have been a person of some consequence, from its being stated that there was peace between the house of Heber and the powerful king Jabin. At the time the history brings him under our notice, his camp was in the plain of Zaanaim, near Kedesh, in Naphtali" See JAEL; KENITE.

6. "HEBER" (same Heb. word as last, Sept. Ἀβάρ), apparently a son of Mered (of Judah) by Jehudijah, and "father" of Socho (1 Chron. iv, 18). B.C. post 1612. See MERED.

7. "HEBER" (same Heb. word as last, Sept. Ἀβέρ), one of the "sons" of Elpaal, and a chief of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. viii. 17). B.C. apparently cir. 598.

Heber, REGINALD, bishop of Calcutta, was born at Malpas, Cheshire, April 21, 1783. He gave early indications of poetical talent. At thirteen he was placed in the school of a clergyman near London; in November, 1800, he was entered at Brasenose College, Oxford, and in the same year he gained the prize for Latin verse. In the spring of 1803 he wrote his prize poem, *Palestine*, which has obtained a permanent place in English literature. In 1804 he became a fellow of All Souls. About the middle of 1805, in company with Mr. John Thornton, he set out on a Continental tour, and spent a year travelling through Russia, the Crimea, Hungary, Austria, and Prussia. In 1807 he took orders, and was instituted by his brother Richard to the family living at Hodnet. Here, as he himself described, he was in a "half-way situation between a parson and a squire." "While discharging the duties of his parish with great fidelity, he was ardently devoted to the pursuits of literature. He was a frequent contributor to the *Quarterly Review* from its commencement. In 1812 he commenced the preparation of a *Dictionary of the Bible*, on which he labored with much delight; but other duties compelled him to suspend this work, and no part of it was ever published. In the same year he published a small volume of *Hymns adapted to the Weekly Church Service* (new ed. London, 1838, 12mo). The composition of his *Hymns*, with a view of improving the psalmody and devotional poetry used in churches, was also a favorite recreation. He was an elegant versifier, and continued to indulge his poetical talents even while engaged in visiting his diocese in India. He had a great distaste for controversial theology, and only once was engaged in a discussion of this kind, in reply to what he conceived were the unwarrantable imputations of a writer in the *British Critic*. His political views were those of the High Church and Tory party, but quite devoid of bitterness. In 1815 he was appointed Bampton lecturer, and the subject he selected was *The Personality and Office of the Christian Comforter* (2d ed. Lond. 1818, 8vo). In 1817, Dr. Luxmore, the bishop of St. Asaph, appointed Heber to a stall in that cathedral, at the request of his father-in-law the dean. In 1819 he edited the works of bishop Jeremy Taylor (15 vols. 8vo, with *Life of Taylor*). In April, 1822, he was elected preacher of Lincoln's Inn, for which he had formerly been an unsuccessful candidate." In December of that year, the see of Calcutta, vacated by the death of bishop Middleton, was offered to him.

Twice the offer was declined on account of his wife and child, but immediately after the second refusal he wrote (Jan. 12, 1823) stating his willingness to go to India. He congratulated himself upon the fact that no worldly motives led him to this decision. The prospects of usefulness in so grand a field as India overbore all pecuniary considerations, and they had no influence in determining his conduct when the proposition of going to that country was first made to him. Besides, he had often expressed his liking for such a sphere of action, and he had "a lurking fondness for all which belongs to India or Asia." On the 22d of April he saw Hodnet for the last time, and, after having been consecrated, he embarked for his diocese on the 16th of June, 1823. The diocese of Calcutta extended at this time over the whole of India, and embraced Ceylon, the Mauritius, and Australasia. In India the field of the bishop's labors was three times larger than Great Britain and Ireland. The number of chaplains who constituted his staff at Bengal was fixed at twenty-eight, but this number was never completed, and of the number who were appointed several were on furlough. The bishop had no council to assist him, was required to act on his own responsibility, and to write almost every official document with his own hand. On the 15th of June, 1824, bishop Heber began the visitation of his vast diocese. He visited nearly every station of importance in the upper provinces of Bengal and north of Bombay, and after an absence from Calcutta of about eleven months, during which he had seldom slept out of his cabin or tent, he arrived at Bombay. The journal which he kept during his visitation (published under the title *Narrative of a Journey in Upper India*, Lond. 1829, 3 vols. 8vo, since reprinted in Murray's *Home and Colonial Library*) shows the extent of his observations on general subjects, and the graphic power which he possessed of describing the novel scenes in which he was placed. From April to August he remained at Bombay to investigate and superintend the interests of the western portion of his diocese. On the 15th of August he sailed for Ceylon, and after remaining there some time he proceeded to Calcutta, which he reached on the 21st of October. If it had been possible to have educated his children in India, he was now prepared, he states, to end his days among the objects of his solicitude. In February, 1826, he left Calcutta for Madras to visit the southern provinces. On the 1st of April he arrived at Trichinopoli, and on the 3d, after investigating the state of the mission and confirming fifteen natives, on whom he bestowed the episcopal benediction in the Tamul language, he retired to use a cold bath, in which he was found dead about half an hour afterwards. Within less than three weeks he would have completed his forty-third year. The candor, modesty, and simplicity of bishop Heber's manners, his unwearied earnestness, and his mild and steady zeal, combined with his talents and attainments, had inspired veneration and respect not only among the European, but the native population of India" (*English Cyclopædia*, s. v.). In theology he was an Arminian. His whole life, after his elevation to the episcopate, was devoted to its great duties. He had a profound faith in the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and of their adaptation to the heathen. His heart daily breathed the most earnest wishes for the diffusion of its precious blessings. His tastes and pursuits were all subordinated to that grand object, and, had he been spared to the usual term of life, there is no doubt that a career, begun in the spirit and prosecuted on the system of itinerancy he had adopted, would have yielded a rich harvest of spiritual fruit to the Lord of his vineyard. Besides the works above mentioned, he published *Parish Sermons* (Lond. 1844, 5th ed. 2 vols. 8vo). His *Poetical Works* are printed in various editions. See *Life of Heber*, by his Widow (Lond. 1830, 2 vols. 4to); Robinson, *Last Days of Heber* (1830, 8vo); *Memoir of Heber*, abridged from the large ed. (Boston, 1856, 12mo); Krohn, *H.'s Leben u. Nachrichten über Indien* (Berlin, 1831, 2 vols.); *Quarterly Review* (London), xliii, 366; *Edinburgh Review*, lii, 431; Villemain, *Revue des deux Mondes*, Dec. 15, 1857; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 606.

He'berite (Numb. xxvi, 45). See HÉBER, 4.

Hebrew (Heb. *Ibri'*, עִבְרִי, plur. עִבְרִים or עִבְרִיִּים, Exod. iii, 18; fem. עִבְרִיָּה, "Hebrewess," plur. עִבְרִיּוֹת, Greek Ἑβραῖος), a designation of the people of Israel, used first of their progenitor Abraham (Gen. xiv, 13; Sept. τῷ περάτῃ). This name is never in Scripture applied to the Israelites except when the speaker is a foreigner (Gen. xxxix, 14, 17; xli, 12; Exod. i, 16; ii, 6; 1 Sam. iv, 6, 9, etc.), or when Israelites speak of themselves to one of another nation (Gen. xl, 15; Exod. i, 19; Jonah i, 9, etc.), or when they are contrasted with other peoples (Gen. xliii, 32; Exod. i, 3, 7, 15; Deut. xv, 12; 1 Sam. xiii, 3, 7). See Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* s. v. (The only apparent exception is Jer. xxxiv, 9; but here there is probably such an implied contrast between the Jews and other peoples as would bring the usage under the last case.) By the Greek and Latin writers this is the name by which the descendants of Jacob are designated when they are not called Jews (Pausan. v. 5, 2; vi, 24, 6; Plut. *Sympos.* iv, 6, 1; Tacit. *Hist.* v, 1); and Josephus, who affects classical peculiarities, constantly uses it. In the N. T. we find the same contrast between Hebrews and foreigners (Acts vi, 1; Phil. iii, 5): the Hebrew language is distinguished from all others (Luke xxiii, 38; John v, 2; xix, 13; Acts xxi, 40; xxvi, 14; Rev. ix, 11); while in 2 Cor. xi, 22 the word is used as only second to *Israelite* in the expression of national peculiarity. On these facts two opposing hypotheses have been raised; the one that Israelite or Jew was the name by which the nation designated itself (just as the Welsh call themselves *Cymry*, though in speaking of themselves to a Saxon they would probably use the name *Welsh*); the other is that "Hebrew" is a national name, merely indicative of the people as a people, while Israelite is a sacred or religious name appropriate to them as the chosen people of God. This latter opinion Gesenius dismisses as "without foundation" (*Lexicon* by Robinson, s. v.), but it has received the deliberate sanction of Ewald (*Ausführl. Lehrb. der Heb. Spr.* p. 18, 5th ed.).

Derivation of the Name.—I. From Abram, *Abræi*, and by euphony *Hebræi* (August., Ambrose). Displaying, as it does, the utmost ignorance of the language, this derivation was never extensively adopted, and was even retracted by Augustine (*Retract.* 16). The euphony alleged by Ambrose is quite imperceptible, and there is no parallel in the Lat. *meridie*=*medidie*.

II. According to the sacred writer, עברי, *Hebrew*, is a derivative from עבר, Eber, the ancestor of Abraham; at least the same persons who are called Hebrews are called בני עבר, *sons of Eber* (Gen. x, 21); and עבר, *Eber* (Numb. xxiv, 24); and this is tantamount to a derivation of the name Hebrew from Eber. In support of this, it may be urged that עברי is the proper form which a patronymic from עבר would assume; according to the analogy of מואבי, *a Moabite*, דני, *a Danite*, כלבי, *a Calebite*, etc. (Hiller, *Onomast. Sac.* c. xiv, p. 231 sq.). What adds much force to this argument is the evident antithesis in Gen. xiv, 13, between אברם הצברי and ממרא האמרי; the former of these is as evidently a patronymic as the latter. This view is supported by Josephus, Suidas, Bochart, Vatablus, Drusius, Vossius, Buxtorf, Hottinger, Leusden, Whiston, and Bauer. Theodoret (*Quæst. in Gen.* 61) urges against it that the Hebrews were not the only descendants of Eber, and, therefore, could not appropriate his name; and the objection has often been repeated. To meet it, recourse has been had to the suggestion, first adduced, we believe, by Ibn Ezra (*Comment. ad Jon.* i, 9), that the descendants of Abraham retained the name Hebrew from Eber, because

they alone of his descendants retained the faith which he held. This may be, but we are hardly entitled to *assume* it in order to account for the fact before us. It is better to throw the *onus probandi* on the objector, and to demand of him, in our ignorance of what determined the use of such patronymics in one line of descent and not in others, that he should show cause why it is inconceivable that Abraham might have a good and sufficient reason for wishing to perpetuate the memory of his descent from Eber, which did not apply to the other descendants of that patriarch. Why might not one race of the descendants of Eber call themselves by pre-eminence sons of Eber, just as one race of the descendants of Abraham called themselves by pre-eminence sons of Abraham. But Eber, it is objected, is a name of no note in the history; we know nothing of him to entitle him to be selected as the person after whom a people should call themselves. But is our ignorance to be the measure of the knowledge of Abraham and his descendants on such a point? Because *we* know nothing to distinguish Eber, does it follow that *they* knew nothing? Certain it is that he was of sufficient importance to reflect a glory on his father Shem, whose highest designation is "the father of all the children of Eber" (Gen. x, 21); and certain it is that his name lingered for many generations in the region where he resided, for it was as "Eber" that the Mesopotamian prophet knew the descendants of Jacob, and spoke of them when they first made their appearance in warlike force on the borders of the promised land (Numb. xxiv, 24).

On the other hand, it is contended that the passage Gen. x, 21 is not so much genealogical as ethnographical; and in this view it seems that the words are intended to contrast Shem with Ham and Japhet, and especially with the former. Now Babel is plainly fixed as the extreme east limit of the posterity of Ham (ver. 10), from whose land Nimrod went out into Assyria (ver. 11, margin of A. Vers.): in the next place, Egypt (ver. 13) is mentioned as the western limit of the same great race; and these two extremes having been ascertained, the historian proceeds (ver. 15–19) to fill up his ethnographic sketch with the intermediate tribes of the Canaanites. In short, in ver. 6–20 we have indications of three geographical points which distinguish the posterity of Ham, viz. Egypt, Palestine, and Babylon. At the last-mentioned city, at the river Euphrates, their proper occupancy, unaffected by the exceptional movement of Asshur, terminated, and at the same point that of the descendants of Shem began. Accordingly, the sharpest contrast that could be devised is obtained by generally classing these latter nations as those *beyond* the river Euphrates; and the words "father of all the children of Eber," i. e. father of the nations to the east of the Euphrates, find an intelligible place in the context.

It must also be confessed that in the genealogical scheme in Gen. xi, 10–26, it does not appear that the Jews thought of Eber as a source primary, or even secondary of the national descent. The genealogy neither starts from him, nor in its uniform sequence does it rest upon him with any emphasis. There is nothing to distinguish Eber above Arphaxad, Peleg, or Serug. Like them, he is but a link in the chain by which Shem is connected with Abraham. Indeed, the tendency of the Iraelitish retrospect is to stop at Jacob. It is with Jacob that their history as a nation begins: beyond Jacob they held their ancestry in common with the Edomites; beyond Isaac they were in danger of being confounded with the Ishmaelites. The predominant figure of the emphatically *Hebrew* Abraham might tempt them beyond those points of affinity with other races, so distasteful, so anti-national; but it is almost inconceivable that they would voluntarily originate and perpetuate an appellation of themselves which landed them on a platform of ancestry where they met the whole population of Arabia (Gen. x, 25, 30).

III. Hence others (as Jerome, Theodoret, Origen, Chrysost., Arias Montanus, R. Bechai, Paul Burg., Munster, Grotius, Scaliger, Selden, Rosenm., Gesenius, and Eichhorn) prefer tracing עברי to the verb עָבַר, *to pass over*, or the noun עֵבֶר, *the region or country beyond.* By those who favor the former etymology, "Hebrew" is regarded as equivalent to "the man who passed over;" by those who favor the latter, it is taken to mean "the man from the region beyond;" and under both suppositions it is held to be applied by the Canaanites to Abraham as having crossed the Euphrates, or come from the region beyond the Euphrates to Canaan. Of these etymologies the former is now generally abandoned; it is felt that the supposition that the crossing of the Euphrates was such an unparalleled achievement as to fix on him who accomplished it a name that should descend to his posterity, and become a national appellation, is somewhat too violent to be maintained; and, besides, as the verb עבר signifies to pass from *this* side to *that*, not from *that* side to *this*, it would not be the term applied by the people of Canaan to designate the act of one who had come from the other side of the Euphrates *to* them. The other etymology has more in its favor. It is that sanctioned by the Greek translators (Sept. ὁ περάτης, Aq. περαίτης); it is in accordance with the usage of the phrase עֵבֶר הַנָּהָר, which was employed to designate the region beyond the Euphrates (Josh. xxiv, 2, 3; 2 Sam. x, 16; 1 Chron. xix, 16); and it is not improbable that Abraham, coming among the Canaanites from beyond the Euphrates, might be designated by them "the man from the region beyond," just as Europeans might call an American "a transatlantic." But, though Bleek very confidently pronounces this view "without doubt the right one" (*Einleitung ins A. T.* p. 72), it is open to serious, if not fatal objections.

1. There is no instance of עבר by itself denoting the region beyond the Euphrates, or any other river; the phrase invariably used is עבר הנהר. Rosenmüller, following Hyde (*Histor. Relig. Vet. Pers.* p. 51), seeks to supply this desiderated instance by taking עבר as epexegetical of אשור in Numb. xxiv, 24 = "affligant Assyriam et totam transfluvialem regionem." But the learned writer has in his zeal overlooked the second עבר, which quite precludes his exegesis. Knobel avoids this error by simply taking אשור = Assyria, and עבר = Mesopotamia; but in this case it is the proper name עֵבֶר, *Eber*, and not the preposition עֵבֶר, *trans*, which is in question. 2. If עברי was the proper designation of those who lived on the other side of the Euphrates, we should find that name applied to such as *continued* to dwell there, not to a race descended from one who had left that region never to return. 3. Though Abraham, as having been originally a transfluvian, might be so called by the Canaanites, it is improbable that they should have extended this name to his posterity, to whom it in no sense applied. No one would think of continuing the term "transatlantic" to persons born in Britain on the ground that a remote ancestor had come from across the Atlantic to settle in that country! As to the sanction which this etymology derives from the Sept., no great weight can be attached to that when we remember how often these translators have erred in this way; and also that they have given ἑβραίους as the rendering of בני עבר in Numb. xxiv, 24; "Plus vice simplici hallucinati sunt interpretes Græci eorum ut nobis standum cadendumve non sit autoritate" (Carpzov, *Crit. Sac. V. T.* p. 171). We may add that the authority of the Sept. and Aquila on such a point is urged with a bad grace by those who treat with contempt the etymologies of the Hebrew text as resting on mere Jewish tradition; if a Jewish tradition of the time of Moses is subject to suspicion, *à fortiori* is one of the age of Ptolemy Lagi and of Alexandrian origin. Ewald pronounces this derivation "quite uncertain." 4. This

derivation is open to the strong objection that Hebrew nouns ending in י are either patronymics or gentilic nouns (Buxtorf, Leusden). This is a technical objection which—though fatal to the περάτης, or *appellative* derivation as traced back to the verb—does not apply to the same as referred to the noun עֵבֶר. The analogy of Galli, Angli, Hispani, derived from Gallia, Anglia, Hispania (Leusden), is a complete blunder in ethnography; and, at any rate, it would confirm rather than destroy the derivation from the noun.

IV. Parkhurst, whose works occasionally present suggestions worth consideration, has advanced the opinion that עברי is a derivation from the verb עבר in the sense of *passing through* or *from place to place* (compare Gen. xviii, 5; Exod. xxxii, 27; Ezek. xxxv, 7; 2 Chron. xxx, 10, etc.); so that its meaning would be *a sojourner* or *passer through*, as distinct from a *settler* in the land. This undoubtedly exactly describes the condition of Abraham and his immediate descendants, and might very naturally be assumed by them as a designation; for, as the apostle says, "they confessed they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth" (Heb. xi, 13). In this case the statement in Gen. x, 21; Numb. xxiv, 24, must be understood as referring to the posterity of Eber generally, and not to the Hebrews specially or exclusively. The most serious objection to Parkhurst's suggestion arises from the form of the word עברי. A word from עבר, to convey the meaning of *transitor*, or *one passing through*, we should expect to find in the form עוֹבֵר or עֹבֵר.

On the whole. the derivation of *Ibri* (Hebrew) from *Eber* seems to have most in its favor and least against it. (See on this side Augustine, *De Civit. Dei*, vi, 11; Buxtorf, *Diss.* iii, 27; Bochart, *Phaleg*, ii, 14; Hottinger, *Thes. Phil.* p. 4; Leusden, *Phil. Heb.* Diss. xxi; Morinus, *De Ling. Primæv.* p. 64; Pfeiffer, *Diff. Script. Locc.*, *Opp.* p. 49; Carpzov, *Crit. Sac.* p. 165; Hezel, *Gesch. d. Hebr. Spr.* sec. 4; Ewald, *Ausführl. Lehrbuch der Heb. Gram.* p. 19, 5th edit.; *Geschichte des V. Israel*, i, 334; Hävernick, *Introd. to the O. Test.* p. 125; Baumgarten, *Theol. Comment. zum Pent.* ad loc. On the other side, see Theodoret, *Quæst. in Gen.* 16; Chrysost., *Hom.* 35 *in Gen.*; Selden, *De Diis Syris*, p. 13; Walton, *Prolegg.* p. 15 sq., in Dathe's edit. p. 68; Gussetius, *Comment. Ling. Heb.* Diss. Proem. p. 7; Michaelis, *Spicileg. Geogr. Heb. Ext.* ii, 66; Gesenius, *Gesch. der Heb. Spr.* p. 11; *Grammar*, sec. 2.) See JEW.

HEBREW OF THE HEBREWS (Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων, emphatically a Hebrew, one who was so by both parents, and that by a long series of ancestors, without admixture of Gentile or even proselyte blood. In this way the Hebrews formed a superlative of intensity—as "holy of holies," i. e. the most holy place; "vanity of vanities," i. e. exceedingly vain; "heaven of heavens," i. e. the highest heaven. Hence Paul, when speaking of the ground of precedence which he might claim above the false teachers at Philippi, says that "*he is a Hebrew of the Hebrews*" (Phil. iii, 5), i. e. one of full Hebrew descent, and acquainted with the Hebrew language. Although he was born at Tarsus, he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel in Jerusalem (Acts xxii, 3). To this same fact he seems to appeal again in a similar case, "*Are they Hebrews? so am I*" (2 Cor. xi, 22). He was a *genuine* Hebrew man in *every* important respect (Acts xxi, 39, 40).

HEBREWS, THE (Acts vi, 1), i. e. Hebrew-speaking Jews, in contrast with those speaking the Greek language. See HELLENIST.

Hebrew Language, the language of the Hebrew people, and of the Old-Testament Scriptures, with the exception of the few chapters written in Chaldee. See CHALDEE LANGUAGE. The importance of this subject in a religious and especially an exegetical aspect justifies a somewhat copious treatment of it here. (See Ewald's *Hebrew Grammar*, § 1-18, 135-160.)

In the Bible this language is nowhere designated by the name *Hebrew*, but this is not surprising when we consider how rarely that name is employed to designate the nation. See HEBREW. If we except the terms "lip of Canaan" (שְׂפַת כְּנַעַן) in Isa. xix, 18—where the diction is of an elevated character, and is so far no evidence that this designation was the one commonly employed—the only name by which the Hebrew language is mentioned in the Old Testament is "Jewish" (יְהוּדִית, used adverbially, *Judaicè, in Jewish*, 2 Kings xviii, 26, 28; Isa. xxxvi, 11, 13; 2 Chron. xxxii, 18 [in Neh. xiii, 24, perhaps the *Aramaic* is meant]), where the feminine may be explained as an abstract of the last formation, according to Ewald's *Hebr. Gram.* § 344, 457, or as referring to the usual gender of לָשׁוֹן understood. In a strict sense, however, "Jewish" denotes the idiom of the kingdom of Judah, which became the predominant one after the deportation of the ten tribes. It is in the Greek writings of the later Jews that "Hebrew" is first applied to the language, as in the ἑβραϊστί of the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, and in the γλῶσσα τῶν Ἑβραίων of Josephus. (The ἑβραῒς διάλεκτος of the New Testament is used in contradistinction to the idiom of the Hellenist Jews, and does not mean the *ancient* Hebrew language, but the then vernacular Aramaic dialect of Palestine.) Our title to use the designation *Hebrew* language is therefore founded on the fact that the nation which spoke this idiom was properly distinguished by the ethnographical name of *Hebrews*.

The Hebrew language belongs to the class of languages called Shemitic—so called because spoken chiefly by nations enumerated in Scripture among the descendants of Shem. The Sanscrit, Persian, Greek, Latin, with the Germanic and Celtic languages, are the principal members of another large class or group of languages, to which have been affixed the various names of Japhetic, Indo-European, Indo-Germanic, and Aryan. This latter class embraces most of the languages of Europe, including of course our own. The student, therefore, who, besides mastering his own language, has passed through a course of Greek, Latin, French, and German (and few of our students, except with a professional view, extend their linguistic studies farther), has not, after all his labor, got beyond the limits of the same class of languages to which his mother tongue belongs, and of which it forms one of the most important members. But when he passes to the study of the Hebrew language he enters a new field, he observes new phenomena, he traces the operation of new laws.

I. *Characteristics of the Shemitic Languages, and in particular of the Hebrew.*—1. With respect to *sounds*, the chief peculiarities are the four following:

(1.) The predominance of *guttural* sounds. The Hebrew has four or (we may say) five guttural sounds, descending from the slender and scarcely perceptible throat-breathing represented by the first letter of the alphabet (א) through the decided aspirate ה, to the strong ח and gurgling ע. To these we must add ר, which partakes largely of the guttural character. Nor were these sounds sparingly employed; on the contrary, they were in more frequent use than any other class of letters. In the Hebrew dictionary the four gutturals occupy considerably more than a fourth part of the whole volume, the remaining eighteen letters occupying considerably less than three fourths. This predominance of guttural sounds must have given a very marked character to the ancient Hebrew, as it does still to the modern Arabic.

(2.) The use of the very strong letters ט, צ, ק, which may be represented by *tt* or *ts*, *q*, in pronouncing which the organ is more compressed and the sound given forth with greater vehemence. These letters, especially the last two, are also in frequent use.

When the Greeks borrowed their alphabet from the Phœnicians, they softened or dropped these strong let-

ters (ט being softened into θ, and צ, ק being dropped except as marks of number), and changed the guttural letters into the vowels α, ε, η, o.

(3.) The Shemitic languages do not admit, like the Indo-European, of an accumulation or grouping of consonants around a single vowel sound. In such words as *craft*, *crush*, *grind*, *strong*, *stretch*, we find four, five, and six consonants clustering around a single vowel. The Shemitic languages reject such groupings, usually interposing a vowel sound more or less distinct after each consonant. It is only at the end of a word that two consonants may stand together without any intermediate vowel sound; and even in that case various expedients are employed to dispense with a combination which is evidently not in accordance with the genius of the language.

(4.) The vowels, although thus copiously introduced, are nevertheless kept in strict subordination to the consonants; so much so that it is only in rare and exceptional cases that any word or syllable begins with a vowel. In Hebrew we have no such syllables as *ab*, *ag*, *ad*, in which the initial sound is a pure vowel; but only *ba*, *ga*, *da*. If Sir H. Rawlinson is correct, it would appear that the Assyrian language differed from the other Shemitic languages in this particular. In his syllabic alphabet a considerable number of the syllables begin with a vowel.

If we endeavor to calculate the effect of the foregoing peculiarities on the character of the language, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the Shemitic languages are of a more primitive type than the European—much less matured, polished, compacted—the natural utterance of a mind vehement and passionate, impulsive rather than calmly deliberative.

2. With respect to *roots* and *words*, the Shemitic languages are distinguished in a very marked manner: (1.) *By the three-letter root.* This is one of the most striking characteristics of these languages, as it does not appear that there is any language not belonging to this class in the formation of whose roots the same law has been at work. It is very difficult to ascertain the origin of this singular phenomenon. It may possibly be regarded as a kind of equivalent for the compound roots of other languages (which are altogether wanting in the Shemitic); an original *two-letter* root being enlarged and expanded into a greater or less number of *three-letter* roots, for the purpose of giving expression to the various modifications and shades of the primitive root idea. The attempt has indeed been made, and with no small measure of success, to point out and specify the two-letter roots from which the existing three-letter roots have been derived; but it has been properly remarked that such an investigation carries us quite away from the Shemitic province. When we reach the two-letter root we have left behind us the Shemitic languages altogether, and drawn forth a new language, which might be regarded, did we not know that the most ancient is not always the most simple, as the one primeval language of mankind. By "three-letter roots" we mean those having three consonants forming a dissyllable, and we must except from our remarks those containing the so-called weak letters, which assimilate themselves very strongly to the monosyllabic roots of primitive verbs in the Indo-European group of languages. See PHILOLOGY, COMPARATIVE.

(2.) The consideration of the Hebrew three-letter root, and its possible growth out of a more original two-letter root, leads on to the notice of another prominent feature of the Shemitic languages, viz. *the further growth and expansion of the three-letter root itself into a variety of what are called conjugational forms, expressing intensity, reflexiveness, causation*, etc. A similar formation may be traced in all languages; in some non-Shemitic languages, as the Turkish, it is very largely and regularly developed (Max Müller, *Lectures on Science of Language*, p. 318, etc.). In English we have examples in such verbs as *sit* and *set*, *lie* and *lay*, *set* being the causative of *sit*, *lay* of *lie*; or we may say *sit* is the reflexive of *set*, and *lie* of *lay*. So in Latin *sedo* and *sedeo*, *jacio* and *jaceo*, etc., in which latter root the conjugational formation is still farther developed into *jacto* and *jactito*. But what in these languages is fragmentary and occasional, in Hebrew and the cognate languages is carried out and expanded with fulness and regularity, and consequently occupies a large space in the Shemitic grammar. The conjugations are of three sorts: (*a*) Those expressing *intensity*, *repetition*, etc., which are usually distinguished by some change *within* the root; (*b*) those expressing *reflexiveness*, *causation*, etc., which are usually distinguished by some *addition to* the root; (*c*) the *passives*, distinguished by the presence of the *u* or *o* sound in the first syllable.

(3.) Another prominent distinction of the Shemitic languages is *the extent to which modifications of the root idea are indicated, not by additions to the root, but by changes within the root.* "The Shemitic roots," says Bopp (*Comparative Grammar of the Indo-European Tongues*, i, 99), "on account of their construction, possess the most surprising capacity for indicating the secondary ideas of grammar by the mere internal moulding of the root, while the Sanscrit roots at the first grammatical movement are compelled to assume external additions." These internal changes are principally of two sorts:

(*a*) *Vowel changes.* Nothing is more remarkable in the Shemitic languages than the significance of their vowel sounds; the sharp *a* sound, formed by opening the mouth wide, being associated as a symbol with the idea of activity, while the *e* and *o* sounds are the symbols of rest and passiveness. In the Arabic verb this characteristic is very marked, many of the roots appearing under three forms, each having a different vowel, and the signification being modified in accordance with the nature of that vowel. The same law appears in the formation of the passives. Thus *katala*—pass. *kutela*.

(*b*) *Doubling of consonants*, usually of the middle letter of the root. By means of this most simple and natural device, the Shemitic languages express *intensity* or *repetition* of action, and also such qualities as prompt to repeated action, as *righteous*, *merciful*, etc. By comparing this usage with the expression of the corresponding ideas in our own language, we observe at once the difference in the genius of the two languages. We say *merciful*, *sinful*, i. e. full of mercy, full of sin. Not so the Shemitic. What we express formally by means of an added root, the Shemitic indicates by a sign, by simply laying additional stress on one of the root letters. And thus again the observation made under the head *sound* recurs, viz. that in the formation of the Shemitic languages the dominant influence was that of instinctive feeling, passion, imagination—the hand of nature appearing everywhere, the voice of nature heard in every utterance: in this, how widely separated from the artificial and highly organized languages of the Indo-European family (Adelung, *Mithridates*, i, 361).

(4.) The influence of the imagination on the structure of the Shemitic languages is further disclosed in *the view which they present of nature and of time.* To these languages a neuter gender is unknown. All nature viewed by the Shemitic eye appears instinct with life. *The heavens declare God's glory; the earth showeth his handiwork. The trees of the field clap their hands and sing for joy.* This, though the impassioned utterance of the Hebrew poet, expresses a common national feeling, which finds embodiment even in the structure of the national language. Of inanimate nature the Hebrew knows nothing: he sees life everywhere. His language therefore rejects the neuter gender, and classes all objects, even those which we regard as inanimate, as masculine or feminine, according as they appear to his imagination to be endowed with male or female attributes. As his imagination thus endowed the lower forms of nature with living properties, so, on the other hand, under the same influence, he clothed with mate-

rial and sensible form the abstract, the spiritual, even the divine. In Hebrew the abstract is constantly expressed by the concrete—the mental quality by the bodily member which was regarded as its fittest representative. Thus *hand* or *arm* stands for *strength;* אַף, *nostril*, means also *anger;* the *shining of the face* stands for *favor* and *acceptance*, the *falling of the face* for *displeasure.* So also to *say* often means to *think;* to *speak with one mouth* stands for *to be of the same sentiment.* The verb to *go* is employed to describe *mental* as well as bodily *progress.* One's *course of life* is his *way*, *the path of his feet.* Nor only in its description of nature, but also in its *mode of indicating time*, do we observe the same predominant influence. The Shemitic tense system, especially as it appears in Hebrew, is extremely simple and primitive. It is not threefold like ours, distributing time into past, present, and future, but twofold. The two so-called *tenses* or rather *states* of the verb correspond to the division of nouns into abstract and concrete. The verbal idea is conceived of either in its realization or in its non-realization, whether actual or ideal. That which lies before the mind as realized, whether in the actual past, present, or future, the Hebrew describes by means of the so-called preterite tense; that which he conceives of as yet to be realized or in process of realization, whether in the actual past, present, or future, he describes by means of the so-called future tense. Hence the use of the future in certain combinations as a historical tense, and of the so-called preterite in certain combinations as a prophetic tense. Into the details of the tense usages which branch out from this primitive idea we cannot now enter. It is in the structural laws of the Hebrew language that its influence is most strongly marked: in the Aramæan it is almost lost. (See Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, § 134 *a; Journal of Sacred Literature* for Oct. 1849.)

(5.) The influence of the imagination upon the structure of the Shemitic languages may also be traced in the *absence of not a few grammatical forms which we find in other languages.* Much that is definitely expressed in more highly developed languages is left in the Shemitic languages, and especially in the Hebrew, to be caught up by the hearer or reader. In this respect there is an analogy between the language itself and the mode in which it was originally represented in writing. Of the language as written, the vowel sounds formed no part. The reader must supply these mentally as he goes along. So with the language itself. It has not a separate and distinct expression for every shade and turn of thought. Much is left to be filled in by the hearer or the reader, and this usually without occasioning any serious inconvenience or difficulty. The Shemitic languages, however, do not all stand on the same level in this respect. In the Syriac, and still more in the Arabic, the expression of thought is usually more complete and precise than in Hebrew, though often for that very reason less animated and impressive. A principal defect in these languages, and especially in the Hebrew, is the fewness of the particles. The extreme simplicity of the verbal formation also occasions to the European student difficulties which can be surmounted only by a very careful study of the principles by which the verb-usages are governed.

In this respect the Hebrew occupies a middle position between those languages which consist almost entirely of roots with a very scanty grammatical development, and the Indo-European class of languages in which the attempt is made to give definite expression even to the most delicate shades of thought. The Greek, says Paul, seeks after wisdom: he reasons, compares, analyzes. The Jew requires a sign—something to strike the imagination and carry conviction to the heart at once without any formal and lengthened argument. The Greek language, therefore, in its most perfect form, was the offspring of reason and taste; the Hebrew, of imagination and intuition. The Shemites have been the quarriers whose great rough blocks the Japhethites have cut, and polished, and fitted one to another. The former, therefore, are the teachers of the world in religion, the latter in philosophy. This peculiar character of the Shemitic mind is very strongly impressed upon the language.

A national language being an embodiment and picture of the national mind, there is thus thrown around the otherwise laborious and uninteresting study of grammar, even in its earliest stages, an attractive power and value which would not otherwise belong to it. It was the same mind that found expression in the Hebrew language, which gave birth, under the influence of divine inspiration, to the sublime revelations of the Old-Testament Scriptures. And it would be easy to trace an analogy between these revelations and the language in which they have been conveyed to us. It is curious to find that even the divinest thoughts and names of the Old Testament connect themselves with questions in Hebrew grammar. Thus, when we investigate the nature and use of the Hebrew plural, and discover from a multitude of examples that it is employed not only to denote *plurality*, but likewise *extension*, whether in space or time, as in the Hebrew words for *life*, *youth*, *old age*, etc., and also whatever seems bulky before the mind, we are unwittingly led on to one of the most important questions in the criticism of the Old Testament, viz. the origin of the plural form of the divine name אלהים (*Elohim*), in our version rendered *God.* Or, again, when we study the difficult question of the *tenses*, and endeavor to determine the exact import and force of each, we speedily discover that the grammatical investigation we are pursuing is one of unspeakable moment, for it involves the right apprehension of that most sacred name of God which the Jew still refuses to take upon his lips, the four-letter name יהוה, *Jehovah* (q. v.).

3. In the *syntax* and *general structure* of the Shemitic languages and writings we trace the operation of the same principles, the same tendencies of mind which manifest themselves in the structure of *words.* In this respect the Hebrew language exhibits a more simple and primitive type than any of the sister tongues. The simplicity of the Hebrew composition is very obvious even to the reader of the English Bible, or to the scholar who compares the Greek Testament, the style of which is formed on the model of the Old Testament, with the classical Greek writers. We observe at once that there is no such thing as the building up of a lengthened period, consisting of several propositions duly subordinated and compacted so as to form a harmonious and impressive whole. Hebrew composition consists rather of a succession of co-ordinate propositions, each of which is for the moment uppermost in the view of the speaker or writer, until it is superseded by that which follows. This results at once from the character of the Shemitic mind, which was more remarkable for rapid movements and vivid glances than for large and comprehensive grasp. Such a mind would give forth its thoughts in a rapid succession of independent utterances rather than in sustained and elaborated composition. It is a consequence of the same mental peculiarity that the highest poetry of the Shemitic nations is lyrical.

The Hebrew composition is also extremely *pictorial* in its character—not the poetry only, but also the prose. In the history the past is not described, it is painted. It is not the ear that hears, it is rather the eye that sees. The course of events is made to pass before the eye; the transactions are all acted over again. The past is not a fixed landscape, but a moving panorama. The reader of the English Bible must have remarked the constant use of the word *behold*, which indicates that the writer is himself, and wishes to make his reader also, a spectator of the transactions he describes. The use of the tenses in the Hebrew historical writings is specially remarkable. To the young student of Hebrew the constant use of the *future* tense in the description of the *past* appears perhaps the most striking pe-

culiarity of the language. But the singular phenomenon admits of an easy explanation. It was because the Hebrew viewed and described the transactions of the past, not as all past and done, but as in actual process and progress of evolvement, that he makes such frequent use of the so-called future. In imagination he quits his own point of time, and lives over the past. With his reader he sails down the stream of time, and traces with open eye the winding course of history. It is impossible always to reproduce exactly in English this peculiarity of the Hebrew Bible.

Further, in writing even of the commonest actions, as that one *went*, *spoke*, *saw*, etc., the Hebrew is not usually satisfied with the simple statement that the thing was done, he must describe also the process of doing. We are so familiar with the style of our English Bibles that we do not at once perceive the pictorial character of such expressions as these, recurring in every page: *he arose and went; he opened his lips and spake; he put forth his hand and took; he lifted up his eyes and saw; he lifted up his voice and wept.* But what we do not consciously perceive we often unconsciously feel; and doubtless it is this painting of events which is the source of part at least of the charm with which the Scripture narrative is invested to all pure and simple minds.

The same effect is also produced by the *symbolical way of representing mental states and processes* which distinguishes the Hebrew writers. Such expressions as *to bend* or *incline the ear* for "to hear attentively," to *stiffen the neck* for "to be stubborn and rebellious," to *uncover the ear* for "to reveal," are in frequent use. Even the acts of the Divine Mind are depicted in a similar way. In the study especially of the Old Testament we must keep this point carefully in view, lest we should err by giving to a symbolical expression a literal interpretation. Thus, when we read (Exod. xxxiii, 11) that "the Lord spake unto Moses face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend," we must remember that it was a Hebrew who wrote these words, one who was accustomed to depict to himself and others the spiritual under material symbols, and thus we shall be guarded against irreverently attaching to them a meaning which they were never intended to bear. But, though such modes of expression are open to misapprehension by us whose minds are formed in so very different a mould, nevertheless, when rightly understood, they have the effect of giving us a more clear and vivid impression of the spiritual ideas which they embody than could be conveyed to us by any other mode of representation or expression.

The simplicity and naturalness of the language further appears in the prominence which is constantly given to the word or words embodying the leading idea in a sentence or period. Thus the noun stands before the adjective, the predicate stands before the subject, unless the latter be specially emphatic, in which case it is not only put first, but may stand by itself as a nominative absolute without any syntactical connection with the rest of the sentence.

The constant use of the *oratio directa* is also to be specially noted, as an indication of the primitive character of the language. The Hebrew historian does not usually inform us that such and such a person said such and such things; he actually, as it were, produces the parties and makes them speak for themselves. To this device (if it may be so called) the Bible history owes much of its freshness and power of exciting and sustaining the interest of its readers. No other history could be so often read without losing its power to interest and charm.

Lastly, in a primitive language, formed under the predominating influence of imagination and emotion, we may expect to meet with many elliptical expressions, and also with many redundancies. Not a little which we think it necessary formally to express in words, the Hebrew allowed to be gathered from the context; and, conversely, the Hebrew gave expression to not a little which we omit. For example, nothing is more common in Hebrew than the omission of the verb *to be* in its various forms; and, on the other hand, a very striking characteristic of the Hebrew style is the constant use of the forms וַיְהִי, וְהָיָה, *and it came to pass—and it shall come to pass*, which, in translating into English, may be altogether omitted without any serious loss. In the Hebrew prose, also, we often meet with traces of that echoing of thought and expression which forms one of the principal characteristics of the poetic style; as in Gen. vi, 22, "And Noah did according to all that God commanded him—*so did he*;" and similar passages, in which we seem to have two different forms of recording the same fact combined into one, thus: "And Noah did according to all that God commanded him;" "According to all that the Lord commanded him, so did he."

II. *History of the Hebrew Language.*—1. *Its Origin.*—The extant historical notices on this point carry us back to the age of Abraham, but no further. The best evidences which we possess as to the form of the Hebrew language prior to its first historical period tend to show that Abraham, on his entrance into Canaan, found the language then prevailing among almost all the different tribes inhabiting that country to be in at least dialectual affinity with his own. This is gathered from the following facts: that nearly all the names of places and persons relating to those tribes admit of Hebrew etymologies; that, amid all the accounts of the intercourse of the Hebrews with the nations of Canaan, we find no hint of a diversity of idiom; and that even the comparatively recent remains of the Phœnician and Punic languages bear a manifest affinity to the Hebrew. But whether the Hebrew language, as seen in the earliest books of the Old Test., is the very dialect which Abraham *brought with him* into Canaan, or whether it was the common tongue of the Canaanitish nations, which Abraham only *adopted* from them, and which was afterwards developed to greater fulness under the peculiar moral and political influences to which his posterity were exposed, are questions which, in the absence of conclusive arguments, are generally discussed with some dogmatical prepossessions. Almost all those who support the first view contend also that Hebrew was the primitive language of mankind. S. Morinus (*Ling. Primæv.*) and Löscher (*De Causis Ling. Hebr.*) are among the best champions of this opinion; but Hävernick has more recently advocated it with such modifications as make it more acceptable (*Einleit. in das Alte Test.* I, i, 148 sq.). The principal argument on which they depend is that, as the most important proper names in the first part of Genesis (as Cain, Seth, and others) are evidently founded on Hebrew etymologies, the essential connection of these names with their etymological origins involves the historical credibility of the records themselves, and leaves no room for any other conclusion than that the Hebrew language is coeval with the earliest history of man. The evidence on the other side is scanty, but not without weight. (1.) In Deut. xxvi, 5, Abraham is called a Syrian or Aramæan (אֲרַמִּי), from which we naturally conclude that Syriac was his mother tongue, especially when we find, (2.) from Gen. xxxi, 47, that Syriac or Chaldee was the language spoken by Laban, the grandson of Nahor, Abraham's brother. Moreover, it has been remarked (3.) that in Isa. xix, 18, the Hebrew is actually called the *language of Canaan;* and (4.) that the language itself furnishes internal evidence of its Palestinian origin in the word יָם, *sea*, which means also *the west*, and has this meaning in the very earliest documents. (5.) Finally, Jewish tradition, whatever weight may be attached to it, points to the same conclusion (Gesenius, *Geschichte*, sect. vi, 4).

If we inquire further how it was that the Canaanites, of the race of Ham, spoke a language so closely allied to the languages spoken by the principal members of

the Shemitic family of nations, we shall soon discover that the solution of this difficulty is impossible with our present means of information; it lies beyond the historic period. It may be that long before the migration of Abraham a Shemitic race occupied Palestine; and that, as Abraham adopted the language of the Canaanites, so the Canaanites themselves had in like manner adopted the language of that earlier race whom they gradually dispossessed, and eventually extirpated or absorbed. However this may be, leaving speculation for fact, is it not possible to discover a wise purpose in the selection of the language of Tyre and Sidon—the great commercial cities of antiquity—as the language in which was to be embodied the most wonderful revelation of himself and of his law which God made to the ancient world? When we remember the constant intercourse which was maintained by the Phœnicians with the most distant regions both of the East and of the West, it is impossible to doubt that the sacred books of the Hebrews, written in a language almost identical with the Phœnician, must have exercised a more important influence on the Gentile world than is usually acknowledged.

Of course the Canaanitish language, when adopted by the Hebrews, did not remain unchanged. Having become the instrument of the Hebrew mind, and being employed in the expression of new and very peculiar ideas, it must have been modified considerably thereby. How far may possibly be yet ascertained, should accident or the successful zeal of some explorer bring to light the more ancient monuments of the Phœnician nation, which may still have survived the entombment of centuries.

2. *Influences modifying the Form of the Hebrew Language, and the Style of the Hebrew Writings.*—(1.) *Time.*—The history of the Hebrew language, as far as we can trace its course by the changes in the diction of the documents in which it is preserved, may here be conveniently divided into that of the period preceding and that of the period succeeding the Exile. If it be a matter of surprise that the thousand years which intervened between Moses and the Captivity should not have produced sufficient change in the language to warrant its history during that time being distributed into subordinate divisions, the following considerations may excuse this arrangement. It is one of the signal characteristics of the Hebrew language, as seen in all the books prior to the Exile, that, notwithstanding the existence of some isolated but important archaisms, such as in the form of the pronoun, etc. (the best collection of which may be seen in Hävernick, *l. c.* p. 183 sq.), it preserves an unparalleled general uniformity of structure. The extent to which this uniformity prevails may be estimated either by the fact that it has furnished many modern scholars, who reason from the analogies discovered in the changes in other languages in a given period, with an argument to show that the Pentateuch could not have been written at so remote a date as is generally believed (Gesenius, *Gesch. der Hebr. Sprache*, § 8), or by the conclusion, *à fortiori*, which Hävernick, whose express object is to vindicate its received antiquity, candidly concedes, that "the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah are the *earliest* in which the language differs sensibly from that in the historical portions of the Pentateuch" (*Einleit.* i, 180). Even those critics who endeavor to bring down the Pentateuch as a whole to a comparatively late date allow that a portion at least of its contents is to be assigned to the age of Moses (Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, sec. 2, *c*): and thus, unless it can be shown that this most ancient portion bears in its language and style the stamp of high antiquity, and is distinguished in a very marked manner from the other portions of the Pentateuch (which has not been shown), the phenomenon still remains unexplained. But, indeed, the phenomenon is by no means unexampled. It does not stand alone. It is said, for example, that the Chinese language displays the same tenacity and aversion to change still more decidedly, the books of the great teacher Confucius being written in language not essentially different from that of his commentators fifteen hundred years later. So we are informed by a writer of the 15th century that the Greeks, at least the more cultivated class, even in his day spoke the language of Aristophanes and Euripides, maintaining the ancient standard of elegance and purity (Gibbon, viii, 106). Or, to take another example more closely related to the Hebrew, it is well known that the written Arabic of the present day does not differ greatly from that of the first centuries after Mohammed. In each of the cases just mentioned, it is probable that the language was as it were stereotyped by becoming the language of books held in highest esteem and reverence, diligently studied by the learned, frequently committed to memory, and adopted as a model of style by succeeding writers. Now, may not the sacred writings of the Mosaic age have had a similar influence on the written Hebrew of the following ages, which continued undisturbed till the Captivity, or even later? We know how greatly the translations of the Bible into English and German have affected the language and literature of England and Germany ever since they were given to the world. But among a people like the ancient Hebrews, living to a certain extent apart from other nations, with a literature of no great extent, and a learned class specially engaged in the study and transcription of the sacred writings, we may well suppose that the influence of these writings upon the form of the national language must have been much more decided and permanent. The learned men would naturally adopt in their compositions the language of the books which had been their study from youth, and large portions of which they were probably able to repeat from memory. Thus the language of these old books, though it might differ in some respects from that spoken by the common people, would naturally become the language of the learned and of books, especially of those books on sacred subjects, such as have alone come down to us from ancient Israel. In explanation of the fact under discussion, appeal has also been made (*a*) to the permanence of Eastern customs, and (*b*) to the simple structure of the Hebrew language, which rendered it less liable to change than other more largely developed languages (see Ewald, *Heb. Gram.* § 7). It has also been remarked that some of the peculiarities of the early writings may be concealed from view by the uniformity of the system of punctuation adopted and applied to the Scriptures by the Hebrew grammarians.

In the canonical books belonging to the first period the Hebrew language thus appears in a state of mature development. Although it still preserves the charms of freshness and simplicity, yet it has attained great regularity of formation, and such a precision of syntactical arrangement as insures both energy and distinctness. Some common notions of its laxity and indefiniteness have no other foundation than the very inadequate scholarship of the persons who form them. A clearer insight into the organism of language absolutely, joined to such a study of the cognate Syro-Arabian idioms as would reveal the secret, but no less certain, laws of its syntactical coherence, would show them to what degree the simplicity of Hebrew is compatible with grammatical precision. One of the most remarkable features in the language of this period is the difference which distinguishes the diction of poetry from that of prose. This difference consists in the use of unusual words and flexions (many of which are considered to be Aramaisms or archaisms, although in this case these terms are nearly identical), and in a harmonic arrangement of thoughts, as seen both in the parallelism of members in a single verse, and in the strophic order of larger portions, the delicate art of which Ewald has traced with pre-eminent success in his *Poetische Bücher des Alte Bundes*, vol. i.

The Babylonian Captivity is assigned as the com-

mencement of that decline and corruption which mark the second period in the history of the Hebrew language; but the Assyrian deportation of the ten tribes, in the year B.C. 720, was probably the first means of bringing the Aramaic idiom into injurious proximity with it. The Exile, however, forms the epoch at which the language shows evident signs of that encroachment of the Aramaic on its integrity, which afterwards ended in its complete extinction. The diction of the different books of this period discovers various grades of this Aramaic influence, and in some cases approaches so nearly to the type of the first period that it has been ascribed to mere imitation.

The writings which belong to the second age—that subsequent to the Babylonian Captivity—accordingly differ very considerably from those which belong to the first; the influence of the Chaldee language, acquired by the Jewish exiles in the land of their captivity, having gradually corrupted the national tongue. The historical books belonging to this age are the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. In the prophets who prophesied during and after the Captivity, with the exception of Daniel, the Chaldee impress is by no means so strong as we might anticipate, they having evidently formed their style on that of the older prophets. It is important, however, to observe that the presence of what appears to be a Chaldaism is not always the indication of a later age. Chaldee words and forms occasionally appear even in the most ancient Hebrew compositions, especially the poetical, the poet delighting in archaic and rare words, and substituting these for the more usual and commonplace. But between the Chaldaic archaisms and the Chaldeisms of the later Scriptures there is this marked distinction, that the former are only occasional, and lie scattered on the surface; the latter are frequent, and give a peculiar color and character to the whole language.

A still more corrupt form of the language appears in the Mishna and other later Jewish writings, in which the foreign element is much more decided and prominent.

(2.) *Place.*—Under this head is embraced the question as to the existence of different dialects of the ancient Hebrew. Was the Hebrew language, as spoken by the several tribes of Israel, of uniform mould and character? or did it branch out into various dialects corresponding to the leading divisions of the nation? In attempting to answer this question, there is no direct historical testimony of which we can avail ourselves. From Neh. xiii, 23, 24, we learn nothing more than that the language of Ashdod differed from that of the Jews after their return from captivity, which is only what we might have anticipated. The notices in Judg. xii, 6 and xviii, 3, which are more to the purpose, refer rather to a difference in pronunciation than in the form of the language. Notwithstanding it seems *prima facie* probable (*a*) that the language of the trans-Jordanic tribes was in course of time modified to a greater or less extent by the close contact of these tribes with the Syrians of the north and the Arab tribes of the great eastern desert; and (*b*) that a similar dialectic difference would gradually be developed in the language of Ephraim and the other northern tribes to the west of the Jordan, especially after the political separation of these tribes from the tribe of Judah and the family of David. Possibly in the *Jewish language* of 2 Kings xviii, 28 we may discover the trace of some such difference of dialect; for we can scarcely suppose the name *Jewish* to have been introduced in the very brief period which intervened between the taking of Samaria and the transaction in the record of which it occurs; and, if in use before the taking of Samaria and the captivity of the ten tribes, it must have been restricted to the form of the Hebrew language prevailing in Judæa, which, being thus distinguished *in name* from the language of the northern tribes, was probably distinguished in other respects also. It is not improbable that some of the linguistic peculiarities of the separate books of Scripture are to be accounted for on this hypothesis.

3. *When the Hebrew Language ceased to be a living Language.*—The Jewish tradition, credited by Kimchi, is to the effect that the Hebrew language ceased to be spoken by the body of the people during their captivity in Babylon; and this is the opinion of many Christian scholars also, among whom are Buxtorf and Walton. Others, as Pfeiffer and Löscher, argue that it is quite unreasonable, considering the duration and other circumstances of the Exile, to suppose that the Jews did not retain the partial use of their native tongue for some time after their return to Palestine, and lose it by slow degrees at last. There can be no doubt that the Hebrew was never spoken *in its purity* after the return from captivity; but that it ceased altogether to be the language of the people after that period, and was retained only as the language of books and of the learned, has not been established. The principal evidence relied on by those who hold this opinion is derived from Neh. viii, 8: "So they read in the book, in the law of God, *distinctly*, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." *Distinctly*, מְפֹרָשׁ, i. e. says Hengstenberg, "with the addition of a translation" (*Genuineness of Daniel*, ch. iii, sec. 5). But, though this gloss has some support in Jewish tradition, it is at variance both with Hebrew and with Chaldee usage. מְפֹרָשׁ means *made clear or distinct*, as is evident from Numb. xv, 34 (the meaning of מְפָרֵשׁ, in Ezra iv, 18, is disputed); and וַיִּקְרְאוּ מְפֹרָשׁ can scarcely be otherwise rendered than "*they read distinctly*" (see the Lexicons of Cocceius, Gesenius, and Fürst; Buxtorf and Gussetius render by *explanate*, *explicate*). This, indeed, is evident from the context; for if we should render with Hengstenberg, "*They read it with the addition of a translation*," to what purpose the clause which follows, "*and gave the sense*," etc.? At the same time, though this passage does not furnish sufficient evidence to prove that in the time of Nehemiah Hebrew had ceased to be the language of every-day life, it does seem to point to the conclusion that at that time it had considerably degenerated from its ancient purity, so that the common people had some difficulty in understanding the language of their ancient sacred books. Still we believe that the Hebrew element predominated, and, instead of describing, with Walton (*Prolegom.* iii, sec. 24), the language of the Jews on their return from exile as "*Chaldee with a certain admixture of Hebrew*," we should rather describe it as *Hebrew with a large admixture of Chaldee*. Only on this hypothesis does it appear possible satisfactorily to account for the fact that Hebrew continued even after this period to be the language of prophets and preachers, historians and poets, while there is no trace of any similar use of the Chaldee among the Jews of Palestine (compare also Neh. xiii, 24).

At what time Chaldee became the dominant element in the national language it is impossible to determine. All political influences favored its ascendency, and with these concurred the influence of that large portion of the nation still resident in the East, and maintaining constant intercourse with a Chaldee-speaking population. To these influences we cannot wonder that the Hebrew, notwithstanding the sacred associations connected with it, by-and-by succumbed. On the coins of the Maccabees, indeed, the ancient language still appears; but we cannot conclude from this circumstance that it maintained its position as a living language down to the Maccabæan period (Rénan, *Langues Sémitiques*, p. 137). The fragments of the popular language which we find in the New Testament are all Aramæan, and ever since the Hebrew has been preserved and cultivated as the language of the learned and of books, and not of common life. On the history of the *post-Biblical Hebrew* we do not now enter.

III. *Of the Written Hebrew.*—The Shemitic nations have been the teachers of the world in religion; *by the*

invention of the alphabet they may likewise lay claim to the honor of having laid the foundation of the world's literature. The Shemitic alphabet, as is well known, has no signs for the pure vowel sounds. All the letters are consonants; some, however, are so weak as easily to pass into vowels, and these letters we accordingly find in use, especially in the later Scriptures, as vowel marks. Two interesting questions here present themselves: 1. As to the age and origin of the characters or letters which appear in all extant Hebrew MSS. and in our printed Hebrew Bibles; and, 2. As to the origin and authority of the punctuation by which the vowel sounds are indicated.

1. On the former of these questions there are two conclusions which may be relied on as certain: (1.) That the present square characters were not in use among the Jews previous to the Babylonian Captivity. The Jewish tradition is that they were introduced or reintroduced by Ezra (Gesenius, *Geschichte*, p. 150; Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, Matt. v, 18). (2.) That the square characters have been in use since the beginning of our æra (Hupfeld in *Stud. und Krit.* for 1830, p. 288). But between these two limits several centuries intervene; is it not possible to approximate more closely to the date of their introduction? The only fact to which appeal can be made with this view is this, that on the coins of the Maccabees the square characters do not appear; but whether we are entitled to conclude from this that these characters had not then come into use in Judæa is very doubtful (Gesenius, *Geschichte*, sect. xliii, 3). The probability is that the introduction of these characters, called by the Jewish doctors Assyrian, and generally admitted to be of Aramæan origin, had some connection with the introduction of the Aramæan language, and that the change from the ancient written characters, like that from the ancient language, was not accomplished at once, but gradually. It is possible that in the intensity of national feeling awakened during the Maccabæan struggle, there was a reaction in favor of the ancient language and writing.

The earliest monuments of Hebrew writing which we possess are these *genuine* coins of the Maccabees, which date from the year B.C. 143. The character in which their inscriptions are expressed bears a very near resemblance to the Samaritan alphabet, and both are evidently derived from the Phœnician alphabet. The Talmud also, and Origen and Jerome, both attest the fact that an ancient Hebrew character had fallen into disuse; and by stating that the Samaritans employed it, and by giving some descriptions of its form, they distinctly prove that the ancient character spoken of was essentially the same as that on the Asmonæan coins. It is therefore considered to be established beyond a doubt that, before the exile, the Hebrews used this ancient character (the Talmud even calls it the "Hebrew"). The Talmud, and Origen, and Jerome ascribe the change to Ezra: and those who, like Gesenius, admit this tradition to be true in a limited sense, reconcile it with the late use of the ancient letters on the coins, by appealing to the parallel use of the Kufic characters on the Mohammedan coins, for several centuries after the Nishi was employed for writing, or by supposing that the Maccabees had a mercantile interest in imitating the coinage of the Phœnicians. The other opinion is that, as the square Hebrew character has not, to all appearance, been developed directly out of the ancient stiff Phœnician type, but out of an alphabet bearing near affinity to that found in the Palmyrene inscriptions, a combination of this palæographical fact with the intercourse which took place between the Jews and the Syrians under the Seleucidæ, renders it probable that the square character was first adopted at some inconsiderable but undefinable time before the Christian æra. Either of these theories is compatible with the supposition that the square character underwent many successive modifications in the next centuries, before it attained its full calligraphical perfection. The passage in Matt. v, 18 is considered to prove that the copies of the law were already written in the square character, as the *yod* of the ancient alphabet is as large a letter as the *aleph;* and the Talmud and Jerome speak as if the Hebrew MSS. of the Old Testament were, in their time, already provided with the final letters, the *Taggin*, the point on the broken horizontal stroke of ח, and other calligraphical minutiæ.

The characters in use before the Babylonian exile have been preserved by the Samaritans even to the present day without material change (Gesenius, *Monum. Phœn.* sect. li, 1; comp. on this subject also Kopp, *Bilder und Schriften*, ii, sect. 165–167; Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, sect. lxxvii; Gesenius, *Geschichte der Hebräischen Sprache u. Schrift*, sect. 41–43).

2. *As to the origin and authority of the punctuation*, the controversy which raged so fiercely in the 17th century may be said now to have ceased; and the views of Ludovicus Cappellus, from the adoption of which the Buxtorfs anticipated the most dangerous consequences, now meet with almost universal acquiescence. The two following conclusions may now be regarded as established: (1.) That the present punctuation did not form an original part of the inspired record, but was introduced by the Jewish doctors long after that record had been closed, for the purpose of preserving, as far as possible, the true pronunciation of the language; and (2.) That the present pointed text, notwithstanding its comparative recency, presents us with the closest possible approximation to the language which the sacred writers actually used. It would be tedious to go over the evidence by which these positions are established. Those who wish to do so will find the fullest information in the great work of Ludovicus Cappellus, entitled *Arcanum Punctationis Revelatum*, with the reply of the younger Buxtorf. Keeping these conclusions in view in interpreting the Hebrew Scriptures, we shall be careful neither, on the one hand, to neglect the traditional text, nor, on the other hand, servilely to adhere to it when a change of the points would give a better sense to any passage.

The origin of the vowel-points is to be ascribed to the effort which the Jewish learned men made to preserve the pronunciation of their sacred language at a time when its extinction as a living tongue endangered the loss of the traditional memory of its sound. Every kind of evidence renders it probable that these signs for the pronunciation were first introduced about the 7th century of the Christian æra, that is, after the completion of the Talmud, and that the minute and complex system which we possess was gradually developed from a few indispensable signs to its present elaborateness. The existence of the present complete system can, however, be traced back to the 11th century. The skilful investigation of Hupfeld (in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1830, p. 549 sq.) has proved that the vowel-points were unknown to Jerome and the Talmud; but, as far as regards the former, we are able to make a high estimate of the degree to which the traditionary pronunciation, prior to the use of the points, accorded with our Masoretic signs; for Jerome describes a pronunciation which agrees wonderfully well with our own vocalization. We are thus called on to avail ourselves thankfully of the Masoretic punctuation, on the double ground that it represents the Jewish traditional pronunciation, and that the Hebrew language, unless when read according to its laws, does not enter into its full dialectual harmony with its Syro-Arabian sisters. See MASSORAH.

Although it may be superfluous to enforce the general advantages, not to say indispensable necessity, of a sound scholarlike study of the Hebrew language to the theological student, yet it may be allowable to enumerate some of those particular reasons, incident to the present time, which urgently demand an increased attention to this study. First, the English-speaking race have an ancient honorable name to retain. Selden, Castell, Lightfoot, Pocock, Walton, Spencer, and Hyde,

were once contemporary ornaments of its literature. We daily see their names mentioned with deference in the writings of German scholars; but we are forcibly struck with the fact that, since that period, Great Britain has hardly, with the exception of Lowth and Kennicott, produced a single Syro-Arabian scholar whose labors have signally advanced Biblical philology; while America, although possessing some well-qualified teachers, has produced but little that is original in this direction. Secondly, the bold inquiries of the German theologians will force themselves on our notice. It is impossible for us to ignore their existence, for the works containing them are now speedily circulated among us in an English dress. These investigations are conducted in a spirit of philological and historical criticism which has never yet been brought to bear, with such force, on the most important Biblical questions. The wounds which they deal to the ancient traditions cannot be healed by reference to commentators whose generation knew nothing of our doubts and difficulties. The cure must be sympathetic; it must be effected by the same weapon that caused the wound. If the monstrous disproportion which books relating to ecclesiastical antiquity bear, in almost every theological bookseller's catalogue, over those relating to Biblical philology, be an evidence of the degree to which these studies have fallen into neglect, and if the few books in which an acquaintance with Hebrew is necessary, which do appear, are a fair proof of our present ability to meet the Germans with their own weapons, then there is indeed an urgent necessity that theological students should prepare for the increased demands of the future.

III. *History of Hebrew Learning.*—It is not till the closing part of the 9th century that we find, even among the Jews themselves, any attempts at the formal study of their ancient tongue. In the Talmudic writings, indeed, grammatical remarks frequently occur, and of these some indicate an acute and accurate perception of the usages of the language; but they are introduced incidentally, and are to be traced rather to a sort of living sense of the language than to any scientific study of its structure or laws. What the Jews of the Talmudic period knew themselves of the Hebrew they communicated to Origen and Jerome, both of whom devoted themselves with much zeal to the study of that language, and the latter of whom especially became proficient in all that his masters could teach him concerning both its vocabulary and its grammar (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.;* Jerome, *Adv. Rufin.* i, 363; *Epist. ad Damas.; Præf. ad Jobum, ad Paralipom.* etc.; Carpzov, *Crit. Sac.* vi, § 2). As represented by Jerome, the Church was quite on a par with the synagogue in acquaintance with the language of the ancient Scriptures; but how imperfect that was in many respects may be seen from the strange etymologies, which even Jerome adduces as explanatory of words, and from his statement that from the want of vowels in Hebrew "the Jews pronounce the same words with different sounds and accents, *pro voluntate lectorum ac varietate regionum*" (*Ep. ad Evangelum*).

Stimulated by the example of the Arabians, the Jews began, towards the end of the 9th century, to bestow careful study on the grammar of their ancient tongue; and with this advantage over the Arabian grammarians, that they did not, like them, confine their attention to one language, but took into account the whole of the Shemitic tongues. An African Jew, Jehuda ben-Karish, who lived about A.D. 880, led the way in this direction; but it was reserved for Saadia ben-Joseph of Fayum, gaon (or spiritual head) of the Jews at Sora in Babylonia, and who died A.D. 942, to compose the first formal treatise on points of Hebrew grammar and philology. To him we are indebted for the Arabic version of the O. T., of which portions are still extant [see ARABIC VERSIONS]; and though his other works, his commentaries on the O. T., and his grammatical works, have not come down to us, we know of their existence from, and have still some of their contents in, the citations of later writers. He was followed by R. Jehuda ben-David Chajug, a native of Fez, who flourished in the 11th century, whose services have procured for him the honorable designation of "chief of grammarians." From him the succession of Jewish grammarians embraces the following names [for details, see separate articles]. R. Salomo Isaaki (רש״י, Rashi), a native of Troyes in France, d. ab. 1105; Abu'l Walid Mervan ibn-Ganach, a physician at Cordova, d. 1120; Moses Gikatilla, ab. 1100; Ibn-Esra, d. 1194; the Kimchis, especially Moses and David, who flourished in the 13th century; Isaak ben-Mose (Ephodæus, so called from the title of his work מַעֲשֵׂה אֵפוֹד); Solomon Jarchi wrote a grammar, in which he sets forth the seven conjugations of verbs as now usually given; Abraham de Balmez of Lecci; and Elias Levita (1472–1549). The earliest efforts in Hebrew lexicography with which we are acquainted is the little work of Saadia Gaon, in which he explains seventy Hebrew words; a codex containing this is in the Bodleian library at Oxford, from which it has been printed by Dukes in the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, V, i, 115 sq. In the same codex is another small lexicographical work by Jehuda ben-Karish, in which Hebrew words are explained from the Talmud, the Arabic, and other languages; excerpts from this are given in Eichhorn's *Biblioth. der Bibl. Litt.* iii, 951-980. More copious works are those of Ben-Ganach, where the Hebrew words are explained in Arabic; of R. Menahem ibn-Saruk, whose work has been printed with an English translation by Herschell Philipowski (Lond. 1854); of R. Salomo Parchon (about 1160), specimens of whose work have been given by De Rossi in his collection of Various Readings, and in a separate work entitled *Lexicon Heb. select. quo ex antiquo et inedito R. Parchonis Lexico novas et diversas rariorum et difficiliorum vocum significationes sistit*, J. B. De Rossi (Parm. 1805); of David Kimchi, in the second part of his *Michlol*, entitled סֵפֶר הַשָּׁרָשִׁים (often printed; best edition by Biesenthal and Leberecht, 2 vols. Berl. 1838–47); and of Elias Levita (*Tishbi*, Bas. 1527, and with a Latin translation by Fagius, 4to, 1541). The Concordance of Isaac Nathan (1437) also belongs to this period.

The study of the Hebrew language among Christians, which had only casually and at intervals occupied the attention of ecclesiastics during the Middle Ages, received an impulse from the revived interest in Biblical exegesis produced by the Reformation. Something had been done to facilitate the study of Oriental literature and to call attention to it by the MSS., Hebrew and Arabic, which the emperor Frederick II brought into Europe after the fourth crusade in 1228 (Cuspinian, *De Cæsaribus*, p. 419; Boxhorn, *Hist. Univ.* p. 779); and a few men—such as Raymund Martini, a native of Catalonia (born 1236), Paulus Bugensis, Libertas Cominetus, who is said to have known and used fourteen languages, etc.—appeared as lights in the otherwise beclouded firmament of Biblical learning. But it was not until the beginning of the 16th century that any general interest was awakened in the Christian Church for the study of Hebrew literature. In 1506 appeared the grammar and lexicon of Reuchlin, which may be regarded as the first successful attempt to open the gate of Hebrew learning to the Christian world; for though the work of Conrad Pellican, *De Modo legendi et intelligendi Hebræa* (Basel, 1503), had the precedence in point of time, it was too imperfect to exert much influence in favor of Hebrew studies. A few years later, Santes Pagnini, a Dominican of Lucca, issued his *Institutionum Hebraicarum Libb. iv* (Lyons, 1526), and his *Thesaurus Ling. Sanct.* (ibid. 1529); but the former of these works is inferior to the Grammar of Reuchlin, and the latter is a mere collection of excerpts from David Kimchi's *Book of Roots*, often erroneously understood. No name of any importance occurs in the history of Hebrew philology after this till we come to those of Sebastian Münster and the Buxtorfs. The former translated the grammatical works

of Elias Levita, and from these chiefly he constructed his own *Dictionarum Hebr., adj. Chald. vocabulis* (Basel, 1523), and his *Opus Grammaticum ex variis Elianis libris concinnatum* (Bas. 1542). The latter rendered most important service to the cause of Hebrew learning. See BUXTORF. The grammars and lexicons of the older Buxtorf were for many years the principal helps to the study of Hebrew in the Christian Church, and one of them, his *Lexicon Chald. Talmud. et Rabbinicum* (Basel, 1640), is still indispensable to the student who would thoroughly explore the Hebrew language and literature. The names also of Förster and Schindler may be mentioned as marking an epoch in the history of these studies. Previous to them scholars had followed almost slavishly in the track of rabbinical teaching. By them, however, an attempt was made to gather materials from a wider field. Förster, in his *Dict. Hebr. Nov.* (Basel, 1557), sought to determine the meaning of the words from the comparison of the different passages of Scripture in which they occur, and of allied words, words having two consonants in common, or two consonants of the same organ. Schindler added to this the comparison of different Shemitic dialects for the illustration of the Hebrew in his *Lex. Pentaglotton* (Han. 1612). The example thus set was carried forward by Sam. Bohle, a Rostock professor (*Dissertt. pro formali Signif. S. S. eruenda*, 1637), though by his fondness for metaphysical methods and conceits he was often betrayed into mere trifling; by Christian Nolde, professor at Copenhagen (*Concordant. particularum Ebræo. Chald. V. T.* Hamb. 1679); by Joh. Cocceius (Coch), professor at Leyden (*Lex. et Comment. serm. Hebr.* Lond. 1669); by Castell (*Lex. Heptaglot.* Lond. 1669); by De Dieu in his commentaries on the O. Test.; and by Hottinger in his *Etymologicum Orient. sive Lex harmonicum heptaglot.* (Frankf. 1661). Sol. Glass also, in his *Philologia Sacra*, 1636, rendered important service to Hebrew learning and O.-T. exegesis.

Meanwhile a new school of Hebrew philology had arisen under the leading of Jakob Alting and Johann Andr. Danz. The former in his *Fundamenta punctationis linguæ sanctæ sive Grammat. Hebr.* (Grön. 1654), and the latter in his *Nucifrangibulum* (Jena, 1686), and other works, endeavored to show that the phenomena which the Hebrew exhibited in a grammatical respect, the flexions, etc., had their basis in essential properties of the language, and could be rationally evolved from principles. Peculiar to them is the "systema morarum," a highly artificial method of determining the placing of long or short vowels, according to the number of *moræ* appertaining to each or to the consonant following, a method which led to endless niceties, and no small amount of learned trifling. The fundamental principle, however, which Alting and Danz asserted is a true one, and their assertion of it was not without fruits. Nearly contemporary with them was Jacques Gousset, professor at Gröningen, who devoted much time and labor to the preparation of a work entitled *Commentarii Ling. Heb.* (Amst. 1702), in which he follows strictly the method of deducing the meanings of the Hebrew words from the Hebrew itself, rejecting all aid from rabbins, versions, or dialects. The chief merit of Gousset and his followers, of whom the principal is Chr. Stock (*Clavis Ling. Sanct. V. et N. Ti.* Lips. 1725), consists in the close attention they paid to the *usus loquendi* of Scripture, and Hävernick thinks that adequate justice has not been done to Gousset's services in this respect (*Introd. to O. T.* p. 221. Eng. trans.).

Hitherto not much attention had been paid to etymology as a source for determining the meaning of Hebrew words. This defect was in part remedied by Caspar Neumann and Valentin Löscher, the former of whom in different treatises, the latter in his treatise *De Causis Ling. Heb.* (Frankf. and Leipsic, 1706), set forth the principle that the Hebrew roots are *biliteræ*, that these are the "characteres significationis," as Neumann called them, or the "semina vocum," as they were designated by Löscher, and that from them the triliterals, of which the Hebrew is chiefly composed, were formed. They contended also that the fundamental meaning of the biliterals is to be ascertained from the meaning of the letters composing each, and for this purpose they assigned to each letter what the former called "significatio hieroglyphica," and the latter "valor logicus." This last is the most dubious part of their system; but, as a whole, their views are worthy of respect and consideration (see Hupfeld, *De emendanda lexicog. Semit. ratione*, p. 3).

A great advance was made in the beginning of the 18th century by the rise almost simultaneously of two rival schools of Hebrew philology—the Dutch school, headed by Albert Schultens, and the school of Halle, founded by the Michaelis family. In the former the predominating tendency was towards the almost exclusive use of the Arabic for the illustration of Hebrew grammar and lexicography. Schultens himself was a thorough Arabic scholar, and he carried his principle of appealing to that source for the elucidation of the Hebrew to an extent which betrayed him into many mistakes and extravagances; nevertheless, to his labors Hebrew philology owes an imperishable debt of obligation. Besides his commentaries on Job and Proverbs, which are full of grammatical and lexicographical disquisition, he wrote *Origines Hebrææ seu Heb. Ling. antiquissima natura et indoles ex Arabiæ penetralibus revocata* (Frankfort, 1723), and *Institutiones ad fundamenta Ling. Heb.* (Leyd. 1737). To this school belongs Schröder, professor at Gröningen, who published in 1776 a Hebrew grammar of great excellence, and which has passed through many editions, under the same title as the second of the works of Schultens above noted; and Robertson, professor at Edinburgh (*Grammatica Hebr.* Edinb. 1783, 2d ed.). Both these works excel that of Schultens in clearness and simplicity, and in neither is the Arabic theory so exclusively adhered to. Venema, as a commentator, was also one of the luminaries of this school.

The school of Halle was founded by Johann Heinrich and Christian Benedikt Michaelis, but its principal ornament in its earlier stage was the son of the latter, John David, professor at Göttingen. See MICHAELIS. The principle of this school was to combine the use of all the sources of elucidation for the Hebrew—the cognate dialects, especially the Aramaic, the versions, the rabbinical writings, etymology, and the Hebrew itself as exhibited in the sacred writings. The valuable edition of the Hebrew Bible, with exegetical notes, the conjoint work of J. H. and Christ. B. Michaelis, some grammatical essays by the latter, and the *Hebräische Grammatik* (Halle, 1744), the *Supplementa ad lexica Hebraica* (6 parts, Gött. 1785-92), and several smaller essays of John David, comprise the principal contributions of this illustrious family to Hebrew learning. To their school belong the majority of more recent German Hebraists—Moser (*Lex. Man. Heb. et Chald.* Ulm, 1795), Vater (*Heb. Sprachlehre*, Lpz. 1797), Hartmann (*Anfangsgründe der Heb. Sprache*, Marburg, 1798), Jahn (*Grammatica Ling. Heb.* 1809), and the *facile princeps* of the whole, Gesenius (*Hebr. Deutsches Handwörterbuch*, Lpz. 1810-12, and later; *Heb. Grammatik*, Halle, 1813, and often since; *Geschichte der Heb. Spr. und Schrift*, 1815, and since; *Ausführliches Gram.-Krit. Lehrgebäude der Heb. Spr.* 1817; *Lexicon Manuale*, 1833, and later; *Thesaurus Phil. Crit. Ling. Hebr. et Chald.* Lpz. 1835-1858). See GESENIUS. Gesenius has been followed closely by Moses Stuart in his *Grammar of the Hebrew Language*, of which many editions have appeared. Under the Halle school may also be ranked Joh. Simonis (*Onomast. Vet. Test.* Halle, 1741; *Lexicon Man. Heb. et Chald.* 1756; re-edited by Eichhorn in 1793, and with valuable improvements by Winer in 1828); but, though a pupil of Michaelis, Simonis shows a strong leaning towards the school of Schultens.

Among recent Hebraists the name of Lee (*Grammar*

of the Heb. Lang. in a Series of Lectures, Lond. 3d edit. 1844; *Lexicon Heb. Chald. and Engl.* 1840), Ewald (*Krit. Gramm. der Heb. Spr. Ausführlich bearbeitet*, Lpz. 1827; 7th ed. 1863, under the title of *Ausführliches Lehrb. der Heb. Spr. des A. B.*), and Hupfeld (*Exercitationes Æthiopicæ*, 1825; *De emend. Lexicogr. Sem. ratione Comment.* 1827; *Ueber Theorie der Heb. Gr.* in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* for 1828; *Ausf. Hebr. Gram.* 1841), are the most prominent. Each of these pursues an independent course, but all of them incline more or less to the school of Alting and Danz. Lee avows that the aim of his grammatical investigations is to "study the language as *it is*, that is, as its *own analogy* collected from itself and its cognate dialects exhibits it" (*Grammar*, Pref. p. iv, new ed. 1844). Ewald has combined with his philosophical analysis of the language, as it exists in its own documents, a more extended use of the cognate dialects: he contends that, to do justice to the Hebrew, one must first be at home in all the branches of Shemitic literature, and that it is by combining these with the old Hebrew that the latter is to be called from the dead, and piece by piece endowed with life (*Grammatik*, Pref. p. ix). Hupfeld's method is eclectic, and does not differ from that of Gesenius, except that it assigns a larger influence to the philosophic element, and aims more at basing the grammar of the language on first principles analytically determined; by him also the Japhetic languages have been called in to cast light on the Shemitic, a course to which Gesenius too, after formally repudiating it, came in his later works to incline.

Among the Jews, the study of Hebrew literature has been much fettered by rabbinical and traditional prejudices. Many able grammarians, however, of this school have appeared since the beginning of the 16th century, among whom the names of the brothers David and Moses Provençale, Lonzano Norzi, Ben-Melech, Süsskind, and Lombroso are especially to be mentioned. A more liberal impulse was communicated by Solomon Cohen (1709-62), but Mendelssohn was the first to introduce the results and methods of Christian research among his nation. Fürst (*Lehrgeb. d. Aram. Idiome mit Bezug auf die Indo-Germ. Spr.* I. *Chald. Gram.* 1835; *Charuze Peninim*, 1836; *Concordantiæ Libr. Vet. Test.* 1840; *Hebr. und Chald. Handwörterbuch über der A. T.* 2 vols. 1857) seeks to combine the historical with the analytical method, taking note of all the phenomena of the Hebrew itself, illustrating these from the cognate tongues, and those of the Indo-Germanic class, and at the same time endeavoring on philosophic grounds to separate the accidental from the necessary, the radical from the ramified, the germ from the stem, the stem from the branches, so as to arrive at the laws which actually rule the language. All his works are of the highest value. Mr. Horwitz has also published an excellent *Heb. Grammar* (Lond. 1835). We especially notice the philosophical method pursued by Nordheimer (*Heb. Grammar*, N. Y. 1838-42, 2 vols. 8vo). The latest Jewish production in English is Kalisch's *Hebrew Gramm.* (Lond. 1863, 8vo).

See generally Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* (1715-53); Löscher, *De Causis Ling. Ebr.* (1706); Hezel, *Gesch. der Hebr. Spr. und Litter.* (1776); Gesenius, *Gesch. d. Hebr. Spr.* (1815); Delitzsch, *Jeshurun, Isagoge in Gramm. et Lexicogr. linguæ Hebr.* (1838); Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, passim; also his appendix on Jewish Lexicography to his *Lex. Hebr.*; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, per. ii, § 16; per. iii, § 27; *Bibliograph. Handbuch für Hebr. Sprachk.* (Lpz. 1859, 8vo). See SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.

Hebrews, THE EPISTLE TO THE, the last of the Pauline Epistles, according to the arrangement of the Received Text of the New Testament.

I. *Its Canonicity.*—The universal Church, by allowing it a place among the holy Scriptures, acknowledges that there is nothing in its contents inconsistent with the rest of the Bible. But the peculiar position which is assigned to it among the epistles shows a trace of doubts as to its authorship or canonical authority, two points which were blended together in primitive times. Has it, then, a just claim to be received by us as a portion of that Bible which contains the rule of our faith and the rule of our practice, laid down by Christ and his apostles? Was it regarded as such by the primitive Church, to whose clearly expressed judgment in this matter all later generations of Christians agree to defer? Of course, if we possessed a declaration by an inspired apostle that this epistle is canonical, all discussion would be superfluous. But the interpretation (by F. Spanheim and later writers) of 2 Pet. iii, 15 as a distinct reference to Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews seems scarcely tenable. For, if the "you" whom Peter addresses be all Christians (see 2 Pet. i. 1), the reference must not be limited to the Epistle to the Hebrews; or if it include only (see 2 Pet. iii, 1) the Jews named in 1 Pet. i, 1, there may be special reference to the Galatians (vi, 7-9) and Ephesians (ii, 3-5), but not to the Hebrews. Was it, then, received and transmitted as canonical by the immediate successors of the apostles?

In the Western Church this book underwent a somewhat singular treatment. The most important witness here, Clement of Rome (A.D. 70 or 95) refers to this epistle in the same way as, and more frequently than, to any other canonical book. It seems to have been "wholly transfused," says Mr. Westcott (*On the Canon*, p. 32), into Clement's mind. After his time it seems to have come under some doubt or suspicion in the West. It is not cited or referred to by any of the earlier Latin fathers except Tertullian, who ascribes it to Barnabas, and says it was "receptior apud ecclesias illo apocrypho pastore moschorum," that is, the pastor of Hermas (*De Pudicit.* c. 20). Irenæus is said by Eusebius to have made quotations from it in a work now lost (*Hist. Eccl.* v, 26), but he did not receive it as of Pauline authorship (Phot. *Biblioth. Cod.* 252, p. 904, cited by Lardner, ii, 165); and as Eusebius connects the Wisdom of Solomon with the Epistle to the Hebrews, as cited by Irenæus, it is probable the latter viewed the two as on the same footing. It is omitted by Caius, who only reckons thirteen Pauline epistles (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vi, 26; Jerome, *De Vir. illust.* c. 59); Hippolytus expressly declares it not to be Paul's (Phot. p. 301); it is omitted in the Muratori fragment; and by the Roman Church generally it seems to have been suspected (Euseb. *H. E.* iii, 3; vi, 20). Victorinus has one or two passages which look like quotations from it, but he does not mention it, and certainly did not receive it as the work of Paul (Lardner, iii, 300). In the 4th century it began to be more generally received. Lactantius, in the beginning of the century, apparently borrows from it; Hilary of Poictiers, Lucifer of Cagliari, Faustinus, and Marcellinus (who cites it as *divina Scriptura*); Victorinus of Rome, Ambrose, Philaster (though admitting that some rejected the epistle); Gaudentius, Jerome, and Augustine, in the latter half and the end of the century, attest its canonicity, and generally its Pauline origin.

In the Eastern churches it was much more generally, and from an earlier date, received. It is doubtful whether any citation from it is made by Justin Martyr, though in one or two passages of his writings he seems to have had it in his eye. Clement of Alexandria held it to be Paul's, originally written by him in Hebrew, and translated by Luke (Eusebius, *H. E.* vi, 14). Origen wrote homilies on this epistle; he frequently refers to it as canonical, and as the work of Paul, and he tells us he had intended to write a treatise to prove this (Lardner, ii, 472 sq.). Origen further attests that the ancients handed it down as Paul's (Euseb. *H. E.* vi, 25), by which, though he cannot be understood as intending to say that it had never been questioned by any of those who had lived before him, we must understand him at least to affirm that in the Church of Alexandria it had from the earliest period been received. Dionysius of Alexandria acknowledged it as part of sacred Scripture, and as written by Paul. By Basil, the Gregories, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, and all the Greeks, as Jerome attests, it was received. Eusebius, though he ranks it

in one place among the ἀντιλεγόμενα, in deference to the doubts entertained respecting it in the Roman Church, nevertheless asserts its apostolic authority, and includes it among the books generally received by the churches. In public documents of the Eastern Church also, such as the Epistle of the Synod at Antioch, the Apostolical Constitutions, the Catalogue of the Council, its claims are recognised. In the Syrian churches it was received; it is found in the Peshito version; it is quoted by Ephrem as Paul's; and it is included among the canonical Scriptures in the catalogue of Ebedjesu (Lardner, iv, 430, 440). To this uniform testimony there is nothing to oppose, unless we accept the somewhat dubious assertion of Jerome that it was rejected by the heretical teacher Basilides (*Proem. in Ep. ad Tit.;* but compare Lardner, ix, 305).

At the end of the 4th century, Jerome, the most learned and critical of the Latin fathers, reviewed the conflicting opinions as to the authority of this epistle. He considered that the prevailing, though not universal view of the Latin churches was of less weight than the view not only of ancient writers, but also of all the Greek and all the Eastern churches, where the epistle was received as canonical and read daily; and he pronounced a decided opinion in favor of its authority. The great contemporary light of North Africa, St. Augustine, held a similar opinion. And after the declaration of these two eminent men, the Latin churches united with the East in receiving the epistle. The third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, and a decretal of pope Innocent, A.D. 416, gave a final confirmation to their decision.

Such was the course and the end of the only considerable opposition which has been made to the canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Its origin has not been ascertained. Some critics have conjectured that the Montanist or the Novatian controversy instigated, and that the Arian controversy dissipated so much opposition as proceeded from orthodox Christians. The references to Paul in the Clementine Homilies have led other critics to the startling theory that *orthodox* Christians at Rome, in the middle of the 2d century, commonly regarded and described Paul as an enemy of the faith—a theory which, if it were established, would be a much stranger fact than the rejection of the least accredited of the epistles that bear the apostle's name. But perhaps it is more probable that that jealous care with which the Church everywhere, in the 2d century, had learned to scrutinize all books claiming canonical authority, misled, in this instance, the churches of North Africa and Rome. For to them this epistle was an anonymous writing, unlike an epistle in its opening, unlike a treatise in its end, differing in its style from every apostolic epistle, abounding in arguments and appealing to sentiments which were always foreign to the Gentile, and growing less familiar to the Jewish mind. So they went a step beyond the church of Alexandria, which, while doubting the authorship of this epistle, always acknowledged its authority. The church of Jerusalem, as the original receiver of the epistle, was the depository of that oral testimony on which both its authorship and canonical authority rested, and was the fountain head of information which satisfied the Eastern and Greek churches. But the church of Jerusalem was early hidden in exile and obscurity. And Palestine, after the destruction of Jerusalem, became unknown ground to that class of "dwellers in Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome," who once maintained close religious intercourse with it. All these considerations may help to account for the fact that the Latin churches hesitated to receive an epistle, the credentials of which, from peculiar circumstances, were originally imperfect, and had become inaccessible to them when their version of Scripture was in process of formation, until religious intercourse between East and West again grew frequent and intimate in the 4th century.

Cardinal Cajetan, the opponent of Luther, was the first to disturb the tradition of a thousand years, and to deny the authority of this epistle. Erasmus, Calvin, and Beza questioned only its authorship. The bolder spirit of Luther, unable to perceive its agreement with Paul's doctrine, pronounced it to be the work of some disciple of the apostle, who had built not only gold, silver, and precious stones, but also wood, hay, and stubble upon his master's foundation. And whereas the Greek Church in the 4th century gave it sometimes the tenth place, or at other times, as it now does, and as the Syrian, Roman, and English churches do, the fourteenth place among the epistles of Paul, Luther, when he printed his version of the Bible, separated this book from Paul's epistles, and placed it with the epistles of James and Jude, next before the Revelation; indicating by this change of order his opinion that the four relegated books are of less importance and less authority than the rest of the New Testament. His opinion found some promoters, but it has not been adopted in any confession of the Lutheran Church.

The canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews is, then, secure, so far as it can be established by the tradition of Christian churches. The doubts which affected it were admitted in remote places, or in the failure of knowledge, or under the pressure of times of intellectual excitement; and they have disappeared before full information and calm judgment.

II. *Authorship.*—From the above testimonies it will be perceived that the assertion of the canonicity of this book is mostly identified with the assertion of its Pauline authorship. The former of these positions does not, it is true, necessarily depend upon the latter, for a book may be canonical, yet not be the production of any individual whose name we know; but, as the case stands, the external evidence for the canonicity of the book is so nearly commensurate with that for the Pauline authorship of the book that we cannot make use of the one unless we admit the other. This gives immense importance to the question on which we now enter; for if it could be shown that this epistle is not Paul's, the entire historical evidence for its canonicity must be laid aside as incredible.

1. *History of Opinion on this Subject.*—In this epistle the superscription, the ordinary source of information, is wanting. Its omission has been accounted for, since the days of Clement of Alexandria (*apud* Euseb. *H. E.* vi, 14) and Chrysostom by supposing that Paul withheld his name lest the sight of it should repel any Jewish Christians who might still regard him rather as an enemy of the law (Acts xxi, 21) than as a benefactor to their nation (Acts xxiv, 17). Pantænus, or some other predecessor of Clement, adds that Paul would not write to the Jews as an apostle because he regarded the Lord himself as their apostle (see the remarkable expression, Heb. iii, 1, twice quoted by Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i, 12, 63).

It was the custom of the earliest fathers to quote passages of Scripture without naming the writer or the book which supplied them. But there is no reason to doubt that at first, everywhere, except in North Africa, Paul was regarded as the author. "Among the Greek fathers," says Olshausen (*Opuscula*, p. 95), "no one is named either in Egypt, or in Syria, Palestine, Asia, or Greece, who is opposed to the opinion that this epistle proceeds from Paul." The Alexandrian fathers, whether guided by tradition or by critical discernment, are the earliest to note the discrepancy of style between this epistle and the other thirteen. They received it in the same sense that the speech in Acts xxii, 1-21 is received as Paul's. Clement ascribed to Luke the translation of the epistle into Greek from a Hebrew original of Paul. Origen, embracing the opinion of those who, he says, preceded him, believed that the thoughts were Paul's, the language and composition Luke's or Clement's of Rome. Tertullian, knowing nothing of any connection of Paul with the epistle, names Barnabas as

the reputed author according to the North African tradition, which in the time of Augustine had taken the less definite shape of a denial by some that the epistle was Paul's, and in the time of Isidore of Seville appears as a Latin opinion (founded on the dissonance of style) that it was written by Barnabas or Clement. At Rome Clement was silent as to the author of this as of the other epistles which he quoted; and the writers who follow him, down to the middle of the 4th century, only touch on the point to deny that the epistle is Paul's.

The view of the Alexandrian fathers, a middle point between the Eastern and Western traditions, won its way in the Church. It was adopted as the most probable opinion by Eusebius (Blunt, *On the right Use of the early Fathers*, p. 439-444); and its gradual reception may have led to the silent transfer, which was made about his time, of this epistle from the tenth place in the Greek Canon to the fourteenth, at the end of Paul's epistles, and before those of other apostles. This place it held everywhere till the time of Luther; as if to indicate the deliberate and final acquiescence of the universal Church in the opinion that it is one of the works of Paul, but not in the same full sense as the other ten epistles, addressed to particular churches.

In the last three centuries every word and phrase in the epistle have been scrutinized with the most exact care for historical and grammatical evidence as to the authorship. The conclusions of individual inquirers are very diverse, but the result has not been any considerable disturbance of the ancient tradition. No new kind of difficulty has been discovered; no hypothesis open to fewer objections than the tradition has been devised. The laborious work of the Rev. C. Forster (*The Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews*), which is a storehouse of grammatical evidence, advocates the opinion that Paul was the author of the language as well as the thoughts of the epistle. Professor Stuart, in the Introduction to his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, discusses the internal evidence at great length, and agrees in opinion with Mr. Forster. Dr. C. Wordsworth (*On the Canon of the Scriptures*, Lect. ix) leans to the same conclusion. Dr. S. Davidson, in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, gives a very careful and minute summary of the arguments of all the principal modern critics who reason upon the internal evidence, and concludes, in substantial agreement with the Alexandrian tradition, that Paul was the author of the epistle, and that, as regards its phraseology and style, Luke co-operated with him in making it what it now appears. The tendency of opinion in Germany has been to ascribe the epistle to some other author than Paul. Luther's conjecture that Apollos was the author has been widely adopted by Le Clerc, Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Bunsen, Alford, and others. Barnabas has been named by Wieseler, Thiersch, and others. Luke by Grotius. Silas by others. Neander attributes it to "some apostolic man" of the Pauline school, whose training and method of stating doctrinal truth differed from Paul's. The distinguished name of H. Ewald has been given recently to the hypothesis (partly anticipated by Wetstein) that it was written neither by Paul nor to the Hebrews, but by some Jewish teacher residing at Jerusalem to a church in some important Italian town, which is supposed to have sent a deputation to Palestine.

2. *Arguments for and against the different Authors proposed, other than the Apostle Paul.*—Most of these guesses are quite destitute of historical evidence, and require the support of imaginary facts to place them on a seeming equality with the traditionary account. They cannot be said to rise out of the region of possibility into that of probability, but they are such as any man of leisure and learning might multiply till they include every name in the limited list that we possess of Paul's contemporaries.

(1.) *Silas.*—The claims of this companion of Paul to the authorship of one epistle find no support from the testimony of antiquity. The suggestion of them is entirely modern, having been first advanced by Böhme in the introduction to his commentary on this epistle (Lips. 1825), and by Mynster in the *Studien und Kritiken*, ii, 344; but they have adduced nothing in support of these claims which might not with equal plausibility have been urged on behalf of any other of the apostle's companions.

(2.) *Clement of Rome.*—Origen tells us that the tradition which had reached him was that some held this epistle to have been written by Clement, bishop of Rome, while others said it was written by Luke the evangelist (ap. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* vi, 25). Erasmus espoused the claims of Clement, and Calvin inclined to the same view. Some evidence in favor of this hypothesis has been thought to be supplied by the resemblance of some passages in Clement's first epistle to the Corinthians to passages in one epistle; but these have much more the appearance of quotations from the former, or reminiscences of it on the part of the author of the latter, than such similarities of thought and expression as would indicate a community of authorship for the two. A close comparison of the one with the other leaves the impression very strongly that they are the productions of different minds; neither in style nor in the general cast of thought is there any prevailing affinity between them. Clement also was in all probability a convert from heathenism, whereas the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was undoubtedly by birth and education a Jew. Perhaps what Origen records means nothing more than that Clement or Luke acted as the party who reduced the epistle to writing, leaving the question of the authorship, properly so called, untouched. His whole statement is—"not heedlessly (οὐκ εἰκῇ) had the ancients handed it down as Paul's; but who wrote the epistle God truly knows. But the story which has come down to us from some is, that Clement, who was bishop of Rome, wrote the epistle; from others, that it was Luke who wrote the Gospel and the Acts." Jerome also, in referring to the tradition, explains it thus —"quem [Clementem] aiunt ipsi adjunctum sententias Pauli proprio ordinasse et ornasse sermone" (*De Viris illust.* c. 5).

(3.) *Luke.*—The claims of Luke apparently rise a degree higher from the circumstance that, besides being named by Origen and Jerome as dividing with Clement the honors which, as these writers testify, were in certain quarters assigned to the latter, there is a character of similarity with respect to language and style between this epistle and the acknowledged productions of the evangelist. This has led several eminent scholars to adopt the hypothesis that, while the thoughts may be Paul's, the composition is Luke's. But against this conclusion the following considerations may be urged. 1. Where there is no other evidence, or at least none of any weight, in favor of identity of authorship, mere general similarity of style cannot be allowed to possess much force. Luke, however, is known to have been in such a connection with Paul as to justify in some sort the assumption of his having written on the apostle's behalf. 2. Assuming the epistle to be the production of Paul, it is easy to account for the resemblance of its style to that of Luke, from the fact that Luke was for so many years the companion and disciple of Paul; for it is well known that when persons for a long time associate closely with each other, and especially when one of the parties is an individual of powerful intellect whose forms of thought and modes of speech imperceptibly impress themselves on those with whom he associates, they fall insensibly into a similarity of tone and style both of speaking and writing (so Chrysostom, *Hom. iv in Matt.*, quoted by Forster, *Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 648). The resemblances, however, in this case (see them pointed out by Alford, vol. iii, passim) are too striking and minute to be fully explained in this general manner. 3. It is not in the Epistle to the Hebrews alone that a resemblance to the style of Luke may be detected: the same feature pervades all Paul's

epistles, especially those of a later date, as has frequently been observed by critics. In fine, while there are such resemblances of style, etc., as have been referred to between this epistle and the writings of Luke, there are *differences* of a nature so weighty as completely to overbalance these resemblances, and authorize the conclusion that the author of the latter could not also be the author of the former. Both Stuart (*Comment.* i, 333, London, 1828) and Eichhorn (*Einleit.* iii, 465) justly lay stress on the greater predominance of Jewish feelings in the Epistle to the Hebrews than in any of Luke's writings, and still more on the marked familiarity with the peculiarities of the Jewish schools displayed by the writer of the epistle, but of which no traces are apparent in any of the writings of the evangelist. Both writings display the combined influence of the Palestinian and the Hellenistic character on the part of their author; but in the Epistle to the Hebrews the former so decidedly predominates over the latter, while the reverse is the case with the writings of Luke, that it seems to the last degree improbable that the same person could have written both. Luke, moreover, was a convert from heathenism, whereas the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was evidently a Jew. It appears, therefore, that for the theory which ascribes the composition of this epistle to Luke as of his own dictation, there is no evidence of any kind which will bear examination, but, on the contrary, not a little against it. 4. Nevertheless, the association of Luke with Paul, and the many marked coincidences between Luke's phraseology and that of this epistle, give a strong color of probability to the supposition that the evangelist had something to do with its authorship, doubtless as assistant or under another's authority; for it cannot be presumed that he would have personally assumed the responsibility of a work like this, evidently conceived, written, and sent out as of apostolical authority, and with the personal allusions to the history apparently of Paul which we find in the final salutations. But if Luke were joint author with Paul, what share in the composition is to be assigned to him? This question has been asked by those who regard joint authorship as an impossibility, and ascribe the epistle to some other writer than Paul. Perhaps it is not easy, certainly it is not necessary, to find an answer which would satisfy or silence persons who pursue a historical inquiry into the region of conjecture. Who shall define the exact responsibility of Timothy, or Silvanus, or Sosthenes, in those seven epistles which Paul inscribes with some of their names conjointly with his own? To what extent does Mark's language clothe the inspired recollections of Peter, which, according to ancient tradition, are recorded in the second gospel? Or, to take the acknowledged writings of Luke himself—what is the share of the "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" (Luke i, 2), or what is the share of Paul himself in that gospel which some persons, not without countenance from tradition, conjecture that Luke wrote under his master's eye in the prison at Cæsarea; or who shall assign to the follower and the master their portions respectively in those seven characteristic speeches at Antioch, Lystra, Athens, Miletus, Jerusalem, and Cæsarea? If Luke wrote down Paul's Gospel, and condensed his missionary speeches, may he not have afterwards taken a more important share in the composition of this epistle?

(4.) *Barnabas.*—The hypothesis which claims the authorship of this epistle for Barnabas has in its support the testimony of Tertullian (*De Pudicitia*, c. 20), with whom, as we learn from Jerome (*Epist.* 129, *ad Dardanum*), several (*plerique*) among the Latins concurred. For this opinion Tertullian, in the passage referred to, assigns no reasons, and Jerome appears to have treated it as a mere conjecture resting upon Tertullian's authority alone; for, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers (c. 5), he refers to this opinion as one "juxta Tertullianum," whilst he says that the opinion that Luke was the author was one "juxta quosdam." Hug is of opinion (*Introd.* p. 596, Fosdick's transl.) that in this passage we have not Tertullian's own view so much as a concession on his part to those whom he was opposing, and who, because of the very passage he is about to quote from the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi, 4–8), were inclined to reject the claims of that epistle to be esteemed the production of Paul. This conjecture is of use, as it tends to show that Tertullian might have another reason for ascribing this epistle to Barnabas than his total ignorance that it had ever been imputed to Paul, as has been confidently inferred by several writers from the fact that it was obviously to the interest of his argument to uphold the Pauline origin of this epistle had he been aware of it. In recent times the ablest defender of this hypothesis is Ullmann, who has devoted to it an article in the first volume of his journal, the *Studien und Kritiken;* but the evidence he adduces in favor of it is very feeble. After enlarging on the testimony of Tertullian, he proceeds to the internal evidence in favor of Barnabas; but of the *six* reasons he assigns for ascribing the epistle to him, none possesses any force. The *first*, viz. the traces in the epistle of an Alexandrian education on the part of the author, supposing it granted, would not apply particularly to Barnabas, who was a native of Cyprus, and who, though Ullmann says "he had *perhaps* been in Alexandria," for aught we know had never seen that seat of allegorical learning. The *second*, viz. that Barnabas, being a Levite, was more likely, on that account, to understand the Jewish ritual, as we see the author of this epistle did, is of no weight, for there is nothing stated in the epistle on that head which any intelligent Jew might not have known, whether a Levite or not. The *third*, viz. that what the author of this epistle says concerning the law, divine revelation, faith, etc., is very Pauline, and such as we might expect from a companion of Paul, such as Barnabas was; the *fourth*, viz. that the tenor of the epistle is worthy such a man as Barnabas; the *fifth*, viz. that the writer of this epistle speaks of the Saviour very frequently by the appellation ὁ Ἰησοῦς, which Dr. Ullmann thinks indicates that the writer must have known our Lord during his personal ministry, which was *probably* the case with Barnabas; and the *sixth*, viz. that the names of persons mentioned in this epistle are names which Barnabas *might* have referred to had he written it—are reasons such as it would be idle to refute, and such as fill us with surprise that a man of Ullmann's learning and vigor should have gravely adduced them. With regard to the *fifth* also, Olshausen has justly observed (*Opusc. Theologica*, p. 115) that if it were certain that Barnabas had enjoyed the advantage of our Lord's personal ministry, it would clearly prove that he was not the author of this epistle, for the latter distinctly classes himself with those by whom this advantage had not been enjoyed (ch. ii, 3). Stuart and some others have laid great stress on the contrast afforded by this epistle to the extant epistle which passes under the name of Barnabas, with respect to style, tone, and general character, as supplying indubitable evidence that the former is the production of a different and a far superior mind. Of this there can be no question, and, were we quite certain that the epistle ascribed to Barnabas was really his production, the argument would be conclusive. But, though some very distinguished names may be cited in support of its authenticity, the greater weight, both of authority and evidence, is against it. See BARNABAS, EPISTLE OF. The total absence of any reason in favor of imputing the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews to Barnabas affords sufficient ground for rejecting this hypothesis without our attempting to adduce dubious and uncertain reasons against it.

(5.) *Some Alexandrian Christian.*—This hypothesis rests on certain features of the epistle which are said to betray Alexandrian culture, habits, and modes of thought on the part of the writer. These have been much insisted upon by Eichhorn, Schulz, Bleek, and others: but they are not such, we think, as carry with them the weight which these writers have allowed to them. The

standard of comparison by which the supposed Alexandrian tone of this epistle is evinced is supplied by the writings of Philo, between which and this epistle it is affirmed that there is so close a resemblance that it can be accounted for only on the supposition that the author of the latter was, like Philo, an Alexandrian Jew. Now, before this reasoning can be so much as looked at, it behooves those who use it to point out clearly how much of Philo's peculiar style and sentiment was owing to his Jewish, and how much to his Alexandrian education or habits of thought; because, unless this can be done, it will be impossible to show that any alleged peculiarity *necessarily* bespeaks an Alexandrian origin, and could not possibly have appeared in the writings of a pure Jew of Palestine. No attempt, however, of this sort has been made; on the contrary, it has been assumed that whatever is Philonian is therefore Alexandrian, and hence all resemblances between the writings of Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews have been urged as certain proofs that the latter must have been written by a converted Jew of Alexandria. Such an assumption, however, we would by no means concede; and we feel confirmed in this by an examination of the evidence adduced in support of the alleged Alexandrian character of this epistle. As Stuart has, we think, clearly shown (i, 321), and as even Tholuck, though obviously inclining the other way, has candidly admitted (*Comment. on the Hebrews*, i, 68, § 7), there is nothing in this evidence to show that this epistle might not have been written by a Jew who had never left the bounds of Palestine. It is worthy of notice that several of the points on which Eichhorn chiefly insists as favoring his view, such as the prevalence of typical expositions of the Mosaic ritual in this epistle, and the greater elegance of its language and style (*Einleit.* iii, 443 sq.), are given up by Bleek, and that of the two chiefly insisted upon by the latter, viz. the close affinity between this epistle and the writings of Philo, and the alleged mistake in regard to the furniture of the tabernacle which Bleek charges upon the author of this epistle in chap. ix, 3, 4, and which he thinks no Jew of Palestine could have committed, both are relinquished by Tholuck as untenable (comp. the valuable remarks of Hug, *Introd.* p. 584, note, Fosdick's transl.). With regard to the latter, it may be remarked that, even supposing it proved that the writer of this epistle had erred in asserting that the pot containing the manna and Aaron's rod were placed in the ark of the testimony, and that, supposing θυμιατήριον to denote the *altar of incense*, and not the *censer*, he had fallen into the mistake of placing this within instead of without the vail, nothing could be thence deduced in favor of the Alexandrian origin of the author. For, with regard to the former of these, it was a matter on which the Jews of Palestine had no better means of information than those of any other place, since, in the Temple as then standing, none of the furniture of the Holy of Holies had been preserved; and with regard to the latter, as it could not be the result of *ignorance* either in a Jew of Palestine or in a Jew of Alexandria, but must have been a piece of mere *inadvertence* on the part of either, it seems rather too much to conclude that it was such as the latter alone was capable of committing. That, however, there is no blunder in the case, has, we think, been very satisfactorily shown by Deyling (*Obs. Sac.* tom. ii, No. 47) and others (comp. Stuart, Tholuck, and Delitzsch, ad loc.).

(6.) *Apollos.*—The first to suggest Apollos as the probable author of this epistle was Luther (*Werke*, ed. Walch, xii, 204, 1996, etc.). He has been followed by the majority of recent German scholars, many of whom have supported his conjecture with much ingenuity. It has undoubtedly been shown by them that Apollos *may* have been the writer; and they have, we think, proved that of all Paul's companions this is the one who was most fitted by education, life-circumstances, modes of thought, and religious stand-point, to have accomplished such a task had it fallen to his lot. Beyond this, however, their arguments seem to us signally to fail. What weight they have is derived almost entirely from the assumed Alexandrian tone of the epistle; so that in setting aside this we of necessity invalidate what has been built on it. But it may be permitted us to remark that, even supposing the former established, the latter would by no means follow, any more than because a work produced in Germany in the present day was deeply tinctured with Hegelianism, it would follow from that alone that it must be the production of some certain individual rather than of any other disciple of Hegel's school. The adoption of this theory by Tholuck, after his exposure of the unsoundness of Bleek's reasonings, is matter of surprise. "Still," says he (i, 69), "could it be rendered probable that any distinguished person having intercourse with Paul were an Alexandrian, and of Alexandrian culture, we might, with the greatest appearance of truth, regard him as the author of the epistle. Now such a one is found in the person of Apollos." What is this but to say, "The arguments for the Alexandrian origin of this epistle, I must confess, prove nothing; but show me an end to be gained by it, and I will admit them to be most conclusive!" Such a statement affords, we think, very clear evidence that the disposition to ascribe this epistle to Apollos is to be traced not to any constraining force of evidence, but exclusively to what Olshausen, in his strictures on Bleek (*Opusc.* p. 92), justly denounces as the main source of that able writer's errors on this question—"Quod non ab omni partium studio alienum animum servare ipsi contigit." It may be added that if this epistle was the product of Apollos or any other Alexandrian convert, it is very strange that no tradition to this effect should have been preserved in the church at Alexandria, but, on the contrary, that it should be there we find the tradition that Paul was the author most firmly and from the earliest period established.

3. We now pass on to the question of the *Pauline* origin of this epistle. Referring our readers for particulars to the able and copious discussion of this question furnished by the works of Stuart (*Commentary*, Introd.), Forster (*The Apostol. Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, etc.), and Hug, we shall attempt at present a condensed outline of the evidence both for and against the Pauline authorship of this epistle.

a. Internal evidence, i. In favor of the Pauline origin of the epistle. (1.) A person familiar with the doctrines on which Paul is fond of insisting in his acknowledged epistles will readily perceive that there is such a correspondence in this respect between these and the Epistle to the Hebrews as supplies good ground for presuming that the latter proceeded also from his pen. That Christianity as a system is superior to Judaism with respect to clearness, simplicity, and moral efficiency; that the former is the substance and reality of what the latter had presented only the typical adumbration; and that the latter was to be abolished to make way for the former, are points which, if more fully handled in the Epistle to the Hebrews, are familiar to all readers of the epistles of Paul (comp. 2 Cor. iii, 6–18; Gal. iii, 22; iv, 1–9, 21–31; Col. ii, 16, 17, etc.). The same view is given in this epistle as in those of Paul of the divine glory of the Mediator, specifically as the reflection or manifestation of Deity to man (compare Col. i, 15–20; Phil. ii, 6; Heb. i, 3, etc.). His condescension is described as having consisted in an impoverishing, and lessening, and lowering of himself for man's behalf (2 Cor. viii, 9; Phil. ii, 7, 8; Heb. ii, 9); and his exaltation is set forth as a condition of royal dignity, which shall be consummated by all his enemies being put under his footstool (1 Cor. xv, 25–27; Heb. ii, 8; x, 13; xii, 2). He is represented as discharging the office of a "mediator," a word which is never used except by Paul and the writer of this epistle (Gal. iii, 19, 20; Heb. viii, 6); his death is represented as a sacrifice for the sins of man; and the peculiar idea is announced in connection with this, that he was prefigured by the sacrifices of the Mosaic dispensation (Rom. iii, 22–26; 1 Cor. v, 7; Eph. i, 7; v, 2; Heb. vii–x). Pe-

culiar to Paul and the author of this epistle is the phrase "the God of peace" (Rom. xv, 33, etc.; Heb. xiii, 20); and both seem to have the same conception of the spiritual "gifts" (1 Cor. xii, 4; Heb. ii, 4). It is worthy of remark, also, that the momentous question of a man's personal acceptance with God is answered in this epistle in the same peculiar way as in the acknowledged epistles of Paul. All is made to depend upon the individual's exercising what both Paul and the author of this epistle call "faith," and which they both represent as a realizing apprehension of the facts, and truths, and promises of revelation. (Bleek and Tholuck have both endeavored to show that the πίστις of the Epistle to the Hebrews is not the same as the πίστις of Paul's acknowledged writings, but, in our view, with singular want of success. Tholuck's chief argument, which he urges as of more weight than any Bleek has advanced, is, that the writer has not here contrasted νόμος and πίστις, the ἔργα νόμου and the ἔργα πίστεως, as Paul would have done. But how can this be said when the great lesson of the epistle is, that *always*, even *under the law itself*, πίστις was the medium of acceptance and the channel of divine blessing to men? When Paul says, "We walk by faith, not by sight" [2 Cor. v, 7], and the writer to the Hebrews says that faith, by which the just live, is the evidence of things not seen [x, 28; xi, 1], what essential difference in their notion of faith and its working can be discerned?) By both, also, the power of this gracious principle is frequently referred to and illustrated by the example of those who had distinguished themselves in the annals of the Jewish race (comp. Rom. iii, 4; v, 2; Heb. iii, 6; Gal. iii, 5-14; Heb. x, 38; xi, 40). (2.) Some of the figures and allusions employed in this epistle are strictly Pauline. Thus the word of God is compared to a *sword* (Eph. vi, 17; Heb. iv, 12); inexperienced Christians are *children* who need *milk*, and must be instructed in the *elements*, whilst those of *maturer* attainments are *full-grown men* who require *strong meat* (1 Cor. iii, 1, 2; xiv, 20; Gal. iv, 9; Col. iii, 14; Heb. v, 12, 13; vi, 1); redemption through Christ is an *introduction* and an *entrance with confidence* unto God (Rom. v, 2; Eph. ii, 18; iii, 12; Heb. x, 19); afflictions are a *contest* or *strife*, ἀγών (Phil. i, 30; Col. ii, 1; Heb. x, 32); the Christian life is a *race* (1 Cor. ix, 24; Phil. iii, 14; Heb. xii, 1); the Jewish ritual is a λατρεία (Rom. ix, 4; Heb. ix, 1, 6); a person under the constraint of some unworthy feeling or principle is "subject to bondage" (Gal. v, 1; Heb. ii, 15), etc. (3.) Certain marked characteristics of Paul's style are found in this epistle. This department of the internal evidence has more, perhaps, than any other been canvassed by recent critics, and in some cases opposite conclusions have been drawn from the same phenomena. Thus the occurrence of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in this epistle has been adduced by the German scholars *against* the Pauline origin of it, whilst Stuart and Forster have both rested on this fact as strongly *in favor* of that conclusion; and as it appears to us with justice, for if it be made out from Paul's acknowledged writings that the use of unusual words is a characteristic of his style (and this has been placed by these writers beyond all question), it is obvious that the occurrence of the *same* characteristic in this epistle, so far from being an argument *against*, is, as far as it goes, an argument *for* our ascribing it to Paul. On arguments, however, based on such minute phenomena, we are not disposed to rest much weight on either side. Every person must be aware that an author's use of words is greatly modified by the circumstances under which he writes, or the design he has in writing; and the literature of every country presents us with numerous cases of authors whose works, written at different periods, and with different designs, present far greater diversities of expression than any which have been pointed out between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the acknowleged epistles of Paul. Hence cautious critics have declined to rest much in questions of literary parentage upon what Bentley calls (*Dissert. on Phalaris*, p. 19, London, 1699) "censures that are made from stile and language alone," and which, he adds, "are commonly nice and uncertain, and depend upon slender notices." Apart, however, from such minute niceties, there are certain marked peculiarities of style which attach to particular writers, and flow so directly from the character of their genius or education that they can hardly express themselves in discourse without introducing them. Now such peculiarities the writings of Paul present, and the occurrence of them has always been felt to afford no small evidence of the authenticity of any production claiming to be his in which they are found. Paley, in enumerating these (*Horæ Paulinæ*, ch. vi, No. 2, 3), has laid stress chiefly on the following: A disposition to the frequent use of a word, which cleaves, as it were, to the memory of the writer, so as to become a sort of *cant* word in his writings; a propensity "to go off at a word," and enter upon a parenthetic series of remarks suggested by that word; and a fondness for the paronomasia, or play upon words. (4.) There is a striking analogy between Paul's use of the O. T. and that made by the writer of this epistle. Both make frequent appeals to the O. T.; both are in the habit of accumulating passages from different parts of the O. T., and making them bear on the point under discussion (comp. Rom. iii, 10-18; ix, 7-33, etc.; Heb. i, 5-14; iii; x, 5-17); both are fond of linking quotations together by means of the expression "and again" (compare Rom. xv, 9-12; 1 Cor. iii, 19, 20; Heb. i, 5; ii, 12, 13; iv, 4; x, 30); both make use of the same passages, and that occasionally in a sense not naturally suggested by the context whence they are quoted (1 Cor. xv, 27; Eph. i, 22; Heb. ii, 8; Rom. i, 17; Gal. iii, 11; Heb. x, 38); and both, in one instance, quote a passage in a peculiar way (comp. Rom. xii, 19; Heb. x, 30). On the other hand, great stress has been laid by the opponents of the Pauline origin of this epistle on the fact that whilst Paul, in his acknowledged writings, quotes from the Hebrew original in preference to the Sept., where the latter differs from the former, the author of this epistle quotes exclusively from the Sept., even when it departs very widely from the Hebrew. To this it may be replied, 1st, That both Paul and the author of this epistle quote *generally* from the Sept.; 2dly, That where the Sept. differs from the Hebrew, Paul does not *always* follow the Hebrew in preference to the Sept. (comp. Rom. ii, 24; x, 11-18; xi, 27; xv, 12; 1 Cor. i, 19, etc.); and, 3dly, That the writer of this epistle does not *always* follow the Sept. where it differs from the Hebrew, but occasionally deserts the former for the latter (e. g. x, 30; xiii, 5); (comp. Davidson, *Introd.* iii, 231). There is no ground, therefore, for this objection to the Pauline origin of this epistle. (5.) The Epistle to the Hebrews contains some personal allusions on the part of the writer which strongly favor the supposition that he was Paul. These are the mention of his intention to pay those to whom he was writing a visit speedily, in company with Timothy, whom he affectionately styles "our brother," and whom he describes as having been set at liberty, and expected soon to join the writer (Heb. xiii, 23); the allusion to his being in a state of imprisonment at the time of writing, as well as of his having partaken of their sympathy while formerly in a state of bondage among them (Heb. xiii, 19; x, 34); and the transmission to them of a salutation from the believers in Italy (Heb. xiii, 24), all of which agree well with the supposition that Paul wrote this epistle while a prisoner at Rome.

ii. Let us now glance at the main objections which from various sources have been urged against its Pauline origin. (1.) It is unaccountable that Paul, had he written this epistle, should have withheld his name. But is it less unaccountable that Clement, or Apollos, or Luke, had any of them been the author, should have withheld his name? (2.) "This epistle is more calmly and logically written than it was possible for the energetic Paul to have written; all the analogies between Judaism and Christianity are calmly investigated and calmly ad-

duced; the materials are arranged in the strictest order, and carefully wrought out according to this disposition, and conclusion follows conclusion with the greatest regularity; the language also is rotund and choice, and the representation unusually clear. All this is unlike Paul" (Eichhorn, *Einleit.* iii, 459). This is a singular assertion to make respecting the author of the Epistle to the Romans, a production characterized most eminently by these traits, excepting, perhaps, a less degree of calmness, which the special object of the present epistle may have more peculiarly called for. (3.) "Whilst we occasionally meet Pauline *termini*, we find precisely in the *leading ideas* of the epistle a terminology different from that of Paul" (Tholuck, i, 39, English transl.). The instances specified by Tholuck are the use of ἱερεύς, ποιμήν, and ἀπόστολος, as designations of Christ; of ὁμολογία, which he says is confined to this epistle; of ἐγγίζειν τῷ Θεῷ; and of τελειοῦν, with its derivatives in the sense in which it is used, Heb. vii, 19. Now, with regard to this objection, it may be observed, 1st, That supposing all the instances adduced by Tholuck to be unimpeachable, and supposing no reason could be assigned why Paul should use such in writing to Hebrews, when he did not use them in writing to others, still the objection cannot have much weight with any person accustomed to weigh evidence, because not only is the number of Pauline *termini* found in this epistle far greater than the number of termini which, according to Tholuck, are "foreign to the apostle to the Gentiles;" but it is always less likely that the peculiar phrases of a writer should be borrowed by another, than that a writer noted for the use of peculiar words and phrases should, in a composition of a character somewhat different from his other productions, use terms not found elsewhere in his writings. But, 2dly, let us examine the instances adduced by Tholuck, and see whether they bear out his reasoning. "Paul nowhere calls Christ *priest*." True; but though Paul, in writing to churches composed more or less of Gentile converts, whose previous ideas of priests and priestly rites were anything but favorable to their receiving under sacerdotal terms right notions of Christ and his work, never calls Christ a priest, is that any reason for our concluding that in writing to Jews, who had amongst them a priesthood of divine organization, and writing for the express purpose of showing that that priesthood was typical of Christ, it is inconceivable that the apostle should have applied the term *priest* to Christ? To us the difficulty would rather seem to be to conceive how, in handling such a topic, he could *avoid* calling Christ a priest. "Paul nowhere calls Christ a *shepherd* and an *apostle*, as the writer of this epistle does." But the whole weight of this objection to the Pauline origin of this epistle must rest on the assumption that Paul never uses figurative appellations of Christ in his writings; for if he does, why not here as well as elsewhere? Now it could only be the grossest unacquaintedness with the apostle's writings that could lead any to affirm this. The very opposite tendency is characteristic of them. Thus we find Christ termed τέλος νόμου (Rom. x, 4), διάκονον περιτομῆς (xv, 8), τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν (1 Cor. v, 7), ἡ πέτρα (x, 4), ἀπαρχή (xv, 23), εἷς ἀνήρ (2 Cor. xi, 2), ἀκρογωνιαῖος (Eph. ii, 20), etc. With these instances before us, why should it be deemed so utterly incredible that Paul could have called Christ ἀπόστολος and ποιμήν, that the occurrence of such terms in the epistle before us is to be held as a reason for adjudging it not to have been written by him? With regard to the use of ὁμολογία in the sense of *religious profession*, the reader may compare the passages in which it occurs in this epistle with Rom. x, 9; 2 Cor. ix, 13; 1 Tim. vi, 12, and judge for himself how far such a usage is foreign to the apostle. The phrase ἐγγίζειν τῷ Θεῷ occurs once in this epistle (vii, 19), and once in Jas. iv, 8; Paul also once uses the verb actively (Phil. ii, 30); and, on the other hand, the author of this epistle once uses it intransitively (x, 25). As there is thus a perfect analogy in the usage of the verb between the two, why it should be supposed improbable that Paul should use it in reference to God, or why a phrase used by James should be deemed too Alexandrian to be used by Paul, we feel ourselves utterly at a loss to conceive. With regard to the use of τελειοῦν, Tholuck himself contends (Appendix, ii, 297) that it everywhere in this epistle retains the idea of *completing;* but he cannot understand how Paul could have contemplated the work of redemption under this term in this epistle, since in no other of his epistles is it so used. This difficulty of the learned professor may, we think, be very easily removed by remarking that it does not appear to have been Paul's design elsewhere, so fully at least as here, to represent the superiority of Christianity over Judaism, as that arises from the former being sufficient, whilst the latter was not sufficient to *complete* men in a religious point of view, i. e. to supply to them all they need, and advance them to all of which they are capable. That this is the theme of the writer, the passages in which the word in question occurs show; and we see no reason why such an idea might not have occurred to Paul as well as to any other man. Arguments drawn from such special terms, moreover, must always be precarious when urged as objections, because they are not only indefinite, but are mostly *negative* in their character. A minute examination shows that they are not of much force in the present case; for if the expressions referred to do not occur in the same form in Paul's other epistles, yet *similar* phrases undoubtedly prevail, and the variation here is sufficiently accounted for by the different character and object of this epistle. See this and all the other questions connected with this epistle amply reviewed by Dr. Davidson (*Introd. to the N. T.* iii, 163-295), who, however, inclines to the opinion that these peculiarities indicate the co-operation of some other hand with Paul in the composition of the epistle.

b. It yet remains that we should look at the *external* evidence bearing on this question. Passing by, as somewhat uncertain, the alleged testimony of Peter, who is supposed (2 Pet. iii, 15, 16) to refer to the Epistle to the Hebrews as the composition of Paul, and passing by also the testimonies of the apostolic fathers, which, though very decisive as to the antiquity and canonical authority of this epistle (see Forster's *Inquiry*, sec. 13), yet say nothing to guide us to the author, we come to consider the testimony of the Eastern and Western churches upon this subject. As respects the former, there are two facts of much importance. The one is, that of the Greek fathers not one positively ascribes this epistle to any but Paul; the other is, that it does not appear that in any part of the Eastern Church the Pauline origin of this epistle was ever doubted or suspected (compare Olshausen, *Opusc. Theolog.* p. 95).

In the Western Church this epistle did not, as we have seen, meet with the same early and universal reception. But of what value is the state of opinion in the early churches of the West in the question of evidence now before us? To judge of this, we must bear in mind that the sole amount of evidence arising from the testimony of the Latin churches is *negative;* all we can conclude from it, at the most, is that they had no sufficient evidence in favor of this epistle being Paul's; they do not seem to have had a shadow of historical evidence against its being his. The claims of Barnabas, Clement, and Luke rest upon mere individual conjecture, and have no historical support. Supposing, then, that the rejection of this epistle by the Latins cannot be accounted for by circumstances peculiar to them, still this fact cannot diminish the weight of evidence accruing from the unanimity of the Greeks and Asiatics. Had the Latins been as unanimous in favor of Apollos or Clement as the Eastern churches were in favor of Paul, the case would have been different. The value of Paul's claims would in that case have been equal to the difference between the value of the Eastern tradition and the value of the Western. This would have furnished a somewhat puzzling problem; though ever

in that case the superiority of the Eastern witnesses to the Western would have materially advanced the claims of the apostle. As the case stands, *all* the positive external evidence extant is in favor of the Pauline authorship of this epistle; and the only thing against it is that in the Latin churches there appears to have been no commonly received tradition on the subject. Under such circumstances, the claims of the apostle are entitled to be regarded as fully substantiated by the external evidence.

The result of the previous inquiry may be thus stated. 1. There is no substantial evidence, external or internal, in favor of any claimant to the authorship of this epistle except Paul. 2. There is nothing incompatible with the supposition that Paul was the author of it. 3. The preponderance of the internal, and all the direct external evidence goes to show that it was written by Paul. (See the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct. 1867.) 4. The apparent coincidences with Luke's phraseology merely go to show, if they indeed be anything more than casual, that he exercised more than usual liberty as an amanuensis or reporter of Paul.

III. *Time and Place of Writing.*—Assuming the Pauline authorship of the epistle, it is not difficult to determine *when* and *where* it was written. The allusions in xiii, 19, 21, point to the closing period of the apostle's two years' imprisonment at Rome as the season during "the serene hours" of which, as Hug describes them (*Introd.* p. 603), he composed this noblest production of his pen. Modern criticism has not destroyed, though it has weakened this conclusion, by substituting the reading τοῖς δεσμίοις, "the prisoners," for τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου (A.V. "me in my bonds"), x, 34; by proposing to interpret ἀπολελυμένον, xiii, 23, as "sent away" rather than "set at liberty;" and by urging that the condition of the writer, as portrayed in xiii, 18, 19, 23, is not necessarily that of a prisoner, and that there may possibly be no allusion to it in xiii, 3. In this date, however, almost all who receive the epistle as Paul's concur; and even by those who do not so receive it nearly the same time is fixed upon, in consequence of the evidence furnished by the epistle itself of its having been written a good while after those to whom it is addressed had become Christians. The references to former teachers (xiii, 7) and earlier instruction (v, 12 and x, 32) might suit any time after the first years of the Church: but the epistle was evidently written before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The whole argument, and especially the passages viii, 4 sq., ix, 6 sq. (where the present tenses of the Greek are unaccountably changed into past in the English version), and xiii, 10 sq., imply that the Temple was standing, and that its usual course of divine service was carried on without interruption. A Christian reader, keenly watching in the doomed city for the fulfilment of his Lord's prediction, would at once understand the ominous references to "that which beareth thorns and briers, and is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned;" "that which decayeth and waxeth old, and is ready to vanish away;" and the coming of the expected "Day," and the removing of those things that are shaken (vi, 8; viii, 13; x, 25, 37; xii, 27). Yet these forebodings seem less distinct and circumstantial than they might have been if uttered *immediately* before the catastrophe. From the expression "they of (ἀπό) Italy" (xiii, 24), it has been inferred that the writer could not have been in Italy; but Winer (*Grammatik*, § 66, 6) denies that the preposition necessarily has that force. Alford (*Comment.* iv, Proleg. p. 68 sq.), after Holzmann (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1859, ii, 297 sq.), contends that it was addressed to the Judaico-Christian Church at Rome; but in that case, how could it have been needful to inform *them* of Timothy's release (as the author does in the same connection. xiii, 23)?

IV. *To whom addressed.*—That the parties to whom this epistle was addressed were converted Jews the epistle itself plainly shows. Ancient tradition points out the church at Jerusalem, or the Christians in Palestine generally, as the recipients. Stuart contends for the church at Cæsarea, not without some show of reason; but the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the ancient tradition. Two things make this clear, says Lange: the one is, that only the Christians in Jerusalem, or those in Palestine generally, formed a great Jewish-Christian Church in the proper sense; the other is, that for the loosening of these from their religious sense of the Temple-worship there was an immediate and pressing necessity (*Apostol. Zeitalter*, i, 176). We know of no purely Jewish-Christian community, such as that addressed in this epistle, out of Palestine, while the whole tone of the epistle indicates that those for whom it was intended were in the vicinity of the Temple. The inscription of the epistle, πρὸς Ἑβραίους, which is of great antiquity, favors the same conclusion (Roberts, *Discussions on the Gospels*, p. 215 sq.). Ebrard limits the primary circle of readers even to a section of the Church at Jerusalem. Considering such passages as v, 12; vi, 10; x, 32, as probably inapplicable to the whole of that church, he conjectures that Paul wrote to some neophytes whose conversion, though not mentioned in the Acts, may have been partly due to the apostle's influence in the time of his last recorded sojourn in Jerusalem (Acts xxi, 22). This, however, is unnecessary.

V. *In what Language was it written?*—Like Matthew's Gospel, the Epistle to the Hebrews has afforded ground for much unimportant controversy respecting the language in which it was originally written. The earliest statement is that of Clement of Alexandria (preserved in Euseb. *H. E.* vi, 14), to the effect that it was written by Paul in Hebrew, and translated by Luke into Greek; and hence, as Clement observes, arises the identity of the style of the epistle and that of the Acts. This statement is repeated, after a long interval, by Eusebius, Theodoret, Jerome, and several later fathers; but it is not noticed by the majority. Nothing is said to lead us to regard it as a tradition, rather than a conjecture suggested by the style of the epistle. No person is said to have used or seen a Hebrew original. The Aramaic copy, included in the Peshito, has never been regarded otherwise than as a translation. Among the few modern supporters of an Aramaic original, the most distinguished are Joseph Hallet, an English writer in 1727 (whose able essay is most easily accessible in a Latin translation in Wolf's *Curæ Philologicæ*, iv, 806-837). The same opinion has found in Michaelis a strenuous defender (*Introd.* iv, 221). The arguments he adduces, however, are more specious than sound; and it has been abundantly shown by Lardner, Hug, Eichhorn, and others, that this opinion is untenable. Bleek (i, 6-23) argues in support of a Greek original on the grounds of (1) the purity and easy flow of the Greek; (2) the use of Greek words, which could not be adequately expressed in Hebrew without long periphrase; (3) the use of paronomasia—under which head he disallows the inference against an Aramaic original which has been drawn from the double sense given to διαθήκη (ix, 15); and (4) the use of the Sept. in quotations and references which do not correspond with the Hebrew text. Why Paul should have written in Greek to persons residing in Judæa is best answered by the reasons which Hug (*Introd.* p. 326 sq.) and Diodati (*De Christo Græce loquente exercitatio*, etc., edited by O. T. Dobbin, LL.B., London, 1843, and republished in the *Biblical Repository* for Jan. 1844) have adduced to show that Greek was at that time well known to the mass of the Jews (compare Tholuck, i, 78).

VI. Some have doubted whether this composition be justly termed an epistle, and have proposed to regard it rather as a treatise. The salutations, however, at the close seem rather to favor the common opinion, though it is of little moment which view we espouse.

VII. *Condition of the Hebrews and Scope of the Epistle.*—The numerous Christian churches scattered through-

out Judæa (Acts ix, 31; Gal. i, 22) were continually exposed to persecution from the Jews (1 Thess. ii, 14), which would become more searching and extensive as churches multiplied, and as the growing turbulence of the nation ripened into the insurrection of A.D. 66. Personal violence, spoliation of property, exclusion from the synagogue, and domestic strife were the universal forms of persecution. But in Jerusalem there was one additional weapon in the hands of the predominant oppressors of the Christians. Their magnificent national Temple, hallowed to every Jew by ancient historical and by gentler personal recollections, with its irresistible attractions, its soothing strains, and mysterious ceremonies, might be shut against the Hebrew Christian. And even if, amid the fierce factions and frequent oscillations of authority in Jerusalem, this affliction were not often laid upon him, yet there was a secret burden which every Hebrew Christian bore within him—the knowledge that the end of all the beauty and awfulness of Zion was rapidly approaching. Paralyzed, perhaps, by this consciousness, and enfeebled by their attachment to a lower form of Christianity, they became stationary in knowledge, weak in faith, void of energy, and even in danger of apostasy from Christ. For, as afflictions multiplied round them, and made them feel more keenly their dependence on God, and their need of near, and frequent, and associated approach to him, they seemed, in consequence of their Christianity, to be receding from the God of their fathers, and losing that means of communion with him which they used to enjoy. Angels, Moses, and the high-priest—their intercessors in heaven, in the grave, and on earth—became of less importance in the creed of the Jewish Christian; their glory waned as he grew in Christian experience. Already he felt that the Lord's day was superseding the Sabbath, the New Covenant the Old. What could take the place of the Temple, and that which was behind the veil, and the Levitical sacrifices, and the holy city, when they should cease to exist? What compensation could Christianity offer him for the loss which was pressing the Hebrew Christian more and more?

James, the bishop of Jerusalem, had just left his place vacant by a martyr's death. Neither to Cephas at Babylon, nor to John at Ephesus, the third pillar of the Apostolic Church, was it given to understand all the greatness of this want, and to speak the word in season. But there came from Rome the voice of one who had been the foremost in sounding the depth and breadth of that love of Christ which was all but incomprehensible to the Jew—one who, feeling more than any other apostle the weight of the care of all the churches, yet clung to his own people with a love ever ready to break out in impassioned words, and unsought and ill-requited deeds of kindness. He whom Jerusalem had sent away in chains to Rome again lifted up his voice in the hallowed city among his countrymen; but with words and arguments suited to their capacity, with a strange, borrowed accent, and a tone in which reigned no apostolic authority, and a face veiled in very love from wayward children who might refuse to hear divine and saving truth when it fell from the lips of Paul.

He meets the Hebrew Christians on their own ground. His answer is, "Your new faith gives you Christ, and in Christ all you seek, all your fathers sought. In Christ, the Son of God, you have an all-sufficient Mediator, nearer than angels to the Father, eminent above Moses as a benefactor, more sympathizing and more prevailing than the high-priest as an intercessor: his Sabbath awaits you in heaven; to his covenant the old was intended to be subservient; his atonement is the eternal reality of which sacrifices are but the passing shadow; his city heavenly, not made with hands. Having him, believe in him with all your heart—with a faith in the unseen future strong as that of the saints of old, patient under present and prepared for coming woe, full of energy, and hope, and holiness, and love."

Such was the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. We do not possess the means of tracing out step by step its effect upon them, but we know that the result at which it aimed was achieved. The Church at Jerusalem did not apostatize. It migrated to Pella (Eusebius, *H. Eccl.* iii, 5); and there, no longer dwarfed under the cold shadow of overhanging Judaism, it followed the Hebrew Christians of the Dispersion in gradually entering on the possession of the full liberty which the law of Christ allows to all.

The primary design of this epistle, therefore, was to dissuade those to whom it is written from relapsing into Judaism, and to exhort them to hold fast the truths of Christianity which they had received. For this purpose the apostle shows the superiority of the latter dispensation over the former, in that it was introduced by one far greater than angels, or than Moses, from whom the Jews received their economy (i–iii), and in that it affords a more secure and complete salvation to the sinner than the former (iv–ix). In demonstrating the latter position, the apostle shows that in point of dignity, perpetuity, sufficiency, and suitableness, the Jewish priesthood and sacrifices were far inferior to those of Christ, who was the substance and reality, while these were but the type and shadow. He shows, also, that by the appearance of the antitype the type is necessarily abolished; and adduces the important truth that now, through Christ, the privilege of personal access to God is free to all. On all this he founds an exhortation to a life of faith and obedience, and shows that it has ever been only by a spiritual recognition and worship of God that good men have participated in his favor (xi). The epistle concludes, as is usual with Paul, with a series of practical exhortations and pious wishes (xii–xiii).

But this great epistle remains to after times a keystone binding together that succession of inspired men which spans over the ages between Moses and John. It teaches the Christian student the substantial identity of the revelation of God, whether given through the prophets or through the Son; for it shows that God's purposes are unchangeable, however diversely in different ages they have been "reflected in broken and fitful rays, glancing back from the troubled waters of the human soul." It is a source of inexhaustible comfort to every Christian sufferer in inward perplexity, or amid "reproaches and afflictions." It is a pattern to every Christian teacher of the method in which larger views should be imparted, gently, reverently, and seasonably, to feeble spirits prone to cling to ancient forms, and to rest in accustomed feelings.

VIII. *Literature.*—1. Of general introductory treatises, besides the formal *Introductions* of Michaelis, Eichhorn, De Wette, Davidson, Bleek, Horne, etc., and the prolegomena in the regular commentaries of Stuart, Alford, etc., the following express treatises in volume form may be especially named: Ziegler, *Einleit.* (Gott. 1791, 8vo); Bratt, *De argum. et auct.* etc. (Gryph. 1806, 4to); Seyfarth, *De Indole*, etc. (Lips. 1821, 8vo); Winzer, *De Sacerdotis officio*, etc. (Lips. 1825, 4to); De Groot, *Comparatio*, etc. (Tr. ad Rh. 1826, 8vo); Bleek, *Einleit.* (Berl. 1828, 8vo); Baumgarten-Crusius, *Conjecturæ*, etc. (Jenæ, 1829, 4to); Gelpe, *Vindiciæ*, etc. (L. B. 1832, 8vo); Grossmann, *De philos. Jud.* etc. (Lips. 1834, 4to); Stenglin, *Zeugnisse*, etc. (Bamb. 1835, 8vo); Forster, *Apostolical Authority*, etc. (Lond. 1838, 8vo); Thiersch, *De Ep. ad Hebr.* (Marburg, 1848, 8vo); Mole, *De Christologia*, etc. (Halle, 1854); Wieseler, *Untersuchung*, etc. (Kiel, 1861, 8vo); Riehm, *Lehrbegr.* etc. (1867, 8vo).

2. The following are special *commentaries* on the whole of the epistle alone, the most important of which are here designated by an asterisk (*) prefixed: Athanasius, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* I, ii); Chrysostom, *Homiliæ* (in *Opp.* xii, 1); Cyril, *Commentaria* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* VIII, ii, 147); Alcuin, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* I, ii); Aquinas, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* vii); *Calvin, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.*; also in English, by Cotton, Lond. 1605, 4to; by a clergyman, London, 1841, 12mo; by Owen, Edinb.

1853, 8vo); Zuingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* iv, 564); Œcolampadius, *Explanationes* (Argent. 1534, Basil, 1536, 8vo); Megander, *Adnotationes* (Tig. 1539, 8vo); Grandis, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1546, 8vo); Bachmeister [ed. Streuensee], *Disputatio* (Rost. 1569, 8vo; also in Germ. Hal. 1755, 8vo); Brentz, *Commentarius* (Tub. 1571, 4to); Hyperius, *Commentarii* (Tig. 1585, fol.); Grynæus, *Explanatio* (Basil. 1587, 8vo); Buccafoci, *Commentarius* [including John] (Rom. 1587, 4to); Hunn, *Exegesis* (F. ad M. 1589, 8vo); De Ribera [concluded by others], *Commentarius* (Salæn. 1598, Cologne, 1600, Turin, 1605, 8vo); Galenus, *Commentarius* (Duac. 1578, Lov. 1599, 8vo); Dering, *Lectures* [on chap. i–vi] (in *Works*); Cameron, *Responsiones* (in *Opp.* p. 366); Crell, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* ii, 61); Rung, *Analysis* (Vit. 1600, 8vo); Nahum, *Commentarius* [including Gal. and Ephes.] (Han. 1602, 8vo); Rollock, *Commentarius* (Gen. 1605, 1610, 12mo; also *Analysis*, Edinburgh, 1605, 8vo); Junius, *Enarratio* (Heidelberg, 1610, 8vo; also in *Opp.* i, 1368); De Tena, *Commentarius* (Toledo, 1611, 1617, fol.; with additions by others, London, 1661, fol.; also in the *Critici Sacri*); Lyser, *Commentarius* (Vit. 1616, 4to); Capellus, *Observationes* (Sed. 1634, 8vo); Cocceius, *In. Ep. ad H.* (in *Opp.* xii, 315); Alting, *Prælectiones* [on chap. i–x] (in *Opp.* iv); Scultetus, *Ideæ* (Fracof. 1634, 8vo); Slichting, *Commentarius* (Rac. 1634, 8vo); Jones, *Commentary* [includ. Philem.] (Lond. 1635, fol.); Dickson, *Explanation* (Aberd. 1635, 1649; Glasg. 1654; Lond. 1839, 8vo); Rapine, *Expositio* (Par. 1636, 8vo); Guillebert, *Paraphrase* [in French] (Paris, 1638, 8vo); Gerhard, *Commentarius* (Jena, 1641, 1661, 4to); Vincent, *Commentaria* (Paris, 1644, fol.); Douname, *Commentary* (London, 1646, fol.); Lushington, *Commentary* [chiefly a translation of Crell and Slichting] (Lond. 1646, fol.); Godeau, *Paraphrase* [in French] (Paris, 1651, 12mo; in English, Lond. 1715, 12mo); Gouge, *Commentary* (London, 1655, fol.); Horne, *Expositio* (Bruns. 1655, 4to); Major, *Commentaria* (Jen. 1655, 1668, 4to); Wandalin, *Paraphrasis* (Havn. 1656, 4to); Caspar Streso, *Commentarius* (Hague, 1661, 4to); Lamson, *Exposition* (Lond. 1662, fol.); Owen, *Exposition* [Rabbinical illustrations] (London, 1668–74, 4 vols. fol.; Edinb. 1812–14, 7 vols. 8vo; London, 1840, 4 vols. 8vo; Edinb. 1854, 7 vols. 8vo; abridged, London, 1790, 1815, 4 vols. 8vo); *Seb. Schmid, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1680, Lips. 1698, 4to); Maius, *Paraphrasis* (Giess. 1687, 1700, 4to); Wittich, *Investigatio* (Amsterd. 1691, 4to); *Van Hoeke, *Commentarius* (Lugd. B. 1693, 4to; in German, Frankf. 1707, 4to); Groenwegen, *Vytlegginge* (Leyden, 1693, 1702, 4to); Nemeth, *Explicatio* (Franec. 1695, 1702, 4to); De Marck, *Commentarius* [including min. proph.] (Tub. 1696, 5 vols. 4to; 1734, 2 vols. fol.); Ackersloot, *Vytlegginge* (Hag. 1697, 4to; in German, Bremen, 1714, 4to); Creyghton, *Verklaaring* (Amst. 1699, 4to); Heidegger, *Exegetica* [including some other books of Scripture] (Tig. 1700, 1706, 1710, 4to); Schomer, *Exegesis* [includ. part of 1 Peter] (Rost. 1701, 4to); Braun, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1705, 4to); Olearius, *Analysis* (Lips. 1706, 4to); Brochmand, *Commentarius* (Havn. 1706, 4to); Starck, *Notæ* (Lips. 1710, 4to); *D'Outrein, *Verklaaring* (Amst. 1711, 4to; in German, Frankf. 1713, 1718, 2 vols. 4to); Limborch, *Commentarius* [includ. Acts and Rom.] (Rotterd. 1711, fol.); Clement Streso, *Meditatien* (Amst. 1714, 4to); Dorsche, *Commentarius* (Frankfort et Lips. 1717, 4to); Vermaten, *Ontleeding* (Amsterd. 1722, 4to); Hulse, *Verklaaring* (Rotterd. 1725, 2 vols. 4to); Peirce [continued by Hallet], *Paraphrase* (London, 1727, 4to; also [with Col. and Phil.] ib. 1733, 4to; in Latin, with additions, by J. D. Michaelis, Hal. 1747, 4to); Duncan, *Exposition* (Edinb. 1731, 8vo; 1844, 12mo); Cellarius, *Auslegung* (Ulm, 1731, 4to); *Rambach, *Erklärung* [ed. Neubaier] (Frankf. 1742, 4to); Carpzov, *Exercitationes* [comparison with Philo] (Helmst. 1750, 8vo; in Germ. ib. 1795, 8vo); Anon. *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1750, 8vo; in Latin, by Semler, Halle, 1779, 8vo); Sykes, *Paraphrase* [Arian] (Lond. 1755, 4to); *Cramer, *Erklärung* (Copenh. 1757, 4to); Michaelis, *Erklärung* (Frankf. 1762–4, 1780–6, 2 vols. 8vo); Streuensee, *Erklärung* (Flensb. 1763, 4to); Baumgarten, *Erklärung* (Hal. 1763, 4to); C. F. Schmid, *Observationes* (Lipsiæ, 1766, 8vo); Zachariä, *Erklärung* (Gott. 1771; ed. by Rosenmüller, ib. 1793, 8vo); Morus, *Uebersetzung* (Leipz. 1776, 1786, 8vo); Blasche, *Commentar* (Leipzig, 1781, 8vo); Abresch, *Annotationes* (L. B. 1786–7, 3 vols. 8vo); Delphinus, *Commentarius* [includ. John] (Rom. 1787, 8vo); Storr, *Erläuterung* (Tub. 1789, 1809, 8vo); *Ernesti, *Lectiones* [edit. Dindorf] (Lips. 1795, 8vo); Hezel, *Versuch* (Leipzig, 1795, 8vo); Valnecker, *Scholæ* (in his selections, Amsterd. 1815, ii, 345–600); Schulz, *Anmerk.* (Breslau, 1818, 8vo); Maclean, *Commentary* (London, 1819, 8vo); W. Jones, *Lectures* (Lond. 1821, 8vo); Boehme, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1825, 8vo); *Stuart, *Commentary* (Andover, 1827, 1833, 1851, 1860; Lond. 1837, 8vo); G. V. Sampson, *Notes* (Lond. 1828, 8vo); *Bleek, *Commentar* (Berlin, 1828–41; Elberf. 1838, 1868, 8vo); *Kuinöl, *Commentarius* (Lipsiæ, 1831, 8vo); Paulus, *Erläuterung* (Heidelb. 1833, 8vo); Klee, *Commentar* (Mainz, 1833, 8vo); Knox, *Sermons* (Lond. 1834, 8vo); Bishop Parry, *Exposition* (Lond. 1834, 8vo); Conder, *Notes* (Lond. 1834, 8vo); Duke of Manchester, *Argument* [of chap. i–iv, 11] (Lond. 1835, 8vo); *Tholuck, *Commentar* (Hamburg, 1836, 1840, 8vo; translated, London, 1842, 2 vols. 12mo); *Stier, *Auslegung* (Halle, 1842, 8vo; Brunswick, 1862, 2 vols. 8vo); Maurice, *Lectures* (London, 1846, 8vo); Stengel, *Erklärung* (Karlsruhe, 1849, 8vo); *Delitzsch, *Commentar* (Leipz. 1850, 8vo; translated, Edinburgh, 1868–70, 2 vols. 8vo); Miller, *Notes* (Lond. 1851, 12mo); *Turner, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1852, 8vo); Ellard, *Commentary* (Edinburgh, 1854, 8vo); Lüneman, *Erklärung* (Götting. 1855, 8vo); Tait, *Exposition* (Lond. 1855, 2 vols. 12mo); Patterson, *Commentary* (Edinb. 1856, 8vo); F. S. Sampson, *Commentary* [ed. by Dabney] (New York, 1856, 8vo); Boultbee, *Lectures* (London, 1856, 12mo); Anon. *Comparison with Old Test.* (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Am. Bib. Union, *Trans. with Notes* (N. Y. 1858, 4to); Haldane, *Notes* (Lond. 1860, 12mo); Knowles, *Notes* (Lond. 1862, 8vo); John Brown, *Exposition* (Lond. 1862, 2 vols. 8vo); Kluge, *Erklärung* (Neu Rup. 1863, 8vo); Dale, *Discourses* (London, 1865, 8vo); Blech, *Predigten* (Danz. 1865, in pts. 8vo); Hartmann, *Ausleg.* (Berl. 1866, 8vo); Longking, *Notes* (N. Y. 1867, 12mo); Lindsay, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1867, 5 vols. 8vo); Kurtz, *Erklär.* (Mitau, 1869, 8vo); Ewald, *Erklär.* (Gött. 1870, 8vo). See EPISTLE.

He'bron (Heb. *Chebron'*, חֶבְרוֹן, a *community;* Sept. Χεβρών), the name of an important city and of several men, also (in a different Heb. form) of a smaller town.

1. A place in the south of Palestine, situated 20 Roman miles south of Jerusalem, and the same distance north of Beersheba (Eusebius, *Onom.* s. v. Ἀρκώ); and still extant, 18 miles south from Jerusalem, in 31° 32′ 30″ N. lat., 35° 8′ 20″ E. long., at the height of 2664 Paris feet above the level of the sea (Schubert). It is one of the most ancient cities existing, having been built "seven years before Zoan in Egypt," and being mentioned even prior to Damascus (Numb. xiii, 22; Gen. xiii, 18; comp. xv, 2). Its earlier name was KIRJATH-ARBA, that is, *the city of Arba*, from Arba, the father of Anak and of the Anakim who dwelt in and around Hebron (Gen. xxiii, 2; Josh. xiv, 15; xv, 3; xxi, 11; Judg. i, 10). It appears still earlier to have been called MAMRE, probably from the name of Abraham's Amoritish ally (Gen. xxiii, 19; xxxv, 27; comp. xiv, 13, 28); but the "oak of Mamre," where the patriarch so often pitched his tent, appears to have been not in, but near Hebron. (See below.) The chief interest of this city arises from its having been the scene of some of the most remarkable events in the lives of the patriarchs. Sarah died at Hebron, and Abraham then bought from Ephron the Hittite the field and cave of Machpelah, to serve as a family tomb (Gen. xxiii, 2–20). The cave is still there, and the massive walls of the Haram or mosque, within which it lies, form the most remarkable object in the whole city. The ancient city lay in a valley, and the two remaining pools, one of which at least

existed in the time of David, serve, with other circumstances, to identify the modern with the ancient site (Gen. xxxvii, 14; 2 Sam. iv, 12). Much of the lifetime of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was spent in this neighborhood, where they were all entombed, and it was from hence that the patriarchal family departed for Egypt by the way of Beersheba (Gen. xxxvii, 14; xlvi, 1). After the return of the Israelites, the city was taken by Joshua and given over to Caleb, who expelled the Anakim from its territories (Josh. x, 36, 37; xiv, 6-15; xv, 13-14; Judg. i, 20). It was afterwards made one of the cities of refuge, and assigned to the priests and Levites (Josh. xx, 7; xxi, 11, 13). David, on becoming king of Judah, made Hebron his royal residence. Here he reigned seven years and a half, here most of his sons were born, and here he was anointed king over all Israel (1 Sam. ii, 1-4, 11; 1 Kings ii, 11; 2 Sam. v, 1, 3). On this extension of his kingdom Hebron ceased to be sufficiently central, and Jerusalem then became the metropolis. It is possible that this step excited a degree of discontent in Hebron which afterwards encouraged Absalom to raise in that city the standard of rebellion against his father (2 Kings xv, 9, 10). Hebron was one of the places fortified by Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi, 10); and after the exile, the Jews who returned to Palestine occupied Hebron and the surrounding villages (Neh. xi, 15). Hebron is not named by the prophets, nor in the New Testament; but we learn from the Apocrypha, and from Josephus, that it came into the power of the Edomites, who had taken possession of the south of Judah, and was recovered from them by Judas Maccabæus (1 Macc. v, 65; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 8, 6). During the great war, Hebron was seized by the rebel Simon Giorides, but was recaptured and burnt by Cerealis, an officer of Vespasian (Joseph. *War*, iv, 9; vii, 9). Josephus describes the tombs of the patriarchs as existing in his day; and both Eusebius and Jerome, and all subsequent writers who mention Hebron down to the time of the Crusades, speak of the place chiefly as containing these sepulchres. In the course of time, the remarkable structure enclosing the tombs of Abraham and the other patriarchs was called the "Castle of Abraham;" and by an easy transition, this name came to be applied to the city itself, till in the time of the Crusades the names of Hebron and Castle of Abraham were used interchangeably. Hence, as Abraham is also distinguished among the Moslems by the appellation of *el-Khulil*, "the Friend" (of God), this latter epithet became, among them, the name of the city; and they now know Hebron only as el-Khulil (Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 456). Soon after the Crusaders had taken Jerusalem, Hebron also appears to have passed into their hands, and in 1100 was bestowed as a fief upon Gerhard of Avennes; but two years after it is described as being in ruins (Wilken, *Gesch. der Kreuz.* ii, 44; Saewulf, *Peregrin.* p. 269). In 1167 Hebron was raised to the rank of a bishopric (Will. Tyr. xx, 3), and the title of bishop of Hebron long remained in the Romish Church, for it occurs so late as A.D. 1365. But it was merely nominal; for after the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin in 1187, Hebron also reverted to the Moslems, and has ever since remained in their possession. In the modern history of Hebron, the most remarkable circumstance is the part which the inhabitants of the town and district took in the rebellion of 1834, and the heavy retribution which it brought down upon them. They held out to the last, and gave battle to Ibrahim Pasha near Solomon's Pools. They were defeated, but retired and intrenched themselves in Hebron, which Ibrahim carried by storm, and gave over to sack and pillage. The town has not yet recovered from the blow it then sustained. In the 14th century pilgrims passed from Sinai to Jerusalem direct through the desert by Beersheba and Hebron. In the following century this route seems to have been abandoned for that by Gaza; yet the pilgrims sometimes took Hebron in their way, or visited it from Gaza. The travellers of that period describe as existing here an immense charitable establishment, or hospital, where 1200 loaves of bread, besides oil and other condiments, were daily distributed to all comers, without distinction of age or religion, at the annual expense of 20,000 ducats. Hebron continued to be occasionally visited by European travellers down to the latter part of the 17th century, but from that time till the present century it appears to have been little frequented by them. The principal travellers who have been more recently there are Seetzen, Ali Bey, Irby and Mangles, Poujoulat, Monro, Stephens, Paxton, Lord Lindsay, Russegger, Schubert, Dr. Robinson, Dr. Olin, De Saulcy, Stanley, etc.

The town of Hebron lies low on the sloping sides of a narrow valley (of Mamre), surrounded by rocky hills. This is thought to be the "valley of Eshcol," whence the Jewish spies got the great bunch of grapes (Numb. xiii, 23). Its sides are still clothed with luxuriant vineyards, and its grapes are considered the finest in Southern Palestine. Groves of gray olives, and some other fruit-trees, give variety to the scene. The valley runs from north to south; and the main quarter of the town, surmounted by the lofty walls of the venerable *Haram*, lies partly on the eastern slope (Gen. xxxvii, 14; comp. xxiii, 19). The houses are all of stone, solidly built, flat-roofed, each having one or two small cupolas. The town has no walls. The streets are narrow, seldom more than two or three yards in width; the pavement, where one exists, is rough and difficult. The shops are well furnished, better indeed than those of towns of the same class in Egypt, and the commodities are of a very similar description. The only display of local manufactures is the produce of the glass-works, for which the place has long been celebrated in these parts. Gates are placed not only at the entrance of the city, but in different parts of the interior, and are closed at night for the better preservation of order, as well as to prevent communication between the different quarters.

There are nine mosques in Hebron, none of which possess any architectural or other interest, with the exception of the massive structure which is built over the tombs of the patriarchs. This is esteemed by the Moslems one of their holiest places, and Christians are rigorously excluded from it. The only Europeans who, until a late period, have found their way to the interior, were Ali Bey and Giovanni Finati, the Italian servant of Mr. Bankes. The best account of it is that furnished by the Rev. V. Monro, who states that "the mosque, which covers the cave of Machpelah, and contains the patriarchal tombs, is a square building, with little external decoration, at the south end of the town. Behind it is a small cupola, with eight or ten windows, beneath which is the tomb of Esau, excluded from the privilege of lying among the patriarchs. Ascending from the street, at the corner of the mosque, you pass through an arched way by a flight of steps to a wide platform, at the end of which is another short ascent; to the left is the court, out of which, to the left again, you enter the mosque. The dimensions within are about forty paces by twenty-five. Immediately on the right of the door is the tomb of Sarah, and beyond it that of Abraham, having a passage between them into the court. Corresponding with these, on the opposite side of the mosque, are those of Isaac and Rebekah, and behind them is a recess for prayer, and a pulpit. These tombs resemble small huts, with a window on each side and folding-doors in front, the lower parts of which are of wood, and the upper of iron or bronze bars plated. Within each of these is an imitation of the sarcophagus that lies in the cave below the mosque, which no one is allowed to enter. Those seen above resemble coffins with pyramidal tops, and are covered with green silk, lettered with verses from the Koran. The doors of these tombs are left constantly open; but no one enters those of the women—at least men do not. In the mosque is a baldakin, supported by four columns, over an octagonal figure of black and white marble inlaid, around a small hole in the pavement, through which a chain passes from the

top of the canopy to a lamp continually burning to give light in the cave of Machpelah, where the actual sarcophagi rest. At the upper end of the court is the chief place of prayer; and on the opposite side of the mosque are two larger tombs, where are deposited the bodies of Jacob and Leah" (*Summer's Ramble*, i, 245). The cave itself he does not describe, nor does it appear that even Moslems are admitted to it; for Ali Bey (a Spaniard travelling as a Moslem) does not even mention the cave below while describing the shrines of the mosque. John Sanderson (A.D. 1601) expressly says that none might enter, but that persons might view it, as far as the lamp allowed, through the hole at the top, Moslems being furnished with more light for the purpose than Jews. At an earlier period, however, when the Holy Land was in the power of the Christians, access was not denied; and Benjamin of Tudela says that the sarcophagi above ground were shown to the generality of pilgrims as what they desired to see; but if a rich Jew offered an additional fee, "an iron door is opened, which dates from the time of our forefathers who rest in peace, and, with a burning taper in his hands, the visitor descends into a first cave, which is empty, traverses a second in the same state, and at last reaches a third, which contains six sepulchres, those of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and of Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah, one opposite the other. All these sepulchres bear inscriptions, the letters being engraved; thus, upon that of Abraham: 'This is the sepulchre of our father Abraham, upon whom be peace;' even so upon that of Isaac and all the other sepulchres. A lamp burns in the cave and upon the sepulchres continually, both night and day; and you there see tubs filled with the bones of Israelites; for it is a custom of the house of Israel to bring hither the bones and relics of their forefathers, and leave them there, unto this day" (*Itinerary*, i, 77; ed. Asher, Berlin, 1840). The identity of this place with the cave of Machpelah is one of the few local traditions in Palestine which even Dr. Robinson suffers to pass without dispute, and may therefore be taken for granted. M. Pierotti, an engineer to the pasha of Jerusalem, has lately had an opportunity of leisurely examining the building; and in the spring of the year 1862 the prince of Wales and his suite were allowed to visit the interior, of which a description is given in App. ii to Stanley's *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, pt. i: "We reached the south-eastern corner of the massive wall of inclosure. . . . Up the steep flight of the exterior staircase, gazing close at hand on the polished surface of the wall, amply justifying Josephus's account of the marble-like appearance of the huge stones which compose it, we rapidly mounted. At the head of the staircase, which by its long ascent showed that the platform of the mosque was on the uppermost slope of the hill, and therefore above the level where, if anywhere, the sacred cave would be found, a sharp turn at once brought us within the precincts, and revealed to us for the first time the wall from the inside. . . . We passed at once through an open court into the mosque. With regard to the building itself, two points at once became apparent. First, it was clear that it had been originally a Byzantine church. To any one acquainted with the cathedral of St. Sophia at Constantinople, and with the monastic churches of Mount Athos, this is evident from the double narthex, or portico, and from the four pillars of the nave. Secondly, it was clear that it had been converted at a much later period into a mosque. . . . I now proceed to describe the tombs of the patriarchs, premising always that these tombs, like all those in Mussulman mosques, and, indeed, like most tombs in Christian churches, do not profess to be the actual places of sepulture, but are merely monuments or cenotaphs in honor of the dead who lie beneath. Each is inclosed with a separate chapel or shrine, closed with gates or railings similar to those which surround or enclose the special chapels or royal tombs in Westminster Abbey. The first two of these shrines or chapels are contained in the inner portico, or narthex, before the entrance into the actual building of the mosque. In the recess on the right is the shrine of Abraham, in the recess on the left that of Sarah, each guarded by silver gates. The shrine of Sarah we were requested not to enter, as being that of a woman. A pall lay over it. The shrine of Abraham, after a momentary hesitation, was thrown open. The chamber is cased in marble. The so-called tomb consists of a coffin-like structure, about six feet high, built up of plastered stone or marble, and hung with three carpets—green embroidered with gold. Within the area of the church or mosque were shown the tombs of Isaac and Rebekah. They are placed under separate chapels, in the walls of which are windows, and of which the gates are grated, not with silver, but iron bars. Their situation, planted as they are in the body of the mosque, may indicate their Christian origin. In almost all Mussulman sanctuaries, the tombs of distinguished persons are placed, not in the centre of the building, but in the corners. To Rebekah's tomb the same decorous rule of the exclusion of male visitors naturally applied as in the case of Sarah's. But on requesting to see the tomb of Isaac, we were entreated not to enter. . . . The chapel, in fact, contains nothing of interest; but I mention this story both for the sake of the singular sentiment which it expresses, and also because it well illustrates the peculiar feeling which has tended to preserve the sanctity of the place—an awe, amounting to terror, of the great personages who lay beneath, and who would, it was supposed, be sensitive to any disrespect shown to their graves, and revenge it accordingly. The shrines of Jacob and Leah were shown in recesses, corresponding to those of Abraham and Sarah, but in a separate cloister opposite the entrance of the mosque. . . . It will be seen that up to this point no mention has been made of the subject of the greatest interest, namely, the sacred cave itself, in which one at least of the patriarchal family may possibly still repose intact—the embalmed body of Jacob. It may well be supposed that to this object our inquiries throughout were directed. One indication alone of the cavern beneath was visible. In the interior of the mosque, at the corner of the shrine of Abraham, was a small circular hole, about eight inches across, of which one foot above the pavement was built of strong masonry, but of which the lower part, as far as we could see and feel, was of the living rock. This cavity appeared to open into a dark space beneath, and that space (which the guardians of the mosque believed to extend under the whole platform) can hardly be anything else than the ancient cavern of Machpelah. This was the only aperture which the guardians recognised. Once, they said, 2500 years ago, a servant of a great king had penetrated through some other entrance. He descended in full possession of his faculties and of remarkable corpulence; he returned blind, deaf, withered, and crippled. Since then the entrance was closed, and this aperture alone was left, partly for the sake of suffering the holy air of the cave to escape into the mosque, and be scented by the faithful; partly for the sake of allowing a lamp to be let down by a chain, which we saw suspended at the mouth, to burn upon the sacred cave. We asked whether it could not be lighted now. 'No,' they said; 'the saint likes to have a lamp at night, but not in the full daylight.' With that glimpse into the dark void we and the world without must for the present be satisfied. Whether any other entrance is known to the Mussulmans themselves must be a matter of doubt. The original entrance to the cave if it is now to be found at all, must probably be on the southern face of the hill, between the mosque and the gallery containing the shrine of Joseph, and entirely obstructed by the ancient Jewish wall, probably built across it for this very purpose." This account is somewhat at variance with the results of the researches of M. Pierotti, who states, in a letter to the London *Times*, April 30, 1862, "The true entrance to the patriarchs' tomb is to be seen close to the western

wall of the enclosure, and near the north-west corner; it is guarded by a very thick iron railing, and I was not allowed to go near it. I observed that the Mussulmans themselves did not go very near it. In the court opposite the entrance-gate of the mosque there is an opening, through which I was allowed to go down for three steps, and I was able to ascertain by sight and touch that the rock exists there, and to conclude it to be about five feet thick. From the short observations I could make during my brief descent, as also from the consideration of the east wall of the mosque, and the little information I extracted from the chief santon, who jealously guards the sanctuary, I consider that a part of the grotto exists under the mosque, and that the other part is under the court, but at a lower level than that lying under the mosque." See MACHPELAH.

The court in which the mosque stands is surrounded by an extensive and lofty wall, formed of large stones, and strengthened by square buttresses. This wall is the greatest antiquity in Hebron, and even Dr. Robinson supposes that it may be substantially the same which is mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* i, 14; *War*, iv, 9, 7), and by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Arboch), as the sepulchre of Abraham. A common Moslem tomb in the neighborhood of Hebron passes as the tomb of Abner. He was certainly interred in this city (2 Sam. iii, 32); and the head of Ishbosheth, after his assassination, was deposited in the same sepulchre (2 Sam. iv, 12); but there is slight evidence in favor of the tradition which professes to point out this locality to the modern traveller. Besides this venerable wall, there is nothing at Hebron bearing the stamp of antiquity save two reservoirs for rain-water outside the town. One of these is just without the southern gate, in the bottom of the valley. It is a large basin 133 feet square, and 21 feet 8 inches deep. It is built of hewn limestone of very solid workmanship, and obviously of ancient date. The depth of water of course varies at different times of the year: in May it is 14 feet. The descent is by flights of steps at the four corners, by which the water is brought up in vessels and skins, and poured out into troughs for the flocks, or carried away for domestic uses. Just at the north end of the main part of the town is another and smaller pool, also occupying the bed of the valley, and measuring 85 feet by 55, with a depth of 18½ feet, containing (in May) 7 feet of water. These cisterns, which are connected with no perennial springs, and which are filled only by the rains, seem (at least in summer) to be the main dependence of the inhabitants for water, although that of the larger pool is neither clear nor clean. As these pools are doubtless of high antiquity, one of them is in all likelihood the "pool of Hebron" over which David hanged up the assassins of Ishbosheth (2 Sam. iv, 12).

The present population of Hebron has not been clearly ascertained, but is probably about 5000. Most of the inhabitants are Moslems, of fierce and intolerant character. There are no resident Christians. The Jews amount to about 50 families, mostly natives of different countries of Europe, who have emigrated to this place for the purpose of having their bones laid near the sepulchres of their illustrious ancestors. They have two synagogues and several schools. As usual, they have a quarter of the city to themselves, where the streets are narrow and filthy, and the houses mean. In a few instances, however, they are in tolerable repair, and whitewashed.

The environs of Hebron are very fertile. Vineyards and plantations of fruit-trees, chiefly olive-trees, cover the valleys and arable grounds; while the tops and sides of the hills, although stony, are covered with rich pastures, which support a great number of cattle, sheep, and goats, constituting an important branch of the industry and wealth of Hebron. The hill-country of Judah, of which it is the capital, is indeed highly productive, and under a paternal government would be capable of sustaining a large population. That it did so once is manifest from the great number and extent of ruined terraces and dilapidated towns. It is at present abandoned, and cultivation ceases at the distance of two miles north of the town. The hills then become covered with prickly and other stunted trees, which furnish Bethlehem and other villages with wood. About a mile from the town, up the valley, is one of the largest oak-trees in Palestine. It stands quite alone in the midst of the vineyards. It is 23 feet in girth, and its branches cover a space 90 feet in diameter. This, say some, is the very tree beneath which Abraham pitched his tent; but, however this may be, it still bears the name of the patriarch (Porter's *Handbook*, p. 67 sq.). See OAK.

2. The third son of Kohath the Levite, and hence the uncle of Moses (Exod. vi, 18; 1 Chron. vi, 2, 18; xv, 9; xxiii, 12, 19). B.C. ante 1738. His descendants are called HEBRONITES (Numb. iii, 27, etc.).

3. A son of Mareshah, and apparently grandson of Caleb of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 42, 43). B.C. post 1612.

4. (Heb. *Ebron'*, עֶבְרוֹן, prob. for עַבְדּוֹן, *Abdon*, as many MSS. read; Sept. Ἐβρών, Vulg. *Abran.*) A town on the northern border of Asher (Josh. xix, 28); possibly the same (Keil, *Comment.* in loc.) elsewhere (Josh. xxi, 30) called ABDON (q. v.).

He'bronite (Heb. *Chebroni'*, חֶבְרוֹנִי, Sept. Χεβρών and Χεβρωνί, Vulg. *Hebronitæ*), a designation of the descendants of HEBRON, the third son of Kohath, who was the second son of Levi, the younger brother of Amram, father of Moses and Aaron (Exod. vi, 18; Numb. iii, 19; 1 Chron. vi, 2, 18; xxiii, 12). The immediate children of Hebron are not mentioned by name (comp. Exod. vi, 21, 22), but he was the founder of a "family" (*mishpachah*) of Hebronites (Numb. iii, 27; xxvi, 58; 1 Chron. xxvi, 23, 30, 31) or Bene-Hebron (1 Chron. xv, 9; xxiii, 19), who are often mentioned in the enumerations of the Levites in the passages above cited. JERIAH was the head of the family in the time of David (1 Chron. xxiii, 19; xxvi, 31; xxiv, 23: in the last of these passages the name of Hebron does not now exist in the Hebrew, but has been supplied in the A. V. from the other lists). In the last year of David's reign we find them settled at Jazer, in Gilead (a place not elsewhere named as a Levitical city), "mighty men of valor" (בְּנֵי חַיִל), 2700 in number, who were superintendents for the king over the two and a half tribes in regard to all matters sacred and secular (1 Chron. xxvi, 31, 32). At the same time 1700 of the family under Hashabiah held the same office on the west of Jordan (ver. 30).

Heckewelder, JOHN GOTTLIEB ERNESTUS, a distinguished Moravian missionary among the Indians of North America, born at Bedford, England, Mar. 12, 1743, where his father, who had fled from Moravia for the sake of religious liberty, was engaged in the service of the Church. On the 2d of April, 1754, young Heckewelder came to America with his parents. At the age of nineteen years (1762) he accompanied Christian Frederick Post, an Indian teacher and colonial agent, to the Tuscarawas Valley, in Ohio, where they attempted to establish a mission among the natives. This enterprise proving a failure, Heckewelder labored for some time as the assistant of David Zeisberger, on the Susquehanna. In the spring of 1771 he joined this illustrious evangelist at Friedenstadt, on the Beaver Creek, Pa., and for the next fifteen years shared all the hardships, sufferings, and triumphs of the Indian mission, at its various stations in Ohio and Michigan. See ZEISBERGER, DAVID. In the course of this period he married Miss Sarah Ohneberg (July 4, 1780), at Salem, Ohio, which was probably the first wedding ever solemnized in that state. Having severed his connection with the mission (October, 1786) on account of his wife's feeble health, he was appointed (1788) agent of the "Society of the United Brethren for propagating the Gospel among the Heathen" [see ETTWEIN, JOHN], and made

repeated but unsuccessful attempts, in consequence of the Indian War, to survey a tract of land in the Tuscarawas Valley, granted to the Christian Indians by Congress as an indemnification for their losses in the Revolution. In 1792 and 1793 he was twice appointed assistant peace commissioner by the United States government, and was active in aiding the other commissioners to bring about a pacification. These humane efforts, however, proved abortive, and the war continued, ending in the total defeat of the Western tribes. In 1801 he settled at Gnadenhütten, Ohio, and devoted himself to the duties of his agency until 1810, when he resigned. The rest of his life he spent at Bethlehem in literary labors, producing two works, namely, *An Account of the History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations who once inhabited Pennsylvania and the neighboring States* (Philadelphia, 1818; transl. into French by Duponceau, Paris, 1822, 8vo); and *A Narrative of the Mission of the United Brethren among the Delaware and Mohegan Indians* (Philadelphia, 1820). He died January 31, 1823. General Cass criticised his writings in the *North Amer. Review*, vol. xxvi. See also Rondthaler, *Life of Heckewelder* (Phila. 1847, 12mo). (E. de S.)

Hedding, Elijah, D.D., a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Pine Plains, N. Y., June 7, 1780. Trained religiously by a pious mother, he was converted on the Vergennes Circuit, Vermont, in 1798, and in 1800 was licensed to preach. His early labors in the itinerant ministry were full of toil and privation, and he often met with fierce persecution; but powerful revivals followed his ministry, especially in Vermont and New Hampshire. On the 16th of June, 1801, he was admitted on trial in the New York Annual Conference, and appointed to Plattsburg Circuit; in 1802 to Fletcher; in 1803 to Bridgewater Circuit, New Hampshire; after which his work as a preacher lay wholly in New England. In 1807 he was made presiding elder of the New Hampshire District. The country was mountainous, newly settled, and poor; and Mr. Hedding's whole receipts for the first year were $4 25, besides his travelling expenses. In 1808 he was elected a delegate to the General Conference held at Baltimore. A plan for a "delegated" General Conference was discussed by this body, and at first rejected; a rupture seemed imminent, but a reconsideration was brought about, largely through Hedding's influence, and the plan was finally adopted. In 1809 he was appointed to the New London District, and in 1810 he married. In the ten years before his marriage he travelled 3000 miles a year, and preached nearly every day. His pay for this time averaged $45 per annum. "The circuits were large, often requiring three to five hundred miles to complete one round, and this round was completed in from two to six weeks, during which a sermon was to be preached and a class met daily; and often three sermons and three classes to be attended on the Sabbath. The journeys, too, were performed . . . on horseback, through rough and miry ways, and through wildernesses where no road as yet had been cast up. Rivers and swamps were to be forded. Nor could the journey be delayed. On, on, must the itinerant press his way, through the drenching rains of summer, the chilling sleet of spring or autumn, and the driving blasts or piercing cold of winter: and often amid perils, weariness, hunger, and almost nakedness, carrying the Bread of Life to the lost and perishing. And then, when the day of toil was ended, in the creviced hut of the frontier settler, the weary itinerant, among those of kindred hearts and sympathies, found a cordial though humble place of repose." . . . . "For twenty-four years before his election to the episcopacy he received his annual appointments at Conference, and prosecuted the duties assigned him on circuits, and stations, and presiding elders' districts. The fields of his labor lay, after the first few years, wholly in the New-England States; and when the New-England Conference was separated from New York, he became identified with that work. In the introduction and establishment of Methodism in New England—itself one of the most romantic, as it is perhaps the best recorded portion of Methodist history—he was an active and most efficient agent, and in its stirring scenes and forlorn but heroic labors he spent the flower of his manhood; and upon it, no doubt, he left the impress of his own great spirit, which remains his noblest and most enduring monument." From 1808 to 1824 he was a delegate to every General Conference, and was always eminent in influence and power at the sessions of that body. In the "Presiding Elder Question" at the Conferences of 1820 and 1824, he stood with those who favored the election of presiding elders by the Conferences; but his zeal in the cause never degenerated into rashness, or became liable to the charge of disloyalty. In 1824 he was elected bishop. He accepted the office with great reluctance, and filled it with the most distinguished ability and acceptance for 26 years. "In the exercise of the episcopal functions he developed rare qualifications as a presiding officer, and especially as an expounder of ecclesiastical law. The soundness of his views upon the doctrines and discipline of the Church was so fully and so universally conceded, that in the end he became almost an oracle in these respects, and his opinions are regarded with profound veneration. As a theologian and divine, his views were comprehensive, logical, and well matured. Not only had they been elaborated with great care, but the analysis was very distinct; and the successive steps were not only clearly defined in the original analysis, but distinct even in the minutiæ of their detail. His discourses were after the same pattern—an example of neatness, order, perspicuity, and completeness. From the year 1844, age and increasing infirmities compelled him to seek relief from the heavy burden of labor he had previously preformed, and his visits to the Annual Conferences became less frequent. Yet his labors and responsibilities were still very great. He was almost incessantly sought unto by ministers in almost every part of the United States for counsel and assistance, and for information upon points of ecclesiastical law and in the administration of discipline." In 1850 he had a severe attack of acute disease, but he partially recovered, and lingered, after suffering severely, until the 9th of April, 1852, when he died in peace and triumph at his home in Poughkeepsie. His intellect suffered neither weakness nor obscuration to the last. "About three o'clock in the morning, a change took place betokening the near approach of death. Early in the morning his sufferings were great; his extremities were cold, and his death agony was upon him; but his intellectual powers—consciousness, perception, memory, reason, were unaffected. Several Christian friends witnessed his dying struggles, and the glorious triumph of his abiding faith. The Rev. M. Richardson came in, and inquired whether his prospect was clear; he replied with great emphasis, 'Oh yes, *yes*, YES! I have been wonderfully sustained of late, beyond the usual degree.' After a pause, he added, '*I trust in Christ, and he does not disappoint me. I feel him, I enjoy him, and I look forward to an inheritance in his kingdom.*'" A full account of the labors of this great and good man will be found in the *Life and Times of the Rev. E. Hedding, D.D.*, by D. W. Clark, D.D. (New York, 1855, 8vo; reviewed by Dr. Curry in the *Methodist Quarterly*, Oct. 1855); see also Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church;* Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 354; *North American Review*, lxxxii, 349.

Hedge, the rendering in the A. V. (besides derivatives from סוּךְ or סָכַךְ, rendered as a *verb*), 1, of three words from the same root (גָּדַר), which, as well as their Greek equivalent (φραγμός), denotes simply that which surrounds or encloses, whether it be a stone wall (גֶּדֶר, *ge'der*, Prov. xxiv, 31; Ezek. xlii, 10) or a fence of other materials. גָּדֵר, *gader'*, and גְּדֵרָה, *gederah'*, are used of the hedge of a vineyard (Numb. xxii, 24; Psa. lxxxix, 40; 1 Chron. iv, 23); and the latter is employed to describe the wide walls of stone, or fences of thorn, which

served as a shelter for sheep in winter and summer (Numb. xxxii, 16). The stone walls which surround the sheepfolds of modern Palestine are frequently crowned with sharp thorns (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 299), a custom at least as ancient as the time of Homer (*Od.* xiv, 10), when a kind of prickly pear (ἄχερδος) was used for that purpose, as well as for the fences of cornfields at a later period (Arist. *Eccl.* 355). In order to protect the vineyards from the ravages of wild beasts (Psa. lxxx, 12), it was customary to surround them with a wall of loose stones or mud (Matt. xxi, 33; Mark xii, 1), which was a favorite haunt of serpents (Eccles. x, 8), and a retreat for locusts from the cold (Nah. iii, 17). Such walls are described by Maundrell as surrounding the gardens of Damascus. "They are built of great pieces of earth, made in the fashion of brick and hardened in the sun. In their dimensions they are each two yards long and somewhat more than one broad, and half a yard thick. Two rows of these, placed one upon another, make a cheap, expeditious, and, in this dry country, a durable wall" (*Early Travels in Pal.* p. 487). A wall or fence of this kind is clearly distinguished in Isa. v, 5 from the tangled hedge, 2, מְשׂוּכָה, *mesukah'* (מְסוּכָה, Mic. vii, 4), which was planted as an additional safeguard to the vineyard (comp. Ecclus. xxviii, 24), and was composed of the thorny shrubs with which Palestine abounds. The prickly pear, a species of cactus, so frequently employed for this purpose in the East at present, is believed to be of comparatively modern introduction. The aptness of the comparison of a tangled hedge of thorn to the difficulties which a slothful man conjures up as an excuse for his inactivity will at once be recognised (Prov. xv, 19; comp. Hos. ii, 6). The narrow paths between the hedges of the vineyards and gardens, "with a fence on this side and a fence on that side" (Numb. xxii, 24), are distinguished from the "highways," or more frequented tracks, in Luke xiv, 23 (Hackett, *Illustra. of Scripture*, p. 166; Trench, *On the Parables*, p. 193).—Smith, s. v.

Hedge, Levi, LL.D., a professor in Harvard University, was born in 1777 at Hardwick, Mass. He graduated at Harvard University in 1792. "His whole life, from his childhood, may be said to have been connected with the University. In 1795 he was appointed tutor, and subsequently received the appointment of permanent tutor; in 1810 he was made college professor of logic and metaphysics; and in 1827 he was transferred to the Alford professorship of natural religion, moral philosophy, and civil polity. In 1830 he was compelled by an attack of paralysis to resign his position. He died Jan. 3, 1844. He is remembered by many pupils as a faithful instructor and kind friend." He published a "System of Logic" (1818, 18mo), which passed through several editions, and has been translated into German. He was the father of Dr. F. H. Hedge, an eminent Unitarian minister.—*Christian Examiner*, xxxvi, 299.

Hedio, Gaspar or Caspar, one of the early German Reformers, was born at Ettlingen, Baden, in 1494. He studied theology at Freiburg and Basle, where in 1519 he sustained, in presence of Capito, the theses afterwards printed under the title *Conclusiones ex Evangelica Scripturæ et veteri utriusque linguæ theologia mutuatas disp. Caspar Hedio* (1519, fol.). They are 24 in number, treating on the attributes of God and predestination, and evince a decided tendency towards the Reformation. In 1520 he began to correspond with Luther and Zwingle; in the same year he was called to Mentz on the recommendation of Capito, and was made court preacher and vicar to the archbishop. He resigned his offices in 1523, and retired to Strasburg. The chapter of that city offered him the pulpit of the cathedral, but the bishop refused to confirm the offer until Hedio had promised to confine himself to preaching the Word of God. His preaching was very popular, because it was simple and Biblical. He was naturally timid, and incapable of taking a leading part in the religious movement then going on; but his services as coadjutor to Bucer and Capito in consolidating the Reformation in Strasburg were very great. In 1551 he was sent, with Lenglin and Söll, to confer with the German theologians on the subject of the Confession of Faith. He died at Strasburg Oct. 17, 1552. Among his writings are *Chronicon Germanicum, oder Beschr. aller alten christl. Kirchen bis aufs Jahr* 1545 (Strasb. 1530, 3 vols. fol.):—*Smaragdi abbatis Commentarii in Evangelia et Epistolas*, which he translated himself into German:—*Chronicon abbatis Urspergensis correctum, et Paralipomena addita ab anno* 1230 *ad ann.* 1537, translated also into German by himself:—*Sententiæ Ph. Melanchthonis, Mart. Buceri, Gasp. Hedionis et aliorum de pace Ecclesiæ, ann.* 1534 (1607, 8vo). Melchior Adam considers him also as the translator of the histories of Eusebius, Hegesippus, and Josephus, and other works. See Melchior Adam, *Vitæ Germanorum Philosophorum* (Heidelberg, 1615–1620, 4 vols. 8vo), i, 116; Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 718. (J. N. P.)

Hedschra or **Hedjra**. See Hegira.

Heduosmon. See Mint.

Hedwig, St., was the daughter of Agnes and Berthold, duke of Carinthia. She married Henry, duke of Poland and Silesia, by whom she had three sons and three daughters. They afterwards made a vow of chastity, Henry becoming priest and subsequently bishop, while Hedwig entered a Cistercian convent near Trebnitz, without, however, taking the veil. She died there October 15, 1243, and was buried in the convent. She was canonized by pope Clement IV in 1267 (or 1268). She is commemorated on the 17th of October. See Arnaud d'Andilly, *Vie des Saints illustres;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 728.

Heerbrand, Jakob, a Lutheran theologian, was born at Giengen Aug. 12, 1521. After studying at Ulm and Wittenberg, he was ordained at Tübingen, from whence he was banished for objecting to the Interim; but he was soon recalled, and made pastor of Herrenberg. In 1551, duke Christopher sent him as one of the theological delegates to the Council of Trent. Charles, prince of Baden, employed him in reforming the churches in his dominions, and in 1560 he was chosen professor of divinity at Tübingen, where he died May 22, 1600. Of his works, which are numerous both in German and Latin, the principal is *Compendium Theologiæ* (Tübingen, 1578, fol., often reprinted), a work which long held its place as a text-book. The negotiations between the Tübingen theologians of that time and the patriarch of Constantinople caused this compend to be translated into Greek (by M. Crusius), and to be sent to Constantinople. The Greek traslation was published, together with the original, at Wittenberg in 1782. His opponents used to call him, on account of his polemical zeal, Höllbrand ("hell-fire"). See Melchior Adam, *Vit. Theologorum*, i, 137; Hook, *Eccl. Biography*, vol. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 627.

Heermann, Johann, a Silesian Protestant pastor and hymn writer, was born at Rauten, Silesia, Oct. 11, 1585. At school he displayed early talent. In 1611 he became pastor at Köben. During the Thirty Years' War Silesia was the seat of war and plunder, and Heermann was often obliged to conceal himself to save his life. He gave up his pastoral charge at Köben in 1638, and died Feb. 17, 1647. In the height of his troubles in 1630, he published a volume of hymns under the title *Devoti Musica Cordis*, and his productions afterwards were very numerous. Heermann's hymns are "distinguished by great depth and tenderness of feeling, by an intense love of the Saviour, and by humility, while in form they are sweet and musical." Many of them are still in use in Germany, and some have been translated into English. Two of them—"A Song of Tears" and "A Song of Comfort"—together with several hymns written during his last illness, are given in Winkworth, *Christian Singers of Germany*, p. 197 sq., with a sketch

of the life of Heermann. Others are given in Miss Winkworth, *Lyra Germanica*, and in Schaff, *Christ in Song* (N. York, 1869). A selection from his hymns, in German, may be found in Wackernagel, *Heermann's geistliche Lieder* (Stuttgardt, 1856). Of his other works we mention *Heptalogus Christi* (on the seven words on the cross), Breslau, 1619; new edit. Berlin, 1856.

He'gai (Heb. *Hegay'*, הֵגַי, perh. *eunuch*, Esth. ii, 8, 15; Sept. Γαΐ, Vulg. *Egeus*) or **He'gè** (Heb. *id.* הֵגֵא, *idem*, Esth. ii, 3; Sept. omits, Vulg. *Egeus*), the eunuch having charge of the harem of Xerxes, and the preparation of the females sought as concubines for him. B.C. 479. Winer (*Wörterb.* s. v.) thinks he may be the same with *Hegias* (Ἡγίας), who is mentioned by Ctesias (*Perseus*, 24) as present at the check of the Persian army at Thermopylæ.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, the greatest of modern German metaphysicians. The following sketch of his life is modified from the *English Cyclopædia*. He was born at Stuttgardt Aug. 27, 1770, and was educated at the gymnasium of his native city. From 1788 to 1793 he studied at Tübingen, where he had for his class-fellow the illustrious Schelling; and where he acquired not only a knowledge of the history of philosophy, but also a thorough acquaintance with the natural and political sciences. Upon being admitted doctor in philosophy, he accepted an engagement as private tutor, in which capacity he lived for some years, first in Switzerland, and afterwards at Frankfort-on-the-Main, until, on the death of his father in 1800, he was enabled, by the inheritance of a small patrimony, to devote himself to the study of philosophy. He accordingly proceeded to Jena, where Schelling was teaching his system of "Absolute Identity," of which Hegel was at this period one of the warmest partisans. "Here he composed his first philosophical work, entitled *Ueber die Differenz der Fichte'schen und Schelling'schen Philosophie* (On the Difference of the Systems of Fichte and Schelling); which treatise, notwithstanding the sincerity with which Hegel then advocated the views of the latter, contained the germ of that dissent which was afterwards expanded into a peculiar theory. He was also associated with Schelling in conducting the *Kritische Journal der Philosophie* (Critical Journal of Science); and among the most important of the articles contributed by him is that "On Faith and Science," which contains a luminous review of the doctrines of Kant, Jacobi, and Fichte, whose several systems are represented as nothing more than so many forms of a purely subjective philosophy. In 1806, when Schelling went to Würzburg, Hegel was appointed to supply his place as lecturer. Now for the first time Hegel openly avowed his dissatisfaction with the system of Schelling. The difference between the ideas of the master and disciple was marked still more strongly in the *Phænomenologie des Geistes* (Phenomenology of Mind), which was published at Bamberg, whither Hegel had retired after the battle of Jena. This work he used to call his 'Voyage of Discovery,' as indicating the researches he had passed through in order to arrive at a clear knowledge of the truth. It contains an account of the several grades of development through which the 'self,' or 'ego,' proceeds: first of all from consciousness into self-consciousness; next into reflective and active reason, from which it becomes philosophical reason, self-cognizant and self-analyzing, until at last, rising to the notion of God, it manifests itself in a religious form. The title 'Phenomenology' points out the limits of the work, which is confined to the phenomena of mind as displayed in the elements of its immediate existence, that is, in experience. It traces the course of mind up to the point where it recognises the identity of thought and substance, of reason and reality, and where the opposition of science and reality ceases. Henceforward mind develops itself as pure thought or simple science, and the several forms it successively assumes, which differ only in their subject-matter or contents, are the objects of logic, or 'dialectic.' In 1808 he was called to preside over the gymnasium of Nürnberg. In 1812 he published his Logic (*Wissenschaft der Logik*), which was designed, with the 'Phenomenology,' to complete the whole body of science. Hegel employs the term logic in a very extended sense. He does not confine it, as is usually the case, to the account of the abstract forms of thought and the laws of connection of ideas, but understands by it the science of the self-sufficient and self-determining idea—the science of truth and of reality. From his fundamental principle that thought and substance are one and identical, it followed that whatever is true of the former is true also of the latter, and consequently the laws of logic become ontological. From this point of view Hegel describes in this work the progress of reason; how, by virtue of a peculiar and inherent impulse, it passes constantly onwards, until at last it returns into itself. The general merits of this work were at once admitted, and the high powers of philosophical reflection which it evinced were acknowledged by the offer of a professorship at Heidelberg in 1817. His first course of lectures was attended by a numerous and distinguished class, attracted by the profoundness and originality of his views, notwithstanding the great obscurity of his style. By the publication of the *Encyklopädie der philos. Wissenschaften* (Encyclopædia of Philosophical Sciences) in 1817, his reputation as a philosopher was established, and Hegel was invited by the Prussian government to fill the chair at Berlin, which had remained vacant since the death of Fichte in 1814. This work, being designed as a manual for his class, takes a general view of his whole system, and exhibits in the clearest manner the ultimate tendency of his views. Considering logic as the base of all ontology, and starting from the idea in itself or potentially, he considers it as the essence and primary substance. He then examines thought as at first existing in itself, then *in other* or in nature; next in the mind of the individual, in a purely subjective point of view; and then objectively, in its outward realization; and, lastly, as he terms it, absolutely, that is, as manifesting itself in art, religion, and philosophy. From 1817 until death terminated his career there is nothing to relate in the life of Hegel beyond the constantly increasing celebrity of his lectures and the publication of several works. He successively published the *Philosophy of Jurisprudence*, two new editions of the *Encyclopædia*, the first volume of the second edition of his *Logic*, and several articles in the *Annals of Scientific Criticism*, which he had established as an organ of his system, and of its application to every branch of art and science" (*Eng. Cyclop.*). He died Nov. 14, 1831, of cholera.

Hegel's influence upon the philosophy and theology of Germany has been very great. It is impossible, in brief space, to give a full idea of the Hegelian system. "The transcendental idealism of Kant formed the transition from the *empiricism* of the 18th century, and effected, as it were, a compromise between the ancient realism and the scepticism of Hume. To the system of Kant succeeded the pure and absolute idealism of Fichte, destined to be displaced in its turn by Schelling's system of absolute identity and intellectual intuition, which was itself to be further modified and developed by the *dialectical momentum* of Hegel. Essentially the systems of Hegel and Schelling are both founded on the same principle, namely, the absolute ideality of thought and being; for there is evidently but little difference between the doctrine of Schelling, which supposed that the human mind contained within it the fulness of reality and truth, the consciousness of which it may attain to simply by contemplating its own nature, and that of Hegel, according to whom the *concrete notion*, or the reason, comprises within itself all verity, and that, in order to arrive at the science thereof, it is only necessary to employ logical thought, or dialectic. The difference is purely a difference of method. For the rigorous for-

malism of Fichte, Schelling had substituted a sort of poetical enthusiasm, and, banishing from philosophy the scientific form it had received from Wolff, had introduced into it the rapturous mysticism of the intellectual intuition. Hegel, however, insisting that the scientific system is the only form under which truth can exist, re-established the rights and utility of method by his doctrine of the dialectical momentum, or development of the idea. Indeed, with Hegel the method of philosophy is philosophy itself. This he defines to be the knowledge of *the evolution of the concrete.* The concrete is the idea, which, as a unity, is diversely determined, and has in itself the principle of its activity. The origin of the activity, the action itself, and the result are one, and constitute the concrete. Its movement is the development by which that which exists merely potentially is realized. The concrete in itself, or virtually, must become actual; it is simple, yet different. This inherent contradiction of the concrete is the spring of its development. Hence arise differences, which, however, ultimately vanish into unity. There is both movement, and repose in the movement. The difference scarcely becomes apparent before it disappears, whereupon there issues from it a full and concrete unity. Of this he gives the following illustration: the flower, notwithstanding its many qualities, is one; no single quality that belongs to it is wanting in the smallest of its leaves, and every portion of the leaf possesses the same properties as the entire leaf. He then observes that although this union of qualities in sensible objects is readily admitted, it is denied in immaterial objects, and held to be irreconcilable. Thus it is said that man possesses liberty, but that freedom and necessity are mutually opposed; that the one excluding the other, they can never be united so as to become concrete. But, according to Hegel, the mind is in reality concrete, and its qualities are liberty and necessity. It is by necessity that man is free, and it is only in necessity that he experiences liberty. The objects of nature are, it is true, subject exclusively to necessity; but liberty without necessity is an arbitrary abstraction, a purely formal liberty" (*English Cyclopædia*, s. v.).

Hegel "rejected the intellectual intuition of the philosophy of nature, and studied to make philosophy an intelligible science and knowledge by means of dialectics. He called philosophy the Science of Reason, because it is the idea and consciousness of all *esse* in its necessary development. It is his principle to include all particular principles in it. Now as the Idea is reason identical with itself, and as, in order to be cognizant of itself, or, in other words, as, in order to be self-existing (*für sich seyn*), it places itself in opposition to itself, so as to appear something else, without, however, ceasing to be one and the same thing; in this case philosophy becomes divided: 1. Into logic considered as the science of the Idea in and for itself. 2. Into the philosophy of nature considered as the science of the Idea representing itself externally (reason thrown out in nature). 3. Its third division is that of the philosophy of mind, expressing the return of the Idea within itself, after having thrown itself without externally. All logic, according to Hegel, presents three momentums: 1. The abstract or intelligible momentum, which seizes the object in its most distinct and determinate features, and distinguishes it with precision. 2. The dialectic or negative rational momentum consists in the annihilation of the determinations of objects, and their transition to the opposite determinations. 3. The speculative momentum perceives the unity of the determinations in their opposition. Such is the method which philosophy ought to follow, and which is frequently styled by Hegel the immanent movement, the spontaneous development of the conception. Logic is essentially speculative philosophy because it considers the determinations of thought in and for itself, consequently of concrete and pure thoughts, or, in other words, the conceptions, with the significations of the self-subsisting foundation of all. The primary element of logic consists in the oneness of the subjective and objective; this oneness is the absolute science to which the mind rises as to its absolute truth, and is found in the truth, that *pure Esse is pure conception in itself, and that pure conception alone is true Esse.* The absolute idealism of Hegel has considerable affinity with Schelling's doctrine of Identity on this point, but it shows a clear departure from it in the method. With Hegel, logic usurps the place of what had been previously styled Metaphysics and Critique of pure Reason. The first, and perhaps the most suggestive, of Hegel's works, his *Phenomenology of the Mind,* contains a history of the progressive development of the consciousness. Instinctive or common knowledge only regards the object, without considering itself. But the consciousness contains, besides the former, also a perception of itself, and embraces, according to Hegel, three stages in its progress — consciousness, self-consciousness, and reason. The first represents the object standing in opposition to the *Ego*, the second the *Ego* itself, and the third accidents attaching to the *Ego*, i. e. thoughts. This phenomenology constituted at first a sort of introduction to pure science, whereas later it came to form a part of his doctrine of the mind. Pure science or logic is divided, 1st, into the logic of *Esse* or being (*das Seyn*); 2d, into the logic of qualified nature (*das Wesen*); 3d, into logic of the conception or of the idea. The two first constitute the objective logic, and the last division the subjective logic, containing the substance of vulgar logic. Hegel treated as fully of the philosophy of right and of art as of the metaphysical part of his system. According to his view, the *essential* in man is thought; but thought is not a general abstraction, opposed to the particular abstraction; on the contrary, it embraces the particular within itself (concrete generality). Thought does not remain merely internal and subjective, but it determines and renders itself objective through the medium of the will (practical mind). To will and to know are two inseparable things; and the free-will of man consists in the faculty of appropriating and of rendering the objective world his own, and also in obeying the innate laws of the universe, because he wills it. Hegel places the existence of right in the fact that every existence in general is the existence of a free-will. Right is usually confounded with morality, or with duty placed in opposition to inclination. There exists, however, a higher morality raised above this, which bids us act according to truly rational ends, and which ought to constitute the true nature of man. We find the objective development of this higher morality in the State and in history" (Tennemann, *Manual of the History of Philosophy*, § 424).

Hegel's view of the philosophy of religion is thus stated by Schwegler: "All religions seek a union of the divine and human. This was done in the crudest form by (*a.*) the natural religions of the Oriental world. God is, with them, but a power of nature, a substance of nature, in comparison with which the finite and the individual disappear as nothing. (*b.*) A higher idea of God is attained by the religions of spiritual individuality, in which the divine is looked upon as subject—as an exalted subjectivity, full of power and wisdom in Judaism, the religion of sublimity; as a circle of plastic divine forms in the Grecian religion, the religion of beauty; as an absolute end of the State in the Roman religion, the religion of the understanding or of design. (*c.*) The revealed or Christian religion first establishes a positive reconciliation between God and the world by beholding the actual union of the divine and the human in the person of Christ, the God-man, and apprehending God as triune, i. e. as himself, as incarnate, and as returning from this incarnation to himself. The intellectual content of revealed religion, or of Christianity, is thus the same as that of speculative philosophy; the only difference being that in the one case the content is represented in the form of the representation, in the form of a history, while in the other it appears in the form of

the conception" (Schwegler, *Hist. of Philosophy*, transl. by Seelye, N. Y. 1864, p. 364).

If, now, after having acquired a general idea of Hegel's philosophical system, we ask what solution that system gives to the questions which most interest humanity; what becomes in it of a just and merciful God, of the individuality and personality of man, the free agency and morality of his acts, his hopes of another life, of a brighter future, we shall find no satisfactory answer. The system claims to agree completely with true Christianity, yet its tendencies seem to be pantheistic and anti-Christian. Hegel himself constantly asserts that his philosophical system is in no way contradictory to the Christian religion, and only differs from it in its forms and expressions. Yet in his system the absolute idea, whose evolution constitutes both the spiritual and the material world, becomes, in its last development, *the universal mind*, the absolute and infinite subject; and this absolute subject is put in the place of God, who therefore can have no self-conscious existence except in finite and individual subjects. And since this system has no substance but the idea, no reality but the development of the idea, and no absolute reality except the mind, which is its end, it follows that finite and individual subjects themselves are but fleeting forms of the universal mind, which is their substance. What becomes, then, of the immortality of the soul, which presupposes in it an independent substantiality, a true personality, an undying individuality? And if the universal mind be but the logical sum of finite minds, without other consciousness than what it finds in individuals, it follows that pantheism can only be avoided by falling into atheism; *our* personality can only be saved at the expense of that of God himself. Hegel's moral system seems to float between two extremes, each as dangerous as the other. In either case free agency and morality appear equally endangered. While actually destroying all distinctions—which, it is true, he considers as continually reproduced by universal motion, the single existing actuality—does not Hegel at the same time obliterate all distinction between good and evil, and destroy one of the surest pledges of a future life? If all is but evolution, the evolution of a given content, then all is virtually determined; and freedom, though proclaimed by the very essence of the mind, becomes necessity, in finite beings: all that they consider as their own work, the effect of their individual action, becomes really but a part of the universal work, an effect of the eternal activity of the general and absolute mind.

The essence of Hegel's religious philosophy is found in the doctrine that the world, including nature and humanity, is only the self-manifestation of God. Such a system, presented with the wonderful dialectical skill that Hegel possessed, could not fail to exert a great effect upon the theology of his age. Soon after he commenced the publication of *The Journal for Scientific Criticism* (1817), the Hegelian philosophy began to show its power. This magazine was at first exclusively devoted to the external propagation of Hegelianism, and it added greatly, during Hegel's lifetime, to the number of proselytes. Immediately after the death of Hegel his orthodox followers effected the publication of all his works (G. W. F. Hegel's *Werke, durch einen Verein von Freunden des Verewigten*, etc., Berlin, 1834-45, 18 vols. 8vo). Disputes soon arose in the Hegelian school concerning the Person of God, the Immortality of the Soul, and the Person of Christ, which terminated in the division of the school into two camps. Daumer, Weisse, Goschel, Rosenkranz, Schaller, and others (called the *right* wing), attempted to connect the theistic idea of God with the common notion of the divinity contained in the Hegelian philosophy, and to prove the former from the latter; whilst Michelet, Strauss, and others (the *left* wing), maintained that the pantheistic idea of God was the only true result of the Hegelian principle, and represented God as the universal substance or the eternal universe, which becomes first absolutely conscious of itself in humanity. Göschel, Heinrichs, Rosenkranz, Marheinecke, and others, attempted, besides, to justify the ecclesiastical idea of Christ, as specifically the only God-man, on philosophical grounds, whereas Bauer, Conradi, Michelet, Strauss, and others, maintained that the unity of the divinity and of humanity was not realized in one individual, but in the whole of humanity, so that the latter in reality is the God-man. Finally, Strauss and Feuerbach (the extreme *left*) developed Hegelianism into full-blown atheism and infidelity. "The Hegelian school pretended to find an equivalent for the objects of Christian faith and the propositions of Christian theology in the dogmas of their system. The latter were said to be the pure and final rendering of that which Christianity presents in a popular form. The substantial contents of both were averred to be identical. The Trinity, the Atonement, and the other doctrines of the orthodox creed had now—so it was claimed—received a philosophical vindication, and the vulgar rationalism which had flippantly impugned these high mysteries was at length laid low. These sounding pretensions could only mislead the undiscerning. A philosophy which denies the distinct personality of God, and consequently must regard prayer as an absurdity, can by no legerdemain be identified with Christian doctrine. The appearance of the *Life of Christ* by Strauss, and the subsequent productions of Baur and his school, through the applications which they made of the Hegelian tenets to the New-Testament history and the teaching of the apostles, placed this conclusion beyond a doubt" (Fisher, *Essays on the Supernatural*, p. 587).

It is not to be understood that Hegel's system is now *universally* held to be pantheistic or even anti-Christian in tendency. An analysis and translation of Hegel's *Phenomenology*, also *Outlines* of his *Logic*, are given in the *Journ. of Spec. Philos.* vols. i, ii, iii (St. Louis, 1868-9), by the editor, W. T. Harris, which journal demands the careful study of all who profess to judge of Hegelianism. The points made in the *Journal* are also summed up by a writer in the *Amer. Quar. Church Review*, Oct. 1869, who maintains not only that Hegel's system is not pantheistic, but that it is the widest and deepest system of thought yet offered to mankind, and that, too, in full harmony with Christianity. We cite from this article the following passages: "To help us to the highest education of our reason is the aim of Hegel, and this help is the inestimable gift he offers to all who will understand him. To him philosophy is not philosophy unless it 'stands up for all those great religious interests to which alone we virtually live.' Every step of his system is towards the deep truths of the faith; but these things are not mere dogmas with Hegel; they appear as the logical results of the most logical of systems" (*Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, i, 256). "In the Christian religion," says Hegel, "God has revealed himself, that is, he has given us to understand what he is; and the possibility of knowing him thus afforded us renders such knowledge a duty. God wishes no narrow-hearted souls or empty heads for his children, but those whose spirit is of itself, indeed, poor, but rich in the knowledge of him, and who regard this knowledge as their only valuable possession" (*Amer. Ch. Rev.* Oct. 1869, p. 415). "They who regard God as negative unity, and the creature not as self-determining, these are pantheists. With such a God we should only seem to be; we should only be 'modes' of that 'substance.' But man, being a self-determining creature, is his own negative unity, and hence his immortality. 'He cannot be a mere phase of a higher being, for he is essentially a reflection of that.' We are made in God's image, and in him spiritually we see ourselves: who does not see, then, that the highest thought in Hegel's philosophy is only an elucidation of the central dogma of the Christian faith. God is this ideal unity, and each person of the Holy Trinity is that one God in his entirety. To sum up briefly the points of this comparison: We have found that Hegel's doctrine of Being is the direct converse of the pantheistic

theory; for whereas the latter considers pure Being identical with the All, Hegel regards it as equivalent to nonentity. Secondly, pantheism has always held fast to the abstractions of the understanding, and hence it has attacked all forms of Becoming; but Hegel's invincible dialectic has demolished this strong position, and led us up to the higher ground of the concrete notion. Thirdly, the pantheistic view of the Negative is abstract. 'Being alone is, and non-being is not.' But with Hegel the ultimate form of the negative is immanent contradiction; the negative is not a *for itself*, but out of it is constituted the true positive. (This leads to the view of the Universal as the only real, independent individual, the I Am that I Am.) Fourthly, the true pantheists held Distinction to be impossible, while the theory of the materialistic pantheists was Atomism, the abstract and separate validity of Identity and Distinction; but Hegel leaves both theories far behind him when he penetrates to the inmost depths of the subject, and arrives at Self-determination as the origin and principle of all distinction whatever. (This, again, leads to the self-determination of the Absolute—the spirituality of God.) Fifthly, the unity of pantheism is a 'negative unity,' which annuls the independence of multiple factors; but with Hegel the true unity, the unity of the Absolute, is purely affirmative, subsisting through the very independence of its members. (And here we reach a development of the great Christian idea of the Trinity.) Here is not pantheism taking a new dress, but pantheism receiving a flat contradiction upon its cardinal principles" (*ibid.* p. 403–4).

Literature.—For an able article on Hegel's philosophy, and its influence on religion and theology in Germany, see Ulrici, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 629–646. See also, besides the works cited above, Kahnis, *History of German Protestantism*, p. 196, 244; Saintes, *History of Rationalism*, chap. xiii, xviii; Schaff, *Apostolic Church*, § 34; *Princeton Review*, Oct. 1848, art. iv; Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy*, chap. v.; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, viii, 503; Vera, *Introduction à la Philosophie de Hegel* (Paris, 1855); Haym, *Hegel und seine Zeit* (Berlin, 1858); Chalybæus, *History of Philosophy from Kant to Hegel;* Sibree, translation of Hegel's *Philosophy of History* (London, Bohn); Sloman and Wallon, translation of Hegel's *Subjective Logic* (Lond. 1855); Lewes, *History of Philosophy* (4th edit. Lond. 1871, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 531 sq.; Stirling, *Secret of Hegel*, giving a translation of portions of Hegel's *Logic* (London, 1865, 2 vols. 8vo); Saisset, *Modern Pantheism*, ii, 11 sq.; Rosencranz, *Hegel als deutscher Naturalphilosoph* (Leipz. 1870).

Hegesippus, one of the earliest writers on Church History (between A.D. 150 and 180), was originally a Jew, born near the beginning of the 2d century. He was converted to the Christian faith, and came to Rome about A.D. 168, where he died, according to the Alexandrine Chronicle, in the reign of Commodus, about A.D. 180. He wrote a collection of Ὑπομνήματα, or *Memorials of the History of the Church*, in five books, from the birth of our Lord to the time of Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, who succeeded Anicetus in A.D. 170. This work is all lost except a few fragments preserved by Eusebius, and one in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius. Several extracts may be found translated by Lardner (*Credibility*, vol. ii). All that remains of Hegesippus is given by Routh (*Reliquiæ Sacræ*, 2d edit. i, 205 sq.), and also by Grabe (*Spicilegium*, ii, 203 sq.) and by Galland (*Bibl. Patr.* ii, 59). "The reports of Hegesippus on the character and martyrdom of St. James the Just, Simeon of Jerusalem, the rise of heresies, the episcopal succession, and the preservation of the orthodox doctrine in Corinth and Rome, as embodied in the history of Eusebius, command attention for their antiquity; but, as they show that his object was apologetic and polemical rather than historical, and as they bear a somewhat Judaizing (though by no means Ebionistic) coloring, they must be received with critical attention" (Schaff, *Church History*, vol. i, § 123). The Socinians of the 17th century use his brief statements as proof of the general spread of Judaizing tendencies in the 1st and 2d centuries, and Baur, of Tübingen, and his school, have recently reproduced this view. Bishop Bull answered the former, and Dorner, in his *Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, i, 219 (Edinburgh trans. i, 139 sq.), has refuted the latter. "The evidence tends to prove that he was not even a Hebrew Christian in the sense of observing the law, and there is the most complete proof that he did not regard the observance of the law as essential to salvation. With the destruction of this premise, the keystone of the two theories of the early Unitarians and of Baur is utterly destroyed. The Unitarians maintained that Hegesippus was an Ebionite or Nazarene, and that consequently the whole Church was in his day Ebionitic, though, unfortunately, the few Platonizing writers, who formed a miserable exception to the mass, have been the only writers that a subsequent corrupt age has preserved to us. Baur finds in Hegesippus a most determined antagonist of Paul, and his testimony is appealed to as proof that the Petrine faction had gained the predominance not only in the churches of the East, but even in those of the West. Both theories run directly contrary to the repeated testimony of Eusebius, and to all the information which we have in regard to the Western churches, and they both fall to pieces unless it be proved that Hegesippus insisted upon the observance of the law as essential to salvation" (Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature*, iii, 188 sq.). See also Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature;* Neander, *Church History*, i, 675, 676; Lardner, *Works*, vol. ii; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i, 265; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, vii, 156; Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. ii; Illgen, *Zeitschrift*, 1865, pt. iii.

Hegira, an Arabic word signifying *flight* (*Hejra*), now used to designate the epoch from which the Mohammedans compute time. The flight of Mohammed from Mecca to Medina is fixed by the Mohammedans on July 15, A.D. 622. The process of converting the years of the Hegira into the date after the birth of Christ is as follows. Divide the given number by thirty (the quotient expresses the intercalary cycles elapsed since the Hegira, the remainder represents the number of years elapsed in the current intercalary cycle); multiply the quotient by 10,631 (the number of days contained in an intercalary cycle), adding to the product the sum of the days contained in the elapsed years of the current cycle, the days of the elapsed current months of the current year up to the time of reckoning, and to the result add again 227,015 (the number of days elapsed between Jan. 1 of the year 1, and July 15, 622, the date of the Hegira). The sum of days thus obtained is most readily converted into Julian years by dividing it by 1461 (the number of days in a Julian intercalary period), then multiplying the quotient by four, and adding to the product the number of whole years contained in the remainder of the division, which is obtained by dividing this remainder by 365. The number of days still remaining shows the day of the month in the current Julian year. Or else the following proportion may be made use of (T representing any date in the Turkish calendar, and C the corresponding date in the Julian calendar): $C = 0.970203\ T + 621.567785$, and $T = 1.030712\ C - 64.65745$. If the date is subsequent to the Gregorian reform in the calendar, which can only be the case for modern times, then the Turkish date must first be converted into the Julian, which is then altered to the Gregorian by adding ten days to it for the period extending from Oct. 5, 1582, to the end of February, 1700; eleven days after the latter until the end of February, 1800, and twelve days for all subsequent dates. In making this reduction, the difference between the time at which the day begins in the Turkish and in the Christian calendar must be taken into consideration whenever the time of day of the event calculated is known, as it may make a difference in the date of one day more or less. The Turkish year begins at the end of July. The year 1859 A.C. is in their calendar 1275–76. A simpler mode of

reduction, but not strictly accurate, is as follows: The Mohammedan year = a lunar year of 354 days, and therefore 33 Mohammedan years = 32 Christian. To reduce years of the Hegira, therefore, to years of the Christian æra, subtract one from every thirty-three years, and add 622. Thus A.D. 1861 = 1277 of the Hegira.—Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, viii, 721.

Hegius, Alexander (the name, according to some accounts, being Latinized from the name of his native village, Heck), a German humanist of the 15th century, was born within the diocese of Münster about 1433 or 1455 (the exact date is undetermined), and died at Deventer, Holland, in the latter part of 1498. He claims notice here because of his influence in reviving classical learning, especially by means of the celebrated college which he established at Deventer. This school is named by Hallam (*Lit. of Europe*, i, 109, Harpers' ed.) as one of the three schools thus early established in Western Europe, outside of Italy, for instruction in the classic languages, "from which issued the most conspicuous ornaments of the next generation." Hegius is said to have been a friend of Rudolph Agricola, and to have himself received intruction in classical literature from Thomas à Kempis. Among his pupils may be named Erasmus, Hermann von dem Busche, Murmellius, and others, whose labors and success in literature add lustre to their teacher's fame. Hegius's writings were but few, and those mainly in the form of poetry and brief grammatical and philosophical treatises; one of a theological type is found in a miscellaneous collection of writings by him, published at Deventer, 1530, 4to, and entitled *De Incarnationis Mysterio Dialogi duo, quibus additum de Pascha et Celebratione et inventione.* Hallam (*l. c.* note) attributes to him "a small 4to tract entitled *Conjugationes Verborum Græcæ, Daventriæ Noviter extremo labore collectæ et impressæ*," without date or printer's name, and which he regards as the first book printed this side of the Alps in Greek.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 616; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 763. (J. W. M.)

He-Goat (prop. עַתּוּד, *attud'*, so called as being *adult;* also צָפִיר, *tsaphir'*, so called from *leaping*, 2 Chron. xxix, 21; Ezra viii, 35; Dan. viii, 5, 8 [Ezra vi, 17]; תַּיִשׁ, *ta'yish*, a *buck*, Gen. xxx, 35; xxxii, 14; 2 Chron. xvii, 11; Prov. xxx, 31). See Goat.

Heidanus, Abraham, professor of theology at Leyden, was born at Frankenthal, in the Palatinate, Aug. 10, 1597. He was educated at Amsterdam and Leyden, and in 1627 was appointed to a pastoral charge in the latter city. In 1647 he became professor in the University of Leyden. Heidanus held a mild view of the doctrine of predestination, and adopted the Cartesian philosophy, of which he became a strong advocate. This involved him in various controversies, in which he bore himself admirably. Yet, when nearly eighty years old, he was dismissed from his professorship by the curators of the University. He died at Leyden Oct. 15, 1678. His *Corpus Theologiæ Christianæ* was posthumously published (1686, 2 vols. 4to).

Heidegger, Johann Heinrich, D.D., a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born near Zurich July 1, 1633. He studied at Marburg and Heidelberg, where he graduated, and soon after became extraordinary professor of Hebrew, and then professor of theology. In 1659 he went to Steinfurt as professor of theology and ecclesiastical history. War having dispersed the students of Steinfurt, Heidegger returned to Zurich in 1665, and was professor of moral philosophy in the University of the city until 1667. He died at Zurich Jan. 18, 1698. He was the compiler of the famous *Formula Consensus*, adopted by the Synod of Zurich in 1675. See Helvetic Confessions. His writings are chiefly polemical; the most important are *Disputatio theologica de fine mundi* (Steinfurt, 1660, 4to):—*De fide decretorum Concilii Tridentini Quæstiones theologicæ* (Steinfurt, 1662, 8vo):—*De Articulis fundamentalibus Judaicæ Religionis* (Steinfurt, 1664, 4to):—*De Hist. sacra Patriarcharum* (Amst. 1667-1671, 2 vols. 4to; Zurich, 1729, 2 vols. 4to):—*Anatome Concilii Tridentini* (Zurich, 1672, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Dissertationes selectæ sacram theologiam dogmaticam*, etc. *illust.* (Zur. 1675-1690, 4 vols. 4to):—*Enchirid. Biblicum succinctius* (Zurich, 1681, 8vo; Amst. 1688, 8vo; Jena, 1723, 8vo):—*Histor. Papatus, novissimo Historiæ Lutheranismi et Calvinismi Fabro opposita* (Amst. 1684, 4to; 2d ed. 1698, 4to; French, Amst. 1685, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Mysterium Babylonis, seu in Divi Johannis theologi Apocalypseos prophetiam de Babylone magna diatribæ* (Leyden, 1687, 2 vols. 4to):—*In viam Concordiæ ecclesiasticæ Protestantium Manuductio* (Amst. 1687, 8vo):—*Tumulus Concilii Tridentini*, etc. (Zurich, 1690, 2 vols. 4to):—*Labores exegetici in Josuam, Matthæum, Romanos, Corinthios et Hebræos* (Zurich, 1700, 4to):—*Corpus Theologiæ christ.* (Zurich, 1700, fol.):—*Medulla Medullæ Theol. christ. in gratiam et usum tyronum*, etc. His autobiography was published by Hofmeister under the title *Hist. Vitæ J. H. Heideggeri, cui non pauca historiam Ecclesiæ temporis ejusdem, nec non litteras concernantia, inseruntur* (Zurich, 1698, 4to).—Niceron, *Mémoires pour servir*, xvii, 143; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 766 sq.; Schweizer, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 652.

Heidelberg Catechism, one of the symbolical books of the Reformed Church. Its name is derived from the city in which it was compiled and first printed. It is also sometimes styled the Palatinate Catechism, from the territory (the Palatinate) of the prince (Frederick III) under whose auspices it was prepared. The original German title (of the *editio princeps*) is *Catechismus, oder Christlicher Underricht, wie der in Kirchen und Schulen der Churfürstlichen Pfalz getrieben wirdt. Gedruckt in der Churfürstlichen Stad Heydelberg, durch Johannem Mayer*, 1563 (Catechism, or Christian Instruction, according to the Usages of the Churches and Schools of the Electoral Palatinate).

I. *History.*— Soon after the introduction of Protestantism into the Palatinate in 1546, the controversy between Lutherans and Calvinists broke out, and for years, especially under the elector Otto Heinrich (1556-59), it raged with great violence in Heidelberg. Frederick III, who came into power in 1559, adopted the Calvinistic view on the Lord's Supper, and favored that side with all his princely power. He reorganized the Sapienz College (founded by his predecessor) as a theological school, and put at its head (1562) Zacharias Ursinus, a pupil and friend of Melancthon, who had adopted the Reformed opinions. See Ursinus. In order to put an end to religious disputes in his dominions, he determined to put forth a Catechism, or Confession of Faith, and laid the duty of preparing it upon Zacharias Ursinus (just named) and Caspar Olevianus, for a time professor in the University of Heidelberg, then court-preacher to Frederick III. They made use, of course, of the existing catechetical literature, especially of the catechisms of Calvin and of John à Lasco. Each prepared sketches or drafts, and "the final preparation was the work of both theologians, with the constant co-operation of Frederick III. Ursinus has always been regarded as the principal author, as he was afterwards the chief defender and interpreter of the Catechism; still, it would appear that the nervous German style, the division into three parts (as distinguished from the five parts in the Catechism of Calvin and the previous draft of Ursinus), and the genial warmth and unction of the whole work, are chiefly due to Olevianus" (Schaff, in *Am. Presb. Rev.* July, 1863, p. 379).

When the Catechism was completed, Frederick laid it before a synod of the superintendents of the Palatinate (December, 1562). After careful examination it was approved. The first edition, whose full title is given above, appeared in 1563. The preface is dated January 19 of that year, and runs in the name of the elector Frederick, who probably wrote it. A Latin version appeared in the same year, translated by Johannes Lagus and Lambertus Pithopæus. The German version is the authentic standard. Two other editions of the

German version appeared in 1563. What is now the eightieth question (*What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Roman Mass?*) is not to be found in the first edition; part of it appears in the second edition; and in the third, of 1563, it is given in full as follows: "What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Popish Mass? The Lord's Supper testifies to us that we have full forgiveness of all our sins by the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which he himself has once accomplished on the cross; and that by the Holy Ghost we are ingrafted into Christ, who with his true body is now in heaven at the right hand of the Father, and is to be there worshipped. But the Mass teaches that the living and the dead have not forgiveness of sins through the sufferings of Christ, unless Christ is still daily offered for them by the priest; and that Christ is bodily under the form of bread and wine, and is therefore to be worshipped in them. (And thus the Mass at bottom is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and passion of Christ, and an accursed idolatry.)" The occasion for the introduction of this eightieth question appears to have been the decree of the Council of Trent "touching the sacrifice of the Mass," Sept. 17, 1562. This declaration, and the anathemas pronounced at Trent against the Protestant doctrine of the sacraments, had not time to produce their effect before the issue of the first edition of the Catechism. But the elector soon saw the necessity for a strong and clear declaration on the Protestant side, and such a declaration is furnished in this eightieth question, which was added to the Catechism in 1563. The first edition of 1563 was for a long time lost; that given by Niemeyer (*Collectio Confessionum*, p. 390) is the third of that year. But in 1864 pastor Wolters found a copy and reprinted it, with a history of the text (*Der Heidelb. Katechismus in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt*, Bonn, 1864, sm. 8vo), which cleared up all doubt as to the various editions of 1563. In 1866 professor Schaff published a very valuable edition, revised after the first edition of 1563, with an excellent history of the Catechism (*Der Heidelb. Kat. nach d. ersten Ausgabe von 1563 revidirt*, Philad. 18mo). Other editions appeared in 1571 and 1573, and in this last the questions are divided, as now, into lessons for fifty-two Sundays, and the questions are numbered. An abstract of the Catechism appeared in 1585. The larger Catechism has since been republished by millions; no book, perhaps, has gone through more editions, except the Bible, Bunyan's *Pilgrim*, and Kempis. It has been translated into nearly every spoken language. It was, of course, at once used throughout the Palatinate by command of the elector. But it soon spread abroad wherever the Reformed Church had found footing, especially in North Germany and parts of Switzerland. It was early received in the Netherlands, and formally adopted at the Synod of Dort, 1618. Long and bitter controversies with Roman Catholics and Lutherans on the Catechism only endeared it the more to the Reformed. It is to this day an authoritative confession for the Reformed churches (German and Dutch). The (Dutch) Reformed Church directs all her ministers to explain the Catechism regularly before the congregations on the Sabbath day.

II. *Contents.*—The Catechism, in its present form, consists of 129 questions and answers. It is divided into three parts: 1. Of the misery of man. 2. Of the redemption of man. 3. Of the gratitude due from man (duties, etc.). The arrangement of the matter is admirable, looking not simply to logical order, but also to practical edification. The book is not simply dogmatic, but devotional. It assumes that all who use it are Christians, and is thus not adapted for missionary work. As to the theology taught by the book, it is, in the main, that of pure evangelical Protestantism. On the doctrine of predestination it is so reticent that it was opposed, on the one hand, by the Synod of Dort, the most extreme Calvinistic body perhaps ever assembled, and, on the other (though not without qualification), by James Arminius, the greatest of all the opponents of Calvinism. On the nature of the sacraments the Catechism is Calvinistic, as opposed to the Lutheran doctrine. Dr. Heppe (*deutscher Protestantismus*, i, 443 sq.) goes too far in asserting that the Catechism is thoroughly Melancthonian, and in no sense Calvinistic. Sudhoff answers this in his article in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 658 sq.; but he himself goes too far, on the other side, in finding that the Calvinistic theory of predestination, though not expressly stated, is implied and involved in the view of sin and grace set forth in the Catechism (see Gerhart's article in the *Tercentenary Monument*, p. 387 sq., and also his statement in this Cyclopædia, iii, 827). Olevianus, it will be remembered, was educated under the influence of Calvin; Ursinus under that of Melancthon. Dr. Schaff remarks judiciously that "the Catechism is a true expression of the convictions of its authors; but it communicates only so much of these as is in harmony with the public faith of the Church, and observes a certain reticence or reservation and moderation on such doctrines (as the *twofold* predestination), which belong rather to scientific theology and private conviction than to a public Church confession and the instruction of youth" (*American Presb. Review*, July, 1863, p. 371).

Literature.—The 300th anniversary of the formation and adoption of the Heidelberg Catechism was celebrated in 1863 both in Europe and America. One of the permanent fruits of this celebration was the publication of *The Heidelberg Catechism, Tercentenary Edition* (New York, 1863, sm. 4to). This noble volume gives a comprehensive Introduction (by Dr. Nevin), and a critical edition of the Catechism in four texts—Old German, Latin, Modern German, and English—printed in parallel columns. The Introduction gives an admirable account of the literature and history of the Catechism. The text used is that given by Niemeyer, and not that of the first edition of 1563, which, as has been stated above, was reprinted in 1864. See also Dr. Schaff's edition cited above, and an article by him in the *American Presbyterian Review* for 1863. The Latin text (with the German of the 3d ed. of 1563) is given in Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 390 sq.; also in an edition by Dr. Steiner, *Catechesis Religionis Christianæ seu Catechismus Heidelbergensis* (Baltimore, 1862). Another valuable fruit of the anniversary is *The Tercentenary Monument* (Chambersburg, 1863, 8vo), containing twenty essays by eminent Reformed theologians of Germany, Holland, and America, on the Catechism, its origin, history, its special relations to the German Reformed Church, and cognate subjects. For the older literary history, see Alting, *Historia Ecclesiæ Palatinæ* (Frankf. 1701); Struve, *Pfälzische Kirchenhistorie* (Frankfort, 1721); Mundt, *Grundriss der pfälzischen Kirchengeschichte bis* 1742 (Heidelb. 1798); Köcher, *Katechetische Geschichte der Reformirten Kirche* (Jena, 1756); Planck, *Geschichte d. prot. Theologie*, ii, 2, 475–491; Van Alpen, *Geschichte u. Litteratur d. Heidelb. Katechismus* (Frankf. 1800); Augusti, *Einleitung in die beiden Haupt-Katechismen d. Evang. Kirche* (Elberf. 1824); Ersch und Gruber's *Allg. Encykl.* ii, 4, 386 sq.; Nevin, *Hist. and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism* (Chambersburg, 1847); Sudhoff, *Theologisches Handbuch zur Auslegung d. Heidelb. Kat.* (Frankf. 1862). An elaborate article on the literature of the Catechism, by Dr. Harbaugh, is given in the *Mercersburg Review*, October, 1860. A copious list of writers on the Catechism (covering twelve pages) is given at the end of Bethune, *Expository Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism* (N. York, Sheldon and Co., 2 vols. 12mo), an admirable practical commentary, with a valuable historical introduction. Among the older commentators are Ursinus, *Explicationes Catechesis Palatinæ* (Opera, 1612, vol. i); Ursinus, *Apologia Catechismi Palatini* (Opera, vol. ii). Translations — Ursinus, *The Summe of Christian Religion*, lectures on the *Catechism*, transl. by H. Parrie (Lond. 1617 4to). The best transl. of Ursinus's Commentary is that of the Rev. G. W. Wil-

liard (Columbus, 1852, 8vo, 2d ed.), with Introduction by Dr. J. W. Nevin. See also Cocceius, *Heid. Cat. explicata et illustrata* (Lugd. Bat. 1671, Amst. 1673); Driessen, *Ad Cat. Heid. Manuductio* (Gron. 1724, 4to); Kemp. *Fifty-three Sermons on the Heidelberg Catechism*, trans. by Van Harlingen (New Brunswick, N. J., 1810, 8vo). For the views of the early Dutch Arminians on the Catechism, see *Considerationes Remonstrantium in Cat. Heidelb.* (in *Act. et Script. Synod.* Harderwyk, 1620). See also Wolters, *Zur Urgeschichte d. Heidelb. Kat.*, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, Heft 1; Trechsel, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, Heft 3; Plitt, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1863, Heft 1; *Mercersburg Review*, October, 1860.

Heidenheim (*Heydenheim*), WOLF, or BENJAMIN BEN-SIMSON, a Hebrew scholar and typographer, is distinguished in Hebrew literature by his exertions to provide editions of the Pentateuch free from the errors which marred preceding copies. Indeed, the city in which he lived, *Rödelheim*, near Frankfort on the Maine, became in his day the centre of attraction for Hebrew typography. But he has also left us works of his own which betoken a thorough acquaintance with Hebrew philology. Jost even assigns him a place by the side of Mendelssohn. Heidenheim died in 1832, at a very old age. His most important works are מִשְׁפְּטֵי הַטְּעָמִים, a tract on the Hebrew accents (Rödelheim, 1808, 12mo):—מְבוֹא הַלָּשׁוֹן, a treatise on different parts of Hebrew grammar (Rödelheim, 1806, 12mo):—אַרְבָּעִים חוּמָּשׁ מְאִיר, the Pentateuch, with a Hebrew commentary, etc. (Rodelh. 1818–1821, 8vo). We have also from him a catalogue of his works, containing 800 in number, under the title רְשִׁימַת הַסְּפָרִים (Rödelh. 1833, 8vo).—Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, i, 369; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Lit.* p. 422; Steinschneider, *Bibliog. Hdbch.* p. 60; Jost, *Gesch. d. Juden.* p. 361; Kitto, ii, 267. (J. H. W.)

Heifer (עֶגְלָה, *eglah'*, fem. of עֵגֶל, "calf:" פָּרָה, *parah'*, fem. of פַּר, "bullock;" Sept. and N. T. δάμαλις; Vulg. *vacca*). The Hebrew language has no expression that exactly corresponds to our "heifer," for both *eglah* and *parah* are applied to cows that have calved (1 Sam. vi, 7-12; Job xxi, 10; Isa. vii, 21); indeed, *eglah* means a young animal of any species, the full expression being עֶגְלַת בָּקָר, "heifer of kine" (Deut. xxi, 3; 1 Sam. xvi, 2: Isa. vii, 21). The heifer or young cow was not commonly used for ploughing, but only for treading out the corn (Hos. x, 11; but see Judg. xiv, 18), when it ran about without any headstall (Deut. xxv, 4); hence the expression an "unbroken heifer" (Hos. iv, 16; Auth. V. "backsliding"), to which Israel is compared. A similar sense has been attached to the expression "calf of three years old," עֶגְלַת שְׁלִשִׁיָּה, i. e. *unsubdued*, in Isa. xv, 5; Jer. xlviii, 34; but it has by some been taken as a proper name, *Eglath Shelishiyah*, such names being not very uncommon. The sense of "dissolute" is conveyed undoubtedly in Amos iv, 1. The comparison of Egypt to a "fair heifer" (Jer. xlvi, 20) may be an allusion to the well-known form under which Apis was worshipped (to which we may also refer the words in ver. 15, as understood in the Sept., "Why is the bullock [μόσχος ἐκλεκτός] swept away?"), the "destruction" threatened being the bite of the gad-fly, to which the word *keretz* would fitly apply. "To plough with another man's heifer" (Judg. xiv, 18) implies that an advantage has been gained by unfair means. The proper names Eglah, Eneglaim, and Parah are derived from the Hebrew terms at the head of this article. See RED HEIFER.

Heilmann, JOHANN DAVID, a learned German theologian, was born at Osnabrück Jan. 13, 1727. He studied at Halle, became rector of Hameln in 1764, and professor of theology at Göttingen in 1754, where he died Feb. 22, 1764. His principal writings are *Specimen observ. ad illustrat. N. T.* (Halle, 1743, 4to):—*Parallèle entre l'esprit d'irréligion d'aujourdhui et les anciens adversaires de la religion Chrétienne* (Halle, 1750, 8vo):—*Compendium theologiæ dogmaticæ* (Göttingen, 1761 and 1774, 8vo):—*Opuscula theol. Argumenti* (ed. Danovius, Jena, 1774–77, 2 vols. 8vo).—G. G. Heyne, *Heilmanni Memoria* (Göttingen, 1764); Jöcher, *Allgem. gelehrt. Lexikon*, continued by Adelung, ii, 1868.

Heilprin, JECHIEL, a distinguished Jewish philologist and historian, flourished in the first part of the 18th century. He is said to have been born at Minsk in 1728, but the time of his death is unknown. He wrote (סֵדֶר הַדּוֹרוֹת) a History of the Jews, divided into three parts: Chronicles of Historic Events, from the Creation to his own Time. 2. Alphabetical Catalogue of the Mishnaic and Talmudic Doctors. 3. Alphabetical Index of Jewish Literati (Karlsr. 1769, and Zolkien, 1808, folio). Also (סֵ׳ עֶרְכֵי הַכִּנּוּיִים) a Hebrew Rabbinic Dictionary adapted to the Rabboth, Sifra, Mekiltha, Yolkut, and the works of the Cabalists (Dyrchenfurt, 1806, fol.). Fürst commends the excellency of these works, and believes that the first part of Heilprin's history is an able contribution to Hebrew literature.—Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, i, 372; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebr. Literature*, p. 449. (J. H. W.)

Heineccius, JOHANN MICHAEL, a Lutheran divine, was born at Eisenberg Dec. 12, 1674, and was educated at Jena, Frankfort, and Giessen. After a visit to Holland and Hamburg, he settled for a time in Helmstädt as tutor (*Docent*), but in 1699 became deacon at Goslar. In 1709 he removed to Halle as pastor, and in 1720 was appointed consistorial counsellor and ecclesiastical inspector of the circle of the Saal (*Saalkreis*). He died Sept. 11, 1722. His chief work, *Eigentliche und wahrhaftige Abbildung der alten und neuen griechischen Kirche nach ihrer Historie, Glaubenslehren und Kirchengebräuchen* (Leipsic, 1711), presents historically the doctrines, government, liturgy, and morals of the Greek Church, ancient and modern. It is still a work of great value. Besides works in the departments of antiquities and history, Heineccius wrote *Prüfung der sogenannten neuen Propheten und ihres ausserordentlichen Aufstandes* (Halle, 1715), against the French prophets (q. v.):—*Sendschreiben an Thomas Ittig wegen des Termini Gratiæ*, on the Terminist controversy:—*De Jurisconsultis Christianis priorum sæculorum eorumque in ecclesiam meritis* (Halle, 1713):—*Colloquia religiosa publice et privatim inter bina hæc sæcula habita* (Halle and Magdeburg, 1719, 4to).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 624; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 782; Sax, *Onomasticon literarium*, pt. vi, p. 45. (J. W. M.)

Heinicke, SAMUEL, a German philanthropist, "the most distinguished of the early teachers of the deaf and dumb in Germany," was born April 10, 1729, at Nautzschütz, near Weissenfels, in Prussia, and died at Leipsic April 30, 1790. He passed his early life as a farmer and soldier, then pursued a course of study in the University of Jena, was subsequently for ten years a tutor of the children of count Schimmelmann at Hamburg, and then removed to Eppendorf. In this latter place, as early as 1754, he became much interested in a deaf and dumb child, and devised a system of instruction for it, which proved so successful as to attract other deaf mutes to him for instruction, and led to the establishment by the elector of Saxony in 1772 of a school at Leipsic for the education of deaf mutes. This school, "the first ever established or supported by the civil government," was placed under Heinicke's charge, was continued after his death under the charge of his widow, and is still existing and prosperous. The "method of instruction was by articulation and reading on the lip," and is said to have been superior in some respects to that of the abbé de l'Epée. Heinicke's labors and noble character gained for him deservedly the affection of the German people, though his method of treatment of his pupils was probably too harsh, and some of his writings were marred by coarse and ill-natured criticisms of opinions differing from his own. He wrote upon the

education of deaf mutes and theological subjects, viz.: *Biblische Geschichte des Alten Testaments zum Unterrichte taubstummer Personen* (Hamburg, 1776, 8vo; only first part given):—*Beobachtungen über Stumme und über die menschliche Sprache in Briefen* (Hamb. 1778, 8vo): —*Ueber die Denkart der Taubstummen und die Misshandlungen, denen sie durch unsinnige Kuren und Lehrarten ausgesetzt sind* (Leipsic, 1780, 8vo):—*Ueber alte und neue Lehrarten* (Leipsic, 1783):—*Wichtige Entdeckungen und Beiträge zur Seelenlehre und zur menschlichen Sprache* (Leipsic, 1784, 8vo):—*Metaphysik für Schulmeister und Plusmacher* (Halle, 1785):—*Ueber graue Vorurtheile und ihre Schaedlichkeit* (Copenhagen and Leipsic, 1787):—*Scheingötterei der Naturalisten, Deisten und Atheisten* (Koethen, 1788):—*Neues A B C, Sylben- und Lesebuch nebst einer Anweisung, das Lesen in kurzer Zeit auf die leichteste Art und ohne Buchstabiren zu lernen* (many editions, last Leipsic, 1790). Schlichtegroll assigns to Heinicke also a work on Kant's philosophical works, printed in German (Presburg, 1789, 8vo), but Meusel only the preface to it. Heinicke also wrote articles in the *Teutscher Merkur* and *Teutsches Museum*, in which he maintained, against the views of the abbé de l'Epée, that deaf mutes should be taught not only to write, but also to speak.—*New American Cyclopædia*, vi, 301; ix, 59; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxiii, 786 sq.; Petschke, *Historische Nachricht von dem Unterrichte der Taubstummen und Blinden* (Leipsic, 1793); Schlichtegroll, *Nekrolog* (1790), p. 313-315; Meusel, *Lexikon der von 1750 bis 1800 verstorbenen deutschen Schriftsteller* (Leipsic, 1802-16). (J. W. M.)

Heinsius, Daniel, an eminent scholar, was born in 1580 at Ghent. He studied law for some months at Franeker, but, determining to devote himself to letters, he went to Leyden, where he studied under Joseph Scaliger. In 1599 he began to teach Latin in the university, and on the death of Scaliger (1609) he was made professor of history. He was afterwards made librarian to the University, and historiographer to the States of Holland. He was secretary to the Synod of Dort, 1618. See Dort. He died Feb. 23, 1655. Besides editing many Latin and Greek classics, he published *Sacrarum exercitationum ad N. T.* libri xx (Lugd. Bat. 1639, fol.): —*Aristarchus sacer, sive Exercitationes ad Nonni Paraphrasin in Johannem* (Lugd. Bat. 1627, sm. 8vo). Heinsius was a strong advocate of a special Hellenistic dialect.

Heir (some form of the verb יָרַשׁ, to *possess;* Gr. κληρόνομος, a *receiver by lot*). The Hebrew institutions relative to inheritance were of a very simple character. Under the patriarchal system the property was divided among the sons of the legitimate wives (Gen. xxi, 10; xxiv, 36; xxv, 5), a larger portion being assigned to one, generally the eldest, on whom devolved the duty of maintaining the females of the family. See Birthright. The sons of concubines were portioned off with presents (Gen. xlix, 1 sq.), but this may have been restricted to cases where the children had been adopted by the legitimate wife (Gen. xxx, 3). But Jacob made the sons whom he had by his concubines heirs, as well as the others (Gen. xlix, 12-27). Moses laid no restrictions upon the choice of fathers in this respect; and we may infer that the sons of concubines, for the most part, received an equal share with the other sons, from the fact that Jephthah, the son of a concubine, complained that he was excluded from his father's house without any portion (Judg. xi, 1-7). Daughters had no share in the patrimony (Gen. xxxi, 14), but received a marriage portion, consisting of a maid-servant (Gen. xxix, 24, 29) or some other property. As a matter of special favor they sometimes took part with the sons (Job xlii, 15). The Mosaic law regulated the succession to real property thus: it was to be divided among the sons, the eldest receiving a double portion (Deut. xxi, 17), the others equal shares: if there were no sons, it went to the daughters (Numb. xxvii, 8), on the condition that they did not marry out of their own tribe (Numb. xxxvi, 6 sq.; Tob. vi, 12; vii, 13), otherwise the patrimony was forfeited (Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 7, 5). If there were no daughters, it went to the brother of the deceased; if no brother, to the paternal uncle; and, failing these, to the next of kin (Numb. xxvii, 9-11). In the case of a widow being left without children, the nearest of kin on her husband's side had the right of marrying her, and, in the event of his refusal, the next of kin (Ruth iii, 12, 13): with him rested the obligation of redeeming the property of the widow (Ruth iv, 1 sq.), if it had been either sold or mortgaged: this obligation was termed מִשְׁפַּט הַגְּאֻלָּה ("the right of inheritance"), and was exercised in other cases besides that of marriage (Jer. xxxii, 7 sq.). If none stepped forward to marry the widow, the inheritance remained with her until her death, and then reverted to the next of kin. See Widow. The object of these regulations evidently was to prevent the alienation of the land, and to retain it in the same family: the Mosaic law enforced, in short, a strict entail. Even the assignment of the double portion, which under the patriarchal *regime* had been at the disposal of the father (Gen. xlviii, 22), was by the Mosaic law limited to the eldest son (Deut. xxi, 15-17). The case of Achsah, to whom Caleb presented a field (Josh. xv, 18, 19; Judg. i, 15), is an exception; but perhaps even in that instance the land reverted to Caleb's descendants either at the death of Achsah or in the year of Jubilee. The land being thus so strictly tied up, the notion of *heirship*, as we understand it, was hardly known to the Jews: succession was a matter of right, and not of favor—a state of things which is embodied in the Hebrew language itself, for the word יָרַשׁ (A. V. "to inherit") implies *possession*, and very often *forcible* possession (Deut. ii, 12; Judg. i, 29; xi, 24), and a similar idea lies at the root of the words אֲחֻזָּה and נַחֲלָה, generally translated "inheritance." Testamentary dispositions were, of course, generally superfluous: the nearest approach to the idea is the *blessing*, which in early times conveyed temporal as well as spiritual benefits (Gen. xxvii, 19, 37; Josh. xv, 19). It appears, however, that eventually the father had at least the right of expressing his last wishes or *will* in the presence of witnesses, and probably in the presence of the heirs (2 Kings xx, 1). The references to wills in the apostle Paul's writings are borrowed from the usages of Greece and Rome (Heb. ix, 17), whence the custom was introduced into Judæa: several wills are noticed by Josephus in connection with the Herods (*Ant.* xiii, 16, 1; xvii, 3, 2; *War*, ii, 2, 3).

With regard to *personal* property, it may be presumed that the owner had some authority over it, at all events during his life-time. The admission of a slave to a portion of the inheritance with the sons (Prov. xvii, 2) probably applies only to the personalty. A presentation of half the personalty formed the marriage portion of Tobit's wife (Tob. viii, 21). A distribution of goods during the father's life-time is implied in Luke xv, 11-13: a distinction may be noted between οὐσία, a general term applicable to personalty, and κληρονομία, the *landed* property, which could only be divided after the father's death (Luke xii, 13).

There is a striking resemblance between the Hebrew and Athenian customs of heirship, particularly as regards heiresses (ἐπίκληροι), who were, in both nations, bound to marry their nearest relation: the property did not vest in the husband even for his life-time, but devolved upon the son of the heiress as soon as he was of age, who also bore the name, not of his father, but of his maternal grandfather. The object in both countries was the same, viz. to preserve the name and property of every family (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s. v. Epiclerus). See Inheritance.

In Col. i, 15, Christ is called "the first-born of every creature," i. e. "the *heir* of the whole creation," as in Heb. i, 2 he is called the "*heir* of all things." Believers

are called "*heirs* of the promise," "of righteousness," "of the kingdom," "of the world," "of God," "joint heirs" with Christ, inasmuch as they are partakers of the blessings which God bestows upon his children, implying admission to the kingdom of heaven and its privileges (Gal. iii, 29; Heb. vi, 17; xi, 7; Jas. ii, 5; Rom. iv, 13; viii, 17), and finally possession of the heavenly inheritance (John xvii, 22–24; Rev. iii, 22). See ADOPTION.

He'lah (Heb. *Chelah'*, חֶלְאָה, *rust*, as in Ezek. xxiv, 6; Sept. Ἀλαά v. r. Ἀωδά), one of the two wives of Ashur (a descendant of Judah), by whom she had three sons (1 Chron. iv, 5, 7). B.C. prob. cir. 1612.

Helali Codex OF THE O. T. See MANUSCRIPTS.

He'lam (Heb. *Cheylam'*, חֵילָם, *place of abundance*, 2 Sam. x, 16; but in ver. 17, *Chelam'*, חֵאלָם [with *hê* "directive," חֵאלָמָה, Josephus Χαλαμά], for which the margin prefers חֵלָאם; Sept. Αἰλάμ, Vulgate *Helam*), a place "beyond the river" (i. e. either east of the Jordan or west of the Euphrates, although Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 6, 3, understands it to mean east of the Euphrates), where David gained a victory over the combined forces of the Syrians under Hadadezer, apparently between Damascus and the country of the Ammonites. Ewald (*Isr. Gesch.* ii, 620) compares the *Alamathu* (Ἀλάμαθα) of Ptolemy (v, 15, 25), on the west bank of the Euphrates, near Nicephorium. See DAVID.

Hel'bah (Heb. *Chelbah'*, חֶלְבָּה, *fatness;* Sept. Ἐλβά v. r. Χεβδά and Σχεδία), a town in the tribe of Asher, from which the Canaanites were not expelled, mentioned between Achzib and Aphik (Judg. i, 31); but not (as Gesenius suggests) identical with Ahlab, which is also mentioned in the same verse. Perhaps it was situated in some fertile tract (as the names imply) in the valley of the Kishon, possibly at *Haifa*.

Hel'bon (Heb. *Chelbon'*, חֶלְבּוֹן, *fat*, i. e. fertile; Sept. Χελβών v. r. Χεβρών), a name which occurs only in Ezek. xxvii, 18, where "the wine of Helbon" is named among the commodities brought from Damascus to the great market of Tyre. The Syriac, Symmachus, the Chaldee, and Vulgate, all regard the word as an appellative descriptive of the quality of the wine as *pingue vinum* or *vinum dulce coctum.* But it is better to accept the indication of the Sept., which, by giving the proper name Χελβών, must be supposed to have had in view a place, which has hence generally been inferred to be the same with that old city of Syria that appears under the form of *Chalybon* (Χαλυβών) in Ptolemy (*Geog.* v, 15) and Strabo (xv, 505). The latter author mentions this Chalybon as a place famous for wine; and in describing the luxury of the kings of Persia, he says they would have wheat brought from Assos in Æolia, Chalybonian wine out of Syria, and water from the Eulæus (the river Ulai of Dan. viii, 2), which was the lightest of any. Both Hesychius and Plutarch (*Vit. Alex.* ii) speak of this famous wine. It has generally been thought that the name was derived from Chalybon, where it was supposed the wine was produced. But is it not strange that Damascus should be represented as supplying the wine of Helbon to the marts of Tyre? Why would not the native merchants themselves carry it thither? A passage which Bochart quotes from Athenæus (i, 51) throws light on this point: "The king of the Persians drank Chalybonian wine alone; which, says Poseidonius, *was also produced in Damascus*" (Bochart, *Opp.* ii, 486). We are thus led, both by the statement of Ezekiel and by that of Poseidonius, who was himself a native of Syria, to look for a Helbon or Chalybon at or near Damascus. Seleucus Nicator is said to have changed the name to *Berœa* (Niceph. Callist. xiv, 39); but the old name, as we see from Ptolemy, was not forgotten, and on the capture of the city by the Arabs in the 7th century it was again resumed (Schultens, *Index Geogr. in vitam Saladini*, s. v. Halebum). The city referred to has usually been identified with the modern *Aleppo*, a large city of Syria, called *Haleb* by the Arabs; but Russel states (*Natural Hist. of Aleppo*, Lond. 1794, i, 80) that but little wine is made there, and that the white wines especially are poor and thin, and difficult to keep; nor has this place ever obtained any celebrity for its vintages. Hence Prof. Hackett is inclined to adopt the suggestion made to him while visiting this region in 1852 by Dr. Paulding, one of the American missionaries there, that the Biblical Helbon should rather be sought in one of the principal villages of the same name lying in the wady *Helbon*, on the eastern slope of Anti-Lebanon, north of the Barrada. He was informed by those who had visited the place that the grapes produced there are remarkable for their fine quality, and that the wine obtained from them is regarded as the choice wine of that part of Syria (*Illustrations of Scripture*, N. York, 1855, p. 214). Dr. Robinson, to whom he mentioned this suggestion, visited the place in his last journey to Palestine, and fully accords with the identification. He thus describes the valley and town: "Wady Helbon is a valley an hour or more in length, shut in by high and rugged sides. The bottom is a strip of level ground, everywhere well cultivated. Throughout the whole extent of the valley there are well-kept vineyards. Even places so steep that the vine-dresser can approach them with difficulty are made to produce an abundance of grapes. In Damascus the grapes are chiefly esteemed for their fine flavor, and from them is made the best and most highly-prized wine of the country. The village of Helbon is nearly midway up the valley. There are many ruins in and around it, but mostly dilapidated; and hewn stones, capitals, friezes, and broken columns are built into the walls of the modern dwellings. On the west of the village is an extensive ruin, supposed to have once been a temple. On some of the blocks are fragments of Greek inscriptions no longer legible" (new ed. of *Researches*, iii, 471, 472).

Helchi'ah (Χελκίας, 1 Esd. viii, 1) or **Helchi'as** (*Helcias*, 2 Esd. i, 1), the Greek and Latin forms of the name of the high-priest HILKIAH (q. v.).

Hel'dai (Heb. *Chelday'*, חֶלְדַּי, *worldly;* Sept. Χολδαΐ, but οἱ ἄρχοντες in Zech. vi, 10; Vulg. *Holdai*), the name of two men.

1. A Netophathite and descendant of Othniel, chief of the twelfth division (24,000) of David's forces (1 Chron. xxvii. 15). B.C. 1014. In 1 Chron. xi, 30 (where he is called HELED) his father's name is said to be Baanah; and in the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii, 29) he is called HELEB.

2. One of those lately returned from the Captivity whom the prophet Zechariah was directed to take with him when he went to crown the high-priest Joshua, as a symbol of the future Messiah's advent (Zech. vi, 10). B.C. 520. In ver. 14 the name is written HELEM.

Heldua, the first station mentioned in the *Jerusalem Itinerary* south of Berytus and north of Porphyreon; now probably khan *el-Khulda* (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 435).—Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 320.

He'leb (Heb. *Che'leb*, חֵלֶב, *fatness*, as often; Sept. Ἐλάδ, Vulg. *Heled*), son of Baanah the Netophathite, and one of David's warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 29); elsewhere more correctly called HELED (1 Chron. xi, 30), or, still better, HELDAI (1 Chron. xxvi, 15).

He'led (Heb. *Che'led*, חֵלֶד, this *world*, as transitory; Sept. Ἐλάδ, Vulg. *Heled*), son of Baanah, a Netophathite, and one of David's warriors (1 Chron. xi, 30); called in the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii, 29) HELEB, but more accurately HELDAI in 1 Chron. xxvii, 15.

He'lek (Heb. *Che'lek*, חֵלֶק, a *portion*, as often; Sept. Χελέχ and Χέλεχ, Vulg. *Helec*), the second son of Gilead of the tribe of Manasseh (Josh. xvii, 2), whose descendants were called HELEKITES (Hebrew *Chelki'*, חֶלְקִי, Numb. xxvi, 30; Sept. Χελεκί). B.C. cir. 1612.

He'lekite (Numb. xxvi, 30). See HELEK.

He'lem, the name of one or two men, variously written in the Hebrew.

1. He'lem (חֵלֶם, a *stroke;* Sept. Ἑλάμ, Vulg. *Helem*), a brother of Shamer (or Shomer) and great-grandson of Asher, several of whose sons are enumerated in 1 Chron. vii, 35; perhaps the same with Hotham, ver. 32. B.C. prob. cir. 1658.

2. Che'lem (חֵלֶם, in Chaldee a *dream*, as often in Dan.; or *robust;* Sept. οἱ ὑπομένοντες αὐτόν, Vulg. *Helem*), one of those associated with Zechariah in the typical crowning of the high-priest, or, as it appears, himself also crowned (Zech. vi, 14, "Heled," prob. by erroneous transcription for Heled or Heldai, ver. 10).

Helena, St., mother of Constantine the Great. She was born about 274; Gloucester, Triers, and Bithynia dispute the honor of being her birthplace. Some consider her as of noble family, while the older authorities state that she was daughter of a shepherd or innkeeper. Constantius Chlorus is said to have married her for her beauty. She is also said to have at first been only his concubine, but this, perhaps, is a mistake, arising from the fact that the Roman law applied to women marrying above their station a name which had also this meaning. When Constantius became emperor he repudiated her, and she resided, perhaps, in the neighborhood of Triers until her son Constantine called her back with the title of Augusta. She did much towards softening the naturally tyrannical disposition of her son. She undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land about 325, where, by so-called miraculous agencies, she is said to have discovered, under the ruins of a heathen temple, the sepulchre and cross of Christ, the latter of which was "proved genuine by the miracles it wrought!" She built a church on the site, which remains to this day in part. All this gave a great impulse to pilgrimages to the Holy Land, and indirectly to the Crusades. She left Palestine in 327, returned to her son, and died probably soon after. The Romans claim to have her remains in the church of Ara Cœli. The monks of Hautvilliers, near Rheims (France), claim, on the other hand, that one of their order, as early as in the 9th century, brought the body of the saint from thence to their convent. Unfortunately, the Venetians state, on the other side, that the saint was buried at Constantinople, and that her remains were thence transferred to their city. So devotees kneel in three different places, on the 18th of August, before the remains of the daughter of a shepherd or innkeeper, who subsequently became a sainted empress. Monographs on St. Helena and her history are enumerated in Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 125. See Eusebius, *Life of Constantine;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.;* and the articles Cross; Jerusalem.

He'leph (Heb. *Che'leph*, חֵלֶף, an *exchange*, as in Numb. xviii, 21, 31; Sept. joins with prefixed preposition Μεέλεφ; Vulg. *Heleph*), a city mentioned apparently as the starting-point of the northern border of Naphtali, beginning at the west (Josh. xix, 33). Van de Velde thinks it may be the same with *Beit-lif*, a village with ancient remains (comp. Robinson, *Later Researches*, p. 61, 62), nearly due east of the Ras Abyad, and west of Kades, on the S. edge of a very marked ravine (wady el-Ayun), which probably formed part of the boundary between Naphtali and Asher (Van de Velde, *Syria*, i, 233); nor is the objection of Keil (*Comment.* ad loc.), that the position is represented as being at the intersection of the northern border of Palestine with the eastern line of Asher, altogether correct, since several of the associated names are likewise somewhat interior.

He'lez (Heb. *Che'lets*, חֶלֶץ or חֵלֶץ, in pause חָלֶץ, *Cha'lets*, perh. *loin* or *strong;* Sept. Χαλλής or Χελλής v. r. Σελλής; Vulg. *Heles, Helles*), the name of two men.

1. Son of Azariah and father of Eleasah, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 39). B.C. apparently ante 1017.

2. An Ephraimite of Pelon, and one of David's warriors, and afterwards captain of his seventh regiment (2 Sam. xxiii, 26; 1 Chron. xi, 27; xxviii, 10). B.C. 1014 et ante.

Helfenstein, Charles, a minister of the German Reformed Church, and son of Rev. J. C. A. Helfenstein, was born March 29, 1781. He spent his youth as a printer, and afterwards studied theology with Rev. Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md. He was licensed and ordained by the Synod of the German Reformed Church in May, 1801, and was pastor successively at Allemangel, Berks County, Pa.; Goshenhoppen, Montgomery County, Pa.; Ephrata, Lancaster County, Pa.; Hanover and Berlin, York County, Pa.; Rockingham County, Va.; and Mechanicsburg, Cumberland County, Pa. He died Dec. 19, 1842. With many innocent eccentricities, he was actuated by deep earnestness, a childlike piety, and a kindly spirit. He preached in both the German and English languages. (H. H.)

Helfenstein, John Conrad Albert, one of the fathers of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born at Moszbach, Palatinate, Feb. 16, 1748. He studied theology at the University of Heidelberg, and was sent by the Synod of Holland, in company with Rev. J. H. Helfferich and Rev. J. G. Gebhard, as missionaries to America. He arrived in New York Jan. 14, 1772, and soon after took charge of the congregation at Germantown, Pa. Towards the close of 1775 he accepted a call from Lancaster, but in 1779 returned to his Germantown congregation, and labored there until his death, May 17, 1790. He was an eloquent and successful preacher, and his ministry, both at Lancaster and Germantown, proved a great blessing. Several small volumes of his sermons have been published.—Harbaugh, *Fathers of the Reformed Church*, ii, 222 sq.

Helfenstein, Jonathan, a German Reformed minister, third son of Rev. J. C. A. Helfenstein, was born in Germantown, Pa., Jan. 19, 1784. He studied theology with Rev. Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md. He was licensed in 1805, and ordained in 1807; pastor of the German Reformed congregation in Carlisle till 1811, when he was called to Frederick, Md., where he labored with great success to the time of his death, Sept. 29, 1829. He was a zealous pastor, and an impressive preacher in both the German and English languages. (H. H.)

Helfferich, John Henry, a minister of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born at Moszbach, Palatinate, Oct. 22, 1739. After studying theology, he was licensed Sept. 22, 1761, and labored for a time in his own country. In January, 1772, he arrived in New York as a missionary, together with Rev. J. C. A. Helfenstein and Rev. J. G. Gebhard. He soon after settled at Weissenberg, Lehigh County, Pa., where his charge comprehended as many as seven congregations at one time. Here he remained, declining all calls from other churches, and labored faithfully until his death, Dec. 5, 1810. "During his ministry Mr. Helferich baptized 5830, and confirmed 4000 souls. He may be regarded as the father of the German Reformed Church in the field over which his labors extended. Though that part of the Church did not escape the general stagnation of a later period through German rationalism and indifference, yet the vantage-ground upon which it was placed, by means of his labors, has been a blessing to it down to our day."—Harbaugh, *Fathers of the Reformed Church*, ii, 241 sq.

Helfferich, John, a son of Rev. John Henry Helfferich, was born in Weissenberg, Lehigh County, Pa., Jan. 17, 1795. He completed his theological studies with Rev. Dr. Samuel Helfenstein in Philadelphia, was licensed in 1816, and ordained in 1819. He became pastor of the same congregations in Lehigh County, Pa., which his father had served for many years, in which field he continued to labor with much zeal and success to the end of his life. He died suddenly, April 8, 1852. During his ministry he baptized 4591, and received into full communion with the Church, by confirmation, be-

tween two and three thousand persons. He preached only in the German language. (H. H.)

He'li, or rather ELI ('Ηλί, in some ed. 'Ηλί or 'Ηλεί, Heb. עֵלִי, *Eli*), a name that occurs once in the N. T. and once in the Apocrypha.

1. The third of three names inserted between Achitob and Amarias in the genealogy of Ezra, in 2 Esd. i, 2, for which there is no corresponding name in the Heb. list (Ezra vii, 2, 3).

2. The father-in-law of Joseph, and maternal grandfather of Christ (Luke iii, 23). B.C. ante 22. See GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

Heli'as, the Latin form (2 Esd. vii, 39) of the name of the prophet ELIJAH.

Heliodōrus ('Ηλιόδωρος, i. e. *gift of the sun*, a not unfrequent Greek name), the treasurer (ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων) of Seleucus Philopator, who was commissioned by the king, at the instigation of Apollonius (q. v.), to carry away the private treasures deposited in the Temple at Jerusalem. According to the narrative in 2 Macc. iii, 9 sq., he was stayed from the execution of his design by a "great apparition" (ἐπιφάνεια), in consequence of which he fell down "compassed with great darkness," and speechless. He was afterwards restored at the intercession of the high-priest Onias, and bore witness to the king of the inviolable majesty of the Temple (2 Macc. iii). The full details of the narrative are not supported by any other evidence. Josephus, who was unacquainted with 2 Macc., takes no notice of it (*Ant.* xii, 3, 3); and the author of the so-called iv Macc. attributes the attempt to plunder the Temple to Apollonius, and differs in his account of the miraculous interposition, though he distinctly recognises it (*De Macc.* 4 οὐρανόθεν ἔφιπποι προυφάνησαν ἄγγελοι . . . καταπεσὼν δὲ ἡμιθανὴς ὁ 'Απολλώνιος . . .). Heliodorus afterwards murdered Seleucus, and made an unsuccessful attempt to seize the Syrian crown (App. *Syr.* 45). B.C. 175. Comp. Wernsdorf, *De fide Libr. Macc.* § liv. Raffaelle's grand picture of "Heliodorus" has often been copied and engraved.

Heliodorus OF EMESA, in Syria, flourished in the latter part of the 4th century after Christ. He was the author of the celebrated romance entitled *Æthiopica*, or account of the love and adventures of Theogenes and Chariclea, the oldest and best of the Greek romances, and the model of many subsequent ones. This was written in early life, and afterwards Heliodorus became a Christian, and was made bishop of Tricca, in Sicily, where he introduced the regulation that every married priest should, upon his ordination, separate from his wife or be deposed (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* v, 22). Nicephorus states (*Hist. Eccles.* xii, 34) that a provincial synod, because of the injurious tendency of the *Æthiopica* upon the minds of the young, decreed that Heliodorus should either condemn and disown it, or resign his bishopric. This statement is generally rejected as improbable, since it is made by no other author, and the *Æthiopica* contains nothing of a corruptive tendency. The best edition of the Greek text is that by Coraes (Paris, 1804, 2 vols. 8vo).—Smith, *Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog. and Mythology*, ii, 373; Dunlop, *Hist. of Fiction* (London, 1845, 1 vol. 8vo), p. 18–24; Photius, *Cod.* 73; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 699. (J. W. M.)

Heliogabālus (ELAGABALUS), emperor of Rome, was born at Emesa about A.D. 205. His name was Varus Avitus Bassianus, but he was made priest of Elagabalus (El-Gabal), the Syro-Phœnician Sun-god, about A.D. 217, and took that name. In May, 218, through the intrigues of his mother, Julia Mœsa, with the soldiery, he was proclaimed emperor; and, soon after, Macrinus, who was marching to put down this usurpation, was defeated. His reign, which lasted not quite four years, was characterized by superstition, licentiousness, and cruelty to a degree hardly rivalled by the worst Roman emperors. He introduced the worship of the Sun-god into Rome, and even passed a decree that no other celestial power should be worshipped. The prætorians slew him in camp, A.D. 222. As he himself introduced a new religion into Rome, it was not his policy to persecute, and so, during that time, the Christians had "rest."

Hel'kai (Heb. *Chelkay'*, חֶלְקַי, for חִלְקִיָּה, *Jehovah is his portion;* Sept. 'Ελκαΐ), son of Meraioth, and one of the chief priests in the time of the high-priest Joiakim (Neh. xii, 15). B.C. post 536.

Hel'kath (Heb. *Chelkath'*, חֶלְקַת, Josh. xix, 25, but חֶלְקַת, even without pause-accent, Josh. xxi, 31; "construct" of חֶלְקָה, *smoothness*, as in Gen. xxvii, 16, or *portion*, as in Gen. xxxiii, 19, etc.; Sept. Χελκάθ), a town of Asher, on the eastern border, mentioned as the starting-point in the direction (apparently southward) to Achshaph (Josh. xix, 25); assigned as one of the Levitical cities (Josh. xxi, 31). In 1 Chron. vi, 75, it appears to be erroneously written HUKOK. See HUKKOK. In the *Onomasticon* it is simply mentioned by Eusebius as 'Εθάη, by Jerome as *Elcath;* but neither seems to have known it. De Saulcy inclines to identify it with a village called *Kirkeh*, which he reports not far south-east of Akka (*Narrative*, i, 68); and Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 191) thinks it is the modern *Yerka*, about seven miles north-east of Akka; but neither of these positions is in the neighborhood indicated by the text, which rather requires a locality nearer the north-eastern angle of the tribe, not unlikely at the ruined village *Ukrith*, about twelve miles S.E. of Tyre, as proposed by Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 320). See HELKATH-HAZZURIM.

Hel'kath-haz'zurim (Heb. *Chelkath' hats-Tsurim'*, חֶלְקַת־הַצֻּרִים, *plot of the rocks*), a designation of the plain just below the pool of Gibeon, on the east, acquired from the deadly combat between twelve of Ishbosheth's men and as many of David's, which formed a prelude to the general engagement (2 Sam. ii, 16). See GIBEON. As to the name, "Ewald approves the reading which the Sept. seem to have followed (μερὶς τῶν ἐπιβούλων, apparently from their reading הַצָּדִים), as that which alone gives a suitable meaning to the name (*Gesch. Isr.* ii, 575, note 1). Gesenius renders by 'the field of swords,' which can hardly be admitted; for, though צוּר is used in the sense of an 'edge,' it is never used simply for 'sword.' Fürst gives *Felsenkahlheit*, 'rock-smoothness,' as the meaning, the place being smooth and level as a surface of rock. Aquila gives κλῆρος τῶν στερεῶν, and the Vulg. *Ager robustorum*, taking צוּר in a figurative sense, of which, however, there is no other instance"

Helki'as (Χελκίας), a still different Greek form (1 Esd. i, 8) of the name of the high-priest HILKIAH.

Hell, a term which originally corresponded more exactly to HADES, being derived from the Saxon *helan*, to cover, and signifying merely the *covered*, or invisible place—the habitation of those who have gone from this visible terrestrial region to the world of spirits. But it has been so long appropriated in common usage to the place of future punishment for the wicked, that its earlier meaning has been lost sight of. In the English Bible it is used in the wider sense.

I. *Hebrew and Greek Terms.*—The three words, which all but monopolize the subject, are שְׁאוֹל, *Sheôl'*, in the O. T.; and "Αιδης, *Hadès*, and Γέεννα, *Gehenna*, in the N. T. שְׁאוֹל occurs 65 times; in 61 of these it is rendered in the Sept. by "Αδης; twice by Θάνατος (2 Sam. xxii, 6, and Prov. xxiii, 14); and twice omitted in the common text (Job xxiv, 19; Ezek. xxxii, 21). In the Vulg. שְׁאוֹל is translated 48 times by *Infernus*, and 17 times by *Inferus* [mostly *Inferi* (plur.)]. In our A. V. it is represented 31 times by *Grave*, 31 times by *Hell*, and 3 times by *Pit*. In the N. Test. our word *Hell* occurs 23 times; 12 times it stands for Γέεννα, and 11 times [*perhaps* the twelfth should be added, see Tischendorf and Bruder (*Concord.*) on Rev. iii, 7] for "Αδης. The Vulg.

closely follows the original in its N.-T. renderings; in all the twelve passages Γέεννα is simply copied into *Gehenna,* while *Infernus* stands for every occurrence of ῞Αδης, except once (Matt. xvi, 18), where the phrase πύλαι ᾅδου ("*gates of hell*") becomes "portæ *inferi.*" Since, therefore, שְׁאוֹל, ῞Αδης, and Γέεννα, are employed in the sacred original to designate the mysteries of HELL, we proceed to give first their probable derivation, and then their meaning, so far as Holy Scripture assists in its discovery.

(I.) *Their Derivation.*—1. שְׁאוֹל (or, as it is occasionally written, שְׁאֹל), *Sheôl',* is by most of the old writers (see Cocceius, *Lex.* p. 840, 841; Schindler, *Lex. Pent.* 1782; Robinson, *Key to Hebrew Bible,* ii, 217; and Leigh, *Crit. Sacra,* i, 238; ii, 6) referred for its origin to שָׁאַל, to *demand, seek,* or *ask.* They are not agreed as to the mode of connecting the derivative with this root; Cocceius suggests an absurd reason, "שְׁאוֹל notat eum locum in quo qui est *in quæstione est*" (!) A more respectable solution is suggested by those who see in the *insatiableness* of שְׁאוֹל (Prov. xxx, 15, 16) a good ground for connecting it with the root in question. Thus Fagius on Gen. xxxvii; Buxtorf, *Lexicon,* s. v., referring to Isa. v, 14; Habak. ii, 5; Prov. xxvii, 20. (Ernst Meier, *Hebr. W-w-b,* p. 187, also adopts this root, but he is far-fetched and obscure in his view of its relation to the derived word). (A good defence [by a modern scholar] of this derivation of Sheol from the verb שָׁאַל is given by Güder, *Lehre v. d. Erschein. Jesu Christi unter den Todten* [Berne, 1853], and more briefly in his art. *Hades* [Herzog, v,,441, Clark's trans. ii, 468]. His defence is based on the many passages which urge the insatiable *demand* of Sheol for all men, such as those we have mentioned in the text, and Gen. xxxvii, 35; 1 Sam. xxviii; Psa. vi, 6, and lxxxix, 49. See also Venema [on Psa. xvi, 10]; J. A. Quensted, *Tract. de Sepultura Veterum,* ix, 1.) Böttcher (*De Inferis,* p. 76, § 159) finds in the root שָׁעַל, *to be hollow,* a better origin for our word. Gesenius (*Thes.* p. 1347), who adopts the same derivation, supposes that שָׁעַל means *to dig out,* and so contrives to unite שׁעל and שׁאל, by making the primary idea of *digging* lead to the derived one of *seeking* (see Job iii, 21). Böttcher goes on to connect the German words *Hohl* (hollow) and *Höhle* (cavity) with the idea indicated by שׁעל, and timidly suggests the possibility of *Hölle* (Hell) coming from *Höhle.* Whilst decidedly rejecting this derivation, we do not object to his derivation of the *Hebrew* noun; amidst the avowed uncertainty of the case, it seems to be the least objectionable of the suggestions which have been offered, and, to provide an intelligible sense for the word *Sheôl,* most in harmony with many Biblical passages. Böttcher defines the term to mean "*vastus locus subterraneus*" (p. 72, § 153). This agrees very well with the rendering of our A. V. in so far as it has used the comprehensive word *Hell,* which properly signifies "a covered or concealed place."

2. *Hades.* — The universally allowed statement that the N. T. has shed a light on the mysteries of life and immortality which is only in an inferior degree discovered in the O. T., is seldom more distinctly verified than in the uncertainty which attaches to *Sheol* (the difficulty of distinguishing its various degrees of meaning, which it is generally felt exist, and which our A. V. has endeavored to express by an equal balance between *Hell* and *Grave*), in contrast with the distinction which is implied in the about equally frequent terms of *Hades* and *Gehenna,* now to be described. The ῞Αδης of the N. T. was suggested, no doubt, by its frequent occurrence in the Sept. The word was originally unaspirated, as in Homer's Ἀΐδαο πύλαι (*Il.* v, 646; ix, 312), and Hesiod's Ἀΐδεω κύνα χαλκεόφωνον (*Theog.* 311), and Pindar's Ἀΐδαν λαχεῖν (*Pyth.* v, 130). This form of the word gives greater credibility to the generally received derivation of it from *α* privat. and *ἰδεῖν, to see.* (The learned authors of Liddell and Scott's *Greek Lex.* [s. v. ῞Αδης] throw some doubt on this view of the origin of the word, because of its aspirated beginning, in Attic Greek. But surely this is precarious ground. Is it certain that even in *Attic* writers it was invariably aspirated? Æschylus [*Sept. c. Theb.* (Paley) 310] has Ἀΐδᾳ προϊάψαι [*with the lenis*], according to the best editing. It is true that this is in a chorus, but in the *Agam.* 1505, also a choral line, we read μηδὲν ἐν ῞Αιδου μεγαλαυχείτω [with the aspirate], as if the usage were uncertain. Possibly in the elliptical phrase ἐν ῞Αιδου [scil οἴκῳ] the aspirate occurs because the genitive is really the name of the *God* [not of the region, which might, for distinction, have been *then* unaspirated]). Plutarch accordingly explains it by ἀειδὲς καὶ ἀόρατον (*De Isid. et Osir.* p. 382), and in the *Etymol. Magn.* ᾅδης is defined as χωρίον ἀφεγγές, σκότους αἰωνίου καὶ ζόφου πεπληρομένον . . . ἐν ᾧ οὐδὲν βλέπομεν. *Hades* is thus "*the invisible place or region;*" "*Locus visibus nostris subtractus,*" as Grotius defines it.

3. *Gehenna* (Γέεννα) is composed of the two Heb. words גֵּיא (*valley*) and הִנֹּם (*Hinnom,* the name of the proprietor of the valley). In the Sept. Γαίεννα is used in Josh. xviii, 16 to designate "*the valley of the son of Hinnom,*" the full expression of which is גֵּי בֶן־הִנֹּם. The shorter appellation גֵּי הִנֹּם occurs in the same verse. The Rabbinical writers derive הִנֹּם from נָהַם, "*rugire*" [*to groan* or *mourn,* in Ezek. xxiv, 23], as if indicative of the cries of the children in the horrid rites of the Moloch-worship (see Buxtorf, *Lex. Rab.* p. 108; Glassius [ed. Dathii], *Philolog. Sacr.* i, 806). The etymological remarks have paved our way to the next section of our subject.

(II.) *Biblical Meaning of these three Terms.*—1. *Meanings of* שְׁאוֹל, *Sheôl.*—(1.) The "*Grave.*" Much controversy has arisen whether within the meaning of *Sheol* should be included "*the grave;*" indeed this is the only question of difficulty. The fact, which we have already stated, that our A. V. translates שְׁאוֹל quite as often by "grave" as by the general term "hell," supplies a *primâ facie* reason for including it. Without, however, insisting on the probability that polemical theology, rather than Biblical science, influenced our translators, at least occasionally, in their rendering of the word, we may here adduce on the other side the telling fact that of all the ancient versions not one translates in any passage the Hebrew *Sheol* by the equivalent of *grave.* The other Greek translators, like the venerable Sept., so far as their fragments show (see Origen, *Hexapla, passim*), everywhere give ῞Αιδης for שְׁאוֹל (sometimes they use for the locative case the older and better phrase εἰς, ἐν ῞Αιδου, sometimes the more recent and vulgar εἰς τὸν ῞Αιδην, ἐν τῷ ῞Αιδῃ). The Samaritan text in the seven passages of the Pentateuch has either שיול (*Siol*) or שיאול. Onkelos and Jonathan everywhere, except in five passages, retain שְׁאוֹל. The Peshito everywhere in both Testaments renders the Hebrew *Sheol* and the Greek *Hades* by [שְׁיוּל] *Shiul;* and, as we have already seen, the Vulg. translates the same words in both the O. T. and the N. T. by *inferus* (plur. *Inferi* mostly), and, above all, *Infernus* (see above for particulars). It is to the later Targumists (the pseudo-Jonathan and the *Jerusalem* Targum), and afterwards to the Rabbinical doctors of the Middle Ages, that we trace the version of the "sepulchre" and "the grave" (thus in Gen. xxxvii, 35; xlii, 38; xliv, 29, 31, these Targumists rendered *Sheol* by בֵּי קְבוּרְתָּא [*the house of burial*]; similarly did they render Psa. cxli, 7; Job vii, 9; xiv, 13; xvii, 13, 16; xxi, 13; Eccles. ix, 10, and other passages, in which it is observable how often they have been followed by our translators). See, for more information on this point, archbishop Usher, *Works* [by Elrington], iii, 319–321; and, more fully, Böttcher (p. 68–70, sec. 146–149), who quotes Rashi and Aben Ezra [on Gen. xxxvii,

35]; D. Kimchi (*Lib. Radic.* s. v. שְׁאוֹל); and other Rabbis who expressly admit *the grave* within the scope of the meaning of *Sheol;* Böttcher also quotes a very long array of commentators and lexicographers [Rabbi Mardochai Nathan, with extravagant one-sidedness, in his *Hebr. Concord.* gives no other sense to *Sheol* but קֶבֶר, *the grave*], who follow the Rabbinical doctors herein; and he adds the names of such writers as deny the meaning of the *grave* to the Hebrew *Sheol:* among these occur the learned Dutch divines Vitringa and Venema. The latter of these expressly affirms, "שְׁאוֹל *nullo modo ad sepulchrum pertinebit*" (*Comment. ad Ps.* i, 504). To the authorities he mentions we would add, as maintaining the same view, the learned Henry Ainsworth (on Gen. xxxvii, 35, *Works*, p. 135), who draws an important distinction; "שְׁאוֹל, *the grave*, the word meaneth not the grave digged or made with hands, which is named in Hebrew קֶבֶר, but it meaneth the common place or state of death" (a similar distinction is drawn by Luther [*Enarr. in Genes.* xlii, 38]; קבר is only the grave in which an actual interment takes place; none that die *unburied* can have this word used of them; *their* receptacle is שאול, "commune quoddam receptaculum non corporum tantum sed et animarum, ubi omnes mortui congregantur." Ann. Seneca [*lib.* viii, *controvers.* 4] observes between *natural* burial and *artificial*—"Omnibus natura sepulturam dedit," etc. So Lucan, vii, 818, says—"Capit omnia tellus Quæ genuit; cœlo tegitur, qui non habet urnam." Pliny [*Hist. Nat.* vii, 54] distinguishes between natural burial by applying to it the word *sepelire*, and burial by ceremony by using of it the synonyme *humare*); Nicolaus (*De Sepulchris Hebr.* i, 8–14), who shows that שְׁאוֹל is never used of funeral pomp, nor of the burial of the body in the ground; Eberhard Busmann, who [in 1682] wrote *Dissertatio philol. de Scheol Hebr.*, makes a statement to the effect that he had examined all the passages in the O. T., and pronounces of them thus—"*Nullum eorum* (excepto forsan uno vel altero, de quo tamen adhuc dubitari potest) *de sepulchro necessario est intelligendum* . . . multa tamen contra ita sunt comparata ut de sepulchro nullo modo intelligi possint, nec debeant." Some modern writers, who have specially examined the subject, also deny that שְׁאוֹל *ever* means "the grave." Thus Breecher, *On the Immortality of the Soul as held by the Jews* (and Pareau, *Comment. de Immort. ac vitæ fut. notit.* 1807).

These reasons have led learned men, who have especially examined the subject, to exclude *the grave* (specifically understood as a *made* or *artificial one*) from the proper meaning of Sheol. We cannot but accept their view *in critical exactness.* But there is an inexact and generic sense of *Sheol* in which the word *grave* well expresses the meaning of the Scripture passages just mentioned, and (in justice to the A.V. it may be admitted) of most of the others, which our translators rendered by this word. (The passages in which the A.V. renders שְׁאוֹל by *grave* are these—Gen. xxxvii, 35; xlii, 38; xliv, 29, 31; 1 Sam. ii, 6; 1 Kings ii, 6, 9; Job vii, 9; xiv, 13; xvii, 13; xxi, 13; xxiv, 19; Psa. vi, 5 [Hebr. 6]; xxx, 3 [4]; xxxi, 17 [18]; xlix, 14 [15], twice; xlix, 15 [16]; lxxxviii, 3 [4]; lxxxix, 48 [49]; cxli, 7; Prov. i, 12; xxx, 16; Eccles. ix, 10; Cant. viii, 6; Isa. xiv, 11 [marg. of v, 9 has *grave*]; xxxviii, 10, 18; Ezek. xxxi, 15; Hos. xiii, 14, twice; and in Jonah ii, 2 [3] the *margin* has "grave.") Of this more vague sense Usher (*Works*, iii, 324) says—"When *Sheol* is said to signify *the grave*, the term *grave* must be taken in as large a sense as it is in our Saviour's speech (John v, 28), and in Isa. xxvi, 19, according to the Sept. reading: upon which passage writes Origen thus—'Here and in many other places the graves of the dead are to be understood, not such only as we see are builded for the receiving of men's bodies—either cut out in stones, or digged down in the earth; but *every place wherein a man's body lieth either entire or in part* . . . otherwise they which are not committed to burial, nor laid in graves, but have ended their life in shipwrecks, deserts, and such like ways, should not seem to be reckoned among those which are said to be raised from the grave' (*In Esai. lib.* 28 *citatus a Pamphilo, in Apol.*)" We have here, then, the *first* meaning of the Hebrew שְׁאוֹל, largely applied, as we have seen, in our A.V. to "the grave," considered in a universal sense (see the passages in the last note), commensurate with *death* itself as to the extent of its signification. (Comp. "*the grave and gate of death*" of the English Liturgy, Collect for Easter Even.) Though we carefully exclude the artificial grave, or קֶבֶר, from this category, there is no doubt, as bishop Lowth has well shown (*De Sacra Poesi Hebr.* Præl. vii [ed. Oxon. with notes of Michaelis and Rosenmüller, 1821], p. 65–69), that the Hebrew poets drew all the imagery with which they describe the state and condition of the dead from the funeral rites and pomp, and from the vaulted sepulchres of their great men. The bishop's whole treatment of the subject is quite worth perusal. We can only quote his final remarks: "You will see this transcendent imagery better and more completely displayed in that noble triumphal song which was composed by Isaiah (xiv, 4–27) . . . previous to the death of the king of Babylon. Ezekiel has also grandly illustrated the same scene, with similar machinery, in the last prophecy concerning the fall of Pharaoh (xxxii, 18–32)." For an excellent vindication of the A.V. in many of its translations of *the grave*, we refer the reader to the treatise of archbishop Usher (*Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, Works* [ed. Elrington], iii, 319–324 and 332–340). We doubt not that, if *grave* is an admissible sense of שְׁאוֹל, our translators have, on the whole, made a judicious selection of the passages that will best bear the sense: their purpose was a popular one, and they accomplished it, in the instance of *uncertain* words and phrases, by giving them the most *intelligible* turn they would bear, as in the case before us. We undertake not to decide whether it would be better to leave the broad and generic word *Sheol*, as the great versions of antiquity did, everywhere; whether, e. g., Jacob's lament (Gen. xxxvii, 35; xlii, 38) and like passages would be more suitably, if not correctly, rendered by the simple retention of the original word, or the equally indefinite *hades*. There is some force in the observation often made (see Corn. a Lapide, on Gen. xxxvii, 35; Bellarmine and others, adduced by Leigh, *Crit. Sacra*, i, 239) that "it was not the *grave* of Joseph which Jacob meant, for he thought indeed that his son was devoured of wild beasts, and not buried." See more on this passage in Pearson, *Creed* [ed. Chevallier], p. 437; Fulke, *Translations*, etc., p. 314; both which writers defend the version of *grave*. Ainsworth ad loc. (among the older commentators) and Knobel (among the moderns) contend for the general word *hell* [Knobel, *Schattenreich*]. Rosenmüller learnedly states both views, and leans in favor of "locum, ubi mortui umbrarum instar degunt" (*Scholia*, i, 576).

(2.) The other meaning of שְׁאוֹל, "*Hell*," so rendered in thirty-one passages of A.V., according to the more ancient and, as it seems to us, preferable opinion, makes it *local*, i. e. *the place of disembodied spirits.* (Ἅιδης δὲ τόπος ἡμῖν ἀειδής, ἤγουν ἀφανὴς καὶ ἄγνωστος, ὁ τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν ἐντεῦθεν ἐκδημούσας δεχόμενος, Andr. Cæsaricus *in Apocal.* c. 63.) A later opinion supposes the word to indicate "not the place where souls departed are, but *the state and condition of the dead*, or their permansion in death," as bishop Pearson calls it (*Creed* [ed. Chevallier], p. 439). On this opinion, which that great divine "cannot admit as a full or proper exposition," we shall say nothing more than that it is at best only a *deduction* from the foregoing *local* definition. That definition we have stated in the broadest terms, because, in reference to Dr. Barrow's enumeration (*Serm.*

on the Creed [Art. "He descended into Hell"], *Works* [Oxford, 1830], v, 416, 417) of the questions which have arisen on the subject before us, we believe that Holy Scripture warrants the most ample of all the positions suggested by that eminent writer, to the effect that the *Sheôl* or *Hell* of which we treat is not merely "the place of good and happy souls," or "that of bad and miserable ones," but "indifferently and in common of both those." We propose to arrange the Biblical passages so as to describe, first, *the state of the occupants of Sheol*, and, secondly, the *locality of it*, in some of its prominent features. As to the first point, *Sheôl* is (*a*) the receptacle of the spirits of *all that depart this life*. (Among the scriptural designations of the inhabitants of Sheol is רְפָאִים [קְהַל ר׳ (in Prov. xxi, 16) is rendered "congregation of the *dead*" (or *departed*) in the A. V. This is better than the Sept. rendering συναγωγὴ γιγάντων, and Vulg. "coetus *gigantum*." There is force in the word קהל thus applied, derived from the use of the word to designate the great "*congregation*" of the Jewish nation; see CONGREGATION]. For the use of the word רפאים, as applicable to *the dead*, see especially Böttcher, *De Infer.* p. 94-10, § 193-204. The word occurs in this sense also in the grand passage of Isa. xiv. [In ver. 9 "*Sheol* stirs up its *Rephaim*" on the entrance of the spirit of the king of Babylon.] רפאים is met with in six other places in the same sense of *departed spirits*. It is connected with רָפָה, "weak," which occurs in Numb. xiii, 18, and other passages [see Fürst, *Hebr. W.-b.* ii, 383]. The gentile noun [mentioned in Gen. xiv, 5 and elsewhere, and rendered *Rephaim* and *Giants*] is of the same form, but probably of a different origin [see Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1302].) This general signification appears from Psa. lxxxix, 47, 48, and Isa. xxxviii, 18, 19 (in which latter verse the opposition in its universal sense between *sheol* and the state of life in this world is to be observed). We do not hesitate, with archbishop Usher (*Works*, iii, 318), to translate שְׁאוֹל in these passages "*hell*" or "*sheol*," instead of "*grave*," as in the A. V. *Sheol*, therefore, is (*b*) *the abode of the wicked*, Numb. xvi, 33; Job xxiv, 19; Psa. ix, 17 (*Hebr.* 18); xxxi, 17 (18); Prov. v, 5; ix, 18; Isa. lvii, 9; and (*g*) *of the good* [both in their "disembodied" condition], Psa. xvi, 10, comp. with Acts ii, 27, 31; Psa. xxx, 3 (4); xlix, 15 (16); lxxxvi, 13; Isa. xxxviii, 10, compared with Job iii, 17-19; Hos. xiii, 14, comp. with 1 Cor xv, 55. With regard to the second point, touching some *local* features of *Sheol*, we find it described as *very deep* (Job xi, 8); *dark* (Job x, 21, 22); (yet *confest and open* to the eye of God, Job xxvi, 6); *with* "*valleys*" (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1348) *or depths* of various gradations (Psa. lxxxvi, 13 [compared with Deut. xxxii, 22]; Prov. ix, 18); *with bars* (Job xvii, 16, comp. with Jon. ii, 6) and *gates* (Isa. xxxviii, 10); *situated beneath us*; hence the dead are said "to go down" (יָרַד) to Sheol, Numb. xvi, 30, 33; Ezek. xxxi, 15, 16, 17 (compared with Job vii, 9; Gen. xlii, 38). Comp. Josephus (*Ant.* xvii, 1, 3), who, when describing the tenets of the Jewish sects, attributes to the Pharisees the belief of a future state, in which "rewards and punishments" will be dealt out "to men in their disembodied state" (ταῖς ψυχαῖς) "under the earth" (ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαιώσεις τε καὶ τιμάς, κ. τ. λ.). On the phrase of the creed "*descended* into hell," and sundry uses of יָרַד and κατελθεῖν as not necessarily implying local *descent*, but rather "*removal from* one place to another," see Usher (*Works*, iii, 392, 393). We have seen how some have derived the name of *Sheol* from its insatiability; such a quality is often attributed to it: it is *all-devouring* (Prov. i, 12); *never satisfied* (Prov. xxx, 16; Isa. v, 14), and *inexorable* (Cant. viii, 7).

2. There is in the *Hades* (Ἅιδης) of the N. T. an equally *ample* signification with the *Sheol* of the O. T., as the abode of both happy and miserable beings. Its characteristics are not dissimilar; it is represented as "*a prison*" (comp. 1 Pet. iii, 19, where inhabitants of *hades* are called τὰ ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύματα); with *gates* and bars (πύλαι ᾅδου, Matt. xvi, 18; comp. with the phrase εἰς Ἅδου of Acts ii, 27, 31, with the ellipsis of δῶμα or οἶκον); and *locks* (the "keys" of *Hades*, αἱ κλεῖς τοῦ Ἅιδου, being in the hands of Christ, Rev. i, 18); its situation is also *downwards* (see the ἕως ᾅδου καταβιβασθήσῃ of Matt. xi, 23, and Luke x, 15). As might be expected, there is more plainly indicated in the N. T. the *separate* condition of the righteous and the wicked: to indicate this separation other terms are used; thus, in Luke xxiii, 43, *Paradise* (παράδεισος—no doubt different from that of Paul, 2 Cor. xii, 4, which is designated, in Rev. ii, 7, as ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ Θεοῦ, the *supernal* Paradise; see Robinson, *Lexicon*, N. T., p. 13, 547; Wahl, *Clavis*, N. T., p. 376; Kuinöl [ed. London] on N. T. ii, 237; and especially Meyer, *Kommentar u. d. Neue Test.* [ed. 4] vi, 292, and the authorities there quoted by him) is used to describe that part of Hades which the blessed dead inhabit—a figurative expression, so well adapted for the description of a locality of happiness that the inspired writers employ it to describe the three happiest places, the Eden of Innocence, the Hades of departed saints, and the heaven of their glorious rest. The distinction between the upper and the lower *Paradise* was familiar to the Jews. In Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum*, ii, 295-322, much of their curious opinions on the subject is collected. In p. 298 are given the seven names of the *heavenly* Paradise, while in the next three are contained the seven names of the *lower* Paradise of *Hades*. See PARADISE.

Another figurative expression used to designate the *happy* part of Hades is "Abraham's bosom," ὁ κόλπος Ἀβραάμ, Luke xvi, 22. (St. Augustine, who says [*Quæst. Evang.* ii, 38] "Sinus Abrahæ requies est beatorum pauperum . . . . in quo post hanc vitam recipiuntur," yet doubts whether *hades* is used at all in N. T. in a good sense. He says [*Ep.* clxxxvii, *Works*, ii, 689], "Whether *the bosom of Abraham*, where the wicked Dives was, when in his torment he beheld the poor man at rest, were either to be deemed the same as *Paradise*, or to be thought to pertain to hell or hades, *I cannot define* [non facile dixerim];" so also he writes *on Psa. lxxxv* [*Works*, iv, 912]). For an explanation of the phrase, see ABRAHAM'S BOSOM.

3. We need not linger over the Biblical sense of our last word Γέεννα. *Gehenna*. We refer the reader to a "Discourse" by the learned Joseph Mede (*Works*, p. 31-33) on *Gehenna*, which he shows was not used to designate "hell" before the captivity. He, in the same treatise, dwells on certain Hebrew words and phrases, which were in use previous to that epoch for designating *Hades* and its inhabitants—among these he especially notes רפאים and קְהַל ר׳, on which we have observed above. As Παράδεισος is not limited to the finite happiness of Hades, but embraces in certain passages the ultimate blessedness of heaven, so there is no violence in supposing that Γέεννα (from the *finite* signification which it possibly bears in Matt. v, 29, 30; xxiii, 15, equivalent to the Τάρταρος referred to by Peter, 2 Epist. ii, 4, as the place where the fallen angels *are reserved unto judgment*, or "until sentence," comp. Jude v, 6) goes on to mean, in perhaps most of its occurrences in the N. T., the final condition of the lost, as in Matt. xxiii, 33, where the expression ἡ κρίσις τῆς γεέννης probably means *the condemnation* [or sentence] *to Gehenna* as the ultimate doom. See GEHENNA.

IV. *Synonymous Words and Phrases.*—(Most of these are given by Eisenmenger, *Entdeck. Jud.* ii, 324, and Galatinus, *De Arcanis*, vi, 7, p. 345.) 1. דּוּמָה, *Dumâh*, in Psa. cxv, 17, where the phrase כָּל־יֹרְדֵי ד׳, "all that go down into silence," is in the Sept. πάντες οἱ καταβαίνοντες εἰς ᾅδου, while the Vulg. has "*omnes qui descendunt in inferum*" (comp. Psa. xciv, 17). 2. אֲבַדּוֹן, *Abaddôn*, in Job xxvi, 6, is in poetical apposition with שְׁאוֹל

(comp. Prov. xxvii, 20 [Kethib], where אֲ is in conjunction with שְׁ, forming an hendiadys for *destructive hell;* Sept. Ἅιδης καὶ ἀπώλεια; Vulg. *Infernus et perditio;* A. V. "Hell and destruction"). 3. בְּאֵר שַׁחַת, *Beër Shachath*, Psa. lv, 24; A. V. "pit of destruction;" Sept. Φρέαρ διαφθορᾶς; Vulg. *Puteus interitus* (see also passages in which בּוֹר and שַׁחַת occur separately). 4. צַלְמָוֶת, *Tsalmaveth*, with or without חֹשֶׁךְ, in Psa. cvii, 10, and other passages; Sept. Σκία θανάτου; Vulg. *Umbra mortis;* A. V. "shadow of death." 5. תַּחְתִּיּוֹת־אֶרֶץ, *Tachtiyôth Erets*, in Isa. xliv, 23; A. V. "lower parts of the earth" [*Sheol* or *Hades*, Gesen.]; Sept. Τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς; Vulg. *Extrema terræ* (comp. Ezek. xxvi, 20, etc., where the phrase is inverted, ארץ־תחתיות); of similar meaning is בּוֹר תַּחְתִּיּוֹת, Psa. lxxxviii, 6 (7). 6. תָּפְתֶּה, *Tophtêh*, in Isa. xxx, 33 [according to Eisenmenger]; for another application of this word, see Gesenius, *Thes.* s. v.; and Rosenmüller, ad loc. 7. The phrase first used of Abraham, Gen. xxv, 8 (where it occurs, in the solemn description of the holy patriarch's end, *midway between death and burial*), "He was gathered to his fathers," is best interpreted of the departure of the soul to *Hades* to the company of those who preceded him thither (see Cajetan, ad loc., and Gesen. *Thes.*, s. v. אָסַף [Niphal], p. 131, col. 1). 8. Τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, "the outer darkness" of Matt. viii, 12, et passim, refers probably to what Josephus (*War*, iii, 25) calls ᾅδης σκοτιώτερος, "the darker *Hades*."

V. *Biblical Statements as to the Condition of those in "Hell."*—The dreadful nature of the abode of the wicked is implied in various figurative expressions, such as "outer darkness," "I am tormented in this flame," "furnace of fire," "unquenchable fire," "where the worm dieth not," "the blackness of darkness," "torment in fire and brimstone," "the ascending smoke of their torment," "the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone" (Matt. viii, 12; xiii, 42; xxii, 13; xxv, 30; Luke xvi, 24; comp. Matt. xxv, 41; Mark ix, 43-48; Jude 13; comp. Rev. xiv, 10, 11; xix, 20; xx, 14; xxi, 8). The figure by which hell is represented as burning with fire and brimstone is probably derived from the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, as well as that which describes the smoke as ascending from it (comp. Rev. xiv, 10, 11, with Gen. xix, 24, 28). To this coincidence of description Peter also most probably alludes in 2 Pet. ii, 6. See FIRE.

The names which in many of the other instances are given to the punishments of hell are doubtless in part figurative, and many of the terms which were commonly applied to the subject by the Jews are retained in the New Testament. The images, it will be seen, are generally taken from death, capital punishments, tortures, prisons, etc. And it is the obvious design of the sacred writers, in using such figures, to awaken the idea of something terrible and fearful. They mean to teach that the punishments beyond the grave will excite the same feelings of distress as are produced on earth by the objects employed to represent them. We are so little acquainted with the state in which we shall be hereafter, and with the nature of our future body, that no strictly literal representation of such punishments could be made intelligible to us. Many of the Jews, indeed, and many of the Christian fathers, took the terms employed in Scripture in an entirely literal sense, and supposed there would be actual fire, etc., in hell. But from the words of Christ and his apostles nothing more can with certainty be inferred than that they meant to denote great and unending miseries.

The punishments of sin may be distinguished into two classes: 1. *Natural* punishments, or such as necessarily follow a life of servitude to sin. 2. *Positive* punishments, or such as God shall see fit, by his sovereign will, to inflict.

1. Among the natural punishments we may rank the privation of eternal happiness (Matt. vii, 21, 23; xxii, 13; xxv, 41; compare 2 Thess. 1, 9); the painful sensations which are the natural consequence of committing sin, and of an impenitent heart; the propensities to sin, the evil passions and desires which in this world fill the human heart, and which are doubtless carried into the world to come. The company of fellow-sinners and of evil spirits, as inevitably resulting from the other conditions, may be accounted among the natural punishments, and must prove not the least grievous of them.

2. The positive punishments have already been indicated. It is to these chiefly that the Scripture directs our attention. "There are but few men in such a state that the merely natural punishments of sin will appear to them terrible enough to deter them from the commission of it. Experience also shows that to threaten positive punishment has far more effect, as well upon the cultivated as the uncultivated, in deterring them from crime, than to announce, and lead men to expect, the merely natural consequences of sin, be they ever so terrible. Hence we may see why it is that the New Testament says so little of natural punishments (although these, beyond question, await the wicked), and makes mention of them in particular far less frequently than of positive punishments; and why, in those passages which treat of the punishments of hell, such ideas and images are constantly employed as suggest and confirm the idea of positive punishments" (Knapp's *Christian Theology*, § 156).

As the sins which shut out from heaven vary so greatly in qnality and degree, we should expect from the justice of God a corresponding variety both in the natural and the positive punishments. This is accordingly the uniform doctrine of Christ and his apostles. The more knowledge of the divine law a man possesses, the more his opportunities and inducements to avoid sin, the stronger the incentives to faith and holiness set before him, the greater will be his punishment if he fails to make a faithful use of these advantages. "The servant who knows his lord's will and does it not, deserves to be beaten with many stripes:" "To whom much is given, of him much will be required" (Matt. x, 15; xi, 22, 24; xxiii, 15; Luke xii, 48), Hence Paul says that the heathen who acted against the law of nature would indeed be punished; but that the Jews would be punished more than they, because they had more knowledge (Rom. ii, 9-29). In this conviction that God will, even in hell, justly proportion punishment to sin, we must rest satisfied. We cannot now know more; the precise degrees, as well as the precise nature of such punishments, are things belonging to another state of being, which in the present we are unable to understand. For a naturalistic view of the subject, with a copious review of the literature, see Alger, *Doctrine of a Future Life* (Bost. 1860). For the theological treatment of this topic, see HELL PUNISHMENTS.

HELL, CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO (*descensus ad inferos; κατάβασις εἰς ᾅδου*), a phrase used to denote the doctrine taught, or supposed to be taught, in the fifth article of the Apostles' Creed.

1. *History of the Clause.*—The clause is not found in the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed (A.D. 381), nor in any creed before that date. Pearson states that it was not "so anciently used in the Church" as the rest of the Apostles' Creed; and that it first appears in the Creed of Aquileia, 4th century, in the words *descendit in inferna*. King, in his *Histor. Symbol. Apost.* c. iv, asserts that it was inserted as a testimony against Apollinarism; but this view is controverted by Waage in his *Commentatio* on this article of the Creed (1836). It is certain, however, that the clause was afterwards used by the orthodox as an argument against the Apollinarian heresy which denied to Christ a rational human soul (see Neander, *Church History*, Torrey's ed., ii, 433). Rufinus († 410), while stating that it is found in the Creed of Aquileia, denies that it existed before that time in the Creed as used in the Roman or Eastern churches. Rufinus adds that "though the Roman and

Oriental churches had not the words, yet they had the sense of them in the word *buried*," implying that the words "he descended into Hades" are equivalent to "he descended into the grave." Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* ii, 37, 41, gives it as stated in the Arian Creed adopted at Sirmium A.D. 350, and at Rimini in 360. It is given in the Athanasian Creed (5th century). It fails to be found, except in the Athanasian Creed and in a few MSS., before the 6th century, but became quite common in the 7th, and is universal after the 8th century (Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. v, notes). It remains in the Apostles' Creed as used in the Greek and Roman churches, the Lutheran Church, and the Church of England. It is also retained in the Creed as used by the Protestant Episcopal Church, with a note in the rubric that "any churches may omit the words *He descended into hell*, or may, instead of them, use the words *He went into the place of departed spirits*, which are considered as words of the same meaning in the Creed." The clause was omitted by the Convention of 1785, but, the English bishops objecting, it was replaced, with the qualification named, after a great deal of discussion in 1786, 1789, and 1792 (see White, *Hist. of the Prot. Episcopal Church;* Muenscher, in *Bib. Sac.* April, 1859). It is omitted in the Creed as used by the Methodist Episcopal Church.

II. *The Doctrine.*—1. *Scripture.*—There is no passage in which it is expressly stated that Christ descended into hell, but there are several which express or imply that his soul went, after his death, into the "place of departed spirits." (1.) Thus David says (Psa. xvi, 9, 10): "*Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.*" And Peter applies this passage to Christ (Acts ii, 25-27): "*For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.*" (2.) The passage in Ephes. iv, 8-10 ("*Now that he ascended,*" etc.), is supposed by some writers to imply the descent into Hades, but the best interpreters apply it to the Incarnation. (3.) Paul, in Rom. x, 7 ("*Who shall descend into the deep,*" etc.—τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον), seems to imply a descent of Christ "into the abyss." (4.) 1 Pet. iii, 18-20: "*For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.*" This passage is relied on by many, not only as strongly asserting that Christ descended into Hades, but also as explaining the object of that descent. But the weight of interpretation, from Augustine downwards, seems to be against this view. Dr. A. Schweitzer, in a recent monograph (*Hinabgefahren z. Hölle als Mythus*, etc., Zurich, 1868, p. 49), interprets the passage to mean that the preaching spoken of was "addressed to 'the spirits in prison' in the days of Noah, while they were yet in the flesh; and this preaching consisted, to a great extent, in the building of the ark. By this work, undertaken at the command of the Spirit of Christ, and prosecuted, through many years, to completion in the sight of the people, they were warned to repent; but the people persisted in disobedience, and at last the flood swept them away" (*Baptist Quarterly Review*, July, 1869, p. 384). This view accords with that held by Augustine, Aquinas, Scaliger, Beza, Gerhard, Hammond, Leighton, and others, and which has of late been readopted by Dr. Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, II, i, 335), of the influence of the pre-existent Spirit of Christ at the time of the Deluge. It is also the interpretation of the passage given by Dr. A. Clarke (*Comm. on 1 Peter*). So also Dr. Bethune: "Christ, in Noah, by his Spirit, preached to them before the Flood, just as in his ministers he preaches to us by his Spirit now" (*Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism*, i, 406). Alford (*Comment.* ad loc.) gives a copious account (chiefly translated from Meyer) of the views of various commentators, ancient and modern, on the passage, and subjoins his own view, as follows: "I understand these words to say that our Lord, in his disembodied state, did go to the place of detention of departed spirits, and did there announce his work of redemption, preach salvation, in fact, to the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the Flood was hanging over them. Why these rather than others are mentioned—whether merely as a sample of the like gracious work on others, or for some special reason unimaginable by us—we cannot say. It is ours to deal with the plain words of Scripture, and to accept its revelations so far as vouchsafed to us. And they are vouchsafed to us to the utmost limit of legitimate inference from revealed facts. That inference every intelligent reader will draw from the fact here announced; it is not purgatory, it is not universal restitution, but it is one which throws blessed light on one of the darkest enigmas of the divine justice—the cases where the final doom seems infinitely out of proportion to the lapse which has incurred it; and as we cannot say to what other cases this κήρυγμα may have applied, so it would be presumption in us to limit its occurrence or its efficacy. The reason of mentioning here these sinners above other sinners appears to be their connection with the type of baptism which follows. If so, who shall say that the blessed act was confined to them?" (*Comm. on N. T.* vol. iv, pt. i, p. 368).

2. *The Fathers.*—In several of the Ante-Nicene fathers we find the doctrine that "Christ descended into Hades to announce to the souls of the patriarchs and others there the accomplishment of the work of redemption, and to conduct them to his kingdom of glory." So Justin Martyr († 167?), *Dial. cum Tryph.* § 72, cites a passage from Jeremiah (cut out, he says, by the Jews) as follows: "The Lord God remembered his dead people of Israel who lay in the graves; and he descended to preach to them his own salvation." Irenæus († 200?), *Adv. Hær.* iv, 27, 2: "The Lord descended into the regions beneath the earth, preaching his advent there also, and declaring the remission of sins received by those who believe on him" (see also v, 31, 2). Clement of Alexandria († 220) devotes chap. vi of book vi of the *Stromata* to the "preaching of the Gospel to Jews and Gentiles in Hades." See also Tertullian, *De Anima*, vii, lv; Origen, *Cont. Cels.* ii, 43. The Gnostics generally denied the *descensus ad inferos;* but Marcion (2d century) regarded it as intended to benefit the heathen who were in need of redemption. The later fathers were still more distinct in their utterances; see Cyril, *Catech.* iv, 11; xiv, 19; Ambrose, *De Incarn.* 37, 42; Augustine, *Epist.* clxiv et al.; Jerome, *Epist.* xxii et al. "The later fathers generally adopted the notion that, till Christ's death, the patriarchs and prophets were in Hades, but afterwards (from the time that Christ said to the thief on the cross that he should be with him in Paradise) they passed into Paradise, which, therefore, they distinguished from Hades. Hades, indeed, they looked on as a place of rest to the just, but Paradise as far better. Here, of course, we begin to perceive the germ of the doctrine of the Limbus Patrum. Yet the notion entertained by the fathers was vastly different from that of the mediæval Church. Another opinion, however, grew up also in the early ages, namely, that Christ not only translated the pious from Hades to more joyous abodes, but that even some of those who in old times had been disobedient, yet, on hearing Christ's preaching, believed, and so were saved and delivered from torment and hell. This appears to have been the opinion of Augustine. He was evidently puzzled as to the meaning of the word Hades, and doubted whether it ever meant a place of rest and happiness (although at

times he appears to have admitted that it did); and, thinking it a place of torment, he thought Christ went thither to save some souls, which were in torment, from thence. Some, indeed, went so far as to think that hell was cleared of all souls that were there in torment, and that all were taken up with Christ when he rose from the dead and ascended into heaven; but this was reckoned as a heresy. . . . One principal reason why the fathers laid great stress on the belief in Christ's descent to Hades was this. The Arians and Apollinarians denied the existence of a natural human soul in Jesus Christ. Now the true doctrine of our Lord's humanity, namely, that 'he was perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting,' was most strongly maintained by asserting the article of his descent to Hades. For whereas his body was laid in the grave, and his soul went down to Hades, he must have had both body and soul. Accordingly, the fathers with one consent maintain the descent of Christ's soul to hell" (Browne, *On the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 93). Nevertheless, it was not opposition to Apollinarism that originally led to the adoption of the clause into the Creed; the Gnostics, long before, had denied the *descensus ad inferos*, but Apollinaris *did not deny it* (Neander, *Ch. Hist.*, Torrey, ii, 433).

In what may be called the mythology of Christendom, the "descent into hell" has always played an important part. The apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus contains a vivid description of it, very highly colored. A voice like thunder is heard crying, "Lift up your gates, and be ye lift up," etc. But the gates were made fast, but on a repetition of the call were opened, "and the King of glory entered, in form as a man, and all the dark places of Hades were lighted up." "And straightway Hades cried out (ch. xxii), 'We are conquered. Woe unto us! But who art thou, that hast such power and privilege? And what art thou, that comest hither without sin, small in seeming but excellent in power, the humble and the great, slave at once and master, soldier and king, wielding power over the dead and the living, nailed to the cross, and the destroyer of our power? Truly thou art the Jesus of whom the archsatrap Satan spake to us, that by thy cross and death thou shouldest purchase the universe!' Then the King of Glory, holding Satan by the head, delivered him to the angels, and said, 'Bind his hands and feet, and neck and mouth, with irons.' And giving him over to Hades, he said, 'Receive and hold him surely until my second advent' (ch. xxiv). Then the King of Glory stretched out his right hand, and took the forefather Adam, and raised him up, and turning to the rest also, he said, 'Come with me, all of you, as many as have died by the wood which this man ate of; for lo! I upraise ye all by the wood of the cross!' After these things he brought them all forth. And the forefather Adam, filled with exceeding joy, said, 'I render thee thanks, O Lord, that thou hast brought me up from the depths of Hades.' Thus, too, said all the prophets and saints: 'We thank thee, O Christ, Saviour of the world, that thou hast redeemed our life from corruption.' And while they were saying these things, the Saviour blessed Adam in the forehead with the sign of the cross, and did the like to the patriarchs and the prophets, and the martyrs and forefathers, and taking them with him, he rose up out of Hades. And as he journeyed, the holy fathers, accompanying him, sang, 'Praised be he who hath come in the name of the Lord. Hallelujah!'" (Thilo, *Cod. Apocryph.* i, 667 sq.; Forbes, *On the Thirty-nine Articles*, i, 52 sq.) A dramatic representation of the "descent into hell," in imitation of the above picture in Nicodemus, is given in the discourse *De Adventu et annunciatione Joannis Bapt. ap. Inferos*, commonly ascribed to Eusebius of Emesa (†c. 360); see Augusti's edition of Eusebius of Emesa, p. 1 sq. (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, § 134).

3. *Middle Age.*—These images took possession of the popular mind, and were even held as true pictures by many of the clergy. In the mediæval mysteries, the "harrowing of hell" was one of the most popular representations. Death and hell were pictured as dismayed at the loss of their victims, as Christ was to set all the captives free. So the *Vision of Piers Plowman* declares that Christ

> "Would come as a Kynge,
> Crouned with aungels,
> And have out of helle
> Alle mennes soules."

The subject was also a favorite one in the religious art of the 14th and 15th centuries.

The scholastic divines divided Hell into three different apartments: "1. Hell, properly so called, where the devils and the damned are confined; 2. Those subterranean regions which may be regarded as the intermediate states between heaven and hell, and be again subdivided into (*a.*) Purgatory, which lies nearest to hell; (*b.*) The *limbus infantum* (*puerorum*), where all those children remain who die unbaptized; (*c.*) The *limbus patrum*, the abode of the Old Testament saints, the place to which Christ went to preach redemption to the souls in prison. The limbus last mentioned was also called Abraham's bosom; different opinions obtained concerning its relation to heaven and hell" (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, § 208). Aquinas taught that Christ rescued the souls of the pious of the old dispensation from the *limbus patrum* (*Summa Suppl.* qu. 69, art. 5).

4. *Modern.*—(1.) The *Greek Church* holds that the *descensus* was a voluntary going down into Hades of the human soul of Christ united to his divinity; that he remained there during the period between his death and his resurrection, and devoted himself to the work he had performed on earth: i. e. that he offered redemption and preached the Gospel to those who were subject to Satan's power in consequence of original sin, releasing all believers, and all who died in piety under the O. T. dispensation, from Hades (*Conf. Orthod.* i, 49, ed. Kimmel, 1840, p. 118).

(2.) The *Roman Church* rests its doctrine in tradition alone. It teaches that Christ, in his entire personality, including his divine and human natures, descended voluntarily, for the sake of the saints of Israel, into the *limbus patrum*, or into the *ignus purgatorius* (fire of purgatory), and there demonstrated himself Son of God by conquering the dæmons, and by granting to the souls of the ancients who dwelt in Hades their freedom from the *limbus*, and admission to felicity in heaven. "His soul also really and substantially descended into hell, according to David's testimony: '*Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell*' . . . (Psa. xv, 10). He descended in order that, clothed with the spoils of the arch-enemy, he might conduct into heaven those holy fathers and the other just souls whose liberation from prison he had purchased," etc. (*Cat. Concil. Trid.* art. v).

(3.) *Lutherans.*—Luther himself did not speak positively on this topic. He agreed at first with Jerome and Gregory in supposing a *limbus patrum* whither Christ went. But whenever he mentioned the subject after 1533, he was accustomed to remark that Christ destroyed the power of the devil and of hell, whither he went with soul and body. The later Lutheran theology recognised the descent as a real descent into hell. Christ, the God-man, after the resurrection and the reunion of his soul with his body, immediately before his reappearance on earth, i. e. early on Easter morning, went, body and soul, to the hell of the damned, the time which elapsed between his death on the cross and the resurrection having been spent in Paradise. The "descent into hell" was the first act accomplished by the God-man after his entrance into his divine unlimited power, and is therefore considered as the first degree of the state of *exaltation*. It thus constitutes also his first entering into possession of the kingdom of his power, and in the revelation of his victory over the devil, and the consequent inability of the latter to prevail against believers, whence the "descent" is also designated as "the triumph over the devil and his angels." His preaching in hell is designated as condemnatory (*legalis* and *damnatoria*,

Formula Concordiæ, art. 9). The Lutheran divines have generally maintained the doctrine as thus put forth, though not without controversy among themselves. Æpinus (Johannes Hoch, † 1533) taught that Christ's descent into hell belonged, not to his state of *exaltation*, but to that of *humiliation*, his soul suffering the punishments of hell while his body remained in the grave. He denied that 1 Pet. iii, 18 refers to the "descent into hell" at all.

(4.) *Reformed.*—In the Reformed theology in general, the "descent into hell" has been interpreted metaphorically, or as meaning simply either the burial of Christ or his sufferings. So Calvin: "It was necessary for Christ to contend with the powers of hell and the horror of eternal death." . . . He was treated as a criminal himself, to sustain all the punishments which would have been inflicted on transgressors; only with this exception, that it was not possible that he should be holden of the pains of death. Therefore it is no wonder if he be said to have descended into hell, since he suffered that death which the wrath of God inflicts on transgressors" (*Institutes*, bk. ii, ch. xvi, § 10).

The Heidelberg Catechism substantially follows Calvin: "*Quest.* 44. Why is there added 'he descended into hell?' That in my greatest temptations I may be assured, and wholly comfort myself in this, that my Lord Jesus Christ, by his inexpressible anguish, pains, terrors, and hellish agonies, in which he was plunged during all his sufferings, but especially on the cross, hath delivered me from the anguish and torments of hell." Dr. Nevin remarks on this answer that it gives the words of the Creed "a signification which is good in its own nature, but, at the same time, notoriously at war with the historical sense of the clause itself." The doctrine is stated in the Westminster Catechism (Larger), answer to question 50, as follows: "Christ's humiliation after death consisted in his being buried and continuing in the state of the dead, and under the power of death, until the third day, which has been otherwise expressed in the words 'he descended into hell.'" Beza maintained that the descent into Hades simply meant the burial of Christ; and in this opinion he was followed by Drusius, by Dr. Barrow, and other English divines; and so Piscator, and several of the Remonstrants (Arminius, Curcellæus, Limborch), refer it to the state of death (*status ignominiosus*) as part of the humiliation to which the Prince of Life was subjected.

Church of England.—The third article of religion runs as follows: "As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also is it to be believed that he went down into hell." In the first book of Edward VI it was more fully stated as follows: "The body of Christ lay in the sepulchre until his resurrection; but his ghost departing from him, was with the ghosts which were in prison, or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify." And in the Creed in Metre, given at the end of the old version of the Psalms in the Prayer-book, it is stated as follows:

"His body then was buried
As is our use and right;
His spirit after this descent
Into the lower parts,
Of them that long in darkness were,
The true light of their hearts."

Pearson, after an elaborate but not always luminous examination of the clause, sums up his own view of the doctrine as follows: "I give a full and undoubting assent unto this as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the cross, and his soul was separated from his body, though his body were dead, yet his soul died not; and though it died not, yet it underwent the condition of the souls of such as die; and being he died in the similitude of a sinner, his soul went to the place where the souls of men are kept who died for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death: but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others which he took upon him, therefore, as God suffered not his Holy One to see corruption, so he left not his soul in hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to Christ of never coming under the power of Satan, or suffering in the flames prepared for the devil and his angels. And thus, and for these purposes, may every Christian say, I believe that Christ descended into hell" (*Exp. of the Creed*, Oxford, 1820, p. 376). Some of the divines of the Church of England held the Calvinistic view of this subject; others held the old theory of the descent of Christ into hell that he might triumph over Satan, as he had before triumphed over death and sin (Heylyn, *Hist. Presb.* p. 349; Bilson, *Survey of Christ's Sufferings*, 1604). Hugh Broughton († 1612) taught conclusively that *Hades* is simply the place of departed souls, and that the rational soul of Christ, in his intermediate state, went into this locality. This has since been the generally received opinion in the Church of England; so Horsley, "Christ descended to the invisible mansion of departed spirits, and to that part of it where the souls of the faithful, when delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity. . . . In that place he could not but find the souls that are in it in safe keeping; and, in some way or other, it cannot but be supposed he would hold conference with them; and a particular conference with one class might be the means, and certainly could be no obstruction, to a general communication with all" (*Sermons*, vol. i, serm. xx). Dr. Joseph Muenscher discusses the whole subject, historically and critically, in an able article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1859, and concludes, as to the Protestant Episcopal Church, that her doctrine, as given in the Liturgy and Homilies, "can only be reconciled with that of the Creed and Articles by a liberal construction of the Creeds. And this has been done by the American Church herself in the rubric prefixed to the Creed, in which she substitutes the words 'he went into the place of departed spirits' as of equivalent import. The terms in which this substitute is couched are quite general and indefinite. By employing the verb *went* in the place of *descended*, she virtually repudiates the hypothesis of a subterranean cavity as the receptacle of disembodied souls. And the phrase "place of departed spirits" *determines nothing* as to an immediate locality, separate and distinct from both heaven and hell. It merely affirms that the soul of Jesus at his death went to its appropriate place in the invisible, spiritual world. Thus understood, the dogma of Christ's descent into hell is freed from all difficulty and mystery, and made plain to the comprehension of every mind, as well as consonant with the general tenor of Scripture. The results to which we are brought by the preceding remarks are: 1. That the soul of man does not die or sleep with the body, but, immediately after the dissolution of the latter, passes into a separate, disembodied, conscious state, and into its appropriate place (so far as spirits may be supposed to occupy place), either of enjoyment or suffering—its heaven or its hell—according to the moral character which it may possess. 2. That there is no third intermediate place of spiritual existence; no subterranean habitation of disembodied souls, either of probation or of purgation; no imaginary paradise in the under world where the souls of the pious are preserved in safe-keeping; no limbus patrum, no *limbus infantum*, no purgatory. 3. That our Saviour, according to the Creed, was perfect man as well as perfect God, having a human soul no less than a human body. 4. That when crucified he died in reality, and not merely in appearance (syncope), since there took place an actual separation of his soul and body. 5. That the idle and unprofitable question as to the object of Christ's descent into Hades is precluded; a question which greatly perplexed the fathers, the schoolmen, and the Reformers, and led to the invention of many absurd and unscriptural theories."

See Petavius, *De Theol. Dogmat.* (Antw. 1700), tom. ii, pt. ii, p. 196; Knapp, *Theology*, § 97; Dietelmayr, *Hist. dogmatis de descensu Christi ad inferos* (2d ed. Altorf, 1762, 8vo); Hacker, *Dissert. de descensu Christi ad*

Inferos (Dresden, 1802); Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. v; Edwards, *History of Redemption*, notes, p. 351, 377; Stuart, *Exegetical Essays on Future Punishment;* Plumptre, *Christ and Christendom*, p. 342; Burnet, Hardwick, Browne, *On the Thirty-nine Articles*, art. iii; Neale, *Hist. of the Puritans* (Harpers' ed.), i, 210; König, *die Lehre von Christi Höllenfahrt* (Frankf. 1842); Böttcher, *de Inferis rebusque post mortem futuris*, etc. (Dresden, 1846, 2 vols.); Güder, *Lehre v. d. Erscheinung Christi u. d. Todten* (Berlin, 1853); Güder, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 178; *Zeitschrift für die Lutherische Theologie*, 1868, No. 4; *Biblical Repository*, April, 1843, p. 470; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Nov. 1847, p. 708; Huidekoper, *Christ's Mission to the Under World* (Boston, 1854); Bp. Hobart, *On the State of the Departed;* Bethune, *Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism*, lect. xix; *Christian Examiner*, l, 401; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, § 171; Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Index, s. v. Hell); *Church Review*, July, 1857; Muenscher, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1859. For old monographs on the subject, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 67. See INTERMEDIATE STATE.

HELL PUNISHMENTS, NATURE OF.—The term HELL (*Hölle*), as stated above, originally denoted the "nether world," the "place of departed spirits." It came to be almost exclusively applied at a later period to the "place of torment" for the wicked. The scholastic divines distinguished between the *Limbus*, or place of the souls of departed spirits, and *Hell*, properly so called, where the damned suffer their punishment (Aquinas, *Summæ Supplem.* qu. 69).

The nature of the punishments of hell has been very variously understood in different times. In the early Church the fire of hell was generally considered as a real, material fire. So Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Cyprian. Origen, however, "believed the misery of the wicked to consist in separation from God, the remorse of conscience, etc. (*De Princ.* ii, 10, *Opp.* i, 102). The eternal fire is neither material nor kindled by another person, but the combustibles are our sins themselves, of which conscience reminds us: thus the fire of hell resembles the fire of passions in this world. The separation between the soul and God may be compared with the pain which we suffer when all the members of the body are torn out of their joints. By 'outer darkness' Origen does not so much understand a place devoid of light as a state of complete ignorance; he thus appears to adopt the idea of *black bodies* only by way of accommodation to popular notions. It should also be borne in mind that Origen imagined that the design of all these punishments was to heal or to correct, and thus finally to restore the sinner to the favor of God" (Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 78).

From the latter part of the 3d century onward to the rise of scholasticism, the punishments of hell were generally described by material images, and, indeed, were considered, to a large extent, as material punishments. Gregory of Nazianzus († 389?) supposed the punishment of the damned to consist essentially in their separation from God, and in the consciousness of their own moral debasement (*Orat.* xvi, 9, p. 306: Τοῖς δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων βάσανος, μᾶλλον δὲ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων τὸ ἀπεῤῥίφθαι θεοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἐν τῷ συνειδότι αἰσχύνη πέρας οὐκ ἔχουσα). Basil, on the contrary, gives a more vivid description of that punishment (*Homil. in Psa.* xxiii, *Opp.* i, 151, and elsewhere). Chrysostom represents the torments of the damned in a variety of horrid pictures (in *Theod. lapsum*, i, c. 6, *Opp.* iv, 560, 561). Nevertheless, in other places (e. g., in his *Ep. ad Rom. hom.* xxxi, *Opp.* x, 396) he justly observes that it is of more importance to know how to escape hell than to know where it is and what is its nature. Gregory of Nyssa (*Orat. Catech.* 40) endeavors to divest the idea of hell of all that is sensuous (the fire of hell is not to be looked upon as a material fire, nor is the worm which never dies an ἐπίγειον θηρίον). Augustine imagines that separation from God is in the first instance to be regarded as the death and punishment of the damned (*De morib. eccles. cath.* c. 11); but he leaves it to his readers to choose between the more sensuous or the more spiritual mode of perception. It is, he says, at all events, better to think of both (*De civit. Dei*, xxi, 9, 10).

From the 8th to the 16th centuries the tendency was to regard the punishments of hell more as physical and material than as moral and spiritual; in the doctrine of the Church the two sorts of punishment were combined. Aquinas treats of the punishments of hell under the title *Pœna Damnatorum* (*Summæ Suppl.* qu. 97), and teaches, 1. that the damned will suffer other punishments besides that of fire; 2. that the "undying worm" is remorse of conscience; 3. that the "darkness" of hell is physical darkness, only so much light being admitted as will allow the lost to see and apprehend the punishments of the place; that, as both body and soul are to be punished, the fire of hell will be a material fire. Augustine's view, he says, is to be considered rather as a passing opinion than as a decision (*loquitur opinando et non determinando*). The fire, according to Aquinas, is of the same nature as our ordinary fire, though "with different properties;" and the place of punishment, though not certainly known, is probably under the earth. Others of the schoolmen, however (especially the Mystics), made the suffering of hell to consist rather in separation from God, and in the consequent consciousness of sin, and of unavailing repentance, than in material penalties.

The Reformation made little change in the doctrine as to the nature of future punishment. The substance of the Reformed doctrine is given in the *Westminster Confession*, chap. xxxiii, as follows: "The wicked, who know not God, and obey not the Gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast into eternal torments, and be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power;" and in the *Larger Catechism*, quest. 29, "*What are the punishments of sin in the world to come? A.* The punishments of sin in the world to come are everlasting separation from the comfortable presence of God, and most grievous torments in soul and body, without intermission, in hell-fire forever." In general, both Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians agree in making that punishment to consist (1) of the *pœna damni*, penalty of loss or deprivation, separation from God, and hence loss of all possible sources of enjoyment (Matt. vi, 21; xxii, 13; xxv, 41; compare Wesley, *Sermons*, ii, 148), of which loss the damned will be fully conscious; (2) of the *pœna sensus*, penalty of sense or feeling, as the natural consequence of sin. "These punishments are inevitable, and connected as closely and inseparably with sin as any effect with its cause. From the consciousness of being guilty of sin arise regret, sorrow, and remorse of conscience, and it is these inward pangs which are the most grievous and tormenting. The conscience of man is a stern accuser, which cannot be refuted or bribed, and the more its voice is disregarded or suppressed here upon earth, the more loudly will it speak hereafter. Add to this that the propensity to sin, the passions and evil desires which in this world occupy the human heart, are carried along into the next. For it cannot be supposed that they will be suddenly eradicated as by a miracle, and this is not promised. But these desires and propensities can no longer find satisfaction in the future world, where man will be placed in an entirely different situation, and surrounded by a circle of objects entirely new, hence they will become the more inflamed. From the very nature of the case, it is plain, therefore, that the state of such a man hereafter must necessarily be miserable. Shame, regret, remorse, hopelessness, and absolute despair, are the natural, inevitable, and extremely dreadful consequences of the sins committed in this life." (3) Besides these natural penalties of sin, there will also be *positive* penalties inflicted by divine justice. The New Testament speaks far more distinctly and frequently of these positive punishments than of the natural ones, and especially of the "undying worm," and of "the eternal fire." The general tendency of modern theology is to

regard these expressions as figurative representations of the positive penalties of hell. Doddridge remarks that, "On the whole, it is of very little importance whether we say there is an external fire, or only an idea of such pain as arises from burning; and should we think both doubtful, it is certain God can give the mind a sense of agony and distress which should answer and even exceed the terrors of those descriptions; and care should certainly be taken so to explain Scripture metaphors as that hell may be considered as consisting more of mental agony than of bodily tortures" (*Lect. on Divin.* ccxxiii).

Of similar tenor are the following remarks by Dr. Wardlaw: "What the nature of that suffering shall be it is vain for us to attempt to conjecture. It has been conceived that if we suppose clear apprehensions of God and sin in the understanding; an unslumbering conscience; an unceasing conflict between full, irrepressible convictions of all that is awful in truth, and an enmity of heart remaining in all its virulence; passions raging in their unmitigated violence; regrets as unavailing as they are torturing; conscious desert and unalleviated hopelessness; with the entire removal of all, in whatever form, that on earth enabled the sinner to banish thought and exclude anticipation, we have materials for a sufficient hell. I will not deny it. . . . I cannot but think, therefore, that there must be something more than conscience, something of the nature of positive punitive infliction: conscience attesting its justice, certifying its being all deserved. What shall be the precise nature of that infliction is another question. There may surely be something of the nature of punitive infliction without adopting the theory of literal fire, of a lake of fire, a lake burning with brimstone. I have no more belief, as I have just said, in a literal fire than in a literal worm; and no more belief in either than in the existence, for the heaven of the Bible, of a literal paradise, in the centre of which grows the tree of life, or of a literal city, of which the length, and breadth, and height are equal, of which the foundations are precious stones, the gates of pearl, and the streets of gold, with a pure river of living water flowing through the midst of it. But the mind of fallen man is in love with sin, and in selfish hatred of God and holiness. In a mind of this character the difficulty may amount to impossibility of awakening any adequate sense of future suffering, or any salutary alarm in the anticipation of it, by any representation of it more directly spiritual, or even mental. In these circumstances, then, if an impression of extreme suffering is to be made, it seems as if figure, taken from what is still in the midst of all the perversions of depravity felt to be fearful, were almost, if not altogether, indispensable for the purpose. The figures of Scripture on this subject are felt, and felt powerfully, by every mind. The very mention of the "worm that dieth not" awakens a more thrilling emotion, undefined as it is (perhaps, indeed, the more thrilling that it is undefined), than anything you can say to an unregenerate man about the operations of conscience, and the "fire that never shall be quenched" than any representation you can ever make to him of sin, and the absence of God, and the sway of evil passions, and the pangs of remorse, and horribleness of sin-loving and God-hating company. Such images have the full effect intended by them. They give the impression, the vivid and intense impression, of extreme suffering; although what proportion of that suffering shall be the native and necessary result of the constitution of human nature when placed in certain circumstances, and what proportion of more direct penal infliction, the Scriptures do not tell us, entering into no such discussions. And it would be useless for us to conjecture, or to attempt the adjustment of such proportions" (*Systematic Theology*, Edinburgh, 1857, iii, 700). For a copious list of books on the subject, see Abbot's bibliographical appendix to Alger, *History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, § iii, F, 3.

On the *Duration* of the punishment of hell, see UNIVERSALISM.

Hellenist (Ἑλληνιστής, A. V. "Grecian;" comp. Ἑλληνισμός, 2 Macc. iv, 13). In one of the earliest notices of the first Christian Church at Jerusalem (Acts vi, 1), two distinct parties are recognised among its members, "*Hebrews*" and *Hellenists*, who appear to stand towards one another in some degree in a relation of jealous rivalry. So, again, when Paul first visited Jerusalem after his conversion, he spoke and disputed with the *Hellenists* (Acts ix, 29), as if expecting to find more sympathy among them than with the rulers of the Jews. The term Hellenist occurs once again in the N. T. according to the common text, in the account of the foundation of the Church at Antioch (Acts xi, 20), but there the context, as well as the form of the sentence (καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἑ., though the καὶ is doubtful), seems to require the other reading "Greeks" (Ἕλληνες), which is supported by great external evidence as the true antithesis to "Jews" (Ἰουδαίοις, not Ἑβραίοις, v, 19). See HEBREWS.

The name, according to its derivation, whether the original verb (Ἑλληνίζω) be taken, according to the common analogy of similar forms (μηδίζω, ἀττικίζω, Φιλιππίζω), in the general sense of *adopting the spirit* and character of Greeks, or, in the more limited sense, of *using the Greek language* (Xenophon, *Anab.* vii, 3, 25), marks a class distinguished by peculiar habits, and not by descent. Thus the Helllenists as a body included not only the proselytes of Greek (or foreign) parentage (οἱ σεβόμενοι Ἕλληνες, Acts xvii, 4 (?); οἱ σεβόμενοι προσήλυτοι, Acts xiii, 43; οἱ σεβόμενοι, Acts xvii, 17), but also those Jews who, by settling in foreign countries, had adopted the prevalent form of the current Greek civilization, and with it the use of the common Greek dialect, to the exclusion of the Aramaic, which was the national representative of the ancient Hebrew. Hellenism was thus a type of life, and not an indication of origin. Hellenists might be Greeks, but when the latter term is used (Ἕλληνες, John xii, 20), the point of race and not of creed is that which is foremost in the mind of the writer. (See *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Jan. and April, 1857.) See GRECIAN.

I. As to the particular class in question, referred to in the Acts, the following are the different opinions that have been held: 1. That the distinctive difference between them was simply one of *language*, the Hebrews speaking the Aramaic of Palestine, the Hellenists the Greek. This is the most ancient opinion, being that expressed in the Peshito, and given by Chrysostom, Theophylact, etc.; and it is the one which has received the largest number of suffrages in more recent times. Among its advocates are Joseph Scaliger, Heinsius, Drusius, Grotius, Selden, Hottinger, Hug, etc.

2. That the distinction was partly of *country*, partly of *language*: the Hebrew being a native of Judæa, and using the Aramaic language; the Hellenist born among the Gentiles, and using the speech of the country of which he was a native. So Erasmus, Lightfoot, Bengel, Wahl, De Wette, Davidson, Alford, Baumgarten, etc.

3. That the difference was one of *religious history*, the Hebrew being a born child of the covenant, the Hellenist a proselyte from heathenism. So Beza, Salmasius, Pearson, Basnage, Pfannkuche, etc.

4. That the difference was one of *principle*: the Hebrew adhering to one set of beliefs or modes of thought, the Hellenist adopting another. According to some, this difference had the effect of constituting the Hellenists into a distinct sect among the Jews, such as the Essenes; whilst others, without going this length, regard the two classes as standing to each other very much in the relation in which parties in the state holding different political views, or parties in the same Church having different aims and modes of regarding religious truth in modern times, may stand to each other; the Hebrews being like the Conservative or High-Church party, while the Hellenists advocated a more progressive, unfettered, and comprehensive scheme of thinking and acting. This latter view, in its substance, has recently found an able

advocate in Mr. Roberts (*Discussions on the Gospels*, p. 148 sq.). According to him, "the *Hellenists* were those Jews, whether belonging to Palestine or not, who willingly yielded to the influence of Gentile civilization and habits, and were thus distinguished by their free and liberal spirit; the *Hebrews*, again, were the rigid adherents to Judaism, who, in spite of the providential agencies which had been long at work, endeavored to keep up those peculiar and exclusive usages by which the Jews had for so many centuries been preserved distinct from all other nations."

We are not disposed to reject entirely any of these opinions. Each of them seems to have an element of truth in it, though the contributions they make to the whole truth on this subject are by no means of equal importance. The last alone points to what must be regarded as the fundamental and formative characteristic of Hellenism among the Jews. There can be no doubt historically that some such distinction as that to which it refers did subsist in the Jewish nation (see Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, i, 99 sq., 345 sq.), and had come to a height at the commencement of the Christian æra; and nothing can be more probable than that the existence of such a distinction should manifest itself in the very way in which the distinction between the Hebrews and the Hellenists is asserted to have shown itself in Acts vi, 1 sq. It is in agreement with this, also, that Paul should have entered into discussion chiefly with the Hellenistic Jews at Jerusalem; for it is probable that as his early Hellenic culture pointed him out as the person most fitted to meet them on their own ground, he may have been specially set upon this work by the other apostles.—Kitto, s. v. Still this difference of views could hardly of itself have constituted so marked and obvious a distinction as is implied in the various texts above cited, unless it had been exhibited in some outward characteristic; and no external sign could have been more certain, natural, and palpable than that familiar use of the Greek language which at once betrayed a foreign Jew, to whom it was vernacular, in contrast with the Palestinian Jew, by whom Greek, although too prevalent in that age everywhere to have been unknown to any, was nevertheless always spoken with a Hebrew coloring and accent. See DISPERSION.

II. It remains to characterize briefly the elements which the Hellenists contributed to the language of the N. T., and the immediate effects which they produced upon the apostolic teaching:

1. The flexibility of the Greek language gained for it in ancient times a general currency similar to that which French enjoys in modern Europe; but with this important difference, that Greek was not only the language of educated men, but also the language of the masses in the great centres of commerce. The colonies of Alexander and his successors originally established what has been called the Macedonian dialect throughout the East; but even in this the prevailing power of Attic literature made itself distinctly felt. Peculiar words and forms adopted at Alexandria were undoubtedly of Macedonian origin, but the later Attic may be justly regarded as the real basis of Oriental Greek. This first type was, however, soon modified, at least in common use, by contact with other languages. The vocabulary was enriched by the addition of foreign words, and the syntax was modified by new constructions. In this way a variety of local dialects must have arisen, the specific characters of which were determined in the first instance by the conditions under which they were formed, and which afterwards passed away with the circumstances that had produced them. But one of these dialects has been preserved after the ruin of the people among whom it arose, by being consecrated to the noblest service which language has yet fulfilled. In other cases the dialects perished together with the communities who used them in the common intercourse of life, but in that of the Jews the Alexandrine version of the O. Test., acting in this respect like the great vernacular versions of England and Germany, gave a definiteness and fixity to the popular language which could not have been gained without the existence of some recognised standard. The style of the Sept. itself is, indeed, different in different parts, but the same general character runs through the whole, and the variations which it presents are not greater than those which exist in the different books of the N. T.

The functions which this Jewish-Greek had to discharge were of the widest application, and the language itself combined the most opposite features. It was essentially a fusion of Eastern and Western thought; for, disregarding peculiarities of inflection and novel words, the characteristic of the Hellenistic dialect is the combination of a Hebrew spirit with a Greek body, of a Hebrew form with Greek words. The conception belongs to one race, and the expression to another. Nor is it too much to say that this combination was one of the most important preparations for the reception of Christianity, and one of the most important aids for the adequate expression of its teaching. On the one hand, by the spread of the Hellenistic Greek, the deep, theocratic aspect of the world and life, which distinguishes Jewish thought, was placed before men at large; and, on the other, the subtle truths which philosophy had gained from the analysis of mind and action, and enshrined in words, were transferred to the service of revelation. In the fulness of time, when the great message came, a language was prepared to convey it; and thus the very dialect of the N. T. forms a great lesson in the true philosophy of history, and becomes in itself a monument of the providential government of mankind.

This view of the Hellenistic dialect will at once remove one of the commonest misconceptions relating to it. For it will follow that its deviations from the ordinary laws of classic Greek are themselves bound by some common law, and that irregularities of construction and altered usages of words are to be traced to their first source, and interpreted strictly according to the original conception out of which they sprang. A popular, and even a corrupt dialect is not less precise, or, in other words, is not less human than a polished one, though its interpretation may often be more difficult from the want of materials for analysis. But in the case of the N. T., the books themselves furnish an ample store for the critic, and the Sept., when compared with the Hebrew text, provides him with the history of the language which he has to study.

2. The adoption of a strange language was essentially characteristic of the true nature of Hellenism. The purely outward elements of the national life were laid aside with a facility of which history offers few examples, while the inner character of the people remained unchanged. In every respect, the thought, so to speak, was clothed in a new dress. Hellenism was, as it were, a fresh incorporation of Judaism according to altered laws of life and worship. But, as the Hebrew spirit made itself distinctly visible in the new dialect, so it remained undestroyed by the new conditions which regulated its action. While the Hellenistic Jews followed their natural instinct for trade, which was originally curbed by the Mosaic law, and gained a deeper insight into foreign character, and with this a truer sympathy, or at least a wider tolerance towards foreign opinions, they found means at the same time to extend the knowledge of the principles of their divine faith, and to gain respect and attention even from those who did not openly embrace their religion. Hellenism accomplished for the outer world what the Return accomplished for the Palestinian Jews: it was the necessary step between a religion of form and a religion of spirit: it witnessed against Judaism as final and universal, and it witnessed for it as the foundation of a spiritual religion which should be bound by no local restrictions. Under the influence of this wider instruction, a Greek body grew up around the synagogue—not admitted into the Jewish Church, and yet holding a recognised position with regard to it—which was able to apprehend the apostolic

teaching, and ready to receive it. The Hellenists themselves were at once missionaries to the heathen and prophets to their own countrymen. Their lives were an abiding protest against polytheism and pantheism, and they retained with unshaken zeal the sum of their ancient creed, when the preacher had popularly occupied the place of the priest, and a service of prayer, and praise, and exhortation had succeeded in daily life to the elaborate ritual of the Temple. Yet this new development of Judaism was obtained without the sacrifice of national ties. The connection of the Hellenists with the Temple was not broken, except in the case of some of the Egyptian Jews. Unity coexisted with dispersion; and the organization of the Church was foreshadowed, not only in the widening breadth of doctrine, but even externally in the scattered communities which looked to Jerusalem as their common centre.

In another aspect Hellenism served as the preparation for a catholic creed. As it furnished the language of Christianity, it supplied also that literary instinct which counteracted the traditional reserve of the Palestinian Jews. The writings of the N. Test., and all the writings of the apostolic age, with the exception of the original Gospel of Matthew, were, as far as we know, Greek; and Greek seems to have remained the sole vehicle of Christian literature, and the principal medium of Christian worship, till the Church of North Africa rose into importance in the time of Tertullian. The Canon of the Christian Scriptures, the early creeds, and the liturgies, are the memorials of this Hellenistic predominance in the Church, and the types of its working; and if in later times the Greek spirit descended to the investigation of painful subtleties, it may be questioned whether the fulness of Christian truth could have been developed without the power of Greek thought tempered by Hebrew discipline.

The general relations of Hellenism to Judaism are well treated in the histories of Ewald and Jost; but the Hellenistic language is as yet, critically speaking, almost unexplored. Winer's Grammar (*Gramm. d. N. T. Sprachidioms*, 7th ed. 1868) has done great service in establishing the idea of law in N.-T. language, which was obliterated by earlier interpreters, but even Winer does not investigate the origin of the peculiarities of the Hellenistic dialect. The idioms of the N. T. cannot be discussed apart from those of the Sept., and no explanation can be considered perfect which does not take into account the origin of the corresponding Hebrew idioms. For this work even the materials are as yet deficient. The text of the Sept. is still in a most unsatisfactory condition; and while Bruder's Concordance leaves nothing to be desired for the vocabulary of the N. T., Trommius's Concordance to the Sept., however useful, is quite untrustworthy for critical purposes. See GREEK LANGUAGE.

Heller, YOMTOV LIPMAN B.-NATHAN, a distinguished Rabbi of the Polish school, born at Wallerstein, duchy of Anspach, Germany, in 1579. He filled the appointment of Rabbi to the great synagogues at Vienna, Prague, and Krakau. While at Prague (1629) he was prosecuted by the government upon a charge that he had written in praise of the Talmud to the injury of the Christian religion, was imprisoned, and fined 10,000 florins. After his release he went to Poland, where, in 1644, he became Rabbi of the synagogue at Krakau. Here he died in 1654. Heller wrote his autobiography (מגילת איבה), printed in 1836, which contains a complete list of all his works. Among the most important of them are his glossaries to the Mishna (תוספות יו״ט). These are considered by Oriental scholars as very valuable.—Jost, *Gesch. d. Juden.* iii, 243; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Literature*, p. 448.

Helm, πηδάλιον, the *rudder* of a ship (Jas. iii, 4). See RUDDER.

Helmet (כּוֹבַע or קוֹבַע, *koba'*, περικεφαλαία), a military cap for the defence of the head in battle (1 Sam.

Ancient Helmets: *a–e*, Egyptian; *f, g*, Persian; *h–k*, Syrian; *l–o*, Phrygian; *p, q*, Dacian; *r–u*, Assyrian.

xvii, 5, 38, etc.; Eph. vi, 17; 1 Thess. v, 8). See ARMOR.

Helmont, FRANÇOIS MERCURE, baron VAN, was born at Vilvorde in 1618. In his youth he studied medicine, and applied himself especially to alchemy. He then joined a band of gypsies, with whom he travelled through part of Europe, but was arrested in Italy in 1662, and cast into the dungeons of the Inquisition. In 1663, being liberated, he went to Sulzbach, where he worked with Knorr of Rosenroth at the *Kabbala denudata*. He published, about the same time, a work on the alphabet of the primitive tongue, i. e. Hebrew (Sulzbach, 1667, 12mo), which, according to him, is so natural that every letter expresses merely the position of the lips while pronouncing it: he pretended to teach the deaf and dumb to articulate all the sounds of his alphabet at first sight. He believed in the transmigration of souls, the universal remedy, and the philosopher's stone. He travelled afterwards through England, and returned through Hanover to Berlin, in a suburb of which city he died in 1699 (Moréri says he died at Cologne; Toppens, in Switzerland; Wachter, at Emmerich, in Dec. 1698). Leibnitz wrote on him the following epitaph:

> "Nil patre inferior, jacet hic Helmontius alter,
> Qui junxit varias mentis et artis opes:
> Per quem Pythagoras et cabbala sacra revixit
> Elœusque, parat qui sua cuncta sibi."

Besides the alphabet above mentioned, he wrote *Opuscula Philosophica, quibus continentur principia philosophiæ antiquissimæ et recentissimæ*, etc. (Amsterd. 1690, 12mo):—*Quædam præmeditatæ et consideratæ Cogitationes super quatuor priora capita libri primi Moisis, Genesis nominati* (Amst. 1697, 8vo):—*De Attributis divinis*, etc. See Adelung, *Hist. de la Folie humaine*, iv, 294–323; Moréri, *Grand dict. hist.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 864.

Helmuth, JUSTUS CHRISTIAN HENRY, D.D., a Lutheran minister, was born at Helmstadt, in the duchy of Brunswick, in 1745. His father dying when he was yet a boy, he left home without the knowledge of the family, and was overtaken on the highway by a nobleman in his carriage, who entered into a conversation with him, and inquired whither he was going. The lad informed him that he had left home because he was angry with God, having prayed earnestly to him during his father's illness for his restoration to health, but God had not answered his petition. Interested in the artless reply of the innocent boy, the nobleman took him into his carriage, and afterwards sent him to Halle at his expense, to be educated at the Orphan House, and afterwards at the University. His first sermon was preached in the chapel of the Orphan House, and among his hearers was Bogatzky, the author of the *Schatz-Kästlein* (Golden Treasury), who predicted the future greatness of the young preacher. He was ordained by the *Consistorium* at Wernigerode, and was sent by the theological faculty at Halle as a missionary to America in 1769. The first ten years of his ministry he labored in Lancaster, Pa., with great acceptance. In 1779 he accepted a unanimous call to Philadelphia, where he continued the pastoral work as long as his physical strength admitted. For eighteen years he was professor of German and Oriental languages in the University of Pennsylvania, from which institution he received in 1785 the degree of D.D. In connection with his colleague, Dr. Schmidt, he organized a private seminary for candidates for the Lutheran ministry, which was in operation twenty years. In the pulpit he had more than ordinary power. His preaching was characterized by great unction and overwhelming pathos, and often produced wonderful results. During the prevalence of the yellow fever he visited the sick and dying without fear. He buried 625 of his members. He died in the 80th year of his age, Feb. 5, 1824. He was the author of a work on *Baptism and the Sacred Scriptures*, published in 1793; also of a practical treatise on *Communion with God;* numerous devotional books for children, and a volume of Hymns. He edited likewise the *Evangelical Magazine*, published for some years in Philadelphia in the German language. (M. L. S.)

Heloïse. See ABELARD.

He'lon (Heb. *Chelon'*, חֵלֹן, *strong;* Sept. Χαιλών), the father of Eliab, which latter was phylarch of the tribe of Zebulon at the Exode (Numb. i, 9; ii, 7; vii, 24, 29; x, 16). B.C. ante 1658.

Help, besides its ordinary signification of *assistance* in general, has in two passages of the N. T. a technical application.

1. HELPS (βοήθειαι), nautical *apparatus* for securing a vessel, when leaking, by means of ropes, chains, etc., passed around in the process of "undergirding" (q. v.), in the emergency of a storm (Acts xxvii, 17). See SHIP.

2. HELPS (ἀντιλήψεις; Vulg. *opitulationes;* 1 Cor. xii, 28). This Greek word, signifying *aids* or assistances, has also a meaning, among others, corresponding to that in this passage, in the classical writers (e. g. Diod. Sic. i, 87). In the Sept. it answers to עֶזְרָה (Psa. xxii, 19), to מָצוֹן (Psa. cviii, 12), and to זְרוֹעַ (Psa. lxxxiii, 8). It is found in the same sense, Ecclus. xi. 12; 2 Macc. xi, 26; and in Josephus (*War*, iv, 5, 1). In the N. T. it occurs once, viz. in the enumeration of the several orders or classes of persons possessing miraculous gifts among the primitive Christians (*ut supra*), where it seems to be used by metonymy, the abstract for the concrete, and to mean *helpers;* like the words δυνάμεις, "miracles," i. e. *workers* of miracles; κυβερνήσεις, "governments," i. e. *governors*, etc., in the same enumeration. Many persons in this country, by a similar idiom, call their servants "help." Great difficulty attends the attempt to ascertain the nature of the office so designated among Christians. Theophylact explains ἀντιλήψεις by ἀντέχεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενῶν, *helping* or *supporting the infirm.* So also Gennadius, in Œcumenius. But this seems like an inference from the etymology (see the Greek of Acts xx, 35). It has been *assumed* by some eminent modern writers that the several "orders" mentioned in ver. 28 correspond respectively to the several "gifts" of the Spirit enumerated in ver. 8, 9. In order, however, to make the two enumerations tally, it is necessary to make "divers kinds of tongues" and "*interpretation* of tongues" in the *one* answer to "*diversities of tongues*" in the *other*, which, *in the present state of the received text*, does not seem to be a *complete* correspondence. The *result* of the collation is that ἀντιλήψεις answers to "prophecy;" whence it has been inferred that these persons were such as were qualified with the gift of "lower prophecy," to *help* the Christians in the public devotions (Barrington's *Miscellanea Sacra*, i, 166; Macknight on 1 Cor. xii, 10–28). Another result is that "governments" answers to "discerning of spirits." To both these Dr. Hales very reasonably objects as unlikely, and pronounces this tabular view to be "perplexed and embarrassing" (*New Analysis*, etc., Lond. 1830, iii, 289). Bishop Horsley has adopted this classification of the gifts and office-bearers, and points out as "helps," i. e. persons gifted with "prophecies or predictions," such persons as Mark, Tychicus, Onesimus. Vitringa, from a comparison of ver. 28, 29, 30, infers that the ἀντιλήψεις denote those who had the gift of *interpreting foreign languages* (*De Synag. Vet.* ii, 505, Franque. 1696); which, though certainly *possible*, as an *arbitrary* use of a very significant word, stands in need of confirmation by actual instances. Dr. Lightfoot also, according to his biographer, adopted the same plan and arrived at

the same conclusion (Strype's *Life of Lightfoot*, prefixed to his *Works*, p. 4, Lond. 1684). But Lightfoot himself explains the word "persons who accompanied the apostles, baptized those who were converted by them, and were sent to places to which they, being employed in other things, could not come, as Mark, Timothy, Titus." He observes (ii, 781) that the Talmudists sometimes call the Levites מסעדי לכהנים, "the helpers of the priests." Similar catalogues of miraculous gifts and officers occur Rom. xii, 6-8, and Eph. iv, 11, 12; but they neither correspond in *number* nor in *the order of enumeration*. In the *former*, "prophecy" stands first, and in the *latter* second; and in the former many of the terms are of wide import, as "ministering," while *minute distinctions* are made between others, as between "teaching" and "exhortation," "giving" and "showing mercy." Other writers pursue different methods, and arrive at different conclusions. For instance, Hammond, arguing from the etymology of the word, and from passages in the early writers, which describe the office of relieving the poor as peculiarly connected with that of the apostles and bishops by the deacons, infers that ἀντιλ. "denotes a special *part of the office* of those men which are set down at the beginning of the verse." He also explains κυβερνήσεις as another part of their *office* (Hammond, *Comment.* ad loc.). Schleusner understands "*deacons* who had the care of the sick." Rosenmüller, "Diaconi qui pauperibus, peregrinis, ægrotis, mortuis, procurandis præerant." Bishop Pearce thinks that both these words may have been originally put in the *margin* to explain δυνάμεις, "miracles or powers," and urges that ἀντιλ. is nowhere mentioned as a gift of the Spirit, and that it is not *recapitulated* in ver. 29, 30. Certainly the *omission* of these two words would nearly produce exactitude in the *recapitulation*. Bowyer adopts the same conjecture, but it is without support from MSS. or versions. He also observes that to the end of ver. 28 some copies of the Vulgate add "interpretationes sermonum," ἑρμηνείας γλωσσῶν; as also the later Syriac, Hilary, and Ambrose. This *addition* would make the *recapitulation perfect*. Chrysostom and all the Greek interpreters consider the ἀντιλ. and κυβερν. as importing the *same thing*, namely, *functionaries* so called with reference to the *two* different parts of their *office:* the ἀντιλ. superintending the care of the poor, sick, and strangers; the κυβερν. the burial of the dead and the executorship of their effects, including the care of their widows and orphans, rather *managers* than governors (Blomfield's *Recensio Synopt.*). After all, it must be confessed, with Doddridge, that "we can only guess at the meaning of the words in question, having no principles on which to proceed in fixing it absolutely" (*Family Expositor*, on 1 Cor. xii, 28). (See Alberti, *Glossar.* p. 123; Suicer, *Thesaurus*, in voc.; Salmasius, *De Fœnore Trapezitico*, p. 409, Wolfii *Curæ Philolog.* Basil. 1741.) Stanley remarks (*Comment.* ad loc.) that the word "ἀντίληψις, as used in the Sept., is not (like διακονία) help ministered by an inferior to a superior, but by a superior to an inferior (comp. Psa. lxxxix, 18; Ecclus. xi, 12; li, 7), and thus is inapplicable to the ministrations of the deacon to the presbyter." Probably it is a general term (hence the plur.) to include those occasional labors of *evangelists* and special laborers, such as Apollos in ancient times and eminent revivalists in modern days, who have from time to time been raised up as powerful but independent promoters of the Gospel. See GIFTS, SPIRITUAL.

Help-meet (or rather, as the best editions of the Bible now punctuate it, HELP MEET *for him*, עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ, *e'zer, ke-negdo'*, *a help as his counterpart*, i. e. an aid suitable and supplementary to him), a delicate and beautiful designation of a wife (Gen. ii, 18-20), which exactly expresses her relation. See MARRIAGE.

Helve (עֵץ, *ets*, *wood*, as often elsewhere), the *handle* or wooden part of an axe (Deut. xix, 5). See AXE; TREE.

Ancient Egyptian Axes and Hatchets.

Helvetic Confessions, the later Confessions of faith of the Reformed churches of Switzerland. See BASLE, CONFESSIONS OF.

I. *The Confessio Helvetica prior* (the second Confession of Basle) was framed by a convention of delegates from Basle, Zürich, Berne, Schaffhausen, Mülhausen, St. Gall, and Biel, which began its sessions at Basle Jan. 30, 1536. Among the eminent theologians who took part in it were Megander of Berne, Grynæus and Myconius of Basle, Leo Judæ and Bullinger of Zürich. During their sessions, Bucer and Capito, who were striving earnestly to unite the Lutheran and Reformed churches, arrived in Basle, and seem to have exercised a decided influence in the formation of the Confession, though they had no vote in the Convention. The Confession was drawn up by Bullinger, Myconius, and Grynæus, in Latin, and translated into German by Leo Judæ (Augusti, *Lib. Symb. Reform.* p. 626). In March, 1536, it was adopted as the standard of doctrine. It consists of twenty-seven short articles: i–v, of Scripture and Tradition; vi, of God; vii, viii, of Man, the Fall, and Original Sin; ix, of Free Will; x–xiii, the Person and Work of Christ as Saviour; xiv–xix, the Church and Ministry; xx–xxiv, the Sacraments; xxvi, Civil Government; xxvii, Marriage. The Latin title of the Confession is *Ecclesiarum per Helvetiam Confessio fidei summaria et generalis, composita Basileæ*, A.D. 1536. It is Calvinistic and (moderately) Zwinglian in doctrine. The Confession, in both German and Latin, is given in Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 105-122.

II. *Confessio Helvetica Posterior*, the second Helvetic Confession, A.D. 1566. The first Confession above mentioned, though generally received, did not give universal satisfaction in Switzerland, especially as it was believed that the Lutheran influence had been allowed to operate in its formation. Bullinger undertook to revise it, and, at the request of the elector Palatine, Frederick III, he finished the work, with the aid of Beza and Gualter, and handed over the Confession, thus prepared, to the elector, who printed it in German, and adopted it (A.D. 1565) as the Reformed standard in his territory. The elector also made use of it to vindicate the Reformed doctrines against the Lutherans at the Diet of Augsburg, January, 1566. The attention of the Swiss churches

was called to this revised Confession as a standard under which they could all agree. By the year 1578 the Confession had received the sanction of the Swiss cantons, and had also been approved by the Reformed churches of Poland, Hungary, Scotland, and France (the latter receiving it in Beza's translation). It adopts Calvin's doctrine on the Lord's Supper, but "presents the Augustinian doctrine of election in a mild form, far behind Calvin" (Gieseler, *Church History*, ed. H. B. Smith, iv, 422). No Reformed Confession has been more widely diffused. The title of the Confession is *Confessio et Expositio Brevis et Simplex sinceræ Religionis Christianæ.* It consists of thirty chapters: chaps. i and ii treat of the Scriptures, Tradition, etc.; iii, of God and the Trinity; iv and v, of Idols or Images of God, Christ, and the Saints, and of the Worship of God through Christ, the sole Mediator; vi, of Providence; vii, of the Creation of all Things, of Angels, Devils, Man; viii, of Sin and the Fall of Man; ix, of Free Will. The condition of man after the fall is thus stated: *Non sublatus est quidem homini intellectus, non erepta ei voluntas, et prorsus in lapidem vel truncum est commutatus* (The intellect of man was not taken away by the fall, nor was he robbed of will, and changed into a stock or stone). Art. x treats of Predestination and Election. The second paragraph runs thus: *Ergo non sine medio, licet non propter ullum meritum nostrum, sed in Christo et propter Christum, nos elegit Deus, ut qui jam in Christo insiti per fidem; illi ipsi etiam sint electi, reprobi vero, qui sunt extra Christum, secundum illud Apostoli*, 2 Cor. xiii, 5 (Therefore, not without a medium, though not on account of any merit of ours, but in Christ, and on account of Christ, God elected us; so that they who are ingrafted in Christ by faith are the elect, while the reprobate are those who are out of Christ, according to the apostle, in 2 Cor. xiii, 5). This chapter has been the subject of much controversy, both Calvinists and Arminians finding their own doctrine in it. Chap. xi treats of Christ as God-man, the only Saviour; xii and xiii, of the Law and the Gospel; xiv-xvi, of Repentance and of Justification by Faith; xvii-xxii, of the Church, the Ministry, the Sacraments; xxiii and xxiv, of Assemblies, Worship, Feasts, and Fasts; xxv-xxix, Catechism, Rites, Ceremonies, etc.; xxx, of the Civil Magistracy. This Confession is given in Latin in the *Sylloge Confessionum* (Oxon. 1827, 8vo); by Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 462 sq.; by Augusti, *Corpus Librorum Symbolicorum*, p. 1-102. A tercentenary edition, edited by Dr. E. Bohl, was published at Vienna, 1865 (120 pp. 8vo). See Gieseler, *Church History*, l. c.; Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, ii, 469; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 221; Fritzsche, *Conf. Helv. Posterior*, Zürich, 1839; Augusti, *Allg. christl. Symbolik*, 1861, p. 158.

Helvetic Consensus (*Formula Consensus Helvetica*), a confession of faith drawn up in 1675 by J. G. Heidegger at the request of the Calvinistic divines of Switzerland. It was chiefly designed to restrain the progress of the mitigated Calvinism of Amyraldus and the school of Saumur generally, which was spreading in Switzerland. See AMYRALDUS. Turretin, Zwinger, Werenfels, Hottinger, and other Swiss theologians aided in its preparation, but its form is chiefly due to Heidegger.

It consists of a preface and twenty-six canons. Canons 1-3 treat of the Scriptures; and the second (against Cappel) maintains that the Hebrew text is to be received as divinely inspired, not only as to the substance, but as to the very words, consonants, vowels, and vowel-points (*tum quoad consonas, tum quoad vocalia, sive puncta ipsa, sive punctorum saltem potestatem, et tum quoad res, tum quoad verba* Θεόπνευστος). The remaining canons are chiefly occupied with definitions of the Calvinistic view of predestination, sin, grace, the extent of the atonement, etc., all which are set forth in language as decided as that cited above with regard to the Scriptures. The *Formula* is given in full by Augusti (*Corpus Libr. Symbol. Reform.* p. 443 sq.) and by Niemeyer (*Collectio Confess.* p. 729). Within a year from its promulgation it was adopted by the magistrates of Basle, Zurich, Berne, etc., but it was not received at Geneva until 1679. It was finally made authoritative throughout Switzerland: all ministers, teachers, and professors were bound to subscribe to it; and it was ordained that no candidate for the ministry should be admitted except upon declaration that he received it *ex animo* (Augusti, l. c. p. 646). But these strong measures, together with the influence of the French clergy, and especially the intercession of Frederick William of Brandenburgh, produced a reaction; and in 1686 the magistrates of Basle allowed the admission of candidates without subscription to the *Formula.* By 1706 its strict obligation had fallen into disuse at Geneva. In the other cantons it was still retained, but gave rise to long conflicts. In 1722 the kings of Prussia and England sent letters to the Swiss Cantons, for the sake of the unity and peace of Protestantism, to drop the use of the *Formula* as a binding creed. In 1723 they renewed these letters to the same purpose. By 1740 the Formula had fallen entirely into disuse. "It never acquired authority outside of Switzerland. Within about fifty years it was abrogated. One of the strongest advocates of this last measure was Turretin's own son, Alphonso Turretin, who was as zealous in opposing as his father had been in advocating it. If there was ever a creed which deserves to be called the manifesto of a theological party rather than a confession of faith on the part of the Church, the *Formula Consensus* is that one" (Fisher, in *New Englander*, July, 1868, p. 502). See Hottinger, *Formulæ Consensus Historia* (1723, 4to), in favor of the Consensus; Pfaff, *Schediasma theol. de Form. Consens. Helvet.* (Tübingen, 1723, 4to), on the Lutheran side; Schröckh, *Kircheng. seit der Reformation*, viii, 659 sq.; Barnaud, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des troubles à l'occasion du Consensus* (Amst. 1726, 8vo); Mosheim, *Ch. History*, cent. xvii, pt. ii, ch. iii; Trechsel, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 719 sq.; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 472; Augusti, *Allg. christl. Symbolik*, 1861, p. 160; Schweizer, in *Zeitschrift für d. hist. Theol.* 1860, p. 122; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, ed. H. B. Smith, § 222, and references there.

Helvetius, CLAUDE ADRIEN, a French infidel, was born in Paris in January, 1715, and was educated by the Jesuits at the College of Louis-le-Grand. He afterwards studied law and finance, and, through the influence of queen Maria Leczinska, became a farmer-general. His life was disorderly up to the time of his marriage in 1751. In 1758 he published his *De l'Esprit*, which was a summary of the doctrines of the *Encyclopédie.* The book was bitterly denounced; and, "to regain the favor of the court, Helvetius successively published three letters of apology which gradually advanced in humility and submission. Notwithstanding the confession which they contained of a Christian faith, and his disclaimer of all opinions inconsistent with its spirit, the doctors of the Sorbonne drew up a formal condemnation of the work, which they declared to be a compendium of all the evil contained in all the bad books that had yet appeared. It was publicly burned, according to a decree of the Parliament of Paris." The style of the book is vicious and declamatory. Helvetius died at Paris Dec. 26, 1771, leaving a work behind him entitled *De l'Homme, de ses Facultés, et de son Education*, which was published the same year at London and Amsterdam by prince Gallitzin, 2 vols. 8vo. "By *esprit* Helvetius understood as well the mental faculties as the ideas acquired by them. Both faculties and ideas he reduced to simple sensation, and he accounts for man's superiority over the brutes by the finer organism of his senses and the structure of his hands. Man, he considers, is the work of nature, but his intelligence and virtue are the fruit of education. The end of virtue is happiness, and utility determines the value of all actions, of which those are virtuous which are generally useful. Utility and inutility are, however, merely relative, and

there is consequently nothing which is either absolutely good, or absolutely evil. The happiness and enlightenment of the people he makes to be the true end of all human government; and, denying a divine Providence in the government of the world, he declares all religion to be a cheat and a prejudice" (*Engl. Cyclopædia*, s. v.). His system is simply the lowest materialism. There have been several editions of his complete works (Lond. 1777, 2 vols. 4to; 1794, 5 vols. 8vo; Paris, 1795, 14 vols. 18mo, ed. by Lefebvre; Paris, 1818, 3 vols. 8vo). See St. Lambert, *Essai sur la Vie et les Ouvrages d'Helvetius; English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 885; Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy*, p. 110, 337; Remusat, in *Revue d. deux Mondes*, Aug. 15, 1858; Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought*, lect. v.

Helvicus (HELWIG), CHRISTOPH, was born Dec. 26, 1581, at Sprendlingen, Darmstadt, where his father was minister. He studied at Marburg, and was able to teach Hebrew at twenty. It is said that he spoke Hebrew as freely as his mother tongue. In 1605 he was made professor of Greek and Hebrew at the School of Giessen, which in 1606 was erected into a university by the landgrave. In 1610 he was made professor of divinity. He died Sept. 10, 1617. His most important work is *Theatrum Historicum et Chronologicum sive Chronologiæ Systema novum* (1610, often reprinted, and translated into English); also a *Chronologia Universalis* (1612).

Helvidius, a so-called heresiarch of the 4th century, a layman who opposed the growing superstitions of the Church, and especially the nascent worship of the Virgin Mary. He was a pupil of Auxentius, bishop of Milan, and the precursor of Jovinian (q. v.). Jerome was at the time preaching the "gospel of celibacy," and Helvidius opposed this tendency also. He maintained that Mary had other children besides Jesus, and supported his opinion by the N. Test., and by the authority of Tertullian and Victorinus. "He affirmed also that by this opinion he in nowise infringed on the honor of Mary. He attacked also the exaggerated undervaluation of married life. He quoted the examples of the patriarchs, who had maintained a pious life in wedlock; while, on the other hand, he referred to the examples of such virgins as had by no means lived up to their calling. These opinions of Helvidius might lead us to conclude that the combating of a one-sided ascetic spirit was a matter of still more weight with him than the defence of his views with regard to Mary. Perhaps, also, he may have been led into these views simply by exegetical inquiries and observations, and so had been drawn into this opposition to the *overvaluation* of celibacy merely for the purpose of defending his opinion against an objection on the score of propriety" (Neander, *Ch. Hist.*, Torrey's, ii, 340). Augustine (*De Hæres.* c. 84) calls his followers *Helvidiani.* Jerome wrote a treatise against him (*adv. Helvidium*), in which we find some passages of Helvidius's writings. See Epiphanius, *Hæres.* c. 70, 78; Augustine, *Hæres.* c. 56, 84; Neander, l. c.

Helyot, PIERRE, a Franciscan monk of great learning (known also as father HIPPOLYTUS), was born at Paris in 1660, and died in 1716. He went twice to Rome on business of the order, and travelled through the whole of France. He is chiefly distinguished as the author of the *Histoire des ordres monastiques religieux et militaires* (Paris, 1714-21, 8 vols. 4to), of which he gathered the materials during his travels, and which is to this day the most complete work of the kind, though several of the orders are not treated in it. He died during the publication of the fifth volume, and the work was finished by Bullot. A new edition by Migne appeared at Paris in 1847-50 (4 vols. royal 8vo). See Lelong, *Bibl. histor. de la France;* Querard, *La France littér.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxiii, 893.

Hem OF A GARMENT (שׁוּל, *shûl*, Exod. xxviii, 33, 34; xxxix, 24-26: elsewhere the "skirt" of a robe; *κράσπεδον*, Matt. ix, 20; xiv, 30; elsewhere "border"). The importance which the later Jews, especially the Pharisees (Matt. xxiii, 5), attached to the hem or fringe of their garments was founded upon the regulation in Numb. xv, 38, 39, which ascribed a symbolical meaning to it. We must not, however, conclude that the fringe owed its origin to that passage; it was in the first instance the ordinary mode of finishing the robe, the ends of the threads composing the woof being left in order to prevent the cloth from unravelling, just as in the Egyptian *calasiris* (Herod. ii, 81; see Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, ii, 90), and in the Assyrian robes as represented in the bas-reliefs of Nineveh, the blue ribbon being added to strengthen the border. The Hebrew word צִיצִת, *tsitsith'*, "fringe" (Numb. xv, 38, 39), is expressive of the *fretted edge:* the Greek *κράσπεδα* (the etymology of which is uncertain, being variously traced to *κροσσός*, *ἄκρος πέδον*, and *κρηπίς*) applies to the *edge* of a river or mountain (Xenoph. *Hist. Gr.* iii, 2, § 16; iv, 6, § 8), and is explained by Hesychius as *τὰ ἐν τῷ ἄκρῳ τοῦ ἱματίου κεκλωσμένα ῥάμματα καὶ τὸ ἄκρον αὐτοῦ.* The *beged* or outer robe was a simple quadrangular piece of cloth, and generally so worn that two of the corners hung down in front: these corners were ornamented with a "ribbon of blue," or, rather, *dark violet*, the ribbon itself being, as we may conclude from the word used, פְּתִיל, as narrow as a thread or piece of string. The Jews attached great sanctity to this fringe (Matt. ix, 20; xiv, 36; Luke viii, 44), and the Pharisees made it more prominent than it was originally designed to be, enlarging both the fringe and the ribbon to an undue width (Matt. xxiii, 5). Directions were given as to the number of threads of which it ought to be composed, and other particulars, to each of which a symbolical meaning was attached (Carpzov, *Apparat.* p. 198). It was appended in later times to the *talith* more especially, as being the robe usually worn at devotions, whence the proverbial saying quoted by Lightfoot (*Exercit.* on Matt. v, 40), "He that takes care of his fringes deserves a good coat" (see Hilder, *De Hebræor. vestib. frimbriatis*, Tubingen, 1701). See FRINGE.

He'mam (Gen. xxxvi, 22). See HOMAM.

Heman (Heb. *Heyman'*, הֵימָן, i. q. מְהֵימַן, Chald. *faithful;* Sept. Αἱμάν or Αἰμάν, v. r. Ἀμάν, Ἀνάν, Αἱμονάμ, etc.), the name of two men.

1. A person named with three others celebrated for their wisdom, to which that of Solomon is compared (1 Kings iv, 31), probably the same as the son of Zerah and grandson of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 6). B.C. post 1856. See ETHAN.

2. Son of Joel, and grandson of Samuel, a Kohathite of the tribe of Levi, and one of the leaders of the Temple music as organized by David (1 Chron. vi, 33; xv, 17; xvi, 41, 42). B.C. 1014. This, probably, is the Heman to whom the 88th Psalm is ascribed. He had fourteen sons and three daughters (1 Chron. xxv, 5), some of whom are enumerated in ver. 4. Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun are termed "seers" in 2 Chron. xxix, 14, 30; xxxv, 15, which refers rather to their genius as sacred musicians than to their possessing the spirit of prophecy (1 Chron. xv, 19; xxv, 1; 2 Chron. v, 12), although there is not wanting evidence of their occasional inspiration. See ASAPH.

He'math (Heb. *Chammath'*, חַמַּת, the same name as *Hammath;* Sept. Αἱμάθ; Vulg. translates *calor*), a Kenite, ancestor of the Rechabites (1 Chron. ii, 55). B.C. prob. cir. 1612. "Hemath," in Amos vi, 14, is an incorrect Anglicized form of חֲמָת (*Chamath'*, Sept. Αἱμάθ v. r. Ἐμάθ, Vulg. *Emath*), the city HAMATH, q. v.

Hem'dan (Heb. *Chemdan'*, חֶמְדָּן, *pleasant;* Sept Ἀμαδά, Vulgate *Hemdam*), the first named of the four "children" of Dishon, which latter was a son of Seir and one of the Horite "dukes" antecedent to the supremacy of the Edomites in Mt. Seir (Gen. xxxvi, 26). B.C. cir.

1964. In 1 Chron. i, 41, the name is, by an error of transcribers, written *Hamran* (Heb. *Chamran'*, חַמְרָן, Sept. correctly 'Αμαδί, Vulg. *Hamram*, Eng. Vers. "Amram"). "The name Hemdan is by Knobel (*Genesis*, p. 256) compared with those of *Humeidy* and *Hamady*, two of the five families of the tribe of Omran or Amran, who are located to the E. and S.E. of Akaba (Robinson, *Researches*, i, 268); also with the *Bene-Hamyde*, who are found a short distance S. of Kerek (S.E. corner of the Dead Sea); and from thence to El-Busaireh, probably the ancient Bozrah, on the road to Petra. (See Burckhardt, *Syria*, etc., p. 695, 407.)"

Hemerobaptistæ (ἡμεροβαπτισταί). Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iv, 22) cites from Hegesippus a list of heresies prevalent among the Jews, and names, as one of the heretical sects, the *Hemerobaptistæ*. Epiphanius (*Hæres.* xvii) also names this sect, and derives their name from the fact that they hold daily ablutions to be essential to salvation (see also *Apost. Const.* lib. vi, cap. vi). Mosheim (*Commentaries*, Introd. chap. ii, § 9, endeavors to show that the so-called "Christians of St. John" are descended from these ancient Hemerobaptists. See Suicer, *Thesaurus* (Amst. 1728), i, 1331; and the articles CHRISTIANS OF ST. JOHN; MENDEANS.

Heminge. See HEMMING.

Hemlock appears in the Auth. Vers. as the rendering of two Heb. words in some of the passages where they occur.

1. RÔSH (ראשׁ and רושׁ) is thought originally to signify "poison," and is therefore supposed to indicate a poisonous, or, at least, a bitter plant. This we may infer from its being frequently mentioned along with *laanah* or "wormwood," as in Deut. xxix, 18, "Lest there should be among you a root that beareth *gall* (*rosh*) and *wormwood* (*laanah*);" so also in Jer. ix, 15; xxiii, 15; and in Lam. iii, 19, "Remembering mine affliction and my misery, the *wormwood* and the *gall*." That it was a berry-bearing plant has been inferred from Deut. xxxii, 32, "For their vine is of the vine of Sodom, and their grapes are grapes of *gall* (*rosh*); their clusters are bitter." In Jer. viii, 14; ix, 15; xxiii, 15, "water of *gall*" (*rosh*) is mentioned, which may be either the expressed juice of the fruit or of the plant, or a bitter infusion made from it. That it was a plant is very evident from Hosea x, 4, where it is said "their judgment springeth up as *hemlock* (*rosh*) in the furrows of the field;" also in Amos vi, 12, "For ye have turned judgment into *gall* (*laanah*, 'wormwood'), and the fruit of righteousness into *hemlock* (*rosh*)." The only other passages where it occurs are in speaking of the "poison" (Job xx, 16) or "venom" of asps (Deut. xxii, 33), or "gall" in a figurative sense for sorrow (Lam. iii, 5), or as food (Psa. lxix, 21). See GALL; POISON.

Though *rosh* is generally acknowledged to indicate some plant, yet a variety of opinions have been entertained respecting its identification: some, as the Auth. Vers. in Hosea x, 4, and Amos vi, 12, consider *cicuta* or *hemlock* to be the plant intended. Tremellius adopts this as the meaning of *rosh* in all the passages, and is followed by Celsius (*Hierobot.* ii, 49). The *cicuta* of the Romans, the κώνειον of the Greeks, is generally acknowledged to have been what we now call *hemlock*, the *conium maculatum* of botanists. There can be no doubt of its poisonous nature (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxv, 13). Celsius quotes the description of Linnæus in support of its growing in the furrows of fields, but it does not appear to be so common in Syria. Celsius, however, adduces Ben-Melech, the most learned of Rabbins, as being of opinion that *rosh* was *conium* or *hemlock*. But there does not appear any necessity for our considering *rosh* to have been more poisonous than *laanah* or *wormwood*, with which it is associated so frequently as to appear like a proverbial expression (Deut. xxix, 18; Jer. ix, 15; xxiii, 15; Lam. iii, 19; Amos vi, 12). The Sept. translators render it *agrostis*, intending some species of grass. Hence some have concluded that it must be *lolium temulentum*, or *darnel*, the zizanium of the ancients; while others have thought that some of the *solaneæ* or *luridæ* of Linnæus, as the *belladonna* or the *solanun nigrum*, common nightshade, or still, again, the *henbane*, is intended. But no proof appears in favor of any of this tribe, and their sensible properties are not so remarkably disagreeable as to have led to their being employed in what appears to be a proverbial expression. Hiller, in his *Hierophyticon* (ii, 54), adduces the *centaury* as a bitter plant, which, like others of the tribe of gentians, might answer all the passages in which *rosh* is mentioned, with the exception of that (Deut. xxxii, 32) where it is supposed to have a berried fruit. Dr. Harris, quoting Blayney on Jer. viii, 14, says, "In Psa. lxix, 21, which is justly considered as a prophecy of our Saviour's sufferings, it is said, 'They gave me *rosh* to eat,' which the Sept. have rendered χολήν, *gall*. Accordingly, it is recorded in the history, Matt. xxvii, 34, 'They gave him vinegar to drink, mingled with gall,' ὄξος μετὰ χολῆς. But in the parallel passage (Mark xv, 23) it is said to be 'wine mingled with myrrh,' a very bitter ingredient. From whence I am induced to think that χολή, and perhaps *rosh*, may be used as a general name for whatever is exceedingly bitter: and, consequently, when the sense requires, it may be put specially for any bitter herb or plant, the infusion of which may be called 'waters of *rosh*.'" See MYRRH.

2. LAANAH' (לַעֲנָה) occurs in the passages above cited and in a few others, where it is translated "wormwood" (Deut. xxix, 18; Prov. v, 4; Jer. ix, 15; xxiii, 15; Lam. iii, 15, 19; Amos v, 7); and only in a single passage is it rendered "hemlock" (Amos vi, 12). See WORMWOOD.

Hemmenway, MOSES, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in 1735 at Framingham, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1755, and was ordained pastor in Wells, Mass., Aug. 8, 1759, where he labored until his death, April 5, 1811. He published *Seven Sermons on the Obligation and Encouragement of the Unregenerate to labor for the Meat which endureth to everlasting Life* (1767):—*Vindication of the Power, Obligation, etc., of the Unregenerate to attend the Means of Grace, against the Exceptions of Samuel Hopkins in his Reply to Mills* (1772):—*Remarks on Rev. Mr. Hopkins's Answer to a Tract entitled "A Vindication," etc.* (1774):—*A Discourse on the divine Institution of Water Baptism as a standing Ordinance of the Gospel* (1781):—*A Discourse on the Nature and Subjects of Christian Baptism* (1781):—*Discourse concerning the Church, in which the several Acceptations of the Word are explained, etc.* (1792):—*Remarks on the Rev. Dr. Emmons's Dissertation on the scriptural Qualifications for Admission and Access to the Christian Sacraments, and on his Strictures on a Discourse concerning the Church* (1794); and several occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 541.

Hemmerlin or **Hämmerlein,** FELIX (*Malleolus*), a Swiss theologian, was born at Zurich in 1389. After studying the canon law at the University of Erfurt he went to Rome. On his return to Switzerland in 1421 he was appointed canon at Zoffingen, and the year after he was made provost of St. Ursus, in Soleure. With the revenues of these livings he collected a large library. He took part in the Council of Basle (1441-3), and was conspicuous there for his zeal in reforming ecclesiastical discipline. He made many bitter enemies, and in 1439 they made an attempt on his life, and wounded him seriously. This did not, however, deter him from continuing his reproofs of the loose lives of the clergy, and the general lack of discipline. After long-continued disputes with his colleagues at Zurich, he was stripped, through their influence, of all his emoluments. He also drew upon himself the hatred of a party of his countrymen by the thirtieth chapter of his treatise *De Nobilitate*, in which he condemned the Swiss confederates, who in 1444 made war on his native city. Some members of this party, who attended the Carnival at Zurich

in 1554, seized Hemmerlin and carried him to Constance, where he was thrown into prison, and treated with great cruelty. He was unwilling to retract any of his writings, and was condemned to perpetual imprisonment in a convent. He was taken to a monastery of barefooted monks at Lucerne, and died there in 1457, a martyr to his devotion, not, indeed, to evangelical, but to ecclesiastical discipline. Many of his writings are collected in *Variæ Oblectationis Opuscula et Tractatus* (Basle, 1497, fol.).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 268; Reber, *Felix Hemmerlin* (Zurich, 1746); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 732.

Hemming (Hemmingius), Nicolas, an eminent theologian of Denmark, was born in the isle of Laland in 1513. He studied four years at Wittenberg under Melancthon, and imbibed his mild spirit. Returning to Denmark, he became preacher, and afterwards professor of Hebrew and theology at Copenhagen. In 1557 he became professor of theology and vice-chancellor. He was a voluminous writer in exegetical, dogmatical, and practical theology, and his Latin style is highly praised. Opposing the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity, he was greatly reproached by the Lutherans as a Crypto-Calvinist. In his *Syntagma Institt. Christ.* (1574) he expressed himself on the Eucharist in a conciliatory way; but this so-called recantation has been interpreted in accordance with the Calvinistic doctrine, as well as with the Lutheran. In 1579 he was made canon of Roeskilde, where he died in peace in 1600. His *Opuscula Theologica*, including his shorter treatises, were edited by Goulart (Geneva, 1586, fol.).

Hemsen, Johann Tychsen, a German theologian, was born at Boldixum (Schleswig) Oct. 15, 1792. He studied at Copenhagen and Göttingen, where he graduated in 1821. In 1823 he became extraordinary professor of theology in the University of Göttingen, and died there May 14, 1830. He wrote *Anaxagoras Klazomenensis, seu de vita ejus et philosophia* (Gött. 1821, 8vo):—*Die Authenticitaet d. Schriften d. Evangelisten Johannes* (Schleswig, 1823; against Bretschneider's *Probabilien*):—*De Christologia Joannis Baptistæ* (Gött. 1824):—*Der Apostel Paulus, sein Leben, Wirken, und seine Schriften*, posthumous (Gött. 1830, 8vo), etc. He also wrote in the *Gelehrte Anzeigen* of Göttingen, and the *Neue Krit. Bibliothek* of Seebold; and edited Stäudlin's *Gesch. u. Literatur d. Kirchengesch.* (Hanover, 1827), and *Berengarii Turonensis Liber de sacra Cœna, adversus Lanfrancum* (Lpz. 1830). See *Neuer Nekrolog d. Deutschen* (1830), i, 422–424; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxiii, 901. (J. N. P.)

Hen (Heb. *Chen*, חֵן, *grace*, as often; Sept. translates χάρις, Vulg. *Hem*), the son of Zephaniah, to whom the prophet was sent with a symbolical crown (Zech. vi, 14); probably a figurative name for Josiah (ver. 10).

Hen (ὄρνις, a *bird*, especially the domestic fowl, Matt. xxiii, 37; Luke xiii, 34). We have no evidence that the ancient Hebrews were accustomed to the breeding of poultry, but that the later Jews were acquainted with it (Chald. תַּרְנְגוֹלְתָּא) is evident from 2 Esdras i, 30; Matt. xxiii, 37; Luke xiii, 34; xxii, 60, 61. Michaelis is of opinion that the incubation of the common hen is referred to in Jer. xvii, 11. The original country of the common poultry fowl is India, where it is called the jungle bird. See Cock. The metaphor used in the passages of the Gospels where the term "hen" occurs has always been admired for its beauty. When the hen sees a bird of prey coming, she makes a noise to assemble her chickens, that she may cover them with her wings from the danger. The Roman army, as an eagle, was about to fall upon the Jews; our Lord expresses a desire to guard them from threatened calamities, but they disregarded his invitations and warnings, and fell a prey to their adversaries. The word there employed is used in the same specific sense in classical Greek (Aristoph. *Av.* 102, *Vesp.* 811). That a bird so intimately connected with the household, and so common in Palestine, as we know from Rabbinical sources (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 256), should receive such slight notice, is certainly singular (see Reland, *De galli cantu Hier. audito*, Rotterd. 1709; Detharding, *id.* Rost. 1752); it is almost equally singular that it is nowhere represented in the paintings of ancient Egypt (Wilkinson, i, 234). See Fowl.

He'na (Heb. *Hena'*, הֵנַע, signif. unknown; Sept. 'Ανά, but in Isa. xxxvii, 13 blends with the following name into 'Αναεγγουγανά, q. d. "Ana-near-Ava;" Vulg. *Ana*), a city (apparently of Mesopotamia) mentioned in connection with Sepharvaim and Ivah as one of those overthrown by Sennacherib before his invasion of Judæa (2 Kings xviii, 34; xix, 13; Isa. xxxvii, 13). According to the conjecture of Busching (*Erdbeschr.* xi, 263, 757), it is the town which is still called by the Arabs *Anah*. It lies on the Euphrates, amid gardens, which are rich in dates, citrons, oranges, pomegranates, and other fruits. The modern site is on the right bank of the stream, while the name also attaches to some ruins a little lower down upon the left bank; but between them is "a string of islands" (Chesney's *Euphrates Expedition*, i, 53), upon one of which stands a castle. Perhaps, in ancient times, the city lay, for the most part, or entirely, upon this island, for Abulfeda says that "Anah is a small town on an island in the middle of the Euphrates" (see Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* III, ii, 717; Michaelis, *Supplem.* p. 562). The inhabitants are chiefly Arabs and Jews. Conjecture further identifies *Ana* with a town called *Anat* (ת is merely the feminine termination), which is mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions as situated on an island in the Euphrates (Fox Talbot's *Assyrian Texts*, p. 21; Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 355), at some distance below its junction with the Chabour, and which appears as Anatho ('Αναθώ) in Isidore of Charax (*Mans. Parth.* p. 4). Hitzig, however (*Comment. on Isa.* l. c.), thinks the name an appellation, equivalent to "the *Lowland*," and in this signification Fürst (*Heb. Lexikon*, s. v.) concurs (q. d. כנע; see Canaan). Comp. Sepharvaim.

Hen'adad (Heb. *Chenadad'*, חֵנָדָד, probably for חֵן הֲדַד, *favor of Hadad*; Sept. 'Ηναδάδ), a Levite whose sons were active in the enterprises of the restoration after the captivity (Ezra iii, 9); two of the latter, Bavai and Binnui, are named (Neh. iii, 18, 24; x, 9). B.C. ante 535.

Hendel, William, D.D., one of the pioneers of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born in the Palatinate in the first half of the 18th century. Having completed his theological studies, he came to America in 1764, and in Jan. 1765 became pastor of the German Reformed congregation at Lancaster, Pa. During the years 1769–1782 he had charge of the congregation at Tulpehocken and neighboring congregations. Indeed, he served as many as nine at a time, besides making frequent missionary excursions. In Sept. 1782, he accepted a call to return to his Lancaster congregation. He was made D.D. by the College of New Jersey in 1788. In February, 1794, he removed to Philadelphia, which was his last station. Shortly after his arrival the yellow fever broke out the second time, and while faithfully ministering to the sick and dying, he died of the fever Sept. 29, 1798. Dr. Hendel was a good scholar, and a man of great pulpit talents.—Harbaugh, *Fathers of the Reformed Church*, ii, 120 sq.

Henderson, Alexander, a minister of the Church of Scotland, was born in Fifeshire about 1583. He studied at St. Andrew's, where he passed A.M. in 1603, and where, about 1610, he was professor of philosophy. About 1615 (according to M'Crie) he was presented to the parish of Leuchars by archbishop Gladstanes. As the episcopal government was very unpopular with the people, they resisted Mr. Henderson's settlement, even to the extent of closing the church doors against him. In a few years, however, Henderson became convinced

that "episcopacy was unauthorized by the Word of God, and inconsistent with the reformed Constitution of the Church of Scotland." He entered into the strife against prelacy with great vigor. In 1619 he was called before the High Commission at St. Andrew's, but defended himself successfully. When the episcopal liturgy was ordered to be used in Scotland in 1637 he joined in the resistance made to it. He was one of the writers of the renewed "League and Covenant," sworn to by thousands at Grayfriars' Church, Edinburgh, March 1, 1638. He was moderator of the famous General Assembly of that year, and he executed the functions of his office with singular skill, firmness, and prudence. At the nineteenth session Henderson preached a powerful sermon, and at its close pronounced the sentence of deposition (against the bishops) which had been adopted by the Assembly. He was removed, much against his will, in 1638, from the church at Leuchars to Edinburgh. In 1640 he was made rector of the University of Edinburgh. During 1642 he was employed in managing the correspondence with England regarding reformation and reunion of the churches. In 1643 he was again moderator of the General Assembly; and in that year he, with others, represented Scotland at the Westminster Assembly, and he resided in London for three years. In 1645 he was appointed to assist the commissioners of Parliament to treat with the king at Uxbridge, and also at Newcastle in 1686. In the papers on episcopacy delivered by him in these conferences he displayed great learning and ability. His constitution was broken by long and excessive labors. In the summer of 1846 he returned to Edinburgh, and on the 19th of August in that year he died of the stone. The Constitution of the Scottish Church was framed chiefly by Henderson. "He was evidently of that sort of men of which martyrs are made, and needed only a change of circumstances to have given his name a high place among those who have sealed a good confession with their blood. Nearly every considerable production of that memorable period bears his impress. The Solemn League and Covenant was his own composition. The Directory was formed under his eye. He wrote the principal part of the Confession of Faith with his own hand. And the form of Church government which the Assembly attempted in vain to give to the Church of England was little more than a transcript of that which he had a little before drawn up for the Church of Scotland" (Curry, in *Methodist Quarterly*, 1848, p. 600). "So long as the purity of our Presbyterian establishment remains," says Dr. Aiton, "as often as the General Assembly of our Church is permitted to convene—while the Confession of Faith and Catechisms Larger and Shorter hold a place in our estimation second to the Scriptures alone—and till the history of the revolution during the reign of Charles I is forgotten—the memory of Alexander Henderson will be respected, and every Presbyterian patriot in Scotland will continue grateful for the Second Reformation of our Church, which Henderson was so instrumental in effecting." His life was spent in active labors, allowing little time for writing, except the documents and pamphlets necessary to the great controversy in which he took so large a part. Two of his sermons—preached severally before the two houses of Parliament (1644) and the House of Lords (1645)—are given at the end of M'Crie's *Life of Alexander Henderson* (Edinburgh, 1846). See also Howie, *Scots' Worthies*, p. 349; Collier, *Eccles. Hist. of England*, viii, 293-325; Hetherington, *Church of Scotland*, vol. i; Cunningham, *Church Principles* (Edinburgh, 1863), p. 384 sq.

Henderson, Ebenezer, D.D., an eminent Scotch divine, was born at Dunfermline Nov. 17, 1784. At an early age he determined to devote his life to foreign missions, and went to Denmark, in order to sail thence for India. But he found work in the north of Europe in the circulation of the Bible, which occupied him for twenty years. After several years spent in this way in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, he was deputed by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1814 to proceed to Iceland on a similar mission; and in 1819 he was sent through Russia on the same errand. In 1826 he was appointed president of the Missionary College at Hoxton; and in 1830 he was made professor of theology and Biblical literature at the Highbury College. His studies in the language and literature of the Bible had been carried on vigorously during his previous long career in the service of the Bible Society, and he distinguished himself, both as professor and as author, by thorough and scholarly work. In 1850 he was compelled by decline of health to relinquish his literary labors, and after a short service as pastor at East Sheer he gave up all public work. He died at Mortlake, Surrey, May 16, 1858. Dr. Henderson's reputation as a Biblical critic was equal to that of any man of his time in England, and he was widely known and respected in other countries. He received the degree of D.D. from Amherst College, Mass., and from the University of Copenhagen at the same time. His knowledge of the languages of the Bible was accurate, and he used freely most of the important living languages. He was orthodox in his theology, and never handled the text of the Bible in the reckless and arbitrary manner which was common in Germany in his time. He was not an elegant writer, and his translations of Scripture are not always in good taste; but most persons competent to judge will agree to Dr. W. L. Alexander's judgment that "his contributions to Biblical literature are among the most valuable the age has produced, especially his lectures on Inspiration, and his commentaries on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets." His writings include *Iceland, Journal of a Residence in that Island* (Edinb. 1818, 2 vols. 8vo): —*Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia, with Observations on the Rabbinical and Caraib Jews* (Lond. 1826, 8vo):—translation of M. F. Roos, *Exposition of Daniel* (1811, 8vo):—*The Mystery of Godliness*, on 1 Tim. iii, 16 (Lond. 1830):—*Divine Inspiration* (Lond. 1836, often reprinted, 8vo):—*Commentary on Isaiah, with a new translation* (London, 1840, 8vo):—*Comm. on the Minor Prophets, with a new translation* (London, 1845, 8vo):—*Comm. on Jeremiah, with translation* (Lond. 1851, 8vo): —*Comm. on Ezekiel* (Lond. 1855, 8vo). He edited, with additions, Stuart's translation of Ernesti, *Elements of Interpretation* (1827, 12mo), Ægid. Gutbirii *Lexicon Syriacum* (1836, 24mo), and a new edition of Buck, *Theological Dictionary* (Lond. 1833, and often). A *Life* of Dr. Henderson has recently been issued (1869).

Henderson, John, a Scotch merchant and philanthropist, was born in 1782 at Borrowstanes; was bred to business, and was eminently successful in trade. His religious life was even more earnest than his mercantile zeal, and he devoted a large part of his income to benevolence. He took especial interest in the observance of the Lord's Day, and offered prizes to working-men for essays on Sabbath Observance. See SABBATH. He was one of the most active promoters of the Evangelical Alliance (q. v.), and contributed largely to its funds. The Waldensian churches, as well as Foreign Missions, received large benefactions from him; while at home, he was a constant contributor to the erection of churches, and for all works of benevolence. It is said that for years his charitable outlays amounted to more than £30,000 a year. He died at his residence, The Park, near Glasgow, May 1, 1867.—*Evangelical Christendom*, June, 1867.

Hengstenberg, ERNST WILHELM, a German theologian was born Oct. 20, 1802, at Fröndenberg, in Westphalia, and was prepared for the ministry under the instruction of his father, who was pastor at Fröndenberg. Entering the University of Bonn, he gave himself earnestly to Oriental and philosophical studies, an early fruit of which appeared in his translation of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* (Bonn, 1824), and in an edition of the *Moallakah* of Amralkais (Bonn, 1823). In 1823 he went to Basle, where, under the influence of the Missionary Institute,

he became earnestly interested in religion and theology. In 1824 he became *privatdocent* in theology at Berlin; in 1826, professor extraordinary; in 1828, ordinary professor; and in 1829, doctor of theology. For many years his organ was the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, begun in 1827, an orthodox journal, which, during its active and often stormy career, has rendered great service against Rationalism, but has also been noted for its violent polemical spirit in favor of Lutheranism, and, of late, even of Ritualism, as well as of absolutism in Church and State. He was, after 1848, a bitter opponent of the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches in Prussia, so much desired by Frederick William III, and by Neander and other leading theologians, against whom Hengstenberg's severity of language was often inexcusable. His contributions to the *Kirchenzeitung*, during his forty-two years' connection with it, were enough to make many volumes; but he was, besides, a laborious writer, especially in exegetical theology. He died June 3, 1869. His principal works are *Christologie des alten Testaments* (Berlin, 2d edit. 3 vols. 8vo, 1854–57; translated by Reuel Keith from 1st edit., N. York, 1836–39, 3 vols. 8vo; also transl. by Theo. Meyer from 2d edit. Edinburgh, 4 vols. 8vo, 1863):—*Beiträge zur Einleitung ins alte Test.* (Berlin, 1831–39, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Die Bücher Moses u. Egypten* (Berlin, 1841, 8vo):—*Commentar über die Psalmen* (Berlin, 2d edit. 1849–52, 4 vols. 8vo; translated by Fairbairn and Thompson, Edinburgh, 1857, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Erläuterungen ü. d. Pentateuch*, vol. i. (*Die Geschichte Bileams*, etc.), transl. by Ryland, Edinb. 1858:—*Offenbarung Johannis* (2d edit. Berlin, 1861–62, 2 vols. 8vo; transl. by Fairbairn from 1st edit., Edinb. 1851, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Das Evangelium d. Johannes erläutert* (Berlin, 1861–2, 2 vols.; translated, Edinb. 1865, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Ezechiel erklärt:—Ecclesiastes:—Das Hohelied Salomonis ausgelegt* (Berlin, 1853, 8vo). There are also the following additional translations from the *Einleitung: Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, by Ryland (Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, by Robbins (Edinburgh, 8vo; Andover, 1843); *On the Genuineness of Daniel and Zechariah*, bound with Ryland's translation of the *History of Balaam* (Edinb. 1858, 8vo); *Comm. on Ecclesiastes*, with *Treatise on the Song of Solomon, Job, Isaiah*, etc. (Philadelphia, 1860).

Henhöfer, Aloys, a German divine, was born at Völkersbach, near Ettlingen, of Roman Catholic parents, July 11, 1789. His mother destined him for the Roman Catholic priesthood, and hoped that he would become a missionary. He studied at the University of Freiburg, and at the Roman Catholic Seminary of Meersburg. After his ordination as priest, he was tutor for some years in a noble family, and in 1818 became pastor at Muhlhausen. Here he soon found the need of a deeper personal religion, and was greatly edified by the conversation of Fink, one of Sailer's disciples, and by reading the *Life of Martin Boos*. His preaching became earnestly evangelical, and crowds flocked to hear him. His orthodoxy was soon questioned, and, on examination, he avowed his doubts as to the Romanist doctrine of the Mass. His excommunication followed (Oct. 16, 1822), and gave occasion to his book *Christliches Glaubensbekenntniss d. Pfarrer's Henhöfer*. A flock of his converts speedily gathered around him, and in 1823 he was installed as its Evangelical Protestant pastor. In 1827 he was called to Spöck, near Carlsruhe, where he labored as pastor for thirty-five years. His influence was felt widely in the revival of evangelical religion throughout Baden. He died December 5, 1862. Besides numerous pamphlets on the Roman Catholic controversy, and on practical questions, he published *Der Kampf des Unglaubens mit Aberglauben u. Glauben, ein Zeichen unserer Zeit* (Heidelberg, 1861):—*Predigten* (posthumous, Heidelberg, 1863). See also Frommel, *Aus dem Leben des Dr. Aloys Henhöfer* (Carlsruhe, 1865, 8vo).

Henke, Heinrich Philipp Konrad, a German theologian, was born at Hehlen, in Brunswick, July 3, 1752. His early proficiency was so great that before he went to the university he was employed as a gymnasial teacher (1771–72). After studying philology and theology at Helmstadt, he was made professor of philosophy there in 1777, and in 1780 professor of theology. In 1803 he became principal of the Carolinum, Brunswick. After a very successful career, both as teacher and writer, he died May 2, 1809. In theology he belonged to the rationalistic school of Semler, and his Church History is written in a spirit of bitter hatred of ecclesiastical authority. His *Life* by Bollmann appeared at Helmstadt in 1816. As a critic he certainly had great merits, but his rationalistic views have made his writings shortlived. His reputation chiefly rests on his *Allgemeine Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche* (Brunsw. 1799–1808, 6 vols. 8vo; finished by Vater, 1813–20, vols. vii and viii). It is a "clever and spirited work; but the Church appears in it, not as the temple of God on earth, but as a great infirmary or bedlam" (Schaff, *Ch. History*, i, 22; see also Kahnis, *German Protestantism*, p. 177). He wrote also, *Lineamenta institutionum fidei christianæ historico-criticarum* (Helmstadt, 1783; 2d ed. 1795; German, 1803):—*Magazin f. d. Religions-philosophie, Exegese und Kirchengesch.* (Helmst. 1793–1804, 12 vols.):—*Archiv. für die neueste Kirchengesch.* (Weimar, 1794–99, 6 vols.):—*Religionsannalen* (Brunsw. 1800–05, 12 numbers):—*Kirchengesch. des 18ten Jahrh.* (Brunsw. 1802):—*Hist. Untersuchungen in d. Christ. Glaubenslehre* (Helmst. 1802):—*Beiträge z. neuesten Gesch. d. Religion*, etc. (Berlin, 1806, 2 vols.). See F. A. Ludewig, *Abriss einer Lebensgesch. Henkes;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 933.

Henkel, Charles, was descended from a long line of ministerial ancestors in the Lutheran Church. He was born May 18, 1798, in New Market, Va. He studied theology under the direction of his father, the Rev. Paul Henkel, and was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1818, and immediately commenced his ministry in Mason County, Va. In 1820 he removed to Columbus, Ohio, and in this field continued, amid many deprivations and toils, till 1827, when he took charge of the Somerset pastorate. His health, however, gradually failed, and he died Feb. 2, 1841. He was a man of vigorous mind, and a diligent student. Several of his sermons were published. On one occasion he was engaged in a public controversy with a Roman Catholic priest, and was very successful in exposing the absurdities of that false system. (M. L. S.)

Henkel, Paul, a divine of the American Lutheran Church, was born in Rowan County, N. C., Dec. 15, 1754. In 1776 he was awakened under the preaching of Whitefield, who at that time was exciting deep interest throughout the country. He commenced a course of study under the direction of pastor Krüch, of Frederick, Md., with a view to the Lutheran ministry. He was licensed to preach by the Synod of Pennsylvania, and in 1792 became pastor at New Market, Va. His labors extended to Augusta, Madison, Pendleton, and Wythe counties. His position was very much that of an itinerant missionary, visiting destitute portions of the Church, gathering together the scattered members, instructing and confirming the youth, and administering the sacraments. In 1800 he accepted a call to Rowan, his native county, N. C.; but, the location being unfavorable to the health of his family, he removed in 1805 to New Market, and labored as an independent missionary, preaching wherever his services were required, and depending for his support solely upon the good-will of the people. He made repeated tours through Western Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, and Ohio. In 1809 he wrote a work on *Christian Baptism* in the German language, which he subsequently translated into English. In 1810 he published a German *Hymn-book*, and in 1816 one in English, many of the hymns being his own composition. In 1811 he published his German, and, soon after, his English Catechism. He also published a Ger-

man work in rhyme, entitled *Zeitvertreib*, designed to satirize the fanaticism, the folly, and vices of the day. Mr. Henkel adhered with great tenacity to the standards and usages of his Church. In the earlier part of his ministry he approved of some of the alterations made by Melancthon in the Augsburg Confession, but at a later period his doctrinal position was the unaltered *Confession.* As a preacher he had more than ordinary power. He educated a large number of candidates for the ministry, who have occupied responsible positions in the Lutheran Church. His habits of life were plain and simple, and, although opposed to everything that looked like ostentation in the discharge of his official duties, he invariably wore his clerical robes. In person he was large and well formed, measuring nearly six feet in height. Five of his sons became ministers in the Lutheran Church. Towards the close of his life he was attacked with paralysis, and died November 17, 1825. (M. L. S.)

Hennepin, Louis, a Recollect missionary and traveller, was born in Flanders about 1640. In 1675 he was sent to Canada, and in 1678 started to accompany the traveller Lasalle. He founded a convent at Fort Cataracouy, and with two other monks followed Lasalle in his tour among the Canadian lakes in 1679. Lasalle sent him, in 1680, with another person named Dacan, to find the sources of the Mississippi. They followed the stream up to the 46° lat. north, but were stopped by a fall which Hennepin called Sault de St. Antoine de Padoue. He was then for eight months a prisoner among the Sioux, but was liberated by the French, and returned to Quebec April 5, 1682. After his return to Europe he was for a while keeper of the convent of Renty, in Artois, and finally retired to Holland. The date of his death is not ascertained. Hennepin disparaged the Jesuits as missionaries, and was, in turn, disparaged by the Jesuit Charlevoix. He wrote *Déscription de la Louisiane, etc., avec la carte du pays, les mœurs et la manière de vivre des sauvages* (Paris, 1683 and 1688, 12mo; 1688, 4to):—*Nouvelle Découverte d'un très grand pays situé dans l'Amérique, entre le Nouveau Méxique et la mer Glaciale, avec cartes, etc., et les avantages que l'on en peut tirer par l'établissement des colonies* (Utrecht, 1697, 12mo; and in the *Recueil des Voyages au Nord*, vol. ix, etc.):—*Nouveau Voyage dans un pays, etc., depuis 1679 jusqu'à 1682, avec les réflexions sur les entreprises du sieur Lasalle* (Utrecht, 1698, 12mo; *Recueil des Voyages au Nord*, vol. v, 1734). See Charlevoix, *Hist. générale de la Nouvelle France;* Dinaux, *Archives hist. du Nord;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 940 sq. (J. N. P.)

Henninger, John, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Washington Co., Va.; was converted while young; entered the Western Conference in 1807; was made presiding elder in 1816 on French-Broad District; located in 1818, and yet labored with zeal until he re-entered the itinerancy in Holston Conference in 1825, and so labored until his death, Dec. 3, 1829. Mr. Henninger was a faithful, popular, and successful minister, and a consistent and devout Christian. During the latter part of his life he was very efficient as presiding elder, and as agent for Holston College.—*Minutes of Conferences*, iii, 56; Radford, *Methodism in Kentucky*, ii, 57.

He'noch (1 Chron. i, 3, 33). See Enoch.

Henoticon (Greek, ἑνωτικόν, *uniting into one*), the name given to a "Decree of Union" issued by the Greek emperor Zeno, A.D. 482, by the advice of Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, with a view to reconcile the Monophysites and the orthodox to the profession of one faith. It recognised the Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds, but did not name the decrees of Chalcedon. It thus required a sacrifice of opinion on the part of the Monophysites; but, at the same time, it deprived the orthodox of the advantages they had gained at the Council of Chalcedon. The Roman patriarch, Felix II, condemned it in 483, and in 518 it was suppressed.—Mosheim, *Church Hist.* cent. v, pt. ii, ch. v, § 19. The *Henoticon* is given, in Greek, in Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* i, § 108. See Monophysites.

Henricians. See Henry of Lausanne.

Henry of Ghent (*Henricus de Gandavo:* proper name *Goethals*), a theologian of the 13th century. He was born at Ghent in 1217, studied at the University of Paris, and was a pupil of Albertus Magnus. Admitted to lecture at the Sorbonne, he acquired great distinction as a teacher of philosophy and theology, and obtained the surname of *Doctor Solemnis.* "He was endowed with great sagacity of understanding, attached to the system of the Realists, and blended the ideas of Plato with the formularies of Aristotle: attributing to the first a real existence independent of the divine Intelligence. He suggested some new opinions in psychology, and detected many speculative errors, without, however, suggesting corrections for them, owing to the faultiness of the method of the philosophy of his time" (Tennemann). Henry became canon, and afterwards archdeacon of Tournay, and died there A.D. 1293. His writings are, *Quodlibeta in iv Libb. Sententiarum* (Paris, 1518, fol. reprinted, with commentary by Zuccoli, 1613, 2 vols. fols.):—*Summa Theologiæ* (Paris, 1520, fol.):—*De Scriptor. Ecclesiasticis* (in Fabricius, *Bibl. Eccl.*). See Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. xiii; Ritter, *Gesch. d. Philosophie*, viii, 355; Tennemann, *Manual Hist. Phil.* § 267.

Henry of Gorcum (*Henricus Gorcomius*), so named from his birthplace, Gorcum, in Holland, a philosopher and theologian of the 15th century, vice-chancellor of the Academy of Cologne. He wrote commentaries on Aristotle, Aquinas, and Peter Lombard; also *Tract. de cæremoniis Ecclesiasticis:—De Celebritate Festorum:—Contra Hussitas.*

Henry of Huntingdon, an early English historian, was born about the end of the 11th century. He became archdeacon of Huntingdon before 1123. At the request of Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, he wrote a general history of England, from the landing of Julius Cæsar to the death of Stephen (1154), in eight books. It is to be found in Savile's *Scriptores post Bedam præcipui* (Lond. 1596, fol.; Francof. 1601); also in English, *The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon*, etc., edited by T. Forester (Lond. 1853, sm. 8vo). Warton (*Anglia Sacra*, ii, 694) gives a letter of Henry of Huntingdon to the abbot of Ramsey, *Epistola ad Walterum de Mundi Contemptu*, which contains many curious anecdotes of the kings, nobles, prelates, and other great men who were his contemporaries. It is given also in D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, iii, 503.—*English Cyclopædia;* Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1439; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* (*Anglo-Norman Period*).

Henry of Lausanne (frequently called Henry of Clugny), founder of the sect of *Henricians* in the 12th century. He is represented by Papal writers as a heretic and fanatic, but the truth seems to be that he was one of the "reformers before the Reformation." He is said to have been an Italian by birth, and a monk of Clugny. Disgusted with the corruptions of the times, he left his order, and became "a preacher of repentance." At first he was held in high honor even by the clergy. The field of his labor was the South of France; the time between A.D. 1116 and 1148. His first efforts were made at Lausanne and its neighborhood (hence his surname). His piety, modesty, and eloquence soon gained him a wide reputation. He preached vigorously against that "sham Christianity which did not prove its genuineness by the fruits of good living, and warning against the prevalent vices. This led him next to warn men against their false guides, the worthless clergy, whose example and teaching did more to promote wickedness than to put a stop to it. He contrasted the clergy as they actually were with what they ought to be; he attacked their vices, particularly their unchastity. He was a zealot for the observance of the laws of celibacy, and appeared in this respect, like other monks, a promoter of the Hildebrandian reformation. It was

probably his practical, restless activity, and the opposition that he met with on the part of the higher clergy, which led him to proceed further, and, as he traced the cause of the corruption to a deviation from the primitive apostolical teaching, to attack errors in doctrine. He must have possessed extraordinary power as a speaker, and this power was enhanced by his strict mode of living. Many men and women were awakened by him to repentance, brought to confess their sins, and to renounce them. It was said a heart of stone must have melted under his preaching. The people were struck under such conviction by his sermons, which seemed to lay open to them their inmost hearts, that they attributed to him a sort of prophetic gift, by virtue of which he could look into the very souls of men" (Neander, *Church History*, Torrey's, iv, 598). He was invited to Mans, where Hildebert, the bishop, favored him at first; but his preaching soon excited the people against the priests to such a degree that even the monasteries were threatened with violence. Hilbebert drove him from Mans; and, after various wanderings, he joined the disciples of Peter of Bruys, in Provence. The archbishop of Arles arrested him, and at the second Council of Pisa, 1134, he was declared a heretic, and confined in a cell. "Subsequently, however, he was set at liberty, when he betook himself again to South France, to the districts of Toulouse and Alby, a principal seat of anti-churchly tendencies, where also the great lords, who were striving to make themselves independent, favored these tendencies from hatred to the dominion of the clergy. Among the lower classes and the nobles Henry found great acceptance; and, after he had labored for ten years in those regions, Bernard of Clairvaux, in writing to a nobleman and inviting him to put down the heretics, could say, 'The churches are without flocks, the flocks without priests, the priests are nowhere treated with due reverence, the churches are levelled down to synagogues, the sacraments are not esteemed holy, the festivals are no longer celebrated.' When Bernard says, in the words just quoted, that the communities are without priests, he means the priests had gone over to the Henricians, for so he complains in a sermon, in which he speaks of the rapid spread of this sect: 'Women forsake their husbands, and husbands their wives, and run over to this sect. Clergymen and priests desert their communities and churches; and they have been found sitting with long beards (to mark the *habitus apostolicus*) among weavers'" (Neander, *l. c.*). Bernard of Clairvaux opposed him earnestly. Pope Eugene III sent Bernard, with the cardinal of Ostia, into the infected district. Henry was arrested, and condemned at the Council of Rheims, A.D. 1148, to imprisonment for life. He died in prison A.D. 1149. See Basnage, *Hist. des Églises Réformées*, iv, ch. vi, p. 145; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iv, 601 sq.; Neander, *Heilige Bernard*, p. 294 sq.; Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer*, cent. xii; Gieseler, *Church History*, period iii, § 84.

Henry of St. Ignatius, a Flemish theologian, was born at Ath in the 17th century. He joined the Carmelites of his native city, and for many years taught theology in their schools. During a journey he made to Rome in 1701-1709, he acquired great influence with pope Clement XI. On his return he wrote a number of books of Jansenist tendency, and in which he showed himself especially severe on the Jesuit casuists. He died about 1720. The most important of his writings are, *Theologia vetus, fundamentalis* (Liege, 1677, fol.):—*Molinismus profligatus* (Liege, 1715, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Artes Jesuiticæ* (Strasb. 3d ed. 1710; 4th ed. 1717, 12mo):—*Tuba magna mirum clangens sonum, ad SS. D. N. papam Clementem XI, etc. . . , de necessitate reformandi Soc. Jesu* (Strasb. [Utrecht] 1717, 2 vols. 12mo). See Dupin, *Bibl. des Auteurs Ecclés.* pt. i; Richard et Giraud, *Bibl. Sacrée;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 154.

Henry of Zütphen. See Moller.

Henry IV, king of France and Navarre, son of Antoine de Bourbon and Jeanne d'Albret, was born at Pau, in Béarn, Dec. 15, 1553. He was carefully educated in Protestant principles by his excellent mother, who recalled him to her home at Pau from the French court in 1566. In 1569 he joined the Huguenot army at La Rochelle, and was acknowledged as their leader, the actual command, however, being left with Coligni (q. v.). The peace of St. Germain (1570) allowed him to return to court, and in 1572 he married Margaret, sister of Charles IX. The massacre of St. Bartholomew followed soon after, and Henry's life was only spared on that awful night on his promise to become a Roman Catholic. During the next three years he was watched as a prisoner, though not in confinement. In 1576 he again took the field as the head of the Huguenots; and, after years of alternate victory and defeat, he made peace with Henry III, whose death in 1589 made him, in right of the Salic law, king of France. A large part of the nation, however, was too strongly Roman Catholic to allow his accession to the throne in peace. The "League" made the duke of Maine lieutenant general of the kingdom; but in 1590 the battle of Ivry, between the duke and Henry, ended in a grand victory for the latter. In 1593 Henry agreed to become a Roman Catholic, and publicly recanted at St. Denis. By the year 1598 all France was peaceably subject to him. "Henry was censured for his change of religion, and by none more earnestly than by his faithful friend and counsellor, Duplessis Mornay. On the other hand, many of the Roman Catholics never believed his conversion to be sincere. But the truth probably was, that Henry, accustomed from his infancy to the life of camps and the hurry of dissipation, was not capable of serious religious meditation, and that he knew as little of the religion which he forsook as of that which he embraced. In his long conference at Chartres in September, 1593, with Duplessis Mornay, which took place after his abjuration, he told his friend that the step he had taken was one not only of prudence, but of absolute necessity; that his affections remained the same towards his friends and subjects of the Reformed communion; and he expressed a hope that he should one day be able to bring about a union between the two religions, which, he observed, differed less in essentials than was supposed. To this Duplessis replied that no such union could ever be effected in France unless the pope's power was first entirely abolished (*Mém. et Correspondance de Duplessis Mornay depuis l'an* 1571 *jusqu'en* 1623, Paris, 1824-34)" (*English Cyclopædia*, s. v.).

His reign was a very successful one, but we are concerned here only with its relations to the Church. On the 15th of April, 1598, Henry signed the Edict of Nantes (q. v.) to secure justice to his Protestant subjects, and liberty of conscience. During Henry's life no public persecution of Protestants was possible, but the ignorant intolerance of the rural functionaries and priests often frustrated his good wishes and commands. On the 14th of May, 1610, he was assassinated in his carriage by one Ravaillac, supposed to have been a tool of the Jesuits.

Henry VIII, king of England, was born in Greenwich June 28, 1491. He was second son of Henry VII and queen Elizabeth (of York). His elder brother Arthur, prince of Wales, dying in 1502, Henry became heir-apparent. In 1503 a dispensation was obtained from Julius II (pope) to allow Henry to marry his brother Arthur's widow (Catharine of Aragon)—a match which turned out sadly enough. Henry came to the throne April 22, 1509. The early years of his reign were comparatively uneventful. Wolsey became prime minister about 1513, and governed, for about fifteen years, with a view to his own ambition as well as to the passions of his master; but, on the whole, England prospered under his administration. See Wolsey. Henry was at this time an ardent advocate of Roman views; in 1521 he published his *Adsertio septem Sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum* (4to), for which service

the pope conferred on him the title of *Defensor Fidei*, which the sovereigns of England still retain. (See, for details of the controversy between Henry and Luther, Waddington, *History of the Reformation*, ch. xxi.) In a few years Henry began to grow weary of his queen. His male children died, and he fancied that Providence punished him in this way for having contracted an unlawful marriage with his brother's widow. The question of the legitimacy of this marriage had never been fully settled, even by the pope's authorization. At all events, it was easy for a prince of Henry's temperament to believe that the marriage was unlawful, when such a belief was necessary to the gratification of his passions. Moreover, the Spanish queen was unpopular in England. Henry had recourse to an expedient suggested by Cranmer, "namely, to consult all the universities of Europe on the question 'whether the papal dispensation for such a marriage was valid,' and to act on their decision without further appeal to the pope. The question was accordingly put, and decided in the negative by the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Bologna, Padua, Orleans, Angiers, Bourges, Toulouse, etc., and by a multitude of theologians and canonists" (Palmer, *Ch. History*, p. 159). Henry had clearly made up his mind to marry Anne Boleyn as soon as the divorce from Catharine could be accomplished. "Anne was understood to be favorably disposed towards those new views on the subject of religion and ecclesiastical affairs which had been agitating all Europe ever since Luther had begun his intrepid career by publicly opposing indulgences at Wittenberg ten years before. Queen Catharine, on the other hand, was a good Catholic; and, besides, the circumstances in which she was placed made it her interest to take her stand by the Church, as, on the other hand, her adversaries were driven in like manner by their interests and the course of events into dissent and opposition. This one consideration sufficiently explains all that followed. The friends of the old religion generally considered Catharine's cause as their own; the Reformers as naturally arrayed themselves on the side of her rival. Henry himself again, though he had been till now resolutely opposed to the new opinions, was carried over by his passion toward the same side; the consequence of which was the loss of the royal favor by those who had hitherto monopolized it, and its transference in great part to other men, to be employed by them in the promotion of entirely opposite purposes and politics. The proceedings for the divorce were commenced by an application to the court of Rome in August, 1527. For two years the affair lingered on through a succession of legal proceedings, but without any decisive result. From the autumn of 1529 are to be dated both the fall of Wolsey and the rise of Cranmer. See CRANMER, THOMAS. The death of the great cardinal took place on the 29th of November, 1530. In January following the first blow was struck at the Church by an indictment being brought into the King's Bench against all the clergy of the kingdom for supporting Wolsey in the exercise of his legatine powers without the royal license, as required by the old statutes of *provisors* and *premunire;* and it was in an act passed immediately after by the Convocation of the province of Canterbury, for granting to the king a sum of money to exempt them from the penalties of their conviction on this indictment, that the first movement was made toward a revolt against the see of Rome, by the titles given to Henry of 'the one protector of the English Church, its only and supreme lord, and, as far as might be by the law of Christ, its supreme head.' Shortly after, the convocation declared the king's marriage with Catharine to be contrary to the law of God. The same year Henry went the length of openly countenancing Protestantism abroad by remitting a subsidy to the confederacy of the elector of Brandenburg and other German princes, called the League of Smalcald. In August, 1532, Cranmer was appointed to the archbishopric of Canterbury. In the beginning of the year 1533 Henry was privately married to Anne Boleyn; and on the 23d of May following archbishop Cranmer pronounced the former marriage with Catharine void. In the mean time the Parliament had passed an act forbidding all appeals to the See of Rome. Pope Clement VII met this by annulling the sentence of Cranmer in the matter of the marriage, on which the separation from Rome became complete. Acts were passed by the Parliament the next year declaring that the clergy should in future be assembled in convocation only by the king's writ, that no constitutions enacted by them should be of force without the king's assent, and that no first-fruits, or Peter's pence, or money for dispensations, should be any longer paid to the pope. The clergy of the province of York themselves in convocation declared that the pope had no more power in England than any other bishop. A new and most efficient supporter of the Reformation now also becomes conspicuous on the scene, Thomas Cromwell (afterwards lord Cromwell and earl of Essex), who was this year made first secretary of state, and then master of the rolls. See CROMWELL, THOMAS. In the next session, the Parliament, which reassembled in the end of this same year, passed acts declaring the king's highness to be supreme head of the Church of England, and to have authority to redress all errors, heresies, and abuses in the Church; and ordering first-fruits and tenths of all spiritual benefices to be paid to the king. After this, various persons were executed for refusing to acknowledge the king's supremacy; among others, two illustrious victims, the learned Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and the admirable Sir Thomas More. See FISHER, JOHN; MORE, THOMAS. In 1535 began the dissolution of the monasteries, under the zealous superintendence of Cromwell, constituted for that purpose visitor general of these establishments. Latimer and other friends of Cranmer and the Reformation were now also promoted to bishoprics; so that not only in matters of discipline and polity, but even of doctrine, the Church might be said to have separated itself from Rome. One of the last acts of the Parliament under which all these great innovations had been made was to petition the king that a new translation of the Scriptures might be made by authority and set up in churches. It was dissolved on the 18th of July, 1536, after having sat for the then unprecedented period of six years. The month of May of this year witnessed the trial and execution of queen Anne—in less than six months after the death of her predecessor, Catharine of Aragon—and the marriage of the brutal king, the very next morning, to Jane Seymour, the new beauty, his passion for whom must be regarded as the true motive that had impelled him to the deed of blood. Queen Jane dying on the 14th of October, 1537, a few days after giving birth to a son, was succeeded by Anne, sister of the duke of Cleves, whom Henry married in January, 1540, and put away in six months after—the subservient Parliament, and the not less subservient convocation of the clergy, on his mere request, pronouncing the marriage to be null, and the former body making it high treason 'by word or deed to accept, take, judge, or believe the said marriage to be good.' Meanwhile the ecclesiastical changes continued to proceed at as rapid a rate as ever. In 1536 Cromwell was constituted a sort of lord lieutenant over the Church, by the title of vicar general, which was held to invest him with all the king's authority over the spirituality. The dissolution of the monasteries in this and the following year, as carried forward under the direction of this energetic minister, produced a succession of popular insurrections in different parts of the kingdom, which were not put down without great destruction of life, both in the field and afterwards by the executioner. In 1538 all incumbents were ordered to set up in their churches copies of the newly-published English translation of the Bible, and to teach the people the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, in English; the famous image of our Lady at Walsingham, and other similar objects

of the popular veneration, were also under Cromwell's order, removed from their shrines and burnt" (*English Cyclopædia*, s. v.).

But Henry never abandoned the special Romanist opinions to which he had committed himself personally by controversy. "When, in 1538, the princes of the League of Smalcald offered to place him at its head, and even to alter, if possible, the Augsburg Confession so as to make it a common basis of union for all the elements of opposition to Rome, Henry was well inclined to obtain the political advantages of the position tendered him, but hesitated to accept it until all doctrinal questions should be settled. The three points on which the Germans insisted were the communion in both elements, the worship in the vulgar tongue, and the marriage of the clergy. Henry was firm, and the ambassadors of the League spent two months in conferences with the English bishops and doctors without result. On their departure (Aug. 5, 1538) they addressed him a letter arguing the subjects in debate—the refusal of the cup, private masses, and sacerdotal celibacy—to which Henry replied at some length, defending his position on these topics with no little skill and dexterity, and refusing his assent finally. The Reformers, however, did not yet despair, and the royal preachers even ventured occasionally to debate the propriety of clerical marriage freely before him in their sermons, but in vain. An epistle which Melancthon addressed him in April, 1539, arguing the same questions again, had no better effect. Notwithstanding any seeming hesitation, Henry's mind was fully made up, and the consequences of endeavoring to persuade him against his prejudices soon became apparent. Confirmed in his opinions, he proceeded to enforce them upon his subjects in the most arbitrary manner; 'for, though on all other points he had set up the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession,' yet on these he had committed himself as a controversialist, and the worst passions of polemical authorship—the true 'odium theologicum'—acting through his irresponsible disposition, rendered him the cruellest of persecutors. But a few weeks after receiving the letter of Melancthon, he answered it in his own savage fashion" (Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 481). In 1539, under the ascendency of bishop Gardner (q. v.), the "Six Articles" were enacted, in favor of transubstantiation, communion in one kind, celibacy, private masses, and auricular confession. See ARTICLES, SIX, vol. i, p. 442. Cromwell endeavored to mitigate the severity of the government in its cruel persecutions of all who would not accept these articles, and lost his own head for his temerity in 1540. In the same year Henry was divorced from Anne of Cleves and married to Catharine Howard, who, in 1541, was herself repudiated and executed for adultery. He then married his sixth wife, Catharine Parr, who survived him. The licentious monarch died Jan. 28, 1547.

Much has been made by Roman Catholic controvertists of the bad life of Henry VIII as an argument against the Reformation. On this point we cite Palmer, as follows: "The character of Henry VIII, or of any other temporal or spiritual promoters of reformation in the Church, affords (even if it were not exaggerated) no proof that the Reformation was in itself wrong. Admitting, then, that Henry and others were justly accused of crimes, the Reformation which they promoted may in itself have been a just and necessary work; and it would have been irrational and wrong in the Church of England to have refused all consideration of subjects proposed to her examination or approbation by the royal authority, and to refuse her sanction to reforms in themselves laudable, merely because the character of the king or his ministers were unsaintly, and his or their private motives suspected to be wrong. Such conduct on the part of the Church would have been needlessly offensive to temporal rulers, while it would (in the supposed case) have been actually injurious to the cause of religion, and an uncharitable judgment of private motives. It must be remembered that although Henry and the protector Somerset may have been secretly influenced by avarice, revenge, or other evil passions, they have never made them public. They avowed as their reasons for supporting reformation the desire of removing usurpations, establishing the ancient rights of the Church and the crown, correcting various abuses prejudicial to true religion, and therefore the Church could not refuse to take into consideration the specific object of reformation proposed by them to her examination or sanction. Nor does the justification of the Church of England in any degree depend on the question of the lawfulness of Henry's marriage with Catharine of Aragon or with Anne Boleyn; such matters, as Bossuet observes, "are often regulated by mere probabilities," and there were at least abundant probabilities that the marriage with Catharine was null ab initio; but this whole question only affects the character of Henry VIII and of those immediately engaged in it; it does not affect the reformation of the Church of England" (Palmer, *On the Church*, part ii, chap. i). See ENGLAND, CHURCH OF.

Henry, Matthew, a celebrated English nonconformist divine and commentator, was born at the farmhouse of Broad Oak, Flintshire, the dwelling of his maternal grandfather, Oct. 18, 1662. His parents had retired to that place because his father, Rev. Philip Henry (q. v.), had been ejected from his parish by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. His early education was obtained in the school of Mr. Doolittle at Islington. In 1685 he entered Gray's Inn as a student of law; but his religious life had been settled at an early age, and his bent of mind was towards the ministry. While at Gray's Inn he devoted much of his time to theological studies. In 1686 he returned to Broad Oak, and soon began to preach, by the invitation of his friend, Mr. Illidge, at Nantwich. The fame of his discourses having spread, he was invited to Chester, where he preached in the house of a Mr. Henthorne, a sugar-baker, to a small audience which formed the nucleus of his future congregation. But in 1687 king James granted license to dissenters to preach. Mr. Henry accepted a call to a dissenting congregation in Chester, where he remained twenty-five years. During this period he went through the Bible more than once in expository lectures. In 1712 he accepted the charge of a chapel in Hackney, London. "At the commencement of his ministry, therefore, he began with the first chapter of Genesis in the forenoon, and the first chapter of Matthew in the afternoon. Thus gradually and steadily grew his 'Exposition' of the Bible. A large portion of it consists of his public lectures, while many of the quaint sayings and pithy remarks with which it abounds, and which give so great a charm of raciness to its pages, were the familiar extempore observations of his father at family worship, and noted down by Matthew in his boyhood." He suffered much from the stone in his later years, but his labors continued unabated. It was his habit to make a visit to Chester once a year. In 1714 he set out on this journey, May 31. On his return he was taken ill with paralysis at Nantwich, where he said to his friend, Mr. Illidge, "*You have been used to take notice of the sayings of dying men; this is mine: that a life spent in the service of God, and communion with him, is the most pleasant life that any one can live in this world.*" He died June 22, 1714. Mr. Henry was a faithful pastor, a discriminating preacher, and a laborious, versatile, and original author. "Although his publications furnish much less to afford gratification, in a literary point of view, than do the works of many who are justly designated 'fine writers,' they possess a vigor which, without the least endeavor to attract, awakens and sustains the attention in an uncommon degree. In a single sentence he often pours upon Scripture a flood of light; and the palpableness he gives to the wonders contained in God's law occasions excitement not unlike that which is produced by looking through a microscope. The feelings, too, which his

subject had called forth in himself he communicates admirably to others. In his whole manner—the same at nine years old as at fifty—there is a freshness and vivacity which instantly put the spirits into free and agile motion—an effect somewhat similar to that play of intellectual sprightliness which *some* minds (obviously the greatest only) have the indescribable faculty of creating. But the crowning excellency remains; nothing is introduced in the shape of counteraction. There are no speeches which make his sincerity questionable; no absurdities to force suspicion as to accuracy in theological knowledge, or inattention to the analogy of faith; no staggering, and untoward, and unmanageable inconsistencies; nothing by which 'the most sacred cause can be injured;' or the highest interests of men placed in jeopardy; or which can render it imperative, exactly in proportion as the understanding is influenced, to repress or extinguish the sentiments, 'in order to listen with complacency to the Lord Jesus and his apostles'" (Foster, *Essays*, p. 440). His most important work is *An Exposition of the Old and New Testament* (many editions; best, London, 1849, 6 vols. 4to; New York, 6 vols. imp. 8vo). It was completed by Henry up to Acts; the rest was framed on his MSS. by a number of ministers. It is a popular rather than a scientific commentary, abounding in practical wisdom; and it has been more widely circulated than any work of the kind, except, perhaps, Clarke's Commentary. He also published a *Life of Philip Henry*, and a number of sermons and practical writings, which may be found in his *Miscellaneous Works*, edited by J. B. Williams (Lond. 1830, imp. 8vo; N.Y. 1850, 2 vols. 8vo). See Williams, *Life and Writings of M. Henry* (prefixed to his *Miscel. Works*); Tong, *Life of M. Henry* (1716, 8vo; also reprinted with the *Exposition*); Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 824; *Literary and Theological Review*, i, 281; Kitto's *Journal of Sacred Lit.* ii, 222; Bogue and Bennett, *History of the Dissenters*, i, 493.

Henry, Paul Emile, a Protestant writer, was born at Potsdam March 22, 1792. He was of French extraction, and studied at the French College in Berlin. He afterwards devoted himself to the study of Hebrew. He was consecrated minister at Neufchatel in 1813, visited Paris in 1814, during the occupation of the city by the Allies. Having returned to Berlin, he was appointed catechist of the Orphan Asylum, pastor of the church of Frederickstadt in 1826, and director of the French Seminary. He died at Berlin Nov. 24, 1853. He wrote *Das Leben Johann Calvin's* (Berlin, 1844; Hamb. 1835–44, 3 vols. 8vo; 1846, 8vo; transl. by Stebbing, *Life and Times of Calvin*, Lond. 1849, 2 vols. 8vo). He published also a German translation of the Confession of Faith of the French Reformed Church (Berlin, 1845). He intended publishing a collection of Calvin's letters as a continuation of the Life of that reformer, but died before it was completed. See Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 225.

Henry, Philip, an English dissenting divine, was born Aug. 24, 1631, at the palace of Whitehall, where his father was page to James, duke of York. He was educated at Westminster School, and at Christ Church, Oxford, where he obtained a studentship in 1648. He was ordained as a Presbyterian minister in 1657, and settled at Worthenbury, Flintshire. He married Miss Mathews, a lady of fortune, and became possessed of the estate of Broad Oak, Shropshire. He was driven out of his church by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. "Our sins," he said, "have made Bartholomew-day, in the year 1662, the saddest day for England since the death of Edward the Sixth, but even this for good." By the Conventicle and Five-mile acts he was driven from his house, and compelled to seek safety in concealment. In 1687, when king James proclaimed liberty of conscience, Mr. Henry immediately fitted up part of his own house for worship. His labors were not confined to Broad Oak, but it was his habit to preach daily at different places in the neighborhood. But his labors hastened his rest; for, when writing to a friend who anxiously inquired after his health, he says, "I am always habitually weary, and expect no other till I lie down in the bed of spices." He died June 24, 1696, exclaiming, "O death, where is thy sting?" An account of his *Life and Death* was written by his son Matthew, and has often been reprinted (see Henry, *Miscellaneous Works*, vol. i; N. York, Carters. 1855, 2 vols. 8vo). A volume of his *Sermons*, with notes by Williams, was first published in 1816 (London, 8vo), and has since been reprinted in the *Miscellaneous Works* of Mr. Henry, above cited. See *Life* by Matt. Henry; Jones, *Christian Biography;* Bogue and Bennett, *History of the Dissenters*, i, 433.

Henry, Thomas Charlton, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia Sept. 22, 1790, and educated at Middlebury College, Vt., where he graduated in 1814. After studying theology at Princeton, he was ordained in 1816; became pastor of a Presbyterian church in Columbia, S. C., 1818; and removed to the Second Church, Charleston, in 1824. In 1826 his health failed, and he spent several months travelling in Europe. He died in Charleston of yellow fever, Oct. 4, 1827. He published *A Plea for the West* (1824):—*An Inquiry into the Consistency of Popular Amusements with Christianity* (Charleston, 1825, 12mo):—*Etchings from the Religious World* (Charleston, 1828, 8vo):—*Letters to an Anxious Inquirer* (1828, 12mo; also London, 1829, with a memoir of the author).—Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 826; Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 538.

Henschenius, Godfrey, a Dutch Jesuit and ecclesiastical historian, was born at Venrai, Flanders, Jan. 21, 1601. In 1635 he was appointed assistant to Bollandus in compiling the *Acta Sanctorum* (q. v.). After the death of Bollandus in 1665, when only five volumes of that work had made their appearance, father Daniel Papebroch was associated with Henschenius in the task of completing it. Henschenius continued the work until his death in 1681.—Alegambe, *Script. Soc. Jesu*, s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 231.

Henshaw, John K., D.D, a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Middletown, Conn., June 13, 1792, and passed A.B. in Middlebury College in 1808. He was bred a Congregationalist, but, under the influence of Rev. Dr. Kewley, then of Middletown, he became religious, and entered the Protestant Episcopal Church. Bishop Griswold appointed him a lay reader, and by his zealous labors several congregations were established in different parts of Vermont. On his twenty-first birthday he was ordained deacon, and soon after he was called to St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., where, on his twenty-fourth birth-day (June 13, 1816), he was ordained priest. In 1817 he was called to St. Peter's, Baltimore, where he served as pastor with uninterrupted success for twenty-six years. In 1830 the degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Middlebury College. In 1843 he was elected bishop of Rhode Island, and made rector of Grace Church, Providence. He was alike energetic and successful in his parish and in his diocese, and during his administration the Church grew not only in numbers, but in power. In 1852 he was called to perform episcopal functions in the diocese of Maryland during bishop Whittingham's absence; and on the 19th of July, 1852, he died of apoplexy, near Frederick, Maryland. Bishop Henshaw was a man of clear, sound, and vigorous intellect: he was trained to patient labor, and his moral power was very great indeed. These qualities fitted him eminently for his work, and both within and without the Church he was recognised as in every way worthy to exercise the high functions of a Christian bishop. He published several *Sermons, Charges, and Discourses:*—*An Oration delivered before the Associated Alumni of Middlebury College* (1827):—A volume of *Hymns* (1832):—*The Usefulness of Sunday Schools:*—*Henshaw's Sheridan* (1834):—*The*

ology for the People of Baltimore (1840, 8vo):—*Memoir of Right Rev. Richard Channing Moore, D.D.* (1842):—*An Inquiry concerning the Second Advent* (1842). See Sprague, *Annals*, v, 545; *Church Review*, v, 397.

He'pha (Heb. *Cheyphah'*, חֵיפָה, in the Talmud, Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 197; mentioned by several ancient writers [Reland, *Palæst.* p. 699] as lying on the Phœnician coast of Palestine; the *Sycaminos* of the *Onomast.*, the Jerusalem Itin., and Josephus [*Ant.* xiii, 12, 3]), the modern *Haifa*, a place of considerable trade at the foot of Carmel, on the bay of Acre (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 194), with the ruins of Sycaminos 1½ mile north-west of the present town (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 320).

He'pher (Heb. *Che'pher*, חֵפֶר, a *well*, or *shame*: Sept. Ὀφέρ or Ὄφερ, Ἔφερ and Ἀφέρ, but Ἡφάλ in 1 Chron. i, 6), the name of a city and of three men. See also GATH-HEPHER.

1. A royal city of the Canaanites captured by Joshua (Josh. xii, 17); probably the same district as "the land of Hepher," in the vicinity of Sochoh and Aruboth, assigned to Ben-Hesed, one of Solomon's table-purveyors (1 Kings iv, 10). The locality thus indicated would seem to be in the vicinity of *Um-Burj*, south of Suweicheh.

2. The youngest son of Gilead, and great-grandson of Manasseh (Numb. xxvi, 32). He was the father of Zelophehad (Numb. xxvii, 1; Josh. xvii, 2, 3), and his descendants are called HEPHERITES (Numb. xxvi, 32). B.C. ante 1618.

3. The second son of Ashur (a descendant of Judah) by one of his wives, Naarah (1 Chron. iv, 6). B.C. cir. 1612.

4. A Mecherathite, one of David's heroes, according to 1 Chron. xi, 36; but the text is apparently corrupt, so that this name is either an interpolation, or identical with the ELIPHALET of 2 Sam. xxiii, 34. See UR.

He'pherite (Heb. *Chephri'*, חֶפְרִי, Sept. Ὀφερί), a descendant of HEPHER 2 (Numb. xxvi, 32).

Heph'zi-bah (Heb. *Chephtsi-bâh'*, חֶפְצִי־בָהּ, *my delight* is *in her*), a (fem.) real and also symbolical name.

1. (Sept. Ἑψιβά, Vulg. *Haphsiba.*) The mother of king Manasseh, and consequently queen dowager of king Hezekiah (2 Kings xxi, 1). Notwithstanding the piety of her husband, and her own amiable name, her irreligion may be inferred from the character of her son. B.C. 709-696.

2. (Sept. Θέλημα ἐμόν, Vulg. *Voluntas mea in ea.*) A figurative title ascribed to Zion in token of Jehovah's favor (in the return from the Captivity, and especially in the Messiah's advent), in contrast with her predicted desolation (Isa. lxii, 4).

Heraclas, SAINT, patriarch of Alexandria, was a brother of Plutarch, who was martyred about A.D. 204, under Septimius Severus. They had both been heathen, but were converted by Origen, who was then teaching at Alexandria. After escaping from the persecution to which his brother fell victim, Heraclas became an ascetic, but still continued to study Greek philosophy under Ammonius Saccas. He was next associated with Origen as a catechist, and when the latter was compelled to leave Egypt on account of his difficulty with Demetrius of Alexandria, Heraclas remained alone in charge of the theological school of that city. He retained this position until he became himself patriarch. He died in 246. The Roman martyrology commemorates him on the 14th of July. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi, 15; Tillemont, *Mémoires Ecclés.* vol. iii; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, July 14th.

Heracleon. See HERACLEONITES.

Heracleonites, a Gnostic sect of the 2d century, so named from Heracleon (a disciple of Valentinus), who was distinguished for his scientific bent of mind. "He wrote a commentary on the Gospel of St. John, considerable fragments of which have been preserved by Origen; perhaps also a commentary on the Gospel according to Luke. Of the latter, a single fragment only, the exposition of Luke xii, 8, has been preserved by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iv, 503). It may easily be conceived that the spiritual depth and fulness of John must have been pre-eminently attractive to the Gnostics. To the exposition of this gospel Heracleon brought a profound religious sense, which penetrated to the inward meaning, together with an understanding invariably clear when not led astray by theosophic speculation. But what he chiefly lacked was a faculty to appreciate the simplicity of John, and earnest application to those necessary means for evolving the spirit out of the letter, the deficiency in which among the Gnostics generally has already been made a subject of remark. Heracleon honestly intended, indeed, so far as we can see, to derive his theology from John. But he was entirely warped by his system; and with all his habits of thought and contemplation, so entangled in its mesh-work that he could not move out of it with freedom, but, spite of himself, implied its views and its ideas in the Scriptures, which he regarded as the fountain of divine wisdom" (Neander). His fragments are gathered in Grabe, *Spicilegium*, ii, 83. See Neander, *Ch. History*, i, 434; Mosheim, *Comm.* i, 472; Lardner, *Works*, ii, 256; and the article GNOSTICS.

Heraclēs. See HERCULES.

Heraclītus (Ἡράκλειτος), a philosopher of Ephesus, flourished about B.C. 500. He belonged to the Ionian school. "He was a profound thinker, of an inquisitive spirit, and the founder of a sect called after him, which had considerable reputation and influence. His humor was melancholy and sarcastic, which he indulged at the expense of the democracy established in his native town, and with which he was disgusted. The knowledge he had acquired of the systems of preceding philosophers (vying with one another in boldness), of Thales, Pythagoras, and Xenophanes, created in him a habit of scepticism of which he afterwards cured himself. The result of his meditations was committed to a volume (Περὶ φύσεως), the obscurity of which procured for him the appellation of σκοτεινός. He also made it his object to discover an elemental principle; but either because his views were different, or from a desire to oppose himself to the Eleatæ, he assumed it to be *fire*, because the most subtle and active of the elements" (Tennemann, *Manual History of Philosophy*, § 102).

"According to Heraclitus, the end of wisdom is to discover the ground and principle of all things. This principle, which is an eternal, ever-living unity, and pervades and is in all phenomena, he called *fire*. By this term Heraclitus understood, not the elemental fire or flame, which he held to be the excess of fire, but a warm and dry vapor; which therefore, as air, is not distinct from the soul or vital energy, and which, as guiding and directing the mundane development, is endued with wisdom and intelligence. This supreme and perfect force of life is obviously without limit to its activity; consequently, nothing that it forms can remain fixed; all is constantly in a process of formation. This he has thus figuratively expressed: 'No one has ever been twice on the same stream.' Nay, the passenger himself is without identity: 'On the same stream we do and we do not embark; for we are and we are not.' The vitality of the rational fire has in it a tendency to contraries, whereby it is made to pass from gratification to want, and from want to gratification, and in fixed periods it alternates between a swifter and a slower flux. Now these opposite tendencies meet together in determinate order, and by the inequality or equality of the forces occasion the phenomena of life and death. The quietude of death, however, is a mere semblance which exists only for the senses of man. For man in his folly forms a truth of his own, whereas it is only the universal reason that is really cognizant of the truth. Lastly, the rational principle which governs the whole moral

and physical world is also the law of the individual; whatever, therefore, is, is the wisest and the best; and 'it is not for man's welfare that his wishes should be fulfilled; sickness makes health pleasant, as hunger does gratification, and labor rest.' The physical doctrines of Heraclitus formed no inconsiderable portion of the eclectical system of the later Stoics, and in times still more recent there is much in the theories of Schelling and Hegel that presents a striking though general resemblance thereto." Hegel declared that the doctrine of Heraclitus, that all things are "perpetual flux and reflux," was an anticipation of his own dogma, "Being is the same with non-being." "The fragments of Heraclitus have been collected from Plutarch, Stobæus, Clemens of Alexandria, and Sextus Empiricus, and explained by Schleiermacher in Wolf and Buttmann's *Museum der Alterthumswissenschaft*, vol. i" (*English Cyclopædia*). Professor Bernays, of Bonn, gathered from Hippocrates a series of quotations from Heraclitus, and published them under the title *Heraclitea* (1848). The *Epistles* which bear the name of Heraclitus are spurious; they are given, with valuable notes and dissertations, in *Die Heraclitischen Briefe, ein Beitrag z. philos. u. relig. Lit.* (Berl. 1869). See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Lewes, *Hist. of Philos.* 1867, i, 65 sq.; Lassalle, *Die Philosophie d. Herakleitos* (Berlin, 1858).

Heraclius. See MONOTHELITE.

Herald only occurs in Dan. iii, 4; the term there used (כָּרוֹז, *karôz*) is connected etymologically (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 712) with the Greek *κηρύσσω* and *κράζω*, and with our "cry." There is an evident allusion to the office of the herald in the expressions *κηρύσσω*, *κήρυξ*, and *κήρυγμα*, which are frequent in the N. T., and which are but inadequately rendered by "preach," etc. The term "herald" might be substituted in 1 Tim. ii, 7; 2 Tim. i, 11; 2 Pet. ii, 5, as there is evidently in these passages an allusion to the Grecian games (q. v.).

Herb is the rendering of the following terms in the Auth. Vers. of the Bible: usually עֵשֶׂב, *e'seb*, any *green plant* or *herbage* collectively, often rendered "grass;" applied generally to annual plants without woody stems, growing in the fields (Gen. ii, 5; iii, 18; Exod. ix, 22; x, 12, 15) and on mountains (Isa. xlii, 15; Prov. xxvii, 25), growing up and setting seed (Gen. i, 11, 12, 29), and serving as food for man (Gen. i, 30; iii, 18; Psa. civ, 14) and for beast (Deut. xi, 15; Psa. cvi, 20; Jer. xiv, 6; Dan. iv, 15, 23, 32, 33; v, 21); comprehending, therefore, *vegetables, greens*, and sometimes all *green herbage* (Amos vii, 1, 2). Men are said to "flourish as a *green herb*" (Psa. lxxii, 16; xcii, 7; Job v, 25); also *to wither* (Psa. cii, 4, 11). Hence, too, those seized with fear and turning pale (Gr. *χλωροί*) are compared to the *herb of the field* which grows yellow and withers (2 Kings xix, 26; Isa. xxxvii, 27). יָרָק, *yarak'*, properly signifies *green*, and is applied to any green thing, verdure, foliage of fields and trees (2 Kings xix, 26; Isa. xxxvii, 27; xv, 6, Exod. x, 15; Numb. xxii, 4; Psa. xxxvii, 2; Gen. i, 30; ix, 3); specially *a plant, herb* (Deut. xi, 10; 1 Kings xxi, 2); a portion *of herbs*, vegetables (Prov. xv, 17). דֶּשֶׁא, *de'shè*, and חָצִיר, *chatsîr'*, properly designate *grass*, the first when young and tender, the latter when grown and fit for mowing. See BOTANY.

אוֹר, *ôr* (lit. *light*), in the fem. אוֹרָה, *ôrâh'*, plural אוֹרוֹת, *ôrôth'*, "occurs in two passages of Scripture, where it is translated *herb* in the Auth. Vers.: it is generally supposed to indicate such plants as are employed for food. The most ancient translators seem, however, to have been at a loss for its meaning. Thus the Sept. in one passage (2 Kings iv, 39) has only the Heb. word in Greek characters, *ἀριώθ*, and in the other (Isa. xxvi, 19) *ἴαμα*, *healing*. The Vulg., and the Chaldee and Syriac versions, translate *oroth* in the latter passage by *light*, in consequence of confounding one Heb. word with another, according to Celsius (*Hierobot.* i, 459). Rosenmüller says that *oroth* occurs in its original and generic signification in Isa. xxvi, 19, viz. *green herbs*. The future restoration of the Hebrew people is there announced under the type and figure of a revival of the dead. '*Thy dew is a dew of green herbs*,' says the prophet, i. e. as by the dew green herbs are revived, so shalt thou, being revived by God's strengthening power, flourish again. The other passage, however, appears an obscure one with respect to the meaning of *oroth*. Celsius has, with his usual learning, shown that mallows were much employed as food in ancient times. Of this there can be no doubt, but there is no proof adduced that *oroth* means mallows; there are many other plants which were and still are employed as articles of diet in the East, as purslane, goosefoot, chenpodiums, lettuce, endive, etc. But *oroth* should be considered in conjunction with *pakyoth;* for we find in 2 Kings iv, 39, that when Elisha came again to Gilgal, and there was a dearth in the land, he said unto his servant, 'Set on the great pot, and seethe pottage for the sons of the prophets; and one went out into the field to gather *herbs* (*oroth*), and found a wild vine, and gathered thereof *wild gourds* (*pakyoth*) his lap full, and came and shred them into the pot of pottage, for they knew them not.' As *pakyoth* is universally acknowledged to be the *fruit* of one of the gourd tribe, so it is not unreasonable to conclude that *oroth* also was the fruit of some plant, for which the *pakyoth* had been mistaken. This may be admitted, as nothing better than conjecture has been adduced in support of other interpretations, and as there are fruits, such as that of the egg-plant, which are used as articles of diet, and for which the fruit of the *pakyoth*, or wild gourd, might have been mistaken by an ignorant person" (Kitto). But perhaps, as this was a time of great famine, the servant went out to gather any green vegetable likely to contribute towards the savoriness and nutritiousness of the broth, and his mistake may have arisen not so much from any resemblance between the *pakyoth* and any particular kind of *oroth* of which he was in quest, but rather from indiscriminately seizing whatever vegetable he met with, without knowing its noxious properties. Thus we may regard *oroth* in both passages as a general designation of esculent plants, in this case wild ones. See GOURD.

The "bitter herbs" (מְרֹרִים, *merorim'*) with which the Israelites were commanded to eat the Passover bread (Exod. ii, 8; Numb. ix, 11: the same Heb. word occurs also in Lam. iii, 15, "He hath filled me with bitterness, he hath made me drunken with wormwood") doubtless in general "included the various edible kinds of bitter plants, whether cultivated or wild, which the Israelites could with facility obtain in sufficient abundance to supply their number either in Egypt, where the first Passover was eaten, or in the deserts of the peninsula of Sinai, or in Palestine. The Mishna (*Pesachim.* c. 2, § 6) enumerates five kinds of bitter herbs—*chazereth*, *'ulshin*, *thamcah*, *charchabina*, and *maror*—which it was lawful to eat either green or dried. There is great difficulty in identifying the plants which these words respectively denote, but the reader may see the subject discussed by Bochart (*Hieroz.* i, 691, ed. Rosenmüller) and by Carpzovius (*Apparat. Hist. Crit.* p. 402). According to the testimony of Forskål, in Niebuhr's Preface to the *Description de l'Arabie* (p. xliv), the modern Jews of Arabia and Egypt eat lettuce, or, if this is not at hand, bugloss, with the Paschal lamb. The Greek word *πικρίς* is identified by Sprengel (*Hist. Rei Herb.* i, 100) with the *Helminthia echioides*, Lin., bristly helminthia (ox-tongue), a plant belonging to the chicory group. The *Picris* of botanists is a genus closely allied to the *Helminthia*. Aben Esra, in Celsius (*Hierob.* ii, 227), remarks that, according to the observations of a certain learned Spaniard, the ancient Egyptians always used to place different kinds of herbs upon the table, with mustard, and that they dipped morsels of bread into this salad. That the Jews derived this custom of eating herbs with their meat from the Egyptians is extremely probable, for it is easy to see how, on the

one hand, the bitter-herb salad should remind the Jews of the bitterness of their bondage (Exod. i, 14), and, on the other hand, how it should also bring to their remembrance their merciful deliverance from it. It is curious to observe, in connection with the remarks of Aben Esra, the custom, for such it appears to have been, of dipping a morsel of bread into *the* dish (τὸ τρυβλίον) which prevailed in our Lord's time. May not τὸ τρύβλιον be the salad-dish of bitter herbs, and τὸ ψωμίον the morsel of bread of which Aben Esra speaks? The *merôrim* may well be understood to denote various sorts of bitter plants, such particularly as belong to the *cruciferæ*, as some of the bitter cresses, or to the chicory group of the *compositæ*, the hawkweeds, and sow-thistles, and wild lettuces, which grow abundantly in the peninsula of Sinai, in Palestine, and in Egypt (Decaisne, *Florula Sinaica*, in *Annal. des Scienc. Nat.* 1834; Strand, *Flor. Palæst.* No. 445, etc.)" See BITTER HERBS.

Herbart, JOHANN FRIEDRICH, an eminent German philosopher, was born at Oldenburg May 4, 1776. He became professor of philosophy in the University of Göttingen in 1805, afterwards at Königsberg in 1809, and finally returned to Göttingen in 1833. He died there, Aug. 14, 1841. His most important works are: *Kurze Darstellung eines Planes z. philosoph. Vorlesungen* (Gött. 1804):—*De platonici systematis fundamento* (Gött. 1805):—*Allg. praktische Philosophie* (Götting. 1808):—*Hauptpunkte d. Metaphysik* (Gött. 1808):—*Lehrbuch z. Einleitung in d. Philos.* (Königsb. 1815; 4th ed. 1841):—*Lehrbuch d. Psychologie* (Königsb. 1816; 3d ed. 1834):—*Psychologie als Wissenschaft* (Königsb. 1824, 2 parts):—*Allg. Metaphysik* (Königsb. 1828, 2 parts; 2d ed. Halle, 1841):—*Gespräche ü. d. Böse* (Königsb. 1817):—*Encyk. d. Philosophie* (Königsb. 1831; 2d ed. 1841):—*Analytische Beleuchtung d. Naturrechtes u. d. Moral* (Götting. 1836):—*Zur Lehre von der Freiheit d. menschl. Willens* (Gött. 1836):—*Psychologische Untersuchungen* (Götting. 1839, 2 vols.). Herbart's philosophical essays and pamphlets were published by Hartenstein (Lpz. 1841–43, 3 vols.), who also published a complete collection of his works (*Sämmtliche Werke*, Lpz. 1850–52, 12 vols.).

Herbart was at first a Kantian, but afterwards, influenced by the study of ancient Greek philosophy, he created a philosophical system of his own, which is distinguished by ingenuity above all the other post-Kantian systems. "Although Herbart occasionally professes to be a follower of Kant, still he is of opinion that Kant's *Criticism of Pure Reason* is almost without any objective value, and that its method must be entirely abandoned if metaphysics are to be founded on a secure and permanent basis. Herbart's realistic tendency further reminds us of the monades of Leibnitz. Philosophy, according to Herbart, has not, like ordinary sciences, any particular set of subjects which are its province, but it consists in the manner and method in which any subject whatsoever is treated. The subjects themselves are supposed to be known, and are called by him 'notions' (Begriffe), so that philosophy is the methodical treatment and working out of those 'notions.' The different methods of treatment constitute the main departments of philosophy. The first of them is logic, which considers the nature and clearness of notions and their combinations. But the contemplation of the world and of ourselves brings before us notions which cause a discord in our thoughts. This circumstance renders it necessary for us to modify or change those notions according to the particular nature of each. By the process of modification or change something new is added, which Herbart calls the supplement or complement (Ergänzung). Now the second main department of philosophy is metaphysics, which Herbart defines to be the science of the supplementary notions. The method of discovering the supplementary notions which are necessary in order to render given facts which contain contradictory notions intelligible, is, according to him, the method of relations, and it is by this method alone that the other notions of the world and of ourselves can be properly defined. Hence arises what he calls practical metaphysics, which is subdivided into psychology, the philosophy of nature, and natural theology. A third class of notions, lastly, add something to our conceptions, which produces either pleasure or displeasure, and the science of these notions is æsthetics, which, when applied to given things, forms a series of theories of art, which may be termed practical sciences. They are founded upon certain model notions, such as the ideas of perfection, benevolence, malevolence, justice, compensation, equity, and the like. In his metaphysics Herbart points out three problems containing contradictions, viz. things with several attributes, change, and our own subjectivity (das Ich). In order to solve these contradictions, and to make the external and internal world agree and harmonize so as to become conceivable, he assumes that the quantity of everything existing (des Seienden) is absolutely simple. Things therefore which exist have no attributes referring to space and time, but they stand in relation to a something, which is the essence of things. Wherever this essence consists of a plurality of attributes there must also be a plurality of things or beings, and these many simple things or beings are the principles of all things in nature, and the latter, consequently, are nothing but aggregates of simple things. They exist by themselves in space so far as it is conceived by our intellect, but not in physical space, which contains only bodies. We do not know the real simple essence of things, but we may acquire a certain amount of knowledge concerning internal and external relations. When they accidentally meet in space they disturb one another, but at the same time strive to preserve themselves; and in this manner they manifest themselves as powers, although they neither are powers nor have powers. By means of these principles Herbart endeavors to reform the whole system of psychology which he found established by his predecessors; for, according to him, the soul, too, is a simple being, and as such it is and remains unknown to us; and it is neither a subject for speculation nor for experimental psychology. It never and nowhere has any plurality of attributes, nor has it any power or faculty of receiving or producing anything; and the various faculties usually mentioned by psychologists, such as imagination, reason, etc., which sometimes are at war and sometimes in concord with each other, are, according to Herbart, mere fictions of philosophers. In like manner he denies that it possesses certain forms of thought or laws regulating our desires and actions. The soul as a simple being, and in its accidental association with others, is like the latter subject to disturbance, and exerts itself for its own preservation. The latter point is the principal question in Herbart's psychology, and he endeavors to deduce and calculate the whole life of the soul, with the aid of mathematics, from those mutual disturbances, checks, and from its reactions against them. Hence he is obliged to deny man's moral or transcendental freedom, although he allows him a certain free character. He maintains the immortality of the soul, because the simple principles of all things are eternal; but he denies the possibility of acquiring any knowledge whatever of the Deity" (*English Cyclopædia*, s. v.). On the whole, it may be said that Herbart was a careful observer of psychological phenomena; but that speculation, in the proper sense, was not congenial to him. See also Thilo, *Die Wissenschaftlichkeit der mod. specul. Theologie*, etc. (Leipsic, 1851, 8vo); Tennemann, *Manual Hist. of Philosophy*, p. 462; Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy*, p. 482–489; Schwegler, *Epit. Hist. Phil.*, transl. by Seelye, p. 304 sq.; Hollenberg, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, xix, 630 sq.

Herbelot, BARTHOLOMEW D' (or D'HERBELOT), a distinguished French Orientalist, was born at Paris Dec. 4, 1625. He studied at the University of his native city, where he acquired a good knowledge of Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, Persian, and Turkish. He then visited Italy, in order to establish relations with the peo-

ple of the Oriental countries, of which there were a large number at Genoa, Leghorn, and Venice. At Rome he became acquainted with Lucas Holstenius and Leo Allatius, and was highly esteemed by the cardinals Barberini and Grimaldi, as well as by queen Christina of Sweden. On his return to France he received a pension of 1500 francs from Fouquet, and was afterwards appointed royal secretary and interpreter of Oriental languages at Paris. On a second journey to Italy in 1666, the grand duke of Tuscany, Ferdinand II, endeavored to persuade him to remain, and presented him with a number of Eastern MSS., but in vain. He returned to Paris, where Colbert granted him again a pension of 1500 francs, and Louis XIV appointed him professor of Syriac at the College of France, after the death of James d'Auvergne in 1692. Herbelot died Dec. 8, 1695. He wrote *Bibliothèque Orientale, ou dictionnaire universel contenant tout ce qui fait connaître les peuples de l'Orient*. It was published after his death by Ant. Galland (Paris, 1697, fol.; Maestricht, 1776, fol.; supplement, 1781, etc.; best ed. Par. 1782, 8vo). The title of this work gives a good idea of its character: it is a storehouse of whatever belongs to Oriental literature. The book, however, is merely a translation of passages, alphabetically arranged, from Hadji Khalfah's bibliographical dictionary, and of some hundred and fifty MSS. Herbelot did not take the trouble to compare their statements with those of other writers, so that it contains only the views of the Mohammedans on themselves and their neighbors. Yet it is a very useful work for students, and being the only one of its kind, is still highly considered. Désessarts has given a popular abridgment of it (Paris, 1782, 6 vols. 8vo); it was translated into German by Schultz (Halle, 1785-1790, 4 vols. roy. 8vo). Herbelot wrote also a catalogue of part of the MSS. contained in the Palatine Library at Florence, which was translated from Italian into Latin, and is to be found in Schellhorn's *Amœnitates litterariæ*. See Cousin, *Éloge de D'Herbelot* (in the *Journal des Savants*, Jan. 3d, 1696); Perrault, *Hommes illustres*, ii, 154-158; Goujet, *Mém. sur le Collége de France*, iii, 155-158; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 283. (J. N. P.)

Herbert, Edward (Lord Herbert of Cherbury), a distinguished English Deist, was born at Eyton, Shrewsbury, in 1581 or 1582. He was educated at Oxford, served with great credit in the war in the Netherlands, and on his return became one of the most accomplished gentlemen at the court of James I, who made him a knight of the Bath, and sent him minister to France in 1618. On a second mission to France he published a work embodying the principles of deism, entitled *Tractatus de Veritate, prout distinguitur à Revelatione*, etc. (Paris, 1624, 4to). In 1631 he was made a peer. In 1645 he published a new edition of the *Tractatus*, adding to it his *De Religione Gentilium* (also published separately at Amsterdam, 1663, 4to; and in an English translation, by Lewis, *The Ancient Religion of the Gentiles*, London, 1705, 8vo). He died at London Aug. 20, 1648. His *Life, written by himself*, and *continued to his death*, was published by Horace Walpole (London, 1764; new edition, with additions, London, 1826, 8vo).

"Herbert of Cherbury was the contemporary of Hobbes of Malmesbury, to whose principles of philosophizing he was directly opposed, notwithstanding the striking coincidence of many of the results at which they respectively arrived. He maintained the theory of innate ideas, and made a certain instinct of the reason (rationalis instinctus) to be the primary source of all human knowledge. Accordingly he did not, with Aristotle and the Stoics, compare the mind to a pure tablet, or to the tabula rasa of the schoolmen, but to a closed volume which opens itself at the solicitation of outward nature acting upon the senses. Thus acted upon, the mind produces out of itself certain general or universal principles (*communes notiones*), by reference to which all debatable questions in theology and philosophy may be determined, since upon these principles, at least, all men are unanimous. Consistently with these views, he does not, with Hobbes, make religion to be founded on revelation or historical tradition, but upon an immediate consciousness of God and of divine things. The religion of reason, therefore, resting on such grounds, is, he argues, the criterion of every positive religion which claims a foundation in revelation. No man can appeal to revelation as an immediate evidence of the reasonableness of his faith, except those to whom that revelation has been directly given; for all others, the fact of revelation is a matter of mere tradition or testimony. Even the recipient of a revelation may himself be easily deceived, since he possesses no means of convincing himself of the reality or authenticity of his admitted revelation. Herbert made his own religion of reason to rest upon the following grounds: There is a God whom man ought to honor and reverence; a life of holiness is the most acceptable worship that can be offered him; sinners must repent of their sins, and strive to become better; and after death every one must expect the rewards or penalties befitting the acts of this life. Lord Herbert is one of the numerous instances on record of the little influence which speculative opinions exercise upon the conduct of life. Maintaining that no revelation is credible which is imparted to a portion only of mankind, he nevertheless claims the belief of his hearers when he tells them that his doubts as to the publication of his work were removed by a direct manifestation of the divine will" (*English Cyclopædia*). He states the phenomena of this revelation as follows: "Thus filled with doubts, I was, on a bright summer day, sitting in my room; my window to the south was open; the sun shone brightly; not a breeze was stirring. I took my book *On Truth* into my hand, threw myself on my knees, and prayed devoutly in these words: 'O thou one God, thou author of this light which now shines upon me, thou giver of all inward light which now shines upon me, thou giver of all inward light, I implore thee, according to thine infinite mercy, to pardon my request, which is greater than a sinner should make. I am not sufficiently convinced whether I may publish this book or not. If its publication shall be for thy glory, I beseech thee to give me a sign from heaven; if not, I will suppress it.' I had scarcely finished these words when a loud, and yet, at the same time, a gentle sound came from heaven, not like any sound on earth. This comforted me in such a manner, and gave me such satisfaction, that I considered my prayer as having been heard." His style is very obscure, and his writings have been but little read, in spite of the talent and subtlety of thought which they evince. He is properly regarded as the founder of the school of English Deists, although he was himself a sceptic of a very high and pure sort rather than an infidel. Herbert did not profess, in his writings, to oppose Christianity, but held that his "five articles" embraced the substance of what is taught in the Scriptures. "The ideas which his writings contributed to Deistical speculation are two, viz. the examination of the universal principles of religion, and the appeal to an internal illuminating influence superior to revelation, 'the inward light,' as the test of religious truth. This was a phrase not uncommon in the 17th century. It was used by the Puritans to mark the appeal to the spiritual instincts, the heaven-taught feelings; and, later, by mystics, like the founder of the Quakers, to imply an appeal to an internal sense. But in Herbert it differs from these in being universal, not restricted to a few persons, and in being intellectual rather than emotional or spiritual" (Farrar, *Critical History*, p. 120). For an examination and refutation of his theory of religion, see Leland, *Deistical Writers*, letter i, and Halyburton, *Nat. Religion* (Works, 1835, 8vo, p. 253). See also Kortholt, *De Tribus impostoribus* (Herbert, Hobbes, Spinoza; Hamb. 1701, 4to); Van Mildert, *Boyle Lectures*, 1838; Remusat, *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1854, p. 692; Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought*, lect. iv; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines*, bk. ii, ch. iv, § 2; *Contemporary Review*, July, 1869.

Herbert, George, brother of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, was born at Montgomery Castle April 3, 1593. He was educated at Cambridge, where he became a fellow in 1615. In the year 1619 he was made university orator, and a letter of thanks which he wrote in that capacity to James I excited the monarch's attention, who declared him to be the jewel of that university, and gave him a sinecure of £120 per annum. He became intimate with Bacon and Wotton, and had prospects of great success in public life, but the death of his friends, the duke of Richmond and the marquis of Hamilton, followed by that of king James, frustrated these expectations, and Herbert determined to devote himself to the ministry. He was accordingly ordained, and in 1626 was made prebendary of Layton, in the diocese of Lincoln. In 1630 he became rector of Bemerton, near Salisbury. A quotidian ague soon destroyed his health, and he died March 3, 1633. George Herbert's piety was humble and profound. He was zealous in his pastoral duties; an undue reverence for ceremonies, as such, was his chief failing. A beautiful sketch of him is given in Walton's *Lives* (often reprinted). "Men like George Herbert are rare. It is not his wide learning, nor his refined taste; not his high spirit, nor his amiability, nor his strictness of life; but the rare combination in one person of qualities so diversely beautiful. He was master of all learning, human and divine; yet his learning is not what strikes the reader most, it is so thoroughly controlled and subordinated by his lively wit and practical wisdom. He was a man of extraordinary endowments, both personal and such as belonged to his rank, not lost in indolence, nor wasted in trivialities, but all combined and cultivated to the utmost, and then devoted to the highest purposes" (*Christian Remembrancer*, 1862, p. 137). His writings include *The Temple: sacred Poems and private Ejaculations* (Lond. 1633, 12mo; and many editions since, in various forms):—*The Country Parson, his Character and Rule of holy Life* (many editions). There are several editions of his complete works, such as, *Works, Prose and Verse, with Walton's Life and Coleridge's Notes* (London, 1846, 2 vols. 12mo); *Works, with Sketch of his Life* by Jerdan (1853, small 8vo; *not* including all of Herbert's works); *Works, Prose and Verse*, edited by Willmott (1854, 8vo); *Life and Writings of G. Herbert* (Boston, 1851, 12mo). The best edition of his *Works* is Pickering's (Lond. 1850, 2 vols.). See Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 829; Middleton, *Evangelical Biography*, iii, 48; *Christian Examiner*, vol. li; *Brit. Quarterly Review*, April, 1854, art. ii.

Her'culès (Ἡρακλῆς) is mentioned in 2 Macc. iv, 19 as the Tyrian god to whom the Jewish high-priest Jason sent a religious embassy (θεωροί), with the offering of 300 drachmæ of silver. That this Tyrian Hercules (Herod. ii, 44) is the same as the Tyrian Baal is evident from a bilingual Phœnician inscription found at Malta (described by Gesenius, *Monum. Ling. Phœn.* i, 96), in which the Phœnician words, "To our Lord, to Melkarth, the Baal of Tyre," are represented by the Greek Ἡρακλεῖ Ἀρχηγέτει. Moreover, Herakles and Astarte are mentioned together by Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 5, 3), just in the same manner as Baal and Ashtoreth are in the Old Testament. The further identity of this Tyrian Baal with the Baal whom the idolatrous Israelites worshipped is evinced by the following arguments, as stated chiefly by Movers (*Die Phönicier*, i, 178). The worship of Baal, which prevailed in the time of the Judges, was put down by Samuel (1 Sam. vii, 4), and the effects of that suppression appear to have lasted through the next few centuries, as Baal is not enumerated among the idols of Solomon (1 Kings xi, 5-8; 2 Kings xxiii, 13), nor among those worshipped in Judah (2 Kings xxiii, 12), or in Samaria, where we only read of the golden calves of Jeroboam (1 Kings xii, 28; xv, 26). That worship of Baal which prevailed in the reign of Ahab cannot, therefore, be regarded as a mere continuation or revival of the old Canaanitish idolatry (although there is no reason to doubt the essential identity of both Baals), but was introduced directly from Phœnicia by Ahab's marriage with the Sidonian princess Jezebel (1 Kings xvi, 31). In like manner, the establishment of this idolatry in Judah is ascribed to the marriage of the king with a daughter of Jezebel (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 13, 1; ix, 6, 6).

The power of nature, which was worshipped under the form of the Tyrian Hercules, Melkarth, Baal, Adonis, Moloch, and whatever his other names are, was that which originates, sustains, and destroys life. These functions of the Deity, according to the Phœnicians, were represented, although not exclusively, by the *sun*, the influence of which both animates vegetation by its genial warmth, and scorches it up by its fervor (see Davis, *Carthage*, p. 276-9).

Almost all that we know of the worship of the Tyrian Hercules is preserved by the classical writers, and relates chiefly to the Phœnician colonies, and not to the mother state. The eagle, the lion, and the thunny-fish were sacred to him, and are often found on Phœnician coins. Pliny expressly testifies that human sacrifices were offered up every year to the Carthaginian Hercules (*Hist. Nat.* xxxvi, v, 12), which coincides with what is stated of Baal in Jer. xix, 5, and with the acknowledged worship of Moloch. Mention is made of public embassies sent from the colonies to the mother state to honor the national god (Arrian, *Alex.* ii, 24; Q. Curt. iv, 2; Polyb. xxxi, 20), and this fact places in a clearer light the offence of Jason in sending envoys to his festival (2 Macc. iv, 19).

Movers endeavors to show that Herakles and Hercules are not merely Greek and Latin synonymes for this god, but that they are actually derived from his true Phœnician name. This original name he supposes to have consisted of the syllables אר (as found in אריר, *lion*, and in other words), meaning *strong*, and כל, from יכל, *to conquer;* so that the compound means *Ar conquers.* This harmonizes with what he conceives to be the idea represented by Hercules as the destroyer of Typhonic monsters (*l. c.* p. 430). Melkarth, the Μελίκαρθος of Sanchoniathon, occurs on coins only in the form מלקרת. We must in this case assume that a *kaph* has been absorbed, and resolve the word into מֶלֶךְ קרתא, *king of the city*, πολιοῦχος. The bilingual inscription renders it by Ἀρχηγέτης; and it is a title of the god as the patron of the city. See BAAL.

Herd (prop. בָּקָר, of neat cattle; עֵדֶר, a flock of smaller animals; מִקְנֶה, as property; ἀγέλη, a drove). The herd was greatly regarded both in the patriarchal and Mosaic period. Its multiplying was considered as a blessing, and its decrease as a curse (Gen. xiii, 2; Deut. vii, 14; xxviii, 4; Psa. cvii, 38; cxliv, 14; Jer. li, 23). The ox was the most precious stock next to horse and mule, and (since those were rare) the thing of greatest value which was commonly possessed (1 Kings xviii, 5). Hence we see the force of Saul's threat (1 Sam. xi, 7). The herd yielded the most esteemed sacrifice (Numb. vii, 3; Psa. lxix, 31; Isa. lxvi, 3); also flesh-meat and milk, chiefly converted, probably, into butter and cheese (Deut. xxxii, 14; 2 Sam. xvii, 29), which such milk yields more copiously than that of small cattle (Arist. *Hist. Anim.* iii, 20). The full-grown ox is hardly ever slaughtered in Syria; but, both for sacrificial and convivial purposes, the young animal was preferred (Exod. xxix, 1)—perhaps three years might be the age up to which it was so regarded (Gen. xv, 9)—and is spoken of as a special dainty (Gen. xviii, 8; Amos vi, 4; Luke xv, 23). The case of Gideon's sacrifice was one of exigency (Judg. vi, 25), and exceptional. So that of the people (1 Sam. xiv, 32) was an act of wanton excess. The agricultural and general usefulness of the ox in ploughing, threshing, and as a beast of burden (1 Chron. xii, 40; Isa. xlvi, 1), made such a slaughtering seem wasteful; nor, owing to difficulties of grazing, fattening, etc., is beef the product of an Eastern climate. The

animal was broken to service probably in his third year (Isa. xv, 5; Jer. xlviii, 34; comp. Pliny, *H. N.* viii, 70, ed. Par.). In the moist season, when grass abounded in the waste lands, especially in the "south" region, herds grazed there; e. g. in Carmel, on the west side of the Dead Sea (1 Sam. xxv, 2; 2 Chron. xxvi, 10). Dothan also, Mishor, and Sharon (Gen. xxxvii, 17; comp. Robinson, iii, 122; Stanley, *S. and Pal.* p. 247, 260, 484; 1 Chron. xxvii, 29; Isa. lxv, 10) were favorite pastures. For such purposes Uzziah built towers in the wilderness (2 Chron. xxvi, 19). Not only grass, but foliage, is acceptable to the ox, and the woods and hills of Bashan and Gilead afforded both abundantly; on such upland (Psa. l, 10; lxv, 12) pastures cattle might graze, as also, of course, by river sides, when driven by the heat from the regions of the "wilderness." Especially was the eastern table-land (Ezek. xxxix, 18; Numb. xxxii, 4) "a place for cattle," and the pastoral tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh, who settled there, retained something of the nomadic character and handed down some image of the patriarchal life (Stanley, *S. and Pal.* p. 324, 325). Herdsmen in Egypt were a low, perhaps the lowest, caste; hence, as Joseph's kindred, through his position, were brought into contact with the highest

An Egyptian deformed Oxherd, so represented on the Monuments to mark contempt. (Wilkinson.)

castes, they are described as "an abomination;" but of the abundance of cattle in Egypt, and of the care there bestowed on them, there is no doubt (Gen. xlvii, 6, 17; Exod. ix, 4, 20). Brands were used to distinguish the owners' herds (Wilkinson, iii, 8, 195; iv, 125-131). So the plague of hail was sent to smite especially the cattle (Psa. lxxviii, 48), the firstborn of which also were smitten (Exod. xii, 29). The Israelites departing stipulated for (Exod. x, 26) and took "much cattle" with them (xii, 38). See EXODE. Cattle formed thus one of the traditions of the Israelitish nation in its greatest period, and became almost a part of that greatness. They are the subject of providential care and legislative ordinance (Exod. xx, 10; xxi, 28; xxxiv, 19; Lev. xix, 19; xxv, 7; Deut. xi, 15; xxii, 1, 4, 10; xxv, 4; Psa. civ, 14; Isa. xxx, 23; Jon. iv, 11), and even the Levites, though not holding land, were allowed cattle (Numb. xxxv, 2, 3). When pasture failed, a mixture of various grains (called, Job vi, 5, בְּלִיל, rendered "fodder" in the A. V., and, Isa. xxx, 24, "provender;" compare the Roman *farrago* and *ocymum*, Pliny, xviii, 10 and 42) was used, as also תֶּבֶן, "chopped straw" (Gen. xxiv, 25; Isa. xi, 7; lxv, 25), which was torn in pieces by the threshing-machine, and used probably for feeding in stalls. These last formed an important adjunct to cattle-keeping, being indispensable for shelter at certain seasons (Exod. ix, 6, 19). The herd, after its harvest duty was done, which probably caused it to be in high condition, was especially worth caring for; at the same time, most open pastures would have failed because of the heat. It was then probably stalled, and would continue so until vegetation returned. Hence the failure of "the herd" from "the stalls" is mentioned as a feature of scarcity (Hab. iii, 17). "Calves of the stall" (Mal. iv, 2; Prov. xv, 17) are the objects of watchful care. The Reubenites, etc., bestowed their cattle "in cities" when they passed the Jordan to share the toils of conquest (Deut. iii, 19), i. e. probably in some pastures closely adjoining, like the "suburbs" appointed for the cattle of the Levites (Numb. xxxv, 2, 3; Josh. xxi, 2). Cattle were ordinarily allowed as a prey in war to the captor (Deut. xx, 14; Josh. viii, 2), and the case of Amalek is exceptional, probably to mark the extreme curse to which that people was devoted (Exod. xvii, 14; 1 Sam. xv, 3). The occupation of herdsman was honorable in early times (Gen. xlvii, 6; 1 Sam. xi, 5; 1 Chron. xxvii, 29; xxviii, 1). Saul himself resumed it in the interval of his cares as king; also Doeg was certainly high in his confidence (1 Sam. xxi, 7). Pharaoh made some of Joseph's brethren "rulers over his cattle." David's herd-masters were among his chief officers of state. In Solomon's time the relative importance of the pursuit declined as commerce grew, but it was still extensive (Eccles. ii, 7; 1 Kings iv, 23). It must have greatly suffered from the inroads of the enemies to which the country under the later kings of Judah and Israel was exposed. Uzziah, however (2 Chron. xxvi, 10), and Hezekiah (xxxii, 28, 29), resuming command of the open country, revived it. Josiah also seems to have been rich in herds (xxxv, 7-9). The prophet Amos at first followed this occupation (Amos i, 1; vii, 14). A goad was used (Judg. iii, 31; 1 Sam. xiii, 21, דָּרְבָן, מַלְמָד), being, as mostly, a staff armed with a spike. For the word Herd as applied to swine, see SWINE. On the general subject, Ugolini, xxxix, *De Re Rust. vett. Hebr.* c. ii, will be found nearly exhaustive. See CATTLE.

Herder, JOHANN GOTTFRIED VON, one of the most variously gifted of German writers, was born August 25, 1744, at Mohrungen, in East Prussia, where his father kept a little girls'-school. His early training was strict and religious. A preacher named Trescho taught him Greek and Latin: and the pastor's books of theology were devoured by the young student. A complaint in the eyes brought him under the notice of a Russian surgeon, who offered to instruct him in surgery gratis. Herder accepted the offer, but at Königsberg fainted at the first dissection which he attended, and thereupon resolved to study theology. He gained the acquaintance of persons who appreciated him, and procured him a place as instructor in the Frederick's College at Königsberg. Here he became intimate with Kant and Hamann, who greatly influenced the development of his mind. With the most indefatigable industry he studied philosophy, natural science, history, and languages, and in 1764 became assistant at the cathedral school at Riga, to which office that also of preacher was attached. Here he laid the foundations of his great celebrity as a pulpit orator. Some literary disputes disgusted him, and he went to France, and was there chosen by the prince of Holstein-Oldenburg as his travelling companion. He would have gone from France to Italy had he not been arrested by the complaint in his eyes at Strasbourg, where he first became acquainted with Göthe. In 1776 he was called to Weimar as court preacher, and in that little capital, then celebrated as the Athens of Germany, he spent the remainder of his life, respected as a preacher and as an active promoter of education and other public improvements, and laboring unweariedly in his multifarious literary pursuits. He died Dec. 18, 1803. Herder's literary activity was enormous. There is hardly a field of literature which he left unexplored. His collected writings amount to sixty volumes (*Sämmtliche Werke*, Stuttgardt, 1827–30, 60 vols. 18mo; also 45 vols. 8vo, edited by Heyne and Müller, Tübingen, 1805-1820). They may be divided into four classes—History, Belles-Lettres, Philosophy, and Theology. In philosophy, Herder was rather an observer than a metaphysician. His reputation in that field rests chiefly on his *Ideen zur Geschichte der Menschheit* (4th ed. Leips. 1841, 2 vols.), translated into English by Churchill, under the title *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man* (2d edit. London, 1803, 2 vols. 8vo).

As a theologian, Herder is noted not for science or system so much as for his freedom of thought and his genial spirit. In some respects he was the precursor of Schleiermacher, and his rationalism, though low enough, was of a totally different school from that of Semler, Paulus, and the neologists generally. He sought especially to render *Biblical studies* more profitable by making them more free, and by investing them with a human and scientific interest. In his work on the *Geist der ebräischen Poesie* (1782; translated by Dr. Marsh, of Vermont, under the title *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, 1833, 2 vols. 12mo), he dwelt especially on the æsthetical and human side of the Bible, which, in his view, instead of weakening its claims to divine authority, greatly strengthens them. He was the first to show critically the poetical beauties of the Bible, which he did not consider as mere ornaments, but rather as being grounded in the inner nature of the revelation, and not to be separated from a correct view of the inspiration of the contents of the O. T. Though others, Lowth for instance, had already treated this subject of the poetry of the Hebrews, none had seen so deeply into its nature, or shown so plainly the true spirit which pervaded it. By this poetical consideration of the O. T. history, and of the series of religious precepts based on this history, he rid the Bible from the mistakes of such interpreters as Michaelis and others. His *älteste Urkunde d. Menschengeschlechts, eine nach Jahrhunderten enthüllte heilige Schrift*, which appeared in 1774, revolutionized the system of O.-T. exegesis by attempting to treat the history of creation (Gen. i) from a different stand-point from the one which generally prevailed. In his *Erlaüterungen z. N. T. aus einer neu eröffneten morgenländischen Quelle* (the Zend Avesta), which he published in 1775, he also endeavored to render the exegesis of the N. T. more accurate and profound, by showing the influence of Parseeism on the Hebrew and, incidentally, on the Christian mode of thought. He worked especially on the books of James and Jude, under the title of *Briefe zweier Brüder Jesu in unserm Kanon* (1775), and on the Apocalypse in *Das Buch v. der Zukunft des Herrn* (Riga, 1779). In the former work he considers James and Jude as the real brothers of the Lord according to the flesh, while in the second he maintains that the predictions of the Apocalypse were fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem. Herder also wrote on various points of the history of the New-Testament revelation and of Biblical dogmatics, especially in his *Christliche Schriften*. In these he treats of the gift of tongues on the first Christian Pentecost; of the resurrection as a point of faith, history, and dogma; of the Redeemer as presented in the three gospels; of the Son of God, the Saviour of the world; of the spirit of Christianity; of religion, doctrinal meanings, usages, etc. "One of the chief services of Herder to Christianity was his persistent labor to elevate the pastoral office to its original and proper dignity. He held that the pastor of the church should not be solely a learned critic, but the minister of the common people. In his day the pastor was considered the mere instrument of the state, a sort of theological policeman—a degradation which Herder could hardly permit himself to think of without violent indignation. In his *Letters on the Study of Theology*, published in 1780, and in subsequent smaller works, he sought to evoke a generation of theologians, who, being imbued with his own ideas of humanity, would betake themselves to the edification of the humble mind. He would eject scholasticism from the study of the Bible, and show to his readers that simplicity of inquiry is the safest way to happy results. He would place the modern pastor, both in his relations to the cause of humanity and in the respect awarded him by the world, close beside the patriarch and prophet of other days; and that man, in his opinion, was not worthy the name of pastor who could neglect the individual requirements of the soul. According to Herder, the theologian should be trained from childhood in the knowledge of the Bible and of practical religion. Youth should have ever before them the example of pious parents, who were bringing them up with a profound conviction of the doctrines of divine truth. To choose theology for a profession from mercenary aims would preclude all possibility of pastoral usefulness. 'Let prayer and reading the Bible be your morning and evening food,' was his advice to a young preacher. Some of the most eloquent words from his pen were written against the customary moral preaching which so much afflicted him. 'Why don't you come down from your pulpits,' he asks, 'for they cannot be of any advantage to you in preaching such things? What is the use of all these Gothic churches, altars, and such matters? No, indeed! Religion, true religion, must return to the exercise of its original functions, or a preacher will become the most indefinite, idle, and indifferent thing on earth. Teachers of religion, true servants of God's word, what have you to do in our century? The harvest is plenteous, but the laborers are few; pray the Lord of the harvest that he will send out laborers who will be something more than bare teachers of wisdom and virtue. More than this, help yourselves!' The counsel given by Herder to others was practised first by himself. He lived among critical minds, who spurned humble pastoral work, but he felt it his duty, and therefore discharged it to the best of his ability. His preaching was richly lucid, and not directed to the most intelligent portion of his auditors. He took up a plain truth and strove to make it plainer. Yet, while the masses were most benefited by his simplicity of pulpit conversation, those gifted men who thought with him arose from their seats profoundly impressed with the dignity and value of the Gospel. A witty writer of the time, Sturz, gives an account of Herder's preaching that throws some light upon the manner in which the plain, earnest exposition of God's word always affected the indifferent auditor. 'You should have seen,' says this man, 'how every rustling sound was hushed and each curious glance was chained upon him in a very few minutes. We were as still as a Moravian congregation. All hearts opened themselves spontaneously; every eye hung upon him and wept unwonted tears; deep sighs escaped from every breast. My dear friend, nobody preaches like him'" (Hurst, *History of Rationalism*, ch. vii). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 747; *Erinnerungen aus d. Leben Herder's* (Tübingen, 1820, 8vo); Quinet, *Ideen z. Gesch.* (Par. 1834); E. G. Herder, *Herder's Characterbild* (Erlang. 1846, 6 vols.); article by Bancroft, *North American Review*, July, 1836, p. 216; Menzel, *German Literature* (American translation, ii, 419); review of Marsh's translation, *Christian Examiner*, xviii, 167; Hagenbach, *History of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries*, translated by Hurst, vol. ii, lectures i-v.

Herdman (prop. בּוֹקֵר, a tender of oxen; in distinction from רוֹעֶה, a feeder of sheep; but practically the two occupations were generally united). From the earliest times the Hebrews were a pastoral people. Abraham and his sons were masters of herds and flocks, and were regulated in their movements very much by a regard to the necessities of their cattle, in which their wealth almost entirely consisted. In Egypt the Israelites were known as keepers of cattle. When they left Egypt, they, notwithstanding the oppressions to which they had been subjected, took with them "flocks and herds" (Exod. xii, 38); and though during their wanderings in the wilderness their stock was in all probability greatly reduced, before they entered Canaan they had so replenished it by their conquests in the pastoral regions beyond Jordan that they took with them a goodly number of animals wherewith to begin their new life in the land that had been promised them. Of that land large tracts were suited for pasturage; certain of the tribes were almost exclusively devoted to pastoral occupations; and traces of a nomadic life among other tribes than those settled on the east of the Jordan are found even as late as the time of the monarchy (compare 1 Chron. iv, 38-43).

The pastoral life has always had a charm for the Shemitic peoples; and among them, as well as among other nations, it has always been held in honor. In the open and spacious fields bordering on the Jordan and in the hill country of Palestine it is a life of comparative ease and of great independence even in the present day; men possessed of flocks and herds become quietly and gradually rich without any severe exertion or anxiety; and but for feuds among themselves, the oppression of superiors, and the predatory tendency of their less respectable neighbors, their life might flow on in an almost unbroken tranquillity. The wealth of sheiks and emirs is measured chiefly by the number of their flocks and herds; and men who would count it an intolerable indignity to be constrained to engage in any handicraft occupation, or even in mercantile adventure, fulfil with pride and satisfaction the duties which their pastoral life imposes upon them. It was the same in ancient times. Job's substance consisted chiefly of cattle, his wealth in which made him the greatest of all the men of the East (i, 3). The first two kings of Israel, Saul and David, came from "following the herd" to ascend the throne (1 Sam. ix; xi, 5; Psa. lxxviii, 70). Men "very great," like Nabal, derived their riches from their flocks, and themselves superintended the operations connected with the care of them (1 Sam. xxv, 2 sq.). Absalom, the prince of Israel, had a sheep-farm, and personally occupied himself with its duties (2 Sam. xiii, 23). Mesha, king of Moab, was "a sheepmaster" (נוֹקֵד, 2 Kings iii, 4). The daughters of chiefs and wealthy proprietors did not think it beneath them to tend the flocks and herds of their family (Gen. xxix, 9 [comp. xxiv, 15, 19]; Exod. ii, 16; comp. Homer, *Il.* vi, 423; *Odys.* xii, 121; xiii, 221; Varro, *De Re Rust.* ii, 1). The proudest title of the kings of Israel was that of shepherds of the people (Jer. xxiii, 4; Ezek. xxxiv, 2, etc.; comp. ποιμένες λαῶν in Homer and Hesiod, *passim*, and Plato, *De Rep.* iv, 15, p. 440, D.), and God himself condescended to be addressed as the Shepherd of Israel (Psa. lxxx, 1), and was trusted in by his pious servants as their shepherd (Psa. xxiii, 1). In later times the title of shepherd was given to the teachers and leaders of the synagogues, who were called פַּרְנָסִים (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. in Matt. iv*, 23); but this was unknown to the times before Christ.

By the wealthier proprietors their flocks and herds were placed under the charge of servants, who bore the designation of רֹעֵה מִקְנֶה, רֹעֵה צֹאן, רֹעֶה, שֹׁמֵר, or נֹקְדִים. These were sometimes armed with weapons, to protect themselves and their charge from robbers or wild beasts; though, if we may judge from the case of David, their furniture in this respect was of the simplest description. Usually they carried with them a staff (שֵׁבֶט מַקֵּל) furnished with a crook, which might be used for catching an animal by the foot; those who had the charge of oxen carried with them a sharper instrument (Judg. iii, 31; 1 Sam. xiii, 21). See GOAD. They had also a wallet or small bag (יַלְקוּט, πήρα) in which to carry provisions, ammunition, or any easily portable article (1 Sam. xvii, 40, 43; Psa. xxiii, 4; Micah vii, 14; Matt. x, 10; Luke ix, 3, 10). Their dress consisted principally of a cloak or mantle (the *burnûs* of the modern Arabs) in which they could wrap the entire body (Jer. xliii, 12). For food they were obliged to be contented with the plainest fare, and often were reduced to the last extremities (Amos vii, 14; Luke xv, 15). Their wages consisted of a portion of the produce, especially of the milk of the flock (Gen. xxx, 32 sq.; 1 Cor. ix, 7). That they cultivated music is not unlikely, though it hardly follows from 1 Sam. xvi, 18, for David's case may have been exceptional; in all countries and times, however, music has been associated with the pastoral life. When the servants belonging to one master existed in any number, they were placed under a chief (שַׂר מִקְנֶה, Gen. xlvii, 6; ἀρχιποιμήν, 1 Pet. v, 4); and under the monarchy there was a royal officer who bore the title of אַבִּיר הָרֹעִים, "chief of the herdsmen" (1 Sam. xxi, 7; compare 1 Chron. xxvii, 29, and "magister regii pecoris," Livy, i, 4).

The animals placed under the care of these herdsmen were chiefly sheep and goats; but besides these there were also neat cattle, asses, camels, and in later times swine. It would seem that the keeping of the animals last named was the lowest grade in the pastoral life (Luke xv, 15); and probably the keeping of sheep and goats was held to be the highest, as that of horses is among the Arabs in the present day (Niebuhr, *Arabie*, i, 226). The herdsman led his charge into the open pasture-land, where they could freely roam and find abundant supply of food; the neat cattle were conducted to the richer pastures, such as those of Bashan, while the sheep, goats, and camels found sufficient sustenance from the scantier herbage of the more rocky and arid parts of Palestine, provided there was a supply of water. While in the fields the herdsmen lived in tents

Ancient Egyptian Herdsmen giving an Account of the Cattle. (Wilkinson.)

Fig. 1. Herdsmen giving an account to the scribe, 3. 2. Another doing obeisance to the master of the estate, or to the scribe. 4. Other herdsmen. 5. The driver of the cattle, carrying a rope in his hand. 6. Bowing and giving his report to the scribe, 7, over whom is the usual satchel, and two boxes.

(מִשְׁכְּנוֹת, Song of Sol. i, 8; Isa. xxxviii, 12; Jer. vi, 3), and there were folds (גְּדֵרוֹת, Numb. xxxii, 16; 2 Sam. vii, 8; Zeph. ii, 6), and apparently in some cases tents (אֹהָלִים, 2 Chron. xiv, 15) for the cattle. Watch-towers were also erected, whence the shepherd could descry any coming danger to his charge; and vigilance in this respect was one of the shepherd's chief virtues (Mic. iv, 8; Nah. iii, 18; Luke ii, 8). If any of the cattle wandered he was bound to follow them, and leave no means untried to recover them (Ezek. xxxiv, 12; Luke xv, 5); and harsh masters were apt to require at their servants' hands any loss they might have sustained, either by the wandering of the cattle or the ravages of wild beasts (Gen. xxxi, 38 sq.), a tendency on which a partial check was placed by the law, that if it was torn by beasts, and the pieces could be produced, the person in whose charge it was should not be required to make restitution (Exod. xxii, 13; comp. Amos iii, 12). To assist them in both watching and defending the flocks, and in recovering any that had strayed, shepherds had dogs (Job xxx, 1), as have the modern Arabs; not, however, "like those in other lands, fine, faithful fellows, the friend and companion of their masters . . . but a mean, sinister, ill-conditioned generation, kept at a distance, kicked about, and half starved, with nothing noble or attractive about them" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 301), a description which fully suits Job's disparaging comparison. The flocks and herds were regularly counted (Lev. xxvii, 32; Jer. xxxiii, 13), as in Egypt (Wilkinson, ii, 177).

The pastures to which the herdsmen conducted their flocks were called חוּצוֹת, *the places without, the country, the desert* (Job v, 10; xviii, 17; Prov. viii, 26; compare ἔξω ἐν ἐρήμοις, Mark i, 45); also נְאוֹת (Jer. xxv, 37; Amos i, 2), נ׳ מִדְבָּר (Psa. lxv, 13; Jer. ix, 9, etc.), נָוֶה (1 Sam. vii, 8; Hos. ix, 13, etc.), מִדְבָּר (Psa. lxv, 13; Isa. xlii, 11; Jer. xxiii, 10; Joel ii, 22, etc.). In summer the modern nomades seek the northern and more hilly regions, in winter they betake themselves to the south and to the plain country (D'Arvieux, iii, 315; v, 428); and probably the same usage prevailed among the Hebrews. In leading out the flocks the shepherd went before them, and they followed him obedient to his call; a practice from which our Saviour draws a touching illustration of the intimate relation between him and his people (John x, 4). The young and the sickly of the flock the shepherd would take in his arms and carry, and he was careful to adapt the rate of advance to the condition and capacity of the feebler or burdened portion of his charge, a practice which again gives occasion for a beautiful illustration of God's care for his people (Isa. xl, 11; comp. Gen. xxxiii, 13). These usages still prevail in Palestine, and have often been described by travellers; one of the most graphic descriptions is that given by Mr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, i, 301 sq.; compare Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, ii, 322). As the Jews advanced in commercial wealth the office of shepherd diminished in importance and dignity. Among the later Jews the shepherd of a small flock was precluded from bearing witness, on the ground that, as such fed their flocks on the pastures of others, they were infected with dishonesty (Maimon. *in Demai*, ii, 3). See SHEPHERD.

He'res, part of the name of two places, different in the Hebrew. See also KIR-HERES; TIMNATH-HERES.

1. HAR-CHÉRES (הַר־חֶרֶס, *mountain of* the *sun;* Sept. τὸ ὄρος τὸ ὀστρακώδης, Vulg. *mons Hares, quod interpretatur testaceus*, i. e. of tiles; Auth. Vers. "mount Heres"), a city (in the valley, according to the text, but in a part of Mt. Ephraim, according to the name) of Dan, near Aijalon, of which the Amorites retained possession (Judg. i, 35). It was probably situated on some eminence bordering the present Merj Ibn-Omeir on the east, possibly near the site of Emmaus or Nicopolis. We may even hazard the conjecture that it was identical with Mt. Jearim (q. d. Ir-Shemesh, i. e. sun-city), i. e. Chesalon (q. v.).

2. IR HA-HÉRES (עִיר הַהֶרֶס, *city of destruction;* Sept. πόλις ἀσεδέκ v. r. ἀχερές; Vulg. *civitas solis*, evidently reading עִיר הַחֶרֶס, *city of the sun*), a name that occurs only in the disputed passage Isa. xix, 18, where most MSS. and editions, as also the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, the Syriac, and the English, read, *one* (of these five cities) *shall be called The city of destruction*, i. e. in the idiom of Isaiah, *one of these cities shall be destroyed*, a signification (from הָרַס, to *tear* down) for which Iken (*Dissert. phil. crit.* 16) contends. The Jews of Palestine, who approved this reading, referred it to Leontopolis and its temple, which they abhorred, and the destruction of which they supposed to be here predicted. But instead of הֶרֶס, *heres*, the more probable reading is חֶרֶס, *cheres*, which is read in sixteen MSS. and some editions, and is expressed by the Sept. (Complut.), Symmachus, Vulgate, Saadias, and the margin of the English version, and has also the testimony of the Talmudists (*Menachoth*, fol. 110, A.). If we follow the certain and ascertained usus loquendi, this latter denotes *city of the sun*, i. e. *Heliopolis* in Egypt, elsewhere called *Beth-Shemesh*, and *On*. The Arabic meaning of the term is *to defend, to preserve*, and the passage may be rendered, *one shall be called A city preserved*, i. e. one of those five cities shall be preserved. (See Gesenius, *Comment.* ad loc.) Whichever interpretation may be chosen, this reading is to be preferred to the other. See IR-HA-HERES.

He'resh (Heb. *Che'resh*, חֶרֶשׁ, *silence;* Sept. Ἀρές), one of the Levites that dwelt in the "villages of the Netophathites" near Jerusalem, on the return from Babylon (1 Chron. ix, 15). B.C. 536.

Heresiarch, a leader in heresy, founder of a sect of heretics. See HERESY.

Heresy, in theology, is any doctrine containing Christian elements, but along with them others subversive of Christian truth.

I. *Origin and early Use of the Word.*—The word αἵρεσις (*hæresis*) originally meant simply *choice* (e. g. of a set of opinions); later, it was applied to the *opinions* themselves; last of all, to the *sect* maintaining them. "Philosophy was in Greece the great object which divided the opinions and judgments of men; and hence the term heresy, being most frequently applied to the adoption of this or that particular dogma, came by an easy transition to signify the sect or school in which that dogma was maintained;" e. g. the heresy of the Stoics, of the Peripatetics, and Epicureans. Josephus also speaks of the three *heresies* (αἱρέσεις, *sects*, *Ant.* xii, 5, 9 = φιλοσοφίαι, xviii, 1, 2) of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. In the historical part of the New Testament, the word denotes a sect or party, whether good or bad (Acts v, 17; xv, 5; xxiv, 5; xxvi, 5; xxviii, 22). In Acts xxvi, 4, 5, St. Paul, in defending himself before king Agrippa, uses the same term, when it was manifestly his design to exalt the party to which he had belonged, and to give their system the preference over every other system of Judaism, both with regard to soundness of doctrine and purity of morals. In the Epistles the word occurs in a somewhat different sense. Paul, in Gal. v, 20, puts αἱρέσεις, *heresies*, in the list of crimes with uncleanness, seditions (διχοστασίαι), etc. In 1 Cor. xi, 19 (there must also be *heresies* among you), he uses it apparently to denote schisms or divisions in the Church. In Tit. iii, 10 he comes near to the later sense; the "heretical person" appears to be one given over to a self-chosen and divergent form of belief and practice. John Wesley says: "Heresy is not in all the Bible taken for 'an error in fundamentals' or in any thing else, nor schism for any separation made from the outward communion of others. Both heresy and schism, in the modern sense of the words, are sins that the Scripture knows nothing of" (*Works*, N. Y. edit. vii, 286). In the early

post-apostolic Church, if "a man admitted a part, or even the whole of Christianity, and added to it something of his own, or if he rejected the whole of it, he was equally designated as a heretic. Thus, by degrees, it came to be restricted to those who professed Christianity, but professed it erroneously; and in later times, the doctrine of the Trinity, as defined by the Council of Nice, was almost the only test which decided the orthodoxy or the heresy of a Christian. Differences upon minor points were then described by the milder term of *schism;* and the distinction seems to have been made, that unity of faith might be maintained, though schism existed; but if the unity of faith was violated, the violator of it was a heretic." In general, in the early Church, all who did not hold what was called the Catholic faith (the *orthodox*) were called *heretics.* At a very early period the notion of wilful and immoral perversity began to be attached to heresy, and thus we may account for the severe and violent language used against heretics. "Charges, indeed, or insinuations of the grossest impurities are sometimes thrown out by the orthodox writers against the early heretics; but we are bound to receive them with great caution, because the answers which may have been given to them are lost, and because they are not generally justified by any authentic records which we possess respecting the lives of those heretics. The truth appears to be this, that some flagrant immoralities were notoriously perpetrated by some of the wildest among their sects, and that these have given coloring to the charges which have been thrown upon them too indiscriminately. But, whatsoever uncertainty may rest on this inquiry, it cannot be disputed, first, that the apostolical fathers, following the footsteps of the apostles themselves, regarded with great jealousy the birth and growth of erroneous opinions; and next, that they did not authorize, either by instruction or example, any severity on the *persons* of those in error. They opposed it by their reasoning and their eloquence, and they avoided its contagion by removing from their communion those who persisted in it; but they were also mindful that within these limits was confined the power which the Church received from the apostles who founded it over the spiritual disobedience of its members" (Waddington, *History of the Church*, ch. v, p. 59).

II. *Relations of Heresy to the Church and to Doctrine.*—"Heresies, like sin, all spring from the natural man; but they first make their appearance in opposition to the revealed truth, and thus presuppose its existence, as the fall of Adam implies a previous state of innocence. There are religious errors, indeed, to any extent out of Christianity, but no heresies in the theological sense. These errors become heresies only when they come into contact, at least outwardly, with revealed truth and with the life of the Church. They consist essentially in the conscious or unconscious reaction of unsubdued Judaism or heathenism against the new creation of the Gospel. Heresy is the distortion or caricature of the original Christian truth. But as God in his wonderful wisdom can bring good out of all evil, and has more than compensated for the loss of the first Adam by the resurrection of the second, so must all heresies in the end only condemn themselves, and serve the more fully to establish the truth. The New-Testament Scriptures themselves are in a great measure the result of a firm resistance to the distortions and corruptions to which the Christian religion was exposed from the first. Nay, we may say that every dogma of the Church, every doctrine fixed by her symbols, is a victory over a corresponding error, and in a certain sense owes to the error, not, indeed, its substance, which comes from God, but assuredly its logical completeness and scientific form. Heresies, therefore, belong to the process by which the Christian truth, received in simple faith, becomes clearly defined as an object of knowledge. They are the negative occasions, the challenges, for the Church to defend her views of truth, and to set them forth in complete scientific form" (Schaff, *Apostolic Church*, § 165).

Heresy and Schism.—"Near akin to heresy is the idea of *schism* or Church division, which, however, primarily means a separation from the government and discipline of the Church, and does not necessarily include departure from her orthodoxy. . . Thus the Ebionites, Gnostics, and Arians were heretics; the Montanists, Novatians, and Donatists, schismatics. By the standard of the Roman Church, the Greek Church is only schismatic, the Protestant both heretical and schismatic. Of course, in different branches of the Church . . there are different views of heresy and truth, heterodoxy and orthodoxy, and likewise of schism and sect" (Schaff, *Apost. Church*, § 165). "Heresy, as distinguished from schism, consists in the adoption of opinions and practices contrary to the articles and practices of any particular church, whereas schism is secession from that church, the renouncing allegiance to its government, or forming parties within it; for surely Paul (in 1 Cor. and elsewhere) censures men as causing divisions who did not openly renounce allegiance. Neither schism nor heresy, then, is properly an offence against the Church universal, but against some particular Church, and by its own members. On the same principle, no Church can be properly called either heretic or schismatic; for churches, being independent establishments, may indeed consult each other, but if they cannot agree, the guilt of that Church which is in error is neither schism nor heresy, but corrupt faith or bigoted narrowness. Accordingly, our Reformers, whilst they characterize the Romish Church as one that has *erred,* have very properly avoided the misapplication of the terms 'schismatic' and 'heretic' to it. Nevertheless, if a Church has been formed by the secession of members from another Church, on disagreement of principles, each seceder is both a schismatic and a heretic because of his former connection; but the crime does not attach to the Church so formed, and accordingly is not entailed on succeeding members who naturally spring up in it. If the schism was founded in *error,* the guilt of error would always attach to it and its members, but not that of schism or heresy. He who is convinced that his Church is essentially in error is bound to secede; but, like the circumstances which may be supposed to justify the subject of any realm in renouncing his country and withdrawing his allegiance, the plea should be long, and seriously, and conscientiously weighed; but with respect to distinct churches, as they can form alliances, so they can secede from this alliance without being guilty of any crime. So far from the separation between the Romish and Protestant churches having anything of the character of schism or heresy in it, the Church of England (supposing the Church of Rome not to have needed any reform) would have been justified in renouncing its association with it simply on the ground of expediency" (Hinds, *Early Christian Church*).

III. *List of the principal Early Heresies.*—The following list includes the chief heresies of the first six centuries; each will be found in its alphabetical place in this Cyclopædia: *Century I.* Nazarenes, who advocated the observance of the Jewish law by the worshippers of Christ. Simonians, followers of Simon Magus, who prided themselves in a superior degree of knowledge, and maintained that the world was created by angels, denied the resurrection, etc. Nicolaitanes, followers of Nicolaus of Antioch. Cerinthians and Ebionites, followers of Cerinthus and Ebion, who denied the divinity of Christ, and adopted the principles of Gnosticism. Many of them were Millenarians. *Century II.* Elcesaites, the followers of Elxai or Elcesai, who only partially admitted the Christian religion, and whose tenets were mostly of philosophic origin. Gnostics, so called from their pretences to γνῶσις, superior knowledge: this seems to have been the general name of all heretics. (1.) Among *Syrian* Gnostics were the followers of Saturninus, who adopted the notion of two principles reigning over the world, assumed the evil nature of matter, denied the reality of Christ's human body, etc. Bardesanians: their

principles resembled those of Saturninus. Tatianists and Encratitæ, who boasted of an extraordinary continence, condemned marriage, etc. Apotactici, who, in addition to the opinions of the Tatianists, renounced property, etc., and asserted that any who lived in the marriage state were incapable of salvation. (2.) Gnostics of *Asia Minor*. Cerdonians, who held two contrary principles, denied the resurrection, despised the authority of the Old Testament, and rejected the Gospels. Marcionites, who resembled the Cerdonians, and in addition admitted two Gods, asserted that the Saviour's body was a phantasm, etc. The followers of Lucian and Apelles may be classed among the Marcionites. (3.) Among *Egyptian* Gnostics were the Basilidians, followers of Basilides, who espoused the heresies of Simon Magus, and admitted the fundamental point on which the whole of the hypotheses then prevalent may be said to hinge, namely, that the world had been created, not by the immediate operation of the divine being, but by the agency of æons. Carpocratians, Antitactæ, Adamites, Prodicians, the followers of Secundus, Ptolemy, Marcus, Colobarsus, and Heracleon. (4.) *Inferior* sects of Gnostics—Sethians, Cainites, Ophites.

Heresies not of Oriental origin: Patripassians, whose principal leader was Praxeas; Melchizedechians, under Theodotus and Artemon; Hermogenians, Montanists, Chiliasts or Millenarians. *Century III.* The Manichæans, the Hieracites, the Patripassians, under Noëtus and Sabellius; heresy of Beryllus; Paulianists, under Paul of Samosata, Novatians, under Novatus and Novatian; the Monarchici, the Arabici, the Aquarians, the Origenists. *Century IV.* The Arians, Colluthians, Macedonians, Agnoëtæ, Apollinarians, Collyridians, Seleucians, Anthropomorphites, Jovinianists, Messalians, Timotheans, Priscillianists, Photinians, Donatists, Messalians, Bonosians. *Century V.* The Pelagians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Theopaschites. *Century VI.* The Aphthartodocetæ, Severiani, Corrupticolæ, Monothelites.

IV. *Punishment of Heresy.*—Soon after the triumph of Christianity over paganism, and its establishment by the State, the laws became very severe against heretics. Those of the *State*, made by the Christian emperors from the time of Constantine, are comprised under one title, *De Hæreticis*, in the Theodosian code. (See below.) The principal are the note of infamy affixed to all heretics in common; commerce forbidden to be held with them; privation of all offices of dignity and profit; disqualification to dispose of their property by will, or to receive property; pecuniary mulcts; proscription and banishment; corporal punishment, such as scourging. Heretics were forbidden to hold public disputations; to propagate their opinions; their children could not inherit patrimony, unless they returned to the Church, etc. The laws of the *Church* consisted in pronouncing formal *anathema*, or excommunication, against them; forbidding them to enter the church, so much as to hear sermons or the reading of the Scriptures (this was but partially observed); the prohibition of all persons, under pain of excommunication, to join with them in any religious exercises; the enjoining that none should eat or converse familiarly with them, or contract affinity with them; their names were to be struck out of the diptychs; and their testimony was not to be received in any ecclesiastical cause (Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* vol. ii). Augustine's view of heresy is deserving of special notice, as it forms the basis of the doctrine and practice of the Middle Ages. In *De Civit. Dei*, xviii, 51, he says; "Qui ergo in ecclesia morbidum aliquid pravumque sapiunt, *si correpti*, ut sanum rectumque sapiant, *resistunt contumaciter*, suaque pestifera et mortifera dogmata emendare nolunt, sed *defensare persistunt*, *hæretici fiunt*, et foras exeuntes *habentur in exercentibus inimicis*." The earlier fathers of the Church had steadily refused using force in opposing heresy (Hilarius, *Pictav. ad Constant.* i, 2 and 7; *contr. Auxent.* lib. init.; Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.* § 33), and at most permitted the secular powers to interfere to prevent the organization of heretical communities (Chrysost. *Homil.* 29, 46, *in Matth.*), and even this was often censured (see Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* vi, 19, where it is said that the misfortunes which befel Chrysostom were by many considered as a punishment for his having caused churches belonging to the Quartodecimani and Novatians of Asia to be taken away from them and closed). Augustine, on the contrary (*Retractat.* ii, c. 5; ep. 93, *ad Vincentium*, § 17; ep. 185, *ad Bonifac.* § 21; *Opus. imperf.* 2, 2), basing himself on the passage Luke xiv, 23 (*cogite intrare*, etc.), completely reversed his former opinion that heretics and schismatics were not to be brought back by the aid of secular power, and stated explicitly, as a fundamental principle, that "*damnata hæresis ab episcopis non adhuc examinanda, sed coercenda est potestatibus Christianis.*" He only rejects the infliction of capital punishment, yet more on account of the general opposition of the ancient Church to this mode of punishment than from leniency towards heresy. It is, consequently, not strange if even this protest against the execution of heretics came subsequently to be disregarded, and the punishment even approved (see Leo M. *ep.* 15, *ad Turribium;* Hieronymus, *ep.* 37, *ad Bipar.*). In the Middle Ages we find the Roman Church, on the one hand, condemning capital punishment by its canon law, and at the same time demanding the application of this punishment to heretics from the secular law. Julian the Apostate had long before reproached the Christians of his time for persecuting heretics by force (*ep.* 52, and *ap. Cyrill. c. Julianum VI*). As to the principles which guided the conduct of the secular powers towards heretics, we find that it wavered long between an entire liberty in establishing sects, submitting them to mere police regulations, restricting them in the carrying out of their system of worship, depriving them of some political rights and privileges, formally prohibiting them, and finally punishing them as criminals. Through all these variations the fundamental principle was adhered to that the secular power possesses in general the right to punish, repress, or extirpate heresy. Hesitation is shown only in the mode of applying this principle, not in the principle itself. Moreover, the exercise of this right was in no way subject to the decision of the Church, and the secular power could by itself decide whether and how far a certain heresy should be tolerated—a right which the states retained without opposition until the Middle Ages. The numerous laws contained in the *Codex Theodosianus*, xvi, tit. v, *De Hæreticis*, to which we may add xvi, tit. i, 2, 3, are the principal sources for the history of the laws concerning sects in antiquity. History shows us that in the use of compulsion and punishments against heretics the secular power anticipated the wishes of the Church, doing more than the latter was at first disposed to approve. Julian the Apostate granted full freedom to heretics with a view to injure the Church. Augustine first succeeded, in the 5th century, in establishing an agreement between Church and State on this question, yet without contesting the right of the State to use its independent authority. This is proved by Justinian's *Institutes* (compare cod. i, tit. 5), which interfere directly with the private rights of heretics; and in case of mixed marriages, they order, regardless of the *patria potestas*, that the children shall be brought up in the orthodox faith (cod. i, tit. 5; i, 18).

In the Middle Ages the notion of heresy and of its relations to the Church and the State acquired a further development. At one time, in view of the authority of the pope in matters of faith and of the doctrine of *fides implicita et explicita*, the notion of heresy was so modified that the act of disobedience to the pope in refusing to accept or reject some distinction according to his command, was considered almost as its worst and most important feature. The Scholastics treated the doctrine concerning heresy scientifically. Finally the Church came to deny to the State the right to tolerate *any* heresy it had condemned. It even compelled the secular powers to repress and extirpate heresy according to its

dictates by threats of ecclesiastical censure, by inviting invasion and revolution in case of resistance, and by commanding the application of secular punishments, such as the sequestration of property, and the deprivation of all civil and political rights, as was especially done by Innocent III. Nevertheless, the Church continued in the practice, whenever it handed over condemned heretics to the secular powers for punishment, of requesting that no penalty should be inflicted on them which might endanger their lives; but this was a mere formality, and so far from being made in earnest that the Church itself made the allowableness of such punishment one of its dogmas. Thus Leo X, in his bull against Luther, in 1520, condemns, among other propositions, that which says that *Hæreticos comburere est contra voluntatem Spiritus* (art. 33), and recommended the use of such punishment himself. About the same time, a special form of proceedings was adopted against heretics, and their persecution was rendered regular and systematic by the establishment of the *Inquisition* (q. v.). Thus, in course of time, a number of secular penalties came to be considered as inevitably connected with ecclesiastical condemnation, and were even pronounced against heretics by the Church itself without further formalities. The Church, whenever any individual suspected of heresy recanted, or made his peace with the Church, declared him (in full court, after a public abjuration) released either partially or fully from the ecclesiastical and secular punishment he had *ipso facto* incurred. This implied the right of still inflicting these punishments after the reconciliation (which was especially done in the cases of sequestration of property, deprivation of civil or ecclesiastical offices, and degradation, while a return to heresy after recantation was to be punished by death). See the provisions of the Canon Law as found in *X. de hæretic.* v, tit. 7; c. 49; *X. de sentent. excommun.* v, 39; *tit. de Hær.* in VI°, v, 2; *De hæret.* in Clement. v, 3; *De hæret.* in Extravag. comm. v, 3; and comp. the *Liber septimus*, v, 3, 4, and the laws against heretics of the emperor Frederick II, which are connected with the ecclesiastical laws (in Pertz, *Monum.* ii, 244, 287, 288, 327, 328); and the regulations concerning mixed marriages and the marriage of heretics. All these are yet considered by the Roman Catholic Church as having the *force of law*, though, under present circumstances, they are not enforced (comp. Benedict XIV, *De synod. Diocc.* vi, 5; ix, 14, 3; xiii, 24, 21).

Even in the 18th century Muratori defended the assertion that the secular power is bound to enforce the most severe secular penalties against heretics (*De ingeniorum moderatione in religiones negotio*, ii, 7 sq.). In the beginning of the 19th century, pending the negotiations for the crowning of Napoleon I, pope Pius VII declared that he could not set foot in a country in which the law *recognised the freedom of worship of the different religions*. The same pope wrote in 1805 to his nuncio at Vienna, "The Church has not only sought to prevent heretics from using the properties of the Church, but has also established, as the punishment for the sin of heresy, the sequestration of private property, in c. 10, *X. d. hæret.* (v, 7), of principalities, and of feudal tenures, in c. 16, eod.; the latter law contains the canonical rule that the subjects of a heretical prince are free from all oaths of fealty as well as from all fidelity and obedience to him; and there is none at all acquainted with history but knows the decrees of deposition issued by popes and councils against obstinately heretical princes. Yet we find ourselves now in times of such misfortune and humiliation for the bride of Christ that *the Church is not only unable to enforce these, its holiest maxims, against the rebellious enemies of the faith*, with the firmness with which they should be, but it even cannot proclaim them openly without danger. Yet, if it cannot exert its right in depriving heretics of their estates, it may," etc. With this may be compared the permission granted in anticipation, in 1724 (Bullar. *Propagandæ*, ii, 54, 56), to the Ruthenes, in case of conversion, to take possession of the properties they had lost by their apostasy; the satisfaction manifested by the Church on the expulsion of the Protestants from Salzburg (Bull. *Propag.* ii, 246); and many things happening every day in strictly Roman Catholic countries, under the eyes of the Roman See. Quite recently, Philippi, in his *Canon Law*, honestly acknowledged the validity of the old laws against heretics, and asserted their correctness. Even now, in all countries where the secular power has not put an end to this, the bishops promise, in taking the oath of obedience to the pope, *hæreticos, schismaticos, et rebelles eidem Domino nostro vel successoribus prædictis pro posse persequar et impugnabo.* Yet the Roman See has renounced, since Sept. 17, 1824, the use of the expression of "Protestant heretics" in its official acts; and it has even admitted that, under the pressure of existing circumstances, the civil powers may be forgiven for tolerating heretics in their states! Still, as soon *as circumstances will permit*, the Roman See is prepared to apply again the old laws, which are merely temporarily suspended in some countries, but in nowise repealed.

Governments, however, naturally take a different view of these laws. The secular power, even while it freed itself from its absolute subjection to the Church, still continued to persecute in various ways the Protestants whom the Church denounced as heretics. We even see them deprived under Louis XIV of the right of emigration; while, in refusing to recognise the validity of their marriage, the civil authorities showed themselves even more severe than the Church. But, becoming wiser by experience, and taught by the general reaction which its measures provoked in the 18th century, the State has confined itself to interfering with heresy so far only as is necessary to promote public order and the material good of the State; thus claiming only the right to repress or expel those whose principles are opposed to the existence of government, or might create disorder. This right, of course, has been differently understood in different countries according to local circumstances, and has even become a pretence for persecutions against denominations which a milder construction of it would not have deprived of the toleration of the State, as in the persecution of dissidents in Sweden, etc.

Let us now compare this practice of the Romish Church and of Roman Catholic states with the dogmatic theory of the Middle Ages. Thomas Aquinas treats heresy as the opposite of faith, connecting it with *infidelitas in communi* and *apostasia a fide.* He treats *schism*, again, as opposed to *charitas.* He defines heresy as *infidelitatis species pertinens ad eos, qui fidem Christi profitentur, sed ejus dogmata corrumpunt* (l. c., qu. ii, art. i), yet (art. ii) he remarks at the same time that some holy fathers themselves erred in the early times of the Church on many points of faith. In art. iii he comes to the question whether heretics are to be tolerated. He asserts that they also have their use in the Church, as serving to prove its faith, and inducing it diligently to search the Scriptures, yet their usefulness in these respects is involuntary. Considered for themselves only, heretics "are not only deserving of being cut off from communion with the Church, but also with the world, by being put to death. But the Church must, in her mercy, first use all means of converting heretics, and only when it despairs of bringing them back must cut them off by excommunication, and then deliver them up to secular justice, which frees the world of them by condemnation to death." He only admits of toleration towards heretics when persecution against them would be likely to injure the faithful. In this case he advises sparing the tares for the sake of the wheat. He further maintains that such heretics as repent may, on their first offense, be entirely pardoned, and all ecclesiastical and secular punishment remitted, but asserts that those who relapse, though they may be reconciled with the Church, must not be released from the sentence of death incurred, lest the bad example of their inconstancy might prove injurious to others.

The Reformation protested against these doctrines. Luther, from the first, denounced all attempts to overcome heresy by sword and fire instead of the Word of God, and held that the civil power should leave heretics to be dealt with by the Church. On this ground he opposed Carlstadt. Yet it was a fundamental principle with all the Reformers, that governments are bound to prevent blasphemy, to see that the people receive from the Church built on the Word of God the pure teaching of that word, and to prevent all attempts at creating sects. This led to the adoption of preventive measures in the place of the former penalties of confiscation, bodily punishment, and death. These preventive measures confined the heresy to the individual, and extended as far as banishment, when no other means would avail. Luther admitted the use of secular punishment against heretics only in exceptional cases, and then not on account of the heresy, but of the resulting disorders. Even then he considered banishment sufficient, except when incitations to revolution, etc., required more severe punishment, as was the case with the Anabaptists; yet he often declared against the application of capital punishment to such heretics. Zwingle took nearly the same stand as Luther on this point, yet was somewhat more inclined to the use of forcible means. The Anabaptists were treated in a summary manner in Switzerland. Calvin went further, and with his theocratic ideas considered the state as bound to treat heresy as blasphemy, and to punish it in the severest manner. His approbation and even instigation of the execution of Servetus gave rise to a controversy on the question whether heresy might be punished with the sword (compare Calvini *Defensis orthodoxæ fidei*, etc.). Calvin's views were attacked not only by Bolsec, but also by Castellio, who, under the pseudonym of Martin Bellius, wrote on this occasion his *De hæreticis* (Magdeb. 1554), quoting against Calvin the opinions of Luther and of Brentius. Lälius Socinus, in his *Dialogus inter Calvinum et Vaticanum* (1554), also advocated toleration. Among all the German theologians, Melancthon alone sided with Calvin, consistently with the views (*Corp. Ref.* ii, 18, an. 1530; and iii, 195, an. 1536) which he had long previously defended against the more moderate views of Brentius (see Hartmann and Jäger, *Johann Brenz*, i, 299 sq.).

In England, in the first year of queen Elizabeth, an act of Parliament was passed to enable persons to try heretics, and the following directions were given for their guidance: "And such persons to whom the queen shall by letters patent under the great seal give authority to execute any jurisdiction spiritual, shall not in any wise have power to adjudge any matter or cause to be heresy, but only such as heretofore have been adjudged to be heresy, by the authority of the canonical Scriptures, or *by some of the first four general councils*, or by any other general council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be judged or determined to be heresy by the high court of Parliament, with the assent of the clergy in their convocation." "This statute continued practically in force, with certain modifications, till the 29 Charles II, c. 9, since which time heresy has been left entirely to the cognizance of the ecclesiastical courts; but, as there is no statute defining in what heresy consists, and as, moreover, much of the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts has been withdrawn by the various toleration acts; and, above all, as the effect of various recent decisions has been to widen almost indefinitely the construction of the doctrinal formularies of the English Church, it may now be said that the jurisdiction of these courts in matters of heresy is practically limited to preventing ministers of the Established Church from preaching in opposition to the doctrine and the articles of the establishment from which they derive their emoluments, and that, even in determining what is to be considered contrary to the articles, a large toleration has been juridically established. See the recent trial of Dr. Rowland Williams, and the judgment given by Dr. Lushington in the Court of Arches" (Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.). The Protestant churches generally, in the 19th century, deny the power of the State to punish heresy. The Roman Church retains its old theories upon the subject, but its power is limited by the progress of civilization. See TOLERATION.

The *history* of the various heresies is given, with more or less fulness, in the Church histories. Walch's *Entw. einer vollständ. Historie d. Ketzereien*, etc. (1762–1785, 11 vols.), gives a history of doctrines and heresies (so-called) up to the 9th century. "As a history of heresies, divisions, and religious controversies, it is still indispensable. Walch is free from polemic zeal, and bent upon the critical and pragmatic representation of his subject, without sympathy or antipathy" (Schaff, *Apost. History*, § 31). See also Lardner, *History of the Heretics of the first two Centuries, with additions by Hogg* (Lond. 1780, 4to; and in Lardner, *Works*, 11 vols. 8vo); Füssli, *Kirchen-u.-Ketzerhistorien d. mittlern Zeit* (Frcft. 1770–1774, 3 vols.); Baumgarten, *Geschichte d. Religionspartheien* (Halle, 1766, 4to). Professor Oehler commenced in 1856 the publication of a *Corpus Hæresiologicum*, designed to contain, in 8 vols., all the principal works on heresies, with notes and prolegomena. See also Burton, *Enquiry into the Heresies of the Apostolic Age* (*Bampton Lecture for* 1829, 8vo); Campbell, *Preliminary Diss. to Comm. on Four Gospels;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 468; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, bk. iii, ch. iii, et al.; Cramp, *Text-book of Popery*, p. 252, 480; Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Edinb. transl.), i, 344; Neander, *History of Dogmas* (Ryland's transl.), i, 16. See also HÆRETICO COMBURENDO; PERSECUTION; TOLERATION.

Heretic. See HERESY.

Heretics, Baptism by. When the line between the orthodox and the heretics [see HERESY] was clearly drawn in the early Church, the question whether baptism performed by heretics should be regarded as valid by the orthodox began to be mooted. It afterwards became of great moment, especially with regard to the claims of the Church of Rome.

1. As early as the 3d century heretical baptism was pronounced invalid. Clemens Alexandrinus calls it false and foreign (*Stromat.* i, 375). Tertullian declared that it was of no value (*De Baptismo*, cap. xv). "Cyprian, whose epistles afford the clearest information on this subject, followed Tertullian in rejecting baptism by heretics as an inoperative mock baptism, and demanded that all heretics coming over to the Catholic Church be baptized (he would not say *re*-baptized). His position here was due to his High-Church exclusivism and his horror of schism. As the one Catholic Church is the sole repository of all grace, there can be no forgiveness of sins, no regeneration or communication of the Spirit, no salvation, therefore no valid sacraments, out of her bosom. So far he had logical consistency on his side. But, on the other hand, he departed from the objective view of the Church, as the Donatists afterwards did, in making the efficiency of the sacrament depend on the subjective holiness of the priest. 'How can one consecrate water,' he asks, 'who is himself unholy, and has not the Holy Ghost?' He was followed by the North African Church, which, in several councils at Carthage in the years 255–6, rejected heretical baptism; and by the Church of Asia Minor, which had already acted on this view, and now, in the person of the Cappadocian bishop Firmilian, a disciple and venerator of the great Origen, vigorously defended it against the intolerance of Rome. The Roman bishop Stephen (253–257) appeared for the opposite doctrine, on the ground of the ancient practice of the Church. He offered no argument, but spoke with the consciousness of authority, and followed a catholic instinct. He laid chief stress on the objective nature of the sacrament, the virtue of which depended neither on the officiating priest nor on the

receiver, but solely on the institution of Christ. Hence he considered heretical baptism valid, provided it had been administered in the right form, to wit, in the name of the Trinity, or even of Christ alone; so that heretics coming into the Church needed only confirmation, or the ratification of baptism by the Holy Ghost. 'Heresy,' says he, 'produces children and exposes them; and the Church takes up the exposed children, and nourishes them as her own, though she herself has not brought them forth.' The doctrine of Cyprian was the more consistent from the churchly point of view, that of Stephen from the sacramental. The one preserved the principle of the exclusiveness of the Church, the other that of the objective force of the sacraments, even to the borders of the opus-operatum theory. Both were under the direction of the same hierarchical spirit, and the same hatred of heretics; but the Roman doctrine is, after all, a happy inconsistency of liberality, an inroad upon the principle of absolute exclusiveness, an involuntary concession that baptism, and, with it, the remission of sins, and regeneration, therefore salvation, are possible outside of Roman Catholicism. The controversy itself was conducted with great warmth. Stephen, though advocating the liberal view, showed the genuine papal arrogance and intolerance. He would not even admit to his presence the deputies of Cyprian, who brought him the decree of the African Synod, and called this bishop, who in every respect far excelled Stephen, and whom the Roman Church now venerates as one of her greatest saints, a 'pseudo-Christum, pseudo-apostolum, et dolosum operarium.' He broke off all intercourse with the African Church, as he had already done with the Asiatic. But Cyprian and Firmilian, nothing daunted, vindicated with great boldness, the latter also with bitter vehemence, their different view, and continued in it to their death. The Alexandrian bishop Dionysius endeavored to reconcile the two parties, but with little success. The Valerian persecution, which soon ensued, and the martyrdom of Stephen (257) and of Cyprian (258), suppressed this internal discord. In the course of the 4th century, however, the Roman practice gradually gained on the other, was raised to a doctrine of the Church by the Council of Nice in 325, and was afterwards confirmed by the Council of Trent, with an anathema on the opposite view" (Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, ch. vi, § 104).

2. The decree of the Council of Trent as to baptism by heretics is as follows: "If any man shall say that the baptism which is given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church doth, is not true baptism, let him be anathema" (sess. vii, can. iv). This, at first view, may appear liberal; but the indirect intention of it is to claim all baptized persons as under the jurisdiction of Rome. Canon viii affirms that the baptized are bound "by all the precepts of the Church, whether written or transmitted." Canon xiv declares that any one who shall say "that those who have been baptized when infants are to be left to their own will when they grow up, and are not meanwhile to be *compelled* to a Christian life by any other penalty save exclusion from the Eucharist and the other seven sacraments till they repent," is to be anathema.

3. Luther admitted the validity of Romish baptism, and in this he is followed by Protestants generally, who do not rebaptize converts from Rome. The Protestant churches (except the Baptist) admit the validity of each other's baptism. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 538; Coleman, *Anc. Christianity*, p. 363; Elliott, *Romanism*, bk. ii, ch. ii; Guericke, *Christl. Symbolik*, § 59.

Heriger. See LOBBES.

Heritage, denoted by several Heb. words: אֲחֻזָּה, *achuzzah'*, a "possession;" נַחֲלָה, *nachalah'*, or נַחֲלַת. *nachalath'*, "heritage," etc.; also יְרֻשָּׁה, *yerushshah'*; מוֹרָשָׁה, *morashah'*. Only *sons* (compare Gen. xxi, 10; xxxi, 14 sq.), and, indeed, only those of regular wives (comp. Gen. xxi, 10 sq.; xxiv, 36; xxv, 5 sq.; Jephthah is no exception, Judg. xi, 2, 7; see BASTARD), had any legal title to the paternal inheritance, according to ancient usage among the Israelites; and amongst these the first-born, who might be of the favorite or a less favored wife, enjoyed a double portion (Deut. xxi, 15 sq.). See PRIMOGENITURE. Daughters became heiresses, when sons existed, only by the special grant of the father (Josh. xv, 18 sq.; comp. Job xlii, 15), but regularly in the absence of male heirs (Numb. xxvii, 8); yet heiresses (ἐπίκληροι—such, according to many, was Mary, the mother of Jesus) were not allowed to marry a man of another tribe (Numb. xxxvi, 6 sq.; comp. Tobit vi, 12 sq.; vii, 14; Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 7, 5; see Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, ii, 81; Buxtorf, *Sponsal. et Divort.* p. 67 sq., in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxx; Selden, *De successione in bona pat.* c. 18), so as not to interrupt the regular transmission of the estate (see Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterthumsk.* iii, 206, 213; Gans, *Erbrecht*, i, 337 sq.; comp. Rhode, *Rel. Bild. d. Hindu*, ii, 608). On the heirship of distant kinsmen, see Numb. xxvii, 9 sq. (comp. Philo, *Works*, ii, 172; see Mishna, *Baba Bathra*, iv, 3, c. 8, 9; Gans, *Erbrecht*, i, 152 sq.). Respecting written wills, we find nothing legally prescribed (see S. Rau, *De Testamentificatione Hebræis vet. ignota*, præs. L. Van Wolde, Traj. ad Rhen. 1760; also in Oelrich's *Collect. Opusc.* i, 305 sq.), and as the heirship-at-law had undisputed force as a legal principle (Numb. xxi, 11), it must have operated as a testamentary disposition of the inheritance, to the exclusion of any more formal method of bequest (Gans, *Erbrecht*, i, 149 sq.); for the passage in Tobit viii, 23 does not refer to a devise by will, and Prov. xvii, 2 only shows that slaves might become heirs by a special arrangement of their masters (see Rosenmüller in loc.; Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* i, 483), while Gen. xv, 3 refers to an earlier period. But in later times regular testaments must have obtained among the Jews (Gal. iii, 15; Heb. ix, 17; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 16, 1; xvii, 3, 2; *War*, ii, 2, 3), in imitation of the Greeks and Romans (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Heres, Testamentum); and in the Talmudical law of heritage they became of effect (Gans, *Erbrecht*, i, 171), although not in the extensive sense of the Roman law. Sometimes the parent divided the inheritance (i. e. a portion of it) among his children during his lifetime (Luke xv, 12; comp. Tobit viii, 23; see Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* v, 197). (On the subject generally, see Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, ii, 76 sq.; J. Selden, *De successione in bona defuncti ad leg. Hebr.* Lond. 1636; also in his *Uxor. Ebr.* and in his *Works*, ii, 1 sq.) See INHERITANCE.

Hermann OF COLOGNE (prince archbishop), son of Frederick I, count of Wied, was educated for the priesthood, elected archbishop in 1515, and confirmed by pope Leo X as Hermann V. Having imbibed the principles of the Reformation, he first attempted a Roman Catholic reform in Cologne, but, finding this impossible, he at last assumed a Protestant position, and invited Bucer and Melancthon, in 1542, to assist him. Had he succeeded in his plans, the whole Rhine country would probably have become Protestant; but he was excommunicated by the pope, menaced by the emperor, and abandoned by his estates. He finally resigned his office in 1547, and retired to his estates in Wied, where he died Aug. 15, 1552. He was beloved by his people, honored by the emperor Charles V, and esteemed by the great leaders of the Reformation. An account of Hermann's relation to his times is given in Deckers, *Hermann von Wied* (Cologne, 1840). His *Form of Service* was made use of in the framing of the English "Book of Common Prayer." See Hase, *Church History*, § 337-340; Hardwick, *History of the Reformation*, p. 65, 213. See COMMON PRAYER.

Hermann OF FRITZLAR, a mystic, was born at Fritzlar, in Hesse, towards the middle of the 14th century. Nothing certain is known of his position or so-

cial relations; it is probable, however, that he was a rich layman, like Nicholas of Basle, who retired from the world to devote himself to reading and writing theological works. One of his earlier works, to which he refers himself, *Die Blume der Schauung* (doubtless of speculative tendency), appears to have been lost. We have, however, his *Heiligenleben* (printed in Pfeiffer's *Deutschen Mystikern des* 14 *Jahrh.* i, 1-258, from the Heidelberg MS. executed under his supervision in 1343-1349). It is an extensive work, compiled from sources now mostly lost.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* (J. N. P.)

Hermann of Lehnin. See Lehnin.

Hermann of Salga. See Salga.

Hermann of Wied. See Wied.

Hermann, or **Hermannus**, Contractus, so called from disease having shrunk up his limbs, was a monk of Reichenau, and one of the learned men of the 11th century, being well skilled in Latin, Greek, and Arabic. He was born in 1013, and was the son of the count of Weringen in Suevia. He wrote a Chronicle (*De Sex ætatibus mundi*), which commences at the Creation and ends A.D. 1052. The events occurring before the Christian æra are very briefly noticed, but afterwards he enters into more details, and amplifies as he approaches nearer to his own times. The "Chronicle" was continued by Berthold of Constance up to 1065, and published at Basle in 1536, and again at St. Blaise in 1790 (2 vols. 4to). It may be found also in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. xviii. Trithemius ascribes the hymns *Alma Redemptoris mater* and *Salve Regina* to Hermann. See Dupin, *Eccl. Writers*, ix, 102.

Hermann or **Hermannus**, abbot of Tours, A.D. 1127, resigned his office in consequence of long-continued illness. He wrote *Tractatus de Incarnatione Christi* (ed. C. Oudin, Vet. Sac. Lugd. Bat. 1692); *three* books of the *Miracles* of Mary of Laon; and a *History of the Monastery of St. Martin in Tours*, which are given in D'Achery, *Spicileg.* ii, 888.—Dupin, *Ecclesiastical Writers*, x, 181.

Hermann von der Hardt, a German Protestant theologian and philologist, was born at Melle (Westphalia) Nov. 15, 1660. He studied at Osnabruck, Jena, and Hamburg. In 1681 he began to lecture privately at Jena, but, not succeeding as well as he had expected, he went to Leipzig in 1686, where he joined the celebrated *Collegium philobiblicum.* In 1688 he became librarian and secretary of duke Rudolph August of Brunswick, and the latter caused him finally to be appointed professor of Oriental languages at the University of Helmstadt in 1690. He afterwards became senior of the University and provost of the convent of Marienburg. He died Feb. 28, 1746. Hermann was a very active and ingenious scholar, but his tendency to paradoxical assertions caused him to fall into errors, which, however, were perhaps too severely condemned by his adversaries. He wrote *Autographa Lutheri aliorumque celebrium virorum*, etc. (Brunsw. 1690-1693, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Ephemerides Philologicæ, quibus difficiliora quædam loca Pentateuchi ad Hebraicorum fontium tenorem explicata*, etc. (Helmstadt, 1693, 1696, and 1703):—*Hoseas illustratus chaldaica Jonathanis versione et philologicis celebrium rabbinorum Raschi, Aben Esræ et Kimchi commentariis* (Helmst. 1702, 1775):—*Magnum œcumenicum Constantinense Concilium de universali Ecclesiæ reformatione, unione et fide*, etc. (Frankf. and Leipz. 1700, 1742, 4 vols. fol.):—*Historia litteraria Reformationis* (Frankfort and Leipz. 1717):—*Evangelicæ Rei Integritas in negotio Jonæ quatuor libris declarata* (Frankf. 1719, 4to):—*Ænigmata prisci orbis: Jonas in luce in historia Manassis et Josiæ; Ænigmata Græcorum et Latinorum ex caligine; Apocalypsis ex tenebris* (Helmst. 1723, fol.). This work attracted great attention when first published:—*Tomus primus in Jobum, historiam populi Israelis in Assyriaco exilio, Samaria eversa et regno extincto*, etc. (Helmstadt, 1728, fol.). See J. Fabricius, *Hist. Biblioth.* pt. ii, p. 342-347, 351-352; *Nova Acta Eruditorum* (an. 1746, p. 475-480); Breithaupt, *Memoria Herm. v. d. Hardt* (Helmst. 1746); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiii, 362.

Hermann, Nikolaus, one of the earliest evangelical hymnologists, flourished about the middle of the 16th century. His intimate relation with the minister of the church of his place (which he served as organist), Mathesius, the biographer of Luther, gave to his compositions a true reform spirit and the child-like simplicity of a Christian mind. They have been preserved in general use even to our own day.—Brockhaus, *Conversations Lexicon*, vii, 841; Gervinus, *Gesch. d. poetischen Nationallit. d. Deutschen*, iii, 10, 32.

Hermaphrodite Orders. See Monasticism.

Her'mas (Ἑρμᾶς, from Ἑρμῆς, the Greek god of gain, or *Mercury*), the name of a person to whom Paul sends greeting in his Epistle to the Romans (xvi, 14), and consequently then resident in Rome and a Christian (A.D. 55); and yet the origin of the name, like that of the other four mentioned in the same verse, is Greek. However, in those days, even a Jew, like Paul himself, might acquire Roman citizenship. Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen agree in making him identical with the author of "*the Shepherd*" of the following article, but this is greatly disputed. He is celebrated as a saint in the Roman calendar on May 9.—Smith, s. v.

Hermas, one of the so-called apostolical fathers (q. v.), the supposed author of a tract that has come down to us under the name of Ποιμήν, *The Shepherd*, and generally designated by the title *Pastor Hermæ.* The authorship of the tract is uncertain, but it is clearly *not* the work of the Hermas (Ἑρμᾶς) mentioned in Rom. xvi, 14, as Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome believed, and as the tract itself seems to pretend. The author appears to have been a layman of the 2d century, probably a Roman tradesman "who had lost his wealth through his own sins and the misdeeds of his neglected sons" (Hilgenfeld; Schaff, *History of the Church*, § 121). Others ascribe it to Hermas or Hermes, brother of Pius, bishop of Rome from A.D. 142 to 157. Of the Greek original we have nothing left but fragments, which are given in Fabricius, *Cod. Apocryph. N. Test.* iii, 378, and in Grabe, *Spicileg.* i, 303. M. d'Abbadie claims (1860) to have discovered a third in Ethiopia, which he has transcribed and translated into Latin (Lpz. 1860); but whether the text from which it is taken is correct is a matter for further investigation. The Greek text was at an early period translated into Latin, and, since the beginning of the 15th century, often published (Paris, 1513, fol.; Strasb. 1522, 4to; Basle, 1555 and 1569, fol.; Oxford, 1685, 12mo; with additions by Le Clerc, Amst. 1698, 1724; Paris, 1715, 12mo). It is also inserted in the various collections of the fathers in Cotelier, *Patres ævi apostolici* (Paris, 1672, fol.), and in French in Desprez's *Bible* (Paris, 1715, fol. vol. iv). It is also given in the various editions of the Apostolical Fathers (q. v.). Of late years this tract has been the subject of more editing and literary criticism than almost any relic of the early Church. In 1857 Dressel published at Leipzig a new Latin translation of the *Pastor* which he found in a MS. at Rome, and which differs from the other. The edition contains also a Greek text of the Ποιμήν, revised by Tischendorf. This text, it is claimed, was found in a convent of Mount Athos by Simonides. Tischendorf considers it, however, only as a retranslation from the Latin into Greek, and places its origin in the Middle Ages. Tischendorf himself discovered, in the *Codex Sinaiticus*, the Greek text of book i of the *Shepherd*, and the first four chapters of book ii; this is given in the recent edition of Dressel, *Patres Apost.* (Lips. 1863); also by Hilgenfeld, who has carefully edited the *Pastor Hermæ* in his *Nov. Test. extra Canonem receptum* (fasc. iii, Lips. 1866). The *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. i (Edinb. 1867), contains a new and good translation of the *Shepherd*, following the text of Hilgenfeld, who makes use of the text found in the Sinaitic Codex.

The *Pastor* is written in the form of a dialogue, and is divided into three parts: 1 *Visiones; 2. Mandata; 3. Similitudines.* Hermas, in his childhood, had been brought up with a young slave. In after life, and when he was married, he met her again, and experienced for her a passion which, however pure in itself, was yet forbidden by the Church under the circumstances. Soon afterwards the young slave died. One day, as Hermas was wandering in the country, thinking of her, he sat down and fell asleep. "During my sleep," says he, "my mind carried me away to a steep path, which I found great difficulty in ascending on account of rocks and streams. Arriving on a piece of table-land, I knelt down to pray; and as I was praying the heavens opened, and I saw the young maiden I was wishing for, who saluted me from the sky, saying, 'Good day, Hermas.' And I, looking at her, answered, 'What art thou doing there?' 'I have been called here,' she answered, 'to denounce thy sins before the Lord.' 'What!' exclaimed I, 'and wilt thou accuse me?' 'No; but listen to me...,'" etc. The conversation goes on with a blending of severity and tenderness. "Pray to the Lord," says the young girl, as she disappears from his sight; "he will heal thy soul, and will efface the sins of all thy house, as he has done those of all the saints." One cannot help noticing the striking similarity which exists between this *Vision* and the celebrated passage in the *Divina Commedia* where Beatrice appears to Dante. This vision is followed by three others. They are all invitations to penitence, and though in the first it appears as if the invitation was especially directed to Hermas, it clearly applies also to the Church in general. This becomes more evident in the following visions.

The *Mandata* begin also with a vision. An angel appears to Hermas under the form of a shepherd, wearing a white cloak, and bearing a staff in his hand. This shepherd is the angel of penitence, and gives Hermas twelve precepts, which embrace the rules of Christian morals. They are given under the different headings: 1. *De fide in unum Deum;* 2. *De fugienda obtrectatione, et eleemosyna facienda in simplicitate;* 3. *De fugiendo mendacio;* 4. *De dimittenda adultera;* 5. *De tristitia cordis et patientia;* 6. *De agnoscendis uniuscujusque hominis duobus geniis et utriusque inspirationibus;* 7. *De Deo timendo et dæmone non timendo;* 8. *Declinandum est a malo et facienda bona;* 9. *Postulandum a Deo assidue et sine hæsitatione;* 10. *De animi tristitia et non contristando Spiritum Dei, qui in nobis est;* 11. *Spiritus et prophetas probari ex operibus, et de duplici spiritu;* 12. *De duplici cupiditate. Dei mandata non esse impossibilia et diabolum non metuendum credentibus.*

The *Similitudines*, finally, are a series of parables and allegories. The vine, with its rich fruits and flexible boughs, is used to symbolize the fruitfulness of the Church. The willow is made the emblem of divine law. This latter image is made by Hermas the ground of a most graceful allegory. *Similitudines* 1 to 4 are short and simple images or descriptions; *Simil.* 5 to 9 are visions of the approaching completion of the Church, and of judgment, as well as invitations to penitence on that account; *Simil.* 10, finally, is a sort of conclusion of the whole.

This work was perhaps the most popular book in the Christian Church of the 2d and 3d centuries. Yet, while it pleased the masses, it did not always satisfy the teachers. Irenæus (*adv. Hær.* iv, 3), Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i, 29), and Origen (*Explan. Epist. ad Rom.* 16) held it in high estimation. Eusebius asserts (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 3) that many other ecclesiastical writers contested its authenticity. Jerome, after praising Hermas in his *Chronicon*, accuses him of foolishness (*stultitia*) in his *Comment. in Habacuc* (i, 1), and Tertullian treats him no better, designating the book as apocryphal in *De Pudicit.* (10). The learned Duguet, in his *Conférences ecclésiastiques* (i, 7), even claims to find in the *Pastor* the germ of all heresies which troubled the Church in the 2d century. Others among modern theologians, and especially Mosheim, have violently attacked the *Pastor*, and considered Hermas as an impostor. The book "knows little of the Gospel, and less of justifying faith; on the contrary, it talks much of the law of Christ and of repentance, enjoins fasting and voluntary poverty, and teaches the merit, even the supererogatory merit, of good works, and the sin-atoning virtue of martyrdom" (Schaff, *l. c.*). See Gratz, *Disquisitio in Past. Hermæ* (Bonn, 1820); Hefele, *Patr. Apost. Prolegomena;* Hilgenfeld, *Apost. Väter* (Halle, 1853); Cave, *Hist. literaria;* Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, vii, 18; Tillemont, *Mémoires ecclés.* vol. ii, May 9th; Dom. Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs sacrés et ecclés.* i, 582; Mosheim, *Comment.* i, 208-9; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 660, Hase, *Ch. Hist.* § 39 and Appendix; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 371; Schaff, *Church History*, § 121; Bunsen, *Christianity and Mankind*, i, 182; E. Gaab, *Der Hirt d. Hermas* (Basel, 1866, 8vo); Zahn, *Der Hirt d. Hermas untersucht* (Gotha, 1868, 8vo); Alzog, *Patrologie*, § 19; Lipsius, in *Zeitschrift f. Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1865, heft 3; Hilgenfeld, *Der Hirt d. Hermas u. sein neuester Bearbeiter, in Zeitsch. f. Wiss. Theol.* 1869, heft 2; Lipsius (in same journal, 1869, heft 3), *Die Polemik eines Apologeten* (a severe review of Zahn's *Hermas*).

Hermeneutæ (ἑρμηνευταί, *interpreters*), officers in the ancient Church, whose business it was to render one language into another, as there was occasion, both in reading the Scriptures, and in the homilies that were made to the people; an office chiefly used in those churches where the people spoke different languages, as in Palestine, where some spoke Syriac, others Greek; and in the churches of Africa, where some spoke Latin and others Punic. "So far was the primitive Church from encouraging ignorance, by locking up the Scriptures in an unknown tongue, that she not only translated them into all languages, but also appointed a standing office of interpreters, who were *viva voce* to make men understand what was read, and not suffer them to be barbarians in the service of God, which is a tyranny that was unknown to former ages."—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. iii, ch. xiii, § 4.

Hermeneutics (from ἑρμηνεύω, *to explain*), the techical or scientific name of that branch of theology which consists in *exposition* in general, as distinguished from exegesis (q. v.) in particular. Reserving for the more usual and equivalent title INTERPRETATION (OF SCRIPTURE) the history and literature of the subject, we propose to give in the present article only a brief view of those principles or *Canons* which should be observed in the elucidation of the meaning of the sacred text.

I. The first and most essential process is to apply the natural and obvious principles of a careful and conscientious exegesis to the passage and all its terms. This may be called the PHILOLOGICO-HISTORICAL rule. It embraces the following elements:

1. The diligent and discriminative use of an accurate and judicious *Lexicon.*

2. The painstaking and constant reference to the best *Grammars.*

A well-grounded knowledge of the language is implied in these prescriptions, yet the interpreter needs to confirm or modify his judgment by these independent authorities.

3. An intimate acquaintance with the *archæology* involved, including geography, chronology, and Oriental usages.

4. The *context* should be carefully consulted; and the general drift of the argument, as well as the author's special design in writing, must be kept in mind.

5. Especially is a cordial *sympathy* with spiritual truth a prerequisite in this task. A deep religious experience has enlightened many an otherwise ill-instructed mind as to the meaning of much of Holy Writ.

II. PARALLEL AND ILLUSTRATIVE PASSAGES from the same book or writer, or (if these are not to be had) from other parts of Scripture, are to be attentively con-

sidered, on the principle that *Scripture is its own best interpreter.* This is pre-eminently true of types, metaphors, parables, prophetical symbols, and other figurative representations. For this purpose "reference Bibles" alone are not sufficient: the examination should include an extensive comparison of doctrine, theory, and topic, as well as of example, fact, and expression.

III. When various meanings are assignable to a given passage or word, that should be selected which is the *broadest* in its import and application; if possible, one that is INCLUSIVE of all or most of the others. This rule should especially be observed in expounding the language of Christ, of God directly, or the more cardinal statements of inspiration.

In prophetical and eschatological passages of Scripture especially must the fact be borne in mind that one event or circumstance is often made the type or image of another; the two being generally related to the same essential principle as proximate and remote, or as personal and national, or as temporal and spiritual manifestations of the divine economy. In some cases this correlation runs through an entire piece or book, e. g. the Canticles and many of the Psalms. See DOUBLE SENSE (OF SCRIPTURE).

IV. The CONSENSUS of the universal Church in past and present time should have its due influence; not as being of absolute *authority*, but as an exponent of the aggregate and deliberate judgment of good and unprejudiced men. This will guard the expositor against fanciful subtleties and extravagant or dangerous impressions. To this end creeds, confessions, and articles of faith are useful, as well as the study of exploded or living heresies, but more particularly a collation of the views of preceding commentators. In weighing none of these, however, is any superstitious reverence to be indulged, for the word of God itself is superior to them all, and it is not only possible, but certain, that in some points they have alike erred, as in many they have fluctuated or conflicted with each other. Even the objections and cavils of infidels and rationalists should not be overlooked, for "fas est ab hoste doceri."

V. Where different interpretations are possible, that must be selected which is most consistent with *common sense.* Especially must those be set aside which lead to a psychological or theological impossibility or contradiction. Such a principle we always feel bound to apply to the communication of a friend, and to every obscure passage in a rational writer. Interpreters, from overlooking this rule, have often increased rather than explained the difficulties of the sacred text. For example, to understand Paul as meaning in Rom. ix, 3 that he was willing to forfeit his title to eternal bliss, is to attribute to him a sentiment incompatible with mental and moral sanity; and to refer the preference in 1 Cor. vii, 21 to a state of slavery, is to outrage the spontaneous instincts of the human mind.

VI. It will sometimes become necessary to modify our conclusions as to particular passages in consequence of the discoveries and deductions of MODERN SCIENCE. Instances in point are the theories respecting the creation and deluge, arising from the progress of astronomical and geological knowledge. All truth is consistent with itself; and although the Bible was not given for the purpose of determining scientific questions, yet it must not, and need not be so interpreted as to contradict the "elder scripture writ by God's own hand" in the volume of nature. In like manner history is often the best expositor of prophecy.

Her'mès (Ἑρμῆς, i. e. the Greek *Mercury* [q. v.]), the name of a man mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans as a disciple at Rome (Rom. xvi, 14). A.D. 55. "According to the Greeks," says Calmet (*Dict.* s. v.), "he was one of the seventy disciples, and afterwards bishop of Dalmatia." His festival occurs in their calendar upon April 8 (Neale, *Eastern Church*, ii, 774).

Hermes, Georg, a distinguished modern Romanist theologian and philosopher. He was born at Dreierwalde, near Münster, April 22, 1775, became gymnasial teacher in 1798, priest in 1799, and professor of theology at Münster in 1807. The bent of his mind was towards philosophy, and his theological studies were all through his life conducted on philosophical methods. His first publication of this class was the *Innere Wahrheit des Christenthums* (Münst. 1805, 8vo). In 1819 he published his *Philosophische Einleitung in die Christ-Katholische Theologie*, which passed to a second edition in 1831. In 1819 he was appointed professor of theology in the new University of Bonn, where he soon added greatly to his reputation, and his system, before his death, had found its way into most of the Roman Catholic schools of Prussia. He died at Bonn May 26, 1831. His followers have since been called *Hermesians.* The writings of Hermes published in his lifetime have been mentioned above. After his death appeared his *Christliche-Katholische Dogmatik* (Münst. 1834–5, 3 vols. 8vo). In 1832 the Hermesians established a journal at Cologne as their organ. During the lifetime of Hermes there had been many complaints of the heretical tendencies of his system, which, in fact, demanded philosophy, rather than faith, as the basis of theology. Hermes admitted all the dogmas of the Church, but held that the ground of belief in these dogmas could only be laid in a philosophical proof, first, of a divine revelation; and, secondly, that the Roman Church is the medium of that revelation. At Rome the question was put into Perrone's hands, whose report strongly condemned Hermes and his doctrines. On the 26th of September, 1835, a papal brief was issued against them. The Hermesians, however, maintained that the doctrines censured were not contained in the system of Hermes. In accordance with their request to be allowed to present in Rome a Latin translation of the works of Hermes, and to plead their orthodoxy, in 1837 two of their prominent spokesmen, professor Braun, of Bonn, and professor Elvenich, of Breslau, arrived in Rome, but, finding that they would not get an impartial hearing, soon returned. In consequence of the pressure brought upon the Hermesians by the bishops, most of them now gradually submitted; two professors of the University of Bonn who refused to submit, Braun and Achterfeld, were in 1845 forbidden by the archbishop of Cologne to continue their theological lectures. In 1847, Pius IX again sanctioned the condemnatory brief of 1835, and Hermesianism gradually died out. A sketch of the controversy from the Hermesian side may be found in Elvenich, *Der Hermesianismus und sein Römischer Gegner Perrone* (Breslau, 1844, 8vo). Perrone's refutation of Hermes is given in Migne's *Démonstrations Évangéliques*, ii, 945 sq. See also Stupp, *Die letzten Hermesianer* (Cologne, 1844–5); Hagenbach, *History of 18th and 19th Centuries*, tr. by Hurst, ii, 444; and art. GÜNTHER.

Hermes Trismegistus, or MERCURIUS (Ἑρμῆς, Ἑρμῆς Τρισμέγιστος), the putative author of a large number of Greek works, many of which are still extant. The Greek Hermes was in the time of Plato identified with the Egyptian *Thot, Thoth,* or *Theut* (as it was also with the Alexandrian *Thoyth*), a mythical personage regarded as the discoverer of all sciences, especially as the originator of language, of the alphabet, and of the art of writing; of geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, etc. In Egypt, all works relating to religion or science bore the name of *Thot* or of *Hermes.* According to a passage in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* l. vi), two of Hermes's books contained the hymns of the gods and rules of conduct for the kings, four related to astrology, etc. The expressions used by Clement of Alexandria imply that there was a much larger number of so-called *Hermetic* books than he mentions. As for the 36,525 mentioned by Iamblichus (*De Myst. Ægypt.*), a number which corresponds to the great sacred period of Egypt, Goerres supposes it to refer to verses, not to books. All this leads to the belief that Hermes Trismegistus was but a personification of the Egyptian priesthood. According

to Champollion junior, Hermes Trismegistus was, like Horus, represented by a hawk's head. The surname of *Trismegistus* (thrice great) appears to have been given to him on account of the many discoveries attributed to him. Looked at in the mystical sense, Thot, or the Egyptian Hermes, was the symbol of divine intelligence, thought incarnate, the living word—the primitive type of Plato's *Logos*.

It appears clear that a certain number of the books bearing the name of Hermes Trismegistus were translated into Greek about the time of the Ptolemies. The authenticity of the fragments of these translations which have come down to us is more doubtful. It was the time when so many supposititious works of Orpheus, Zoroaster, Pythagoras, etc., were composed. Leaving aside Augustine's testimony (*De civitate Dei*, l. viii, c. 26), Champollion junior considers the books of Hermes Trismegistus as containing really the old Egyptian doctrines, of which some traces can be found in the hieroglyphics. Besides, a careful examination of these remaining fragments discloses a theological system somewhat similar from that of Plato in his *Timæus;* a doctrine which differs entirely from those of all the other Greek schools, and which therefore was supposed to have been brought by him from Egypt, where he had been to consult with the priests of that country. They are written in a barbarous Greek, in which it is easy to perceive the effort made by translators to follow literally the text of the original rather than the sense. Menard, a recent translator of Hermes, views the Hermetic books "as representing the final aspirations of the higher Greek wisdom, dimly anticipating the fuller revelation of the Christian faith; as a mystical system, hovering between the negations of Greek thought and the dogmas of the Christian faith" (*Am. Pres. Rev.* January, 1869, p. 195). The following works, attributed to Hermes, have been published: Λόγος τέλειος; the Greek original, quoted by Lactantius (*Div. Instit.* vii, 18), is lost, and there remains only a Latin translation of it, attributed to Apuleius of Madaura, and which is entitled *Asclepius*, or *Hermetis Trismegisti Asclepius, sive de natura deorum dialogus.* This work appears to have been written shortly before the time of Lactantius, and in Egypt, probably at Alexandria. It is in the form of a dialogue between Hermes and Asclepius, his disciple, on God, the universe, nature, etc. The spirit of this work is thoroughly Neo-Platonic, and though the writer directs it against Christianity, he evidently borrowed many Christian doctrines to serve his end. The *Asclepius* was embodied in several editions of Apuleius, and in those of the *Pœmander* by Ficinus and Patricius. These latter editions, and the Pœmander of Adrian Turnebus, contain Ὅροι Ἀσκληπίου πρὸς Ἄμμωνα βασιλέα, probably a translation by the author of the preceding work, and treating also of God, matter, and man. Ἑρμοῦ τοῦ Τρισμεγίστου Ποιμάνδρης is an extensive work. The title Ποιμάνδρης, or *Pœmander*, from ποιμήν, *pastor* or *shepherd*, seems to be imitated from the Ποιμήν or *Pastor* of Hermas. See HERMAS. Indeed, the latter has sometimes been considered as the author of the *Pœmander*. It is written in the form of a dialogue, and could hardly have been composed before the 4th century. It treats of nature, creation, and God. These different subjects are viewed from the Neo-Platonic stand-point, but intermingled with Christian, Jewish, and Eastern notions. The *Pœmander* was at first published as a Latin translation by Ticinus, under the title *Mercurii Trismegisti Liber de Potestate et Sapientia Dei* (Treves, 1471, fol.; often reprinted at Venice). The Greek text, with Ficinus's translation, was first published by Adr. Turnebus (Paris, 1554, 4to; latest edit., with a commentary, Cologne, 1630, fol.). It was translated into French by G. du Préau, under the title *Deux livres de Mercure Trismégiste, l'un De la Puissance et Sapience de Dieu, l'autre De la Volonté de Dieu* (Paris, 1557, 8vo); and by others:—Ἰατρομαθηματικὰ ἢ περὶ κατακλίσεως νοσούντων προγνωστικὰ ἐκ τῆς μαθηματικῆς ἐπιστήμης πρὸς Ἄμμωνα Αἰγύπτιον; this treatise, much less important than the preceding one, gives the means of foretelling the issue of a sickness by means of astrology:—*De Revolutionibus nativitatum*, another treatise on astrology (Basle, 1559, fol.):—*Aphorismi, sive centum sententiæ astrologicæ*, called also *Centiloquium*, supposed to have been written originally in Arabic, but of which we possess but the Latin translation (Venice, 1492, fol.; latest edit. Ulm, 1672, 12mo):—*Liber physicomedicus Kiranidum Kirani, id est regis Persarum, vere aureus gemmeus*, another astrological work, which is known to us only in the Latin translation published by Andr. Privinus, though the Greek text is yet extant in MS. at Madrid. Some of the books bearing the name of Hermes Trismegistus were evidently productions of the Middle Ages; these are *Tractatus vere aureus de Lapidis philosophici Decreto*, i. e. on the philosopher's stone (Latin, by D. Gnosius, Leipz. 1610, 1613, 8vo; and translated into French by G. Joly and F. Habert, Paris, 1626, 8vo); *Tabula smaragdina*, an essay on the art of gold-making, published in Latin (Nuremburg, 1541, 4to; Strasb. 1566, 8vo); Περὶ βοτανῶν χυλώσεως, published at the end of Röther's edition of L. Lydus's *De Mensibus*, with notes by Bähr; Περὶ σεισμῶν, a fragment consisting of sixty-six hexameters, attributed by some to Orpheus: it is to be found in Maittaire's *Miscellanea* (London, 1722, 4to), and in Brunck's *Analecta*, iii, 127. All the extant fragments of Hermes are given in French by Menard, *Hermes Trismégiste* (2d edit. Paris, 1868). See J. H. Ursinus, *Exercitatio de Mercurio Trismegisto*, etc. (Nuremb. 1661, 8vo); Roeser, *De Hermete Trismegisto litterarum inventore* (Wittemb. 1686, 4to); Colberg, *De libris antiquitatem mententibus, sibyllarum, Hermetis, Zoroastris* (Greifswald, 1694, 8vo); G. W. Wedel, *De Tabula Hermetis smaragdina* (Jena, 1704, 4to); Baumgarten-Crusius, *De Librorum Hermeticorum Origine*, etc. (Jena, 1827, 4to); Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, i, 46, 94; F. Hoefer, *Hist. de la Chimie*, i, 244; Pauly, *Real-Encyklop.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 377; Smith, *Dictionary of Mythology and Biography*, vol. ii; Warburton, *Divine Legation*, i, 442; Mosheim, *Commentaries*, i, 290; Cudworth, *True Intellectual System of the Universe.*

Hermesians. See HERMES, GEORG.

Hermetic Books. See HERMES TRISMEGISTUS.

Hermians, a heretical sect of the 2d century, which, according to Augustine, denied baptism by water on the pretence that this was not the kind of baptism instituted by Christ; for John the Baptist, comparing his own baptism with that of our Lord, says, "I baptize you with water; but he that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire" (Augustine, *De Hær.* c. 59). They affirmed that the souls of men consisted of fire and spirit, and therefore a baptism of fire was more suitable to their nature. Early ecclesiastical writers are not agreed as to what was meant by this expression. Clemens Alexandrinus mentions some who, when they had baptized men in water, also made a mark on their ears with fire, so joining together baptism by water, and, as they imagined, baptism by fire (apud Combefis, *Auctarium*, i, 202). Others, by some deceptive art during baptism, made fire to appear on the surface of the water, and confirmed this by a reference to some apocryphal writing of their own invention called "The Preaching of Paul or Peter," in which it was said that, when Christ was baptized, fire appeared on the water. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xi, ch. ii, § 3.

Hermias, a writer, supposed by some to date from the 2d century. Nothing is known of his life, but we possess under his name a work entitled Διασυρμὸς τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων, "A satirizing of the Heathen Philosophers." It is written in the form of a dialogue addressed to the author's friends. Hermias reviews the opinions of the philosophers on nature, the universe, God, his essence, his relations to the world, the human soul, etc. He shows their differences and contradictions on all these points, and thus proves the insufficien-

cy and futility of all their theories. This little work, written in the manner and somewhat in the style of Lucian, is an interesting document for the history of ancient philosophy, but has no other merit, philosophical or theological. It was published, with a Latin translation by Seiler (Zurich, 1553, 8vo; 1560, fol.), and is inserted in several collections of ecclesiastical works, namely, in Morel, *Tabula compendiosa* (Basle, 1580, 8vo); in several editions of Justin Martyr; in Worth's edition of Tatian (Oxford, 1700, 8vo); in the *Auctarium Bibl. Patr.* (Paris, 1624, fol.), and in Gallandii *Biblioth. Patr.* J. C. Dommerich published a separate edition, with notes by H. Wolf, Gale, and Worth (Halle, 1764, 8vo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxiv, 387; Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, 2d cent.; Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature*, ii, 179.

Hermit (Gr. ἐρημός, *desert*), one devoted to religious solitude; properly, the solitude of a wilderness. It became, at a later period, the name of certain classes of monks. See MONASTICISM; MONK.

Hermog'enès (Ἑρμογένης, *Mercury-born*), a disciple of Asia Minor, and probably companion in labor of the apostle Paul; mentioned, along with Phygellus, as having abandoned him during his second imprisonment at Rome, doubtless from alarm at the perils of the connection (2 Tim. i, 15). A.D. 64. In the Roman Breviary (*in Fest. S. Jac. Apost. Pars. æstiva*, p. 485, Milan, 1851) the conversion of Hermogenes is attributed to St. James the Great, and in the legendary history of Abdias, the so-called bishop of Babylon (Fabricius, *Cod. Apocryph. N. T.* p. 517 sq.), Hermogenes is represented as first practising magic, and converted, with Philetus, by the same apostle. Grotius, apparently misled by the circumstance that the historian or geographer Hermogenes, mentioned by the scholiast of Apollonius Rhodius (ii, 722, *Frag. Hist. Græc.* Didot. ed., iii, 523), wrote on primitive history, and incidentally (?) speaks of Nannacus or Anacus—and may therefore probably be the same as the Hermogenes whom Josephus mentions as having treated on Jewish history (*Apion*, i, 23)—suggests that he may be the person mentioned by the apostle Paul. This, however, is not likely. Nothing more is known of the Hermogenes in question, and he cannot be identified either with Hermogenes of Tarsus, a historian of the time of Domitian, who was put to death by that emperor (Sueton. *Domit.* 10; Hoffman, *Lex. Univ.* s. v.; Alford on 2 Tim. i, 15), nor with Hermogenes the painter, against whom Tertullian wrote (Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biography*, s. v.), nor with the saints of the Byzantine Church, commemorated on Jan. 24 and Sept. 1 (Neale, *Eastern Church*, ii, 770, 781).

Hermogĕnes, a heretic of the 2d century. Our knowledge of him is chiefly derived from a treatise against him by Tertullian (*adv. Hermogenem*), and from an account in the newly-discovered MS. of Hippolytus. He was living, probably in Africa, when Tertullian wrote against him, and was a painter by profession. Tertullian charged that Hermogenes was a believer in the doctrines of the heathen philosophers, and especially in those of the Stoics, and especially that he taught the eternity of matter. Hermogenes argued that God must have made the world either out of his own substance, or out of nothing, or out of pre-existent matter. The first, he thought, was inconsistent with God's immutability; the second with the origin of evil; and therefore the third must be received as true. "He rejected both the Gnostic Emanation doctrine and the Church doctrine of Creation: the former contradicted the unchangeable nature of God, and necessitated attributing to him the origin of evil; the latter was contradicted by the nature of this world; for if the creation of the perfect God had been conditioned by nothing, a perfect world must have been the result. Hence he believed that creation supposed something conditioning, and this he thought must be the *Hyle* which he received from Platonism into connection with the Christian system. He did not think that he gave up the doctrine of the μοναρχία as long as he admitted a ruling, all-powerful principle, and ascribed to God such a supremacy over the Hyle. He regarded the Hyle as altogether undetermined, predicateless, in which all the contrarieties that afterwards appeared in the world were as yet unseparated and undeveloped; neither motion nor rest, neither flowing nor standing still, but an inorganic confusion. It was the receptive, God alone the creative; his formative agency called forth from it determinate existence. But with this organization there was a residuum which withstood the divine formative power. Hence the defective and the offensive in nature; hence also evil. Had he been logical he must have admitted a creation without a beginning; he could not have regarded it as a single and transitive act of God, but as immanent, and resulting immediately from the relation of God to matter. He said God was always a ruler, consequently he must always have had dominion over matter" (Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, Ryland's transl., i, 118). The account in Hippolytus, Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων (bk. xxiv), agrees, in the main, with that given above, and adds that Hermogenes taught that Christ, after his resurrection, when he "ascended to heaven, leaving his body in the sun, proceeded himself to his Father." See Augustine, *De Hær.* xli; Tertullian, *adv. Hermogenem*, passim; Ritter, *Geschichte d. Philosophie*, v, 178; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* (Torrey's), i, 568; Mosheim, *Comm.* vol. i; Lardner, *Works*, ii, 203; viii, 579; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, vol. i, § 47.

Her'mon (Heb. *Chermon'*, חֶרְמוֹן, according to Gesenius, from the Arabic *Charmun*, a *peak;* Sept. Ἀερμών), a mountain which formed the northernmost boundary (Josh. xii, 1) of the country beyond the Jordan (Josh. xi, 17) which the Hebrews conquered from the Amorites (Deut. iii, 8), and which, therefore, must have belonged to Anti-Libanus (1 Chron. v, 23), as is, indeed, implied or expressed in most of the other passages in which it is named (Deut. iv, 48; Josh. xi, 3, 17; xii, 5; xiii, 5, 11; Psa. lxxxix, 12; cxxxiii, 3; Cant. iv, 8). It has two or more summits, and is therefore spoken of in the plur. (חֶרְמֹנִים, Psa. xlii, 7; Sept. Ἑρμωνιείμ, Engl. Vers. "Hermonites"). In Deut. iii, 9 it is said to have been called by the Sidonians *Sirion* (שִׂרְיוֹן), and by the Amorites *Shenir* (שְׂנִיר), both of which words signify "a coat of mail," as glittering in the sun. In Deut. iv, 48 it is called Mount *Sion* (שִׂיאוֹן), meaning "an elevation," "a high mountain"—which it was well entitled to be designated by way of excellence, being (if correctly identified with Jebel *es-Sheik*) by far the highest of all the mountains in or near Palestine. In the later books of the Old Testament, however (as in 1 Chron. v, 23; Sol. Song, iv, 8), Shenir is distinguished from Hermon properly so called. Probably different summits or parts of this range bore different names, which were applied in a wider or narrower acceptation at different times (see Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 56). See HIVITE.

Hermon was a natural landmark. It could be seen from the "plains of Moab" beside the Dead Sea, from the heights of Nebo, from every prominent spot, in fact, in Moab, Gilead, and Bashan—a pale blue, snow-capped peak, terminating the view on the northern horizon. When the people came to know the country better—when not merely its great physical features, but its towns and villages became familiar to them, then Baal-Gad and Dan took the place of Hermon, both of them being situated just at the southern base of that mountain. Hermon itself was not embraced in the country conquered by Moses and Joshua; their conquests extended only *to* it (see Josh. xi, 17; Deut. xxxiv, 1; 1 Sam. iii, 20). Hermon was also the north-western boundary of the old kingdom of Bashan, as Salcah was the south-eastern. We read in Josh. xii, 5 that Og "reigned in Mount Hermon, and in Salcah, and in all Bashan;" i. e. in all Bashan, from Hermon to Salcah.

Another notice of Hermon shows the minute accuracy of the topography of Joshua. He makes "Lebanon towards the sun-rising," that is, the range of Anti-Lebanon, extend from Hermon to the entering into Hamath (xiii, 5). Every Oriental geographer now knows that Hermon is the southern and culminating point of this range. The beauty and grandeur of Hermon did not escape the attention of the Hebrew poets. From nearly every prominent point in Palestine the mountain is visible, but it is when we leave the hill-country of Samaria and enter the plain of Esdraelon that Hermon appears in all its majesty, shooting up on the distant horizon behind the graceful rounded top of Tabor. It was probably this view that suggested to the Psalmist the words "The north and the south thou hast created them: Tabor and Hermon shall rejoice in thy name" (lxxxix, 12). The "dew of Hermon" is once referred to in a passage which has long been considered a geographical puzzle—"As the dew of Hermon, the dew that descended on the mountains of Zion" (Psa. cxxxiii, 3). Some have thought that *Zion* (צִיּוֹן) is used here for *Sion* (שִׂיאֹן), one of the old names of Hermon (Deut. iv, 48), but this identification is unnecessary. The snow on the summit of this mountain condenses the vapors that float during the summer in the higher regions of the atmosphere, causing light clouds to hover around it, and abundant dew to descend on it, while the whole country elsewhere is parched, and the whole heaven elsewhere cloudless. One of its tops is actually called *Abu-Nedy*, i. e. "father of dew" (Porter, *Handb.* ii, 463).

Since modern travellers have made us acquainted with the country beyond the Jordan, no doubt has been entertained that the Mount Hermon of those texts is no other than the present Jebel *es-Sheik*, or the Sheik's Mountain, or, which is equivalent, Old Man's Mountain, a name it is said to have obtained from its fancied resemblance (being topped with snow, which sometimes lies in lengthened streaks upon its sloping ridges) to the hoary head and beard of a venerable sheik (Elliot, i, 317). This Jebel es-sheik is a south-eastern, and in that direction culminating, branch of Anti-Libanus. Its top is partially covered with snow throughout the summer, and has an elevation of 9376 feet (Van de Velde, *Memoir.* p. 170, 176). Dr. Clarke, who saw it in the month of July, says, "The summit is so lofty that the snow entirely covered the upper part of it, not lying in patches, but investing all the higher part with that perfectly white and smooth velvet-like appearance which snow only exhibits when it is very deep." Dr. Robinson only differs from the preceding by the statement that the snow is perpetual only in the ravines, so that the top presents the appearance of radiant stripes around and below the summit (*Bib. Researches*, iii, 344). At his last visit to Palestine, he observes, under date of April 9 (new ed. of *Researches*, iii, 48), that "the snow extended for some distance down the sides, while on the peaks of Lebanon opposite there was none." In August, 1852, Rev. J. L. Porter, of Damascus, ascended Jebel es-Sheik from Rashey, and spent a night near its summit. He describes the highest peak as composed strictly of three peaks, so near each other as to appear one from below. On the south-easternmost of these peaks are some interesting remains, called Kulal Antar, probably relics of an ancient Syro-Phœnician temple, consisting of a circular wall around a rock about 15 feet high, which has a rude excavation upon it, and heaps of beveled stones adjoining it. The snow-banks explain the supply anciently made for cooling drinks in Tyre and Sidon (*Bibliotheca Sac.* Jan. 1854). The summit is about 9000 feet above the Mediterranean (Lieut. Warren, in the *Quarterly Statement* of the "Palestine Exploration Fund," No. 5, p. 210, where also are a description and cut of the ruined temple).

In two passages of Scripture this mountain is called *Baal-hermon* (בַּעַל חֶרְמוֹן, Judg. iii, 3; 1 Chron. v, 23), and the only reason that can be assigned for it is that Baal was there worshipped. Jerome says of it, "Dicituque *in vertice ejus insigne templum*, quod ab ethnicis cultui habetur e regione Paneadis et Libani"—reference must here be made to the building whose ruins are still seen (*Onom.* s. v. Hermon). It is remarkable that Hermon was anciently encompassed by a circle of temples, *all facing the summit.* Can it be that this mountain was the great sanctuary of Baal, and that it was to the old Syrians what Jerusalem was to the Jews, and what Mecca is to the Moslems? (See Porter, *Handbook for Syria and Pal.* p. 454, 457; Reland, *Palæst.* p. 323 sq.) The above described ruins seem to confirm this conjecture. See BAAL-HERMON.

It has been suggested that one of the southern peaks of Hermon was the scene of the Transfiguration. Our Lord travelled from Bethsaida, on the northern slope of the Sea of Galilee, "to the coasts of Cæsarea-Philippi," where he led his disciples "into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them;" and afterwards he returned, going towards Jerusalem through Galilee (comp. Mark viii, 22-28; Matt. xvi, 13; Mark ix, 2-13, 30-33). No other mountain in Palestine is more appropriate to the circumstances of that glorious scene, except Tabor, to which many centuries' tradition has assigned this honor (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 358); but if it be assigned to this locality, it will give additional celebrity to the prince of Syrian mountains (Porter's *Damascus*, i, 306).

The mention of Hermon along with Tabor in Psa. lxxxix, 12, led to its being sought near the latter mountain, where, accordingly, travellers and maps give us a "Little Hermon." But that passage, as well as Psa. cxxxiii, 3, applies better to the great mountain already described; and in the former it seems perfectly natural for the Psalmist to call upon these mountains, respectively the most conspicuous in the western and eastern divisions of the Hebrew territory, to rejoice in the name of the Lord. Besides, we are to consider that Jebel es-sheikh is seen from Mount Tabor, and that both together are visible from the plain of Esdraelon. There is no reason to suppose that the so-called Little Hermon is at all mentioned in Scripture. Its actual name is Jebel ed-Duhy; it is a shapeless, barren, and uninteresting mass of hills, in the north of the valley of Jezreel and opposite Mount Gilboa (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 171).

Her'monite (Psa. xliii, 7). See HERMON.

Hernandez. See JULIAN THE LITTLE.

Her'od (Ἡρώδης, *hero-like*, a name that appears likewise among the Greeks, Dio. Cass. lxxi, 35; Philost. Soph. ii, 1, etc.), the name of several persons of the royal family of Judæa in the time of Christ and the apostles (see Noldius, *De vita et gestis Herodum*, in Havercamp's edit. of Josephus; Reland, *Palæst.* p. 174 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, i, 160 sq. Other monographs are named by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 16, 77, and by Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, i, 386; ii, 127-130. See also De Saulcy, *Hist. d'Hérode*, Par. 1867; Gilder, *Herodes*, Bern, 1869), whose history is incidentally involved in that of the N. Testament, but is copiously detailed by Josephus; notices of it also occur in the classical writers, especially Strabo (xvi, c. ii, 16). We therefore devote a large space to consideration of the subject.

The history of the Herodian family presents one side of the last development of the Jewish nation. The evils which had existed in the hierarchy that grew up after the Return, found an unexpected embodiment in the tyranny of a foreign usurper. Religion was adopted as a policy; and the hellenizing designs of Antiochus Epiphanes were carried out, at least in their spirit, by men who professed to observe the law. Side by side with the spiritual "kingdom of God" proclaimed by John the Baptist, and founded by the Lord, a kingdom of the world was established, which in its external splendor recalled the traditional magnificence of Solomon. The simultaneous realization of the two principles, national and spiritual, which had long variously influenced the Jews, in the establishment of a dynasty and a church, is

GENEALOGICAL SCHEME OF THE HERODIAN FAMILY.*

- (1) Antipater (Antipas), governor of Idumæa (Joseph. *Ant.* xiv, 1, 3).
  - (2) Antipater to Cypros (an Arabian: Joseph. *Ant.* xiv, 7, 3).
    - (3) Phasael
      - (8) Phasael to Salampsio (12)
        - Antipater, Herodes, Alexander, Alexandra, Cypros (33)
    - (4) Herodes†
      - to Doris
        - (9) Antipater.
      - to Mariamne, grandd. of Hyrcanus
        - (10) Aristobulus to Berenice (24)
          - (25) Herodes to Mariamne (32)
            - (34) Aristobulus to Salome (31)
              - (42) Herodes.
              - (43) Agrippa.
              - (44) Aristobulus.
          - (25) Herodes to Berenice (38)
            - Berenicianus.
            - Hyrcanus.
          - (26) Aristobulus to Jotape
            - (35) Jotape.
          - (27) Agrippa§ to Cypros (33)
            - (36) Agrippa.‖
            - (37) Drusus.
            - (38) Berenice.
            - (39) Mariamne.
            - (40) Drusilla to Aziz k. of Edessa, to Felix
              - (45) Agrippa.
          - (28) Herodias.
        - (11) Alexander to d. of Archelaus.
          - (29) Alexander
            - (41) Tigranes
              - (46) Alexander.
          - (30) Tigranes.
        - (12) Salampsio to Phasael (8)
        - (13) Cypros to Antipater.
      - to Mariamne, d. of Simon
        - (14) Herodes (Philip) to Herodias (28)
          - (31) Salome.
      - to Malthace (a Samaritan)
        - (15) Antipas‡ to d. of Aretas to Herodias (28)
        - (16) Archelaus.
        - (17) Olympias.
      - to Cleopatra
        - (18) Herodes
        - (19) Philip to Salome. (31)
      - to Pallas
        - (20) Phasael.
      - to Phædra
        - (21) Roxana.
      - to Elpis
        - (22) Salome.
      - to 9 +
      - to 10 +
    - (5) Joseph
      - (23) Joseph to Olympias (17)
        - (32) Mariamne.
    - (6) Pheroras.
    - (7) Salome
      - to Joseph
      - to Costabarus
        - (24) Berenice.
      - to Alexas.

* Joseph. *Ant.* xviii, 6, 4; xvii, 1, 3; *War*, i, 28, 4.
§ "*Herod the King*," Acts xii, 1.
† "*Herod the King*," Matt. ii, 1 sq.; Luke i, 5.
‡ "*Herod the Tetrarch*," Matt. xiv, 1; Luke iii, 1, 19, ix, 7; "*King Herod*," Mark vi, 14.
‖ "*King Agrippa*," Acts xxv, 13.

a fact pregnant with instruction. In the fulness of time a descendant of Esau established a false counterpart of the promised glories of the Messiah.

Various accounts are given of the ancestry of the Herods. The Jewish partisans of Herod (Nicolas Damascenus, ap. Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 1, 3) sought to raise him to the dignity of a descent from one of the noble families which returned from Babylon; and, on the other hand, early Christian writers represented his origin as utterly mean and servile. Africanus has preserved a tradition (Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* ii, 235), on the authority of "the natural kinsmen of the Saviour," which makes Antipater, the father of Herod, the son of one Herod, a slave attached to the service of a temple of Apollo at Ascalon, who was taken prisoner by Idumæan robbers, and kept by them, as his father could not pay his ransom. The locality (comp. Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, § 30), no less than the office, was calculated to fix a heavy reproach upon the name (comp. Routh, *l. c.*). This story is repeated with great inaccuracy by Epiphanius (*Hær.* xx). Neglecting, however, these exaggerated statements of friends and enemies, it seems certain that the family was of Idumæan descent (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 1, 3), a fact which is indicated by the forms of some of the names that were retained in it (Ewald, *Geschichte*, iv, 477, note). But, though aliens by race, the Herods were Jews in faith. The Idumæans had been conquered and brought over to Judaism by John Hyrcanus (B.C. 130; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 9, 1); and from the time of their conversion they remained constant to their new religion, looking upon Jerusalem as their mother city, and claiming for themselves the name of Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 7, 7; *War*, i, 10, 4; iv, 4, 4).

The general policy of the whole Herodian family, though modified by the personal characteristics of the successive rulers, was the same. It centred in the endeavor to found a great and independent kingdom, in which the power of Judaism should subserve the consolidation of a state. The protection of Rome was in the first instance a necessity, but the designs of Herod I and Agrippa I point to an independent Eastern empire as their end, and not to a mere subject monarchy. Such a consummation of the Jewish hopes seems to have found some measure of acceptance at first [see HERODIANS]; and by a natural reaction the temporal dominion of the Herods opened the way for the destruction of the Jewish nationality. The religion which was degraded into the instrument of unscrupulous ambition lost its power to quicken a united people. The high-priests were appointed and deposed by Herod I and his successors with such a reckless disregard for the character of their office (Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, i, 322, 325, 421), that the office itself was deprived of its sacred dignity (compare Acts xxiii, 2 sq.; Jost, i, 430, etc.). The nation was divided, and amidst the conflict of sects a universal faith arose, which more than fulfilled the nobler hopes that found no satisfaction in the treacherous grandeur of a court. See the name of each member of the family in its order in this CYCLOPÆDIA.

1. HEROD THE GREAT, as he is usually surnamed, mentioned in Matt. ii, 1-22; Luke i, 5; Acts xxiii, 35, was the second son of Antipater and Cypros, an Arabian lady of noble descent (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 7, 3). See ANTIPATER. In B.C. 47 Julius Cæsar made Antipater procurator of Judæa, and the latter divided his territories among his four sons, assigning the district of Galilee to Herod (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 9, 3; *War*, i, 10, 4). At the time when he was invested with the government he was fifteen years of age, according to Josephus (*Ant.* xiv, 9, 2); but this must be a mistake. Herod died, aged sixty-nine, in B.C. 4, consequently he must have been twenty-six or twenty-five in the year B.C. 47, when he was made governor of Galilee (πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι, given by Dindorf in the ed. Didot, but no stated authority). One of his first acts was to repress the brigands who were infesting his provinces, and to put many of their leaders to death upon his own authority. This was made known to Hyrcanus, and Herod was summoned to take his trial before the Sanhedrim for his deeds of violence. Herod, instead of appearing before the Sanhedrim clothed in mourning, came in purple, attended by armed guards, and bearing in his hands a letter from the Roman commander Sextus Cæsar for his acquittal. This overawed the assembly; but Sameas, a just man (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 9, 4), stepped forward, and, boldly addressing the assembly, predicted that, should the offender escape punishment, he would live to kill all those who were his judges, and would not grant the pardon which the assembly seemed inclined to extend to him. He, however, escaped, and took refuge with Sextus Cæsar, who soon appointed him governor (στρατηγός) of Cœle-Syria. He then determined to march against Jerusalem, and would have done so had not his father Antipater and his family restrained him from committing any fresh acts of violence. In B.C. 44, after Cæsar's death, Cassius took the government of Syria. Herod and his father Antipater willingly assisted Cassius in obtaining the taxes levied upon the Jews for the support of the troops. For this Herod was confirmed in the government of Cœle-Syria (Josephus, *War*, i, 11, 4). In B.C. 41 Antony came to Syria, and Herod, by making him valuable presents, soon formed with him a close personal intimacy (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 12, 2). Hyrcanus, to whose beautiful granddaughter Mariamne Herod was betrothed, induced Antony to make Herod and his brother Phasael tetrarchs of Judæa (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 13, 1; *War*, i, 12, 5). The invasion of the Parthians, who sided with Antigonus the Asmonæan, compelled Herod to give up Judæa and fly to Rome. Antony was then in great power, and took Herod under his protection, and, seeing that he might prove useful to him, obtained a decree of the senate appointing him king of Judæa, to the extinction of all the living Asmonæan princes (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 9-14; *War*, i, 10-14; Dion Cass. xlviii). These events took place in B.C. 40, and Herod, only staying seven days at Rome, returned speedily to Jerusalem within three months from the time he had first fled.

It was not, however, so easy for Herod to obtain possession of Jerusalem, or to establish himself as king of Judæa, as it had been to obtain this title from the Romans. The Jews still held firmly to Antigonus as the representative of the Asmonæan line, and it was not for several years that Herod made any material advance whatever. With the assistance of the Romans Herod made preparations to take Jerusalem. He had endeavored to conciliate the people by marrying Mariamne, thinking that by so doing the attachment of the Jews to the Asmonæan family would be extended to him. After six months' siege the Romans entered the city (B.C. 37), and, to revenge the obstinate resistance they had received, began to ransack and plunder, and it was no easy task for Herod to purchase from the conquerors the freedom from pillage of some part of his capital. Antigonus was taken and conveyed to Antioch, where, having been previously beaten, he was ignominiously executed with the axe by the order of Antony, a mode of treatment which the Romans had never before used to a king (Dion Cass. lxix, 22; Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 1, 2). Thus ended the government of the Asmonæans, 126 years after it was first set up (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 16, 4). Immediately on ascending the throne Herod put to death all the members of the Sanhedrim, excepting Pollio and Sameas (the famous Hillel and Shammai of the Rabbinical writers), who had predicted this result, and also all the adherents of Antigonus who could be found. Having confiscated their property, he sent presents to Antony to repay him for his assistance and to further secure his favor. He then gave the office of high-priest, which had become vacant by the death of Antigonus, and the mutilation of Hyrcanus, whose ears had been cut off by Antigonus (comp. Lev. xxi, 16-24), to an obscure priest from Babylon named Ananel. At this insult Alexandra, the mother of Mariamne and Ar-

istobulus, to whom the office of high-priest belonged by hereditary succession, appealed to Cleopatra to use her powerful influence with Antony, and Herod was thus compelled to depose Ananel, and to elevate Aristobulus to the high-priesthood. The increasing popularity of Aristobulus, added to the further intrigues of Alexandra, so excited the jealousy of Herod that he caused him to be drowned while bathing, and expressed great sorrow at the accident. See ARISTOBULUS. Alexandra again applied to Cleopatra, who at last persuaded Antony to summon Herod to Laodicea to answer for his conduct. Herod was obliged to obey, but was dismissed with the highest honors (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 3, 1-8; comp. *War*, i, 22, 2). After the defeat of Antony at Actium, in B.C. 31, Herod had an audience at Rhodes with Octavius, who did not think that Antony was quite powerless while Herod continued his assistance to him (Josephus, *War*, i, 20, 1). Herod so conciliated him that he obtained security in his kingdom of Judæa, to which Octavius added Gadara, Samaria, and the maritime cities Gaza and Joppa. Shortly after the regions of Trachonitis, Batanea, and Auranitis were given him (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 5, 6, 7; 10, 1; *War*, i, 20, 3, 4; comp. Tacit. *Hist.* v, 9). Herod's domestic life was troubled by a long series of bloodshed. Hyrcanus, the grandfather of his wife Mariamne, was put to death before his visit to Octavius, and Mariamne, to whom he was passionately attached, fell a victim to his jealousy soon after his return. See HYRCANUS; MARIAMNE. His remorse for the deed is well described by Josephus, who says that Herod commanded his attendants always to speak of her as alive (*Ant.* xv, 7, 7; *War*, i, 22, 5). In B.C. 20, when Augustus visited Judæa in person, another extensive addition was made to his territories. The district of Paneas was taken away from its ruler Zenodorus for leaguing himself with the Arabs, and given to Herod. In return, Herod adorned this place by erecting a temple, which he dedicated to Augustus (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 10, 3; *War*, i, 20, 4; Dion Cass. liv, 9). Not long after this, the death of his wife was followed by other atrocities. Alexander and Aristobulus, the sons of Mariamne, were put to death; and at last, in B.C. 4, Herod ordered his eldest son, Antipater, to be killed. See ALEXANDER; ARISTOBULUS; ANTIPATER. Herod's painful disease no doubt maddened him in his later years, and in anticipation of his own death he gave orders that the principal Jews, whom he had shut up in the Hippodrome at Jericho, should immediately after his decease be put to death, that mourners might not be wanting at his funeral (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 6, 5). Near his death, too, he must have ordered the murder of the infants at Bethlehem, as recorded by Matthew (ii, 16-18). The number of children in a village must have been very few, and Josephus has passed this story over unnoticed; yet it is worthy of remark that he has given an account of a massacre by Herod of all the members of his family who had consented to what the Pharisees foretold, viz. that Herod's government should cease, and his posterity be deprived of the kingdom (*Ant.* xvii, 2, 4). A confused account of the massacre of the children and the murder of Antipater is given in Macrobius: "Augustus cum audisset inter pueros, quos in Syriâ Herodes, rex Judæorum, intra bimatum jussit interfici, filium quoque ejus occisum, ait: Melius est Herodis *porcum* (? *ὗν, swine*) esse quam *filium* (? *υἱόν, son*)" (*Sat.* ii, 4). Macrobius lived in the 5th century (c. A.D. 420), and the words *intra bimatum* (à bimatu et infra, Matt. ii, 16. Vulg.) seem to be borrowed; the story, too, is wrong, as Antipater was of age when he was executed (Alford, ad loc.). Macrobius may have made some mistake on account of Herod's wish to destroy the heir to the throne of David. The language of the evangelist leaves in complete uncertainty the method in which the deed was effected (*ἀποστείλας ἀνεῖλεν*). The scene of open and undisguised violence which has been consecrated by Christian art is wholly at variance with what may be supposed to have been the historic reality.

Herod was married to no less than ten wives, by most of whom he had children. He died a few days before the Passover, B.C. 4, his death-bed being the scene of the most awful agonies in mind and body. According to the custom of the times, he made his sons the heirs to his kingdom by a formal testament, leaving its ratification to the will of the emperor. Augustus assenting to its main provisions, Archelaus became tetrarch of Judæa, Samaria, and Idumæa; Philip, of Trachonitis and Ituræa; and Herod Antipas, of Galilee and Peræa. His body was conveyed by his son Archelaus from Jericho, where he died, to Herodium, a city and fortress 200 stadia distant, and he was there buried with great pomp (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 8, 2; *War*, i, 28, 9).

On the extirpation of the Asmonæan family, finding that there was then no one who could interfere with him, Herod had introduced heathenish customs, such as plays, shows, and chariot-races, which the Jews condemned as contrary to the laws of Moses (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 8, 1); and on the completion of the building of Cæsarea he also introduced Olympic games and consecrated them to Cæsar, ordering them to be celebrated every fifth year (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 9, 6; xvi, 5, 1). With regard to the prejudices of the Jews, Herod showed as great contempt for public opinion as in the execution of his personal vengeance. He signalized his elevation to the throne by offerings to the Capitoline Jupiter (Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, i, 318), and surrounded his person by foreign mercenaries, some of whom had formerly been in the service of Cleopatra (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 7, 3; xvii, 1, 1; 8, 3). His coins and those of his successors bore only Greek legends; and he introduced heathen games even within the walls of Jerusalem (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 8, 1). He displayed ostentatiously his favor towards foreigners (Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 5, 3), and oppressed the old Jewish aristocracy (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 1, 1). The later Jewish traditions describe him as successively the servant of the Asmonæans and the Romans, and relate that one Rabbin only survived the persecution which he directed against them, purchasing his life by the loss of sight (Jost, i, 319, etc.).

Notwithstanding that he thus alienated his subjects from him, he greatly improved his country by the number of fine towns and magnificent public buildings which he had erected. He built a temple at Samaria, and converted it into a Roman city under the name of Sebaste. He also built Gaba in Galilee, and Heshbonitis in Peræa (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 8, 5), besides several other towns, which he called by the names of different members of his family, as Antipatris, from the name of his father Antipater, and Phasaelis, in the plains of Jericho, after his brother Phasael (Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 5, 2). On many other towns in Syria and Greece he bestowed money, but his grandest undertaking was the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem. It was commenced in the 18th year of his reign (B.C. 21), and the work was carried on with such vigor that the Temple itself (*ναός*), i. e. the Holy House, was finished in a year and a half (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 11, 1, 6). The cloisters and other buildings were finished in eight years (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 11, 5). Additions and repairs were continually made, and it was not till the reign of Herod Agrippa II (c. A.D. 65) that the Temple (*τὸ ἱερόν*) was completed (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 9, 7). Hence the Jews said to our Lord, "Forty and six years was this Temple in building [*ᾠκοδομήθη*—and is not even yet completed], and wilt thou raise it up in three days!" (John ii, 20). This took place in A.D. 26, not long after our Lord's baptism, who "was about thirty years of age" (Luke iii, 23), and who was born some two years before the death of Herod, in B.C. 4, according to the true chronology. This beautiful Temple, though built in honor of the God of Israel, did not win the hearts of the people, as is proved by the revolt which took place shortly before Herod's death, when the Jews tore down the golden eagle which he had fastened to the Temple, and broke it in pieces (Josephus, *Antiq.* xvii, 6, 2, 3).

The diversity of Herod's nature is remarkable. On regarding his magnificence, and the benefits he bestowed upon his people, one cannot deny that he had a very beneficent disposition; but when we read of his cruelties, not only to his subjects, but even to his own relations, one is forced to allow that he was brutish and a stranger to humanity (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 5, 4). His servility to Rome is amply shown by the manner in which he transgressed the customs of his nation and set aside many of their laws, building cities and erecting temples in foreign countries, for the Jews did not permit him so to do in Judæa, even though they were under so tyrannical a government as that of Herod. His confessed apology was that he was acting to please Cæsar and the Romans, and so through all his reign he was a Jewish prince only in name, with a Hellenistic disposition (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 9, 5; xix, 7, 3). It has even been supposed (Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* i, 323) that the rebuilding of the Temple furnished him with the opportunity of destroying the authentic collection of genealogies which was of the highest importance to the priestly families. Herod, as appears from his public designs, affected the dignity of a second Solomon, but he joined the license of that monarch to his magnificence; and it was said that the monument which he raised over the royal tombs was due to the fear which seized him after a sacrilegious attempt to rob them of secret treasures (Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 7, 1). He maintained peace at home during a long reign by the vigor and timely generosity of his administration. Abroad he conciliated the goodwill of the Romans under circumstances of unusual difficulty. His ostentatious display, and even his arbitrary tyranny, was calculated to inspire Orientals with awe. Bold and yet prudent, oppressive and yet profuse, he had many of the characteristics which make a popular hero; and the title which may have been first given in admiration of successful despotism now serves to bring out in clearer contrast the terrible price at which the success was purchased.

Josephus gives Herod I the surname of Great (Ἡρώδης ὁ μέγας). Ewald suggests that the title = *elder* is only intended to distinguish him from the younger Herod (Antipas), and compares the cases of Ἑλκίας ὁ μέγας (*Ant.* xviii, 8, 4) and Agrippa the Great, in contradistinction to Helcias, the keeper of the sacred treasure (*Ant.* xx, 11, 1), and to Agrippa II. The title "Agrippa the Great" is confirmed by coins, on which he is styled ΜΕΓΑΣ (Eckhel, *Doct. Num. Vet.* iii, 492; Akerman, *Num. Chron.* ix, 23), and so, says Ewald, "it may similarly have been given upon the coins of Herod, and from this the origin of the surname may have been derived" (*Geschichte*, iv, 473, note). There are, however, *no coins* of Herod I with the title *great*. It is best to suppose that the title in Josephus is merely a distinguishing epithet, and not meant to express greatness of character or achievements.

Coin of Herod the Great.

2. Herod Antipas (Ἡρώδης, Matt., Mark, Luke; Ἀντίπας, Josephus) was the son of Herod the Great, by Malthace, a Samaritan (Joseph. *Ant.* xvii, 1, 3; *War*, i, 28, 4). His father had already given him "the kingdom" in his first will, but in the final arrangement left him the tetrarchy of Galilee and Peræa (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 8, 1; *War*, ii, 9, 1; Matt. xiv, 1; Luke iii, 1; iii, 19, ix, 1; Acts xiii, 1), which brought him the yearly revenue of 200 talents (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 5, 1). On his way to Rome he visited his brother Philip, and commencing an intrigue with his wife Herodias, daughter of Aristobulus, the son of Mariamne, he afterwards incestuously married her. He had previously been married to a daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia Petræa, who avenged this insult by invading his dominions, and defeated him with great loss (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 5, 1). An appeal to the Romans afforded the only hope of safety. Aretas was haughtily ordered by the emperor to desist from the prosecution of the war, and Herod accordingly escaped the expected overthrow. Josephus says that the opinion of the Jews was that the defeat was a punishment for his having imprisoned John the Baptist on account of his popularity, and afterwards put him to death, but does not mention the reproval that John gave him, nor that it was at the instigation of Herodias that he was killed, as recorded in the Gospels (Joseph. *Ant.* xviii, 5, 4; Matt. xiv, 1-11; Mark vi, 14-16; Luke iii, 19; ix, 7-9). The evangelists evidently give the true reason, and Josephus the one generally received by the people. In A.D. 38, after the death of Tiberius, he was persuaded, especially at the ambitious instigation of Herodias, to go to Rome to procure for himself the royal title. Agrippa, who was high in the favor of Caligula, and had already received this title, opposed this with such success that Antipas was condemned to perpetual banishment at Lyons, a city of Gaul (Joseph. *Ant.* xviii, 7, 2), and eventually died in Spain, whither his wife Herodias had voluntarily followed him (*War*, ii, 9, 6). He is called (by courtesy) *king* by Matthew (xiv, 9) and by Mark (vi, 14). See No. 5.

Herod Antipas was in high favor with Tiberius; hence he gave the name of Tiberias to the city he built on the lake of Gennesareth (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 2, 3). He enlarged and improved several cities of his dominions, and also built a wall about Sepphoris, and round Betharamphtha, which latter town he named *Julias*, in honor of the wife of the emperor (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 2, 1; comp. *War*, ii, 9, 1).

It was before Herod Antipas, who came up to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover (comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xviii, 6, 3), that our Lord was sent for examination when Pilate heard that he was a Galilæan, as Pilate had already had several disputes with the Galilæans, and was not at this time on very good terms with Herod (Luke xiii, 1; xxiii, 6-7), and "on the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together" (Luke xxiii, 12; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 3, 2; Psa. lxxxiii, 5). The name of Herod Antipas is coupled with that of Pilate in the prayer of the apostles mentioned in the Acts (iv, 24-30). His personal character is little touched upon by either Josephus or the evangelists, yet from his consenting to the death of John the Baptist to gratify the malice of a wicked woman, though for a time he had "heard him gladly" (Mark vi, 20), we perceive his cowardice, his want of spirit, and his fear of ridicule. His wicked oath was not binding on him, for Herod was bound by the law of God not to commit murder. He was in any case desirous to see Jesus, and "hoped to have seen a miracle from him" (Luke xxiii, 8). His artifice and cunning are specially alluded to by our Lord, "Go ye and tell that *fox*" (τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ, Luke xiii, 32). Coins of Herod Antipas bear the title ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟΥ. See Antipas.

3. Herod Archelaus (Ἀρχέλαος, Matt.; Josephus; Ἡρώδης, Dion Cassius; coins), son of Herod the Great and Malthace, uterine and younger brother of Herod Antipas, and called by Dion Cassius Ἡρώδης Παλαιστηνός (lv, 57). He was brought up with his brother at Rome (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 3). His father had disinherited him in consequence of the false accusations of his eldest brother Antipater, the son of Doris; but Herod, on making a new will, altered his mind, and gave him "the kingdom," which had before been left to Antipas (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 8, 1). It was this unexpected arrangement which led to the retreat of Joseph to Galilee (Matt. ii, 22). He was saluted as "king" by the army, but refused to accept that title till it should be confirmed by Augustus (Joseph. *Ant.* xvii, 8, 2, 4; *War*, i, 1). Short-

ly after this a sedition was raised against him, which he quelled by killing 3000 persons, and he then set sail with his brother Antipas to Rome (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 9, 2, 4; *War*, ii, 2, 3). Upon this the Jews sent an embassy to Augustus, to request that they might be allowed to live according to their own laws under a Roman governor. Our Lord seems to allude to this circumstance in the parable of the nobleman going into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom: "But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us" (Luke xix, 12–27). While he was at Rome, Jerusalem was under the care of Sabinus, the Roman procurator, and a quarrel ensued in consequence of the manner in which the Jews were treated. Quiet was again established through the intervention of Varus, the president of Syria, and the authors of the sedition were punished (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 10). Augustus, however, ratified the main points of Herod's will, and gave Archelaus Judæa, Samaria, and Idumæa, with the cities of Cæsarea, Sebaste, Joppa, and Jerusalem, the title of *ethnarch*, and a promise that he should have the royal dignity hereafter if he governed virtuously (Joseph. *Ant.* xvii, 11, 4; *War*, ii, 6, 3). Archelaus never really had the title of king (βασιλεύς), though at first called so by the people (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 8, 2), yet we cannot object to the word βασιλεύει in Matthew, for Archelaus regarded himself as king (Josephus, *War*, ii, 1, 1), and Josephus speaks of the province of Lysanias, which was only a tetrarchy, as βασιλείαν τὴν Λυσανίου (*War*, ii, 11, 5). Herod (Antipas) the tetrarch is also called ὁ βασιλεύς (Matt. xiv, 9; Mark vi, 14). When Archelaus returned to Judæa he rebuilt the royal palace at Jericho, and established a village, naming it after himself, Archelais (Joseph. *Ant.* xvii, 13, 1). Shortly after Archelaus's return he violated the Mosaic law by marrying Glaphyra, the daughter of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, and the Jews complaining again loudly of his tyranny, Augustus summoned him to Rome, and finally, A.D. 6, sent him into exile at Vienna in Gaul, where he probably died, and his dominions were attached to the Roman empire (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 13, 2; *War*, ii, 7; compare Strabo, xvi, 765; Dion Cassius, lv, 25, 27). Jerome, however, relates that he was shown the tomb of Archelaus near Bethlehem (*Onomasticon*, s. v.). Coins with the title ΕΘΝΑΡΧΟΥ belong to Archelaus. See Archelaus.

4. Herod Philip I (Φίλιππος, Mark vi, 17; Ἡρώδης, Josephus) was the son of Herod the Great by a second Mariamne, the daughter of Simon the high-priest (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 5, 4), and must be distinguished from Philip the tetrarch, No. 6. He was the husband of Herodias, by whom he had a daughter, Salome. Herodias, however, contrary to the laws of her country, divorced herself from him, and married her uncle Antipas [see Nos. 2 and 5] (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 5, 4; Matt. xiv, 3; Mark vi, 17; Luke iii, 19). He was omitted in the will of Herod in consequence of the discovery that Mariamne was conscious of the plots of Antipater, Herod the Great's son by Doris (Josephus, *War*, i, 30, 7). See Philip.

5. Herodias (Ἡρῳδιάς, Matt. xiv, 1–11; Mark vi, 14–16; Luke iii, 19) was the daughter of Aristobulus, one of the sons of Herod I by the first Mariamne, and of Berenice, the daughter of Salome, Herod's sister, and was consequently sister of Herod Agrippa I (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 5, 4; *War*, i, 28, 1). She was first married to her uncle, Herod Philip I, the son of Herod I and the second Mariamne, by whom she had a daughter Salome, probably the one that danced and pleased Herod Antipas, and who afterwards married her uncle Philip II. Herodias soon divorced herself from him, and married Herod Antipas, who was also her uncle, being the son of Herod I and Malthace, and who agreed, for her sake, to put away his own wife, the daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 5, 1, 4). John the Baptist reproved her for her crimes in thus living in adultery and incest, and she took the first opportunity to cause him to be put to death, thus adding thereto the crime of murder. Her marriage was unlawful for three reasons: first, her former husband, Philip, was still alive (διαστᾶσα ζῶντος, Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 5, 4); secondly, Antipas's wife was still alive; and, thirdly, by her first marriage with Philip she became the sister-in-law of Antipas, who was consequently forbidden by the Jewish law to marry his brother's wife (Lev. xviii, 16; xi, 21; comp. Alford on Matt. xiv, 4). When Antipas was condemned by Caius to perpetual banishment, Herodias was offered a pardon, and the emperor made her a present of money, telling her that it was her brother Agrippa (I) who prevented her being involved in the same calamity as her husband. The best trait of her character is shown when, in true Jewish spirit, she refused this offer, and voluntarily chose to share the exile of her husband [No. 2] (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 7, 2). See Herodias.

6. Herod Philip II (Φίλιππος, Luke and Josephus) was son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra of Jerusalem (Ἱεροσολυμῖτις), and was with his half brothers Archelaus and Antipas brought up at Rome (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 3; *War*, i, 28, 4). He received as his share of the empire the tetrarchy of Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and certain parts about Jamnia, with a revenue of 100 talents (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 11, 4; *War*, ii, 6, 3). He is only mentioned once in the N. T. (Luke iii, 1, Φιλίππου τετραρχοῦντος). He was married to Salome, the daughter of Herod Philip I and Herodias, but left no children (Joseph. *Ant.* xviii, 5, 4). He reigned over his dominions for 37 years (B.C. 4–A.D. 34), during which time he showed himself to be a person of moderation and quietness in the conduct of his life and government (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 4, 6). He built the city of Paneas and named it Cæsarea, more commonly known as Cæsarea-Philippi (Matt. xvi, 13; Mark viii, 27), and also advanced to the dignity of a city the village Bethsaida, calling it by the name of *Julias*, in honor of the daughter of Augustus. He died at Julias, and was buried in the monument he had there built (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 2, 1; 4, 6; *War*, ii, 9, 1). Leaving no children, his dominions were annexed to the Roman province of Syria (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 5, 6). Coins of Philip II bear the title ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟΥ. See Philip.

7. Herod Agrippa I (Ἡρώδης, Acts; Ἀγρίππας, Josephus) was the son of Aristobulus and Berenice, and grandson of Herod the Great (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 2; *War*, i, 28, 1). He is called "Agrippa the Great" by Josephus (*Ant.* xvii, 2, 2). A short time before the death of Herod the Great he was living at Rome, and was brought up with Drusus, the son of Tiberius, and with Antonia, the wife of Drusus (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 6, 1). He was only one year older than Claudius, who was born in B.C. 10, and they were bred up together in the closest intimacy. The earlier part of his life was spent at Rome, where the magnificence and luxury in which he indulged involved him so deeply in debt that he was compelled to fly from Rome, and betook himself to a fortress at Malatha, in Idumæa. Through the mediation of his wife Cypros and his sister Herodias, he was allowed to take up his abode at Tiberias, and received the rank of ædile in that city, with a small annuity (Joseph. *Ant.* xvi, 6, 2). But, having quarrelled with his brother-in-law, he fled to Flaccus, the proconsul of Syria. Soon afterwards he was convicted, through the information of his brother Aristobulus, of having received a bribe from the Damascenes, who wished to purchase his influence with the proconsul, and was again compelled to fly. He was arrested, as he was about to sail to Italy, for a sum of money which he owed to the Roman treasury, but made his escape and reached Alexandria, where his wife succeeded in procuring a supply of money from Alexander the alabarch. He then set sail, and landed at Puteoli. He was favorably received by Tiberius; but he one day incautiously expressed the wish that Caius might soon succeed to the throne, which being reported to Tiberius, he was arrested and thrown into prison, where he remained till the accession of Ca-

ius in A.D. 37 (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 6, 10). Caius shortly after gave him the tetrarchy of Philip, the iron chain with which he had been fastened to a soldier being exchanged for a gold one (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 6, 10). He was also invested with the consular dignity, and a league was publicly made with him by Claudius. He then started to take possession of his kingdom, and at Alexandria was insulted by the people, who dressed up an idiot, and bore him in mock triumph through the streets to deride the new king of the Jews (Philo, *in Flaccum*, 6). The jealousy of Herod Antipas and his wife Herodias was excited by the distinctions conferred upon Agrippa by the Romans, and they sailed to Rome in the hope of supplanting him in the emperor's favor. Agrippa was aware of their design, and anticipated it by a countercharge against Antipas of treasonous correspondence with the Parthians. Antipas failed to answer the accusations, and, after his exile, Agrippa received from Caius the tetrarchy of Galilee and Peræa (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 7, 2); and in A.D. 41, for having greatly assisted Claudius, he received his whole paternal kingdom (Judæa and Samaria), and, in addition, the tetrarchy of Lysanias II (comp. Luke iii, 1). Josephus says in one passage that Caius gave him this tetrarchy (*Ant.* xviii, 6, 10), but afterwards, in two places, that Claudius gave it to him (*Ant.* xix, 5, 1; *War*, ii, 11, 5). Caius probably promised it, and Claudius actually conferred it. Agrippa now possessed the entire kingdom of Herod the Great. At this time he begged of Claudius the kingdom of Chalcis for his brother Herod (Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 5, 1; *War*, ii, 11, 5).

Agrippa loved to live at Jerusalem, and was a strict observer of the laws of his country, which will account for his persecuting the Christians, who were hated by the Jews (Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 7, 3). Thus influenced by a strong desire for popularity, rather than from innate cruelty, "he stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the Church." He put to death James the elder, son of Zebedee, and cast Peter into prison, no doubt with the intention of killing him also. This was frustrated by his miraculous deliverance from his jailers by the angel of the Lord (Acts xii, 1-19). Agrippa I, like his grandfather, displayed great taste in building, and especially adorned the city of Berytus (Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 7, 5). The suspicions of Claudius prevented him from finishing the impregnable fortifications with which he had begun to surround Jerusalem. His friendship was courted by many of the neighboring kings and rulers. In A.D. 44 Agrippa celebrated games at Cæsarea in honor of the emperor, and to make vows for his safety. At this festival a number of the principal persons, and such as were of dignity in the province, attended. Josephus does not mention those of Tyre and Sidon as recorded in the Acts (xii, 20). Though Agrippa was "highly displeased," it does not appear that any rupture worthy of notice had taken place. On the second day Agrippa appeared in the theatre in a garment interwoven with silver. On closing his address to the people, they saluted him as a god, for which he did not rebuke them, and he was immediately seized with violent internal pains, and died five days after (Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 8, 2). This fuller account of Josephus agrees substantially with that in the Acts. The silver dress (*ἐξ ἀργύρου πεποιημένην πᾶσαν*, Josephus; *ἐσθῆτα βασιλικήν*, Acts); and the disease (*τῷ τῆς γαστρὸς ἀλγήματι τὸν βίον κατέστρεψεν*, Joseph.; *γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος ἐξέψυξεν*, Acts). The owl (*βουβῶνα ἐπὶ σχοινίου τινός*), which on this occasion appeared to Agrippa as the messenger of ill tidings (*ἄγγελος κάκων*, Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 8, 2), though on a former one it had appeared to him as a messenger of good news (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 6, 7), is converted by Eusebius (*H. E.* ii, ch. 10), who professes to quote Josephus, into the angel of the Acts (*ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἄγγελος Κυρίου*, Acts xii, 23. For an explanation of the confusion, compare Eusebius, *l. c.*, ed. Heinichen, Excurs. ii, vol. iii, p. 556; Alford, ad loc.). See AGRIPPA.

8. HEROD AGRIPPA II (Ἀγρίππας, Acts; Josephus) was the son of Herod Agrippa I and Cypros (*War*, ii, 11, 6). At the time of his father's death (A.D. 44) he was only seventeen years of age, and the emperor Claudius, thinking him too young to govern the kingdom, sent Cuspius Fadus as procurator, and thus made it again a Roman province (Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 9, 2; Tacit. *Hist.* v, 9). After the death of his uncle Herod in A.D. 48, Claudius bestowed upon him the small kingdom of Chalcis (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 5, 2; *War*, ii, 12, 1), and four years after took it away from him, giving him instead the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 7, 1; *War*, ii, 12, 8) with the title of king (Acts xxv, 13; xxvi, 2, 7). In A.D. 55 Nero gave him the cities of Tiberias and Tarichеæ in Galilee, and Julias, a city of Peræa, with fourteen villages near it (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 8, 4; comp. *War*, ii, 13, 2).

Agrippa II exhibited the Herodian partiality for building. He much enlarged the city of Cæsarea Philippi, and in honor of Nero called it Neronias. He also supplied large sums of money towards beautifying Jerusalem (which he encircled with the "third wall") and Berytus, transferring almost everything that was ornamental from his own kingdom to this latter place. These acts rendered him most unpopular (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 9, 4). In A.D. 60 king Agrippa and Berenice (q. v.) his sister, concerning the nature of whose equivocal intercourse with each other there had been much grave conversation (Juvenal, *Sat.* vi, 155 sq.), and who, in consequence, persuaded Polemo, king of Cilicia, to marry her (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 7, 3), came to Cæsarea (Acts xxv, 13). It was before him and his sister that the apostle Paul made his defence, and somewhat (*ἐν ὀλίγῳ*) "persuaded him to be a Christian." Agrippa seems to have been intimate with Festus (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 7, 11), and it was natural that the Roman governor should avail himself of his judgment on a question of what seemed to be Jewish law (Acts xxv, 18 sq., 26; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 8, 7). The "pomp" (*πολλὴ φαντασία*) with which the king came into the audience chamber (Acts xxv, 23) was accordant with his general bearing.

The famous speech which Agrippa made to the Jews, to dissuade them from waging war with the Romans, is recorded by Josephus (*War*, ii, 16, 4). At the commencement of the war he sided with the Romans, and was wounded by a sling-stone at the siege of Gamala (Josephus, *War*, iv, 1, 3). After the fall of Jerusalem he retired with his sister Berenice to Rome, and there died in the seventieth year of his age, and in the third year of Trajan (A.D. 100). He was on intimate terms with Josephus, who gives two of his letters (*Life*, 65), and he was the last Jewish prince of the Herodian line.

As regards his coins, Eckhel gives two with the head of Nero, one with the legend ΕΠΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΝΕΡΩΝΙΕ, confirming the account of Josephus as regards the city of Cæsarea-Philippi, and the other bearing the prænomen of *Marcus*, which he may have received on account of his family being indebted to the triumvir Antony, or else, as Eckhel thinks, more likely from Marcus Agrippa (Eckhel, *Doct. Num. Vet.* iii, 493, 494; comp. Akerman, *Num. Chron.* ix, 42). There are other coins with the heads of Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. See MONEY. Compare AGRIPPA.

Coin of Herod Agrippa II, with the Head of Titus, and a figure of Victory.

9. BERENICE (q. v.).

10. DRUSILLA (q. v.).

He'rodian (only in the plur. Ἡρωδιανοί), the designation of a class of Jews that existed in the time of Jesus Christ, evidently, as the name imports, partisans of Herod, but whether of a political or religious description it is not easy, for want of materials, to determine. The passages of the New Testament which refer to them are the following: Mark iii, 6; xii, 13; Matt. xxii, 16; Luke xx, 20. From these it appears that the ecclesiastical authorities of Judæa held a council against our Saviour, and, associating with themselves the Herodians, sent an embassy to him with the express but covert design of ensnaring him in his speech, that thus they might compass his destruction, by embroiling him. But what additional difficulty did the Herodians bring? Herod Antipas was now tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa, which was the only inheritance he received from his father, Herod the Great. As tetrarch of Galilee he was specially the ruler of Jesus, whose home was in that province. The Herodians, then, may have been subjects of Herod, Galilæans, whose evidence the priests were desirous of procuring, because theirs would be the evidence of fellow-countrymen, and of special force with Antipas as being that of his own immediate subjects (Luke xxiii, 7). Herod's relations with Rome were in an unsafe condition. He was a weak prince, given to ease and luxury, and his wife's ambition conspired with his own desires to make him strive to obtain from the emperor Caligula the title of king. For this purpose he took a journey to Rome, but he was banished to Lyons, in Gaul. The Herodians may have been favorers of his pretensions; if so, they would be partial hearers, and eager witnesses against Jesus before the Roman tribunal. It would be a great service to the Romans to be the means of enabling them to get rid of one who aspired to be king of the Jews. It would equally gratify their own lord should the Herodians give effectual aid in putting a period to the mysterious yet formidable claims of a rival claimant of the crown. If the Herodians were a Galilæan political party who were eager to procure from Rome the honor of royalty for Herod (Mark vi, 14, the name of king is merely as of courtesy), they were chosen as associates by the Sanhedrim with especial propriety. This idea is confirmed by Josephus's mention of a party as "the partisans of Herod" (*οἱ τὰ Ἡρώδου φανοῦντες, Ant.* xiv, 15, 10). The deputation were to "feign themselves just men," that is, men whose sympathies were entirely Jewish, and, as such, anti-heathen: they were to intimate their dislike of paying tribute, as being an acknowledgment of a foreign yoke; and by flattering Jesus, as one who loved truth, feared no man, and would say what he thought, they meant to inveigle him into a condemnation of the practice. In order to carry these base and hypocritical designs into effect, the Herodians were appropriately associated with the Pharisees; for as the latter were the recognised conservators of Judaism, so the former were friends of the aggrandizement of a native as against a foreign prince. (Comp. Fritzsche and Walch, ad loc. Other hypotheses may be found in Paulus on the passage in Matt.; in Wolff, *Curæ Phil.* i, 311 sq.; see also Köcher, *Analect.* in loc. Matt.; Zorn, *Hist. fisci. Jud.* p. 127; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 275. Monographs on this subject are those of Steuch, *Diss. de Herod.* Lund. 1706; Floder, *Diss. de Herod.* Upsal, 1764; Schmid, *Epist. de Herod.* Lipsiæ, 1763; Leuschner, *De Secta Herodianor.* Hirschberg, 1751; Stollberg, *De Herodianis*, Viteb. 1666; Jensius, *id.* Jen. 1688.) See SECTS, JEWISH.

Hero'dias (Ἡρωδιάς, a female patronymic from Ἡρώδης: on patronymics and gentilic names in ιας, see Matthiæ, *Gk. Gram.* § 101 and 103), the name of a woman of notoriety in the N. T., daughter of Aristobulus, one of the sons of Mariamne and Herod the Great, and consequently sister of Agrippa I. She first married Herod, surnamed Philip, another of the sons of Mariamne and the first Herod (*Ant.* xviii, 5, 4; comp. *War*, i, 29, 4), and therefore her full uncle; then she eloped from him, during his lifetime (*ibid.*), to marry Herod Antipas, her step-uncle, who had long been married to, and was still living with, the daughter of Æneas or Aretas—his assumed name—king of Arabia (*Ant.* xvii, 9, 4). Thus she left her husband, who was still alive, to connect herself with a man whose wife was still alive. Her paramour was, indeed, less of a blood relation than her original husband; but, being likewise the half-brother of that husband, he was already connected with her by affinity—so close that there was only one case contemplated in the law of Moses where it could be set aside, namely, when the married brother had died childless (Lev. xviii, 16, and xxii, 21, and for the exception Deut. xxv, 5 sq.). Now Herodias had already had one child—Salome (the daughter whose dancing is mentioned in the Gospels)—by Philip (*Ant.* xviii, 5, 4), and, as he was still alive, might have had more. Well therefore may she be charged by Josephus with the intention of confounding her country's institutions (*Ant.* xviii, 5, 4); and well may John the Baptist have remonstrated against the enormity of such a connection with the tetrarch, whose conscience would certainly seem to have been a less hardened one (Matt. xiv, 9 says he "was sorry;" Mark vi, 20 that he "feared" John, and "heard him gladly"). A.D. 28. The consequences both of the crime and of the reproof which it incurred are well known. Aretas made war upon Herod for the injury done to his daughter, and routed him with the loss of his whole army (*Ant.* xviii, 5, 1). The head of John the Baptist was granted at the suggestion of Herodias (Matt. xiv, 8-11; Mark vi, 24-28). According to Josephus, the execution took place in a fortress called Machaerus, on the frontier between the dominions of Aretas and Herod; according to Pliny (v, 15), looking down upon the Dead Sea from the south (compare Robinson, i. 570, note). It was to the iniquity of this act, rather than to the immorality of that illicit connection, that, the historian says, some of the Jews attributed the defeat of Herod. In the closing scene of her career, indeed, Herodias exhibited considerable magnanimity, as she preferred going with Antipas to Lugdunum, and there sharing his exile and reverses, till death ended them, to the remaining with her brother Agrippa I, and partaking of his elevation (*Ant.* xviii, 7, 2). This town is probably Lugdunum Convenarum, a town of Gaul, situated on the right bank of the Garonne, at the foot of the Pyrenees, now *St. Bertrand de Comminges* (Murray, *Handbook of France*, p. 314); Eusebius, *H. E.* i, 11, says *Vienne*, confounding Antipas with Archelaus. Burton on Matt. xiv, 3, Alford, and moderns in general, *Lyons*. In Josephus (*War*, ii, 9, 6), Antipas is said to have died in Spain—apparently, from the context, the land of his exile. A town on the frontiers, therefore, like the above, would satisfy both passages. See HEROD.

There are few episodes in the whole range of the New Testament more suggestive to the commentator than this one scene in the life of Herodias.

1. It exhibits one of the most remarkable of the undesigned coincidences between the N. T. and Josephus; that there are some discrepancies in the two accounts only enhances their value. More than this, it has led the historian into a brief digression upon the life, death, and character of the Baptist, which speaks volumes in favor of the genuineness of that still more celebrated passage in which he speaks of "Jesus," that "wise man, if man he may be called" (*Ant.* xviii, 3, 3; comp. xx, 9, 1, unhesitatingly quoted as genuine by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* i, 11). See JOHN THE BAPTIST.

2. It has been warmly debated whether it was the adultery or the incestuous connection that drew down the reproof of the Baptist. It has already been shown that, either way, the offence merited condemnation upon more grounds than one.

3. The birthday feast is another undesigned coincidence between Scripture and profane history. The Jews abhorred keeping birthdays as a pagan custom (Bland *on Matt.* xiv, 6). On the other hand, it was usual with the Egyptians (Gen. xl, 20; comp. Josephus,

Ant. xii, 4, 7), with the Persians (Herod. i, 133), with the Greeks, even in the case of the dead, whence the Christian custom of keeping anniversaries of the martyrs (Bähr *ad Herod.* iv, 26), and with the Romans (Pers. *Sat.* ii, 1-3). Now the Herods may be said to have gone beyond Rome in the observance of all that was Roman. Herod the Great kept the day of his accession; Antipas—as we read here—and Agrippa I, as Josephus tells us (*Ant.* xix, 7, 1), their birthday, with such magnificence that the "birthdays of Herod" (Herodis dies) had passed into a proverb when Persius wrote (*Sat.* v, 180). See BIRTHDAY.

4. Yet dancing, on these festive occasions, was common to both Jew and Gentile, and was practised in the same way: youths and virgins, singly, or separated into two bands, but never intermingled, danced to do honor to their deity, their hero, or to the day of their solemnity. Miriam (Exod. xv, 20), the daughter of Jephthah (Judg. xi, 34), and David (2 Sam. vi, 14) are familiar instances in Holy Writ: the "Carmen Sæculare" of Horace, to quote no more, points to the same custom amongst Greeks and Romans. It is plainly owing to the elevation of woman in the social scale that dancing in pairs (still unknown to the East) has come into fashion. See DANCE.

5. The rash oath of Herod, like that of Jephthah in the O. T., has afforded ample discussion to casuists. It is now ruled that all such oaths, where there is no reservation, expressed or implied, in favor of the laws of God or man, are illicit and without force. So Solomon had long since decided (1 Kings ii, 20-24; see Sanderson, *De Juram. Oblig. Prælect.* iii, 16). See OATH.

Hero'dion (Ἡρωδίων, a deriv. from *Herod*), a Christian at Rome to whom Paul sent a salutation as his kinsman (Rom. xvi, 11). A.D. 55. According to Hippolytus, he became bishop of Tarsus, but according to others, of Patra.

Herodium (Ἡρώδιον), the name of a fortress (Josephus) or town (Pliny), built on a conspicuous spot by Herod the Great (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 820), probably the site anciently occupied by BETH-HACCEREM (Jer. vi, 1; Neh. iii, 14), which the authority of Jerome has led some modern travellers to identify with the well-known eminence called by the natives *Jebel el-Fureidis*, and by Europeans "the Frank Mountain." If this identity be correct, the site has been the scene of many a remarkable change. Two great kings, in different ages and different ways, probably adorned it with magnificent works. From their lofty city the old inhabitants must have seen stretched before them, up the green vale of Urtâs, the beautiful gardens and fountains of king Solomon, which suggested to the royal poet some of the exquisite imagery of the Canticles; and nearly a thousand years later, Herod the Great erected, probably on this very hill of Beth-haccerem, "a fortress with its round towers, and in it royal apartments of great strength and splendor" (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 9, 4), making it serve as an acropolis amidst a mass of other buildings and palaces at the foot of the hill (*War*, i, xxi, 20). To this city, called after him Herodium, the Idumæan tyrant was brought for burial from Jericho, where he died (*Ant.* xvii, 8, 3). The locality still yields its evidence of both these eras. Solomon's reservoirs yet remain (Stanley, p. 165), and the present state of "the Frank Mountain" well agrees with the ancient description of Herodium (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 173; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 427).

Herold, JOHANN, a German divine, was born at Hochstädt, Suabia, in 1511. His early history is not known. In 1539 he made his appearance in Basle as a defender of Protestantism. He was pastor of a parish near Basle for some years, but in 1546 retired from it and returned to Basle to devote his time entirely to literary labors. The date of his death is not ascertained; it was probably about 1570. Among his numerous writings are the following: *Heidenwelt und ihrer Götter anfänglicher Ursprung* (Basel, 1544, fol.; also under the title, in a 2d ed., *Theatrum Divum Dearumque* (Basil. 1628, fol.):—*Orthodoxographi Theologiæ Doctores* LXXVI, *lumina clarissima* (Basil. 1555, fol.):—*Hæresiologia, sive Syntagma veterum theologorum per quos grassatæ in Ecclesia hæreses confutantur*, etc. (Basil. 1556, fol.).

Heron (אֲנָפָה, *anaphah'*, Lev. xi, 19; Deut. xiv, 18), an unclean bird, for which the kite, woodcock, curlew, peacock, parrot, crane, lapwing, and several others have been suggested. But most of these are not found in Palestine, and others have been identified with different Hebrew words. The root אָנַף, *anaph'*, signifies to breathe, to snort, especially from *anger*, and thence, figuratively, *to be angry* (Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 127). Parkhurst observes that "as the heron is remarkable for its *angry* disposition, especially when *hurt* or *wounded*, this bird seems to be most probably intended." But this equally applies to a great number of different species of birds, and would be especially appropriate to the *goose*, which hisses at the slightest provocation. The heron, though not constantly hissing, can utter a similar sound of displeasure with much meaning, and the common species, *Ardea cinerea*, is found in Egypt, and is also abundant in the Hauran of Palestine, where it frequents the margins of lakes and pools, and the reedy watercourses in the deep ravines, striking and devouring an immense quantity of fish. The herons are wading-birds, peculiarly irritable, remarkable for their voracity, frequenting marshes and oozy rivers, and spread over the regions of the East. Most of the species enumerated in English ornithology have been recognised in the vicinity of Palestine, and we may include all these under the term in question—"the anaphah *after his kind*." One of the commonest species in Asia is *Ardea russata*,

Little Golden Egret (*Ardea Russata*).

which is beautifully adorned with plumage partly white and partly of a rich orange-yellow, while the beak, legs, and all the naked parts of the skin are yellow. Its height is about seventeen inches. This is the *caboga*, or cow-heron so abundant in India. Several kinds of heron, one of which, from its form, would serve well enough to represent this little golden egret, are commonly depicted on those Egyptian paintings in which the subject—a favorite one—is the fowling and fishing among the paper-reeds of the Nile.

Bochart supposes that *anaphah* may mean the *mountain falcon*, called ἀνοπαῖα by Homer (*Odys.* i, 320), because of the similarity of the Greek word to the Hebrew. But if it meant *any* kind of *eagle* or *hawk*, it would probably have been reckoned with one or other of those species mentioned in the preceding verses. Perhaps, under all the circumstances, the *traditional* meaning is most likely to be correct, which we will therefore

trace. The Talmudists evidently were at a loss, for they describe it indefinitely as a "high-flying bird of prey" (*Chulin*, 63 a).

The Septuagint renders the Hebrew word by χαραδριός. This rendering, however, has been thought to lose what little weight it might otherwise have had from the probability that it originated in a false reading, viz. *agaphah*, which the translators connected with *agaph*, "a bank." Jerome adhered to the same word in a Latin form, *caradryon* and *caradrium*. The Greek and Roman writers, from the earliest antiquity, refer to a bird which they call *charadrius*. It is particularly described by Aristotle (*Hist. An.* vii, 7), and by Ælian (*Hist. An.* xv, 26). The latter derives its name from χαράδρα, a *hollow* or chasm, especially one which contains water, because, he says, the bird frequents such places. It is, moreover, certain that by the Romans the *charadrius* was also called *icterus*, which signifies the jaundice, from a notion that patients affected with that disease were cured by looking at this bird, which was of a yellow color (Pliny, xxxiv; Cœl. Aurel. iii, 5), and by the Greeks, χλωρίων; and in allusion to the same fabulous notion, ἴκτιρος (Aristotle, *Hist. An.* ix, 13, 15, and 22; Ælian, *Hist. An.* iv, 47). These writers concur in describing a bird, *sometimes* of a *yellow color*, remarkable for its voracity (from which circumstance arose the phrase χαραδριοῦ βίος, applied to a glutton), migratory, inhabiting watery places, and especially mountain torrents and valleys. Now it is certain that the name *charadrius* has been applied by ornithologists to the same species of birds from ancient times down to the present age. Linnæus, under Order IV (consisting of waders or shore birds), places the genus Charadrius, in which he includes all the numerous species of *plovers*. The ancient accounts may be advantageously compared with the following description of the genus from Mr. Selby's *British Ornithology*, ii, 230: "The members of this genus are numerous, and possess a wide geographical distribution, species being found in *every* quarter of the globe. They *visit the East* about April. Some of them, during the greater part of the year, are the inhabitants of open districts and wide wastes, frequenting both dry and moist situations, and only retire toward the coasts during the severity of winter. Others are continually resident upon the banks and about the mouths of rivers (particularly where the shore consists of small gravel or shingle). They live on worms, insects, and their larvæ. The flesh of many that live on the coasts is unpalatable." The same writer describes one "species, Charadrius pluvialis, called the *golden* plover from its color," and mentions the well-known fact that this species, in the course of moulting, turns completely black. Analogous facts respecting the charadrius have been established by observations in every part of the globe, viz. that they are gregarious and migratory. The habits of the majority are *littoral*. They obtain their food along the banks of rivers and the shores of lakes; "like the gulls, they beat the moist soil with their pattering feet, to terrify the incumbent worms, yet are often found in deserts, in green and sedgy meadows, or on *upland moors*." Their food consists chiefly of mice, worms, caterpillars, insects, toads, and frogs, which of course places them among the class of birds ceremonially *unclean*. On the whole, the evidence seems in favor of the conclusion that the Hebrew word *anaphah* designates the numerous species of the *plover* (may not this be the genus of birds alluded to as *the* fowls of the mountain, Psa. l, 11; Isa. xviii, 6?). Various species of the genus are known in Syria and Palestine as the *C. pluvialis* (golden plover), *C. œdicnemus* (stone curlew), and *C. spinosus* (lapwing). (Kitto's *Physical History of Palestine*, p. 106.) In connection with some of the preceding remarks, it is important to observe that in these species a yellow color is more or less marked.

Golden Plover (*Charadrius Pluvialis*)—winter plumage.

Herring, Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, was born in 1693 at Walsoken, Norfolk, of which his father was rector. He studied at Jesus and Bennet colleges, Cambridge, and was made fellow of Corpus Christi in 1716. After having possessed various livings, he was raised in 1737 to the see of Bangor, whence in 1743 he was translated to York. After the defeat of the king's troops at Preston Pans in 1745, the archbishop exerted himself in his diocese with so much patriotism and zeal that he repressed the disaffected, inspirited the desponding, and procured at a county meeting a subscription of £40,000 towards the defence of the country. His zeal for the Hanoverian cause procured him the facetious title of "the red Herring." In 1747 he was removed to the see of Canterbury, and he died at Croydon in 1756. Herring was a man of great celebrity as a preacher. His *Sermons on Public Occasions* were published in 1763 (Lond. 8vo), with a memoir of Herring by Duncombe; followed by his *Letters to W. Duncombe* (1727, 12mo). See *Biographica Britannica*; Rich, *Cyclop. of Biog.*

Herrnhut, a town of Saxony, in Upper Lusatia, in the circle of Dresden, at the foot of Hutberg Mountain, and about fifty miles from the city of Dresden. It was built by Zinzendorf in 1722 for the Moravian Brethren, who, from this town, are often called *Herrnhutters*. See Moravians.

Herron, Francis, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Shippensburg, Pa., June 28, 1774. His parents were Scotch-Irish. Their high regard for knowledge induced them to send him to Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., then under the care of that distinguished Presbyterian, the Rev. Dr. Nesbitt. Here he graduated May 5, 1794. He studied theology with Robert Cooper, D.D., and was licensed by Carlisle Presbytery in 1797. He commenced his work as a missionary in the then backwoods of Ohio. In 1800 he became pastor of the Rocky Spring Church, where he labored for ten years with great success. In June, 1811, he was installed pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburg, Penn. He found his new church embarrassed with debt, and the people "conformed to this world" to a degree almost appalling. But his earnestness and activity relieved the church of debt within a few years, and awoke the members to a sense of their spiritual danger. In 1825 the General Assembly resolved to establish a theological seminary in the West. Dr. Herron, with his naturally quick perception, urged Alleghany City, Pa., as the best location, and by great exertions obtained the decision to locate it there. He then undertook the toils and anxieties of its sustenance; and to no one does the Western Theological Seminary owe its success in a greater degree than to Dr. Herron. In 1827 he was elected moderator of the General Assembly held in Philadelphia. In 1828 and 1832 his ministrations were blessed by gracious revivals of religion; and in 1835 another revival occurred, marked by great excitement. In 1850 he resigned his charge, to the great regret of his people. Being then in his seventy-sixth year, he felt that his work was ended. He lived ten years longer; though the infirmities of age grew apace, his serenity and cheerfulness never failed. He died Dec. 6, 1860. Such was

the estimation in which his character and talents were held by his fellow-citizens, that the courts of Pittsburg adjourned on the announcement of his death, an honor never before paid to any clergyman in that city.—Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 95.

Herse. See HEARSE.

Herŭli (ERULI, ÆRULI), a German tribe, which first appeared with the Goths on the shores of the Black Sea, and thence took an active part in all the incursions of the Goths in the eastern provinces of the Roman empire. We afterwards find them in Attila's armies with the Scythians and Gepidæ. After the death of Attila they established themselves as a powerful nation on the shores of the Danube, and levied tribute on the Lombards. According to Procopius, they were thoroughly barbarous. After the Lombards and other neighboring nations had long been converted to Christianity, the Heruli still preserved their idolatrous worship, and continued to sacrifice human victims (see Procopius, *De bello Goth.* ii, c. 11). Under the leadership of Odoacer, they succeeded, in connection with the Turones, the Scythians, and the Rugii, in taking Rome, and from that time dates the downfall of the Western empire. About 495 they were defeated in an important battle by the Lombards. Paulus Diacon., in *De gest. Longob.*, reports a popular tradition, according to which, after this battle, the whole army of the Heruli became so bewildered in consequence of the anger of the gods that they took the green flax-fields for water, and, having got to them, opened their arms to swim, when the Lombards came up and killed them. A part of the nation then established themselves in Rugiland, at the mouth of the Danube, but finally decided to settle in the eastern Roman empire. The emperor Anastasius received them in his dominions, and assigned them a territory in Illyria, but was subsequently obliged to send an army against them to put an end to their depredations. Those who remained now subjected themselves to Rome, and aided greatly in overthrowing the power of the Ostrogoths in Italy. They were converted to Christianity under Justinian I, joined the Roman Catholic Church, and were gradually civilized. Their history ceased to present any characteristic features. See Morére, *Grand Dictionnaire* (ed. Drouet, Paris, 1759), vol. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 15. (J. N. P.)

Hervæus, NATALIS (French, HERVÉ DE NÉDELLEC), surnamed *Brito*, a mediæval French theologian and scholastic philosopher, was a native of Brittany, and died at Narbonne August, 1323. He became a member of the Dominican convent at Morlaix, studied also at Paris, then taught in various provinces of France, and afterwards was rector and professor of theology in the University of Paris, where he lectured from 1307 to 1309 upon the *Sententiæ* of Peter Lombard. In 1318 he became general of his order. He was a zealous Thomist, and passed for one of the first theologians of his time. He left numerous writings, of which only the following have been printed: *Hervæi Britonis in IV Sententiarum Volumina Scripta subtilissima* (best ed. Venice, 1505, fol.);—*Quodlibeta Magna* (Ven. 1486, fol.):—*De Beatitudine, De Verbo, De Æternitate Mundi, De Materia Cœli, De Relationibus, De Pluralitate Formarum, De Virtutibus, De Motu Angeli*—the whole published together by O. Scot (Venice, 1513, in 1 vol. fol.):—*De Secundis Intentionibus* (Paris, 1489 and 1544, 4to):—*De Potestate Ecclesiæ et Papæ* (Paris, 1500 and 1647). A list of his MS. writings is given by Quétif and Échard (*Script. ord. Præd.* i, 533).—Haureau, *De la Philosophie Scolastique*, ii, 396 sq.; Tennemann, *Man. Hist. of Phil.* p. 241 (Bohn's ed.). (J. W. M.)

Hervey, JAMES, an English divine and popular writer, was born at Hardingstone, near Northampton, Feb. 26, 1714. At eighteen he was sent to Oxford, and there, becoming acquainted with John Wesley, he became seriously impressed with the importance of religion. He afterwards became a Calvinist. At twenty-two he became curate of Weston Favel, and a few years after curate of Biddeford. During that time he wrote his celebrated *Meditations and Contemplations* (1746, 8vo), which obtained immense circulation. It was followed by *Contemplations on the Night and Starry Heavens*, and *A Winter Piece* (1747, 8vo). In 1750, on the death of his father, he succeeded to the livings of Weston and Collingtree; and he devoted himself earnestly to his clerical duties. In 1753 he published *Remarks on Lord Bolingbroke's Letters on the Study and Use of History, so far as they relate to the History of the Old Testament, etc., in a Letter to a Lady of Quality* (1753, 8vo). In 1755 he published *Theron and Aspasio, or a Series of Dialogues and Letters on the most important Subjects* (1755, 3 vols. 8vo), which was attacked by Robert Sandeman, of Edinburgh, on the nature of justifying faith, and other points connected with it, in a work entitled *Letters on Theron and Aspasio.* See SANDEMAN. John Wesley wrote a brief review of his *Theron and Aspasio*, and Hervey wrote in reply *Eleven Letters to John Wesley*, but before his death he directed that the MS. of this work should be destroyed. "His brother, however, judged that it would be a desirable pecuniary speculation to publish it, and placed it in the hands of Cudworth, an erratic dissenting preacher, to be finished, giving him liberty 'to put out and put in' whatever he judged expedient. Cudworth's Antinomian sentiments led him to abhor Wesley's opinions; he caricatured them relentlessly by his interpolations of Hervey's pages, and sent forth in Hervey's name the first and most reckless and odious caveat against Methodism that ever emanated from any one who had sustained friendly relations to it. It was republished in Scotland, and tended much to forestall the spread of Methodism there. Wesley felt keenly the injustice and heartlessness of this attack, but his sorrow was mitigated by the knowledge that the most of the abuse in the publication was interpolated, and that Hervey, who had delighted to call him his 'friend and father,' knew him too well to have thus struck at him from the grave. He answered the book; but time has answered it more effectually—time, the invincible guardian of the characters of great men." He died Dec. 25, 1758. Mr. Hervey's writings are viciously turgid and extravagant in style. "He was eminently pious, though not deeply learned; habitually spiritually-minded; animated with ardent love to the Saviour; and his humility, meekness, submission to the will of God, and patience under his afflicting hand, exemplified the Christian character, and adorned his profession." His writings were collected and published after his death (London, 1797, 7 vols.). His correspondence was published separately (1760, 2 vols. 8vo). See Ryland, *Life of Hervey; Letters of Hervey*, and Life prefixed; Chalmers, *General Biog. Dict.*; Jones, *Christian Biography*; Stevens, *History of Methodism*, i, 372; Wesley's *Works*, vi, 103, 125; Jackson, *Life of Charles Wesley*, ch. xxi; Coke and Moore, *Life of Wesley*, iii, 2.

He'sed (Heb. *Che'sed*, חֶסֶד, *kindness*, as often; Sept. Ἐσέδ), the name of a man whose son (Ben-Hesed) was Solomon's purveyor in the district of Aruboth, Sochoh, and Hepher (1 Kings iv, 10). B.C. cir. 995. See also JUSHAH-HESED.

Heser, GEORGE, a German ecclesiastical writer, was born at Weyern, near Passau, Austria, in 1609. He joined the Jesuits in 1625, and taught rhetoric, dialectics, and controversy at Munich and Ingolstadt. In 1642 he became preacher at St. Maurice's Church, Augsburg, and in 1649 went in the same capacity to St. Mary's Church, Ingolstadt. In 1662 he retired to Munich, where he was still living in 1676. The exact time of his death is not ascertained. He is especially noted for his efforts in proving Thomas à Kempis (q. v.) as the author of *De imitatione Christi*. In his *Dioptra Kempensis* he has gathered a number of testimonies, and describes pretty accurately a number of editions and of translations of Kempis, which appeared during the 16th

and 17th centuries. He wrote also *Vita et Syllabus omnium Operum Thomæ à Kempis ab auctore anonymo, sed coœvo, non longe post obitum illius conscripta* (Ingolstadt, 1650, 12mo; Paris, 1651, 8vo):—*Præmonitio nova ad lectorem Thomæ à Kempis* (Ingolstadt, 1651, 18mo; Paris, 1651, 8vo):—*LXX Palmæ, seu panegyricus in laudem librorum IV Thomæ à Kempis, ex hominum piorum elogiis LXX concinnatus* (Ingolstadt, 1651, 8vo), etc. See Veith, *Biblioth. Augustana;* Ersch und Gruber, *Allgem. Encyklopädie;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* xxiv, 559.

Hesh'bon (Hebrew *Cheshbon',* חֶשְׁבּוֹן, *intelligence,* as in Eccles. vii, 25, etc.; Sept. Ἐσεβών; Josephus), a town in the southern district of the Hebrew territory beyond the Jordan, on the western border of the high plain (*Mishor,* Josh. xiii, 17). It originally belonged to the Moabites, but when the Israelites arrived from Egypt it was found to be in the possession of the Amorites, whose king, Sihon, is styled both king of the Amorites and king of Heshbon, and is expressly said to have "reigned in Heshbon" (Josh. iii, 10; comp. Numb. xxi, 26; Deut. ii, 9). It was taken by Moses (Numb. xxi, 23-26), and eventually became a Levitical city (Josh. xxi, 39; 1 Chron. vi, 81) in the tribe of Reuben (Numb. xxxii, 37; Josh. xiii, 17); but, being on the confines of Gad, is sometimes assigned to the latter tribe (Josh. xxi, 39; 1 Chron. vi, 81). After the Ten Tribes were sent into exile, Heshbon was taken possession of by the Moabites, and hence is mentioned by the prophets in their declarations against Moab (Isa. xv, 4; Jer. xlviii, 2, 34, 45). Under king Alexander Jannæus we find it again reckoned as a Jewish city (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 15, 4). Pliny mentions a tribe of Arabs called *Esbonitæ* (*Hist. Nat.* v, 11; comp. Abulfeda, *Tab. Syr.* p. 11). In the time of Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἐσσεβών) it was still a place of some consequence under the name of *Esbus* (Ἐσβοῦς), but at the present day it is known by its ancient name, in the slightly modified form of *Hesban.* The region was first visited in modern times by Seetzen. The site is twenty miles east of the Jordan, on the parallel of the northern end of the Dead Sea. The ruins of a considerable town still exist, covering the sides of an insulated hill, but not a single edifice is left entire. The view from the summit is very extensive, embracing the ruins of a vast number of cities, the names of some of which bear a strong resemblance to those mentioned in Scripture. These environs, occupying the elevated plain between the mountains of Jazer and the Jabbok, seem to be referred to in Josh. xiii, 16. There are reservoirs connected with this and the other towns of this region. These have been supposed to be the "fish-pools" (בְּרֵכוֹת, *cisterns*) of Heshbon mentioned by Solomon (Cant. vii, 4) [see BATH-RABBIM]; but, say Irby and Mangles, "The ruins are uninteresting, and the only pool we saw was too insignificant to be one of those mentioned in Scripture" (p. 472). In two of the cisterns among the ruins they found about three dozen of human skulls and bones, which they justly regarded as an illustration of Gen. xxxvii, 20 (*Travels,* p. 472; see also George Robinson, lord Lindsay, Schwarz, Tristram, etc.). Dr. Macmichael and his party went to look for these pools, but they found only one, which was extremely insignificant. This is probably the reservoir mentioned by Burckhardt (*Syria,* p. 365). Mr. Buckingham, however, says, "The large reservoir to the south of the town, and about half a mile from the foot of the hill on which it stands, is constructed with good masonry, and not unlike the cisterns of Solomon, near Jerusalem, to which it is also nearly equal in size." Towards the western part of the hill is a singular structure, whose crumbling ruins exhibit the workmanship of successive ages—the massive stones of the Jewish period, the sculptured cornice of the Roman æra, and the light Saracenic arch, all grouped together (Porter, *Handb. for Palest.* p. 298).

Hesh'mon (Heb. *Cheshmon',* חֶשְׁמוֹן, *fatness;* Sept. Ἀσεμών), a city on the southern border of Judah (Simeon), near Idumæa, mentioned between Hazor-Gaddah and Beth-Palet (Josh. xv, 27); hence probably somewhere between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. It is possibly the same as the AZMON (q. v.) elsewhere (Josh. xv, 4) located in this vicinity. See HAZAR-ADDAR.

Hess, Johann, one of the German Reformers, was born in Nuremberg about 1490, studied at Leipzig from 1506 to 1510, and at Wittenberg from 1510 to 1512. In 1513 he became secretary to the bishop of Breslau. After travelling and studying in Italy, he returned in 1529 to Wittenberg, and there became connected with Luther and Melancthon. Returning to Breslau with reformatory views, he found no opposition from his bishop, who was imbued with the new humanistic learning, and was a friend of Erasmus. But the bishop (Turzo) died in 1520, and his successor (Jacob of Salza) was a strenuous Romanist. He left Breslau for a time, but the seed had taken root, and the magistrates recalled Hess as pastor in 1523. Thenceforward he was the soul of the Reformation in Breslau. In 1525 he married, and continued his labors in reforming the Church and the schools, and in providing institutions for the relief of the poor. He died in 1547.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie,* xix, 642.

Hess, Johann Jakob, an eminent Swiss divine, was born at Zurich Oct. 21, 1741, where he studied theology with his uncle, the pastor of Neftenbach, to whom he became assistant in 1760. In 1777 he was called to the church of Notre Dame in Zurich; and in 1795 (contrary to his own wishes) he was chosen, in preference to Lavater, antistes or president of the clergy of the canton. He died May 29, 1828. His long life was faithfully devoted to his work as a pastor, and to literary labor. "Hess was to Switzerland what Reinhard was to the Saxon Church, and Storr to that of Würtemberg. His clear and mild, yet fixed and safe convictions, as expressed in his writings on Biblical history, and especially on the life of our Lord, found a hearty reception in many a pious domestic circle in Germany, and in the soul of many a young theologian" (Hagenbach, *Hist. of the Church in 18th and 19th Centuries,* transl. by Hurst, ii, 409). In 1767 he published a *Geschichte der drei letzten Lebensjahre Jesu* (Zurich, 6 vols.). This work was adapted to the use of Roman Catholics by J. A. von Krapf (Münster, 1782, 2 vols.). Hess continued to study the subject, and wrote *Jugendgeschichte Jesu* (Zurich, 1773), and finally his *Leben Jesu* (1823, 3 vols.). His other works are *Von dem Reiche Gottes* (Zurich, 1774, 2 vols.; 5th edit. 1826):—*Gesch. u. Schriften der Apostel Jesu* (Zurich, 1775, 3 vols.; 4th ed. 1820–1822): this work was also adapted to the use of Roman Catholics (Münster, 1794, 2 vols.; 3d ed. Salzburg, 1801):—*Geschichte d. Israeliten vor d. Zeiten Jesu* (Zurich, 1776–1788, 12 vols.):—*Gesch. Josua* (Zurich, 1779, 2 vols.):—*Predigten ü. d. Apostelgesch.* (Zurich, 1781–1788), a collection of 50 sermons:—*Ueber die Lehre, Thaten, und Schicksale unseres Herrn* (Zurich, 1782, 2 vols.; 4th ed. 1817):—*Gesch. David's u. Salomo's* (Zurich, 1785, 2 vols.):—*Bibl. d. heiligen Gesch.* (Zurich, 1791–1792, 2 vols.):—*Gesch. d. Menschen* (Zurich, 1791–1792, 2 vols.; later ed. 1829):—*Ueber die Volks u. Vaterlandsliebe Jesu* (Winterthur, 1794):—*Der Christ bei Gefahren d. Vaterlandes,* a collection of sermons (Zurich, 1799–1800, 3 vols.). See Ersch u. Gruber, *Encyklopädie;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* xxiv, 575.

Hesse, a country in central Germany. The name is for the first time mentioned in a letter of St. Boniface to the pope (783), and the pupils of Boniface introduced Christianity into the country. At the time of Charlemagne it belonged to the dominions of the counts of Franconia; in the 10th century, a number of Hessian nobles established their independence; in the following, all of them recognised the sovereignty of Ludwig I of Thuringia, who had married the daughter of one of the Hessian princes. This line became extinct in 1247; a long civil war ensued; the result was the confirmation of the rule of Heinrich of Brabant, the son-in-law of the

last ruler of the extinct line. His son Heinrich ("the Child of Brabant") became the ancestor of all the branches of Hessian princes. The Hessian lands, sometimes divided among several princes, were again reunited at the beginning of the 16th century under Wilhelm II, the father of Philip I the Magnanimous, who played so prominent a part in the history of the Reformation of the 16th century. Philip divided his dominions among his four sons, two of whom died childless, thus leaving only two chief lines of the Hessian dynasties, *Hesse-Cassel* and *Hesse-Darmstadt*. The landgraves of Hesse-Cassel in 1803 received the title of elector; but in 1806, in consequence of the German war, in which the elector had taken sides against Prussia, the country was conquered by the Prussians, and annexed to Prussia. The landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt in 1806 received the title of grand-duke. From both main lines others branched off from time to time, but at the establishment of the German Confederation in 1815, only one, the landgravate of *Hesse-Homburg*, a branch of Hesse-Darmstadt, became a member of the Confederation. It became extinct in March, 1866, fell to Hesse-Darmstadt, but in September, 1866, was ceded by Hesse-Darmstadt to Prussia. Thus, in 1870, the only Hessian line retaining sovereignty was the grand-duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt, which was a part of the new North-German Confederation, not for the whole territory, however, but only for one of the three provinces.

The zeal of Philip the Magnanimous for the success of the Reformation made the Hessian territory one of the strongholds of German Protestantism. But the vacillation of the succeeding princes between the Lutheran and the Reformed Creeds caused considerable trouble, especially in Hesse-Cassel, the State Church of which was often left in the dark as to whether it was Lutheran or Reformed. Theological controversies on this subject have been continued up to the present day. In the grand-duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt, the majority of the Protestant churches, both Lutheran and Reformed, have joined (since 1822) the "Union" or United Evangelical Church. Before the union there were in the grand-duchy about 406,000 Lutherans and 173,000 Reformed. According to the census of 1885, there were in the grand-duchy in that year 643,881 Evangelical Christians (67.3 per cent. of the total population), 278,440 Roman Catholics (29.1 per cent.), 26,114 Israelites (2.7 per cent.). In the class of "other Christians" were included, in 1867, 2987 German Catholics, 626 Mennonites, 119 Baptists, 31 Free Religious, 24 Separatists, 22 Greek Catholics, 20 United Brethren in Christ, 6 Darbyites, 4 Pietists, 2 Orthodox Catholics.

The National Evangelical Church comprises the members of the United Evangelical Church as well as the non-united Lutherans and Reformed. The Church constitution, introduced at the time of the Reformation, with two consistories and four superintendents, was changed in 1803. The office of superintendents was abolished; the two consistories were supplanted by Church and School councils which had no consistorial jurisdiction. The new councils were subordinate to the state ministers of the Interior and of Justice, who, in the exercise of their functions, were aided by inspectors. As in other parts of Germany, the Church lost the last remnant of self-government, and became wholly subject to the state. A reorganization of the constitution took place by a decree of June 6, 1832. The administration of all the affairs of the National Evangelical Church was transferred to a Supreme Consistory (Oberconsistorium) at Darmstadt, which consists of a president (a layman), three ministerial counsellors, two lay counsellors, and of one or several assessors. Only in rare cases the Supreme Consistory has to report to the state ministry for a final decision. Each of the three provinces of the grand-duchy has a superintendent. The superintendents are the organs through whom the Supreme Consistory exercises its functions. Subordinate to the superintendents are the deans, thirty in number, who are appointed by the Supreme Consistory for the term of five years. Every congregation has a local church council to assist in the management of the external church discipline and of the local church property. This Church council has two official members, the pastor and the burgomaster (or his representative), and from three to five extraordinary members, who are chosen by the former in union with the council of the civil community. Every parish is to receive an official "visitation" from the superintendent or a dean once within every three years. The highest dignitary of the Church is the "prelate" (prälat), who is also, by virtue of his office, a member of the First Chamber. A theological faculty is connected with the University of Giessen; besides there is a preachers' seminary at Friedeburg. The theological faculty of Giessen has been and still is (Jan. 1870) under the control of the Rationalistic party; among its best known professors were Credner (q. v.) and Knobel (q. v.). As may therefore be expected, a considerable portion of the clergy belong likewise to the Rationalistic party; of late, however, the reaction in favor of evangelical principles has gained ground.

The Roman Catholics belong to the ancient diocese of Mentz (q. v.), which is now a suffragan see to the archbishop of Freiburg. The diocese, which, besides Hesse-Darmstadt, comprises a few parishes in the former landgravate of Hesse-Homburg, had (1865) 158 parishes in 17 deaneries. A faculty of Roman Catholic theology was formerly connected with the University of Giessen; but in 1848 the bishop of Mentz forbade all students of theology to attend the theological lectures of the (prominently Protestant) University, and established a new theological seminary at Mentz. The theological faculty, deserted by all the students, had soon to be suppressed. Of monastic institutions, there were in 1865 houses of the Jesuits, Capuchins, Brothers of the Christian Schools, Englische Fräulein, Sisters of Charity, and other female congregations, with 244 members. At the beginning of the century, the most liberal sentiments prevailed among the majority of the clergy, including even the canons of the cathedral church, and the professor of theological faculty of the University; but since the appointment of the ultramontane bishop of Ketteler (1850), these liberal sentiments have been to a very large extent weeded out or repressed. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 29; Wiggers, *Kirchl. Statistik*, ii, 207; Neher, *Kirchl. Geographie und Statistik*, ii, 311. (A. J. S.)

Hesse von Hessentein, Johann, born at Nuremberg Sept. 21, 1487, studied theology at Leipzig and Wittenberg, and became a priest during a stay in Italy. On his return to Germany his relations became intimate with Luther, to whose influence is attributed the deep Christian experience which characterize the productions of his pen. Hesse is considered one of the first German sacred poets, and many of his hymns are sung in the German churches of to-day.—Wolff, *Encyklop. d. deutsch. Nationallit.* iv, 83. (J. H. W.)

Hesshusen (Hesshusius), Tilemann, a Lutheran theologian, was born November 3, 1527, at Wesel, in Cleves. In his youth he travelled over France, England, Denmark, and Germany; after which he went to Wittenberg, where, in 1550, he became master of arts, and soon made his mark as a preacher. In 1552, when but twenty-five years old, he was appointed pastor of Goslar, and in 1553 was made D.D. But his peculiarities of mind and temper prevented his remaining long in any post. Always in conflict with the authorities, his friend Melancthon in vain procured him several advantageous situations, securing him, when but thirty years old, the nomination as professor of theology at Heidelberg, superintendent of the Palatinate, and president of the Church Council, which he lost again two years after, in 1559, after a bitter controversy with Klebitz (q. v.) on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He fought the same battle again with A. Hardenberg at Bremen. See

CRYPTO-CALVINISM. Having finally sought a refuge in his native city of Wesel, he was driven from it in 1564 for writing his *Unterschied zwischen d. wahren katholischen Lehre d. Kirche u. z. d. Irrthümern d. Papisten u. d. römischen Antichrists*, which highly displeased the government. After varied fortunes, he was in 1573 appointed bishop of Sameland; but, having there awakened great opposition, his doctrines were condemned by a synod in 1577, and he himself was afterwards driven out of the country. Shortly after he entered on his last situation as the leading professor of theology of the University of Helmstädt, where he died, Sept. 25, 1588. During his whole career as a controvertist, Hesshusen was a strong advocate of extreme Lutheranism, against the Melancthonian Synergists. See SYNERGISTIC CONTROVERSY. After the promulgation of the Formula of Concord (q. v.), he opposed it (having subscribed it in 1578) on the ground that certain changes had been made in it before publication. Under his influence, the University of Helmstädt withdrew its sanction from the Formula. Among his writings, the most important are his *Commentar ü. d. Psalmen:—De justificatione peccatoris coram Deo* (1587):—*Examen Theologicum* (Helmstädt, 1586). See Jno. Ge. Leuckfeld, *Hist. Heshusiana* (Quedlinburg, 1716); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 49; Planck, *Gesch. d. Prot. Theol.*; Gass, *Geschichte d. Prot. Theol.* vol. ii.

Hesychasts (Greek *ἡσυχασταί*, *ἡσυχάζειν*, *to be quiet*), a party of Eastern monks of the 14th century, on Mount Athos. They taught a refined and exaggerated mysticism, or quietism (q. v.), seeking "tranquillity of mind and the extinction of evil passions by contemplation." They believed that all who arrive at the blessedness of seeing God may also arrive at a tranquillity of mind entirely free from perturbation, and that all enjoying such a state may have visual perception of divine light, such as the apostles saw when they beheld His glory shining forth in the transfiguration. The monk Barlaam (q. v.), who afterwards became bishop of Gerace, during a visit to the East, learned the doctrines and usages of these quietistic monks, and attacked them violently. They were vigorously defended by Palamas, afterwards bishop of Thessalonica. The charges brought against them were not merely that they professed to seek and obtain a divine and supernatural light not promised in Scripture, but also that the means they used were fanatical and absurd. These means included contemplation, introversion, and ascetic practices; especially it was said that they were accustomed to seat themselves in some secret corner, and fix their eyes steadfastly upon the navel, whence they were called *ὀμφαλόψυχοι*. As the fruit of such contemplation, a divine light, they said, such as that which shone on Tabor, was diffused through their souls. Palamas defended this theory by making a distinction between the essence (*οὐσία*) of God and his activity (*ἐνέργεια*), asserting that the latter, though eternal and uncreated, is yet communicable. To the charge that they thus claimed directly to see God, inasmuch as this uncreated light must be either of the substance or of the attributes of God, they replied that the divine light radiated from God through *ἐνέργεια*, but was not God. The whole matter was brought before a council at Constantinople in 1341, and the decision tending favorably to the Hesychasts, Barlaam retreated to Italy. But his cause was taken up by another monk, George Acyndinus, who attacked the doctrine of Palamas and the usages of the Hesychasts. He also lost his case before a synod at Constantinople. After the death of the emperor Andronicus, however, who had favored Palamas and the Hesychasts, things took a different turn for a while in favor of the Barlaamites; but after the triumph of the emperor John Cantacuzenus, who favored the other side, a synod at Constantinople, in 1351, approved the doctrine of the Hesychasts, especially the distinction between *οὐσία* and *ἐνέργεια*, and excommunicated Acyndinus and Barlaam. The sources of information on these proceedings are the *Historia* of John Cantacuzenus (ii, 39; iv, 23, etc.), which is on the side of the Hesychasts; and the *Historia Byzantina* of Nicephorus Gregoras, which takes the other side. See Petavius, *De Dogm. Theol.* lib. i, c. 12; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, xxxiv, 431; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* cent. xiv, pt. ii, ch. v; Gass, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 52 sq.; Engelhardt, in *Zeitschrift d. hist. Theol.* viii, 48; Gieseler, *Church History*, per. iii, § 127; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. vii, chap. ii, § 14; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Edinb. translation, div. ii, vol. i, p. 236. See MYSTICISM.

Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop of the 3d century, who is mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* viii, 13) as a reviser of the text of the Septuagint (see also Jerome, *De vir. illust.* 77). He also published an edition of the New Testament, of which Jerome does not appear to have formed a favorable opinion. He obtained the crown of martyrdom in the Dioclesian persecution about A.D. 311. Nothing of his works is now extant. See Clarke, *Succ. of Sac. Literature*, s. v.; Lardner, *Works*, iii, 206; Hody, *De Bibl. textibus originalibus* (Oxf. 1705).

Hesychius, the grammarian OF ALEXANDRIA, is of uncertain date, but probably lived about the end of the 4th century. He compiled a Greek Lexicon, which has been of inestimable service to philology and literature. The best edition is that of Alberti and Ruhnken (Leyden, 1746-66, 2 vols.), with additions by Schow (Leipsic, 1792, 8vo); newly edited by Schmidt (Jena, 1857-64, 4 vols. 4to). See Ranke, *De Lexici Hesychiani vera origine et genuina forma Commentatio* (Leipzig and Quedlinburg, 1831, 8vo).

Hesychius OF JERUSALEM, a Greek ecclesiastical writer of the 5th century (supposed to have died about A.D. 434). Consecrated priest by the patriarch of Constantinople against his wishes, he spent the remainder of his life in that city. This is about all that is known with any certainty concerning his life. He appears to have enjoyed great reputation, and wrote a number of books, the principal of which are, *In Leviticum Libri septem* (Latin only, Basle, 1527, foloi; Paris, 1581, 8vo; and in *Bibliotheca Patrum*, xii, 52:—Στιχηρὸν (or Κεφάλαια) *τῶν ιϐ' προφητῶν καὶ* Ἡσαΐου, *Sticheron* (or *Capita*) *in duodecim prophetas minores et Esaiam*, published by David Hoeschel with Adrian's *Isagoge* (Augsburg, 1602, 4to), and inserted in the *Critici Sacri* (London, 1660), viii, 26:—Ἀντιῤῥητικά or Εὐτικά, published with Marcus Eremita's *Opuscula* (Paris, 1563, 8vo), and reprinted in the *Bibliotheca veterum Patrum* of Fronton Ducæus (Paris, 1624, fol.), i, 985. A Latin translation of this work was inserted in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, xii, 194, under the title *Ad Theodulum Sermo compendiosus animæ perutilis de Temperantia et Virtute*, etc.:—*Homiliæ de Sancta Maria deipara*, published by F. du Duc in *Biblioth. veterum Patrum*, ii, 417:—Τὸ *εἰς τὸν ἅγιον* Ἀνδρέαν *ἐγκώμιον*, *Oratio demonstrativa in S. Andream Apostolum:* a Latin translation of this work was inserted in the *Biblioth. Patr.* xii, 188:—*De Resurrectione Domini nostri Christi*, and *De Hora tertia et sexta quibus Dominus fuisse crucifixus dicitur*, in Combefis, *Novum Auctarium:*—Εἰς Ἰάκωϐον *τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ* Δαϐίδ *τὸν* Θεοπάτορα, of which extracts are given in Photius (cod. 275):—Μαρτύριον *τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐνδόξου μάρτυρος τοῦ* Χριστοῦ Λογγίνου *τοῦ ἑκατοντάρχου*, in Bollandus, *Acta Sanct.* March, vol. ii, Appendix, p. 736:—Ἡ *εὐαγγελικὴ συμφωνία*, in Combefis, i, 773; an extract of it was inserted in Cotelier, *Eccles. Græc. Monument.* iii, 1, under the title Συναγωγὴ *ἀποριῶν καὶ ἐπιλύσεων ἐκλεγεῖσα ἐν ἐπιτομῇ ἐκ τῆς* Εὐαγγελικῆς Συμφωνίας. Part of the extant writings of Hesychius are given in Migne's *Patrologia Græca*, vol. xciii. See Photius, *Bibliotheca*; Cave, *Hist. Liter.* i, 571; Tillemont, *Mémoires Ecclésiastiques*, xiv, 227; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 589.

Hetæriæ (*ἑταιρεῖαι*), *associations* or secret societies of the Romans, which were forbidden by an edict of Trajan soon after his accession, A.D. 98. Under this

commission, Pliny proceeded to severe measures against the assemblies of the Christians about A.D. 105.

Heterodox, a term "practically limited to belief in something that is contrary to the decision of some church or churches; thus, when a Romanist or a Lutheran, etc., speaks of heterodoxy, he means something in opposition to the teaching, respectively, of the Romish or Lutheran Church, etc., so that what is, or at least is understood by *heterodox*, at one time or place, will be orthodox in another. See Martensen, *Dogmatics*, § 28. See HERESY; ORTHODOX.

Heterogeneous. See DIVERSE.

Heterousians (*of other essence; ἕτερος, οὐσία*), a sect, the followers of Aëtius, and from him denominated Aëtians. See AËTIANS; ARIANISM.

Heth (Heb. *Cheth*, חֵת, *dread;* Sept. ὁ Χετταῖος, and so Josephus, *Ant.* i, 6, 2), a son (descendant) of Canaan, and the ancestor of the HITTITES (Gen. v, 20; Deut. vii, 1; Josh. i, 4), who dwelt in the vicinity of Hebron (Gen. xxiii, 3, 7; xxv, 10). The "kings of the Hittites" is spoken of all the Canaanitish kings (2 Kings vii, 6). In the genealogical tables of Gen. x and 1 Chron. i, Heth is named as a son of Canaan, younger than Zidon the firstborn, but preceding the Jebusite, the Amorite, and the other Canaanitish families. The Hittites were therefore a Hamitic race, neither of the "country" nor the "kindred" of Abraham and Isaac (Gen. xxiv, 3, 4; xxviii, 1, 2). In the earliest historical mention of the nation—the beautiful narrative of Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah—they are styled, not Hittites, but Bene-Cheth (A.V. "sons and children of Heth," Gen. xxiii, 3, 5, 7, 10, 16, 18, 20; xxv, 10; xlix, 32). Once we hear of the "daughters of Heth" (xxvii, 46), the "daughters of the land," at that early period still called, after their less immediate progenitor, "daughters of Canaan" (xxviii, 1, 8, compared with xxvii, 46, and xxvi, 34, 35; see also 1 Kings xi, 1; Ezek. xvi, 3). In the Egyptian monuments the name *Chat* is said to stand for Palestine (Bunsen, *Ægypten*, quoted by Ewald, *Gesch.* i, 317, note). See HITTITE.

Hetherington, WILLIAM M., a minister of the Free Church of Scotland, was born June 4, 1803, near Dumfries. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, where he distinguished himself in Greek and in moral philosophy. His first service in the ministry was at Hamilton, where he was assistant to Dr. Meek, whose daughter he married. In 1836 he became minister of Torphicken, and in 1844 at St. Andrew's. At the "disruption" he went out with the Free Church. In 1848 he was appointed to Free St. Paul's Church, Edinburgh, and in 1857 he was called to the chair of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in the Free-Church College, Glasgow, where his labors as lecturer were excessive. In 1862 he was struck by paralysis, and on the 23d of May, 1865, he died. His writings, besides the editorship of the Free-Church Magazine (1844–48), and numerous contributions to the *Presbyterian Review* and the *North British Review*, include the following: *Dramatic Sketches* (poems, 1829, 8vo):—*The Fulness of Time* (1834), characterized by Southey as a very original and able treatise:—*Roman History* (in *Encyclop. Brit.*; separately printed, 1852, 12mo):—*The Minister's Family* (1847; 5th edit. 1851, 12mo):—*History of the Church of Scotland* (1841, 8vo; last edit. 1853, 2 vols. 8vo):—*History of the Westminster Assembly* (1843, 12mo):—posthumous, *The Apologetics of the Christian Faith;* being a course of University lectures, with Introduction including a brief biographical sketch of the author by Dr. Alexander Duff (Edinburgh, 1867, 8vo).

Heth'lon (Heb. *Chethlon'*, חֶתְלֹן, *wrapped* up, i. e. a hiding-place; Vulg. *Hethalon*), a place the approach (דֶּרֶךְ, "way") to which lay on the northern border of Palestine, between the Mediterranean and Zedad, in the direction of Hamath (Ezek. xlvii, 15; xlviii, 1). In all probability the "way of Hethlon" is the pass at the (N. or S.) end of Lebanon, from the sea-coast of the Mediterranean to the great plain of Hamath, and is thus identical with "the entrance of *Hamath*" (q.v.) in Numb. xxxiv, 8, etc. See Porter, *Five Years in Damascus*, ii, 356.

Hetzel or **Hezel**, JOHANN WILHELM FRIEDRICH, a German Orientalist and theologian, was born at Königsberg May 16, 1754. He studied at the universities of Wittenberg and Jena, and was appointed professor of Oriental languages at Giessen in 1766. In 1800 he was made librarian of the University of that city, and in 1801 was called to the professorship of Oriental literature in the University of Dorpat, which office he held until 1820. He died Feb. 1, 1829. Hetzel wrote a number of works on the study of Oriental languages, the principal of which are *Ausführliche hebräische Sprachlehre* (Halle, 1777, 8vo):—*Nominalformenlehre d. hebräischen Sprache* (Halle, 1793, 8vo):—*Institutio Philologi Hebræi* (Halle, 1793, 8vo):—*Gesch. d. hebräischen Literatur* (Halle, 1776):—*Syrische Sprachlehre* (Lemgo, 1788, 8vo):—*Arabische Grammatik nebst einer kurzen arabischen Chrestomathie* (Jena, 1776, 8vo). Among his theological works, the most important are *Die Bibel, Altes u. Neues Testament mit vollständig erklärenden Bemerkungen* (Lemgo, 1780–1791, 10 vols.):—*Neuer Versuch ü. d. Brief an d. Hebräer* (Lpz. 1795, 8vo):—*Biblisches Reallexikon* (Lpz. 1783–1785, 3 vols. roy. 8vo):—*Geist d. Philosophie u. Sprache d. alten Welt* (Lübeck, 1794, 8vo). See Eichhorn, *Bibl. d. biblischen Literatur* (v, 1022 sq.); Pierer, *Universal Lex.* viii, 360; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biograph. Générale*, xxv, 598.

Hetzer, LUDWIG, was born in the canton Thurgau, Switzerland (date unknown). When the Reformation broke out in Switzerland he was in the vigor of youth, and he entered into the movement with great zeal and energy. He was chaplain at Wädenschwyl, on Lake Zurich, in 1523, and in September of that year he published a tract against images, under the title *Urtheil Gottes wie man sich mit allen Götzen und Bildnissen halten soll*, etc., which ran through several editions, and greatly stirred the popular mind. In October of the same year, when the second conference on the use of images, etc., took place at Zurich, he was appointed to keep the minutes, and to publish an official account of them. Zwingle and Œcolampadius appreciated his talents, especially his Hebrew learning, and, in spite of a certain heat and rashness which marked his character, they hoped much from his activity in the Reformation. In 1524 he went to Augsburg, with a recommendation from Zwingle, and there his learning and eloquence soon made him popular. But within a year, owing to a theological dispute with Urbanus Rhegius, in which Hetzer maintained Anabaptist views, he was compelled to quit Augsburg. Returning to Switzerland, he was kindly received at Basle by Œcolampadius, and was employed early in 1526 in translating Zwingle's reply to Bugenhagen into German. He seems to have satisfied both Zwingle and Œcolampadius on this visit that he was not an Anabaptist; but before the middle of the same year he was expelled from Zurich for preaching the new doctrine. At Strasburg he agreed with Johann Denk (q. v.) to issue a translation of the Prophets of the O. T. It appeared in the spring of 1527, and passed in four years through thirteen editions. This work is now very scarce; two copies, however, belong to the library of the Crozer Theological Seminary, Upland, Pa. Hetzer seems to have imbibed the theological views of Denk, so far, at least, as the doctrine of the Trinity is concerned, and to have aided him in spreading his doctrines in Worms, Landau, and other places. He had previously been charged with looseness of morals, and in 1827 the crime of adultery was charged upon him. He was brought to trial and beheaded at Constance, Feb. 3, 1529. Such is the common account of Hetzer's life, founded on contemporary writings and letters of Ambrose Blaurer, Zwingle, and others of the Reformers. See Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xvi, ch. iii, § 5; Trechsel,

Antitrinitarier, i, 13; Keim, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 61. Baptist writers, however, deny the charges of Socinianism and immorality, and assert that Hetzer was not only a man of great learning, but of gentle spirit and deep piety; and that he died a martyr to his Baptist principles. See H. Osgood, in *Baptist Quarterly Review*, July, 1869, p. 333.

Heubner, Heinrich Leonhard, a German theologian, was born at Lauterbach, Saxony, June 2, 1780, and was educated at Wittenberg. In 1811 he was made professor extraordinary of theology, in 1817 third director of the Theological Seminary at Wittenberg, and in 1832 first director. In this office he served faithfully and laboriously until his death, Feb. 12, 1853. His piety was marked, and saved him from neology and false philosophy. His writings include the following, viz.: *Interpretatio Miraculorum Novi Testamenti historico-grammatica* (Wittenb. 1807):—*Kirchenpostille* (Halle, 1854, 2 vols.):—*Predigten* (Berl. 1847; Magdeburg, 1851):—*Praktische Erklärung d. N. Test.* (Potsdam, 1855):—*Katechismus-Predigten* (Halle, 1855); also a revised and much enlarged edition of Büchner's *Biblische Handconcordanz* (Halle, 1840–1853). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxv, 599; Tholuck, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 64.

Heugh, Hugh, D.D., a Scotch Presbyterian divine, was born at Stirling Aug. 12, 1782. His father was a minister in the Anti-Burgher party of the Secession Church. The son was educated at the College of Edinburgh, and licensed to preach in 1804. In 1806 he was ordained colleague to his venerable father, on whose death in 1810 he became pastor of the Stirling Church. His pastoral duties were performed with great fidelity: he was a preacher of uncommon power, and he aided all benevolent movements both by tongue and pen. In 1821 he became minister of the Regent Place Church in Glasgow, where he remained until his death, June 16, 1846. He published *The Importance of Early Piety* (Glasgow, 1826, 8vo):—*State of Religion in Geneva and Belgium* (Glasgow, 1844, 12mo). After his death Dr. Macgill published his *Life and Select Works* (Glasgow, 1852, 2d ed., 2 vols. 12mo).—Jamieson, *Religious Biography*, p. 262; Kitto, *Journal of Sacred Lit.* vi, 410.

Heumann, Christoph August, a German theologian, was born at Altstädt (duchy of Weimar) August 3, 1681. He studied theology and philosophy at Jena, and in 1705 travelled through Germany and Holland. After his return he became inspector of the College of Göttingen in 1717, and in 1734 professor of theology in the University of that city. He died May 1, 1764. His principal works are *Lutherus apocalypticus, hoc est historia ecclesiastica ex Johannea Apocalypsi eruta* (Eisenach, 1714, 8vo; Hannover, 1717, 8vo):—*Deutsche Uebersetzung d. Neuen Testaments* (Hann. 1748; 2d edit. 1750, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Erklärung des Neuen Testaments* (Hann. 1750–1763, 12 parts, 8vo), a work which contains numerous ingenious explanations, along with many errors and paradoxes:—*Erweis dasz d. Lehre d. reformirten Kirche von d. heiligen Abendmahl die wahre sei* (Eisleben, 1764, 8vo), etc. See Heyne, *Memoria Heumanni* (Göttingen, 1764); Ersch und Gruber, *Encyklopädie;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 600; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* vi, 65.

Heusde, Von. See Hofstede de Groot.

Hewing (חָצַב) of wood, a laborious service, chiefly of slaves and aliens, to which the Gibeonites were condemned for the supply of the sanctuary by Joshua (Josh. ix, 23). Some of the Rabbins understood, however, that while the Hebrews remained in camp, and before the land was divided, the Gibeonites performed this service for the whole body of the people; but even they admit that afterwards their service were limited to the sanctuary. This service must have been sufficiently laborious at the great festivals, but not generally so, as they probably undertook the duty by turns. They were not reduced to a condition of absolute slavery, but seem to have been rather domestic tributaries than slaves, their tribute being the required personal service. See Gibeonite. In 1 Kings v, 15, we read that Solomon "had fourscore thousand hewers in the mountains." The forests of Lebanon only were sufficient to supply the timber required for building the Temple. Such of these forests as lay nearest the sea were in the possession of the Phœnicians, among whom timber was in such constant demand that they had acquired great skill in the felling and transport of it. See Lebanon. It was therefore of much importance that Hiram consented to employ large bodies of men in Lebanon to hew timber, as well as others to bring it down to the sea-side, whence it was to be taken along the coast in floats to Joppa. The forests of Lebanon have now in a great measure disappeared, but Akma Dagh and Jawur Dagh (the ancient Amanus and Rhosus), in the north of Syria, still furnish an abundance of valuable timber, though vast quantities have been felled of late years by the Egyptian government. See Axe; Wood.

Hewit, Nathaniel, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in New London, Conn., August 28, 1788. He graduated A.B. at Yale College in 1808. He commenced the study of law, but soon became satisfied of his call to the ministry, and devoted himself to theology, under the tuition of Dr. Joel Benedict, of Plainfield, Conn. In 1811 he was licensed to preach by the New-London Congregational Association, and, after preaching for a while in Vermont, went to the new theological seminary at Andover to gain still further preparation for his work. In 1815 he was installed as pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Plattsburg, N. Y. After some years of very successful labor there, he was called to the Congregational Church at Fairfield, Conn. Here he became known as one of "the most eloquent and powerful preachers in the country, and here it was that his pulpit from Sabbath to Sabbath sounded out that clarion blast of God's truth against intemperance, which, with a similar and equally powerful series of sermons at the same time from Dr. Lyman Beecher at Litchfield, soon aroused the whole Church and ministry of the land." He and Dr. Beecher were apostles of the American Temperance Reformation. In 1828 he resigned his charge at Fairfield to become agent of the American Temperance Society, then newly formed. "He addressed himself to this work with the spirit alike of a hero and a martyr, and prosecuted it with amazing ability and success. Far and wide, as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, with invincible logic, with bold earnestness, with fearless fidelity, with torrents—often cataracts—of burning eloquence, he moved, and fired, and electrified the people. The reform made rapid headway. It enlisted the great majority of the moral and Christian portion of society, the aged and the young, reclaiming many and guarding multitudes against intemperance. Of the astounding eloquence and effects of these discourses I have often heard, in forms and from quarters so various as to leave little doubt that what Luther was to the Reformation, Whitefield to the Revival of 1740, Wesley to primitive Methodism, that was Nathaniel Hewit to the early Temperance Reformation" (Atwater, *Memorial Discourse*). In 1830 he became pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Bridgeport, Conn. In 1831 he went to England in behalf of the cause of temperance, and his great powers of eloquence were never more signally displayed than on this visit. In power of logical argument and impassioned delivery few orators of the time exceeded Dr. Hewit. Returning home, he resumed his labors at Bridgeport, where he served until 1853, when he resigned this charge, and assumed that of a new Presbyterian Church formed by members of his old parish. He had always been an adherent to the doctrines of the Westminster Confession. The East Windsor (now Hartford) Theological Seminary owed its existence and maintenance largely to him. In 1862 he was compelled by growing infirmity to withdraw from active duty, and an associate pastor was appointed. He died at Bridgeport February 3, 1867.

Hey, John, D.D., a learned English divine, was born in 1734, and was educated at Catharine Hall, Cambridge. After holding several preferments, he became Norris professor of divinity at Cambridge in 1780, then pastor of Passenham (Northamptonshire) and of Calverton (Buckinghamshire), and died at London in 1815. His writings, which are generally acute and judicious, include *Essay on Redemption* (1763, 4to):—*Lectures in Divinity* (Camb. 1796, 4 vols. 8vo; 3d edit. 1841, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Discourses on the Malevolent Sentiments* (Newport, 1801, 8vo):—*Thoughts on the Athanasian Creed* (1790, 8vo):—*Observations on the Writings of St. Paul* (1811, 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1459.

Heydenreich, Karl Heinrich, a German philosopher, was born February 19, 1764, at Stolpen, in Saxony. He embraced first the philosophy of Spinoza, later that of Kant, and taught the Kantian philosophy as professor at the University of Leipzig from 1789 to 1797. He died April 29, 1801. Among his writings are *Natur und Gott nach Spinoza* (Leipzig, 1788):—*Philosophie der natürlichen Religion* (Leipzig, 1791, 2 vols):—*Einleitung i. d. Studien der Philosophie* (Leipzig, 1793):—*Psychologische Entwickelung des Aberglaubens* (Leipzig, 1797).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxiv, 621; Krug, *Handwörterbuch d. philos. Wissenschaft*, ii, 422.

Heylin (or **Heylyn**), Peter, was born Nov. 29, 1600, at Burford, Oxfordshire. At fourteen he entered Hart Hall, Oxford, and within two years was chosen demy of Magdalen College. Here he devoted himself to science, particularly to geography, on which he wrote a treatise entitled *Microcosmus*, which gained him great reputation. In 1623 he was ordained, and about 1625 undertook an academical exercise at Oxford, where he fell into a dispute with Prideaux, then regius professor of divinity. He maintained the visibility and infallibility of the catholic Church (not the Roman), and raised a storm which lasted for a long time in the University. His doctrines recommended him to the notice of Laud, then bishop of Bath and Wells. In 1628 he became chaplain to lord Danby, and, some time after, king's chaplain. He obtained various livings and clerical offices through the patronage of Laud, from which he was expelled by the Republicans; was the editor of the *Mercurius Aulicus*, the Royalist paper; recovered his preferments at the Restoration; and died May 8, 1662. Heylin was a fierce controversialist, and a bitter opponent of the Puritans, and through these qualities he obtained his various rapid preferments. He even went so far in his opposition to Puritanism as to write a *History of the Sabbath*, vindicating the employment of the leisure hours and evenings of the Lord's day in sports and recreations. In theology he was an Arminian of the latitudinarian sort (see his *Historia Quinq-Articularis*, 1659). His *Examen Historicum* contained an attack on Thomas Fuller which brought on a bitter controversy with that eminent writer. He wrote *The History of St. George and of the Order of the Garter* (2d edit. Lond. 1633, 4to):—*Ecclesia Restaurata: the History of the English Reformation* (1674, fol.; new edit. by Robertson, Lond. 1849, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Sermons* (London, 1659, 4to):—*Life of Abp. Laud* (Lond. 1647, fol.; several editions):—*Ærius Redivivus, a History of the Presbyterians* (2d edit. London, 1672, fol.):—*Theologia Veterum*, on the Apostles' Creed (Lond. 1673, fol.); with many controversial tracts, etc. His life is prefixed to the *Ecclesia Restaurata* (edit. of 1849). See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 13 sq.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 838.

Heylyn, John, D.D., an eminent English divine and prebendary of Westminster. He was deeply read in the Mystic divines, and was himself called "the Mystic doctor." He died about 1760, leaving *Theological Lectures at Westminster Abbey* (Lond. 1749–61, 2 vols. 4to), containing an "interpretation of the New Test.:"—*Sermons* (1770, 12mo):—*Discourses* (1793, 2 vols. 8vo). See Blackwood, *Magazine*, xxv, 33; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 838.

Heywood, Oliver, an English Nonconformist divine, was born at Bolton, 1629, and admitted at Trinity, Cambridge, 1647. He became rector at Halifax in 1652, and was deprived at the Restoration. After much suffering from poverty, he died in 1702. His writings on practical religion were quite numerous, and may be found in his *Whole Works now first collected* (Idle, 1827, 5 vols. 8vo). See also Hunter, *Life of Heywood* (Lond. 1844, 8vo).

Hez'eki (Heb. *Chizki'*, חִזְקִי, *strong;* Sept. Ἀζακί), one of the "sons" of Elpaal, a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 17). B.C. apparently cir. 598.

Hezeki'ah (Heb. *Chizkiyah'*, חִזְקִיָּה, whom *Jehovah has strengthened*, 2 Kings xviii, 1, 10, 14, 15, 16; 1 Chron. iii, 23; Neh. vii, 21; Prov. xxv, 1; "Hizkiah," Neh. x, 17; Zeph. i, 1; also in the prosthetic form *Yechiskiyah'*, יְחִזְקִיָּה, Ezra ii, 16; Hos. i, 1; Micah i, 1; elsewhere in the prolonged form *Chizkiya'hu*, חִזְקִיָּהוּ [in 2 Kings xx, 10; 1 Chron. iv, 41; 2 Chron. xxviii, 27; xxix, 1, 20, 30, 31, 36; xxx, 1, 18, 20, 22; xxxi, 2, 8, 9, 11, 13, 20; xxxii, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32, 33; xxxiii, 3; Isa. i, 1; Jer. xv, 4, it is both prosthetic and prolonged, *Yechizkiya'hu*, יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ]; Sept., Josephus, and N. Test. Ἐζεκίας), the name of four men. See also Jehizkiah.

1. The thirteenth king (reckoning Athaliah) of the separate kingdom of Judah, son of Ahaz and Abi or Abijah (2 Kings xviii, 2; 2 Chron. xxix, 1), born B.C. 751–750 (2 Kings xviii, 2), and his father's successor on the throne for twenty-nine years, B.C. 726–697. In both the above texts he is stated to have been twenty-five years old at his accession; but some, computing (from a comparison with 2 Chron. xxviii, 1) that Ahaz died at the age of thirty-six, make Hezekiah only twenty years old at his accession (reading כ for כה), as otherwise he would have been born when Ahaz was a boy eleven years old. This, indeed, is not impossible (Hieron. *Ep. ad Vitalem*, 132, quoted by Bochart, *Geogr. Sacr.* p. 920; see Keil on 2 Kings xviii, 1; Knobel, *Jes.* p. 22, etc.); but others suppose that *Ahaz* was twenty-five and not twenty years old at his accession (Sept., Syr., Arab., 2 Chron. xxviii, 1), reading כה for כ in 2 Kings xvi, 2. Neither of these suppositions, however, is necessary, for Ahaz was fifty years old at his death, and the date there given of the accession of Ahaz is simply that of his viceroyship or association with his father. See Ahaz.

The history of Hezekiah's reign is contained in 2 Kings xviii, 20; Isa. xxxvi–xxxix, and 2 Chron. xxix–xxxii, illustrated by contemporary prophecies of Isaiah and Micah. He is represented as a great and good king (2 Kings xviii, 5, 6), who set himself, immediately on his accession, to abolish idolatry, and restore the worship of Jehovah, which had been neglected during the careless and idolatrous reign of his father. This consecration was accompanied by a revival of the theocratic spirit, so strict as not even to spare "the high places," which, though tolerated by many well-intentioned kings, had naturally been profaned by the worship of images and Asherahs (2 Kings xviii, 4). On the extreme importance and probable consequences of this measure, see High Place. A still more decisive act was the destruction of a brazen serpent, said to have been the one used by Moses in the miraculous healing of the Israelites (Numb. xxi, 9), which had been removed to Jerusalem, and had become, "down to those days," an object of adoration, partly in consequence of its venerable character as a relic, and partly, perhaps, from some dim tendencies to the ophiolatry common in ancient times (Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 622). To break up a figure so curious and so highly honored showed a strong mind as well as a clear-sighted zeal, and Hezekiah briefly justified his procedure by calling the image נְחֻשְׁתָּן, "a brazen thing," possibly with a contemptuous play on the word נָחָשׁ, "a serpent."

How necessary this was in such times may be inferred from the fact that "the brazen serpent" is, or was, reverenced in the Church of St. Ambrose at Milan (Prideaux, *Connect.* i, 19, Oxf. ed.). The history of this Reformation, of which 2 Kings xviii, 4 sq. gives only a concise summary, is copiously related, from the Levitical point of view, in 2 Chron. xxix sq. It commenced with the cleansing of the Temple "in the first month" of Hezekiah's first year, i. e. in the month Nisan next after his accession, and was followed in the next month (because at the regular season neither Levites nor Temple were in a due state of preparation) by a great Passover, extended to fourteen days, to which not only all Judah was summoned, but also the "remnant" of the Ten Tribes, some of whom accepted the invitation. Some writers (as Jahn, Keil, and Caspari) contend that this passover must have been subsequent to the fall of Samaria, alleging that the mention of the "remnant" (2 Chron. xxx, 6) is unsuitable to an earlier period, and that, while the kingdom of Samaria still subsisted, Hezekiah's messengers would not have been suffered to pass through the land, much less would the destruction of the high places in Ephraim and Manasseh have been permitted (xxxi, 1). But the intention of the chronicler at least is plain enough: the connection of xxix, 17, "the first month," with xxx, 2, "the second month," admits of but one construction—that both are meant to belong to one and the same year, the first of the reign. Accordingly, Thenius, in the *Kgf. exeg. Hdb.* 2 Kings, p. 379, urges this as an argument against the historical character of the whole narrative of this passover, which, he thinks, "rendered antecedently improbable by the silence of the Book of Kings, is perhaps completely refuted by 2 Kings xxiii, 22. The author of the story, wishing to place in the strongest light Hezekiah's zeal for religion, represents *him*, not Josiah, as the restorer of the Passover after long desuetude, and this in the very beginning of his reign, without, perhaps, caring to reflect that the final deportation of the Ten Tribes, implied in xxx, 6, had not then taken place." But 2 Kings xxiii, 22, taken in connection, as it ought to be, with the preceding verse, is perfectly compatible with the account in the Chronicles. It says: "Surely *such* a Passover"—one kept in all respects "as it is written in the Book of the Covenant"—"was not holden from the time of the Judges," etc.: whereas Hezekiah's Passover, though kept with even greater joy and fervor than Josiah's, was held neither at the appointed season, nor in strict conformity with the law. Nor is it necessary to suppose that by "the remnant" the chronicler understood those who were left by Shalmaneser. Rather, his view is, that the people of the Ten Tribes, untaught by the judgments brought upon them by former reverses and partial deportations (under Tiglath-Pileser), with respect to which they might well be called a "remnant" (comp. the very similar terms in which even Judah is spoken of, xxxix, 8, 9), and scornfully rejecting the last call to repentance, brought upon themselves their final judgment and complete overthrow (Bertheau, *Kgf. exeg. Hdb.* 2 Chron. p. 395 sq.). Those, however, of the Ten Tribes who had taken part in the solemnity were thereby (such is evidently the chronicler's view of the matter, xxxi, 1) inspired with a zeal for the true religion which enabled them, on their return home, in defiance of all opposition on the part of the scorners or of Hoshea, to effect a destruction of the high places and altars in Ephraim and Manasseh, as complete as was effected in Jerusalem before, and in Judah after the Passover.

That this prudent and pious king was not deficient in military qualities is shown by his successes against the Philistines, seemingly in the early part of his reign, before the overthrow of Sennacherib (2 Kings xviii, 8), and by the efficient measures taken by him for the defence of Jerusalem against the Assyrians. Hezekiah also assiduously cultivated the arts of peace, and by wise management of finance, and the attention which, after the example of David and Uzziah, he paid to agriculture and the increase of flocks and herds, he became possessed, even in troubled times, of an ample exchequer and treasures of wealth (2 Chron. xxxii, 27-29; 2 Kings xx, 13; Isa. xxxix, 2). Himself a sacred poet, and probably the author of other psalms besides that in Isa. xxxviii, he seems to have collected the psalms of David and Asaph for the Temple worship, and certainly employed competent scribes to complete the collection of Solomon's Proverbs (Prov. xxv, 1). He appears also to have taken order for the preservation of genealogical records (Browne, *Review of Lepsius on Bible Chronology*, in Arnold's *Theological Critic*, i, 59 sq.).

By a rare and happy providence, this most pious of kings was confirmed in his faithfulness and seconded in his endeavors by the powerful assistance of the noblest and most eloquent of prophets. The influence of Isaiah was, however, not gained without a struggle with the "scornful" remnant of the former royal counselors (Isa. xxviii, 14), who in all probability recommended to the king such alliances and compromises as would be in unison rather with the dictates of political expediency than with that sole unhesitating trust in the arm of Jehovah which the prophets inculcated. The leading man of this cabinet was Shebna, who, from the omission of his father's name, and the expression in Isa. xxii, 16 (see Blunt, *Undes. Coincidences*), was probably a foreigner, perhaps a Syrian (Hitzig). At the instance of Isaiah, he seems to have been subsequently degraded from the high post of prefect of the palace (which office was given to Eliakim, Isa. xxii, 21), to the inferior, though still honorable station of state secretary (סֹפֵר, 2 Kings xviii, 18); the further punishment of exile with which Isaiah had threatened him (xxii, 18) being possibly forgiven on his amendment, of which we have some traces in Isa. xxxvii, sq. (Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 617).

At the head of a repentant and united people, Hezekiah ventured to assume the aggressive against the Philistines, and in a series of victories not only rewon the cities which his father had lost (2 Chron. xxviii, 18), but even dispossessed them of their own cities except Gaza (2 Kings xviii, 8) and Gath (Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 13, 3). It was perhaps to the purposes of this war that he applied the money which would otherwise have been used to pay the tribute exacted by Shalmaneser, according to the agreement of Ahaz with his predecessor, Tiglath-Pileser. When the king of Assyria applied for this impost, Hezekiah refused it, and omitted to send even the usual presents (2 Kings xviii, 7), a line of conduct to which he does not appear to have been encouraged by any exhortations of his prophetic guide.

Instant war was averted by the heroic and long-continued resistance of the Tyrians under their king Eluœus (Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 14), against a siege, which was abandoned only in the fifth year (Grote, *Greece*, iii, 359, 4th edit.), when it was found to be impracticable. This must have been a critical and intensely anxious period for Jerusalem, and Hezekiah used every available means to strengthen his position, and render his capital impregnable (2 Kings xx, 20; 2 Chron. xxxii, 3-5, 30; Isa. xxii, 8-11; xxxiii, 18; and to these events Ewald also refers, Psa. xlviii, 13). But while all Judæa trembled with anticipation of Assyrian invasion, and while Shebna and others were relying "in the shadow of Egypt," Isaiah's brave heart did not fail, and he even denounced the wrath of God against the proud and sinful merchant-city (Isa. xxiii), which now seemed to be the main bulwark of Judæa against immediate attack.

At what time it was that Hezekiah "rebelled against the king of Assyria, and served him not," we do not learn from the direct history: in the brief summary, 2 Kings xviii, 7, 8 (for such it clearly is), of the successes with which the Lord prospered him, that particular statement only introduces what is more fully detailed in the sequel (xviii, 13; xix, 37). That it precedes the notice of the overthrow of Samaria (ver. 9 sq.), does not warrant the inference that the assertion of independence

belongs to the earliest years of Hezekiah's reign (see Winer, *Real-Worterb.* i, 497, n. 2). Ewald, however, thinks otherwise: in the absence of direct evidence, making history, as his manner is, out of his own peremptory interpretation of certain passages of Isaiah (ch. i and xxii, 1-14), he informs us that Hezekiah, holding his kingdom absolved by the death of Ahaz from the obligations contracted with Tiglath-Pileser, prepared himself from the first to resist the demands of Assyria, and put Jerusalem in a state of defence. (It matters not to Ewald that the measures noted in 2 Kings xx, 20; 2 Chron. xxxii, 3-5, 30, are in the latter passage expressly assigned to the time of Sennacherib's advance upon Jerusalem.) "From Shalmaneser's hosts at that time stationed in Phœnicia and elsewhere in the neighborhood of Judah, forces were detached which laid waste the land in all directions: an army sent against them from Jerusalem, seized with panic at the sight of the unwonted enemy, took to flight, and, Jerusalem now lying helplessly exposed, a peace was concluded in all haste upon the stipulation of a yearly tribute, and the ignominious deliverance was celebrated with feastings in Jerusalem" (*Gesch. des V. Israel*, iii, 330 sq.): all of which rests upon the supposition that Ewald's interpretation of Isa. i, 22 is the only possible one: it cannot be said to be on record as history.

As gathered *from the Scriptures only*, the course of events appears to have been as follows: Ahaz had placed his kingdom as tributary under the protection of Tiglath-Pileser (2 Kings xvi, 7). It would seem from Isa. x, 27, and xxviii, 22, that in the time of Shalmaneser, to which the latter passage certainly, and the former probably, belongs, Judah was still under the yoke of this dependence. The fact that Sargon (whether or not the same with the Shalmaneser of the history), in his expedition against Egypt, left Judah untouched (Isa. xx), implies that Judah had not yet asserted its independence. A powerful party, indeed, was scheming for revolt from Assyria and a league with Egypt; but there appears no reason to believe that Hezekiah all along favored a policy which Isaiah in the name of the Lord, to the last, strenuously condemned. It was not till after the accession of Sennacherib that Hezekiah refused the tribute, and at the instigation of his nobles made a league with Egypt by ambasadors sent to Zoan (Tanis) (Isa. xxx, xxxi; compare xxxvi, 6-9). (Some, indeed [as Ewald and Caspari], place Isa. xxix-xxxii before the fall of Samaria, to which time ch. xxviii must unquestionably be assigned. Possibly ch. xxix may belong to the same time, and ver. 15 may refer to plottings for a league with Egypt already carried on in secret. Knobel, *Kgf. exeg. Hdb.* p. 215, 223, decides too peremptorily that such *must* be the reference, and consequently that ch. xxix falls only a little earlier than the following chapters, where the league is openly denounced, viz. in the early part of the reign of Sennacherib.)

The subsequent history, as gathered from the Scriptures, compared with the notices on the ancient monuments, is thought to be as follows. Sargon was succeeded by his son Sennacherib, whose two invasions occupy the greater part of the Scripture records concerning the reign of Hezekiah. The first of these took place in the third year of Sennacherib, and occupies only three verses (2 Kings xviii, 13-16), though the route of the advancing Assyrians may be traced in Isa. x, 5; xi. The rumor of the invasion redoubled Hezekiah's exertions, and he prepared for a siege by providing offensive and defensive armor, stopping up the wells, and diverting the watercourses, conducting the water of Gihon into the city by a subterranean canal (Ecclus. xlviii, 17. For a similar precaution taken by the Mohammedans, see Will. Tyr. viii, 7, Keil). But the main hope of the political faction was the alliance with Egypt, and they seem to have sought it by presents and private entreaties (Isa. xxx, 6), especially with a view to obtaining chariots and cavalry (Isa. xxxi, 1-3), which was the weakest arm of the Jewish service, as we see from the derision which it excited (2 Kings xviii, 23). Such overtures kindled Isaiah's indignation, and Shebna may have lost his high office for recommending them. The prophet clearly saw that Egypt was too weak and faithless to be serviceable, and the applications to Pharaoh (who is compared by Rabshakeh to one of the weak reeds of his own river) implied a want of trust in the help of God. But Isaiah did *not* disapprove of the spontaneously proffered assistance of the tall and warlike Ethiopians (Isa. xviii, 2, 7, acc. to Ewald's transl.), because he may have regarded it as a providential aid.

The account given of this first invasion in the cuneiform "Annals of Sennacherib" is that he attacked Hezekiah because the Ekronites had sent their king Padiya (or "Haddiya," acc. to Col. Rawlinson) as a prisoner to Jerusalem (comp. 2 Kings xviii, 8); that he took forty-six cities ("all the fenced cities" in 2 Kings xviii, 13 is apparently a general expression; compare xix, 8) and 200,000 prisoners; that he besieged Jerusalem with mounds (comp. 2 Kings xix, 32); and although Hezekiah promised to pay 800 talents of silver (of which perhaps only 300 were ever paid) and 30 of gold (2 Kings xviii, 14; but see Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 148), yet, not content with this, he mulcted him of a part of his dominions, and gave them to the kings of Ekron, Ashdod, and Gaza (Rawlinson, *Herod.* i, 475 sq.). So important was this expedition that Demetrius, the Jewish historian, even attributes to Sennacherib the Great Captivity (Clem. Alexand. *Strom.* p. 147, ed. Sylb.). In almost every particular this account agrees with the notice in Scripture, and we may see a reason for so great a sacrifice on the part of Hezekiah in the glimpse which Isaiah gives us of his capital city driven by desperation into licentious and impious mirth (xxii, 12-14). This campaign must at least have had the one good result of proving the worthlessness of the Egyptian alliance; for at a place called Altagû (the Eltekon of Josh. xv, 59?) Sennacherib inflicted an overwhelming defeat on the combined forces of Egypt and Ethiopia, which had come to the assistance of Ekron. But Isaiah regarded the purchased treaty as a cowardly defection, and the sight of his fellow-citizens gazing peacefully from the house-tops on the bright array of the car-borne and quivered Assyrians filled him with indignation and despair (Isa. xxii, 1-7, if the latest explanations of this chapter be correct).

Hezekiah's bribe (or fine) brought a temporary release, for the Assyrians marched into Egypt, where, if Herodotus (ii, 141) and Josephus (*Ant.* x, 1-3) are to be trusted, they advanced without resistance to Pelusium, owing to the hatred of the warrior-caste against Sethos, the king-priest of Pthah, who had, in his priestly predilections, interfered with their prerogatives. In spite of this advantage, Sennacherib was forced to raise the siege of Pelusium, by the advance of Tirhakah or Tarakos, the ally of Sethos and Hezekiah, who afterwards united the crowns of Egypt and Ethiopia. This magnificent Ethiopian hero, who had extended his conquests to the Pillars of Hercules (Strabo, xv, 472), was indeed a formidable antagonist. His deeds are recorded in a temple at Medinet-Abu, but the jealousy of the Memphites (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* i, 141) concealed his assistance, and attributed the deliverance of Sethos to the miraculous interposition of an army of mice (Herod. ii, 141). This story may have had its source, however, not in jealousy, but in the use of a mouse as the emblem of destruction (Horapoll. *Hierogl.* i, 50; Rawlinson, *Herod.* ad loc.), and of some sort of disease or plague (? 1 Sam. vi, 18; Jahn, *Arch. Bibl.* § 185). The legend doubtless gained ground from the extraordinary circumstance which ruined the army of Sennacherib.

Returning from his futile expedition (ἄπρακτος ἀνεχώρησε, Josephus, *Ant.* x, 1, 4), Sennacherib "dealt treacherously" with Hezekiah (Isa. xxxiii, 1) by attacking the stronghold of Lachish. This was the commencement of that *second* invasion, respecting which we have such full details in 2 Kings xviii, 17 sq.; 2 Chron. xxxii, 9 sq.; Isa. xxxvi. That there *were* two invasions (con-

trary to the opinion of Layard, Bosanquet, Vance Smith, etc.) is clearly proved by the details of the first given in the Assyrian annals (see Rawlinson, *Herod.* i, 477). Although the annals of Sennacherib on the great cylinder in the British Museum reach to the end of his *eighth* year, and this second invasion belongs to his fifth year, yet no allusion to it has been found. So shameful a disaster was naturally concealed by national vanity. From Lachish he sent against Jerusalem an army under two officers and his cup-bearer, the orator Rabshakeh, with a blasphemous and insulting summons to surrender, deriding Hezekiah's hopes of Egyptian succor, and apparently endeavoring to inspire the people with distrust of his religious innovations (2 Kings xviii, 22, 25, 30). The reiteration and peculiarity of the latter argument, together with Rabshakeh's fluent mastery of Hebrew (which he used to tempt the people from their allegiance by a glowing promise, ver. 31, 32), give countenance to the supposition that he was an apostate Jew. Hezekiah's ministers were thrown into anguish and dismay; but the undaunted Isaiah hurled back threatening for threatening with unrivalled eloquence and force. He even prophesied that the fires of Tophet were already burning in expectancy of the Assyrian corpses which were destined to feed their flame. Meanwhile Sennacherib, having taken Lachish (an event possibly depicted on a series of slabs at Mosul, Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 148–152), was besieging Libnah, when, alarmed by a "rumor" of Tirhakah's advance (to avenge the defeat at Altagû?), he was forced to relinquish once more his immediate designs, and content himself with a defiant letter to Hezekiah. Whether on the occasion he encountered and defeated the Ethiopians (as Prideaux precariously infers from Isa. xx, *Connect.* i, 26), or not, we cannot tell. The next event of the campaign about which we are informed is that the Jewish king, with simple piety, prayed to God with Sennacherib's letter outspread before him (comp. 1 Macc. iii, 48), and received a promise of immediate deliverance. Accordingly "that night the angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians 185,000 men."

There is no doubt that some secondary cause was employed in the accomplishment of this event. We are certainly "not to suppose," as Dr. Johnson observed, "that the angel went about with a sword in his hand stabbing them one by one, but that some powerful natural agent was employed." The Babylonish Talmud and some of the Targums attribute it to storms of lightning (Vitringa, Vogel, etc.); Prideaux, Heine (*De causâ Strag. Assyr.* Berl. 1761), Harmer, and Faber to the simoom; R. Jose (in *Seder Olam Rabba*), Marsham, Usher, Preiss (*De causâ clad. Assyr.* Gottingen, 1776), to a nocturnal attack by Tirhakah; Paulus to a poisoning of the waters; and, finally, Josephus (*Ant.* x, 1, 4 and 5), followed by an immense majority of ancient and modern commentators (including Michaelis, Döderlein, Dathe, Heusler, Bauer, Ditmar, Gesenius, Maurer, Knobel, etc., and even Keil), to the pestilence (compare 2 Sam. xxiv, 15, 16). This would be a cause not only adequate (Justin, xix, 11; Diodor. xix, 434; see the other instances quoted by Rosenmüller, Keil, Jahn, etc.), but most probable in itself, from the crowded and terrified state of the camp. There is, therefore, no necessity to adopt the ingenious conjectures by which Döderlein, Koppe, and Wessler endeavor to get rid of the large number 185,000. It is not said where the event occurred: the prophecies concerning it, Isa. x–xxxvii, seem to denote the neighborhood of Jerusalem, as would Psa. lxxvi, if it was written at that time. On the other hand, the narrative would probably have been fuller had the overthrow, with its attendant opportunities of beholding the bodies of their dreaded enemies and of gathering great spoil, befallen near Jerusalem, or even within the immediate limits of Judah. That version of the story which reached Herodotus (ii, 140)—for few after Josephus will hold with Ewald (*Gesch.* iii, 336) that the story is not substantially the same—indicates the frontier of Egypt, near Pelusium, as the scene of the disaster. The Assyrian army would probably break up from Libnah on the tidings of Tirhakah's approach, and advance to meet him. In ascribing it to a vast swarm of field-mice, which, devouring the quivers and bow-strings of the Egyptians, compelled them to flee in the morning, Herodotus may have misinterpreted the symbolical language of the Egyptians, in which the mouse denotes annihilation (ἀφανισμός, Horapoll. i, 50): though, as Knobel (*u. s.* p. 280) has shown by apposite instances, an army of mice is capable of committing such ravages, and also of leaving pestilence behind it. That the destruction was effected in the course of one night is clearly expressed in 2 Kings xix, 35, where "that night" is plainly that which followed after the delivery of Isaiah's prophecy, and is evidently implied alike in Isa. xxxvi, 36 ("when men arose early in the morning"), and in the story of Herodotus.

After this reverse Sennacherib fled precipitately to Nineveh, where he revenged himself on as many Jews as were in his power (Tob. i, 18), and, after many years (not fifty-five days, as Tobit says, i, 21), was murdered by two of his sons as he drank himself drunk in the house of Nisroch (Assarac?) his god. He certainly lived till B.C. 695, for his 22d year is mentioned on a clay tablet (Rawlinson, *l. c.*); he must therefore have survived Hezekiah by at least one year. It is probable that several of the Psalms (e. g. xlvi–xlviii, lxxvi) allude to his discomfiture.

"In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death." So begins, in all the accounts, and immediately after the discomfiture of Sennacherib, the narrative of Hezekiah's sickness and miraculous recovery (2 Kings xx, 1; 2 Chron. xxxii, 24; Isa. xxxviii, 1). The time is defined, by the promise of fifteen years to be added to the life of Hezekiah, to the fourteenth year complete, or fifteenth current, of his reign of twenty-nine years. But it is stated to have been in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah that Sennacherib took the fenced cities of Judah, and thereafter threatened Jerusalem and came to his overthrow. The two notes of time, the express and the implied, fully accord, and place beyond question, at least, the view of the writer or last redactor in 2 Kings xviii, xix; Isa. xxxvi, xxxvii, that the Assyrian invasion began before Hezekiah's illness, and lies in the middle of his reign. In the received chronology, as the first year of Hezekiah precedes the fourth of Jehoiakim = first of Nebuchadnezzar (i. e. B.C. 604 in the Canon, B.C. 606 in the Hebrew reckoning) by 29, 55, 2, 31, 3 = 120 years, the epoch of the reign is B.C. 724 or 726, and its 14th year B.C. 711 or 713. But it is contended that so early a year is irreconcilable with definite and unquestionable data of contemporary history, Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian. From these it has been inferred that during the siege of Samaria Shalmaneser died, and was succeeded by Sargon, who, jealous of Egyptian influence in Judæa, sent an army under a Tartan or general (Isa. xx, 1), which penetrated Egypt (Nah. iii, 8–10) and destroyed No-Amon; although it is clear from Hezekiah's rebellion (2 Kings xviii, 7) that it can have produced but little permanent impression. Sargon, in the tenth year of his reign (which is regarded as parallel with the fourteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah), made an expedition to Palestine; but his annals make no mention of any conquests from Hezekiah on this occasion, and he seems to have occupied himself in the siege of Ashdod (Isa. xx, 1), and in the inspection of mines (Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geogr.* ix). This is therefore thought to be the expedition referred to in 2 Kings xviii, 13; Isa. xxxvi, 1; an expedition which is merely alluded to, as it led to no result. But if the Scripture narrative is to be reconciled with the records of Assyrian history, it has been thought necessary to make a transposition in the text of Isaiah (and therefore of the book of Kings). That some such expedient must be resorted to, if the Assyrian history is trustworthy, is maintained by Dr. Hincks in a paper *On the rectification of Chronology,*

which the newly-discovered Apis-steles render necessary (in *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1858). "The text," he says, "as it originally stood, was probably to this effect (2 Kings xviii, 13): Now in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah *the king of Assyria came up* [alluding to the attack mentioned in Sargon's "Annals"], xx, 1-19. In those days was king Hezekiah sick unto death, etc., xviii, 13. And Sennacherib, king of Assyria, came up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them, etc., xviii, 13; xix, 37." It has been conjectured that some later transcriber, unaware of the earlier and unimportant invasion, confused the allusion to Sargon in 2 Kings xviii, 13 with the detailed story of Sennacherib's attack (2 Kings xviii, 14 to xix, 37), and, considering that the account of Hezekiah's illness broke the continuity of the narrative, removed it to the end. According to this scheme, Hezekiah's dangerous illness (2 Kings xx; Isa. xxxviii; 2 Chron. xxxii, 24) nearly synchronized with Sargon's futile invasion, in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign, eleven years before *Sennacherib's* invasion. That it must have *preceded* the attack of Sennacherib has also been inferred from the promise in 2 Kings xx, 6, as well as from modern discoveries (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* i, 145); and such is the view adopted by the Rabbis (Seder Olam, cap. xxiii), Usher, and by most commentators, except Vitringa and Gesenius (Keil, ad loc.; Prideaux, i, 22). It should be observed, however, that the difficulties experienced in reconciling the scriptural date with that of the Assyrian monuments rests on the synchronism of the fall of Samaria with the 1st or 2d year of Sargon (q. v.). Col. Rawlinson has lately given reasons himself (*Lond. Athenæum*, No. 1869, Aug. 22, 1863, p. 246) for doubting this date; and it is probable that further researches and computations may fully vindicate the accuracy of the Biblical numbers.

Tirhakah is mentioned (2 Kings xix, 9) as an opponent of Sennacherib shortly before the miraculous destruction of his army in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, corresponding to B.C. 713. It has lately been proved from the Apis tablets that the first year of Tirhakah's reign over Egypt was the vague year current in B.C. 689 (Dr. Hincks, in the *Jour. Sac. Lit.* October, 1858, p. 130). There is, therefore, a *primâ facie* discrepancy of several years. Bunsen (*Bibelwerk*, i, p. cccvi) unhesitatingly reduces the reign of Manasseh from fifty-five to forty-five years. Lepsius (*Königsbuch*, p. 104) more critically takes the thirty-five years of the Sept. as the true duration. Were an alteration demanded, it would seem best to make Manasseh's computation of his reign commence with his father's illness in preference to taking the conjectural number forty-five, or the very short one thirty-five. The evidence of the chronology of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings is, however, we think, conclusive in favor of the sum of fifty-five. In the Bible we are told that Shalmaneser laid siege to Samaria in the fourth year of Hezekiah, and that it was taken in the sixth year of that king (2 Kings xviii, 9, 10). The Assyrian inscriptions indicate the taking of the city by Sargon in his first or second year, whence we must suppose either that he completed the enterprise of Shalmaneser, to whom the capture is not expressly ascribed in the Scriptures, or that he took the credit of an event which happened just before his accession. The first year of Sargon is shown by the inscriptions to have been exactly or nearly equal to the first of Merodach-Baladan, i. e. Mardocempadus: therefore it was current B.C. 721 or 720, and the second year, 720 or 719. This would place Hezekiah's accession B.C. 726, 725, or 724, the first of them being the very date the Hebrew numbers give. Again, Merodach-Baladan sent messengers to Hezekiah immediately after his sickness, and therefore in about his fifteenth year, B.C. 712. According to Ptolemy's Canon, Mardocempadus reigned 721-710, and, according to Berosus, seized the regal power for six months before Elibus, the Belibus of the Canon, and therefore in about 703, this being, no doubt, a second reign. See MERODACH-BALADAN. Here the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the earlier dates of Hezekiah. Thus far the chronological data of Egypt and Assyria appear to clash in a manner that seems at first sight to present a hopeless knot, but not on this account to be rashly cut. An examination of the facts of the history has afforded Dr. Hincks (*Jour. of Sac. Literature*, Oct. 1858) what he believes to be the true explanation. Tirhakah, he observes, is not explicitly termed Pharaoh or king of Egypt in the Bible, but king of Cush or Ethiopia, from which it might be inferred that at the time of Sennacherib's disastrous invasion he had not assumed the crown of Egypt. The Assyrian inscriptions of Sennacherib mention kings of Egypt, and a contemporary king of Ethiopia in alliance with them. The history of Egypt at the time, obtained by a comparison of the evidence of Herodotus and others with that of Manetho's lists, would lead to the same or a similar conclusion, which appears to be remarkably confirmed by the prophecies of Isaiah. He holds, therefore, as most probable, that, at the time of Sennacherib's disastrous expedition, Tirhakah was king of Ethiopia in alliance with the king or kings of Egypt. In fact, in order to reconcile the discrepancy between the date of the fourteenth year of Hezekiah in B.C. 713, and its contemporaneousness with the reign of Tirhakah, who did not ascend the Egyptian throne till B.C. 689, we have only to suppose that the latter king was the ruler of Ethiopia some years before his accession over Egypt itself. See TIRHAKAH.

In this way, however, we again fall into the other difficulty as to the coincidence of this date with that of Sennacherib's invasion. It is true, as above seen, that the warlike operations of Sennacherib recorded in the Bible have been conjectured (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, i, 383) to be those of two expeditions. See SENNACHERIB. The fine paid by Hezekiah is recorded in the inscriptions as a result of an expedition of Sennacherib's third year, which, by a comparison of Ptolemy's Canon with Berosus, must be dated B.C. 700, and this would fall so near the close of the reign of the king of Judah (B.C. 697) that the supposed second expedition, of which there would naturally be no record in the Assyrian annals on account of its calamitous end, could not be placed much later. The Biblical account would, however, be most reasonably explained by the supposition that the two expeditions were but two campaigns of the same war, a war but temporarily interrupted by Hezekiah's submission. Now as even the former (if there were two) of these expeditions of Sennacherib fell in B.C. 700, it would be thirteen years later than the synchronism of Tirhakah and Hezekiah as above arrived at. It is probable, therefore, that there is some miscalculation in these dates from the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments, as indeed seems to be betrayed by the discrepancy between Sennacherib's invasion (B.C. 700) and Tirhakah's reign (not earlier than B.C. 689), as thereby determined, whereas the above Biblical passage makes them contemporaneous. Dr. Hincks (*ut sup.*), however, proposes to solve this difficulty also by the uncritical supposition that the name of Sennacherib has been inserted in the Biblical account of the first Assyrian invasion of Judah (2 Kings xviii, 13; Isa. xxvi, 1; 2 Chron. xxxii) by some copyist, who confounded this with the later invasion by that monarch, whereas the Assyrian king referred to was Sargon (Isa. xx, 1), his predecessor. A less violent hypothesis for the same purpose of reconcilement, and one in accordance with the custom of these Oriental kings, e. g. in the case of Nebuchadnezzar, is that Sargon sent Sennacherib as viceroy to execute this campaign in Palestine, and that the annals of the reign of the latter refer to different and later expeditions when actually king. See CHRONOLOGY.

Some writers have thought to find a note of time in 2 Kings xix, 29; Isa. xxxvii, 30, "Ye shall eat this year such as groweth of itself," etc., assuming that the passage is only to be explained as implying the interven-

tion of a sabbath-year, or even of a sabbath-year followed by a year of jubilee. All that can be said is that the passage *may* be interpreted in that sense; and it does happen that according to that view of the order of sabbatic and jubilæan years which is the best attested, a sabbath-year would begin in the autumn of B.C. 713 (Browne, *Ordo Sæclorum*, sec. 272–280), i. e. on the perhaps precarious assumption that the cycle persisted without interruption. At most, however, this no more fixes the fourteenth of Hezekiah to the year B.C. 713, than it does to 706, or 699, or any other year of the series. But, in fact, it is not necessary to assume any reference to a sabbath-year. Suppose the words to have been spoken in the autumn, then, the produce of the previous harvest (April, May) having been destroyed or carried off by the invaders, there remained only that which sprang naturally from the dropped or trodden-out seed (סָפִיחַ), and as the enemy's presence in the land hindered the autumnal tillage, there could be no regular harvest in the following spring (only the סָחִישׁ, αὐτόματα). Hence there is no need to infer with Thenius, ad loc. that the enemy must have been in the land at least eighteen months, or, with Ewald, that Isaiah, speaking in the autumn, anticipated that the invasion would last through the following year (*Die Propheten des A. B.* i, 301, and similarly Knobel, *u. s.* p. 278).

There seems to be no ground whatever for the vague conjecture so confidently advanced (Jahn, *Hebr. Common.* § xli), that the king's illness was the same plague which had destroyed the Assyrian army. The word שְׁחִין is not elsewhere applied to the plague, but to carbuncles and inflammatory ulcers (Exod. ix, 9; Job ii, 1, etc.). Hezekiah, whose kingdom was still in a dangerous state from the fear lest the Assyrians might return, who had at that time no heir (for Manasseh was not born till long afterwards, 2 Kings xxi, 1), and who regarded death as the end of existence (Isa. xxxviii), "turned his face to the wall and wept sore" at the threatened approach of dissolution. God had compassion on his anguish, and heard his prayer. Isaiah had hardly left the palace when he was ordered to promise the king immediate recovery, and a fresh lease of life, ratifying the promise by a sign, and curing the boil by a plaster of figs, which were often used medicinally in similar cases (Gesenius, *Thes.* i, 311; Celsius, *Hierobot.* ii, 377; Bartholinus, *De Morbis Biblicis*, x, 47). What was the exact nature of the disease we cannot say; according to Meade, it was fever terminating in abscess. On this remarkable passage we must here be content to refer the reader to Carpzov, *App. Crit.* p. 351 sq.; Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 332 sq.; the elaborate notes of Keil on 2 Kings xx; Rosenmüller and Gesenius on Isa. xxxviii, and especially Ewald, *Geschichte* iii, 638.

The sign given to Hezekiah in the going back of the shadow on the "sun-dial of Ahaz" can only be interpreted as a miracle. The explanation proposed by J. von Gumpach (*Alt. Test. Studien*, p. 181 sq.) is as incompatible with the terms of the narrative (Isa. xxxviii, 8, especially the fuller one, 2 Kings xx, 8–11) as it is insulting to the character of the prophet, who is represented to have managed the seeming return of the shadow by the trick of secretly turning the movable dial from its proper position to its opposite! Thenius (*u. s.* p. 403 sq.) would naturalize the miracle so as to obtain from it a note of time. The phenomenon was due, he thinks, to a solar eclipse, very small, viz. the one of 26th September, B.C. 713. Here, also, the prophet is taxed with a deception, to be justified by his wish to inspire the despairing king with the confidence essential to his recovery. The prophet employed for this purpose his astronomical knowledge of the fact that the eclipse was about to take place, and of the further fact that "at the beginning of an eclipse the shadow (e. g. of a gnomon) goes back, and at its ending goes forward:" an effect, however, so minute that the difference amounts at most to sixty seconds of time; but then the "degrees" would mark extremely small portions of time, possibly even 1080 to the hour (like the later Hebrew *Chlakim*), and the so-called "dial" was enormously large! Not more successfully, Mr. Bosanquet (*Trans. of R. Asiat. Soc.* xv, 277) has recourse to the same expedient of an eclipse on Jan. 11, 689 B.C., which, in this writer's scheme, lies in the fourteenth of Hezekiah. "Whoever truly believes in the Old Testament, as Mr. Bosanquet evidently does, must also be prepared to believe in a miracle," is the just comment made by M. v. Niebuhr, *Gesch. Assurs und Babels*, p. 49. Mr. Greswell's elaborate attempt to prove from ancient astronomical records that the day of this miracle was preternaturally lengthened out to thirty-six hours will scarcely convince any one but himself (*Fasti Temporis Catholici*, etc., and Browne's "Remarks" on the same, 1852, p. 23 sq.). See DIAL.

Various ambassadors came with letters and gifts to congratulate Hezekiah on his recovery (2 Chron. xxxii, 23), and among them an embassy from Merodach-Baladan (or Berodach, 2 Kings xx, 12; ὁ Βάλαδας, Josephus, *l. c.*), the viceroy of Babylon, the Mardokempados of Ptolemy's canon. The ostensible object of this mission was to compliment Hezekiah on his convalescence (2 Kings xx, 12; Isa. xxxix, 1), and "to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land" (2 Chron. xxxii, 31), a rumor of which could not fail to interest a people devoted to astrology. But its real purpose was to discover how far an alliance between the two powers was possible or desirable, for Mardokempados, no less than Hezekiah, was in apprehension of the Assyrians. In fact, Sargon expelled him from the throne of Babylon in the following year (the 16th of Hezekiah), although after a time he seems to have returned and re-established himself for six months, at the end of which he was murdered by Belibos (Dr. Hincks, *l. c.*; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geograph.* ch. viii; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* i, 141). Community of interest made Hezekiah receive the overtures of Babylon with unconcealed gratification; and, perhaps, to enhance the opinion of his own importance as an ally, he displayed to the messengers the princely treasures which he and his predecessors had accumulated. These stores remained even after the largesses mentioned in 2 Kings xviii, 14, 16. If ostentation were his motive it received a terrible rebuke, and he was informed by Isaiah that from the then tottering and subordinate province of Babylon, and not from the mighty Assyria, would come the ruin and captivity of Judah (Isa. xxxix, 5). This prophecy and the one of Micah (Mic. iv, 10) are the earliest definition of the locality of that hostile power, where the clouds of exile so long threatened (Lev xxvi, 33; Deut. iv, 27; xxx, 3) were beginning to gather. It is an impressive and fearful circumstance that the moment of exultation was chosen as the opportunity for warning, and that the prophecies of the Assyrian deliverance are set side by side with those of the Babylonian captivity (Davidson, *On Prophecy*, p. 256). The weak friend was to accomplish that which was impossible to the powerful foe. But, although pride was the sin thus vehemently checked by the prophet, Isaiah was certainly not blind to the *political* motives (Joseph. *Ant.* x, 2, 2) which made Hezekiah so complaisant to the Babylonian ambassadors. Into those motives he had inquired in vain, for the king met *that* portion of his question ("What said these men?") by emphatic silence. Hezekiah's meek answer to the stern denunciation of future woe has been most unjustly censured as "a false resignation which combines selfishness with silliness" (Newman, *Hebr. Mon.* p. 274). On the contrary, it merely implies a conviction that God's decree could not be otherwise than just and right, and a natural thankfulness for even a temporary suspension of its inevitable fulfilment.

After this embassy we have only a general account of the peace and prosperity in which Hezekiah closed his days. No man before or since ever lived under the certain knowledge of the precise length of the span of life before him. "He was buried in the going up (מַעֲלֵה)

to the sepulchres of the sons of David," 2 Chron. xxxii, 33: from this, and the fact that the succeeding kings were laid in sepulchres of their own, it may be inferred that after Ahaz, thirteenth from David, there was no more room left in the ancestral sepulchre (Thenius, *u. s.* p. 410). In later times, he was held in honor as the king who had "after him none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him" (2 Kings xviii, 5); in Jer. xxvi, 17 the elders of the land cite him as an example of pious submission to the word of the Lord spoken by Micah; and the son of Sirach closes his recital of the kings with this judgment—that of all the kings of Judah, "David, Hezekiah, and Josiah alone transgressed not, nor forsook the law of the Most High" (Ecclus. xlix, 4).

Besides the many authors and commentators who have written on this period of Jewish history (on which much light has been recently thrown by Mr. Layard, Sir G. Wilkinson, Sir H. Rawlinson, Dr. Hincks, and other scholars who have studied the Nineveh remains), see for continuous lives of Hezekiah, Josephus (*Ant.* ix, 13-x, 2), Prideaux (*Connect.* i, 16-30), Jahn (*Hebr. Com.* § xli), Ewald (*Gesch.* iii, 614-644, 2d ed.), Stanley (*Jewish Church*, ii, 305-540), Nicholson (*Lectures on Hezekiah*, Lond. 1839), Rochah (*Meditations on Hez.* tr. by Hare, Lond. 1839), Michaelis (*De Ezechia*, Hal. 1717), Scheid (*Canticum Ezechiæ*, Leyd. 1769), Nicolai (*De terroribus Hiskiæ*, Helmst. 1749), Taddel (*Precatio Chiskiæ*, Wittenb. 1704). For sermons, etc., see Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, col. 330, 340, 341.

HEZEKIAH'S POOL, the modern traditionary name of a cistern or reservoir in the western part of the city of Jerusalem, referred by Robinson (*Later Researches*, p. 112) and Bartlett (*Walks about Jerusalem*, p. 82) to the military preparations of that king (2 Chron. xxxii, 3 sq.: compare 2 Kings xx, 20; Ecclus. xlviii, 17 sq.; Isa. xxii, 9-11; Psa. xlviii, 12, 13), but disputed by Ritter (*Erdk.* xvii, 371 sq.). See JERUSALEM.

2. The great-great-grandfather of the prophet Zephaniah (Zeph. i, 1, where the name is Anglicized "Hizkiah"), supposed by some to be the same with the foregoing (see Huetius, *Demonstr. Evang.* Lips. p. 512; contra Rosenmüller, *Proleg. ad Zeph.*). B.C. much ante 635.

3. A person mentioned in connection with Ater (but whether as father or otherwise is not clear), which latter was the father (or former residence) of ninety-eight Israelites who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii, 21). In Neh. x, 17 his name (Anglicized "Hizkijah") appears in a similar connection (but without the connective "of") among those who subscribed the covenant of Nehemiah. B.C. ante 536.

4. The second of the three sons of Neariah, a descendant of Salathiel (1 Chron. iii, 23); probably a brother of the Esli of Luke iii, 25, and also of the Azor of Matt. i, 13. (See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gosp.* p. 16.) B.C. post 536.

Hezel. See HETZEL.

Hezer. See HETZER.

He'zion (Heb. *Chezyon'*, חֶזְיוֹן, *vision;* Sept. 'Αζιών), the father of Tabrimon and grandfather of the Ben-hadad I, king of Damascene-Syria, to whom Asa sent a largess to conciliate his aid against Baasha (1 Kings xv, 18). B.C. ante 928. A question has long been raised whether this name (which only occurs in the above passage) indicates the same person as the REZON of 1 Kings xi, 23. Thenius, after Ewald, suggests that the successful adventurer who became king of Damascus, and was so hostile a neighbor to Solomon throughout his reign, was really called *Hezion*, and that the designation *Rezon* (רְזוֹן, "prince") was either assumed by him, or bestowed on him by his followers after he was seated on his new throne. There is, of course, no chronological difficulty in this supposition. Less than forty years intervened between the death of Solomon, when Rezon was reigning at Damascus (1 Kings xi, 25), and the treaty between Asa and Ben-hadad I (1 Kings xv, 18, 19), during which interval there is no violence to probability in assuming the occurrence of the death of Rezon or Hezion, the accession and entire reign of Tabrimon his son, who was unquestionably king of Syria and contemporary with Asa's father (1 Kings xv, 19), and the succession of Tabrimon's son, Ben-hadad I. This identity of Hezion with Rezon is an idea apparently as old as the Sept. translators; for they associated in their version with Solomon's adversary the Edomite Hadad [or, as they called him, *Ader*, τὸν Ἄδερ], "*Esrom*, the son of Eliadah" (see the Sept. of 1 Kings xi, 14); a name which closely resembles our *Hezion*, though it refers to Rezon, as the patronymic proves (1 Kings xi, 23). The later versions, Peshito (*Hedron*) and Arabic (*Hedron*), seem to approximate also more nearly to *Hezion* than to *Rezon*. Of the old commentators, Junius, Piscator, Malvenda, and Menochius have been cited (see Poli *Synops.* ad loc.) as maintaining the identity. Köhler also, and Marsham (*Can. Chron.* p. 346), and Dathe have been referred to by Keil as in favor of the same view. Keil himself is uncertain. According to another opinion, Hezion was not identical with Rezon, but his successor; this is propounded by Winer (*B. R. W.* i, 245, and ii, 322). If the account be correct which is communicated by Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 5, 2) from the fourth book of *Nicolaus Damascenus*, to the effect that the name of the king of Damascus who was contemporary with David was *Hadad* (Ἄδαδος), we have in it probably the *dynastic* name which Rezon or Hezion adopted for himself and his heirs, who, according to the same statement, occupied the throne of Syria for ten generations. According to Macrobius (*Saturnalia*, i, 23), *Adad* was the name of the supreme god of the Syrians; and as it was a constant practice with the kings of Syria and Babylon to assume names which connected them with their gods (comp. *Tabrimon* of 1 Kings xv, 18, the son of our Hezion, whose name=טָב+רִמּוֹן, "good is Rimmon," another Syrian deity, probably the same with Adad; see 2 Kings v, 18, and Zech. xii, 11), we may not unreasonably conjecture that Hezion, who in his *political* relation called himself *Rezon*, or "prince," adopted the name *Hadad* [or, rather, *Ben-hadad*, "Son of the supreme God"] in relation to the *religion* of his country and to his own *ecclesiastical* supremacy. It is remarkable that even after the change of dynasty in Hazael this title of *Ben-hadad* seemed to survive (see 2 Kings xiii, 3). If this conjecture be true, the energetic marauder who passes under the names of *Rezon* and *Hezion* in the passages which we quoted at the commencement of this article was strong enough not only to harass the great Solomon, but to found a dynasty of kings which occupied the throne of Syria to the tenth descent, even down to the revolution effected by Hazael, "near two hundred years, according to the exactest chronology of Josephus" (Whiston's note on *Ant.* vii, 5, 2). See REZON.

He'zir (Heb. *Chezir'*, חֵזִיר, a *swine*, or, according to Fürst, *strong;* Sept. 'Ιεζείρ and 'Ηζείρ v. r. Χηζίν), the name of two men.

1. The head of the seventeenth course of priests as established by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 15). B.C. 1014.

2. A chief Israelite who subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 20). B.C. cir. 410.

Hez'rai (2 Sam. xxiii, 35). See HEZRO.

Hez'ro (Heb. *Chetsro'*, חֶצְרוֹ, i. q. *Hezron;* Sept. 'Ασαραί, Vulg. *Hezro*), a Carmelite, one of David's distinguished warriors (1 Chron. xi, 37). He is called in the margin and in 2 Sam. xxiii, 35, HEZRAI (*Chetsray'*, חֶצְרַי, Sept. 'Ασαρί, Vulg. *Hesrai*). B.C. 1046. Kennicott, however (*Dissertation*, p. 207), decides, on the almost unanimous authority of the ancient version, that *Hezrai* is the original form of the name.

Hez'ron (Heb. *Chetsron'*, חֶצְרוֹן, *enclosed* [Gesen.]

or *blooming* [Fürst]; Sept. 'Ἀσρών, 'Ἀσερών), the name of two men, and also of a place.

1. The third son of Reuben (Gen. xlvi, 9; Exod. vi, 14; 1 Chron. iv, 1; v, 3). His descendants were called HEZRONITES (*Chetsroni'*, חֶצְרֹנִי, Sept. 'Ἀσρωνί, Numb. xxvi, 6, 21). B.C. 1874.

2. The oldest of the two sons of Pharez and grandson of Judah (Gen. xlvi, 12; Ruth iv, 18, 19; 1 Chron. ii, 5, 9, 18, 21, 24, 25); called ESROM ('Ἐσρώμ) in Matt. i, 3. B.C. 1856.

3. A place on the southern boundary of Judah, west of Kadesh-Barnea, and between that and Adar (Josh. xv, 3); otherwise called HAZOR (ver. 25). The punctuation and enumeration, however, require us to connect the associated names thus: Kerioth-hezron = Hazor-anam. See HAZOR.

Hez'ronite (Numb. xxvi, 6, 21). See HEZRON 1.

Hibbard, BILLY, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Norwich, Conn., Feb. 24, 1771, united with the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1792, entered the New York Conference in 1798, in 1821–2–3 was superannuated, became effective in 1824, was finally superannuated in 1828, and died Aug. 17, 1844, having preached forty-six years. He was an eccentric but very able man. His wit and humor, and his long, able, and abundantly successful labors in the Church, furnish the material of an interesting biography. He possessed a vigorous intellect, and acquired a sound and effective store of theological and general knowledge. His piety was deep and cheerful. See *Minutes of Conferences*, iii, 600; Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*; Sherman's *New-England Divines*, p. 285; *Life of Billy Hibbard* (N. Y. 12mo); Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 298.

Hickes, GEORGE, D.D., a nonjuring divine of great learning, was born June 20, 1642, at Newsham, in Yorkshire; was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, and in 1644 was elected fellow of Lincoln College. He became chaplain to the duke of Lauderdale in 1676, king's chaplain in 1682, and dean of Worcester in 1683. He was disappointed of the bishopric of Bristol by the death of Charles II. After the Revolution of 1688, refusing to take the oaths to William III, he was deprived in 1689, and became an active enemy of the government. He was consecrated bishop of Thetford by the Nonjurors in 1694, and died in 1715. His scholarship is shown in his valuable *Antiquæ Litteraturæ Septentrionalis Thesaurus* (Oxford, 1705, 3 vols. fol.), and his *Institutiones Grammaticæ Anglo-Saxonicæ* (Oxford, 1689, 4to). Among his theological and controversial writings, which were very numerous, are *The Christian Priesthood, and the Dignity of the Episcopal Order* (new ed. Oxford, 1847, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Bibliotheca Script. Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ* (London, 1709, 8vo):—*Sermons* (London, 1713, 2 vols. 8vo). See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 32 sq.; Lathbury, *History of the Nonjurors.*

Hicks, ELIAS, a member of the Society of Friends, or Quakers, and the author of a schism in that body, was born at Hempstead, L. I., March 19, 1748, and in early life became a preacher in the society. Imbibing Socinian opinions as to the Trinity and the Atonement, he began to preach them, cautiously at first, and with little sympathy from his brethren. By "degrees, however, the boldness of his views and the vigor with which he repelled assailants began to attract attention, and to win hearers over to his opinions, which, proclaimed without faltering, in public and private for years, at length found large numbers of sympathizers, who, with Mr. Hicks himself, unable to impress their convictions upon the denomination at large, in 1827 seceded from that body, and set up a distinct and independent association, but still holding to the name of Friends. In this secession were members from the Yearly Meetings of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Ohio, Indiana, and New England." He was a man of great acuteness and energy of intellect, and of elevated personal character. He died at Jericho Feb. 27, 1830. He published *Observations on Slavery* (New York, 1811, 12mo):—*Journal of Life and Labors* (Philadelphia, 1828):—*Sermons* (1828, 8vo):—*Letters relating to Doctrines* (1824, 12mo). See *Christian Examiner*, li, 321; Senneff, *Answer to Elias Hicks's Blasphemies* (1837, 2d ed. 12mo); Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 842; Janney, *Hist. of the Friends* (4 vols. 12mo); Gibbons, *Review and Refutation* (Philadelphia, 1847, 12mo); and the article FRIENDS (No. 2).

Hicksites. See HICKS.

Hid'dai (Heb. *Hidday'*, הִדַּי, *exuberant* or *mighty;* Sept. Alex. MS. 'Ἀθθαί, Vat. MS. omits; Vulg. *Heddai*), one of the thirty-seven heroes of David's guard (2 Sam. xxiii, 30), described as "of the torrents of Gaash." In the parallel list of 1 Chron. (xi, 32) the name is given as HURAI (q. v.), in favor of which reading Kennicott (*Dissert.* p. 194) decides.—Smith.

Hid'dekel (Heb. *Chidde'kel*, חִדֶּקֶל, in pause *Chiddá'kel*, חִדָּקֶל; Sept. Τίγρις, to which in Dan. x, 4 it adds 'Ἐνδεκέλ v. r. 'Ἐδδεκέλ; Vulg. *Tigris*), the name of the third of the four rivers of Paradise, being that which runs on the border (קִדְמַת) of Assyria (Gen. ii, 14), and "the great river" on the banks of which Daniel received his remarkably minute vision, or, rather, angelic prediction of the mutual history of Egypt and Syria (Dan. ii, 4). There has never been much dispute of the traditional interpretation which identifies the *Tigris* with the Hiddekel. According to Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 448), this river in Aramæan is called *Digla*, in Arabic *Diglat*, in Zend *Teger*, in Pehlvi *Tegera*, "stream;" whence have arisen both the Aramæan and Arabic forms, to which also we trace the Hebrew *Dekel* divested of the prefix *Hid*. This prefix denotes activity, rapidity, vehemence, so that Hid-dekel signifies "the rapid Tigris." From the introduction of the prefix, it would appear that the Hebrews were not entirely aware that *Teger*, represented by their דֶּקֶל, *Dekel*, by itself signified velocity; so in the language of Media, Tigris meant an *arrow* (Strabo, ii, 527; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* vi, 27; comp. Persic *teer*, "arrow;" Sanscrit *tigra*, "sharp," "swift"); hence arose such pleonasms as "king Pharaoh" and "the Al-coran." Fürst, however (*Heb. Lex.* s. v.), regards the *last* syllable as a mere termination to an original form חִדֶּק, *Hiddek*, from חָדַק, to *be sharp*, hence to flow swiftly. "The form *Diglath* occurs in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, in Josephus (*Ant.* i, 1), in the Armenian Eusebius (*Chron. Can.* pt. i, c. 2), in Zonaras (*Ann.* i, 2), and in the Armenian version of the Scriptures. It is hardened to *Diglit* (Diglito) by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* vi, 27). The name now in use among the inhabitants of Mesopotamia is *Dijleh*. It has generally been supposed that *Higla* is a mere Shemitic corruption of *Tigra*, and that this latter is the true name of the stream; but it must be observed that the two forms are found side by side in the Babylonian transcript of the Behistûn inscription, and that the ordinary name of the stream in the inscriptions of Assyria is *Tiggar*. Moreover, if we allow the *Dekel* of *Hid-dekel* to mean the Tigris, it would seem probable that this was the more ancient of the two appellations. Perhaps, therefore, it is best to suppose that there was in early Babylonian a root *dik*, equivalent in meaning, and no doubt connected in origin, with the Arian *tig* or *tij*, and that from these two roots were formed independently the two names, *Dekel*, *Dikla*, or *Digla*, and *Tiggar*, *Tigra*, or Tigris. The stream was known by either name indifferently; but, on the whole, the Arian appellation predominated in ancient times, and was that most commonly used even by Shemitic races. The Arabians, however, when they conquered Mesopotamia, revived the true Shemitic title, and this (*Dijleh*) continues to be the name by which the river is known to the natives down to the present day."

The Tigris rises in the mountains of Armenia, about fifteen miles south of the sources of the Euphrates, and pursues nearly a regular course south-east till its junc-

tion with that river at Korna, fifty miles above Basrah (Bassorah). The Tigris is navigable for boats of twenty or thirty tons' burden as far as the mouth of the Odorneh, but no further; and the commerce of Mosul is consequently carried on by rafts supported on inflated sheep or goats' skins. See FLOAT. These rafts are floated down the river, and when they arrive at Bagdad the wood of which they are composed is sold without loss, and the skins are conveyed back to Mosul by camels. The Tigris, between Bagdad and Korna, is, on an average, about two hundred yards wide; at Mosul its breadth does not exceed three hundred feet. The banks are steep, and overgrown for the most part with brushwood, the resort of lions and other wild animals. The middle part of the river's course, from Mosul to Korna, once the seat of high culture and the residence of mighty kings, is now desolate, covered with the relics of ancient greatness in the shape of fortresses, mounds, and dams, which had been erected for the defence and irrigation of the country. At the ruins of Nimrûd, eight leagues below Mosul, is a stone dam quite across the river, which, when the stream is low, stands considerably above the surface, and forms a small cataract; but when the stream is swollen, no part of it is visible, the water rushing over it like a rapid, and boiling up with great impetuosity. It is a work of great skill and labor, and now venerable for its antiquity. The inhabitants, as usual, attribute it to Nimrod. It is called the Zikr ul-Aawaze. At some short distance below there is another Zikr (dike), but not so high, and more ruined than the former. The river rises twice in the year: the first and great rise is in April, and is caused by the melting of the snows in the mountains of Armenia; the other is in November, and is produced by the periodical rains. (See Kinneir, *Geog. Mem. of Persian Empire*, p. 9, 10; Rich's *Koordistan;* Chesney's *Euphrates Expedition;* Sir R. K. Porter's *Travels;* etc.) See TIGRIS.

Hi'ël (Heb. *Chiël'*, חִיאֵל, *life of*, i. e. *from God*, or perh. for יְחִיאֵל, *God shall live;* Sept. Ἀχιήλ), a native of Bethel, who rebuilt Jericho (B.C. post 915), above 700 years after its destruction by the Israelites, and who, in so doing (1 Kings xvi, 34), incurred, in the death of his eldest son Abiram and his youngest son Segub, the effects of the imprecation pronounced by Joshua (Josh. vi, 26):

> "Accursed the man in the sight of Jehovah,
> Who shall arise and build this city, even Jericho;
> With [the loss of] his first-born shall he found it,
> And with [the loss of] his youngest shall he fix its gates."

See JERICHO. Strabo speaks of such cursing of a destroyed city as an ancient custom, and instances the curses imprecated by Agamemnon and Crœsus (Grotius, *Annot. ad Josh.* vi, 26); Masius compares the cursing of Carthage by the Romans (Poli *Syn.*). The term Betheiite (בֵּית הָאֱלִי) here only is by some rendered *family of cursing* (Pet. Martyr), and also *house* or *place of cursing* (Ar., Syr., and Chald. verss.), qu. בֵּית אָלָה; but there seems no reason for questioning the accuracy of the Sept. ὁ Βαιθηλίτης, which is approved by most commentators, and sanctioned by Gesenius (*Lex.* s. v.). The rebuilding of Jericho was an intrusion upon the kingdom of Jehoshaphat, unless, with Peter Martyr, we suppose that Jericho had already been detached from it by the kings of Israel. See ACCURSED.

Hieracas. See HIERAX.

Hiërap'olis (Ἱεράπολις, *sacred city*), a city of Phrygia, situated above the junction of the rivers Lycus and Mæander, not far from Colossæ and Laodicea, where there was a Christian church under the charge of Epaphras as early as the time of the apostle Paul, who commends him for his fidelity and zeal (Colos. iv, 12, 13). The place is visible from the theatre at Laodicea, from which it is five miles distant northward. Its association with Laodicea and Colossæ is just what we should expect, for the three towns were all in the basin of the Mæander, and within a few miles of one another. It is probable that Hierapolis was one of the "illustres Asiæ urbes" (Tacitus, *Ann.* xiv, 27) which, with Laodicea, were simultaneously desolated by an earthquake about the time when Christianity was established in this district. There is little doubt that the church of Hierapolis was founded at the same time with that of Colossæ, and that its characteristics in the apostolic period were the same. Smith, in his journey to the Seven Churches (1671), was the first to describe the ancient sites in this neighborhood. He was followed by Pococke and Chandler; and more recently by Richter, Cockerell, Hartley, Arundel, etc. The place now bears the name of *Pambûk-Kalek* (Cotton-Castle), from the white appearance of the cliffs of the mountain on the lower summit, or, rather, an extended terrace, on which the ruins are situated. It owed its celebrity, and probably the sanctity indicated by its ancient name, to its very remarkable thermal springs of mineral water (Dio Cass. lxviii, 27; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* ii, 95), the singular effects of which, in the formation of stalactites and incrustations by its deposits, are shown in the accounts of Pococke (ii, pt. 2, c. 13) and Chandler (*Asia Minor*, c. 68) to have been accurately described by Strabo (xiii, 629). A great number and variety of sepulchres are found in the approaches to the site, which on one side is sufficiently defended by the precipices overlooking the valleys of the Lycus and Mæander, while on the other sides the town walls are still observable. The magnificent ruins clearly attest the ancient importance of the place. The main street can still be traced in its whole extent, and is bordered by the remains of three Christian churches, one of which is upwards of 300 feet long. About the middle of this street, just above the mineral springs, Pococke, in 1741, thought that he distinguished some remains of the Temple of Apollo, which, according to Damascius, quoted by Photius (*Biblioth.* p. 1054), was in this situation. But the principal ruins are a theatre and gymnasium, both in a state of uncommon preservation; the former 346 feet in diameter, the latter nearly filling a space 400 feet square. Strabo (loc. cit.) and Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* v, 29) mention a cave called the Plutonium, filled with pestilential vapors, similar to the celebrated Grotto del Cane in Italy. High up the mountain-side is a deep recess far into the mountain; and Mr. Arundell says that he should have supposed that the mephitic cavern lay in this recess, if Mr. Cockerell had not found it near the theatre, the position anciently assigned to it; and he conjectures that it may be the same in which Chandler distinguished the area of a stadium (Arundell, *Asia Minor*, ii, 210). The same writer gives, from the *Oriens Christianus*, a list of the bishops of Hierapolis down to the time of the emperor Isaac Angelus. (See Col. Leake's *Geogr. of Asia Minor*, p. 252, 253; Hamilton's *Res. in Asia Minor*, i, 514, 517 sq.; Fellows, *Lycia*, p. 270; *Asia Minor*, p. 283 sq.; Cramer's *Asia Minor*, ii, 37 sq.).

Coin of Hierapolis.

HIERAPOLIS, COUNCIL OF, held about A.D. 197 by Apollinarius, bishop of the see, and 26 other bishops, who excommunicated Montanus, Maximilian, and Theodotus.—Landon, *Man. of Councils*, p. 265.

Hierarchy (ἱεραρχία, from ἱερός, *sacred*, and ἄρχων, *ruler*), a term used to denote, in churches in which the whole ruling power is held by the priesthood, a sacred principality instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ in

his Church, and consisting of orders of consecrated persons, with gradations of rank and power, who constitute exclusively the governing and ministering body in the Church. It implies the transmission, under what is called the Apostolical Succession [see SUCCESSION], of the authority to teach and govern given by Christ to his apostles; and thus the hierarchy, as a corporation, perpetuates itself. The hierarchy on earth is supposed to correspond with the hierarchy of "angels and archangels, and all the hosts" of heaven, with the Virgin Mary at their head. The Christian hierarchy, again, is supposed to correspond to the Jewish gradations of the priesthood. See CHURCH. The notion of a "continuity of plan running on from the Jewish hierarchical system into the Christian, i. e. the Romish spiritual monarchy, is an ideal analogy which has captivated" many an ardent imagination, from Cyprian down to Manning and Newman. For an exposure of its fallacy, see Taylor, *Ancient Christianity* (Lond. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 403.

I. *Roman Catholic.*—According to the Roman Catholic theory, the hierarchy is divinely ordained, and was established in the Church by Christ, who gave the primacy of authority to Peter, and instituted, in subordination to the primacy, the three orders bishops, priests, and deacons. The primacy of Peter is perpetuated in the popes, from whom bishops hold their authority to govern their dioceses, and to ordain priests and deacons. This monarchico-hierarchical system grew up gradually in the Latin Church by a series of usurpations of power on the part of the bishops of Rome in succeeding centuries. In the Greek Church the hierarchy is oligarchical, not monarchical, no patriarch having supreme authority over all other prelates (see Schaff, in *Brit. and Foreign Evangelical Review*, Oct. 1865 and Jan. 1866). The Roman hierarchy is divided into the hierarchy of *orders* and the hierarchy of *jurisdiction.* The hierarchy of orders, again, includes the hierarchy by *divine right* (juris divini) and the hierarchy by *ecclesiastical right* (juris ecclesiastici).

(I.) *Hierarchy of Orders.*—(1.) The hierarchy *juris divini* includes, 1. Bishops (*sacerdotes primi ordinis, apices et principes omnium*), who are successors of the apostles, and by whom alone, through ordination, the ministry of Christ is preserved among men. As to order, the bishops are only a fuller form of the order of priests, with governing and ordaining power superadded. Some Roman Catholics hold that bishops have their authority by divine right *immediately*, others (and these are now the majority) that they have it *mediately* through the pope. See EPISCOPACY. 2. Priests (presbyters), who receive from the bishop, by ordination, the power to administer the sacraments, to change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and to absolve penitents from their sins. The *place* in which they shall exercise these functions is not optional with themselves, but depends entirely upon the will of the bishop. 3. Deacons, who serve as helpers to bishops and priests in the administration of the sacraments, and in the pastoral care of the sick and poor.

(2.) The *hierarchy of ecclesiastical right* includes the minor orders of subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, lictors, and doorkeepers, being all extensions of the diaconate downwards, so to speak.

(II.) *Hierarchy of Jurisdiction.*—This embraces the manifold "principalities and powers" which have been constituted in the Church in the course of her progress towards universal dominion. It includes archdeacons, archpresbyters, deans, vicars, inferior prelates, and cardinals. In the order of bishops, again, there are archbishops, metropolitans, exarchs, and patriarchs. The pope is at the head of all, the bearer of all the functions of every office, and the source of authority for each. See PAPAL SYSTEM. The Roman hierarchy is a vast politico-ecclesiastical corporation, with the pope at its head, claiming universal dominion over all men and over all governments. See CURIA ROMANA; POPE. It is a great power, more important, as De Maistre, one of the greatest modern Roman writers remarks, than sound doctrine, inasmuch as it is "more indispensable to the preservation of the faith" (*Lettres*, ii, 285). This idea of a hierarchy with a universal dominion, and with an infallible head, constituting a visible principality on earth, and therefore necessarily using secular means of support, and "therefore also unavoidably offering the highest possible excitements to carnal ambition," is a magnificent one, considered merely as a human organization seeking power over men; but it is utterly out of harmony with Scripture, and with the character and claims of Christianity as a spiritual religion.

II. After the Reformation, the churches on the Continent of Europe relinquished the hierarchy, although it might have been retained with ease in Germany, Sweden, and Denmark, as numerous bishops became Protestants. The Church of England, however, retained it, and, in fact, she is distinguished from all other European Protestant churches by her claim to a regular hierarchy, in full apostolical succession. The High-Church notion of the hierarchy is stated by J. H. Blunt (*Dictionary of Historical and Doctrinal Theology*, s. v.) as follows: "Our Lord, the chief bishop, chose out twelve apostles and seventy disciples, corresponding to the twelve princes of tribes and the seventy elders, who, with Moses, governed God's ancient people, in order to show that his Church is the true spiritual Israel of God. St. Paul gave authority to Timothy and Titus to constitute bishops and deacons; St. Paul exercised visitation over the priests summoned to Ephesus; with Barnabas he ordained priests (Acts xiv, 23). St. Peter gave charge to priests and deacons (1 Pet. v, 1-5), and St. John received divine commission to exercise anthority over the seven angels or bishops of the churches of Asia. In order to preserve the unity of the Church, Christendom was divided into dioceses, each with a number of priests and deacons under one head, the bishop, to regulate the faith and manners of the people, and to minister to them in God's name. The hierarchy embraces the power of jurisdiction and of order, considered as a *principality.* The hierarchy of *order* was established to sanctify the Body of Christ, and is composed of all persons in orders. The hierarchy of *jurisdiction* was established for the government of the faithful, and to promote their eternal holiness, and is composed of prelates. The hierarchy of order by ministration of the sacraments and preaching the Gospel aims at elevating and hallowing the spiritual life; the hierarchy of jurisdiction is for the promotion of exterior discipline. The hierarchy of order confers no jurisdiction, but simply power to perform ecclesiastical functions and administer sacraments, whereas the other hierarchy bestows jurisdiction, and consequently the right of making ordinances concerning the faith and ecclesiastical discipline, and to correct offenders. The principal duty of ministers of the Church is to lead men to the knowledge and worship of God, and the Church therefore requires laws and rules for the guidance of her ministers. The hierarchy of order, that of the ministration of the Word and sacraments, appertains to all clergy according to the measure of their power; the hierarchy of jurisdiction, which is, in fact, the hierarchy, being the chief power of the Church, pertains to prelates alone, but cannot exist without the other hierarchy, although the latter can be without jurisdiction, which it presupposes, and is its foundation. In the one the clerical character or *order*, i. e. the ecclesiastical office, only is regarded; in the other the degree, the rank in jurisdiction of a prelate, is alone considered. Both have one origin and one object, and both flow from the clerical character; but order is of divine right, jurisdiction an ecclesiastical necessity, with its differences of chief bishops, prelacies, and ranks of ministers." The *Protestant Episcopal Church* retains the hierarchy of order, viz. bishops, priests, and deacons, together with the claim of apostolical succession. But the power of jurisdiction is divided with the laity, who are represented in the highest judicatory, the General Convention, and in

this view that Church is not hierarchical. The *Methodist Episcopal Church* preserves the order of bishops, presbyters or elders, and deacons, but does not claim that her episcopacy retains the so-called apostolical succession; and she admits the laity to many of her offices, especially to those in which temporalities are concerned. The Presbyterian and Congregational churches of America are not hierarchical in government. See BISHOPS; CHURCH; EPISCOPACY; LAITY; ORDERS; PAPAL SYSTEM; PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH; ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Hierax or **Hieracas**, an Egyptian ascetic philosopher, native of Leontus or Leontopolis, classed among the heretics of the 3d century. Epiphanius, Photius, and Peter of Sicily considered him a Manichæan. "He was, at all events, a perfectly original phenomenon, distinguished for his varied learning, allegorical exegesis, poetical talent, and still more for his eccentric ascetism. He taught that, as the business of Christ on earth was to promulgate a new law, more perfect and strict than that of Moses, he prohibited the use of wine, flesh, matrimony, and whatever was pleasing to the senses. Hierax denied the historical reality of the fall and the resurrection of the body; excluded children dying before years of discretion from the kingdom of heaven; distinguished the substance of the Son from that of the Father; taught that Melchizedec was the Holy Ghost; obscured the sacred volume with allegorical interpretations; and maintained that paradise was only the joy and satisfaction of the mind. His followers were sometimes called Abstinents, because of their scrupulously abstaining from the use of wine and certain meats. He wrote some commentaries on Scripture, and hymns, which are only known by quotations in Epiphanius. See Lardner, *Works*, iii, 285; Mosheim, *Comm.* ii, 404; Neander, *Church History*, i, 713; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, p. 510; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 647.

Hier'eël (Ἱερεήλ), given (1 Esdr. ix, 21) as the name of one of the "sons of Emmer" who divorced their heathen wives after the Captivity; evidently the JEHIEL (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 21).

Hier'emoth (Ἱερεμώθ), the name of two men in the Apocrypha.

1. A "son of Ela," who divorced his Gentile wife after the Captivity (1 Esdr. ix, 27); the JERIMOTH (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 26).

2. A "son of Mani" who did the same (1 Esdr. x, 30); the RAMOTH (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 29).

Hierie'lus (Ἱερίηλος v. r. Ἰεζριῆλος), another of the "sons of Ela" who in like manner divorced his wife (1 Esdr. ix, 27); the JEHIEL (q. v.) of Ezra x, 26.

Hier'mas (Ἱερμάς), one of "the sons of Phoros" who did the same (1 Esdr. x, 26); the RAMIAH (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 25).

Hierocles, governor of Bithynia, and afterwards of Alexandria (A.D. 306), is said by Lactantius (*Inst. Divin.* v, 2; *De Morte Persec.* c. 17) to have been the principal adviser of the persecution of the Christians in the reign of the emperor Diocletian (A.D. 302). He also wrote two books against Christianity, entitled Λόγοι φιλαλήθεις πρὸς τοὺς Χριστιανούς (*Truth-loving Words to the Christians*), which, like Porphyry's (q. v.) work, have been destroyed by the mistaken zeal of the later emperors, and they are known to us only by the replies of Eusebius of Cæsarea. In these, according to Lactantius, "he endeavored to show that the sacred Scriptures overthrow themselves by the contradictions with which they abound; he particularly insisted upon several texts as inconsistent with each other; and indeed on so many, and so distinctly, that one might suspect he had some time professed the religion which he now attempted to expose. He chiefly reviled Paul and Peter, and the other disciples, as propagators of falsehood. He said that Christ was banished by the Jews, and after that got together 900 men, and committed robbery. He endeavored to overthrow Christ's miracles, though he did not deny the truth of them, and aimed to show that like things, or even greater, had been done by Apollonius of Tyana" (*Inst. Divin.* v, 2, 3). Eusebius's treatise above referred to is "*Against Hierocles;*" in it he reviews the *Life of Apollonius* written by Philostratus (published by Olearius, with Latin version, Leips. 1709). See Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, i, 792; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 306; *English Cyclopædia;* Farrar, *History of Free Thought*, p. 62, 64; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 173; Schaff, *Ch. History*, i, 194; Brockhaus, *Encyklop.* vii, 916; Lardner, *Works*, vii, 207, 474, etc.

Hierocles, a Neo-Platonist of the 5th century at Alexandria. He is said to be the author of a *Commentary upon the Golden Verses of Pythagoras*, which is still extant; and also a *Discourse on Foreknowledge and Fate*, of which Photius has preserved large extracts. Stobæus has also preserved the fragments of several other works which are ascribed to Hierocles. The Greek text of the *Commentary on the Golden Verses of Pythagoras* was first published by Curterius (Paris, 1583; reprinted at London, 1654; also 1742; and Padua, 1744). The fragments of the *Discourse on Foreknowledge and Fate*, in which Hierocles attempts to reconcile the free-will of man with the foreknowledge of God, have been edited by Morell (Paris, 1593, 1597), and by Pearson (London, 1655, 1673); the latter edition contains the fragments of the other works of Hierocles. A complete edition of his works was published by Needham (Cambridge, 1709). Both Pearson and Needham confound this Hierocles with Hierocles, the prefect of Bithynia. The *Discourse on Foreknowledge and Fate* was translated into French by Regnaud (Lyons, 1560). Grotius translated part of this work into Latin in his *Sententiæ Philosophorum de Fato* (Paris, 1624; Amst. 1648; reprinted in the third volume of his theological works, 1679). The *Commentary on the Golden Verses* has been translated into English by Hall, London, 1657; Norris, London, 1682; Rayner, Norw. 1797; and into French (with life) by Dacier, Paris, 1706. See *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Smith, *Dictionary of Biography and Mythology*, ii, 453; Augusti, *Dogmengeschichte*, i and ii; Lardner, *Works*, viii, 127.

Hieroglyphics (from ἱερός, *sacred*, and γλύφω, *to carve*), the term usually applied to the inscriptions in the so-called sacred or symbolical characters on the Egyptian monuments. See EGYPT. "They were either engraved in relief, or sunk below the surface on the public monuments and hard materials suited for the glyptic art, or else traced in outline with a reed pen on papyri, wood, slices of stone, and other objects. The scribe, indeed, wrote from a palette or canon called *pes*, with pens, *kash*, from two little ink-holes in the palette, containing a black ink of animal charcoal, and a red mineral ink. The hieroglyphics on the monuments are sometimes sculptured and plain; at others, decorated with colors, either one simple tone for all the hieroglyphs, which are then called monochrome, or else ornamented with a variety of colors, and then called polychrome; and those painted on coffins and other objects are often first traced out, and then colored in detail. On the papyri and some few inferior materials they are simply sketched in outline, and are called linear hieroglyphs. The hieroglyphs are arranged in perpendicular columns, separated by lines, or in horizontal, or distributed in a sporadic manner in the area of the picture to which they refer. Sometimes all these modes of arrangement are found together. One peculiarity is at once discernible, that all the animals and representations face in the same direction when they are combined into a text; and when mixed up with reliefs and scenes, they usually face in the direction of the figures to which they are attached. When thus arranged, the reliefs and hieroglyphs resemble a MS., every letter of which should also be an illumination, and they produce a gay and agreeable impression on the spectator. They are written very square,

the spaces are neatly and carefully packed, so as to leave no naked appearance of background.

"The invention of hieroglyphs, called *Neter kharu*, or 'divine words,' was attributed to the god Thoth, the Egyptian Logos, who is repeatedly called the scribe of the gods and lord of the hieroglyphs. Pliny attributes their invention to Menon. The literature of the Egyptians was in fact called Hermaic or Hermetic, on account of its supposed divine origin, and the knowledge of hieroglyphs was, to a certain extent, a mystery to the uninitiated, although universally employed by the sacerdotal and instructed classes. To foreign nations, the hieroglyphs always remained so, although Moses is supposed to have been versed in the knowledge of them (Philo, *vita Moysis*); but Joseph is described (Gen. xlii, 23) as conversing with his brethren through interpreters, and does not appear to allude to hieroglyphic writing. The Greeks, who had settled on the coast as early as the 6th century B.C., do not appear to have possessed more than a colloquial knowledge of the language (Diod. Sic. lxxxi, 3, 4); and although Solon, B.C. 538, is said to have studied Egyptian doctrines at Sebennytus and Heliopolis, and the doctrines of Pythagoras are said to have been derived from Egypt, these sages could only have acquired their knowledge from interpretations of hieroglyphic writings. Hecatæus (B.C. 521) and Herodotus (B.C. 456), who visited Egypt in their travels, obtained from similar sources the information they have afforded of the language or monuments of the country (Herod. ii, 36). Democritus of Abdera, indeed, about the same period (B.C. 459), had described both the Ethiopian hieroglyphs and the Babylonian cuneiform, but his work has disappeared. After the conquest of Egypt by Alexander, the Greek rulers began to pay attention to the language and history of their subjects, and Eratosthenes, the keeper of the museum at Alexandria, and Manetho, the high-priest of Sebennytus, had drawn up accounts of the national chronology and history from hieroglyphic sources. Under the Roman empire, in the reign of Augustus, one Chæremon, the keeper of the library at the Serapæum, had drawn up a dictionary of the hieroglyphs; and both Diodorus and Strabo mention them, and describe their nature. Tacitus, later under the empire, gives the account of the monuments of Thebes translated by the Egyptian priests to Germanicus; but after his time, the knowledge of them beyond Egypt itself was exceedingly limited, and does not reappear till the third and subsequent centuries A.D., when they are mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus, who cites the translation of one of the obelisks at Rome by one Hermapion, and by Julius Valerius, the author of the apocryphal life of Alexander, who gives that of another. Heliodorus, a novelist who flourished A.D. 400, describes a hieroglyphic letter written by queen Candace (iv, 8). The first positive information on the subject is by Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 211), who mentions the symbolical and phonetic, or, as he calls it, cyriologic nature of hieroglyphics (*Strom.* v). Porphyry (A.D. 304) divides them also into cœnologic or phonetic, and œnigmatic or symbolic. Horapollo or Horus-Apollus, who is supposed to have flourished about A.D. 500, wrote two books explanatory of the hieroglyphics, a rude, ill-assorted confusion of truth and fiction, in which are given the interpretation of many hieroglyphs, and their esoteric meaning. After this writer, all knowledge of them disappeared till the revival of letters. At the beginning of the 16th century these symbols first attracted attention, and, soon after, Kircher, a learned Jesuit, pretended to interpret them by vague esoteric notions derived from his own fancy, on the supposition that the hieroglyphs were ideographic, a theory which barred all progress, and was held in its full extent by the learned, till Zoega, at the close of the 18th century (*De Origine Obeliscorum*, fol. Rom. 1797), first enunciated that the duals or cartouches contained royal names, and that the hieroglyphs, or some of them, were used to express sounds" (Chambers, *Cyclopædia*).

"The knowledge of hieroglyphics which we at present possess owes its origin to the Rosetta stone, which is now in the British Museum. This stone was found by the French among the ruins of Fort St. Julien, which is situated near the mouth of the Rosetta branch of the Nile, and was given up to the English in accordance with the terms of the treaty of Alexandria. It is supposed to have been sculptured about B.C. 195, and contains a decree in honor of Ptolemy V (Epiphanes) written in three different characters. One of these is Greek, and a part of it has been explained to state that the decree was ordered to be written in Sacred, Enchorial, and Greek writing. Dr. Young (*Archæologia*, 1817) was the first that attempted to decipher this inscription, in which he partially succeeded by counting the recurrence of the more marked characters in the hieroglyphics, and comparing them with those that occurred about the same number of times in the Greek. Champollion and Wilkinson have followed up Dr. Young's discoveries with great ingenuity, and we can now partially read inscriptions which before were wholly unintelligible to us. Among other obstacles, however, this remains in the way, viz. that the Rosetta stone was sculptured about B.C. 195, and in Lower Egypt; while the major part of the inscriptions were written during the twelve previous centuries, and are found in Upper Egypt. Hieroglyphics are written either from left to right or right to left, according to the direction in which they face; though sometimes the columns are so narrow that they may be almost said to be written from top to bottom. They are partly pictorial; thus 'ox,' 'goose,' 'temple' are represented by pictures or pictorial symbols of an ox, etc. At other times they are phonetic, and written by an alphabet of about 140 letters, of which many are synonymous; some being adapted for writing, others for sculpture; some in use at an earlier period, others at a later. The powers of these letters are determined by the names of the kings in which they are found; but, as this cannot be done very exactly, they are generally arranged under about twelve of our primary letters. We cannot, however, distinguish accurately between the vowels, or P and PH, and other cognate letters. The names of sovereigns are always written within a ring or cartouche: those of any other person are distinguished by a sitting

1 2 3 1′ 2′ 3′ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΩΝ

The Rosetta Stone, with Specimens of the three Styles of Characters found upon it. 1, 1′, Sacred or Hieroglyphic; 2. 2′, Enchorial or Demotic; 3, 3′, Greek.

figure following them: besides these there is nothing to mark the difference between a letter and a pictorial symbol. In some words the meaning is expressed twice; once by a phonetic combination, and again by a pictorial symbol; in others the more important part is symbolical, and the grammatical termination is spelled. Sometimes also we find a species of abbreviation; thus the word ox would be expressed by the first letter of the Coptic word signifying ox.

"But for the purpose of writing, strictly so called, there was a less ornamental and more rapid way of forming the characters, which is always found in the MSS., and which would be the natural consequence of using the pen or stylus. This is called by Strabo and Pliny *hieratic* writing, the hieroglyphics being, as the name imports, peculiar to sculpture. It is chiefly by means of the hieroglyphics that we are enabled to read

HIEROGLYPHIC ALPHABET.

the hieratic writing, the latter being, for the most part, an abbreviated way of writing the former. The Rosetta stone contained the inscription in yet another set of characters, the *demotic* or *enchorial*. It is to Dr. Young that we owe the greater part of our knowledge on this subject. He was greatly assisted by the discovery of two or three papyri written in this character with Greek translations, the earliest of which dates in the reign of Psammeticus, about B.C. 650. An alphabet has been formed from Greek proper names, from which it appears that the few words which we can decipher are Coptic. In this writing the hieroglyphics have almost wholly disappeared, though some still appear scattered here and there."

A popular account of the mode in which the Rosetta stone was used as a key for deciphering the hieroglyphics may be found in Dr. Hawks's *Egypt and its Monuments* (N. Y. 1850, 8vo), and a more critical statement in Osburn's *Monumental History of Egypt* (London, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo). A complete set of the cartouches of the kings is given by Poole in his *Horæ Egyptiacæ* (Lond. 1851, 8vo). Great progress has of late been made in the decipherment of these records, another stone having quite recently been discovered with a bilingual inscription (Lepsius, *Das bilingue Decret von Kanopus*, texts and interlineal translations, etc., Berl. 1867 sq., 4to), and many papyri having been brought to light and read by European Egyptologists, among whom Wilkinson, Lepsius, Dümichen, and Brugsch may be especially named. The annexed view of the hieroglyphical alphabet is taken from Gliddon's *Lectures on Egyptian History* (N. Y. 1843, imp. 8vo), and will be found sufficient for deciphering most of the royal names. A brief account of the language which these characters represent may be found in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, vol. ii. A tolerably complete view of the subject and its literature is contained in Appleton's *New American Cyclopædia*, s. v. The following are some of the latest works of importance on the subject: Sharpe, *Egyptian Hieroglyphics* (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Parrot, *Nouvelle Traduction des Hiéroglyphes* (Par. 1857, fol.); Tattam, *Grammar of the Egyptian Language* (London, 1863, 8vo); Brugsch, *Hieroglyphisches-Demotisches Wörterbuch* (of an extensive character, with a full hieroglyphical grammar, Leips. 1867 sq.). See INSCRIPTIONS.

Hieromax, a river of Palestine (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 16), the *Jarmoch* of the Talmud; now *Nahr Yarmuk* (Edrisi and Abulfeda), or *Sheriat el-Mandhur* (Ritter, xv, 372). The principal sources are near Mezarib, where they form a lake of half an hour in circumference.—Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 321.

Hieromnēmon (Gr. ἱερομνήμων). I. The title in ancient history of that one of the two deputies sent by each tribe to the Amphictyonic Council who superintended the religious rites. II. An officer in the Greek Church, who, during service, stands behind the bishop, and points out to him in order the psalms, prayers, etc. He also dresses the patriarchs, and shows the priests to their places.—Pierer, viii, 368; Brande, ii, 124. (J. W. M.)

Hieron, SAMUEL, a clergyman of the Church of England, somewhat inclined to Puritanism, was born in 1572, was educated at King's College, Cambridge, and was presented to the living of Modbury, Devonshire, which he held till his death in 1617. He was very eloquent as well as pious. His sermons, in two volumes, were published in 1635.—Darling, *Cyclop. Biog.* i, 1470.

Hieronymites, or *Eremites of the Order of Jerome*, a monkish order which was first established about 1370 by the Portuguese Vasco and the Spaniard Peter Fred. Pecha, and was accredited by Gregory XI in 1373. Their dress is a white habit and a black scapulary. In Spain and the Netherlands this order became very opulent, being possessed of many convents; Charles V belonged to this order after his abdication. They spread also into the West Indies and Spanish America. At present they exist only in the latter country. Besides

these, there exists also another order by the same name, with, however, but few members, founded by Peter Gambacorti, of Pisa, about 1380.—Helyot, *Ord. Monast.* ed. Migne, iii, 568; Brockhaus, *Encyklop.* viii, 916. (J. H. W.)

Hieron'ymus (Ἱερώνυμος, *sacred* in *name*, Vulg. *Hieronymus*), a Syrian general in the time of Antiochus V. Eupator (2 Macc. xii, 2). The name was made distinguished among the Asiatic Greeks by Hieronymus of Cardia, the historian of Alexander's successors.—Smith.

Hieronўmus. See JEROME, ST.

Hierophant or **Mystagōgus** (Gr. ἱεροφάντης, μυσταγωγός). I. The high-priest of Demeter who conducted the celebration of the Eleusinian Mysteries and initiated the candidates, being always one of the Eumolpidæ, and a citizen of Attica. The office was for life, and regarded of high religious importance, and the hierophant was required to be of mature age, to be without physical defects, to possess a fine, sonorous voice suited to the character and dignity of the office, and was forbidden to marry, though that prohibition may have applied only to contracting marriage after his installation. He was distinguished by a peculiar cut of his hair, by the strophion, a sort of diadem, and by a long purple robe. In the Mysteries he represented the Demiurge or World-creator, was the only authorized custodian and expositor of the unwritten laws (hence also styled προφήτης), and the utterance of his name in the presence of the uninitiated was forbidden. II. The name is also given in the Greek Church to the prior of a monastery.—Chambers, s. v.; Pierer, viii, 370; Smith, *Dict. of Grk. and Rom. Antiq.* s. v. Eumolpidæ; Brande, *Dict.* ii, 125. See also HIEROMNEMON. (J. W. M.)

Hiester, WILLIAM, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Berks County, Pa., Oct. 11, 1770. In youth he learned the trade of carpenter. He pursued his classical and theological studies with Rev. Daniel Wagner, of York, Pa. He was licensed and ordained in 1799. For a short time he served several congregations in Lancaster County, Pa., when he was called to Lebanon, Lebanon County, Pa., in which charge he labored till his death, Feb. 8, 1828. He is remembered in the German Reformed Church for his earnest piety, great zeal in his pastoral work, and the active interest he took in the establishment of its Theological Seminary. He preached both in the German and English languages. (H. H.)

Higden, RANULPH or RALPH, an English writer of the 14th century, was a Benedictine monk of the monastery of St. Werberg, in Cheshire, who died at a very advanced age in 1367 according to Bale, or in 1373 according to Pits. His *Polychronicon*, a chronicle of events from the Creation to A.D. 1357, was written originally in Latin, and translated into English in 1387 by John of Trevisa. From this translation Caxton made his version, and, continuing in an eighth book the Chronicle to 1460, published the whole under the title of *The Polycronycon, conteynyng the Barynges and Dedes of many Times, in eyght Books*, etc. (1482, fol.). Trevisa's translation "contains many rare words and expressions, and is one of the earliest specimens of English prose." The first volume of a new edition (containing also a translation by an unknown writer of the 15th century), edited by C. Babington, B.D., appeared in 1865. The *Polychronicon* is frequently cited by English historians. Bale published the part relating to the Britons and Saxons in his *Scriptores Quindecim*, etc. (Oxford, 1691). Some have assigned the authorship of the *Chester Mysteries* (1382) to Higden, but on doubtful grounds.—Bale, *Illust. Maj. Brit. Script. Summ.*; Pits, *De illust. Ang. Script.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 656; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 83; *Westminster Review*, July, 1865, p. 128. (J. W. M.)

Higgai'on (Heb. *higgayon'*, הִגָּיוֹן) occurs in Psa. xcii, 3, where, according to Gesenius, it signifies the *murmuring* (Fürst, *low* or solemn) *tone* of the harp, Sept. μετ' ᾠδῆς ἐν κιθάρᾳ. In Psa. ix, 17, *Higgaion Selah* is a musical sign, prob. for a pause in the instrumental interlude, Sept. ᾠδὴ διὰ ψάλματος; and so Symm. Aqu. and Vulg. See SELAH. In Psa. xix, 15 the term signifies (and is rendered) *meditation*, in Lam. iii, 62 a *device*. "Mendelssohn translates it *meditation, thought, idea.* Knapp (*Die Psalmen*) identifies it in Psa. ix, 17 with the Arabic הגי and הגא, 'to mock,' and hence his rendering 'What a shout of laughter!' (because the wicked are entrapped in their own snares); but in Psa. xcii, 4 he translates it by 'Lieder' (*songs*). R. David Kimchi likewise assigns two separate meanings to the word; on Psa. ix, 17, he says, 'This aid is for us (a subject of) meditation and thankfulness,' while in his commentary on the passage, Psa. xcii, 4, he gives to the same word the signification of *melody*, 'This is the melody of the hymn when it is recited (played) on the harp.' 'We will meditate on this forever' (Rashi, *Comment. on Psa.* ix, 17). In Psa. ix, 17, Aben Ezra's comment. on 'Higgaion Selah' is, 'this will I record in truth:' on Psa. xcii, 4 he says, 'Higgaion means the melody of the hymn, or it is the name of a musical instrument.' It would seem, then, that Higgaion has two meanings, one of a general character implying *thought, reflection*, from הגה (comp. והגיון לבי, Psa. ix, 17, and והגיונם עלי כל היום, Lam. iii, 62), and another in Psa. ix, 17, and Psa. xcii, 4, of a technical nature, bearing on the import of musical sounds or signs well known in the age of David, but the precise meaning of which cannot at this distance of time be determined." See PSALMS.

Higgins, SOLOMON, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Maryland in January, 1792. In his twenty-second year he began to preach, but failing health compelled him to quit the ministry, and for several years he was employed as a clerk in Philadelphia. In 1821 he resumed his pastoral connections, and the remainder of his life was spent in the service of the Church as pastor and as Sunday-school agent. He was several times stationed in Philadelphia, and was a member of the General Conferences of 1828, 1832, 1836, and 1840. He died Feb. 12, 1867.—*Minutes of Conferences*, 1867, p. 24.

Higginson, Francis, a Congregational minister and first pastor of Salem, Mass., was born in England in 1587, graduated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, and was appointed minister of a church in Leicester. After some time he became a nonconformist, and was excluded from the parish church. In 1629 he received letters from the governor and company of Massachusetts inviting him to proceed with them to New England. He accordingly sailed, and on his arrival at Salem he was appointed pastor of the church. He died of hectic fever in August, 1630. He wrote *New England's Plantation, or a short and true Description of the Commodities and Discommodities of that Country* (Lond. 1630, 4to). See Allen, *Am. Biog. Dictionary*; Sprague, *Annals*, i, 6.

Higginson, John, son of the preceding, was born in England in August, 1616, and came to Massachusetts with his parents in 1629. In 1636 he removed to Connecticut, engaging in teaching and in theological studies. From 1659 until his death in 1708 he was minister of the church at Salem, Mass. He was zealously engaged in controversy with the Quakers, but subsequently regretted his ardor in persecution. He published several sermons and pamphlets. See Sprague, *Annals*, i, 91.

High-Churchmen, a name first given (circâ 1700) to the nonjurors in England who refused to acknowledge William III as their lawful king. It is now usually applied to those in the Church of England and in the American Protestant Episcopal Church who hold exalted notions of Church prerogatives, and of the powers committed to the clergy, and who lay much stress upon ritual observances and the traditions of the fa-

thers. See Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 312; Hurst, *Hist. Rationalism*, p. 512 sq.; Kurtz, *Ch. History*, ii, 339; Baxter, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 549; Skeats, *Hist. of Free Churches*, p. 289, 317, 318, 343; Rose, *Hist. Chr. Ch.* p. 370; Eden, *Theol. Dictionary;* and articles ENGLAND, CHURCH OF; and PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

High Commission, COURT OF, a court established in England in 1559 to take cognizance of spiritual or ecclesiastical offences, and to inflict penalties for the same. The Puritans complaining loudly of the jurisdiction of this court, a bill passed for putting down both it and the Star-Chamber in the year 1641.—Neal, *Hist. of Puritans*, i, 89 sq.

High Mass. The Mass in the Church of Rome consists in the "consecration of the bread and wine 'into the body and blood of Christ,' as they say, and the offering up of the same body and blood to God by the ministry of the priest for a perpetual memorial of Christ's sacrifice upon the cross, and a continuation of the same unto the world's end." *High Mass* is the same service, accompanied by all the ceremonies which custom and authority have annexed to its celebration, and read before the high altar on Sundays, fast-days, and particular occasions. See MASS.

High place (בָּמָה, *bamah'*; often in the plural, בָּמוֹת; Sept. in the historical books, *τὰ ὑψηλά, τὰ ὕψη*; in the Prophets, *βωμοί*; in the Pentateuch, *στήλαι*, Lev. xxvi, 30, etc.; and once *εἴδωλα*, Ezek. xvi, 16; Vulg. *excelsa, fana*) often occurs in connection with the term *grove*. By "high places" we understand natural or artificial (בָּתֵּי בָמוֹת, 1 Kings xiii, 32; 2 Kings xvi, 29; comp. 1 Kings xi, 7; 2 Kings xxiii, 15) eminences where worship by sacrifice or offering was made, usually upon an altar erected thereon; and by a "grove" we understand a plantation of trees around a spot in the open air set apart for worship and other sacred services, and therefore around or upon the "high places" which were set apart for the same purposes. See GROVE.

We find traces of these customs so soon *after* the deluge that it is probable they existed *prior* to that event. It appears that the first altar after the deluge was built by Noah upon the mountain on which the ark rested (Gen. viii, 20). Abraham, on entering the Promised Land, built an altar upon a mountain between Beth-el and Hai (xii, 7, 8). At Beersheba he planted a grove, and called there upon the name of the everlasting God (Gen. xxi, 33). The same patriarch was required to travel to the Mount Moriah, and there to offer up his son Isaac (xxii, 2, 4). It was upon a mountain in Gilead that Jacob and Laban offered sacrifices before they parted in peace (xxxi, 54). In fact, such seem to have been the general places of worship in those times; nor does any notice of a temple, or other covered or enclosed building for that purpose, occur. Thus far all seems clear and intelligible. There is no reason in the mere nature of things why a hill or a grove should be an objectionable, or, indeed, why it should not be a very suitable place for worship. Yet by the time the Israelites returned from Egypt, some corrupting change had taken place, which caused them to be repeatedly and strictly enjoined to overthrow and destroy the high places and groves of the Canaanites wherever they found them (Exod. xxxiv, 13; Deut. vii, 5; xii, 2, 3). That they were not themselves to worship the Lord on high places or in groves is implied in the fact that they were to have but one altar for regular and constant sacrifice; and it was expressly enjoined that near this sole altar no trees should be planted (Deut. xvi, 21). See ALTAR. The external religion of the patriarchs was in some outward observances different from that subsequently established by the Mosaic law, and therefore they should not be condemned for actions which afterwards became sinful only because they were forbidden (Heidegger, *Hist. Patr.* II, iii, § 53). It is, however, quite obvious that if every grove and eminence had been suffered to become a place for legitimate worship, especially in a country where they had already been defiled with the sins of polytheism, the utmost danger would have resulted to the pure worship of the one true God (Hävernick, *Einl.* i, 592). It would infallibly have led to the adoption of nature-goddesses and "gods of the hills" (1 Kings xx, 23). It was therefore implicitly forbidden by the law of Moses (Deut. xii, 11–14), which also gave the strictest injunction to destroy these monuments of Canaanitish idolatry (Lev. xxvi, 30; Numb. xxxiii, 52; Deut. xxxiii, 29; where Sept. *τραχήλων*), without stating any general reason for this command beyond the fact that they *had* been connected with such associations. It seems, however, to be assumed that every Israelite would perfectly understand why groves and high places were prohibited, and therefore they are only condemned by virtue of the injunction to use but *one* altar for the purpose of sacrifice (Lev. xvii, 3, 4; Deut. xii, *passim;* xvi, 21; John iv, 20). This practice, indeed, was probably of great antiquity in Palestine. Upon the summit of lofty Hermon are the remains of a small and very ancient temple, towards which faced a circle of temples surrounding the mountain. See HERMON. That a temple should have been built on a summit of bare rock perpetually covered with snow shows a strong religious motive, and the position of the temples around the mountain indicates a belief in the sanctity of Hermon itself. This inference is supported by a passage in the treaty of Rameses II with the Hittites of Syria, in which, besides gods and goddesses, the mountains and the rivers, both of the land of the Hittites and of Egypt, and the winds, are mentioned, in a list of Hittite and Egyptian divinities. The Egyptian divinities are spoken of from a Hittite point of view, for the expression "the mountains and the rivers of the land of Egypt" is only half applicable to the Egyptian nature-worship, which had, in Egypt at least, but one sacred river (Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, iii, 146; Brugsch, *Geographische Inschriften*, ii, 29; De Rougé, in *Rev. Arch.* nouv. ser. iv, 372). See HITTITE. That Hermon was worshipped in connection with Baal is probable from the name Mount Baal-Hermon (Judg. iii, 3), Baal-Hermon (1 Chron. v, 23) being apparently given to it, Baal being, as the Egyptian monuments indicate, the chief god of the Hittites. That there was such a belief in the sanctity of mountains and hills seems evident from the great number of high places of the old inhabitants, which is clearly indicated in the prohibition of their worship as compared with the statement of the disobedience of the Israelites. See HILL.

The injunctions, however, respecting the high places and groves were very imperfectly obeyed by the Israelites; and their inveterate attachment to this mode of worship was such that even pious kings, who opposed idolatry by all the means in their power, dared not abolish the high places at which the Lord was worshipped. It appears likely that this toleration of an acknowledged irregularity arose from the indisposition of the people living at a distance from the Temple to be confined to the altar which existed there; to their determination to have places nearer home for the chief acts of their religion—sacrifice and offering; and to the apprehension of the kings that if they were prevented from having places for offerings to the Lord in their own neighborhood they would make the offerings to idols. Moreover, the Mosaic command was a *prospective* one, and was not to come into force until such times as the tribes were settled in the Promised Land, and "had rest from all their enemies round about." Thus we find that both Gideon and Manoah built altars on high places by divine command (Judg. vi, 25, 26; xiii, 16–23), and it is quite clear from the tone of the book of Judges that the law on the subject was either totally forgotten or practically obsolete. Nor could the unsettled state of the country have been pleaded as an excuse, since it seems to have been most fully understood, even during the life of Joshua, that burnt-offerings could be legally of-

fered on *one* altar only (Josh. xxii, 29). It is more surprising to find this law absolutely ignored at a much later period, when there was no intelligible reason for its violation—as by Samuel at Mizpeh (1 Sam. vii, 10) and at Bethlehem (xvi, 5); by Saul at Gilgal (xiii, 9) and at Ajalon (? xiv, 35); by David on the threshing-floor of Ornan (1 Chron. xxi, 26); by Elijah on Mount Carmel (1 Kings xviii, 30); and by other prophets (1 Sam. x, 5). It will, however, be observed that in these cases the parties either acted under an immediate command from God, or were invested with a general commission of similar force with reference to such transactions. It has also been suggested that greater latitude was allowed in this point before the erection of the Temple gave to the ritual principles of the ceremonial law a fixity which they had not previously possessed. This is possible, for it is certain that all the authorized examples occur before it was built, excepting that of Elijah; and that occurred under circumstances in which the sacrifices could not possibly have taken place at Jerusalem, and in a kingdom where no authorized altar to Jehovah then existed. The Rabbins have invented elaborate methods to account for the anomaly: thus they say that high places were allowed until the building of the tabernacle; that they were then illegal until the arrival at Gilgal, and then during the period while the tabernacle was at Shiloh; that they were once more permitted while it was at Nob and Gibeon (compare 2 Chron. i, 3), until the building of the Temple at Jerusalem rendered them finally unlawful (R. Sol. Jarchi, Abarbanel, etc., quoted in Carpzov, *App. Crit.* p. 333 sq.; Reland, *Ant. Hebr.* i, 8 sq.). Others content themselves with saying that until Solomon's time all Palestine was considered holy ground, or that there existed a recognised exemption in favor of high places for private and spontaneous, though not for the stated and public sacrifices. Such explanations are sufficiently unsatisfactory; but it is at any rate certain that, whether from the obvious temptations to disobedience, or from the example of other nations, or from ignorance of any definite law against it, the worship in high places was organized and all but universal throughout Judæa, not only during (1 Kings iii, 2-4), but even after the time of Solomon. The convenience of them was evident, because, as local centres of religious worship, they obviated the unpleasant and dangerous necessity of visiting Jerusalem for the celebration of the yearly feasts (2 Kings xxiii, 9). The tendency was engrained in the national mind; and, although it was severely reprehended by the later historians, we have no proof that it was known to be sinful during the earlier periods of the monarchy, except, of course, where it was directly connected with idolatrous abominations (1 Kings xi, 7; 2 Kings xxiii, 13). In fact, the high places seem to have supplied the need of synagogues (Psa. lxxiv, 8), and to have obviated the extreme self-denial involved in having but one legalized locality for the highest forms of worship. Thus we find that Rehoboam established a definite worship at the high places, with its own peculiar and separate priesthood (2 Chron. xi, 15; 2 Kings xxiii, 9), the members of which were still considered to be priests of Jehovah (although in 2 Kings xxiii, 5 they are called by the opprobrious term כְּמָרִים). It was therefore no wonder that Jeroboam found it so easy to seduce the people into his symbolic worship at the high places of Dan and Bethel, at each of which he built a chapel for his golden calves. Such chapels were, of course, frequently added to the mere altars on the hills, as appears from the expressions in 1 Kings xi, 7; 2 Kings xvii, 9, etc. Indeed, the word בָּמוֹת became so common that it was used for any idolatrous shrine even in *a valley* (Jer. vii, 31), or in the streets of cities (2 Kings xvii, 9; Ezek. xvi, 31). These chapels were probably not structures of stone, but mere tabernacles hung with colored tapestry (Ezek. xvi, 16; Aqu., Theod. ἐμβόλισμα; see Jer. ad loc.; Sept. εἴδωλον ῥαπτόν), like the σκηνὴ ἱερά of the Carthaginians (Diod. Sic. xx, 65; Creuzer, *Symbol.* v, 176), and like those mentioned in 2 Kings xxiii, 7; Amos v, 26. Many of the pious kings of Judah were either too weak or too ill-informed to repress the worship of Jehovah at these local sanctuaries, while they of course endeavored to prevent it from being contaminated with polytheism. It is therefore appended as a matter of blame or a (perhaps venial) drawback to the character of some of the most pious princes, that they tolerated this disobedience to the provisions of Deuteronomy and Leviticus. On the other hand, it is mentioned as an aggravation of the sinfulness of other kings that they built or raised high places (2 Chron. xxi, 11; xxviii, 25), which are generally said to have been dedicated to idolatrous purposes. It is almost inconceivable that so direct a violation of the theocratic principle as the public existence of false worship should have been tolerated by kings of even ordinary piety, much less by the highest sacerdotal authorities (2 Kings xii, 3). When, therefore, we find the recurring phrase, "Only the high places were not taken away; as yet the people did sacrifice and burn incense on the high places" (2 Kings xiv, 4; xv, 5, 35; 2 Chron. xv, 17, etc.), we are forced to limit it (as above) to places dedicated to Jehovah only. The subject, however, is made more difficult by a seeming discrepancy, for the assertion that Asa "took away the high places" (2 Chron. xiv, 3) is opposite to what is stated in the first book of Kings (xv, 14), and a similar discrepancy is found in the case of Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 6; xx, 33). Moreover, in both instances the chronicler is apparently at issue with *himself* (xiv, 3; xv, 17; xvii, 6; xx, 33). It is incredible that this should have been the result of carelessness or oversight, and we must therefore suppose, either that the earlier notices expressed the will and endeavor of these monarchs to remove the high places, and that the later ones recorded their failure in the attempt (Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 468; Keil, *Apolog. Versuch.* p. 290), or that the statements refer respectively to Bamoth dedicated to Jehovah and to idols (Michaelis, Schulz, Bertheau on 2 Chron. xvii, 6, etc.). "Those devoted to false gods were removed, those misdevoted to the true God were suffered to remain. The kings opposed impiety, but winked at error" (bishop Hall). At last Hezekiah set himself in good earnest to the suppression of this prevalent corruption (2 Kings xviii, 4, 22), both in Judah and Israel (2 Chron. xxxi, 1), although, so rapid was the growth of the evil, that even his sweeping reformation required to be finally consummated by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii), and that, too, in Jerusalem and its immediate neighborhood (2 Chron. xxxiv, 3). The measure must have caused a very violent shock to the religious prejudices of a large number of people, and we have a curious and almost unnoticed trace of this resentment in the fact that Rabshakeh appeals to the discontented faction, and represents Hezekiah as a dangerous innovator who had provoked God's anger by his arbitrary impiety (2 Kings xviii, 22; 2 Chron. xxxii, 12). After the time of Josiah we find no further mention of these Jehovistic high places.

As long as the nations continued to worship the heavenly bodies themselves, they worshipped in the open air, holding that no walls could contain infinitude. Afterwards, when the symbol of fire or of images brought in the use of temples, they were usually built in groves and upon high places, and sometimes without roofs. The principle on which high places were preferred is said to have been that they were nearer to the gods, and that on them prayer was more acceptable than in the valleys (Lucian, *De Sacrif.* i, 4). See HILL. The ancient writers abound in allusions to this worship of the gods upon the hill-tops; and some of their divinities took their distinctive names from the hill on which their principal seat of worship stood, such as Mercurius Cyllenius, Venus Erycina, Jupiter Capitolinus, etc. (see especially Sophocles, *Trachin.* 1207, 1208; Appian, *De Bello Mithrid.* § 131; compare Creuzer, *Symbol.* i, 150).

Temple on a hill surrounded by trees, and having an Altar in the approach to it. A viaduct, streams of water, etc., are represented. (Bas-relief from Kouyunjik in the British Museum.)

We find that the Trojans sacrificed to Zeus on Mount Ida (*Il.* x, 171), and we are repeatedly told that such was the custom of the Persians, Greeks, Germans, etc. (Herod. i, 131; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* viii, 7; *Mem.* iii, 8, § 10; Strabo, xv, 732). To this general custom we find constant allusion in the Bible (Isa. lxv, 7; Jer. iii, 6; Ezek. vi, 13; xviii, 6; Hos. iv, 13), and it is especially attributed to the Moabites (Isa. xv, 2; xvi, 12; Jer. xlviii, 35). Evident traces of a similar usage are depicted on the Assyrian monuments. The groves which ancient usage had established around the places of sacrifice for the sake of shade and seclusion, idolatry preserved, not only for the same reasons, but because they were found convenient for the celebration of the rites and mysteries, often obscene and abominable, which were gradually superadded. According to Pliny (book xii), trees were also anciently consecrated to particular divinities, as the esculus to Jove, the laurel to Apollo, the olive to Minerva, the myrtle to Venus, the poplar to Hercules. It was also believed that as the heavens have their proper and peculiar deities, so also the woods have theirs, being the Fauns, the Sylvans, and certain goddesses. To this it may be added that groves were enjoined by the Roman law of the Twelve Tables as part of the public religion. Plutarch (*Numa*, i, 61) calls such groves ἄλση θεῶν, "groves of the gods," which he says Numa frequented, and thereby gave rise to the story of his intercourse with the goddess Egeria. In fact, a degree of worship was, as Pliny states, transferred to the trees themselves. They were sometimes decked with ribbons and rich cloths, lamps were placed on them, the spoils of enemies were hung from them, vows were paid to them, and their branches were encumbered with votive offerings. Traces of this arborolatry still exist everywhere, both in Moslem and Christian countries; and even the Persians, who abhorred images as much as the Hebrews ever did, rendered homage to certain trees. The story is well known of the noble plane-tree near Sardis, before which Xerxes halted his army a whole day while he rendered homage to it, and hung royal offerings upon its branches (Herod. vi, 31). There is much curious literature connected with this subject which we leave untouched, but the reader may consult Sir W. Ouseley's learned dissertation on Sacred Trees, appended to the first volume of his *Travels in the East.* See IDOLATRY.

Mr. Paine remarks (*Solomon's Temple*, etc., Bost. 1861, p. 21), "the 'high place,' בָּמָה, *mound*, was small enough to be made and built in every street, at the head of every way (Ezek. xvi, 24, 25), in all their cities (2 Kings xvii, 9), and upon every high hill, and under every green tree (1 Kings xiv, 23). It could be torn to pieces, beaten small as dust, and burnt up (2 Kings xxiii, 15). Thus it [often] was of combustible materials. . . . . These mounds, with their altars, were built in the streets, where people could assemble around them. When on the hills out of the city they lasted many years; for the mounds built by Solomon on the right hand or south side of the Mount of Destruction before Jerusalem were destroyed by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii, 13; 1 Kings xi, 7), nearly four hundred years after they were built. But mounds of earth no larger than Indian-corn or potato-hills will last a great number of years, and those somewhat larger for centuries (compare the Indian mounds in the West). That the mounds destroyed by Josiah had lasted so many centuries is a proof that they were not wholly of wood; that they could be burnt is a proof that they were not wholly of stone; that they could be beaten to dust indicates that they were made of anything that came readiest to hand, as earth, soil, etc. For the houses of the mounds, or high places, in which were images of their gods, see 2 Kings xvii, 29; priests of these places of worship, 1 Kings xii, 32; xiii, 2, 33; 2 Kings xvii, 32; xxiii, 9, 20; beds for fornication and adultery, in the tents about the mounds, Isa. lvii, 3-7; Ezek. xvi, 16, 25, etc. Some of these houses were tents, for women wove them (2 Kings xxiii, 7). The people—men, women, children, and priests—assembled in groves, on hills and mountains, or in the streets of their cities; threw up a mound, on which they built their altar; set up the wooden idol [Asherah] before the altar; pitched their tents around it under the trees; sacrificed their sons and daughters, sometimes on the altar (Ezek. xvi, 20), and committed fornication and adultery in the tents, where also they had the images of their gods."

Representation of an idolatrous "High place," with its "Grove," altar, and worshippers. (From Paine's *Temple of Solomon.*)

High-priest (הַכֹּהֵן, *hak-kohen'*, the ordinary word for "priest," with the article, i. e. "*the* priest;" and in the books subsequent to the Pentateuch with the frequent addition הַגָּדוֹל, *the great*, and הָרֹאשׁ, "*the head;*" Lev. xxi, 10 seems to exhibit the epithet גָּדוֹל [as ἐπίσ-

κοπος and διάκονος in the N. T.] in a transition state, not yet wholly technical; and the same may be said of Numb. xxxv, 25, where the explanation at the end of the verse, "which was anointed with the holy oil," seems to show that the epithet גָּדֹל was not yet quite established as distinctive of the chief priest [comp. ver. 28]. In all other passages of the Pentateuch it is simply "the priest," Exod. xxix, 30, 44; Lev. xvi, 32; or yet more frequently "Aaron," or "Aaron the priest," as Numb. iii, 6; iv, 33; Lev. i, 7, etc. So, too, "Eleazar the priest," Numb. xxvii, 22; xxxi, 26, 29, 31, etc. In fact, there could be no such distinction in the time of Moses, since the priesthood was limited to Aaron and his sons. In the Sept. ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, or ἱερεύς, where the Heb. has only כֹּהֵן. So likewise in the N. T. ἀρχιερεύς, often merely a "chief priest." Vulgate, *Sacerdos magnus*, or *primus pontifex*, *princeps sacerdotum*), the head of the Jewish hierarchy, and a lineal descendant of Aaron.

I. The *legal* view of the high-priest's office comprises all that the law of Moses ordained respecting it. The first distinct separation of Aaron to the office of the priesthood, which previously belonged to the firstborn, was that recorded in Exod. xxviii. A partial anticipation of this call occurred at the gathering of the manna (Exod. xvi), when Moses bade Aaron take a pot of manna, and lay it up before the Lord: which implied that the ark of the Testimony would thereafter be under Aaron's charge, though it was not at that time in existence. The taking up of Nadab and Abihu with their father Aaron to the Mount, where they beheld the glory of the God of Israel, seems also to have been intended as a preparatory intimation of Aaron's hereditary priesthood. See also Exod. xxvii, 21. But it was not till the completion of the directions for making the tabernacle and its furniture that the distinct order was given to Moses, "Take thou unto thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office, even Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, Aaron's sons" (Exod. xxviii, 1). So after the order for the priestly garments to be made "for Aaron and his sons," it is added, "and the priest's office shall be theirs for a perpetual statute: and thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his sons," and "I will sanctify both Aaron and his sons to minister to me in the priest's office," xxix, 9, 44.

We find from the very first the following characteristic attributes of Aaron and the high-priests his successors, as distinguished from the other priests.

1. Aaron alone was *anointed*. "He poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him to sanctify him" (Lev. viii, 12). whence one of the distinctive epithets of the high-priest was הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ, "the anointed priest" (Lev. iv, 3, 5, 16; xxi, 10; see Numb. xxxv, 25). This appears also from Exod. xxix, 29, 30, where it is ordered that the one of the sons of Aaron who succeeds him in the priest's office shall wear the holy garments that were Aaron's for seven days, to be *anointed* therein, and to be consecrated in them. Hence Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* i, 6; *Dem. Evang.* viii) understands the Anointed (A. V. "Messiah," or, as the Sept. reads, χρίσμα) in Dan. ix, 26, the *anointing* of the Jewish high-priests: "It means nothing else than the succession of high-priests, whom the Scripture commonly calls χριστούς, anointed;" and so, too, Tertullian and Theodoret (Rosenm. ad loc.) The anointing of the sons of Aaron, i. e. the common priests, seems to have been confined to sprinkling their garments with the anointing oil (Exod. xxix, 21; xxviii, 41, etc.), though, according to Kalisch on Exod. xxix, 8, and Lightfoot, following the Rabbinical interpretation, the difference consists in the abundant pouring of oil (יָצַק) on the head of the high-priest, from whence it was drawn with the finger into two streams, in the shape of a Greek X, while the priests were merely marked with the finger dipped in oil on the forehead (מָשַׁח). But this is probably a late invention of the Rabbins. The anointing of the high-priest is alluded to in Psa. cxxxiii, 2, "It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts of his garments." The composition of this anointing oil, consisting of myrrh, cinnamon, calamus, cassia, and olive oil, is prescribed Exod. xxx, 22–25; and its use for any other purpose but that of anointing the priests, the tabernacle, and the vessels, was strictly prohibited, on pain of being "cut off from his people." The manufacture of it was intrusted to certain priests, called apothecaries (Neh. iii, 8). But this oil is said to have been wanting under the second Temple (Prideaux, i, 151; Selden, cap. ix). See ANOINTING OIL.

2. The high-priest had a peculiar *dress*, which, as we have seen, passed to his successor at his death. This dress consisted of eight parts, as the Rabbins constantly note, the *breastplate*, the *ephod* with its curious girdle, the *robe* of the ephod, the *mitre*, the *broidered coat* or diaper tunic, and the *girdle*, the materials being gold, blue, red, crimson, and fine (white) linen (Exod. xxviii). To the above are added, in ver. 42, the *breeches* or drawers (Lev. xvi, 4) of linen; and to make up the number eight, some reckon the high-priest's mitre, or the plate (צִיץ) separately from the bonnet; while others reckon the curious girdle of the ephod separately from the ephod. In Lev. viii, 7–12, there is a complete account of the putting on of these garments by Aaron, and the whole ceremony of his consecration and that of his sons. It there appears distinctly that, besides the girdle common to all the priests, the high-priest also wore the curious girdle of the ephod. Of these eight articles of attire, four, viz. the coat or tunic, the girdle, the breeches, and the bonnet or turban, מִגְבָּעָה, instead of the mitre, מִצְנֶפֶת (Josephus, however, whom Bähr follows, calls the bonnets of the priests by the name of מִצְנֶפֶת. See below), belonged to the common priests. It is well known how, in the Assyrian sculptures, the king is in like manner distinguished by the shape of his head-dress; and how in Persia none but the king wore the *cidaris*, or erect tiara. Bähr compares also the apices of the *flamen Dialis*. Josephus speaks of the robes (ἐνδύματα) of the chief priests, and the tunics and girdles of the priests, as forming part of the spoil of the Temple (*War*, vi, 8, 3). Aaron, and at his death Eleazar (Numb. xx, 26, 28), and their successors in the high-priesthood, were solemnly inaugurated into their office by being clad in these eight articles of dress on seven successive days. From the time of the second Temple, when the sacred oil (said to have been hid by Josiah, and lost) was wanting, this putting on of the garments was deemed the official investiture of the office. Hence the robes, which had used to be kept in one of the chambers of the Temple, and were by Hyrcanus deposited in the Baris, which he built on purpose, were kept by Herod in the same tower, which he called Antonia, so that they might be at his absolute disposal. The Romans did the same till the government of Vitellius, in the reign of Tiberius, when the custody of the robes was restored to the Jews (*Ant.* xv, 11, 4; xviii, 4, 3). Taking the articles of the high-priest's dress in the order in which they would naturally be put on, we have

(1.) The "breeches" or *drawers*, מִכְנָסַיִם, *miknesim'*, of linen, covering the loins and thighs, for purposes of modesty, as all the upper garments were loose and flowing. Their probable form is illustrated by the subjoined cut, from Braun (*De Vestitu Sacerdotum Hebræorum*, p. 364), who calls attention to the bands (Talmud, שנצים) for drawing the top together, and the absence of any opening either before (בית הערוה, *apertura ad pudenda*) or behind (בית הנקב, *apertura ad anum*).

(2.) The inner "coat," כְּתֹנֶת, *kutto'neth*, was a *tunic* or long shirt of linen, with a tesselated or diaper pattern, like the setting of a stone (תַּשְׁבֵּץ, *tashbets'*, "broi-

The Linen "Breeches" of the Priests.

dered"). The subjoined cut (also from Braun, p. 378) will illustrate its probable form (not different from that of the ordinary Oriental under-garment), with its sleeves and mode of fastening around the neck. See COAT.

"Broidered Coat" of Linen worn by the Priests.

(3.) The *girdle*, אַבְנֵט, *abnet'*, also of linen, was wound round the body several times from the breast downwards, and the ends hung down to the ankles. Its form and mode of wearing may be illustrated by the subjoined cuts (from Braun, p. 404). See GIRDLE.

(4.) The "*robe*," מְעִיל, *meïl'*, of the ephod. This was of inferior material to the ephod itself, being all of blue (ver. 31), which implied its being only of "woven work" (מַעֲשֵׂה אֹרֵג, xxxix, 22). It was worn immediately under the ephod, and was longer than it, though not so long as the broidered coat or tunic (כְּתֹנֶת תַּשְׁבֵּץ), according to most statements (Bähr, Winer, Kalisch, etc.). Nor do the Sept. explanation of מְעִיל, ποδήρης, and Josephus's description of it (*War*, v, 5, 7), seem to outweigh the reasons given by Bähr for thinking that the robe only came down to the knees, for it is highly improbable that the robe should thus have swept the ground. Neither does it seem likely that the sleeves of the tunic, of white diaper linen, were the only parts of it which were visible, in the case of the high-priest, when he wore the blue robe over it; for the blue robe had no sleeves, but only slits in the sides for the arms to come through. It had a hole for the head to pass through, with a border round it of woven work, to prevent its being rent. The skirt of this robe had a remarkable trimming of pomegranates in blue, red, and crimson, with a bell of gold between each pomegranate alternately. The bells were to give a sound when the high-priest went in and came out of the Holy Place. Josephus, in the *Antiquities*, gives no explanation of the use of the bells, but merely speaks of the studied beauty of their appearance. In his *Jewish War*, however, he tells us that the bells signified thunder, and the pomegranates lightning. For Philo's very curious observations, see Lightfoot's *Works*, ix, 25. Neither does the son of Sirach very distinctly explain it (Ecclus. xlv), who, in his description of the high-priest's attire, seems chiefly impressed with its beauty and magnificence, and says of this trimming,

The Linen Girdle of the Priests.

The High-priest's Robe. (From Braun, *ut sup.* p. 460.)

"He compassed him with pomegranates and with many golden bells round about, that as he went there might be a sound, and a noise made that might be heard in the Temple, for a memorial to the children of his people." Perhaps, however, he means to intimate that the use of the bells was to give notice to the people outside when the high-priest went in and came out of the sanctuary, as Whiston, Vatablus, and many others have supposed. See ROBE.

(5.) The *ephod*, אֵפוֹד, consisted of two parts, of which one covered the back, and the other the front, i. e. the breast and upper part of the body, like the ἐπωμίς of the Greeks (see Smith, *Dict. of Antiquities*, s. v. Tunica). These were clasped together on the shoulder with two large onyx stones, each having engraved on it six of the names of the tribes of Israel. It was further united by a "curious girdle" of gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen round the waist. Upon it was placed the breastplate of judgment, which in fact was a part of the ephod, being included in the term in such passages as 1 Sam. ii, 28; xiv, 3; xxiii, 9, and was fastened to it just above the curious girdle of the ephod. Linen ephods were also worn by other priests (1 Sam. xxii, 18), by Samuel, who was only a Levite (1 Sam. ii, 18), and by David when bringing up the ark (2 Sam. vi, 14). The expression for wearing an ephod is "*girded* with a linen ephod." The ephod was also frequently used in the idolatrous worship of the Israelites (see Judg. viii, 27; xvii, 5, etc.). See EPHOD.

(6.) The *breastplate*, חֹשֶׁן, *cho'shen*, or, as it is further named, verses 15, 29, 30, the breastplate of judgment, חֹשֶׁן מִשְׁפָּט, λογεῖον τῶν κρίσεων (or τῆς κρίσεως) in the Sept., only in ver. 4 περιστήθιον. It was, like the inner curtains of the tabernacle, the vail, and the ephod, of "cunning work," מַעֲשֵׂה חֹשֵׁב (Vulg. *opus plumarium* and *arte plumaria*). See EMBROIDER. The breastplate was originally two spans long and one span broad, but when doubled it was square, the shape in which it

1 a b b' d d b b c 2 e e 3 f f g g h h

The High-priest's BREASTPLATE. (From Braun, *De Vestitu Sacerdotum Hebræorum*, p. 486-8.)

1. The חֹשֶׁן, *cho'shen* (lit. *ornament*), or pectoral gorget itself, with its four rings, *b*, טַבָּעוֹת, *tabbaoth'* (lit. *seals* or signets), constituting the inside, *a*, when put on, being then folded down backward under.
2. The plate of twelve gems, set in gold, *c*, attached to the linen backing at the upper edge; with its two gold wreathen chains, *d*, שַׁרְשְׁרוֹת מִגְבָּלוֹת (*chains of cords*), to hook its upper corners to the shoulder-clasps of the ephod, as at *f*, fig. 3; *e*, two hyacinth-colored ribbons at-

tached to the lower corners of the plate for passing through the other two rings of the linen, and then tying to the hip-rings of the ephod, as at *g*, fig 3.

3. The EPHOD (q. v.), with the breastplate inserted, and the two straps, *h*, constituting the girdle, חֵשֶׁב, *che'sheb* (*belt*), of the ephod.

was worn. It was fastened at the top rings and by chains of wreathen gold to the two onyx stones on the shoulders, and beneath with two other rings and a lace of blue to two corresponding rings in the ephod, to keep it fixed in its place, above the curious girdle. But the most remarkable and most important part of this breastplate were the twelve precious stones, set in four rows, three in a row, thus corresponding to the twelve tribes, and divided in the same manner as their camps were, each stone having the name of one of the children of Israel engraved upon it. Whether the order followed the ages of the sons of Israel, or, as seems most probable, the order of the encampment, may be doubted; but, unless some appropriate distinct symbolism of the different tribes be found in the names of the precious stones, the question can scarcely be decided. According to the Sept. and Josephus, and in accordance with the language of Scripture, it was these stones which constituted the Urim and Thummim, nor does the notion advocated by Gesenius after Spencer and others, that these names designated two little images placed between the folds of the breastplate, seem to rest on any sufficient ground, in spite of the Egyptian analogy brought to bear upon it. (For an account of the image of Thmei worn by the Egyptian judge and priest, see Kalisch's note on Exod. xxviii; Hengstenberg's *Egypt and the Books of Moses;* Wilkinson's *Egyptians*, ii, 27, etc.) Josephus's opinion, on the other hand, improved upon by the rabbins, as to the manner in which the stones gave out the oracular answer, by preternatural illumination, appears equally destitute of probability. It seems to be far simplest, and most in agreement with the different accounts of inquiries made by Urim and Thummim (1 Sam. xiv, 3, 18, 19; xxiii, 2, 4, 9, 11, 12; xxviii, 6; Judg. xx, 28; 2 Sam. v, 23, etc.), to suppose that the answer was given simply by the Word of the Lord to the high-priest (comp. John xi, 51), when he had inquired of the Lord, clothed with the ephod and breastplate. Such a view agrees with the true notion of the breastplate, of which it was not the leading characteristic to be oracular (as the term λογεῖον supposes, and as is by many thought to be intimated by the descriptive addition "of judgment," i. e. as they understand it, "decision"), but only an incidental privilege connected with its fundamental meaning. What that meaning was we learn from Exod. xxviii, 30, where we read, "Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually." Now מִשְׁפָּט is the judicial sentence by which any one is either justified or condemned. In prophetic vision, as in actual Oriental life, the sentence of justification was often expressed by the nature of the robe worn. "He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels" (Isa. lxi, 10), is a good illustration of this; comp. lxii, 3. In like manner, in Rev. iii, 5; vii, 9; xix, 14, etc., the white linen robe expresses the righteousness or justification of saints. Something of the same notion may be seen in Esth. vi, 8, 9, and on the contrary ver. 12. The addition of precious stones and costly ornaments expresses glory beyond simple justification. So, in Isa. lxii, 3, "Thou shalt be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God." Exactly the same symbolism of glory is assigned to the precious stones in the description of the New Jerusalem (Rev. xxi, 11, 12-21), a passage which ties together with singular force the arrangement of the tribes in their camps and that of the precious stones in the breastplate. But, moreover, the high-priest being a representative personage, the fortunes of the whole people would most properly be indicated in his person. A striking instance of this, in connection, too, with symbolical dress, is to be found in Zech. iii: "Now Joshua (the high-priest, ver. 1) was clothed with filthy garments and stood before the angel. And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment. And I said, Let them set a fair mitre (צָנִיף) upon his head. So they set a fair mitre upon his head, and clothed him with garments." Here the priest's garments, בְּגָדִים, and the mitre, expressly typify the restored righteousness of the nation. Hence it seems to be sufficiently obvious that the breastplate of righteousness or judgment, resplendent with the same precious stones which symbolize the glory of the New Jerusalem, and on which were engraved the names of the twelve tribes, worn by the high-priest, who was then said to bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart, was intended to express by symbols the acceptance of Israel grounded upon the sacrificial functions of the high-priest. The sense of the symbol is thus nearly identical with such passages as Numb. xxiii, 21, and the meaning of the Urim and Thummim is explained by such expressions as קוּמִי אוֹרִי כִּי־בָא אוֹרֵךְ, "Arise, shine; for thy light is come" (Isa. lx, 1). Thummim expresses alike complete prosperity and complete innocence, and so falls in exactly with the double notion of light (Isa. lx, 1; lxii, 1, 2). The privilege of receiving an answer from God bears the same relation to the general state of Israel symbolized by the priest's dress that the promise in Isa. liv, 13, "All thy children shall be taught of the Lord," does to the preceding description, "I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires, and I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones," ver. 11, 12; comp. also ver. 14 and 17 (Heb.). It is obvious to add how entirely this view accords with the blessing of Levi in Deut. xxxiii, 8, where Levi is called God's holy one, and God's Thummim and Urim are said to be given to him, because he came out of the trial so clear in his integrity. (See also Bar. v, 2.) See BREASTPLATE.

(7.) The "bonnet," מִגְבָּעָה, *migbaah'*, was a *turban* of linen covering the head, but not in the particular form which that of the high-priest assumed when the mitre was added to it. See BONNET.

(8.) The last article peculiar to the high-priest is the *mitre*, מִצְנֶפֶת, *mitsne'pheth*, or upper turban, with its

Form of the Priestly Turban of the Hebrews, as suspended and as worn. (From Braun, *ut sup.* p. 428.)

gold plate, engraved with "Holiness to the Lord," fastened to it by a ribbon of blue. Josephus applies the same Heb. term (μασναεμφθής) to the turbans of the common priests as well, but says that in addition to this, and sewn upon the top of it, the high-priest had another turban of blue; that besides this he had outside the turban a triple crown of gold, consisting, that is, of three rims one above the other, and terminating at the top in a kind of conical cup, like the inverted calyx of the herb hyoscyamus. Josephus doubtless gives a true account of the high-priest's turban as worn in his day. It may fairly be conjectured that the crown was appended when the Asmonæans united the temporal monarchy with the priesthood, and that this was continued, though in a modified shape, after the sovereignty was taken from them. Josephus also describes the πέταλον, the lamina or gold plate, which he says covered the forehead of the high-priest. In *Ant.* vii, 3, 8, he says that the identical gold plate made in the days of Moses existed in his time; and Whiston adds in a note that it was still preserved in the time of Origen, and that the inscription on it was engraved in Samaritan characters (*Ant.* iii, 3, 6). It is certain that R. Eliezer, who flourished in Hadrian's reign, saw it at Rome. It was doubtless placed, with other spoils of the Temple, in the Temple of Peace, which was burnt down in the reign of Commodus. These spoils, however, are especially mentioned as part of Alaric's plunder when he took Rome. They were carried by Genseric into Africa, and brought by Belisarius to Byzantium, where they adorned his triumph. On the warning of a Jew the emperor ordered them back to Jerusalem, but what became of them is not known (Reland, *de Spoliis Templi*). See MITRE.

3. Aaron had peculiar *functions*. To him alone it appertained, and he alone was permitted, to enter the Holy of Holies, which he did once a year, on the great day of atonement, when he sprinkled the blood of the sin-offering on the mercy-seat, and burnt incense within the vail (Lev. xvi). He is said by the Talmudists, with whom agree Lightfoot, Selden, Grotius, Winer, Bähr, and many others, not to have worn his full pontifical robes on the occasion, but to have been clad entirely in white linen (Lev. xvi, 4, 32). It is singular, however, that, on the other hand, Josephus says that the great fast-day was the chief, if not the only day in the year when the high-priest wore all his robes (*War*, v, 5, 7), and, in spite of the alleged impropriety of his wearing his splendid apparel on a day of humiliation, it seems far more probable that on the one occasion when he performed functions peculiar to the high-priest he should have worn his full dress. Josephus, too, could not have been mistaken as to the fact, which he repeats (*cont. Ap.* ii, 7), where he says the high-priests alone might enter into the Holy of Holies, "propriâ stolâ circumamicti." For although Selden, who strenuously supports the Rabbinical statement that the high-priest only wore the four linen garments when he entered the Holy of Holies, endeavors to make Josephus say the same thing, it is impossible to twist his words into this meaning. It is true, on the other hand, that Lev. xvi distinctly prescribes that Aaron should wear the four priestly garments of linen when he entered into the Holy of Holies, and put them off immediately he came out, and leave them in the Temple; no one being present in the Temple while Aaron made the atonement (verse 17). Either, therefore, in the time of Josephus this law was not kept in practice, or else we must reconcile the apparent contradiction by supposing that in consequence of the great jealousy with which the high-priest's robes were kept by the civil power at this time, the custom had arisen for him to wear them, not even always on the three great festivals (*Ant.* xviii, 4, 3), but only on the great day of expiation. Clad in this gorgeous attire, he would enter the Temple in presence of all the people, and, after having performed in secret, as the law requires, the rites of expiation in the linen dress, he would resume his pontifical robes, and so appear again in public. Thus his wearing the robes would easily come to be identified chiefly with the day of atonement; and this is, perhaps, the most probable explanation. In other respects, the high-priest performed the functions of a priest, but only on new moons and other great feasts, and on such solemn occasions as the dedication of the Temple under Solomon, under Zerubbabel, etc. See ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

4. The high-priest had a peculiar place in the law of

The Jewish High-priest in full Costume, according to Braun (*ut sup.* p. 647).

the manslayer, and his taking sanctuary in the cities of refuge. The manslayer might not leave the city of refuge during the lifetime of the existing high-priest who was anointed with the holy oil (Numb. xxxv, 25, 28). It was also forbidden to the high-priest to follow a funeral, or rend his clothes for the dead, according to the precedent in Lev. x, 6. See MANSLAYER.

5. The other respects in which the high-priest exercised superior functions to the other priests arose rather from his position and opportunities than were distinctly attached to his office, and they consequently varied with the personal character and abilities of the high-priest. Such were reforms in religion, restorations of the Temple and its service, the preservation of the Temple from intrusion or profanation, taking the lead in ecclesiastical or civil affairs, judging the people, presiding in the Sanhedrim (which, however, he is said by Lightfoot rarely to have done), and other similar transactions, in which we find the high-priest sometimes prominent, sometimes not even mentioned. (See the historical part of this article.) Even that portion of power which most naturally and usually fell to his share, the rule of the Temple, and the government of the priests and Levites who ministered there, did not invariably fall to the share of the high-priest. For the title "Ruler of the House of God," נְגִיד בֵּית־הָאֱלֹהִים, which usually denotes the high-priest, is sometimes given to those who were not high-priests, as to Pashur, the son of Immer, in Jer. xx, 1; compare 1 Chron. xii, 27. The Rabbins speak very frequently of one second in dignity to the high-priest, whom they call the Sagan, and who often acted in the high-priest's room. He is the same who in the O. T. is called "the second priest" (2 Kings xxiii, 4; xxv, 18). They say that Moses was sagan to Aaron. Thus, too, it is explained of Annas and Caiaphas (Luke iii, 2), that Annas was sagan. Ananias is also thought by some to have been sagan, acting for the high-priest (Acts xxiii, 2). In like manner they say Zadok and Abiathar were high-priest and sagan in the time of David. The sagan is also very frequently called *Memunneh*, or prefect of the Temple, and upon him chiefly lay the care and charge of the Temple services (Lightfoot, *passim*). If the high-priest was incapacitated from officiating by any accidental uncleanness, the sagan or vice-high-priest took his place. Thus the Jerusalem Talmud tells a story of Simon, son of Kamith, that "on the eve of the day of expiation he went out to speak with the king, and some spittle fell upon his garments and defiled him: therefore Judah his brother went in on the day of expiation, and served in his stead; and so their mother Kamith saw two of her sons high-priests in one day. She had seven sons, and they all served in the high-priesthood" (Lightfoot, ix, 35). It does not appear by whose authority the high-priests were appointed to their office before there were kings of Israel; but, as we find it invariably done by the civil power in later times, it is probable that, in the times preceding the monarchy, it was by the elders, or Sanhedrim. The installation and anointing of the high-priest, or clothing him with the eight garments, which was the formal investiture, is ascribed by Maimonides to the Sanhedrim at all times (Lightfoot, ix, 22).

It should be added that the usual age for entering upon the functions of the priesthood, according to 2 Chron. xxxi, 17, is considered to have been twenty years (by the later Jews thirty, Numb. iv, 3; 1 Chron. xxiii, 2), though a priest or high-priest was not actually incapacitated if he had attained to puberty, as appears by the example of Aristobulus, who was high-priest at the age of seventeen. Onias, the son of Simon the Just, could not be high-priest, because he was but a child at his father's death. Again, according to Lev. xxi, no one that had a blemish could officiate at the altar. Moses enumerates eleven blemishes, which the Talmud expands into 142. Josephus relates that Antigonus mutilated Hyrcanus's ears, to incapacitate him for being restored to the high-priesthood. Illegitimate birth was also a bar to the high-priesthood, and the subtlety of Jewish distinctions extended this illegitimacy to being born of a mother who had been taken captive by heathen conquerors (Josephus, *c. Apion*, i, 7). Thus Eleazar said to John Hyrcanus (though, Josephus says, falsely) that if he was a just man, he ought to resign the pontificate, because his mother had been a captive, and he was therefore incapacitated. Lev. xxi, 13, 14, was taken as the ground of this and similar disqualifications. For a full account of this branch of the subject the reader is referred to Selden's learned treatises *De Successionibus*, etc., and *De Success. in Pontif. Ebræor.*; and to Prideaux, ii, 306. It was the universal opinion of the Jews that the deposition of a high-priest, which became so common, was unlawful. Joseph. (*Ant.* xv, 3) says that Antiochus Epiphanes was the first who did this, when he deposed Jesus or Jason; Aristobulus, who deposed his brother Hyrcanus the Second; and Herod, who took away the high-priesthood from Ananelus to give it to Aristobulus the Third. See the story of Jonathan, son of Ananus, *Ant.* xix, 6, 4.

II. The *theological* view of the high-priesthood will be treated under the head of PRIEST. It must suffice here to indicate the consideration of the office, dress, functions, and ministrations of the high-priest, as typical of the priesthood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and as setting forth under shadows the truths which are openly taught under the Gospel. This has been done to a great extent in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and is occasionally done in other parts of Scripture, as Rev. i, 13, where the ποδήρης, and the girdle about the paps, are distinctly the robe, and the curious girdle of the ephod, characteristic of the high-priest. It also embraces all the moral and spiritual teaching supposed to be intended by such symbols. Philo (*De vitâ Mosis*), Origen (*Homil. in Levit.*), Eusebius (*Demonst. Evang.* lib. iii), Epiphanius (*cont. Melchized.* iv, etc.), Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* i, *Eliæ Cretens.* and *Comment.* p. 195), Augustine (*Quæst. in Exod.*), may be cited among many others of the ancients who have more or less thus treated the subject. Of moderns, Bähr (*Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*), Fairbairn (*Typology of Script.*), Kalisch (*Comment. on Exod.*), have entered fully into this subject, both from the Jewish and the Christian point of view.

III. The *history* of the high-priests embraces a period of about 1727 years, according to the opinion of the best chronologers, and a succession of about 83 high-priests, beginning with Aaron, and ending with Phannias. "The number of all the high-priests (says Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 10) from Aaron . . . until Phanas . . . was 83," where he gives a comprehensive account of them. They naturally arrange themselves into three groups—(*a.*) those before David; (*b.*) those from David to the Captivity; (*c.*) those from the return from the Babylonian captivity till the cessation of the office at the destruction of Jerusalem. The two former have come down to us in the canonical books of Scripture, and so have a few of the earliest and the latest of the latter; but for by far the larger portion of the latter group we have only the authority of Josephus, the Talmud, and occasioned notices in profane writers.

(*a.*) The high-priests of the first group who are distinctly made known to us as such are, 1. Aaron; 2. Eleazar; 3. Phinehas; 4. Eli; 5. Ahitub (1 Chron. ix, 11; Neh. xi, 11; 1 Sam. xiv, 3); 6. Ahiah; 7. Ahimelech. Phinehas, the son of Eli, and father of Ahitub, died before his father, and so was not high-priest. Of the above the first three succeeded in regular order, Nadab and Abihu, Aaron's eldest sons, having died in the wilderness (Lev. x). But Eli, the 4th, was of the line of Ithamar. What was the exact interval between the death of Phinehas and the accession of Eli, what led to the transference of the chief priesthood from the line of Eleazar to that of Ithamar, and whether any or which of the descendants of Eleazar between Phinehas and Zadok (seven in number, viz. Abishua, Bukki, Uzzi, Zerahiah, Meraioth, Amariah, Ahitub), were high-priests,

we have no positive means of determining from Scripture. Judg. xx, 28 leaves Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, priest at Shiloh, and 1 Sam. i, 3, 9 finds Eli high-priest there, with two grown-up sons priests under him. The only clew is to be found in the genealogies, by which it appears that Phinehas was 6th in succession from Levi, while Eli, supposing him to be the same generation as Samuel's grandfather, would be 10th. Josephus asserts (*Ant.* viii, 1, 3) that the father of Bukki—whom he calls Joseph, and (*Ant.* v, 11, 5) Abiezer, i. e. Abishua—was the last high-priest of Phinehas's line before Zadok. This is a doubtful tradition, since Josephus does not adhere to it in the above passage of his 5th book, where he makes Bukki and Uzzi to have been both high-priests, and Eli to have succeeded Uzzi; or in book xx, 10, where he reckons the high-priests before Zadok and Solomon to have been thirteen (a reckoning which includes apparently all Eleazar's descendants down to Ahitub), and adds Eli and his son Phinehas, and Abiathar, whom he calls Eli's grandson. If the last of Abishua's line died leaving a son or grandson under age, Eli, as the head of the line of Ithamar, might have become high-priest as a matter of course, or he might have been appointed by the elders. His having judged Israel 40 years (1 Sam. iv, 18) marks him as a man of ability. If Ahiah and Ahimelech are not variations of the name of the same person, they must have been brothers, since both were sons of Ahitub. Of the high-priests, then, before David's reign, *seven* are said in Scripture to have been high-priests, and *one* by Josephus alone. The bearing of this on the chronology of the times from the Exodus to David is too important to be passed over in silence. As in the parallel list of the ancestors of David (q. v.), we are compelled by the chronology to count as incumbents of the office in regular order the four others who are only named in Scripture as lineal descendants of the pontifical family. The comparative oversight of these incumbents receives an explanation from the nature of the times. It must also be noted that the tabernacle of God, during the high-priesthood of Aaron's successors of this first group, was pitched at Shiloh in the tribe of Ephraim, a fact that marks the strong influence which the temporal power already had in ecclesiastical affairs, since Ephraim was Joshua's tribe, as Judah was David's (Josh. xxiv, 30, 33; Judg. xx, 27, 28; xxi, 21; 1 Sam. i, 3, 9, 24; iv, 3, 4; xiv, 3, etc.; Psa. lxxviii, 60). This strong influence and interference of the secular power is manifest throughout the subsequent history. This first period was also marked by the calamity which befell the high-priests as the guardians of the ark, in its capture by the Philistines. This probably suspended all inquiries by Urim and Thummim, which were made before the ark (1 Chron. xiii, 3; comp. Judg. xx, 27; 1 Sam. vii, 2; xiv, 18), and must have greatly diminished the influence of the high-priests, on whom the largest share of the humiliation expressed in the name Ichabod would naturally fall. The rise of Samuel as a prophet at this very time, and his paramount influence and importance in the state, to the entire eclipsing of Ahiah the priest, coincides remarkably with the absence of the ark, and the means of inquiring by Urim and Thummim.

(*b.*) Passing to the second group, we begin with the unexplained circumstance of there being two priests in the reign of David, apparently of nearly equal authority, viz. Zadok and Abiathar (1 Chron. xv, 11; 2 Sam. viii, 17). Indeed it is only from the deposition of Abiathar, and the placing of Zadok in his room by Solomon (1 Kings ii, 35), that we learn certainly that Abiathar was the high-priest, and Zadok the second. Zadok was son of Ahitub, of the line of Eleazar (1 Chron. vi, 8), and the first mention of him is in 1 Chron. xii, 28, as "a young man, mighty in valor," who joined David in Hebron after Saul's death, with 22 captains of his father's house. It is therefore not unlikely that after the death of Ahimelech, and the secession of Abiathar to David, Saul may have made Zadok priest, as far as it was possible for him to do so in the absence of the ark and the high-priest's robes, and that David may have avoided the difficulty of deciding between the claims of his faithful friend Abiathar and his new and important ally Zadok (who, perhaps, was the means of attaching to David's cause the 4600 Levites and the 3700 priests that came under Jehoiada their captain, ver. 26, 27), by appointing them to a joint priesthood: the first place, with the ephod, and Urim and Thummim, remaining with Abiathar, who was in actual possession of them. Certain it is that from this time Zadok and Abiathar are constantly named together, and, singularly, Zadok always first, both in the book of Samuel and that of Kings. We can, however, trace very clearly up to a certain point the division of the priestly offices and dignities between them, coinciding as it did with the divided state of the Levitical worship in David's time. For we learn from 1 Chron. xvi, 1–7, 37, compared with 39, 40, and yet more distinctly from 2 Chron. i, 3, 4, 5, that the tabernacle and the brazen altar made by Moses and Bezaleel in the wilderness were at this time at Gibeon, while the ark was at Jerusalem, in the separate tent made for it by David. See GIBEON. Now Zadok the priest and his brethren the priests were left "before the tabernacle at Gibeon" to offer burnt-offerings unto the Lord morning and evening, and to do according to all that is written in the law of the Lord (1 Chron. xvi, 39, 40). It is therefore obvious to conclude that Abiathar had special charge of the ark and the services connected with it, which agrees exactly with the possession of the ephod by Abiathar, and his previous position with David before he became king of Israel, as well as with what we are told 1 Chron. xxvii, 34, that Jehoiada and Abiathar were the king's counsellors next to Ahithophel. Residence at Jerusalem with the ark, and the privilege of inquiring of the Lord before the ark, both well suit his office of counsellor. Abiathar, however, forfeited his place by taking part with Adonijah against Solomon, and Zadok was made high-priest in his place. The pontificate was thus again consolidated and transferred permanently from the line of Ithamar to that of Eleazar. This is the only instance recorded of the deposition of a high-priest (which became common in later times, especially under Herod and the Romans) during this second period. It was the fulfilment of the prophetic denunciations of the sin of Eli's sons (1 Sam. ii, iii).

Another considerable difficulty that meets us in the historical survey of the high-priests of the second group is to ascertain who was high-priest at the dedication of Solomon's Temple: Josephus (*Ant.* x, 8, 6) asserts that Zadok was, and the *Seder Olam* makes him the high-priest in the reign of Solomon. Otherwise we might deem it very improbable that Zadok, who must have been very old at Solomon's accession (being David's contemporary), should have lived to the 11th year of his reign; and, moreover, 1 Kings iv, 2 distinctly asserts that Azariah, the son of Zadok, was priest under Solomon; and 1 Chron. vi, 10 tells us of an Azariah, grandson of the former, "he it is that executed the priest's office in the Temple that Solomon built in Jerusalem," as if meaning at its first completion. If, however, either of these Azariahs (if two) was the first high-priest of Solomon's Temple, the non-mention of him in the account of the dedication of the Temple, where one would most have expected it (as 1 Kings viii, 3, 6, 10, 11, 62; 2 Chron. v, 7, 11, etc.), and the prominence given to Solomon—the civil power—would be certainly remarkable. Compare also 2 Chron. viii, 14, 15.

In constructing the list of the succession of priests of this group, our method must be to compare the genealogical list in 1 Chron. vi, 8–15 (A.V.) with the notices of high-priests in the sacred history, and with the list given by Josephus, who, it must be remembered, had access to the lists preserved in the archives at Jerusalem, testing the whole by the application of the ordinary rules of genealogical succession. Now, as regards the genealogy, it is seen at once that there is something defective; for whereas from David to Jechoniah there are

20 kings, from Zadok to Jehozadak there are but 13 priests. Moreover, the passage in question is not a list of high-priests, but the pedigree of Jehozadak. Then, again, while the pedigree in its first six generations from Zadok inclusive seems at first sight exactly to suit the history—for it makes Amariah the sixth priest, while the history (2 Chron. xix, 11) tells us he lived in Jehoshaphat's reign, who was the sixth king from David, inclusive; and while the same pedigree in its last five generations also seems to suit the history—inasmuch as it places Hilkiah, the son of Shallum, fourth from the end, and the history tells us he lived in the reign of Josiah, the fourth king from the end—yet is there certainly at least one great gap in the middle. For between Amariah, the high-priest in Jehoshaphat's reign, and Shallum, the father of Hilkiah, the high-priest in Josiah's reign—an interval of about 240 years—there are but two names, Ahitub and Zadok, and these liable to suspicion from their reproducing the same sequence which occurs in the earlier part of the same genealogy—Amariah, Ahitub, Zadok. Besides, they are not mentioned by Josephus, at least not under the same names. This part, therefore, of the pedigree is useless for our purpose. But the historical books supply us with four or five names for this interval, viz. Jehoiada, in the reigns of Athaliah and Joash, and probably still earlier; Zechariah, his son; Azariah, in the reign of Uzziah; Urijah, in the reign of Ahaz; and Azariah, in the reign of Hezekiah. If, in the genealogy of 1 Chron. vi, Azariah and Hilkiah have been accidentally transposed, as is not impossible, then the Azariah who was high-priest in Hezekiah's reign would be the Azariah of 1 Chron. vi, 13, 14. Putting the additional historical names at four, and deducting the two suspicious names from the genealogy, we have 15 high-priests indicated in Scripture as contemporary with the 20 kings, with room, however, for one or two more in the history. Turning to Josephus, we find his list of 17 high-priests (whom he reckons as 18 [*Ant.* xx, 10], as do also the Rabbins) in places exceedingly corrupt, a corruption sometimes caused by the end of one name adhering to the beginning of the following (as in Axioramus), sometimes apparently by substituting the name of the contemporary king or prophet for that of the high-priest, as Joel and Jotham (both these, however, confirmed by the Rabbinical list). Perhaps, however, Sudeas, who corresponds to Zedekiah, in the reign of Amaziah, in the *Seder Olam*, and Odeas, who corresponds to Hoshaiah, in the reign of Manasseh, according to the same Jewish chronicle, may really represent high-priests whose names have not been preserved in Scripture. This would bring up the number to 17, or, if we retain Azariah as the father of Seraiah, to 18, which, with the addition of Joel and Jotham, finally agrees with the 20 kings.

Reviewing the high-priests of this second group, the following are some of the most remarkable incidents: (1.) The transfer of the seat of worship from Shiloh, in the tribe of Ephraim, to Jerusalem, in the tribe of Judah, effected by David, and consolidated by the building of the magnificent Temple of Solomon. (2.) The organization of the Temple service under the high-priests, and the division of the priests and Levites into courses, who resided at the Temple during their term of service —all which necessarily put great power into the hands of an able high-priest. (3.) The revolt of the ten tribes from the dynasty of David, and from the worship at Jerusalem, and the setting up of a schismatical priesthood at Dan and Beersheba (1 Kings xii, 31; 2 Chron. xiii, 9, etc.). (4.) The overthrow of the usurpation of Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab, by Jehoiada the high-priest, whose near relationship to king Joash, added to his zeal against the idolatries of the house of Ahab, stimulated him to head the revolution with the force of priests and Levites at his command. (5.) The boldness and success with which the high-priest Azariah withstood the encroachments of the king Uzziah upon the office and functions of the priesthood. (6.) The repair of the Temple by Jehoiada, in the reign of Joash; the restoration of the Temple services by Azariah in the reign of Hezekiah; and the discovery of the book of the law, and the religious reformation by Hilkiah in the reign of Josiah. See Hilkiah. (7.) In all these great religious movements, however, excepting the one headed by Jehoiada, it is remarkable how the civil power took the lead. It was David who arranged all the Temple service, Solomon who directed the building and dedication of the Temple, the high-priest being not so much as named; Jehoshaphat who sent the priests about to teach the people, and assigned to the high-priest Amariah his share in the work; Hezekiah who headed the reformation, and urged on Azariah and the priests and Levites; Josiah who encouraged the priests in the service of the house of the Lord. On the other hand, we read of no opposition to the idolatries of Manasseh by the high-priest, and we know how shamefully subservient Urijah the high-priest was to king Ahaz, actually building an altar according to the pattern of one at Damascus, to displace the brazen altar, and joining the king in his profane worship before it (2 Kings xvi, 10-16). The preponderance of the civil over the ecclesiastical power, as a historical fact, in the kingdom of Judah, although kept within bounds by the hereditary succession of the high-priests, seems to be proved from these circumstances.

The high-priests of this series ended with Seraiah, who was taken prisoner by Nebuzar-adan, and slain at Riblah by Nebuchadnezzar, together with Zephaniah, the second priest or sagan, after the burning of the Temple and the plunder of all the sacred vessels (2 Kings xxv, 18). His son Jehozadak or Josedech was at the same time carried away captive (1 Chron. vi, 15).

The time occupied by these (say) eighteen high-priests who ministered at Jerusalem between the times of David and the exile was about 424 years, which gives an average of something more than twenty-three years to each high-priest. It is remarkable that not a single instance is recorded after the time of David of an inquiry by Urim and Thummim as a means of ascertaining the Lord's will. The ministry of the prophets seems to have superseded that of the high-priests (see e. g. 2 Chron. xv; xviii; xx, 14, 15; 2 Kings xix, 1, 2; xxii, 12-14; Jer. xxi, 1, 2). Some think that Urim and Thummim ceased with the theocracy; others with the division of Israel into two kingdoms. Nehemiah seems to have expected the restoration of it (Neh. vii, 65), and so perhaps did Judas Maccabæus (1 Macc. iv, 46; comp. xiv, 41), while Josephus affirms that it had been exercised for the last time 200 years before he wrote, viz. by John Hyrcanus (Whiston, *note on Ant.* iii, 8; Prideaux, *Connect.* i, 150, 151). It seems, therefore, scarcely true to reckon Urim and Thummim as one of the marks of God's presence with Solomon's Temple which was wanting to the second Temple (Prid. i, 138, 144, sq.). This early cessation of answers by Urim and Thummim, though the high-priest's office and the wearing of the breastplate continued in force during so many centuries, seems to confirm the notion that such answers were not the fundamental, but only the accessory uses of the breastplate of judgment.

(*c*.) An interval of about fifty-three years elapsed between the high-priests of the second and third group, during which there was neither temple, nor altar, nor ark, nor priest. Jehozadak, or Josedech, as it is written in Haggai (i, 1, 14, etc.), who should have succeeded Seraiah, lived and died a captive at Babylon. The pontifical office revived in his son Jeshua, of whom such frequent mention is made in Ezra and Nehemiah, Haggai and Zechariah, 1 Esdr. and Ecclus.; and he therefore stands at the head of this third and last series, honorably distinguished for his zealous co-operation with Zerubbabel in rebuilding the Temple and restoring the dilapidated commonwealth of Israel. His successors, as far as the O. T. guides us, were Joiakim, Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan (or Jonathan), and Jaddua. Of these we find

Eliashib hindering rather than seconding the zeal of the devout Tirshatha Nehemiah for the observance of God's law in Israel (Neh. xiii, 4, 7); and Johanan, Josephus tells us, murdered his own brother Jesus or Joshua in the Temple, which led to its further profanation by Bagoses, the general of Artaxerxes Mnemon's army (*Ant.* xi, 7). Jaddua was high-priest in the time of Alexander the Great. Concerning him, Josephus relates the story that he went out to meet Alexander at Sapha (probably the ancient Mizpeh) at the head of a procession of priests; and that when Alexander saw the multitude clothed in white, and the priests in their linen garments, and the high-priest in blue and gold, with the mitre on his head, and the gold plate, on which was the name of God, he stepped forward alone and adored the Name, and hastened to embrace the high-priest (*Ant.* xi, 8, 5). Josephus adds many other particulars in the same connection; and the narrative, though sometimes disputed as savoring of the apocryphal, derives support from the circumstances of the times, especially the leniency of Alexander toward the Jews. See ALEXANDER THE GREAT. It was the brother of this Jaddua, Manasseh, who, according to the same authority, was, at the request of Sanballat, made the first high-priest of the Samaritan temple by Alexander the Great. (See on this whole period, Herzfeld, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, 1865, i, 368 sq.)

Jaddua was succeeded by Onias I, his son, and he again by Simon the Just, the last of the men of the great synagogue, as the Jews speak, and to whom is usually ascribed the completion of the Canon of the O. T. (Prid. *Connect.* i, 545). Of him Jesus, the son of Sirach, speaks in terms of most glowing eulogy in Ecclus. l, ascribing to him the repair and fortification of the Temple, with other works. The passage (1–21) contains an interesting account of the ministrations of the high-priest. Upon Simon's death, his son Onias being under age, Eleazar, Simon's brother, succeeded him. The high-priesthood of Eleazar is memorable as being that under which the Sept. version of the Scriptures is said to have been made at Alexandria for Ptolemy Philadelphus, according to the account of Josephus taken from Aristeas (*Ant.* xii, 2). This translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, valuable as it was with reference to the wider interests of religion, and marked as was the providence which gave it to the world at this time as a preparation for the approaching advent of Christ, yet, viewed in its relation to Judaism and the high-priesthood, was a sign, and perhaps a helping cause of their decay. It marked a growing tendency to Hellenism utterly inconsistent with the spirit of the Mosaic economy. Accordingly, in the high-priesthood of Eleazar's rival nephews, Jesus and Onias, we find their very names changed into the Greek ones of Jason and Menelaus, and with the introduction of this new feature of rival high-priests we find one of them, Menelaus, strengthening himself and seeking support from the Syro-Greek kings against the Jewish party by offering to forsake their national laws and customs, and to adopt those of the Greeks. The building of a gymnasium at Jerusalem for the use of these apostate Jews, and their endeavor to conceal their circumcision when stripped for the games (1 Macc. i, 14, 15; 2 Macc. iv, 12–15; Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 5, 1), show the length to which this spirit was carried. The acceptance of the spurious priesthood of the temple of Onion from Ptolemy Philometor by Onias (the son of Onias the high-priest), who would have been the legitimate high-priest on the death of Menelaus, his uncle, is another striking indication of the same degeneracy. By this flight of Onias into Egypt the succession of high-priests in the family of Jozadak ceased; for although the Syro-Greek kings had introduced much uncertainty into the succession, by deposing at their will obnoxious persons, and appointing whom they pleased, yet the dignity had never gone out of the one family. Alcimus, whose Hebrew name was Jakim (1 Chron. xxiv, 12), or perhaps Jachin (1 Chron. ix, 10; xxiv, 17), or, according to Ruffinus (ap. Selden), Joachim, and who was made high-priest by Antiochus Eupator on Menelaus being put to death by him, was the first who was of a different family. One, says Josephus, that "was indeed of the stock of Aaron, but not of this family" of Jozadak.

What, however, for a time saved the Jewish institutions, infused a new life and consistency into the priesthood and the national religion, and enabled them to fulfil their destined course till the advent of Christ, was the cruel and impolitic persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. This thoroughly aroused the piety and national spirit of the Jews, and drew together in defence of their Temple and country all who feared God and were attached to their national institutions. The result was that after the high-priesthood had been brought to the lowest degradation by the apostasy and crimes of the last Onias or Menelaus, and after a vacancy of seven years had followed the brief pontificate of Alcimus, his no less infamous successor, a new and glorious succession of high-priests arose in the Asmonæan family, who united the dignity of civil rulers, and for a time of independent sovereigns, to that of the high-priesthood. Josephus, who is followed by Lightfoot, Selden, and others, calls Judas Maccabæus "high-priest of the nation of Judah" (*Ant.* xii, 10, 6), but, according to the far better authority of 1 Macc. x, 20, it was not till after the death of Judas Maccabæus that Alcimus himself died, and that Alexander, king of Syria, made Jonathan, the brother of Judas, high-priest. Josephus himself, too, calls Jonathan the "first of the sons of Asmonæus, who was high-priest" (*Life*, 1). It is possible, however, that Judas may have been elected by the people to the office of high-priest, though never confirmed in it by the Syrian kings. The Asmonæan family were priests of the course of Joiarib, the first of the twenty-four courses (1 Chron. xxiv, 7), whose return from captivity is recorded 1 Chron. ix, 10; Neh. xi, 10. They were probably of the house of Eleazar, though this cannot be affirmed with certainty; and Josephus tells us that he himself was related to them, one of his ancestors having married a daughter of Jonathan, the first high-priest of the house. The Asmonæan dynasty lasted from B.C. 153 till the family was damaged by intestine divisions, and then destroyed by Herod the Great. Aristobulus, the last high-priest of his line, brother of Mariamne, was murdered by order of Herod, his brother-in-law, B.C. 35. The independence of Judæa, under the priest-kings of this race, had lasted till Pompey took Jerusalem, and sent king Aristobulus II (who had also taken the high-priesthood from his brother Hyrcanus) a prisoner to Rome. Pompey restored Hyrcanus to the high-priesthood, but forbad him to wear the diadem. Everything Jewish was now, however, hastening to decay. Herod made men of low birth high-priests, deposed them at his will, and named others in their room. In this he was followed by Archelaus, and by the Romans when they took the government of Judæa into their own hands; so that there were no fewer than twenty-eight high-priests from the reign of Herod to the destruction of the Temple by Titus, a period of 107 years. (Josephus tells us of one Ananus and his five sons who all filled the office of high-priest in turn. One of these, Ananus the younger, was deposed by king Agrippa for the part he took in causing "James, the brother of Jesus who was called Christ," to be stoned [*Ant.* xx, 9, 1].) The N. T. introduces us to some of these later and oft-changing high-priests, viz. Annas and Caiaphas—the former high-priest at the commencement of John Baptist's ministry, with Caiaphas as second priest; and the latter high-priest himself at our Lord's crucifixion (see Sommel, *De Anna et Caiapha*, Lund. 1772)—and Ananias (erroneously thought to be the Ananus who was murdered by the Zealots just before the siege of Jerusalem), before whom Paul was tried, as we read Acts xxiii, and of whom he said, "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall." The same Caiaphas was the high-priest from whom Saul received letters to the synagogue at

Damascus (Acts ix, 1, 14). Both he and Ananias seem certainly to have presided in the Sanhedrim, and that officially; nor is Lightfoot's explanation (viii, 450 and 484) of the mention of the high-priest, though Gamaliel and his son Simeon were respectively presidents of the Sanhedrim, at all probable or satisfactory (see Acts v, 17, etc.). The last high-priest was appointed by lot by the Zealots from the course of priests called by Josephus Eniachim (probably a corrupt reading for Jachim). He is thus described by the Jewish historian. "His name was Phannias: he was the son of Samuel, of the village of Aphtha, a man not only not of the number of the chief priests, but who, such a mere rustic was he, scarcely knew what the high-priesthood meant. Yet did they drag him reluctant from the country, and, setting him forth in a borrowed character as on the stage, they put the sacred vestments on him, and instructed him how to act on the occasion. This shocking impiety, which to them was a subject of merriment and sport, drew tears from the other priests, who beheld from a distance their law turned into ridicule, and groaned over the subversion of the sacred honors" (*War*, iv, 3, 8). Thus ignominiously ended the series of high-priests which had stretched in a scarcely broken line through more than seventeen, or, according to the common chronology, sixteen centuries. The Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Grecian, and Roman empires, which the Jewish high-priests had seen in turn overshadowing the world, had each, except the last, one by one withered away and died—and now the last successor of Aaron was stripped of his sacerdotal robes, and the temple which he served laid level with the ground, to rise no more. But this did not happen till the true High-priest and King of Israel, the Minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man, had offered his one sacrifice, once for all, and had taken his place at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, bearing on his breast the judgment of his redeemed people, and continuing a Priest forever, in the sanctuary which shall never be taken down!

Annexed is a list of the high-priests from Aaron to the final overthrow of Jerusalem, derived from the Scriptures, Josephus, and an old Jewish chronicle, the *Seder Olam*. Details may be found under their respective names.

No.	1 Chron. vi, 3–15, 50–53; Ezra vii, 1–5.	Other passages of Scripture.	Josephus, *Ant.* v, 11, 5; viii, 1, 3; x, 8; xx, 10.	*Seder Olam.*	B.C.
1.	Aaron	Aaron	Aaron	Aaron	1657–1619
2.	Eleazar	Eleazar	Eleazar	Eleazar	1619–?1580
3.	Phinehas	Phinehas	Phineas	Phinehas	?1580–?1523
4.	Abishua		Abiezer		?1523–?1466
5.	Bukki		Bukki		?1466–?1409
6.	Uzzi		Ozi		?1409–?1352
7.	?Zerahiah		——		?1352–?1295
8.	?Meraioth	Meraioth	——		?1295–?1238
9.	?Amariah I		——		?1238–?1185
	Of Ithamar's line.				
10.		Eli	Eli	Eli	?1185–1125
11.		Ahitub I	(Ahitub)	Ahitub	1125–?1085
12.		Ahimelech or Ahiah	(Ahimelech)		?1085–1060
13.		Abiathar	(Abiathar)	Abiathar	1060–1012
	Of Eleazar's line.				
14.	Zadok I	Zadok I	Zadoc	Zadok	1012–?972
15.	Ahimaaz	Ahimaaz	Achimas	Ahimaaz	?972–?956
16.	Azariah I		Azarias	Azariah	?956–?917
17.		?Amariah II		Jehoachash	?917–?887
18.	?Johanan		Joram	Jehoiarib	?887–884
19			Issus	Jehoshaphat	884–883
20.		Jehoiada	Axioramus	Jehoiadah	883–838
21.			Phideas	Phadaiah	838–?837
22.		?Zechariah	Sudeas	Zedekiah	?837–?809
23.	Azariah II	?Azariah II	Juelus	Joel	?809–?776
24.	?Amariah III		Jotham	Jotham	?776–?742
25.		Urijah	Urias	Uriah	?742–?730
26.	?[Ahitub II]	?Azariah III	Nerias	Neriah	?730–?700
27.	?Zadok		Odeas	Hosaiah	?700–?647
28.	Shallum	Meshullam	Sallumus	Shallum	?647–?634
29.	Hilkiah	Hilkiah	Elcias	Hilkiah	?634–?609
30.	Azariah IV	Azariah IV	——	Azariah	?609–?598
31.	Seraiah	Seraiah	Sareas		?598–588
32.	Jehozadak	Jozadak	Josedec	Jehozadak	588–?540
	Exile.				

No.	Passages of Scripture.	Joseph. *Ant.* v, 11, 5; viii, 1, 3; x, 8, etc.	B.C.
33.	Jeshua (Neh. xii, 10, 11.)		?540–?500
34.	Joiakim (Neh. xii, 10, 11.)		?500–?465
35.	Eliashib (Neh. xii, 10, 11.)		?465–?406
36.	Joiada (Neh. xii, 10, 11.)		406–371
37.	Jonathan (Neh. xii, 10, 11.)		371–339
38.	Jaddua (Neh. xii, 10, 11.)		339–319
39.		(Onias I)	319–302
40.		(Simon I)	302–293
41.		(Eleazar I)	293–260
42.		(Manasseh)	260–234
43.		(Onias II)	234–219
44.		(Simon II)	219–199
45.		(Onias III)	199–175
46.		(Jason)	175–173
47.		Onias IV	173–162
48.		Jacimus	162–160
49.		Jonathan	160–143
50.		Simon III	143–135
51.		Hyrcanus I	135–106
52.		Judas	106–105
53.		Alexander	105–78
54.		Hyrcanus II	78–41
55.		Antigonus	41–37
56.		(Ananeel)	37–35
57.		(Aristobulus)	35
58.		(Jesus I)	35–23
59.		(Simon IV)	23–5
60.		(Matthias I)	5–4
61.		(Joazar)	B.C. 4–1 A.D. 1–4, 5–7
62.		(Eleazar II)	4
63.		(Jesus II)	4–5
64.	Annas	(Ananus I)	7–21
65.		(Ishmael I)	21–22
66.		(Eleazar III)	22–23
67.		(Simon V)	23–25
68.	Caiaphas	(Joseph I)	25–36
69.		(Jonathan I)	36–37
70.		(Theophilus)	37–42
71.		(Simon VI)	42–43
72.		(Matthias II)	43–44
73.		(Elioneus)	44–48
74.		(Joseph II)	48
75.	Ananias	(Ananias)	48–55
76.		(?Jonathan II)	
77.		(Ishmael II)	55–62
78.		(Joseph III)	62
79.		(Ananus II)	62
80.		(Jesus III)	62–65
81.		(Jesus IV)	65–69
82.		(Matthias III)	69–70
83.		(Phannias)	70

Highway (usually מְסִלָּה, *mesillah'*, or [Isa. xxxv, 8] מַסְלוּל, *maslul'*, a *raised road* [see CAUSEWAY] for public use; elsewhere simply אֹרַח, *o'rach*, a *path*, or דֶּרֶךְ, *de'rek*, ὁδός, a "*way*" in general; once [Amos v, 16] חוּץ, *chuts*, *outside*). Travellers have frequently noticed the lack of roads in Palestine. Travel and transport being all performed on the backs of beasts of burden, which usually move in single file, the most important routes are only marked by narrow winding paths; and the soil is often so hard as to take no impression from the feet of animals, so that the eye of an unpractised traveller there perceives, even upon a common thoroughfare, no evidence that others have passed along the same way. No repairs are ever made, no labor employed to remove obstacles.—Bastow. Hence the striking character of the figure by which the preparation for the return of the captives and the Messiah's advent are announced as the construction of a grand thoroughfare for their march (Isa. xi, 16; xxxv, 8; xl, 3; lxii, 10). The Romans, however, during their occupancy of Palestine, constructed several substantial roads, which are laid down in the ancient itineraries, and remains of which subsist to this day. De Saulcy (*Dead Sea*, i, 392) fancied he discovered traces of the old Moabitish highways (Numb. xx, 17). See ROAD.

Higuerra, HIERONYMUS ROMANUS DE LA, a

Spanish Jesuit and historian, was born at Toledo in 1538. He established his reputation by fabricating supposed histories. Thus he composed *Cronicones*, fragments, which he announced as copies of MSS. found at Worms, and the work of Flavius Lucius Dexter, Marcus Maximus, and others, purporting to throw light on the introduction of Christianity into Spain. Father Bivar, who believed these chronicles genuine, added a commentary, and published them at Saragossa in 1619. They were reprinted at Cadiz (1627), at Lyons (1627), and at Madrid (1640, fol.).—Ticknor, *Hist. of Spanish Lit.* iii, 153; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxiv, 658 sq.

Hilaire. See HILARIUS.

Hilali Codex OF THE O. T. See MANUSCRIPTS.

Hilaria, a festival among the ancient Romans, which they observed in the Kalends, April 8, or on March 25, in honor of the goddess Cybele. Its name it derived from the occasion, which was one of general mirth and joy. The citizens went in processions through the streets, carrying the statue of Cybele. Masquerades, and all sorts of disguises, were also permitted. The day preceding the festival, in contrast with the festive day which was to follow, was a day of mourning. The reason for this is that "Cybele represented the earth, which at that time of the year begins to feel the kindly warmth of the spring, and to pass from winter to summer; so that this sudden transition from sorrow to joy was an emblem of the vicissitudes of the seasons, which succeeded one another."—Broughton, *Biblioth. Historico-Sacra*, i, 494.

Hilariānus, a youthful martyr of the 2d century, one of a band of Christians in an inland town of Numidia who were arraigned before the Roman proconsul for attending the Christian meetings. The proconsul supposed that the child would be easily intimidated; but, when threats were applied, he said, "Do what you please; I am a Christian."—Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 152.

Hilario or **Hilarianus**, Q. JULIUS, an ecclesiastical writer of the 4th century. We have no details concerning his life, as none are given either in his own works or in those of his contemporaries. He is considered as the author of *Expositum de die Paschæ et Mensis*, at the end of Lactantius's works (Par. 1712), and in Galland, *Bibl. Patrum* (vol. viii, app. ii, p. 745, Venice, 1772, fol.):—*De Mundi Duratione*, or *De Cursu Temporum*, first published by Pithou in the Appendix to his *Biblioth. Patrum* (Paris, 1579), and afterwards reprinted in Galland, viii, 235. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Lat. med. et infim. ætatis*, iii, 251; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 665.

Hilarion, ST., of Palestine, was born near Gaza about 291. He had been a heathen, but at Alexandria he frequented the Christian schools, and was baptized there in 306. The accounts of him, which abound in incredible stories, are to the following purport: Returning home in 307, he gave away all he had, and retired to a desert near Magum, not far from Gaza, where he led a strictly ascetic life. His protracted fasts and religious exercises gained him the reputation of a saint, and attracted a large number of disciples. When their numbers became too great, he formed colonies of them in various parts of Palestine and Syria, and thus established several monasteries, which he continued to visit and govern. Having gone to Alexandria for the anniversary of the death of St. Anthony, he was on his return reputed to work miracles, such as producing rain, ridding the country of snakes, etc. An attempt having been made against his life by the inhabitants of Gaza, Hilarion retired to Libya, and afterwards to Sicily, but his miracles everywhere betrayed him(!). He afterwards went to Epidaurus (now Raguse), in Dalmatia, where the legend says he prevented an inundation of the town. To avoid the popularity this miracle had gained him, he embarked secretly for Cyprus with his disciple Hesychius, and hid himself in the neighborhood of Paphos. Here again he was discovered, and from all sides they brought sick people to him, whom he cured by the laying on of hands. He died in the island in 371, and his remains, brought back to Palestine by Hesychius, were buried near Magum. The Roman Catholic Church commemorates him on the 21st of October. See Jerome, *Vita Hilarioni;* Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iii, cap. 14; lib. v, cap. 9; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, vol. iii, 21 Oct.; Richard et Géraud, *Biblioth. Sacr.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 666; Taylor, *Ancient Christanity*, i, 308, 309; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. ii; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchen-Gesch.* s. v.; Tillemont, *Mém.* viii, 987.

Hilarius Arelatensis, ST. (HILARY, bishop OF ARLES), was born about A.D. 403, of a noble family, and at an early age attached himself to Honoratus, first abbot of Lerins. When about twenty-five years of age he accompanied Honoratus to his see of Arles, but shortly left it to pursue a monastic life, removed from the cares and bustle of the world. His patron Honoratus dying A.D. 430, Hilary was elected bishop, but he accepted the office with great reluctance. In discharging its functions he conducted himself as an humble and charitable man, but as a rather severe and haughty ecclesiastic. A.D. 455 Hilary deposed the bishop of Vasontis, Chelidonius, on a charge of having violated the canon law in becoming a priest notwithstanding he had formerly married a *widow.* Celidonius referred the matter to pope Leo, but Hilary refused to acknowledge the papal jurisdiction in the matter. Pope Leo, jealous of his own authority, and always anxious to extend his power, was very wrathful at Hilary's summary proceedings, nor could Leo be appeased, though the bishop of Arles took a journey on foot to Rome in order to set matters right. Each saint adhered to his own opinion, and they parted with mutual ill will, and by a rescript of Valentinian in 445, the metropolitan of Gaul was made virtually subordinate to the papal see. Hilary died A.D. 449. His works extant are, *Vita Sancti Honorati*, a panegyric:—*Epistola ad Eucharium*, both of which may be found in *Bib. Max. Patr.* vol. vii. Waterland attributes the composition of the Athanasian Creed to Hilary (*Treatise on Athan. Creed*). See Cave, *Hist. Lit.;* Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* vi, 54; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* i, 340; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, ii, 191; Waterland, *Works*, i, 8; iii, 214 sq.; Milner, *Hist. Ch. Christ*, ii, 317; Riddle, *Christ. Antiquities;* Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i, 272 sq.

Hilarius Diacŏnus, a deacon of the Church of Rome in the 4th century, who was sent by pope Liberius, with Lucifer of Cagliari and others, to plead the cause of the orthodox faith before Constantius at the Council of Milan. His boldness was so offensive that he was scourged and banished by order of the emperor. He afterwards supported the violent opinion of Lucifer (q. v.) that all Arians and heretics must be rebaptized upon applying to be restored to communion in the Church. Two treatises, of doubtful authenticity, are ascribed to him: (1.) *Comm. in Epist. Pauli* (published often with the works of Ambrose); (2.) *Quæst. in Vet. et Nov. Test.*, published with the works of Augustine (Benedictine edit. t. iii, App.). The Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose inform us that the manuscripts of the "Commentary" on St. Paul's Epistles differ considerably, and that in some parts there appear to be interpolations of long passages. This commentary is said by Dupin to be "clear, plain, and literal, and to give the meaning of the text of St. Paul well enough; but it gives very different explanations from St. Augustine in those places which concern predestination, provocation, grace, and free will."—Lardner, *Works*, iv, 382; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. iv, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 43; Dupin, *Eccles. Writ.* cent. iv; *English Cyclopædia.*

Hilarius Pictaviensis (HILARY, ST., bishop OF POITIERS), one of the most distinguished opponents of Arianism in the 4th century, was a native of the city whose name he bears. He was of noble descent, but a heathen. Having become a convert to the Christian faith, he was baptized, together with his wife and daughter. He was subsequently made bishop, about 350, not-

withstanding his being a married man. In 356 he defended Athanasius, in the Council of Béziers, against Saturninus, bishop of Arles (said to have been an Arian, and to have held communion with Ursatius and Valens). For this defense he was, by order of Constantius, exiled to Phrygia, but he still continued to defend the principles of the Church against the Eastern bishops, most of whom were Arians. "In 359 he attended the Council of Seleucia, in Isauria, which had been summoned by order of Constantius, and boldly defended the doctrine of the Trinity against the Arian bishops, who formed the majority of the council. He afterwards followed the deputies of the council to the emperor's court, and presented a petition to Constantius, in which he desired permission to dispute publicly with the Arians in the emperor's presence. In order to get rid of so formidable an opponent, the Arians, it is said, induced the emperor to send him away from the court; but previous to his departure, Hilarius wrote an invective against Constantius, in which he denounced him as Antichrist, and described him as a person who had only professed Christianity in order that he might deny Christ. After the Catholic bishops had recovered their liberty under Julian, Hilarius assembled several councils in Gaul for the re-establishment of the Catholic faith and the condemnation of Arian bishops. He also travelled in Italy for the same purpose, and used every exertion to purify the churches of that country from all Arian heresies. When Auxentius was appointed bishop of Milan by the emperor Valentinian in 364, Hilarius presented a petition to the emperor, in which he denounced Auxentius as a heretic. Though this charge was denied by Auxentius, Hilarius still continued his attacks upon him for heterodoxy, and created so much confusion in the city that he was at length ordered to retire to his own diocese, where he died in the year 367."

In theology, Hilary maintained the Athanasian doctrines with so much vigor that he acquired the name of *Malleus Arianorum*. His exegetical writings show evident marks of the influence of Origen. Of his commentary on the Psalms, Jerome says, "*In quo opere imitatus Origenem, nonnulla etiam de suo addidit.*" His theological system is to be gathered chiefly from his *De Trinitate*, lib. xii. He maintains the essential oneness and equality of the Son with the Father. As to the Holy Spirit, he teaches that "faith in him is necessarily connected with confessing the Father and the Son, and to know this is sufficient. If any one ask what the Holy Spirit is, and is not satisfied with the answer that he is through him and from him through whom are all things; that he is the Spirit of God, and his gift to believers, even apostles and prophets will not satisfy such a person, for they only assert this of him, that he is (*De Trinit.* ii, 29). He does not venture to attribute to him the name of God, because the Scripture does not so call him expressly, yet it says that the Holy Spirit searches the deep things of God, and it therefore follows that he partakes the divine essence (*De Trinit.* xii, 55)." His view of the *body* of Christ is not entirely free from Docetism; and in speaking of the human soul, he seems to think that the idea of a creature includes that of corporeity (*Comm. in Matt.* v, 8). As to predestination, he "emphatically asserted the harmonious connection between grace and free-will, the powerlessness of the latter, and yet its importance as a condition of the operation of divine grace. 'As the organs of the human body,' he says (*De Trinit.* ii, 35), 'cannot act without the addition of moving causes, so the human has, indeed, the capacity for knowing God; but if it does not receive through faith the gift of the Holy Spirit, it will not attain to that knowledge. Yet the gift of Christ stands open to all, and that which all want is given to every one as far as he will accept it.' 'It is the greatest folly,' he says in another passage, 'not to perceive that we live in dependence on and through God, when we imagine that in things which men undertake and hope for, they may venture to depend on their own strength. What we have, we have from God; on him must all our hope be placed' (*Comm. in Psa.* li). Accordingly, he did not admit an unconditional predestination; he did not find it in the passages in Rom. ix respecting the election of Esau, commonly adduced in favor of it, but only a predestination conditioned by the divine foreknowledge of his determination of will; otherwise every man would be born under a necessity of sinning (*Comm. in Psa.* lvii)."

As a writer Hilary is copious, and fertile in thought and illustration, but often turgid and obscure in style. A pretty full analysis of his writings is given in Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, i, 302 sq. The chief among them are, 1. *Ad Constantium Augustum Liber Primus*, written, it is believed, A.D. 355, to demand from the emperor protection against the persecutions of the Arians:—2. *Commentarius* (s. *Tractatus*) *in Evangelium Matthæi* (A.D. 356), in the tone and spirit of Origen: it is repeatedly quoted by Jerome and Augustine. The preface, quoted in Cassianus (*De Incarn.* vii, 24), is lost:—3. *De Synodis Fidei Catholicæ contra Arianos*, etc., or *Epistola* (A.D. 358), explaining the views of the Eastern Church on the Trinity, and showing that their difference from the Western Church lay more in the expressions than in the dogma:—4. *De Trinitate Libri xii*, s. *Contra Arianos*, s. *De Fide*, etc. (A.D. 360), his most important work, and the first great controversial treatise on the Trinity in the Latin Church:—5. *Ad Constantium Augustum Liber secundus* (A.D. 360), a petition concerning his banishment, and a vindication of his principles:—6. *Contra Constantium Augustum Liber*, a virulent attack against Constantius, which has been mentioned above. It is remarkable, inasmuch as it confines the creed to the words of Scripture, and proves that some of the fundamental doctrines of the Romish Church, as opposed to the Protestant, had already been called in question at that time:—7. *Commentarii* (s. *Tractatus*, s. *Expositiones*) *in Psalmos*, general reflections upon the spirit of different psalms, written in the manner of Origen:—8. *Fragmenta Hilarii*, containing passages from a lost work on the synods of Seleucia and Ariminum, etc., first published by Faber in 1598. Some of his works are lost, and others have been erroneously attributed to him. The works of Hilarius have been published by Miræus (Paris, 1544), Erasmus (Basel, 1523; reprinted 1526, 1535, 1550, 1570), Gillot (Paris, 1572; reprinted, with several improvements, 1605, 1631, 1652); by Dom Constant, of the Benedictines (Paris, 1693, deemed by some the best edition), the Marquis de Maffei (Verona, 1730), and Oberthür (1781–88, 4 vols. 8vo). See *Vita S. Hilarii, operibus ejus a Dom. Constant collectis præfixa; Gallia Christiana*, vol. ii, col. 1038; *Hist. littér. de la France*, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 139; Cave, *Scriptores Eccles.* i, 213; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vii, 432; Oudin, *Script. Ecclesiastici*, i, 426; Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques*, v, 1; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 660; Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biogr.* vol. ii; *English Cyclopædia;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 84 sq.; Dorner, *Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, i, 1037; Dupin, *Ecclesiastical Writers*, cent. iv; Neander, *History of Dogmas;* Neander, *Ch.-History*, ii, 396, 419, 427, 559; Waterland, *Works;* Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* i, 248; Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe*, ii, 13, 151; Shedd, *Guericke's Ch. History*, p. 294, 322, 372; Milner, *Hist. Ch. Christ*, ii, 81; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* vi, 46; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, Milman's ed., ii, 320; Schaff, *Hist. Chr. Church*, iii, 589, 664, 959 sq.; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, i, 399; xi, 299; Lardner, *Works*, iv, 178; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities;* Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* i, 1476; Milman, *Hist. Christianity*, ii, 437 sq.; iii, 106, 286, 356; Baur, *Dogmengeschichte;* Taylor, *Ancient Christianity*, i, 223, 326; *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1853, p. 241; *Brit. and For. Evangel. Rev.* Oct. 1866, p. 689.

Hilarius or **Hilarus I**, Pope, or, rather, bishop of Rome, was a Sardinian by birth, and succeeded Leo the Great in the year 461. "He had been employed by Leo in important affairs; among others, he was sent as legate to the Robber Council of Ephesus (q. v.) in 449,

against the Eutychians, and was well versed in matters concerning the discipline of the Church, which he displayed great zeal in enforcing. He interfered in the election and consecration of bishops by their metropolitans in France and Spain, and justified his interference by alleging the pre-eminence of the see of Rome over all the sees of the West, a pre-eminence which he, however, acknowledged, in one of his letters, to be derived from the emperor's favor. He also forbade bishops nominating their successors, a practice which was then frequent. He, however, did not declare elections or nominations to be illegal merely from his own authority, but assembled a council to decide on those questions. Hilarius died at Rome in 467." See *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, ii, 141 sq.; Jaffé, *Regesta Pont. Rom.* p. 48, 933.

Hilary. See HILARIUS.

Hilda, ST., the celebrated abbess of Whitby, was grand-niece of Edwin, king of Northumbria, and conspicuous for piety and devotion to the Christian faith from the age of thirteen. When, after the death of Edwin, the Northumbrians relapsed into idolatry, Hilda withdrew, probably, into East Anglia, but returned to Northumbria on the accession of Oswald, and, devoting herself to a life of celibacy, founded a small nunnery on the Wear. She subsequently (about A.D. 650) became abbess of Heorta, now Hartlepool, where she remained seven years. Oswy, the brother and successor of the gentle and virtuous Oswald, when marching to defend his throne and faith against Penda, the pagan king of Mercia, vowed that if the Lord vouchsafed to him the victory, he would devote to his service in holy virginity his infant daughter, the princess Elfleda. Having defeated and slain his dreaded foe near Leeds, in Yorkshire, Oswy, in pursuance of his vow, committed Elfleda, with princely gifts in lands, etc., to the care of Hilda. Soon afterwards Hilda purchased ten "hides" of land at Streoneshalb, now Whitby, and erected a new monastery, in which she, as abbess, took up her abode with her royal charge. The wealth of this monastery, and the dignity and high religious character of Hilda, made it the most celebrated in England, and a nursery of eminent men, among whom may be mentioned Hedda, Wilfrid, and Cædmon, the poet. Dugdale (as quoted by Mrs. Jameson) says that Hilda "was a professed enemy to the extension of the papal jurisdiction in this country, and opposed with all her might the tonsure of priests and the celebration of Easter according to the Roman ritual." She died in November, 680, aged sixty-three years, and was succeeded as abbess by Elfleda. Among the marvels related of her are that a nun at Hakenes saw angels conveying her soul to bliss, and that certain fossils found near Whitby having the form of coiled snakes were those reptiles thus changed by the power of her prayers.—Smith, *Rel. of Anc. Brit.* p. 343-47; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, Nov. 18; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* (Anglo-Saxon Period), see Index; Jameson, *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, p. 58-62. (J. W. M.)

Hildebert OF TOURS (HILDEBERTUS TURONENSIS), in 1097 bishop of Mans, and in 1125 archbishop of Tours, was born about 1055 at Lavardin. Though accused of licentiousness before his admission to the Church, he became one of its brightest ornaments for piety and learning. During the time of his being bishop of Mans, he and his church suffered much from the contests of William Rufus and Helie, count of Mans; nor was he much more fortunate in his archbishopric, for he fell under the displeasure of Louis the Fat because he refused to dispose of his Church patronage as the king desired: the disagreement was at last settled, and Hildebert restored to favor. He wrote with great severity against the vices of the court of Rome. Hildebert had great "independence of mind, practical sense, and a degree of taste which preserved him from falling into the vain and puerile discussions of his contemporaries." His *Tractatus Philosophicus* and his *Moralis Philosophia*, which are considered his best productions, are the first essays towards a popular system of theology. He died A.D. 1134. His epistles and sermons were quite numerous; they are collected in the best edition of his works, *Opera tam edita quam inedita, studio Beaugendre* (Benedictine, Paris, 1708, fol.). See Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xi, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 74; *Vita Hildeberti*, prefixed to his works (complete list of his works to be found in Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* 1 vol.); *Gallia Christiana*, t. xiv; Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lexikon*, vii, 919; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* p. 454; Neander, *Ch. Hist.*; Neander, *Hist. Christ. Dogmas*, p. 533; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Christl. Religions und Kirchengesch.* ii, 300 sq.; Tenneman, *Man. of Philos.* p. 218.

Hildebrand. See GREGORY VII.

Hildegarde or **Hildegardis**, abbess of St. Rupert's Mount, on the Rhine, was born at Böckelhein, in Germany, A.D. 1098. She attracted much attention by her pretended revelations and visions, which were held to be supernatural, and obtained the countenance of Bernard and others, and at last the approval of Eugenius III and the three succeeding popes, together with numerous prelates. She wrote *Three Books of Revelations* (Coloniæ, 1628):—*Life of St. Robert*:—three *Epistles*, various *Questions*, and an *Exposition of St. Benedict's Rule* (all Colon. 1566). Most of them may also be found in *Bibl. Max. Patrum*, vol. xxiii. She died A.D. 1180.—Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iv, 217, 586; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xii, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 71; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Sept. 17; Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lexikon*, vii, 921.

Hildegonde, a female saint of the Romish Church, whose history is, in fact, a satire on Romish saintship. She is said to have been born at Nuitz, in the diocese of Cologne, towards the middle of the 12th century. Her father having made a vow to visit the Holy Land, she accompanied him, dressed in man's clothes, under the name of *Joseph*. Her father dying, however, on the way, he intrusted her to a man who, after conducting her to Jerusalem and back to Ptolemais, abandoned her in a state of destitution. After various vicissitudes, she came back to Cologne, entered the service of a canon, and finally, in 1185, retired to a Cistercian convent near Heidelberg, where she died April 20, 1188. She was known to the other monks only as *Brother Joseph*, and her sex was not discovered until after her death. The Cistercians commemorate her on the 20th of April. Her life was written by Cæsarius of Heisterbach. See Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, April 20; the Bollandists' *Acta Sanct.*; Richard et Giraud, *Biblioth. Sacrée*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 675.

Hildersham, ARTHUR, a pious and learned Puritan divine, was born at Stechworth, Cambridgeshire, October 6, 1563, of an honorable family. He was brought up a papist, and educated at Christ's College, Cambridge; but while there he avowed himself a Protestant, and was, in consequence, cast off by his father. The earl of Huntingdon, a distant kinsman, on hearing of the circumstance, became his patron, and carried him through the university. In 1587 he was settled as preacher at Ashby de la Zouch, in Leicestershire, where (though often persecuted, and forced to change his dwelling) he lived for the most part of forty-three years, with great success in his ministry, beloved and revered by all classes. He suffered for conscience' sake in 1598, 1605, 1611, 1612, 1616, and 1630, being repeatedly silenced, deprived, censured, and fined to the amount of two thousand pounds by the Court of High Commission. He died March 4, 1631. His character was rich in Christian excellence. His published works consist of *One Hundred and Eight Lectures on John* iv (2d edit. Lond. 1632, fol.):—*Eight Sermons on Psa.* lxxv (1632, fol.):—*One Hundred and Fifty-two Sermons on Psa.* li (London, 1635, fol.):—*A Treatise on the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*:—*Sermons on Fasting*, etc. (Lond. 1633, fol.).—Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, i, 329, 546; Middleton, *Biog. Evangel.* iii, 25; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* vi, 70.

Hildesley, MARK, a clergyman of the Church of England, was born in 1698 at Murson, Kent. Educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, he became, in 1735, after filling several minor positions, rector of Holwell, Bedfordshire, and in 1755 bishop of Sodor and Man. He died December 7, 1772. He was instrumental in the translation of the Scriptures into the Manx language. See Weeden Butler, *Life;* Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* vi, 71.

Hildreth, HOSEA, a Congregational minister, was born in Massachusetts, January 2, 1782. He was graduated at Harvard College in 1805, and was engaged for a number of years in teaching, being professor of mathematics in Phillips Exeter Academy from 1811 to 1825. He had studied divinity in the mean time, and was installed minister of First Parish, Gloucester, Mass., on leaving Exeter Academy. His liberal views, and his persistence in exchanging with Unitarians, caused his separation from the Essex Association. He was an active pioneer in the Temperance reform. His death occurred in 1835. He was the author of various essays and sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, viii, 445.

Hildulf, also **Hidulf**, OF ST. IDON, flourished in the second half of the 7th century, and is said to have been bishop of Trier under king Pepin. This position he resigned, and founded a monastery in the Vogese mountains. Rettberg (*Kirchen-Gesch. Deutschl.* i, 467 sq.; 522 sq.) is inclined to think that Hildulf never held a bishopric. Many biographies have been published of him.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 96. (J. H. W.)

Hi'len (1 Chron. vi, 58). See HOLON.

Hilki'ah (Heb. *Chilkiyah'*, חִלְקִיָּה, *portion of Jehovah;* often in the prolonged form *Chilkiya'hu*, חִלְקִיָּהוּ, 2 Kings xviii, 18, 26; xxii, 4, 8, 14; xxiii, 4, 24; 1 Chron. xxvi, 11; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 9, 14, 15, 18, 20, 22; Isa. xxii, 20; xxxvi, 3, 32; Jer. i, 1; Sept. Χελκίας), the name of a number of men, all priests or Levites.

1. The son of Amzi and father of Amaziah, the sixth in descent from Merari, son of Levi (1 Chron. vi, 45). B.C. long ante 1014.

2. The second son of Hosah, of the family of Merari, appointed by David as a doorkeeper of the tabernacle (1 Chron. xxvi, 11). B.C. cir. 1014.

3. The father of Eliakim, which latter was overseer of the house (Temple) at the time of Sennacherib's invasion (2 Kings xviii, 18, 26, 37; Isa. xxii, 20; xxxvi, 3). B.C. ante 713.

4. The father of Gemariah and companion of Elasah, who were sent with a message to the captives at Babylon (Jer. xxix, 3). B.C. long ante 587. He was possibly identical with the foregoing.

5. The father of the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. i, 1). B.C. ante 628.

6. Son of Shallum (1 Chron. vi, 13; Ezra vii, 1), or Meshullam (1 Chron. ix, 11; Neh. xi, 11), and father of Azariah, the high-priest who assisted Josiah in his work of reformation (2 Kings xxii, 4-14; xxiii, 4, 24; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 9-22; xxxv, 8). B.C. 623. "He is especially remarkable for the discovery which he made in the house of the Lord of a book which is called 'The Book of the Law' (2 Kings xxii, 8), and 'The Book of the Covenant' (xxiii, 2). That this was some well-known book is evident from the form of the expression" (Kitto). "Kennicott (*Heb. Text.* ii, 299) is of opinion that it was the original autograph copy of the Pentateuch written by Moses which Hilkiah found. He argues from the peculiar form of expression in 2 Chron. xxxiv, 14, סֵפֶר תּוֹרַת יְהוָֹה בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה, 'the book of the law of Jehovah by the hand of Moses;' whereas in the fourteen other places in the O. T. where the law of Moses or the book of Moses is mentioned, it is either 'the book of Moses,' or 'the law of Moses,' or 'the book of the law of Moses.' But the argument is far from conclusive, because the phrase in question may quite as properly signify 'the book of the law of the Lord given through Moses.' Compare the expression ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου (Gal. iii, 19), and בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה (Exod. ix, 35; xxxv, 29; Neh. x, 29; 2 Chron. xxxv, 6; Jer. l, 1). Though, however, the copy cannot be proved to have been Moses's autograph from the words in question, it seems probable that it was such, from the place where it was found, viz. in the Temple; and, from its not having been discovered before, but only being brought to light on the occasion of the repairs which were necessary, and from the discoverer being the high-priest himself, it seems natural to conclude that the particular part of the Temple where it was found was one not usually frequented, or ever by any but the high-priest. Such a place exactly was the one where we know the original copy of the law was deposited by command of Moses, viz. by the side of the ark of the covenant within the vail, as we learn from Deut. xxxi, 9, 26" (Smith). "That it was the entire Pentateuch is the opinion of Josephus, Von Lengerke, Keil, Ewald, Hävernick, etc.; but others think it was only part of that collection, and others that it was simply a collection of laws and ordinances appointed by Moses, such as are given in the Pentateuch, and especially in Deuteronomy. The objection to its being the whole Pentateuch is the improbability of that being read in the audience of the people at one time, as was this book (xxiii, 2); and there are many circumstances which render it probable that what was read to the people was the book of Deuteronomy, as the apparent allusion to Deut. xxix, 1, and xxx, 2, in xxiii, 2, 3, and the special effect which the reading of the book had on the king, who did, in consequence, just what one impressed by such passages as occur in Deut. xvi, 18, etc., would be likely to do. At the same time, even if we admit that the part actually read consisted only of the summary of laws and institutions in Deuteronomy, it will not follow that that was the only part of the Pentateuch found by Hilkiah; for, as the matter brought before his mind by Huldah the prophetess (2 Kings xxii, 15 sq.) respected the restoration of the worship of Jehovah, it might be only to what bore on that that the reading specially referred. The probability is that the book found by Hilkiah was the same which was intrusted to the care of the priests, and was to be put in the side of the ark (Deut. xxxi, 9-26); and that this was the entire body of the Mosaic writing, and not any part of it, seems the only tenable conclusion (Hengstenberg, *Beiträge*, ii, 159 sq.)"

7. One of the chief priests (contemporary with Jeshua as high-priest) who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 7). His son Hashabiah is named in ver. 21. B.C. 536.

8. One of those who supported Ezra on the right hand while reading the law to the people (Neh. viii, 4). B.C. cir. 410. It is somewhat uncertain whether he even belonged to the Levitical family; the date of the events with which he is associated seems to forbid his identification with the foregoing.

Hill is the rendering of the following original words in the Auth. Vers. of the Bible. See PALESTINE.

1. *Gib'ah'*, גִּבְעָה, from a root akin to גָּבַע, to *be high*, which seems to have the force of *curvature* or humpishness. A word involving this idea is peculiarly applicable to the rounded hills of Palestine, and from it are derived, as has been pointed out under GIBEAH, the names of several places situated on hills. Our translators have been consistent in rendering *gib'ah* by "hill:" in four passages only qualifying it as "little hill," doubtless for the more complete antithesis to "mountain" (Psa. lxv, 12; lxxii, 3; cxiv, 4, 6). See TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

2. But they have also employed the same English word for the very different term *har*, הַר, which has a much more extended sense than *gib'ah*, meaning a whole district rather than an individual eminence, and to which our word "*mountain*" answers with tolerable accuracy. This exchange is always undesirable, but it sometimes occurs so as to confuse the meaning of a passage where it is desirable that the topography should

be unmistakable. For instance, in Ezek. xxiv, 4, the "hill" is the same which is elsewhere in the same chapter (ver. 12, 13, 18, etc.) and book consistently and accurately rendered "mount" and "mountain." In Numb. xiv, 44, 45, the "hill" is the "mountain" of verse 40, as also in Deut. i, 41, 43, compared with 24, 44. In Josh. xv, 9, the allusion is to the Mount of Olives, correctly called "mountain" in the preceding verse; and so also in 2 Sam. xvi, 13. The country of the "hills," in Deut. i, 7; Josh. ix, 1; x, 40; xi, 16, is the elevated district of Judah, Benjamin, and Ephraim, which is correctly called "the mountain" in the earliest descriptions of Palestine (Numb. xiii, 29), and in many subsequent passages. The "holy hill" (Psa. iii, 4), the "hill of Jehovah" (xxiv, 3), the "hill of God" (lxviii, 15), are nothing else than "Mount Zion." In 2 Kings i, 9, and iv, 27, the use of the word "hill" obscures the allusion to Carmel, which in other passages of the life of the prophet (e. g. 1 Kings xviii, 19; 2 Kings iv, 25) has the term "mount" correctly attached to it. Other places in the historical books in which the same substitution weakens the force of the narrative are as follows: Gen. vii, 19; Deut. viii, 7; Josh. xiii, 6; xviii, 13, 14; Judg. xvi, 3; 1 Sam. xxiii, 14; xxv, 20; xxvi, 13; 2 Sam. xiii, 34; 1 Kings xx, 23, 28; xxii, 17, etc. See MOUNTAIN.

3. On one occasion the word *ma'aleh'*, מַעֲלֶה, is rendered "hill," viz. 1 Sam. ix, 11, where it would be better to employ "ascent," or some similar term. See MAALEH.

4. In the N. T. the word "hill" is employed to render the Greek word βουνός; but on one occasion it is used for ὄρος, elsewhere "mountain," so as to obscure the connection between the two parts of the same narrative. The "hill" from which Jesus was coming down in Luke ix, 36, is the same as "the mountain" into which he had gone for his transfiguration the day before (comp. verse 28). In Matt. v, 14, and Luke iv, 29, ὄρος is also rendered "hill," but not with the inconvenience just noticed. In Luke i, 39, the "hill country" (ἡ ὀρεινή) is the same "mountain of Judah" to which frequent reference is made in the Old Testament. See JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

HILL-GODS (אֱלֹהֵי הָרִים, "gods of the hills") are mentioned (1 Kings xx, 23) by the heathenish Syrians as being those of the Hebrews, because more powerful; and such deities (*dii montium*), i. e. those that have their dwelling or throne on hills, whence they command control of all the region within view, were generally worshipped by the ancient pagans (see Dougtæi *Anal.* i, 178; Deyling, *Observ.* iii, no. 12), sometimes in general (Gruter, *Inscript.* f. 21; Lactant. *Mort. persec.* 11), sometimes as individuals (Arnobius, *Adv. gentt.* iv, 9; Augustine, *Civ. dei*, iv, 8), since heights were generally regarded as seats of the gods (Herodotus, i, 131; Xenophon, *Mem.* iii, 8, 10; Strabo, xv, 732; Dougtæi *Anal.* i, 108; Rimptsch, *De sacris gentium in montibus*, Lipsiæ, 1719; Creuzer, *Symbolik*, i, 158 sq.; Gesenius, *Jesa.* ii, 282; Gramberg's *Religionsid.* i, 20). See HIGH PLACE. Grotius (ad loc.) specially compares the ὀρειβάτης *Pan.* (See Walch, *De deo Ebræor. montano*, Jen. 1746).

Hill, George, D.D., a divine of the Church of Scotland, born at St. Andrews in 1748. He was educated at the university of his native place, where he obtained the Greek professorship, and afterward that of divinity. He subsequently became principal of St. Mary's, chaplain to the king for Scotland, and fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and was long an ornament of the Church of Scotland. He died in 1819. Among his publications are, *Sermons* (1796, 8vo):—*Theological Institutes* (Edinb. 1803, 8vo):—*Lectures on portions of the Old Testament illustrative of the Jewish History* (Lond. 1812, 8vo). But his greatest work is his *Lectures in Divinity*, delivered to the students while principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews. Dr. Hill's doctrinal sentiments were, in consonance with the standards of the Church of Scotland, strongly Calvinistic. He was the successor of Dr. Robertson (1779) in the high office of moderate leader of the Assembly. The best editions of his *Lectures in Divinity* are those of Edinburgh (1825, 3 vols. 8vo) and New York (Carter & Brothers, 8vo). See Jones, *Christian Biog.*; Chalmers, *Posth. Works*, ix, 125; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 846; Hetherington, *Hist. Ch. of Scotland*, ii, 337.

Hill, George, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Charleston, S. C., February 20, 1797, was converted about 1817, entered the South Carolina Conference in 1820, was presiding elder on Savannah District in 1826–27–28, and then stationed at Milledgeville, where he died, August 22, 1829. Mr. Hill possessed, in rare combination, great firmness and great mildness, which, coupled with vigorous ability, made him an excellent administrative officer. He was studious, and deeply pious, "and was universally acknowledged to be a bold, powerful, and eminently successful minister."—*Min. of Confer.* ii, 117.

Hill, Green, a colonel in the Revolutionary army, and one of the pioneer preachers of Methodism in Tennessee, was born in North Carolina in 1741. The year 1780 is given as the first record of his preaching. The first Conference in North Carolina was held at his house in 1785. In 1799 he removed to Tennessee. He died in 1825. See McFerrin, *Methodism in Tennessee*, p. 302.

Hill, Noah, a learned Independent minister, was born at Cradley, England, 1739, and educated at Daventry, where he was classical master for ten years. He became rector of the Gravel Lane Chapel, London, 1771, and preached there thirty-seven years. He died in 1815. His *Sermons* (Lond. 1822, 8vo) are said to abound in felicitous illustrations.

Hill, Sir Richard, one of a family distinguished for piety, eccentricity, and usefulness, son of Sir Rowland Hill of Hawkestone, was born in 1733, and was educated at Westminster School and Magdalen College, Oxford. "In youth he was subject to deep religious impressions; he endeavored to remove them by dissipation on the Continent," but they were only deepened. On his return he sought advice from Fletcher of Madeley, and was converted. He became a zealous promoter of Methodism. When the "Methodist students" were expelled from Oxford, he wrote, in rebuke of that intolerant measure, a large pamphlet, entitled, *Pietas Oxoniensis: a full Account of the Expulsion of Six Students from St. Edmund's Hall* (Lond. 1768, 8vo). When the Calvinistic controversy arose among the Methodists, Hill took sides against Wesley and Fletcher, and wrote a number of virulent *Letters* to Mr. Fletcher (answered in Fletcher's *Checks to Antinomianism*). He also wrote, against Wesley, *The Farrago Double Distilled: a Review of Wesley's Doctrines; The Finishing Stroke*, and other pamphlets, answers to which may be found in Fletcher, as above, and in Wesley, *Works*, vol. vi. He afterward found better employment in writing *An Apology for Brotherly Love, against Daubeny's Guide* (Lond. 1798, 8vo), and *Letter to Mr. Malan on his Defense of Polygamy.* He preached as occasion demanded in dissenting chapels, and was an active and useful Christian throughout his life. He died in 1808. See Rose, *Gen. Biog. Dictionary*; Wesley, *Works*, vi, 144 sq.; Stevens, *History of Methodism*, vol. ii, ch. i and ii; Sidney, *Life of Sir Richard Hill* (Lond. 1839, 8vo).

Hill, Rowland, brother of Sir Richard Hill, a popular and pious, though eccentric minister, was born at Hawkestone Aug. 13th or 23d, 1744. His views were early directed towards the ministry in connection with the Church of England, and his religious life was greatly developed during his residence as a student at Eton and St. John's College, Cambridge, where he imbibed the principles of Whitefield and the Calvinistic Methodists, which he strenuously maintained through life. His religious zeal at college was strongly marked, but he did not allow it to interfere with his studies. He experienced the greatest difficulty in obtaining admission into the Church—six bishops refused in turn to ordain him, and he succeeded at length only through family

influence. After his ordination he resumed itinerancy, much against the wishes of his father. In 1773 he obtained the parish of Kingston, Somerset, and was married in the same year, yet still kept up his itinerant ministry. His vigor of thought, earnestness, eccentricity, and wit drew thousands to listen to him. In 1780 his father's death left him wealth; and, with the aid of his numerous friends, he built Surrey Chapel, London, in 1782. Here he preached to vast congregations for many years. He died April 11, 1833. In the controversy between the Arminian and Calvinistic Methodists Hill took an active part, and wrote several bitter pamphlets against John Wesley, especially *Imposture detected* (Bristol, 1777):—*Full Answer to John Wesley* (Bristol, 1777). When the strife ended Hill regretted his severe language, and suppressed one of his bitterest publications. See Sidney, *Life of Rowland Hill* (Lond. 1835, 8vo); Stevens, *History of Methodism*, vol. ii, ch. i and ii; Wesley, *Works*, iv, 473; vi, 193, 199.

Hill, William, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cumberland Co., Va., March 3, 1769. In 1785 he entered Hampden Sidney College. While there he embraced religion, and decided to study for the ministry. He graduated in 1788, and was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Hanover July 10, 1790. After acting for two years as missionary, he settled in Berkeley, Va., and in January, 1800, assumed charge of the Presbyterian Church in Winchester. In February, 1834, he became pastor of the Briery Presbyterian Church in Prince Edward Co., where he remained only two years, when impaired health obliged him to resign, and he returned to Winchester to pass the last days of his life. He died there Nov. 16, 1852. Dr. Hill was engaged on a *History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States*, intended to make two 8vo vols. He decided to publish it in numbers, but only a single number of it appeared. "In the great contest that issued in the division of the Church, Dr. Hill's judgment, sympathies, and acts were fully with the New School."—*Presb. Quarterly Review*, 1853; Sprague, *Annals*, iii, 563.

Hilla or **Hillel Codex** OF THE O. T. See MANUSCRIPTS.

Hil'lel (Heb. *Hillel'*, הִלֵּל, *praising;* Sept. Ἑλλήλ, Josephus, Ἕλληλος), a Pirathonite, father of the judge Abdon (Judg. xii, 13, 15). B.C. ante 1233.

Hillel I, HA-ZAKEN (הַזָּקֵן, or *the Great*), BEN-SIMON, was born at Babylon about B.C. 75. He was one of the most eminent Jewish rabbis, founder of a school which bore his name, and by his self-denying, holy life, and great wisdom and learning, exercised a very remarkable influence both upon the theology and literature of his nation. About B.C. 36 he came to Jerusalem, where, while obliged to work for his daily bread, he attended at the same time the lectures of Shemaja and Abtalion, then the presiding officers of the Sanhedrim. About B.C. 30 he was himself chosen president of the Sanhedrim. This office he held for forty years with great success. Etheridge says: "His administration, along with his coadjutor Shammai, forms an era in the history of rabbinical learning. His scholars were numbered by thousands. The Talmud commemorates eighty of them by name, among whom are the celebrated R. Jochanan ben-Zachai, and Jonathan ben-Uziel, the Chaldee Targumist on the Prophets." Some have asserted (Ginsburg *in Kitto*, among others) that by his teachings he prepared his people for the coming of Christ, but we are inclined to believe that, while Hillel was a most noble leader of the Jews, teaching as he did that the cardinal doctrine and aim of life is "to be gentle, showing all meekness to all men," and "when reviled not to revile again," yet his views of the prophecies rather inclined him to give warning to his nation—especially prepared, by their social and political discomfort, to look more intently for the coming of that mysterious king who, according to their idea, was to free them from the oppression of Herod as well as Cæsar, and establish in the land of Judah a throne that should have supremacy over all others—by asserting that "no such king will ever appear" (*Sanhedrim*). But it is undoubtedly true that he foresaw the dispersion of his nation, for the Talmud informs us that he drew up civil and political ordinances intended to regulate their relation to each other after their separation. While president of the Sanhedrim, his great aim was to give greater precision to the study of the law. Before his time tradition-learning had been divided into six hundred, or, as some have it, seven hundred sections. He simplified the subject by arranging this once complicated mass under six (Sedarim) treatises—the basis, really, of the future Mishna labors of Akiba, Chijja, and Jehuda Hakkodesh in this department. Hillel was also the first who laid down definite hermeneutical rules for the interpretation of the O. T. They are very important for a proper understanding of the ancient versions (Midrash). His colleague, the vice-president of the Sanhedrim, Shammai, became displeased with the liberality of Hillel's mind, and this finally resulted in the establishment of "the school of Shammai" by the side of "the school of Hillel." Their points of difference related to questions of jurisprudence and Church discipline, not to dogmas, yet their disputes caused great excitement among the Jews. Hillel's party finally prevailed, in consequence, it is said, of a *bath kol* (q. v.) in his favor. Jerome and some other writers have considered Hillel as the founder of the sect of Pharisees, and Shammai as the first Scribe. This, however, is an error, for the Scribes and Pharisees did not constitute two distinct sects, and, moreover, were anterior to these two teachers. Hillel died when Jesus was about ten years of age. It seems strange that Josephus makes no mention of Hillel. Arnold (in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 97, thinks that Pollio (*Ant.* xvi, 1, 1, 10) stands for Hillel. To the school of Hillel is attributed the authorship of *Megillath Beth Hashmonaim*, a work on the history of the Maccabees, now lost. See Bartolocci, *Magna Biblioth. Rabbin.* ii, 783–796; G. E. Geiger et H. Giessman, *Brevis Commentatio de Hillele et Schammai*, etc. (Altdorf, 1707, 4to); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 686; *Engl. Cyclopædia;* Fürst, *Kultur-gesch.* i, 13; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Literat.* p. 33; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, viii, 207; Jost, *Gesch. d. Israel.* i, 254; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bib. Liter.* ii, 303; Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebr.* ii, 824–8. (J. H. W.)

Hillel II, BEN-JEHUDAH III (sometimes called *the younger*, because a descendant of Hillel I, or the elder, q. v.), came to the presidency of the Sanhedrim about A.D. 330 (some say A.D. 258), which he held for about thirty-five years. As president of the Sanhedrim, he was, of course, the head of the Jewish school at Tiberias, and it is said that while in this position he was often consulted by Origen. Some think him the Ellel mentioned by Epiphanius (*adver. Hæres.* xxx, 4 sq.), who embraced the Christian faith on his death-bed. But this fact is unlikely, as the Jews of Hillel's time make no mention of it whatever. Had it occurred they would undoubtedly have execrated his name. It is an interesting fact, however, connected with Biblical literature to learn from Epiphanius that a Hebrew translation of the Gospel of John, of the Acts of the Apostles, and of Christ's genealogy as recorded by Matthew, existed at this early period of Christianity, for it is said of the Ellel above referred to, that a Hebrew translation of the parts of the N. T. just mentioned was found secreted in the cabinet of the nasi (president), subsequently to his death. Hillel is said to have convoked a rabbinical synod which adjusted the period of the sun with that of the moon in calculating time, though it was not used until the change introduced under Alphonso, king of Castile (Bartolocci, *Magna Bibliotheca Rabbinicarum*, ii, 415 sq.). This calendar, while it greatly facilitated the uniform observance of the Paschal festival and other great festivals, tended to promote unity among a people dispersed through so many lands. "If the acts of this synod had been handed down in a written form, we

should probably have had in them some light on the present discrepancies between the chronology of the Hebrew text and that of the Septuagint." It is generally believed that the rabbins of this synod fixed the epoch of the Creation at the vernal equinox, 3761 years before the birth of Christ. Indeed, Hillel's great reputation, nay, immortality, rests upon his introduction of the calendar (q. v.) of the Jewish year, used even at present with little variation. "According to this calendar, the difference between the solar and lunar year, upon which the cycle of the Jewish festivals depends, is yearly made up; the length of the month is made to approximate to the astronomical course of the moon, and attention is also paid in it to the Halachic matters connected with the Jewish festivals. It is based upon the cycle of nineteen years (מחזור הלבנה), introduced by the Greek astronomer Meton, in which occur seven intercalary years. Each year has ten unchangeable months of alternately twenty-nine and thirty days; the two autumnal months, *Cheshvan* and *Kislev*, which follow the important month *Tisri*, are left changeable [see HAPHTARAH], because they depend upon certain astronomical phenomena and the following points of Jewish law: 1. That the month of *Tisri* is never to begin with the day which, to a great extent, belongs to the former month. 2. The Day of Atonement is not to fall on the day before or after the Sabbath; and, 3. That the *Hosanna Day* is not to be on a Sabbath. It is impossible now to say with certainty how much of this calendar is Hillel's own, and how much he took from the national traditions, since it is beyond question that some astronomical rules were handed down by the presidents. This calendar Hillel introduced A.D. 359." A similarity of names has caused him to be considered as the author of a MS. copy of the O. T., which was preserved until the close of the 13th century, and was used to correct later copies. He died towards the close of the 4th century.—Rossi, *Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei*, p. 170, 171; Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebraica;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 688; Etheridge, *Introd. Hebr. Lit.* p. 138; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, iv, 386 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bib. Lit.* ii, 305. (J. H. W.)

Hiller, Matthias, a German Protestant theologian and Orientalist, was born at Stuttgard Feb. 15, 1646. He became professor of logic and metaphysics in 1692, and of Oriental languages and theology in 1698. In 1716 he exchanged these offices for the priory of Königsbronn, where he died, Feb. 11, 1725. He acquired great reputation by his works on philology and hermeneutics. He wrote *Sciagraphia Grammaticæ Hebrææ:* —*Lexicon Latino-Hebraïcum* (1685):—*De Arcano Keri et Kethib* (Tübing. 1692, 8vo), on the accentuation and punctuation of the Bible:—*Institutiones Linguæ Sanctæ* (several times reprinted, as Tubing. 1760, 8vo):—*Onomasticon Sacrum* (Tübingen, 1706, 4to, transl. into German by himself):—*Syntagmata hermeneutica quibus loca S. Scripturæ plurima ex Hebraico textu nove explicantur* (Tübingen, 1711, 4to):—*Hieroglyphicum:*—*De Origine Gentium Celticarum:*—*De Origine, diis et terra Palæstinorum:*—*De Plantis in S. Scriptura memoratis:*—*Hierophyticon* (Utrecht, 1725, 4to). See Fabricius, *Hist. Biblioth.* vi, 44; Ersch und Gruber, *Allg. Encyklopädie;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 689. (J. N. P.)

Hiller, Philip Frederick, one of the best and most prolific hymn writers of the Evangelical Church of Southern Germany, was born at Mühlhausen in 1699; educated under J. A. Bengel; became pastor at two or three little villages, and finally at Steinheim in 1732; lost his voice in 1751, and died in 1769. After his retirement from the pulpit he devoted himself especially to sacred poetry, and produced over 1000 hymns, many of which have great excellencies. It is said that, next to the Bible, his spiritual songs are perhaps the most widely circulated book in Würtemberg (Hurst's Hagenbach). A complete edition appeared at Reutlingen in 1844 and 1851.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. vi; Hagenbach, *Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries* (translated by Hurst), ii, 393; Winkworth, *Christian Singers of Germany*, p. 278.

Hillhouse, AUGUSTUS L., author of the beautiful hymn beginning "Trembling before thine awful throne," was born at New Haven, Conn., about 1792, and died in Paris March 14, 1859. He was a younger brother of James A. Hillhouse, the poet.—*New Englander*, xviii, 557.

Hilliard, TIMOTHY, a Congregational minister, was born in 1746 in Kensington, N. H. He graduated at Harvard College in 1764, and in 1768 was appointed tutor, in which position he remained until 1771, when he was ordained pastor at Barnstable. This charge he resigned April, 1783, and was installed co-pastor at Cambridge Oct. 27, where he remained until his death, May 9, 1790. He published the *Dudleian Lecture at Harvard College* (1788), and several occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 660.

Hillyer, ASA, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Sheffield, Mass., April 6, 1763; entered Yale College in 1782, and graduated in 1786. He was licensed to preach by the old Presbytery of Suffolk, L. I., in 1788, and was appointed to the churches at Connecticut Farms and Bottle Hill (now Madison, N. J., the seat of the Drew Theological Seminary), and shortly after (Sept. 29, 1789) was ordained and installed as pastor at the latter place. In the summer of 1801 he accepted an invitation to the church in Orange, "one of the largest and most influential in the state." Here he labored with great acceptance and success for more than thirty years. In 1818 he received the degree of D.D. from Alleghany College. In the disruption of the Presbyterian Church (1837), Dr. Hillyer sided with the New School. "But, though he regarded the division as an unwise measure, it never disturbed his pleasant relations with those of his brethren whose views and action in reference to it differed from his own" (G. N. Judd, in *Sprague's Annals*). He was a trustee of the College of New Jersey from 1811 to his death, and from 1812 until the division of the General Assembly one of the first directors of the theological seminary at Princeton. This school, too, he regarded to the last with undiminished interest.—Tuttle, (Rev. Samuel L.), *History of the Presbyterian Church, Madison, N. J.* p. 39 sq.; Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, iii, 533.

Himerius (Ἱμέριος), a celebrated Greek sophist and rhetorician, was born at Prusa, in Bithynia, A.D. 315. He received his education of Proæresius, whose rival he afterwards became. After travelling considerably in the East, he settled in Athens as teacher of rhetoric. He became very famous in his profession, having among his pupils Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, and other distinguished men. The emperor Julian, during his visit at Athens, A.D. 355, attracted by his learning and eloquence, invited him to his court at Antioch, and made him his secretary (A.D. 362). After the death of his rival, Proæresius, in A.D. 368, he returned to Athens and resumed his former calling. He became blind toward the close of his life, and died in a fit of epilepsy A.D. 386. Himerius was a pagan, but exceedingly kind towards the Christians. Of his works, only a part are now extant. —Lardner, *Works;* Smith, *Dict. Greek and Rom. Mythol.* ii; Pierer, *Universal Lex.* viii, 383; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv.

Himerius, bishop of Tarragona, Spain, known by a letter which was addressed to him by Siricius, bishop of Rome (385–398), and in which the latter arrogates supreme ecclesiastical authority, and seeks by flattery to gain Himerius's consent to his pretensions. See Hard. *Concil.* i, 848; J. A. Cramer, additions to Bossuet, iv, 597. —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 98, 99. The Roman Catholic views may be seen in Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, v, 197 sq. See SIRICIUS.

Himyarites (by the classics called *Homerites* or *Homeirites*), an Arabian people, claiming to be descend-

ants of Himyar, a grandson of Saba, one of the mythical fathers of the Arabians, who is said to have been a prince in South Arabia about 3000 before Mohammed's time. They established in that part of Arabia some very flourishing towns, including Saba and Aden (Athana), the former noted more especially from its mention in the Bible, and extended their dominion nearly over the entire coast of South Africa. At the time of Constantine the Great this people inclined to Christianity, but in 529 they were subjected by the Ethiopians, and were obliged to forsake their Christian faith. About seventy years later the Persians took the most important cities from the Himyarites, and in A.D. 629 they were subjected to the Mohammedans, and embraced Islamism. The Himyarites had a language of their own [see ARABIC LANGUAGE], the so called Himyaritic, of which traces have lately been found in the ancient remains to which the Oriental scholar Gesenius, and, later, Rödiger, have given much study. Of late Osiander has undertaken this task, and apparently has been much more successful. The results of his investigations are found in *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländ. Gesellsch.* (vol. x and xix, Lpz. 1856 and 1865).—Brockhaus, *Conv.-Lex.* vii, 929. See JEWS.

Hin (הִין, *hin*, Sept. εἷν, ἶν, or ὗν), a measure of liquids, containing the seventh part of a "bath" (Numb. xv, 4 sq.; xxviii, 5, 7, 14; Ezek. iv, 11), i. e. twelve Roman *sextarii*, according to Josephus (εἷν, *Ant.* iii, 8, 3; ix, 4), or about five quarts. The word corresponds with the Egyptian *hn*, *hno*, which properly signifies a *vessel*, and then a small measure, *sextarius*, Greek ἶνον (see Leemans, *Lettre a Salvolini*, p. 154; Böckh, *Metrolog. Untersuch.* p. 244, 260). But it is not certain that the Hebrew and English measures were of the same size.—Gesenius. According to the Rabbins, the hin contains only the *sixth* part of the bath. See MEASURE.

Hinchcliffe, JOHN, D.D., was born in Westminster in 1731. He was educated at Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1764 he was appointed head master of Westminster Seminary, in 1766 vicar of Greenwich, and in 1769 bishop of Peterborough. Hinchcliffe was a man of sound scholarship, and especially celebrated as an orator both in the pulpit and in the forum. He died in 1794. He only published three sermons delivered on public occasions. A collection of his *Sermons* (London, 1796, 8vo) is not without merit, but they certainly did not meet the expectations of his contemporaries.—Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 73; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 850.

Hinckelmann, ABRAHAM, a distinguished German theologian and Orientalist, born at Doebeln, near Hamburg, May 2, 1652, was educated at the University of Wittenberg. After filling several important appointments as minister, he was, in 1687, made court preacher to the landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt, and honorary professor at the University of Giessen. But in the year immediately following he resigned these positions and returned to Hamburg. Here he was accused by some ministers of sympathy with Millenarians and Pietists, which so wrought upon his constitution and mind that he died after a short illness, February 11, 1695. Among his works are especially worthy of note, *Sylloge vocum et phrasum rabbinicarum obscuriorum* (Lübeck, 1675, 4to):—*De Scholiis Hebræorum*:—*De Sacrificiis Hebr.*:—*Testament. et pactiones inter Muhammedem et Christianæ fidei Cultores* (Arab. and Lat., Hamb. 1690, 4to). He published also *Alcoran*, really the first edition of the Koran, as that of Paganini (Ven. 1530) was almost wholly destroyed by order of the pope. He also left in MS. *Lexicon arabico-latinum in Alcoranum*.—Jöcher, *Allgem. Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1612; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxiv, 705 sq.

Hinckley, JOHN, D.D., an English clergyman, was born in Warwickshire in 1617, and was educated at St. Alban's Hall, Oxford. He filled successively the vicarate of Coleshill, Berkshire, and the rectorships of Drayton, Leicestershire, and Northfield, Worcestershire. He died in 1695. He published *Four Sermons* (Oxf. 1657, 8vo):—*Epistola Veridica* (1659, 4to):—*Persuasive to Conformity* (1670, 8vo), addressed in the form of a letter to the Dissenters:—*Fasciculus literarum, or Letters on several Occasions* (1680, 8vo). The first half contains letters exchanged between him and Richard Baxter on the divisions in the Church.—Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 74; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxiv, 706; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 850.

Hincks, Edward, D.D., a clergyman of the Church of England, and a distinguished Assyrian scholar, was born in August, 1792, and was prepared for college under his father's care. He entered Trinity College, Dublin, at a very early age, and obtained a fellowship before he was twenty-one, being *facile princeps* of all the candidates. After graduation he became rector of Ardtrea, one of the college livings, whence he was promoted to Killyleagh, in the diocese of Down (north of Ireland), and there he spent the last forty-one years of his life. Dr. Hincks was considered one of the best philologists in Europe. He contributed numerous valuable papers, especially on Egyptian hieroglyphics and Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions, to the Royal Irish Academy, the Royal Society of Literature, the Asiatic Society, and the British Association. "His talent for deciphering texts in unknown characters and languages was wonderful. It was applied to the study of Egyptian hieroglyphics, and to the inscriptions in the cuneiform character found in Persepolis, Nineveh, and other parts of ancient Assyria. In this field especially he labored for years with great perseverance and success, having been the first to ascertain the numeral system, and the power and form of its signs by means of the inscriptions at Van. He was one of the chief restorers of Assyrian learning, throwing great light on the linguistic character and grammatical structure of the languages represented on the Assyrian monuments. Living in a remote country village, with very limited means at his command, he had to contend with great difficulties. In London, beside the British Museum, he would have accomplished more than he did" (*London Athenæum*, December, 1866). He died December 3, 1866. See CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS; HIEROGLYPHICS. (J. H. W.)

Hincks, John, a Unitarian minister, born in Cork, Ireland, in 1804, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and the Belfast Academical Institution, and in 1827 was called to a Unitarian Church at Liverpool. He died in 1831. The only published writings of his are *Sermons and occasional services, with Memoir by J. H. Thorn* (Lond. 1832, 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* i, 1484; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 850.

Hincmar OF LAON was nephew of Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, who at first patronized him, and had him elected bishop of Laon, about A.D. 856. He soon showed an obstinate and refractory spirit; set at naught his uncle, who was his metropolitan; rebelled against his king, and scorned the decrees of synods, whose sentence of condemnation he for some time avoided by appealing to Rome; but at length he was summoned, heard, condemned, and deposed from his see of Laon. He was also imprisoned and his eyes cruelly put out, A.D. 871. Two years later, at the Council of Troyes, he obtained access to the pope, who reinstated him, assigned him a portion of the episcopal revenues, and permitted him even to resume his pontifical functions in part. He died about A.D. 880. He wrote many *Letters*, etc., which are lost; but a few may be found with his life, defence, etc., in Labbe, *Concil.* tom. vii, and in Sirmond's edition of the works of Hincmar of Rheims (q. v.). See Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, vol. ii; Cellot, *Vie d'Hincmar de Laon*; Biddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii, 24–27; Neander, *Church Hist.* iii, 364; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 208; Illgen, *Zeitsch. f. d. Hist. Theol.* 1858, p. 227.

Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, one of the most learned divines of his age, was born about A.D. 809, of

a noble family, related to the counts of Toulouse, and was educated in the Monastery of St. Denys, near Paris. After finishing his studies he was summoned to the court of Louis le Debonnaire, to whom he faithfully adhered, and who employed him, after his restoration, in settling the ecclesiastical affairs of the empire; after this he retired to his monastery, whence he was again summoned into public life by being chosen archbishop of Rheims, A.D. 845. On the accession of Lothaire, an attempt was made to depose him from his see, without success. He was a zealous supporter of the rights of the Gallican Church. In 847 the controversy with Gottschalk (Godeschalcus) (q. v.) about predestination arose, and when the case of Gottschalk came before him, he drove it on with too great heat, and Gotteschalk by his means was condemned and punished with much and unjust severity. One of the most important events in Hincmar's life was his controversy in 862 with pope Nicholas I, one of the most learned men of the Roman Catholic Church. Rothadius, bishop of Soissons, and suffragan of Hincmar, deposed a priest of his diocese, who appealed to Hincmar as metropolitan, and was ordered by him to be restored to office. Rothadius, who resisted this order, was, in consequence, condemned and excommunicated by the archbishop. He appealed to the pope, who at once ordered Hincmar to restore Rothadius, or to appear at Rome either in person or by his representative, to vindicate the sentence. He sent a legate to Rome, but refused to restore the deposed bishop; whereupon Nicholas annulled the sentence, and required that the cause should have another hearing, and this time in Rome. Hincmar, after some demurral, was forced to acquiesce. The cause of Rothadius was re-examined, and he was acquitted and restored to his see. But perhaps more historically interesting is Hincmar's opposition to the temporal power of the mediæval papacy. See PAPACY. Under the successor of Nicholas, Adrian II, the succession to the sovereignty of Lorraine on the death of king Lothaire was questioned; the pope favored the pretensions of the emperor Louis in opposition to those of Charles the Bold of France. Adrian addressed a mandate to the subjects of Charles and to the nobles of Lorraine, accompanied by a menace of the censure of the Church. To this Hincmar offered a firm and persistent opposition. He was equally firm, ten years later, in resisting the undue extension of the royal prerogative in ecclesiastical affairs. Louis III, in opposition to the judgment of the Council of Vienne, wished to bestow upon his favorite, Odoacer, the see of Beauvais; but Hincmar boldly remonstrated, and fearlessly denounced the attempt as an unjustifiable usurpation. He died A.D. 882. His works consist chiefly of *Letters* about local ecclesiastical affairs, and his treatise *De Prædestinatione Dei et libero arbitrio*, and small tracts on discipline. A former treatise of his, *De Prædest.*, is lost. In the controversy with Gottschalk he maintained that "God wills the salvation of all men; that some will be saved through the gift of divine grace; that others are lost, owing to their demerit; Christ suffered for all; whoever does not appropriate these sufferings has himself to blame." All his remains are to be found in the careful edition of his works edited by Sirmond, *Opera, duos in tomos digesta*, etc. (Paris, 1645, 2 vols. fol.). See Noorden, *Hinkmar, Erzbischof v. Rheims* (Bonn, 1863); Cave, *Hist. Litt.;* Mosheim, *Ch. History*, cent. ix, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 52; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 50; Flodoard, *Ecclesiæ Remensis Hist.; Gallia Christiana*, ix, 39; *Hist. littér. de la France*, v, 544 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 706 sq.; Neander, *History of Dogmas*, ii, 454; Riddle, *History of the Papacy*, ii; Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, iii, 51 et al; iv, 84; Illgen, *Zeitsch. f. d. Hist. Theol.* 1859, p. 478; Hefele (Rom. Cath.) in Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, v, 203.

Hind (אַיָּלָה, *ayalah'*, Gen. xlix, 21; 2 Sam. xxii, 34; Job xxxiv, 1; Psa. xviii, 33; xxix, 9; Cant. ii, 7; iii, 5; Hab. iii, 19; or אַיֶּלֶת, *aye'leth*, Prov. v, 19; Jer.

Female Deer.

xiv, 5; "Aijaleth," Psa. xxii, title), the *female* of the hart or stag, "doe" being the female of the fallow-deer, and "roe" being sometimes used for that of the roebuck. All the females of the *Cervidæ*, with the exception of the reindeer, are hornless. See DEER. The hind is frequently noticed in the poetical parts of Scripture as emblematic of activity (Gen. xlix, 21; 2 Sam. xxii, 34; Psa. xviii, 33; Hab. iii, 19), gentleness (Prov. v, 19), feminine modesty (Cant. ii, 7; iii, 5), earnest longing (Psa. xlii, 1), and maternal affection (Jer. xiv, 5). Its shyness and remoteness from the haunts of men are also noticed (Job xxxix, 1), and its timidity, causing it to cast its young at the sound of thunder (Psa. xxix, 9). The conclusion which some have drawn from the passage last quoted, that the hind produces her young with great difficulty, is not, in reality, deducible from the words, and is expressly contradicted by Job xxxix, 3. It may be remarked on Psa. xviii, 33, and Hab. iii, 19, where the Lord is said to cause the feet to stand firm like those of a hind on high places, that this representation is in perfect harmony with the habits of mountain stags; but the version of Prov. v, 19, "Let the wife of thy bosom be as the beloved hind and favorite roe," seems to indicate that here the words are generalized so as to include under *roe* monogamous species of antelopes, whose affections and consortship are permanent and strong; for stags are polygamous. The Sept. reads אֵילָה in Gen. xlix, 21, rendering it στέλεχος ἀνειμένον, "a luxuriant terebinth," an emendation adopted by Bochart. Lowth has proposed a similar change in Psa. xxix, but in neither case can the emendation be accepted. Naphtali verified the comparison of himself to a "graceful or tall hind" by the events recorded in Judg. iv, 6-9; v, 18. The inscription of Psa. xxii, "the hind of the morning," probably refers to a tune of that name. See AIJELETH.

Hindostan. See INDIA.

Hinds, SAMUEL, bishop of Norwich, was born about 1798, on the isle of Barbadoes. At an early age he was sent to England, and educated at Oxford. In 1822 he took orders in the Church of England, and in 1849 he was appointed bishop of Norwich. Later, he was made vice principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford. He died in 1870. Bishop Hinds wrote *The three Temples of the true God contrasted* (1830; 3d edit. 1857, 8vo):—*Inspiration and Authority of Script.* (1831, 8vo):—*Script. and the Authorized Version of Script.* (1853, 12mo):—*Catechist's Manual* (2d ed. 1855, 12mo):—*Hist. of Christianity* (1829, 1846, 1850, 1853, 2 vols. 8vo), which was originally contributed to the *Encyclop. Metropolitana.*—Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, i, 850; Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemporains*, p. 884.

Hinduism or **Hindu religion**, the name of the variety of creeds derived from Brahmanic sources. It is the religion of the East, professed, in some form or another, by nearly half of the human race (see Max Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, i, 23), especially if

Buddhism (q. v.) is included, or considered as a development of it. The different sects into which the Hindus (on the origin of the Hindus, and their gradual occupation of India, see Lassen, *Ind. Alterth.* i, 511 sq.; Müller, *Science of Language*, p. 240 sq.; Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, p. 118, 119, 2d ed.; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, i, 171, 172, 2d ed.) are divided at present are of modern origin, and the system of theology taught by them differs very much from the religion of their forefathers.

I. *History.*—For brevity's sake, we will divide Hinduism into three great periods, the Vedic, Epic, and Puranic. Our knowledge of the first is derived from the sacred books of the Hindus, the Veda (q. v.); that of the second from the epic poem Râmâyana, and the great epos Mahâbhârata; and that of the third chiefly from the mythological works, the Purânas and Tantras.

1. *The Vedic Period.*—According to the hymns of the Veda, the Hindus of that period regarded the elements of nature as heavenly beings, and worshipped and revered them as such. Among these were first in order *Agni*, the fire of the sun and lightning; *Indra*, the bright, cloudless firmament; the *Maruts*, or winds; *Sûrya*, the sun; *Ushas*, the dawn; and various kindred manifestations of the luminous bodies, and nature in general. "They are supplicated to confer temporal blessings upon the worshipper, riches, life, posterity—the shortsighted vanities of human desire, which constituted the sum of heathen prayer in all heathen countries" (Wilson, *Lectures*, p. 9, 10). The great contrast in this particular between heathen and Christian worshippers has been well commented upon by Stuhr (*Religions-Systeme d. heidnischen Völker d. Orients*, Einleit. p. xii). Indeed, it is a fact worthy the notice of philosophers and of scholars in comparative science of religion that only a very small fraction of heathen prayers are offered for spiritual or moral benefits (compare Creuzer, *Symbolik*, iv, 162; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, i, 181, 182). "We proclaim eagerly, *Maruts*, your ancient greatness, for the sake of inducing your prompt appearance, as the indication of (the approach of) the showerer of benefits;" or, "Offer your nutritious viands to the great hero (*Indra*), who is pleased by praise, and to *Vishnu* (one of the forms of the sun), the two invincible deities who ride upon the radiant summit of the clouds as upon a well-trained steed. *Indra* and *Vishnu*, the devout worshipper glorifies the radiant approach of you two who are the granters of desires, and who bestow upon the mortal who worships you an immediately receivable (reward), through the distribution of that fire which is the scatterer (of desired blessings)." Such is the strain in which the Hindu of that period addressed his gods. Ethical considerations are foreign to these religious outbursts of the mind. Sin and evil, indeed, are often adverted to, and the gods are praised because they destroy sinners and evil-doers; but one would err in associating with these words our notions of sin or wrong. A sinner, in these hymns, is a man who does not address praises to those elementary deities, or who does not gratify them with the oblations they receive at the hands of the believer. He is the foe, the robber, the dæmon—in short, the borderer infesting the territory of the "pious" man, who, in his turn, injures and kills, but, in adoring Agni, Indra, and their kin, is satisfied that he can commit no evil act.

Neither did the Hindu in that early period so frequently evince his consciousness of imperfection by a display of animal sacrifices. The Veda contains not a single example of human victims for sacrifice. It informs us that by far the most common offering was the fermenting juice of the soma (q. v.) or moon plant, which, expressed and fermented, made an exhilarating and inebriating beverage, and for this reason, most probably, was offered to the gods to increase their beneficial potency. In this the Hindu afterwards beheld a vital sap whereby the universe itself is made productive; but in bringing such an oblation, it is more likely that he was actuated by the hope of gratifying the animal wants of his divinity rather than by the idea of deepening his own sense of guilt, or by a desire to compensate for his own demerit (compare Hardwick, i, 183). Besides this, another oblation, mentioned as agreeable to the gods, and likely to belong to this early period of Veda worship, was clarified butter, poured upon the fire. There is, however, a class of hymns in the Veda in which "this distinctive utterance of feeling makes room for the language of speculation," in which "the allegories of poetry yield to the mysticism of the reflecting mind, and the mysteries of nature becoming more keenly felt, the circle of beings which overawe the popular mind becomes enlarged" (Chambers, *Encyclopædia*, i, 541). The objects by which Indra, Agni, and the other deities are propitiated now become gods. Thus, for example, one whole section of the Rig-Veda, the principal part of the Veda (q. v.), is addressed to Soma (see above). Still more prominent is the deification of Soma in the Sáma-Veda (comp. Hardwick, *Christ*, i, 178, 179; Müller, *Chips*, i, 176).

But in the worship of these powers of nature there is an inclination, at least, if not a real desire, to pay homage to one higher being that should prove the Creator of all perishable and changeable beings. There ensued, so to speak, a struggle to reconcile the worship of the elementary powers with the idea of one supreme being, or to emancipate the inquiry into the principle of creation from the elementary religion as found in the oldest portion of Vedic poetry. The former of these efforts is apparent in the Brâhmana of the Veda, the latter in the Upanishad (q. v.). In the Brâhmanas—a second and later class of Vedic hymns—we see the simple and primitive worship become complex and artificial. A special feature is "the tendency to determining the *rank* of the gods, and, as a consequence, to giving prominence to one special god amongst the rest; whereas in the old Vedic poetry, though we may discover a predilection of the poets to bestow more praise, for instance, on Indra and Agni than on other gods, yet we find no intention on their part to raise any of them to a supreme rank. Thus, in some Brâhmanas, *Indra*, the god of the firmament, is endowed with the dignity of a ruler of the gods; in others, the *sun* receives the attributes of superiority. This is no real solution of the momentous problem hinted at in some Vedic hymns, but it is a semblance of it. There the poet asks 'whence this varied world arose'—here the priest answers that 'one god is more elevated than the rest;' and he is satisfied with regulating the detail of the Soma and animal sacrifice according to the rank which he assigns to his deities. A real answer to this great question the theologians attempt who explain the 'mysterious doctrine' held in the utmost reverence by all Hindus, and laid down in the writings known under the name of *Upanishads*, which relate not only to the process of creation, but to the nature of a supreme being, and its relation to the human soul. In the Upanishads, Agni, Indra, Vâyu, and the other deities of the Vedic hymns, become symbols to assist the mind in its attempt to understand the true nature of one absolute being, and the manner in which it manifests itself in its worldly form. The human soul itself is of the same nature as this supreme or great soul: its ultimate destination is that of becoming reunited with the supreme soul, and the means of attaining that end is not the performance of sacrificial rites, but the comprehension of its own self and of the great soul. The doctrine which at a later period became the foundation of the creed of the educated—the doctrine that the supreme soul, or Brahm, is the only reality, and that the world has a claim to notice only in so far as it emanated from this being, is already clearly laid down in these Upanishads, though the language in which it is expressed still adapts itself to the legendary and allegorical style that characterizes the Brâhmanic portion of the Vedas. *The Upanishads became thus the basis of the enlightened faith of India.* They are not a system of

philosophy, but they contain all the germs whence the three great systems of Hindu philosophy arose; and like the latter, while revealing the struggle of the Hindu mind to reach the comprehension of one supreme being, they advance sufficiently far to express their belief in such a being, but at the same time acknowledge the inability of the human mind to comprehend its essence" (Chambers, *Encyclopædia*). See UPANISHAD.

The Veda also teaches the two ideas so contradictory to the human understanding, and yet so easily reconciled in every human heart: God has established the eternal laws of right and wrong; he punishes sin and rewards virtue; and yet the same God is willing to forgive; just, yet merciful; a judge, and yet a father (Müller, i, 38). But there is no trace, at least not in the Veda, of metempsychosis, which has generally been supposed to be a distinguishing feature of the Indian religion, especially of the Vedic period. "Instead of this, we find what is really the *sine qua non* of all real religion, a belief in immortality, and in personal immortality . . . . passages wherein immortality of the soul, personal immortality, and personal responsibility after death are clearly proclaimed" (Müller, i, 45). Professor Roth (*Journal of the German Oriental Society*, iv, 427) says that we find in the Veda "beautiful conceptions of an immortality expressed in unadorned language with childlike conviction. If it were necessary, we might find here the most powerful weapons against the view which has lately been revived and proclaimed as new, that Persia was the only birthplace of the idea of immortality, and that even the nations of Europe had derived it from that quarter—as if the religious spirit of every gifted race was not able to arrive at it by its own strength." We find also in the Veda vague allusions to a place of punishment for the wicked. "In one verse it is said that the dead are rewarded for their good deeds; that they leave or cast off all evil, and, glorified, take their new bodies. . . . A pit is mentioned into which the lawless are said to be hurled down, and into which Indra casts those who offer no sacrifices. . . . In one passage we read that 'those who break the commandments of Varuna, and who speak lies, are born for that deep place'" (Müller, i, 47; comp. Dr. Muir, *Yama*, in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, p. 10).

2. "The *Epic* period of Hinduism is marked by a similar development of the same creeds, the general features of which we have traced in the Vedic writings. The popular creed strives to find a centre round which to group its imaginary gods, whereas the philosophical creed finds its expression in the groundworks of the *Sânkhya*, *Nyâya*, and *Vedânta* systems of philosophy. In the former, we find two gods in particular who are rising to the highest rank, Vishnu and Siva; for as to Brahman (the masculine form of Brahm), though he was looked upon now and then as superior to both, he gradually disappears, and becomes merged into the philosophical Brahma (the neuter form of the same word), which is a further evolution of the great soul of the Upanishads. In the *Râmâyana*, the superiority of Vishnu is admitted without dispute; in the great epos, the *Mahâbhârata*, however, which, unlike the former epos, is the product of successive ages, there is an apparent rivalry between the claims of Vishnu and Siva to occupy the highest rank in the pantheon; but Sanscrit philology will first have to unravel the chronological position of the various portions of this work, to lay bare its groundwork, and to show the gradual additions it received, before it will be able to determine the successive formation of the legends which are the basis of classical Hindu mythology. Yet so much seems to be clear even already, that there is a predilection during this Epic period for the supremacy of Vishnu, and that the policy of incorporating rather than combating antagonistic creeds led more to a quiet admission than to a warm support of Siva's claims to the highest rank." For the character of these gods, and their relation to the Vedic and the Epic period, see below. "We will point, however, to one remarkable myth, as it will illustrate the altered position of the gods during the Epic period. In the Vedic hymns, the immortality of the gods is never matter of doubt; most of the elementary beings are invoked and described as everlasting, as liable neither to decay nor death. The offerings they receive may add to their comfort and strength; they may invigorate them, but it is nowhere stated that they are indispensable for their existence. It is, on the contrary, the pious sacrificer himself who, through his offerings, secures to himself long life, and, as it is sometimes hyperbolically called, immortality. The same notion also prevails throughout the oldest Brâhmanas. It is only in the latest work of this class, the *Satapatha-Brâhmana*, and more especially in the Epic poems, that we find the inferior gods as mortal in the beginning, and as becoming immortal through exterior agency. In the *Satapatha-Brâhmana*, the juice of the soma plant, offered by the worshipper, or at another time clarified butter, or even animal sacrifices, impart to them this immortality. At the Epic period, Vishnu teaches them how to obtain the *Amrita*, or beverage of immortality, without which they would go to destruction; and this epic *Amrita* itself is merely a compound, increased by imagination, of the various substances which in the Vedic writings are called or likened to *Amrita*, i. e. a 'substance that frees from death.' It is obvious, therefore, that gods like these could not strike root in the religious mind of the nation. We must look upon them more as the gods of poetry than of real life; nor do we find that they enjoyed any of the worship which was allotted to the two principal gods, Vishnu and Siva."

"The philosophical creed of this period adds little to the fundamental notions contained in the Upanishads, but it frees itself from the legendary dross which still imparts to those works a deep tinge of mysticism. On the other hand, it conceives and develops the notion that the union of the individual soul with the supreme spirit may be aided by penances, such as peculiar modes of breathing, particular postures, protracted fasting, and the like; in short, by those practices which are systematized by the Yoga doctrine. The most remarkable Epic work which inculcates this doctrine is the celebrated poem *Bhagavadgîtâ*, which has been wrongly considered by European writers as a pure Sânkhya work, whereas *Sankara*, the great Hindu theologian, who commented on it, and other native commentators after him, have proved that it is founded on the Yoga belief. The doctrine of the reunion of the individual soul with the supreme soul was necessarily founded on the assumption that the former must have become free from all guilt affecting its purity before it can be remerged into the source whence it proceeded; and since one human life is apparently too short for enabling the soul to attain its accomplishment, the Hindu mind concluded that the soul, after the death of its temporary owner, had to be born again, in order to complete the work it had left undone in its previous existence, and that it must submit to the same fate until its task is fulfilled. This is the doctrine of *metempsychosis*, which, in the absence of a belief in grace, is a logical consequence of a system that holds the human soul to be of the same nature as that of an absolute God." This doctrine, as we have already stated, is foreign to the Vedic period. It is found in some of the Upanishads, but its fantastical development belongs decidedly to the Epic time, where it pervades the legends, and affects the social life of the nation. See METEMPSYCHOSIS; CABALA, III, 3.

3. "The *Puranic* period of Hinduism is the period of its decline, so far as the popular creed is concerned. Its pantheon is nominally the same as that of the Epic period. The triads of principal Hindu gods, Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva, remain still at the head of its imaginary gods; but whereas the Epic time is generally characterized by a friendly harmony between the higher occupants of the divine spheres, the Purânic period shows discord and destruction. The popular adoration has turned away from Brahma to Vishnu and Siva, who

alone remain to contend with each other for the highest rank in the minds of their worshippers. The elementary principle which originally inhered in these deities is thus completely lost sight of by the followers of the Purânas. The legends of the Epic poems relating to these gods become amplified and distorted, according to the sectarian tendencies of the masses; and the divine element which still distinguishes these gods in the Râmâyana and Mahâbhârata is now more and more mixed up with worldly concerns and intersected by historical events, disfigured in their turn to suit individual interests. Of the ideas implied by the Vedic rites, scarcely a trace is visible in the Purânas and Tantras, which are the textbooks of this creed. In short, the unbridled imagination which pervades these works is neither pleasing from a poetical, nor elevating from a philosophical point of view. Some Purânas, it is true—for instance, the *Bhâgavata*—form in some sense an exception to this aberration of original Hinduism; but they are a compromise between the popular and the Vedânta creed, which is henceforward chiefly the creed of the educated and intelligent. They do not affect the worship of the masses as practised by the various sects; and this worship itself, whether harmless, as with the worshippers of Vishnu, or offensive, as with the adorers of Siva and his wife Durgâ, is but an empty ceremonial, which, here and there, may remind one of the symbolical worship of the Vedic Hindu, but, as a whole, has no connection whatever with the Vedic scriptures, on which it affects to rest. It is this creed which, with further deteriorations, caused by the lapse of centuries, is still the main religion of the masses in India. The opinion these entertain, that it is countenanced by the ritual, as well as by the theological portion of the Veda, is the redeeming feature of their belief; for, as nothing is easier than to disabuse their mind on this score by reviving the study of their ancient and sacred language, and by enabling them to read again their oldest and most sacred books, it may be hoped that a proper education of the people in this respect, by learned and enlightened natives, will remove many of the existing errors, which, if they continued, must inevitably lead to a further, and, ultimately, total degeneration of the Hindu race.

"The philosophical creed of this period, and the creed which is still preserved by the educated classes, is that derived from the tenets of the Vedânta philosophy. It is based on the belief of one supreme being, which imagination and speculation endeavor to invest with all the perfections conceivable by the human mind, but the true nature of which is nevertheless declared to be beyond the reach of thought, and which, on this ground, is defined as not possessing any of the qualities by which the human mind is able to comprehend intellectual or material entity" (Chambers). See Vedânta.

II. *Deities.*—It has been stated above that the *original* worship of the Hindus appears to have been addressed to the elements. The heavens, the sun, the moon, fire, the air, the earth, and spirits are the objects most frequently addressed. In fact, the deities invoked appear to be as numerous as the prayers addressed to them.

"It would be impossible to give any account of the numerous inferior deities, whose number is said to amount to 330,000,000. The most important are the *Lokapalas*, that is, 'guardians of the world,' who are the eight gods next in rank to the Triad: 1. *Indra*, the god of the heavens; 2. *Agni*, the god of fire; 3. *Yama*, the god of hell; 4. *Surya*, the god of the sun; 5. *Varuna*, the god of water; 6. *Purana*, the god of the wind; 7. *Kuvera*, the god of wealth; 8. *Soma*, or *Chandra*, the god of the moon. Many other deities were afterwards included in the list;" among them, *Ganesa*, god of wisdom and science; *Kamas*, god of love; *Ganga*, goddess of the river Ganges; *Naradas*, messenger of the gods, etc. Each of the gods besides has his legal spouse. The most important among these goddesses are *Saraswati*, wife of Brahma, goddess of eloquence, the protector of arts and sciences, and particularly of music, wherefore the vina, or lute, is her attribute; *Sri, Laksehmi*, etc., wife of Vishnu, dispenser of blessings. But the most important of all is Siva's female partner, *Dûrga*, *Kali*, or *Calee*, goddess of evil and destruction, whose worship is by far the most extensive. Aside from these, there is yet a multitude of inferior gods, demigods, etc., the principal of which are the seven or ten *Brahmadikas* or *Rishis* (seers), the most important of whom is *Dakshas*, with *Diti* and *Aditi* for wives; from Diti come the *Daityas* or *Asuras*, the dæmons (of destruction), but from Aditi the *Suras* or *Devas* (i. e. gods). The *Gandharvas* are the musicians and dancers of heaven; the *Apsarasas*, the heavenly nymphs; the *Yakshas*, the keepers of treasures in the mountains; the *Rakshasas*, the enemies of mankind and of all good. The earth is, besides, inhabited by a multitude of evil spirits. The existence of the three worlds (of the gods, the earth, and the lower world) is not considered eternal; it is to be destroyed by Kala, the god of time, who, in regard to this act, is called Mahapralaya, or the great end. Some *animals* also are the objects of religious adoration or fear, particularly the bull; also the snakes, whose connection with the demigods brought forth the monkeys, which are the objects of superstitious dread. Among the birds the *Ganada* is the most honored, and the Banian among trees.

III. *Later Sects.*—The worship of these gods, as well as of numerous others, which was once very popular in Hindustan, has almost disappeared in consequence of the exclusive worship which is paid to Vishnu, Siva, Kali, or Sakti, and a few other deities, by the religious sects of the present day. Each sect maintains that the god it worships unites in his person all the attributes of the deity. Few Brahmins of learning, however, will acknowledge themselves to belong to any of the popular divisions of the Hindu faith; they acknowledge the Vedas, Puranas, and Tantras as the only orthodox ritual, and regard all practices not derived from these sources as irregular and profane. The following is a list of the principal sects:

(1.) *Vaishnavas*, who worship Vishnu, or, rather, *Rama*, *Krishna*, and other heroes connected with the incarnation of that deity. This sect is distinguished generally by an abstinence from animal food, and by a worship less cruel than that of the Saivas (2). They are divided into numerous sects, which often agree only in maintaining that Vishnu is Brahma, that is, Deity. One of the most important of the Vaishnava sects is the *Kabir Panthis*, founded by Kabir in the 15th century. Kabir assailed the whole system of idolatrous worship, and ridiculed the learning of the Pundits and the doctrines of the Shastra. His doctrines have had great influence. His followers are included among the Vaishnavas because they pay more respect to Vishnu than to any other deity; but it is no part of their faith to worship any Hindu deity, or to observe any of the rites of the Hindu religion.

(2.) *Saivas*, who worship Siva, and are more numerous than any other sect. The mark by which they are distinguished is three horizontal lines on the forehead, drawn in ashes, obtained from the hearth on which a sacred fire is kept; while that of the Vaishnavas consists in perpendicular lines, of which the number differs according to the sect to which the individual belongs. "Sivaism recalls the ancient religion of nature, and the gross dualism of Phœnicia" (Pressensé, *Religions before Christ*, p. 58).

(3.) *Saktas*. The Hindu mythology has personified the abstract and active powers of the divinity, and has ascribed sexes to these personages. The Sakti, or active power of God, is female, and is considered the consort of the abstract attribute. The Saktas, who may perhaps be regarded as only a subdivision of the Saivas, worship the Sakti of Siva, and are not very numerous.

(4.) *Sauras*, the worshippers of Surya, the sun.

(5.) *Ganapatyas*, the worshippers of Ganesa, the god of wisdom.

The Sauras and Ganapatyas are not very numerous. The religious sects of India are divided into two classes, which may be called clerical and lay. The priests may also be divided into two classes, the monastic and secular clergy, the majority belonging to the monastic order, since the preference is usually given by laymen to teachers who lead an ascetic life.

The sects which have already been enumerated profess to follow the authority of the Veda, but there are other sects which disavow its authority, and are therefore regarded as forming no part of the Hindu Church. The most important of these are the Buddhists, the Jainas (q. v.), and the Sikhs. The Buddhists have long since been expelled from Hindustan, but it is evident that they were once very numerous in all parts of the country. See BUDDHISM. The sect of the *Sikhs* was founded by Nanak Shah about A.D. 1500. Their present faith is a creed of pure deism, grounded on the most sublime general truths; blended with the belief of all the absurdities of Hindu mythology and the fables of Mohammedanism (Malcolm). They despise the Hindus and hate the Mussulman, and do not recognise the distinction of caste. They also reject the authority of the Veda, the Puranas, and all other religious books of the Hindus; eat all kinds of flesh except that of cows; willingly admit proselytes from every caste; and consider the profession of arms the religious duty of every individual. An interesting account of this sect is given in Malcolm's *Sketch of the Sikhs.—Asiatic Researches*, xi, 197-292; Cunningham, *Sikhs*. For the distinctions of *caste*, see INDIA.

IV. *Doctrines and Worship.*—As already intimated, a broad distinction exists between the religion of the people and that of the learned. The popular religion is a debased polytheism, without unity of belief or worship. The people believe that the performance of certain forms is the only and sure means of salvation, and that those who observe these things will, at a fixed time after death, be admitted into the joys of paradise. The religion of the learned class, on the other hand, professes to rest upon pure contemplation; its theory of the universe is pantheistic; and religious observances, apart from absorption of mind in the universal mind, are of no value. The daily duties of the Brahmin consist of five religious occupations, considered as five sacraments: the study of the Veda (*brahma-jagnas*, or *ahuta*, i. e. not offered); offering for the progress of the honor of the gods (*huta*, i. e. offered); entertaining the fire of the dead (*sradda*) in honor of the manes (*prâsita*); offering of the Bali in honor of the spirits (*prahuta*), and of hospitality, in honor of mankind (*brâhmja-huta*). Offerings and prayers for all possible objects follow each other from morning till night. Prayer is recommended by the Veda for every occasion. The number of ablutions the Hindus consider as obligatory is immense; near every temple a pond is provided for that purpose; but the most sanctifying ablutions are those performed in the Ganges, particularly at the five points where it unites with other streams. The holiest of all, according to the popular belief of the Hindus, is Allahabad, where, besides the Jumna, the Sarasvati also unites with the Ganges. The most important act of worship consists partly of bloody sacrifices. The principal among these is that of *Asvamedha*, or sacrifice of horses. Bloody sacrifices are mostly made to Siva and Kali, whilst the offerings to Vishnu are generally of water, oil, butter, fruit, flowers, etc. All sins of commission or of omission can be effaced by penances described in the laws, and provided for every caste and every case; a thorough fast of twelve days' duration (*Pavaka*) cancels all sins. The prescribed penances must be observed if the sinner desires to avoid the penalty of his sin in a new form of existence. There are therefore a great number of penitents and hermits in India, who seek merit by the renunciation of all enjoyment, and the mortification of the flesh. In fact, Eastern monachism is, in many respects, the type of that of the Romish Church. See MONACHISM.

The *gnosis* of the learned Hindus consists in regarding union (*Yoga*) with God as the highest aim of man; this doctrine is further developed in the philosophy of the Veda. The liberation following death is twofold. Such souls as have arrived at high perfection are admitted into the Brahmic heavens (*Svarga*), where they enjoy much higher happiness than in the paradise of the Indra, but after a time they are sent back again to undergo another period of probation. But when man has by contemplation identified himself with the divinity, or *Nirvana*, his soul enters into, and becomes part of the immense soul (*Atma*), and enjoys everlasting felicity, not having to assume any new form of existence. Those who aim at reaching this unity with the divinity are called *Yogi*. An essential means of arriving at this result is found in the penances or *Tapas*. On certain occasions (feasts) all the practices of the religion are united, sacrifices, offerings, prayers, etc. There are eighteen such feasts considered obligatory. The feast of *Hali*, or *Holaka*, is the oldest and most important. The *Vaisvadera* is the offering to all gods. It consists, as has already been stated in our treatment of the Vedic period, in throwing melted butter (ghee) on the flame of the sacred fire, which must be carefully kept burning. The Brahmins must offer it every morning and evening, first to the god of fire and the moon, then to all the other gods and goddesses. Each particular feast presents some peculiarities, and they are differently observed in the various localities. Aside from these general feasts, each important pagoda has some special ones. The most important are those of Jaggernaut, Benares, Guja, Allahabad, Tripety, Dvaraka, Somnauth, Ramisseran, the sea Manasarovara, Gangotri, Omerkuntuk, Trimbuck-Nasser, Pervuttum, Parkur, Mathura, and Bindrabund.

V. *Images, Temples*, etc.—The Hindus have images of their gods, but they are of a grotesque or fantastic kind; some are represented with heads of animals (as *Ganesa*), others with superabundant limbs (as *Brahma*, with four arms), or disfigured, etc. Antiquity was more sparing in this line, but afterwards the arts of India were applied to the production of innumerable monstrosities. The lower orders of divinities are often represented under the form of animals (thus Hanuman is represented as an ape, Mundi as a bull, etc.), and are generally considered as the steeds of the higher deities. These images of the gods are placed in the temples, which originally were grottoes; they now are pagodas, built in the shape of a pyramid, ornamented with columns, statues, and symbolic figures; they are divided into courts by means of colonnades, surrounded by high walls, and by the habitations of the priests. In the vestibule there is always an image of some inferior deity confronting the worshipper as he enters. Admission into these courts is only granted to the *Kshattriyas* and the *Vaisyas;* the interior of the pagoda is reserved for the *Brahmins* or priests, which, in each pagoda, are under the command of a head Brahmin, who admits as many assistants as the income of the pagoda will permit. In some of the temples there are as many as 3000 Brahmins. Their priestly duties consist in offering sacrifices and reading the Veda. The worship is accompanied by songs and dances from the two higher classes of dancing girls, the *Devadasis* and the *Natakas*.

VI. *Literature.*—See Moor, *Hindu Pantheon* (London, 1810); Coleman, *Mythol. of Hindus* (1832); Rhode, *Ueber relig. Bildung, der Hindu* (Lpz. 1827, 2 vols.); Wilson, *Relig. Sects of the Hindoos* (*As. Res.* xvi and xvii); *Ess. and a Lect. on the Relig. of the Hind.* (2 vols. 8vo); *Vishnu Purana, or Syst. of Hin. Mythol.* (4 vols. 8vo); Colebrooke, *Miscell. Essays* (Lond. 1837, 2 vols.); *Relig. and Philos. of the Hindoos* (Lond. 1858, 8vo); Small, *Hdbk. of Sanskrit Lit.* (Lond. 1869, 12mo); Wheeler, *History of India* (vol. i, Vedic period and the Mahabharata; vol. ii, the Ramyana, the Brahm. period, Lond. 1869, 8vo); Wuttke, *Gesch. d. Heidenthums* (2d ed. Berl. 1855, 2 vols.); Weber, *Akadem. Vorles. ü. Ind. Literaturgesch.* (Berl. 1852); *Ind. Stud.* (Berl. 1849-58, 1-4 vols.); *Ind. Skizzen* (Berl. 1857); Müller, *On the Literat. of the Vedas* (Lond. 1859,

2 vols.); *Chips from a German Workshop* (N. Y. 1870, 2 vols. 12mo); Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters* (2d ed. Lond. 1863, 2 vols. 12mo); Scholten, *Gesch. d. Religion u. Philos.* (Elberf. 1868, 8vo); Wrightson, *Introd. Treatise on Sanskrit Hagiographa, or the Sacred Literat. of the Hindus* (2 parts, 12mo); Corkman's Pressensé, *Religions before Christ*, p. 44 sq.; Barlow, *Ess. on Symbolism* (Lond. 12mo), ch. iv and viii; Williams, *Ind. Epic Poet.* (Lond. 8vo); Pierer, *Univ.-Lex.* viii; Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 540 sq.; *Revue d. deux Mondes*, Jan. 1858; *N. Am. Rev.* April, 1858, p. 435. A clear and concise statement of the religion of India is given by Arthur, *Mission to the Mysore*, ch. ix (Lond. 1847, 12mo). For *India as a Mission-field* (by the Rev. T. J. Scott), see *Methodist Quart. Rev.* Jan. 1869, p. 30; *Biblioth. Sacra*, Apr. 1852, art. i. See also BUDDHISM; BRAHMA; INDIA. (J. H. W.)

Hindu Literature. See SANSKRIT LITERATURE.

Hindu Philosophy is divided into six systems or *sastra*, namely, the *Nyāya*, *Vaiseshika*, *Sankhyā*, *Yoga*, *Mimānsā*, and *Vedanta*. The Sankhyā and Yoga agree in all essentials, except that the former is atheistic and the latter theistic. The systems generally unite on certain points: 1. The Mimānsā excepted, their end is to inculcate expedients for "salvation," which is deliverance from "bondage." 2. The soul, though distinct from the mind, the senses, and the body, yet identifies itself with them. As a consequence of this delusion, it conceives the thought of ownership in itself and others, and supposes that it receives pleasure and pain through the body. As a farther consequence, it engages in good and evil works, which have merit or demerit. As this merit or demerit must be awarded, the soul must pass to Elysium or Hell, and repeatedly be born and die. This is *bondage* caused by ignorance, from which, when the soul is delivered, it gains absorption into the deity. 3. As a consequence of the foregoing, good deeds and their reward are only a less curse than their opposites, and are to be deprecated, as they compel the soul till the award is experienced to abide in the body of a god, or a man, or other superior being. 4. Release from transmigration can only be had through "*right apprehension*," which consists, of course, in the recognition by the soul of itself as distinct from the mind and all else. To gain this "right apprehension" one must study the Shastras; and, in order to clearness of intellect and heart for this work, such good works as sacrifices, alms, pilgrimages, repetitions of sacred words, and the like, are to be performed, but without desire for reward. 5. They all maintain that the soul has existed from everlasting, and that it is exempt from liability to extinction, though it may be again and again invested with a corporeal body. 6. All the systematists teach the eternity of matter. 7. They all receive the words of the Veda as unquestionable authority. See *Refutation of Hindu Systems*, by N. Gore (Calcutta, 1862); *Aphorisms of the Yogā, Sankhyā*, etc. (Allahabad, India, 1864). (J. T. G.)

Hindus, MODERN, a term recently used to designate a class of Hindu reformers, who call themselves Brahmists, and represent a school of thought which originated fifty or sixty ago with Rammohun Roy, who undertook to reform Hinduism on the basis of the *Veda* alone, the religion of which he held to be a pure theism. In 1846 they became dissatisfied with the Veda, and adopted Intuitionalism. They have planted societies throughout Bengal, Madras, the North-west Provinces, the Punjab, and Bombay. They ignore idol worship, caste, metempsychosis, and all Brahminical ceremonies. *The Tuttu Bodheney Press*, of Calcutta, has issued a great number of their publications (see Dr. Duff, in *Christian Work* for 1862; *Foreign Missions*, by Dr. Anderson). See RAMMOHUN ROY. (J. T. G.)

Hindustan. See INDIA.

Hinge (צִיר, *tsír*, that upon which a door *revolves*, Prov. xxvi, 14; also the *pangs* of childbirth, Isa. xiii, 8, etc.; also a *messenger*, Prov. xiii, 17, etc.; פֹּת, *pôth*, lit. an *interstice*, put. for *pudenda muliebra*, Isa. iii, 17; fig. *female hinges*, i. e. the eyes or parts with sockets, 1 Kings vii, 50). "Doors in the East turn rather on pivots than what we term hinges. They were sometimes of metal, but generally of the same material as the door itself, and worked in sockets above and below in the door-frame. As the weight of the door rests on the lower pivot, it opens with much less ease than one moving on hinges, particularly when the lower socket becomes worn by the weight and friction."—*Pict. Bible*, note on Prov. xxvi, 14. "In Syria, and especially the

Ancient Egyptian Door-hinges. (From the British Museum.)

Haurân, there are many ancient doors consisting of stone slabs with pivots carved out of the same piece, inserted in sockets above and below, and fixed during the building of the house. The allusion in Prov. xxvi, 14 is thus clearly explained. The hinges mentioned in 1 Kings vii, 50, were probably of the Egyptian kind, attached to the upper and lower sides of the door (Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p. 177; Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 22, 192; Maundrell, *Early Travels*, p. 447, 448 [Bohn]; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 210; Lord Lindsay, *Letters*, p. 292; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* abridgm. i, 15)." See DOOR.

Hinman, CLARK F., D.D., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Kortright, Delaware Co., N. Y., Aug. 3, 1819. He graduated at the Wesleyan University in 1839, and spent several years in teaching, at one time as principal of Newbury Seminary, Vt. In 1849 he was elected principal of the Wesleyan Seminary at Albion, Michigan, and early in 1853 president of the North-western University. In this position he devoted his whole energy to the work of putting that institution on a proper footing, and his labors in its behalf exhausted his strength and broke his constitution completely. Yet he refused to suspend his exertions until a pending list of engagements was fulfilled, and while thus employed he was prostrated at Troy, N. Y., and died on the 21st of October, 1854. Dr. Hinman distinguished himself in every relation of life, from boyhood to his death, by capacity, energy, and piety. He was a good scholar, an earnest and eloquent preacher, and a very successful educator of youth. His early death was a great loss to the cause of Christian education in America.—Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vii, 817.

Hin'nom (Heb. *Hinnom'*, הִנֹּם, for חִנֹּם, *gracious*, or for הִינֹם, *abundant*), or, rather, BEN-HINNOM (בֶּן־הִנֹּם, *son of Hinnom;* Sept. υἱὸς Ἐννόμ; also in the plur. "sons of Hinnom"), an unknown person (prob. one of the original Jebusites), whose name (perh. as resident) was given to the valley ("Valley of Hinnom," otherwise called "the valley of the son" or "children of Hinnom," גֵּיא־הִנֹּם, or גֵּי־בֶן־ה״, or גֵּי־בְנֵי־ה״, variously rendered by the Sept. φάραγξ Ἐννόμ, or υἱοῦ Ἐννόμ, or Γαιέννα, Josh. xviii, 16; ἐν γῇ Βενέννομ, 2 Chron. xxviii, 3; xxxiii, 6; τὸ πολυάνδριον υἱῶν τῶν τέκνων αὐτῶν,

Jer. xix, 2, 6), a deep and narrow ravine, with steep, rocky sides, on the southerly side of Jerusalem, separating Mount Zion on the south from the "Hill of Evil Counsel," and the sloping, rocky plateau of the "plain of Rephaim" on the north, taking its name, according to Stanley, from "some ancient hero, the son of Hinnom," having encamped in it (*S. and Pal.* p. 172). The earliest mention of the valley of Hinnom in the sacred writings is in Josh. xv, 8, where the boundary-line between the tribes of Judah and Benjamin is described with minute topographical accuracy, as passing along the bed of the ravine from En-Rogel to the top of the mountain "that lieth before the valley westward," at the north end of the plain of Rephaim. It is described in Josh. xviii, 16 as on the south side of Jebusi, that is, Mount Zion, on which the ancient stronghold of the Jebusites stood. The valley obtained wide notoriety as the scene of the barbarous rites of Molech and Chemosh, first introduced by Solomon, who built "a high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem (Olivet); and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon" (1 Kings xi, 7). The inhuman rites were continued by the idolatrous kings of Judah. A monster idol of brass was erected in the opening of the valley, facing the steep side of Olivet, and there the infatuated inhabitants of Jerusalem burnt their sons and their daughters in the fire—casting them, it is said, into the red-hot arms of the idol (Jer. vii, 31; 2 Chron. xxviii, 3; xxxiii, 6). No spot could have been selected near the Holy City so well fitted for the perpetration of these horrid cruelties: the deep, retired glen, shut in by rugged cliffs, and the bleak mountain sides rising over all. The worship of Molech was abolished by Josiah, and the place dedicated to him was defiled by being strewn with human bones: "He defiled Topheth, which is in the valley of the children of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter pass through the fire to Molech . . . and he brake in pieces the images, and cut down their groves, and filled their places with the bones of men" (2 Kings xxiii, 10, 14). The place thus became ceremonially unclean; no Jew could enter it (2 Chron. xxxiv, 4, 5). From this time it appears to have become the common cesspool of the city, into which its sewage was conducted, to be carried off by the waters of the Kidron, as well as a laystall, where all its solid filth was collected. It was afterwards a public cemetery [see ACELDAMA], and the traveller who now stands in the bottom of this valley and looks up at the multitude of tombs in the cliffs above and around him, thickly dotting the side of Olivet, will be able to see with what wondrous accuracy the curse of Jeremiah has been fulfilled: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor The Valley of the Son of Hinnom, but The Valley of Slaughter; for they shall bury in Tophet till there be no more place" (vii, 32). We learn from Josephus that the last terrible struggle between the Jews and Romans took place here (*War*, vi, 8, 5); and here, too, it appears the dead bodies were thrown out of the city after the siege (v, 12, 7). The inhuman rites anciently practised in the valley of Hinnom caused the latter Jews to regard it with feelings of horror and detestation. The Rabbins suppose it to be the gate of hell (Lightfoot, *Opera*, ii, 286); and the Jews applied the name given to the valley in some passages of the Sept. *Γέεννα*, to the place of eternal torment. Hence we find in Matt. v, 22, "Whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of *τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός*—the *Gehenna* of fire." The word is formed from the Hebrew גיא הנם, "Valley of Hinnom." See HELL. The valley was also called TOPHETH (2 Kings xxiii, 10; Isa. xxx, 33; Jer. vii, 31), either from תפת, "spittle," and it would hence mean "a place to spit upon," or from תָּפְתֶּה, "place of burning." See TOPHET.

Most commentators follow Buxtorf, Lightfoot, and others, in asserting that perpetual fires were kept up for the consumption of bodies of criminals, carcases of animals, and whatever else was combustible; but the rabbinical authorities usually brought forward in support of this idea appear insufficient, and Robinson declares (i, 274) that "there is no evidence of any other fires than those of Molech having been kept up in this valley," referring to Rosenmüller, *Biblisch. Geogr.* II, i, 156, 164. For the more ordinary view, see Hengstenberg, *Christol.* ii, 454; iv, 41; Keil *on Kings* ii, 147, Clark's edit.; and comp. Isa. xxx, 33; lxvi, 24. See MOLOCH. It is called, Jer. ii, 23, "the valley," *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, and perhaps "the valley of dead bodies," xxi, 40, and "the valley of vision," Isa. xxii, 1, 5 (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 172, 482). The name by which it is now known is (in ignorance of the meaning of the initial syllable) *Wâdy Jehennam*, or *Wâdy er-Rubêb* (Williams, *Holy City*, i, 56, Supplem.), though in Mohammedan traditions the name Gehenna is applied to the Valley of Kedron (Ibn Batutah, 12, 4; Stanley, *ut sup.*). See GEHENNA.

The valley commences in a broad sloping basin to the west of the city, south of the Jaffa road (extending nearly to the brow of the great wady on the west), in the centre of which, 700 yards from the Jaffa gate, is the large reservoir, supposed to be the "upper pool," or "Gihon" [see GIHON] (Isa. vii, 3; xxxvi, 2; 2 Chron. xxxii, 30), now known as *Birket el-Mamilla*. After running about three quarters of a mile east by south, the valley takes a sudden bend to the south opposite the Jaffa gate, but in less than another three quarters of a mile it encounters a rocky hill-side which forces it again in an easterly direction, sweeping round the precipitous south-west corner of Mount Zion almost at a right angle. In this part of its course the valley is from 50 to 100 yards broad, the bottom every where covered with small stones, and cultivated. At 290 yards from the Jaffa gate it is crossed by an aqueduct on nine very low arches, conveying water from the "pools of Solomon" to the Temple Mount, a short distance below which is the "lower pool" (Isa. xxii, 9), Birket es-Sultán. From this point the ravine narrows and deepens, and descends with great rapidity between broken cliffs, rising in successive terraces, honeycombed with innumerable sepulchral recesses, forming the northern face of the "Hill of Evil Counsel," to the south, and the steep shelving, but not precipitous southern slopes of Mount Zion, which rise to about the height of 150 feet to the north. The bed of the valley is planted with olives and other fruit-trees, and, when practicable, is cultivated. About 400 yards from the south-west angle of Mount Zion the valley contracts still more, becomes quite narrow and stony, and descends with much greater rapidity towards the "valley of Jehoshaphat," or "of the brook Kidron," before joining which it opens out again, forming an oblong plot, the site of Tophet, devoted to gardens irrigated by the waters of Siloam. Towards the eastern extremity of the valley is the traditional site of "Aceldama," authenticated by a bed of white clay still worked by potters (Williams, *Holy City*, ii, 495), opposite to which, where the cliff is thirty or forty feet high, the tree on which Judas hanged himself was located during the Frankish kingdom (Barclay, *City of Great King*, p. 208). Not far from Aceldama is a conspicuously situated tomb with a Doric pediment, sometimes known as the "whited sepulchre," near which a large sepulchral recess, with a Doric portal hewn in the native rock, is known as the "Latibulum apostolorum," where the Twelve are said to have concealed themselves during the time between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. The tombs continue quite down to the corner of the mountain, where it bends off to the south along the valley of Jehoshaphat. None of the sepulchral recesses in the vicinity of Jerusalem are so well preserved; most of these are very old—small gloomy caves, with narrow, rock-hewn doorways. See JERUSALEM.

Robinson places "the valley gate," Neh. ii, 13, 15; 2 Chron. xxvi, 9, at the north-west corner of Mount Zion, in the upper part of this valley (*Researches*, i, 220, 239,

274, 320, 353; Williams, *Holy City*, i, Suppl. 56; ii, 495; Barclay, *City of Great King*, p. 205, 208); but this part was rather called the Valley of Gihon. See Gihon.

Hinrichs, Hermann Friedrich Wilhelm, a German philosopher of the old Hegelian school, was born at Karlseck, in Oldenburg, August 22, 1794. In 1812 he entered the University of Strasburg as a student of theology, but changed for law in 1813 at Heidelberg. Here he studied under Creuzer and Hegel, and became a *privatdocent* in 1814. In 1822 he was called to the University of Breslau as a professor of philosophy. In 1824 Halle gave him a call, which he accepted, and here he remained until his death, August 17, 1861. The work which gave to him particular prominence as a Hegelian was his *Die Religion im innern Verhältniss zur Wissenschaft* (Heidelb. 1822), an essay that gained him a prize sustained by Hegel himself.—Brockhaus, *Conv. Lex.* vii, 933; Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemp.* p. 885. (J. H. W.)

Hinton, Isaac Taylor, a Baptist preacher and author of note, was born at Oxford, England, July 4, 1799. His father, who was teacher in a boy's school of considerable repute, superintended his son's education. At the age of fifteen young Hinton was apprenticed at the "Clarendon Press," and in 1820 he set up as a printer and publisher. He edited and printed the *Sunday Scholars' Magazine*. In 1821 he was converted and baptized. He was soon licensed to preach, continuing, however, in business, which he removed to London. He also assisted his brother, John Howard Hinton, in preparing a *History of the United States*, in two quarto volumes, with 100 engravings. While thus engaged, his republican feelings were so developed that he decided to emigrate to this country. He arrived at Philadelphia in 1832. His services as a preacher were much sought, but he had resolved on fixing his residence in the West. He was, however, induced to accept the pastorate of the First Baptist Church in Richmond, Va. The church had a large colored membership, a fact from which some embarrassment was experienced by him in the consistent application of his principles. This, in connection with his original predilections, led to his removal in 1835 to Chicago, then in its infancy. The Church was unable to give him a sufficient support, and he was compelled to engage in teaching. His congregations were large, and he delivered a course of lectures on the Prophecies, which attracted much attention. The financial disasters of 1837, however, depressed the material prosperity of his Church, and differences on the slavery question divided it. In 1841 he removed to St. Louis, where he labored for about three years, and enjoyed repeated seasons of revival and ingathering. In 1844 he accepted a call to New Orleans, where he had every prospect of success and usefulness, but his labors were cut short by the yellow fever. He died Aug. 28, 1847. His Lectures on Prophecy, above referred to, were repeated in St. Louis, and were published afterwards under the title *The Prophecies of Daniel and John illustrated by the Events of History.* He also published a *History of Baptism, from Inspired and Uninspired Sources.* He was diligent, enthusiastic, yet cautious and investigating in his habit of mind, genial in his private intercourse, and an impressive public speaker. His ardor and energy fitted him for the work of which he did so much, that of a pioneer, founding and building up churches. (L. E. S.)

Hiouen-tsang, a celebrated Buddhist traveller of China, was born A.D. 603. At the age of twenty he took priest's orders. Even at this early age he had become famous for his vast information, especially in the Buddhist faith, and in the doctrines of Confucius and Laotse. A desire to study the origin of Buddhism made him overcome all the obstacles in his way, and he set out on a journey to India in the first half of the 7th century (629). He travelled sixteen years in that country, and on his return wrote a work describing his travels, which were published under the auspices of the Chinese emperor of his time. In this work he gave a very detailed and interesting account of the condition of Buddhism as it prevailed at that period in India. His inquiries having been chiefly devoted to Buddhism, he did not enter much into details concerning the social and political condition of the country; but many curious notices which he gives on other matters, besides those of Buddhist interest that came under his observation, and the high degree of trustworthiness which his narrative possesses, makes it one of the most important works on the history of India in general, and of Buddhism in particular, during this period. He travelled alone, or with a few occasional companions, wearing the garb of a religious mendicant, from China to India. He brought with him on his return to his native country, besides images of Buddha and various sacred relics, an immense collection of works, the extent of which may be estimated from the statement of Müller, "It is said that the number of works translated by Hiouen-tsang, with the assistance of a large staff of monks, amounted to 740, in 1335 volumes" (*Chips*, i, 272). He died A.D. 664. Two of his friends and pupils have left an account of their instructor, and M. Stanislas Julien, who has lately translated the travels of Hiouen-tsang from Chinese into French (*Voyages des Pélerins Bouddhistes*, 2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1853-1857), prefixes a translation of this biography to the translation of the travels of Hiouen-tsang. An abstract of this work, by the late Professor H. H. Wilson, appeared in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, xvii, 106-137. A very full account of the life and works of Hiouen-tsang is given by Max Müller (*Chips*), with a review of the translation of M. Julien.—Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, i, 232-275; Julien, *Histoire de la Vie de Hiouen-tsang; Mémoires sur les Contrées Occidentales, par Hiouen-tsang;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxiv, 715 sq.; Chambers, *Encyclop.* v, 372. (J. H. W.)

Hip (שׁוֹק, *shôk*, usually "shoulder") occurs in the A. V. only in the phrase "hip and thigh" (lit. *leg upon thigh*), in the account of Samson's slaughter of the Philistines (Judg. xv, 8); evidently a proverbial phrase, i. e. "he cut them in pieces so that their limbs, their legs and their thighs, were scattered one upon another, q. d. he totally destroyed them" (Gesenius). See Samson.

Hip, in architecture, is the external angle formed by the meeting of the sloping sides of a roof which have their wall-plates running in different directions: thus, when a roof has the end sloped back, instead of finishing with a gable, the pieces of timber in these angles are called hip-rafters, and the tiles with which they are covered are called hip-tiles. The internal angles formed by the meeting of the sides are termed *valleys*, whether the latter be horizontal or sloping, and the piece of timber that supports a sloping valley is termed the *valley rafter*. Such a roof is called a *hip-roof*.

The lines AB, BC, are the hips.

Hip-knob. See Finial.

Hippicus (Ἱππικός, *equestrian*), the name given by Herod (in honor of one of his generals) to that one of the three towers (Josephus, *War*, ii, 17, 9) along the first wall of Jerusalem, inclosing Mount Zion on the north, which lay westernmost, and at its junction with the third wall (*War*, v, 4, 2), being built up with immense strength (*ib.* 3). Its remains are still a very prominent object in the city (Robinson, *Researches*, i, 453 sq.; Bartlett, *Walks about Jerusalem*, p. 85 sq.). Schwarz absurdly identifies it (*Palest.* p. 251) with the tower of Hananeel (q. v.) of Jer. xxxi, 38, on the authority of Jonathan's Targum, which there has "the tower of *Pikus* (פִּיקוֹס)." See Jerusalem.

Hippo, in Africa, now called *Bona*, a maritime colony. (See Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 993, note 1.) A general council was held at this place in 393. Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, presided. Augustine made a discourse before the council on the subject of faith, the Creed, and against the Manichæans. Forty-one canons were agreed to, which were taken as the model for after councils. "The first express definition of the N.-T. Canon, in the form in which it has since been universally retained, was fixed at the council of A.D. 393, at Hippo." Another council was held in 426, in which Augustine appointed Eradius his successor, requiring Eradius, however, in accordance with the canon of Nicæa, to remain in his priestly office until Augustine's death.—Smith, *Tables of Church History;* Landon, *Manual of Councils;* Schaff, *Church History*, i, § 75; iii. 609.

Hippolўtus, St. (Ἱππόλυτος), the name of several saints and martyrs of the early Church, especially that celebrated one of the fathers of the Church who probably lived in the early part of the 3d century. Every particular of his life has been made a point of controversy. Thus the oldest ecclesiastical writers who make any mention of him, Eusebius and Jerome, give him the title of bishop, but without stating of what see, the latter even saying that he was unable to ascertain this point. "The *Chronicon Paschale*, our earliest authority, makes him 'bishop of the so-called Portus, near Rome;' and as this statement is supported by the authority of Cyril, Zonaras, Anastasius, Nicephorus, and Syncellus (see Bunsen's *Hippolytus*, i, 205), and as Prudentius (lib. περὶ στεφάνων, *Hymn* ix) describes his martyrdom as having taken place at Ostia, close by Portus, most critics will probably regard this point as finally settled. His mastery of the Greek language would render him peculiarly fit to be a 'bishop of the nations,' who frequented the harbor of Rome in multitudes. In spite of Jacobi's assertion (see below) to the contrary, there seems to be no reason why he should not at the same time have been (what the Ἔλεγχος shows him to have been) a presbyter and head of a party at Rome. We know, further, that he was a disciple of Irenæus (Phot. *Cod.* 121), and was engaged in some warm disputes with Callistus on points of doctrine and discipline, which are graphically described in his recovered book, κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος" (Kitto, *Cyclop.* s. v.). On the other hand, the treatise *De duabus Naturis*, attributed to pope Gelasius I, gives Hippolytus the title of metropolitan of Arabia. Le Moyne even indicated a town of the district of Aden, called *Portus Romanus*, on account of its being the great mart of Roman trade in the East, as the seat of his bishopric. The same uncertainty exists with regard to the time in which he lived. Eusebius places him in the first half of the 3d century. Photius states that he was a disciple of Irenæus; Baronius says, of Clement of Alexandria; two assertions which appear equally well grounded. Portius adds that Hippolytus was the intimate friend and zealous admirer of Origen, and that he invited him to comment on the Scriptures, furnishing him for that purpose seven amanuenses to write under his dictation, and seven copyists. Hippolytus himself testifies to his acquaintance with Origen. As for the other details given by Photius, they are based on a misinterpretation of a passage in Jerome. According to this father, Ambrosius of Alexandria, struck with the reputation Hippolytus had acquired by his commentaries on the Scriptures, invited Origen to attempt the same task, and furnished him with a number of secretaries for that purpose. The martyrdom of St. Hippolytus is not mentioned by Eusebius. Jerome, Photius, and other writers, however, call him a martyr, and his name appears with that title in the Roman, Greek, Coptic, and Abyssinian calendars. Yet these martyrologies differ so much from each other that they appear rather to refer to different parties of the same name than to one individual only. Prudentius, a Christian poet of the 4th century, wrote a long poem on the martyrdom of St. Hippolytus, but it is evident that he also confounded several parties of that name, and his pious legend is devoid of all historical authority. The date of St. Hippolytus's death is very doubtful. It is generally believed to have occurred under Alexander Severus, yet it is well known that this prince did not persecute Christians. If we admit that the *Exhortatorius ad Severinam*, mentioned among Hippolytus's works, is the same which Theodoret states was addressed to a certain queen or empress (πρὸς βασιλίδα τινά), and, further, that this Severina, according to Döllinger (see below), was the wife of the emperor Philip the Arabian, this would bring the martyrdom of the saint to the time of Decius's persecution (about 250), and perhaps later. In that case, Hippolytus, having been a disciple of Irenæus, who died about 190, must have been quite advanced in age at the time of his death. It is generally supposed that he suffered martyrdom near Rome, probably at the mouth of the Tiber. According to general opinion, it is thought he was thrown into the sea with a stone tied around his neck. In 1551 a statue was discovered at Rome, near the church of St. Lorenzo, which appeared to date back to the 6th century, and represented a man in monastic garb, in a sitting posture. The inscription bore the name of Hippolytus, bishop of Portus, and on the back of his seat was found inscribed the *canon* or *paschal cycle* which he introduced into Rome, and also a list of his principal works. Some of these works, mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome, Photius, and other ecclesiastical writers, or named on the statue, are yet extant, and we have extensive fragments of several others. A number of them have been published separately. Fabricius gave a complete collection of them under the title *S. Hippolyti, episcopi et martyris, Opera non antea collecta et partem nunc primum e MSS. in lucem edita, Græce et Latine* (Hamb. 1716-1718, fol.). This was reprinted, with additions by Galland, and inserted in his *Bibliotheca Patrum* (Venice, 1766, fol.), vol. ii. A collection of fragments of Syriac translations of Hippolytus is given in the *Analecta* of Lagarde. The same scholar, in an appendix to his *Analecta* (Lagardii *ad Analecta sua Syriaca Appendix* [Lips. 1858]), gives Arabic fragments of a commentary of Hippolytus on Revelation.

A recent discovery has directed general attention to this old ecclesiastical writer. In 1842 M. Mynoide Minas, on his return from a mission on which he had been sent by M. Villemain, minister of public instruction in France, brought back from Mount Athos, among other unpublished works, a mutilated Greek MS. of the 14th century, written on cotton paper, without name of author, and containing a *Refutation of all Heresies* (κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος). This MS. was deposited in the Imperial Library at Paris, where it remained undisturbed until M. Emmanuel Miller found it to contain the last part of a treatise, the beginning of which was printed in the works of Origen. At Miller's request, the University of Oxford consented to publish it, under his direction, at their own press, with the title, Ὠριγένους φιλοσοφούμενα ἢ κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος (*Origenis Philosophumena sive omnium Hæresium Refutatio:* e Codice Parisino nunc primum edidit Emmanuel Miller [Oxford, 1851, 8vo]). This work attracted great attention among the theologians and philologists of Germany and France, as well as of England. The first argument published to show that Hippolytus was the author of the MS. may be found in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* for October, 1851, in an article by professor J. L. Jacobi, of the University of Berlin. After proving that Origen was not the author, Jacobi shows that the writer was certainly *contemporary* with Origen. "He places himself in that age, and all his statements harmonize with this view. Taking him, then, to have lived in the first quarter of the 3d century, at the time of Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome, and of Callistus, we should be led by Eusebius to identify him with the learned presbyter Caius, or with Hippolytus. It is easily shown, however, that Caius could not have been the author of the book, for he was *specially* distinguished

for his writings against Cerinthus, and for his peculiar views with regard to that Gnostic leader; while our author has nothing of his own to offer about Cerinthus, and borrows all that he does say (and that is not much), word for word, from Irenæus. Caius ascribed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus—our author assigns it to the apostle John. The former was a strenuous opponent of the sensual Chiliasm; the latter, while he blames much in Montanism, does not include Chiliasm under it, and indeed it is more than probable that he was a friend of that doctrine." On the other hand, there are the following, among other reasons, for ascribing the work to Hippolytus. (1.) A work bearing the same or a similar title was ascribed by Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, and Nicephorus to Hippolytus. (2.) The monument dug up at Rome (see above) has on it the names of writings which the author of the treatise *on heresies* claims as his own. (3.) The internal evidence is all in favor of Hippolytus. Professor Jacobi developed the argument at greater length in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christl. Wissenschaft* (1852), and Dr. Duncker followed in the *Göttinger gelehrte Anzeigen* (1851). But the most earnest work on the subject was done by the Chevalier Bunsen, who canvassed the whole question with great learning in his copious and somewhat clumsy book, *Hippolytus and his Age, or the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus, and ancient and modern Christianity and Divinity compared* (Lond. 1852, 4 vols. 8vo). In this work it is, we think, established beyond a doubt that the *Refutation of all Heresies* was written by Hippolytus, bishop of Portus, near Rome, in the first quarter of the 3d century. Several writers, however, objected to some of Bunsen's conclusions, and he replied to them by republishing his work, greatly enlarged, under the title *Christianity and Mankind* (London, 1854, 7 vols. 8vo). This work is full of erudition, but often advances hasty statements and unauthorized conclusions.

The importance of this newly-discovered work of Hippolytus in the sphere of Church History and archæology can hardly be overstated. It throws great light upon the Gnostic and other heretical sects of the early Church. Names and even facts are given of which we knew absolutely nothing before; while others that were held to be as unimportant as they were obscure are brought out into light and prominence, illuminating many dark nooks of Church History. The book tells us, for instance, of a Gnostic, by name Justin, of whom we had not before heard: and describes at length Monoïamos and the Peraticians, of whom we knew only the names. The Simonians, and the strange, fragmentary, and enigmatical ideas generally attributed to Simon Magus, are here treated with something approaching to orderly and clear connection. That part of the work which treats of the *morals* of the Roman Church and of its clergy is full of interest. Hippolytus censures them for unchastity, and casts it up to them as a great reproach that many, even of the higher orders of clergy, were married—some of them more than once. His account of Callistus throws much light upon the state of society and of religion in Rome at the time. The work shows us also that the received doctrine of the Church at that time—a century before the Council of Nice—was the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity and the person of Christ. Its revelations are fatal, too, to many of the claims of the papacy. Romanist writers, therefore, have sought to invalidate the conclusions drawn by Jacobi, Bunsen, and the Protestants generally. Professor Döllinger seeks to refute the "calumnies" of the book against Callistus in his *Hippolytus und Kallistus* (Ratisb. 1853, 8vo), and to settle the question of the authorship of the *Philosophoumena*. He undertakes to show also from the character of the work itself that the author was not a Catholic, but a heretic, in the judgment of the Church of the age when he wrote it. The abbé Cruice, of Paris, published *Études sur les . . . Philosophoumena* (Paris, 1853, 8vo), to show that the book is neither genuine nor authentic; and he has since followed it up by his *Histoire de l'Église de Rome sous les Pontificats de St. Victor, St. Zephyrin, et St. Calliste* (Paris, 1856). He has also published an elegant edition of the *Philosophoumena*, with Latin version, notes, and indexes (Par. 1861, 8vo). The best edition of the work, however, is that of Duncker and Scheidewin (Göttingen, 1859, 8vo). Another edition, which embraces all the Greek works of Hippolytus, was published by Lagarde (*Hippolyti Romani quæ feruntur omnia Græce*, Leips. 1858). The subject is very ably treated in its theological aspects, especially in their bearing on the Romish controversy, by Wordsworth, *Hippolytus and the Church of Rome* (London, 1852, 8vo). A very good account of the history and contents of the book, with an English translation of the most important parts, is given by Tayler, *Hippolytus and the Christian Church of the Third Century* (Lond. 1853, 12mo), and by Volkmar, *Hippolytus u. d. röm. Zeitgenossen* (Zürich, 1855). The leading reviews have generally given articles on the subject: see especially *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1851; Jan. 1863, p. 160; *Quarterly Rev.* (Lond.) lxxxix, 87; *Journ. of Sacred Literature*, Jan. 1853, and Jan. 1854; *N. Brit. Review*, Nov. 1854; *Edinburgh Review*, Jan. 1853; Illgen, *Zeitschrift f. hist. Theolog.* 1842, iii, 48-77; 1862, ii, 218; *Journal des Débats*, Dec. 1852; Baur, *Theolog. Jahrbücher* (Tübingen, 1853); *Studien u. Kritiken*, by Gieseler (1853). Another important work ascribed to Hippolytus, a collection of canons, has lately been published for the first time, in an Arabic translation, by Dr. Hamberg (*Canones S. Hippolyti Arabice e codicibus Romanis cum versione Latina, annotationibus et prolegomenis*, Munich, 1870). The collection contains thirty-eight canons which are known to have been in use in the 12th century in the Coptic Church. Before this time no mention is made of this work by any ecclesiastical writer; but the editor regards this as no argument against its authenticity (which he defends), as all the works of Hippolytus had fallen into oblivion. In case it is genuine, its contents are of considerable importance for the history of Christian doctrines and on the constitution of the Christian Church.

Lipsius, in his work *Zur Quellenkritik der Epiphanios* (Vienna, 1865), has shown that the work of Hippolytus against thirty-two sects, the conclusion of which is still extant under the title of a homily against the heresy of Noetus, is the basis of the *Philosophoumena*, and can, to a large extent, be reconstructed from it. See also Schaff, *Church History*, vol. i, § 125; Hare, *Contest with Rome*, p. 214; Neander, *History of Dogmas*, i, 51; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* i, 66 sq.; Lardner, *Works*, ii, 409 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 131 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxiv, 777 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclopœdia*, v, 376; and, for the Roman Catholic side, Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen Lexikon*, v, 210 sq.; *Allgem. Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschland*, v, 374. Early monographs on Hippolytus were written by Frommann, *Interprett. New Test. ex Hippol.* (Coblentz, 1765, 4to); C. G. Hänell, *De Hippol.* (Götting. 1838, 8vo); Heumann, *Ubi et qualis episcop. fuerit Hippolytus* (Götting. 1737, 4to); Woog, *Fragment. Hippolyti Martyris* (Lips. 1762, 4to). On the earlier writings of Hippolytus, see Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, i, 158; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi, 20-23; Lardner, *Credibility of the Gospel History*, ii, 35; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, etc., iii, 104; Neander, *Ch. Hist*, cent. iii, pt. ii, ch. ii, § 7.

Hippolytus, Brothers (or Hospital Monks) of the Christian Love of, a monastic order of the Roman Catholic Church, established about 1585 by Bernardin Alvarez, a citizen of Mexico, for nursing the sick. It was sanctioned by the popes Sixtus V and Clement VIII, and received the same rights as the order of Brothers of Charity which had been established by St. Johannes a Deo, and with which it had statutes, aim, and dress in common. It only differs from it by the color of the monastic dress. The order was named after the patron saint of the city of Mexico, in commemoration of the fall of paganism, and the capture of the city of Mexico

by the Christians on the day of St. Hippolytus (August 13). It never spread beyond Spanish America. (A. J. S.)

Hospital Monk of St. Hippolytus.

Hippopotamus, an animal regarded by Bochart (*Hieroz.* iii, 705), Ludolf (*Hist. Æthiop.* i, 11), Shaw (*Trav.* ii, 299, Lond. 8vo), Scheuzer (*Phys. Sac.* on Job xl), Rosenmüller (*Not. ad Bochart. Hieroz.* iii, 705, and *Schol. ad Vet. Test.* in Job xl), Taylor (*Appendix to Calmet's Dict. Bibl.* No. lxv), Harmer (*Observations*, ii, 319), Gesenius (*Thes.* s. v. בְּהֵמוֹת), Fürst (*Concord. Heb.* s. v.), and English commentators generally, as being designated by the Heb. word בְּהֵמוֹת (*behemôth'* in Job xl, 15), by which, however, some writers, as Vatablus, Drusius, Grotius (*Crit. Sac. Annotationis ad Job.* xl), Pfeiffer, (*Dubia vexata S. S.*, p. 594, Dresden, 1679), Castell (*Lex. Hept.* p. 292), A. Schultens (*Comment. in Job.* xl), Michaelis (*Suppl. ad Lex. Heb.* No. 208), have understood the elephant; while others, again, amongst whom is Lee (*Comment. on Job.* xl, and *Lex. Heb.* s. v. בְּהֵמוֹת), consider the Hebrew term as a plural noun for "cattle" in general; it being left to the reader to apply to the scriptural allusions the particular animal, which may be, according to Lee, "either the horse, or wild ass, or wild bull"(!). Compare also Reiske, *Conjecturæ in Job.* p. 167. Dr. Mason Good (*Book of Job literally translated*, p. 473, Lond. 1712) has hazarded a conjecture that the *behemoth* denotes some extinct pachyderm like the mammoth, with a view to combine the characteristics of the hippopotamus and elephant, and so to fulfil all the scriptural demands. Compare with this Michaelis (*Sup. ad Lex. Heb.* No. 208), and Hasæus (in *Dissertat. Syllog.* No. vii, § 37, and § 38, p. 506), who rejects with some scorn the notion of the identity of behemoth and mammoth. Dr. Kitto (*Pict. Bib.* Job xl) and Colonel Hamilton Smith (Kitto's *Cycl. Bib. Lit.* art. Behemoth), from being unable to make *all* the scriptural details correspond with any one particular animal, are of opinion that behemoth is a plural term, and is to be taken as a poetical personification of the great pachydermata generally, wherein the idea of hippopotamus is predominant. The term *behemoth* would thus be the counterpart of *leviathan*, the animal mentioned next in the book of Job; which word, although its signification in that passage is restricted to the crocodile, does yet stand in Scripture for a python, or a whale, or some other huge monster of the deep. See LEVIATHAN. According to the Talmud, behemoth is some huge land-animal which daily consumes the grass off a thousand hills; he is to have, at some future period, a battle with leviathan. On account of his grazing on the mountains, he is called "the bull of the high mountains." (See Lewysohn, *Zool. des Talmuds*, p. 355). "The 'fathers,' for the most part," says Cary (Job, p. 402), "surrounded the subject with an awe equally dreadful, and in the behemoth here, and in the leviathan of the next chapter, saw nothing but mystical representations of the devil: others, again, have here pictured to themselves some hieroglyphic monster that has no real existence; but these wild imaginations are surpassed by that of Bolducius, who in the behemoth actually beholds Christ!"

The following reasons seem clearly to identify it with the hippopotamus. 1. *The meaning of the original word itself.* Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, p. 183), with whom also Fürst agrees (*Heb. Lex.* s. v.), holds it not to be a Heb. plur., but the Coptic *be-hemout*, "the water-ox" (see Jablonsky, *Opusc.* i, 52), equivalent to the ἵππος ὁ ποτάμιος or river-horse of the ancients (Herod. ii, 71; Aristot. *Anim.* ii, 12 [4]; Diod. Sic. i, 35; Pliny, viii, 39; Ammian. Marcell. xxii, 15; Abdollatif, *Denker.* p. 146 sq.; Prosper Alpinus, *Res Æg.* iv, 12; Ludolph, *Hist. Æth.* i, 11, and *Comment.* p. 155 sq.; Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 280 sq.; Sparrmann, *Reise druch südl. Africa*, p. 562 sq.; Rüppell, *Arab. Petr.* p. 55 sq.; comp. Schneider, *Hist. hippop. vett. crit.* in his edit. of Artedi *Synon. pisc.* p. 247 sq., 316 sq.; Bochart, *Hieroz.* iii, 705 sq.; Oken, *Zool.* ii, 718 sq.). Rosenmüller's objection to the Coptic origin of the word is worthy of observation—that, if this were the case, the Sept. interpreters would not have given θηρία as its representative. Michaelis translates בְּהֵמוֹת by *jumenta*, and thinks the name of the elephant has dropped out ("Mihi videtur nomen elephantis forte פִּיל excidisse"). Many critics, Rosenmüller amongst the number, believe the word is the *plural majestatis* of בְּהֵמָה. But in that case it would hardly be employed with a verb or adj. in the *singular*, and that *masc.*, as it is.

2. A careful examination of the text shows that *all* the details descriptive of the behemoth accord entirely with the ascertained habits of that animal. Gesenius and Rosenmüller have remarked that, since in the first part of Jehovah's discourse (Job xxxviii, xxxix) *land animals and birds* are mentioned, it suits the general purpose of that discourse better to suppose that *aquatic or amphibious* creatures are spoken of in the last half of it; and that since the leviathan, by almost universal consent, denotes the crocodile, the behemoth seems clearly to point to the hippopotamus, his associate in the Nile. Harmer (*Observations*, ii, 319) says, "There is a great deal of beauty in arranging the descriptions of the behemoth and the leviathan, for in the Mosaic pavement the people of an Egyptian bark are represented as darting spears or some such weapons at one of the river-horses, as another of them is pictured with two sticking near his shoulders. . . . . It was then a customary thing with the old Egyptians thus to attack these animals (see also Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* iii, 71); if so, how beautiful is the arrangement: there is a most happy gradation; after a grand but just representation of the terribleness of the river-horse, the Al-

Chase of the Hippopotamus (Wilkinson).

mighty is represented as going on with his expostulations something after this manner: 'But dreadful as this animal is, barbed irons and spears have sometimes prevailed against him; but what wilt thou do with the crocodile? Canst thou fill his skin with barbed irons?'" etc. In the *Lithostrotum Prænestinum*, to which Mr. Harmer refers, there are two crocodiles, associates of three river-horses, which are represented without spears sticking in them, though they seem to be within shot. Behemoth "eateth grass as an ox" (Job xl, 15)—a circumstance which is noticed as peculiar in an animal of aquatic habits; this is strictly true of the hippopotamus, which leaves the water by night, and feeds on vegetables and green crops. Its strength is enormous, ver. 16, 18, and the notice of the power of the muscles of the belly, "his force is in the navel of his belly," appears to be strictly correct. The tail, however, is short, and it must be conceded that the first part of verse 17, "he moveth his tail like a cedar," seems not altogether applicable. His mode of attack is with his mouth, which is armed with a formidable array of teeth, projecting incisors, and enormous curved canines; thus "his Creator offers him a sword," for so the words in ver. 19 may be rendered. But the use of his sword is mainly for pacific purposes, "the beasts of the field playing" about him as he feeds; the hippopotamus being a remarkably inoffensive animal. "With these apparently combined teeth the hippopotamus can cut the grass as neatly as if it were mown with the scythe, and is able to sever, as if with shears, a tolerably thick and stout stem" (Wood's *Nat. Hist.* i, 762). חֶרֶב is perhaps the Greek *ἅρπη*. See Bochart (iii, 722), who cites Nicander (*Theriac.* 566) as comparing the tooth of this animal to a scythe. The next verse explains the purpose and use of the "scythe" with which God has provided his creature, viz., in order that he may eat the grass of the hills. His retreat is among the lotuses (*tzelim;* A. V. "shady trees"), which abounded about the Nile, and amid the reeds of the river. Thoroughly at home in the water, "if the river riseth, he doth not take to flight; and he cares not if a Jordan (here an appellative for a 'stream') press on his mouth." Ordinary means of capture were ineffectual against the great strength of this animal. "Will any take him before his eyes?" (i. e. openly, and without cunning); "will any bore his nose with a gin?" as was usual with large animals. Though now no longer found in the lower Nile, it was formerly common there (Wilkinson, i, 239). The method of killing it in Egypt was with a spear, the animal being in the first instance secured by a lasso, and repeatedly struck until it became exhausted (Wilkinson, i, 240); the very same method is pursued by the natives of South Africa at the present day (Livingstone, p. 73; instances of its great strength are noticed by the same writer, p. 231, 232, 497). The skin of the hippopotamus is cut into whips by the Dutch colonists of South Africa, and the monuments of Egypt testify that a similar use was made of the skin by the ancient Egyptians (*Anc. Egypt.* iii, 73). The inhabitants of South Africa hold the flesh of the hippopotamus in high esteem; it is said to be not unlike pork.

Hippopotamus Amphibius.

It has been said that some parts of the description in Job cannot apply to the hippopotamus: (1.) The 20th verse, for instance, where it is said "the mountains bring him forth food." This passage, many writers say, suits the elephant well, but cannot be applied to the hippopotamus, which is never seen on mountains. In answer to this objection, it has been stated, with great reason, that the word *hârim* (הָרִים) is not necessarily to be restricted to what we understand commonly by the expression "mountains." In the Prænestine pavement alluded to above, there are to be seen here and there, as Mr. Harmer has observed, "hillocks rising above the water." In Ezek. xliii, 15 (margin), the altar of God, only ten cubits high and fourteen square, is called "the mountain of God." "The eminences of Egypt, which appear as the inundation of the Nile decreases, may undoubtedly be called *mountains* in the poetical language of Job." But we think there is no occasion for so restricted an explanation. The hippopotamus, as is well known, frequently leaves the water and the river's bank as night approaches, and makes inland excursions for the sake of the pasturage, when he commits sad work among the growing crops (Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 188). No doubt he might often be observed on the hill-sides near the spots frequented by him. Again, it must be remembered that the "mountains" are mentioned by way of contrast with the natural habits of aquatic animals generally, which never go far from the water and the banks of the river; but the behemoth, though passing much of his time in the water and in "the covert of the reed and fens," eateth grass like cattle, and feedeth on the hill-sides in company with the beasts of the field. According to a recent traveller in Egypt, the Rev. J. L. Errington, "the valley of the Nile in Upper Egypt and Nubia is in parts so very narrow, that the mountains approach within a few hundred yards, and even less, to the river's bank; the hippopotamus, therefore, might well be said to get its food from the mountains, on the sides of which it would grow." There is much beauty in the passages which contrast the habits of the hippopotamus, an amphibious animal, with those of herbivorous land-quadrupeds; but if the elephant is to be understood, the whole description is, comparatively speaking, tame.

(2.) Again, the 24th verse—"his nose pierceth through snares"—seems to be spoken of the trunk of the elephant, "with its extraordinary delicacy of scent and touch, rather than to the obtuse perceptions of the river-horse." With respect to this objection, there is little doubt that the marginal reading is nearer the Hebrew than that of the text. "Will any take him in his sight, or bore his nose with a gin?" Perhaps this refers to leading him about alive with a ring in his nose, as, says Rosenmüller, "the Arabs are accustomed to lead camels," and we may add the English to lead bulls, "with a ring passed through the nostrils."

(3.) The expression in verse 17, "he bendeth his tail like a cedar," has given occasion to much discussion; some of the advocates for the elephant maintaining that the word *zânâb* (זָנָב) may denote either extremity, and that here the elephant's trunk is intended. The parallelism, however, clearly requires the posterior appendage to be signified by the term. The expression seems to allude to the stiff, unbending nature of the animal's tail, which in this respect is compared to the trunk of a strong cedar which the wind scarcely moves.

(4.) The description of the animal's lying under "the shady trees," amongst the "reeds" and willows, is peculiarly applicable to the hippopotamus. It has been argued that such a description is equally applicable to the elephant; but this is hardly the case; for, though the elephant is fond of frequent ablutions, and is *frequently* seen near water, yet the *constant* habit of the hippopotamus, as implied in verses 21, 22, seems to be especially made the subject to which the attention is directed. "At every turn there occurred deep, still pools, and occasional sandy islands densely clad with lofty reeds. Above and beyond these reeds stood trees of immense

age, beneath which grew a rank kind of grass on which the sea-cow delights to pasture" (G. Cumming, p. 297). See BEHEMOTH.

Hippos (Ἵππος, *a horse;* but Reland suggests, *Palæst.* p. 830, that it may be one of the towns called הִיפָּא in the Talmud), a city of Palestine, 30 stadia from Tiberias (Josephus, *Life*, 65), one of the Decapolis (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 215), frequently mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* xv, 7, 3; xvii, 11, 4; *War*, ii, 18, 1; 18, 5; iii, 3, 1; *Life*, 31); later, an episcopal city (Reland, p. 440, 821), identified by Burckhardt with the ruin *es-Sunuah*, at the south-east end of Lake Tiberias.—Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 322.

Hi'rah (Heb. *Chirah'*, חִירָה, *nobility;* Sept. Εἰράς), an Adullamite and friend of Judah (Gen. xxxviii, 1, 12; comp. ver. 20). B.C. cir. 1896-1876.

Hi'ram (Heb. *Chiram'*, חִירָם, *high-born;* generally written "Huram," חוּרָם, *Churam'*, in Chron., and "Hirom," חִירוֹם, *Chirom,'* in 1 Kings v, 10, 18; vii, 40; Sept. Χειράμ or Χιράμ; Joseph. Εἴραμος and Εἴρωμος), the name of three men.

1. HURAM (Sept. makes two names, Ἀχιρὰν καὶ Ἰωίμ), the last named of the sons of Bela, son of Benjamin (1 Chron. viii, 5). B.C. post 1856.

2. HIRAM, HURAM, or HIROM, king of Tyre at the commencement of David's reign. He sent an embassy to felicitate David on his accession, which led to an alliance, or strengthened a previous friendship between them. It seems that the dominion of this prince extended over the western slopes of Lebanon; and when David built himself a palace, Hiram materially assisted the work by sending cedar-wood from Lebanon, and able workmen to Jerusalem (2 Sam. v, 11; 1 Chron. xiv, 1). B.C. cir. 1044. It was probably the same prince who sent to Jerusalem an embassy of condolence and congratulation when David died and Solomon succeeded, and who contracted with the new king a more intimate alliance than ever before or after existed between a Hebrew king and a foreign prince. The alliance seems to have been very substantially beneficial to both parties, and without it Solomon would scarcely have been able to realize all the great designs he had in view. In consideration of large quantities of corn, wine, and oil furnished by Solomon, the king of Tyre agreed to supply from Lebanon the timber required for the Temple, to float it along the coast, and deliver it at Joppa, which was the port of Jerusalem (1 Kings v, 1 sq.; ix, 10 sq.; 1 Chron. ii, 3 sq.). The vast commerce of Tyre made gold very plentiful there; and Hiram supplied no less than 500 talents to Solomon for the ornamental works of the Temple, and received in return twenty towns in Galilee, which, when he came to inspect them, pleased him so little that he applied to them a name of contempt, and restored them to the Jewish king (2 Chron. viii, 2). See CABUL. It does not, however, appear that the good understanding between the two kings was broken by this unpleasant circumstance, for it was after this that Hiram suggested, or at least took part in, Solomon's traffic to the Eastern Seas, which certainly could not have been undertaken by the Hebrew king without his assistance in providing ships and experienced mariners (1 Kings ix, 27; x, 11, etc.; 2 Chron. viii, 18; ix, 10, etc.). B.C. cir. 1010. See OPHIR; SOLOMON.

Josephus has preserved a valuable fragment of the history of Mercander, a native of Ephesus, relating to the intercourse of Hiram and Solomon, professedly taken from the Syrian archives (*Apion*, i, 18). "After the death of Abibalus, Hiromus, his son, succeeded him in his kingdom, and reigned thirty-four years, having lived fifty-three. He laid out that part of the city which is called Eurychoron, and consecrated the golden column which is in the temple of Jupiter. And he went up into the forest on the mountain called Libanus, to fell cedars for the roofs of the temples; and having demolished the ancient temples he rebuilt them, and consecrated the fanes of Hercules and Astarte: he constructed that of Hercules first, in the month Peritius; then that of Astarte, when he had overcome the Tityians who had refused to pay their tribute; and when he had subjected them he returned. In his time was a certain young man named Abdemonus, who used to solve the problems which were propounded to him by Solomon, king of Jerusalem." According to the same authority (*ib.* i, 17), the historian Dius, likewise from the Tyrian annals, says, "Upon the death of Abibalus, his son Hiromus succeeded to the kingdom. He raised the eastern parts of the city, and enlarged the citadel, and joined it to the temple of Jupiter Olympius, which stood before upon an island, by filling up the intermediate space; and he adorned that temple with donations of gold, and he went up into Libanus to cut timber for the construction of the temples. And it is said that Solomon, who at that time reigned in Jerusalem, sent enigmas to Hiromus, and desired others in return, with a proposal that whichsoever of the two was unable to solve them, should forfeit money to the other. Hiromus agreed to the proposal, but was unable to solve the enigmas, and paid treasures to a large amount as a forfeit to Solomon. And it is said that one Abdemonus, a Tyrian, solved the enigmas, and proposed others which Solomon was not able to unriddle, for which he repaid the fine to Hiromus" (Cory's *Ancient Fragments*, p. 193.) Some of these riddles, the Jewish historian states (*ib.* i, 17), were extant in his day; and in *Ant.* viii, 2, 6, 7, he gives what he declares to be authentic copies of the epistles that passed between the two kings respecting the materials for the Temple. See LEBANON. With the letters in 1 Kings v, and 2 Chron. ii, may be compared not only his copies of the letters, but also the still less authentic letters between Solomon and Hiram, and between Solomon and Vaphres (Apries?), which are preserved by Eupolemon (*ap.* Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* ix, 30), and mentioned by Alexander Polyhistor (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i, 24, p. 332). Some Phœnician historians (*ap.* Tatian. *cont. Græc.* § 37) relate that Hiram, besides supplying timber for the Temple, gave his daughter in marriage to Solomon. Jewish writers in less ancient times cannot overlook Hiram's uncircumcision in his services towards the building of the Temple. Their legends relate (Eisenm. *Ent. Jud.* i, 868) that because he was a God-fearing man, and built the Temple, he was received alive into Paradise; but that, after he had been there a thousand years, he sinned by pride, and was thrust down into hell. Eupolemon (Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* ix, 30) states that David, after a war with Hiram, reduced him to the condition of a tributary prince. See DAVID.

Some have regarded this Hiram as a different person from the friend of David, since Josephus states that the Temple was built in the twelfth year of the reign of the Tyrian king who aided Solomon in the work (*Apion*, i, 17 sq.; the eleventh, according to *Ant.* viii, 3, 1); but this is probably only by a computation of the historian, whose numerical calculations in these points are far from trustworthy. (See Nessel, *Diss. de amicitia Salom. et Hirami*, Upsal, 1734.) Hiram is also spoken of by Herodotus (ii, 44) as the builder of new temples to Heracles, Melcart, and Astarte, and the adorner of that of Zeus-Baalsamin.

Ewald (*Gesch. Israel*, III, i, 28, 83) and Movers (II, i, 326 sq., 446 sq.) give a Hiram II, who reigned from 551-532 B.C., toward the close of the Chald.-Babylonian empire, and who is not mentioned in the Bible.

Dr. Robinson describes a remarkable monument of Solomon's ally, still extant, which he passed a little beyond the village of Hunaneh, on his way from Safed to Tyre (*Bib. Res.* iii, 385). "It is an immense sarcophagus of limestone, resting upon a pedestal of large hewn stones; a conspicuous ancient tomb, bearing among the common people the name of *Kaibr Hairan*, 'Sepulchre of Hiram.' The sarcophagus measures twelve feet long by six feet in height and breadth; the lid is three feet thick, and remains in its original position; but a hole

has been broken through the sarcophagus at one end. The pedestal consists of three layers of the like species of stone, each of three feet thick, the upper layer projecting over the others; the stones are large, and one of them measures nine feet in length. This gray, weather-beaten monument stands here alone and solitary, bearing the marks of high antiquity; but the name and the record of him by whom or for whom it was erected have perished, like his ashes, forever. It is indeed possible that the present name may have come down by tradition, and that this sepulchre once held the dust of the friend and ally of Solomon; more probably, however, it is merely of Mohammedan application, like so many other names of Hebrew renown, attached to their welys and monuments in every part of Palestine. I know of no historical trace having reference to this tomb; and it had first been mentioned by a Frank traveller (Monro, 1833) only five years before." (See also Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 290 sq.)

The "Tomb of Hiram."

3. The son of a widow of the tribe of Dan, and of a Tyrian father. He was sent by the king of the same name to execute the principal works of the interior of the Temple, and the various utensils required for the sacred services (1 Kings vii, 13, 14, 40). We recognise in the enumeration of this man's talents by the king of Tyre a character common in the industrial history of the ancients (comp. those of Bezaleel, Exod. xxxi, 3-5), namely, a skilful artificer, knowing all the arts, or at least many of those arts which we practise, in their different branches. See HANDICRAFT. It is probable that he was selected for this purpose by the king from among others equally gifted, in the notion that his half-Hebrew blood would render him the more acceptable at Jerusalem. B.C. cir. 1010. He is called "Huram" in 2 Chron. ii, 13; iv, 11, 16; and "Hirom" in the margin of 1 Kings vii, 40. In 2 Chron. ii, 13, חוּרָם אָבִי is rendered "Huram my father's;" so in 2 Chron. iv, 16, חוּרָם אָבִיו is rendered "Huram his father;" where, however, the words אָבִי and אבִיו can hardly belong to the name, but are appellations; so that "*Huram my* (or *his*) *father*" seems to mean *Huram my counsellor*, i. e. *foreman*, or *master-workman*.

Hirca'nus (Ὑρκανός, i. e. *Hyrcanus*), "a son of Tobias," who had a large treasure placed for security in the treasury of the Temple at the time of the visit of Heliodorus (2 Macc. iii, 11), B.C. cir. 187. Josephus also mentions "children of Tobias" (*παῖδες Τωβίου*, *Ant.* xii, 5, 1), who, however, belonged to the faction of Menelaus, and notices especially a son of one of them (Joseph) who was named Hyrcanus (*Ant.* xii, 4, 2 sq.). But there is no sufficient reason for identifying the Hyrcanus of 2 Macc. with this *grandson* of Tobias either by supposing that the ellipsis (*τοῦ Τωβίου*) is to be so filled up (Grotius, Calmet), or that the sons of Joseph were popularly named after their grandfather (Ewald, *Gesch.* iv, 309), which could scarcely have been the case in consequence of the great eminence of their father.—Smith. See MACCABEES.

The name of Hyrcanus occurs at a later period under the Maccabees. It has been thought that it was adopted on account of a victory gained by John, the son and successor of Simon Maccabæus, over the Hyrcanians (Euseb. *Chron.* lib. ii; Sulp. Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* lib. ii, c. xxvi). Josephus informs us that Hyrcanus accompanied Antiochus VII Sidetes into Parthia, and Nicolaus of Damascus says that a trophy was erected at the river Lycus to commemorate the victory over the Parthian general (*Ant.* xiii, 8, 4). The Hyrcanians were a nation whose territory was bounded on the north by the Caspian Sea, and would thus be at no great distance from Parthia, where John Hyrcanus had gained the victory. It is remarkable that the different statements agree in the position of the countries, Hyrcania, Parthia, and the river Lycus (of Assyria) being contiguous. As Josephus, however, does not give any explanation of the name (*Ant.* xiii, 7, 4; *War*, i, 2, 3), and the son of Simon is nowhere called Hyrcanus in 1 Macc., the reason for its assumption is uncertain. See HYRCANUS.

Hireling (שָׂכִיר, *sakir'*; *μισθωτός*), a laborer who is employed on hire for a limited time (Job xii, 1; xiv, 6; Mark i, 20). By the Mosaic law such a one was to be paid his wages as soon as his work was over (Lev. xix, 13). The little interest which would be felt by such a temporary laborer, compared with that of the shepherd or permanent keeper of the flock, furnish a striking illustration in one of our Lord's discourses (John x, 12, 13). The working-day in the East begins with the rising of the sun, and ends when it sets. The parable in Matt. xx, 1-14, is interesting, not only as showing what were the day's wages of a laborer at this period in Judæa, "a penny," i. e. the Roman *denarius*, about fifteen cents of our money, but also as showing that the salvation of the Gentiles can in itself become no impediment to the Jews; and as eternal life is the free gift of God, he has a right to give it in whatever proportions, at whatever times, and on whatever conditions he pleases. See SERVANT; WAGES, etc.

Hirmologion (*εἱρμολόγιον*), a collection of *hirmoi*; also the exaltation of the Panaghia (q. v.) in the Greek

Church (Neale, *Hist. of the Eastern Church*, p. 890). See HIRMOS.

Hirmos, or rather IRMOS (*εἱρμός*, *a series*) is the name of a strophe in a Greek hymn. "The model of succeeding stanzas, so called as drawing others after it." —Walcott, *Sac. Archæology* (8vo, London, 1868).

Hirnheim or **Hirnhaym**, HIERONYMUS, a distinguished Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Troppau, province of Silesia, in 1635. He took orders in 1659, and pursued his theological studies at Prague until appointed instructor in philosophy at the Norbertin College. A short time after he was made abbé of Mount Sion, and later general vicar of Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, and Austria. Hirnheim is generally ranked among modern skeptics, and most of his works have been placed in the Roman *Index*. He was a great hater of the Protestant Church, and employed, in common with a number of other theologians of his Church, to combat Protestantism, skeptical weapons, as he saw no prospect of vanquishing them in the dogmatic field. He died August 27, 1769. His most important work is *De typho generis humani, sive scientiarum humanarum inani ac ventoso tumore, difficultate, labilitate, falsitate, jactantia, præsumptione, incommodis et periculis, tractatus brevis*, etc. (Prague, 1676, 4to), put into the *Index* April 14, 1682.—Jöchers, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Addenda ii, 2018; Krug, *Philosophisches Handwörterb.* ii, 438; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxiv, 791.

Hirom. See HIRAM.

Hirsch, Andreas, a Lutheran minister of the latter half of the last century. He studied theology at Strasburg, and filled several positions as preacher, but gave dissatisfaction to the people, and was driven from each of them in succession. Notwithstanding all persecution, he found sufficient time to write several works, among which are, *Kircherus Jesuita Germaniæ redonatus*, etc. (Halle, 1662, 8vo):—*Religionsgespräch zwischen zweierlei Religionsverwandten* (Rottenburg, 1672, 4to):—*Predigten und Gelegenheitsschriften* (ibid. 1673, 8vo).—Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Addenda ii, 2018.

Hirsch, Carl Christian, a German theologian, was born at Hersbruck October 20, 1704. He studied at Altorf, Leipzig, and other universities, and went to the theological seminary at Nuremburg in 1729. He entered the ministry in 1734, and in 1740 was appointed deacon of Lorenz Church at Nuremburg. He died Feb. 27, 1754. His works are: *Hadriani Pontii Historiæ Libri rariores*:—*Venerab. Agnetis Blannbeckin Vita et Revelationes* (Frankf. and Leip. 1735):—*Catechismus Historiæ* (Nürnb. 1752, 8vo):—*Lebensbeschreib. aller Geistlichen Nürnbergs* (continued by Wüffel and Waldau, published in 1756-1785, 4to): to this work he devoted his time mainly. He also wrote a number of monographs inserted in the *Acta Histor. eccles.* and in the *Acta Scholast.* of Nuremburg.—Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Append. ii, 2021; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxiv, 793; Döring, *Gelehrt. Theol. Deutschl.* i, 738.

Hirsch-Chotsch, ZEBI, BEN-JERACHMIEL, a Polish Rabbi, and one of the most eloquent preachers of the 17th century, was born at Cracow, but spent his later days in Germany. He gained renown as an author by נַחֲלַת צְבִי, or *Hereditas decoris ex Jer.* iii, 19 (Frankf. 1721, fol.); an allegorical commentary on the Pentateuch, written in German, with Hebrew characters, and in the main drawn from "*Zohar*," one of the works of the Cabalists:—שַׁבַּתָּה דְרִגְלָא, *Sabbathum festi* (Fürth, 1603, 4to):—חֶמְדַּת צְבִי, or *Desiderium decoris*, a commentary on "*Tikune Zohar*" (Amsterd. 1706, fol.), etc.—Fürst, *Bib. Judaica*, i, 177; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxiv. 792; Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1626.

Hirschau or **Hirsau**, a very celebrated old German monastery, of the Benedictine order, in the diocese of Speier, having much in common with the congregation of Clugny (q. v.). It is asserted by the Roman Catholics to have been opened A.D. 645; but it was probably founded about 830 by count Erlafried von Calw and bishop Notting of Vercelli. The monks and the different abbots who inhabited it were distinguished for their scholarship. Some were authors, others rose to high distinction in the Church. Among these, the abbot Wilhelm der Selige (q. v.) did perhaps more than any other to establish the noble reputation of this monastery. After the Reformation it became a Protestant seminary until 1692, when the French, on their invasion of the country, destroyed it. A history of this monastery was written by Johann Trittenhemius, one of its abbots, under the title *Chronicon Hirsaugiense* (Basil, 1559, fol., and 1690, 2 vols. fol.).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 143; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 213; *Real-Encyklopädie für d. Kathol. Deutschl.* v, 375. See BENEDICTINES. (J. H. W.).

Hirscher, JOHANN BAPTIST VON, a celebrated German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Alt-Ergarten, Würtemberg, Jan. 20, 1788. He was educated at the Lyceum of Constance and at the University of Freiburg, and was made a priest in 1810. He held the position of instructor in philosophy and theology in different institutions until 1817, when he was called as professor of ethical and pastoral theology to the University of Tübingen. In 1837 he was called to the University of Freiburg, and in 1839 he became a member of the cathedral chapter of the archdiocese of Freiburg. He was also appointed an "ecclesiastical counsellor," and, somewhat later, a privy counsellor (*Geheim-Rath*). In 1849 he was delegate of the University of Freiburg in the First Chamber of the grand-duchy of Baden, into which he was subsequently several times called by the confidence of the grand-duke. In 1850 he became dean of the cathedral chapter. In 1863 he resigned his position at the university on account of ill health. He died Sept. 4, 1865. Hirscher was one of the representative men of Roman Catholic theology in the 19th century. At the beginning of his literary career he was a zealous advocate of liberal reforms within his Church; subsequently he gradually became, with Möhler (q. v.), Drey (q. v.), and other professors of Tübingen, a more outspoken champion of the tenets of his Church in opposition to Protestantism, and joined his colleagues as founder and co-editor of the *Theologische Quartalschrift* (established 1819), one of the ablest theological organs of the Church of Rome. But, though a prolific and prominent writer in behalf of his Church, he continued, even in later life, to favor the introduction of some reforms, as the admission of the laity to diocesan synods, and laid, in general, greater stress on those points which the Roman Catholic Church has in common with orthodox Protestantism than on those which separate the two churches. He remained an opponent of Ultramontane theories, and was therefore, up to his death, the object of many attacks on the part of Ultramontane writers. Several of his earlier works, in particular the one entitled *De Missa* (Tübingen, 1821; German transl. Baden, 1838), in which he advocated the use of the Latin language at divine service, were put in the Roman *Index*. The chief aim of most of his works is to represent the doctrines of his Church, especially those most offensive to Protestants and liberal Roman Catholics, in as favorable a light as possible. The most important among his works are *Ansichten von dem Jubiläum* (Tüb. 1826), the second edition of which appeared under the title *Die Lehre vom kathol. Ablass* (6th edit. Tüb. 1855):—*Gesch. Jesu Christi* (Tüb. 1840; 2d edit. 1845):—*Katechetik* (4th edit. Tüb. 1840):—*Betrachtungen über sämmtliche Evangelien der Fasten* (Tüb. 1848):—*Die kirchl. Zustände d. Gegenwart* (Tüb. 1848):—*Die christl. Moral* (Tüb. 1835, 3 vols.; 5th ed. 1850-1851):—*Beiträge zur Homiletik u. Katechetik* (Tüb. 1852):—*Betrachtung über die sonntäglichen Evangelien des Kirchenjahres* (5th edit. Tüb. 1853, 2 vols.):—*Erörterungen über die grossen religiösen Fragen der Gegenwart* (3 numbers; 3d ed. Freib. 1846-1857):—*Hauptstücke des christkath. Glaubens* (Tüb. 1857):—*Katechismus* (Freib. 1842, and many edit. since):—*Be-*

trachtungen über sämmtliche sonntägl. Episteln (Freiburg, 1860–1862, 2 vols.):—*Das Leben Mariæ* (5th edit. Freib. 1865). He took a special interest in the education of poor and abandoned children, himself establishing three houses of refuge. He wrote on this subject the work *Die Sorge für die sittlich verwahrlosten Kinder* (Freib. 1856). A volume of minor posthumous works (*Nachgelassene kleinere Schriften*, Freib. 1868) has been published by Rollfuss. This work contains also a biography of Hirscher.—Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, transl. by Smith, ii, 457; Hase, *Church History*, transl. by Blumenthal and Wing, p. 654; *Allgem. Real-Encyklop.* vii, 628. (A. J. S.)

Hirt, Johann Friedrich, a distinguished German theologian, was born at Apolda, in Thuringia, August 14, 1719. He studied at the University of Jena, and in 1758 was made extraordinary professor of philosophy. In 1769 he changed to the chair of theology, and in 1775 was appointed regular professor of theology at the University of Wittenberg. He died July 29, 1784. Hirt was regarded as one of the first theologians at the Wittenberg University, and inferior to no other person as a scholar of the Oriental languages. He is especially known in this department by the development which he gave to the systems of Alting and Danz on the Hebrew language (*Systema trium morarum*); but the advance of late years in the field of exegetical theology decreases the value of all his efforts in this direction. His most important works are, besides a host of dissertations in the field of exegesis, *Biblia Hebræa analytica* (Jena, 1753, 4to):—*Philologisch-exegetische Abhandlung üb. Psalm* xv, 14, 45 (ibid. 1753, 4to):—*Divinitas Christi, ex ejus resurrectione demonstrata* (ibid. 1757, 4to):—*Bibliorum analyticorum pars Chaldaica* (ibid. 1757, 8vo):—*Vollständ. Erklärung d. Sprüche Salomos* (ibid. 1768, 4to):—*Instit. Arabicæ linguæ* (ibid. 1770, 8vo):—*Orientalische und exeget. Biblioth.* (ibid. 1772–1776, 8 vols. 8vo; continued, under the title *Wittenb. Oriental. und exeget. Biblioth.*, Jena, 1776–1779, 4 vols. 8vo).—Jöcher, *Gelehrten Lex.* Addend. ii, 2022; Döring, *Gelehrt. Theol. Deutschl.* i, 740 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biograph. Générale*, xxiv, 795. (J. H. W.)

Hirz, Naphthali, ben-Jacob-Elchanan, one of the most celebrated Jewish Cabalists, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main in the latter half of the 16th century. The only work of Hirz which was printed, עֵמֶק הַמֶּלֶךְ, or *Valley of the King* (Amst. 1848, fol.), is a complete exposé of the Cabala. The vast research which he made for the preparation of this work makes it indispensable for inquirers into the Cabalistic system. He died, Fürst says, in Palestine, but the date is not certainly known.—Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, i, 401; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 800.

Hirzel, Bernhard, a Swiss theologian and Orientalist, was born at Zürich in 1807. He was for many years pastor of a small parish at Pfäffikon. Most of his life he devoted to the study of the Oriental and Sanscrit languages. In the ecclesiastical revolt of Sept. 6, 1839, he led the peasants to the city of Zürich, on which incident he wrote a book entitled *Mein Antheil a. d. Bewegung d. 6ten Sept.* (Zür. 1839). He died in Paris June, 1847. Among his works, his translation of the dramas of Kalisada, *Sakuntala* (Zürich, 1838), and of Solomon's Song: *Das Lied d. Lieder* (ibid. 1840), and the Hebrew poem *Gesicht d. Todesboten ü. d. Erdkreis* (ibid. 1844), are best known.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxiv, 801; Brockhaus, *Conv. Lex.* vii, 946.

Hirzel, Johann Heinrich, a German theologian, was born at Zürich (Switzerland) Dec. 18, 1710. In 1737 he was appointed professor of oratory and Church history at the university of his place; in 1745, of logic and rhetoric; and in 1759 was called to the chair of theology. He died Nov. 20, 1764. Of his writings, most remained in MS. He published *Disp. de verbo Dei unico reformatæ Relig. fundamento* (Zür. 1760, 4to):—*Disp. de vi et amplitudine nominis Div. Jehovah Zebaoth* (ibid. 1762, 4to).—Jöcher, *Gelehrten Lexikon*, Add. ii, 2025. (J. H. W.)

Hiss (שָׁרַק, *sharak'*, to *whistle*), a term usually expressing insult and contempt (Job xxvii, 23); so in the denunciation of the destruction of the Temple (1 Kings ix, 8; comp. Jer. xix, 8; xlix, 17, etc.). To call any one with hissing is a mark of power and authority (Isa. v, 26), and the prophet Zechariah (x, 8), speaking of the return from Babylon, says that the Lord will gather the house of Judah, as it were with a hiss, and bring them back into their own country: an image familiar to his readers, as Theodoret and Cyril of Alexandria remark that, in Syria and Palestine, those who looked after bees drew them out of their hives, carried them into the fields, and brought them back again, with the sound of a flute and the noise of hissing (Isa. vii, 18). See Bee.

Histopĕdēs (ἱστός, *a mast of a ship*, and πούς, *a foot*), a term applied to certain heretics, chiefly Eunomians, who baptized only the upper parts of the body as far as the breast, and this with the heels upward and the head downward (τοὺς πόδας ἄνω, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν κάτω). Hence the name *Histopedes*, or *Pederecti*. See Epiphanius, *Hæres.* c. 79; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xl, chap. xi, § 4.

Histories, a name applied to anthems composed either out of Scripture or from lives of the saints.—Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* p. 312.

History, in its modern sense, is hardly a term that expresses the conception of the sacred writers, who nevertheless have given us invaluable materials for its construction. The earliest records of the O. T. are rather family *pedigrees* (תּוֹלְדוֹת, *generations*), and the Gospels and Acts are properly *memoirs* and personal memoranda. See Chronology.

1. It is evident, however, that the Hebrew people were a *commemorative race;* in other words, they were given to creating and preserving memorials of important events. Even in the patriarchal times we find monuments set up in order to commemorate events. Jacob (Gen. xxviii, 18) "set up a pillar" to perpetuate the memory of the divine promise; and that these monuments had a religious import and sanction appears from the statement that "he poured oil upon the top of the pillar" (see Gen. xxxi, 45; Josh. iv, 9; 1 Sam. vii, 12; Judg. ix, 6). Long-lived trees, such as oaks and terebinths, were made use of as remembrancers (Gen. xxxv, 4; Josh. xxiv, 26). Commemorative names, also, were given to persons, places, and things; and from the earliest periods it was usual to substitute a new and descriptive name for an old one, which may in its origin have been descriptive too (Exod. ii, 10; Gen. ii, 23; iv, 1). Genealogical tables appear, moreover, to have had a very early existence among the people of whom the Bible speaks, being carefully preserved first memoriter, afterwards by writing, among family treasures, and thus transmitted from age to age. These, indeed, as might be expected, appear to have been the first beginnings of history—a fact which is illustrated and confirmed by the way in which what we should term a narrative or historical sketch is spoken of in the Bible, that is, as "the book of the generation" ("of Adam," Gen. v, 1): a mode of speaking which is applied even to the account of the creation (Gen. ii, 4), "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created." The genealogical tables in the Bible (speaking generally) are not only of a very early date, but are free from the mixtures of a theogonical and cosmogonical kind which are found in the early literature of other primitive nations, wearing the appearance of being, as far at least as they go, true and complete lists of individual and family descent (Gen. v, 1). But perhaps the most remarkable fact connected with this subject is the employment of poetry at a very early period to perpetuate a knowledge of historical events. Even in Gen. iv, 23, in the case of Lamech, we find po-

etry thus employed, that is, by the great-grandson of the primitive father. Other instances may be found in Exod. xv; Judg. v; Josh. x, 13; 2 Sam. i, 18.

2. The sources of Biblical history are chiefly the Biblical books themselves. Any attempt to fix the precise value of these sources in a critical point of view would require a volume instead of an article. Whatever hypothesis, however, may eventually be held touching the exact time when these books, or any of them, were put into their actual shape, as also touching the materials out of which they were formed, one thing appears very certain, that (to take an instance) Genesis, the earliest book (probably), contains most indubitable, as well as most interesting historical facts; for though the age, the mode of life, and the state of culture differ so widely from our own, we cannot do otherwise than feel that it is among men and women, parents and children—beings of like passions with ourselves—and not with mere creations of fancy or fraud, that we converse when we peruse the narratives which this composition has so long preserved. The conviction is much strengthened in the minds of those who, by personal acquaintance with the early profane writers, are able to compare their productions with those of the Hebrews, which were long anterior, and must, had they been of an equally earthly origin, have been at least equally deformed by fable. The simple comparison of the account given in Genesis of the creation of the world with the Cosmogonies of heathen writers, whether Hindu, Greek, or Latin, is enough to assure the impartial reader that a purer, if not a higher influence, presided over the composition of Genesis than that whence proceeded the legends or the philosophies of heathenism; nor is the conclusion in the slightest degree weakened on a closer scrutiny by any discrepancy which modern science may seem to show between its own discoveries and the statements in Genesis. The Biblical history, as found in its Biblical sources, has a decided peculiarity and a great recommendation in the fact that we can trace in the Bible more clearly and fully than in connection with any other history, the first crude elements and the early materials out of which all history must be constructed.

How far the literature supplied in the Bible may be only a relic of a literary cyclus called into being by the felicitous circumstances and favorable constitution of the great Shemitic family, but which has perished in the lapse of ages, it is now impossible to determine; but had the other portions of this imagined literature been of equal *religious* value with what the Bible offers, there is little risk in affirming that mankind would scarcely have allowed it to be lost. The Bible, however, bears traces that its were not the only books current in the time and country to which it relates; for writing, writers, and books are mentioned without the emphasis and distinction which always accompany new discoveries or peculiar local possessions, and as ordinary, well-known, and matter-of-course things. It is certain that we do not possess all the works which were known in the early periods of Israelitish history, since in Numb. xxi, 14 we read of "the book of the wars of the Lord," and in Josh. x, 13, of "the book of Jasher."

Without writing, history, properly so called, can have no existence. Under the head WRITING we shall trace the early rudiments and progress of that important art: here we merely remark that an acquaintance with it was possessed by the Hebrews at least as early as their Exodus from Egypt—a fact which shows at least the possibility that the age of the Biblical records stands some thousand years or more prior to the earliest Greek historian, Herodotus.

Other sources for at least the early Biblical history are comparatively of small value. Josephus has gone over the same periods as those the Bible treats of, but obviously had no sources of consequence relating to primitive times which are not open to us, and in regard to those times does little more than add here and there a patch of a legendary or traditional hue which could well have been spared. His Greek and Roman predilections and his apologetical aims detract from the value of his work, while in relation to the early history of his country he can be regarded in no other light than a sort of philosophical interpreter; nor is it till he comes to his own age that he has the value of an independent (not even then an impartial) eye-witness or well-informed reporter. In historical criticism and linguistic knowledge he was very insufficiently furnished. The use of both Josephus and Philo is far more safe for the student of the New Testament than for the expounder of the old. See JOSEPHUS.

The Talmud and the Rabbins afford very little assistance for the early periods, but might probably be made to render more service in behalf of the times of the Saviour than has generally been allowed. The illustrations which Lightfoot and Wetstein have drawn from these sources are of great value; and Gfrörer, in his *Jahrhundert des Heils* (Stuttgart, 1838), has made ample use of the materials they supply in order to draw a picture of the first century, a use which the learned author is at no small pains to justify. The compilations of the Jewish doctors, however, require to be employed with the greatest caution, since the Rabbins were the depositaries, the expounders, and the apologists of that corrupt form of the primitive faith and of the Mosaic institutions which has been called by the distinctive name of Judaism, comprising a heterogeneous mass of false and true things, the colluvies of the East as well as light from the Bible, and which, to a great extent, lies under the express condemnation of Christ himself. How easy it is to propagate fables on their authority, and to do a disservice to the Gospel records, may be learnt from the fact that older writers, in their undue trust of Rabbinical authority, went so far as to maintain that no cock was allowed to be kept in Jerusalem, because fowls scratched unclean things out of the earth, though the authority of Scripture (which in this case they refused to admit) is most express and decided (Matt. xxvi, 34; Mark xiv, 30, 60, 72). On the credibility of the Rabbins, see Ravii *Diss. Phil. Theol. de eo quod Fidei merentur*, etc., in Oelrich's *Collect. Opusc. Hist. Phil. Theol.*; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* ii, 1095; Fabricius, *Bibliog. Antiq.* i, 3, 4; Brunsmann, *Diss. de Judaica* (Hafniæ, 1705).

The classical authors betray the grossest ignorance almost in all cases where they treat of the origin and history of the Hebrew people; and even the most serious and generally philosophic writers fall into vulgar errors and unaccountable mistakes as soon as they speak on the subject. What, for instance, can be worse than the blunder or prejudice of Tacitus, under the influence of which he declared that the Jews derived their origin from Mount Ida, in Crete; that by the advice of an oracle they had been driven out of Egypt; and that they set up in their temple at Jerusalem as an object of worship the figure of an ass, since an animal of that species had directed them in the wilderness and discovered to them a fountain (Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 1, 2). Dion Cassius (xxxvii, 17) relates similar fables. Plutarch (*Quæst. Sympos.* iv, 5) makes the Hebrews pay divine honors to swine, as being their instructors in agriculture, and affirms that they kept the Sabbath and the Feast of Tabernacles in honor of Bacchus. A collection of these gross misrepresentations, together with a profound and successful inquiry into their origin, and a full exposure of their falsehood, has been given by Dr. J. G. Müller, in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* (1843, iv, 893).

3. The children of the faithful Abraham seem to have had one great work of Providence intrusted to them, namely, the development, transmission, and infusion into the world of the religious element of civilization. Their history, accordingly, is the history of the rise, progress, and diffusion of true religion, considered in its source and its developments. Such a history must possess large and peculiar interest for every student of human nature, and pre-eminently for those who love to study the unfoldings of Providence, and desire to learn that

greatest of all arts—the art of living at once for time and for eternity.

The subject-matter contained in the Biblical history is of a wide and most extensive nature. In its greatest length and fullest meaning it comes down from the creation of the world till near the close of the 1st century of the Christian æra, thus covering a space of some 4000 years. The books presenting this long train of historical details are most diverse in age, in kind, in execution, and in worth; nor seldom is it the fact that the modern historian has to construct his narrative as much out of the implications of an epistle, the highly-colored materials of poetry, the far-reaching visions of prophecy, and the indirect and illusive information of didactic and moral precepts, as from the immediate and express statements of history strictly so denominated.

The historical materials furnished relating to the Hebrew nation may be classed under three great divisions: 1. The books which are consecrated to the antiquity of the Hebrew nation—the period that elapsed before the æra of the judges. These works are the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, which, according to Ewald (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i, 72), properly constitute only one work, and which may be termed the great book of original documents. 2. The books which describe the times of the judges and the kings up to the first destruction of Jerusalem; that is, Judges, Kings, and Samuel, to which belongs the book of Ruth: "all these," says Ewald, "constitute also, according to their last formation, but one work, which may be called the Great Book of Kings." 3. The third class comprises the books included under the head of Hagiographa, which are of a much later origin, Chronicles, with Ezra and Nehemiah, forming the great book of general history reaching to the Grecian period. After these books come those which are classed together under the name of Apocrypha, whose use, we think, has been unduly neglected. Then the circle of evangelical records begins, which closed within the century that saw it open. Other books found in the Old and New Testaments, which are not properly of a historical character, connect themselves with one or other of these periods, and give important aid to students of sacred history.

4. Biblical history was often treated by the older writers as a part of Church History in general, since they considered the history given in the Bible as presenting different and successive phases of the Church of God (Buddei *Hist. Eccles.* 2 vols. 1726-29; Stolberg, *Gesch. der Religion Jesu*, i, 111). Other writers have viewed this subject in a more practical light, presenting the characters found in the Bible for imitation or avoidance; among whom may be enumerated Hess (*Geschichte der Israeliten vor den Zeiten Jesu*, Zürich, 1775) and Niemeyer (*Characteristik der Bibel*, Halle, 1830). Among the more strictly learned writers several have had it in view to supply the gaps left in the succession of events by the Bible, out of sources found in profane writers. Here the chief authors are of English birth, namely, Prideaux, Shuckford, Russell; and for the New Testament, the learned, cautious, and fair-dealing Lardner. There is a valuable work by G. Langen: *Versuch einer Harmonie der heiligen und profan. scrib. in der Geschichte der Welt* (Bayreuth, 1775-80). Other writers have pursued a strictly chronological method, such as Usher (*Annales Vet. N. T.* Lond. 1650) and Des Vignoles (*Chronologie de l'Histoire Sainte*, Berlin, 1738). Heeren (*Handb. der Geschichte*, p. 50) recommends, as containing many valuable inquiries on the monarchical period, the following work: J. Bernhardi *Commentatio de causis quibus effectum sit ut regnum Judæ diutius persisteret quam regnum Israel* (Lovanni, 1825). Heeren also declares that Bauer's *Handbuch der Gesch. des Hebr. Volks* (1800) is the best introduction both to the history and the antiquities of the Hebrew nation; though Gesenius complains that he is too much given to the construction of hypotheses. The English reader will find a useful but not sufficiently critical compendium in *The History of the Hebrew Commonwealth*, translated from the German of John Jahn, D.D., by C. E. Stowe (N. Y. 1829, and later). A far more valuable, as well as more interesting, yet by no means faultless work, is Milman's *History of the Jews* (London, 1829, 3 vols. 12mo; revised, Lond. and N. Y. 1870-1, 3 vols. sm. 8vo). A more recent and very valuable work, Kitto's *Pictorial History of Palestine* (Lond. 1841), combines with the Bible history of the Jews the results of travel and antiquarian research, and is preceded by an elaborate Introduction, which forms the only Natural History of Palestine in our language. A valuable compendium is Smith's series of "Student's Histories" (*Old-Testament History* and *New-Testament History*, Lond. and N. Y. 1869, 2 vols. 12mo). Stanley's *Lectures on Jewish History* (London and N. Y. 1863 sq. 2 vols. 8vo) are more brilliantly written.

German theologians are strongly imbued with the feeling that the history of the Hebrews has yet to be written. Niebuhr's manner of treating Roman history has had a great influence on them, and has aroused the theological world to new efforts, which have by no means yet come to an end; nor can we add that they have hitherto led to very definite and generally approved results. The works of the learned Jews, Jost (*Gesch. der Israeliten seit der Maccabäer*, 9 vols.; *Gesch. des Judenthums und Seiner Sekten*, 1857-59, 3 vols.), Herzfeld (*Gesch. d. Volkes Israel v. d. Vollendung des Zweiten Tempels bis zur Einsetzung des Mackabäers Schimon*, 1854-57, 2 vols. 8vo), Grätz (*Geschichte d. Juden*, 11 vols. 8vo, not yet completed), as well as that of Nork (*Das Leben Mosis vom Astron. Stand. betrachtet*, 1838), Raphall (*Post-bibl. History of the Jews*, N. Y. 1855, of which vols. i and ii only ever appeared), and others, must not be overlooked by the professional student; nor will he fail to study with care the valuable introductions to the knowledge of the Old Testament put forth in Germany, with which we have nothing comparable in our language. See INTRODUCTION. Of the more recent works we may mention Stähelin's *Kritisch Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch*, etc. (1843), and H. Ewald's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus* (Götting. 1843 sq., 1851-3, 6 vols. 8vo), the first part of which has been translated into English (London, 1869, 2 vols. 8vo). The latter especially is learned, acute, and profound, but thoroughly pervaded by a rationalistic spirit. Kurtz's *Manual of Sacred History* (Philadel. 1858, 12mo; from the German, Königsberg, 1850, 8vo), and *History of the Old Covenant* (Edinburgh, 1859, 3 vols. 8vo; from the German, Berlin, 1848-55, 3 vols. 8vo), are more evangelical, but less searching and original. Weber und Holtzmann's *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel* (Leipz. 1866, 2 vols. 8vo) is rationalistic. The latest is Hitzig's *Gesch. Isr.* (Lpz. 1870). For other works, see Darling, *Cyclopædia*, col. 1830 sq.

History, Church. See ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

History of Doctrines. See DOCTRINES, HISTORY OF.

Histriomastix is the name of a book written in 1663 by William Prynne, a Puritan barrister, against plays, masks, dancing, etc. It is a thick quarto of 1006 pages, and abounds with learning and curious quotations. The author of this work was arraigned before the Star Chamber Feb. 7, 1663, on account of passages which, it was alleged, reflected on the religious conduct of the royal house. But the fact was that the author condemned, and that justly, the levity and voluptuousness of the court, and the encouragement which even some of the prelates gave to its licentiousness. Prynne was sentenced "to have his book burned by the hands of the common hangman, to be put from the bar, and to be forever incapable of his profession, to be turned out of the society of Lincoln's Inn, to be degraded at Oxford, to stand in the pillory at Westminster and Cheapside, to lose both his ears, one in each place, to pay a fine of £5000, and to suffer perpetual imprisonment." But more remarkable than this, if possible, was

the violent speech of an English earl (Dorset) on this occasion. "I declare you (Prynne) to be a schism-maker in the Church, a sedition sower in the commonwealth, a wolf in sheep's clothing; in a word, omnium malorum nequissimus," continuing in this strain, and closing thus: "I would have him branded in the forehead, slit in the nose, and have his ears chopped off."—Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, i, 316, 317; Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.* ii, 315; Granger, *Biog. Hist.* ii, 230; Carwithen, *History of the Church of England*, ii, 78–80. (J. H. W.)

Hitchcock, Edward, D.D., LL.D., was born in Old Deerfield, Mass., May 24, 1793. Poverty, general ill health, and, worse than all, an affection of his eyes, prevented him from the completion of a collegiate course; but, despite this, he succeeded in obtaining in 1816 the principalship of the academy in his native place, and his success as a teacher received the recognition of Yale College in the degree of M.A., which that institution of learning conferred on him only two years later. In 1819 he went to Yale, and studied theology under Dr. Taylor for about three years. His first and only settlement in the ministry was at Conway, where he remained from 1821 to 1825, when again failing health induced him to accept the professorship of natural history and chemistry in Amherst College, which gave him the prospect of more exercise and less exhaustive labors. He entered this new position after some preparatory study under Prof. Silliman, senior, of Yale College. In 1845 he was elected president of Amherst College, and professor of natural theology and geology. In 1854 he resigned the presidency, but still continued in the chair of geology. He died Feb. 27, 1864. Dr. Hitchcock is especially deserving of our recognition in this place on account of his *Religion of Geology and its connected Sciences* (Boston, 1851, 12mo), the result of thirty years' study and reflection, which had a very extended circulation both in this country and in Europe. Among Dr. Hitchcock's peculiar literary traits (see the *Biblioth. Sacra*, July, 1851, p. 662, 663) may be mentioned "his mode of answering the objection to the resurrection of the body; his proofs from geology of the benevolence of God, of special providence, and of special divine interposition in nature" (comp. his articles in *Bib. Sacra*, x, 166–194, "Relations and Duties of the Philosopher and Theologian;" and xi, 776–800, "Special Divine Interpositions in Nature"). Dr. William S. Tyler, professor in Amherst College, who preached a discourse at Dr. Hitchcock's funeral, which has been printed, gave "an admirable estimate and summary of his life, character, attainments, and influence."—Appleton's *Cyclop.* ix, 210, and *Annual*, 1868, p. 1428; Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 379; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* July, 1864, p. 528.

Hitchcock, Enos, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in Springfield, Mass., graduated at Harvard in 1767, and was ordained colleague of Mr. Chipman, pastor of the Second Congregational Church of Beverley, in 1771. In 1780 he became a chaplain in the army, and at the close of the war in 1783 he took a pastoral charge in Providence, R. I. He bequeathed at his death, which occurred in 1803, $2500 as a fund for the support of the ministry. He published a *Treatise on Education* (1790, 2 vols.):—*Sermons, with an Essay on the Lord's Supper* (1793–1800).—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 852.

Hitchcock, Gad, D.D., a Unitarian minister, was born at Springfield, Mass., Feb. 12, 1718 or 1719. He was educated at Harvard University, where he graduated in 1743, and was ordained and installed in Pembroke (now Hanson, Mass.), in October, 1748. During the Revolutionary War he served as chaplain. In 1787 his alma mater conferred on him the degree of doctor of divinity. In 1797 he was attacked with paralysis while preaching to his people, from which he never recovered so as to engage any further in active service. He died Aug. 8, 1803. His writings were mainly sermons and a (Dudleian) lecture, delivered at Harvard College in 1779.—Sprague, *Ann. of the Amer. Pulpit*, viii, 29.

Hitt, Daniel, a Methodist Episcopal minister of considerable eminence, was born in Fauquier County, Va., entered the itinerancy in 1790, became the travelling companion of bishop Asbury in 1807, and in 1808 was elected by the General Conference one of the agents of the Methodist Book Concern, the duties of which office he discharged for eight years. He next, with great fidelity, served as presiding elder until 1822, when he became the travelling companion of bishop M'Kendree. In 1823 he took charge of the Potomac District; after two years' labors he passed to the Carlisle District, and there closed his earthly work. Mr. Hitt was a man of marked "simplicity and integrity," and "the affability of his manners and the sweetness of his disposition, in his private intercourse in society, gained him the affection of all." He died of typhus fever, in great peace and sure hope, in September, 1825.—*Minutes of Conf.* i, 507.

Hit'tite, or rather Chethite (Heb. *Chitti'*, חִתִּי, usually in the plur. חִתִּים, Sept. Χετταῖοι; also בְּנֵי חֵת, "children of Heth;" fem. חִתִּית, Ezek. xvi, 3; plur. חִתִּיּוֹת, 1 Kings xi, 1; also בְּנוֹת חֵת, "daughters of Heth," Gen. xxvii, 46), the designation of the descendnts of Heth, and one of the nations of Canaan (q. v.).

I. *Biblical Notices.*—(1.) With five exceptions, noticed below, the word is הַחִתִּי = "the Chittite;" in the singular number, according to the common Hebrew idiom. It is occasionally rendered in the A. V. in the singular number, "the Hittite" (Exod. xxiii, 28; xxxiii, 2; xxxiv, 11; Josh. ix, 1; xi, 3), but elsewh. as a plur. (Gen. xv, 20; Exod. iii, 8, 17; xiii, 5; xxiii, 23; Numb. xiii, 29; Deut. vii, 1; xx, 17; Josh. iii, 10; xii, 8; xxiv, 11; Judg. iii, 5; 1 Kings ix, 20; 2 Chron. viii, 7; Ezra ix, 1; Neh. ix, 8; 1 Esdr. viii, 69, Χετταιοι). (2.) The plural form of the word is הַחִתִּים = the Chittim, or Hittites (Josh. i, 4; Judg. i, 26; 1 Kings x, 29; 2 Kings vii, 6; 2 Chron. i, 17). (3.) "A Hittite [woman]" is חִתִּית (Ezek. xvi, 3, 45). In 1 Kings xi, 1, the same word is rendered "Hittites."

In the list of the descendants of Noah, Heth occupies the second place among the children of Canaan. It is to be observed that the first and second names, Sidon and Heth, are not gentile nouns, and that all the names following are gentile nouns in the sing. Sidon is called the first-born of Canaan, though the name of the town is probably put for that of its founder, or eponym, "the fisherman," Ἁλιεύς, of Philo of Byblus. It is therefore probable, as we find no city Heth, that this is the name of the ancestor of the nation, and the gentile noun, children of Heth, makes this almost certain. After the enumeration of the nations sprung from Canaan, it is added, "And afterwards were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad" (Gen. x, 18). This passage will be illustrated by the evidence that there were Hittites and Amorites beyond Canaan, and also beyond the wider territory that must be allowed for the placing of the Hamathites, who, it may be added, perhaps had not migrated from Canaan at the date to which the list of Noah's descendants mainly refers (see verse 19). See Canaanite.

1. Our first introduction to the Hittites is in the time of Abraham, when they are mentioned among the inhabitants of the Promised Land (Gen. xv, 20). Abraham bought from the Bene-Cheth, "Children of Heth"—such was then their title—the field and the cave of Machpelah, belonging to Ephron the Hittite (Gen. xxiii, 3–18). They were then settled at the town which was afterwards, under its new name of Hebron, to become one of the most famous cities of Palestine, then bearing the name of Kirjath-arba, and perhaps also of Mamre (Gen. xxiii, 19; xxv, 9). The propensities of the tribe appear at that time to have been rather commercial than military. The "money current with the merchant," and the process of weighing it, were familiar to them; the peaceful assembly "in the gate of the city" was their manner of receiving the stranger who was de-

sirous of having a "possession" "secured" to him among them. The dignity and courtesy of their demeanor also come out strongly in this narrative. As Ewald well says, Abraham chose his allies in warfare from the Amorites, but he goes to the Hittites for his grave. But the tribe was evidently as yet but small, not important enough to be noticed beside "the Canaanite and the Perizzite," who shared the bulk of the land between them (Gen. xii, 6; xiii, 7). In the southern part of the country they remained for a considerable period after this, possibly extending as far as Gerar and Beersheba, a good way below Hebron (xxvi, 17; xxviii, 10). From their families Esau married his first two wives (Gen. xxvi, 34; xxxvi, 2 sq.), and the fear lest Jacob should take the same course is the motive given by Rebekah for sending Jacob away to Haran. It was the same feeling that had urged Abram to send to Mesopotamia for a wife for Isaac. The descendant of Shem could not wed with Hamites—"with the daughters of the Canaanites among whom I dwell . . . wherein I am a stranger," but "go to my country and thy kindred" is his father's command, "to the house of thy mother's father, and take thee a wife from thence" (Gen. xxviii, 2; xxiv, 4). See Hivite.

From several of the above notices we learn that the original seat of the Hittites, the city of Hebron, was founded by one Arba of the Anakim, whence its earlier name, and had inhabitants of that giant race as late as Joshua's time. It is also connected with Zoan in Egypt, and is said to have been built seven years before that city (Numb. xiii, 22). Zoan or Avaris was built or rebuilt, and no doubt received its Hebrew or Shemitic name, Zoan, the translation of its Egyptian name HA-AWAR, in the time of the first Shepherd-king of Egypt, who was of Phœnician or kindred race. It is also to be noted that, in Abraham's time, the Amorites, connected with the giant race in the case of the Rephaim whom Chedorlaomer smote in Ashteroth Karnaim (Gen. xiv, 5), where the Rephaite Og afterwards ruled, dwelt close to Hebron (ver. 13). The Hittites and Amorites, we shall see, were later settled together in the Orontes valley. Thus at this period there was a settlement of the two nations in the south of Palestine, and the Hittites were mixed with the Rephaite Anakim. See Hebron.

2. Throughout the period of the settlement in Palestine, the name of the Hittites occurs only in the usual formula for the occupants of the Promised Land. Changes occur in the mode of stating this formula, but the Hittites are never omitted (see Exod. xxiii, 28). In the enumeration of the six or seven nations of Canaan, the first names, in four phrases, are the Canaanites, Hittites, and Amorites; in two, which make no mention of the Canaanites, the Hittites and Amorites; and in three, the former three names, with the addition of another nation. In but two phrases are these three nations further separated. It is also to be remarked that the Hittites and Amorites are mentioned together in a bare majority of the forms of the enumeration, but in a great majority of passages. The importance thus given to the Hittites is perhaps equally evident in the place of Heth in the list of the descendants of Noah, in the place of the tribe in the list in the promise to Abraham, where it is first of the known descendants of Canaan (xv, 20), and certainly in the term "all the land of the Hittites," as a designation of the Promised Land in its full extent, from Euphrates to the Mediterranean, and from Lebanon to the desert (Josh. i, 4). The close relation of the Hittites and Amorites seems to be indicated by the prophet Ezekiel, where he speaks of Jerusalem as daughter of an Amorite father and a Hittite mother (xvi, 3, 45). Indeed the Hittites and Amorites seem, in these last-cited passages, to be named for the Canaanites in general.

When the spies examined Canaan they found "the Hittites, and the Jebusites, and the Amorites" dwelling "in the mountains" (Numb. xiii, 29), that is, in the high tracts that afterwards formed the refuges and rallying-points of the Israelites during the troubled period of the judges. There is, however, no distinct statement as to the exact position of the Hittites in Palestine. We may draw an inference from their connection with Jerusalem and the Amorites, and their inhabiting the mountains, and suppose that they were probably seated chiefly in the high region of the tribe of Judah. Of their territory beyond Palestine there are some indications in Scripture. The most important of these is the designation of the Promised Land in its full extent as "all the land of the Hittites" already mentioned, with which the notices of Hittite kings out of Canaan must be compared. Whatever temporary circumstances may have originally attracted them so far to the south as Beersheba, a people having the quiet commercial tastes of Ephron the Hittite and his companions can have had no call for the roving, skirmishing life of the country bordering on the desert; and thus, during the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, they had withdrawn themselves from those districts, retiring before Amalek (Numb. xiii, 29) to the more secure mountain country in the centre of the land. Perhaps the words of Ezekiel (xvi, 3, 45) may imply that they helped to found the city of Jebus.

From this time, however, their quiet habits vanish, and they take their part against the invader, in equal alliance with the other Canaanitish tribes (Josh. ix, 1; xi, 3, etc.).

3. Henceforward the notices of the Hittites are very few and faint. We meet with two individuals, both attached to the person of David. (1.) "Ahimelech the Hittite," who was with him in the hill of Hachilah, and with Abishai accompanied him by night to the tent of Saul (1 Sam. xxvi, 6). He is nowhere else mentioned, and was possibly killed in one of David's expeditions, before the list in 2 Sam. xxiii was drawn up. (2.) "Uriah the Hittite," one of "the thirty" of David's body-guard (2 Sam. xxiii, 39; 1 Chron. xi, 41), the deep tragedy of whose wrongs forms the one blot in the life of his master. In both these persons, though warriors by profession, we can perhaps detect traces of those qualities which we have noticed as characteristics of the tribe. In the case of the first, it was Abishai, the practical, unscrupulous "son of Zeruiah," who pressed David to allow him to kill the sleeping king: Ahimelech is clear from that stain. In the case of Uriah, the absence from suspicion and the generous self-denial which he displayed are too well known to need more than a reference (2 Sam. xi, 11, 12). He was doubtless a proselyte, and probably descended from several generations of proselytes; but the fact shows that Canaanitish blood was in itself no bar to advancement in the court and army of David.

Solomon subjected the remaining Hittites to the same tribute of bond-service as the other remnants of the Canaanitish nations (1 Kings ix, 20). Of all these the Hittites appear to have been the most important, and to have been under a king of their own; for "the kings of the Hittites" are, in 1 Kings x, 29, coupled with the kings of Syria as purchasers of the chariots which Solomon imported from Egypt. It appears that this was some different division of the Hittite family living far away somewhere in the north; although, from their connection in 2 Kings vii, 6, with the Egyptians, others have inferred that the noise came from the south, from which quarter it seems they and the Egyptians were the only people who could be expected to make an attack with chariots. This would identify them with the southern Hivites, who were subject to the sceptre of Judah, and show also that it was they who purchased Egyptian chariots from the factors of Solomon. It is evident in any case, however, that they were a distinct and independent body, apparently outside the bounds of Palestine. The Hittites were still present in Palestine as a distinct people after the Exile, and are named among the alien tribes with whom the returned Israelites contracted those marriages which Ezra urged and Nehemiah compelled them to dissolve (Ezra ix, 1, etc.; comp. Neh. xiii, 23-

28). After this we hear no more of the Hittites, who probably lost their national identity by intermixture with the neighboring tribes or nations. (See Hamelsveld, iii, 51 sq.; *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1851, p. 166.) See HEATHEN.

4. Nothing is said of the religion or worship of the Hittites. Even in the enumeration of Solomon's idolatrous worship of the gods of his wives—among whom were Hittite women (1 Kings xi, 1)—no Hittite deity is alluded to (see 1 Kings xi, 5, 7; 2 Kings xxiii, 13). See below.

5. The names of the individual Hittites mentioned in the Bible are as follow. They are all susceptible of interpretation as Hebrew words, which would lead to the belief either that the Hittites spoke a dialect of the Aramaic or Hebrew language, or that the words were Hebraized in their transference to the Bible records.

ADAH (a woman), Gen. xxxvi, 2.
AHIMELECH, 1 Sam. xxvi, 6.
BASHEMATH, accurately BAS'MATH (a woman); possibly a second name of Adah, Gen. xxvi, 34.
BEERI (father of Judith, below), Gen. xxvi, 34.
ELON (father of Basmath), Gen. xxvi, 34.
EPHRON, Gen. xxiii, 10, 13, 14, etc.
JUDITH (a woman), Gen. xxvi, 34.
URIAH, 2 Sam. xi, 3, etc.; xxiii, 39, etc.
ZOHAR (father of Ephron), Gen. xxiii, 8.

In addition to the above, SIBBECHAI, who in the Hebrew text is always denominated a Hushathite, is by Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 12, 2) styled a Hittite.

II. *Notices in Ancient Inscriptions.*—1. The Egyptian monuments give us much information as to a Hittite nation that can only be that indicated in the two passages in the books of Kings above noticed. The kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties made extensive conquests in Syria and Mesopotamia. They were opposed by many small states, which probably always formed one or more confederacies. In the time of Thothmes III (B.C. cir. 1450), the leading nation was that of the RUTEN (or LUTEN), which appears to have once headed a confederacy defeated by that king before Megiddo (De Rougé, *Revue Archéolog.* n. s., iv, 346 sq.). The KHETA were conquered by or tributary to Thothmes III (Birch, *Annals of Thothmes III*, p. 21); but it is not until the time of Rameses II (B.C. cir. 1306), second king (according to Manetho) of the nineteenth dynasty, that we find them occupying the most important place among the eastern enemies of the Egyptians, the place before held by the RUTEN. The name is generally written KHET, and sometimes KHETA, and was probably in both cases pronounced KHAT. It is not easy to determine whether it properly denotes the people or the country; perhaps it denotes the latter, as it rarely has a plural termination; but it is often used for the former. This name is identical in radicals with that of the Hittites, and that it designates them is clear from its being connected with a name equally representing that of the Amorites, and from the correspondence of this warlike people, strong in chariots, with the non-Palestinian Hittites mentioned in the Bible. The chief or strongest city of the KHETA, or at least of the territory subject to or confederate with the king of the KHETA, was KETESH, on the river ARNUT, ANURTA, or ARUNATA. KETESH was evidently a Kadesh, "a sacred city," קדש, but no city of that name, which could correspond to this, is known to us in Biblical geography. It is represented in the Egyptian sculptures as on or near a lake, which Dr. Brugsch has traced in the modern lake of Kedes, fed by the Orontes, southward of Hems (Emesa). The Orontes, it must be observed, well corresponds to the ARUNATA. The town is also stated to have been in the land of AMAR (or AMARA), that is, of the Amorites. The position of this Amoritish territory is further defined by Carchemish being placed in it, as we shall show in a later part of this article. The territory of these Hittites, therefore, lay in the valley of the Orontes. It probably extended towards the Euphrates, for the KHETA are also connected with NEHARENA, or Mesopotamia, not the NAHIRI of the cuneiform inscriptions, but it is not clear that they ruled that country. Probably they drew confederates thence, as was done by the Syrians in David's time.

The greatest achievement of Rameses II was the defeat of the KHETA and their allies near KETESH, in the fifth year of his reign. This event is commemorated in a papyrus and by several inscriptions and sculptures. The nations confederate with the KHETA were the ARATU (Aradus?), MAÄUSU (Mash?), PAÄTSA OF PATASA, KESHKESH, ARUNU, KATAWATANA, KHERABU (Helbon?), AKATERA, KETESH, RETA, Arkites, TENTENE (or TRATENUEE), and KARAKAMASHA (Carchemish). These names are difficult to identify save the seventh and the last, but it is evident that they do not belong to Palestine. The Hittites are represented as having a regular army, which was strong in chariots, a particular which we should expect from the Biblical notices of them and of the Canaanites, where the latter name seems applied to the tribe so called. Each chariot was drawn by two horses, and held three men, a charioteer and two warriors. They had also cavalry and disciplined infantry. In the great battle with Rameses they had 2500 horses, that is, chariots. The representations of the KHETA in the sculptures relating to this campaign probably show that their forces were composed of men of two different races. Sir Gardner Wilkinson thinks that both belonged to the KHETA nation, and it seems hardly possible to form any other conclusion. "The nation of Sheta [the initial character is thus sometimes read *sh*] seems to have been composed of two distinct tribes, both comprehended under the same name, uniting in one common cause, and probably subject to the same government." These supposed tribes differed in dress and arms, and one was sometimes bearded, the other was beardless (*Ancient Egyptians*, i, p. 400 sq.). They are rather fair than yellow, and the beardless warriors are probably of a different race from the people of Palestine

Ancient Hittites. From the Egyptian Monuments.

generally. In some cases they remind us of the Tatars, and it is impossible to forget that the Egyptians of the Greek period evidently took the KHETA for Scythians or Bactrians. The name Scythian is not remote, nor is that of the Kittas, or warrior-Tatars in the Chinese garrisons; but mere word resemblances are dangerous; and the circumstance that the Scythians appear in history when the Hittites have just disappeared is not of much value. But it is worthy of remark that in the time of Moses there was a Rephaite ruling the Amorites in Palestine, as the sons of Anak had apparently long ruled the Hittites in Hebron, so that we need not be surprised to find two races under the same government in the case of the Hittites of Syria.

In the twenty-first year of Rameses II, the great king of the Hittites, KHETSERA, came to Egypt to make a treaty of peace. A copy of the treaty is preserved in a hieroglyphic inscription. From this it appears that KHETSERA had been preceded by his grandfather SAPRARA, his father MAURASARA, and his brother MAUTNURA, and that in the reigns of SAPRARA and MAUTNURA peace had been made upon the same conditions. In a tablet of the thirty-fourth year of the same king, one of his wives, a Hittite princess with the Egyptian name RA-MA-UR-NE-FRU, is represented as well as her father, the king (or a king) of the KHETA. Solomon also, as Dr. Brugsch remarks, took Hittite women into his harem (1 Kings xi, 1). Rameses III (B.C. cir. 1200) had a war with the KHETA, mentioned in one of his inscriptions with KETE (KETESH) KARA[K]AMSA (Carchemish), ARATU (Aradus?), and ARASA, all described as in the land AMABA.

The religion of the Hittites is only known from the above treaty with Rameses II, though it is probable that additional information may be derived from an examination of proper names. In this inscription the divinities both of the land of KHETA and of Egypt are mentioned, probably because they were invoked to see that the compact was duly kept. They are described from a Hittite point of view, a circumstance which is curious as showing how carefully the Egyptian scribe had kept to the document before him. They are the gods of war, and the gods of women of the land of KHETA and of Egypt, the SUTEKH of the land of KHETA, the SUTEKH of several forts, the ASHTERAT (written ANTERAT) of the land of KHETA, several unnamed gods and goddesses of places or countries, and of a fortress, the mountains and rivers of the land of KHETA, and of Egypt, Amen, SUTEKH, and the winds. SUTEKH, or SET, was the chief god of the Shepherd-kings of Egypt (one of whom appears to have abolished all other worship in his dominions), and is also called BAR, or Baal. SUTEKH is perhaps a foreign form, SET seems certainly of foreign origin. ASHTERAT is, of course, Ashtoreth, the consort of Baal in Palestine. They were the principal divinities of the KHETA, for they are mentioned by name, and as worshipped in the whole land. The worship of the mountains and rivers is remarkably indicative of the character of the religion, and the mention of the gods of special cities points in the same direction. The former is low nature-worship, the latter is entirely consistent with it, and, indeed, is never found but in connection with it.

The Egyptian monuments furnish us with the following additional Hittite names: TARAKANUNASA, KAMAKT, TARKATATASA (an ally?), KHERAPSARA, scribe of books of the KHETA, PESA, TETARA, KRABETUSA, AÄKMA (an ally?), SA.MARUS, TATARA, MATREMA, brother of [the king of] the KHETA, RABSUNUNA (an ally?), TUATASA (an ally?).

These names are evidently Shemitic, but not Hebrew, a circumstance that need not surprise us when we know that Aramaic was distinct from Hebrew in Jacob's time. The syllables SERA in KHET-SERA, and RAB in RAB-SUNUNA, seem to correspond to the SAR and RAB of Assyrian and Babylonian names. TETARA may be the same name as the Tidal of Scripture. But the most remarkable of all these names is MATREMA, which corresponds as closely as possible to Mizraim. The third letter is a hard T, and the final syllable is constantly used for the Hebrew dual. In the Egyptian name of Mesopotamia, NEHARENA, we find the Chaldee and Arabic dual. It would therefore appear that the language of the KHETA was nearer to the Hebrew than to the Chaldee. TARKATATASA probably commences with the name of the goddess Derceto or Atargatis.

The principal source of information on the Egyptian bearings of this subject is Brugsch's *Geographische Inschriften*, ii, 20 sq. The documents to which he mainly refers are the inscriptions of Rameses II, the poem of PENTAUR, and the treaty. The first are given by Lepsius (Denkmäler, *Abth.* iii, bl. 153–161, 164–166, 187, 196; see also 130, 209), and translated by M. Chabas (*Rev. Arch.*, 1859); see also Brugsch, *Histoire d'Égypte*, i, 137 sq.: the second is translated by M. de Rougé (*Revue Contemporaine*, No. 106, p. 389 sq.), Dr. Brugsch (*ll. cc.*), Mr. Goodwin, *Cambridge Essays*, 1858, and in Bunsen's *Egypt's Place*, iv, 675 sq.; and the third is translated by Dr. Brugsch (*ll. cc.*) and Mr. Goodwin (*Parthenon*, 1862).

2. In the Assyrian inscriptions, as lately deciphered, there are frequent references to a nation of *Khatti*, who "formed a great confederacy ruled by a number of petty chiefs," whose territory also lay in the valley of the Orontes, and who were sometimes assisted by the people of the sea-coast, probably the Phœnicians (Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, i, 463). "Twelve kings of the southern Khatti are mentioned in several places." If the identification of these people with the Hittites should prove to be correct, it agrees with the name *Chat*, as noticed under HETH, and affords a clew to the meaning of some passages which are otherwise puzzling. These are (*a*) Josh. i, 4, where the expression "all the land of the Hittites" appears to mean all the land of Canaan, or at least the northern part thereof. (*b*) Judg. i, 26. Here nearly the same expression recurs. See LUZ. (*c*) 1 Kings x, 29; 2 Chron. i, 17, "All the kings of the Hittites and kings of Aram" (probably identical with the "kings on this side Euphrates," 1 Kings iv, 24) are mentioned as purchasing chariots and horses from Egypt, for the possession of which they were so notorious, that (*d*) it would seem to have become at a later date almost proverbial in allusion to an alarm of an attack by chariots (2 Kings vii, 6).

Hi'vite (Heb. *Chivvi'*, חִוִּי, usu. with the art., often collectively for the plur., "the Hivite," i. e. Hivites; Sept. ὁ Εὐαῖος), a designation of one of the nations inhabiting Palestine before the Israelites. See CANAAN. The name is, in the original, uniformly found in the singular number. It never has, like that of the Hittites, a plural, nor does it appear in any other form. Perhaps we may assume from this that it originated in some peculiarity of locality or circumstance, as in the case of the Amorites —"mountaineers," and not in a progenitor, as did that of the Ammonites, who are also styled Bene-Ammon—children of Ammon, or the Hittites, Bene-Cheth—children of Heth. The name is explained by Ewald (*Gesch.* i, 318) as *Binnenländer*, that is, "Midlanders;" by Gesenius (*Thes.* p. 451) as *pagani*, "villagers." In the following passages the name is given in the A.V. in the singular, "the Hivite:" Gen. x, 17; Exod. xxiii, 28; xxxiii, 2; xxxiv, 11; Josh. ix, 1; xi, 3; 1 Chron. i, 15; also Gen. xxxiv, 2; xxxvi, 2. In all the rest it is rendered by the plural.

1. In the genealogical tables of Genesis "the Hivite" is named as one of the descendants—the sixth in order—of Canaan, the son of Ham (Gen. x, 17; 1 Chron. i, 15). In the first enumeration of the nations who, at the time of the call of Abraham, occupied the Promised Land (Gen. xv, 19-21), the Hivites are omitted from the Hebrew text (though in the Samaritan and Sept. their name is inserted). This has led to the conjecture, amongst others, that they are identical with the Kadmonites, whose name is found there and there only (Reland, *Palæst.* p.

140; Bochart, *Phal.* iv, 36; *Can.* i, 19). But are not the Kadmonites rather, as their name implies, the representatives of the Bene-kedem, or "children of the East?" Moreover, in this passage, the position of the Hivites, if represented by the Kadmonites, would be at the head of the nations usually assigned to the Land of Promise, and this is most unlikely, unless the order be geographical. A more ingenious conjecture is that which suggests the identity of the Hivites and the Avites, or Avim, on the grounds (*a*) that at a later time the Galilæans confounded the gutturals; (*b*) that the Sept. and Jerome do not distinguish the two names; (*c*) that the town of ha-Avvim (A.V. "Avvim") was in the same district as the Hivites of Gibeon; (*d*) and that, according to the notice in Deut. ii, the Avim disappear before the Hivites appear; (*e*) to which we may add that, if Gesenius's etymology be sound, it is remarkable that the Avim are described as dwelling "in villages." See Avim. On the other hand, (*a*) it is unlikely that a dialectic difference would be recorded, and it seems too slight to be anything else; (*b*) the Sept. and Jerome are not very careful as to exact transcriptions of proper names; (*c*) the presence of Avim in a district does not prove them to be the same as other inhabitants of that district; (*d*) and the narrative in Deut. ii speaks only of the overthrow, before the coming of the Israelites, by later settlers, of certain tribes or peoples, not mentioned in the list of Gen. x, which were, as far as stated, Rephaim, or of Rephaite stock. The probability that the Avim were of this stock is strengthened by the circumstance that there was a remnant of the Rephaim among the Philistines in David's time, as there was among other nations when the Israelites conquered the country. Therefore it seems to us very unlikely that the Avim were the same as the Hivites, although they may have been related to each other. The name constantly occurs in the formula by which the country is designated in the earlier books (Exod. iii, 8, 17; xiii, 5; xxiii, 23, 28; xxxiii, 2; xxxiv, 11; Deut. vii, 1; xx, 17; Josh. iii, 10; ix, 1; xii, 8; xxiv, 11), and also in the later ones (1 Kings ix, 20; 2 Chron. viii, 7; but comp. Ezra ix, 1, and Neh. ix, 8). It is, however, absent in the report of the spies (Numb. xiii, 29), a document which fixes the localities occupied by the Canaanitish nations at that time. Perhaps this is owing to the insignificance of the Hivites at that time, or perhaps to the fact that the spies were indifferent to the special locality of their settlements.

2. We first encounter the actual people of the Hivites at the time of Jacob's return to Canaan. Shechem was then (according to the current Hebrew text) in their possession, Hamor the Hivite being the "prince (נָשִׂיא) of the land" (Gen. xxiv, 2). The narrative of the transaction of Jacob, when he bought the "parcel of a field," closely resembles that of Abraham's purchase of the field of Machpelah. They were at this time, to judge of them by their rulers, a warm and impetuous people, credulous, and easily deceived by the crafty and cruel sons of Jacob. The narrative further exhibits them as peaceful and commercial, given to "trade" (10, 21), and to the acquiring of "possessions" of cattle and other "wealth" (10, 23, 28, 29). Like the Hittites, they held their assemblies or conferences in the gate of their city (20). We may also see a testimony to their peaceful habits in the absence of any attempt at revenge on Jacob for the massacre of the Shechemites. Perhaps similar indications are furnished by the name of the god of the Shechemites some generations after this, Baal-berith—Baal of the league, or the alliance (Judg. viii, 33; ix, 4, 46); by the way in which the Shechemites were beaten by Abimelech (40); and by the unmilitary character both of the weapon which caused Abimelech's death and of the person who discharged it (ix, 53). In the matter that led to the overthrow of this Hivite city we see an indication of the corruption that afterwards became characteristic of the Canaanitish tribes (Gen. xxxiii, 18-20; xxxiv). Jacob's reproof of his sons seems to imply that the more powerful inhabitants of at least this part of the Promised Land were Canaanites and Perizzites, these only being mentioned as likely to attack him in revenge (xxxiv, 30). It is possible, but not certain, that there is a reference to this matter where Jacob speaks of a portion he gave to Joseph as having been taken by him in war from the Amorite (xlviii, 22), for his land at Shechem was given to Joseph, but it had been bought, and what Simeon and Levi seized was probably never claimed by Jacob, unless, indeed, the Hivites, who might possibly be spoken of as Amorites (but comp. xxxiv, 30), attempted to recover it by force. Perhaps the reference is to some other occurrence. It seems clear, however, from the first of the passages just noticed (xxxiv, 30), that the Hivites ruled by Hamor were a small settlement. See Jacob.

The Alex. MS., and several other MSS. of the Sept., in the above narrative (Gen. xxxiv, 2) substitute "Horite" for "Hivite." The change is remarkable from the usually close adherence of the Alex. Codex to the Hebrew text, but it is not corroborated by any other of the ancient versions, nor is it recommended by other considerations. No instances occur of Horites in this part of Palestine, while we know, from a later narrative, that there was an important colony of Hivites on the high land of Benjamin at Gibeon, etc., no very great distance from Shechem. On the other hand, in Gen. xxxvi, 2, where Aholibamah, one of Esau's wives, is said to have been the daughter of the daughter of Zibeon the Hivite, all considerations are in favor of reading "Horite" for "Hivite." In this case we fortunately possess a detailed genealogy of the family, by comparison of which little doubt is left of the propriety of the change (comp. ver. 20, 24, 25, 30, with 2), although no ancient version has suggested it here. See Horite.

3. We next meet with the Hivites during the conquest of Canaan (Josh. ix, 7; xi, 19), when they are not mentioned in any important position. Their character was then in some respects materially altered. They were still evidently averse to fighting, but they had acquired —possibly by long experience in traffic—an amount of craft which they did not before possess, and which enabled them to turn the tables on the Israelites in a highly successful manner (Josh. ix, 3-27). The colony of Hivites who made Joshua and the heads of the tribes their dupes on this occasion, had four cities—Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjath-jearim—situated, if our present knowledge is accurate, at considerable distances apart. It is not certain whether the last three were destroyed by Joshua or not (xi, 19); Gibeon certainly was spared. In verse 11 the Gibeonites speak of the "elders" of their city, a word which, in the absence of any allusion to a Hivite king, has been thought to point to a liberal form of government (Ewald, *Gesch.* i, 318, 9). This southern branch of the nation embraced the Jewish religion (2 Sam. xxi, 1, 4; Josh. ix, 21. 27), and seem thus to have been absorbed.

4. The main body of the Hivites, however, were at this time living on the northern confines of western Palestine—"under Hermon, in the land of Mizpeh" (Josh. xi, 3)—"in Mount Lebanon, from Mount Baal-Hermon to the entering in of Hamath" (Judg. iii, 3). Somewhere in this neighborhood they were settled when Joab and the captains of the host, in their tour of numbering, came to "all the cities of the Hivites" near Tyre (2 Sam. xxiv, 7). A remnant of the nation still existed in the time of Solomon, who subjected them to a tribute of personal labor, with the remnants of other Canaanitish nations which the Israelites had been unable to expel (1 Kings ix, 20). In the Jerusalem Targum on Gen. x, 17, they are called Tripolitans (טְרִיפּוֹלָאֵי), a name which points to the same general northern locality. The Hermonites may perhaps be a later name for the Hivites; we recognise in the Egyptian remenen alone any trace of the Hivites in the conquests of the Pharaohs who passed through this tract. Chaseaud (*Druses*, p. 361 sq.) refers the modern Druses (q. v.) to them.

5. There are few Hivite names recorded in Scripture. Hamor, "the he-ass," was probably an honorable

name. Shechem, "shoulder," "back," may also be indicative of strength. Such names are suitable to a primitive people, but they are not sufficiently numerous or characteristic for us to be able to draw any sure inference. It is, indeed, possible that they may be connected, as the similar Hittite names seem to be, with low nature-worship. See HITTITE. The names of the Hivite towns do not help us. Gibeon merely indicates lofty position; Kirjath-jearim, "the city of the woods," is interesting from the use of the word Kirjah, which we take to be probably a Canaanitish form: the other names present no special indications.

6. In the worship of Baal-berith, or "Baal of the covenant," at Shechem, in the time of the Judges, we more probably see a trace of the head-city of a Hivite confederacy than of an alliance between the Israelites and the Hivites. (See Hamelsveld, iii, 62 sq.; *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1851, p. 166.)

Hizki'ah (Heb. *Chizkiyah'*, חִזְקִיָּה; Sept. Ἐζεκίας; Vulg. *Ezechia*), an ancestor of Zephaniah the prophet (Zeph. i, 1). See HEZEKIAH.

Hizki'jah (Heb. *Chizkiyah'*, חִזְקִיָּה· Sept. Ἐζεκία; Vulg. *Ezechia*), according to the punctuation of the A.V., a man who sealed the covenant of reformation with Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh. x, 17). But there is no doubt that the name should be taken with that preceding it, as "Ater-Hizkijah," a name given in the lists of those who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel. It appears also extremely likely that the two names following these in x, 17, 18 (Azzur, Hodijah) are only corrupt repetitions of them See HEZEKIAH.

Hizr, founder of the Hizrevites, a monastic order of the Mohammedans, lived at the time of Orchan II. He founded poor-houses at Cairo and Babylon, and many visits are made by the Mohammedans to his grave at Brusa.—Pierer, *Univ.-Lexikon*, viii, 416.

Hjort, VICTOR CHRISTIAN, a celebrated hymnologist of the Protestant Church, born at Gunderslevholm, in Denmark, in 1735, was bishop of Ribe. His collection of sacred songs were almost entirely inserted in the public hymn-book of the Danish Church. He published also collections of songs for the Sunday-schools of workmen, soldiers, etc. He died in 1818, on the island of Amagar, near Copenhagen.—Pierer, *Univ.-Lex.* viii, 417. (J. H. W.)

Hoadley (or **Hoadly**), **Benjamin**, an English prelate, theologian, and politician, was born at Westerham, Kent, Nov. 14, 1678. He studied at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, and passed A.M. in 1699. In 1700 he was appointed lecturer at St. Mildred's, London, and in 1702 rector of St. Peter-le-Poor. "His ability as a controversialist, and his love of civil and religious liberty, became conspicuous in the strife of parties at the beginning of the century, when he entered the field against bishop Atterbury and the High-Church party. His share in this debate, and his intimate connection with the settlement of the new dynasty and the liberties of the country, were recognised by the House of Commons, who addressed the queen in his favor, and thus paved the way for his rapid promotion." In 1710 he was made rector of Streatham, and on the accession of George I, 1714, he became chaplain to the king. In 1715 he was made bishop of Bangor. In 1717 he preached the sermon before the king, on the text, *My kingdom is not of this world*, which gave rise to the famous Bangorian controversy (q. v.), in which Hoadley was assailed by the chiefs of the nonjurors, and with most effect by William Law, the champion of authority both in Church and State. This controversy was brought to a close about 1720, without conciliating either the High-Church party on the one hand, or the Dissenters on the other, but with great credit to Hoadley's ability and tolerant spirit. In 1721 he was translated to Hereford, and thence in 1723 to Salisbury. In 1734 he was made bishop of Winchester. He died April 17, 1761. In the political history of the Church of England, Hoadley is to "be regarded as the great advocate of what are called Low-Church principles, a species of Whiggism in ecclesiastics in opposition to the high pretensions sometimes advanced by the Church or particular churchmen. It was in this character that he wrote his treatise on the 'Measure of Obedience to the Civil Magistrate,' which was animadverted upon by Atterbury, and defended by Hoadley, whose conduct on this occasion so pleased the House of Commons (as stated above) that they represented in an address to queen Anne what signal service he had done to the cause of civil and religious liberty." He maintained the same principles in the Bangorian controversy. The war of pamphlets on the subject was wonderful; the number issued on all sides was nearly fifty. His doctrines excited so violent discussion in the lower House of Convocation that the government, in order to prevent further dissensions, suddenly prorogued the Houses of Convocation, and they have never since been permitted to meet for the dispatch of business. The burden of Hoadley's offence, in the eyes of High-churchmen, lies in his doctrine, as stated in the sermon above mentioned: that the "Church is Christ's kingdom; that he alone is lawgiver; and that he has left behind him no visible human authority: no vicegerents who can properly be said to supply his place; no interpreters upon whom his subjects are absolutely to depend; no judges over the consciences and religion of his people." Against the Dissenters, and especially in answer to Calamy's abridgment of the *Life and Times of Baxter*, he wrote his *Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England* (1703, 8vo), and his *Defence of Episcopal Ordination* (1707, 8vo). Besides the writings named, he wrote a number of theological treatises, in which he shows great freedom of thought. His theology is *Latitudinarian* (q. v.). These writings include *Letters on Miracles, to Dr. Fleetwood* (1702, 4to):—*A Preservation against the Principles of the Nonjurors* (1716, 8vo):—*Sermons* (1718 et al.):—*Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper* (1735, 8vo). All these, with his *Life of Dr. Sam. Clarke*, his controversial pamphlets, sermons, etc., may be found in the *Works of Bishop Hoadley*, edited by his son, John Hoadley, LL.D. (London, 1773, 3 vols. fol., of which the first volume contains a life of bishop Hoadley). See *English Cyclopædia; Biographia Britannica;* Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, vol. vi; Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters*, ii, 154; Buchanan, *Justif.* p. 200–201; Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, p. 227 sq.; Gass, *Gesch. der Dogmatik*, iii, 327; Wesley, *Works*, ii, 445; vi, 510; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines* (Smith's), ii, 417, 516; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* iii; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 852.

Hoadley, John, LL.D., youngest son of bishop Hoadley (q. v.), was born Oct. 8, 1711, and educated at Cambridge. He edited the works of his father, and wrote himself a number of poems, among which are *Love's Revenge*, a pastoral (1737, 4to):—*Jephtha*, an oratorio (1748, 8vo):—*Force of Truth*, oratorio (1764), and others. He died March 16, 1776.—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 852.

Hoag, Ephraim, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Peru, N. Y., Sept. 15, 1815. He was converted in 1835, and, after a course of study at Cazenovia Seminary, entered, in 1841, the Oneida Conference (now merged in the Central New York Conference). His superior talents soon procured for him the favor of the people to whom he was sent, and the good wishes of his brethren in the ministry. Although comparatively a self-made man, he was looked upon as one of the first Methodist ministers in Central New York. He filled the chief appointments of this Conference, e. g. Ithaca (1852–3), Utica (1854–5), Norwich (1856–7), Cazenovia (1860–1), and in 1864 was made presiding elder of Cortland District. Here he labored with great success for four years, when he was sent to Canastota. In 1869, while at the session of the newly-formed New York Central Conference, he was suddenly struck with paralysis,

and was obliged to ask for a superannuate relation. He died Oct. 3, 1869. "As a preacher he was earnest and uncompromising, seeking to please God and save men; as a pastor he was diligent, caring for and seeking the good of all the people under his charge. Of him it was true, the poor welcomed his coming, and blessed him when he went away."—Rev. L. C. Queal, in the *North. Christ. Advocate*, Dec. 16, 1869.

Hoag, Wilbur, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Oswegatchie, N. York, May 12, 1806; was converted in 1821, joined the Genesee Conference in 1826, was stationed at Buffalo in 1831, was agent for the Genesee Wesleyan Seminary in 1832, and died April 12, 1839. Mr. Hoag was a man of "quick perception, ready utterance, and clear discrimination." He was an able business man, and highly esteemed as a winning and successful minister.—*Min. of Conferences*, ii, 677.

Hoar, LEONARD, one of the early presidents of Harvard College, was born about 1630. He graduated at Harvard in 1650, and in 1653 went to England and continued his studies at Cambridge University. He entered the ministry at Wensted, in Sussex County, in 1656, but his nonconformity to the English Church caused his deposition in 1662. A few years afterward he decided to return to America. His first appointment was as assistant to Dr. Thacher, in Boston. In 1672 he was elected president of Harvard, but the college, which had suffered from mismanagement, was then slenderly supported, and he retired from this office in less than three years. See Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 853; *Dictionnaire Universel*, xix, 309.

Hoard, SAMUEL, B.D., was born in London in 1599, and educated at Oxford. He was rector of Moreton, Essex. In the latter years of his life he forsook the Calvinistic path, and became a zealous advocate of the Arminian doctrine. He is said to have been a fine scholar, especially at home in the works of the fathers of the Church, and was considered a superior preacher and good disputant. He died in 1657. Hoard wrote *God's Love to Mankind* (1633, 4to; anonymous, and answered by Bp. Davenant [Cambridge, 1641, 8vo] and Dr. Twiss [Oxford, 1653, fol.], and by Amyraut of Saumur in his *Doctrinæ Jo. Calvini de absoluto Reprobationis Decreto Defensio adv. Script. anonymum* [Saum. 1641, 4to]):—*The Church's Authority asserted* (1637, 4to; and in Hickes's *Tracts*, 1709, 8vo, p. 190). He also published some sermons of less value, however.—Smith's Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 187; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* i, 1498; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 853.

Hoare, CHARLES JAMES, an eminent clergyman of the Church of England, the date of whose birth is uncertain, was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1803. In 1806 he was elected fellow of his alma mater; in 1807 he was appointed vicar at Blanford Forum, Dorsetshire; in 1821, at Godstone; in 1829, archdeacon; and in 1831, canon of Winchester. In 1847 he was translated to the archdeaconate of Surrey, which position he resigned in 1860 on account of his age. He died January 15, 1864. He was an extensive writer, and many of his works have been published. A complete list of them is given in Darling's *Cyclop. Bibl.* i, 1498-99. Among them are, *Course of Divine Judgments; eight Lect. principally in reference to the present Times and the impending Pestilence* (1831, 8vo; 1832):—*Baptism, or the ministration of public Baptism of Infants, to be read in the Church, scripturally illustrated and explained* (1848, sm. 8vo):—*Principles of the Tracts for the Times* (1841, 8vo); and a number of theological essays and sermons, of which *Sermons on the Christian Character*, with occasional sermons (3d edit. Lond. 1822, 8vo), deserve special notice.—Appleton's *Amer. Annual Cyclop.* 1865, p. 664; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 853.

Ho'bab (Heb. *Chobab'*, חֹבָב, *beloved;* Sept. Ὀβάβ, in Judg. Ἰωβάβ), the son of Raguel the Midianite, a kinsman of Moses (Numb. x, 29; Judg. iv, 11). B.C. 1657. He has usually been identified with Jethro (see Exod. xviii, 5, 27, compared with Numb. x, 29, 30); but it is rather his father Reuel to whom the title "Moses's father-in-law" is intended to apply in Numb. x, 29; for that these two latter were names of the same person, and that the father of Moses's wife, seems clear from Exod. ii, 6, 21; iii, 1. Hence Hobab was Moses's brother-in-law (and so we must render חֹתֵן in Judg. iv, 11, where the Auth. Vers. has "father-in-law," being, it is true, the same applied elsewhere to Jethro, but merely signifying any *male relative by marriage*, and rendered even "son-in-law" in Gen. xix, 14); so that while Jethro (as was natural for a person of his advanced age) returned to his home (Exod. xviii, 27), Moses prevailed upon Hobab (whose comparative youth rendered his services the greater object to secure) to remain (as seems implied by the absence of any refusal to his second importunity in Numb. x, 32), so that we find his descendants among the Israelites (Judg, iv, 11). See JETHRO.

Ho'bah (Heb. *Chobah'*, חוֹבָה, *hiding-place;* Sept. Χοβά), a place to the northward of Damascus (מִשְּׂמֹאל לְדַמָּשֶׂק, lit. *on the left*), whither Abraham pursued the kings who had taken Lot captive (Gen. xiv, 15); perhaps the *Chobai* or *Choba* mentioned in the Apocrypha (Χωβαΐ, Judith xv, 4; Χωβά, iv, 4). Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. Choba) confounds this place with *Cocaba*, the seat of the Ebionites in the 4th century; and Burckhardt (*Syria*, p. 312) found a village called *Kokab*, probably the same, which, however, lies south of Damascus. This is apparently also the village *Hoba*, visited in the year 1666 by Ferd. von Troilo, who says, "It lies a quarter of a (German) mile north from the town, on the left hand. Near the city of Damascus is seen a large hill, where the patriarch Abraham overtook and defeated the army of the four kings. There formerly dwelt here a sect of Jews, converted to the (Christian) faith, who were called Ebionites; but at present the place is inhabited by a great number of Moors (Arabs) who have a mosque. In the neighborhood is a cave, in which the patriarch offered to the Divine Majesty his thanksgivings for the victory" (*Travels*, p. 584). On the other hand, Reland thinks of a castle called *Caucab*, mentioned by Edrisi as being on the lake of Tiberias (*Palæst.* p. 727). "Josephus mentions a tradition concerning Abraham which he takes from Nicolaus of Damascus: 'Abraham reigned at Damascus, being a foreigner . . . and his name is still famous in the country; and there is shown a village called from him *The Habitation of Abraham*' (*Ant.* i, 7, 2). It is remarkable that in the village of *Burzeh*, three miles north of Damascus, there is a *wely* held in high veneration by the Mohammedans, and called after the name of the patriarch, *Masjad Ibrahim*, 'the prayer-place of Abraham.' The tradition attached to it is that here Abraham offered thanks to God after the total discomfiture of the Eastern kings. Behind the *wely* is a cleft in the rock, in which another tradition represents the patriarch as *taking refuge* on one occasion from the giant Nimrod. It is remarkable that the word *Hobah* signifies 'a hiding-place.' (See Ritter, *Syria*, iv, 312; Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, ii, 331.) The Jews of Damascus affirm that the village of *Jôbar*, not far from Burzeh, is the Hobah of Scripture. They have a synagogue there dedicated to Elijah, to which they make frequent pilgrimages (see Porter, *Handbook for Syria and Palestine*, p. 491, 492; Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i, 481)."

Hobart, John Henry, D.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of New York, was born Sept. 14, 1775. In 1788 he entered the College of Philadelphia, but soon after went to Princeton, where he passed A.B. in 1793 with high honor. In 1798 he took charge of two suburban churches near Philadelphia. The two following years he was called to New Brunswick, next to Hempstead, Long Island, and later became assistant minister of Trinity, New York. In 1799 he was chosen secre-

tary to the House of Bishops, and subsequently to the Convention, and one of the deputies to the General Convention in 1801. In 1806 he was made D.D. by Union College, and in 1811 he was elected assistant bishop of New York. Afterwards he became diocesan of New York, and rector of Trinity Church. He was especially instrumental in the establishment of the General Theological Seminary, in which he held the chair of pastoral theology and pulpit eloquence. In 1823, his health becoming enfeebled, a voyage to Europe was deemed desirable, and he remained there above two years. He preached in Rome when Protestant worship was barely tolerated, and made an effective appeal in behalf of the Waldenses. In his journey through the Italian States he encountered much annoyance, and when at Milan was examined before the civil magistrates as to the object of his tour. He defended himself with a freedom and frankness that left little doubt of his honesty. When in London he published two volumes of *Discourses preached in America*, which drew forth warm expressions of approbation from the leading periodicals. On his return, he resumed his various duties with zeal and energy, devoting himself to the promotion of every good work, and feeling a special interest in the cause of the Indians. He died at Auburn Sept. 10, 1830. His publications include *A Companion to the Altar* (N. York, 1804, 8vo; many editions since):—*Festivals and Fasts* (N. York, 1804, 12mo; over twenty editions):—*Apology for Apostolic Order* (N. Y. 1807, 8vo; 1844, 8vo):—*The State of departed Spirits* (new ed. N. York, 1846, 12mo):—*Clergyman's Companion* (new ed. 1855, 12mo):—*Christian's Manual* (12mo; several editions); besides numerous *charges* and occasional discourses (reprinted, New York, 2 vols. 8vo). His *Posthumous Works, with a Memoir by the Rev. Dr. Berrian*, were issued in 1833 (N.Y. 3 vols. 8vo). See Schroeder, *Memoir of Bp. Hobart* (N. Y. 1833, 12mo); M'Vickar, *Early and professional Years of Hobart* (N. York, 1836, 12mo); *Christian Spectator*, ix, 79; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 854; Sprague, *Annals*, v, 440; *Christian Journal*, vol. xiv; *Episcopal Church Reg.* A fine tribute is paid to bishop Hobart as an author by Lowndes in his *British Literature*, p. 656, 833.

Hobart, Noah, a Congregational minister, was born at Hingham Jan. 12, 1706. He graduated at Harvard College in 1724, and was ordained pastor of the First Congregational Church at Fairfield, Connecticut, Feb. 7, 1733. About this time a controversy arose in the Eastern States respecting the Episcopalians, in which Hobart enlisted, and wrote in behalf of the validity of Presbyterian ordination a pamphlet entitled *Serious Address to the Episcopal Separation* (1748; 2d address, 1751; 3d address, 1761). His opponents were Dr. Johnson and other ministers who had swerved from Congregationalism. Of Mr. Hobart's ability and learning, Dr. Dwight, who was one of the men of his time, says: "He possessed high intellectual and moral distinction. He had a mind of great acuteness and discernment; was a laborious student; was extensively learned, especially in history and theology; adorned the doctrine which he professed by an exemplary life, and was holden in high veneration for his wisdom and virtue. Among the American writers of the last century, not one has, I believe, handled the subject of Presbyterian ordination with more ability or success." He died Dec. 6, 1773. Besides several sermons, he published *Principles of the Congreg. Church*, etc. (1754).—*Contrib. to Eccl. History of Connecticut*, p. 385; Smith's Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii. 448; Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i, 375.

Hobart, Peter, a Congregational minister, was born in England in 1604, and was educated at Cambridge. After teaching and preaching for a time, he emigrated to this country in 1635, and settled, with his friends who had preceded him, in Hingham, Mass. After a residence of some years, the people of his former charge at Haverhill, England, urged him to return to them as pastor, but he declined, and remained with his friends, preaching only at times. He died in 1678.—Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 68. (J. H. W.)

Hobbes, THOMAS, an English philosopher and deist, was born April 5, 1588, at Malmesbury, in Wiltshire, and was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford. In 1608 he became tutor to lord Hardwick, subsequently earl of Devonshire; and, after their return from travelling, he resided in the family for many years, during which period he translated Thucydides, and made a Latin version of some of lord Bacon's works. In 1628 he went abroad with the son of Sir Gervase Clifton, with whom he remained some time in France. He returned in 1631 to undertake the education of the young earl of Devonshire. In 1634 he went with his new pupil to Paris, where he applied himself much to natural philosophy, and afterwards to Italy, where he formed an acquaintance with Galileo. He returned to England in 1637, and soon after wrote his *Elementa Philosophica de Cive* (Par. 1642). A second edition was printed in Holland in 1647, under the superintendence of M. Sorbière. In 1640, after the meeting of the Long Parliament, Hobbes withdrew to Paris. Here he became acquainted with Des Cartes and Gassendi. In 1647 Hobbes was appointed mathematical tutor to the prince of Wales, afterwards Charles II. His treatises entitled *Human Nature* and *De Corpore Politico* were published in London in 1650, and in the following year the *Leviathan*. Of the last work he caused a copy to be fairly written out on vellum, and presented to Charles II; but the king, having been informed by some divines that it contained principles subversive both of religion and civil government, withdrew his favor from Hobbes, and forbade him his presence. After the publication of the *Leviathan* Hobbes returned again to England, and published his *Letter upon Liberty and Necessity* (1654), which led to a long controversy with bishop Bramhall. See BRAMHALL. It was about this time, too, that he began a controversy with Dr. Wallis, the mathematical professor at Oxford, which lasted until Hobbes's death. By this last controversy he got no honor. In 1666 his *Leviathan* and *De Cive* were censured by Parliament. Shortly after Hobbes was still further alarmed by the introduction of a bill into the House of Commons for the punishment of atheism and profaneness; but this storm blew over. In 1672 Hobbes wrote his own life in Latin verse, being then in his eighty-fifth year, and in 1675 published his translation of the Iliad and Odyssey. This translation is wholly wanting in Homeric fire, bald and vulgar in style and diction; and it must be allowed that the fame of the philosopher is anything but heightened by his efforts as a poet. Hobbes's *Dispute with Laney, bishop of Ely, concerning Liberty and Necessity*, appeared in 1676; and in 1679 he sent his *Behemoth, or a History of the Civil Wars from* 1640 *to* 1660, to a bookseller, with a letter in which he requested him not to publish it until a fitting occasion offered. It appears from this letter that Hobbes, being anxious to publish the book some time before, had with that view shown it to the king, who refused his permission, and for this reason Hobbes would not now allow the bookseller to publish it. It appeared, however, almost immediately after Hobbes's death, which took place by paralysis Dec. 4, 1679.

In *philosophy* Hobbes was the precursor of the modern materialistic schools of Sensationalism and Positivism. Professing to reject "everything hypothetical (of all *qualitatum occultarum*), he affected to confine himself to the comprehensible, or, in other words, to the phenomena of motion and sensation. He defines philosophy to be the knowledge, through correct reasoning, of phenomena or appearances from the causes presented by them, or, vice versâ, the ascertaining of possible causes by means of known effects. Philosophy embraces as an object every body that admits the representation of production and presents the phenomena of composition and

decomposition. Taking the term *Body* in its widest extent, he divides its meaning into natural and political, and devotes to the consideration of the first his *Philosophia Naturalis*, comprehending the departments of logic, ontology, metaphysics, physics, etc.; and to that of the second his *Philosophia Civilis*, or *Polity*, comprehending morals. All knowledge is derived from the senses; but our sensational representations are nothing more than appearances within us, the effect of external objects operating on the brain, or setting in motion the vital spirits. Thought is calculation (*computatio*), and implies addition and subtraction. Truth and falsehood consist in the relations of the terms employed. We can become cognizant only of the finite; the infinite cannot be imagined, much less known: the term does not convey any accurate knowledge, but belongs to a Being whom we can know only by means of faith. Consequently, religious doctrines do not come within the compass of philosophical discussion, but are determinable by the laws of religion itself. All, therefore, that Hobbes has left free to the contemplation of philosophy is the knowledge of our natural bodies (somatology), of the mind (psychology), and polity. His whole theory has reference to the external and objective, inasmuch as he derives all our emotions from the movements of the body, and describes the soul itself as something corporeal, though of extreme tenuity." From these principles no *moral* or *religious* theory can flow, except that of infidelity. Though none of Hobbes's writings are expressly levelled against Christianity, few authors have really done more to subvert the principles of morality and religion. He makes self-love the fundamental law of nature, and utility its end; morality is nothing but utility, and the soul is not immortal. His writings gave rise to a very voluminous controversy. "The Philosopher of Malmesbury," says Dr. Warburton, "was the terror of the last age, as Tindall and Collins are of this. The press sweat with controversy, and every young churchman militant would try his arms in thundering on Hobbes's steel cap" (*Divine Legation*, ii, 9, Preface). His principal antagonists were Clarendon, in *A brief View of the dangerous and pernicious Errors to Church and State in Mr. Hobbes's Book entitled Leviathan;* Cudworth, in his *Eternal and immutable Morality;* and bishop Cumberland, in his Latin work on the *Laws of Nature.* Bishop Bramhall's controversy with Hobbes has been noticed above. We may also mention archbishop Tenison's *Creed of Mr. Hobbes examined*, and Dr. Eachard's *Dialogues on Hobbes.* Hobbes's whole works have been carefully re-edited by Sir William Molesworth, the Latin under the title *Opera Philosophica quæ Latine Scripsit W. Hobbes* (Lond. 1839-45, 5 vols. 8vo); *English Works now first collected* (London, 1839, 4 vols. 8vo). See *English Cyclopædia;* Tennemann, *Man. Hist. Philos.* § 324; Mackintosh, *Ethical Philosophy*, § 4; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xvii, § 22; Hallam, *Lit. of Europe*, iii, 271; Leland, *Deistical Writers*, ch. ii; Morell, *Modern Philosophy*, pt. i, ch. i, § 1; Bayle, *Gen. Dict.* s. v.; Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, vol. ii; *British Quarterly Review*, vi, 155; Lewis, *Hist. of Phil.* ii, 226-235; Krug, *Handwörterbuch d. philos. Wissensch.* ii, 441-443; Leckey, *Hist. of Rationalism* (see Index); Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 114 sq.; *Christian Examiner*, xxix, 320; Leidner, *Philos.* p. 270; Cudworth, *Intell. Syst.* ii; Farrar, *Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 121 sq.; Dorner, *Gesch. d. prot. Theol.;* Gass, *Gesch. d. protest. Dogmat.* iii, 39, 322; Waterland, *Works* (see Index, vol. vi); Watson, *Works;* Tennemann, *Gesch. d. Philos.* x; Sigwart, *Gesch. d. Philos.* ii (see Index); Schröckh, *Kirchen-Gesch. s. d. Reform.* iii; Döderlein, *Lit.* (see Index); *Westm. Review*, April, 1867, p. 162; *Contemp. Review*, Feb. 1868, vol. iii; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, viii, 127.

Hobbhahn, Johann Wilhelm, a German theologian, was born at Ochsenberg March 8, 1665; studied at the universities of Ulm, Strasburg, and Tübingen, and entered the ministry in 1690. In 1716 he was appointed superintendent over a number of churches, and pastor at Knittlingen, where he died in 1727. Hobbhahn wrote, mainly under fictitious names, a number of excellent polemics against the Romish Church and the Syncretists. Of these, his *Obsiegende Wahrheit*, and *Apologet. Schauplatz d. triumphirenden Wahrheit*, against Eust. Eisenhut; *Histor. theolog. Prüfung d. röm. Priester-Weihe*, against Mändle; and especially *Angetastete Jungfer-Ehe d. lutherischen Kirche*, which gave him much trouble, and endangered his life, are considered the best.—Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1631.

Hobbs, Lewis, a Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Burke County, Ga., Feb. 1783; was converted in 1804, and entered the itinerancy in 1808. He was stationed in New Orleans in 1813, and died in Georgia in 1814. Mr. Hobbs was a young man of deep and uniform piety, great simplicity and zeal as a minister, and nobly endured the perils and hardships of missionary life in the Southern wildernesses and the poisonous climate of the Mississippi.—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 254. (G. L. T.)

Hobhouse, Sir Benjamin, was born in 1757, and educated at Oxford for the bar. From 1797-1818 he was a distinguished member of the House of Commons, and filled other important stations. He died in 1831. His name is mentioned here on account of his *Treatise on Heresy* (Lond. 1792, 8vo), and his *Reply to the Rev. F. Randolph's Letter to the Rev. Dr. Priestly, or an Examination of the Rev. F. Randolph's Scriptural Revision of Socinian Arguments* (Lond. 1792, 8vo; and again, Bath, 1793, 8vo).—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 856.

Hobnim. See Ebony.

Hoburg, Christian, a mystic, born at Lüneburg in 1607, was for a time assistant minister at Lauenburg, and, later, subconrector at Uelzen. Here he was deposed from his position on account of his mystical tendencies, and he retired to private life at Hamburg. Later, he was appointed minister to congregations in the duchy of Brunswick, and finally became a Mennonite preacher at Hamburg. He died in 1675. Hoburg wrote much under the pseudonym Bachmann and Prätorius, as *Der unbekannte Christus* (Hamb. 1858; Frankf. 1695):—*Theol. Myst.* (2d edit. 1656; Nimeg. 1672; 3d edit. 1684, and often). See *Lebenbeschreibung* (by his son Philip, 1676); Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 420; Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1668. (J. H. W.)

Hocein. See Hossein.

Hoch, John. See Æpinus.

Hocheisen, Johann Georg, a German theologian, born at Ulm in 1677, was educated at the University of his native place and at Tübingen and Wittenberg. At the last school he at first devoted his time mainly to the study of philosophy, but afterwards changed to the study of theology. He next went to Hamburg, where his acquaintance with the great Fabricius led him to a more thorough study of Greek and Hebrew. In 1705 he was made M.A. at Wittenberg, and immediately began there a course of lectures which procured for him an adjunct professorship in the philosophical department, he entering at the same time as a candidate of theology. In 1709 he was called as professor of Hebrew to the gymnasium at Breslau, where he died in 1712. Hocheisen contributed largely to the learned periodicals of his day. Of his published works the most important are *De Hebræorum vocalium officio et valore in constituenda syllaba* (Viteb. 1705, 4to):—*De Deismo in Cartesianismo deprehenso* (ibid. 1708, 4to):—*De Deismo in Theosophia deprehenso, contra Westphalum novatorem* (ibid. 1709, 4to). Some take him to be the author (though this is unlikely) of the first letter in *Vertrauter Briefwechsel zweier guten Freunde v. Wesen d. Seele* (1713 and 1734, 8vo), in which the soul is regarded only as a mere mechanism of the body.—Döring, *Gelehrt. Theolog. Deutschlands*, i, 744; Adelung's Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Add. ii, 2029. (J. H. W.)

Hochmann (*of Hochenau*), Ernst Christoph, a German mystic, and principal representative of the Witt-

genstein separatists, born at Hochenau (Lauenburg) in 1661 (according to Hagenbach, 1670), and educated at Halle University. During his residence there (1699) he began to attract attention by his addresses to the Jews, whom he endeavored to convert to Christianity. In 1702 he made a journey through nearly all Germany, and attacked the lukewarmness of the clergy with great boldness, oftentimes entering the pulpit either during the discourse or immediately after it. He also conducted devotional exercises in private houses, which were largely attended by the people. "He was a man of rare gifts, and was inspired by a sincere and resigned type of piety, which brought many sides to his heart." He suffered great persecution, and was even imprisoned frequently, but it "was all borne by him with patience, and even with a certain degree of humor." His adherents, in spite of all these difficulties, were numerous, and his influence over them without bounds. Stilling says that an old pietist related to him "that Hochmann once preached on the great meadow below Elberfeld, called the Ox Comb, with so much power and eloquence that his many hundreds of hearers fully believed themselves raised to the clouds, and that they had no other thought than that the morning of eternity had really dawned." The theological views of Hochmann were in the main the same as those of the great mystics, Jacob Bœhme (q. v.), Weigel, Gichtel, etc. He opposed infant baptism, and held that the Lord's Supper should be administered only to the chosen and faithful disciples of Christ. He also insisted on a complete separation of Church and State, and had most peculiar views of the matrimonial state. The charge has been laid against him that he disbelieved the doctrine of the Trinity, but we think without just cause. He was, however, a fervent believer in the doctrine of perfection, and held that only those men should preach the Gospel who felt that the Lord called them to this sacred work. He died in 1721. Hochmann's writings were published in pamphlet form, and were few in number. They are of value mainly as an index to his life and works as a Christian man. A complete list of them may be found in Gobel, *Gesch. d. christl. Lebens in d. rheinisch-westphäl. evangel. Kirche* (Coblenz, 1852), ii, 809 sq. Among these we consider as particularly valuable his *Glaubensbekenntniss sammt seiner an die Juden gehaltenen Rede* (1703, 12mo):—*Necessaria supplicatio et dehortatio ad Germaniæ Rectores s. Magistratus de dura persec. sic dictor. Pietistarum* (without year or date).—Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries*, i, 167–8; Adelung's Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Add. ii, 2029–2030; Fuhrmann, *Hdwrtrb. d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 318; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 163–164. (J. H. W.)

Hochstetter, Andreas Adam, a distinguished German theologian of the Lutheran confession, was born July 13, 1668, at Tübingen, and educated at the university of his native place. In 1688 the reigning prince of his country sent him abroad to visit the different universities of Germany, Holland, and England, where he formed an acquaintance with a number of distinguished scholars. He paid particular attention to the study of the Hebrew and English languages. In the latter he made great proficiency, and translated into Latin, among others, Stillingfleet's *Epistolam ad deistam*, etc. On his return he was appointed a professor extraordinary at his alma mater. In 1707 he was advanced regular professor of theology and city preacher of Tübingen, and in 1711 court preacher and *Consistorial Rath* at Stuttgart. Four years later, however, he returned again as professor to the university. He died April 27, 1718. His own works were mainly dissertations, of which the few published are in pamphlet form. A list of them is given by Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1633. (J. H. W.)

Hochstraten. See Hoogstraten.

Hochwart, Laurentius (*Tursenrutanus*), a distinguished German preacher and historian of the 16th century, born at Tirschenreut in 1493, and educated at Leipzig. His first years after graduation were spent in teaching, first at Freysing, and later at Ingolstadt. In 1528 he became pastor at Waldsassen, and later at Regensburg. In 1531 he had a call as preacher to the court at Dresden, but he gave the preference to an offer from Eichstadt which came at the same time. In 1533 he returned again to Regensburg, and later went to Passau. He died toward the close of 1569 or in the beginning of 1570. His valuable works were left unpublished, with the exception of his *Catalog. Ratisponensium episcoporum libris iii* (printed in A. F. Oefel's *Rerum Boicarum script.* i, 148–242). Among those unpublished the following are of especial value: *Sermones Varii:—Monotessaron in quatuor Evangelia:—Chron. ingens mundi.*—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, i, 253; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 164.

Höck, John. See Æpinus.

Hock Tide (from Anglo-Sax. *hocken*, to seize), or Hoke Days, an English holiday, usually observed on Monday and Tuesday two weeks after Easter, in memory of the slaughter of the Danes by Ethelred, Nov. 13, 1002, according to Henry of Huntingdon, and mentioned in the Confessor's Laws. It was the custom formerly to collect money of the parishioners. A trace of this practice is found as late as 1667. Collections were also taken up at town gates, as at Chichester in the last century.—Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 312.

Hod (Heb. *id.* הוֹד, *majesty*, as often; Sept. Ὢδ), one of the sons of Zophah, of the tribe of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 37). B.C. ante 1017.

Hodaï'ah (Hebrew *Hodayeva'hu*, הוֹדַיְוָהוּ, marg. more correctly, *Hodavya'hu*, הוֹדַוְיָהוּ, a prolonged form of *Hodaviah*; Sept. Ὠδουΐα, Vulgate *Oduja*), the first named of the seven sons of Elioënai, of the descendants of Zerubbabel (1 Chron. iii, 24); probably a brother of the Nahum of Luke iii, 25 (see Strong's *Harm. and Exposition of the Gospels*, p. 17). B.C. cir. 406. See Genealogy of Jesus Christ.

Hodavi'ah (Heb. *Hodavyah'*, הוֹדַוְיָה, *praise of Jehovah*, or perh. i. q. הוֹדוּיָה, *praise ye Jehovah*; Sept. Ὠδουία or Ὠδουΐα), the name of three or four men.

1. A chieftain and warrior of the tribe of Manasseh East at the time of the Assyrian captivity (1 Chron. v, 24). B.C. cir. 720.

2. Son of Has-senuah and father of Meshullam, of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. ix, 7). B.C. ante 588.

3. A Levite whose posterity (to the number of 74) returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 40). In the parallel passage, Neh. vii, 43, his name is written *Hodevah'* (הוֹדְוָה, by contraction for *Hodaviah*, marg. הוֹדְיָה, by contraction for *Hodijah*; Sept. Οὐδουία, Vulgate *Oduja*). B.C. ante 536. Apparently the same is elsewhere called Judah (Ezra iii, 9).

4. See Hodaiah.

Hodegetics, a word properly signifying *the art of induction*, or, better, the art of *introduction* (τέχνη being understood with ὁδηγητική), but generally taken to signify introduction (ὁδηγία) itself, especially when reference is made to scientific Hodegetics. The *Hodegete* (ὁδηγητής), of course, is expected to be thoroughly conversant with the science of which he treats, and which he is to introduce, else he might easily lead in the wrong direction, or into another department. Other names for this science are Methodology (from μέθοδος), or Propædeutics (from πρό and παιδεύω, παῖς), or Isagogics (from εἰς and ἄγω). The difference between Hodegetics and Encyclopædia (q. v.) of Theology is, that "the former has regard to the personal qualifications of the student, his method of study, his preparatory helps, etc., whereas the latter has regard to the various departments and systems of the science itself." The literature of Hodegetics is quite extensive. See Schlegel, *Summe v. Erfahrungen und Beobb. z. Beförd. d. Studien in gel. Schulen und auf. Univ.* (Riga, 1790); Kiesevetter, *Lehrb. d. Hod. o. kurze Anweis. z. studieren* (Berl. 1811); Schel-

ling, *Vorles. üb. d. Methode d. akadem. Studiums* (3d edit. Tübingen, 1832); Scheidler, *Grundr. d. H. o. Methodik d. akadem. Stud.* (3d ed. Jena, 1847).—Krug, *Phil. Lex.* v, 1, 531; Danz, *Univ. Wort. d. theol. Lit.* p. 404; *Bib. Sac.* i, 179. See INTRODUCTION.

Hodegetria (Ὀδηγητρία, the *guide*) is the name which the Greeks give to a painting, said to have been the work of St. Luke, because Michael Palæologus, upon his entry at Constantinople, after the defeat of the Latins, had this portrait borne in advance, he and his army following on foot. The Virgin Mary is also worshipped under this name by the Sicilians, especially at Messina. At Rome they erected and dedicated a church to her, generally called the Constantinopolitan Church.—Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 320; Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* i, 495.

Ho'desh (Heb. *Cho'desh*, חֹדֶשׁ, a *month*, as often; Sept. Ἀδά, Vulg. *Hodes*), one of the wives of Shaharaim, of the tribe of Judah, several of whose children are enumerated (1 Chron. viii, 9); called in ver. 8 more correctly BAARA (q. v.).

Hode'vah (Neh. vii, 43). See HODAVIAH 3.

Hodges, Cyrus Whitman, a Baptist clergyman, was born in Leicester, Vt., July 9, 1802. At the age of twenty he was licensed to preach in Brandon, Vt., and in the autumn of that year accepted an invitation to preach at Minerva for a year. In connection with this work he pursued his ministerial studies under the Rev. Daniel O. Morton, at Shoreham, but so anxious was he to be fully engaged in the work of his calling that he abandoned the idea of a full course of study. He, however, diligently improved such opportunities as he had, and his literary and theological acquisitions became quite respectable. He was ordained in Chester, Warren Co., N. Y., in 1824, and remained there three years. He preached two years in Arlington, Vt.; four years in Shaftesbury; four years in Springfield; six years in Westport, N. Y.; and five years in Bennington, Vt. Thence he went to Bristol, where he finished his career. He died April 4, 1851. He was a true Christian pastor; he believed heartily, entirely. His sincerity, his thorough consecration to his work, was the true secret of his effective and useful ministry. In 1850 Mr. Hodges published a small volume of sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 724.

Hodges, Joseph, a Baptist minister, was born at Norton, Mass., May 19, 1806, and was a graduate of Waterville College in the class of 1830. He took the full course of study at the Newton Theological Institution (1830–33), and was licensed to preach by the Church at Canton, Mass., in April, 1831. He was ordained at Weston, Nov. 18, 1835, and was pastor of the Church in that place four years (1835–39). He had pastorates of a shorter or longer duration at Amherst, Coleraine, Three Rivers, Palmer, East Brookfield, and North Oxford, all in Massachusetts, for fifteen years (1840–55). For six years (1855–61) he was an agent of the American and Foreign Bible Society. He died at Cambridge, Mass., Aug. 23, 1863.

Hodges, Walter, D.D., a clergyman of the Hutchinsonian school and provost of Oriel College, Oxford, flourished about the middle of the last century. He provoked a great deal of attention by his *Elihu, or an Inquiry into the principal Scope and Design of the Book of Job* (London, 1750, 4to; 1751, 8vo; 3d ed. 1756, 12mo, and others), in which he endeavored to show that Elihu is the Son of God, a discovery which he supposed would throw great light on the book of Job, and solve the controversies respecting the doctrines which have been agitated thereupon. He wrote also *The Christian Plan* (2d edit., with additions, and with other theological pieces, London, 1775, 8vo), a no less curious work than the one above mentioned, though it failed to produce so much sensation. "The whole meaning and extent of the Christian plan he represents as embodied, according to his interpretation, in the Hebrew Elohim." The other theological pieces in the addenda of this work are on the historical account of David's life; and on *Sheol, or concerning the Place of departed Souls between the Time of their Dissolution and the general Resurrection;* also, *Oratio habita in domo convocationis.*—Kitto, *Cyclop.* ii, 317; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* i, 1504; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 857.

Hodgson, Bernard, LL.D., principal of Hertford College, is the author of *Solomon's Song, translated from the Hebrew* (Oxford, 1785, 4to), in which his chief design has been to give as literal a rendering of the original as possible. Also, *The Proverbs of Solomon, translated from the Hebrew, with Notes* (Oxford, 1788, 4to):—*Ecclesiastes, a new translation from the original Hebrew* (Oxford, 1791, 4to). The notes are few in number, and are principally devoted to verbal criticism.—Kitto, *Cyclopædia*, ii, 317.

Hodgson, Robert, D.D., was dean of Carlisle in 1820, but the date of his birth is not known. He published mainly his sermons (London, 1803–42), and edited the works of his uncle, bishop Porteus, of London, with his life (Lond. 1816, 6 vols. 8vo), of whom he also published a biography (Lond. 1811, 8vo). He died in 1844.—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 858.

Hodheilids, an heretical sect of the Mohammedans, who believe that the saints live in Paradise in an undisturbed quiet. See MOHAMMEDANISM.

Hodi'ah (הוֹדִיָּה, the same as *Hodijah* [q. v.]), the wife of Mered (Sept. ἡ Ἰδουία; Alex. MS. Ἰουδαία), and the mother of Jered, and Heber, and Jekuthiel (1 Chron. iv, 19), the same who is called JEHUDIJAH (הַיְּהֻדִיָּה, *the Jewess*, i. e. his Jewish wife, as distinguished from Bithiah, who was an Egyptian) in the former part of the verse.

Hodi'jah (Heb. *Hodiyah'*, הוֹדִיָּה, *majesty of Jehovah*; Sept. Ὠδουία, Ὠδουίας, Ὠδούα, Ὠδουΐα), the name of at least two men.

1. One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh. viii, 7; ix, 5), and subscribed Nehemiah's covenant (x, 18; his name is apparently repeated in ver. 13). B.C. cir. 410.

2. One of the chief Israelites who subscribed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 18). B.C. cir. 410.

3. See JEHUDIJAH.

Hodshi. See TAHTIM-HODSHI.

Hody, HUMPHRY, D.D., an English divine, was born Jan. 1, 1659, at Oldcombe, Somersetshire, and was educated at the University of Oxford. In 1684 he was elected a fellow of Wadham College, and in the same year he published a *Dissertatio contra Historiam Aristeæ de LXX Interpretibus.* Hody became principally known by his publications respecting the bishops who had been deprived of their bishoprics during the reign of William and Mary for refusing the oath of allegiance. The first work which he published on this subject was a translation of a Greek treatise, supposed to have been written by Nicephorus in the latter end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th century, in which the writer maintains that "although a bishop was unjustly deprived, neither he nor the Church ever made a separation, if the successor was not a heretic." The original Greek work, as well as the English translation, were both published in 1691. Dodwell replied to it in *A Vindication of the Deprived Bishops* (Lond. 1692). In the following year Hody published *The Case of Sees Vacant by an Uncanonical Deprivation* (Lond. 1693, 4to), in which he replies to the arguments of his opponents. These exertions of Hody in favor of the ruling party in the Church did not pass unrewarded. He was appointed domestic chaplain to Tillotson, archbishop of Canterbury, which office he also held under Tillotson's successor. He was presented with a living in London, and was appointed regius professor of Greek at Oxford in 1698, and archdeacon of

Oxford in 1704. He died Jan. 20, 1706. He founded ten scholarships at Wadham College in order to promote the study of the Greek and Hebrew languages.

Of the other works of Hody, the most important are: 1. *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus, versionibus Græcis et Latina Vulgata, libri iv* (Oxford, 1704, folio), which is said by Bishop Marsh to be "the classical work on the Septuagint." The first book contains the dissertation against the history of Aristeas, which has been mentioned above. The second gives an account of the real translators of the Septuagint, and of the time when the translation was made. The third book gives a history of the Hebrew text and of the Latin Vulgate; and the fourth, of the other ancient Greek versions:—2. *The Resurrection of the (same) Body Asserted* (Lond. 1694, 8vo): —3. *Animadversions on two Pamphlets lately published by Mr. Collier* (Lond. 1696, 8vo). Sir W. Perkins and Sir J. Friend had been executed in 1695 for treason against the government; but previous to their execution they had been absolved of their crime by some nonjuring clergymen. This act was condemned by the ecclesiastical authorities, but was justified by Collier in two pamphlets which he published on the subject:—4. *De Græcis Illustribus linguæ Græcæ litterarumque humaniorum instauratoribus* (Lond. 1742). This work was published several years after the author's death by Dr. Jebb, who has prefixed to it an account of Hody's life and writings. See *English Cyclopædia;* Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 858; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, vi, 104; Kitto, *Cyclop.* ii, 317.

Hoë, Matthias, of Hohenegg, famous in history as the confessor of John George I, elector of Saxony. He was born of a noble family at Vienna in 1580, and educated at Wittenberg. In 1600 he commenced at this university a course of lectures, and published a programme on the position which he was to take, *Oratio detestans Papam et Calvinistas*, in which he manifests that great hatred for Romanists and Calvinists which characterized all the acts of his life. Hoë distinguished himself greatly both as a student and a lecturer. In 1612 he was called to Dresden by the elector, and became court preacher and confessor. His talents and adroitness gave him, in time, complete possession of the judgment and conscience of the elector, whom he hindered from entering into a league with Frederick V, the unfortunate king of Bohemia, by representing to him that the Reformed religion, which Frederick professed, was fatally wrong, and could not exist without injury to Lutheranism. Hoë seems, indeed, to have hated the Reformed even more than he did the Romanists, and there appears not the shadow of a reason to assert that he was bribed by the emperor. To the declaration of his principles while a lecturer at Wittenberg, and above alluded to, he adhered until the end of his life, though it is said he greatly abated in his hatred against the Calvinists in his last days. His private character has been highly commented upon by all who knew him. He wrote a *Commentarius in Apocalypsin* (Lpz. 1610-40, 2 parts), and a number of controversial works against the Reformed Church and the Romanists. He died in 1645. See Bayle, *Gen. Dictionary*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. vi, 165; Mosheim, *Ch. History*, cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. i, ch. i, n. 12; Gass, *Gesch. d. Dogmatik*, ii, 19, 78; Kurtz, *Ch. History*, ii, 183; Dorner, *Gesch. d. protest. Theol.* (see Index); Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 320-322. (J. H. W.)

Hoefel. See Höfel.

Hoefling. See Hofling.

Hoël, bishop of Mans in the 13th century, made himself quite conspicuous by the part which he took for the English in the revolt of the nobility of Mans against them after the death of William the Conqueror. He suffered imprisonment, and after the accession of Hugo was even obliged to seek a refuge in England. But we find him again at Mans in 1092, and an attendant at the councils of Saumur (1094) and Brives. Later he travelled for a time with pope Urban II. He died July 28, 1096.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 359. (J. H. W.)

Hoeschelius, David, an eminent Greek scholar, born at Augsburg in 1556, was professor at St. Anne's College, and, later, the librarian of his native city. He died Oct. 30, 1617. He deserves a notice here on account of his valuable editions of some of the Greek fathers, and of a number of Greek authors who have written in the department of Christian antiquity and ecclesiastical history.—Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* iii, 478.

Hoeven [pronounced *Hoovn*], Abraham (des Amorie) van der, a celebrated Dutch preacher, born at Rotterdam in 1798, was for a time professor at the seminary of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam, and later professor at Utrecht. He died July, 1855. Hoeven wrote *De Joanne Clerico et Philippo a Limborch* (Amst. 1843). —Pierer, *Universal-Lex.* viii, 435.

Hofacker, Ludwig, a German divine and celebrated preacher, born at Wildbad April 15, 1798, and educated at the University of Tübingen. While here he became very zealous for the cause of religion, and especially endeavored to encourage the study of the Bible among his fellow-students. He formed Bible-classes which were largely attended; and his intimate acquaintance with the works of the orthodox commentators Bengel, Oetinger, and Steinhofer rendered him especial service in his sermons, which he frequently delivered at this time, always extemporaneously. After filling the vicarates of Stettin and Plieningen, he was appointed assistant to his father, preacher at St. Leonard's, in Stuttgard. He was now only 28 years old, but his sermons attracted general attention, especially on account of his earnestness and piety. In 1826, after the death of his father, he was sent to Rielingshausen, near Marbach. It is said that his audience was composed not only of his own congregation, but that strangers came from afar to hear the young preacher. In the fall of 1827, urged by his admirers and many friends, he began the publication of some of his sermons: *Predigten* (1827; 27th ed. 1866). The rapid sale of these was really surprising. An edition of 1500 was exhausted almost immediately after publication. His sudden death, November 18, 1828, incited his friends to a publication of all his sermons. They have now been spread abroad in more than 100,000 copies, not only in Germany, but also in translations in France, England, Denmark, Sweden, Russia, and our own country. Speaking of his ability, Knapp (*Leben v. L. Hofacker*, Heidelb. 1852) says that he was the greatest and most powerful preacher of the Würtemberg Church in this century. This opinion was confirmed by the celebrated F. W. Krummacher: "The Suabian Land lost in him its most powerful preacher" (in his *Autobiography*, transl. by Easton, p. 207). A prayer-book, compiled from posthumous works of Hofacker and from his sermons (*Erbauungs- und Gebetbuch für alle Tage*, Stuttgard), appeared in 1869.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 646 sq.

Hofacker, Wilhelm, a younger brother of Ludwig (q. v.), and, like him, a celebrated preacher of the Würtemberg Church, was born February 16, 1805. In 1828 he became assistant to his brother, who was then in failing health. After his decease he travelled through Northern Germany on a literary tour. From 1830-1833 he delivered lectures at the University of Tübingen on Dogmatics, based on the work of Nitzsch, pursuing himself at the same time a course of study. In 1833 he was appointed at Waiblingen, and in January, 1836, at St. Leonard's, in Stuttgard, a church which his father and elder brother had served before him. Here he died, August 10, 1848. Like his brother, he was an earnest servant of the Church of Christ, and a regular attendant at the Bible and Missionary meetings of the University students while at Tübingen, where he also was educated. He was a zealous defender of the orthodox doctrine of the divinity of Christ, asserting that modern science is more in harmony with the Christian doctrine of

the orthodox Church than with the speculative theology of the Hegel-Strauss school. He published, besides a number of polemical articles in different theological periodicals, *Tröpflein aus der Lebensquelle* (Stuttg. 1863 and 1864), and *Predigten für alle Sonn- und Festtage* (ib. 1853). Of his sermons nine editions have already been published. They contain a short biography written by Kapff, a German preacher, one of Hofacker's associates at Tübingen University. See Knapp, *Leben von L. Hofacker;* Hartmann, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 649 sq. (J. H. W.)

Höfel, Johann, a German lawyer, born at Uffenheim in 1600, and educated at the universities of Strasburg, Giessen, and Jena, deserves mention here on account of his *Musica Christiana* (1634), and *Historisches Gesangbuch* (Schleusingen, 1681). He died in 1683.—Pierer, *Univers. Lex.* viii, 440.

Hofer, Joseph Anton, a German Roman Catholic priest, born at Kastelruth May 19, 1742, was educated at the University of Innspruck. In 1765 he was made priest, in 1722 professor of rhetoric and prefect of the Gymnasium at Brix, and in 1776 professor of ecclesiastical law; here he remained, with an interruption of four years only, which he spent at Innspruck, until the discontinuance of the school in 1807, when he was pensioned, retaining, however, the title of an ecclesiastical councillor (Rath) of the government. He died in 1820. Hofer contributed several articles to periodical literature. Of his published works, *Conspectus Juris eccles. publici* (Brixen, 1781, 4to) entitles him to a position in theological literature. Hofer published several sermons which are of superior merit. Of these the following are perhaps the best: *Ermahnungsrede am Titularfeste Mariä* (ib. 1793, 8vo):—*Kunstgriffe frommer Eltern z. Erziehung wohlgesitt. Kinder* (ib. 1794, 8vo):—*Untrügliches Kennzeichen d. sittlich. Aufersteh.* (ibid. 1798, 8vo).—Döring, *Gelehrten Theolog. Deutschl.* i, 746.

Hoffbauer, Clemens Maria, a Roman Catholic, and the first Redemptorist (q. v.) in Germany, was born at Tasswitz, in Moravia, Sept. 26, 1751. His parents had intended him for the ministry, but the sudden death of his father left his mother in destitute circumstances, and at the age of fifteen Hoffbauer was apprenticed to a baker. While engaged in his trade he studied Latin, and passed an examination in the lower class of a monastery school, determined to become a priest at some future time, if possible. The bishop of Tivoli (later Pius VII) finally took him under his protection, and Hoffbauer succeeded in making his way to Vienna, where he studied at the university. In 1783 he went to Rome, whither he had journeyed already twelve times, and joined the congregation of the Redemptorists. Two years later, after consecration to the priesthood, he returned to Vienna, and then to Warsaw, where a house and a church of St. Benno were placed at his disposal. From this he and his associates afterwards bore the name of *Bennonites.* The success of the Redemptorists in the establishment of a monastery at this place was so great that Pius VI, in 1791, decided to give them an annual support of 100 scudi. The Roman Catholics assert that many Protestants became converts of Hoffbauer, and that their confidence in him and his brothers of the monastery was unbounded. While the latter may be possible, the former is surely improbable. The effect of the French Revolution may have led some disturbing minds to join the ranks of the Roman Catholics, because many of that Church had taken such a peculiar attitude in France against true Christianity. Later Hoffbauer also established a monastery in Switzerland. Here he and his followers suffered great persecution, which, while it is possible that the disturbed state of the people gave rise to it, is more likely to have been provoked by Hoffbauer and his followers. This last supposition receives additional strength from the dealings of Napoleon while in Prussia. He imprisoned them one entire month in the fortress of Küstrin, and, after a search of their papers, demolished the monastery and discontinued the order. Some time later Hoffbauer succeeded in establishing an educational institution at Vienna, which had been presented to the Redemptorists by a converted (?) Protestant. In 1815 he went to Bulgaria, and returned to Vienna in 1818, where the government (Roman Catholic) ordered him from the country. The intercession of the clergy influenced the emperor not only to annul the order of the government, but to establish even a monastery at Vienna under his own protection. Hoffbauer died suddenly March 25, 1820. In his labors he was assisted by J. T. Hibel, who died in 1807. Initial steps have been taken for his beatification (q. v.). See Pösl, *D. erste deutsche Redemptorist, in s. Leben und Wirken* (Reg. 1844); S. Brunner, *H. und seine Zeit* (Vienna, 1850); *Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschl.* v, 413 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hoffeditz, Theodore L., D.D., a German Reformed minister, was born near Carhshaven, on the Weser, Germany, December 16, 1783. He emigrated to America in 1807. He first followed the calling of a school-teacher. Subsequently he studied theology with Rev. Samuel Helfenstein, D.D., in Philadelphia. He was licensed and ordained in 1813, and became pastor of German Reformed congregations in Northampton County, Pa., and served this charge during the remainder of his life, with the exception of brief intervals, during which he served numerous congregations which he organized in neighboring counties. In 1843 he, with Rev. Dr. Schneck, visited Germany, bearing a call from the Synod of the German Reformed Church to Dr. Krummacher to become professor of theology in the seminary at Mercersburg. He died July 10, 1858. Mild, warm-hearted, and zealous, Dr. Hoffeditz exerted a wide and blessed influence in the Church. One of his sons entered the ministry.

Hoffmann, Andreas Gottlieb, a very distinguished theologian and Orientalist, born April 13, 1796, at Welbsleben, near Magdeburg, was educated at the University of Halle, where the influence of Gesenius led him to a thorough study of the Shemitic languages, especially the Syriac. After graduation he lectured at his alma mater for a short time on the Arabic language, and in 1822 was called as extraordinary professor to Jena. Here he was advanced to the regular professorship in 1826, with the degree of S.T.D. and membership in the theological faculty. At the time of his death, March 16, 1864, he was senior of the theological faculty and of the *senate* of the university. As a professor at Jena he devoted himself mainly to the philological department of theology. His most popular lectures were on Hebrew Antiquities; but, like Gesenius, he lectured also on Church History, Isagogics, both of the Old and New Testament, Exegesis of the Old Testament, and on all the Shemitic and Eastern languages generally studied at a German university. In philology, his *Grammatica Syriaca* (Hal. 1827; translated into English by Day and Cowper) is by some of the best authorities considered superior to any other yet published, that of Ullmann included. Among his other works are *Entwurf d. hebr. Alterthümer* (Weim. 1832), which is based on the work of Warnekros (Weim. 1782 and 1794):—*Commentarius phil.-crit. in Mosis benedictionem* (in pamphlet form, Halle; later, Jena, 1822, etc.):—*Apokalyptiker d. ält. Zeit unter Juden und Christen* (Jena, 1833–38, vol. i, part i and ii, containing the book of Enoch). Hoffmann was also editor of the second section of the great Encyclopædia of Ersch und Gruber. In addition to these literary labors, he contributed largely to the German theological and philological periodicals.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 651; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 899; Brockhaus, *Conversat.-Lex.* v, 20. (J. H. W.)

Hoffmann, Daniel, a Lutheran theologian, was born at Halle 1540, and educated at the University of Jena. In 1576 he was made professor of theology at the University of Helmstadt. In the theological controversies of his day he took an active part, contend-

ing against the Calvinistic theory of the sacraments, predestination, and also against the doctrine of Ubiquity (q. v.) as held by his own Church. He decried philosophy as hurtful both to religion and to the community, attempting to sustain his position by extracts from the Pauline epistles and the writings of Luther himself, who, as is well known, did in his earlier years hold that there is a contradiction between the truths of theology and those of philosophy. In his later years Luther radically changed his views. Hoffmann was attacked by the two great Aristotelian philosophers, Caselius and Martini, who also complained of him at the university. The duke of Brunswick, after consulting the University of Rostock, obliged Hoffmann to retract, and vacate his chair at the university. He died at Wolfenbüttel in 1611. His followers, on account of their adherence to a twofold doctrine, were called *duplicists*, and their opponents *simplicists*. His controversial writings are numerous, as *De duplici veritate Lutheri a philosophis impugnata* (Magdeb. 1600):—*Super quæstione, num syllogismus rationis locum habeat in regno fidei* (ibid. 1600). An account of his disputes may be found in Thomasius, *De Controversia Hoffmanniana* (Erlangen, 1844, 8vo); *Malleus Impietatis Hoffmannianæ* (Frankf. 1604). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 185 sq.; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xvii, pt. ii, chap. i, § 10; Enfield, *Hist. of Philos.* ii, 506; Gass, *Gesch. d. Dogmat.* ii, 73 sq.; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* iii, 478 sq.; Krug, *Philos. Lex.* v, 531 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reform.* iv, 159-61. See HUNNIUS.

Hoffmann, Gottfried, born at Plagwitz, in Silesia, in 1678, studied at Leipzig, and was rector of the gymnasia at Lauban and Zittau. He died in 1712. His name is mentioned here on account of his contributions to hymnology, as *Leichengesänge* (Laub. 1704):—*Busslieder* (ib. 1705).—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 442.

Hoffmann, Heinrich, a German preacher of the 17th century at Masko, in Finland, was associated with other divines in translating the Bible into the Finnish language, published at Stockholm (1642, fol. and 1658). —Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 447.

Hoffmann, Immanuel, born at Tübingen April 16, 1710, was appointed archdeacon of Tübingen in 1741, and in 1756 professor of Greek in the university of the same place. He died in 1772. Hoffmann published a number of dissertations; of these, the following are considered the best: *Diss. in Oraculum Rom.* x, 5-8 (Tüb. 1752, 4to):—*Diss. de stilo Apostoli Pauli* (1757):—*Diss. in loca parallela*, 2 *Pet.* ii, 4-17; *Jude* 5-13 (1762, 4to): —*Commentatio in* 1 *Cor.* i, 19-21 (1766, 4to). He wrote also, but left unpublished, *Demonstratio Evangelica per ipsum scripturarum consensum in oraculis ex Vetere Testamento in Novo allegatis declarata*, partes iii (Tübingen, 1773-82, 4to). T. G. Hegelmaier, who edited this work after the decease of the author, prefixed to it a life of Hoffmann, and an excursus on the right method of interpreting the quotations made from the O. T. in the New. Orme speaks of this work as "full of learning, and in general very judicious."—Kitto, *Bib. Cyclop.* ii, 318.

Hoffmann, Johann, a distinguished German theologian, was born at Schweidnitz. The date of his birth is not known. He was for a time professor of theology at the University of Prague. In 1409 he and Otto of Münsterberg went to Leipzig, and induced many students to accompany them. They thus contributed to the founding of the Leipzig University. At first he was one of its professors, but in 1414 he was made bishop of Meissen. He died there in 1451.—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 441.

Hoffmann (or HOFMANN), **Melchior**, one of the most celebrated Anabaptist (q. v.) prophets, born at Hall, in Suabia, originally a furrier, went to Livonia about the time of the Reformation, and became a Protestant. His enthusiasm for the cause of the Protestants led him to preach at Wolmar. On account of the great opposition which he there encountered, he went to Dorpat, where the opposition against him was no less great, and he became so embittered against the Roman Catholic priests that he sought to influence the people in favor of destroying all paintings in churches, and all monasteries. This course estranged from him even his own friends, and he left in 1525 for Wittenberg to consult with Luther and Bugenhagen, who encouraged him to return to Dorpat, admonishing his friends, at the same time, to harmonious action. But his success was no better than before, and he soon after left for Reval. Later we find him at Stockholm. In 1527 the king of Denmark appointed him preacher at Kiel, but his determination to explain the Bible apocalyptically, and his deviation from the Lutheran doctrine of the sacraments, made Luther and his followers opponents of Hoffmann, and, after a stay of only two years, a conference to examine his doctrines was appointed. He was condemned for heresy, deposed from his position, and ordered to leave the country. He now went to Strasburg, and next to Emden, where he allied himself with the Anabaptists, and soon became one of their principal leaders. At the latter place he so infatuated his followers that they took him for the prophet Elias, and announced the Day of Judgment as coming in 1536. From Emden he returned to Strasburg, but the disturbances which he provoked occasioned the calling of a synod (June, 1533), which condemned him and caused his imprisonment. He died in prison in 1542. On the person of Christ, Hoffmann, with many other Anabaptists, and like the Valentinians of the early ages, held that our Lord's birth was a mere phantom, laying great stress upon ἐγένετο (John i, 14); that the Logos did not merely assume our nature, but he *became* flesh—hence his blasphemous expression, "Maledicta sit caro Mariæ" (Smith's Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, ii, 349; comp. also Tuchsel, p. 34, 35). On the Eucharist he differed, as we have already stated, from Luther in his doctrine of the real (spiritual) presence, holding that the bodily bread is a seal, sign, and token in memory of the body; the body, however, is received in the word by an unwavering faith in our heart; the *word* is spirit and life; the *word* is Christ, and is partaken of by faith. Thus he thought it possible, while considering the bread only as a symbol, to adhere to the symbol of the real spiritual presence of Christ. The followers of Hoffmann, who took the name of their leader, flourished for a short time after his death near Strasburg and Lower Germany, but finally joined the other Anabaptist sects, from which Hoffmann, while alive, had kept distinct. Fuhrmann (*Hdwörterb. d. christl. Religions- u. Kirchengesch.* ii, 325) says that a number of this sect went to England in 1535, and that there also they suffered greatly from persecutions; twenty-two of them were even imprisoned. Under Edward VI. (1548) they fared somewhat better, but after Mary's accession to the throne they were obliged to flee the country. Under the reign of Elizabeth they again ventured to reside in England, but in 1560 they were finally banished the country. A full account of Hoffmann and his sects is given by Krohn, *Gesch. d. fanat. u. enthus. Wiedertäufer in Niederdeutschland* (Lpz. 1758, 8vo, containing, also, a complete list of the writings of Hoffmann, which were mainly apocalyptical); Herrmann, *Sur la vie et les écrits de M. H.* (Strasburg, 1858). See also Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformat.* iv, 442 sq.; Cunitz, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 191 sq.; Bayle, *Histor. Dict.* ii, 480; Niedner, *Lehrb. d. Kirchengesch.* p. 64; Moller, *Cimbria litterata*, ii, 347 sq.; Röhrich, in *Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol.* (1860, p. 3 sq.); Gass, *Gesch. d. Dogmat.* ii, 73; Baumgarten-Crusius, *Dogmengesch.* p. 628. (J. H. W.)

Hoffmannites. See HOFFMANN, MELCHIOR.

Hoffmeier, JOHN HENRY, a minister of the German Reformed Church, born at Anhalt-Cöhten, Germany, March 17, 1760, was educated at the University of Halle. He spent some time as private tutor in Hamburg; then went to Bremen, where he preached a short time, and finally emigrated to America in 1793.

Here he became pastor of several German Reformed congregations in Northampton County, Pa. In 1806 he was called to Lancaster, Pa., where he continued to labor till 1831. He was able to preach only in German; and, the English language being needed in his charge, he retired from the active duties of the ministry. He died March 18, 1838. Well educated and diligent in his work, he was a successful minister. Two of his sons and three of his grandsons also devoted themselves to the ministry.

Höfling, Johann Wilhelm Friedrich, an eminent German Lutheran minister, born in Drossenfeld, near Baireuth, in 1802, was educated at the Gymnasium of Baireuth and at the University of Erlangen, where he was an attentive hearer of Schelling, whose lectures strengthened his regard for historical Christianity. In 1823 he was appointed minister at Würzburg, and in 1827 at Jost, near Nuremberg. During his residence here he published two little pamphlets in defence of positive Christianity against Rationalism, which was then making rapid progress. These, it is thought, procured him the appointment as professor of practical theology at the University of Erlangen (1833). He died April 5, 1853. Höfling was a firm adherent to the old Protestant idea of the ministry and of the Church, and defended them vigorously with all the means of modern science. His theological writings were mainly in the department of practical theology, especially on the constitution of the Church, worship, and related dogmas. Of his earlier works the best are *De symbolorum natura, necessitate, auctoritate et usu* (Erlangen, 1835; 2d ed. 1841):—*Liturgische Abhandl. v. d. Composition der christl. Gemeinde Gottesdienste* (ib. 1837). But his most important work is undoubtedly that on baptism: *Das Sakrament d. Taufe*, etc., *dogmatisch, historisch, und liturgisch dargestellt* (vol. i, 1846; vol. ii, 1848). But his *Grundsätze evangel.-luther. Kirchenverfassung* (1850; 3d edition, 1852) attracted more general attention than any other work of his. Since his decease Thomasius and Harnack have edited and published his *Liturgisches Urkundenbuch* (1854), containing the rites of communion, ordination, introduction into the Church, and marriage. This book is only a fragment of a larger work, on which he had been engaged the last years of his life. See *Zum Gedächtnisz J. W. F. Höfling's*, etc., by Dr. Nägelsbach and Dr. Thomasius; Kurtz, *Text-book of Ch. Hist.* ii, 317, 373; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 170, 171. (J. H. W.)

Hofmann, Johann Georg, a German theologian, born at Windsheim October, 1724, was educated at Erlangen and Leipzig. In 1757 he began philosophical lectures at Leipzig, and in 1762 was honored with a professorship. In 1764 he went to Giessen as professor of Oriental languages, and in 1765 was made D.D. In 1769 he was called to Altorf as professor of theology, and here he became also archdeacon. He died May 10, 1772. His principal works are *Die Erbauung n. ihrem wahren Begriffe ihren Mitteln und Hinderniszen* (Frankf. 1756, 8vo):—*Grammatica Hebræa Danziana methodo* (Gieszen, 1765, 8vo):—*Lock's paraphrast. Erklärung der Briefe an d. Galater, Korinther, Römer, und Epheser, aus d. Engl. übers.* (Frankf. 1768-69, 2 vols. 4to), besides several essays.—Adelung's Jöcher, *Gelehrt.-Lexik.* Add. ii, 2079.

Hofmann, Karl Gottlob, D.D., a distinguished German theologian, born at Schneeberg Oct. 1, 1703, was educated at the University of Leipzig, and lectured there for several years on philosophy and philology. Later he became a preacher at St. Paul's and St. Thomas's churches, and later still he was called to the St. Nicolas Church. In 1739 he was called to the University of Wittenberg as professor of theology. Here he became the senior of the theological faculty, and one of the brightest lights of the day. He died Sept. 19, 1774. He published many valuable works, of which Adelung's Jöcher gives a complete list. We have space only to mention his *Introductio Theolog.-Crit. in Lectionem epist. Pauli ad Galat. et Coloss.* (Lips. 1750, 4to), and a series of minor works, under the title *Varia Sacra* (Wittenb. et Lips. 1751). He also edited and enlarged the *Introductio in Lectionem N. T.* of J. G. Pritius (Leipsic, 1737).—Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lexik.* (Addenda by Adelung, ii, 2049); Kitto, *Biblical Cyclop.* ii, 318.

Hofmeister, Sebastian. See Wagner.

Hofstede de Groot, Peter, a distinguished Dutch theologian, was born at Rotterdam in 1720, and educated at Groningen. Soon after the completion of his university course he was called to Rotterdam as professor of theology. Here he became a leader of a theological school of "mediation," known as the Groningen School, founded by the Platonist Van Heusde (1778-1839), who was also a professor in the Rotterdam University at that time. Hofstede, assisted by Pareau, published a dogmatic theology, containing a complete exposition of the doctrines of this school, which are nothing more or less than a spiritual Arianism. They held that there is in human nature a divine element which needs development in order to enable humanity to reach its destination. This destination is conformity to God. All religions have aimed and worked at the same problem, but Christianity has solved it in the highest and purest manner. Still there is only a difference in degree between that and other religions. God has fulfilled the desire of man, whom he had prepared for salvation by sending perfection embodied in Christ. To know Christ we need the exegetical study of that preparation of man for Christ which is furnished by the Old Testament. The New Testament is the fulfilment. The latter contains the sayings of Jesus and the conclusions of the apostles. The writers of the Scriptures were not infallible, though they did not often err. Sin is regarded as a mere inconvenience, since *all sinners will eventually be holy and happy.* In stating the influences of the Groningen school in Dutch theology, Hurst (*Rationalism*, p. 366, 367) says that it is similar to the position occupied by Channing with regard to the orthodoxy of the American Church. Hofstede was a violent opponent of the Lutheran Church; and when, in 1779, a Lutheran church was about to be established at the Cape of Good Hope, he protested loudly, and wrote *Oost-indiansche Kerkzaaken*, or Ecclesiastical Affairs of India (Hague, 1779-1780, 2 vols. 8vo). Against Marmontel's celebrated novel *Belisaire* he also wrote a work exposing the vices of distinguished heathens, and showing their utter unfitness for a claim to salvation, to which Marmontel believed those entitled who had lived before Christ's coming. He died Nov. 27, 1803. See Schröckh, *Kircheng.* viii, 735; Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 364-367; Farrar, *Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 445 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxiv, 903 sq. (J.H.W.)

Hog. See Boar; Swine.

Hoge, James, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Moorfield, Virginia, in 1784. He was educated chiefly by his father, though he spent one year at an academy in Baltimore. He was licensed to preach April 17, 1805, was ordained in 1809, and was appointed missionary to the State of Ohio by the General Assembly. Within a year he organized a church at Franklinton, and in 1807 became minister of the First Church at Columbus, Ohio. Here he remained until 1858, when his age and infirmities induced him to resign. Dr. Hoge was the "father of the Presbytery of Columbus, and even of the Synod of Ohio." Not merely in his own parish, but in the Church courts and in the General Assembly, he was a man of great power and influence. The institutions for the deaf, dumb, and blind in Ohio were largely due to his exertions. Though born in a slave state, he was opposed to slavery, and was thoroughly loyal to the nation. He died at Columbus Sept. 22, 1863. A memorial sermon, preached by the Rev. William C. Roberts Oct. 4, 1863 (Columbus, Ohio, 1863), was reviewed in the *Amer. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1864, p. 89 sq.—Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1863, p. 232; 1864, p. 168.

Hoge, Moses, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was

born Feb. 15, 1752, in Frederick County, Va. For a time he attended a classical school in Culpepper County. In 1778 he went to Liberty Hall Academy, and there completed his studies in 1780. In November, 1781, he was licensed to preach, and was ordained pastor of a church at Hardy Dec. 13, 1782. In 1787, the Southern climate proving injurious to his health, he removed to Shepherdstown, where he gathered a large congregation and acquired great popularity. In 1805 he opened a classical school, mainly for the education of his own sons. He maintained this, however, only a short time, when he was called to the presidency of Hampden Sidney College, as successor of Dr. Alexander. Five years later, while at the head of the college, the degree of D.D. was conferred on him by Princeton College. In 1812 the Synod of Virginia established a theological seminary, and Dr. Hoge was called to it as a professor. He accepted this position, retaining, however, the presidency of Hampden Sidney College. He died July 5, 1820. He enjoyed the reputation of being a superior preacher. "John Randolph pronounced him the most eloquent man he had ever heard. . . . . Yet Dr. Hoge had some great disadvantages. His voice had considerable unpleasantness, arising from a nasal twang; so that he must be regarded as a very remarkable man to win such commendation from his gifted countryman." He wrote, in 1793, in defence of the Calvinistic doctrine, a reply to the Rev. Jeremiah Walker, a Baptist minister who had suddenly passed from ultra Calvinism to the entire rejection of the Calvinistic doctrines. He also published *The Christian Panoply* (1799), designed as an antidote to Paine's *Age of Reason.* It consists of two parts, the first containing the substance of Watson's reply to Paine's first part, and the second Hoge's answer to the second part of Paine's work. It had a wide circulation, and exerted a very important influence. A volume of his sermons was published shortly after his death, but their circulation has been very limited, and they hardly do justice to his character as a preacher. A memoir of Dr. Hoge was partly prepared by his sons, but seems to have been lost, as it has never gone into print.—*Amer. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1864, p. 93 sq.; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, iii, 426 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hoge, Samuel Davies, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, son of Dr. Moses, was born in Shepherdstown, Va., in 1791. His early instruction he received from his father, after whose assumption of the presidency of Hampden Sidney College he became a student in that college, and graduated in 1810. He also pursued his theological course under his father, filling at the same time the appointment of tutor at his alma mater. Later he became professor, and at one time he acted even as vice-president. In 1816 he entered the active work of the ministry, serving the two churches of Culpepper and Madison, Virginia, at the same time. In 1821 he removed to Hillsborough, Ohio, serving also a church at Rocky Spring at the same time. Three years later he was elected professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in the Ohio University at Athens. The college being at this time without a president, Dr. Hoge performed the duties of that office, and greatly increased the prosperity of the institution. At the same time, he preached in the college chapel and in the church of the town whenever his time and health would permit. He died in December, 1826.—Sprague, *Ann. of Am. Pulpit*, iv, 483.

Hog'lah (Heb. *Choglah'*, חָגְלָה, from Arab. for *partridge;* Sept. Ἑγλά v. r. Αἰγλά, etc.), the third of the five daughters of Zelophehad the Gileadite, to whom, in the absence of male heirs, portions were assigned by Moses (Numb. xxvi, 33; xxvii, 1; xxxvi, 11; Josh. xvii, 3). B.C. 1619. See also BETH-HOGLAH.

Hogstraaten. See HOOGSTRAATEN.

Ho'ham (Heb. *Hoham'*, הוֹהָם, prob. for יְהוֹהָם, *whom Jehovah impels or confounds;* Sept. Αἰλάμ, Vulgate *Oham*), the king of Hebron, who joined the league against Gibeon, but was overthrown in battle by Joshua and slain after being captured in the cave at Makkedah (Josh. x, 3). B.C. 1618.

Hohburg. See HOBURG.

Hohenburg or **Odilienberg**, an old, celebrated monastery on the Rhine, is said to have been founded by duke Ethicot, whose daughter Odilia was the first abbess. She is supposed to have died in 720. This monastery was celebrated for many years for the great learning of its inmates and the encouragement which it gave to all who devoted themselves to literary labors. About 1429, this, as well as the monastery at the foot of the hill, said to have been founded by Odilia, in order to save weary travellers the task of ascending the mount, was closed. One of the works published by an abbess of this monastery (Herrad, 1167), *Hortus deliciarum*, in Latin, contains contributions to Biblical history and to the entire field of theology. See Albricht, *History von Hohenb.* (Schletstadt, 1751, 4to); Silbermann, *Beschreib. v. Hohenb.* (Strasb. 1781 and 1835); Rettberg, *Kirchen-Gesch. Deutschl.* ii, 75–79; Mabillon, *Ann.* i, 488 sq., 599; ii, 58; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 277. (J. H. W.)

Hohenlohe, ALEXANDER LEOPOLD FRANZ EMMERICH, *prince of*, a Hungarian Roman Catholic bishop, was born near Waldenburg Aug. 17, 1794. His mother, baroness Judith de Reviczky, destined him for the clerical life, and after studying at the Academy of Berne, and the seminaries of Vienna, Tyrnau, and Elwangen, he was ordained priest in 1816. In the same year he made a journey to Rome, where he associated much with Jesuits, and finally joined their *Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.* In 1819 he returned to Germany, and settled in Bavaria, where his birth and fortune soon procured for him a high position. His reputation is chiefly due to his pretended power to cure diseases in a miraculous way. He is said to have made cures in the hospitals of Würzburg and Bamberg. But the authorities at last interfered, and even the pope himself advised Hohenlohe to abstain from these pretensions, and the prince finally left Bavaria for Vienna. He next went to Hungary, and was made bishop *in partibus* of Sardica in 1844, and abbot of the convent of St. Michael of Gabojan. During the Revolution of 1848 he was driven from Hungary, and he went to Innspruck, where the emperor of Austria then resided. In Oct. 1849, he went to Vienna to visit his nephew, count Fries, who had just decided to become a priest. He died at his house Nov. 17, 1849. The renown which Hohenlohe gained by his cures was not confined to his own country, but extended to England, Ireland, and even to our country, where the case of Mrs. Ann Mattingly, of Washington, D. C., who was said to have miraculously recovered of a tumor, March 10, 1824, in consequence of his prayers, caused considerable excitement. The prince ceased these practices many years before his death, at least publicly. Various theories have been propounded to account for the cures attributed to him: the most rational is that which assigns them to the power of the imagination over so-called nervous disorders. His principal works are *Der im Geiste der kathol. Kirche betende Christ* (Bamberg, 1819; 3d edit. Lpz. 1824):—*Des katholischen Priesters Beruf, Würde u. Pflicht* (Bamb. 1821):—*Was ist d. Zeitgeist* (Bamberg, 1821), an attempt to show that none but a good Roman Catholic can be a good and loyal citizen, addressed to Francis of Austria and Alexander of Russia:—*Die Wanderschaft einer Gott suchenden Seele*, etc. (Vienna, 1830):—*Lichtblicke und Ergebnisse aus d. Welt u. dem Priesterleben* (Ratisbon, 1836); a number of sermons, etc. His posthumous works were published by Brunner (Ratisbon, 1851). See Paulus, *Wundercuren z. Würtzb. u. Bamb. unternommen durch. M. Michel u. d. Pr. v. Hohenlohe* (Lpz. 1822); Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte d. neuest. Zeit*, p. 321; *Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschl.* v, 434–5 (gives a full account of his works); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 653 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxiv, 914.

Hohenstaufen. See GUELPHS AND GHIBELLINES.

Hohnbaum, JOHANN CHRISTIAN, a distinguished German preacher, born at Rodach, near Hildburghausen, was educated at the University of Gottingen, under Michaelis, Walch, Heyne, and others. For a time he was private tutor and preacher. In 1777 he was appointed court preacher at Coburg, and, nine years later, minister and superintendent of his native city. He died Nov. 13, 1825. Hohnbaum was an assistant in the preparation of the Hildburger *Gesangbuch* (hymn-book), and contributed also largely to different theological periodicals. His theological works are *Ueber d. heilige Abendmahl* (Cobl. 1781, 8vo):—*Predigten über Gesch. d. A. T.* (ibid. 1788-89, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Gesänge und Predigten* (ib. 1800, 8vo).—Döring, *Deutschl. Kanzelredner*, p. 143 sq. (J. H. W.)

Holbach, PAUL HENRY THIRY, *baron of*, an infidel of the 18th century, was born at Heidelsheim, in the palatinate (now grand-duchy) of Baden, in 1723. He went to Paris at an early age with his father, who at his death left him heir to a large fortune. Holbach's house became then the head-quarters of all the free-thinkers and writers of his day. At the dinners which he gave twice a week, either in Paris or at his castle of Grandval, and which gained him the title of *first maître d'hôtel of philosophy*, met the abbot Galiani, Helvetius, D'Alembert, Diderot, Raynal, Grimm, Buffon, Rousseau, Marmontel, Duclos, Laharpe, Condorcet, etc. It was in these reunions that they exchanged their ideas, and prepared, at least in their minds, many of the articles which appeared in the first *Encyclopédie* (Diderot's), besides many anonymous publications which were also sent forth, consisting either of original articles or of translations from the German or English. They carried their speculation, it is said, to such daring lengths that Buffon, D'Alembert, and Rousseau felt compelled to withdraw from the circle. Holbach himself was one of the most zealous of these champions of naturalism, and contended not only against Christianity, but against every positive religion. He is said, according to Barbier, to have published no less than forty-seven anonymous writings of his own composition. His first philosophical work he published in 1767 under the name of Boulanger: it is entitled *Le Christianisme dévoilé, ou examen des principes et des effets de la religion révélée* (Amst.). In this work he says explicitly that religion is in no way necessary for the welfare of empires; that the dogmas of Christianity are but a heap of absurdities, the propagation of which has exercised the most fatal influence on mankind; that its morality is nowise superior to the morality of other systems, and is only fit for enthusiasts incapable of fulfilling the duties imposed by society; finally, that through the eighteen centuries of its existence Christianity had led to the most deplorable results in politics. Soon after this work, which his infidel associates themselves declared the most terrible that had ever appeared in any part of the world, he published *L'Esprit du Clergé, ou le Christianisme primitif vengé des entreprises et des excès de nos prêtres modernes* (Lond. 1767), and *De l'Imposture sacerdotale, ou recueil de pièces sur le clergé* (Amst. 1767). In the same year Holbach published his most important work, *Système de la Nature* (Lond. 1770), under the signature of "Mirabaud, secrétaire perpétuel de l'Académie Française." It is not definitely known whether he wrote the book alone, or was assisted by La Grange, Grimm, and others, but it is generally conceded to have been sent forth by Holbach, and that he defrayed the expenses of publication. So radical was this work that even Voltaire attacked it in the article "God" of his "Philosophical Dictionary." Yet in 1772 Holbach published a popular edition of that work under the title *Le bon Sens, ou idées naturelles opposées aux idées surnaturelles* (Amst.; often reprinted under the name of the abbot Meslier). The wretched book was largely read by the common people, and contributed perhaps more than all the other philosophical works of the 18th century, taken together, to the subversion of morals and the spread of infidelity. It teaches the most naked and atheistical materialism, and even Voltaire abused it as immoral. In it Holbach discusses the maxims of religious morality, takes a hurried glance at social and savage life, touches the so-called "social compact," and in the course of his observations endeavors to teach, among other things, that self-interest is the ruling motive of man, and that God is only an ideal being, created by kings and priests. His *Système Social, ou les principes naturels de la morale et de la politique* (Amsterd. 1773), aims, as its title indicates, to establish the basis and rules of a moral and political system altogether independent of any religious system. This work was as ill received by the philosophers as by the religious party, and the Paris Parliament (in 1773) condemned this and all other preceding works of Holbach to be publicly burned by the hangman. They were all secretly sent to Holland in MS., and printed there by Michael Rey, who circulated them in France, so that even the friends and guests of Holbach did not know him as their author, and often criticised his works severely while partaking of his hospitality. He was also one of the contributors to the celebrated Encyclopædia (q. v.) of Diderot. Holbach's biographers claim that he was a man of good heart, and that, notwithstanding the pernicious theories of materialism which he sought to inculcate, especially among the French people, his life was better than his books. They claim especially that he was a man of most unselfish benevolence, and that he made his house even an asylum for his foes. Thus he protected and gave a refuge to the Jesuits in the days of their adversity under Louis XV, though he hated their system, and had written against them. He died at Paris January 21, 1789. See Voltaire, *Dictionnaire Philosoph.*; Diderot, *Mémoires*; Damiron, *Etudes sur la philosophie d'Holbach* (in *Mém. de l'Académie d. Sciences morales et politiques*); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 925 sq.; *Biog. Univ.* xx, 460 sq.; Schlosser, *Gesch. d.* 18 *und* 19 *Jahrhund.* i, 580 sq.; ii, 534; Buhle, *Gesch. der neueren Philos.* vi, Abtheil i, p. 94 sq.; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church History of the 18th and 19th Cent.* i, 211 sq.; Farrar, *Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 181 sq.; Vinet, *French Lit.* p. 352 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 50; Morell, *History of Philos.* p. 111 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 220 sq. (J. H. W.)

Holberg, LUDWIG VON, a Danish divine, was born Nov. 6, 1684, at Bergen, in Norway. He studied theology at Copenhagen University, and became a professor in that school. In 1735 he was elected rector of the University, and in 1737 treasurer. In 1747 the king created Holberg a baron on account of his literary services. He died Jan. 27, 1754. He is known as the creator of modern Danish literature, and deserves our notice on account of his *Kirchengeschichte* (1738-40, 2 vols.), and *Jüdische Gesch.* (1742, 2 vols.). Both these works are considered quite valuable even at the present time.—Brockhaus, *Conv. Lex.* viii, 48 sq.; Gorton, *Biograph. Dict.* ii. (J. H. W.)

Holcombe, Henry, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born in Prince Edward County, Va., Sept. 22, 1762. His early education was limited. While yet a boy, he entered the Revolutionary army. In his twenty-second year he was licensed to preach by the Baptists; and in Sept. 1785, was ordained pastor of the church at Pike Creek, S. C. Some time after, he was appointed delegate to the Convention of South Carolina, held at Charleston, to ratify the Constitution of the United States. In 1791 he became pastor of the Baptist Church at Euhaw, preaching also at May River and St. Helena; but, the climate not agreeing with him, he removed to Beaufort. In 1799 he accepted a call to Savannah. Here he labored with great success, and was chiefly instrumental in organizing the Savannah Female Asylum (in 1801), at the same time conducting a Magazine, *The Georgia*

Analytical Repository. He also took part in establishing Mount Enon Academy in 1804, and a Missionary Society in 1806. In 1810 he was made D.D. by Brown University, and in 1812 became pastor of the First Baptist Church in Philadelphia, where he labored with great acceptance until his death, May 22, 1824. He published a number of occasional sermons, addresses, etc.—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 215.

Holcombe, Hosea, a Baptist minister, was born in Union District, S.C., July 20, 1780. He was engaged in agricultural pursuits until 1800, when he turned his attention to theology, and was licensed the following year. He labored in his native region until 1812, when he went to North Carolina, and finally settled in Jefferson Co., Ala., in the fall of 1818. His ministrations in all these places were eminently successful, and he continued his labors until his death, July 31, 1841. Mr. Holcombe published a *Collection of Sacred Hymns* (1815):—a work on Baptism, entitled *A Reply to the Rev. Finis Ewing, of the Cumberland Presbyterian Society* (1832):—*A Refutation of the Rev. Joshua Lawrence's Patriotic Discourse, or Anti-Mission Principles exposed* (1836):—*The History of the Alabama Baptists* (1840).—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 442.

Holcot, Robert, an English scholastic of the 14th century, doctor of Oxford University, and a member of the Dominican order, was one of the most liberal interpreters of sacred Scripture in his day, yet an obedient son of the Roman Catholic Church, and a zealous advocate of Nominalism (q. v.). He died a victim of the plague in 1349. Holcot wrote mainly on the sacred Scriptures, but not many of his works have ever gone into print. This may account for the fact that many books whose authorship is doubtful are attributed to him by the Dominicans. Mazonius (in *Univ. Platonis et Aristot. Philosoph.* p. 201) has severely criticised the philosophical views of Holcot. His most important published theological works are *De Studio Scripturæ* (Venice, 1586, and often):—*In Proverb. Salom.* (Paris, 1515, 4to):—*In Cantica Canticorum et in septem Priora Capita Ecclesiasticis* (Ven. 1509). Among the works attributed to him by the Dominicans we find *Moralisationes Historiarum* (Paris, 1510, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 941; Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1671. (J. H. W.)

Hold [verb] is often used figuratively, but in obvious meanings, in the Bible. *To take hold of God* and *his covenant* is to embrace him as given in the Gospel, and by faith to plead his promises and relations (Isa. lxiv, 7, and lvi, 4). *Christians hold forth the word of life;* they, by practising it in their lives, give light and instruction to others (Phil. ii, 16). *Not holding of Christ the head* is neglecting to draw gracious influence from him, and to yield due subjection to him; as, for instance (Col. ii, 18, 19), worshipping angels, etc. instead of Christ; insisting on penances, etc. instead of on the merit of Christ's work.

Hold [noun] (מְצוּדָה, *metsudah'*, a *fortress*, as often rendered), the term especially applied to the lurking-places of David (1 Sam. xxii, 4, 5; xxiv, 22, etc.). See Stronghold.

Holda. See Hulda.

Holden, Henry, D.D., a distinguished English Roman Catholic controversialist, was born in Lancashire in 1596. He studied at the Seminary of Douai, and afterwards went to Paris, where he took the degree of D.D. He became a priest in the parish of St. Nicholas du Chardonnet. Much of his time was devoted to literary labors, which placed him among the most renowned theologians of that period. He died in 1665. His principal work is *Analysis Fidei* (Paris, 1652, 8vo; 2d ed. by Barbon, 1767, 12mo; translated into English by W. G., 1658, 4to). Dupin commends this book very highly. In 1660 he published *Novum Testamentum*, with marginal notes, and a *Letter to Arnauld* on predestination and grace. See Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. xvii; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 863; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxiv, 935.

Holder, Wilhelm (also known as *Frater Wilhelmus de Stutgardia Ordinis Minorum*), a Würtemberg philosopher and theologian, was born at Marbach in 1542, and educated at Tübingen. He distinguished himself especially by his great opposition to scholastic philosophy and theology, against which he wrote *Mus exenteratus contra Joannem Pistorium* (Tüb. 1593, 4to):—a very rare and curious work on the Mass and baptism, of which extracts have been given in the *N. Götting. Hist. Mag.* vol. ii, pt. iv, p. 716 sq.:—also *Petitorium exhortatorium pro resolutorio super grossis quibusdam dubietatibus et quæstionibus*, etc. (Tübing. 1594, 4to). He died July 24, 1609.—Adelung's Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1672; Krug, *Encyklop.-philos. Lex.* ii, 450.

Holdheim, Samuel, a distinguished Jewish divine of the Liberalistic or so-called reform school, was born at Kempen, province of Posen, Prussia, in 1806. His early education was, like that of every other Jewish Rabbi of his time, confined to a thorough study of the Scriptures and the Talmud. In the latter his proficiency was very great, and was pretty generally known throughout his native province, even while he was yet a young man. With great perseverance, he paved his way for a broader culture than the study of the Talmud and the instructions of the Rabbins could afford him, and he went to the universities of Prague and Berlin. His limited preparation made it, however, impossible for him to graduate at those high-schools. In 1836 he was called as Rabbi to the city of Frankfort on the Oder. Here he distinguished himself greatly by his endeavors to advance the interests of his Jewish brethren in Prussia, and to obtain liberal concessions from the government. He there published, besides a number of sermons delivered in behalf of the cause just alluded to, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* (Frnkf. 1839, 8vo), in which he treats of the Jewish holy days, usages, etc. These sermons were the subject of consideration by the leading Jewish periodicals for successive months. Thus the distinguished Jewish scholar J. A. Frankel aimed to establish on these sermons the laws of Jewish Homiletics (comp. *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1840, No. 35, 39, 47, 49, 50). His scholarly attainments were such at this time (1840) that the University of Leipzig honored him with the degree of "doctor of philosophy." In the same year Holdheim accepted a call as chief Rabbi of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and was installed Sept. 19 (1840). The prominence which this position gave him greatly increased his influence both at home and abroad, and his movements for reform in the Jewish Ritual (q. v.) contributed perhaps more than the efforts of any other person to the reform movements at Berlin with which he was afterwards so intimately associated. In 1843 he published *Ueber d. Autonomie d. Rabbinen u. d. Princip. der jüd. Ehe* (Schwerin and Berlin, 1843, 8vo). In this work he labored for a submission of the Jews in matrimonial questions to the law of the land in which they now sojourned, instead of adhering to their Talmudic laws, so conflicting with the duties of their citizenship, and so antagonistic to the principles of this liberal age. He held, first, that the autonomy of the Rabbins must cease; secondly, that the religious obligations should be distinct from the political and civil, and should yield to the latter as of higher authority; and, thirdly, that marriage is, according to the Jewish law, a civil act, and consequently an act independent of Jewish authorities. (On the controversy of this question, see Jews, Reformed.) In 1844 he published *Ueber d. Beschneidung zunächst. in religiös-dogmat. Beziehung* (Schwerin and Berlin, 1844, 8vo), in which he treats of the question whether circumcision is essential to Jewish membership, and in which his position is even more liberal than in the treatment of the questions previously alluded to. Holdheim was also a prominent member of the Jewish councils held from 1843 to 1846. In 1847 he was called

to Berlin by the Jewish Reform Society of that city, consisting of members who, on account of their liberal views, had separated from the orthodox portion; and he entered upon the duties of this position on September 5. Here he labored with great distinction, and from this, the real centre of Germany, he scattered the seeds of his extremely liberal views among his Jewish brethren throughout the entire length and breadth not only of his own country, but of the world. He died Aug. 22, 1860. Perhaps we can give no better evidence of Holdheim's influence in his later years than by citing the words of Rabbi Einhorn, now of New York city (in *Sinai: Organ für Erkenntniss u. Veredlung d. Judenth.* Baltimore, 1860, p. 288, the November number of which gives a pretty full biography of Holdheim): "The great master in Israel, the high-priest of Jewish theological science, the lion in the contest for light and truth, no longer dwells among us." Besides a number of short treatises in pamphlet form, to which the controversy between the Reformed and Orthodox Jews gave rise, he published *Gesch. der jüd. Reformgemeinde* (Berlin, 1857, 8vo):—*Religions-u. Sittenlehren d. Mischnah z. Gebrauch b. Religionsunterr. i. jüd. Religions-schulen* (Berlin, 1854, 12mo), and a larger work on the same subject under the title האמונה והדעה, *Jüd. Glaubens-u. Sittenlehre* (ib. 1857, 8vo):—*Gebete und Gesänge für das Neujahrs-u. Versöhnungsfest* (Berlin, 1859, 8vo); and *Predigten* (vol. i, 1852; vol. ii, 1853; vol. iii, 1855), besides a number of sermons separately published since his death. A complete list of his works up to 1846 is given by Fürst (*Biblioth. Judenth.* p. 404, 405). See Ritter (Dr. J. H.), *Gesch. der jüd. Reformation*, vol. iii (Samuel Holdheim, Berl. 1865); Jost, *N. Gesch. d. Israel*, i, 99 sq.; iii (*Culturgesch.*), 205 sq.; *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, p. 374 sq. (J. H. W.)

Holdsworth (Holsworth, Oldsworth, or **Oldisworth), Richard,** an English divine, was born in 1590, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. Later he became a fellow of that university. In 1620 he was appointed one of the twelve preachers at Cambridge, was then called to St. Peter-le-Poor, London, and in 1629 was appointed professor of divinity at Gresham College. In 1631 he was made prebendary of Lincoln, in 1633 was further promoted to the archdeaconry of Huntingdon, and in 1637 was recalled to Cambridge as master of Emanuel College. He was a zealous adherent to the cause of Charles I, and suffered on this account by imprisonment at the outbreak of the Rebellion. He died in 1649. Holdsworth wrote, besides a large collection of sermons, of which a list is given by Darling (*Cyclopædia Bibliogr.* i, 1509) and by Allibone (*Dict. of Authors*, i, 863), *Prælectiones Theologicæ* (London, 1661, fol.), published by his nephew, Dr. Wm. Pearson, with the life of the author:—*Valley of Vision*, in twenty-one sermons (London, 1651, 4to), of which Fuller speaks in very commendatory terms, paying the following tribute to Holdsworth (also cited by Allibone): "The author was composed of a learned head, a gracious heart, a bountiful hand, and a patient back, comfortably and cheerfully to endure such heavy afflictions as were laid upon him."—Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 106 sq.

Holdsworth, Winch, D.D., fellow of St. John Baptist's College, was born in the first half of the 18th century, and educated at Oxford University. He is especially celebrated on account of his controversy with Locke, which arose from his views on the *Resurrection of the Body* (Oxford, 1720, 8vo; and the same defended, Lond. 1727, 8vo).—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 863.

Hole, Matthew, D.D., a learned English divine, was born about 1640. He entered the University of Oxford as servitor at Exeter College in 1657, was elected fellow in 1663, and became M.A. in 1664, prebendary of Wells in 1667, and rector of his college in 1715. He died in 1730. His sermons were of high repute in their day. Among his writings are *An Antidote against Infidelity* (Lond. 1702, 8vo):—*Practical Discourses on the Liturgy of the Church of England* (new ed. by the Rev. J. A. Giles, Lond. 1837, 4 vols. 8vo):—*A practical Exposition of the Church Catechism* (3d ed. Lond. 1732, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Practical Discourses on the Nature, Properties, and Excellencies of Charity* (Oxf. 1725, 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1515.

Holgate, archbishop of York under king Edward VI, was one of the prelates of the Reformers who were silenced under queen Mary shortly after her accession to the throne of England, under the pretense that their marriage relations were non-ecclesiastical. Later (Oct. 4, 1553) he was imprisoned in the Tower, and kept there until January 18 of the following year, when he was pardoned. The dates of the birth and death of Holgate are not known.—Strype's *Memorials of the Reformation*, iv, 57 sq.; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Christian Church during the Reformation*, p. 234.

Holidays. See Holy-day; Festivals.

Holiness (קֹדֶשׁ, ἁγιοσύνη), prop. the state of sanctity, but often used of external or ceremonial relations (then more prop. ὁσιότης).

I. *Intrinsic Idea.*—"Holiness suggests the idea, not of perfect virtue, but of that peculiar affection wherewith a being of perfect virtue regards moral evil; and so much, indeed, is this the precise and characteristic import of the term, that, had there been no evil either actual or conceivable in the universe, there would have been no *holiness.* There would have been perfect truth and perfect righteousness, yet not *holiness;* for this is a word which denotes neither any one of the virtues in particular, nor the assemblage of them all put together, but the recoil or the repulsion of these towards the opposite vices—a recoil that never would have been felt if vice had been so far a nonentity as to be neither an object of real existence nor an object of thought" (Chalmers, *Nat. Theol.* ii, 380).—Krauth, Fleming's *Vocab. of Philos.* p. 217.

II. *Applications of the Term.*—1. In the highest sense, holiness belongs to God alone (Isa. vi, 3; Rev. xv, 4), because he only is absolutely good (Luke xviii, 19), and thus demands the supreme veneration of those who would themselves become good (Luke i, 49; John xvii, 11; Acts iii, 14 [iv, 27, 30]; 1 John ii, 20; Heb. vii, 26; Rev. iv, 8). See Holiness of God.

2. Men are called holy (*a*) in as far as they are vessels of the Holy Spirit and of divine power, e. g. the prophets; and also in as far as they belong to an organization which is dedicated to God. In the N. T. Christians are especially holy, as being wholly consecrated to God's service. (Comp. Rom. viii, 27; xii, 13; 1 Cor. vi, 2; Eph. ii, 19; v, 3; vi, 18; Col. i, 11; iii, 12; 2 Pet. i, 21; Rev. xiii, 10; Jude 14.) Men are also called holy (*b*) in so far as they are or become habitually good, denying sin, thinking and acting in a godlike manner, and, in short, conforming, in their innermost being, as well as in their outward conduct, to the highest and absolute law or the will of God (Rom. vi, 19, 22; Eph. i, 4; Tit. i, 8; 1 Pet. i, 15; Rev. xx, 6).

The *grounds* of this sanctification, according to outward appearance, are twofold, viz.: (*a*) Holiness is given of God by the mediation of Christ, conditioned upon faith and an inward surrender, which are themselves likewise the gift of God. (*b*) Man from within, by a proper purification of the heart, may attain this sanctity. Although the last cannot occur without the assistance of God, yet the personal activity of man is necessary and almost preponderant. Still, even interior holiness is, as above implied, the direct work of God.

3. As everything dedicated to God partakes in a certain manner of his holiness, so even things (e. g. the Temple), forms, and ceremonies (e. g. sacrifice): hence "to hallow" means also *to dedicate to God, to offer up, to bring as an offering, to present one's self as dedicated to God through Christ* (Rev. xxvi, 18; 1 Cor. vi, 11; Eph. v, 26; Heb. ii, 11; x, 10, 14; John xvii, 17). In the N. T., where the merciful assistance of God in customary purity or objective holiness appears prominent, the ex-

pression to "sanctify one's self" is used only concerning Christ, and means here the same as *to offer up himself* as a sacrifice for human sin (John xvii, 19). But as man may make himself holy, i. e. under the assistance of the Holy Spirit, he may work for his own purity; similar phraseology is used of Christians (Matt. xxiii, 17; John xvii, 19; 1 Tim. iv, 5).

4. That by which God reveals his holiness, e. g. the Law, is also holy (Rom. vii, 12).

III. *Progression.*—Complete holiness, as applied to men, designates the state of perfect love, which exhibits itself in this, that every thought of man, every emotion and volition, hence also every deed, is determined by the will of God, and thus the old man, who has been fainting under the burdens of worldly lust, and has been carrying the chains of the flesh, is cast off, and the new man is fully put on. This sanctification is both a work of God and of man. This divine grace comes through Christ, first at conversion, and by successive steps thereafter under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Man must seize the proffered hand of God, use the means of grace afforded him, and by the assistance of God perfect holiness. Thus, on the one hand, everything comes from God, and, on the other, the personal work of man is necessary. Whatever the good man is, he is through God and his own will; the evil man, however, is so only through his own will, for evil is falling away from God. Goodness consists ultimately in susceptibility for the divine work of grace, while wickedness has its final ground in the free hardening of the heart against the divine influences.

Personal holiness is a work of development in time, frequently under a variety of hinderances and backslidings, and even with the possibility of entire ruin. Hence the admonitions to watchfulness, to continual prayer, to perseverance in faith, in love, and in hope, are abundant (1 Cor. i, 30; 2 Cor. vii, 1; Eph. iv, 23, 24; comp. Rom. xii, 2); hence also the apostle's prayer that the love of the Philippians might abound yet more and more (Phil. i, 9). But while the laying aside of the old, and the putting on of the new, are thus referred to man, of course it is not the meaning of the sacred writer that sanctification is accomplished by our own power. Christ is our sanctification, as he is our righteousness (1 Cor. i, 30); yet all that Christ through the Holy Spirit works in man may become in vain, because man by his unfaithfulness can hinder the operation of the Spirit.

IV. *Metaphorical Representations of a State of Holiness.*—In the Scriptures this sanctification is described in manifold as well as strong and explicit figures as a "putting off" of the old man, and a putting on of the new man (Col. iii, 9), the subject becoming dead to the old, and having recovered the lost image of God. It is represented as self-denial (1 Cor. ix, 26, 27); as a cleansing (1 John i, 9; comp. Heb. i, 3; ix, 14; Eph. v, 26; 2 Pet. i, 9); as a washing (1 Cor. vi, 11); as a taking away of sin (John i, 29); as being filled with the fruits of righteousness (Phil. i, 11); with the water of life (John vii, 38; compare iv, 14); as a shedding abroad of the love of God in the heart (Rom. v, 5); as baptism into Christ (Rom. vi, 3; Eph. i, 10; ii, 5; Rev. xv, 1); fellowship with God (1 John i, 3); as being in the Father, and in the Son, and in the light (1 John ii, 5, 6, 10, 24; compare Eph. ii, 15; John xiv, 20); as the having God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit dwelling in us (John xiv, 17, 20; Gal. ii, 20; 1 Cor. v, 15; 1 John ii, 24; iv, 4, 12-15; Eph. iv, 6); as a birth unto God and Christ (1 John ii, 29; iii, 9, 10; iv, 4-7; v, 18, 19); as being partaker of the divine nature (2 Pet. i, 4); children of God (Rom. viii, 14; John i, 12; 1 John iii, 1, 2); born again (John iii, 5, 7; Titus iii, 5, 6); as being one with Christ and one another (John xvii, 22, 26).—Krehl, *Neutestam. Wörterb.* p. 356. See SANCTIFICATION.

HOLINESS, *as a note of the Church.* See SANCTITY.

HOLINESS OF GOD, his essential and absolute moral perfection. Primarily, the word *holy* (Sax. *halig;* Germ. *heilig,* whole, sound) denotes perfection in a moral sense. As applied to man, it denotes entire conformity to the will of God. See SANCTIFICATION. "But when we speak of God, we speak of a Being who is a law unto himself, and whose conduct cannot be referred to a higher authority than his own." See HOLINESS, above.

1. "As to the use of the words קָדוֹשׁ and *ἅγιος*, some critics assert that they are only used in Scripture, with reference to God, to describe him as the object of awe and veneration; and it is true that this is their prevailing meaning—e. g. Isa. vi, 9; John xvii, 11 (*ἅγιε πάτερ*) —and that accordingly *ἁγιάζεσθαι* signifies *to be esteemed venerable, to be reverenced.* Still it is undeniable that these words in many passages are applied to God in a moral sense; e. g. Lev. xix, 2, 'Be ye holy, for I am holy;' comp. 1 Pet. i, 14-16. Thus also *ὁσιότης*, Eph. iv, 24; and *ἁγιωσύνη, ἁγιασμός*, by which all moral perfection is so frequently designated, more especially in the New Testament. The different synonymical significations of the words קָדוֹשׁ and *ἅγιος* are clearly connected in the following manner: (*a*) *The being externally pure;* e. g. 2 Sam. xi, 4; Lev. xi, 43, 44; xx, 7, 25, 26 sq. (*b*) *The being separate*, since we are accustomed to divide what is pure from what is impure, and to cast away the latter; and therefore (*c*) *The possessing of any kind of external advantage, distinction*, or *worth.* So the Jews were said to be *holy to God*, in opposition to others, who were *κοινοί*, *profane, common, unconsecrated.* Then everything which was without imperfection, disgrace, or blemish was called *holy;* and קָדוֹשׁ, *ἅγιος*, *sacrosanctus*, came thus to signify what was *inviolable* (Isa. iv, 3; 1 Cor. iii, 17); hence מִקְדָּשׁ, *asylum.* They were then used in the more limited sense of *chaste* (like the Latin *sanctitas*), a sense in which they are also *sometimes* used in the New Testament; e. g. 1 Thess. iv, 3, 7 (comp. Wolf, ad loc.). They then came to denote any *internal* moral perfection; and, finally, perfection, in the general notion of it, as exclusive of all imperfection."

2. "*The holiness* of God, in the general notion of it, is his moral perfection—that attribute by which all moral imperfection is removed from his nature. The holiness of the *will* of God is that, therefore, by which he chooses, necessarily and invariably, what is morally good, and refuses what is morally evil. The holiness and justice of God are, in reality, one and the same thing; the distinction consists in this only, that holiness denotes the internal inclination of the divine will—the disposition of God, and justice the expression of the same by actions. This attribute implies, 1. That no sinful or wicked inclination can be found in God. Hence he is said (James i, 13, 17) to be *ἀπείραστος κακῶν*, incapable of being tempted to evil (not in the active sense, as it is rendered by the Vulgate and Luther); and in 1 John i, 5, to be light, and without darkness; i. e. holy, and without sin. In this sense he is called טָהוֹר, *καθαρός*, *ἁγνός* (1 John iii, 3); also תָּמִים, *ἁπλόος*, *integer* (Psa. xviii, 31). The older writers described this by the word *ἀναμάρτητος*, *impeccabilis.* [The sinlessness of God is also designated in the New Testament by the words *τέλειος* (Matt. v, 48) and *ὅσιος* (Rev. xvi, 5).]. 2. That he never chooses what is false and deceitful, but only what is truly good—what his perfect intelligence recognises as such; and that he is therefore the most perfect teacher and the highest exemplar of moral goodness. Hence the Bible declares that he looks with displeasure upon wicked, deceitful courses (Psa. i, 5 sq.; v, 5: 'Thou hatest all workers of iniquity'); but, on the contrary, he regards the pious with favor (Psa. v, 7, 8: xv, 1 sq.; xviii, 26 sq.; xxxiii, 18)" (Knapp, *Theology*, § 29). Howe speaks of the holiness of God as "the actual, perpetual rectitude of all his volitions, and all the works and actions which are consequent thereupon; and an eternal propension thereto and love thereof, by which it is altogether impossible to that will that it should ever vary."

3. Holiness is an *essential* attribute of God, and adds

glory, lustre, and harmony to all his other perfections (Psa. xxvii, 4; Exod. xv, 11). He could not be God without it (Deut. xxxii, 4). It is *infinite* and *unbounded;* it cannot be increased or diminished. It is also *immutable* and *invariable* (Mal. iii, 6). God is *originally* holy; he is so of and in himself, and the *author* and *promoter* of all holiness among his creatures. The holiness of God is visible by his *works;* he made all things holy (Gen. i, 31): by his *providences,* all which are to promote holiness in the end (Heb. xi., 10): by his *grace,* which influences the subjects of it to be holy (Tit. ii, 10, 12): by his *word,* which commands it (1 Pet. i, 15): by his *ordinances,* which he hath appointed for that end (Jer. xliv, 4, 5): by the *punishment of sin* in the death of Christ (Isa. liii); and by *the eternal punishment* of it in wicked men (Matt. xx, 46) (Buck). See ATTRIBUTES. The holiness of God, like his other attributes, constitutes the divine essence itself, and consequently exists in him in the state of absolute perfection. It were therefore impossible to consider it as a conformity of God to the laws of right, since God himself, on the contrary, is the idea and principle of holiness. But, on the other hand, we may not say that the will of God simply constitutes the essence of divine holiness. To mankind, indeed, the simple will of God is at once law in all things; but with regard to God himself, his will is holy because he wills only according to his immanent holiness, i. e. his own nature. As the absolute Being, God is necessarily in no wise dependent on any outward law; but as a morally perfect spirit God cannot but be true to himself, and thus manifest in all his agency his inherent moral perfection as his immanent law.

The earlier dogmatists of the Reformed Church largely discussed the question whether right is right because God wills it, or whether God wills right because it is right. Some (e. g. Polanus) maintained the former view as the only one consistent with the absolute nature of God. The later writers maintain the opposite view, e. g. Voetius: "God is subject to no moral duty *from without,* because he is no man's debtor, and there is no cause outside of God that can bind or determine him. But *from within* he may be bound (so to speak), not, indeed, in the sense of subjection, because he is *his own debtor, and cannot deny himself.* Thus, in divine things, the Father is bound to love the Son, for he cannot but love him; while the Son, by the very necessity of his divine nature, is bound to work by the Father; nor can he do otherwise whenever a work outside of God is to be performed. So, also, in external acts, the creature having been once produced, God is bound to maintain it by his perpetual power and continual influence (as long as he wishes it to exist), to move directly upon it as its first mover, and guide it to his glory (Prov. xvi, 4; Rom. xi, 34-36). That is immutably good and just whose opposite he cannot wish." So also Heidegger (*Corp. Theol.* iii, 89, 90): "Whatever is the holiness, justice, and goodness of the creature, nevertheless its rule and first norm in the sight of God is *not his free will and command, but his own essential justice, holiness, and goodness.*" On this subject Watson remarks as follows: "Without conducting the reader into the profitless question whether there is a fixed and unalterable nature and fitness of things, independent of the divine will on the one hand; or, on the other, whether good and evil have their foundation, not in the nature of things, but only in the divine will, which makes them such, there is a method, less direct it may be, but more satisfactory, of assisting our thoughts on this subject. It is certain that various affections and actions have been enjoined upon all rational creatures under the general name of righteousness, and that their contraries have been prohibited. It is a matter also of constant experience and observation that the good of society is promoted only by the one, and injured by the other; and also that every individual derives, by the very constitution of his nature, benefit and happiness from rectitude, injury and misery from vice. This constitution of human nature is therefore an indication that the Maker and Ruler of men formed them with the intent that they should avoid vice and practice virtue; and that the former is the object of his aversion, the latter of his regard. On this principle, all the *laws,* which in his *legislative* character almighty God has enacted for the government of mankind, have been constructed. 'The law is *holy,* and the commandment *holy, just,* and *good.*' In the administration of the world, where God is so often seen in his *judicial* capacity, the punishments which are inflicted, indirectly or immediately upon man, clearly tend to discourage and prevent the practice of evil. 'Above all, the Gospel, that last and most perfect revelation of the divine will, instead of giving the professors of it any allowance to sin, because grace has abounded (which is an injurious imputation cast upon it by ignorant and impious minds), its chief design is to establish that great principle, God's moral purity, and to manifest his abhorrence of sin, and inviolable regard to purity and virtue in his reasonable creatures. It was for this he sent his Son into the world to turn men from their iniquities, and bring them back to the paths of righteousness. For this the blessed Jesus submitted to the deepest humiliations and most grievous sufferings. He gave himself (as St. Paul speaks) for his Church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it; that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, but that it should be holy and without blemish; or, as it is elsewhere expressed, he gave himself for us, to redeem us from our iniquities, and to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works' (Abernethy, *Sermons*). Since, then, it is so manifest that 'the Lord loveth righteousness and hateth iniquity,' it must be necessarily concluded that this preference of the one, and hatred of the other, flow from some *principle* in his very *nature*—'that he is the *righteous* Lord; of purer eyes than to behold evil; one who cannot look upon iniquity.' This principle is *holiness,* an attribute which, in the most emphatic manner, is assumed by himself, and attributed to him, both by adoring angels in their choirs, and by inspired saints in their worship. He is, by his own designation, '*the* HOLY ONE *of Israel;*' the seraphs in the vision of the prophet cry continually, 'HOLY, HOLY, HOLY *is the Lord God of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory;*' thus summing up all his glories in this sole moral perfection. The language of the sanctuary on earth is borrowed from that of heaven: '*Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name, for thou only art* HOLY.' If, then, there is this principle in the divine mind which leads him to prescribe, love, and reward truth, justice, benevolence, and every other virtuous affection and habit in his creatures which we sum up in the term *holiness,* and to forbid, restrain, and punish their opposites—that principle, being *essential* in him, a part of his very nature and Godhead, must be the spring and guide of his own conduct; and thus we conceive without difficulty of the essential rectitude or holiness of the divine nature, and the absolutely pure and righteous character of his administration. This attribute of holiness exhibits itself in two great branches, *justice* and *truth,* which are sometimes also treated of as separate attributes." See Watson, *Theolog. Institutes,* i, 436; Knapp, *Theology,* § 29; Leland, *Sermons,* i, 199; Abernethy, *Sermons,* ii, 180; Heppe, *Dogmatik der evang-reform. Kirche,* p. 73 sq.; Pye Smith, *Theol.* p. 173 sq.; Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed,* i, 10, 531, 541; Smith's Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines,* i, 110 sq.; Dorner, in *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* i, 2; ii, 3; iii, 3; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* xix, 618; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 133; iii, 321; xix, 618-624; *Biblioth. Sac.* xii, 377; xiii, 840; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* xi, 505; Thomasius, *Dogmatik,* i, 141; Staudenmeier, *Dogmatik,* ii, 590-610; Dwight, *Theol.* i (see Index); Martensen, *Dogmatik,* p. 99; Clark, *Outl. of Theol.* ii, 9 sq.; Calvin, *Institutes,* i, 377; Wesley, *Works,* ii, 430. See GOD.

Holiness, a title of the Pope. See POPE.

Holkot. See HOLCOT.

Holland, also called THE NETHERLANDS, a kingdom in Europe, has an area of 13,890 English square miles. Holland still owns extensive colonies in the East and West Indies, and in South America, which together make an area of about 685,700 English square miles.

I. *Church History.*—At the beginning of the Christian æra, the country which is now called Holland or the Netherlands was inhabited by Germanic tribes, of whom the Batavians and Frisians (q. v.) are best known. Their subjection, begun by Cæsar, was completed by Germanicus. At the beginning of the 4th century the Franks conquered a large portion of the country; only the Frisians maintained their independence until the 7th century. Charlemagne appointed counts in Batavia and in Zealand, and compelled the people to embrace the Christian religion. After the division of the empire of Charlemagne, the Netherlands were united with Lorraine, and they both were made a dependency of Germany. But gradually a number of princes became semi-independent; among them the bishops of Utrecht, who ruled over Upper-Yssel and Groningen. The most powerful among the princes were the counts of Flanders, and after the extinction of these last their land fell by marriage to the dukes of Burgundy, who gradually came into possession of the whole of the Netherlands, remaining, however, feudal to the German emperor. The marriage of the daughter of the last duke of Burgundy with Maximilian, archduke of Austria (later, emperor Maximilian I of Germany), made the Netherlands a part of the extensive dominions of the house of Hapsburg.

The Christianization of the country has been referred to in the arts. BELGIUM and FRIESLAND. Holland, like Belgium, early became distinguished for its excellent cathedral schools, especially that of Utrecht. A great influence upon the religious life not only of Holland, but of many other countries, was exercised by the Brothers of Common Life, who were founded by Gerhard Groote (q. v.) (1340-1384). This order soon established a number of schools, especially in the Netherlands and the adjacent parts of Germany, which imparted not only elementary instruction, but also a higher education. Thus Holland became celebrated for its learning and scholarship, which in the 15th century was further promoted by the establishment of the University of Deventer. Many of the prominent men of Holland took an active part in the efforts to reform the Church of Rome; the best known of these reformers is John de Wessel. The Mennonites (q. v.) fully separated from the Church of Rome, and, living in a country which was favorable to religious toleration, suffered less from persecution than most of the mediæval sects.

The Reformation of the 16th century found in few countries so congenial a soil as in Holland. Favored by the liberal traditions of the country, the national spirit of independence, and the extensive commerce with foreign countries, it spread rapidly. In vain did Charles V issue a number of cruel edicts (the first in March, 1520, the last in 1550) to put it down; it grew in spite of all persecution. Among the different reformed systems which then began to establish themselves, it was especially that of Calvin, first introduced by young Dutch students of Geneva, which struck deep root. The Lutheran doctrines, and, still more, Anabaptist movements, also found numerous adherents, but Calvinism soon obtained the ascendency, owing to a large extent to the influence of the Reformed churches of England and France. Thus arose the *Dutch Reformed Church*, embracing at its origin the reformed churches of Belgium, as well as those of Holland, as these countries were at this time politically united. [The inner history of this Church is given in the article REFORMED CHURCH.] Philip II was determined to destroy the new doctrine, and introduced into the Netherlands all the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition. This called forth a general opposition. The lower nobility united in presenting to the regent Margaret of Parma a protest against religious persecutions; the citizens assembled in the open field for divine service. In 1566, general attacks began against the Roman Catholic churches. In 1567, Philip sent duke Alba to the Netherlands with an army, consisting of Spaniards and Italians, to subdue the religious movement; but the cruel tyranny of the duke led to very different results. William of Orange, the stadtholder, who had escaped death by flight, unsuccessfully attempted, at the head of an army of exiles, to expel the Spaniards, but in 1572 nearly the whole of the northern provinces fell into the hands of the patriots. The efforts of Alba to suppress the revolution by force of arms having entirely failed, he was recalled, and departed in Jan. 1574, boasting that during his administration 18,600 men had been executed, chiefly on account of religion. The efforts of his successors likewise failed to re-establish the rule of Spain. In 1579, the provinces of Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, Friesland, Groningen, Overyssel, and Guelderland formed the Union of Utrecht, and thus laid the foundation of the republic of the Seven United Provinces. From this time the history of the Netherlands divides itself into that of Holland, in which the ascendency of Protestantism was henceforth established, and that of Flanders (subsequently *Belgium*, q. v.), or the ten provinces, which remained under the Spanish dominion, and adhered to the Roman Catholic Church. William of Orange was assassinated in 1584 by a partisan of Spain, but his son Maurice successfully defended the independence of Holland, and in 1609 compelled Spain to agree to a truce for twelve years. During the peace an unfortunate quarrel broke out between the Calvinists and the Arminians (q. v.). Maurice, who aspired to become hereditary sovereign of Holland, placed himself, from political reasons, at the head of the strict Calvinists, and when he prevailed, the venerable head of the Arminian party, Barneveldt, one of the most illustrious of the Dutch statesmen, was (May 13, 1619) executed, while Hugo Grotius, another distinguished leader of the Arminians, or, as they were generally called, from their remonstrances in favor of religious toleration, Remonstrants, escaped by an artifice. The war with Spain was renewed in 1621, but at the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, Spain had to recognise the independence of Holland.

Under various political vicissitudes, Holland remained henceforth a Protestant country. On the establishment of the Batavian republic in 1795, in consequence of the conquest of the country by France, Church and State were separated; the constitution of the national Church remained, however, substantially as before. Simultaneously with the erection of the kingdom of Holland under Napoleon, an attempt was made to reorganize the Church, at the head of which the national Synod was to be placed; but this plan, also, was not executed, as in 1810 Holland was incorporated with the French empire. An introduction of the Organic Articles (1812) was then meditated, but never carried through. The re-establishment of the Netherlands as an independent state, with which also Belgium was united, restored to the national Church most of the rights formerly possessed by her, and gave her for the first time a national Synod. In the new state a majority of the population belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, but the government knew how to maintain in its legislation the ascendency of Protestantism, to the great dissatisfaction of the southern provinces, which revolted in 1830, and constituted the independent kingdom of Belgium (q. v.). From that time Holland again became a predominantly Protestant state, in which, however, the Roman Catholic Church comprises about two fifths of the entire population. Of late, an almost complete separation between Church and State has been effected.

II. *Church Statistics.*—The total population of the kingdom of Holland amounted in December, 1888, according to an official calculation, to 4,505.932. This is exclusive of the grand-duchy of Luxemburg (q. v.), which is governed by the king of Holland as grand-duke, but is entirely independent from Holland in point of administration. A little over a majority of the en-

tire population, according to the official census taken in 1879, 2,469,814, belong to the National Reformed Church. The present constitution of this Church, which almost makes it autonomous, was regulated by a law of March 23, 1852. The Church embraces 43 classes in 10 provincial districts. A classis consists of the pastors and a number of the elders, but the number of the latter must not exceed the number of the pastors. Each classis meets annually, and elects a standing committee, which exercises ecclesiastical discipline. The General Synod, which meets every year in June at the Hague, consists of ten pastors, one being elected by each of the provincial synods, three elders, and the representatives of the three theological faculties of Leyden, Utrecht, and Groningen. To these are added delegates appointed by the Commission of the Reformed Walloon Churches (those which use the French language), and by the East and West Indian churches. A Synodal Commission, consisting of the president, the vice-president, and the secretary of the Synod, of three preachers and elders, and one professor of theology, is chosen for a period of three years. The number of parishes in 1884 was 1345, which were administered by 1611 pastors. The Walloon churches were seventeen in number, with twenty-five pastors, and a population of 9678. They are placed under a special commission for the affairs of the Walloon churches, but form an integral part of the National Reformed Church. Theological faculties representing this Church are connected with the state universities of Leyden, Utrecht, Groningen, and the Athenæa of Deventer and Amsterdam. The famous theological schools of Harderwyk and Franeker (q. v.) have been abolished.

As the National Reformed Church in Holland, in the second half of the 18th and in the present century, fell more and more under the predominant influence of rationalism [for the doctrinal history of the Church, see the art. REFORMED CHURCH], a number of the leading defenders of the ancient creed of the Church deemed it best to secede from the National Church, and to organize an independent Church (*De afgescheid. reform. kerk*). In 1884 this Church comprised forty classes in ten provinces, with about 200 ministers and 379 congregations. It has a theological school at Kampen, with fifty to sixty students. Its membership belongs chiefly to the poorer classes of the population, and numbers 139,903 souls. The Remonstrants and followers of Arminius (q. v.) have considerably decreased since the beginning of the present century. While in 1809 they still numbered thirty-four congregations and forty pastors, they had in 1884 only twenty-four congregations and twenty-four preachers left. They regard themselves as members of the Reformed Church, and call themselves the Remonstrant Reformed Brotherhood. They have been supported since 1795 by the state, and their pastors are educated at the Athenæum of Amsterdam. Their Synod meets annually, alternating between Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The Lutherans of Holland adopted as early as 1596 a constitution similar to that of the Reformed Church. Like them, they have elective pastors, elders, and deacons; and by the new regulations of 1858, a Church Council, Synodal Commission, and Synod, as the three stages of ecclesiastical representation. Their Synod likewise meets annually at the Hague. The population connected with the Church amounted in 1884 to 61,825; the number of parishes and pastors is about fifty; the number of classes six. They have a theological seminary at Amsterdam. The professors of this seminary, as well as the pastors, receive salaries from the state. The Mennonites, whose origin falls into the time before the Reformation, have likewise decreased since the beginning of the present century. In 1809 they numbered 133 congregations and 185 ministers; in 1884, 126 congregations and 129 ministers. They, too, have a seminary at Amsterdam, with fifteen students in 1884. Rationalism largely prevails among them. The population connected with their congregations numbered in 1884, 50,705. The churches are self-supporting, and independent of each other. The Moravians have two churches and four ministers. The Jews in 1888 numbered about 100,000 souls.

Among the religious societies of Holland the following are the most important: (1.) The *Netherlands Bible Society*, which had in 1867 a circulation of 32,251 copies, and an income of $30,000. (2.) The *Sunday-school Union* had in 1867 established 271 Sunday-schools in ninety-five different places; they had together 1301 teachers and 24,400 children. It publishes a weekly paper, *The Christian Family Circle*. (3.) The *Society for Christian National-school Instruction* (established in 1860), whose design is the establishment throughout the country of schools in which a sound Christian education shall be given, as opposed to that given in the national schools. Eighty schools had in 1867 been established in different parts of the country on this principle. The income of the society was about $9000. (4.) The *Netherlands Evangelical Protestant Union*, established in 1853, endeavors to "counteract the terrible power of Rome, and unbelief prevailing throughout the country, by means of colporteurs and evangelists." The income of the society is about $1500. (5.) The missionary societies of Holland labor exclusively in the Dutch colonies, and in the neighboring islands of the Indian Archipelago. Great open-air missionary gatherings are now held every year in Holland.

Until the Reformation, the whole of modern Holland belonged to the diocese of Utrecht (q. v.). In 1559 this see was made an archbishopric, and five suffragan sees were erected—Haarlem, Middleburg, Deventer, Leeuwarden, and Groningen. The success of the Reformed Church, after the establishment of the independence of Holland, put an end to all the dioceses. In 1583 an apostolical vicariate was established for those who continued to adhere to the Church of Rome. It was at first administered by the apostolical nuncio in Brussels. At the beginning of the 17th century the Dutch mission again received a resident vicar apostolic at Utrecht (who was to supply the place of the former archbishops), and five provicars at the former episcopal sees. In 1723 the Jansenist (q. v.) canons of Utrecht elected an archbishop; in 1742 a Jansenist bishop was elected for Haarlem, and in 1755 another for Deventer. All these sees are still extant, but the number of parishes and the membership have decreased. These have at present (1870) a population of about 4000 souls in twenty-five parishes. After the establishment of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Roman Catholic Church in the seven old provinces was divided into seven arch-presbyterates, who were placed under the papal nuncio at the Hague as "vice superior of the Dutch mission," while the apostolic vicariates of Herzogenbusch, Breda, and Limburg (1840) were erected into districts which had formerly belonged to other states. On March 7, 1853, Pius IX re-established the regular hierarchy by erecting the archbishopric of Utrecht, and the four bishoprics of Haarlem, Breda, Herzogenbusch, and Roeremonde. The Catholic population in 1879 numbered 1,439,137 souls), with 39 convents of monks (containing 815 members) and 137 female monasteries (containing 2188 members). Among the monks are Jesuits, Redemptorists, Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, and Norbertines. Several congregations of Sisters of Charity have arisen in Holland.

A complete Church History of Holland has been published by Glasius, *Geschiedeniss der christelijke kerk en godsdienst in de Nederlanden* (Leyden, 1833 sq., 6 vols.). The introduction of Christianity into the Netherlands is specially treated of by Diest Lorgion (*Gesch. van de invoering des christend. in Nederlanden* (Leuw. 1841), and by Prof. Royaards (*Gesch. der invoering en vestiging van et christend. in Nederl.* Utr. 1841; 3d ed. 1844). The latter began a Church History of Holland during the Middle Ages (*Gesch. van et gerestigde Christendom en de christ. kerk in Nederlande gedurende de middeleeuwen*,

Utr. 1849-53, 2 vols.), but the death of this eminent historian (1854) prevented the completion of the work. A biographical Church History, from a Roman Catholic stand-point, was begun by Alberdingk Thijm (*Gesch. der kerk in de Nederl.;* vol. i, *H. Willibrodus, Apostel der Nederlanden*, Amsterd. 1861; Germ. transl. Munster, 1863). A work of great ability is the Church History of Holland before the Reformation, by Moll (*Kerkegeschiedeniss van Nederland voor de hervorming*, Arnheim, 1864 sq., 3 vols.). See BELGIUM. (A. J. S.)

Holland, Guido, an English Jesuit, was born in Lincoln about 1587. He was educated at the University of Cambridge, devoting his time mainly to metaphysics. After graduation he went to Spain, and here pursued a course in theology. In 1615 he entered the order of the Jesuits, and was sent to England as a Roman Catholic missionary. He died Nov. 26, 1660. He wrote a work of some importance on the immortality of the soul, under the title *Prærogativa naturæ humanæ*.—Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1674.

Holland, John M., a Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Williamson County, Tenn., about 1803 or 1804, was converted in early life, and entered the ministry in 1822. After holding several important charges, he was appointed presiding elder of the Cumberland District in 1829. Two years later he was sent to Nashville, and in 1832 was reappointed presiding elder over the Forked Deer District, transferred in 1833 to the Memphis, and in 1836 to the Florence District. In 1837 he was selected as the agent of La Grange College, but in 1838 he returned to the active work of the ministry as presiding elder of Holly Springs District, in Mississippi. In 1839 he was once more chosen agent for a college—this time for Holly Springs University; but in 1840 he again returned to the presiding eldership, that of the Memphis District. On this district he died in 1841. Holland was one of the most able and useful servants of the Methodist Episcopal Church in his day, and is generally acknowledged to rank foremost among the preachers of Tennessee.—Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vii, 662.

Holland, Thomas, a celebrated English divine, born at Ludlow, in Shropshire, in 1539, was educated at Exeter College, Oxford. His broad and thorough scholarship secured him the regius professorship at Oxford, and in this station "he distinguished himself so much by every kind of desirable attainment, divine or human, that he was esteemed and admired not only in our seminaries of learning at home, but also in the universities abroad" (Middleton, *Ev. Biog.* ii, 373 sq.; compare also Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1674). He died March 17, 1612. Holland was a zealous Protestant, and labored earnestly to drive from Oxford all Papists and their sympathizers, of whom it had not a few at this early date of Protestantism in England. It is to be regretted that most of the works he left, and these were few indeed, were never printed. Allibone mentions *Oratio Oxon.* (Oxford, 1599, 4to) and *Sermons* (ibid. 1601, 4to).

Hollaz, David, a German Lutheran divine, was born at Wulkow, near Stargard, in 1648. He studied at Wittenberg, and became successively pastor of Pützerkin, near Stargard, in 1670, co-rector of Stargard in 1680, rector and preacher of Colberg, and, finally, provost and pastor of Jakobshagen. He died in 1713. Aside from minor productions on different subjects, as sermons, etc., he wrote a work on dogmatics which was long in great favor. It is entitled *Examen theologicum acroamaticum universam theologiam thetico-polemicam complectens* (1707, 4to; reprinted in 1717, 1722, 1725, 1735, and 1741; and, with additions and corrections, by R. Teller in 1750 and 1763). The popularity enjoyed by this work was not so much due to its scientific originality, for it was mainly based on the works of Gerhard, Calov, Scherzer, etc., as to its convenient arrangement, the clearness and precision of its definitions, and the careful and thorough classification of its contents. Another, and perhaps still more powerful cause of its success is to be found in its liberal spirit, coupled with unimpeachable orthodoxy. Hollaz occupies the first place among the Lutheran theologians of the close of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century. He sought to find a medium between the orthodox scholastic divinity and the wants of practical religion, and endeavored to reconcile ecclesiastical orthodoxy with freedom of thought. See Ernesti, *Neue Theol.* v, 185; Walch, *Bibl. Theol.* i, 62; Ersch und Gruber, *Allg. Encyklopädie;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 240; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* ii, 263, 264, 339; Gass, *Geschichte d. Dogmat.* ii, 495 sq.; Kurtz, *Church. Hist.* ii, 245; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* viii, 16 sq.; Dorner, *Gesch. d. Dogmat.* p. 430 sq.

Hollebeck, Ewald, a Dutch theologian, born at Hamstede in 1719, was educated at the University of Leyden. In 1762 he was called to his alma mater as professor of theology. He is especially distinguished in the Church of Holland by his revolutionary efforts in the homiletical field of theology. He was the first to condemn the old method of making a sermon an exegetical dissertation, and to introduce the English method of preaching to the *edification* of the people. He set forth his views in *De optimo concionum genere* (Leyden, 1768; much enlarged, 1770, 8vo). At first he encountered great opposition; but, as he bore himself calmly in the contest, he soon got the better of his opponents, and, as a mark of his popularity at the university, he was elected rector in 1764. He died Oct. 24, 1796.—Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reform.* viii, 653 sq.; Walch, *Neuest. Religionsgesch.* ii, 411 sq.; Ernesti, *U. Theolog. Biblioth.* i, 230 sq.; Adelung's Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 2098; *Biog. Univ.* xx, 480.

Holleshow, Johann von, a Benedictine monk, born at Holleshow, in Bohemia, in 1366, was educated at Paris. He was one of the most violent opponents of Huss, and contributed more than any other person to his execution. This explains why the Hussites afterwards (1420) destroyed the monastery to which Holleshow belonged. He died in 1436. A list of his works is given in Adelung's Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 2098. (J. H. W.)

Holley, Horace, LL.D., a Unitarian minister, was born in Salisbury, Conn., Feb. 13, 1781; graduated at Yale College in 1803; in 1805 was minister of Greenfield Hill, Fairfield, and in 1809 minister of Hollis Street, Boston. In 1818 he became the president of Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky., which office he retained until 1827. He died on a voyage to New York July 31, 1827. He had great reputation as a pulpit orator, and published several occasional sermons and addresses. See *Memoir of Dr. Holley*, by his Widow; *North American Review*, xxvii, 403; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 866.

Holliday, Charles, a Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Baltimore Nov. 23, 1771, was licensed to preach in 1797, and entered the itinerancy in 1809. He was made presiding elder on Salt River District in 1813; located in 1816; was again presiding elder on Cumberland District, Tennessee Conference, 1817-21; on Green River District, Kentucky Conference, 1821-25; and on Wabash District, Illinois Conference, 1825-28. At the General Conference of 1828 he was appointed Book Agent at Cincinnati, where he remained eight years. After this he was for several years presiding elder in the Illinois Conference. He was superannuated in 1846, and died March 8, 1850. Mr. Holliday was a "clear, sound, and practical preacher," a deeply pious Christian, and amiable and beloved in all the relations of life.—*Minutes of Conferences*, iv, 528; Redford, *History of Methodism in Kentucky*, ii, 95 sq. (G. L. T.)

Hollingshead, William, D.D., a Congregational minister, born at Philadelphia Oct. 8, 1748, was educated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1770, and entered the ministry in 1772. His first pastoral charge was at Fairfield, N. J. In 1783 he accepted a call from a church

in Charleston, S.C. In 1793 Princeton College conferred on him the degree of D.D. He died Jan. 26, 1817. He published several sermons (1789, 1794, 1805).—Sprague, *Annals of Amer. Pulpit*, ii, 58.

Hollis, Thomas, Sr., one of the early benefactors of Harvard College, was born in London in 1659. His father, though a Baptist, was a member of the Independent Church at Pinner's Hall, and he followed in the same relation. Having accumulated a fortune in trade, he gave large sums to charity and to advance the Baptist and Independent Churches. Still more substantial marks of his liberality were conferred on Harvard College, Mass., in which he founded a professorship of mathematics and one of theology, and endowed scholarships for poor students, enriched the library and the cabinets, etc. He died in London in 1731. See Crosby, *Hist. of the Baptists*, iv, 229; Bogue and Bennett, *History of the Dissenters*, ii, 414; *Christian Examiner*, vii, 64; Skeats, *Free Churches of England*, p. 323.

Hollis, Thomas, Jr., nephew of the preceding, was born in London in 1720, and devoted himself to literature and to the propagation of the principles of civil and religious liberty. He travelled over the Continent from 1748 to 1750, and then settled down on his estate at Corsecombe, Dorset. It is said that half of his large fortune was given away for benevolent purposes. Among his benefactions was a donation of books to the library of Harvard College to the value of £1400 sterling. He died at Corsecombe in 1774. His *Memoirs* were published in 1780, in two splendid quartos, with engravings. See *Gentl. Mag.* vol. lxxiv; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 866.

Hollister, Theorem O., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in 1822 at Sharon, Conn. He was converted in early life, preached under the presiding elder in the state of New York, removed to Wisconsin, and joined the Wisconsin Conference in 1853. His appointments were: Summit, Fort Atkinson, Lake Mills, Greenbush, Sheboygan Falls, Fond du Lac Station, Fond du Lac District, Oconomowoc, Waukesha, and Hart Prairie. "He was truly a laborer in God's harvest, zealously affected always in every good thing, serving the Lord most emphatically with all his heart, and soul, and mind, and strength." He died at Salem, Wisconsin, March 13, 1869. Hollister was a self-educated man, but good native talent, a logical mind, and vivid imagination atoned for his earlier deficiency, and he ranked among the first in his Conference. See *Min. Ann. Conf.* 1869, p. 225.

Hollman, Samuel Christian, a distinguished German theologian, born at Stettin Dec. 3, 1696, was educated at the University of Wittenberg. After lecturing a short time at the universities of Greifswald and Jena, he returned in 1723 to Wittenberg, and was made adjunct professor of philosophy in 1724. Two years later he was promoted to an extraordinary professorship, and in 1734 was called as a regular professor to the University of Göttingen, then opening. He died in 1787. Hollman devoted his time mainly to philosophical studies. He was at first an opponent of Wolf's philosophy, later an admirer of it, and finally became an Eclectic. He wrote text-books in metaphysics, which were well received, and used so long as eclecticism was in vogue in Germany. He was also active in awakening an interest in his contemporaries for the study of the natural sciences. His most important works are: *De stupendo naturæ mysterio anima sibi ipsi ignota* (Greifs. and Wittenb. 1722-24, 4to):—*Commentatio philos. de harmonia inter animam et corpus præstabilita* (Wittenb. 1724, 4to): —*Apologia Prælectionum in N. T. Græc. habitarum* (ibid. 1727, 4to):—*Comm. phil. de miraculis et genuinis eorundem criteriis*, etc. (Frankf. and Lpz. 1727, 4to):—*Instit. philoss.* (Wittenberg, 1727, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Ueberzeugender Vortrag v. Gott u. Schrift* (ibid. 1733, 8vo, and often):—*Von d. menschl. Erkenntniss u. d. Quell. der Weltweisheit* (ibid. 1737, 8vo):—*Instit. pneumatologiæ et theologiæ naturalis* (Göttingen. 1740, 8vo), etc. A list of his works is given in Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Adelung's Add. ii, 2099 sq. See Krug, *Philos. Lex.* ii, 451 sq.

Holm, Peter, Jr., a Danish divine, born at Moum, Norway, June 6, 1706, was educated at the university at Copenhagen, and afterwards lectured at his alma mater. In 1738 he was appointed professor of theology and philosophy, when, in addition to the duties of his chair, he instructed in Greek and Hebrew, and assisted in the revision of the Danish version of the Bible. In 1746 he was promoted to a regular professorship of theology. He died June 9, 1777. His writings, which, on account of his excessive labor in the revision of the Bible, were few in number, are mainly in the form of dissertations. A list of them may be found in Adelung's Addenda ii. to Jöcher's *Gelehrt. Lex.* p. 2102. (J. H. W.)

Holm-Tree (πρῖνος, *ilex*) occurs only in the apocryphal story of Susanna (ver. 58). The passage contains a characteristic play on the names of the two trees mentioned by the elders in their evidence. That on the mastich (σχῖνον . . . ἄγγελος σχίσει σε) will be noticed under that head. See Mastick. That on the holm-tree (πρῖνον) is: "The angel of God waiteth with the sword to cut thee in two" (ἵνα πρίσαι σε). For the historical significance of these puns, see Susanna. The πρῖνος of Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* iii, 7, § 3, and 16, § 1, and elsewhere) and Dioscorides (i, 144) denotes, there can be no doubt, the *Quercus coccifera*, or the *Q. pseudo-coccifera*, which is perhaps not specifically distinct from the first-mentioned oak. The *ilex* of the Roman writers was applied both to the holm-oak (*Quercus ilex*), and to the *Q. coccifera*, or kermes oak. See Pliny (*N. H.* xvi, 6). For the oaks of Palestine, see a paper by Dr. Hooker in the *Transactions of the Linnæan Society*, vol. xxiii, pt. ii, p. 381-387.—Smith, s. v. See Oak.

Holman, David, a Congregational minister, was born in Sutton, Mass., Dec. 13, 1777. He entered the sophomore class at Brown University in 1800, and graduated in 1803. He studied theology with his brother, the late Rev. Nathan Holman, of Attleborough, and Rev. Dr. Emmons, of Franklin, commenced preaching in Douglass, Mass., in the autumn of 1807, and was ordained Oct. 19, 1808. He continued pastor of the church in Douglass until Aug. 17, 1842, when he was obliged to resign on account of impaired health. "In 1848 he renewed his labors among his old flocks, and continued to perform the duties of a pastor for five years. Several revivals of religion were enjoyed during his ministry, as the results of which more than 200 were added to the Church. He died Nov. 16, 1866. See *Congreg. Quarterly*, ix, 208.

Holman, William, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born April 20, 1790, near Shelbyville, Ky., then in Virginia. He joined the Church in 1812; four years later he entered the Ohio Conference, and was appointed to Limestone Circuit. In 1821 he was sent to the Newport Circuit, and a year later was appointed to Frankfort, the capital of the state. Here he built up a fine society, and remained four years. He next went to Danville and Harrodsburg, where he labored with equal zeal and success. After serving Lexington, Russelville, and Mt. Stirling in succession, he was appointed to Louisville, where he succeeded in building the Brook Street Church. He remained in this city "from 1833 to the close of his ministry, except two years, serving all the churches either as pastor or presiding elder." During the war he separated his connection with the "M. E. Church South," and, espousing the Federal cause, "accepted a post-chaplaincy, to the arduous duties of which he addressed himself with a faithfulness that was really surprising—visiting hospitals, and administering to the sick and dying night and day." He died Aug. 1, 1867. — Redford, *History of Methodism in Kentucky*, ii, 374 sq.

Holmes, Abiel, D.D., a Congregational minister, born in Woodstock, Conn., Dec. 24, 1763, was educated at Yale College (class of 1783), and served his alma mater as tutor a short time. He became pastor in Mid-

way, Georgia, Nov. 1785, and Jan. 25, 1792, pastor of the First Church, Cambridge, Mass. When the increase of new theological opinions caused a division of the society, he retained his connection with the "orthodox" portion of the parish. A colleague having been settled with him, he resigned his share of the duties Sept. 26, 1831, and passed his last days at Cambridge. He died June 4, 1837. Dr. Holmes was a director of the American Education Society, a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and of several other well known associations. The University of Edinburgh conferred on him the degree of D.D. in 1805. He published *Proceedings of a Council at the Ordination of Rev. Abiel Holmes, at Midway, Georgia, with the Pastoral Address* (1787):—*Life of President Stiles* (1798, 8vo):—*Memoir of Stephen Pannenius, of Buda,* with his Latin Poem translated; also *Memoir of the Moheagan Indians:* both published in vol. ix, *Mass. Hist. Coll.* (1804):—*American Annals* (1805, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Biographical Memoir of the Rev. John Lothropp,* in *Mass. Hist. Coll.* vol. i, 2d series:—*Historical Sketch of the English Translations of the Bible* (1815):—*Memoir of the French Protestants who settled in Oxford, Mass., in* 1686, printed in *Mass. Hist. Coll.* vol. ii, 3d series (1826):—*Annals of America from the Discovery by Columbus in* 1492 *to the Year* 1826 (1829, 2d edit. 2 vols. 8vo); and a large number of occasional sermons and addresses.—Sprague, *Annals,* ii, 240; Allen, *American Biography;* Duyckinck, *Cyclop. of American Literature,* i, 511 sq.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors,* i, 868; *American Almanac,* 1836, p. 316.

Holmes, Robert, D.D., an English divine, born in Hampshire in 1749, was educated at New College, Oxford. He became successively rector of Staunton, canon of Salisbury, and finally (1804) dean of Winchester. In 1790 he succeeded Thomas Warton as professor of poetry at Oxford. He died at Oxford in 1805. Holmes wrote *The Resurrection of the Body deduced from the Resurrection of Christ* (Oxf. 1777, 4to):—*On the Prophecies and Testimony of John the Baptist, and the parallel Prophecies of Jesus Christ* (Bampton Lectures for 1782, Oxf. 1782, 8vo):—Four tracts on the *Principles of Religion as a Test of Divine Authority;* on the *Principles of Redemption;* on the *Angelical Message of the Virgin Mary;* and on the *Resurrection of the Body, with a Discourse on Humility* (Oxf. 1788); etc. But his principal work was the collation of the Septuagint. "As early as 1788 he published at Oxford proposals for a collation of all the known MSS. of the Septuagint—a labor which had never yet been undertaken on an *extensive scale,* and the want of which had long been felt among Biblical scholars. Dr. Holmes's undertaking was promoted by the delegates of the Clarendon Press. In addition to the learned editor's own labors, literary men were engaged in different parts of the Continent for the business of collation, and Dr. Holmes annually published an account of the progress which was made" (Kitto). The book of Genesis, successively followed by the other books of the Pentateuch, making together one folio volume, with one title-page and one general preface, was published at Oxford in 1798. From this preface we learn that eleven Greek MSS. in uncial letters, and more than one hundred MSS. in cursive writing (containing either the whole or parts of the Pentateuch), were collated for this edition, of which the *text* was a copy of the Roman edition of 1587 [that of Sixtus V]: the deviations from three other cardinal editions (the Complutensian, the Aldine, and Grabe's) are always noted. The quotations found in the works of the Greek fathers are also alleged, and likewise the various readings of the ancient versions made from the Septuagint. "The plan of this edition thus bore a close resemblance to what had been already applied by Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach to the criticism of the Greek Testament, and the execution of it has been highly commended as displaying uncommon industry and apparently great accuracy." It is to be regretted that "the learned editor died in the midst of this honorable labor; but shortly before his death he had published the book of Daniel, both according to the Sept. version and that of Theodotion, the latter *only* having been printed in former editions, because the translation of this book is not contained in the common MSS., and was unknown till it was printed in 1772 from a MS. belonging to cardinal Chigi" (Kitto). The work was continued by the Rev. J. Parsons, B.D., and completed on the original plan. The title of the work is *Vetus Testamentum Græcum, cum variis Lectionibus* (Oxf. 1798-1804, 15 vols. fol.). Tischendorf, however, condemns the work as inaccurately done (*Proleg.* to ed. of Sept. 1856, p. lii-lvi). See Chalmers, *Biographical Dict.;* Bp. Marsh, *Divinity Lectures,* lect. xii; Lowndes, *Brit. Lib.* p. 28, 29; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors,* i, 870; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica,* i, 1520; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* ii, 318. (J. H. W.)

Holmpatrick, COUNCIL OF, held at Holmpatrick, an island off the eastern coast of Ireland, in 1148, by the advice of the pope, Innocent II, to consider the question of granting the pall to the archbishops of Armagh and Cashel. This synod was attended by fifteen bishops and two hundred priests. The council lasted four days, the first three of which were occupied with questions concerning the general welfare of the Church, confining the question of the palls to the last day. The result was a formal petition to pope Eugenius III (who had meanwhile succeeded Innocent), which Malachy O'Morgais, a former archbishop of Armagh, was commissioned to carry to Rome, in favor of the grant.—Todd, *Hist. of Ancient Church in Ireland,* p. 113; Landon's *Manual of Councils,* p. 265, 266.

Holocaust. See SACRIFICE.

Holofer'nès, or, rather, OLOFERNES (Ὀλοφέρνης), a person mentioned only in the Apocrypha (Judith ii, 4, etc.). The name occurs twice in Cappadocian history, as borne by the brother of Ariarathes I (B.C. cir. 350), and afterwards by a pretender to the Cappadocian throne, who was at first supported and afterwards imprisoned by Demetrius Soter (B.C. cir. 158). The termination (Tissa*phernes,* etc.) points to a Persian origin, but the meaning of the word is uncertain.—Smith. See Volkmar, *Einleitung in die Apokryphen* (Tüb. 1860-3), i, 179 sq.; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden,* iv, 455. According to the account in the book of Judith, Nebuchadnezzar, "king of Nineveh," having resolved to "avenge himself on all the earth," appointed Holofernes general of the expedition intended for this purpose, consisting of 120,000 foot and 12,000 horse. Holofernes marched westward and southward, carrying devastation everywhere he came, destroying harvests, and flocks, and cities, as well as men, old and young; making even the "cities of the sea-coast," which had submitted to him, feel the weight of his arm. Having reached Esdraelon, he encamped "between Geba and Scythopolis" a whole month to collect his forces. The Jews, however, resolved to resist him, and fortified all the mountain passes. Dissuaded by Achior, "captain of the sons of Ammon," from attacking the Jews, he resented the advice, and delivered Achior into the hands of the Jews in Bethulia, from whom, however, he met with a kind reception. Holofernes proceeded against Bethulia (q. v.), where he was brought to bay; and, instead of attacking it, seized upon two wells on which the city depended for water, and sat down before it to take it by siege. While here he fell a victim to the treachery of Judith, a beautiful Jewish widow, who artfully managed to be brought into his presence, and who, by playing the hypocrite, secured his favor and confidence. Having invited her to a banquet, he drank freely, and, having fallen asleep, fell beneath the arm of his fair guest, who cut off his head with his own sword, and escaped with her bloody trophy to her own people in Bethulia. The Jews immediately fell on their enemies, who, finding their general dead in his tent, fled in confusion. Such is the story. Is is scarcely necessary to add that it is wholly unhistorical.—Kitto. See JUDITH.

Holomerians. See SPIRITUALISM.

Ho'lon (Heb. *Cholon'*, חוֹלוֹן or חֹלֹן, *sandy*), the name of one or two places.

1. (Sept. Ἡλών, Ὠλών, etc.; Vulg. *Holon, Olon.*) A city in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv. 51, where it is mentioned between Goshen and Giloh); assigned to the Levites (Josh. xxi, 15, where it is mentioned between Eshtemoa and Debir); in the parallel passage (1 Chron. vi, 58) it is written HILEN (Heb. *Chilen'*, חִילֵן; Sept. Νηλών, but transposes with Jether; Vulg. *Helon*). De Saulcy is inclined to identify it with the village *Nuhhalin*, on the hills (*Dead Sea*, i, 453, 454) west of Bethlehem, or, according to Dr. Robinson (new ed. of *Researches*, iii, 284), at the bottom of wady el-Musurr, on its southern side; but this is not in the same group of towns with the others, which all lie in the south-west part of the mountain district (Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.). The position seems rather to correspond to that of *Beit Amreh*, a large ruined village on a hill near wady el-Khulil, north-west of Juttah, on the road to Hebron (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 629 and note).

2. (Sept. Χελών, Vulg. *Helon.*) A city of Moab (Jer. xlviii, 21). It was one of the towns of the *Mishor*, the level downs (A.V. "plain country") east of Jordan, and is named with Jahazah, Dibon, and other known places; but no identification of it has yet taken place, nor does it appear in the parallel lists of Numb. xxxii and Josh. xiii.—Smith. Perhaps it is the same as HORONAIM (q. v.).

Holste or **Holstenius**, LUCAS, born at Hamburg in 1596, was educated at the University of Leyden, and ranks as one of the first scholars of his time. Failing to secure a professorship, he travelled through Italy, England, and other countries, and settled at Paris, where he became acquainted with the distinguished Jesuits Dupuy, Peiresc, and other learned men of that order, and he finally became a Roman Catholic, in consequence, he said, of his careful study of the works of the fathers, and of his seeking for the principle of unity in the Church; but others think that his conversion was wholly due to his association with the Jesuits, and to his desire to have freer access to the libraries of France and Italy; and some even, among whom is Salmasius (see Moller, *Cimbr. Lit.* iii, 323), ascribe it to his severe poverty and great ambition. Soon after his conversion his friends introduced him to the pope's nuncio, cardinal Barberini, nephew of Urban VIII, whom he accompanied to Rome in 1527. He lived with the cardinal, and became his librarian. Later, he was promoted canon of St. Peter's, and finally he became librarian of the Vatican and *consultore* of the Congregation of the Index. He was sent on several missions to Germany; among others, to Innspruck, to receive the abjuration of queen Christina of Sweden. He was also instrumental in effecting the conversion of other distinguished Protestants to Catholicism. Holstenius, even in his eminent positions in the Church of Rome, retained some of the liberal principles imbibed as a Protestant, and they often severely provoked his Romish friends. Thus he advocated earnestly, but in vain, the union of the Greek and Roman churches in 1639, advising liberal action on the part of his own Church. In the Congregation of the Index also, he would never favor any stringency against valuable works of Protestants, and he was even obliged to retire from the council for this reason. In the dispute between the Jansenists and Molinists, he counselled pope Alexander VII against any decision likely to be in favor of the Jesuits, notwithstanding his relation to them. He died at Rome Feb. 2, 1661, leaving his patron, cardinal Barberini, his universal legatee. Holstenius, with much application and a great thirst for knowledge, lacked perseverance. He was apt to desert one branch of study suddenly for another; thus he had collected with great care and much application a vast quantity of scarce books and MSS., but had not progressed sufficiently far in his own works to make them of much value in their unfinished state. Among his published works are the following: *Porphyrii liber de Vita Pythagoræ*, etc. (Rom. 1630, 8vo; Cambr. 1655, 8vo), with a Latin version and notes, and a dissertation on the life and writings of Porphyrius, considered a model of learned biography:—*Demophili, Democratis, et Secundi Veterum Philosophorum Sententiæ Morales* (Rome, 1638, 8vo; Leyden, 1639, 12mo):—*Notæ in Sallustium Philosophum de Diis et Mundo* (Rome, 1638, 8vo):—*Observationes ad Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica* (Leyden, 1641, 8vo):—*Arrianus de Venatione*, with a Latin version (Par. 1644, 8vo):—*Adnotationes in Geographiam Sacram Caroli a S. Paulo, Italiam Antiquam Cluverii, et Thesaurum Geographicum Ortelii* (Rome, 1666, 8vo):—*Notæ et Castigationes Posthumæ in Stephani Byzantini de Urbibus*, edited by Ryckius:—*Liber Diurnus Pontificum Romanorum*, a collection of papal acts and decrees. He also wrote a collection of the rules of the earlier monastic orders, published after his death (Rome, 1661; later at Paris; and, lastly, much enlarged, Augsburg, 1759, 6 vols. fol.), which is considered as among the most valuable of his writings; he also edited in his lifetime the *Antiquities of Præneste*, by Suares. Many of his Latin letters have also been published in the *Collectio Romana veterum aliquot histor. eccles. monumentorum*, etc. See Wilkens, *Leben d. gelehrten Lucæ Holstenii* (Hamb. 1723, 8vo); *English Cyclop.*; Herzog, *Real-Lex.* vi, 241 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Histor.* vol. iii (see Index); Gieseler, *Church Hist.* iii, 185, note; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte s. d. Reform.* vii, 76; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxv, 4 sq.; Dupin, *Biblioth. Ecclés.* (17th century). (J. H. W.)

Holstein. See SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN.

Holy. See HOLINESS.

HOLY OF HOLIES. See TABERNACLE; TEMPLE.

HOLY, HOLY, HOLY. See TRISAGION.

Holy Alliance, a compact formed between the sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, in 1815, for the humane and liberal administration of their governments. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, v, 669; Wing's Hase, *Ch. Hist.* (see Index); Hurst's Hagenbach, *Hist. Christ. Church in 18th and 19th Cent.* ii, 342 sq.; and the references in Poole's *Index*, s. v. See ALLIANCE, HOLY.

Holy Ark. See ARK, 3.

Holy Ashes are called, in the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, the ashes used at the old ceremonial in Lent. See LENT.

Holy Bible. See BIBLE.

Holy-Bread Skep or **Maund** is called, in the Roman and Anglican Churches, the basket used for the eulogia (q. v.).—Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 312.

Holy Candle, BLESSING WITH THE. Bishops Latimer and Tyndale say that in their day "dying persons committed their souls to the holy candle, and that the sign of the Cross was made over the dead with it, 'thereby to be discharged of the burden of sin, or to drive away devils, or to put away dreams and phantasies.'"—Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 313. Compare the use of tapers (holy candles) at *Candlemas*. See CANDLE.

Holy Catholic Church, the "congregation of faithful men dispersed throughout the whole world." Some persons speak of this Church as if it were a visible community, comprising all Christians as its members, as having existed from the earliest days, and as retaining the same authority which it formerly had to frame and promulgate decrees. The opponents of such views maintain that no proof can be offered "that there is or ever was any one community on earth recognised, or having any claim to be recognised as the universal Church, bearing rule over and comprehending all particular churches. They further allege that no accredited organ exists empowered to pronounce its decrees, nor any registry of those decrees. They consider, therefore, that the Catholic Church is an invisible community

(because its Head is so) in itself and regarded as a whole, though visible in its several parts to those of its members who constitute each separate part. See CHURCH.

Holy City. See JERUSALEM.

Holy Coat OF TREVES, a relic preserved with great reverence in the cathedral of Treves, in the southern part of France, and esteemed as one of the greatest treasures of that city. The priests claim that it was the seamless coat of our Saviour, and that it was discovered in the 4th century by the empress Helena on her visit to Palestine, and by her deposited at Treves. The Treves

The "Holy Coat" of Treves.

relics were concealed from the Normans in the 9th century in crypts, but the holy coat was rediscovered in 1196. It was solemnly exhibited again to the public in 1512. Multitudes flocked to see and venerate it, and Leo X appointed an exhibition of it every seven years. The Reformation and wars prevented the regular observance of this great religious festival, but it was celebrated in 1810, and was attended by a concourse of more than 225,000 persons, and in 1844 by still greater multitudes. Miraculous cures were confidently asserted to be performed by the precious relic. The exhibition of the holy coat in 1844 is otherwise memorable for the reaction which it produced, leading to the secession of Rongé and the German Catholics from the Church of Rome. See Gildemeister and Sybel, *Der heil. Rock zu Trier* (1845).

Holy Cross. See CROSS.

Holy-Cross-Day. See CROSS, EXALTATION OF THE, vol. ii, p. 581.

HOLY CROSS, ORDER OF. See CROSS, HOLY, ORDER OF.

Holy Day, a day set apart by certain churches for the commemoration of some saint or some remarkable particular in the life of Christ. It has been a question agitated by divines whether it be proper to appoint or keep any holy days (the Sabbath excepted). The advocates for holy days suppose that they have a tendency to impress the minds of the people with a greater sense of religion; that if the acquisitions and victories of men be celebrated with the highest joy, how much more those events which relate to the salvation of man, such as the birth, death, and resurrection of Christ, etc. On the other side, it is observed that, if holy days had been necessary under the present dispensation, Jesus Christ would have said something respecting them, whereas he was silent about them; that it is bringing us again into that bondage to ceremonial laws from which Christ freed us; that it is a tacit reflection on the Head of the Church in not appointing them; that such days, on the whole, are more pernicious than useful to society, as they open a door for indolence and profaneness; yea, that Scripture speaks against such days (Gal. iv, 9-11). See FEASTS; FESTIVALS.

Holy Family is the general title, in the language of art, of the various representations of the domestic life of the Virgin Mary and the infant Jesus and his attendants. "In the early part of the Middle Ages, when the object in view was to excite devotion, the Virgin and Child were usually the only persons represented. At a later period, Joseph, Elizabeth, St. Anna (the mother of the Virgin), and John the Baptist were included. Some of the old German painters have added the twelve apostles as children and playfellows of the infant Christ, as well as their mothers, as stated in the legends. The Italian school, with its fine feeling for composition, was the first to recognise how many figures the group must comprise if the interest is to remain undivided and be concentrated on one figure, whether that figure be the Madonna or the Child. Two masters are pre-eminent in this species of representation—Leonardo da Vinci and Raphael" (Chambers). Mrs. Jameson (*Legends of the Madonna*, p. 252 sq.) also insists on drawing a distinction between the domestic and the devotional treatment. The latter, she says, is a group in which the sacred personages are placed in direct relation to the worshippers, and their supernatural character is paramount to every other. The former, a group of the Holy Family so called, in which the personages are placed in direct relation to each other by some link of action or sentiment which expresses the family connection between them, or by some action which has a dramatic rather than a religious significance.

Holy Father. I. "The first person of the Trinity was represented as in Daniel's vision, vii, 9, and vested in a cope, and wearing a tiara. It was contrary to our Lord's declaration (John vi, 46), and indefensible."—Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 312. II. A title of the pope (q. v.).

Holy Fire, a ceremony in the Romish Church, observed on Holy Saturday (q. v.) of Easter, with especial pomp at Rome, where the pope himself is in attendance. A light is kindled by sparks struck from a flint, to commemorate Christ—according to the Missal—as the great corner-stone. This light is hailed by kneeling ecclesiastics saying "Light of Christ" (*Lumen Christi*), all the lights in the chapel having been previously extinguished, to be rekindled at the new fire. In the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, at the Easter of the Oriental Church, the Holy Fire is claimed to be miraculous. "The Greek and Armenian clergy combine on this occasion, and amidst processions, solemnities, an excited multitude, and scenes disgraceful not only to the name of religion, but to human nature, the expected fire makes its appearance from within an apartment in which a Greek and an Armenian bishop have locked themselves."

Holy Font, the vessel containing the baptismal water. See FONT.

Holy Fridays, Fridays in Ember-weeks (q. v.).—Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 312. See FRIDAY.

Holy Gates. See JUBILEE (ROMAN CATHOLIC).

Holy Ghost (πνεῦμα ἅγιον), the third person in the Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son, and equal with them in power and glory (see Vth Art. of Religion, Church of England, and IVth of Methodist Episcopal Church). For the significations of the original words rendered in the English version by "Spirit," "Holy Spirit," "Holy Ghost," see SPIRIT. The Scrip-

tures teach, and the Church maintains, I. the *Procession;* II. the *Personality;* and, III. the *Divinity* of the Holy Ghost. For the offices of the Holy Ghost, see SPIRIT, HOLY; PARACLETE; WITNESS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

I. PROCESSION *of the Holy Ghost.*—The orthodox doctrine is, that as Christ is God by an eternal filiation, so the Holy Ghost is God by an eternal *procession.* He proceedeth from the Father and from the Son. "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which *proceedeth* from the Father, he shall testify of me" (John xv, 26). He is the Spirit of the Father, he is the Spirit of the Son: he is sent by the Father, he is sent by the Son. The Father is never sent by the Son, but the Father sendeth the Son; neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Ghost, but he is sent by both. The Nicene Creed teaches, "And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who *proceedeth* from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified." The Athanasian Creed, "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but *proceeding.*" The article of the Church of England says, "The Holy Ghost, *proceeding* from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God." The term *spiration* was introduced by the Latin Church to denote the manner of the procession. When our Lord imparted the Holy Ghost to his disciples, "he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John xx, 22).

During the first three centuries there was nothing decided by ecclesiastical authority respecting the relations of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son. The Nicene Creed (A.D. 325) declared only that "the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father" (*ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον*), and the Greek fathers generally adhered to this view: so Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Alexandria, and others. Epiphanius added to the formula, *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον*, the explanatory clause, *ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λαμβάνον* (John xvi, 15). John of Damascus represents the Spirit as proceeding from the Father through the Son, as Novatian had done before him, relying on John xv, 26. With this modification, the formula adopted at the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), and appended to the Nicene Creed, was retained in the Greek Church.

"But there were many in the *Latin* Church who maintained that the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Father only, but *also from the Son.* They appealed to John xvi, 13, and to the texts where the Holy Spirit is called the *Spirit of Christ*, e. g. Rom. viii, 9 sq. To this doctrine the Greeks were for the most part opposed. It prevailed, however, more and more in the Latin Church; and when, in the fifth and sixth centuries, the Arians, who then prevailed very much in Spain, urged it as an argument against the equality of Christ with the Father, that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father only, and not from the Son, the Catholic churches of that region began to hold more decidedly that the Holy Spirit proceeded *from both* (*ab utroque*), and to insert the adjunct *Filioque* after *Patre* in the *Symbolum Nicæno-Constantinopolitanum.* In this the churches of Spain were followed, first by those of France, and at a later period by nearly all the Western churches. But as the Eastern Church still adhered substantially to the more ancient formula, it accused the Western Church of falsifying the Nicene symbol; and thus at different periods, and especially in the 7th and 9th centuries, violent controversies arose between them" (Knapp, *Theology*, § 43; Hey, *Lectures on Divinity*, vol. i). The true causes of these dissensions were, however, very different from those which were alleged, and less animated, it seems, by zeal for the truth than by the mutual jealousies of the Roman and Byzantine bishops. But, however uncertain the reason that provoked these disputes, they terminated in the 11th century in an entire separation of the Eastern and Western churches, continuing to the present time. The addition of the word *filioque* to the creed of the Western Church first appears in the acts of the Synod of Braga (A.D. 412), and in the third Council of Toledo (A.D. 589). See Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 234; Harvey, *History of the Three Creeds*, p. 452; and the article FILIOQUE.

The scriptural argument for the procession of the Holy Ghost is thus stated by bishop Pearson: "Now the procession of the Spirit, in reference to the Father, is delivered expressly in relation to the Son, and is contained virtually in the Scriptures. 1. It is expressly said that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, as our Saviour testifieth, 'When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me' (John xv, 26). This is also evident from what has already been asserted; for inasmuch as the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and, being thus the same in the unity of the nature of God, are yet distinct in the personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other; and because the Father hath already been shown to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from him. 2. Though it be not expressly spoken in the Scripture that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son, yet the substance of the same truth is virtually contained there; because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for the very reason that he proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son, therefore there must be the same reason presupposed in reference to the Son which is expressed in reference to the Father. Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore it is called 'the Spirit of God,' and 'the Spirit of the Father.' 'It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you' (Matt. x, 20). For by the language of the apostle, 'the Spirit of God' is the Spirit which is of God, saying, 'The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God; and we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God' (1 Cor. ii, 11, 12). Now the same Spirit is also called 'the Spirit of the Son:' for 'because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts' (Gal. iv, 6). 'The Spirit of Christ:' 'Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his' (Rom. viii, 9); 'Even the Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets' (1 Pet. i, 11). 'The Spirit of Jesus Christ,' as the apostle speaks: 'I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ' (Phil. i, 19). If, then, the Holy Ghost be called 'the Spirit of the Father' because he proceedeth from the Father, it followeth that, being called also 'the Spirit of the Son,' he proceedeth also from the Son. Again: because the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, he is therefore sent by the Father, as from him who hath, by the original communication, a right of mission; as, 'the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send' (John xiv, 26). But the same Spirit which is sent by the Father, is also sent by the Son, as he saith, 'When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you.' Therefore the Son hath the same right of mission with the Father, and consequently must be acknowledged to have communicated the same essence. The Father is never sent by the Son, because he received not the Godhead from him; but the Father sendeth the Son, because he communicated the Godhead to him: in the same manner, neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Spirit, because neither of them received the divine nature from the Spirit; but both the Father and the Son send the Holy Ghost, because the divine nature, common to the Father and the Son, was communicated by them both to the Holy Ghost. As, therefore, the Scriptures declare expressly that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, so do they also virtually teach that he proceedeth from the Son" (Pearson, *On the Creed*).

II. PERSONALITY *of the Holy Ghost.* — 1. *Definition and History of the Doctrine.*—A *person* is "a thinking, intelligent being that has reason and reflection;" "a singular, subsistent, intellectual being;" "an intelligent agent." As personality implies thought, reason, reflection, and an individual existence, distinct from that of other beings, when we speak of the personality of the Holy Ghost we mean his distinct and individual existence as an intelligent and reflecting being. He is represented throughout the Scriptures as a personal agent, and the earlier Christian writers so speak of him, though without any aim at dogmatic precision. It is the habit of some writers, opposed to the orthodox doctrine, to assert that not only was the doctrine of the Holy Ghost not precisely defined in that early period, but that it was not received. "On the contrary, the thorough investigations of recent times show plainly that the ante-Nicene fathers, with the exception of the Monarchians, and perhaps Lactantius, agreed in the two fundamental points that the Holy Ghost, the sole agent in the application of redemption, is a supernatural divine being, and that he is an independent person; closely allied to the Father and the Son, yet hypostatically different from them both" (Schaff, *Ch. History*, i, § 80). The first positive and dogmatic *denial* of the personality and deity of the Holy Ghost seems to have been made by Arius, who applied the doctrine of subordination here, and placed the same distance between the Son and the Spirit as between the Father and the Son. According to him, the Holy Spirit was only the first of created beings, brought into existence by the Son as the organ of the Father. Later anti-Trinitarians represent the Holy Spirit simply as an operation of the divine mind, as the "exerted energy of God," or as an attribute only of the divine activity.

2. *Proof of the Personality of the Spirit.*—"The Holy Spirit is represented in the New Testament not only as different from the Father and Son, and not only as the personification *of some attribute of God*, or of some effect which he has produced, but as a literal *person* (see Semler, *Disp. Spiritum Sanctum recte describi personam*). The proof of this is thus made out from the following texts: (1.) From the texts John xiv, 16, 17, 26; xv, 26. The Holy Spirit is here called παράκλητος, not *comforter, advocate*, nor merely *teacher*, as Ernesti renders it, but *helper, assistant, counsellor*, in which sense it is used by Philo, when he says, God needs no παράκλητος (monitor). Of the *Paracletus*, Christ says *that the Father will send him in his* (Christ's) *name* (i. e. in his place) *to instruct his disciples.* To these three subjects similar personal predicates are here equally applied, and the Paracletus is not designated by the abstract word *auxilium*, but by the concrete *auxiliator;* so that we have the Father who sent him, the Son in whose place he comes, and the Holy Spirit who is sent. His office is to carry forward the great work of teaching and saving men which Christ commenced, and to be to the disciples of Christ what Christ himself was while he continued upon the earth. John xv, 26, *When the Paracletus shall come, whom I will send to you from the Father* (*I mean the Spirit*—i. e. teacher—*of truth, who proceeds from the Father*), *he will instruct you further in my religion;* where it should be remarked that the phrase ἐκπορεύεσθαι παρὰ Πατρός means *to be sent or commissioned by the Father.* (2.) 1 Cor. xii, 4–11, *There are various gifts* (χαρίσματα), *but there is one and the same Spirit* (τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα), *from whom they all proceed.* Here the χαρίσματα are clearly distinguished from the Spirit, who is the author of them. In verse 5 this same person is distinguished from Christ (ὁ Κύριος), and in ver. 6 from ὁ Θεός. In ver. 11 it is said *all these* (various gifts) worketh one and the self-same Spirit, who imparteth to every man his own, as he will (καθὼς βούλεται). (3.) Those texts in which such attributes and works are ascribed to the Holy Spirit as can be predicated of no other than a personal subject. In John xvi, 13 sq., he is said to 'speak,' to 'hear,' to 'take,' etc. So in 1 Cor. ii, 10, *God hath revealed the doctrines of Christianity to us by his Spirit* (the παράκλητος before mentioned, who was sent to give us this more perfect instruction). *And this Spirit searches* (ἐρευνᾷ) *all things, even the most secret divine purposes* (βάθη Θεοῦ; comp. Rom. xi, 33 sq.); in his instruction, therefore, we may safely confide. The expressions, the Holy Spirit *speaks, sends any one, appoints any one for a particular purpose*, and others, which occur so frequently in the Acts and elsewhere, show that the Holy Spirit was understood by the early Christians to be a *personal* agent (Acts xiii, 2, 4; xx, 28; xxi, 11 sq.). (4.) The formula of baptism, Matt. xxviii, 19, and other similar texts, such as 2 Cor. xiii, 14, where Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are mentioned in distinction (ver. 35), may now be used in proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit, since the other texts upon which the meaning of these depends have already been cited. From all these texts, taken together, we may form the following result: The Holy Spirit is represented in the Bible as a personal subject, and, as such, is distinguished from the Father and the Son. In relation to the human race, he is described as sent and commissioned by the Father and the Son, and as occupying the place which Christ, who preceded him, held. In *this* respect he depends (to speak after the manner of men) upon the Father (John xiv, 16) and upon the Son (John xiv, 16, 26; also xvi, 14, ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται); and in *this sense* he proceeds from them both, or is sent by them both. This may be expressed more literally as follows: The great work of converting, sanctifying, and saving men, which the Father commenced through the Son, will be carried on by the Father and Son, *through the Holy Spirit.*

"The objectors to this doctrine frequently say that the imaginative Orientalists were accustomed to represent many things as personal subjects, and to introduce them as speaking and acting, which, however, they themselves did not consider as persons, and did not intend to have so considered by others; and to this Oriental usage they think that Christ and his apostles might here, as in other cases, have conformed. But, whenever Christ and his apostles spoke in figurative language, they always showed, by the explanations which they gave, that they did not intend to be understood literally. But they have given no such explanation of the language which they employ with regard to the Holy Spirit. We therefore fairly conclude that they intended that their language should be understood literally, otherwise they would have led their readers and hearers into error, and the more so as they well knew that their readers and hearers were accustomed to personifications" (Knapp, *Theology*, § 39).

The scriptural argument is thus logically developed by Watson. "1. The mode of the subsistence of the Holy Spirit in the sacred Trinity proves his personality. He proceeds from the Father and the Son, and cannot, therefore, be either. To say that an attribute proceeds and comes forth would be a gross absurdity. 2. Many passages of Scripture would be wholly unintelligible, and even absurd, unless the Holy Ghost is allowed to be a person. For as those who take the phrase as ascribing no more than a figurative personality to an attribute, make that attribute to be the *energy* or *power of God*, they reduce such passages as the following to utter unmeaningness: 'God anointed Jesus with the Holy Ghost and with power;' that is, with the power of God and with power. 'That ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost;' that is, through the power of power. 'In demonstration of the Spirit and of power;' that is, in demonstration of power and of power. 3. Personification of any kind is, in some passages in which the Holy Ghost is spoken of, impossible. The reality which this figure of speech is said to present to us is either some of the attributes of God, or else the doctrine of the Gospel. Let this theory, then, be tried upon the following passages: 'He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that

shall he speak.' What attribute of God can here be personified? And if the doctrine of the Gospel be arrayed with personal attributes, where is there an instance of so monstrous a prosopopœia as this passage would exhibit? the doctrine of the Gospel not speaking 'of himself,' but speaking 'whatsoever he shall hear!' 'The Spirit maketh intercession for us.' What attribute is capable of interceding, or how can the doctrine of the Gospel intercede? Personification, too, is the language of poetry, and takes place naturally only in excited and elevated discourse; but if the Holy Spirit be a personification, we find it in the ordinary and cool strain of mere narration and argumentative discourse in the New Testament, and in the most incidental conversations. 'Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.' How impossible is it here to extort, by any process whatever, even the shadow of a personification of either any attribute of God, or of the doctrine of the Gospel! So again: 'The Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot.' Could it be any attribute of God which said this, or could it be the doctrine of the Gospel? Finally, that the Holy Ghost is a person, and not an attribute, is proved by the use of masculine pronouns and relatives in the Greek of the New Testament, in connection with the neuter noun Πνεῦμα, *Spirit*, and also by many distinct personal acts being ascribed to him, as 'to come,' 'to go,' 'to be sent,' 'to teach,' 'to guide,' 'to comfort,' 'to make intercession,' 'to bear witness,' 'to give gifts,' 'dividing them to every man as he *will*,' 'to be vexed,' 'grieved,' and 'quenched.' These cannot be applied to the mere fiction of a person, and they therefore establish the Spirit's true personality" (Watson, *Theological Institutes*, i, 637 sq.).

III. DIVINITY *of the Holy Spirit.*—1. The same arguments that prove the personality of the Holy Ghost, go also, to a certain extent, to establish his divinity. The *direct* scriptural argument may be thus summed up: (*a.*) *Names* proper only to the Most High God are ascribed to him; as *Jehovah* (Acts xxviii, 25, with Isa. vi, 9; and Heb. iii, 7, 9, with Exod. xvii, 7; Jer. xxxi, 31, 34; Heb. x, 15, 16), *God* (Acts v, 3, 4), *Lord* (2 Cor. iii, 17, 19). "The Lord, the Spirit." (*b.*) *Attributes* proper only to the Most High God are ascribed to him; as omniscience (1 Cor. ii, 10 11; Isa. xl, 13, 14), omnipresence (Psa. cxxxix, 7; Eph. ii, 17, 18; Rom. viii, 26, 27), omnipotence (Luke i, 35), eternity (Heb. ix, 14). (*c.*) Divine *works* are evidently ascribed to him (Gen. ii, 2; Job xxvi, 13; Psa. xxxii, 6; civ, 30). (*d.*) *Worship*, proper only to God, is required and ascribed to him (Isa. vi, 3; Acts xxviii, 25; Rom. ix, 1; Rev. i, 4; 2 Cor. xiii, 14; Matt. xxviii, 19).

2. The argument for the personal divinity of the Spirit is developed by Watson as follows: (1.) "The first argument may be drawn from the frequent association, in Scripture, of a Person under that appellation with two other Persons, one of whom, the Father, is by all acknowledged to be divine; and the ascription to each of them, or to the three in union, of the same acts, titles, and authority, with worship of the same kind, and, for any distinction that is made, of an equal degree. The manifestation of the existence and divinity of the Holy Spirit may be expected in the law and the prophets, and is, in fact, to be traced there with certainty. The Spirit is represented as an agent in creation, 'moving upon the face of the waters;' and it forms no objection to the argument that creation is ascribed to the Father, and also to the Son, but is a great confirmation of it. That creation should be effected by all the three Persons of the Godhead, though acting in different respects, yet so that each should be a Creator, and, therefore, both a Person and a divine Person, can be explained only by their unity in one essence. On every other hypothesis this scriptural fact is disallowed, and therefore no other hypothesis can be true. If the Spirit of God be a mere influence, then he is not a Creator, distinct from the Father and the Son, because he is not a Person; but this is refuted both by the passage just quoted, and by Psa. xxxiii, 6: 'By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath (Hebrew, *Spirit*) of his mouth.' This is farther confirmed by Job xxxiii, 4: 'The Spirit of God hath made me, and the *breath* of the Almighty hath given me life;' where the second clause is obviously exegetic of the former: and the whole text proves that, in the patriarchal age, the followers of the true religion ascribed creation to the Spirit as well as to the Father, and that one of his appellations was 'the *Breath* of the Almighty.' Did such passages stand alone, there might, indeed, be some plausibility in the criticism which resolves them into a personification; but, connected as they are with the whole body of evidence, as to the concurring doctrine of both Testaments, they are inexpugnable. Again: If the personality of the Son and the Spirit be allowed, and yet it is contended that they were but instruments in creation, through whom the creative power of another operated, but which creative power was not possessed by them; on this hypothesis, too, neither the Spirit nor the Son can be said to create, any more than Moses created the serpent into which his rod was turned, and the Scriptures are again contradicted. To this association of the three Persons in creative acts may be added a like association in acts of preservation, which has been well called a *continued creation*, and by that term is expressed in the following passage: 'These wait all upon thee, that thou mayest give them their meat in due season. Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to dust: thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth' (Psa. civ, 27–30). It is not surely here meant that the Spirit by which the generations of animals are perpetuated is *wind;* and if he be called an attribute, *wisdom, power*, or both united, where do we read of such attributes being 'sent,' 'sent forth from God,' 'sent forth from' God to 'create and renew the face of the earth?'

(2.) "The next association of the three Persons we find in the *inspiration* of the prophets: 'God spake unto our fathers by the prophets,' says Paul (Heb. i, 1). Peter declares that these 'holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost' (2 Pet. i, 21); and also that it was 'the Spirit of Christ which was in them' (1 Pet. i, 11). We may defy any Socinian to interpret these three passages by making the Spirit an influence or attribute, and thereby reducing the term Holy Ghost into a figure of speech. 'God,' in the first passage, is unquestionably God the Father; and the 'holy men of God,' the prophets, would then, according to this view, be moved by the *influence* of the Father; but the influence, according to the third passage, which was the source of their inspiration, was the Spirit or the *influence* of 'Christ.' Thus the passages contradict each other. Allow the Trinity in unity, and you have no difficulty in calling the Spirit, the Spirit of the Father, and the Spirit of the Son, or the Spirit of either; but if the Spirit be an influence, that influence cannot be the influence of two persons, one of them God and the other a creature. Even if they allowed the pre-existence of Christ, with Arians, these passages are inexplicable by the Socinians; but, denying his pre-existence, they have no subterfuge but to interpret 'the Spirit of Christ,' *the spirit which prophesied of Christ*, which is a purely gratuitous paraphrase; or 'the spirit of an anointed one, or prophet:' that is, the prophet's own spirit, which is just as gratuitous and as unsupported by any parallel as the former. If, however, the Holy Ghost be the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, united in one essence, the passages are easily harmonized. In conjunction with the Father and the Son, he is the source of that prophetic inspiration under which the prophets spoke and acted. So the same Spirit which raised Christ from the dead is said by Peter to have preached by Noah while the ark was preparing, in allusion to the passage

'My Spirit shall not always strive (contend, debate) with man.' This, we may observe, affords an eminent proof that the writers of the New Testament understood the phrase 'the Spirit of God,' as it occurs in the Old Testament, *personally*. For, whatever may be the full meaning of that difficult passage in Peter, Christ is clearly declared to have preached by the Spirit in the days of Noah; that is, he, by the Spirit, inspired Noah to preach. If, then, the apostles understood that the Holy Ghost was a Person, a point which will presently be established, we have, in the text just quoted from the book of Genesis, a key to the meaning of those texts in the Old Testament where the phrases 'My Spirit,' 'the Spirit of God,' and 'the Spirit of the Lord' occur, and inspired authority is thus afforded us to interpret them as of a Person; and if of a Person, the very effort made by Socinians to deny his personality itself indicates that that Person must, from the lofty titles and works ascribed to him, be inevitably divine. Such phrases occur in many passages of the Hebrew Scriptures; but in the following the Spirit is also eminently distinguished from two other Persons: 'And now the Lord God, and his Spirit, hath sent me' (Isa. xlviii, 16): or, rendered better, 'hath sent me and his Spirit,' both terms being in the accusative case. 'Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read; for my mouth it hath commanded, and his Spirit it hath gathered them' (Isa. xxxiv, 16). 'I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts, according to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you: fear ye not. For thus saith the Lord of hosts, I will shake all nations, and the Desire of all nations shall come' (Hag. ii, 4-7). Here, also, the Spirit of the Lord is seen collocated with the Lord of hosts and the Desire of all nations, who is the Messiah [according to the usual interpretation].

(3.) "Three Persons, and three only, are associated also, both in the Old and New Testament, as objects of supreme worship, and form the one divine 'name.' Thus the fact that, in the vision of Isaiah, the Lord of hosts, who spake unto the prophet, is, in Acts xxviii, 25, said to be the Holy Ghost, while John declares that the glory which Isaiah saw was the glory of Christ, proves indisputably that each of the three Persons bears this august appellation; it gives also the reason for the threefold repetition, 'Holy, holy, holy!' and it exhibits the prophet and the very seraphs in deep and awful adoration before the Triune Lord of hosts. Both the prophet and the seraphim were, therefore, worshippers of the Holy Ghost and of the Son, at the very time and by the very acts in which they worshipped the Father."

3. In the *Apostolical Benediction*, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all, Amen," the Holy Ghost is acknowledged, equally with the Father and the Son, "to be the source of the highest spiritual blessings; while the benediction is, from its specific character, to be regarded as an act of prayer to each of the three Persons, and therefore is at once an acknowledgment of the divinity and personality of each. The same remark applies to Rev. i, 4, 5: 'Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which was, and which is, and which is to come; and from the seven spirits which are before his throne' (an emblematical reference, probably, to the golden branch with its seven lamps), 'and from Jesus Christ.' The style of this book sufficiently accounts for the Holy Spirit being called 'the seven spirits;' but no created spirit or company of created spirits is ever spoken of under that appellation; and the place assigned to the seven spirits, between the mention of the Father and the Son, indicates with certainty that one of the sacred Three, so eminent, and so exclusively eminent in both dispensations, is intended.

4. "The form of baptism next presents itself with demonstrative evidence on the two points before us, the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit. It is the form of covenant by which the sacred Three become our one or only God, and we become his people: 'Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' In what manner is this text to be disposed of if the personality of the Holy Ghost is denied? Is the form of baptism to be so understood as to imply that baptism is in the name of one *God*, one *creature*, and one *attribute?* The grossness of this absurdity refutes it, and proves that here, at least, there can be no personification. If all the Three, therefore, are persons, are we to have baptism in the name of one God and two creatures? This would be too near an approach to idolatry, or, rather, it would be idolatry itself; for, considering baptism as an act of dedication to God, the acceptance of God as our God, on our part, and the renunciation of all other deities and all other religions, what could a heathen convert conceive of the two creatures so distinguished from all other creatures in heaven and in earth, and so associated with God himself as to form together the *one name*, to which, by that act, he was devoted, and which he was henceforward to profess and honor, but that they were equally divine, unless special care was taken to instruct him that but one of the Three was God, and the two others but creatures? But of this care, of this cautionary instruction, though so obviously necessary upon this theory, no single instance can be given in all the writings of the apostles."

5. A further argument is derived from the fact that the Spirit is "the subject of blasphemy: 'The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men' (Matt. xii, 31). This blasphemy consisted in ascribing his miraculous works to Satan; and that he is capable of being blasphemed proves him to be as much a person as the Son; and it proves him to be divine, because it shows that he may be sinned against, and so sinned against that the blasphemer shall not be forgiven. A person he must be, or he could not be blasphemed: a divine person he must be to constitute this blasphemy a sin against him in the proper sense, and of so malignant a kind as to place it beyond the reach of mercy. He is called God: 'Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie unto the Holy Ghost? Why hast thou conceived this in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God' (Acts v, 3, 4). Ananias is said to have lied particularly 'unto the Holy Ghost,' because the apostles were under his special direction in establishing the temporary regulation among Christians that they should have all things in common: the detection of the crime itself was a demonstration of the divinity of the Spirit, because it showed his omniscience, his knowledge of the most secret acts" (Watson, *Theol. Institutes*, i, 629 sq.).

See, besides the works already cited, Hawker, *Sermons on the Divinity of the Holy Ghost* (Lond. 1794, 8vo); Owen, *Discourses on the Spirit;* Pye Smith, *On the Holy Ghost* (Lond. 1831, 8vo); *Christian Review*, xvii, 515 (on the *personality* of the Spirit); Neander, *History of Dogmas*, i, 171, 303; Neander, *Ch. History*, vol. i, ii; Kahnis, *Die Lehre vom Heil. Geiste* (Leipsic, 1847, 8vo); Dewar, *Personality, Divinity, etc., of the Holy Ghost* (London, 1848, 8vo); Fritzsche, *De Spiritu Sancto* (Halle, 1840); Büchsenschütz, *Doctrine de l'Esprit de Dieu* (Strasburg, 1840); Hase, *Evangel. Dogmatik*, § 175; Guyse, *Godhead of the Holy Spirit* (London, 1790, 12mo); Pierce, *Divinity and Personality of the Spirit* (London, 1805, 12mo); Heber, *Personality and Office of the Spirit* (Bampton Lecture, 1816); Ffoulkes, *Divis. in Christendom*, i, 70, 101 sq.; Bickersteth, *Christ. Stud. Assist.* p. 453; Bull, *Trinity*, i, 135 sq.; ii, 470 sq.: Wilson, *Apost. Fathers;* Baur, *Dogmengesch.* vol. i, ii; Monsell, *Redemption*, p. 156 sq.; Waterland, *Works*, vol. vi; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vol. i; Milman, *Latin Christ.* i, 98; Burnet, *Articles of the Christian Faith*, see Index; Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* p. 312; Wesley, *Works*, i, 34 sq.; Leidner, *Philosophy*, p. 99; Stillingfleet, *Works*, vol. i; Smeaton, *Atonement*, p. 293, 296; Bethune, *Lect. on Catechism*, vol. ii, see Index; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doct.* i, 125, 258, 262, 453; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1856, ii, 298; 1867, vol. iii; *Mercers-*

burg Rev. Jan. 1867, p. 464; *Bib. Sac.* 1863, p. 600, 877; 1864, p. 119; *Am. Presb. Rev.* April, 1863, p. 336; *Chr. Rev.* xv, 115; April, 1852, art. iv; *Bullet. Théol.* i, 1868; *Christian Observer*, vol. xx; *Lond. Quart. Review*, April, 1867, lxiii, 257; *Ev. Ch. Reg.* vol. i; *Brit. and For. Ev. Review*, April, 1869; *Congreg. Quart.* July, 1869; *Baptist Quart.* Oct. 1869, p. 498; *Christ. Remembr.* July, 1853. See MACEDONIANS; TRINITY; SOCINIANISM.

HOLY GHOST, BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE. See BLASPHEMY.

Holy Ghost, Orders of. 1. *Order of the Holy Ghost di Sassia* (*Order of the Holy Ghost de Montpellier*), established in 1178 by Guido of Montpellier, according to the rule of St. Augustine for hospital knights. In 1204 the order obtained the Hospital di Sassia, in Rome, in which the superior of the order took his seat as grand master. Henceforth the members of the order were divided into hospital knights, with simple, and into regular canons, with solemn vows. Pius II abolished the knights in 1459 in Italy, but in France they survived. Having been restored in 1693, the order was divided into the degrees of Knights of Justice and Grace, Serving Brothers and Oblates, and in 1700 was changed into regular canons, who still exist. At an early period in the history of the order a female branch

Regular Canon of the Order of the Holy Ghost. Nun of the Order of the Holy Ghost.

was established. 2. *Sisters of the Holy Ghost of Poligny*, established in 1212, and still continuing in France, a branch of the *White Sisters*. 3. *Hospitallers* (brothers and sisters) *of the Holy Ghost in France*, established in 1254 as a secular association, and connected with the Order of the Holy Ghost di Sassia. The sisters, on account of their dress commonly called the *White Sisters*, are still numerous; they are devoted to the nursing of the sick and the poor, and to the education of young girls. 4. *Canons of the Holy Ghost*, probably founded in Lorraine by Jean Herbert, and confirmed in 1588 by Sixtus V, are devoted to instruction. 5. *The Society of Missionary Priests of the Holy Ghost* was founded in 1700 by abbé Desplaces and Vincent le Barbier for missions, seminaries, and the nursing of the sick; newly established in 1805; still exists, and is active in the foreign missionary fields of the Roman Catholic Church.

Holy Grass (*Hierochloa borealis*), a grass about a foot high, of a brownish glossy lax panicle, found in the northern parts of Europe, has a sweet smell like that of vernal grass. In Iceland, where it is plentiful, it is used for scenting apartments and clothes. In some countries it is strewed on the floors of places of worship on holy-days, whence its name.

Holy Handkerchief. "It is said that one of the women who followed Jesus to the crucifixion lent him her handkerchief to wipe the sweat and blood from his face, and that the impress of his features remained upon it. Of course, St. Veronica (q. v.) very carefully preserved the cloth, and it is now at Rome. Jesus, according to tradition, sent another handkerchief to Agbarus (q. v.), king of Edessa, who had requested a portrait of him. Veronica is only a mythical personage, the name being a hybrid compound signifying 'true image.'"—Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* p. 303. See CHRIST, IMAGES OF.

Holy of Holies. See TABERNACLE; TEMPLE.

Holy, Holy, Holy. See TRISAGION.

Holy Hours. See HOURS, HOLY.

Holy Innocents, a festival in commemoration of the slaughter of infant martyrs (at Bethlehem, Matt. ii, 16), of which the Greek menology and Ethiopic liturgy give the number at 40,000, is alluded to by the early Christian fathers, especially Irenæus and Cyprian, Origen and Augustine, as of memorial observance. In the 4th century, Prudentius celebrates it in the hymn "All hail, ye infant Martyr-Flowers," and, in connection with the Epiphany, also Fulgentius, in his homilies for the day. St. Bernard also alludes to them: "Stephen was a martyr before men, John before angels, but these before God, confessing Christ by dying, not by speech, and their merit is known only to God." Violet was used on this day in memory of the sorrow of their mothers, and the Te Deum, Alleluia, and doxologies were forbidden. In England, at Norton (Worcestershire), "a muffled peal is rung to commemorate the slaughter, and then a peal of joy for the escape of the infant Christ; a half-muffled peal is rung at Minety, Maisemore, Leigh-on-Mendip, Wick, Rissington, and Pattington."—Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 313. See INNOCENTS.

Holy Land. See PALESTINE.

Holy League. I. The name given to an offensive and defensive alliance contracted between the party of the Guises in France, king Philip II of Spain, the pope, the monks, and the French Parliament, in consequence of the edict of toleration of May 14, 1576. The object of the league was the overthrow of the Huguenot party in France, and of its chief, king Henry III, whom one of the Guises was to succeed on the throne. Duke Henry of Guise (surnamed Le Balafré) was the head of the league. In order to avoid the danger, Henry joined the anti-Protestant movement himself, and was thus led to renew the persecutions against the Huguenots. The war commenced in 1577, but soon ended by the peace of Bergerac. When the duke of Alençon died in 1584, leaving Henry of Navarre, a Protestant, heir presumptive to the throne, the league sprung again into existence under the influence of the adherents of the Guises, the strict Roman Catholic members of the Parliament, the fanatical clergy, and the ultra conservative party. The states, especially the sixteen districts of Paris (whence the association also took the name of *Ligue des Seize*), took an active part in it. A treaty was finally concluded with Spain, and signed at the castle of Joinville Jan. 3, 1585, to prevent the accession of Henry of Navarre to the throne. The contracting parties also pledged themselves to the total uprooting of Protestantism in France and the Netherlands. The results of the league soon became manifest in the intolerant edict of Nemours in 1585, and led in 1587 to the war, known as the war of the three Henrys. (See FRANCE, vol. iii, p. 642.) Henry III having caused Henry of Guise to be murdered at Blois in 1588, his brother, the duke of Mayenne, became chief of the league. Henry III was in turn murdered near Paris in 1589, and the war continued until the abjuration of Henry IV in 1588. The pope having absolved him, the members of the league gradually joined the royal standard, and the party ceased to exist. See Mignet, *Hist. de la Ligue* (Par. 1829, 5 vols.); Labitte, *De la Democratie chez les Prédicateurs de la Ligue* (Paris, 1841); Riddle, *Persec. of Popery*, i, 309 sq.;

De Felice, *Hist. of Protestantism in France* (Lond. 1853, 12mo); Ranke, *History of Papacy* (see Index); Wright, *Hist. of France*, i, 680 sq.; Poujoulat, *Nouv. Coll. de Mémoires pour servir à l'hist. de France* (Paris, 1839, 4to, 1st series, iv, 1 sq.); Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, x, 374. See GUISE, HOUSE OF; HUGUENOTS.

II. HOLY LEAGUE OF NUREMBERG, LIGA SANCTA, contracted July 10, 1538, by the emperor Charles V, the archbishops of Mayence and Salzburg, dukes William and Louis of Bavaria, George of Saxony, Erich and Henry of Brunswick, for the defence of the Roman Catholic faith against the league of Smalcald (q. v.). The treaty was concluded for eleven years. The armies of the contracting parties were to be divided into two parts, respectively commanded by duke Louis of Bavaria and duke Henry of Brunswick. The truce of April 19, 1539, rendered, however, these combinations unnecessary.—Leo, *Universalgesch.* iii, 157 sq.; Hardwick, *Church History during the Reformation*, p. 63 sq.; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist. from the Reform.* p. 83; Pierer, *Universal-Lex.* x, 374.

Holy Mortar is the "mortar used in cementing altar stones, and made with holy water."—Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* p. 314.

Holy Mother. See MARY, VIRGIN.

Holy Mountain. See HERMON; SINAI; ZION.

Holy Night, the night before Holy Day, is the first Sunday in Lent. "By Theodulph's Chapters, the previous week was employed in shriving penitents."—Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 313.

Holy Office. See MINISTRY; INQUISITION.

Holy of Holies. See TABERNACLE; TEMPLE.

Holy Oil, a name applied in the 4th century to oil brought to Europe from Jerusalem. "It was carried in cotton within little phials, and distributed to the faithful at a time when relics were sparingly distributed." In Gregory of Tours's time, oil blessed at saints' tombs was very general, and in St. Gregory's day oil taken from lamps which burned before the graves of martyrs in the Catacombs was called "holy oil." "Several of these phials, which Gregory the Great gave to queen Theodolinda, are preserved at Monza."—Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* p. 313, 314. See AMPULLA; CHRISM.

Holy Orders. See ORDINATION.

Holy Phial or **Sainte Ampoule**, ORDER OF, the name of an old order of knighthood in France, which was composed of four persons, of the very first families in the province of Champagne, and were styled *Barons de la Sainte Ampoule*. At the coronation of the French kings they were hostages to the dean, priors, and chapter of Rheims until the return of the holy phial in which the coronation oil was kept, and which, according to the legend, was brought from heaven by the Holy Ghost under the form of a dove, and put into the hands of St. Remy at the coronation of Clovis, an enormous crowd having prevented the messenger from bringing in time that which had already been prepared. The knights of this order were only knights while the holy phial was used at the coronation service. They wore as a badge a cross of gold enamelled white, cantoned with four fleur-de-lis, and on the cross a dove descending with a phial in its beak, and a right hand receiving it.—Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 393.

Holy Place. See TABERNACLE; TEMPLE.

Holy Places. See HEBRON; JERUSALEM; MECCA; PALESTINE, etc.

Holy Rood (*rode* or *rod*), "the name of the cross so often erected in churches."—Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* p. 312. See CROSS; ROOD.

Holy-Rood Day, a festival on the 14th of September to commemorate in churches the Exaltation of the Cross; the Invention or Finding of the Holy Cross being celebrated on the 3d of May.—Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 314; Eadie, *Eccl. Dict.* p. 312. See CROSS.

Holy Saturday. In some churches the Saturday before Easter is so called. See HOLY WEEK.

Holy Scripture. See SCRIPTURE, HOLY.

Holy Sepulchre. See SEPULCHRE OF CHRIST.

Holy Sepulchre, Orders of. 1. A religious order in the Roman Catholic Church according to the rule of St. Augustine, founded in 1114 by the archdeacon (subsequently patriarch of Jerusalem) Arnold; according to others, it was founded in 1099 by Godfrey of Bouillon. It embraced regular canons and canonesses, was at one time established all through Europe, and received a new rule under Urban VIII. The canons became extinct soon after the renewal of their rule, but the canonesses still have a number of houses in France, Germany (Baden), and the Netherlands, and, living in strict seclusion, occupy themselves with the instruction and education of young girls. 2. *The Order of Knights of the Holy Sepulchre in England*, established in 1174; extinct since the 16th century. The knights were obliged to guard, at least during two years, the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem. 3. *Knights of the Holy Sepulchre*, an order founded very likely by pope Alexander VI to guard the Holy Sepulchre, and at the same time to afford relief and protection to pilgrims to the Holy Land. Originally the pope was the grand master of the order, but he finally ceded this right to the "guardian father of the Holy Sepulchre." The knights must be, according to the rules of the order, of noble descent, hear mass daily, fight, live, and die for the Roman Catholic faith, etc. But they enjoyed also extraordinary privileges, as exemption from taxation, permission to marry, possession of Church property, etc. When Jerusalem was recaptured by the Turks, the knights of the Holy Sepulchre went to Perugia, in Italy. "After a temporary union with the Hospitallers, the order was reconstructed in 1814 both in France and in Poland, and is still in existence within a very small circle of knights elected by the guardian father from the most respectable pilgrims who come to Jerusalem."

Holy Spear (ἁγία λόγχη), as it is called in the Greek Church, is a kind of spear with a long handle, ending in a cross, "with which the altar-bread, called sphragis or holy lamb, is cut out from the loaf for consecration by the priest, with a solemn form in the liturgy of Chrysostom founded on Isa. liii, 78; John xix, 34."—Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* p. 314.

Holy Spirit. See SPIRIT, WORK OF THE; HOLY GHOST; PARACLETE; WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT.

Holy Synod is the title in the Greek Church of the highest governing body.

Holy Table, as it is called in some churches, is the table on which are placed the bread and wine, the appointed emblems of the Saviour's death. See ALTAR.

Holy Thursday (called also MAUNDY THURSDAY, from *mandatum* [commandment], the first word with which the Church services of the day begin), a day observed in some churches in commemoration of our Lord's ascension. In the Roman Calendar it is the thirty-ninth day after Easter Sunday. See ASCENSION DAY; HOLY WEEK.

Holy Union. See HOLY LEAGUE.

Holy Wars. See CRUSADES.

Holy Water, in the Romish, as also in the Greek, Russian, and Oriental churches, denotes water blessed by a priest or bishop for certain religious uses. The theory of its first introduction seems to have been that water is a fitting symbol of purity, and accordingly, in most of the ancient religions, the use of lustral or purifying water not only formed part of the public worship, but also entered largely into the personal acts of sanctification prescribed to individuals. The Jewish law also prescribed this, and it was a practice held in common by many Pagan nations (compare Riddle, *Christ. Ant.* p. 725). The sprinkling of the hands and face with water before

entering the sanctuary, still generally observed by the adherents to that law, was retained, or, no doubt, may have given rise to its adoption by the early Christian Church. But its use was certainly for a very different purpose. Thus bishop Marcellus ordered Equitius, his deacon, to sprinkle holy water, hallowed by him, in houses and churches, to exorcise devils, which is said to have been done also by pope Alexander I. "Joseph, the converted Jew, Epiphanius says, used consecrated water in exorcism. Holy water was used in all benedictions of palm and olive branches, vestments, corporals, candles, houses, herds, fields, and in private houses. By the canon law it is mingled with salt. The Council of Nantes ordered the priest before mass to sprinkle the church court and close, offering prayers for the departed, and to give water to all who asked it for their houses, food, cattle, fodder, fields, and vineyards. By the Capitulars of Charlemagne, Louis, and Lothaire, on Easter and Whitsun eves all the faithful might take, for purposes of aspersion in their houses, consecrated water before its admixture with chrism (q. v.). In monasteries, a novice carried the holy water before the cross in procession" (Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 314). In the Romish Church of to-day holy water is directed to be made of pure spring water, with the admixture of a little consecrated salt. This water (generally placed at the entrance of places of worship, and sanctified by a solemn benediction, prescribed in the diocesan ritual) the Romanist has come to look upon with the most superstitious regard, and it is used not merely for the sprinkling of persons on entering and leaving the church, but also in sprinkling books, bells, etc., and it is frequently taken to their homes, as having some peculiar virtue. Its use has thus become nothing more than a charm. In the Greek Church, holy water is usually consecrated by the bishop or his vicar-general on the eve of the Epiphany. No salt is employed, and they regard the use of it by the Latins as a grievous and unauthorized corruption. The Greeks perform the ceremony on January 6, the day on which they believe that Christ was baptized by John, and twice a year it is usual to drink a portion, viz. at the end of the midnight mass of Christmas and on the feast of Epiphany. In the Armenian Church, holy water is consecrated by plunging a cross into it on the day of the Epiphany, after which it is distributed among the congregation, who take it to their homes. The offerings made on this occasion form a considerable portion of the emoluments of the Armenian priesthood. On the practice of using water for baptism, see BAPTISM, vol. i, p. 650.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. viii, ch. iii, § 67; Eadie, *Eccl. Cyclop.* p. 313, 658, 659; Coleman, *Anc. Christianity*, p. 369, 395; Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 394. For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index Program.* p. 142.

Holy-water Sprinkler, "the *aspergill*, a brush for scattering holy water. A horrible Tudor mace, with radiating spikes, was called the morning star, or sprinkler."—Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 314.

Holy-water Stock (i. e. pillar) or **Stoup** (i. e. bucket). A stationary stone basin (any porous substance which could suck it up was to be carefully avoided) for holy water, placed at the entrance of the house of worship, called by the French *bénitier*. Pope Leo III erected one at Ostia. "The stoup is found in all periods of architecture, formed in the wall, set on a pillar, or in the porch, or standing on a pedestal." The vessel used by the Temple priests was a brazen laver (see Isa. i, 16; lii, 2; Exod. xxx, 20; 2 Cor. vii, 1; Psa. li, 2, 7).—Walcott, *Sac. Archæology*, p. 314 sq.

Holy-water Stone at Romsey, Hants.

Holy-water Vat (French, *bénitier;* Latin, *situla, vas*), a vessel in which the holy water was carried about, and which, according to Micrologus, was first consecrated by pope Alexander V, as Cranmer says, to "put us in remembrance of our baptism, and the blood of Christ for our redemption, sprinkled on the cross." Eadie says "this vessel was termed *ama* or *amula.* Du Cange recognises *aspersol, aspergillum,* and *aspersorium* as the vessels from which the priests sprinkled the water, and *guadalerium* as that which contained it. The first three are plainly the same as the περιῤῥαντήριον of paganism." "The fixed holy-water stoup (q. v.) was used by those who came too late into church to receive the aspersion by the sprinkler and water carried in the portable vat, which in the churches of the West represented the bodily ablution made by the Oriental Christians."—Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 315; Eadie, *Eccles. Dictionary*, p. 313.

Holy Week, the last week of Lent (q. v.), i. e. the week before Easter, and specially devoted to commemorating the sufferings and death of Christ. In English use, it is also called *Passion Week* (a name appropriated, in Roman use, to the week before Palm Sunday). This institution is of very early origin, and was "formerly called the 'Great Week,' and in mediæval times the 'Authentic,' with the same meaning; in Germany and Denmark, the popular title is 'Still Week,' in allusion to the holy quiet and abstraction from labor during its continuance." In the Roman Catholic Church, the special characteristics of the celebration of the Holy Week are increased solemnity and gloom, penitential rigor, and mourning. If any of the ordinary Church festivals fall therein, they are transferred till after Easter. All instrumental music is suspended in the churches, the altars are stripped of their ornaments, the pictures and statues are veiled from public sight, manual labor is voluntarily suspended, the rigor of fasting is redoubled, and alms-deeds and other works of mercy ard sedulously enjoined and practised. The days specially solemnized are Palm Sunday, Spy Wednesday, Holy (or Maundy) Thursday, Good Friday (q. v.), Holy Saturday. Holy Thursday (q. v.), in the Roman Catholic Church, is specially designed as a commemoration of the Last Supper, and of the institution of the Eucharist. Besides these services, there are still others annexed to the day, as the solemn consecration of the oil or chrism (q. v.) used in baptism, confirmation, orders, and extreme unction, the washing of pilgrims' feet, and the chanting of the *Tenebræ* (darkness), consisting of the matins and lauds for the following mornings, which it is customary to recite at night. "During the service, a large candlestick, supporting fifteen lights, arranged in the form of a triangle, which denote Christ and the prophets who predicted his coming, stands in the sanctuary; the lights are one by one extinguished until only the upper one remains, which is taken down and placed under the altar until the close of the office, and then brought back; this symbolizes Christ's burial and resurrection." On Holy Saturday follow the solemn blessing of fire and the water of the baptismal font, the baptism of catechumens, and the ordination of candidates for the ministry. From the fire solemnly blessed on this day is lighted the Paschal Light, which is regarded as a symbol of Christ risen from the dead. This symbolical light is kept burning during the reading of the gospel at Mass throughout the interval between Easter and Pentecost.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vol. ii, art. Charwoche; Procter, *Com. Prayer*, p. 279 sq.; Guericke, *Antiquities*, p. 144 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 394; Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 315; Appleton, *Amer. Cyclop.* ix, 240, 241. See PASSION.

Holy Wells, sacred springs in Popish countries—scenes of pilgrimage and expected miracles.

Holyoke, EDWARD, a Congregational minister, was

born in 1690 at Boston. He graduated at Harvard College in 1705, was elected tutor in 1712, and on April 25, 1716, was ordained first pastor of the Second Church in Marblehead. In 1737 he was elected president of Harvard College, and remained in that office until his death, June 1, 1769. He published an *Answer to Whitefield* (1744), and a few occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 293. (G. L. T.)

Holzhauser, Bartholomäus, founder of the order of Bartholomites (q. v.), was born at Langnau, Switzerland, in 1613, and was brought up to his father's trade, shoemaking. By the exertions of some charitable persons he was admitted into an establishment for poor students at Neuburg, and afterwards studied philosophy at Ingolstadt under the Jesuits. Ordained priest in 1639, he conceived the idea of bringing back the priesthood to the common life of the primitive Church. He founded at Tittmoningen an institution intended to show the working of his system, and in 1640 founded a preparatory seminary at Salzburg in connection with it. He was successively curate of Tittmoningen, Löggenthal, and Bingen, where he died in 1658. His zeal and ascetic practices inclined him to revery and exaltation, so that he claimed to have visions; and it is said that, having been visited by Charles II, then a fugitive, he predicted that a better future awaited him. He wrote, *Constitutiones cum exercitiis clericorum* (Colon. 1662 sq.; approved by the Church of Rome in 1680):—*De humilitate*, together with a treatise *On the Love of God* (Mayence, 1663):—*Opusculum visionum variarum*. A biography of Holzhauser, and a German translation of his works, were published by Clarus (Ratisbon, 1852); a French translation, with a biography, by Gaduel (Paris, 1861).—Ersch und Gruber, *Allg. Encyklopädie;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 14; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* i, 700. (J. N. P.)

Homage. See Adoration; Dulia; Fief; Worship.

Homagium is a term applied in ecclesiastical language to the adoration (q. v.) which the clergy in the Roman Catholic Church pay to the pope.—Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Relig. und Kirchengesch.* ii, 333.

Ho'mam (Heb. *Homam'*, הוֹמָם, *discomfiture;* Sept. Αἱμάν, Vulg. *Homan*), the second named of the two sons of Lotan, son of Seir the Horite (1 Chron. i, 39). In the parallel passage (Gen. xxxvi, 22) his name is written Hemam (Heb. *Heymam'*, הֵימָם, Sept. Αἱμάν, Vulg. *Heman*). B.C. considerably ante 1964. Homam is assumed by Gesenius to be the original form (*Thes.* p. 385 *a*). By Knobel (*Genesis*, p. 254) the name is compared with that of *el-Homaima*, a town now ruined, though once important, half way between Petra and Ailath, on the ancient road at the back of the mountain, which the Arabic geographers describe as the native place of the Abassides (Robinson, *Res.* ii, 572). (See Laborde, *Journey*, p. 207, *Ameimé;* also the Arabic authorities mentioned by Knobel.)

Hombergk zu Vach, Johann Friedrich, a learned jurist, born at Marburg April 15, 1673, was educated at the University of Utrecht. He visited England, remaining for some time in London, Oxford, and Cambridge, and formed an intimate acquaintance with Richard Bentley. He died April 20, 1748. In addition to works on professional topics, he published, as the result of his private study of the New Testament, *Parerga Sacra seu interpretatio succincta et nova quorundam textuum Novi Testamenti* (Ultraj. 1708, 8vo), and enlarged and improved under the title *Parerga Sacra seu observationes quædam ad Novum Testamentum* (Ultraj. 1712, 4to). The criticisms contained in this work were attacked by Elsner, and defended by the author's son, Æmilius Ludwig, also a jurist—*J. H. Hombergk zu Vach Parerga sacra ab impugnationibus J. Elsneri vindicata* (Marb. 1739, 4to), replied to by a relative of Elsner: *Brevem Hombergianarum vindicarum adv. J. Elsnerum profligationem* (Berlin, 1742, 4to). "Hombergk takes a medium position between the Hebraists and the Purists."—Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 319; Jöcher, *Gel. Lex.* ii, 1686.

Homburg, Ernst Christoph, a German hymnologist, was born at Mühla, near Eisenach, in 1605. His profession was that of lawyer. In his early years he wrote secular verses, but in his riper years he was led to turn his thoughts to sacred themes, and the results are some very beautiful hymns, of which a few are found in the *Liturgy and Hymns* for the use of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren (1836), and in the *Christian Psalmist* (1832). The "Man of Sorrows" is generally regarded as the best of these. He died June 21, 1681.—Miller (Josiah), *Our Hymns, their Authors and Origin* (Lond. 1867, 12mo), p. 32.

Home, David, a French divine of Scottish birth, who flourished towards the close of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century, "was engaged by James I to attempt the impracticable task of uniting all the Protestant divines in Europe in one system of religious belief." The most important of his writings is *Apologia Basilica, seu Machiavelli Ingenium Examinatum.* He is also supposed to be the author of two satires against the Jesuits, entitled *Le Contre Assassin, ou reponse à l'Apologie des Jesuites* (1612, 8vo), and *L'assassinat du Roi, ou maximes du Viel de la Montagne Vaticane*, etc. (1617, 8vo).—*Nouv. Dict. Hist.* i, 271; Gorton, *Biogr. Dict.* vol. ii.

Home Missions. See Missions.

Homer (חֹמֶר, *cho'mer*, a *heap*, as in Exod. viii, 14), a Hebrew measure of capacity for things dry, containing ten baths (Lev. xxvii, 16; Numb. xi, 32; Ezek. xlv, 11, 13, 14). In later writers it is usually termed a cor. See Measure.

The *le'thek* (לֶתֶךְ, vessel for *pouring;* Sept. ἡμίκορος, Vulg. *corus dimidius*, Engl. Vers. "half a homer") was a measure for grain of half the capacity of the *homer* or *cor*, as seems probable from the only passage where it is mentioned (Hos. iii, 3). See *Stud. u. Krit.* 1846, i, 123.

Homer, Jonathan, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born October, 1759. He graduated at Harvard College in 1777, was ordained pastor of the First Church in Newton Feb. 13, 1782, resigned in April, 1839, and died Aug. 11, 1843. Dr. Homer published a *Description and History of Newton* in the *Massachusetts Historical Collection*, vol. v (1798), and a few occasional sermons. He also superintended an edition of *Teal's Columbian Bible.*—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 173.

Homer, William Bradford, a Congregational minister, was born in Boston Jan. 31, 1817. He was educated at Amherst College, from which he graduated in 1836, and immediately entered on a course of theological study at Andover. While in the middle year of his course he declined the offer of a tutorship in Amherst College. He was ordained pastor of South Berwick, Me., Nov. 11, 1840, where he died, March 22, 1841. The remarkable development of Homer's intellect was a matter of great surprise to all of his instructors. When only eleven years old he was already thoroughly conversant with the Latin, the modern Greek, and French languages. The last two he is said to have spoken with fluency. At Andover he closed the exercises of his class by an essay so scholarly in its bearings that he was requested to publish it. An oration of his, delivered on leaving the president's chair of the Porter Rhetorical Society of the Theological Seminary, was also printed. His "writings" have been published, *with an Introductory Essay and a Memoir*, by Prof. Edward A. Park, of Andover Theological Seminary (2d ed. Boston, 1849, 8vo). See also the *Christian Review* (May, 1849). —Sprague, *Annals*, ii. 753 sq.

Homerites. See Himyarites.

Homes or **Holmes, Nathaniel**, a learned Eng-

lish divine, was for a time incumbent of the living of St. Mary Staining, London, but was ejected for nonconformity in 1662. He died in 1678. His publications, now become rare, include *The Resurrection Revealed* (Lond. 1654, fol.; 2d ed. 1833, 8vo):—*The Resurrection Revealed raised above Doubts and Difficulties, in ten Exercitations* (London, 1661, folio):—*A Continuation of the Histories of Foreign Martyrs from the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to these Times* (in Fox's *Acts and Monuments*, ed. 1684, iii, 865):—*The New World, or the New Reformed Church discovered out of* 2 *Pet.* iii, 13 (London, 1641, 4to). See Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.*; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, vol. i; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 873.

Homes, William, was born in Ireland in 1663, and was ordained in that country in 1692. He emigrated to America in 1714, and became minister at Martha's Vineyard, Mass. He died in 1746. Homes published four sermons (1732, 1747, etc.).—Allen's *American Biographical Dictionary*.

Homicide. See MAN-SLAYER.

Homiletics is the science of Christian address. The term is derived from ὁμιλία, *converse*, which, in early Christian usage, signified a religious address; or, more directly, from the adjective ὁμιλητικός, *conversational*, or pertaining to verbal communion. It came into permanent use during the 17th century, at a period when, under the influence of the scholastic method, the principal branches of theology received scientific designations derived from the Greek language: e. g. Apologetics, Dogmatics, Hermeneutics, Polemics. Although promptly naturalized on the continent of Europe, the term Homiletics was not for a long time generally adopted in England. In fact, its present accepted use in the English language is largely due to American authorship. In Germany some attempts have been made to introduce other terms also derived from the Greek. Stier proposed *Keryktics*, from κήρυξ, *a herald*; and Sickel *Halieutics*, from ἁλιεύς, *a fisherman*; the latter being used tropically in the Gospels in application to the disciples as "fishers of men." Both of these terms have been regarded as fanciful and undeserving of perpetuation, even though limited to missionary preaching. The term Homiletics is not entirely unexceptionable, but is retained and employed for lack of a better.

I. *History.*—With some authors, especially in Germany, the use of a scientific term to designate the theory of preaching has seemed to extenuate, if not to suggest, some practical errors in its treatment. Setting out with the idea of exhibiting a science in a scientific manner, not a few writers have ignored the proper origin and the religious design of preaching. They have treated it exclusively from the rhetorical and human point of view. They have cumbered it with artificial and arbitrary rules, apparently not having conceived of it as an agency specially and divinely appointed for the moral renovation of the world. But a perverted use of terms was not the origin of mistakes on this subject, nor was error in reference to it first developed in modern times. Indeed, misconceptions of the true design of preaching, as well as of the Christian truth it had been appointed to propagate, became common at a very early period in the history of the Church.

1. The true scriptural idea of preaching was corrupted in the ancient Church by (1) ritualistic tendencies; (2) rhetorical ambition. No sooner had the idea that the Christian ministry is a priesthood gained prevalence in the Church than preaching became secondary to sacerdotal rites, and the power of the Gospel waned under an increasing array of forms and ceremonies. Instead of being foremost as the grand agency of Christian propagandism, it became an appendage to public worship. Instead of going forth to find hearers in the marketplaces and by the wayside, preaching began to be regarded as one of the mysteries of the Church from which the heathen, and even catechumens of the first degree, were excluded. Catechumens of the second degree were called by the Greek Church ἀκροώμενοι, and by the Latin *audientes*, "from their being admitted to *hear* sermons and the Scriptures read in the church; but they were not allowed to stay during any of the prayers, not even during those that were said over the rest of the catechumens, or energumens, or penitents; but before these began, immediately after the sermon, at the word of command then solemnly used—'*Ne quis audientium;* Let none of the hearers be present'—they were to depart the church" (Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. x, c. ii, § 3).

Preaching, having become a ceremony, was next corrupted by embellishments, and an artificial style adopted from the Greek rhetoricians. Exhortations and sermons of a scriptural character began to be substituted by formal orations, and panegyrics upon martyrs and confessors subsequently worshipped as saints. Nevertheless, homilies, or familiar expositions of Scripture, were maintained by the ablest of the fathers, and were sometimes furnished for the use of clerics incompetent to produce original addresses (see Augustine, *Doctrina Christiana*, lib. iv). The 5th century has been called the oratorical period of the Church, with reference to the distinguished preachers who then flourished, such as Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, and Augustine. Two books which have come down to us from the last-named fathers are often quoted as containing the best specimens of homiletical literature that appeared both in the Greek and Latin churches during the long period of a thousand years, if indeed they have ever been excelled in those churches; yet neither of these works formally or fully discussed the subject of preaching. Chrysostom's περὶ Ἱερωσύνης, being devoted to the subject of the priesthood, only alluded to preaching incidentally; nevertheless, it embodied some excellent precepts concerning it, such as may be supposed to have governed the studies and the habits of the writer himself, and by means of which he obtained his wonderful success. Yet no estimate of Chrysostom (the *golden-mouthed*) can be accepted as just which does not concede to him extraordinary genius and transcendent abilities as an orator. Augustine, in his *Doctrina Christiana*, treated the subject of preaching more fully, and discussed it more systematically. He divided his treatise into four books. Three of them are entitled *De inveniendo*, and treat of invention in a broad sense, including the interpretation of the Scriptures. These books have not in modern times been very highly valued. The fourth relates to expression, *De proferendo*. Although a brief fragment, it has been pronounced the best homiletical production that appeared between the days of Paul and Luther. It has been translated into various languages, and its most important precepts have often been quoted, and in various forms reproduced. The chief intrinsic interest of this fragment from the pen of Augustine consists in its showing the best views of an eminent Christian bishop of the 4th century, who, after his conversion, made his Roman rhetorical education in a high degree subservient to the promulgation of Christian truth. Well would it have been for the Church of the following centuries had the spirit and power of Augustine's instructions to preachers been held in remembrance and kept in practice. But, unhappily, even this light became obscured. The Scriptures of truth having lapsed out of use, ceremonies became multiplied more and more. The doctrine of Christ's eternal sacrifice for sin having become corrupted by incipient theories of transubstantiation, the pretended sacrifice of the Mass rose to greater prominence, and so far usurped the time of public worship that sermons and homilies gave place to a diminutive form of public religious address called *postils*. Even the function of postillating was chiefly confined to bishops, the common clergy not attempting or being allowed to preach. As if such a degradation of one of the highest offices ever committed to men was not sufficient, preaching sank still lower by being employed for the promotion of error under the guise of truth. Mediæval preach-

ing was largely occupied in eulogizing the Virgin Mary, and in exciting reverence for the pictures and images of saints. Thus preaching was made to corrupt the very religion it was designed to promote. Beyond this, it even became the agency of exciting millions of men to war and bloodshed. Successive crusades were preached by popes and friars, and even the cruel persecutions of the Albigenses were stimulated by the preaching of vengeance against innocent men, who sought to follow Christ in sincerity. For such ends, more than for the promulgation of truth, were several orders of preaching and mendicant monks established in the 13th century. Among these, the Dominicans were the founders and principal abettors of the Inquisition, while others, of less cruel temper, went about to harangue the masses in the interests of papal supremacy, and to promote the sale of indulgences.

2. It was not till mediæval superstition had culminated in the grossest abuses, and the Reformation had begun to exert a counter influence, that the Scriptures began to be restored to their proper supremacy. From that period the original design and true character of preaching came to be better comprehended. Much of the preaching of the Reformation was indeed controversial, but so far as it was founded on the Word of God it tended to revive scriptural conceptions of the preaching office. The diligence of the Protestant reformers in promulgating their views made preaching also necessary to Roman Catholics, among whom, from that time, it became more common, and, especially in Protestant countries, it was no longer confined to bishops, but enjoined upon the clergy of all grades.

II. *Literature.*—The inspired Scriptures, especially those of the New Testament, must ever be considered the primary and most valuable source of homiletical instruction. Patristic literature on this subject, as already shown, is meagre and fragmentary. Homiletical literature, in following ages, may be classified in four principal departments: 1. Treatises on preaching; 2. Aids to preaching, so-called; 3. Sermons, or the products of preaching; 4. Biographies of preachers and miscellaneous articles relating to the objects and manner of preaching. The first only of these departments will be particularly considered in this article. Immediately consequent upon the revival of preaching in the 16th century, there also occurred a renaissance of homiletical productions, which have continued to multiply ever since. Prior to the middle of the 17th century there were extant some seventy different treatises, "writ particularly upon this subject," chiefly in the Latin language. These books were classified by Draudius in his *Bibliotheca Classica*, under the head of "*Concionatorum instructio*," and by Molanus, in his *Bibliotheca Materiarum*, under the head of "*Concionandi munus.*" To these, bishop Wilkins remarks, "may be added those many other discourses wherein these things have been largely handled by the by, though not chiefly intended, in all which many learned men have laid down such rules as, according to their several geniuses and observations, seemed most useful." In the enumeration of works referred to, no proper distinction was made between the office of preacher and pastor. Hence we find enumerated in the list the works of Bowls and Hemingius, both entitled *De Pastore;* also that of Hen. Diest, styled *De ratione studii Theologici.* Some of the earlier books on the subject of preaching by English authors were written in Latin, e. g. that of William Perkins, entitled "*Arte of Prophecying*, or a treatise concerning the sacred and onely trve manner & method of preaching. First written in Latin by Mr. William Perkins, and now faithfully translated into English (for that it containeth many worthy things fit for the knowledge of men of all degrees) by Thomas Tuke. Motto, Nehemiah viii, 4, 5, 6 (Cambridge, 1613)." Cotton Mather's *Manductio ad Ministerium*, written about 1710, in addition to a Latin title, had a very formal and sonorous Latin preface. In the text of his treatise the learned author makes this remark concerning homiletical literature prior to the period in which he wrote: "There is a troop of authors, and even an host of God, who have written on the Pastoral care from the days of Gregory down to the days of Gilbert; yea, and since these, every year some to this very day. I cannot set you so tedious a task as to read a tenth part of what has been offered on the art, and the gift, and the method of preaching."

In modern times, several different epochs of homiletical literature may be recognised corresponding to the character of preaching at different periods and in different countries. In Germany, the Lutheran reformation was characterized by great earnestness and even bluntness in the mode of preaching, not only in controversial discourses, but even in the proclamation and enforcement of evangelical truth. Luther wrote no work on preaching, but by his example and occasional precepts, some of which are recorded in his *Table-Talk*, he greatly influenced his coadjutors and followers as to their theory and practice as preachers. The following are some of Luther's characteristic sayings. *Portrait of a good preacher:* "A good preacher should have these virtues and qualities: 1. He should be able to teach plainly and in order; 2. He should have a good head; 3. a good voice; 4. a good memory; 5. He should know when to stop; 6. He should study diligently, and be sure of what he means to say; 7. He should be ready to stake body and life, goods and glory, on its truth; 8. He should be willing to be vexed and criticised by everybody." *Advices to young preachers:* "*Tritt frisch auf, thu's maul auf, hör bald auf*," i. e. Stand up cheerily, speak up manfully, leave off speedily. "When you are about to preach, speak to God and say, 'My Lord God, I wish to preach to thine honor, to speak of thee, to praise thee, and to glorify thy name.'" "Let all your sermons be of the simplest. Look not to the princes, but to the simple and unlearned people. We should preach to the little children, for the sake of such as these the office of preaching is instituted. Ah! what pains our Lord Christ took to teach simply. From vineyards, sheep, and trees he drew his similes; anything in order that the multitudes might understand, embrace, and retain the truth." "If we are found true to our calling we shall receive honor enough, not, however, in this life, but in the life to come."

After Luther's death a reaction occurred, in which there was a return to scholastic formulas and other objectionable features of the mediæval homilies and postils. This second period has sometimes been called that of the postilists, in allusion as well to Protestants as Catholics. In the following period the pietism of Spener and Francke promoted a healthful reform in the Protestant pulpit of Germany, although the reform was to some extent neutralized by the nearly simultaneous development of the Wolfian philosophy, which gloried more in logical forms than in the power of the cross. This philosophy was fascinating to students, and, having gained an ascendency in the universities, it antagonized the plainer and more evangelical mode of preaching commended by Luther and Francke.

Mosheim, the Church historian of the middle of the 18th century, was also a celebrated preacher, and is regarded as having introduced another homiletical epoch in Germany. His style was majestic and oratorical, similar to that of Tillotson in England, and Bourdaloue in France. By him it was well applied to religious instruction, but after him it greatly degenerated, many of his imitators being more noted for the form of sound words than for the spirit of vital piety. By degrees, preaching declined in its religious power, until sermons scarcely aimed at being more than didactic or rhetorical entertainments.

Reinhard, court preacher in Dresden about 1800, not only inaugurated a better style of preaching, but illustrated his theory in numerous published sermons (a collection of his sermons was published at Sulzb. 1831-7, in 39 vols. 8vo), and also in a series of letters entitled his

"Confessions." His style was characterized by richness of thought, clearness, definiteness, force, and dignity of expression. It prevailed both among the rationalists and the orthodox to the time of Schleiermacher. The power of Schleiermacher as a preacher corresponded to his great influence as a theologian, and his example is regarded as having introduced another period in German homiletics, although he did not write specially on that topic. In the course of his life his own style of preaching improved, rising from the moralisms with which he commenced to a more evangelical tone in subsequent years.

Apart from those who have treated of preaching as a branch of practical theology, the more prominent German authors on homiletics during the current century have been Schott, Reinhard, Marheinecke, Theremin, Stier, Lentz, Paniel, Palmer, Ficker, Schweitzer.

In France the golden age of pulpit oratory occurred about the close of the 17th and at the beginning of the 18th century. It was the age of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, and Fénelon, among the Roman Catholics, and of Claude, Superville, and Saurin, among the Protestants. Fénelon and Claude became representative authors of the two churches: the former by his *Dialogues on Eloquence, particularly that of the Pulpit;* the latter by his *Essay on the Composition of a Sermon.* These valuable contributions to homiletical literature are still read with interest, not only in the French, but in the English language. Even the former has been more appreciated and oftener reprinted by Protestants than by Romanists. France, in the 19th century, has also produced many examples of great preachers and good writers on homiletics. Without attempting to enumerate the former, the principal authors are Vétu, Martin, Bautain, and Mullois, of the Catholics, and Vinet, Vincent, and Coquerel, of the Protestants.

In Great Britain, the principal homiletical writers of the 18th century were John Edwards, 1705; Dr. Doddridge, 1751; Fordyce, 1754; and George Campbell, 1775.

Apart, however, from the influence of any of these writers, there arose during that century a style of Christian address destined to have a great influence upon the subsequent preaching of English-speaking countries. Allusion is made to the reformation that commenced in connection with the labors of Wesley, Whitefield, and others about 1740. The preaching of these men was characterized by a return to scriptural simplicity and fervor, and was followed by extensive religious awakenings, which in due time extended a quickening influence to ministers of all the churches. The Wesleyan reformation was further characterized by field-preaching, and by the employment of unordained men as lay preachers, who gave evidence of a divine impulse to call sinners to repentance. John Wesley, like Luther, though he wrote no treatise on preaching, gave numerous advices and some rules to preachers, which largely influenced the practice of those who became associated with him, and which did not, as in the case of Luther, soon after become obsolete under the influence of formalistic reaction. In the minutes of one of his early conferences, Wesley gave rules for his preachers which have been officially perpetuated in Methodist societies and churches ever since. These rules pointed out in the briefest words the grand objects and essentials of preaching, regarding all rhetorical precepts and "smaller advices" as merely auxiliary. "*Quest.* What is the best general method of preaching? *Ans.* 1. To invite. 2. To convince. 3. To offer Christ. 4. To build up." Here was the essence of the evangelical idea of preaching, and its fruits followed. Fletcher's portrait of St. Paul expanded and illustrated the same idea; but no extended work on preaching was produced by any Methodist of that period.

The early part of the 19th century witnessed the publication in England of but few, if any, homiletical works of permanent value. Between 1808 and 1819 the Rev. Charles Simeon, of Cambridge, laboriously developed the system of Claude on the composition of a sermon in a series of plans of sermons on the principal texts of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. This work, which attained the magnitude of twenty-one octavo volumes, was designed to be a thesaurus of help and guidance in sermonizing. It contained no less than 2536 "skeletons," enough to supply two sermons each Sabbath for nearly a quarter of a century. What more could a minister want? Such a wealth of supply would not have been provided had there not been a demand. The demand may have been healthy as far as it indicated a disposition on the part of the English clergy to escape from the still more indolent practice, not yet entirely extinct, of copying sermons in full, and reading manuscripts prepared for market, and sold in the shambles. Nevertheless, the idea that sermon plans for use, any more than sermons for delivery, could be an article of merchandise, was inherently wrong, and, as far as adopted, could only tend to mental torpor, and a servile dependence on the brain-work of others. Yet pulpit assistants, pulpit cyclopædias, books of sketches, and other devices for "preaching made easy," have had their day in England, as well as in Germany and France. Simeon's *Horæ Homileticæ*, notwithstanding inherent faults, was by far the noblest of its class. It may now be pronounced obsolete in reference to its primary design, yet one of its features is imitated in some of the best commentaries of the present day, by the insertion in a less formal manner of homiletical notes on important texts and passages.

Several valuable works on preaching have been published in England during the last thirty-five years. The following deserve mention: *The Ministerial Character of Christ practically considered,* by Charles R. Sumner, bishop of Winchester (London, 1824, 8vo); *Apostolical Preaching considered,* by John Bird Sumner, lord bishop of Chester (1839; 9th ed. 1850); *Ecclesiastes Anglicanus,* a treatise on preaching as adapted to a Church-of-England congregation, by W. Gresley (Lond. 3d edition 1844, 12mo); *Preaching, its Warrant, Subject, and Effects,* by W. S. Bricknell (London, 1845); *The Modern Pulpit, viewed in Relation to the State of Society,* by Robert Vaughan (Lond. 1842, post 8vo); *Paul the Preacher,* by John Eadie, D.D. (Lond. 1859, post 8vo; reprinted, N.Y. 12mo); *Thoughts on Preaching, specially in Relation to the Requirements of the Age,* by Daniel Moore (Lond. 1861, cr. 8vo); *The Duty and Discipline of Extemporary Preaching,* by F. Barham Zincke (reprint, N.Y. 1867, 12mo); *Sacred Eloquence, or the Theory and Practice of Preaching,* by Thomas J. Potter (Roman Catholic) (Dublin, 1868).

As to homiletical authorship in America, Cotton Mather's *Manductio ad Ministerium, or Angels preparing to sound the Trumpets,* although rare and little known, had the pre-eminence of being the first and only work of its class up to 1824. At that date Henry Ware, Jun., of Cambridge, Mass., published his *Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching,* a truly valuable work. In 1819 Ebenezer Porter, of Andover, republished Fénelon's *Dialogues,* Claude's *Essay,* and several minor works, under the title *The Young Preacher's Manual* (Boston, 1839, 8vo). Subsequently the following principal works have appeared: *Lectures on Homiletics and Preaching,* by Ebenezer Porter, D.D. (And. and N.Y. 1834, 8vo); *Sacred Rhetoric, or Composition and Delivery of Sermons,* by Henry J. Ripley (N.Y. 1849, 12mo); *The Power of the Pulpit, Thoughts addressed to Christian Ministers,* by Gardiner Spring, D.D. (1854); *Preaching required by the Times,* by Abel Stevens, LL.D. (N.Y. 1856, 12mo); *The Model Preacher, a Series of Letters on the best Mode of Preaching the Gospel,* by William Taylor, of California (Cincinnati, 1859, 12mo); *Preachers and Preaching,* by Nicholas Murray, D.D. (1860); *Thoughts on Preaching,* by James W. Alexander, D.D. (1861, 12mo); *A Treatise on Homiletics,* by Daniel P. Kidder, D.D. (1864, 12mo); *Homiletics and Pastoral Theology,* by W. G. T. Shedd, D.D. (1867, 8vo); *Office and Work*

of the Christian Ministry, by James M. Hoppin (1869, 12mo). The larger part of the last-named work is devoted to the subject of homiletics, although not so indicated in the title.

From the foregoing lists it may be seen that recently American authorship on this subject is somewhat in excess of English. Several of the last-named books have been written by teachers of practical theology representing different churches, and have the merit of discussing the subject not only from an evangelical point of view, but in the light of the most modern developments and applications of Christianity. The state of society in the United States of America is favorable to the illustration of the true theory of preaching, as well as to its most efficient practice. All the churches, as were those of primitive times, are dependent on voluntary support. Neither their congregations nor their success can be maintained without attractive, and, in some degree, effective preaching. Even the Roman Catholic Church has adopted regular Sunday sermons and week-day missions, a species of revival efforts. Contrary to its universal custom where maintained as a religion of the state, it here builds its churches and cathedrals with pews or sittings for audiences instead of open naves for processions and moving crowds. The people of America, of whatever class, are free to hear whom they choose, or not to hear at all, unless addressed in a manner adapted to please or profit them. Corresponding to this state of things, the preachers of all churches, together with errorists of every description, are in active competition for the ears and hearts of the masses. The people, too, having great advantages for education, and no reverence for prescriptive authority, demand the best forms of Christian address, and such appeals to their reason and their emotions as challenge their respect. To none of these conditions does a true Christianity object, since it relies for its propagation upon truth and legitimate persuasion. Nevertheless, these circumstances make it obligatory on preachers of the Gospel to comprehend well their vocation, and the manner of "rightly dividing the truth." That this necessity is more and more recognised is an omen of promise to the Church of the future, especially as facilities for the easier and better comprehension of this branch of the minister's work increase.

III. *Principles.*—Homiletics, in a human point of view, may thus be considered a progressive science. It grows with the growing experience of the Church, and becomes enriched with the ever-accumulating examples of good and great preachers. It avails itself of the agency of the press to perpetuate specimens of the ever-multiplying homiletical productions of successive generations, and also to discuss the great problems of human destiny and influence. Thus the modern study and discussions of homiletics have had a tendency to place the subject in a clearer light, and to make it more justly comprehensible than it has been at any former period since the days of the apostles. This result has not been attained by means of modern inventions, but rather by a return to the original idea of preaching, as indicated and illustrated by the author and finisher of the Christian faith; at the same time, all science is made auxiliary to the Saviour's grand design in the appointment of preaching as an instrumentality for the diffusion of truth and the salvation of men. Space only remains for a brief summary of demonstrated and now generally accepted homiletical principles.

1. *The true Idea of Preaching.*—Preaching is an original and peculiar institution of Christianity. It was not derived from any pre-existing system. It had no proper counterpart even in Judaism, although a limited teaching office was committed to both the priests and prophets of the Jewish dispensation. See PROPHET. Old-Testament examples of persons called preachers, like Noah, Solomon, and Ezra, fall far below the idea of preaching as appointed by Christ. See APOSTLE. Only in the Messianic prophecies was the office of Christian evangelism clearly foreshadowed (see Isa. lxi, 1, 2). See GOSPEL. In the fulness of time, the Lord Jesus Christ, recognising his predicted mission, authoritatively established and appointed the office and work of preaching as a principal means of evangelizing the world. See PREACHING. In preparation for this office he instructed his disciples both by precept and example, giving them before his ascension a world-wide commission to "go and teach all nations," and "preach the Gospel to every creature." In this appointment the Saviour availed himself of no pre-existing rhetorical system, but rather a universal capacity of the human race now for the first time specially devoted to the divine use, and consecrated to the propagandism of revealed truth. See JESUS CHRIST. Yet he left his followers free to adopt, as auxiliary to their great work, whatever good thing might be derived from human study, whether of logic, rhetoric, or any other science. Thus, as Christianity multiplied its achievements and extended its influence along the ages, facilities for comprehending the philosophy and the art of preaching would of necessity increase.

The peculiarity of the preaching office is seen in the specialty of its address for moral ends, not merely to the judgment, but to the consciences of men; also in the grandeur of its aims, which are nothing less than the salvation of the human soul from sin in the present life, and its complete preparation for the life everlasting. As the objects of preaching are peculiar, so are the necessary prerequisites. Of these a true Christian experience and a special divine call may be affirmed to be essential. The mere form or ceremony of preaching may be taken up and laid aside as easily as other forms, but true preaching, the preaching that Christ instituted and designed to be maintained in the Church, demands the constant power of an active faith, a holy sympathy, and a conscious mission from God.

2. *The Subject-Matter of Preaching.*—In secular oratory, themes are perpetually changing with circumstances. In preaching, the theme is one. Nevertheless, the one theme prescribed to the preacher is adapted to all circumstances and all times. It may be summarily stated to be God manifested in Christ Jesus for the redemption of men. This central truth, which is the special burden of revelation, embraces in its correlations all other truths, natural as well as revealed. The word of God should be considered not only the text-book, but the grand treasury of truth for the preacher. In it he is furnished with history, poetry, experience, and philosophy, as well as perceptive instruction and full statements of the Gospel scheme; nevertheless, he may bring to its illustration whatever truth will aid in its corroboration and comprehension. Still, the preacher's great work must be to publish the doctrine of the cross, "the truth as it is in Jesus." To do this effectually, he not only needs an intellectual perception of its excellence, but the consciousness of its power as bestowed by the baptism "of the Holy Ghost and of fire." Thus the persecuted disciples "went everywhere preaching the word" (Acts viii, 4), and Paul, as a representative apostle, emphatically declared, "We preach Christ crucified;" "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord;" "Christ in you the hope of glory, whom we preach, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus" (Col. i, 28).

3. *Agencies of Homiletical Preparation.*—In addition to the essential preliminaries of character and experience heretofore alluded to, the preacher must bring to bear on his theme such mental exercises as will enable him to elaborate it appropriately and to the best effect. The following are indispensable: (1.) *Interpretation*, by which the true meaning of God's word is elicited. (2.) *Invention*, by which suitable materials, both of fact and of thought, are gathered from the universe of matter and of mind. Invention is aided by generalization, analysis, hypothesis, comparison, and diligent exercise. (3.) *Disposition*, by which all material employed is ar-

ranged in the most appropriate and effective order, whether in the introduction, argument, or conclusion of the discourse.

4. *Different Forms of Homiletical Production.*—The proclamation of Christian truth is not confined to any one form of address. Our Lord opened his public mission by a sermon—the Sermon on the Mount. Most of his other discourses were brief and informal, and many of his most important utterances fell from his lips in parables and conversations. The reported addresses of the apostles were exhortations rather than sermons according to the modern idea. In the early patristic age explanatory and hortatory addresses prevailed, resulting in the homily as the leading product of that period. As preaching declined in mediæval times, the homily dwindled into the postil. The Reformation brought the sermon again into use, and secured for it the prominence which it still maintains. In addition to re-establishing the sermon in its original prominence, modern Christianity has developed the platform address, in which a semi-secular style of oratory is made auxiliary to various phases of Christian benevolence. At the present time, it is essential to both ministers and laymen, who would participate in the most prominent activities of the Church, such as Sunday-schools and missionary efforts, that they should cultivate the talent of effective platform speaking. Nevertheless, the sermon is likely to remain as it was in the beginning, the first and most important of homiletical productions. Hence it should be specially studied, and thoroughly comprehended in all its capacities and bearings, as the standard form of clerical Christian address. See SERMON.

5. *Style and Qualities of Sermons.*—It is due to the dignity of Christian truth that the words in which it is uttered should be well chosen and fitly arranged. Hence the general qualities of a good style, such as purity, precision, perspicuity, unity, and strength, should be regarded as of primary and absolute necessity in pulpit style. At the same time, Christian discourse sternly rejects all the faults of style which rhetorical laws condemn, such as dryness, tautology, floridity, and bombast. Preaching also requires more than mere rhetoric. In order to its higher objects, it demands certain peculiar combinations, such as a blending of dignity with simplicity, of agreeableness with pointedness, and of energy with love. The style of the sermon should at once be fully within the comprehension of its hearers, and yet elevated by a certain scriptural congruity, which shows that it emanated from communion with God, and a familiarity with his inspired word.

Beyond mere verbal expression, sermons should possess several important qualities. (1.) They should be *evangelical*, setting forth the unadulterated truth of the Gospel in its just proportions, and in an evangelical spirit. (2.) Sermons should be *interesting.* To this end, the preacher must be deeply interested himself. He must utter his thoughts with clearness and vividness. He must use frequent illustrations. He must group things new and old in just and graphic combinations. (3.) Sermons should be *instructive.* The minister of the Gospel must never forget the Saviour's command to TEACH. Hence every sermon should be tributary to the diffusion of knowledge as well as holiness. (4.) Sermons should be *efficient.* Failing to accomplish some of the special objects of preaching, they are failures themselves. Hence their great essentiality must be considered an adaptation to high and true religious results. If possible, all these qualities should be combined in every sermon, though in proportions to suit occasions.

6. *Delivery.*—Four different modes of delivery are recognised in Christian oratory: (1.) the *extemporaneous;* (2.) the *recitative;* (3.) that of *reading;* (4.) the *composite*, in which two or all of the foregoing are blended. The last finds little favor among theorists, and is rarely practiced with any high degree of success. The first is the normal mode of human speech. No other was practiced by the Great Preacher, the apostles, or the early fathers. Recitative came into the Church in the 4th and 5th centuries, and reading in the 16th. Few questions pertaining to Homiletics have during the last 300 years been more zealously discussed than the relative advantages and disadvantages of the different modes of pulpit delivery. While it may justly be conceded that each mode has both advantages and disadvantages, especially when considered in reference to the peculiar capacity of individuals, yet it may be affirmed as the result of all discussion and experience that the primitive mode of extemporaneous address is commended by the best modern opinion as a gift to be earnestly coveted by every minister of the Gospel, and as a result of proper effort within the reach of most, if not all earnest preachers.

7. *Conditions and Elements of Success in Preaching.*—Mere eloquence, although a great auxiliary, is not of itself a guaranty of success in the proclamation of God's word. There is an infinite difference between the form and the power of preaching. The form is easy; the power is the gift of God crowning the highest human effort. To attain this great gift various conditions are prerequisite. A preacher must have clear and abiding conceptions of the dignity and overwhelming importance of his sacred vocation. With these must be associated a consuming love for his work, evidenced by tireless diligence and unslumbering faithfulness in its discharge. He must make preaching his great business, his absorbing employment. He must have discretion in the adaptation of his subjects, and style of address both to his hearers and to occasions. He must cultivate the habit of making all his observations, reading, and experience subservient to his capacity of instruction and religious impression. Above all, he must aim at the supreme glory of God, and at the end of his most earnest efforts depend with trustful confidence upon the divine blessing to give efficiency to his labors, and crown them with success. See PASTORAL CARE. (D. P. K.)

IV. *Additional Treatises.*—1. *Foreign* (Latin, French, and German): Lange (Joannes), *Oratoria sacra* (Frankf. and Lpz. 1707, 8vo; Halle, 1713, 8vo); Vitringa (Camp.), *Animadversiones ad Method. homiliar. ecclesiasticar. rite instituendar.* (Jena, 1722, 8vo); Maitre (J. H. Le), *Réflexions sur la manière de prêcher* (Halle, 1745, 8vo); Hollebeck (Eberhard), *De Opt. Concionum genere* (Leyd. 1768, 8vo); Ammon (C. F.), *Handbuch d. Anleit. z. Kanzelberedsamkeit* (Gött. 1799; 3d edit. Nürnb. 1858, 8vo); *Gesch. d. Homiletik v. Huss b. Luther* (Gött. 1804, 8vo); Tittmann (J. A. H.), *Lehrb. d. Homiletik* (Breslau, 1804; 2d ed. Lpz. 1824, 8vo); Schott (A. H.), *Entw. einer Theorie d. Beredsamkeit, mit besonderer Anwend. a. d. Kanzelberedsamkeit* (Lpz. 1807, 1815, 8vo); *Theorie d. Beredsamkeit* (Lpz. 1815–28; 2d edit. 1828–47, 3 vols. in 4 pts. 8vo); Fénelon (Fr. Salignac de la Motte), *Dialogues sur l'éloquence de la chaire* (Paris, 1714, 8vo; transl. by Stevens, Lond. 1808; Bost. 1832, 12mo); Dahl (J. Ch. W.), *Lehrbuch d. Homiletik* (Lpz. and Rost. 1811, 8vo); Marheinecke (Ph.), *Grundleg. d. Homiletik* (Hamburg, 1811, 8vo); Theremin (F.), *Die Beredsamkeit eine Tugend; oder Grundlinien e. systemat. Rhetorik* (Berl. 1814; 2d ed. 1837, 8vo); Kaiser (G. Ph. Ch.), *Entwurf e. Systems d. geistlichen Rhetorik* (Erlangen, 1816, 8vo); Grotefend (J. G.), *Ansicht. Gedank. u. Erfahrungen ü. d. geistl. Beredsamkeit* (Hannov. 1822); Ziehnert (J. G.), *Casual-Homilet. und Liturg.* (Meissen, 1825); Schmidt (A. G.), *Die Homilie* (Halle, 1827); Van Hengel (W. A.), *Institutio oratoris sacri* (Lugd. 1829); Sickel (G. A. F.), *Grundr. d. christlichen Halieutik* (Lpz. 1829, 8vo); Stier (Rudolf), *Kurz. Grundriss e. bibl. Keryktik* (Halle, 1830); Chénevière (J. J.), *Observations sur l'Eloquence* (Gen. 1834); Brand (J.), *Handb. d. geistl. Beredsamk.* (edit. by Hahn, Frankf. 1836, 1839; new ed. Const. 1850, 2 vols.); Zarbl (J. B.), *Handb. d. Kathol. Homiletik* (Landsh. 1838); Alt (J. K. W.), *Kurze Anleitung z. Kirchl. Beredsamk.* (Lpz. 1840); Palmer (Ch.), *Evang. Homiletik* (Stuttgard, 1842; 4th edition, 1857, 8vo); Ficker (Ch. G.), *Grundlinien d.*

evang. Homilet. (Lpz. 1847, 8vo); Schweizer (A.), *Homilet. d. evang.-prot. Kirche* (Lpz. 1848, 8vo); Baur (Gustav,) *Grundzüge d. Homilet.* (Giessen, 1848, 8vo); Gaupp (K. F.), *Pract. Theol.* (Berl. 1848, 1852, 2 vols. 8vo; vol. ii, pt. i, Homiletics); Lutz (J.), *Handbuch d. Kathol. Kanzelberedsamk.* (Tübing. 1851); Vinet (A.), *Homilétique ou théorie de la prédication* (Paris, 1853); Beyer (J. H. F.), *Das Wesen d. christl. Predigt. n. Norm u. Urbild d. apostol. Predigt* (Göttingen, 1861, 8vo); Hagenbach (K. R.), *Grundlin. d. Lit. u. Homiletik* (Leipzig, 1863, 8vo); Lang (Gust.), *Handb. z. homilet. Behandl. d. Evangelien und der Episteln* (Bresl. 1865. 1869, 8vo); Wapler, *Disposit. ü. d. evangel. Perikopen* (Stendal, 1865, 8vo); Pröhle, *Predigt Entwürfe* (2d ed. Nordhausen, 1865, 8vo); Röder (Max), *Homilet. Handbuch z. Gebr. b. Predigten* (a very superior work, to be in 5 volumes when completed, Nürnburg, 1863 sq. 8vo); Thym, *Homilet. Handb.* (1st part, Grätz, 1866, 8vo; 2d part, 1868, 8vo); Zimmermann (Karl), *Beitr. z. vergleichenden Homilet.* (Darmst. and Lpz. 1866, 8vo); Palmer (Chr.), *Evangel. Homilet.* (5th ed. Stuttg. 1867, 8vo); Geissler (M.), *Pred.-Entwürfe mit Anleit. z. Predigt-Ausarbeiten* (Hamb. 1867, 8vo); Meineke (J. H. F.), *Tägl. Handb. für Prediger*, edited by Dr. Wohlfarth (Quedlinburg and Lpz. 1867, 8vo); Stock (Prof. Chrn.), *Homilet. Real-Lexikon* (new edit. St. Louis, Mo., and Lpz. 1867, 4to); Wallroth, *Ged. und Anl. z. Predigten* (Oldenb. 1868, 8vo); Sommer (J. L.), *Predigtstudien* (Erlangen, 1868, 8vo).

2. In *English:* Barecroft (J.), *Ars Concionandi, or, Preaching*, etc. (Lond. 1715; 4th ed. 1751); D'Oyley (Samuel), *Christ. Eloquence in Theory and Pract.* (Lond. 1718, 12mo); Henley (John), *On Action in Preaching* (Lond. 1730); Blackwell (S.), *Method of Preaching* (London, 1736, 24mo); Jennings (John), *Discourses* (Lond. 1754, 12mo); Fordyce (David), *Theodorus; Dialogue on the Art of Preaching* (Lond. 1755, 12mo); Glanville, *Essay concerning Preaching* (London, 1768, 12mo); Franke, *The most useful Way of Preaching* (Lond. 1790, 8vo); Claude (John), *On the Composition of a Sermon* (5th ed. Cambr. 1827, 8vo; edited by the Rev. Chas. Simeon, N. Y. 1849, 18mo); Bickersteth (Edward), *On Preaching and Hearing* (4th ed. London, 1829, 12mo); Close (Francis), *Sermons on the Liturgy* (London, 1835, 12mo); Williams, *Christian Preacher* (collection of treatises by Wilkins, Jennings, Franck, Claude, etc., Lond. 1843, 12mo); Beveridge (Bp. William), *Sermons* (vol. i-iv of his *Works*, Oxford, 1844-45, 8vo); *Thesaurus Theologicus* (vol. ix and x of his *Works*, Oxford, 1847, 8vo); Ryland, *Pulpit and People* (1847, 8vo); Gouldburn (Edward M.), *Sermons* (Lond. 1849, 8vo); Russell (W.), *Pulpit Eloquence* (2d ed. Andover, 1853); *Short Sermons* (London, 1855, 2 vols. 12mo); Styles, *Nature and Effect of Evangelical Preaching* (Lond. 1856, 2 vols. 12mo): Moore, *Thoughts on Preaching* (Lond. 1861, cr. 8vo).

Homiliāre or **Homiliarius** is a term applied to a collection containing such homilies of the early fathers of the Church as were read on Sunday, on the festal days of the saints, on Easter, and Pentecost. See Durandi, *Rationale*, bk. vi, ch. i; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, ii, 337.

Homiliarium, the name given to collections of sermons for the ecclesiastical year, to be read in case of incapacity preventing the preacher from delivering a sermon of his own. The idea of such a collection arose in the early part of the Middle Ages. The most celebrated work of the kind, which took the place of all preceding ones, is that known as Charlemagne's *Homiliarium* (see Neander, *Church Hist.* iii, 174). The title of the Cologne edition, 1530, sets forth Alcuin as its author (*Homiliæ seu mavis sermones sive conciones ad populum, præstantissimorum ecclesiæ doctorum, Hieronymi, Augustini, Ambrosii, Gregorii, Origenis, Chrysostomi, Bedæ, etc., in hunc ordinem digestæ per Alchuinum Levitam, idque injungente ei Carolo M. Rom. Imp. cui a secretis fuit*). According to other accounts, however—and even to the instruction by Charlemagne himself which accompanies the work—Charlemagne had caused this work to be done by Paulus Diaconus because (see Ranke in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, ii, 387 sq.) "the Hours contained a number of fragments from the fathers used for reading which were full of faults and badly selected." But it is possible that both had a part in it, Alcuin forming the plan and Paulus Diaconus executing it. The work acquired great importance from the fact that it established more firmly the system of Church lessons introduced by Jerome, which had heretofore been subject to various alterations. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 249 sq.; Rheinwald, *Kirchl. Archäol.* p. 276; Siegel, *Handb. d. christl.-kirchl. Alterth.* ii, 331; Neander, *Ch. History*, iii, 126; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 35; and the art. HOMILY.

Homilies. See HOMILY.

Homilists. Among the homilists who have distinguished themselves in the primitive Church, Origen (3d century) ranks first. The schools of Alexandria and Antioch appear to have been the great centres of this class of sacred literature, and in the early centuries we find the names of Hippolytus, Metrodorus, Clement of Alexandria, and Gregory Thaumaturgus principally distinguished. But it was in the following centuries that the homily received its full development in the hands of the early Greek fathers Ephraim the Syrian, Athanasius, the two Gregories of Nazianzum and of Nyssa, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, the two Cyrils of Alexandria and of Jerusalem, and Theodoret; in the Latin Church, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, Peter Chrysologus, Fulgentius, and Cæsar of Arles. In later centuries, Venerable Bede, the popes Sabinian, Leo II and III, Adrian I, and the Spanish bishops Isidore of Seville and Ildefonsus, continued to use the homiletic form.—Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 399. See CATECHETICS; CATECHISTS; HOMILETICS; HOMILIARIUM; HOMILY.

Homilius, GOTTFRIED AUGUST, one of the most celebrated German organists and Church composers of the 18th century, was born at Rosenthal Feb. 2, 1714. In 1742 he became organist at the "Frauenkirche" at Dresden, and in 1755 was promoted musical director. He died June 1, 1785. Among his published musical works those considered best are, *Passionscantate* (1755), and *Weihnachtscantate* (1777).—Brockhaus, *Conv. Lex.* viii, 76.

Homily (Gr. ὁμιλία, *communion*, a *meeting;* hence *a discourse adapted to the people*), the name of a certain class of sermons. It is now applied to a simple exposition of a text, in contradistinction from the discussion of a topic. In the early Church the term λόγος, *oration*, was applied to less familiar discourses; ὁμιλία to the plainer, much as the term *lecture* is now used.

1. The distinction between the homily and the sermon is thus set forth by Vinet. "The special character of the homily is, not that it has to do most frequently with recitals, or that it is more familiar than other discourses, but that its chief business is to set in relief the successive parts of an extended text, subordinating them to its contour, its accidents, its chances, if we may so speak, more than can be done in the sermon, properly so called. Nothing distinguishes, essentially, the homily from the sermon except the comparative predominance of analysis; in other terms, the prevalence of *explanation* over *system*. The difficulty as to unity presented by this kind of discourse never amounts to impossibility. We do not at random cut from the general text of the sacred book the particular text of a homily. The selection is not arbitrary. The limit of the text is predetermined by reference to unity, which, therefore, we shall be at no loss to discover in it. The only danger is that unity of subject will be relinquished, as the thread of a path may be buried and lost beneath an intertwined and tufted vegetation. As the preacher appears to be more sustained by his text in the homily than in the synthetic sermon, the former is thought to

be more easy of execution. It certainly is more easy to make a homily than a sermon, but a good sermon is made with more facility than a good homily. The great masters in the art of preaching—Bourdaloue, for example—have not succeeded in homily. The most excellent judges in the matter of preaching have recommended the homily" (*Homiletics*, p. 148 sq.).

2. In the primitive Church we find the style of the homily already in the discourses of Christ and his apostles. They frequented the synagogues of the Jews wherever they went, and in these it was customary, after the reading of the Scriptures, to give an invitation to any one to comment upon what had been read. In this way the disciples frequently took occasion to speak of Christ and his doctrines. Thus we find in the Acts (i, 15; ii, 14; iv, 7; v, 29; vi, 34; xiii, 40, 41; xvii, 22; xx, 18; xxii, xxiii, xxvi) brief notices of several addresses made by Peter and Paul, and one by Stephen, which give us quite a distinct impression of their style of address. Tertullian and Justin Martyr inform us that a like practice was common in the churches of Africa and Asia. "We meet together to read the Holy Scriptures, and, when circumstances permit, to admonish one another. In such sacred discourse we establish our faith, we encourage our hope, we confirm our trust, and quicken our obedience to the word by a renewed application of its truths" (Tertullian, *Apol.* p. 39).

(*a*) A similar mode of discourse we find again in the early Greek Church, beginning with Origen (A.D. 320). This was in some respects, however, a new style of address, as it inclined to an allegorical mode of interpreting the Scriptures. But, aside from this characteristic, the sermons, or, rather, homilies of this period, were soon followed by all the preachers, as Origen was considered by all a standard who was to be imitated, while there were others less commendable. In general they were faulty in style, corrupt with "philosophical terms and rhetorical flourishes, forms of expression extravagant and farfetched, Biblical expressions unintelligible to the people, unmeaning comparisons, absurd antitheses, spiritless interrogations, senseless exclamations, and bombast." The causes which contributed to form this style are due to the prevalence of pagan philosophy among the Christian preachers of this time, many of whom were converts from paganism, and had received an imperfect preparation before entering on the discharge of their sacred office.

(*b*) In the early Latin Church, the homilies of this period are, if anything, even greatly inferior to those in the Greek. The cause of this was, as in the Greek Church, the imperfect education of those in the ministry, more especially their ignorance of the original languages of the Bible. See Eschenburg, *Versuch e. Gesch. der öffentl. Religionsvorträge*, p. 300 sq.

3. In the Church of Rome, at an early period, when few of the priests were capable of preaching, discourses were framed out of the fathers, chiefly expository, to be read from the pulpits. These were also called homilies. See HOMILIARIUM.

4. In England, homilies were early in use in the Anglo-Saxon Church. Ælfric, archbishop of Canterbury, who, after Alfred, ranks first among the Anglo-Saxon vernacular writers, finding that but few persons of his day (latter part of the 10th century) could read the Gospel doctrines, as they were written in the Latin, the language of the Church, was led to compile a collection of eighty homilies, some of which were perhaps written by himself, but most of which he translated from the Latin. In these Anglo-Saxon homilies "almost every vital doctrine which distinguished the Romish from the Protestant Church meets with a direct contradiction," and they proved of no little value in the religious controversy at the period of the English Reformation. They condemn especially, among other things, without reserve, the doctrine of transubstantiation (q. v.) as a *growing error*, and go to prove that the novelties which are generally charged to the Protestants are really of older date than the boasted argument of apostolical tradition. Some of the MSS. of these homilies, however, which had been stored away in monastic libraries, are found to be mutilated by the removal of all such obnoxious passages (comp. Soames, *Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, Bampton Lecture, Oxford, 1830, 8vo). A second collection of Ælfric's, undertaken at the request of Ethelward, commemorates the different saints revered by the Anglo-Saxon Church, and, like the former collection, was divided into two books. Of these homilies were published, *An English-Saxon Homily on the Birthday of St. Gregory, used anciently in the English-Saxon Church, giving an Account of the Conversion of the English from Paganism to Christianity*, transl. into mod. Engl, with notes, etc., by Elizabeth Elstob (Lond. 1709, 8vo; new ed. Lond. 1839, 8vo); *Elfrici Homiliæ*, ed. Eliz. Elstob (of which only 36 pages were ever published; Oxf. 1710, fol.). Another attempt was *The English-Saxon Homilies of Ælfric*, transl. by Eliz. Elstob (Oxf. 1715, folio, of which only two leaves were printed, now preserved in the British Museum). Besides these, there are some Anglo-Saxon homilies extant, to which the name of Lupus Episcopus is generally affixed. They are by Wanley (*Catalog. of A.-S. MSS.* p. 140 sq.), and apparently with good reason attributed to Wulfstan (q. v.), one of the Anglo-Saxon prelates of the 11th century. "The most remarkable of these is the one entitled in the MS. *Sermo lupi ad Anglos quando Dani maxime persecuti sunt eos*, in which the author sets before the eyes of his countrymen the crimes which had disgraced the age preceding that in which he wrote, and the increasing wickedness of their own time." See Wright, *Biog. British Lit.* p. 487 sq., 506 sq. See ÆLFRIC.

5. In the Church of England, the term homily has acquired a special meaning from the fact that in the time of the Reformation, a number of easy and simple discourses were composed to be read in the churches. "The Thirty-fifth Article of religion says, 'The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward VI; and, therefore, we judge them to be read in churches by the ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people.' The following are the titles of the homilies: 1. Of the right use of the church. 2. Against peril of idolatry. 3. Of repairing and keeping clean of churches. 4. Of good works; first of fasting. 5. Against gluttony and drunkenness. 6. Against excess of apparel. 7. Of prayer. 8. Of the time and place of prayer. 9. That common prayers and sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue. 10. Of the reverend estimation of God's Word. 11. Of alms-doing. 12. Of the nativity of Christ. 13. Of the passion of Christ. 14. Of the resurrection of Christ. 15. Of the worthy receiving of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. 16. Of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. 17. For the Rogation days. 18. Of the state of matrimony. 19. Of repentance. 20. Against idleness. 21. Against rebellion."

"The first volume of these homilies is supposed to have been composed by archbishop Cranmer and bishops Ridley and Latimer at the beginning of the Reformation, when a competent number of ministers of sufficient abilities to preach in a public congregation was not to be found." It was published, as already stated, in the article above cited, in the beginning of the reign of Edward VI. The second volume was perhaps prepared under Edward VI, but it was not published until 1563, during the reign of Elizabeth (comp. Hardwick, *Church History during the Reformation*, p. 206, 211, 249). "In neither of these books can the several homilies be assigned to their several authors with any certainty. In the second book no single homily of them all has been appropriated. In the first, that on 'Salvation' was probably written by Cranmer, as also those on 'Faith' and

'Good Works.' Internal evidence, arising out of certain homely expressions and peculiar forms of ejaculation, the like of which appear in Latimer's sermons, pretty clearly betray the hand of the bishop of Worcester as having been engaged in the homily against 'Brawling and Contention;' the one against 'Adultery' may be safely given to Thomas Becon, one of Cranmer's chaplains, in whose works, published in 1564, it is still to be found; of the rest nothing is known but by the merest conjecture. All members of the Church of England agree that the homilies 'contain a godly and wholesome doctrine,' but they are not agreed as to the precise *degree* of authority to be attached to them. In them, the authority of the fathers of the first six general councils, and of the judgments of the Church generally, the holiness of the primitive Church, the secondary inspiration of the Apocrypha, the sacramental character of marriage and other ordinances, and regeneration in holy baptism, and the real presence in the Eucharist, are asserted" (Bp. Burnet). One of the best editions of the *Homilies* is that by Corrie at the University press (Cambridge, 1850, 8vo), and the latest, and perhaps most complete edition, is that published at Oxford (1859, 8vo). See also Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* i, 1524; Wheatly, *Common Prayer*, p. 272; Baxter, *Ch. History*, p. 379 sq., 486 sq.; Browne, *Exposit.* 39 *Articles*, p. 782 sq.; Wesley, *Works* (see Index, vol. vii); Forbes, *On the* 39 *Articles*, ii, 685 sq.; Buchanan, *Justific.* p. 193, 198; Hook, *Ch. Dict.* p. 303.

6. For the Clementine Homilies, see CLEMENTINES; and on the points above given, see Schmidt, *Die Homilie* (Halle, 1827, 8vo); Augusti, *Denkwürdigk. a. d. christl. Archäol.* vi, 266 sq.; Schöne, *Geschichtsforsch. über die Kirchl. Gebr.* i, 74 sq.; ii, 226–53; *De concionibus veterum*, in Hoornbeck's *Miscellanæ sacræ* (Ultraj. 1689); Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* iv, 20, 21, 81 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 126; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 335; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* book xiv, ch. iv; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. xviii; *Primit. Ch.* p. 387; *Apostol. and Primit. Ch.* xiii; Bickersteth, *Christ. Stud. Ass.* p. 325, 470; Taylor, *Anc. Christ.;* Siegel, *Handb. christl.-kirchl. Alterth.* ii, 328 sq.; *London Review*, June, 1854, Jan. 1857; *Bib. Sacr.* May and Aug. 1849; *Presb. Quart. Rev.* April, 1862, art. ii; *Methodist Quart. Rev.* i, 283; vii, 63 sq. See HOMILETICS; HOMILISTS; POSTILLE.

Homines intelligentiæ (French *hommes d'intelligence*, men of understanding), a heretical sect which flourished in the Netherlands about 1412, most likely a later branch of the Brethren of the Free Spirit (q. v.). It was founded by Ægidius Cantor, and the most celebrated of their leaders was the German Carmelite Hildernissen. Ægidius Cantor asserted that "he was the saviour of the world, and that by him the faithful should see Jesus Christ, as by Jesus Christ they should see God the Father; . . . that the ancient law was the time of the Father, the new law the time of the Son; and that there should shortly be a third law, which was to be the time of the Holy Ghost, under which men would be at full liberty." They also held that there was no resurrection, but an immediate translation to heaven; and advanced the pernicious doctrines that prayer had no merit, and that sensual pleasures, being natural actions, were not sinful, but rather foretastes of the joys of heaven. They were accused of heresy, and, Hildernissen having recanted, the sect finally dissolved.—Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sacr.* i, 405; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ii, 399; Pierer, *Univers. Lex.* viii, 511; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* p. 339.

Homœousian or **Homoiousian**, a term describing the opinions of Arius and his fellow-heretics, who declared the Son of God to be only of *like* substance (ὁμοιούσιος) with the Father. See ARIANISM.

Homologouměna (ὁμολογούμενα, universally *acknowledged*), the name given by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 5, 25) to those books of the New Testament, of the canonical authority of which no doubts had been expressed. Eusebius includes under the term the four gospels, the Acts, the fourteen epistles of Paul, and the first epistles of Peter and John, while the epistle of James, the second epistle of Peter, and the second and third epistles of John, and the epistle of Jude, were placed among the Antilegomena. In a third or lower class, some, Eusebius says, placed the Apocalypse, though others placed it among the acknowledged books. It therefore properly belonged to the Antilegomena.—Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* See ANTILEGOMENA.

Homoousian, a term used to describe the orthodox view of the person of Christ, established at the Council of Nice in opposition to Arius, viz., that the Son of God is "of the *same* substance (or *essence*) with the Father," (ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρί). See ARIANISM; CHRIST, PERSON OF; TRINITY.

Honain, IBN-ISAAC, an Arabic-Nestorian philosopher and physician of the Abadite tribe, was born near Hirah in A.D. 809. He went to Greece, and there studied the Greek language and philosophy, and returned to Bagdad with a large collection of Greek books, part of which he translated into the Arabic and Syriac. He was assisted in this work by his son Isaac Ibn-Honain and his grandson Hobaish, who likewise distinguished themselves as philosophers. In this manner many works of the Greeks became accessible to the Arabians and the Syrians, and promoted among them more especially the study of Greek philosophy. It is to be regretted that after the completion of the translations the original works were burned, according, it is said, to a command of the caliph Al Mamun. Besides these translations, Honain wrote largely on medicine, philosophy, theology, and philology. He left also a Syriac grammar and a Syriac-Arabic dictionary, the first dictionary of the kind ever prepared. He died in 877.—Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orientale*, p. 423; Assemani, *Bibl. Orientale*, ii, 270, 438; iii, pt. ii, p. 168; Krug, *Philosoph. Lex.* ii, 455 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xv, 75.

Honduras. See CENTRAL AMERICA.

Hone, WILLIAM, an Independent minister, whose father is said to have been an occasional preacher among the Dissenters, was born in 1779 at Bath. He was brought up in rigid religious notions, and in his early years not suffered to read out of any other book than the Bible. At the age of ten he was apprenticed to an attorney, but he finally quitted the law, and became a bookseller in London in 1800. He devoted himself at the same time to the study of literature, and wrote several works on that subject. In 1823 he published a work entitled *Ancient Mysteries described, especially the English Miracle Plays, founded on the apocryphal N.-T. Story, extant among the unpublished MSS. in the British Museum*, etc. (8vo). "This is a curious work, not at all addressed to the multitude, or chargeable with any irreverence of design or manner, but treating an interesting antiquarian subject in the dispassionate style of a studious inquirer." His acquaintance with members of the "Independents" led him to join the Independent Church, and finally he became a minister of that society. He died Nov. 6, 1842. Hone also published *The Apocryphal N. T.* (Lond. 1820, 8vo; 4th ed. 1821), for an account of which see Horne, *Introd. to the Study of the Script.*, and *Lond. Quart. Rev.* vol. xxv and xxx. See his *Early Life and Conversion* (1841, 8vo); *English Cyclopædia;* Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* i, 1525; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 874. (J. H. W.)

Honert, JOHANN VAN DEN, a distinguished Dutch divine, was born near Dortrecht Dec. 1, 1693. His early years were spent in military service, but on his father's accession to a professor's chair in the University of Leyden he decided to follow a literary life, and, after four years of study, he became a candidate for the ministry in his twenty-fourth year. In 1718 he was appointed minister at Catwick, on the Rhine; later, at Enkhuysen, and then at Haarlem. In 1727 he was called as pro-

fessor of theology to the University at Utrecht, and in 1731 was honored with the professorship of Church History. In 1734 the University of Leyden called him as professor of theology, to which was added, in 1738, the department which he last filled at the Utrecht University, and in 1746 the department of Homiletics. He died April 7, 1758. A complete list of his works, which in a great part have now nearly gone out of date, is given by Adelung (in Jöcher's *Gel. Lexik.* Addenda ii, 2123 sq.). His *De gratia Dei non universali, sed particulari* (Lugd. 1723, 8vo), which was intended to serve as an intermediator at the time when the Calvinistic predestinarian doctrine was much softened by the French and Swiss theologians, so rigidly opposed by many systematic theologians, involved him in a controversy with some of the Remonstrants (q. v.). (Comp. *Acta hist. eccl.* ii, 819 sq.) His *Oratio de hist. eccles. studio Theologis maxime necess.* (Lugd. 1734, 4to) was, like many other translations of German theological works, of great value to the Church of his country. He wrote also *Institt. Theol.* (Lugd. 1735). Honert was regarded by all parties as a very scholarly divine, and was consulted by all of them without distinction.—Gass, *Gesch. der Protest. Dogmat.* iii, 1862; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 339 sq. (J. H. W.)

Honestus, St. See Damian, Peter.

Honey (דְּבַשׁ, *debash'*, sometimes rendered "*honeycomb*," in composition with יַעַר, *ya'ar*, or צוּף, *tsuph*; while נֹפֶת, *no'pheth*, singly, is sometimes translated "honey-comb;" Greek μέλι) is represented by several terms, more or less accurately, in the original languages of Scripture.

1. יַעַר, *ya'ar*, which only occurs (in this sense) in 1 Sam. xiv, 25, 27, 29; Cant. v, 1; and denotes the honey of bees, and that only. The word properly signifies a *copse* or forest, and refers to the honey found in the woods.

2. נֹפֶת, *no'pheth*, honey that drops (from נוּף, to *sprinkle* or distil), usually associated with the comb, and therefore bee-honey. This occurs in Psa. xix, 10; Prov. v, 3; xxiv, 13; xxvii, 7; Cant. iv, 11.

3. דְּבַשׁ, *debash'* (from its *glutinous* nature). This is the most frequent word. It sometimes denotes bee-honey, as in Judg. xiv, 8, but may also refer to a vegetable honey distilled from trees, and called *manna* by chemists; also the sirup of dates, and even dates themselves. It appears also sometimes to stand as a general term for all kinds of honey, especially the sirup of grapes, i. e. the newly-expressed juice or must boiled down. At the present day this sirup is still common in Palestine, under the same Arabic name *dibs* (Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 442, 453), and forms an article of commerce in the East; it was this, and not ordinary bee-honey, which Jacob sent to Joseph (Gen. xliii, 11), and which the Tyrians purchased from Palestine (Ezek. xxvii, 17). The mode of preparing it is described by Pliny (xiv, 11): the must was either boiled down to a half (in which case it was called *defrutum*), or to a third (when it was called *siracum*, or *sapa*, the σίραιος οἶνος, and ἕψημα of the Greeks): it was mixed either with wine or milk (Virg. *Georg.* i, 296; Ovid, *Fast.* iv, 780): it is still a favorite article of nutriment among the Syrians, and has the appearance of coarse honey (Russell, *Aleppo*, i, 82). It was used for sweetening food, like sugar with us (Exod. xvi, 31).

4. צוּף, *tsuph* (literally a *flowing*), denotes rather the *cells* of the honey-comb full of honey (Prov. xvi, 24; Psa. xix, 11).

5. The "wild honey" (μέλι ἄγριον) which, with locusts, formed the diet of John the Baptist, was, according to some, the *manna* or vegetable honey noticed under *debash* (No. 3, above), but may very naturally refer to the honey stored by bees in the rocks of Judæa Deserta, in the absence of the trees to which they usually resort. Such wild honey is clearly referred to in Deut. xxii, 13; Psa. lxxxi, 17. Josephus (*War*, iv, 8, 3) specifies bee-honey among the natural productions of the plain of Jericho: the same Greek expression is certainly applied by Diodorus Siculus (xix, 94) to honey exuding from trees; but it may also be applied, like the Latin *mel silvestre* (Pliny, xi, 16), to a particular kind of bee-honey. A third kind has been described by some writers as "vegetable" honey, by which is meant the exudations of certain trees and shrubs, such as the *Tamarix mannifera*, found in the peninsula of Sinai, or the stunted oaks of Luristan and Mesopotamia. A kind of honey is described by Josephus (*l. c.*) as being manufactured from the juice of the date.

Honey was not permitted to be offered on the altar (Lev. ii, 11). As it is coupled with leaven in this prohibition, it would seem to amount to an interdiction of things sour and sweet. Aben Ezra and others allege that it was because honey partook of the fermenting nature of leaven, and when burnt yielded an unpleasant smell—qualities incompatible with offerings made by fire of a sweet savor unto the Lord. The prohibition appears to have been grounded on the fermentation produced by it, honey soon turning sour, and even forming vinegar (Pliny, xxi, 48). This fact is embodied in the Talmudical word *hidbish*="to ferment," derived from *debash*. Other explanations have been offered, as that bees were unclean (Phil. ii, 255), or that the honey was the artificial *dibs* (Bähr, *Symbol.* ii, 323). But Maimonides and others think it was for the purpose of making a difference between the religious customs of the Jews and the heathen, in whose offerings honey was much employed. The first-fruits of honey were, however, to be presented, as these were destined for the support of the priests, and not to be offered upon the altar (2 Chron. xxxi, 5). It is related in 1 Sam. xiv, 24–32, that Jonathan and his party, coming to the wood, found honey dropping from the trees to the ground, and the prince extended his rod to the honey-comb to taste the honey. From all this it is clear that the honey was bee-honey, and that honey-combs were above in the trees, from which honey dropped upon the ground; but it is not clear whether Jonathan put his rod into a honey-comb that was in the trees or shrubs, or into one that had fallen to the ground, or that had been formed there (Kitto's *Pict. Bible*, ad loc.). Moreover, the vegetable honey is found only in small globules, which must be carefully collected and strained before being used (Wellsted, ii, 50). In India, "the forests," says Mr. Roberts, "literally flow with honey; large combs may be seen hanging on the trees as you pass along, full of honey" (*Oriental Illustrations*). We have good reason to conclude, from many allusions in Scripture, that this was also, to a considerable extent, the case formerly in Palestine. It is very evident that the land of Canaan abounded in honey. It is indeed described as "a land flowing with milk and honey" (Exod. iii, 8, etc.); which we apprehend to refer to *all* the sweet substances which the different Hebrew words indicate, as the phrase seems too large to be confined to the honey of bees alone. Yet the great number of bees in Palestine has been noticed by many travellers; and they were doubtless still more common in ancient times, when the soil was under more general cultivation. Where bees are very numerous, they sometimes resort to places for the deposit of their honey which we would little think of. The skeleton of a lion, picked clean by birds, dogs, and insects, would afford no bad substitute for a hive, as in Judg. xiv, 8, 9 (Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.). A recent traveller, in a sketch of the natural history of Palestine, names bees, beetles, and mosquitoes as the insects which are most common in the country (Schubert, *Reise im Morgenlande*, ii, 120). In some parts of Northern Arabia the hills are so well stocked with bees that no sooner are hives placed than they are occupied (Wellsted's *Travels*, ii, 123). Dr. Thomson speaks of immense swarms of bees in the cliffs of wady Kum, and compares

Deut. xxii, 13 (*Land and Book*, i, 460). Prof. Hackett saw hives in several places in Palestine (*Illustrations of Script.* p. 96). Milk and honey were among the chief dainties in the earlier ages, as they are now among the Bedawin; and butter and honey are also mentioned among articles of food (Isa. vii, 15). The ancients used honey instead of sugar (Psa. cxix, 103; Prov. xxiv, 13); but when taken in great quantities it causes nausea, a fact employed in Prov. xxv, 16, 17, to inculcate moderation in pleasures. Honey and milk are put also for sweet discourse (Cant. iv, 11). The preservative properties of honey were known in ancient times. Josephus records that the Jewish king Aristobulus, whom Pompey's partisans destroyed by poison, lay buried in honey till Antony sent him to the royal cemetery in Judæa (*Ant.* xiv, 7, 4). See BEE.

HONEY, a portion of which, with milk, was sometimes given to newly-baptized persons in allusion to the name anciently given to Canaan, and in token that they belonged to the spiritual Israel. Honey and milk had a distinct consecration (Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.*). See Augusti, *Christl. Archäol.* ii, 446 sq.; Riddle, *Christ. Antiq.* p. 519 sq.; Wheatly, *Common Prayer*, p. 326.

Honolulu. See SANDWICH ISLANDS.

Honor, (1.) respect paid to superiors, those to whom we owe particular deference and distinction. (2.) It is sometimes, in Scripture, used to denote real services: "Honor thy father and mother (Exod. xx, 12);" that is, not only show respect and deference, but assist them, and perform such services to them as they need. By honor is also understood that adoration which is due to God only: "Give unto the Lord the honor due unto his name (Psa. xxix, 2)." (3.) Specifically, it is used to denote the testimony of esteem or submission, by which we make known the veneration and respect we entertain for any one on account of his dignity or merit. The word is used in general for the esteem due to virtue, glory, reputation, and probity. In every situation of life, religion only forms the true honor and happiness of man. "It cannot arise from riches, dignity of rank, or office, nor from what are often called splendid actions of heroes, or civil accomplishments; these may be found among men of no real integrity, and may create considerable fame; but a distinction must be made between fame and true honor. The former is a loud and noisy applause; the latter a more silent and internal homage. Fame floats on the breath of the multitude; honor rests on the judgment of the thinking. In order, then, to discern where true honor lies, we must not look to any adventitious circumstance, not to any single sparkling quality, but to the whole of what forms a man; in a word, we must look to the soul. It will discover itself by a mind superior to fear, to selfish interest, and corruption; by an ardent love to the Supreme Being, and by a principle of uniform rectitude. It will make us neither afraid nor ashamed to discharge our duty, as it relates both to God and man. It will influence us to be magnanimous without being proud; humble without being mean; just without being harsh; simple in our manners, but manly in our feelings. This honor, thus formed by religion, or the love of God, is more independent and more complete than what can be acquired by any other means. It is productive of higher felicity, and will be commensurate with eternity itself; while that honor, so called, which arises from any other principle, will resemble the feeble and twinkling flame of a taper, which is often clouded by the smoke it sends forth, but is always wasting, and soon dies totally away" (Blair, *Sermons*, Serm. 33). (4.) The term "honor" is also used to denote the personal quality of magnanimity, especially in relation to truth and fidelity. Among men of the world, the "sense of honor," so called, takes the place of conscience; perhaps it might more justly be said that it *is* conscience, regulated, however, by the personal pride of the individual. Coleridge remarks that wherever "genuine morality has given way, in the general opinion, to a scheme of ethics founded on utility, its place is soon challenged by the spirit of HONOR. Paley, who degrades the spirit of honor into a mere club-law among the higher classes, originating in selfish convenience, and enforced by the penalty of excommunication from the society which habit had rendered indispensable to the happiness of the individuals, has misconstrued it not less than Shaftesbury, who extols it as the noblest influence of noble natures. The spirit of honor is more, indeed, than a mere conventional substitute for honesty; but, on the other hand, instead of being a finer form of moral life, it may be more truly described as the shadow or ghost of virtue deceased; for to take the word in a sense which no man of honor would acknowledge may be allowed to the writer of satires, but not to the moral philosopher. Honor implies a reverence for the invisible and supersensual in our nature, and so far it is virtue; but it is a virtue that neither understands itself nor its true source, and therefore often unsubstantial, not seldom fantastic, and often more or less capricious. Abstract the notion from the lives of lord Herbert of Cherbury, or Henry the Fourth of France, and then compare it with 1 Cor. xiii and the Epistle to Philemon, or, rather, with the realization of this fair ideal in the character of St. Paul himself. This has struck the better class even of infidels. Collins, one of the most learned of our English deists, is said to have declared that, contradictory as miracles appeared to his reason, he would believe in them notwithstanding if it could be proved to him that St. Paul had asserted any one as having been worked *by himself* in the modern sense of the word *miracle; adding, 'St. Paul was so perfect a gentleman, and a man of honor!'* I know not a better test. Nor can I think of any investigation that would be more instructive where it would be *safe*, but none, likewise, of greater delicacy from the probability of misinterpretation than a history of the rise of honor in the European monarchies as connected with the corruptions of Christianity, and an inquiry into the specific causes of the inefficacy which has attended the combined efforts of divines and moralists against the practice and obligation of duelling." Of the merely worldly sense of honor, Carlyle remarks, sharply enough, that it "reveals itself too clearly as the daughter and heiress of our old acquaintance, Vanity" (*Essays*, ii, 74). Montesquieu remarks that what is called honor in Europe is unknown, and of course unnamed, in Asia; and that it would be difficult to render the term intelligible to a Persian." See Montesquieu, *Spirit of Laws*, bk. iii, ch. viii; Coleridge, *Friend*, p. 377.

Honoratus, St., a Manichæan, and archbishop of Arles, was born, according to Baillet, in Belgian Gaul, in the second half of the 4th century. He belonged to a noble family who were pagans; and when he and his brother Venantius became Christians, they left their country and parents, and travelled through Achaia, and afterwards founded a monastery on the island of Serino, opposite Cannes, which acquired great celebrity. Some of the most eminent bishops and theologians of the 5th and 6th centuries came out of this convent. Honoratus himself became archbishop of Arles A.D. 426, and died A.D. 429. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 78.

Honoratus, St., bishop of Marseilles, was born about 420 or 425, and is said to have been educated at the school of Lerins. He was the successor of the celebrated Tillemont in the episcopacy (probably in 475), but of his works very little is known at present. Some ascribe to him the authorship of a life of St. Hilarius, which other critics suppose to be the production of Viventius. He died about 492, counting pope Gelasius I among his admirers.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxv, 78.

Honorius, Roman emperor, son of Theodosius I, was born in 384. He was named Augustus Nov. 20, 393, and succeeded his father Jan. 17, 395, as first emperor of the Western empire, with Rome as its capital,

while the Eastern fell to the lot of his brother Arcadius. Honorius was at this time only ten years of age, and he was therefore put under the guardianship of Stilicho, a Vandal, who had aided him in ascending the throne, and whose daughter Maria he married. Honorius, soon after his accession, renewed and even rendered more stringent his father's enactments against heathenism; but the weakness of his government, together with the fears or heathenish tendencies of some of the governors, rendered these regulations almost of no effect in several provinces. It having been represented to Honorius that the continued existence of heathen temples kept up the heathen spirit among the people, he ordered (399) that all such temples should be quickly destroyed, so that the people should no longer have this temptation before them. As the heathen laid great stress on a prediction that Christianity would disappear in its 365th year, the destruction of their own temples at that time made great impression on them. Yet in some districts of Northern Africa the heathen still remained numerous enough not only to resist, but even to oppress the Christians. After the death of Stilicho, Honorius modified his severe course against heathenism: a law was promulgated for the Western empire in A.D. 410—"*ut libera voluntate quis cultum Christianitatis exciperet*"—by which the penalties pronounced by preceding laws against all who participated in any but Christian worship were suspended. This law, however, remained in force but a short time, and the old enactments came again into use. An edict of 416 excluded the heathen from civil and military offices, yet we are told by Zozimus (v, 46) that such was the weakness of Honorius that at the request of a heathen general, who declined continuing in his service on any other terms, the edict was at once taken back. This vacillating, irresolute prince was also led to take part in discussions on the points of doctrine then agitating the Church. In 418 he promulgated an edict against Pelagius and the Pelagians and Cœlicolæ, which was framed more in a theological than an imperial style. He acted in the same manner towards the Donatists. The envoys of the North African Church succeeded in obtaining from the emperor a rule that the penalty of ten pounds of gold to which his father Theodosius had condemned heretic priests, or the owners of the places where heretics assembled to worship, should only be enforced against those Donatist bishops and priests in whose dioceses violence had been offered to the orthodox priests. In an edict Honorius issued against the Donatists (405), he condemned them as heretics, and this with more severity even than the Council of Carthage demanded. Later he appointed a council, to be held at Carthage (411), to decide the difficulty between the Donatists and the orthodox party. The imperial commissioners, of course, decided for the latter, and new edicts were published exiling Donatist priests, and condemning their followers to be fined. The fanaticism of the oppressed party was excited by these measures, and the heresy only spread the more rapidly. While the reign of Honorius is thus of great importance in the history of the Church, the emperor himself showed the greatest want of energy in all his dealings, and his death, which occurred in August, 423, cannot be said to have been a loss to either the State or the Church.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 251; Mosheim, *Ch. History*, vol. i; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. xxix–xxxiii; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* chap. viii–x; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 66 sq.; Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 54, 72, 83; *Christ. Remembrancer*, July, 1868, p. 237. See DONATISTS.

Honorius, an archbishop of Canterbury in 627. He instituted parishes in England; but litte is known of his life and works. He died in 653.

Honorius OF AUTUN (*Augustodunensis*), surnamed "the Solitary," a scholastic theologian of the first half of the 11th century, is generally supposed to have been born in France, and was connected with a church at Autun, in Burgundy. His personal history is rather obscure; but if he be really the author of the *Elucidarium*, a summary of theology, published in France as the work of Anselm (Paris, 1560, 8vo), he deserves to be ranked among the most celebrated men of his century. The *Elucidarium* shows that Honorius was devoted to a practical mysticism, and in his work he seems to have followed the new Platonic-Augustinian theology. He condemned the Crusades and pilgrimages to Jerusalem, all decorations of the altar, the extreme unction, etc. On the doctrine of the Trinity, he held that the godhead consists of three distinct powers. He is also said to have been the author of a work, *De Prædestinatione et libero arbitrio* (Col. 1552; also found in Cassander's *Works*, p. 623 sq.). In this work he holds that "God's foreknowledge has no compelling influence upon our actions, nor his predestination any necessitating power over our fate; for, as all futurity is present to an omnipresent Being, he knows our future acts, because he sees them as already done; and his predestination to either life or death is the consequence of his foreknowing the line of conduct which his creatures would choose to pursue." In many respects he agreed with Abelard (q. v.). Honorius also wrote several Biblical works, among which his *Introduction to the Explanation of Solomon's Song* is considered as his best production. All his theological and philosophical works are collected in the *Bibl. Max. Patr.* vol. xx. See Dupin, *Bibl. Nouv. des aut. eccl.* ix, 154; Oudin, *De Script. Eccles.*; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxiv, 361 sq.; xxviii, 335, 416 sq., 427 sq.; xxix, 341; Ritter, *Gesch. der Philos.* vii, 435 sq.; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Lit.* ii, 680; Waterland, *Works* (see Index); Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 342; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 321 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 19 sq.; Darling, *Encyklop. Bibliog.* i, 1526. (J. H. W.)

Honorius DE SANCTA MARIA, who was also known as *Blaise Vauxelle*, was born at Limoges, in France, July 4, 1651. He joined the Carmelites at Toulouse in 1671, and then went on a mission to the Levant. Returning to France, he taught theology for some years, and became prior, counsellor, provincial, and, finally, visitor general of the French Carmelites. He died in 1729. The most important and useful of his publications is entitled *Réflexions sur les Règles et sur l'Usage de la Critique, touchant l'Histoire de l'Eglise, les Ouvrages des Pères, les Actes des anciens Martyrs, les Vies des Saintes*, etc. (Paris and Lyons, 1712–1720, 3 vols. 4to). He wrote several treatises against Jansenism, and in favor of the bull Unigenitus; also *Vie de Saint Jean de la Croix* (Tournay, 1724):—*Observations sur l'Histoire ecclésiastique de Fleury* (Mechlin, 1726–1729):—*Expositio Symboli Apostolorum*, etc. (Perpignan, 1689):—*Traditions des Pères et auteurs ecclés. sur la Contemplation* (Paris, 1706, 2 vols. 8vo), which last was translated into Italian and Spanish, and to which he subsequently added *Des Motifs et de la Pratique de l'amour de Dieu* (Paris, 1713, 8vo); etc.—Moréri, *Nouv. Dict. Histor.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 83.

Honorius I, Pope, was a native of the Campania, and succeeded Boniface V in 625. His general administration of Church affairs has been favorably commented upon by historians, and his name is very prominent in the history of the paschal controversy in Ireland, and in that of the early Anglo-Saxon Church. The feast of the elevation of the cross was organized during his time (about 628), and he was very active in converting the heathen. He died in 638. Some of his letters are preserved in Labbe's *Collect. Conciliorum*, vol. iii. Honorius is especially distinguished for the part he took in the Monothelistic controversies of that period. While the controversy was gaining ground in the West, Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, wrote to Honorius, explaining the Monothelistic doctrines in the most favorable light, and suggested that Honorius should impose silence on both parties in a

dispute which really did not affect the substance of the Catholic doctrine. Misled, it is alleged, by this statement of Sergius, Honorius consented, and even expressed himself in language which would appear to condemn the doctrine of two wills in Christ. After his death, attempts were made at Rome to exculpate his memory from all accusation of heresy, yet he was condemned and anathematized by the Œcumenical Council of Constantinople in 680, and this sentence was confirmed at different times, as, for instance, by Leo II, who anathematized him as heretic for having attempted *apostolicam ecclesiam—profana proditione immaculatam subvertere* (Mansi, x, 731). Modern Roman Catholic historians have tried in various ways to exonerate Honorius. Baronius says that the acts of the Council of Constantinople were falsified; Bellarmine says that this was the case with Honorius's letter to Sergius; while Garnier and Ballerini claim that he was not anathematized for heresy, but *propter negligentiam.* Some Roman Catholic historians, however, maintain that even in disclaiming the belief of two wills in Christ, Honorius merely denied the existence in Christ of two discordant or conflicting wills, that is, of a *corrupt and sinful human* will opposed to the divine will, and that he did not put forth any dogmatic declarations irreconcilable with the strict ultramontane doctrine of infallibility. Orsi went even so far as to maintain that Honorius composed this letter to Sergius as "a private teacher;" but the expression *doctor privatus*, when used of a pope, is like talking of wooden iron (comp. Janus, *The Council and the Pope*, p. 405). In modern times, the agitation of the question of papal infallibility has given a special interest to the letters of Honorius. The champions of infallibility, following the lead of the above-mentioned writers, tried all kinds of arguments to explain away the assent of Honorius to the heretical doctrines of Sergius, without being able to adduce any new argument. The Jesuit Damberger even attempted a full justification of the course of Honorius. Most of the Roman Catholic writers, however, admitted that the words, though they may bear an orthodox construction, must have appeared as favoring the heretics, and that Honorius probably fell into a trap which the shrewd patriarch of Constantinople had set for him. The Gallicans, and the opponents of papal infallibility, have in general endeavored to show that Honorius was really a favorer of Monothelism. The ablest treatment of the subject from this school in the Roman Catholic Church may be found in the work on *The Pope and the Council*, by Janus; two works by P. Le Page Renouf (*The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, London, 1868); and [in reply to the ultramontane reviews of the first work by Dr. Ward, the editor of the *Dublin Review*, and the Jesuit Bottalla] *The Case of Pope Honorius reconsidered* (London, 1869); in two letters, by the distinguished French Oratorian and member of the French Academy, P. Gratry (*L'évêque d'Orleans et l'archevêque de Malines*, Paris, 1870); and in an essay by bishop Hefele, published in Naples, 1870. Renouf, whose thoroughness and keenness is admitted by all his opponents, in his works, undertakes to prove three assertions: 1. Honorius, in his letters to Sergius, really gave his sanction to the Monothelistic heresy; 2. Honorius was, on account of heresy, condemned by general councils and popes; 3. Honorius taught a heresy *ex cathedra.* The fact that Honorius was condemned by general councils and popes as a heretic is admitted by many of those Catholic writers who insist that his words may be indeed, though they are obscure, explained in an orthodox sense. Since the convocation of the Vatican Council in 1869, many Roman Catholic theologians (among them Döllinger and Gratry), who were formerly regarded as personally favorable to the doctrine of papal infallibility, now, after a new investigation of the question, strongly urge the case of Honorius as an irrefutable argument against it. The literature on the Honorius question is so voluminous that, according to the opinion of the learned Döllinger, during the last 130 years more has been written on it than on any other point of Church History within 1500 years. Recent monographs on the subject, besides the works already mentioned, have been written by Schneemann (*Studien über die Honoriusfrage*, 1864) and Reinerding (*Beiträge zur Honorius- und Liberiusfrage*, 1865). It is also extensively discussed in a number of articles in the theological reviews, especially those of the Roman Catholic Church, in the larger works on Church History, and in particular, since 1869, in a vast number of works treating of the question of papal infallibility. See INFALLIBILITY. See Richer, *Historia Concil. general.* i, 296; Du Pin, *De antiqua eccles. disciplina*, p. 349; M. Havelange, *Ecclesiæ infallibilitas in factis dogmaticis* (*Journ. hist. et litt.* April 1, 1790); F. Marchesius, *Clypeus fortium* (1680); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 88; Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, v, 407; Ceillier, *Hist. des aut. sac.* xvii, 522 sq.; Llorente, *Die Päpste*, i, 196–200; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xix, 492 sq.; Bower, *History of the Popes*, iii, 11 sq.; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 340 sq.; Neander, *Ch. History*, iii, 179, 195; *Dogmas*, ii, 439; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, ii, 169; Riddle, *History of the Papacy*, i, 195; Hardwick, *Church Hist.* (Middle Ages), p. 70 and n. 3, p. 75 and n. 8; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, vol. ii; *West. Review*, Oct. 1868, p. 239; *Edinb. Rev.* Oct. 1869, p. 160; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iii, 322 sq.; Lefevre, in *Revue Cathol. de Louvain*, February, 1870; Hefele, *Honorius u. d. sechste allgem. Concil.* (Tüb. 1870, 8vo). See MONOTHEISM. (J. H. W.)

Honorius II (*Peter Cadolus*), Antipope, was elected in 1061, through the influence of Henry IV, in opposition to Alexander II, who had been chosen by the cardinals without his assent. The election took place in a council convened at Basle, and Honorius afterwards went to Rome. The German bishops, however, under the influence of Hanno, archbishop of Cologne, sided with Alexander II at the Synod of Augsburg, 1062; and, finally, the Synod of Mantua, 1064, pronounced the deposition of Honorius, and he was obliged thereafter to confine himself to the bishopric of Padua, which he held before his election. Yet he upheld his pretensions to the pontifical see until his death in 1072. He was accused of simony and of concubinage. He is generally not counted among the popes on account of his deposition.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. v; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxii, 382, 385 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii, 119; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 318 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 323. See ALEXANDER II.

Honorius II (*cardinal Lambert*), Pope, originally bishop of Ostia, was elected pope by the cardinals in 1124, after the death of Calixtus II, while most of the bishops assembled at Rome elected Tebaldus, cardinal of Santa Anastasia. Tebaldus, finding that Honorius was supported by the powerful family of the Frangipani, and that the people were divided in opinion, to avoid further strife, waived his claim. Honorius himself also expressed doubts concerning the validity of his own election; he was subsequently re-elected by the clergy and the people of Rome without opposition, and was consecrated Dec. 21, 1124. He refused the investiture of the duchies of Apulia and Calabria to Roger, count of Sicily; and Roger having besieged the pope within Benevento, Honorius excommunicated him; but afterwards peace was concluded between them, and Honorius granted the investiture. He confirmed the election of Lothaire II to the empire, and excommunicated his rival, Conrad of Franconia. He also confirmed the organization of the order of Premonstratensis, and at the Synod of Troyes (1128) that of the Templars; and condemned the abbots of Cluny and of Mount Cassin, against whom complaints had been made. He died in the convent of St. Andrew, Feb. 14, 1130.—*English Cyclopædia;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxv, 89; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vi, 19 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii, 169; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxvi, 95 sq.; Mil-

man, *Lat. Christianity*, iv, 144, 151 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 317 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 323 sq.

Honorius III (*Cencio Savelli*), Pope, a native of Rome, was cardinal of St. John and St. Paul, and succeeded pope Innocent III in 1216. He showed a very accommodating spirit in his relations with the temporal powers. Thus, when Frederick II permitted his son Henry, already king of Sicily, to be elected king of Germany, in April, 1220, he even consented to officiate at the coronation (November, 1220). But it is generally believed that the object of the pope in consenting so readily to the desires of Frederick II was to gain him for the great crusade against the Mussulmans in the East which he contemplated. This good understanding between the pope and the emperor was interrupted when the latter, instead of proceeding directly to Palestine, tarried in Apulia and Sicily, and attempted to regain those countries. Honorius sent his chaplain, Alatrinus, to the imperial diet at Cremona in 1226, and the emperor was obliged to renounce his plan of aggrandizement. Honorius even went so far as to threaten him (1225) with excommunication if he did not start for the Holy Land by August, 1227, and he would probably have executed his threat had not death interfered. This conciliatory spirit Honorius failed to manifest towards count Raymond VII of Toulouse. He excited Louis VIII of France to make war against Raymond; but neither Honorius nor Louis lived to see the end of the conflict. He was also frequently at variance with the nobles and people of Rome, by whom he was a number of times driven from the city. His pontificate was therefore not a very quiet one. He died March 12, 1227. Officially Honorius confirmed the organization of the Dominicans in 1216, and of the Franciscans in 1223. He was the first pope who granted indulgences at the canonization of saints. He was considered a learned man in his day, and is supposed to have been the author of the *Conjurationes adversus principem tenebrarum* (Rome, 1629, 8vo).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vol. v; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 90; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vi, 216-221; Neander, *Ch. History*, iv, 41, 177, 270, 341; Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, v (see Index); Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* iii, 811 sq.; Ebrard, *Dogmengesch.* ii, 180; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxvi, 328; xxv, 145 sq., 329 sq.; xxix, 632; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch.* ii, 341; Cave, *Hist. lit. script. eccl.* ii, 287; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 319; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 324; Raumer, *Geschichte d. Hohenstaufen*, iii, 307 sq. (J. H. W.)

Honorius IV (*Giacomo Savelli*), was pope from April 2, 1285, to April 3, 1287. He espoused the cause of Charles of Anjou against the Aragonese, who had occupied Sicily; and he even incited to a crusade against the latter, qualifying it as a "holy war." He distinguished himself greatly by his zeal for the preservation and augmentation of the privileges of the Church, and for the recovery of the Holy Land. He cleared the Papal States of the bands of robbers with which they were overrun, and imparted a new impulse to arts and sciences, which up to his time had been much neglected; among other improvements, he attempted to establish a course of Oriental languages at the University of Paris, but he did not succeed. During his brief pontificate he is said to have succeeded in enriching his family.—Migne, *Dict. Eccles.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 91; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 301; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxvi, 511 sq.; Bower, *History of the Popes*, vi, 326 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vi, 172; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii, 235; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iv, 65, 627; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 322; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 325.

Honorius, Bartholomew, a Præmonstratist, who flourished in the second half of the 16th century, was born at Eerfel, in Brabant, became canon at Floreffe, near Naumur, later preacher at Helmont, and finally, being persecuted by the Calvinists, went to Rome. He wrote *Admonitio ad fratres inferioris Germaniæ* (Herzogenb. 1578):—*Hodæporicon celebriorum ordinis Præmonstratensis per orbem universum Abbatiarum* (ibid. 1584):—*Quæstiones theologicæ LXX adversus Calvinistas* (ibid. 1586):—*Elucidarium Anselmi Cantuariensis* (ibid. 1586); and a number of other, but less valuable works.—Pierer, *Univers. Lex.* viii, 522.

Honter, John, one of the apostles of Protestantism in Transylvania, was born at Cronstadt in 1498; studied at Wittenberg under Luther, then went as a teacher to Cracow, whence he moved to Basle to continue his studies. In 1533 he returned to his native city, where he started a printing establishment, and published Luther's writings. He also published at his own expense a translation of Luther's works in Hungarian. In 1544 he was appointed pastor, and became quite popular as a preacher. He died Jan. 23, 1549.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 254; Hardwick, *Ch. Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 98; *Hist. of Prot. Church in Hungary*, p. 59.

Hontheim, John Nicolas von (known commonly as Febronius), suffragan bishop of Treves (in Rhenish Prussia), was born Jan. 27, 1701, and educated at the Jesuits' college and university of that place. Having completed his studies, he went on a journey to Rome, and after his return (1727) was appointed successively to several high positions in the Church, and finally became suffragan bishop May 13, 1748, which post he filled until 1788. He died Sept. 2, 1790. His *Historia Trevirensis, diplomatica et pragmatica* (Trevir, 1750, 3 vols. fol., with a *Prodromus*, 1757, 2 vols. fol.; Augsb. 1757, 2 vols. fol.) is considered a work of great merit; but it was as the author of *De Statu Ecclesiæ et legitima Potestate Romani Pontificis Liber singularis, ad reuniendos dissidentes in religione Christiana compositus* (Bullioni apud Guillelmum Evrard, 1763, 4to), published under the pseudonym of "Justinus Febronius," that he attracted the attention of the Christian world. The daring expressions of independent thought which characterize the entire work created general excitement. As early as 1763-5 he issued an enlarged edition, and a third, still more enlarged, in 1770-74. An abridgment of the work appeared in German in 1764, another in Latin in 1777, and the translations into the various modern languages soon made it known throughout Europe (French, Sedan and Paris, 1767; Italian, Venice, 1767, etc.). Many Roman celebrities wrote against it, especially Zaccaria (to whose writings an answer is given in *Nova defensio Febronii contra P. Zaccaria*, Bullioni, 1763, 3 vols.) and Ballerini (*De potestate ecclesiastica Roman. Pontif. et concil. generalium contra opus J. Febronii* (Verona, 1768, 4to, and often). Pope Clement XIII caused the book to be entered on the *Index*, although it was dedicated to himself. Hontheim seeks especially to draw a line of distinction between the spiritual and the ecclesiastical power of the Roman see. He seems to say to his readers, "Without becoming Protestants, you may very well oppose the encroachments and abuse of power of the papal court." The principal points of which the work treats are, the constitution of the primitive Church, the representative character of general councils, the thoroughly *human* basis on which rests the primacy of the bishop of Rome, the fatal influence of the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, the tendency to usurpation of power by the nuncios, the illegal influence of the mendicant orders, and the monopoly of episcopal elections possessed by the chapters at the expense of the rights of the lower clergy and the people. As all his assertions are accompanied by historical proofs, and his book contains hardly anything but quotations from the fathers in support of his views, it exerted great influence. As the work had been published under the *nom de plume* of Justinius Febronius, the system of Church government which Hontheim propounded is generally called Febronianism. During the years which followed its publication, papal authority was greatly restricted in

many countries. Hence, as soon as the real author of the *De Statu Ecclesiæ* was known, he became the object of ceaseless persecutions. Pope Pius VI showed himself especially the enemy of Hontheim. The ex-Jesuit Beck, privy councillor of the elector Clement Wenceslas, not satisfied with persecuting Hontheim, persecuted also all the members of his family, most of whom held offices in the province of Trier. The old man (Hontheim was then nearly seventy-nine), tired of all these annoyances, and perhaps frightened at the prospect of what he might still have to undergo, finally gave way, and submitted to the pope. When his recantation reached Rome in 1778, Pius VI held a special consistory in order to apprise the whole Roman Catholic world of the event; but several Roman Catholic governments opposed the publication of the acts of this consistory in their states. Moreover, the effects of the dispute had been too widely felt to be obliterated by a tardy expression of repentance. The author himself wrote to his friends, "I gave way, like Fénelon, in order to avoid ceaseless annoyance. My recantation can do no harm to the Christian religion, neither can it in any way benefit the court of Rome; the thinking world has read my arguments, and has indorsed them." Some of the more liberal-minded Roman Catholic historians say that Hontheim, in his (first) recantation, declared his object to have been to effect a union of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches. He believed that this could only be accomplished by altering or removing some of the institutions of the Romish Church. Later, he modified his recantation greatly by a subsequent *Commentary* (Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1781), to which cardinal Gardi replied, at the special request of the pope. But eventually Hontheim made full submission to the Church. In 1788 he resigned his charges, and spent the last years of his life on his estate of Monquentin, in Luxemburg. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 91; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 255; Hase, *Church Hist.* p. 528; Möhler, *Symbolism*, p. 45; Menzel, *Neuere Gesch. d. Deutschen*, xi, 456 sq.; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch.* ii, 343 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxii, 13; *s. d. Reform.* vi, 532 sq.; Walch, *Neueste Relig. Gesch.* i, 145 sq.; vii, 175 sq., 210 sq., 453 sq.; Henke, *Kirchengesch.* vii, 133 sq.; Baur, *Gallerie hist. Gemälde d. 18ten Jahrh.* iv, 402 sq.; Kurtz, *Text-book of Ch. History*, ii, 234; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 528. On the Roman Catholic side: Aschbach, *Kirch.-Lex.* ii, 745 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 324 sq.; *Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschl.* v, 473; Werner, *Gesch. d. kathol. Theol.* p. 209 sq., 273, and especially *Briefwechsel zw. d. Churfürsten Clemens Wene, v. Trier u. d. Weihbisch. N. v. Honheim ü. d. Buch J. Fabronius*, etc. (Frankfort-a-M. 1813).

Hood (צָנִיף, *tsaniph'*), a *tiara* round the head, spoken of a female head-band (Isa. iii, 23); elsewhere rendered "diadem," e. g. a man's *turban* (Job xxix, 14); the high-priest's "*mitre*" (Zech. iii, 5); the king's *crown* (Isa. lxii, 3, marg.). See HEAD-DRESS, etc.

HOOD (Saxon *hod;* comp. Germ. *hut*, hat), borrowed from the Roman *cuculus*, is (1.) the *cowl* of a monk. (2.) In England, an ornamental fold that hangs down the back of a graduate to mark his degree. This part of the dress was formerly not intended for distinction and ornament, but for use. It was generally fastened to the back of the cope or other vesture, and in case of rain or cold was drawn over the head. In the universities the hoods of the graduates were made to signify their degrees by varying the colors and materials. By the fifty-eighth canon of the Church of England "every minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the sacraments, or other rites of the Church, if they are graduates, shall wear upon their surplices, at such times, such hoods as by the orders of the universities are agreeable to their degrees."—Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s. v.; Wheatly, *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 102, 103.

Hoof (פַּרְסָה, *parsah'*, *cloven*, i. e. a cleft hoof as of neat cattle, Exod. x, 26; Ezek. xxii; Mic. iv, 13, etc.; hence of the horse, though not cloven, Isa. v, 28; Jer. xlvii, 3; "claws" of any animal, Zech. xi, 16). In Lev. xi, 3 sq.; Deut. iv, 6 sq., the "parting of the hoof" is made one of the main distinctions between clean and unclean animals; and this is applied even to the camel, after a popular rather than a scientific classification. See CAMEL.

Hooght, EBERHARD VAN DER, a distinguished Dutch Orientalist, was born in the latter half of the 17th century. He was a Reformed preacher at Nieuwendam, but spent the greater part of his time in the study of the Oriental languages, especially the Hebrew. He died in 1716. He wrote *Janua linguæ sanctæ* (Amst. 1687, 4to; ibid. 1696 [?], 8vo):—*Medulla gramm. Hebr.* (Amst. 1696, 8vo):—*Syntaxis Ebræa, Chald. et Syr.*:—*Lex. Novum Test. Græco-Latinum*, etc. Especially celebrated is his edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* (Amsterd. and Utrecht, 1705, Oxf. 1750, London, 1774, and often; lately again by Tauchnitz, Lpz. 1835, and often).—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 524; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* ii, 381; iv, 117. See CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

Hoogstraten (also called HOCHSTRATEN), JACOB VAN, prior of the Dominican convent of Cologne, and an ardent adversary of Reuchlin, Luther, and Erasmus, was born at Brabant in 1454. He studied at the University of Cologne without much success. Nevertheless, he was received master of arts in 1485, and afterwards made prior. His great zeal and opposition to the Reformation secured him the nomination of inquisitor at Louvain, besides a professorship of theology at the University of Cologne, for which he was in nowise qualified. In 1513 he summoned Reuchlin to appear before him, thereby transcending his powers, as Reuchlin, residing in another state, could only be summoned by the provincial of the order. He had already published his *Libellus accusatorius contra speculum ocul. Joh. Reuchlini*, when the chapter of Mentz took Reuchlin's case in hand. But pope Leo X gave commission to bishop George of Speer to settle the controversy. Hoogstraten, not appearing, lost his cause, and was condemned to pay the costs; but, as he refused to submit to the decree, the whole matter was brought before Leo X, and Hoogstraten was summoned to Rome. Unwilling either to offend the humanists in the person of Reuchlin, or the powerful Dominicans represented by Hoogstraten, the pope issued a *mandatum de supersedendo.* Returning to Cologne, Hoogstraten published in 1518 two so-called Apologies, full of malice, and in 1519 his *Destructio cabalæ, seu cabalistæ perfidiæ a Joh. Reuchlino seu Capnione* (Col. 1519). He also opposed Luther in the most violent manner, proposing that he should be burned at once. Hoogstraten died at Cologne Jan. 21, 1527. His collected works were published at Cologne in 1526. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 257; Echard, *Scriptor. Ord. Prædicatorum;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 105; Raumer, *Gesch. Europa's*, i, 210; Mayerhoff, *Joh. Reuchlin u. s. Zeit*, p. 158 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxx, 248; *s. d. Reform.* i, 139; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* iii, 471 sq.; Mosheim, *Church History*, iii, 22.

Hook is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the following terms in the original. See also FISH-HOOK; FLESH-HOOK; PRUNING-HOOK. The idea of a *thorn* enters into the etymology of several of them, probably because a thorn, *hooked* or straight, was the earliest instrument of this kind. Tacitus thus describes the dress of the ancient Germans. "A loose mantle, fastened with a clasp, or, when that cannot be had, with a thorn" (*Germ.* 17). See THORN.

1. חָח, *chach* (lit. a *thorn*), a *ring* inserted in the nostrils of animals, to which a cord was fastened in order to lead them about or tame them (2 Kings xix, 28; Isa. xxxvii, 29; Ezek. xxix, 4; xxxviii, 4; compare Job xl, 26); also a "chain" for a captive (Ezek. xix, 4, 9), and "bracelets" for females (Exod. xxv, 22, where others a *nose-ring*, others a *clasp* for fastening the dress). In the first two of the above passages, Jehovah intimates his

absolute control over Sennacherib by an allusion to the practice of leading buffaloes, camels, dromedaries, etc., by means of a cord, or of a cord attached to a *ring*, passed through the nostrils (Shaw, *Travels*, p. 167-8, 2d ed.). Such a ring is oftentimes placed through the nose of a bull, and is likewise used in the East for leading about lions, camels, and other animals. A similar method was adopted for leading prisoners, as in the case of Manasseh, who was led with rings (2 Chron. xxxiii, 11). An illustration of this practice is found in a bas-relief discovered at Khorsabad (Layard, ii, 376; see also the cut under EYE). The term מוֹקֵשׁ is used in a similar

Ancient Assyrian Hook of Bronze (belonging, as Layard thinks, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 178, to some part of a chariot or horse-trappings).

sense in Job xl, 24 (A.V. "bore his nose with a gin." margin). Another form of the same term, חוֹחַ (A.V. "thorn"), is likewise properly a *ring* placed through the mouth of a large fish, and attached by a cord (אַגְמֹן) to a stake for the purpose of keeping it alive in the water (Job xli, 2); the word meaning the *cord* is rendered "hook" in the A.V. See below.

2. The cognate word חַכָּה, *chakkah'*, means a *fish-hook* (Job xli, i, "angle;" Isa. xix, 8; Hab. i, 15). This passage in Job has occasioned the following speculations (see, for instance, Harris's *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, art. Leviathan, Lond. 1825). It has been assumed that Bochart has completely proved the Leviathan to mean the *crocodile* (Rosenmüller on Bochart, iii, 737, etc., 769, etc., Lips. 1796). Herodotus has then been quoted, where he relates that the Egyptians near Lake Mœris select a crocodile, render him tame, and suspend ornaments to his ears, and sometimes gems of great value; his fore feet being adorned with *bracelets* (ii, 69); and the mummies of crocodiles, having their ears thus bored, have been discovered (Kenrick's *Egypt of Herodotus*, p. 97, Lond. 1841). Hence it is concluded that this passage in Job refers to the facts mentioned by Herodotus; and, doubtless, the terms employed, especially by the Sept. and Vulg., and the *third and following verses*, favor the supposition, for there the captive is represented as suppliant and obsequious, in a state of security and servitude, and the object of diversion, "played with" as with a bird, and serving for the sport of maidens. Herodotus is further quoted to show that in his time the Egyptians captured the crocodile with a hook (*ἄγκιστρον*), with which (*ἐξελκύσθη εἰς τὴν γῆν*) he was *drawn* ashore; and accounts are certainly given by modern travelers of the continuance of this practice (Maillet, *Descrip. d'Egypte*, ii, 127, ed. Hag., 1740). But does not the *entire description* go upon the supposition of the *impossibility* of so treating *Leviathan?* Supposing the allusions to be correctly interpreted, is it not as much as to say, 'Canst thou treat *him* as thou canst treat the crocodile and *other fierce* creatures?" Dr. Lee has, indeed, given reasons which render it *doubtful*, at least, whether the leviathan *does* mean the crocodile in this passage, or whether it does not mean some species of *whale*, as was formerly supposed—the *Delphinus orca communis*, or common grampus, found in the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and also in the Nile. (See his examination of Bochart's reasonings, etc., in *Translation and Notes on Job*, p. 197 and 529-539, Lond. 1837). So the above term in Ezek. xxix, "I will put my hooks in thy jaws, and I will *cause thee to come up out of the midst of thy rivers*," where the prophet foretells the destruction of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, by allusions to the destruction, possibly, of a crocodile, the symbol of Egypt. Thus Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* viii, 25) states, that the Tentyritæ (inhabitants of Egypt) followed the crocodile, swimming after it in the river, sprung upon its back, thrust a bar into its mouth, which being held by its two extremities, serves as a bit, and enables them *to force it on shore* (comp. Ezek. xxix, 3, 4). Strabo relates that the Tentyritæ displayed their feats before the Romans (xvii, 560, ed. Casaub.). See LEVIATHAN.

3. וָו, *vav*, a *peg* or pin, upon which the curtains of the Tabernacle were hung, springing out of the capitals (Exod. xxvi, 32, etc.). The Sept. and Jerome seem to have understood the *capitals of the pillars;* and it has been urged that this is more likely to be the meaning than *hooks*, especially as 1775 shekels of silver were used in making these וָוִים for the pillars, overlaying the chapiters, and filleting them (ch. xxxviii, 28), and that the *hooks* are really the קרסים, *taches* (Exod. xxvi, 6, 11, 33, 35; xxxix, 33). Yet the Sept. also renders ווים, *κρίκοι*, *rings* or *clasps* (Exod. xxvii, 10, 11, and *ἀγκύλαι*, Exod. xxxviii, 17, 19); and from a comparison of these two latter passages, it would seem that these hooks, or rather *tenters*, rose out of the chapiters or heads of the pillars. The word seems to have given name to the letter ו in the Hebrew alphabet, possibly from a similarity of the form in which the latter appears in the Greek *Digamma*, to that of a hook. Mr. Paine (*Solomon's Temple*, etc., p. 25) regards these "hooks" as having been rather *pins* driven into the heads of the pillars, and thus projecting upward from them like a small tenon, upon which the silver rods were slipped by means of a small hole or eye in the latter. This would serve to keep the pillars together. See TABERNACLE.

4. צִנָּה, *tsinnah'* (lit. *thorn*), a *fish-hook* (Amos iv, 2; elsewhere a *shield*). See FISHING, etc.; ANGLE.

In the same verse, סִירוֹת, *siroth'*, "fish-hooks," where both Sept. and Vulg. seem to have taken סיר in the sense of a pot or caldron instead of a fish-hook. See CALDRON.

5. מַזְלֵג, *mazleg'* (1 Sam. ii, 13, 14), "flesh-hook," and the מִזְלָגוֹת, "the flesh-hooks" (Exod. xxvii, 3, and elsewhere). This was evidently in the first passage a trident "of three teeth," a kind of fork, etc., for turning the sacrifices on the fire, and for collecting fragments, etc. See FLESH-HOOK.

6. מַזְמֵרוֹת, *mazmeroth'* (Isa. ii, 4, and elsewhere), "beat their spears into pruning-hooks" (*δρέπανα*, *falces*). The Roman poets have the same metaphor (Martial, xiv, 34, "Falx ex ense"). In Mic. iv, 3, *in ligones*, weeding-hooks, or shovels, spades, etc. Joel reverses the metaphor "pruning-hooks" into spears (iii, 10, *ligones*); and so Ovid (*Fasti*, i, 697, *in pila ligones*). See PRUNING-HOOK.

7. Doubtful is שְׁפַתַּיִם, *shephatta'yim*, *stalls* for cattle ("pots," Psa. lxviii, 13), also the cedar beams in the Temple court with hooks for flaying the victims (Ezek. xl, 43). Other meanings given are ledges (Vulg. *labia*), or eaves, as though the word were שְׂפָתַיִם; pens for keeping the animals previous to their being slaughtered; hearth-stones, as in the margin of the A.V.; and, lastly, gutters to receive and carry off the blood from the slaughtered animals. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1470) explains the term as signifying *stalls* in the courts of the Temple where the sacrificial victims were fastened: our translators give in the margin "endirons, or the two hearth-stones." The Sept. seems equally at a loss, *καὶ π λαιστὴν ἕξουσι γεῖσος*; as also Jerome, who renders it *labia*. Schleusner pronounces *γεῖσος* to be a barbarous word formed from חריץ, and understands *epistylium*, a little pillar set on another, and *capitellum*, columned. The Chaldee renders צינקלין, short posts in the house of the slaughterers on which to suspend the sacrifices. Dr. Lightfoot, in his chapter "on the altar, the rings, and the laver," observes, "On the north side of the altar were six orders of rings, each of which contained

six, at which they killed the sacrifices. Near by were *low pillars* set up, upon which were laid overthwart beams of cedar; on these were fastened rows of *hooks*, on which the sacrifices were hung; and they were flayed on marble tables, which were between these pillars" (see vers. 41, 42; *Works*, vol. xi, ch. xxxiv; Lond. 1684–5–6). See TEMLPE.

8. Obviously an incorrect rendering for אַגְמוֹן, *agmon'*, a *rush-rope*, used for binding animals, perhaps by means of the ring in their nose (Job xli, 2; elsewhere "rush" or "caldron"). See FLAG.

9. Finally, δρεπανηφόρα in 2 Macc. xiii, 2 is rendered "armed with hooks," referring to the *scythe*-armed chariots of the ancients. See CHARIOT.

Hook, JAMES, LL.D., an English prelate, was born in London in 1771, and educated at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. He became archdeacon of Huntingdon in 1814, dean of Worcester in 1825, and held also other preferments in the English Church. He died in 1828. Besides some dramatic pieces and novels which are ascribed to Hook, he published *Anguis in Herba, a true Sketch of the Church of England and her Clergy* (Lond. 1802, 8vo):—*Sermons*, etc. (1812, 8vo, and another series in 1818, 8vo). For a biographical sketch of Hook, see the *London Gent. Mag.* April, 1828.—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 875.

Hooke, Luce Joseph, a French theologian of English origin, was born about 1716, and educated at the seminary of "Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet." He received the doctor's degree from the Sorbonne, and was appointed professor of theology in 1750. The following year he presided at the discussion of abbé Parades's (q. v.) thesis, which contained many heterodox doctrines, and which he had signed without reading. Hooke was deposed from his professorship; but the professors of the Sorbonne and of the College of Navarre interceded in his behalf, and obtained the revocation of the order. At the outbreak of the French Revolution he was made librarian of the Mazarin Library, but he held this place only a short time, when he retired to St. Cloud. He died in 1796. Hooke published *Religionis naturalis revelatæ et Catholicæ Principia* (Paris, 1754, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1774, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Discours et Réflex. crit. sur l'hist. et le gouvernement de l'anc. Rome* (Paris, 1770–84, 4 vols. 12mo—a translation of one of his father's works from the English):—*Principe sur la Nature et l'Essence du Pouvoir de l'Église* (Paris, 1791, 8vo). (J. H. W.)

Hooke, William, a Congregational minister, was born in Southampton in 1601, and educated at Trinity College, Oxford. After having received orders in the Church of England, he became vicar of Axmouth, in Devonshire. About 1636 he emigrated to this country, as his nonconforming views had caused him considerable trouble, and in 1644 or 1645 he was installed pastor at New Haven, Conn. He was by marriage a cousin of Oliver Cromwell, after whose ascendency he returned to England, and became Cromwell's domestic chaplain. After the death of Cromwell, Hooke became an ejected and silenced minister, and he spent his remaining days in retirement. He died near London March 21, 1678. Besides several sermons—among them, *New England's Tears for Old England's Fears*, a Fast sermon (Taunton, 1640, London, 1641, 4to), which is considered one of the best productions of his day—he published *The Privileges of the Saints on Earth beyond those in Heaven*, etc., containing also a *Discourse on the Gospel Day* (1673).—Sprague, *Ann. Am. Pulpit*, i, 104 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 878.

Hooker, Asahel, a Congregational minister, was born in Bethlehem, Conn., Aug. 29, 1762. He graduated at Yale College in 1789, and was installed pastor at Goshen in September, 1791. This charge he resigned on account of ill health June 12, 1810. After preaching in various pulpits, he became pastor of Chelsea parish, Norwich, Conn., Jan. 16, 1812, where he remained until his death, April 19, 1813. Mr. Hooker published several occasional sermons, and a number of articles in the *Connecticut Evangelical Magazine*.—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 316.

Hooker, Herman, D.D., a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Poultney, Vt., in 1804; graduated at Middlebury College in 1825, and later at the Princeton Theological Seminary, and was licensed as a Presbyterian, with great promise both as a scholar and speaker. He finally joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, but the partial loss of his sight and of his voice soon compelled his retirement from the ministry; and he became a bookseller at Philadelphia, continuing, however, at the same time, his theological studies. He died at Philadelphia, Pa., Sept. 26, 1865. His principal works are, *The Portion of the Soul* (Philad. 1835, 32mo, and republished in England):—*Popular Infidelity* (Philadel. 1836, 12mo):—*Family Book of Devotion* (1836, 8vo):—*The Uses of Adversity and the Provisions of Consolation* (Philad. 1846, 18mo):—*Thoughts and Maxims* (Philad. 1847, 16mo):—*The Christian Life a Fight of Faith* (Philad. 1848, 18mo). He also published a large number of English and American works. "Dr. Hooker was a vigorous and close thinker, a clear writer, a devout and conscientious Christian, full of true and consistent charity. He made the Nashotah Seminary a residuary legatee, which bequest probably amounted to about $10,000." See *Church Rev.* Jan. 1866; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 878.

Hooker, Richard, one of the most eminent divines in the history of the Church of England, was born in or near Exeter about 1553, according to Walton, or about Easter, 1554, according to Wood. His early education was received at the expense of his uncle, John Hooker, chamberlain of Exeter, and he was afterwards introduced by the same relative to the notice of bishop Jewel, who procured him in 1567 a clerkship in Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In December, 1573, he became a student in that college, and a fellow and master of arts in 1577. In 1579 he was appointed lecturer on Hebrew in the university, and in October of the same year he was expelled his college, with Dr. John Reynolds and three other fellows, but he was restored the same month. About two years after he took orders, and was appointed to preach at Paul's Cross. Having married the following year, he lost his fellowship, but he was presented to the living of Drayton-Beauchamp, in Bucks, by John Cherry, Esq., in 1584. Through the influence of the archbishop of York, he was appointed Master of the Temple in 1585. Here he became engaged in a controversy on Church discipline and some points of doctrine with Walter Travers, afternoon lecturer at the Temple, who had been ordained by the Presbytery at Antwerp, and held most of the opinions of the divines of Geneva. Travers, being silenced by archbishop Whitgift, appealed to the privy council, but without success. His petition to the council was published, and answered by Hooker. Travers had many adherents in the Temple, and it was their opposition, according to Izaak Walton, which induced Hooker to commence his work on the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Finding that he had not leisure at the Temple to complete that work, he applied to Whitgift for removal to a more quiet station, and was accordingly presented to the living of Boscombe in Wiltshire in 1591. On the 17th of July in the same year he was made a prebendary of Salisbury. At Boscombe he finished four books of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, which were published in 1594. On the 7th of July, 1595, he was presented by the queen to the living of Bishopsbourne in Kent, which he held till his death, on the 2d of November, 1600. "Hooker's manner was grave even in childhood; the mildness of his temper was proved by his moderation in controversy; and his piety and learning procured him the general esteem of his contemporaries. His great work is his defence of the constitution and discipline of the Church of England, in eight books,

under the title of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity.* This work obtained during the author's lifetime the praise of a pope (Clement VIII) and a king (James I), and has ever since been looked upon as one of the chief bulwarks of the Church of England and of ecclesiastical establishments in general. As a work of solid learning, profound reasoning, and breadth and sustained dignity of style, it is indeed beyond praise; but the common objection is a just one, that Hooker's reasoning is too frequently that of an advocate. The publication of the first four books has been mentioned above; the fifth was published in 1597. He completed the last three books, but they were not published till several years after his death. The account which Walton gives of the mutilation of the last three books is very improbable, and little doubt can be entertained of their authenticity, though they are certainly imperfect, and probably not in the condition in which he left them" (*English Cyclopædia*). Hooker was charged with Romanizing tendencies, but the charge had no better foundation than his prelatical theory of the Church. For a series of shrewd and genial notes and criticisms on Hooker, see Coleridge, *Complete Works*, N. Y. edition, v, 28 sq. Of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* many separate editions have appeared. *His Works, with Life*, edited by Dr. Gauden, were published in London, 1662 (fol.); again in 1666 (fol.), with life by Izaak Walton. The latest editions are Hanbury's, with life of Cartwright, and Notes, from the dissenting point of view (London, 1830, 3 vols. 8vo); Keble's (Lond. 1836, 4 vols. 8vo, and 1841, 3 vols. 8vo; without the Introduction and notes, 2 vols. 8vo). See Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, vi, 126 sq.; Orme, *Life of Baxter*, i, 22; Stanley, *Life of Arnold*, ii, 64; Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, ii, 98; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 880; Grant, *Ch. Hist.* i, 443; Baxter, *Ch. Hist. of Engl.* p. 489, 537 sq., 543; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, i, 206; Bennett, *Hist. of the Dissenters*, p. 226; Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of Engl.* p. 29 sq.; Cunningham, *Ch. Principles*, p. 321, 391 sq.; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* (see Index, vol. ii); Lecky, *Hist. of Rationalism*, ii, 79, 199 sq.; Bickersteth, *Stud. Assist.* p. 245; Tulloch, *English Puritanism and its Leaders*, p. 24 sq.; Calamy, *Hist. Account of my Life*, i, 235 sq.; ii, 236; *Journ. Sac. Lit.* xxvii, 467; *Theolog. Magazine*, vol. ii.

Hooker, Thomas, an eminent Congregational minister, was born July 7, 1586, at Marfield, Leicestershire, Eng. He was successively student and professor at Emanuel College, Cambridge. After preaching a short time in London, he settled in 1626 at Chelmsford as assistant minister. In 1630 he was silenced by archbishop Laud for nonconformity, and enjoined, under a bond of fifty pounds, to come before the Court of High Commission; but forfeiting the bond, he escaped to Holland, and remained three years, when he returned, and sailed, July, 1633, for Boston. He arrived in this country Sept. 4, and was ordained first pastor of the church in Cambridge, Oct. 11. After a stay of nearly three years (June, 1636), in company with Mr. Stone, the teacher in his church, and others, he started into what was then the wilderness, and settled at Hartford. He died at that place July 7, 1647. Hooker published *The Soul's Ingrafting into Christ* (1637):—*The Soul's Implantation; a Treatise containing The Broken Heart, The Preparing of the Heart, The Soul's Ingrafting into Christ, Spiritual Love and Joy* (1637):—*The Soul's Preparation for Christ* (1638):—*The Unbeliever's Preparation for Christ*, parts i and ii (1638):—*The Soul's Exaltation—embracing Union with Christ, Benefits of Union with Christ, and Justification* (1638):—*The Soul's Vocation, or Effectual Calling to Christ* (1638):—*Ten Particular Rules to be practised every day by Converted Christians* (1641):—*Survey of the Sum of Church Discipline* (1648):—*Christ's Prayer for Believers; a Series of Discourses founded on John* xvii, 20-26 (1657):—*The Soul's Possession of Christ:—The Soul's Justification; eleven Sermons on* 2 *Corinthians* v, 21; *Proverbs* i, 28, 29; and a number of occasional sermons. See Neal, *Hist. of N. England*; Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 317; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 192, 298; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, i, 317; *Contrib. to Eccles. Hist. of Connecticut* (1861, 8vo), p. 16, 23, 87, 404, 412.

Hooper, George, D.D., an English prelate, born in Worcestershire in 1640, was educated at St. Paul's and Westminster School, and afterwards at Christ Church, Oxford. He first became chaplain of Morley, bishop of Winchester, and, later, archbishop Sheldon gave him the living of Lambeth. In 1677 he was appointed almoner of the princess of Orange. On the accession of William, the queen chose Hooper for her chaplain, and he was appointed dean of Canterbury in 1691. In 1703 he was made bishop of St. Asaph, and in March following was transferred to the see of Bath and Wells. He died at Barkley, Somersetshire, in September, 1727. His principal works are, *A fair and methodical Discussion of the first and great Controversy between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, concerning the Infallible Guide* (Lond. 1687):—*De Valentinianorum Hæresi Conjecturæ, quibus illius origo ex Ægyptiaca theologia deducitur* (ibid. 1711):—*An Inquiry into Ancient Measures, etc., and especially the Jewish, with an Appendix concerning our old English Money and Measures of Content* (ib. 1721). There has been but one complete edition of his *Works*, namely, that published by Dr. Hunt, Hebrew professor (Oxf. 1757, fol.). See Todd, *Lives of the Deans of Canterbury;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 124.

Hooper (HOPER, or HOUPER), **John,** an English bishop, and one of the martyrs of the Reformation, was born in Somersetshire about 1495. He was educated at Merton College, Oxford. Having embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, he was obliged to leave the university, and finally the country in 1540. He went to Switzerland, passing most of his time at Zurich. On the accession of Edward VI (1547) he returned to England, and acquired great reputation in London as a preacher. In 1550 he was made bishop of Gloucester, but his repugnance to wearing the vestments of that office caused considerable delay in his consecration. After entering on his duties, he labored with great zeal for the cause of the Reformation. In 1552 he was appointed bishop of Worcester *in commendam.* In the early part of the reign of Mary (1553), he was arrested and condemned to be burned at the stake for his Protestant zeal. He firmly refused all offers of pardon which required the abandonment of his principles, and though, on account of the wood with which he was burned being green, he suffered the severest torments for nearly an hour, he manifested unshaken fortitude. He died Feb. 9, 1555. Hooper was the author of a number of sermons and controversial treatises. Among his best works are *A Declaration of Christ and his Office* (1547, 8vo):—*Lesson of the Incarnation of Christ* (1549, 8vo):—*Twelve Lectures on the Creed* (1581, 8vo). Several letters of Hooper are preserved in the archives of Zurich. We have recent reprints, by the Parker Society, of *The Early Writings of Bishop Hooper*, edited by the Rev. S. Carr (Cambridge, 1843, 8vo); and of his *Later Writings, with Letters*, etc., edited by the Rev. C. Nevinson (Cambridge, 1852, 8vo). A sketch of his life and writings is given in the *British Reformers*, vol. iv (Lond. Tract Society). See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. i; Fox, *Book of Martyrs;* Middleton, *Evangel. Biogr.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 123; Burnet, *Hist. of Engl. Reformation*, vols. ii and iii; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, vi, 148; Tulloch (John), *Engl. Puritanism and its Leaders* (1861, 12mo), p. 8 sq.; Baxter, *Ch. Hist. of Engl.* p. 408, 446; Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches*, p. 8 sq.; Middleton, *Reformers*, iii, 242; Hardwick, *Reform.* p. 215 sq., 409, 425 sq.; Wesley, *Works*, ii, 292; v, 368; vi, 67, 197; Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* v, 376 sq.; Fuller, *Ch. Hist.* iv, bk. vii, p. 66; *Brit. and For. Rev.* Oct. 1868, p. 881; Soames, *Hist. of the Reform.* iii, 558 sq.; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, i, 51 sq.; Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters*, p. 133; Pun-

chard (George), *Hist. of Congregationalism* (N. Y. 1865, 2 vols. 12mo), ii, 194 sq., 297.

Hoornbeek, Johann, a distinguished Dutch divine, was born at Harlem Nov. 4, 1617. He entered the ministry at Cologne in 1639, and was appointed to Utrecht as minister and professor of theology in 1644. In 1654 he went to Leyden as professor, where he died Sept. 1, 1666. He was a prolific and much esteemed writer. Among those of his works which may yet be of interest to the scholar are, *Epistola ad Joh. Duræum de Independentismo* (Lugd. Bat. 1659):—*Brevis instit. studii theologici* (Ultraj. 1658):—*Summa controversiarum religionis* (1653), which is still, with Spanheim's, one of the most useful compendiums of reformed polemics:—*Socinianismus confutatus* (Utrecht and Amst. 1650–1664, 3 vols. 4to), an extract of which was given by Knibble (Leyd. 1690):—*Miscellanea Sacra* (Utrecht, 1677). Of especial value is his *Theologia practica cum irenica* (Ultraj. 1663–1698, 3 vols. 4to; new edit. 1672).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 260; Bayle, *Gen. Dictionary*, s. v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, vi, 149; Stäudlin, *Geschichte d. theol. Moral s. d. Wiederauflebung d. Wissenschaft*, p. 429 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reform.* viii, 603 sq.; Gass, *Gesch. d. Dogmat.* ii, 287, 293.

Hope (ἐλπίς), a term used in Scripture generally to denote the desire and expectation of some good (1 Cor. ix, 10); specially to denote the assured expectation of salvation, and of all minor blessings included in salvation, for this life and the life to come, through the merits of Christ. (1.) It is one of the three great elements of Christian life and character (1 Cor. xiii, 13). Faith is the root, love the fruit-bearing stem, and hope the heaven-reaching crown of the tree of Christian life. Faith appropriates the grace of God in the facts of salvation; love is the animating spirit of our present Christian life; while hope takes hold of the future as belonging to the Lord, and to those who are his. The kingdom of God, past, present, and future, is thus reflected in faith, love, and hope. Hope is joined to faith and love because spiritual life, though present, is yet not accomplished. It stands in opposition to seeing or possessing (Rom. viii, 24 sq.; 1 John iii, 2 sq.); but it is not the mere wish or aspiration for liberation and light which is common to all creation (Rom. viii, 19–22), nor the mere reception of the doctrine of a future life, which may be found even among the heathen philosophers. It is, beyond these, the assurance that the spiritual life which dwells in us here will be prolonged into eternity. Hence, in the scriptures of the N. T., Christians are said to have *hope* rather than *hopes* (Rom. xv, 4, 13; Heb. iii, 6; vi, 11, 18). The Holy Spirit imparted to believers is the ground and support of their hope (1 Pet. i, 3; Acts xxiii, 6; 2 Cor. v, 5; Rom. viii, 11; xv, 13; Gal. v, 5). Hence the notion of hope appeared first in the disciples in its full force and true nature, *after* the resurrection of Christ and the descent of the Holy Ghost. In the O. Test. we do not find it with its significance (see Heb. vii, 19).

Thus hope is an essential and fundamental element of Christian life, so essential, indeed, that, like faith and love, it can itself designate the essence of Christianity (1 Pet. iii, 15; Heb. x, 23). In it the whole glory of the Christian vocation is centred (Eph. i, 18; iv, 4); it is the real object of the propagation of evangelical faith (Tit. i, 2; Col. i, 5, 23), for the most precious possessions of the Christian, the σωτηρία, ἀπολύτρωσις, υἱοθεσία, δικαιοσύνη, are, in their fulfilment, the object of his hope (1 Thess. v, 8 sq.; Rom. viii, 23; comp. Ezech. i, 14; iv, 30; Gal. v, 5; 2 Tim. iv, 8). Unbelievers are expressly designated as those who are without hope (Eph. ii, 12; 1 Thess. iv, 13), because they are without God in the world, for God is a God of hope (Rom. xv, 13; 1 Pet. i, 21). But the actual object of hope is Christ, who is himself called ἡ ἐλπίς, not only because in him we place all our dependence (the general sense of ἐλπίς), but especially because it is in his second coming that the Christian's hope of glory shall be fulfilled (1 Tim. i, 1; Col. i, 27; Tit. ii, 13). The *fruit* of hope is that through it we are enabled patiently and steadfastly to bear the difficulties and trials of our present existence, and thus the ὑπομονή is a constant accompaniment of the ἐλπίς (1 Thess. i, 3; Rom. viii, 25), and even is sometimes put in its place with faith and love (Tit. ii, 2; compare 2 Tim. iii, 10; 1 Tim. vi, 11). As it is the source of the believer's patience in suffering, so it is also the cause of his fidelity and firmness in action, since he knows that his labor "is not in vain in the Lord" (1 Cor. xv, 58). Christianity is the religion of hope, and it is an essential point of its absolute character, for whatever is everlasting and eternal is absolute. To the Christian, as such, it is therefore not time, but eternity; not the present, but the future life, which is the object of his efforts and hope. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop*, vi, 195; Krehl, *N. T. Handwörterbuch*, p. 372.

(2.) "One scriptural mark," says Wesley, "of those who are born of God, is hope. Thus St. Peter, speaking to all the children of God who were then scattered abroad, saith, 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope' (1 Pet. i, 3)—ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν, a *lively* or *living* hope, saith the apostle, because there is also a *dead* hope as well as a dead faith; a hope which is not from God, but from the enemy of God and man, as evidently appears by its fruits, for as it is the offspring of pride, so it is the parent of every evil word and work; whereas, every man that hath in him the living hope is 'holy as he that calleth him is holy'—every man that can truly say to his brethren in Christ, 'Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and we shall see him as he is,' 'purifieth himself even as he is pure.' This hope (termed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. x, 22, πληροφορία πίστεως, and elsewhere πληροφορία ἐλπίδος, ch. vi, 11; in our translation, 'the full assurance of faith, and the full assurance of hope,' expressions the best which our language could afford, although far weaker than those in the original), as described in Scripture, implies, first, the testimony of our own spirit or conscience that we walk 'in simplicity and godly sincerity;' but, secondly and chiefly, the testimony of the Spirit of God 'bearing witness with' or to 'our spirit that we are the children of God,' 'and if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.'" The passage, "Thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mother's breasts" (Psa. xxi, 9), suggests that hope is an inbred sentiment. Considered as such, it implies (*a*) a future state of existence; (*b*) that progress in blessedness is the law of our being; (*c*) that the Christian life is adapted to our constitution. See, besides the works above cited, *Homilist*, v, 116; Jay, *Sermons*, vol. ii; Tyerman, *Essay on Christian Hope* (Lond. 1816, 8vo); Craig, *Christian Hope* (Lond. 1820, 18mo); Garbett, *Sermons*, i, 489; Wesley, *Sermons*, i, 157; Liddon, *Our Lord's Divinity* (Bampton Lecture), p. 72, 75; Martensen, *Dogmatics*, p. 450 sq.; Pye Smith, *Christian Theology*, p. 622 sq.; Pearson, *On the Creed*, i, 24, 401, 460, 501; Fletcher, *Works* (see Index, vol. iv); *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* x, 694; Bates, *Works* (see Index in vol. iv); Harless, *System of Ethics* (Clark's Theol. Libr.), p. 174 sq.; Nitzsch, *System d. christl. Lehre*, § 209 sq.

Hope, Matthew B., a distinguished Presbyterian minister, and professor at Princeton, was born in Pennsylvania in 1812, and was educated at Jefferson College in that state. He entered the theological seminary at Princeton in 1831, and, after completing his theological course, he also studied medicine, and received the appropriate degree from the University of Pennsylvania: his object, in this additional course of study, being the more completely to prepare himself for the missionary work. He was ordained as a missionary, and stationed at Singapore, India; but his health failing him, he returned home, after a stay of two years only. He was soon afterwards elected assistant secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Education. In 1846 he accepted the

office of professor of belles-lettres in the College of New Jersey. In 1854 he was also made professor of political economy. During the fourteen years of his connection with the college, he continued in the diligent and thorough discharge of the duties of his professorship, with the exception of an interval of about fifteen months, the most of which was passed in Southern Europe, whither he had gone to seek some alleviation of a deeply-seated neuralgic affection. He died suddenly at Princeton, Dec. 17, 1859. He published a *Treatise of Rhetoric* (a syllabus for his college classes), and was a frequent contributor to the *Princeton Review.—Presbyterian*, Dec. 1859; *Presbyterian Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p. 90; *Newark Daily Advertiser*, Dec. 1859.

Höpfner, Heinrich, a German theologian, was born at Leipsic in 1582, and educated at the university of his native place, and at Jena and Wittenberg. In 1612 he was appointed professor of logic at Leipsic, and very soon after was called to Jena as professor of theology. He died in 1642. Höpfner wrote *Commentarii in veterem quam vocant logicam* (Leipsic, 1620):—*Tractatus in priorum et posteriorum Anal. libr. Aristotelis* (ibid. 1620):—*Saxonia evangelica* (ibid. 1625, 1672):—*De justificatione hominis peccatoris coram Deo* (ibid. 1639 and 1653; new ed. 1728 and often).—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 530.

Hoph'ni (Heb. *Chophni'*, חָפְנִי, perh. *pugilist*, according to others *client;* Sept. Ὀφνί), the first-named of the two sons of the high-priest Eli (1 Sam. i, 3; ii, 34), who fulfilled their hereditary sacerdotal duties at Shiloh. Their brutal rapacity and lust, which seemed to acquire fresh violence with their father's increasing years (1 Sam. ii, 22, 12-17), filled the people with disgust and indignation, and provoked the curse which was denounced against their father's house first by an unknown prophet (ver. 27-36), and then by the youthful Samuel in his first divine communication (1 Sam. iii, 11-14). They were both cut off in one day in the flower of their age, and the ark which they had accompanied to battle against the Philistines was lost on the same occasion (1 Sam. iv, 10, 11). B.C. cir. 1130. The predicted ruin and ejectment of Eli's house were fulfilled in the reign of Solomon. See Zadok. The unbridled licentiousness of these young priests gives us a terrible glimpse into the fallen condition of the chosen people (Ewald, *Gesch.* ii, 538-638). The Scripture calls them "sons of Belial" (1 Sam. ii, 12). See Eli.

Hoph'ra (Heb. *Chophra'*, חָפְרַע; Sept. Οὐαφρῆ [compare Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i, 143], Vulg. *Ephree*), or Pharaoh-Hophra, king of Egypt in the time of Zedekiah, king of Judah, and of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. B.C. 588. He formed alliance with the former against the latter, and his advance with an Egyptian army constrained the Chaldæans to raise the siege of Jerusalem (Jer. xxxvii, 5); but they soon returned, and took, and destroyed the city. This momentary aid, and the danger of placing reliance on the protection of Hophra, led Ezekiel to compare the Egyptians to a broken reed, which was to pierce the hand of him that leaned upon it (Ezek. xxxix, 6, 7). This alliance was, however, disapproved by God; and Jeremiah was authorized to deliver the prophecy contained in his forty-fourth chapter, which concludes with a prediction of Hophra's death, and the subjugation of his country by the Chaldæans. See Egypt.

This Pharaoh-Hophra is identified with the *Apries* (Ἀπρίης, Herod. ii, 161 sq., 169; iv, 159; Diod. Sic. i, 68; Ἀπρίας, Athen. xiii, 560) of ancient authors, and

ra *ho* *ph*

Hieroglyph of *Hophra*. (The first character, *ra*=the sun, i. e. king, is read last; the other characters, *hoph*, signify *servant* [Rossellini, I, iv, 201] or *priest* [ουηβ, Jablonsky, *Opusc.* i, 444].)

the *Ouaphris* (Οὐάφρις) of Manetho, the eighth king of the twenty-sixth or Saitic dynasty (Eusebius, *Chron.* i, 219). Under this identification, we may conclude that his wars with the Syrians and Cyrenæans prevented him from affording any great assistance to Zedekiah. Apries is described by Herodotus (ii, 169) as a monarch who, in the zenith of his glory, felt persuaded that it was not in the power even of a deity to dispossess him of his kingdom, or to shake the stability of his sway; and this account of his arrogance fully accords with that contained in the Bible. Ezekiel (xxix, 3) speaks of this king as "the great dragon that lieth in the midst of the rivers, which hath said, My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself." His overthrow and subsequent captivity and death are foretold with remarkable precision by Jeremiah (xliv, 30): "I will give Pharaoh-Hophra, king of Egypt, into the hands of his enemies, and into the hands of them that seek his life." This was brought about by a revolt of the troops, who placed Amasis at their head, and, after various conflicts, took Apries prisoner. B.C. 569. He was for a time kept in easy captivity by Amasis, who wished to spare his life; but he was at length constrained to give him up to the vengeance of his enemies, by whom he was strangled (Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 209 sq.). See Raphel, *De Pharaone Hophra*, Luneb. 1734.) See Pharaoh.

Hôpital (also Hospital), Michel de L'., a distinguished French statesman and opponent of the Inquisition, was born at Aigueperse, in Auvergne, about 1504. He studied law at Toulouse, and first became known as an advocate in the Parliament of Paris; and after discharging various public functions, he became chancellor of France in 1560, during the minority of Francis II. That country at this time was torn by contending factions. "The Guises, in particular, were powerful, ambitious, and intensely Catholic; and when one of the family, the Cardinal de Lorraine, wished to establish the Inquisition in the country, Hôpital boldly and firmly opposed it, and may be said to have saved France from that detestable institution. He summoned the states-general, which had not met for 80 years, and, being supported by the mass of moderate Catholics, he forced the Guises to yield." His speech at the opening of the assembly was worthy of his wise and magnanimous spirit: "Let us do away," said he, "with those diabolical words of Lutherans, Huguenots, and Papists—names of party and sedition; do not let us change the fair appellation of Christians." An ordinance was passed abolishing arbitrary taxes, regulating the feudal authority of the nobles, and correcting the abuses of the judicial system. He also secured various benefits for the persecuted Huguenots in various ways, but especially by the edict of pacification, which granted to the Protestants the free exercise of their religion (issued January 17, 1562). In 1568 he was instrumental in establishing the peace of Longjumeau, when, on account of his opposition to Catharine de Medicis, who was inclined to break the compact, he was suspected of being a Huguenot. Finding it impossible to prevent the execution of Catharine's plans, he resigned his position (October 7, 1568), and retired to his estate at Vignay, near Etampes. He died May 13, 1573. Hôpital's family had all embraced the Protestant faith, and this was well known even at court while he occupied his prominent position there. But his character was so blameless that he held his position for some time even during the fearful contests preparatory to the massacre of St. Bartholomew.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxxi, 86 sq.; Chambers, *Encyclop.* v, 414 sq.; Pierer, *Univers.-Lex.* viii, 334; Bayle, *Histor. Dict.* p. 505 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 283 sq.; Raumer, *Gesch. Europa's*, ii; Soldan, *Gesch. d. Prot. in Frankr.* ii. See Huguenots. (J. H. W.)

Hopkins, Daniel, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Oct. 16, 1734, at Waterbury, Conn., and graduated at Yale College in 1758. After being licensed,

he preached in Halifax, N. S., a short time. In 1775 he was chosen member of the Provincial Congress, and in 1778 one of the Council of the Conventional Government. He was ordained pastor of the Third Church in Salem Nov. 18, 1778, and remained in this place until his death, Dec. 14, 1814. He published two or three occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 581.

Hopkins, Ezekiel, D.D., an English prelate and author, was born at Sandford, Devonshire, in 1633. He was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and, after holding a short time the chaplaincy to the college, he became minister of St. Mary Woolnoth, London, and later of St. Mary's, Exeter. He finally removed to Ireland with his father-in-law, lord Robartes (afterwards earl of Truro), and was made dean of Raphoe in 1669, and bishop of the same place in 1671. He was transferred to Londonderry in 1681, but in consequence of the Roman Catholic troubles in Ireland he returned to England in 1688, and was appointed minister of Aldermanbury, London, in 1689. He died June 22, 1690. In his doctrines he was a Calvinist. His works are remarkable for clearness, strength of thought, originality, and pureness of style; the most important are, *Exposition of the Lord's Prayer* (1691):—*An Exposition of the Ten Commandments* (1692, 4to):—*The Doctrine of the two Covenants* (Lond. 1712, 8vo); and *Works, now first collected, with Life of the Author*, etc., by Josiah Pratt (Lond. 1809, 4 vols. 8vo). See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. ii; Prince, *Worthies of Devon;* Chalmers, *Gen. Biogr. Dict.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxv, 128; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliog.* i, 1535. (J. H. W.)

Hopkins, John Henry, D.D., LL.D., bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Vermont, was born of English parents in Dublin, Ireland, Jan. 30, 1792, and came to this country when about eight years old. He was educated chiefly by his mother. In 1817 he entered the legal profession, but six years later he quitted the bar for the ministry, and was ordained in 1824 as rector of Trinity Church, Pittsburg. In 1827 he was a prominent candidate for the office of assistant bishop of Pennsylvania, but as the vote of Mr. Hopkins was to decide between himself and Dr. H. U. Onderdonk, another candidate, he cast his vote in favor of the latter. In 1831 he became assistant minister at Trinity Church, Boston, and professor of divinity in the Episcopal Theological Seminary of Massachusetts. In 1832 he was elected bishop of Vermont, and was consecrated Oct. 31. At the same time he accepted also the rectorship of St. Paul's Church, Burlington, Vt., which he held until 1856. Besides this, he also established a school for boys, employing poor clergymen and candidates for orders as teachers. His heavy expenses from this enterprise embarrassed him seriously for many years. After relinquishing this school, he projected and established the "Vermont Episcopal Institute," a semi-theological school, over which he presided until his death, January 9, 1868. In 1867, bishop Hopkins was present at the Pan-Anglican Synod held in Lambeth, and took a prominent part in its proceedings. In the dissensions dividing the Anglican Church he was a decided champion of the High-Church party, and refused to sign the protest of a majority of the American bishops against Romanizing tendencies. Several of the posthumous works of bishop Hopkins will be published by one of his sons. Bishop Hopkins was one of the most learned men of his denomination. He had remarkable versatility of mind, and was a persevering and successful student in the field of theology. Indeed, "it was hard to find a highway or byway of ingenious investigation where he has not left his footprint." The great mistake of his life, and one which he undoubtedly regretted before his death, was his apology for the institution of human slavery. But we have every reason to believe that the bishop was sincere in what he preached, and that, notwithstanding this failing, he was a devout and consistent man of God. He was a voluminous writer. Besides a number of pamphlets, sermons, and addresses, he published *Christianity vindicated in a series of seven discourses on the external Evidences of the N. Test.* (Burlington, 1833, 12mo):—*The primitive Creed examined and explained* (1834, 12mo):—*The primitive Ch. compared with the P. E. Ch.* (1835, 12mo):—*The Ch. of Rome in her primitive purity compared with the Ch. of Rome at the pres. day* (1839, 12mo):—*Causes, Principles, and Results of the Brit. Reform.* (Philad. 1844, 12mo):—*Hist. of the Confessionals* (N. Y. 1850, 12mo):—*Refutation of Milner's End of Controversy* (1854, 2 vols. 12mo). An answer has recently been published by Kenrick, *Vindication of the Catholic Church* (Baltimore, 1855, 12mo). Bishop Hopkins's last works are a little *brochure* on the law of ritualism—an argument based on scriptural and historical grounds in behalf of the beauty of holiness in the public services of his Church; and a *History of the Church in verse* for Sunday-schools.—*Amer. Ch. Review*, April, 1868, p. 160; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors;* Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemporains*, p. 897. (J. H. W.)

Hopkins, Samuel, D.D., a noted Calvinistic divine, was born at Waterbury, Conn., Sept. 17, 1721, and was at once set apart by his father for the ministry of the Gospel. He entered Yale College in September, 1737. During his collegiate course the town of New Haven was stirred by the preaching of Whitefield and Gilbert Tennent. The students were deeply affected, and Hopkins was one of the converted. After graduation he commenced the study of theology with president Edwards, and, though not an imitator of the president, he was more powerfully influenced by him than by any other man. In 1741 he began to preach, but with great embarrassment and despondency. During his first few months of probation he declined five invitations for settlement. On Dec. 23, 1743, he was ordained over an infant church of five members in Housatonick, now Great Barrington, Mass. He remained in this pastorate twenty-five years. He often preached extemporaneously, and was indefatigable in parochial labor. He gave offence to his people by his practice of reading portions of Scripture in the Sabbath services, a practice which was then unusual in New England. From 1744 to 1763 the prosperity of the church was more or less interrupted by the French and Indian war. Hopkins was obliged often to remove his family, and sometimes to go himself, for safety from Great Barrington. His criticisms on the military movements of the British army are quite acute: "Our generals are very grand. The baggage of each one amounts to five cart-loads. Mighty preparations, but nothing done." On the banks of the Monongahela Washington was uttering almost the same words to general Braddock. His church, during his pastorate, increased in membership from five to 116. He labored faithfully among the Indians of his vicinity, and spent much of his time in personal intercourse with Jonathan Edwards, then of Stockbridge. He became unpopular with some members of his parish on account of his strict terms of Church communion, his bold assertions of Calvinistic doctrine, and his staunch patriotism. He was especially disliked by the British Tories. Some of his parishioners would give nothing for his support, and others had nothing to give. In great poverty, he left his parish in 1769. In April, 1770, he was installed pastor of the church at Newport, which town was then a port of commercial importance, and for many years the rival of New York. During the first year of his pastorate Hopkins enjoyed a visit from Whitefield. His church in Newport flourished until the outbreak of the Revolutionary War. In 1776 the town was captured by the British, and remained in their possession three years. Hopkins continued at his post until the last moment, and then was compelled to flee. He spent the interval in assisting his friend, Dr. Samuel Spring, of Newburyport (see *Life and Times of Gardiner Spring* [N. Y. 1866, 2 vols. 12mo], i, 12 sq.), and in supplying destitute churches in Connecticut. During his absence his people were scattered, and his meeting-house nearly

demolished. He returned in 1779, and began to preach in a private room, but soon received aid from his friends in Boston and Newburyport for the restoration of his church edifice. He rejected eligible offers of settlement in other places, and remained faithful to his people, receiving no regular salary, but depending on precarious and meagre contributions.

As soon as Hopkins commenced his pastoral labors at Newport he began to agitate the subject of slavery. At that time Newport was the great slave-market of New England. Hopkins affirmed that the town was built up by the blood of the Africans. Some of the wealthiest members of his church were slave-traders, and many of his congregation were slave-owners. He astonished them by his first sermon against the slave system. The poet Whittier says: "It may well be doubted whether on that Sabbath day the angels of God, in their wide survey of his universe, looked down upon a nobler spectacle than that of the minister of Newport rising up before his slaveholding congregation, and demanding, in the name of the Highest, the deliverance of the captive, and the opening of the prison-doors to them that were bound." Only one family left his church; the others freed their slaves. He continued to preach on the subject, and made himself intensely unpopular throughout Rhode Island. In 1776 he published his celebrated *Dialogue concerning the Slavery of the Africans*, together with his *Address to Slaveholders*, copies of which were sent to all the members of the Continental Congress, and to prominent men throughout the country. It was reprinted by the New York Manumission Society as late as 1785. Hopkins entered into correspondence with Granville Sharp, Zachary Macaulay, and other English abolitionists. From them he borrowed the idea of colonizing the blacks; and he devised a colonization scheme, in which he manifested a practical statesmanship unusual for a clergyman. When the Federal Constitution was framed in 1787, he pointed to the clause recognising slavery in the United States, and said, "I fear this is an Achan, which will bring a curse, so that we cannot prosper." Of a movement so vast as the anti-slavery reform in the United States no one man can claim to be the author; but Dr. Hopkins was most certainly the pioneer in that movement.

It is not, however, as a philanthropist, but as a theologian, that Hopkins is generally known. In his extreme indigence he writes: "I have been saved from anxiety about living, and have had a thousand times less care and trouble in the world than if I had had a great abundance. Being unconnected with the great and rich, I have had more time to attend to my studies, and particularly have had leisure to write my 'System of Divinity,' which I hope will not prove useless." By this system, and by his various independent treatises, he gave occasion for the name "*Hopkinsian*," as applied to the views of eminent New England divines. He regarded himself as an Edwardean. He had been the most intimate of president Edwards's companions, had revised the president's manuscripts, had carefully edited some of them, and was more exactly acquainted than any other man with the president's original speculations. He wrote the first memoir of Edwards, of which the *Encyclopædia Britannica* says, it is "equal in simplicity, though by no means in anything else, to the most exquisite biographies of Izaak Walton."

The prominent tenets of Hopkinsianism are the following: 1. All real holiness consists in disinterested benevolence. 2. All sin consists in selfishness. 3. There are no promises of regenerating grace made to the doings of the unregenerate. 4. The impotency of sinners with respect to believing in Christ is not natural, but moral. 5. A sinner is required to approve in his heart of the divine conduct, even though it should cast him off forever. 6. God has exerted his power in such a manner as he purposed would be followed by the existence of sin. 7. The introduction of moral evil into the universe is so overruled by God as to promote the general good. 8. Repentance is before faith in Christ. 9. Though men became sinners by Adam, according to a divine constitution, yet they have, and are accountable for, no sins but personal. 10. Though believers are justified through Christ's righteousness, yet his righteousness is not transferred to them. Dr. Nathanael Emmons (q. v.), who was the most eminent defender of Hopkinsianism, and who described it as characterized by the ten preceding articles, added the following (see Park, *Memoir of Emmons*) as his own views, and as supplemental to those of his friend Hopkins: 1. Holiness and sin consist in free voluntary exercises. 2. Men act freely under the divine agency. 3. The least transgression of the divine law deserves eternal punishment. 4. Right and wrong are founded in the nature of things. 5. God exercises mere grace in pardoning or justifying penitent believers through the atonement of Christ, and mere goodness in rewarding them for their good works. 6. Notwithstanding the total depravity of sinners, God has a right to require them to turn from sin to holiness. 7. Preachers of the Gospel ought to exhort sinners to love God, repent of sin, and believe in Christ immediately. 8. Men are active, not passive, in regeneration. Some of these eight propositions are distinctly avowed, others more or less clearly implied in the writings of Hopkins. Emmons regarded Hopkinsianism as in some respects high and intense Calvinism; as, in other respects (the doctrine of general atonement for example), moderate Calvinism; and as, on the whole, "consistent Calvinism."

Amid his labors as a reformer and theologian, Dr. Hopkins vigorously discharged his parochial duties, until he was struck with paralysis, in his seventy-eighth year. He continued to preach during the next four years. With a revival of religion his ministry had commenced, with a revival also it ended—the rising and the setting of his sun. He wrote out a list of his congregation, and offered a separate prayer for each individual. Thirty-one conversions followed. After his discourses on the 16th of Oct. 1803, he exclaimed, "Now I have done; I can preach no more." He staggered from the pulpit to his bed, from which he never rose. He died on the 20th of December, 1803.

In person Dr. Hopkins was tall and vigorous; in his movements dignified, though unwieldy. His head was large and square, and his face beamed with intelligence. The movements of his mind were like those of his body, powerful, but often clumsy. Inflexible faithfulness to what he deemed his duty, with utter self-sacrifice for the right, was his main characteristic. "Love to being in general" was with him not the mere by-word of a sect, but the enthusiastic purpose of his life. He had not the temperament which inspires enthusiasm, and he had but little tact in personal intercourse with men; but in the depths of his indigence he was true to himself, and showed all the courage of a Hampden. He studied hardly ever less than fourteen hours a day, and sometimes even as many as eighteen, in a little room of eleven feet by seven. Every Saturday he fasted, and thus gained spiritual strength for the toils of earth by communion with Heaven. He labored for Indians and selfish white men; for poor negroes who had then no other friend; and for theological science, which gave him respect, but little bread—*vixit propter alios*. In 1854 his *Works* (before repeatedly reprinted) were published by the Massachusetts Doctrinal Tract Society (3 vols. 8vo), containing over 2000 pages, with a *Memoir* by Prof. Edward A. Park of 266 pages.

The character and writings of Dr. Hopkins have recently been depicted for general readers in a very striking way in Mrs. Stowe's *Minister's Wooing*. See also *Congregat. Quar. Rev.* 1864, p. 1 sq.; Hagenbach, *History of Doctr.* ii, 436, 438; Shedd, *Hist. of Doctr.* i, 383, 408; ii, 25, 81, 489; Buchanan, *Justification*, p. 190. For the diffusion of Hopkinsianism and its later modifications, see NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY. On the relation of Hopkins's theory to the orthodox view of redemption,

see Bangs, *Errors of Hopkinsianism* (N. York, 12mo); Hodgson, *New Divinity Examined* (N. York, 12mo); art. Edwards, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.; Christian Examiner*, 1843, p. 169 sq.; Adams, *View of all Religions*, p. 168; Spring, *On the Nature of Duty;* Ely, *Contrast between Calvinism and Hopkinsianism* (N. Y. 1811); *Bib. Sac.* April, 1852, p. 448 sq.; Jan. 1853, p. 633, 671; July, 1862 (art. vi); *New Englander*, 1868, p. 284 sq.; *Life and Times of Gardiner Spring* (N. Y. 1866, 2 vols. 12mo), ii, 5 sq. (W. E. P.)

Hopkins, William, 1, an English divine, was born at Evesham, Worcestershire, and educated at Trinity College, Oxford. He entered the ministry in 1675, and, after holding several minor appointments, was made vicar of Lindridge in 1686, and in 1697 master of St. Oswald's Hospital, Worcester. He died in 1700. He published *Sermons* (1683, 4to):—*Bartram* (or *Rartram*), *on the Body and Blood of the Lord* (2d ed. 1688):—*Animad. on Johnson's Answer to Jovian* (Lond. 1691, 8vo):—*Latin transl. of a Saxon Tract on the Burial-places of the Saxon Saints* (in Hickes's *Septentrional Grammar*, Oxf. 1705). After his death, Dr. Geo. Hickes published *Seventeen Sermons, with Life* (Lond. 1708, 8vo).

Hopkins, William, 2, a Church of England clergyman, but an Arian in theology, was born at Monmouth in 1706. He entered All Souls College, Oxford, in 1724, and became vicar of Bolney, Sussex, in 1731. In 1756 he became master of the grammar-school of Cuckfield, and died in 1786. His principal works are *An Appeal to the Common Sense of all Christian People* on the doctrine of the Trinity (Lond. 1754, 12mo):—*Exodus, a correct Translation, with Notes critical and explanatory* (Lond. 1784, 4to). He published also several anonymous pamphlets against compulsory subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles.—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 886; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, p. 1537.

Hopkinsianism, a name given to the theological system of Dr. Samuel Hopkins (q. v.).

Hoplothēca (Ὁπλοθήκη, an *armory*) is the title of a book which contains the decisions of the Church fathers against heretical doctrines, and which was used to controvert such doctrines. It was most probably prepared at the request of the emperor Emanuel Comnenus.—Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch.* ii, 347. (J. H. W.)

Hopton, Susannah, a religious writer, born in Staffordshire, England, in 1627, was the wife of Richard Hopton, a Welsh judge. She became at one time a Roman Catholic, but, realizing her mistake, she returned to the Protestant Church. She died in 1709. Her writings are all on religious topics, intended to lead the reader to a devout and holy life. They are *Daily Devotions* (Lond. 1673, 12mo; 5th ed. 1713):—*Meditations*, etc. (publ. by N. Spinckes, Lond. 1717, 8vo). She also remodeled the *Devotions in the ancient Way of Offices* (originally by John Austin, who died in 1669), with a preface by Dr. George Hickes (q. v.) (1717, 8vo; new ed. 1846, 8vo).—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 887; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliograph.* i, 1538.

Hor (Heb. *id.* הוֹר or הֹר; Sept. Ὥρ), the name of two eminent mountains (הֹר הָהָר, i. e. "Hor the mountain," remarkable as the only case in which the name comes first; Sept. Ὥρ τὸ ὄρος, Vulg. *Mons Hor*). The word Hor is regarded by the lexicographers as an archaic form of *Har*, the usual Heb. term for "mountain" (Gesen. *Thes.* p. 391 *b;* Fürst, *Handwb.* s. v.), so that the meaning of the name is simply "the mountain of mountains," as the Sept. have it in one case (see below, No. 2) τὸ ὄρος τὸ ὄρος; Vulg. *mons altissimus;* and Jerome (*Ep. ad Fabiolam*) *non in monte simpliciter sed in montis monte.* See Mountain.

1. An eminent mountain of Arabia Petræa, on the confines of Idumæa, and forming part of the mountain chain of Seir or Edom. It is first mentioned in Scripture in connection with the circumstances recorded in Numb. xx, 22-29. It was "on the boundary line" (Numb. xx, 23) or "at the edge" (xxxiii, 37) of the land of Edom. It was the next halting-place of the people after Kadesh (xx, 22; xxxiii, 37), and they quitted it for Zalmonah (xxxiii, 41), in the road to the Red Sea (xxi, 4). It was during the encampment at Mt. Hor that Aaron was gathered to his fathers (Numb. xxxiii, 37-41). At the command of Jehovah, he, his brother, and his son ascended the mountain, in the presence of the people, "in the eyes of all the congregation." The garments, and with the garments the office, of high-priest were taken from Aaron and put upon Eleazar, and Aaron died there in the top of the mountain. In the circumstances of the ascent of the height to die, and in the marked exclusion from the Promised Land, the end of the one brother resembled the end of the other; but in the presence of the two survivors, and of the gazing crowd below, there is a striking difference between this event and the solitary death of Moses. See Aaron. The Israelites passed the mountain several times in going up and down the Arabah; and the station Mosera (Deut. x, 6) must have been at the foot of the mount (Deut. xxxii, 50). See Mosera.

The mountain now identified with Mount Hor is the most conspicuous in the whole range of Mount Seir, and at this day bears the name of Mount Aaron (*Jebel-Harûn*). It is in N. lat. 30° 18′, E. long. 35° 33′, about midway between the Dead Sea and the Ælanitic Gulf. It may be open to question if this is really the Mount Hor on which Aaron died, seeing that the whole range of Seir was anciently called by that name; yet, from its height, and the remarkable manner in which it rises among the surrounding rocks, it seems not unlikely to have been the chosen scene of the high-priest's death (Kinneir, p. 127). Accordingly, Stanley observes that Mount Hor "is one of the very few spots connected with the wanderings of the Israelites which admit of no reasonable doubt" (*S. and P.* p. 86). It is almost unnecessary to state that it is situated on the eastern side of the great valley of the Arabah, the highest and most conspicuous of the whole range of the sandstone mountains of Edom, having close beneath it, on its eastern side—though, strange to say, the two are not visible to each other—the mysterious city of Petra. The tradition has existed from the earliest date. Josephus does not mention the name of Hor (*Ant.* iv, 4, 7), but he describes the death of Aaron as taking place "on a very high mountain which surrounded the metropolis of the Arabs," which latter "was formerly called *Arke* (Ἄρκη), but now Petra." In the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius and Jerome it is *Or mons*—"a mountain in which Aaron died, close to the city of Petra." When it was visited by the Crusaders (see the quotations in Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 521) the sanctuary was already on its top, and there is little doubt that it was then what it is now —the *Jebel Nebi-Harûn*, "the mountain of the prophet Aaron."

Of the geological formation of Mount Hor we have no very trustworthy accounts. The general structure of the range of Edom, of which it forms the most prominent feature, is new red sandstone, displaying itself to an enormous thickness. Above that is the Jura limestone, and higher still the cretaceous beds, which latter in Mount Seir are reported to be 3500 feet thick (Wilson, *Bible Lands*, i, 194). Through these deposited strata longitudinal dikes of red granite and porphyry have forced their way, running nearly north and south, and so completely silicifying the neighboring sandstone as often to give it the look of a primitive rock. To these combinations are due the extraordinary colors for which Petra is so famous. One of the best descriptions of the mountain itself is that given by Irby and Mangles (*Travels*, p. 433 sq.). It is said to be entirely sandstone, in very horizontal strata (Wilson, i, 290). Its height, according to the latest measurements, is 4800 feet (Eng.) above the Mediterranean, that is to say, about 1700 feet above the town of Petra, 4000 above the level of the Arabah, and

View of Mount Hor, with "Aaron's Tomb."

more than 6000 above the Dead Sea (Roth, in Peterman's *Mittheil.* 1858, i, 3). The mountain is marked far and near by its double top, which rises like a huge castellated building from a lower base, and is surmounted by the circular dome of the tomb of Aaron, a distinct white spot on the dark red surface of the mountain (Laborde, p. 143). This lower base is the "plain of Aaron," beyond which Burckhardt was, after all his toils, prevented from ascending (*Syria*, p. 431). "Out of this plain, culminating in its two summits, springs the red sandstone mass, from its base upwards rocky and naked, not a bush or a tree to relieve the rugged and broken corners of the sandstone blocks which compose it. On ascending this mass a little plain is found to lie between the two peaks, marked by a white cypress, and not unlike the celebrated plain of the cypress under the summit of Jebel Mûsa, traditionally believed to be the scene of Elijah's vision. The southernmost of the two, on approaching, takes a conical form. The northernmost is truncated, and crowned by the chapel of Aaron's tomb." The chapel or mosque is a small square building, measuring inside about 28 feet by 33 (Wilson, i, 295), with its door in the S.W. angle. It is built of rude stones, in part broken columns; all of sandstone, but fragments of granite and marble lie about. Steps lead to the flat roof of the chapel, from which rises a white dome as usual over a saint's tomb. The interior of the chapel consists of two chambers, one below the other. The upper one has four large pillars and a stone chest, or tombstone, like one of the ordinary slabs in church-yards, but larger and higher, and rather bigger at the top than the bottom. At its head is a high round stone, on which sacrifices are made, and which retained, when Stephens saw it, the marks of the smoke and blood of recent offerings. "On the slab are Arabic inscriptions, and it is covered with shawls chiefly red. One of the pillars is hung with votive offerings of beads, etc., and two ostrich eggs are suspended over the chest. Steps in the north-west angle lead down to the lower chamber, which is partly in the rock, but plastered. It is perfectly dark. At the end, apparently under the stone chest above, is a recess guarded by a grating. Within this is a rude protuberance, whether of stone or plaster was not ascertainable, resting on wood, and covered by a ragged pall. This lower recess is no doubt the tomb, and possibly ancient. What is above is only the artificial monument, and certainly modern." In one of the walls of this chamber is a "round, polished black stone," one of those mysterious stones of which the prototype is the Kaaba at Mecca, and which, like that, would appear to be the object of great devotion (Martineau, p. 419 sq.).

The chief interest of Mount Hor will always consist in the prospect from its summit—the last view of Aaron —"that view which was to him what Pisgah was to his brother" (Ortlob, *De Morte Aaronis*, Lips. 1704). It is described at length by Irby (p. 134), Wilson (i, 292–9), Martineau (p. 420), and is well summed up by Stanley in the following words: "We saw all the main points on which his eye must have rested. He looked over the valley of the Arabah countersected by its hundred watercourses, and beyond, over the white mountains of the wilderness they had so long traversed; and at the northern edge of it there must have been visible the heights through which the Israelites had vainly attempted to force their way into the Promised Land. This was the western view. Close around him on the east were the rugged mountains of Edom, and far along the horizon the wide downs of Mount Seir, through which the passage had been denied by the wild tribes of Esau who hunted over their long slopes." On the north lay the mysterious Dead Sea, gleaming from the depths of its profound basin (Stephens, *Incidents*). "A dreary moment and a dreary scene—such it must have seemed to the aged priest. . . . The peculiarity of the view is the combination of wide extension with the scarcity of marked features. Petra is shut out by intervening rocks. But the survey of the Desert on one side, and the mountains of Edom on the other, is complete; and of these last the great feature is the mass of red, bald-headed sandstone rocks, intersected, not by valleys, but by deep seams" (*S. and Pal.* p. 87). Though Petra itself is entirely shut out, one outlying building—if it may be called a building—is visible, that which goes by the name of the *Deir*, or Convent. Professor Stanley has thrown out a suggestion on the connection between the two which is well worth further investigation. (See Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 548, 579, 651.) The impression received on the spot is that Aaron's death took place in the small basin between the two peaks, and that the people were stationed either on the plain at the base of the peaks, or at that part of the *wady Abu-Kusheybeh* from which the top is commanded. Josephus says that the ground was sloping downwards (κατάντες ἦν τὸ χωρίον; *Ant.* iv, 4, 7). But this may be the mere general expression of a man who had never been on the spot. (See Bertou, *Le mont Hor*, Par. 1860.)

2. A mountain entirely distinct from the preceding, named in Numb. xxxiv, 7, 8, only as one of the marks of the northern boundary of the land which the children of Israel were about to conquer. By many it has been regarded as a designation of Mount Casius, but this is rather the northern limit of Syria. The Targum Pseudojon. renders Mount Hor by *Umanos*, probably intending Amana. The latter is also the reading of the Talmud (*Gittin*, 8, quoted by Fürst, s. v.), in which it is connected with the Amana named in Cant. iv, 8. But the situation of this Amana is nowhere indicated by them. It cannot have any connection with the Amana or Abana river which flowed through Damascus, as that is quite away from the position required in the passage. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 25), after Parchi (in Benj. of Tudela, p. 413 sq.), identifies it with Jebel *Nuria*, south of Tripoli, but on frivolous grounds; nor was the mount in question on the Mediterranean, and Palestine did not extend so far north. The original is הֹר הָהָר, *mount of the mountain*, i. e. by a common Hebrew idiom, *the* Mountain, by way of eminence, i. q. the lofty mountain; Sept. τὸ ὄρος, Vulg. *mons altissimus;* and therefore probably only denotes the prominent mountain of that vicinity, i. e. Lebanon, or at most Mount Hermon, which is an offshoot of the Lebanon range. It can hardly be regarded here as a proper name. The northern boundary started from the sea; the first point in it was Mount Hor, and the second the entrance of Hamath. Since Sidon was subsequently allotted to the most northern tribe—Asher, and was, as far as we know, the most northern town so allotted, it would seem probable that the northern boundary would commence at about that point; that is, opposite to where the great range of Lebanon breaks down to the sea. The next landmark, the entrance to Hamath, seems to have been determined by Mr. Porter as the pass at Kalat el-Husn, close to Hums, the ancient Hamath—at the other end of the range of Lebanon. Surely "Mount Hor," then, can be nothing else than the great chain of Lebanon itself. Looking at the massive character and enormous height of the range, it is very difficult to suppose that any individual peak or mountain is intended and not the whole mass, which takes nearly a straight course between the two points just named, and includes below it the great plain of the Buka'a, and the whole of Palestine properly so called.

Horæ Canonĭcæ, etc. See BREVIARY; HOURS, CANONICAL; etc.

Ho'ram (Heb. *Horam'*, הֹרָם, *lofty;* Sept. Ὡράμ v. r. Ἐλάμ, Αἰλάμ), the king of Gezer, who, coming to the relief of Lachish, was overthrown by Joshua (Josh. x, 33). B.C. 1618.

Horapollo, or **Horus Apollo**, an Egyptian priest, and author of a treatise on Egyptian Hieroglyphics. Several writers of this name are mentioned by Suidas, Stephanus of Byzantium under Phenebethis, Photius (p. 536, ed. Bekker), and Eustathius (Homer, *Od.* δ), but it is doubtful which of them was actually the author of the treatise on Egyptian Hieroglyphics. The probability is that the work was originally written in the Egyptian language, and translated into Greek by Philip. Horus was the name of one of the Egyptian deities, who was considered by the Greeks to be the same as Apollo (Herod. ii, 144-156). We learn from Lucian (*Pro Imag.* § 27) that the Egyptians were frequently called by the names of their gods. But, whatever may be thought respecting the author, it is evident that the work was written after the Christian æra, since it contains allusions to the philosophical tenets of the Gnostics. The value of this work in interpreting existing hieroglyphics has been variously estimated. Champollion, Leemans, and other recent scholars esteem it more highly than former critics did. It was printed for the first time by Aldus (Venice, 1505), with the Fables of Æsop. The best editions are by Mercer (1551), Hœschelius (1595), De Pauw (1727), and Leemans (Amst. 1834). The last discussed in his Introduction the date and authorship of the work. See *English Cyclopædia;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxv, 166; Bunsen, *Ægyptens Stelle in d. Weltgesch.* i, 402; Champollion, *Précis du Système Hiéroglyphique des Anciens Egyptiens*, p. 347 sq. Comp. HIEROGLYPHICS.

Horayoth. See TALMUD.

Horb, JOHANN HEINRICH, a distinguished German pietist, brother-in-law and co-worker of Spener, was born at Colmar, Alsace, June 11, 1645. He studied at the universities of Strasburg, Jena, Wittenberg, and Cologne, afterwards travelled through the Netherlands, England, and France, and finally returned to Strasburg in 1670. In 1671 he received an appointment as minister at Birkenfeld, and in 1673 at Trarbach. Here the boldness with which he presented his so-called pietistic views disturbed the equanimity of the orthodox authorities, and he was obliged to resign. He next became pastor at Windsheim, Franconia, and in 1685 accepted a call as pastor of St. Nicholas Church, Hamburg, where he found himself associated with two other pietists, John Winkler and Abraham Hinkelmann. Their joint teachings created great excitement, which culminated when, in 1693, Horb published, under the title of *D. Klugheit d. Gerechten*, a translation of Pairet's excellent pamphlet, *Les vrais principes de l'éducation Chrétienne des enfants*, The agitation became so violent that in 1694 he was formally suspended, after which he retired to Steinbeck, where he died in Jan. 1695. He published *Hist. Origeniana*, etc. (Frankf. 1670, 4to):—*Hist. Manichæorum* (Argent. 1670, 4to):—*Disquis. de ultima origine hæreseos Simonis Magi* (Leipz. 1669, 4to; also in Vogt's *Bibl. hist. hæresiol.* i, 308 sq.):—*Hist. hæres. Unitarior.* (Frankfort, 1671, 4to); and a collection of sermons, *D. Leiden Jesu-Christi* (Hamburg, 1700).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 261; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 847 sq.; Molleri, *Cimbr. literata*, ii, 355 sq.; Walch, *Relig. Streitigkeit. in d. luth. Kirche*, i, 615 sq.; Henke, *Kirchengeschichte*, iv, 526 sq. (J. H. W.)

Horbery, MATTHEW, D.D., an English divine, was born at Haxay, Lincolnshire, in 1707; educated at Lincoln College, and elected fellow of Magdalen College. He became successively vicar of Eccleshall, canon of Lichfield, vicar of Hanbury, and rector of Stanlake. He died in 1773. He was greatly respected as a sound, able, and learned theologian, and an amiable and excellent man. His sermons were praised by Dr. Johnson; they are written in nervous, animated language, yet with great simplicity. Van Mildert classes them "among the best compositions of English divines." His *Works*, including the *Sermons*, and an *Essay on the Eternity of Future Punishments*, have been collected and published (Oxford, 1828, 2 vols. 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1539; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 150; Waterland, *Works*, i, 116, 242, 254; vi, 416 sq.

Horch, HEINRICH, S.T.D., a German Pietist and Mystic, was born at Eschwege, Hessen, in 1652. He studied theology and medicine at Marburg, where he came under the influence of the great follower of Spener (q. v.), Theodor Untereyk, and embraced the doctrines of the Mystics. He also studied the Cartesian philosophy with much interest. In 1683 he was appointed minister at Heidelberg, in 1685 court preacher at Kreuznach, but in 1687 he returned again to Heidelberg. At the university of that place he obtained the degree of doctor of theology. In 1689 he went to Frankfort as minister of a Reformed Church, and in 1790 was made professor of theology at Hernborn. By his firm adherence, however, to the Mystic Arnold (q. v.), and his peculiar views of theology, holding, e. g. that divine revelations still continue, that the symbolical books are useless, that the eucharist and baptism are unnecessary, etc., he finally lost his position (1698). He afterwards travelled about, preaching in city halls and in cemeteries. At times he even entered churches, and preached in spite

of the remonstrances of the ministers. He was arrested for this conduct in 1699, and became partially insane. He recovered, however, towards the close of the year 1700, and, by the interposition of his friends, he was granted a pension in 1708, which was continued until his death, August 5, 1729. Horch was also a Millenarian; he likewise demanded a second and more complete reformation of the Church, advocated celibacy, though he did not think the married life sinful, and is said to have been a member of the Philadelphia Society (q. v.), founded in 1696 by Jane Leade. He wrote a number of works, of which a complete list is given by Jöcher (*Gel. Lex.*, Adelung's Supplem. ii, 2138 sq.), and of which the *Mystische u. Prophetische Bibel* (Marb. 1712, 4to) is especially celebrated as the forerunner of the Berleburg Bible (q. v.). See Haas (G. Fr. L.), *Lebensbeschreib. d. Dr. Horch* (Cassel, 1769, 8vo); Göbel (M.), *Geschichte d. christliche Lebens in d. rhein. westph. ev. Kirche* (Coblenz, 1852), ii, 741-51; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 262 sq.; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 349 sq.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* ii, 369. (J. H. W.)

Ho'reb (Heb. *Choreb'*, חוֹרֵב or חֹרֵב, *desert;* Sept. Χωρήβ or Χώρηβ; occurs Exod. iii, 1; xvii, 6; xxxiii, 6; Deut. i, 2, 6, 19; iv, 10, 15; v, 2; ix, 8; xviii, 16; xxix, 1; 1 Kings viii, 9; xix, 8; 2 Chron. v, 10; Psa. cvi, 19; Mal. iv, 4; Ecclus. xlviii, 7), according to some, a lower part or peak of Mount Sinai, so called at the present day, from which one ascends towards the south the summit of Sinai (Jebel Musa), properly so called (so Gesenius and others after Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 566 sq.); but, according to others, a general name for the whole mountain, of which Sinai was a particular summit (so Hengstenberg, *Auth. des Pentat.* ii, 396; Robinson, *Bibl. Researches*, i, 177, 551). See SINAI.

Horebites, a sect of the Hussites, who, upon the death of Ziska, when they had retired from Bohemia, chose Bedricus of Bohemia as their leader. They called themselves Horebites because they had given the name of Horeb to a mountain to which they had retired.—Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxxiv, 688. See HUSSITES.

Ho'rem (Heb. *Chorêm'*, חֳרֵם, *consecrated* [but *fortress* according to Fürst]; Sept. Ὡράμ [but most texts blend with preceding name into Μεγαλααρίμ or Μαγδαλιηωράμ], Vulg. *Horem*), one of the "fenced cities" of Naphtali, mentioned between Migdal-el and Beth-Anath (Josh. xix, 38). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 184) confounds it with the place preceding, and seeks to identify both in the modern village *Medj el-Kerum*, eight miles east of Akka; but this does not lie within the ancient limits of Naphtali (Keil, ad loc.). Van de Velde (i, 178, 9; *Memoir*, p. 322) suggests *Hurah* as the site of Horem. It is an ancient site, in the centre of the country, half way between the Ras en-Nakhura and the lake Merom, on a *tell* at the southern end of the wady el-Ain, one of the natural features of the country. It is also in favor of this identification that Hurah is near Yarûn, probably the representative of the ancient IRON, named with Horem. (Compare Seetzen, *Reisen durch Syrien*, Berlin, 1854-9, ii, 130.)

Hor-hagid'gad (Hebrew *Chor hag-Gidgad'*, חוֹר הַגִּדְגָּד, *hole of the Gidgad;* Sept. ὄρος Γαδγάδ, Vulg. *mons Gadgad*, both apparently reading or misunderstanding הַר or הֹר for חוֹר), the thirty-third station of the Israelites between Bene-Jaakan and Jotbathah (Numb. xxxiii, 32, 33); evidently the same with their forty-first station GUDGODAH, between the same places in the opposite direction, and not far from Mount Hor (Deut. x, 6, 7). Winer (*Realwört.* s. v. Horgidgad) assents to the possibility of the identity of this name with that of wady *Ghudhaghid*, in the eastern part of the desert et-Tih (Robinson's *Researches*, iii, App. 210, b), although the names are spelt and signify differently (this valley would be in Hebrew characters צְצַאצַ), but objects to the identification thus proposed by Ewald (*Isral. Gesch.* ii, 207) on the ground that חוֹר can hardly mean a *wide* valley. This difficulty, however, does not weigh much, since the wady may only be the representative of the name anciently attached to some spot in the vicinity, more properly called a *chasm;* and even this spot is sufficiently a *gully* to form a receptacle for the loose sand washed down by the freshets, which may naturally have partly filled it up in the course of ages. With this identification Rabbi Schwarz likewise agrees (*Palest.* p. 213). See EXODE. The name *Gidgad* or *Gudgod*, according to Gesenius, is from an Ethiopic reduplicated root, signifying to *reverberate*, as thunder; but, according to Fürst, signifies a *cleft*, from גּוּד or גָּדַד, to *incise.* See GUDGODAH.

Ho'ri (Heb. *Chori'*, חֹרִי or חוֹרִי, prob. a "troglodyte," or dweller in a cave, חֹר, otherwise an *auger;* Sept. Χοῤῥί, Οὐρί, and Χοῤῥέ; Vulg. *Hori* and *Huri*), the name of two men.

1. A son of Lotan and grandson of Seir, of the aboriginal inhabitants of Idumæa (Gen. xxxvi, 12; 1 Chron. i, 39). B.C. cir. 1964.

2. The father of Shaphat, which latter was the commissioner of the tribe of Simeon sent by Moses to explore the land of Canaan (Numb. xiii, 5). B.C. ante 1657.

3. (Gen. xxxvi, 30.) See HORITE.

Ho'rim (Deut. ii, 12, 22). See HORITE.

Ho'rite (Heb. *Chori'*, חוֹרִי or חֹרִי, prop. the same word as *Hori;* but, according to Fürst, *noble;* often with the art. הַחֹרִי), a designation (both singly and collectively) of the people who anciently inhabited Mount Seir, before their supersedure by the Edomites; rendered "Horites" in Gen. xiv, 6 (Sept. Χοῤῥαῖοι, Vulg. *Corrhæi*),; xxxvi, 21 (Χορραῖος, *Horræus*), 29 (Χοῤῥί, *Horræi*); "Horite," Gen. xxxvi, 20 (Χοῤῥαῖος, *Horræus*), "Horims," Deut. ii, 12 (Χοῤῥαῖος, *Horrhæus*), 22 (Χοῤῥαῖος, *Horrhæi*), and "Hori," Gen. xxxvi, 30 (Χοῤῥί, *Horræi*). See IDUMÆA. There are indications of Canaanitish affinity between the Horites and the Hittites or Hivites (Michaelis, *Spicileg.* i, 169, and *De Troglodytis Seir*, in his *Syntagma Comment.* 1759, p. 194; Faber, *Archæol.* p. 41; Hamelsveld, iii, 29; but see contra Bertheau, *Gesch. der Isr.* p. 150). See HITTITE. "Their excavated dwellings are still found by hundreds in the sandstone cliffs and mountains of Edom, and especially in Petra. See EDOM and EDOMITE. It may, perhaps, be to the Horites Job refers in xxx, 6, 7. They are only three times mentioned in Scripture: first, when they were smitten by the kings of the East (Gen. xiv, 6); then when their genealogy is given in Gen. xxxvi, 20-30, and 1 Chron. i, 38-42; and, lastly, when they were exterminated by the Edomites (Deut. ii, 12, 22). It appears probable that they were not Canaanites, but an earlier race, who inhabited Mount Seir before the posterity of Canaan took possession of Palestine (Ewald, *Geschichte*, i, 304, 5)" (Smith). Knobel (*Völkertafel d. Genesis*, p. 195, 206) holds that they formed part of the great race of the Ludim, to which also the Rephaim, the Emim, and the Amorites belonged (comp. Hitzig, *Gesch. d. V. Israel*, Lpz. 1869, i, 29-36). In this case the Amorites were of Shemitic descent. According to the account in Gen. xxxvi, 20 sq., they were divided into seven tribes. See CANAAN.

Hor'mah (Heb. *Chormah'*, חָרְמָה, *devoted* city, otherwise *peak* of a hill; Sept. Ἑρμά v. r. occasionally Ἑρμάθ and ἀνάθεμα), a royal city of the Canaanites in the south of Palestine (Josh. xii, 14; 1 Sam. xxx, 30), near which the Israelites experienced a discomfiture from the Amalekites resident there, as they perversely attempted to enter Canaan by that route after the divine sentence of wandering (Numb. xiv, 45; xxi, 1-3; Deut. i, 44). Joshua afterwards besieged its king (Josh. xv, 30), and on its capture assigned the city to the tribe of Judah, but finally it was included in the territory given

to Simeon (Josh. xix, 4; Judg. i, 17; 1 Chron. iv, 30). It is elsewhere mentioned only in 1 Chron. iv, 30. It was originally called ZEPHATH (Judg. i, 17), under which name it appears to have been again rebuilt and occupied by the Canaanites (see Bertheau, ad loc.; Hengstenberg, *Pentat.* ii, 220); whereas the name Hormah was probably given to the site by the Israelites in token of its demolition (see Numb. xxi, 3). Hence traces of the older name alone remain. See ZEPHATH.

Hörmann, SIMON, with the surname *Bavarus*, was prior in the monastery of Altenmünster St. Salvator, in Bavaria, and later general of the order. He died in 1701. His works are *Breviarium una cum Missali Monialium*, and an edition of *Revelationes cœlestes S. Brigittæ, ordinis S. Salvatoris Fundatricis* (Munich, 1680, fol.).—Pierer, *Univ.-Lex.* viii, 537.

Hormisdas, pope, born at Frosinone, near Rome, was elected bishop of Rome in 514, as successor of Symmachus. In 515, by invitation of the Eastern emperor Anastasius, he sent an embassy to a council held at Heraclea for the purpose of settling the points of disunion between the Oriental and Occidental churches; but as this council, as well as a second one held in 517, did not bring about any favorable results, Anastasius, wearied by Hormisdas's refusal to make any concessions, broke off all relations with Rome. After his death in 518, his successor Justinus made another attempt at reconciliation, and the union of that Church with Rome was finally restored in 519, after a schism of thirty-five years. Hormisdas's conduct was much more measured in the controversy concerning Faustus of Rhegium, of whom he said that, though his writings may not deserve a place with those of the fathers, yet that such parts of them were to be received as did not conflict with the teachings of the Church. He died Aug. 6, 523. Eighty letters of Hormisdas are preserved in Labbe.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. vi; Labbe, *Concilia*, iv, 1415; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* i, 342 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, i, 199; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, ii, 279 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 325; Neander, *Ch. History*, ii, 533, 649 sq.; *Hist. of Dogmas*, p. 384; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* ii, 280; Dorner, *Lehre v. d. Pers. Christi*, ii, 156; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 329; Döllinger, *Lehrb. d. Kirchengesch.* i, 151. See EUTYCHIANS. (J. H. W.)

Horn (קֶרֶן, *ke'ren*, identical in root and signif. with the Latin *cornu* and Engl. *horn;* Gr. *κέρας*) is used in Scripture with a great latitude of meaning.

I. *Literally* (Josh. vi, 4, 5; compare Exod. xix, 13; 1 Sam. xvi, 1, 13; 1 Kings i, 39; Job xlii, 14).—Two purposes are mentioned in the Scriptures to which the horn seems to have been applied. As horns are hollow and easily polished, they have in ancient and modern times been used for drinking-vessels and for military purposes. They were especially convenient for holding liquids (1 Sam. xvi, 1, 13; 1 Kings i, 39), and were even made instruments of music (Josh. vi, 5).

1. *Trumpets* were probably at first merely horns perforated at the tip, such as are still used upon mountain-farms for calling home the laborers at meal-time. If the A. V. of Josh. vi, 4, 5 ("rams' horns," קֶרֶן הַיּוֹבֵל) were correct, this would settle the question [see RAM'S HORN]; but the fact seems to be that יוֹבֵל has nothing to do with *ram*, and that קֶרֶן, *horn*, serves to indicate an instrument which originally was made of horn, though afterwards, no doubt, constructed of different materials (comp. Varro, *L. L.* v, 24, 33, "cornua quod ea quæ nunc sunt ex ære tunc fiebant e cornu bubuli"). See CORNET. The horns which were thus made into trumpets were probably those of oxen rather than of rams: the latter would scarcely produce a note sufficiently imposing to suggest its association with the fall of Jericho. See TRUMPET.

2. The word "horn" is also applied to a *flask*, or vessel made of horn, containing *oil* (1 Sam. xvi, 1, 13; 1 Kings i, 39), or used as a kind of toilet-bottle, filled with the preparation of antimony with which women tinged their eyelashes (Keren-happuch = *paint-horn*, name of one of Job's daughters, Job xlii, 14). So in English drinking-horn (commonly called a *horn*). In the same way the Greek *κέρας* sometimes signifies bugle, trumpet (Xenoph. *An.* ii, 2, 4), and sometimes drinking-horn (vii, 2, 23). In like manner the Latin *cornu* means *trumpet*, and also *oil-cruet* (Horace, *Sat.* ii, 2, 61), and *funnel* (Virgil, *Georg.* iii, 509). See also INK-HORN.

II. *Metaphorically.*—These uses of the word are often based upon some literal object like a horn, and at other times they are purely figurative.

1. *From similarity of Form.*—To this use belongs the application of the word *horn* to a trumpet of metal, as already mentioned. Horns of ivory, that is, elephants' teeth, are mentioned in Ezek. xxvii, 15, either metaphorically, from similarity of form, or, as seems more probable, from a vulgar error. See IVORY. But more specific are the following metaphors:

(1.) The altar of burnt-offerings (Exod. xxvii, 2) and the altar of incense (Exod. xxx, 2) had each at the four corners four horns of shittim-wood, the first being overlaid with brass, the second with gold (Exod. xxxvii, 25; xxxviii, 2; Jer. xvii, 1; Amos iii, 14). Upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offerings was to be smeared with the finger the blood of the slain bullock (Exod. xxix, 12; Lev. iv, 7-18; viii, 15; ix, 9; xvi, 18; Ezek. xliii, 20). By laying hold of these horns of the altar of burnt-offering the criminal found an asylum and safety (1 Kings i, 50; ii, 28), but only when the crime was accidental (Exod. xxi, 14). These horns are said to have served as a means for binding the animal destined for sacrifice (Psa. cxviii, 27), but this use Winer (*Handwörterb.*) denies, asserting that they did not and could not answer for such a purpose. These altar-horns are, of course, not to be supposed to have been made of horn, but to have been metallic projections from the four corners (*γωνίαι κερατοειδεῖς*, Josephus, *War*, v, 5, 6). See ALTAR.

(2.) The *peak* or *summit* of a hill was called a horn (Isa. v, 1, where hill = horn in Heb.; comp. *κέρας*, Xenophon, *An.* v, 6, 7, and *cornu*, Stat. *Theb.* v, 532; Arab. "Kurûn Hattîn," Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* ii, 370; German *Schreckhorn, Wetterhorn, Aarhorn;* Celt. *cairn*).

In Isa. v, 1, the emblematic vineyard is described as being literally "in a horn the son of oil," meaning, as given in the English Bible, "a very fruitful hill"—a strong place like a hill, yet combining with its strength peculiar fruitfulness.

(3.) In Hab. iii, 4 ("he had horns coming out of his hand") the context implies *rays of light* (comp. Deut. xxxiii, 2).

The denominative קָרַן = "to emit rays," is used of Moses's face (Exod. xxxiv, 29, 30, 35): so all the versions except Aquila and the Vulgate, which have the translations *κερατώδης ἦν, cornuta erat.* This curious idea has not only been perpetuated by paintings, coins, and statues (Zornius, *Biblioth. Antiq.* i, 121), but has at least passed muster with Grotius (*Annot.* ad loc.), who cites Aben-Ezra's identification of Moses with the horned Mnevis of Egypt, and suggests that the phenomenon was intended to remind the Israelites of the golden calf! Spencer (*Leg. Hebr.* iii, *Diss.* i, 4) tries a reconciliation of renderings upon the ground that *cornua = radii lucis;* but Spanheim (*Diss.* vii, 1), not content with stigmatizing the efforts of art in this direction as "præpostera industria," distinctly attributes to Jerome a belief in the veritable horns of Moses. See NIMBUS.

2. *From similarity of Position and Use.*—Two principal applications of this metaphor will be found—*strength* and *honor*. Of *strength* the horn of the unicorn [see UNICORN] was the most frequent representative (Deut. xxxii, 17, etc.), but not always; comp. 1 Kings xxii, 11, where probably horns of iron, worn defiantly and symbolically on the head, are intended. Expressive of the same idea, or perhaps merely a decoration, is the Oriental military ornament mentioned by Taylor (*Calmet's*

Hair of South Africans ornamented with Buffalo-horns. (Livingstone.)

Frag. cxiv), and the conical cap observed by Dr. Livingstone among the natives of S. Africa, and not improbably suggested by the horn of the rhinoceros, so abundant in that country (see Livingstone's *Travels*, p. 365, 450, 557; comp. Taylor, *l. c.*). Among the Druses upon Mount Lebanon the married women wear silver horns on their heads. The spiral coils of gold wire projecting on either side from the female head-dress of some of the Dutch provinces are evidently an ornament borrowed from the same original idea. But it is quite uncertain whether such dresses were known among the covenant people, nor do the figurative allusions in Scripture to horns render it in the least degree necessary to suppose that reference was made to personal ornaments of that description. (See below.)

Heads of modern Asiatics ornamented with Horns.

In the sense of *honor*, the word *horn* stands for the *abstract* (*my* horn, Job xvi, 15; *all the horns of Israel*, Lam. ii, 3), and so for the supreme authority (comp. the story of Cippus, Ovid, *Met.* xv, 565; and the horn of the Indian sachem mentioned in Clarkson's *Life of Penn*). Perhaps some such idea may be denoted by the horned conical cap peculiar to the regal apparel on the Ninevite sculptures. It also stands for *concrete*, whence it comes to mean *king, kingdom* (Dan. viii, 2, etc.; Zech. i, 18; compare Tarquin's dream in Accius, ap. Cicero, *Div.* i, 22); hence, on coins, Alexander and the Seleucidæ wear horns (see cut in vol. i, p. 140), and the former is called in Arab. two-horned (Kor. xviii, 85 sq.), not without reference to Dan. viii. See Goat.

Horned Caps of the Assyrian Kings.

Coin of Alexander the Great, represented as horned.

Out of either or both of these last two metaphors sprang the idea of representing gods with horns. Spanheim has discovered such figures on the Roman denarius, and on numerous Egyptian coins of the reigns of Trajan, Hadrian, and the Antonines (*Diss.* v, 353). The Bacchus Ταυροκέρως, or *cornutus*, is mentioned by Euripides (*Bacch.* 100), and among other pagan absurdities Arnobius enumerates "Dii cornuti" (*c. Gent.* vi). In like manner river-gods are represented with horns ("tauriformis Aufidus," Hor. *Od.* iv, 14, 25; ταυρόμορφον ὄμμα Κηφισοῦ, Eurip. *Ion.* 1261). For various opinions on the *ground-thought* of this metaphor, see *Notes and Queries*, i, 419, 456. Manx legends speak of a *tarroo-ushtey*, i. e. water-bull (see Cregeen's *Manx Dict.*). (See Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 288; and, for an admirable compendium, with references, Zornius, *Bibliotheca Antiquaria*, ii, 106 sq.).

Some of these metaphorical applications of the word horn require more special elucidation.

(1.) *Symbolical.*—As horns are the chief source of attack and defence with the animals to which God has given them, they serve in Scripture as emblems of power, dominion, glory, and fierceness (Dan. viii, 5, 9; 1 Sam. xvi, 1, 13; 1 Kings i, 39; Josh. vi, 4, 5; 1 Sam. ii, 1; Psa. lxxv, 5, 10; cxxxii, 17; Luke i, 69; Deut. xxxiii, 17; Lam. ii, 3; Mic. iv, 13; Jer. xlviii, 25; Ezek. xxix, 21; Amos vi, 13). In 1 Kings xxii, 11, we find a striking display of symbolical action on the part of the false prophet Zedekiah. He made him horns of iron, and said, "Thus saith Jehovah, With these thou shalt push the Syrians, until thou have consumed them." Hence, to defile the horn in the dust (Job xvi, 2) is to lower and degrade one's self, and, on the contrary, to lift up, to exalt the horn (Psa. lxxv, 4; lxxix, 17; cxlviii, 14), is poetically to raise one's self to eminent honor or prosperity, to bear one's self proudly (comp. also 1 Chron. xxv, 5). Something like this is found in the classic authors (see Horace, *Carm.* iii, 21, 18). The expression "horn of salvation," which Christ is called (Luke i), is equivalent to a salvation of strength, or a Saviour, who is possessed of the might requisite for the work (see Brünnings, *De cornu salutis*, Heid. 1743).

Horns were also the symbol of royal dignity and power; and when they are distinguished by *number*, they signify so many monarchies. Thus horn signifies a monarchy in Jer. xlviii, 25. In Zech. i, 18, etc., the four horns are the four great monarchies, which had each of them subdued the Jews. The ten horns, says Daniel, vii, 24, are ten *kings*. The ten horns, spoken of in Rev. xiii, 1 as having ten crowns upon them, no doubt signify the same thing, for so we have it interpreted in xvii, 12. The king of Persia is described by Ammianus Marcellinus as wearing golden rams' horns by way of diadem (69, 1). The effigy of Ptolemy with a ram's horn, as exhibited in ancient sculpture, is mentioned by Spanheim, *Dissert. de Numism.* Hence also the kings of Media and Persia are depicted by Daniel (viii, 20) under the figure of a horned ram. See Ram.

When it is said, in Dan. viii, 9, that out of one of the four notable horns came forth a little horn, we are to understand that out of one of the four kingdoms represented by the four horns arose another kingdom, "which became exceeding great." This is doubtless Antiochus Epiphanes; others refer it to one of the first Cæsars; and others refer it to the Turkish empire, and will have Egypt, Asia, and Greece to be the three horns torn up or reduced by the Turk. See Little Horn.

(2.) *Ornamental.*—In the East, at present, horns are used as an ornament for the head, and as a token of eminent rank (Rosenmüller, *Morg.* iv, 85). The women among the Druses on Mount Lebanon wear on their heads silver horns of native make, "which are the distinguishing badge of wifehood" (Bowring's *Report on Syria*, p. 8). "These *tantours* have grown, like other horns, from small beginnings to their present enormous

size by slow degrees, and pride is the soil that nourished them. At first they consisted merely of an apparatus designed to finish off the headdress so as to raise the veil a little from the face. Specimens of this primitive kind are still found in remote and semi-civilized districts. I have seen them only a few inches long, made of pasteboard, and even of common pottery. By degrees the

Procession of Oriental Horned Ladies.

more fashionable ladies used tin, and lengthened them; then rivalry made them of silver, and still further prolonged and ornamented them; until finally the princesses of Lebanon and Hermon sported gold horns, decked with jewels, and so long that a servant had to spread the veil over them. But the day for these most preposterous appendages to the female head is about over. After the wars between the Maronites and Druses in 1841 and 1845, the Maronite clergy thundered their excommunications against them, and very few Christians now wear them. Many even of the Druse ladies have cast them off, and the probability is that in a few years travellers will seek in vain for a horned lady" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 101). See HEAD-DRESS.

Horn, JOHN, or, more properly, JOHN ROH (CORNU or KORN being a translation of the surname, which he assumed according to the usage of the times), was a distinguished bishop of the Ancient Unitas Fratrum, or Church of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. He was born at Yauss, in Bohemia, near the close of the 15th century. In 1518 he was ordained to the priesthood, and in 1529 consecrated bishop by a synod assembled at Brandeis, on the Adler. Three years later (1532) he became senior bishop and president of the Ecclesiastical Council, which position he held until his death, governing the Unitas Fratrum with great wisdom, and furthering its interests with ardent zeal. Supported by John Augusta (q. v.), he inaugurated a new policy, which brought the Church out of its partial obscurity, and made it thereafter an important element in the national history of Bohemia. His immediate predecessor, Martin Skoda, had strictly abstained from all intercourse with the Reformers, following the principles established by Luke of Prague (q. v.). Horn, who had twice been a delegate to Luther (1522 and 1524), and who entertained a high regard for him and his work, reopened a correspondence with him, and induced the publication of a new Confession of the Brethren's faith at Wittenberg, with a commendatory preface of his own (1533). This led to a still closer fellowship, Horn sending two deputations to Luther in 1536, a third in the following year, and a fourth in 1542. In 1538 Luther published another and the principal Confession of the Church, again with a preface from Horn's pen. This Confession had been drawn up in 1535, and formally presented to the emperor Ferdinand at Vienna (November 14) by several barons and divines in the name of the Unitas Fratrum. Encouraged by his intercourse with Luther, Horn also sent an embassy to the Swiss Reformers in 1540, which resulted in a correspondence with Bucer, Calvin, and others. Thus the Brethren joined hands with the Reformers in carrying on the great work of evangelical truth, and gave the earliest tokens of those efforts to bring about a union among all Protestants which afterwards resulted in the *Consensus Sendomiriensis* of the Polish churches. The most important literary production of bishop Horn was the authorized edition of the German Hymn-book of the Brethren, published in 1540. He died in 1547. Bishop Blaloslav, the illustrious historian and grammarian of the Church, wrote his biography, which is, however, no longer extant. (E. de S.)

Hornbeck. See HOORNBECK.

Horne, George, D.D., an English prelate, was born at Otham, near Maidstone, Nov. 1, 1730. He was educated at University College, Oxford, where he devoted himself especially to the study of Hebrew and of the fathers. He became fellow of Magdalen in 1749, and president in 1768. In 1776 he was made vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford, dean of Canterbury in 1781, and, finally, bishop of Norwich in 1789. He died Jan. 17, 1792. In his early youth he imbibed the doctrines of John Hutchinson (q. v.), and defended them in an *Apology* (1756), which is given in vol. vi of his collected *Works*. He was considered the best preacher of his time, a sincere and exemplary Christian, and a thorough scholar. Many of his writings were controversial tracts, arising out of the Hutchinsonian theory, and the quarrels which it provoked. His more important and durable works are, *Commentary on the Psalms* (Oxford, 1766, 2 vols. 4to, often reprinted):—*Discourses on several Subjects and Occasions* (London, 4th ed. 1803, 4 vols. 8vo). These, with his other writings, are collected in *The Works of Bishop Horne, with his Life*, by William Jones, of Nayland (London, 1795, 6 vols. 8vo). See Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, vi, 160; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliograph.* i, 1541; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 887; Horne (T. H.), *Bibliographical Appendix; Ch. Review*, i, 59; Bickersteth, *Bib. Stud. Assist.* p. 306, 319; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctr.* ii, 419; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Reformation*, p. 252, n. 1; 253, n. 3.

Horne, John, a Nonconformist divine, born in 1615, was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. He became successively vicar of Allhallows, Lynn, Regis, and finally Norfolk in 1647. He was ejected for nonconformity in 1662, and died in 1676. "He was a learned man, of most exemplary and primitive piety, very ready in the Scriptures, skilled in the Oriental languages, and an Arminian in doctrine." Shortly before his ejection he published *The open Door for Man's Approach to God, or a Vindication of the Record of God concerning the Extent of the Death of Christ.* His other principal works are, *The Brazen Serpent, or God's grand Design*—on John iii, 14, 15 (Lond. 1673, 4to):—*The best Exercise for Christians in the worst of Times, in Order to their Security against Profaneness and Apostasy*—on Jude xx, 21 (Lond. 1671, sm. 8vo), etc.—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1543; Stoughton (John), *Eccles. Hist. of England* (Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 407 sq.

Horne, Melville, a Wesleyan minister, born in England in the latter part of the last century, was originally a lay preacher of the Wesleyan societies, but by the advice of his brethren he took orders in the Church of England, and went as missionary to Sierra Leone. On his return he was made vicar of Olney, later at Macclesfield, and finally went to West Thurrock, Essex. He died in the early part of the present century. Horne is known especially by his *Letters on Missions, addressed to the Protestant Ministers of the British Churches* (1794, 8vo; reprinted at Boston, 1835), which, it is generally believed, "prompted the first counsels that led to the formation of the London Missionary Society (comp. Ellis's *Hist. of Lond. Miss. Soc.* i, 13-15; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, ii, 295 sq.). He published also several of his sermons (1791-1811), and an *Investigation of the Definition of Justifying Faith* (1809, 12mo).

Horne, Thomas Hartwell, D.D., an English Biblical scholar, born October 20, 1780, was educated at

Christ's Hospital. At first he became clerk to a barrister. Devoting his leisure hours to the study of the Bible, in 1818 he published his *Introduction to the critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures* (which has now reached the 11th edition, and is enlarged from 3 to 5 vols. 8vo; it has also been reprinted in this country in 2 vols. imp. 8vo, and 4 vols. 8vo), a work which procured for him admission into orders without the usual preliminaries. Subsequently St. John's College, Cambridge, conferred on him the degree of B.D., and two American colleges that of D.D. In 1824 he found employment in the library of the British Museum as assistant in the department of printed books. In 1833 archbishop Howley appointed him to the rectories of St. Edmund and St. Nicholas, London, which positions he held until his death, Jan. 27, 1862. Horne was for some years actively engaged in the work of Methodism, numbering among his friends Dr. Adam Clarke and Dr. Bunting. He entered the ministry of the Church of England in deference to the earnest desire of his father, with the hope of securing leisure for literary pursuits, but he always maintained a hearty interest in the Church of his early choice, and preserved to the end of his life that simple and earnest godliness which Methodism had taught him to cultivate in his youthful days. He was distinguished as a polemic of considerable ability; his controversial writings alone would have given him a high status among the men of his time; and his versatility is further attested by the variety of his publications, many of which are given to subjects not usually treated by scholars and divines. His researches in bibliography were conducted with amazing industry, and tabulated with great judgment and skill. But he will be best known to posterity by his *Introduction to the critical Study of the Scriptures* (referred to above), which, at the time of its first appearance, was a marvel of labor and scholarship. Hundreds of Biblical students owe their taste for critical pursuits to the reading of this work; and, though somewhat below the spirit and results of the more recent criticisms, it is yet invaluable to those whose resources will not permit the large outlay which the collection of a critical library demands. The most important of his other works are, *Compend. Introd. to the Study of the Bible, or Analysis of the Introd. to the Holy Scriptures* (12mo, 1827):—*Deism Refuted, or plain Reasons for being a Christian* (12mo, 1819):—*Romanism contradictory to Scripture, or the peculiar Tenets of the Church of Rome, as exhibited in her accredited Formularies, contrasted with the Holy Scriptures* (12mo, 1827):—*Mariolatry, or Facts and Evidences demonstrating the Worship of the blessed Virgin Mary by the Church of Rome* (2d ed. 1841):—*The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* (12mo):—*Manual of Parochial Psalmody* (18mo, 1829):—*Manual for the Afflicted* (18mo, 1832), etc. A list of all the productions of Dr. Horne is given by Allibone (*Dict. of Authors*, i, 889-892). See *Reminiscences, personal and bibliographical, of Thomas Hartwell Horne*, with Notes by his daughter, Sarah Anne Cheyne, and a short Introduction by the Rev. Joseph B. M'Caul (Lond. 1862); Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 419; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 324; Keil, *Introd. to N. T.* p. 38; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* i, 154 sq.; *North Am. Review*, xvii, 130 sq.; *Journ. Sac. Lit.* v, 29, 250. (J. H. W.)

Horneck, Anthony, D.D., an English divine, was born at Baccharack, in the Lower Palatinate, in 1641. He studied at Heidelberg and at Leyden, and finally went to England, and entered Queen's College, Oxford, at the age of nineteen. Two years after he became tutor to lord Torrington, who gave him the living of Doulton, in Devonshire, and procured him a prebend in the church of Exeter. In 1671 he was chosen preacher at the Savoy, upon which he resigned his living in Devonshire. Admiral Russel, afterwards earl of Orford, recommended him to the queen for preferment, and, by the advice of Dr. Tillotson, then archbishop, he was presented to the prebendary of Westminster in 1693. He died Jan. 31, 1697. He was a good linguist, a learned divine, an excellent preacher, and a faithful pastor. His church was so crowded that it was often difficult for him to reach the pulpit. In the reign of James II, when it became clear that there was danger of a revival of popery, he spared no pains in resisting the movement. His zeal for the promotion of practical religion was incessant; and, among other means, he made use of the so-called *Religious Societies* of the time, of which, indeed, some suppose him to have been the original founder. The rules of these *societies* seem in some points to have suggested to Wesley his *class-meetings* (q. v.). The following is a summary of them: "1. All that enter the society shall resolve upon a holy and serious life. 2. No person shall be admitted into the society until he has arrived at the age of sixteen, and has been first confirmed by the bishop, and solemnly taken upon himself his baptismal vows. 3. The members shall choose a minister of the Church of England to direct them. 4. They shall not be allowed in their meetings to discourse on any controverted point of divinity. 5. Neither shall they discourse on the government of Church or State. 6. In their meetings they shall use no prayers but those of the Church, such as the litany and collects, and other prescribed prayers; but still they shall not use any that peculiarly belongs to the minister, as the absolution. 7. The minister whom they choose shall direct what practical divinity shall be read at these meetings. 8. They shall have liberty, after prayer and reading, to sing a psalm. 9. After all is done, if there be time left, they may discourse to each other about their spiritual concerns; but this shall not be a standing exercise which any shall be obliged to attend to. 10. One day in the week shall be appointed for this meeting for such as cannot come on the Lord's day; and he that absents himself without cause shall pay threepence to the box. 11. Every time they meet they shall give sixpence to the box. 12. On a certain day in the year, viz. Whit-Tuesday, two stewards shall be chosen, and a moderate dinner provided, and a sermon preached; and the money distributed (necessary charges deducted) to the poor. 13. A book shall be bought in which these orders shall be written. 14. None shall be admitted into this society without the consent of the minister who presides over it; and no apprentice shall be capable of being chosen. 15. If any case of conscience shall arise, it shall be brought before the minister. 16. If any member think fit to leave the society he shall pay five shillings to the stock. 17. The major part of the society shall conclude the rest. 18. The following rules are more especially recommended to the members of this society, viz.: To love one another. When reviled, not to revile again. To speak evil of no man. To wrong no man. To pray, if possible, seven times a day. To keep close to the Church of England. To transact all things peaceably and gently. To be helpful to each other. To use themselves to holy thoughts in their coming in and going out. To examine themselves every night. To give every one their due. To obey superiors, both spiritual and temporal." Dr. Horneck's writings include the following: *Sermons on the fifth of St. Matthew*, with *The Life of the Author*, by Richard (Kidder), lord bishop of Bath and Wells (Lond. 2d ed. 1706, 2 vols. 8vo):—*The crucified Jesus, or a Treatise on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, etc. (London, 6th edit. 1716, 8vo):—*The great Law of Consideration* (Lond. 11th ed. 1729, 8vo):—*The happy Ascetic, or the best Exercise* (on 1 Tim. iv, 7), *to which is added a Letter concerning the holy Lives of the primitive Christians* (Lond. 3d ed. enlarged, 1693, 8vo):—*The Fire of the Altar, a Preparation for the Lord's Supper* (London, 13th ed. 1718, 12mo):—*Sermon on Rom.* viii, 20 (Lond. 1677, 4to).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliograph.* i, 1547; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, vi, 166; Birch, *Life of Tillotson.*

Hornejus (Horney), Konrad, a German Lutheran divine, was born in Brunswick Nov. 25, 1590. He studied theology, philosophy, and philology at Helmstädt, where he settled in 1612. Here he became professor of

logic and ethics in 1619, and of theology in 1628. He died Sept. 26, 1649. As a theologian, especially in the Synergistic controversy (q. v.), he was distinguished for his moderation. His principal works are, *Disputationes ethicæ* (Helmst. 1618; 7th ed. 1666):—*Exercitationes et disputationes logicæ* (1621):—*Disquisitiones metaphysicæ* (1622):—*Institutiones logicæ* (1623):—*Compendium dialecticæ succinctum* (1623; 12th ed. 1666):—*Compendium historiæ eccles.* (1649):—*Commentar z. Hebräer und den Katholischen Briefen* (1654):—*Compendium theologiæ* (Brunsw. 1655).—Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, viii, 542; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 265; Gass, *Dogmengesch.* ii, 147, 159, 210; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 201.

Hornet or WASP (צִרְעָה, *tsirah'*, Exod. xxiii, 28; Deut. vii, 20; Josh. xxiv, 12; Sept. *σφηκία*, Vulg. *crabro*). The Heb. term appears to be indicative of *stinging;* and the ancient versions with the Rabbins favor the interpretation of "hornet" rather than "wasp," as appears from the application of the above Greek and Latin words (comp. Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* v, 19, 617; ix, 65, 66; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xi, 24). The above passages in which the word occurs refer to some means of expulsion of the Canaanites before the Israelites. Not only were bees exceedingly numerous in Palestine, but from the name Zoreah (Josh. xv, 33) we may infer that hornets in particular infested some parts of the country: the frequent notices of the animal in the Talmudical writers (Lewysohn, *Zool.* § 405) lead to the same conclusion. Gesenius, however, maintains that the term is not to be taken in a *literal* sense, but metaphorically, as the symbol of the panic with which God would inspire the inhabitants, adducing the expressions "terror of God" (Gen. xxxv, 5), "mighty destruction" (Deut. vii, 23), and the antithesis of the angel to defend them (Exod. xxiii, 20, etc.), in favor of this interpretation (see *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 1186). Indeed, the following arguments seem to decide in favor of a metaphorical sense: (1) that the word "hornet" in Exod. xxiii, 28 is parallel to "fear" in ver. 27; (2) that similar expressions are undoubtedly used metaphorically, e. g. "to chase as the bees do" (Deut. i, 44; Psa. cxviii, 12); (3) that a similar transfer from the literal to the metaphorical sense may be instanced in the classical *œstrus*, originally a "gad-fly," afterwards *terror* and *madness;* and, lastly (4), that no historical notice of such intervention as hornets occurs in the Bible. We may therefore regard it as expressing under a vivid image the consternation with which Jehovah would inspire the enemies of the Israelites, as declared in Deut. ii, 25; Josh. ii, 11. Among the moderns, Michaelis has defended the figurative sense. In addition to other reasons for it, he doubts whether the expulsion of the Canaanites *could* be effected by swarms of *σφηκίαι*, and proposes to derive the Hebrew from a root signifying "scourges," "plagues," *scutica, plagæ*, etc. (*Supplem. ad Lexic. Hebr.* vi, 2154); but his reasons are ably refuted by Rosenmüller, apud Bochart (*Hieroz.* Lips. 1796, iii, ch. 13, p. 402, etc.). In favor of the possibility of such an event, it is observed that Ælian relates that the Phaselitæ were actually driven from their locality by such means (Φασηλίτας δὲ σφῆκες κ. τ. λ. *Hist. Anim.* ix, 28), and Bochart has shown that these Phaselitæ were a *Phœnician people* (*ut sup.* p. 412). For a parallel case of an army being seriously molested by hornets, see Ammian. Marcell. xxiv, 8. Even Rosenmüller himself adopts the figurative sense in his *Scholia* on Exod. xxiii, 28; but on Josh. xxiv, 12 he retracts that opinion, and amply refutes it. His reasonings and refutations have been adopted by numerous writers (among others, see Paxton's *Illustrations of Scripture*, i, 303, etc., Edinb. 1819). Michaelis's doubt of the abstract possibility seems very unreasonable, when the irresistible power of bees and wasps, etc., attested by numerous modern occurrences, and the thin and partial clothing of the Canaanites, are considered. It is observable that the event is represented by the author of the apocryphal book of Wisdom (xii, 8) as a merciful dispensation, by which the Almighty, he says, "spared as men the old inhabitants of his holy land," and "gave them place for repentance." If the hornet, considered as a *fly*, was in any way connected with their idolatry, the visitation would convey a practical refutation of their error. Ewald (*Gesch. d. V. Israel*, 3d ed. Götting. 1864-8, ii, 116 sq.) connects the word (reading צָרְעָה i. q. צרעאת) with Manetho's story (Josephus, *Apion*, i, 26) of the expulsion of the Israelites from Egypt on account of a disease. See BAALZEBUB.

The hornet (*Vespa crabro*) is a hymenopterous insect with six legs and four wings. It bears a general resemblance to the common wasp, but is of a darker color, and much larger. It is exceedingly fierce and voracious, especially in hot climates, but even in Western countries its sting is frequently dangerous. Roberts observes on Deut. vii, 20, "The sting of the hornet and wasp of the East is much more poisonous than in Europe, and the insect is larger in size. I have heard of several who died from having a single sting; and not many days ago, as a woman was going to a well 'to draw water,' a hornet stung her in the cheek, and she died the next day. The god Siva is described as having destroyed many giants by hornets." It may be remarked, that the hornet, no less than the whole species of wasps, renders an essential service in checking the multiplication of flies and other insects, which would otherwise become intolerable to man; and that in regard to their architecture, and especially their *instincts* and *habits*, they do not yield to their more popular congener, the bee, but even, in several respects, greatly excel it. The hornet, in common with the other social wasps, displays great ingenuity in the manufacture of its nest. It is made of a coarse gray paper, much like the coarsest wrapping-paper, but less firm. This is arranged in several globose leaves, one over the other, not unlike the outer leaves of a cabbage, the base of which is attached by a small footstalk to the upper part of the cavity in which it is inclosed. Within this protecting case the combs are built in parallel rows of cells, exactly like those of the bee, but made of paper, and ranged horizontally instead of vertically, and in single series, the entrances always being downwards. Each story is connected with that above it by a number of pillars of the common paper, thick and massive. These cells do not contain honey, but merely the eggs, and, in due time, the young, being in fact nursing cradles. The paper with which the hornet builds is formed either from decayed wood or the bark of trees, the fibres of which it abrades by means of its jaws, and kneads into a paste with a viscid saliva. When a morsel as large as a pea is prepared, the insect flies to the nest and spreads out the mass in a thin layer at the spot where it is required, moulding it into shape with the jaws and feet. It is soon dry, and forms real paper, coarser than that of the common wasp. (Kirby and Spence, *Introduct. to Entomology*, 8vo, Lond. 1828, i, 273, 274; Réaumur, *Histoire des Insectes*, vol. vi, Mem. 6, 4to, Par. 1734-42; Wood, *Bible Animals*, Lond. 1869, p. 614 sq.). See WASP.

Horologion (*ὡρολόγιον*, literally *a dial*) is the title of one of the "office-books" of the orthodox Eastern Church. It contains the daily hours of prayer, so far as respects their immovable portions, and answers in a measure to the *Officium Hebdomadæ* which is found at the opening of each volume of the breviary of the Eastern Church. But it generally contains also other formularies of that Church. See Neale, *Introd. to the Hist. of the Eastern Church*, ii, 848. See HOURS.

Horon. See BETH-HORON; HORONAIM.

Horona'ïm (Heb. *Chorona'yim*, חֹרֹנַיִם, *two caverns;* Sept. Ἀρωνιείμ and Ὡρωναΐμ), a Moabitish city near Zoar, Luhith, Nimrim, etc., on a declivity along the route of the invading Assyrians (Isa. xv, 5; Jer. xlviii, 3, 5, 34); probably the same called HOLON (חֹלוֹן, perh. by an error for חֹרוֹן, *Horon*, which would appear to be

the original form of the word Horonaim; from חוֹר, a *hole*) in Jer. xlviii, 22 (Sept. Χελών, Vulg. *Helon*). The associated names only afford a conjectural locality east of the north end of the Dead Sea, probably on some one of the great roads (דֶּרֶךְ) leading down from the plateau of Moab to the Jordan valley. It is doubtless the *Oronæ* (Ὠρῶναι) of Josephus (*Ant.* xiii, 15, 4; xiv, 1, 4). Sanballat "the Horonite" (חֹרֹנִי, Neh. ii, 10, 19; xiii, 28) was probably a native of this place, and not (as stated by Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 147) of Beth-horon, which was entirely different.

Ho'ronite [many *Hor'onite*] (Heb. with the art. *ha-Choroni'*, הַחֹרֹנִי; Sept. ὁ Ἀρωνί, Οὐρανίτης, Vulg. *Horonites*), the designation of Sanballat (q. v.), who was one of the principal opponents of Nehemiah's works of restoration (Neh. ii, 10, 19; xiii, 28). It is derived by Gesenius (*Thes.* p. 459) from Horonaim, the Moabitish town, but by Fürst (*Handwb.*) from Horon, i. e. Beth-horon. The latter supposition agrees with the local relations of Sanballat towards the Samaritans, but the former suits better his heathenish affinities, as well as the simple form of the primitive.

Horse, סוּס, *sûs*, ἵππος, of frequent occurrence; other less usual or proper terms and epithets are: סוּסָה, *susah'*, a *mare*, rendered "company of horses," i. e. cavalry, Cant. i, 9; פָּרָשׁ, *parash'*, a horse for riding, "horseman," of frequent occurrence; רֶכֶב or רַכָּב, *re'keb* or *rakkab,'* a beast of burden, also a chariot, charioteer, or chariot-horse, especially a *team*, variously rendered, and of frequent occurrence; אַבִּיר, *abbir'*, "*strong*," as an epithet of the horse, only in Jeremiah, as viii, 16; xlvii, 3; l, 11; רֶכֶשׁ, *re'kesh*, a horse of a nobler breed, a courser, rendered "dromedary" in 1 Kings iv, 8; "mule," Esth. viii, 10, 14; "swift beast," Mic. i, 13; רַמָּךְ, *rammak'*, a *mare*, rendered "dromedary," Esth. viii, 10. The origin of the first two of these terms is not satisfactorily made out; Pott (*Etym. Forsch.* i, 60) connects them respectively with Susa and Pares, or Persia, as the countries whence the horse was derived; and it is worthy of remark that *sûs* was also employed in Egypt for a *mare*, showing that it was a foreign term there, if not also in Palestine. There is a marked distinction between the *sûs* and the *parash;* the former were horses for driving in the war-chariot, of a heavy build, the latter were for riding, and particularly for cavalry. This distinction is not observed in the A. V. from the circumstance that *pârâsh* also signifies horseman; the correct sense is essential in the following passages—1 Kings iv, 26, "forty-thousand *chariot*-horses and twelve thousand *cavalry*-horses;" Ezek. xxvii, 14, "driving-horses and riding-horses;" Joel ii, 4, "as riding-horses, so shall they run;" and Isa. xxi, 7, "a train of horses in couples."

The most striking feature in the Biblical notices of the horse is the exclusive application of it to warlike operations; in no instance is that useful animal employed for the purposes of ordinary locomotion or agriculture, if we except Isa. xxviii, 28, where we learn that horses (A. V. "horsemen") were employed in threshing, not, however, in that case put in the gears, but simply driven about wildly over the strewed grain. This remark will be found to be borne out by the historical passages hereafter quoted, but it is equally striking in the poetical parts of Scripture. The animated description of the horse in Job xxxix, 19-25, applies solely to the war-horse; the mane streaming in the breeze (A. V. "thunder") which "clothes his neck;" his lofty bounds "as a grasshopper;" his hoofs "digging in the valley" with excitement; his terrible snorting—are brought before us, and his ardor for the strife. The following is a close rendering of this fine description of the war-horse:

Canst thou give to the horse prowess?
Canst thou clothe his neck [with] a shuddering [mane]?
Canst thou make him prance like the locust?
The grandeur of his snorting [is] formidable.
They will [eagerly] paw in the valley,
And [each] rejoice in vigor;
He will go forth to meet [the] weapon:
He will laugh at dread,
Nor will he cower,
Nor retreat from before [the] sword:
Against him may rattle quiver,
Flaming lance or dart [in vain].
With prancing and restlessness he will absorb [the] earth [by fleetness];
Nor can he stand still when the sound of the trumpet [is heard]:
As oft [as the] trumpet [sounds], he will say, "Aha!"
For from afar he can scent [the battle],
The thunder of the captains and shouting.

So, again, the bride advances with her charms to an immediate conquest "as a company of horses in Pharaoh's chariots" (Cant. i, 9); and when the prophet Zechariah wishes to convey the idea of perfect peace, he represents the horse, no more mixing in the fray as before (ix, 10), but bearing on his bell (which was intended to strike terror into the foe) the peaceable inscription, "Holiness unto the Lord" (xiv, 20). Lastly, the characteristic of the horse is not so much his speed or his utility, but his strength (Psa. xxxiii, 17; cxlvii, 10), as shown in the special application of the term *abbir* (אַבִּיר), i. e. strong, as an equivalent for a horse (Jer. viii, 16; xlvii, 3; l, 11). Hence the horse becomes the symbol of war, or of a campaign (Zech. x, 3; comp. Psa. xlv, 5; Deut. xxxii, 13; Psa. lxvi, 12; Isa. lviii, 14, where horsemanship is made typical of conquest), especially of speedy conquest (Jer. iv, 13), or rapid execution of any purpose (Rev. vi).

The Hebrews in the patriarchal age, as a pastoral race, did not stand in need of the services of the horse, and for a long period after their settlement in Canaan they dispensed with it, partly in consequence of the hilly nature of the country, which only admitted of the use of chariots in certain localities (Judg. i, 19), and partly in consequence of the prohibition in Deut. xvii, 16, which would be held to apply at all periods. Accordingly they hamstrung the horses of the Canaanites (Josh. xi, 6, 9). David first established a force of cavalry and chariots after the defeat of Hadadezer (2 Sam. viii, 4), when he reserved a hundred chariots, and, as we may infer, all the horses; for the rendering "houghed all the chariot-*horses*" is manifestly incorrect. Shortly after this Absalom was possessed of some (2 Sam. xv, 1). But the great supply of horses was subsequently effected by Solomon through his connection with Egypt; he is reported to have had "40,000 stalls of horses for his chariots, and 12,000 cavalry-horses" (1 Kings iv, 26), and it is worthy of notice that these forces are mentioned parenthetically to account for the great security of life and property noticed in the preceding verse. There is probably an error in the former of these numbers; for the number of chariots is given in 1 Kings x, 26; 2 Chron. i, 14, as 1400, and consequently, if we allow three horses for each chariot, two in use and one as a reserve, as was usual in some countries (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* vi, 1, § 27), the number required would be 4200, or, in round numbers, 4000, which is probably the correct reading. Solomon also established a very active trade in horses, which were brought by dealers out of Egypt, and resold at a profit to the Hittites, who lived between Palestine and the Euphrates. The passage in which this commerce is described (1 Kings x, 28, 29) is unfortunately obscure; the tenor of verse 28 seems to be that there was a regularly established traffic, the Egyptians bringing the horses to a mart in the south of Palestine, and handing them over to the Hebrew dealers at a fixed tariff. The price of a horse was fixed at 150 shekels of silver, and that of a chariot at 600; in the latter we must include the horses (for an Egyptian war-chariot was of no great value), and conceive, as before, that three horses accompanied each chariot, leaving the value of the chariot itself at 150 shekels. In addition to this source of supply, Solomon received horses by way of tribute (1 Kings x, 25). He bought chariots and teams of horses in Egypt (1 Kings x, 28), and probably in Armenia, "in all lands," and had them brought into his

dominions in strings, in the same manner as horses are still conducted to and from fairs: for this interpretation, as offered by professor Paxton, appears to convey the natural and true meaning of the text; and not "strings of linen yarn," which here seem to be out of place (2 Chron. i, 16, 17; ix, 25, 28). The cavalry force was maintained by the succeeding kings, and frequent notices occur both of riding-horses and chariots (2 Kings ix, 21, 33; xi, 16), and particularly of war-chariots (1 Kings xxii, 4; 2 Kings iii, 7; Isa. ii, 7). The force seems to have failed in the time of Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii, 23) in Judah, as it had previously in Israel under Jehoahaz (2 Kings xiii, 7). Josiah took away the horses which the kings of Judah, his predecessors, had consecrated to the sun (2 Kings xxiii, 11). See SUN. The number of horses belonging to the Jews on their return from Babylon is stated at 736 (Neh. vii, 68).

In the countries adjacent to Palestine the use of the horse was much more frequent. It was introduced into Egypt probably by the Hyksos, as it is not represented on the monuments before the 18th dynasty (Wilkinson, i, 386, abridgm.). Yet these animals are not mentioned among the presents which Abraham received from Pharaoh (Gen. xii, 16), and occur first in Scripture among the valuables paid by the Egyptians to Joseph in exchange for grain (Gen. xlvii, 17). They were still sufficiently important to be expressly mentioned in the funeral procession which accompanied the body of Jacob to his sepulchre in Canaan (Gen. i, 9). At the period of the Exodus horses were abundant in Egypt (Exod. ix, 3; xiv, 9, 23; Deut. xvii, 17), and subsequently, as we have already seen, they were able to supply the nations of Western Asia. The Tyrians purchased these animals from Solomon, and in the time of

Ancient Egyptian Horse.

Ezekiel imported horses themselves from Togarmah or Armenia (Ezek. xxvii, 14). The Jewish kings sought the assistance of the Egyptians against the Assyrians in this respect (Isa. xxxi, 1; xxxvi, 8; Ezek. xvii, 15). The Canaanites were possessed of them (Deut. xx, 1; Josh. xi, 4; Judg. iv, 3; v, 22, 28), and likewise the Syrians (2 Sam. viii, 4; 1 Kings xx, 1; 2 Kings vi, 14; vii, 7, 10)—notices which are confirmed by the pictorial representations on Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, i, 393, 397, 401), and by the Assyrian inscriptions relating to Syrian expeditions. But the cavalry of the Assyrians themselves and other Eastern nations was regarded as most formidable; the horses themselves were highly bred, as the Assyrian sculptures still testify, and fully merited the praise bestowed on them by Habakkuk (i, 8), "swifter than leopards, and more fierce than the evening wolves;" their riders "clothed in blue, captains and rulers, all of them desirable young men" (Ezek. xxiii, 6), armed with "the bright sword and glittering spear" (Nah. iii, 3), made a deep impression on the Jews, who, plainly clad, went on foot; as also did their regular array as they proceeded in couples, contrasting with the disorderly troops of asses and camels which followed with the baggage (Isa. xxi, 7, *rekeb* in this passage signifying rather a *train* than a single chariot). The number employed by the Eastern potentates was very great, Holofernes possessing not less than 12,000 (Judith ii, 15). At a later period we have frequent notices of the cavalry of the Græco-Syrian monarchs (1 Macc. i, 18; iii, 39, etc.).

Ancient Persian Horse.

The above notices of the use of the horse by the ancient Egyptians derives abundant illustration from their monuments. In the sculptured battle-scenes, which are believed to represent victories of Sesostris, or of Thothmes II and III, over nations of Central Asia, it is evident that the enemy's armies, as well as the foreign allies of Egypt, were abundantly supplied with horses, both for chariots and for riders; and in triumphal processions they are shown as presents or tribute—proving that they were portions of the national wealth of conquered states sufficiently valuable to be prized in Egypt. That the Assyrians and Babylonians were equally well supplied with this valuable animal is likewise attested by the martial scenes depicted on the sculptures discovered among the ruins of Nineveh and the vicinity. They are represented in almost every variety of position and employment, such as the chase, and for other purposes of pleasure; but chiefly in war, for which the Assyrians used them both with the saddle and in the chariot. According to Mr. Layard (*Nineveh*, 1st series, i, 275 sq.), the horses of the Assyrians were well formed and of noble blood, as appears from the figures no doubt faithfully copied on the sculptures. Cavalry formed an important part of the Assyrian army. The horsemen carried the bow and spear, and wore coats of mail, high greaves, and the pointed helmet. Their horses also were covered, and even, it would seem, with a kind of leather armor, from the head to the tail, to protect them from the arrows of the enemy. It consisted of several pieces fastened together by buttons or loops. Over it was thrown an ornamented saddle-cloth, or a leopard's skin, upon which the rider sat. Under the head of the horse was hung a bell (comp. Zech. xiv, 20) or a tassel. The reins appear to have been tightened round the neck of the horse by a sliding button, and then dropped as the war-

Ancient Assyrian Horse.

Chariot-horse of Rameses III. (From the Monuments at Ipsamboul.)

rior was engaged in fight. Between the horse's ears was an arched crest, and the different parts of the harness were richly embroidered, and ornamented with rosettes (Layard's *Nin.* 2d ser. p. 456). See HORSEMAN.

Ancient Assyrian Stable; Groom currying a Horse.

With regard to the trappings and management of the horse among the Hebrews and adjoining nations, we have little information; the bridle (*resen*) was placed over the horse's nose (Isa. xxx, 28), and a bit or curb (*metheg*) is also noticed (2 Kings xix, 28; Psa. xxxii, 9; Prov. xxvi, 3; Isa. xxxvii, 29; in the A. V. it is incorrectly given "bridle," with the exception of Psa. xxxii). The harness of the Assyrian horses was profusely decorated, the bits being gilt (1 Esdr. iii, 6), and the bridles adorned with tassels; on the neck was a collar terminating in a bell, as described by Zechariah (xiv, 20). Saddles were not used until a late period; only one is represented on the Assyrian sculptures (Layard, ii, 357). The horses were not shod, and therefore hoofs as hard "as flint" (Isa. v, 28) were regarded as a great merit. The chariot-horses were covered with embroidered trappings—the "precious clothes" manufactured at Dedan (Ezek. xxvii, 20): these were fastened by straps and buckles, and to this perhaps reference is made in Prov. xxx, 31, in the term *zarzir*, "one girded about the loins" (A. V. "greyhound"). Thus adorned, Mordecai rode in state through the streets of Shushan (Esth. vi, 9). White horses were more particularly appropriate to such occasions as being significant of victory (Rev. vi, 2; xix, 11, 14). Horses and chariots were used also in idolatrous processions, as noticed in regard to the sun (2 Kings xxiii, 11). As to kinds of harness, etc., by means of which the services of the horse were anciently made available by other nations, it may be well to notice that the riding bridle was long a mere slip-knot, passed round the under jaw into the mouth, thus furnishing only one rein; and that a rod was commonly added to guide the animal with more facility. The bridle, however, and the reins of chariot-horses were, at a very early age, exceedingly perfect, as the monuments of Egypt, Etruria, and Greece amply prove. Saddles were not used, the rider sitting on the bare back, or using a cloth or mat girded on the animal. The Romans, no doubt copying the Persian Cataphractæ, first used pad saddles, and from the northern nations adopted stimuli or spurs. Stirrups were unknown. Avicenna first mentions the *rikiab*, or Arabian stirrup, perhaps the most ancient; although in the tumuli of Central Asia, Tahtar horse skeletons, bridles, and stirrup saddles have been found along with idols, which proves the tombs to be more ancient than the introduction of Islam. With regard to horse-shoeing, bishop Lowth and Bracy Clark were mistaken in believing that the Roman horse or mule shoe was fastened on without nails driven through the horny part of the hoof, as at present. A contrary conclusion may be inferred from several passages in the poets; and the figure of a horse in the Pompeii battle mosaic, shod in the same manner as is now the practice, leaves little doubt on the question. The principal use of horses anciently was for the chariot, especially in war; to this they were attached by means of a pole and yoke like oxen, a practice which continued down to the times of the Romans. (See *Bible Animals*, p. 248 sq.) See CHARIOT; BRIDLE.

It appears that the horse was derived from High Asia, and was not indigenous in Arabia, Syria, or Egypt (Jardine's *Naturalist's Library*, vol. xii), where his congeners the zebra, quagga, and ass are still found in primitive freedom, although the horse is found in all parts of the world—free, it is true, but only as a wild descendant of a once domesticated stock. (See Schlieben, *Die Pferde des Alterthums*, Neuwied. 1867; Abd el-Kader, *Horses of the Desert*, trans. by Daumas, London, 1863.) All the great original varieties or races of horses were then known in Western Asia, and the Hebrew prophets themselves have not unfrequently distinguished the nations they had in view by means of the predominant colors of their horses, and that more correctly than commentators have surmised. Taking Bochart's application (*Hieroz.* i, 31 sq.) of the Hebrew names, the *bay* race, אֲדֻמִּים, *adom*, emphatically belonged to Egypt and Arabia Felix; the *white*, לְבָנִים, *lebonim*, to the regions above the Euxine Sea, Asia Minor, and northern High Asia; the *dun*, or cream-colored, שְׂרֻקִּים, *serukkim*, to the Medes; the spotted *piebald*, or skewbald,

Ancient Assyrian Riding-horse, with Trappings.

בְּרֻדִּים, *beruddim*, to the Macedonians, the Parthians, and later Tahtars; and the *black*, שְׁחוֹרִים, *shachorim*, to the Romans; but the *chestnut*, אֲמֻץ, *amotz*, does not belong to any known historical race (Zech. i, 8; vi, 2). See Ass; Mule; Dromedary. Bay or red horses occur most frequently on Egyptian painted monuments, this being the primitive color of the Arabian stock, but white horses are also common, and, in a few instances, black—the last probably only to relieve the paler color of the one beside it in the picture. There is also, we understand, an instance of a spotted pair, tending to show that the valley of the Nile was originally supplied with horses from foreign sources and distinct regions, as, indeed, the tribute pictures further attest. The spotted, if not real, but painted horses, indicate the antiquity of a practice still in vogue; for staining the hair of riding animals with spots of various colors, and dyeing their limbs and tails crimson, is a practice of common occurrence in the East. These colors are typical, in some passages of Scripture, of various qualities, e. g. the white of victory, the black of defeat and calamity, the red of bloodshed, etc. (compare Rev. vi). See Color.

Horse-Gate (שַׁעַר הַסּוּסִים, *sha'ar has-susim'*, *Gate of the horses;* Sept. πύλη ἵππων or ἱππέων, Vulg. *porta equorum*), a gate in the first or old wall of Jerusalem, at the west end of the bridge leading from Zion to the Temple (Neh. iii, 28; Jer. xxxi, 40), perhaps so called as being that by which the "horses of the sun" (2 Kings xxiii, 11) were led by the idolaters into the sacred inclosure (2 Chron. xxiii, 15; comp. 2 Kings xi, 16). (See Strong's *Harmony of the Gospels*, Append. i, p. 14.) Barclay, however, thinks of a position near the Hippodrome (which, on the contrary, was a later edifice), at the S.E. corner of the Temple wall (*City of the Great King*, p. 152). See Jerusalem.

Horse-leech (עֲלוּקָה, *alukah'*; Sept. ἡ βδέλλα, Vulg. *sanguisuga*, A. V. some eds. as two words, "horse leech") occurs once only, viz. Prov. xxx, 15, "The horseleech hath two daughters, crying, Give, give." Although the Hebrew word is translated *leech* in nearly all the versions, there has been much dispute whether that is its proper meaning. *Against the received translation*, it has been urged that, upon an examination of the context in which it occurs, the introduction of the leech seems strange; that it is impossible to understand what is meant by its "*two* daughters," or *three*, as the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic versions assign to it; and that, instead of the incessant craving apparently attributed to it, the leech drops off when filled. In order to evade these difficulties, it has been attempted, but in vain, to connect the passage either with the preceding or subsequent verse. It has also been attempted to give a different sense to the Hebrew word. But as it occurs nowhere besides in Scripture, and as the root from which it would seem to be derived is never used as a verb, no assistance can be obtained from the Scriptures themselves in this investigation. Recourse is therefore had to the Arabic. The following is the line of criticism pursued by the learned Bochart (*Hierozoicon*, ed. Rosenmüller, iii, 785, etc.). The Arabic word for leech is *alakah*, which is derived from a verb signifying to hang or to adhere to. But the Hebrew word, *alukah*, he would derive from another Arabic root, *aluk*, which means "fate, heavy misfortune, or impending calamity;" and hence he infers that *alukah* properly means destiny, and particularly the *necessity of dying* which attaches to every man by the decree of God. He urges that it is not strange that *offspring* should be ascribed to this divine appointment, since, in Prov. xxvii, 1, offspring is attributed to time, a day—"Thou knowest not what a day may *bring forth*." Now the Hebrews call events "the children of time." We also speak of "the womb of time." He cites Prov. xxvii, 20, as a parallel passage: "Hell (*sheol*) and the grave are never full." Hence he supposes that *sheol* and the *grave* are the two daughters of Alukah or Destiny; each cries "give" at the same moment—the former asks for the soul, and the latter for the body of man in death; both are insatiable, for both involve all mankind in one common ruin. He further thinks that both these are called daughters, because each of the words is of the feminine, or, at most, of the common gender; and in the 16th verse, the grave (*sheol*) is specified as one of the "things that are never satisfied." In further confirmation of this view, Bochart cites rabbinical writers, who state that by the word *alukah*, which occurs in the Chaldee paraphrase on the Psalms, they understand destiny to be signified; and also remark that it has two daughters—Eden and Gehenna, Paradise and Hell—the former of whom never has enough of the souls of the righteous, the latter of the souls of the wicked. (See also Alb. Schultens, *Comment.* ad loc.).

In behalf of the received translation, it is urged that it is scarcely credible that all the ancient translators should have confounded *alukah* with *alakah;* that it is peculiarly unlikely that this should have been the case with the Septuagint translator of the book of Proverbs, because it is believed that "this ranks next to the translation of the Pentateuch for ability and fidelity of execution;" and that the author of it must have been well skilled in the two languages (Horne's *Introduction*, ii, 43, ed. 1828). It is further pleaded that the application of Arabic analogies to Hebrew words is not decisive; and finally, that the theory proposed by Bochart is not essential to the elucidation of the passage. In the preceding verse the writer (not Solomon—see ver. 1) speaks of "a generation, whose teeth are as swords, and their jaw-teeth as knives to *devour* the *poor* from off the earth, and the needy from among men;" and then, after the abrupt and picturesque style of the East, especially in their proverbs, which is nowhere more vividly exemplified than in this whole chapter, the leech is introduced as an illustration of the covetousness of such persons, and of the two distinguishing vices of which it is the parent, avarice and cruelty. May not also the "two *daughters* of the leech, crying, Give, give," be a figurative description of the two *lips* of the creature (for these it has, and perfectly formed), which are a part of its very complicated mouth? It certainly is agreeable to the Hebrew style to call the offspring of inanimate things *daughters*, for so branches are called daughters of trees (Gen. xlix, 22, margin). A similar use of the word is found in Eccles. xii, 4, "All the *daughters* of music shall be brought low," meaning the lips, front teeth, and other parts of the mouth. It is well remarked by Prof. Paxton that "this figurative application of the entire genus is sufficient to justify the interpretation. The leech, as a symbol in use among rulers of every class and in all ages, for avarice, rapine, plunder, rapacity, and even assiduity, is too well known to need illustration" (see Plautus, *Epidic.* art. 2; Cicero, *ad Attic.;* Horace, *Ars. Poet.* 476; Theocritus, *Pharmaceut.;* etc.). In confirmation of this view, Prof. Stuart remarks (*Comment.* ad loc.), "The Arabians have the same word, and in the *Camûs*, their standard dictionary, it is defined by another Arabic word, viz. *Ghoul*. This latter the Camûs again defines as meaning, (1) *Calamity*, (2) *Forest-devil*, (3) *A dæmon man-eating and insatiable*. The Arabians, down to the present hour, maintain that it is often met with in the forests of Arabia, and they stand in great terror of it when entering a thick woods. (See Lane's *Modern Egyptians*, i, 344.) The Syrians had a like superstition, but, like the Hebrews, they more generally named the sprite *lilith*. In Isa. xxxiv, 14, this last word occurs (Auth. Version screech-owl), and it is amply and finely illustrated by Gesenius (*Comment.* ad loc.). In like manner, Western superstition is full of spokes, hobgoblins, elves, imps, and vampires; all, especially the last of which, are essentially insatiable, bloodsucking spectres." (See also Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 1038.) See Spectre.

There is, then, little doubt that *alukah* denotes some species of leech, or, rather, is the generic term for any blood-sucking annelid, such as *Hirudo* (the medicinal leech), *Hæmopis* (the horse-leech), *Limnatis*, *Trochetia*, and *Aulastoma*, if all these genera are found in the marshes and pools of the Bible-lands. The leech or blood-sucker belongs to the genus *vermes*, order *intestinata*, Linn. It is viviparous, brings forth only *one* offspring at a time, and the genus contains many species. "The *horse*-leech" is properly a *species* of leech discarded for medical purposes on account of the coarseness of its bite. There is no ground for the *distinction of species* made in the English Bible. The valuable use of the leech (*Hirudo*) in medicine, though undoubtedly known to Pliny and the later Roman writers, was in all probability unknown to the ancient Orientals; still they were doubtless acquainted with the fact that leeches of the above-named genus would attach themselves to the skin of persons going barefoot in ponds; and they also were probably cognizant of the propensity horse-leeches (*Hæmopis*) have of entering the mouth and nostrils of cattle, as they drink from the waters frequented by these pests, which are common enough in Palestine and Syria. The use which, from its thirst for blood, we make of the leech, being unknown to the ancient Orientals, as it is unknown in the East at the present day, it is there spoken of with feelings of horror and aversion, particularly as it causes the destruction of valuable animals by fastening under their tongues when they come to drink. The lake called Birket er-Ram, the ancient Phiala, about three hours from Banias, is said to be so crowded with leeches that a man can gather 6000 or even 8000 in a day, while the fountain at Banias is not infested by a single leech.

The mechanism by which the leech is enabled to gratify its greedy thirst for blood is highly curious. The throat is spacious, and capable of being everted to a great degree. The front border of the mouth is enlarged so as to form a sort of upper lip, and this combines with the wrinkled muscular margin of the lower and lateral portions to form the sucker. We may even slit down the ventral margin of the sucker, exposing the whole throat. Then, the edges being folded back, we see implanted in the walls on the dorsal regions of the cavity three white eminences of a cartilaginous texture, which rise to a sharp crescentic edge; they form a triangular, or, rather, a triradiate figure, and by a peculiar saw-like motion so abrade the surface as to cause a flow of blood, which is greatly assisted by the contraction of the edges forming a vacuum like a cupping-glass.

Mouth and Throat of the Leech. opened and magnified.

Horseman (properly and usually בַּעַל פָּרָשׁ. *ba'al parash'*, *master of a horse*). Our translation would make it appear that a force of cavalry accompanied Pharaoh in his pursuit—"his horsemen" (Exod. xiv, 9, etc.). It is, however, a fact not a little remarkable, that in the copious delineations of battle-scenes which occur in the monuments, and which must have been coeval with these events, in which, moreover, everything that could tend to aggrandize the power or flatter the pride of Egypt would be introduced, there never occurs any representation of Egyptian cavalry. The armies are always composed of troops of infantry armed with the bow and spear, and of ranks of chariots drawn by two horses. Both Diodorus and Herodotus attribute cavalry to the early Pharaohs; and some eminent antiquarians, as Sir Gardiner Wilkinson, endeavor to account for the absence of such a force in the pictorial representations consistently with its existence. But professor Hengstenberg has maintained, and not without some degree of probability, that the word "horsemen" of the above passage should rather be rendered "chariot-riders." We quote his words: "It is accordingly certain that the cavalry, in the more ancient period of the Pharaohs, was but little relied on. The question now is, what relation the declarations of the passage before us bear to this result. Were the common view, according to which riding *on horses* is superadded with equal prominence to the chariot of war, in our passage, the right one, there might arise strong suspicion against the credibility of the narrative. But a more accurate examination shows that the author does not mention Egyptian cavalry at all; that, according to him, the Egyptian army is composed only of chariots of war, and

The Son of king Rameses with his Charioteer. (Wilkinson.)

that he therefore agrees in a wonderful manner with the native Egyptian monuments. And this agreement is the more minute, since the second division of the army represented upon them, the infantry, could not, in the circumstances of our narrative, take part in the pursuit. The first and principal passage concerning the constituent parts of the Egyptian army which pursued the Israelites is that in Exod. xiv, 6, 7: 'And he made ready his chariot, and took his people with him; and he took six hundred chosen chariots, and all the chariots of Egypt, and *chariot-warriors* upon all of them.' Here Pharaoh's preparation for war is fully described. It consists, first, of chariots, and, secondly, of chariot-warriors. Cavalry are no more mentioned than infantry. This passage, which is so plain, explains the second one (ver. 9), where the arrival of this same army in sight of the Israelites is plainly and graphically described, in order to place distinctly before the reader the impression which the view made upon the Israelites: 'And the Egyptians followed them and overtook them, where they were encamped by the sea, all the *chariot-horses* of Pharaoh, and his *riders*, and his host'" (*Egypt and Moses*, ch. iv). See CHARIOT.

In the same connection we may remark that, although the Egyptian warriors usually rode two in a chariot only, yet it appears, from the use of the peculiar term שָׁלִישׁ, *shalish'* (lit. *third*, A.V. "captain"), applied to

Ancient Assyrian Horseman, ready to mount.

Ancient Egyptian Princes in their Chariot.

the charioteers destroyed in the Red Sea (Exod. xv, 4), and to other officers (2 Sam. xxiii, 8, etc.), that occasionally at least *three* persons were accustomed to ride together in battle; and this is confirmed by the fact that in some of the delineations on the Egyptian monuments we find two persons represented as principals in a war-car, while a third manages the reins. See CAPTAIN.

Among the Assyrians, on the other hand, single riders on horseback were not uncommon, although with them, too, the cavalry arm of the military service consisted chiefly of chariots. See ARMY.

Horsley, SAMUEL, one of the most distinguished divines ever produced by the Church of England, was born in London, October, 1733. He was the son of the Reverend John Horsley (whose father was originally a Nonconformist), for many years the clerk in orders at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, and who held two rectories, Thorley in Hertfordshire, and Newington Butts in Surrey. Samuel Horsley was educated at Westminster School and Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and had the rectory of Newington, which his father resigned to him soon after he had taken orders in 1759. His more public career may be said to have commenced in 1767, when he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society, of which body he became secretary in 1773. His earliest publications were tracts on scientific subjects, but in 1776 he projected a complete and uniform edition of the philosophical works of Sir Isaac Newton. This design was not accomplished till 1785, when the fifth and last of the five quarto volumes made its appearance. In the earlier years of his public life he found patrons in the earl of Aylesford, and in Lowth, bishop of London; but we pass over the presentations to his various livings, and the dispensations which the number of his minor preferments rendered necessary. In 1781 he was appointed archdeacon of St. Albans. It was a little before the date last named that he first appeared in the field of theological controversy, in which, from the great extent of his knowledge and from the vigor of his intellect, he soon showed himself a very powerful combatant. His attacks were chiefly directed against Dr. Joseph Priestley, who in a series of publications defended with great subtilty and skill the doctrines of philosophical necessity, materialism, and Unitarianism. Dr. Horsley began his attack in 1778 on the question of *Man's Free Agency;* it was continued in a *Charge* delivered in 1783 to the clergy of his archdeaconry, in which he animadverted on many parts of Dr. Priestley's *History of the Corruptions of Christianity.* This charge produced a reply from Dr. Priestley, which led to a rejoinder from Dr. Horsley in *Seventeen Letters to Dr. Priestley*, a masterly defence of the orthodox faith, and the secure foundation of a lasting theological reputation. These writings are believed to have stopped the progress, for that age, of Socinianism in England. The tide of preferment now began to flow in upon him. Thurlow, who was then chancellor, presented him with a prebendal stall in the church of Gloucester, observing, as it is said, that "those who defended the Church ought to be supported by the Church;" and in 1788 he was made bishop of St. David's. In Parliament he distinguished himself by the hearty support which he gave to the measures of Pitt's administration. His political conduct gained him the favor of the court: in 1793 he was translated to Rochester, and in 1802 to St. Asaph. He died October 4, 1806. Dr. Horsley has been, not inaptly, described as the last of the race of episcopal giants of the Warburtonian school. He was a man of an original and powerful mind, of very extensive learning, and profoundly versed in the subject of ecclesiastical history, of which he gave ample evidence in his controversy with Dr. Priestley, while archdeacon of St. Albans. Even Gibbon says, "His spear pierced the Socinian's shield." His sermons and critical disquisitions frequently display a rich fund of theological acumen, and of successful illustration of the sacred writings. Besides the works named above, his theological writings include *Critical Disquisitions on Isaiah* xviii (Lond. 1799, 4to):—*The Book of Psalms, translated, with Notes* (3d edit. London, 1833, 8vo):—*Hosea, translated, with Notes* (2d edit. Lond. 1804):—*Biblical Criticism on the O. Test.* (2d edit. Lond. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Sermons on the Resurrection* (3d edit. Lond. 1822, 8vo); all which, with his tracts in the Priestley controversy, are to be found in his *Collected Works* (Lond. 1845, 6 vols. 8vo). See *English Cyclopædia; Quarterly Review* (Lond.), vols. iii and ix; *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xvii; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 894; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1548; Chalmers, *Biog. Dictionary;* Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 171 sq.; Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, p. 513 sq.; Donaldson, *Hist. of Christ. Lit. and Doctrines*, i, 72; *Ch. Hist. of the 13th Century*, p. 445; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 418, 421; Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, i, 57, 386; *General Repository*, i, 22, 229; ii, 7, 257; iii, 13, 250; *Quarterly Review*, iii, 398; ix, 30; *Edinburgh Review*, xvii, 455; *Monthly Review*, lxxxiv, 82; *Analytical Magazine*, iv, 268.

Horstius, JACOB MERLO, a Roman Catholic theologian, was born towards the close of the 16th century at Horst, Holland (whence his name). He was priest at the Lyskirchen in Cologne, where he died in 1644. Horstius is the author of several ascetical works. He wrote *Enchiridion officii divini; Paradisus animæ Christianæ* (transl. into French by Nicolaus Fontane, under the title *Heures Chrétiennes, tirées de l'Écriture et des saints Pères*):—*Septem tubæ orbis Christiani* (a compilation from the writings of the fathers, and intended for young Roman Catholic priests). He also edited a commentary of Estius on the *Pauline Letters;* the works of St. Bernard (2 vols.), and of Thomas à Kempis.—Wetzer

und Welte, *Kircken-Lexikon*, xii, 593; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* (Elberf. 1868), ii, 369.

Hort, JOSIAH, an Anglican prelate, was born towards the close of the 17th century, and educated at a Dissenting school together with Dr. Isaac Watts. In 1695 he became chaplain to John Hampden, Esq., M.P., and afterwards settled as Dissenting minister at Marshfield. About 1708 he conformed, and became a minister of the Church of England. He now rose quickly to distinguished positions in the Church. In 1721 he was consecrated bishop of Ferns and Leighlin in Ireland, translated in 1727 to Kilmore and Ardagh, and was advanced to the archbishopric of Tuam in 1742, with the united bishopric of Enaghdoen, and with permission to hold also his former bishopric of Ardagh. He died Dec. 14, 1751. Bishop Hort published, besides, several collections of *Sermons* (1708-9, 1738, 1757):—*Instrutions to the Clergy of Tuam* (1742, 8vo; 1768, 8vo; also in *Clergyman's Instructor*). See Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* vi, 184 sq.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 895.

Hortig, KARL ANTON, a distinguished German Roman Catholic (also known by the name given him by his order, JOHANN NEPOMUCK), was born at Pleistein, Bavaria, in 1774, and was educated at the University of Ingolstadt. He entered the order of the Benedictines in 1794, and in 1799 became chaplain of a nunnery at Nonnberg. In 1802 he was appointed professor of logic and metaphysics at the school of the Andech Cloister, and promoted, after filling various minor positions, to a professorship of theology at Landshut in 1821. In 1826 he removed with the university to Munich, where he received many honors, and died Feb. 27, 1847. His theological works are, *Predigten f. alle Festtage* (Landsh. 1821; 3d edit. 1832):—*Predigten ü. d. sontägigen Evangel.* (ibid. 1827; 2d ed. 1832):—*Handb. d. christl. Kirchengesch.* (2 vols. 1826-28, of which the second part of vol. ii was completed by the celebrated Döllinger).—*Real-Encyklop. f. d. kathol. Deutschl.* xii, 1031 sq.; Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 550.

Horton, THOMAS, D.D., an English divine, was born at London, and was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow. In 1637 he was university preacher, and in July of this year he was chosen master of Queen's College, Cambridge, and minister of St. Mary Colechurch, London. In 1641 he became professor of divinity at Gresham College, and in 1647 preacher of Gray's Inn, and vice-chancellor of Cambridge in 1650. He was ejected for nonconformity in 1662, but he afterwards conformed, and was appointed vicar of Great St. Helen's, London, in 1666. He died in 1673. He was a pious and learned man, especially skilled in the Oriental languages. Of his works, which are very scarce, the principal are *Sermon* (Psa. lxxxvii, 4-6), *Zion's Birth-register unfolded* (Lond. 1656, 4to):—*Forty-six Sermons on the eighth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans* (Lond. 1674, fol.):—*Choice and practical Expositions on four select Psalms* (iv, xlii, lix, lxiii) (London, 1675, fol.):—*One hundred select Sermons upon several Texts; fifty upon the Old Testament and fifty on the New:* left perfected in the press under his own hands (Lond. 1679, fol.).—Stoughton (John), *Eccles. Hist. of England* (London, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), i, 156, 288; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1531; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 185 sq.; Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* ii (see Index); Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 895.

Horus (῟Ωρος), the Egyptian god of the sun, generally written in hieroglyphics by the sparrow-hawk, and represented with a bird's beak. The old derivation from the Hebrew *aur*, light, is now recognised as incorrect. As an Egyptian divinity he is mentioned generally as the son of Isis and Osiris, and brother of Bubastis, the Egyptian Diana. Various esoteric explanations have been given of him, e. g. that "he represents the Nile, as Typhon the desert, the fruitful air or dew which revives the earth, the moon, the sun in relation to the changes of the year, or the god who presided over the course of the sun." He also represented three planets—Jupiter (Harapshta), Saturn (Harka), and Mars (Harteshr). The sparrow-hawk was sacred to him; so were lions, which were placed at the side of his throne. There was a festival to celebrate his eyes on the 30th Epiphi, when the sun and moon, which they represented, were on the same right line with the earth. A movable feast, that of his coronation, is supposed to have been selected for the coronations of the kings of Egypt, who are described as sitting upon his throne. When adult, he is generally represented hawk-headed; as a child, he is seen carried in his mother's arms, wearing the *pshent* or *atf*, and seated on a lotus-flower with his finger on his lips. He had an especial local worship at Edfou or Hut, the ancient Apollinopolis Magna, where he was identified with Ra, or the Sun. There were also books of Horus and Isis, probably referring to his legend (Lucian, *De Somn. sive Gall.* s. 183). The magnet was called his bone; he was of fair complexion (Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 430 sq.). He was also worshipped very extensively in Greece, and later at Rome, in a somewhat modified form. In Grecian mythology he was compared with Apollo, and identified with Harpocrates, the last son of Osiris (Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 19). See HORAPOLLO. They were both represented as youths, and with the same attributes and symbols (Artemid. *Oneir.* ii, 36; Macrobius, *Sat.* i, 23; Porphyry ap. Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* v, 10; Iamblichus, *De Myster.* vii, 2). In the period of the worship of this god at Rome he seems to have been regarded as the god of quiet life and silence (Varro, *De L. L.* iv, 17, Bip.; Ovid, *Met.* ix, 691; Ausonius, *Epist. ad Paul.* xxv, 27), which was due, no doubt, to the belief that he was born

A finely-executed bronze figure of HAR-OERI, son of Osiris and Athor, who is frequently called the elder Horus. At Ombos he is styled "Resident in the eyes of light, Lord of Ombos, the great God, Lord of the Heavens, Lord of Eelak, Philæ," etc., and is evidently connected with the Sun. From Memphis. (From Abbott's Collection of Egyptian Antiquities.)

with his finger in his mouth, as indicative of secrecy and mystery. Horus acts also a prominent part in the mystic works attributed to Hermes Trismegistus (q. v.). See Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, ii, 526; Birch, *Gall. of Antiq.* p. 35; Wilkinson, *Man. and Cust.* iv, 395; Jablonski, *Panth.* ii, 4, p. 222; Champollion, *Panth. Eg.*; Hincks, *Dublin Univ. Mag.* xxviii, 187; Böckh, *Manetho*, p. 61; Bunsen, *Aegyptens Stelle in d. Weltgesch.* i, 505 sq. See VALENTINIAN THEOLOGY. (J. H. W.)

Horwitz, a Jewish family, several members of which have become distinguished as writers. The most renowned are:

1. HORWITZ (*Sabbatai-Scheftel*), HA-LEVI BEN-AKIBA, head of the synagogue of Prague at the beginning of the 16th century. He wrote פֶּלַח הָרִמּוֹן (Kerez, 1793, 4to), or Commentary on Sam. Galicho's עֲסִיס רִמּוֹנִים:—נִשְׁמַת שַׁבְּתַי הַלֵּוִי (Prague, 1616, 4to), a dialogue expounding the Cabalistic doctrine of the soul:—שֶׁפַע טָל (Zolkiew, 1780, 4to), a Cabalistic work di-

vided into two parts, making a key to the Jezirah, Zohar, and other Cabalistic books.

2. HORWITZ, ABRAHAM, son of the preceding, and known also under the name of *Schefteles*, was born at Prague in the first half of the 16th century. He wrote the following Hebrew works: בְּרִית אַבְרָהָם, *On Repentance and Confession* (Cracow, 1602, and often):—חֶסֶד לְאַבְרָהָם, a complete commentary on Maimonides's Introd. to the book Aboth of the Talmud (Cracow, 1577, and often):—יֵשׁ נוֹחֲלִין (Prague, 1615, 4to), containing moral instructions, especially intended for his own children:—עֵמֶק בְּרָכָה (Amst. 1757, 4to), containing remarks on the blessings of the Jews and their origin.

3. HORWITZ, ISAIAH, son of the foregoing, born at Prague about 1550, became the most distinguished of this family. He was Rabbi first at Frankfort, then at Posen, at Cracow, and at Prague. In 1622 he went to Jerusalem. Poverty induced him to leave that city, and he retired to Tiberias, where he died in 1629. He wrote שְׁנֵי לוּחוֹת הַבְּרִית (Amsterd. 1649, fol.; several times reprinted), a work which enjoys great reputation among the Jews. It is divided into two parts: the first treats of the existence of God, the law, the privileges of the people of Israel, the attributes of God, the sanctuary, judgment, free agency, the Messiah, worship, ceremonies, and feasts. The second part contains ten treatises on six hundred and thirteen precepts, the oral law, etc. Three abridgments have been published, one by Eppstein (Amst. 1683, 4to; several edit.); the second by Zoref Ha-Levi (Frankf. 1681, 4to); and the third by Œttling Ben-Jechia (Ven. 1705, 8vo):—בִּגְדֵי יֶשַׁע, or Commentary on "the book of Mordecai," was at first published only in part with the *Seder Mohed*, then separately (Amst. 1757, 4to; Zolkiew, 1826, fol.), and oftener as an appendix to the book of Mordecai, or in some editions of the Talmud:—הַגָּהוֹת לְסֵ' עֵמֶק בְּרָכָה, reflections on the *Emek Berakah* of his father, and printed along with it (Crac. 1597, 4to); also in the two separate editions of the preceding work:—שַׁעַר הַשָּׁמַיִם (Amst. 1717, 4to; with a preface and glossaries by one of his descendants, Abraham Horwitz): it is a Cabalistic commentary on the Psalms and on prayers. The same work contains also his father's *Sepher Berith Abraham.*

4. HORWITZ (*Sabbatai Scheftel*), son of the preceding, was Rabbi of Frankfort, then of Posen, and finally of Vienna, where he died about 1658. He is the author of three Hebrew works, the first entitled *A Treatise on Morals*, in six parts, serving as an introduction to his father's work, שְׁנֵי לוּחוֹת הַבְּרִית, and printed with it (Amst. 1649, fol.; several editions):—צַוָּאָה, printed with his grandfather's יֵשׁ נוֹחֲלִין (Amst. 1717, 4to), a work on morals already referred to above:—חִדּוּשֵׁי מַסֵּ' בְּרָכוֹת, printed with his grandfather's *Emek Berakah*, on which it is a sort of commentary (Amst. 1757, 4to; Zolkiew, 1826, fol.).

5. HORWITZ, ISAIAH BEN-JACOB, nephew of the foregoing, and grandson of the former Isaiah Horwitz, was a native of Poland, and died there in 1695. He wrote בֵּרִית הַלֵּוִי (Venice, 1663, 4to), and some commentaries on the Talmud relating to Jewish jurisprudence. See J. Buxtorf, *Rabbinica Bibliotheca;* Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraica;* Rossi, *Dizionario degli Autori Ebrei;* J. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Génér.* xxv, 207. (J. H. W.)

Ho'sah (Heb. *Chosah'*, חֹסָה, *refuge*; Sept. Ὡσά, Ὡσά, and Ὡσηέ), the name of a place and also of a man.

1. A place on the border of the tribe of Asher, at a point where the line turned from the direction of Tyre to its terminus on the Mediterranean, in the direction of Achzib (Josh. xix, 29). It is possibly the same with the modern village *el-Ghazieh*, a little south of Zidon; notwithstanding the objection of Schwarz (who thinks this too far north, and prefers a village called *el-Bussah*, a little north of Eczib, *Palest.* p. 194), since it is uncertain which way the boundary is here described as running, and the account is a good deal involved. Van de Velde proposes to identify it with *el-Kauzah*, "a village with traces of antiquity near wady el-Ain" (*Memoir*, p. 322), the *Kauzih* of Robinson (new *Researches*, p. 61, 62); but to this Keil objects (*Comment. on Josh.* ad loc.) that "the situation does not suit in this connection," although it lies very near Ramah, and in the direction from Tyre towards Achzib. See ELKOSH.

2. A Levite of the family of Merari, who, with thirteen of his relatives, was appointed by David porter of the gate Shallecheth, on the west side of the Temple (1 Chron. xvi, 38; xxvi, 10, 11, 16). B.C. 1014.

Hosai. See HOZAI.

Hosan'na (ὡσαννά, from the Heb. הוֹשִׁיעָה־נָּא, as in Psa. cxviii, 25; Isa. lix, 1; xlv, 20), a form of acclamatory blessing or wishing well, which signifies *Save now!* i. e. "succor now! be now propitious!" It occurs in Matt. xxi, 9 (also Mark xi, 9, 10; John xii, 13), "Hosanna to the Son of David; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest." This was on the occasion of our Saviour's public entry into Jerusalem, and, fairly construed, would mean, "Lord, preserve this Son of David; heap favors and blessings on him!" It is further to be observed that *Hosanna* was a customary form of acclamation at the Feast of Tabernacles. This feast was celebrated in September, just before the commencement of the civil year, on which occasion the people carried in their hands bundles of boughs of palms, myrtles, etc. (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 13, 6; iii, 10, 4). They then repeated the 25th and 26th verses of Psa. cxviii, which commence with the word *Hosanna;* and from this circumstance they gave the boughs, and the prayers, and the feast itself the name of *Hosanna.* They observed the same forms, also, at the Encænia, or Festival of Dedication (1 Macc. x, 6, 7; 2 Macc. xiii, 51; Rev. vii, 9), and the Passover.—Kitto. The psalm from which it was taken, the 118th, was one with which they were familiar, from being accustomed to recite the 25th and 26th verses at the Feast of Tabernacles. On that occasion the Great *Hallel*, consisting of Psa. cxiii–cxviii, was chanted by one of the priests, and at certain intervals the multitudes joined in the responses, waving their branches of willow and palm, and shouting as they waved them Hallelujah, or Hosanna, or "O Lord, I beseech thee, send now prosperity" (Psa. cxviii, 25). This was done at the recitation of the first and last verses of Psa. cxviii, but, according to the school of Hillel, at the words "Save now, we beseech thee" (ver. 25). The school of Shammai, on the contrary, say it was at the words "Send now prosperity" of the same verse. Rabban Gamaliel and R. Joshua were observed by R. Akiba to wave their branches only at the words "Save now, we beseech thee" (Mishna, *Succah*, iii, 9). On each of the seven days during which the feast lasted the people thronged in the court of the Temple, and went in procession about the altar, setting their boughs bending towards it, the trumpets sounding as they shouted Hosanna. But on the seventh day they marched seven times round the altar, shouting meanwhile the great Hosanna to the sound of the trumpets of the Levites (Lightfoot, *Temple Service*, xvi, 2). The very children who could wave the palm branches were expected to take part in the solemnity (Mishna, *Succah*, iii, 15; Matt. xxi, 15). From the custom of waving the boughs of myrtle and willow during the service the name Hosanna was ultimately transferred to the boughs themselves, so that, according to Elias Levita (*Thisbi*, s. v.), "the bundles of the willows of the brook which they carry at the Feast of Tabernacles are called Hosannas." The term is frequently applied by Jewish writers to denote the Feast of Tabernacles, the seventh day of the feast being distinguished as the great Hosanna (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* s.

v. ישע). Monographs on this ejaculation have been written in Latin by Bindrim (Ros. 1671), Nothdurfft (Brunsw. 1713), Pfaff (Tübingen, 1789), Winzer (Lips. 1677-78, 1703), Bucher (Zittav. 1728), Wernsdorf (Viteb. 1765), Zopf (Lips. 1703). See HALLEL.

HOSANNA. The early Christian Church adopted this word into its worship. It is found in the apostolical constitutions connected with the great doxology or exclamation of triumph, "Glory be to God on high," and was frequently used in the communion service, during which the great doxology was also sung.—Eadie, *Eccl. Dict.* p. 314; Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* i, 41; ii, 690. (J. H. W.)

Hose (פַּטִּישׁ, *pattish'*, only in the plur., marg. פְּטַשׁ, *pe'tesh*, Chald., "hosen," Dan. iii, 21). What article of apparel is here denoted is not certain. Theodotion (perhaps also the Sept.) and the Vulg. understand a *tiara;* compare Greek πέτασος, Venet. Gr. vers. ἀναξυρίς; but the Heb. interpreters more correctly render a *tunic* or under-garment (כְּתֹנֶת = χιτών), a signification that better agrees with an *ample* garment (from (פָּטַשׁ, to *expand*). The term does not elsewhere occur; but see Buxtorff, *Lex. Talm.* col. 1865. See DRESS.

Hose'ä (Heb. *Hoshe'ä*, הוֹשֵׁעַ, *deliverance*), or "HOSHEA" (as it is more correctly Anglicized in Deut. xxxii, 44; 2 Kings xv, 30; xvii, 1, 3, 4, 6; xviii, 1, 9, 10; 1 Chron. xxvii, 20; Neh. x, 23; but "Oshea" in Numb. xiii, 8, 6), the name of several men.

1. HOSHEA or OSHEA (Sept. Αὐσή and Ἰησοῦς, Vulg. *Osee* and *Josue*), the original name of JOSHUA (q. v.), Moses's successor (Numb. xiii, 8, 16; Deut. xxxii, 44).

2. HOSHEA, the son of Azariah, and viceroy of the Ephraimites under David (1 Chron. xxvii, 20).

3. HOSEA (Sept. Ὠσηέ, Vulg. *Osee*, N. T. Ὡσηέ, "Osee," Rom. ix, 25), the son of Beeri (Hos. i, 1, 2), and author of the book of prophecies which bears his name. See PROPHET.

The personal history of the prophet Hosea is so closely interwoven with his book of prophecies that it will be most convenient to consider them together; indeed, the principal recorded events of his life were a series of prophetical symbols themselves. The figments of Jewish writers regarding Hosea's parentage need scarcely be mentioned (see J. Fredericus, *Exercit. de Hosea et vaticiniis ejus*, Lips. 1715). His father has been confounded with *Beerah*, a prince of the Reubenites (1 Chron. v, 6). So, too, Beeri has been reckoned a prophet himself, according to the rabbinical notion that the mention of a prophet's father in the introduction to his prophecies is a proof that sire as well as son was endowed with the oracular spirit.

1. *Place.*—Whether Hosea was a citizen of Israel or Judah has been disputed. The pseudo-Epiphanius and Dorotheus of Tyre speak of him as being born at Belemoth, in the tribe of Issachar (Epiphan. *De Vitis Prophet.* cap. xi; Doroth. *De Proph.* cap. i). Drusius (*Critici Sacri*, in loc., tom. v) prefers the reading "Beth-semes," and quotes Jerome, who says, "Osee de tribu Issachar fuit ortus in Beth-semes." But Maurer contends strenuously that he belonged to the kingdom of Judah (*Comment. Theol.*, ed. Rosenmüller, ii, 391); while Jahn supposes that he exercised his office, not, as Amos did, in Israel, but in the principality of Judah. Maurer appeals to the superscription in Amos as a proof that prophets of Jewish origin were sometimes commissioned to labor in the kingdom of Israel (against the appeal to Amos, see Credner, *Joel*, p. 66; Hitzig, *Kurzgef. exeget. Handb. zum A. T.* p. 72). But with the exception of the case recorded in 1 Kings xiii, 1 (a case altogether too singular and mysterious to serve as an argument), the instance of Amos is a solitary one, and seems to have been regarded as anomalous by his contemporaries (Amos vii, 12). Neither can we assent to the other hypothesis of Maurer, that the mention of the Jewish kings Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, by Hosea in his superscription, is a proof that the seer regarded them as his rightful sovereigns, as monarchs of that territory which gave him birth. Hengstenberg has well replied, that Maurer forgets "the relation in which the pious in Israel generally, and the prophets in particular, stood to the kingdom of Judah. They considered the whole separation, not only the religious, but also the civil, as an apostasy from God. The dominion of the theocracy was promised to be the throne of David." The lofty Elijah, on a memorable occasion, when a direct and solemn appeal was made to the head of the theocracy, took *twelve* stones, one for each tribe—a proof that he regarded the nation as one in religious confederation. It was also necessary, for correct chronology, that the kings of both nations should be noted. The other argument of Maurer for Hosea's being a Jew, viz. because his own people are so severely threatened in his reproofs and denunciations, implies a predominance of national prepossession or antipathy in the inspired breast which is inconsistent with our notions of the piety and patriotism of the prophetic commission (Knobel, *Der Prophetismus der Hebräer*, i, 203). We therefore accede to the opinion of De Wette, Rosenmüller, Hengstenberg, Eichhorn, Manger, Uhland, and Kuinöl, that Hosea was an Israelite, a native of that kingdom with whose sins and fates his book is specially and primarily occupied. The name Ephraim occurs in his prophecies about thirty-five times, and Israel with equal frequency, while Judah is not mentioned more than fourteen times. Samaria is frequently spoken of (vii, 1; viii, 5, 6; x, 5, 7; xiv, 1), Jerusalem never. All the other localities introduced are connected with the northern kingdom, either as forming part of it, or lying on its borders: Mizpah, Tabor (v, 1), Gilgal (iv, 15; ix, 15; xii, 12 [11]), Bethel, called also Bethaven (x, 15; xii, 5 [4]; iv, 15; v, 8; x, 5, 8); Jezreel (i, 4), Gibeah (v, 8; ix, 9), Ramah (v, 8), Gilead (vi, 8; xii, 12 [11]), Shechem (vi, 9), Lebanon (xiv, 6, 7), Arbela (x, 14 [?]).

2. *Time.*—There is no reason, with De Wette, Maurer, and Hitzig, to doubt the genuineness of the present superscription, or, with Rosenmüller and Jahn, to suppose that it may have been added by a later hand—though the last two writers uphold its authenticity. These first and second verses of the prophecy are so closely connected in the structure of the language and style of the narration, that the second verse itself would become suspicious if the first were reckoned a spurious addition. This superscription states that Hosea prophesied during a long and eventful period, commencing in the days of Jeroboam, the son of Joash, extending through the lives of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and concluding in the reign of Hezekiah. As Jeroboam died B.C. 782, and Hezekiah ascended the throne 726, we have the round term of about sixty years, B.C. cir. 784-724, as the probable space of time covered by the utterance of these predictions (Maurer, in the *Comment. Theol.* p. 284, and more lately in his *Comment. Gramm. Hist. Crit. in Proph. Min.* Lips. 1840). The time when they were committed to writing may probably be fixed at about B.C. 725. This long duration of office is not improbable, and the book itself furnishes strong presumptive evidence in support of this chronology. The first prophecy of Hosea foretells the overthrow of Jehu's house; and the menace was fulfilled on the death of Jeroboam, his great-grandson. This prediction must have been uttered during Jeroboam's life. Again, in ch. x, 14, allusion is made to an expedition of Shalmaneser against Israel; and if it was the first inroad against king Hoshea (2 Kings xvii, 4), who began to reign in the twelfth year of Ahaz, the event referred to by the prophet as past must have happened close upon the beginning of the government of Hezekiah. These data corroborate the limits assigned in the superscription, and they are capable of verification by reference to the contents of the prophecy. (*a.*) As to the beginning, Eichhorn has clearly shown that we cannot allow Hosea much ground in the reign of Jeroboam (823-782).

The book contains descriptions which are utterly inapplicable to the condition of the kingdom of Israel during this reign (2 Kings xiv, 25 sq.). The pictures of social and political life which Hosea draws so forcibly are rather applicable to the interregnum which followed the death of Jeroboam (781-771), and to the reign of the succeeding kings. The calling in of Egypt and Assyria to the aid of rival factions (x, 3; xiii, 10) has nothing to do with the strong and able government of Jeroboam. Nor is it conceivable that a prophet who had lived long under Jeroboam should have omitted the mention of that monarch's conquests in his enumeration of Jehovah's kindnesses to Israel (ii, 8). It seems, then, almost certain that very few at least of his prophecies were written until after the death of Jeroboam (781). (*b.*) As regards the end of his career, the title leaves us in still greater doubt. It merely assures us that he did not prophesy beyond the reign of Hezekiah. But here, again, the contents of the book help us to reduce the vagueness of this indication. In the sixth year of Hezekiah the prophecy of Hosea was fulfilled, and it is very improbable that he should have permitted this triumphant proof of his divine mission to pass unnoticed. He could not, therefore, have lived long into the reign of Hezekiah; and as it does not seem necessary to allow more than a year of each reign to justify his being represented as a contemporary on the one hand of Jeroboam, on the other of Hezekiah, we may suppose that the life, or, rather, the prophetic career of Hosea, extended from 782 to 725, a period of fifty-seven years.

3. *Order in the Prophetic Series.*—Hosea is the first in order of the twelve minor prophets in the common editions of the Scriptures (Heb., Sept., and Vulg.), an arrangement, however, supposed to have arisen from a misinterpretation of chap. i, 2, which rather denotes that what follows were the first divine communications enjoyed by this particular prophet (see Jerome, *Prefat. in xii Prophetas;* Hengstenberg, *Christol.* Keith's transl., ii, 23; De Wette, *Einleitung*, § 225; Rosenmüller, *Scholia in Min. Proph.* p. 7; Newcome, *Pref. to Min. Prophets*, p. 45). The probable causes of this location of Hosea may be the thoroughly national character of his oracles, their length, their earnest tone, and vivid representations. The contour of the book has a closer resemblance to the greater prophets than any of the eleven productions by which it is succeeded. (See below.) There is much doubt as to the relative order of the first four or five of the minor prophets: as far as titles go, Amos is Hosea's only rival; but 2 Kings xiv, 25 goes far to show that they must both yield in priority to Jonah. It is perhaps more important to know that Hosea must have been more or less contemporary with Isaiah, Amos, Jonah, Joel, and Nahum.

4. *Circumstance, Scope, and Contents of the Book.*—The years of Hosea's public life were dark and melancholy (see Pusey, *Minor Prophets*, ad loc.). The nation suffered under the evils of that schism which was effected by "Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin." The obligations of law had been relaxed, and the claims of religion disregarded; Baal became the rival of Jehovah, and in the dark recesses of the groves were practised the impure and murderous rites of heathen deities; peace and prosperity fled the land, which was harassed by foreign invasion and domestic broils; might and murder became the twin sentinels of the throne; alliances were formed with other nations, which brought with them seductions to paganism; captivity and insult were heaped upon Israel by the uncircumcised; the nation was thoroughly debased, and but a fraction of its population maintained its spiritual allegiance (2 Kings xix, 18). The death of Jeroboam II was followed by an interregnum of eleven years (B.C. 781-770), at the end of which his son Zachariah assumed the sovereignty, and was slain by Shallum, after the short space of six months (2 Kings xv, 10). In four weeks Shallum was assassinated by Menahem. The assassin, during a disturbed reign of ten years (B.C. 769-759), became tributary to the Assyrian Pul. His successor, Pekahiah, wore the crown but two years, when he was murdered by Pekah. Pekah, after swaying his bloody sceptre for twenty years (B.C. 757-737), met a similar fate in the conspiracy of Hoshea; Hoshea, the last of the usurpers, after another interregnum of eight years, ascended the throne (B.C. 729), and his administration of nine years ended in the overthrow of his kingdom and the expatriation of his people (2 Kings xvii, 18, 23).

The prophecies of Hosea were directed especially against the country of Israel or Ephraim, whose sin had brought upon it such disasters—prolonged anarchy and final captivity. Their homicides and fornications, their perjury and theft, their idolatry and impiety, are censured and satirized with a faithful severity. Judah is sometimes, indeed, introduced, warned, and admonished. Bishop Horsley (*Works*, iii, 236) reckons it a mistake to suppose "that Hosea's prophecies are almost wholly directed against the kingdom of Israel." The bishop describes what he thinks the correct extent of Hosea's commission, but has adduced no proof of his assertion. Any one reading Hosea will at once discover that the oracles having relation to Israel are primary, while the references to Judah are only incidental. In chap. i, 7, Judah is mentioned in contrast with Israel, to whose condition the symbolic name of the prophet's son is specially applicable. In ver. 11 the future union of the two nations is predicted. The long oracle in chap. ii has no relation to Judah, nor the symbolic representation in chap. iii. Chap. iv is severe upon Ephraim, and ends with a very brief exhortation to Judah not to follow his example. In the succeeding chapters allusions to Judah do indeed occasionally occur, when similar sins can be predicated of both branches of the nation. The prophet's mind was intensely interested in the destinies of his own people. The nations around him are unheeded; his prophetic eye beholds the crisis approaching his country, and sees its cantons ravaged, its tribes murdered or enslaved. No wonder that his rebukes were so terrible, his menaces so alarming, that his soul poured forth its strength in an ecstasy of grief and affection. Invitations replete with tenderness and pathos are interspersed with his warnings and expostulations. Now we are startled with a vision of the throne, at first shrouded in darkness, and sending forth lightnings, thunders, and voices; but while we gaze, it becomes encircled with a rainbow, which gradually expands till it is lost in that universal brilliancy which itself had originated (chaps. xi and xiv).

5. *The Prophet's Family Relations.* — The peculiar mode of instruction which the prophet details in the first and third chapters of his oracles has given rise to many disputed theories. We refer to the command expressed in i, 2—"And the Lord said unto Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms," etc.; iii, 1, "Then said the Lord unto me, Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress," etc. Were these real events, the result of divine injunctions literally understood, and as literally fulfilled? or were these intimations to the prophet only intended to be pictorial illustrations of the apostasy and spiritual folly and unfaithfulness of Israel? The former view, viz. that the prophet actually and literally entered into this impure connubial alliance, was advocated in ancient times by Cyril, Theodoret, Basil, and Augustine; and more recently has been maintained by Mercer, Grotius, Houbigant, Manger, Horsley, Eichhorn, Stuck, and others. Fanciful theories are also rife on this subject. Luther supposed the prophet to perform a kind of drama in view of the people, giving his lawful wife and children these mystical appellations. Newcome (*Minor Prophets*) thinks that a wife of fornication means merely an Israelite, a woman of apostate and adulterous Israel. So Jac. Capellus (*In Hoseam; Opera*, p. 683). Hengstenberg supposes the prophet to relate actions which happened, indeed, actually, but not outwardly. Some, with Maimonides (*Moreh Nevochim*, pt. ii), imagine it to be a nocturnal vision; while others make it wholly an allegory, as the Chaldee Paraphrast,

Jerome, Drusius, Bauer, Rosenmüller, Kuinöl, and Lowth. The view of Hengstenberg (*Christology*, ii, 11-22), and such as have held his theory (Markii *Diatribe de uxore fornicationum accipienda*, etc., Lugdun. Batav. 1696), is not materially different from the last to which we have referred (see Lübkerk in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 647 sq.). Besides other arguments resting on the impurity and loathsomeness of the supposed nuptial contract, it may be argued against the external reality of the event that it must have required several years for its completion, and that the impressiveness of the symbol would therefore be weakened and obliterated. But this would almost equally apply to the repeated case of Isaiah (viii, 3; xx, 3). Other prophetic transactions of a similar nature might be referred to. Jerome (*Comment.* ad loc.) has referred to Ezek. iv, 4. On the other hand, the total absence of any figurative or symbolical phraseology seems to require the command to be taken in a literal sense, and the immediate addition of the declaration that the order was obeyed serves to confirm this view. It is not to be supposed, as has sometimes been argued, that the prophet was commanded to commit fornication. The divine injunction was to marry—"Scortum aliquis ducere potest sine peccato, scortari non item" (Drusius, *Comm.* ad loc. in *Critici Sacri*, tom. v.). Moreover, if, as the narrative implies, and as the analogy of the restored nation requires, the formerly unchaste woman became a faithful and reformed wife, the entire ground of the objection in a moral point of view vanishes (see Cowles, *Minor Prophets*, ad loc.). In fact, there were two marriages by the prophet: the first, in chap. i, ii, of a woman (probably of lewd inclinations already) who became the mother of three children, and was afterwards repudiated for her adultery; and the second, in chap. iii, of a woman at least attached formerly to another, but evidently reformed to a virtuous wife. Both these women represented the Israelitish nation, especially the northern kingdom, which, although unfaithful to Jehovah, should first be punished and then reclaimed by him. Keil, after combating at length (*Minor Prophets*, introduct. to Hosea) against Kurtz's arguments for the literal view, is obliged to assign the *moral* objection as the only tenable one. This, however, is a very unsatisfactory mode of disposing of the question, for we are not at liberty thus to explain away the reality of the occurrence simply to evade its difficulties. Moreover, if it be a *symbol*, what becomes of its force unless based upon a fact? Nor do the prophets receive *visions* respecting their own personal acts. Finally, the internal suggestion of a wrong act to the prophet's mind as one to be not merely tolerated, but committed, would be equivalent, in point of moral obliquity, to the actual deed itself; at least according to our Saviour's rule of guilt in such a matter (Matt. v, 28). This last remark leads us to the true solution of the whole difficulty, which has simply arisen from judging O.-T. morals by a Gospel standard, in neglect of the important principle enunciated by Christ himself on the very question of the relations of the sexes (Matt. xix, 8). The Mosaic precept (Lev. xxi, 14) has no pertinence here, for Hosea was not a priest.

But in whichever way this question may be solved—whether these occurrences be regarded as a real and external transaction, or as a piece of spiritual scenery, or only (Witsii *Miscell. Sac.* p. 90) as an allegorical description—it is agreed on all hands that the actions are typical; that they are, as Jerome calls them, *sacramenta futurorum.* One question which sprang out of the literal view was whether the connection between Hosea and Gomer was marriage or fornication. Another question which followed immediately upon the preceding was "an Deus possit dispensare ut fornicatio sit licita." This latter question was much discussed by the schoolmen, and by the Thomists it was avowed in the affirmative.

Expositors are not at all agreed as to the meaning of the phrase "wife of whoredoms," אֵשֶׁת זְנוּנִים; whether the phrase refers to harlotry before marriage, or unfaithfulness after it. It may afford an easy solution of the difficulty if we look at the antitype in its history and character. Adultery is the appellation of idolatrous apostasy. The Jewish nation were espoused to God. The contract was formed in Sinai; but the Jewish people had prior to this period gone a-whoring. Josh. xxiv, 2-14, "Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, and they served other gods." Comp. Lev. xvii, 7, in which it is implied that idolatrous propensities had also developed themselves during the abode in Egypt: so that the phrase here employed may signify one devoted to lasciviousness prior to her marriage. Yet this propensity of the Israelites to idolatry had been measurably covert prior to the Exode. On the other hand, none but a female of previously lewd inclinations would be likely to violate her conjugal obligations; and Eichhorn shows that marrying an avowed harlot is not necessarily implied by אֵשֶׁת זְנוּנִים, which may very well imply a wife who after marriage becomes an adulteress, even though chaste before. In any case the marriage must be supposed to have been a real contract, or its significance would be lost. Jer. ii, 2, "I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals, when thou wentest after me in the wilderness, in a land that was not sown." The facts in the case of the Israelitish nation correspond with this symbol of a woman who had been of bad repute before marriage, and who proved a notorious profligate afterwards. יַלְדֵי זְנוּנִים, *children of whoredoms*, refer most naturally to the two sons and daughter afterwards to be born. They were not the prophet's own, but a spurious offspring palmed upon him by his faithless spouse, as is intimated in the allegory, and they followed the pernicious example of the mother. Spiritual adultery was the debasing sin of Israel. "Non dicitur," observes Manger, "cognovit uxorem, sed simpliciter concepit et peperit." The children are not his. It is said, indeed, in ver. 3, "She bare *him* a son." The word לוֹ is wanting in some MSS. and in some copies of the Sept. If genuine, it only shows the effrontery of the adulteress, and the patience of the husband in receiving and educating as his own a spurious brood. The Israelites who had been received into covenant very soon fell from their first love, and were characterized by insatiable spiritual wantonness: yet their Maker, their husband, did not at once divorce them, but exhibited a marvellous long-suffering.

The names of the children being symbolical, the name of the mother has been thought to have a similar signification. *Gomer Bath-Diblaim* may have the symbolic sense of "one thoroughly abandoned to sensual delights;" גֹּמֶר signifies *completion* (Ewald, *Grammat.* § 228); בַּת־דִּבְלַיִם, "*daughter of grape-cakes*," the dual form being expressive of the mode in which these dainties were baked in double layers. The names of the children are Jezreel, Lo-ruhamah, and Lo-ammi. The prophet explains the meaning of the appellations. It is generally supposed that the names refer to three successive generations of the Israelitish people. Hengstenberg, on the other hand, argues that "wife and children both are the people of Israel: the three names must not be considered separately, but taken together." But as the marriage is first mentioned, and the births of the children are detailed in order, some time elapsing between the events, we rather adhere to the ordinary exposition. Nor is it without reason that the second child is described as a female. The first child, Jezreel, may refer to the first dynasty of Jeroboam I and his successors, which was terminated in the blood of Ahab's house shed by Jehu at Jezreel. The name suggests also the cruel and fraudulent possession of the vineyard of Naboth, "which was in Jezreel," where, too, the woman Jezebel was slain so ignominiously (1 Kings xvi, 1; 2 Kings ix, 21). But since Jehu and his family had become as corrupt as their predecessors, the scenes of Jezreel

were again to be enacted, and Jehu's race must perish. Jezreel, the spot referred to by the prophet, is also, according to Jerome, the place where the Assyrian army routed the Israelites. The name of this child associates the past and future, symbolizes past sins, intermediate punishments, and final overthrow. The name of the second child, Lo-ruhamah, "not-pitied," the appellation of a degraded *daughter*, may refer to the *feeble*, *effeminate* period which followed the overthrow of the first dynasty, when Israel became weak and helpless as well as sunk and abandoned. The favor of God was not exhibited to the nation: they were as abject as impious. But the reign of Jeroboam II was prosperous; new energy was infused into the kingdom; gleams of its former prosperity shone upon it. This revival of strength in that generation may be typified by the birth of a third child, a *son*, Lo-ammi, "not-my-people" (2 Kings xiv, 25). Yet prosperity did not bring with it a revival of piety; still, although their vigor was recruited, they were not God's people (*Lectures on the Jewish Antiquities and Scriptures*, by J. G. Palfrey, ii, 422, Boston, 1841). See each name in its place.

6. *Division of the Book.*—Recent writers, such as Bertholdt, Eichhorn, De Wette, Stuck, Maurer, and Hitzig, have labored much, but in vain, to divide the book of Hosea into separate portions, assigning to each the period at which it was written; but from the want of sufficient data the attempt must rest principally on taste and fancy. A sufficient proof of the correctness of this opinion may be found in the contradictory sections and allotments of the various writers who have engaged in the task. Chapters i, ii, and iii evidently form one division: it is next to impossible to separate and distinguish the other chapters. The form and style are very similar throughout all the second portion.

The subdivision of these several parts is a work of greater difficulty: that of Eichhorn will be found to be based upon a highly subtle, though by no means precarious criticism. (1.) According to him, the first division should be subdivided into three separate poems, each originating in a distinct aim, and each after its own fashion attempting to express the idolatry of Israel by imagery borrowed from the matrimonial relation. The first, and therefore the least elaborate of these, is contained in chap. iii; the second in i, 2-11; the third in i, 2-9, and ii, 1-23. These three are progressively elaborate developments of the same reiterated idea. Chap. i, 2-9 is common to the second and third poems, but not repeated with each severally (iv, 273 sq.). (2.) Attempts have been made by Wells, Eichhorn, etc., to subdivide the second part of the book. These divisions are made either according to reigns of contemporary kings, or according to the subject-matter of the poem. The former course has been adopted by Wells, who gets *five*, the latter by Eichhorn, who gets *sixteen* poems out of this part of the book.

These prophecies—so scattered, so unconnected that bishop Lowth has compared them with the leaves of the Sibyl—were probably collected by Hosea himself towards the end of his career.

8. *Style.*—The peculiarities of Hosea's style have often been remarked. Jerome says of him, "Commaticus est, et quasi per sententias loquens" (*Præf. ad XII. Proph.*). Augustine thus criticises him: "Osea quanto profundius loquitur, tanto operosius penetratur." His style, says De Wette, "is abrupt, unrounded, and ebullient; his rhythm hard, leaping, and violent. The language is peculiar and difficult" (*Einleitung*, § 228). Lowth (*Prælect.* 21) speaks of him as the most difficult and perplexed of the prophets. Bishop Horsley has remarked his peculiar idioms—his change of person, anomalies of gender and number, and use of the nominative absolute (*Works*, vol. iii). Eichhorn's description of his style was probably at the same time meant as an imitation of it (*Einleitung*, § 555): "His discourse is like a garland woven of a multiplicity of flowers: images are woven upon images, comparison wound upon comparison, metaphor strung upon metaphor. He plucks one flower, and throws it down that he may directly break off another. Like a bee, he flies from one flower-bed to another, that he may suck his honey from the most varied pieces. It is a natural consequence that his figures sometimes form strings of pearls. Often he is prone to approach to allegory—often he sinks down in obscurity" (compare v, 9; vi, 3; vii, 8; xiii, 3, 7, 8, 16). Obscure brevity seems to be the characteristic quality of Hosea; and all commentators agree that, "of all the prophets, he is, in point of language, the most obscure and hard to be understood" (Henderson, *Minor Prophets*, p. 2). Unusual words and forms of connection sometimes occur (De Wette, § 228; see also Davidson, in Horne, ii, 945).

9. *Citation in the N. T.*—Hosea, as a prophet, is expressly quoted by Matthew (ii, 15). The citation is from the first verse of chap. xi. Hos. vi, 6 is quoted twice by the same evangelist (ix, 13; xii, 7). Other quotations and references are the following: Luke xxiii, 30; Rev. vi, 16; Hos. x, 8;—Rom. ix, 25, 26; 1 Pet. ii, 10; Hos. i, 10; ii, 23;—1 Cor. xv, 4; Hos. vi, 2;—Heb. xiii, 15; Hos. xiv, 2. Messianic references are not clearly and prominently developed (Gramberg, *Religionsid.* ii, 298). This book, however, is not without them, but they lie more in the spirit of its allusions than in the letter. Hosea's Christology appears written, not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God, on the fleshly tables of his heart. The future conversion of his people to the Lord their God, and David their king, their glorious privilege in becoming sons of the living God, the faithfulness of the original promise to Abraham, that the number of his spiritual seed should be as the sand of the sea, are among the oracles whose fulfilment will take place only under the new dispensation.

10. *Commentaries.*—The following are the exegetical helps on the whole book of Hosea separately, and the most important are designated by an asterisk (*) prefixed: Origen, *Selecta* (in *Opp.* iii, 438); Ephraem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* v, 234); Remigius Antissod., *Commentarius* [fragment] (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* VI, ii, 103); Jarchi, Aben-Ezra, and Kimchi, *Scholia* (ed. with Notes, by Coddæus, L. B. 1623, 4to; by De Dieu, ib. 1631, 4to; also extracts, with additions, by Von der Hardt, Helmst. 1702, 4to [with a historical Introd. ib. eod.]; and by Mercer, Gen. 1574, 1578; L. B. 1621, 4to; and [including several other minor prophets] Gen. 15.., fol.; Giess. 1595, 4to; Gotting. 1755, 4to); Abrabanel, *Comment.* (in Lat. with notes, by F. al-Husen, L. B. 1687, 4to); Luther, *Enarratio* (Vitemb. 1526, 1545; Frcft. 1546, 8vo; also in *Opp.* iv, 598; also *Sententiæ*, *ib.* 684); Capito, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1528, 8vo); Quinquarboreus, *Notæ* [including Amos, Ruth, and Lam.] (Par. 1556, 4to); Brentz, *Commentarius* (Hag. 1560, 4to; Tub. 1580, fol.; also in *Opp.* iv); Box, *Commentaria* (Cæsaraug. 1581, fol.; Ven. 1585, 4to; Lugd. 1587, 8vo; improved edition by Gyrel, Brix. 1604, 4to); De Castro, *Commentaria* (Samant. 1586, fol.); Vavassor, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* Vitemb. iv, 348; Jen. iv, 764); Matthæus, *Prælectiones* (Basil. 1590, 4to); Polansdorf, *Analysis* (Basil. 1599, 4to; 1601, 8vo); Zanchius, *Commentarius* (Neost. 1600, 4to; also in *Opp.* v); Gesner, *Illustratio* (Vitemb. 1601, 1614, 8vo); Pareus, *Commentarius* (Heidelberg, 1605, 1609, 4to); Downame, *Lectures* [on. ch. i-iv] (Lond. 1608, 4to); Cocceius, *Illustratio* (in *Opp.* xi, 591); Krackewitz, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1619, 4to); Meisner, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1620, 8vo); Rivetus, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1625, 4to; also in *Opp.* ii, 488); *Burroughs, *Lectures* [chapter xiv by Sibbs and Reynolds] (Lond. 1643 52, 4 vols. 4to; Lond. 1843, 8vo); Lightfoot, *Expositio* (in *Works*, ii, 423); Ursinus, *Commentarius* (Norib. 1677, 8vo); *Pocock, *Commentary* (Oxon. 1685, fol.; also in *Works*, ii, 1); *Seb. Schmid, *Commentarius* (F. ad M. 1687, 4to); Biermann, *Ontleding* (Utrecht, 1702, 4to); Wacke, *Expositio* (Ratisb. 1711, 8vo); Gräff, *Predigten* (Dresd. 1716, 4to); Kromayer, *Specimen*, etc. [including Joel and Amos] (Amst. 1730, 8vo); Terne, *Erklärung* (part i, Jen. 1740; ii, Eisenb. 1748, 8vo); Klemmius, *Notæ* (Tübing. 1744, 4to);

Dathe, *Dissertatio* [on Aquila's vers. of H.] (Lips. 1757; also in *Opusc.* Lips. 1796); Happach, *Expositio* [on certain passages] (Cobl. 1766 sq., 8vo); Struensee, *Uebers.* (Frankf. and Lpz. 1769, 8vo); Neale, *Commentary* (Lond. 1771, 8vo); Michaelis, *Chaldaica* [Jonathan's Targum] (Gött. 1775, 4to); Stäudlin, *Erläut.* (in his *Beitr.* 1 sq.); Euren, *Examen* [of var. readings] (i, Upsal. 1782; ii, ib. 1786; also in Aurivellii, *Dissert.* p. 594); Schröer, *Erläut.* (Dessau, 1782, 8vo); Manger, *Commentarius* (Campis, 1782, 4to); Pfeiffer, *Uebers.* (Erlangen, 1785, 8vo); Uhland, *Annotationes* (in xii pts. Tübing. 1785-97, 4to); Volborth, *Erklärung* (part i, Gött. 1787, 8vo); Kuinöl, *Erläuterung* (Leips. 1789, 8vo; also in Latin, ibid. 1792, 8vo); Roos, *Observationes* [on difficult passages] (Erlang. 1780, 4to); Vaupel, *Erklär.* (Dresden, 1793, 8vo); *Horsley, *Notes* (Lond. 1801, 1804, 4to; also in *Bib. Crit.* ii, 134); Philippson, *Commentirung* [includ. Joel] (Dessau, 1805, 8vo; also in his *Israelitische Bibel*); Böckel, *Erläut.* (Konigsb. 1807, 8vo); Gaab, *Dijudicatio* [on the vers. of H. in the Lond. Polyglot] (in 2 pts. Tüb. 1812, 4to); Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (part 7, vol. i, 1827, 8vo); Goldwitzer, *Anmerk.* (Landsh. 1828, 8vo); *Stuck, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1828, 8vo); Schröder, *Erläut.* [vol. i of min. proph., includ. Hosea, Joel, and Amos] (Lpz. 1829, 8vo); De Wette, *Ueber d. geschl. Beziehung*, etc. (in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1831, p. 807); Mrs. Best, *Dialogues* (Lond. 1831, 12mo); Redslob, *Die Integrität*, etc. [of vii, 4-10] (Hamb. 1842, 8vo); *Simson, *Erklär.* (Hamb. 1851, 8vo); Drake, *Notes* [includ. Jonah] (Lond. 1853, 8vo; also *Sermons* [includ. also Amos], ib. ed. 8vo); Kurtz, *Ehe d. H.* (Dorpat. 1859, 8vo); Kara, פֵּרוּשׁ (Breslau, 1861, 4to); Wünsche, *Auslegung* [Rabbinical] (Lpz. 1868 sq. 8vo); Bassett, *Translation* (London, 1869, 8vo). See PROPHETS, MINOR.

4, 5. HOSHEA (q. v.).

Hosein. See HOCEIN.

Hosen. See HOSE.

Hoshaï'ah (Heb. *Hoshayah'*, הוֹשַׁעְיָה, whom *Jehovah delivers;* Sept. 'Ωσαΐα, but identifies those named in Jer. xlii, 1; xliii, 2, yet changes in both passages to Μαασαίας; Vulg. *Osajas*), the name of two men.

1. The father of Jehazaniah, which latter besought Jeremiah to favor the flight of the remnant of the Jews into Egypt (Jer. xlii, 1). He is apparently the same with the father of Azariah, which latter is mentioned as rejecting the advice of Jeremiah after he had thus solicited it (Jer. xliii, 2). B.C. 587.

2. One who headed the procession of the chief men of Judah along the southern section of the newly-rebuilt walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 32). B.C. 446.

Hosha'ma [many *Hosh'ama*] (Heb. *Hoshama'*, הוֹשָׁמָע, whom *Jehovah hears;* Sept. 'Ωσαμώ v. r. 'Ωσαμάθ and 'Ιωσαμώ), one of the sons of king Jehoiachin, born during his captivity (1 Chron. iii, 18). B.C. post 598. (See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 17.) See JEHOIACHIN.

Hoshe'ä (Heb. the same name as "Hosea," q. v.), the name of several persons.

1. The original name (Deut. xxxii, 44, Sept. 'Ιησοῦς, Vulg. *Josue;* A.V. in Numb. xiii, 8, 16, "Oshea," Sept. Αὐσῆ, Vulg. *Osee*) of the son of Nun, afterwards called JOSHUA (q. v.), by the more distinct recognition of the divine name *Jah.*

2. (Sept. 'Ωσή; Vulg. *Osee*). A son of Azariah in the time of David; also an Ephraimite and prince of his people (1 Chron. xxvii, 20). B.C. 1014.

3. The prophet HOSEA (q. v.).

4. HOSHEA (Sept. 'Ωσηέ, Vulg. *Osee*), the son of Elah, and last king of Israel. In the twentieth (posthumous) year of Jotham (2 Kings xv, 30), i. e. B.C. 737-6, he conspired against and slew his predecessor Pekah, thereby fulfilling a prophecy of Isaiah (Isa. vii, 16). Although Josephus calls Hoshea a *friend* of Pekah (φίλου τινὸς ἐπιβουλεύσαντος αὐτῷ, *Ant.* ix, 13, 1), we have no ground for calling this "a treacherous murder" (Prideaux, i, 16). But he did not become established on the throne he had thus usurped till after an interregnum of warfare for eight years, namely, in the twelfth year of Ahaz (2 Kings xvii, 1), i. e. B.C. 729-8. "He did evil in the sight of the Lord," but not in the same degree as his predecessors (2 Kings xvii, 2). According to the Rabbis, this superiority consisted in his removing from the frontier cities the guards placed there by his predecessors to prevent their subjects from worshipping at Jerusalem (*Seder Olam Rabba*, cap. 22, quoted by Prideaux, i, 16), and in his not hindering the Israelites from accepting the invitation of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxx, 10), nor checking their zeal against idolatry (id. xxxi, 1). The compulsory cessation of the calf-worship may have removed his greatest temptation, for Tiglath-Pileser had carried off the golden calf from Dan some years before (*Sed. Ol. Rab.* 22), and that at Bethel was taken away by Shalmaneser in his first invasion (2 Kings xvii, 3; Hos. x, 14). Shortly after his accession (B.C. 728) he submitted to the supremacy of Shalmaneser, who appears to have entered his territory with the intention of subduing it by force if resisted (2 Kings xvii, 3), and, indeed, seems to have stormed the strong caves of Beth-arbel (Hos. x, 14), but who retired pacified with a present. This peaceable temper, however, appears not to have continued long. The intelligence that Hosea, encouraged perhaps by the revolt of Hezekiah, had entered into a confederacy with So, king of Egypt, with the view of shaking off the Assyrian yoke, caused Shalmaneser to return and punish the rebellious king of Israel by imprisonment for withholding the tribute for several years exacted from his country (2 Kings xvii, 4), B.C. cir. 725. He appears to have been again released, probably appeasing the conqueror by a large ransom; but a second relapse into revolt soon afterwards provoked the king of Assyria to march an army into the land of Israel, B.C. 723; and after a three-years' siege Samaria was taken and destroyed, and the ten tribes were sent into the countries beyond the Euphrates, B.C. 720 (2 Kings xvii, 5, 6; xviii, 9-12). The king no doubt perished in the sack of the city by the enraged victor, or was only spared for the torture of an Assyrian triumph. He was aparently treated with the utmost indignity (Mic. v, 1). That he disappeared very suddenly, like "foam upon the water," we may infer from Hos. xiii, 11; x, 7. His name occurs on the Assyrian monuments. The length of the siege was owing to the fact that this "glorious and beautiful" city was strongly situated, like "a crown of pride" among her hills (Isa. xxviii, 1-5). During the course of the siege Shalmaneser must have died, for it is certain that Samaria was taken by his successor Sargon, who thus laconically describes the event in his annals: "Samaria I looked at, I captured; 27,280 men (families?) who dwelt in it I carried away. I constructed fifty chariots in their country . . . . I appointed a governor over them, and continued upon them the tribute of the former people" (Botta, p. 145, 11, quoted by Dr. Hincks, *Journ. of Sacr. Lit.* Oct. 1858; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* i, 148). For an account of the subsequent fortunes of the unhappy Ephraimites, the places to which they were transplanted by the policy of their conqueror and his officer, "the great and noble Asnapper" (Ezra iv, 10), and the nations by which they were superseded, see SAMARIA. Hoshea came to the throne too late, and governed a kingdom torn to pieces by foreign invasion and intestine broils. Sovereign after sovereign had fallen by the dagger of the assassin; and we see from the dark and terrible delineations of the contemporary prophets [see HOSEA; MICAH; ISAIAH] that murder and idolatry, drunkenness and lust, had eaten like "an incurable wound" (Mic. i, 9) into the inmost heart of the national morality. Ephraim was dogged to its ruin by the apostate policy of the renegade who had asserted its independence (2 Kings xvii; Joseph. *Ant.* ix, 14; Prideaux, i, 15 sq.; Keil, *On Kings*, ii, 50 sq., English ed.; Jahn, *Hebr. Com.* § xl; Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 607-613; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geogr.* chap. ix,

English transl.; Rawlinson, *Herod.* i, 149). See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

5. HOSHEA (Sept. Ὡσηέ, Vulg. *Osee*), one of the chief Israelites who joined in the sacred covenant after the Captivity (Neh. x, 23). B.C. cir. 410.

Hosius or **Osius** (Ὅσιος, *the saint*), an early Christian bishop, was born probably about A.D. 256. It is doubtful whether he was a native of Spain, but he was bishop of the see of Cordova, Spain, for some sixty years. He was a particular favorite of the emperor Constantine, who is said to have been converted to Christianity under the instrumentality of Hosius, by offering him, as an inducement, the remission of his sins, a satisfaction which the heathen priests were unable to grant. He was present at the Council held at Eliberi or Elvira (q. v.), near Granada (305 or 306), and suffered for his faith (*confessus sum*, as he says in his letter to Constantine) during the persecutions of Diocletian and Maximianus. In 324 Constantine sent him to Alexandria, to settle the dispute between Alexander and Arius, also the troubles which had arisen concerning the observance of the Easter festival. He failed in this mission, but still remained in favor with the emperor. He took part in the Council of Nice (325), where Baronius claims that Hosius attended as legate of the pope; but this is not generally conceded even by Roman Catholic historians. Hosius's signature is the first amongst the subscriptions to the acts of this council. He pronounced (ἐξέδετο) or *drew up* (according to Tillemont) the symbol or confession of faith of Nice. In 347 he presided at the Council of Sardica, called by order of the emperors Constantius and Constans at the request of Athanasius. In 355 Constantius desired him to take part in the condemnation of Athanasius, but Hosius replied by a letter, recalling all he had suffered on behalf of the faith, and closing with an earnest defense of Athanasius. A second attempt of Constantius, who called him to Milan, met with the same opposition, and likewise a third, Hosius, who was then nearly a hundred years old, still refusing to condemn Athanasius. This decided stand in favor of Athanasius finally caused Hosius's banishment in 355. At length, worn out by imprisonment, he consented to give countenance to Arianism in a formula which was presented to the Synod of Sirmium (357). He was permitted to return again to his see, where he died in 359. Athanasius and Augustine praise his virtues and excuse his weakness. See Athanasius, *Hist. Arian. ad Monach.* c. 42, 44; Augustine, *Cont. Epistolam Permeniani*, i, 7; Eusebius, *De Vit. Constantini*, ii, 63; iii, 7; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* i, 7, 8; ii, 20, 29, 31; Sozomen, i, 10, 16, 17; iii, 11; Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Hist. Ecclés.* vii, 300; Baronius, *Ann. Eccles.*; Galland, *Biblioth. Patrum*, vol. v, Proleg. c. viii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 209; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 275 sq.; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* i, 245; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* i, 33 sq.; Neander, *Church Hist.* ii, 154, 371, 398, 404; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 627, 635 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* v, 343 sq., 349, 354 sq., 364; vi, 83, 140; Stanley, *Eastern Ch.* (see Index); Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i, 99, 101; Baur, *Dogmengesch.* i, 146; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 127 sq., 135, 140; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 336 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 331 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hosius, STANISLAUS, a distinguished Romish theologian of Poland, of German origin, was born at Cracow May 5, 1504. He studied at Padua and Bologna, and obtained, on his return to Poland in 1538, a canonry. He was afterwards made secretary to the king, and, in 1549, bishop of Culm. He was intrusted by the king with important missions to the emperors Charles V and Ferdinand I, and as a reward for his services was made also bishop of Ermeland. Hosius was an ardent opponent of Luther, and having written the *Confessio catholicæ fidei* (Mayence, 1551, etc.) in opposition to the Augsburg Confession, he was rewarded with a cardinal's hat. He attended the Council of Trent as legate, and afterwards returned to Poland, where he used his influence in favor of the Jesuits, and in 1564, to prevent the spread of Lutheranism, he established the College of Braunsberg, called after him *Collegium Hosianum*, and still existing with the two faculties of theology and philosophy. He afterwards made a journey to Rome for the purpose of settling some questions of importance to the Polish Church, but was detained by pope Gregory XIII, who received him with the highest honors. He died at Caprarola Aug. 15, 1579. A collection of his works has been published under the title *Opera omnia* (Col. 1584, 2 vols. folio). It contains *De Communione sub utraque Specie; De Sacerdotum conjugio; De Missa vulgari lingua celebranda*, etc. See Father Paul, *History of the Council of Trent;* Krasinski, *Ref. in Poland* (London, 1840, 2 vols.); *Ch. Hist. 13th Cent.* p. 243; Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, ii, 82; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* iii, 98; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* iii, 499 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 339 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirch.-Lex.* iii, 333 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reform.* ii, 695; Palavicini, *Hist. Concilii Trident.* lib. ii, ch. iv; Ersch u. Gruber, *Allg. Encykl.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 210; Eichhorn, *Der Bischof Stan. Hosius* (Mainz, 1844–55, 2 vols.).

Hospice, the name by which are known the pious establishments kept up by monks on some of the Alpine passes, to afford assistance and shelter to travellers. The first of these established was that situated on the Great St. Bernard, of which the priests of the canton of Valais obtained possession in 1825. Another hospice existed on St. Gothard as early as the 13th century. This establishment the monks have left, and it is now occupied by a "hospitaller," who entertains travellers gratis. Hospices are also found on Mount Cenis, the Simplon, and the Little St. Bernard.—Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 432. See HOSPITALS.

Hospinian, RUDOLPH, a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Altdorf, near Zurich, Nov. 7, 1547, of a family several members of which had been martyrs of the Reformation. Rudolph was brought up by his uncle, and studied theology at the universities of Marburg and Heidelberg. After his return to Zurich in 1568 he began to preach, and became successively rector in 1576, archdeacon in 1588, and pastor of the church of the Abbey in 1594. He died March 11, 1626. Hospinian is especially distinguished as a writer, and most of his works are of a polemic character, against the Romish Church, inquiring into the cultus and constitution of that Church. The first of them was his *De origine et progressu Rituum et Ceremoniarum Ecclesiasticarum* (1585). Two years after he published *De Templis hoc est de origine, progressu, usu et abusu templorum, ac omnino rerum omnium ad templa pertinentium* (Zur. 1587, fol.; enlarged edition, 1602, fol.). His *De Monachis, seu de origine et progressu Monachatus ac Ordinum Monasticorum, Equitum militarium tam sacrorum quam sæcularium omnium* was published at Zurich (1588), and reprinted, with additions, as an answer to Bellarmine's *De Monachis* (Zurich, 1609, folio):—*De Festis Christianorum, hoc est de origine, progressu, cœrimoniis et ritibus festorum dierum Christianorum Liber unus*, etc. (Zur. 1592–3, 2 vols. fol.; augmented, ib. 1612, fol.); the additions to the second edition are in answer to the objections of cardinal Bellarmine and of the Jesuit Gretser:—*De Festis Judæorum, et Ethnicorum, Libri tres* (Zurich, 1592, fol.; 2d edit., augmented, Zurich, 1611, fol.):—*De Origine et Progressu Controversiæ Sacramentariæ de Cœna Domini inter Lutheranos, Ubiquistas et Orthodoxos quos Zuinglianos seu Calvinistas vocant* (Zur. 1602, fol.): the Lutherans are strongly attacked by Hospinian in the work:—*Sacræ Scripturæ, orthodoxis symbolis, toti antiquitati puriori, et ipsi etiam Augustanæ Confessioni repugnantia*, etc. (Zurich, 1609, folio). This work gave rise to great controversy. Frederick IV, elector of the Palatinate, blamed Hospinian strongly, and Leonard Hutter answered this and the preceding work in his *Concordia Concors* (Wittemb. 1614, folio). Hospinian intended to answer Hutter, but gave up the idea lest he should displease the Protestant princes and embitter the controversy, which was very agreeable to the Roman

Catholic party:—*Historia Jesuitica* (Zurich, 1619, fol.), a very valuable work:—*An Anima sit in toto corpore simul? De Immortalitate ejus* (Zurich, 1586, 4to). A complete edition of Hospinian's works was published by J. H. Heidegger at Geneva (1669–81, 7 vols. fol.), containing a full memoir. See Fabricius, *Historia Bibl.* pt. i, p. 349, 350; pt. ii, p. 510, 511; pt. iii, p. 87, 88; Dupin, *Bibl. des Auteurs séparés de la communion Romaine*, etc. (Paris, 1718); Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 211; Bayle, *Historical Dict.* iii, 502; Darling, *Encyclop. Bibliog.* vol. i. See HUTTER. (J. N. P.)

Hospital, MICHAEL DE L'. See HÔPITAL.

Hospitality (φιλοξενία). The practice of receiving strangers into one's house and giving them suitable entertainment may be traced back to the early origin of human society. It was practiced, as it still is, among the least cultivated nations (Diod. Sic. v, 28, 34; Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.* vi, 23; Tacit. *Germ.* 21). It was not less observed, in the early periods of their history, among the Greeks and Romans. With the Greeks, hospitality (ξενία) was under the immediate protection of religion. Jupiter bore a name (ξένιος) signifying that its rights were under his guardianship. In the *Odyssey* (vi, 206) we are told expressly that all guests and poor people are special objects of care to the gods. There were, both in Greece and Italy, two kinds of hospitality, the one private, the other public (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Hospitium). The first existed between individuals, the second was cultivated by one state towards another. Hence arose a new kind of social relation: between those who had exercised and partaken of the rites of hospitality an intimate friendship ensued, which was called into play whenever the individuals might afterwards chance to meet, and the right, duties, and advantages of which passed from father to son, and were deservedly held in the highest estimation (Potter's *Greek Antiquities*, ii, 722 sq.).

But, though not peculiarly Oriental, hospitality has nowhere been more early or more fully practiced than in the East. It is still honorably observed among the Arabs, especially at the present day. (See Niebuhr, *Arabia*, p. 46; Burckhardt, i, 331, 459; ii, 651, 739; Jaubert, *Trav.* p. 43; Russel's *Aleppo*, i, 328; Buckingham's *Mesopot.* p. 23; Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 331, 335, 603; Prokesch, *Erinn.* ii, 245; Harmer, ii, 114; Schultens, *Excerpt.* p. 408, 424, 454, 462; Layard's *Nineveh*, 2d ser. p. 317 sq.; Hackett's *Ill. of Script.* p. 64 sq.) An Arab, on arriving at a village, dismounts at the house of some one who is known to him, saying to the master, "I am your guest." On this the host receives the traveller, and performs his duties, that is, he sets before his guest his supper, consisting of bread, milk, and *borgul*, and, if he is rich and generous, he also takes the necessary care of his horse or beast of burden. Should the traveller be unacquainted with any person, he alights at any house, as it may happen, fastens his horse to the same, and proceeds to smoke his pipe until the master bids him welcome, and offers him his evening meal. In the morning the traveller pursues his journey, making no other return than "God be with you" (good-by) (Niebuhr, *Reis.* ii, 431, 462; D'Arvieux, iii, 152; Burckhardt, i, 69; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* vi, 82, 257). The early existence and long continuance of this amiable practice in Oriental countries are owing to the fact of their presenting that condition of things which necessitates and calls forth hospitality. When population is thinly scattered over a great extent of country, and travelling is comparatively infrequent, inns or places of public accommodation are not found; yet the traveller needs shelter, perhaps succor and support. Pity prompts the dweller in a house or tent to open his door to the tired wayfarer, the rather because its master has had, and is likely again to have, need of similar kindness. The duty has its immediate pleasures and advantages, for the traveller comes full of news—false, true, wonderful; and it is by no means onerous, since visits from wayfarers are not very frequent, nor are the needful hospitalities costly. In later periods, when population had greatly increased, the establishment of inns (caravanserais) diminished, but did by no means abolish the practice (Josephus, *Ant.* v, 1, 2; Luke x, 34).

Accordingly, we find hospitality practiced and held in the highest estimation at the earliest periods in which the Bible speaks of human society (Gen. xviii, 3; xix, 2; xxiv, 25; Exod. ii, 20; Judg. xix, 16). Express provision for its exercise is made in the Mosaic law (Lev. xix, 33; Deut. xiv, 29). In the New Testament also its observance is enjoined, though in the period to which its books refer the nature and extent of hospitality would be changed with the change that society had undergone (1 Pet. iv, 9; 1 Tim. iii, 2; Tit. i, 8; 1 Tim. v, 10; Rom. xii, 13; Heb. xiii, 2). The reason assigned in this last passage (see Pfaff, *Diss. de Hospitalitate*, ad loc., Tubing. 1752), "for thereby some have entertained angels unawares," is illustrated in the instances of Abraham and Lot (Gen. xviii, 1–16; xix, 1–3); nor is it without a parallel in classical literature; for the religious feeling which in Greece was connected with the exercise of hospitality was strengthened by the belief that the traveller might be some god in disguise (Homer, *Odyss.* xvii, 484). The disposition which generally prevailed in favor of the practice was enhanced by the fear lest those who neglected its rites should, after the example of impious men, be subjected by the divine wrath to frightful punishments (Ælian, *Animalia*, xi, 19). Even the Jews, in "the latter days," laid very great stress on the obligation: the rewards of Paradise, their doctors declared, were his who spontaneously exercised hospitality (Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb.* i, 220; Kype, *Observ. Sacr.* i, 129).

The guest, whoever he might be, was, on his appearing, invited into the house or tent (Gen. xix, 2; Exod. ii, 20; Judg. xiii, 15; xix, 21). Courtesy dictated that no improper questions should be put to him, and some days elapsed before the name of the stranger was asked, or what object he had in view in his journey (Gen. xxiv, 33; *Odyss.* i, 123; iii, 69; *Iliad*, vi, 175; ix, 222; Diod. Sic. v, 28). As soon as he arrived he was furnished with water to wash his feet (Gen. xviii, 4; xix, 2; 1 Tim. v, 10; *Odyss.* iv, 49; xvii, 88; vi, 215); received a supply of needful food for himself and his beast (Gen. xviii, 5; xix, 3; xxiv, 25; Exod. ii, 20; Judg. xix, 20; *Odyss.* iii, 464), and enjoyed courtesy and protection from his host (Gen. xix, 5; Josh. ii, 2; Judg. xix, 23). See SALT, COVENANT OF. The case of Sisera, decoyed and slain by Jael (Judg. iv, 18 sq.), was a gross infraction of the rights and duties of hospitality. On his departure the traveller was not allowed to go alone or empty-handed (Judg. xix, 5; Waginseil, *ad Sot.* p. 1020, 1030; Zorn, *ad Hecat. Abder.* 22; *Iliad*, vi, 217). This courtesy to guests even in some Arab tribes goes the length (comp. Gen. xxi, 8; Judg. xix, 24) of sacrificing the chastity of the females of the family for their gratification (Lane, *Modern Eg.* i, 443; Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins*, i, 179). As the free practice of hospitality was held right and honorable, so the neglect of it was considered discreditable (Job xxxi, 32; *Odyss.* xiv, 56); and any interference with the comfort and protection which the host afforded was treated as a wicked outrage (Gen. xix, 4 sq.). Though the practice of hospitality was general, and its rites rarely violated, yet national or local enmities did not fail sometimes to interfere; and accordingly travellers avoided those places in which they had reason to expect an unfriendly reception (compare Judg. xix, 12). The quarrel which arose between the Jews and Samaritans after the Babylonian captivity destroyed the relations of hospitality between them. Regarding each other as heretics, they sacrificed every better feeling (see John iv, 9). It was only in the greatest extremity that the Jews would partake of Samaritan food (Lightfoot, p. 993); and they were accustomed, in consequence of their religious and political hatred, to avoid passing through Samaria in journeying from one extremity of the land to the other. The

animosity of the Samaritans towards the Jews appears to have been somewhat less bitter; but they showed an adverse feeling towards those persons who, in going up to the annual feast at Jerusalem, had to pass through their country (Luke ix, 53). At the great national festivals, hospitality was liberally practiced as long as the state retained its identity. On these festive occasions no inhabitant of Jerusalem considered his house his own; every home swarmed with strangers; yet this unbounded hospitality could not find accommodation in the houses for all who stood in need of it, and a large proportion of visitors had to be content with such shelter as tents could afford (Helon, *Pilgrim.* i, 228 sq.). The primitive Christians considered one principal part of their duty to consist in showing hospitality to strangers (1 Pet. iv, 9; 1 Tim. iii, 2; Tit. i, 8; compare Acts ii, 44; vi, 32, 35). They were, in fact, so ready in discharging this duty that the very heathen admired them for it. They were hospitable to all strangers, but especially to those of the household of faith (see Ambrose, *De Abrahamo*, v; *De Offic.* ii, 21; iii, 7; Augustine, *Epist.* xxxviii, n. 2; Tertullian, *Apologet.* xxxix). Even Lucian praises them in this respect (*De morte peregrin.* ii, p. 766). Believers scarcely ever travelled without letters of communion, which testified the purity of their faith, and procured for them a favorable reception wherever the name of Jesus Christ was known. Calmet is of opinion that the two minor epistles of John may be such letters of communion and recommendation. (On the general subject, see Unger, *De ξενοδοκίᾳ ejusque ritu antiquo*, in his *Annal. de Cingulis*, p. 311 sq.; Stuck, *Antiq. Conviv.* i, 27; De Wette, *Lehrbuch der Archäologie;* Scholz, *Handb. der Bibl. Archäologie;* Deyling, *Observ.* i, 118 sq.; Jahn, *Archäologie*, I, ii, 227 sq.; Küster, *Erläuterung*, § 202 sq.; Laurent, in Gronov. *Thesaurus*, ix, 194 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* 283.) See CARAVAN; ENTERTAINMENT; GUEST.

Hospitallers is the name generally given to charitable brotherhoods, consisting of laymen, monks, choristers, and knights of religious orders, who, while continuing under the rules and exercises of conventual life (chiefly after the rule of St. Augustine), devoted themselves to the care of the poor and the sick in the hospitals. These brotherhoods were founded at various times and in different countries. They added to the ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, the special vow that they would devote themselves to this work of mercy. The hospitals (q. v.), in the age when these were instituted, were mostly connected with monasteries, and were subject to the bishops. Oftentimes the care of them was so great that a special officer was appointed, with the appellation of general, and the officer under him as intendant, superior, or major. Some of the Hospitaller brotherhoods, however, were not subject to the bishops, but only to the pope, as the Hospitallers of St. John of God, also called the Brethren of Love, etc. As an order of spiritual knights, they were divided into knights, priests, and serving brethren. Among them we find (1.) The *Hospitallers of St. Anthony* [see ANTHONY, ORDERS OF], founded by Gaston in consequence of an epidemic known as St. Anthony's fire. (2.) The *Brethren of the Hospital of St. John* of Jerusalem. See MALTA, KNIGHTS OF. (3.) The *Order of Teutonic Knights* (q. v.). (4.) The *Brethren of the Hospital of the Order of the Holy Ghost* [see HOLY GHOST, ORDERS OF], founded by Guido at Montpellier. (5.) The *Hospitallers of Burgos*, founded in 1212. (6.) The *Hospitallers of our Lady of Christian Charity* were founded near Châlons in the end of the 13th century by Guy de Joinville; a like order was founded at Paris in 1294. (7.) The *Hospitallers of our Lady Della Scala*, which, according to some authorities, dates as far back as the 9th century, is said by others to have been founded about this time at Sienna, in Italy. (8.) The *Hospitallers of the Order of St. John of God* (de Dieu), also called "Brothers of Charity," etc. See CHARITY, BROTHERS OF. (9.) Of the *Congregation of penitent Brethren*, founded in Flanders in 1615; the *Hospitallers of the Order of Bethlehemites* (q. v.), in 1655; and a number of congregations of the third order of St. Francis, which arose in the 14th century, some are still in existence. The dress of the hospitallers was a black robe or cloak, on the breast of which was worn a white cross, with eight points, which, according to their statutes, is the true symbol of the virtues. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 285; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 345; Helyot, *Gesch. d. Klöster- u. Ritterorden*, ii, 200 sq.; iii, 86 sq., 463 sq.; Vertot, *Hist. des Chevaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem* (Amst. 1732, 5 vols. 8vo); Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxv, 93 sq.; Hardwick, *Hist. of the Middle Ages*, p. 255 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, ii, 276; Milman's Gibbon, *Roman Empire*, v, 598 sq.; Lea, *Histor. Sacerdot. Celib.* p. 365 sq., 475; *New Englander*, Aug. 1851, p. 388 sq. See JERUSALEM; KNIGHTHOOD; TEMPLARS; etc.

Hospitals, so called from the mediæval *hospitia*, are now generally understood to be establishments intended for the reception of the poor, the sick, or the infirm, where their spiritual and temporal wants are gratuitously ministered to. Though various provisions were made for the poor among the Greeks and Romans, and public largesses were distributed in many ways, hospitals were unknown. The true spirit of Christian charity, however, considers the most useless and abandoned characters as most in need of assistance, and imitates Christ in bestowing it upon them. The early Christians fed, not only their own poor, but also those of the heathen. Even Julian the Apostate praised their example in this respect. As soon as the early Christians were free to practice their religion openly, they commenced building charitable institutions, to which they gave various names, according to the character of their inmates: thus they had the *Brephotrophium*, or infant asylum; the *Orphanotrophium*, or orphan asylum; the *Nosocomium*, or sick hospital; the *Xenodochium*, or retreat for strangers, more particularly pilgrims. The latter was properly the hospital, or house of hospitality; and in monasteries, that part of them which was reserved for the accommodation of visitors, and was divided into sections according to the classes of society to which the visitors belonged, was also so called (Du Cange, *Gloss.* s. v. Hospitale). These hospitals were soon found in all the large cities. Epiphanius says (*Hæres.* 75, No. 1): "The bishops, in their charity towards strangers, are in the habit of establishing institutions wherein they receive the maimed and the sick, providing them with such accommodations as their means will allow." They were generally in charge of the clergy (*Constit. Apostol.* I, iii, c. 19), though rich laymen would occasionally erect hospitals also, and wait on their inmates themselves, as did Pammachius of Porto, and Gallican of Ostia. The bishops were careful to have the poor properly buried, ransomed the prisoners of war, and often emancipated slaves. They often went so far as to sell the communion service, or the altar ornaments, to raise the means of accomplishing these charitable objects (*Mœurs des Chrétiens*, § 51). One of the most famous of these institutions was founded at Cæsarea in the latter half of the 4th century. The next notable institution was that of St. Chrysostom, built at his own expense at Constantinople. There was also a very fine hospital at Rome, which was built by Fabiola, a Roman lady and friend of St. Jerome, who himself likewise built one at Bethlehem. The inmates of the hospitals in the early Church, very much like the practice of our own day, were divided according to sex. The male portion was placed under the charge of a deacon, and the women under the care of the deaconesses, who, according to Epiphanius (*Exposit. fid.* c. xvii), rendered to persons of their sex whatever services their infirmity required. It was a rule for the deacons and deaconesses to seek for the unfortunate day by day, and to inform the bishops, who in turn, accompanied by a priest, visited the sick and needy of all classes (Augustine, *De civit. Dei*, I, xxii, c. 8). The hospitals known as *Noso-*

comia were really first instituted under Constantine. They were under the direct care of the bishop himself, and were, until the Middle Ages, oftentimes placed near or incorporated with their dwellings. But they must not be understood to have been, like the hospitals of our own day, one immense building. They consisted of a number of small cottages (dormunculæ), each intended for a certain malady. Procopius (*De ædif. Justinian.* I, i, c. 2; *Hist. Byzant.* iii), in speaking of an ancient valetudinarium which was re-established and enlarged by Justinian, says that the enlargement consisted in the addition of a certain number of small houses ("numero dormuncularum"), and of additional annual revenues ("annuo censu"). These numberless small houses, spread over a large area, gave to a hospital the appearance and extent of a village by itself. The nosocomia were also established in the West, but, unlike those of the East, they were confined to the houses of the bishops. Thus Augustine dined at the same table with the sick and poor to whom he afforded relief (Posidius, *In ejus Vita*, c. xxiii). After the downfall of the Roman empire, we find no mention made of hospitals in Europe for several centuries. During that period the bishops generally took the whole care of the poor and the sick. The bishops' house was the refuge of the poor, the widows, the orphans, the sick, and the strangers; the care of receiving and entertaining them was, as we have already stated, always considered one of the chief duties of the clergy. During the troubled times which followed the downfall of the Carlovingian dynasty the poor were almost forsaken; gaunt famine stalked over Europe, and the clergy were hardly able to keep off starvation from their own doors. But in the 13th and 14th centuries, when contagious diseases were rife in Europe, hospitals were generally established in nearly all parts of the continent. Some were the fruit of private charity, others were established by the Church, and others by the state. They were usually under the direction of priests and monks, and in the course of time many abuses arose. In the progress of civilization both the condition and the management of such institutions were greatly improved. At the present day, no civilized country is without its hospitals, either endowed and supported by the government or by private charity. The Protestant Church of Germany has institutions of deaconesses, who especially devote themselves to the care of the sick in hospitals, and from Germany these institutions have spread to many other countries. There are also in many countries special schools for the training of nurses in hospitals. Among those who, in modern times, have exerted themselves for the improvement of the hospital service, Florence Nightingale is prominent. See Bergier, *Dictionnaire de Théologie*, s. v.; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquités Chrét.* p. 289 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 336 sq.; Leckey, *History of Rationalism*, ii, 263 sq.; Gosselin, *Power of the Pope*, i, 120, 222; *Church of England Review*, July, 1855; Low, *The Charities of London* (Lond. 1850, 12mo); Nightingale, *Notes on Nursing* (Lond. 1859); Dieffenbach, *Anleit. zur Krankenwartung* (Berl. 1832). See ALMONER; ALMS; DEACONESSES; FOUNDLING HOSPITALS; ORPHAN ASYLUMS. (J. H. W.)

Hospital Sisters, also called "Daughters of God," are communities of nuns and lay sisters founded for the same purpose originally as the Hospitallers (q. v.). Their organization spread even more rapidly than the latter, but they soon abandoned their original purpose, and turned their attention to the education of young girls, especially orphans, and also to the redeeming of lost women. They are to be found to this day in France, the Netherlands, and in Italy, and are especially useful in taking care of the sick. Among their many branches we find the following: (1.) *Hospital Sisters of Notre Dame of Refuge*, founded in 1624 by Elizabeth of the Cross at Nancy, confirmed in 1634 by pope Urban VIII. They received in their houses three classes of women—virtuous girls, who by vows bound themselves to works of charity; fallen women, who, after their reformation, were likewise admitted to taking the vows; finally, voluntary penitents, and women who were sent to these institutions against their will for correction. (2.) *Hospital Sisters of Loches* (in Touraine), founded in 1630 by the priest Pasquier Bouray. They had a very strict rule. (3.) *Hospital Sisters of the Mercy of Jesus*, established in 1630 according to the rule of St. Augustine; confirmed in 1638 by patent letters, and in 1664 and 1667 by papal bulls. (4.) *Hospital Sisters of St. Joseph or of Providence;* see PROVIDENCE, ORDERS OF. (5.) *Hospital Sisters of St. Thomas of Villeneuve*, established in 1660 by Angelus le Proust and Louis Chaboisseau, according to the third rule of St. Augustine; received in 1661 the royal sanction, and still exist in France. (6.) *Hospital Sisters of St. Augustine of Notre Dame of Christian Love*, who originated in 1679 at Grenoble. (7.) *Hospital Sisters of Besançon*, established in 1685, revived in 1807, have (1870) about eighteen houses. (8.) *Hospital Sisters of St. Martha of Pontarlier*, established in 1687. (9.) *Hospital Sisters of the Holy Ghost;* see HOLY GHOST, ORDERS OF. To the class of Hospital Sisters, in the wider sense of the word, may also be counted the Elizabethines, the Sisters of Charity, and many other congregations.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 285; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 345 sq.; Helyot, *Geschichte d. Klöster- u. Ritterorden*, ii, 362; iv, 404, 437, 475, 482; vii, 342 sq.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* ii, 370 sq. (A. J. S.)

Hossbach, PETER WILHELM, S.T.D., a distinguished German theologian, born in Wusterhausen, Prussia, Feb. 20, 1784, was educated at the universities of Halle and Frankfort on the Oder. He was a regular attendant at the lectures of Knapp and Niemeyer. After his graduation he studied with great interest the works of Schleiermacher, with whom he was intimately associated the greater part of his life, and through whose influence he obtained the position of preacher to the Prussian military school for officers (Kadettenhaus) at Berlin. In 1819, while in this position, he published *Das Leben Joh. Val. Andreäs*, which was highly commented upon by Tholuck (comp. the article Andreä in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* i, and Supplem. i), and which at once assigned him an eminent position in the ranks of the Church historians. In 1821 he became pastor of the New Jerusalem Church. His opening sermon, which he published, led to the publication of an entire volume of his sermons (1822), which he dedicated to his friend Schleiermacher. Other collections of his sermons were published in 1824, 1827, 1831, 1837, 1843, and after his death another collection, with an introduction by Pischon, in 1848. Hossbach published his most important work in 1828: *Spener u. s. Zeit* (2 vols. 8vo). The second edition, which was published in 1853, contains also, as an addendum, an introduction to the history of the Evangelical Church and theology of the 18th century, a portion of a work on which he was engaged the latter part of his life, and which was left uncompleted. He died April 7, 1846. Hossbach was a popular preacher, but his published sermons enjoyed even greater popularity, and established his reputation as an able divine. He held a midway position between the strictly orthodox and the liberal theologians of Germany, and his great endeavor was to effect a compromise between these two antagonistic elements. A very fine autobiography as a minister Hossbach has furnished in his last sermon of the sixth collection, delivered to his congregation February 5, 1843, after a successful treatment of his eyes, one of which the physician was obliged to remove. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 655 sq.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* ii, 371. (J. H. W.)

Hossein BEN-MANSOUR, ABOU'L MOGHITS, a Persian Mohammedan Mystic surnamed *Al-Hellaj*, was born at Khorassan or Beidah (Fars) in the second half of the 9th century. He was a descendant of a Guebre who had embraced Islamism. After studying under the most distinguished *sofis*, one of whom prescribed for him solitude and silence for two years, he travelled through the East as far as China, preaching on his way. Some be-

lieved in him, others considered him an impostor. He uttered new opinions in religion and morals, which did not very well harmonize with each other, nor with his mode of living: thus sometimes he was a strict observer of all the practices of Islamism, while he taught that good works were more meritorious than devotional practices. His morals, however, were unimpeachable, and his life one of the utmost simplicity. He professed Pantheism, which he symbolized in these words: "I am God, and all is God." The imams and sheiks of Bagdad condemned him to death, and handed him over to the secular power. After remaining one year and a half in prison, by order of the vizir, Ali ben-Assa, he was taken out to undergo torture. Instead of cursing his persecutors, he prayed for them, and died thus, the 23d dzou'l-cadèh, 309 (March, 922). His body was burnt, and his ashes thrown into the Tigris. His theological and mystical works are some thirty in number. See Ibn Khallikan, *Biograph. Dict.* i, 423; and Fragments translated by Tholuck, *Blüthensamml. aus d. morgenländischen Mystik* (Berlin, 1825, 8vo), p. 310, 327; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 215; D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orientale*, p. 392 (Hallage). (J. N. P.)

Host occurs in the A. V. of the Bible in two very different senses, the latter and most frequent now nearly obsolete.

1. *Socially* (ξένος, lit. a *stranger*, as usually; hence a *guest*, and by inference an *entertainer*, Rom. xvi, 23; πανδοχεύς, one *who receives all* comers, i. e. a *tavern-keeper*, e. g. the custodian of a caravanserai [q. v.], Luke x, 35). See HOSPITALITY; INN.

2. *Military* (prop. and usually צָבָא, *tsaba'*, *warfare*, hence an *army*, στρατία; also מַחֲנֶה, *machaneh'*, an *encampment*, *host*; sometimes גְּדוּד, *gedud'*, a *troop*; חַיִל, *cha'yil*, or חֵיל, *cheyl*, a *force*; מַעֲרָכָה, *maarabah'*, a military *station*; Gr. στράτευμα or στρατόπεδον), the usual designation of the standing army among the Israelites. This consisted originally of infantry (compare Numb. xi, 21; 1 Sam. iv, 10; xv, 4), not simply because the country of Palestine prevented the use of cavalry, since already the Canaanites and Philistines had iron (iron-armed) chariots, which they knew how to use to advantage in the plains and open land (Josh. xvii, 16, Judg. i, 19; iv, 3, 13; v, 22; 1 Sam. xiii, 5; comp. Wichmausen, *De currib. bellic. in oriente usitatis*, Viteb. 1722; see CHARIOT), and the same was true of horsemen (2 Sam. i, 6); moreover, the neighboring nations (Syrians and Egyptians) employed these military instruments in their campaigns against the Israelites (Josh. xi, 9; Judg. iv, 3; 2 Sam. x, 18, etc.). This last circumstance (which appears to have had no influence over David, 2 Sam. viii, 4), especially when the theatre of war was removed into foreign countries, may naturally have induced Solomon (contrary to the command, Deut. xvii, 16; comp. Gesenius, *Comment. zu Jesa.* i, 186 sq.) to add cavalry to his army (1 Kings iv, 26; x, 26), which he distributed among the cities (1 Kings ix, 19; x, 26); also under the later kings we find this description of troops mentioned (1 Kings xvi, 9; 2 Kings xiii, 7), although they were eager to avail themselves of the assistance of the Egyptian cavalry (Isa. xxxi, 1; xxxvi, 9; 2 Kings xviii, 24). The Mosaic laws obliged every male Israelite from 20 years of age (Numb. i, 3; xxvi, 2; 2 Chron. xxv, 5) to 50 (Joseph. *Ant.* iii, 12, 4; comp. Macrob. *Sat.* i, 6; Seneca, *Vit. brev.* 20) to bear arms (see in Mishna, *Sota*, viii, 7), yet there were many causes of exemption (Deut. xx, 5; compare 1 Macc. iii, 55). Whenever an occasion of hostilities occurred, the young men assembled, and the requisite enumeration of the soldiers (by means of a סֹפֵר, *sopher*, "scribe" or *registrar*, Jer. lii, 25; Isa. xxxiii, 18) was made according to the several tribes (Numb. xxxi, 2 sq.; Josh. vii, 3; Judg. xx, 10). On sudden incursions of enemies, the able-bodied Israelites were summoned by special messengers (Judg. vi, 35), or by the sound of trumpets, or by beacons (נֵס, *nes*) placed upon the hill-tops (Judg. iii, 27; vi, 34; vii, 24; Jer. iv, 5 sq.; vi, 1; Ezek. vii, 14; comp. Isa. xiii, 2; xlix, 22; 2 Kings iii, 21; Jer. i, 2; 1 Macc. vii, 45; Diod. Sic. xix, 97). The entire army, thus raised by levy, was divided, according to the various kinds of weapons (2 Chron. xiv, 8), into troops (officers and soldiers together being called שָׂרִים וַעֲבָדִים, *captains and servants*) of 1000, 100, and 50 men (Numb. xxxi, 14, 48; Judg. xx, 10; 1 Sam. viii, 12; 2 Kings i, 9; xi, 15), each having its own leader (שַׂר הָאֲלָפִים, *captain of the thousands*; שַׂר הַמֵּאוֹת, *captain of the hundreds*; שַׂר חֲמִשִּׁים, *captain of fifty*; 2 Kings i, 9; xi, 4; 2 Chron. xxv, 5; for later times, comp. 1 Macc. iii, 55): larger divisions are also referred to (1 Chron. xxvii, 1 sq.; 2 Chron. xvii, 14 sq.). The commander-in-chief of the entire army (called שַׂר הַחַיִל, *captain of the host*, or שַׂר הַצָּבָא, *captain of the army*, or שַׂר עַל הַצָּבָא, *captain over the army*, 2 Sam. ii, 8; xxiv, 2; 1 Kings i, 19) formed a council of war (general's staff) with the commanders of the chiliads and centuries (1 Chron. xiii, 1 sq.), and in time of peace had the direction of the military enrolment (2 Sam. xxiv, 2 sq.). But the king generally led the army in person in battle. The national militia of the Hebrews wore no uniform, and at first each soldier was at his own expense, although commissaries of provisions are occasionally mentioned (Judg. xx, 10). On military weapons, see ARMOR. The strength of the Israelitish armies is sometimes stated in very high figures (1 Sam. xi, 8; xv, 4; 1 Chron. xxvii, 1 sq.), which is not so surprising, as they were gathered in mass by messengers (at a later day, Josephus got together in Galilee alone 100,000 men of the Jewish soldiery, *War*, ii, 20, 6); but the numbers are probably often corrupt (2 Sam. xxiv, 9 sq.; 1 Chron. xxi, 5 sq.; 2 Chron. xiii, 3; xiv, 8; xvii, 14; xxvi, 12 sq.) or (in the Chronicles, see Gramberg, p. 117) exaggerated. See NUMBER.

The organization of a standing army was begun by Saul (1 Sam. xiii, 2 sq.; xxiv, 3) in the establishment (by voluntary enlistment) of a picked corps of 3000 strong from the whole mass of the people subject to military duty (1 Sam. xiv, 52). David followed his example, but, besides the body-guard (see CHERETHITE and PELETHITE), he likewise instituted a national army, to serve in turn in monthly divisions (1 Chron. xxvii, 1 sq.). Solomon did the same (1 Kings iv, 26); and even princes of the royal stock, before they came to the throne, invested themselves with a life-guard of troops (2 Sam. xv, 1; 1 Kings i, 5). Likewise under Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 14 sq.), Athaliah (2 Kings xi, 4), Amaziah (2 Chron. xxv, 5), and Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi, 11), as also under Ahaziah of Israel (2 Kings i, 9 sq.), standing troops are mentioned in time of peace, but they were probably not in constant service. Their pay probably consisted in agricultural produce. Foreigners were not excluded from the honors of war (as may be seen in the case of Uriah the Hittite, and other warriors of David, q. v.); and Amaziah, king of Judah (although with the disapprobation of the prophet), even hired a whole troop of Ephraimitish soldiers (2 Chron. xxv, 6 sq.). (See generally J. F. Zachariæ, *De re militari vet. Hebr.* Kil. 1735, a work of no great merit.) In post-exilian times a fresh organization of Jewish military force was instituted under the Maccabees. Judas early established his military companies (1 Macc. iii, 55) in divisions of 1000 100, 50, and 10; and Simon, as prince, first paid a standing army out of his own resources (1 Macc. xiv, 32). His successors commanded a still larger number of troops, and John Hyrcanus was the first who enlisted also foreigners (Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 8, 4), probably Arabians, who served in mercenary armies (1 Macc. v, 39). On the other hand, the Jews likewise engaged in foreign warfare, for instance, as auxiliaries of the Egyptians (1 Macc. x, 36; Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 10, 4), and individuals even attained the rank of commanders (Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 10, 4; 13, 1; *Apion*, ii, 5), although they generally abstained from serving in foreign armies, on ac-

count of being obliged to violate the Sabbath (Joseph. *Ant.* xiv, 10, 11 sq., 14). The discontent and party jealousies of the Jews rendered necessary the employment of foreign mercenaries by king Alexander and queen Alexandra (Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 13, 5; 14, 1; 16, 2), called heavy-armed (ἑκατονταμάχοι, Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 12, 5). Herod the Great had in his army, no doubt, many foreigners, even Germans (Joseph. *Ant.* xvii, 8, 3; *War*, ii, 1, 2); Kändler (in *Act. Acad. Erford. Mogunt.* i, 415 sq.) understands also a special chosen corps as a body-guard (σωματοφύλακες, Joseph. *Ant.* xv, 9, 3; comp. *War*, ii, 1, 3). He, as also his successor (Joseph. *Ant.* xvii, 10, 3; *War*, ii, 20, 1), suffered his troops in certain cases to unite with the Roman legions (Josephus, *War*, ii, 18, 9; iii, 4, 2; *Ant.* xvii, 10, 3), and these Herodian soldiers, like the Roman, were employed to guard prisoners (Acts xii, 4 sq.). Respecting the discipline of these Herodian troops we know nothing positive, but they were certainly organized on Roman principles, as also Josephus himself armed and disciplined the Jewish militia who were under his command, after the Roman custom (*War*, ii, 20, 7). In the times of the direct Roman government of Judæa, in order to maintain tranquillity, there were Roman military bodies in the country, who were regularly stationed at the head-quarters of the procurator at Cæsarea (Acts x, 1); but during the great festival, namely, the Passover, they were in part detailed to Jerusalem (Acts xxi, 31; Joseph. *War*, ii, 12, 1). See ROMAN EMPIRE. (See generally Danz, *De Ebræor. re milit.* Jenæ, 1690; J. Lydii *Syntagma de re milit.* cum notis S. van Til, Dordrac. 1698: both also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xxvii.) See ARMY; WAR.

HOST OF HEAVEN (צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם, *tseba' hash-shama'yim, army of the skies*), in Gen. ii, 1, refers to the sun, moon, and stars, as the host of heaven under the symbol of an army, in which the sun is considered as the king, the moon as his vicegerent, the stars and planets as their attendants, and the constellations as the battalions and squadrons of the army drawn up in order, that they may come with their leaders to execute the designs and commands of the sovereign. According to this notion, it is said in the song of Deborah, "The stars in their courses fought against Sisera" (Judg. v, 20). The worship of the host of heaven was one of the earliest forms of idolatry (q. v.), and, from finding it frequently reprobated in the Scriptures, we may conclude that it was very common among the Jews in the days of their declension from the pure service of God (Deut. iv, 19; 2 Kings xvii, 16; xxi, 3, 5; xxiii, 5; Jer. xix, 13; Zeph. i, 5; Acts vii, 42). See HEAVEN.

In the book of Daniel it is said, "And it (the little horn) waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them" (viii, 10, 11). This doubtless points to the aspiring nature and usurping power of Antiochus Epiphanes, who in 2 Macc. ix, 10 is described as the man who thought he could reach to the stars of heaven; which, from Isa. xiv, 13; xxiv, 21, may be understood to signify the rulers, both civil and ecclesiastical, among the Jews. The priests and Levites, like the angels, were continually waiting on the service of the King of heaven in the Temple, as of old in the tabernacle (Numb. viii, 24), aud these were that part of the host, or the holy people, that were thrown down and trampled upon; for Antiochus overthrew some of the most celebrated luminaries among the leaders of the Jewish people, and reduced them to the lowest degradation. Spencer, in his treatise *De Legibus Heb.* bk. i, ch. iv, p. 202, takes notice that the Scripture often borrows expressions from military affairs to accommodate itself to the use of the tabernacle, and hence is the frequent use of the term "host." The *host of heaven* and the *prince of the host* he thinks must refer to the body of the priests, who exercised the offices of their warfare under the standards of the Deity. See LITTLE HORN.

A very frequent epithet of Jehovah is "*Jehovah God of hosts*," i. e. of the celestial armies; generally rendered "Lord God of hosts" (Jer. v, 14; xxxviii, 17; xliv, 7; Hos. xii, 5; Amos iii, 13; Psa. lix, 5; lxxx, 4, 7, 14). This is a very usual appellation of the Most High God in some of the prophetical and other books, especially in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, and Malachi; but does not occur in the Pentateuch, in the books of Joshua and Judges, nor in Ezekiel, Job, and the writings of Solomon. The Hebrew word "*Sabaoth*," i. e. *hosts*, is used by the apostles Paul and James (Rom. ix, 29; James v, 4), and is retained untranslated in the English Version. As to the grammatical construction of *Jehovah of hosts*, some suppose it to be by ellipsis for *Jehovah God of hosts;* Gesenius says this is not necessary, and the Arabs, too, subjoin in like manner a genitive of attribute to the proper names of persons, as *Antara, of the horse*, q. d. *Antara, chief of the horse.* So, too, in the construction *God of hosts*, the word *hosts* may be taken as an attribute which could be put in apposition with the names of God. The *hosts* thus signified in *Jehovah of hosts* can hardly be doubtful if we compare the expressions *host* and *hosts of Jehovah* (Josh. v, 14, 15; Psa. ciii, 21; cxlviii, 2), which, again, do not differ from *host of* heaven, embracing both angels, and the sun, moon, and stars (Gen. xxxii, 1, 2; Deut. iv, 19). The phrase *Jehovah of hosts*, therefore, differs little from the latter form, *God of heaven*, and *Jehovah God of heaven* (Gen. xxiv, 7; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 23; Job xv, 15; Ezra i, 2; v, 11, 12; vi, 9, 10; Neh. i, 4, 5; ii, 4, 20; Psa. cxxxvi, 26; Jon. i, 9; Dan. ii, 18, 37; Rev. xi, 13). See SABAOTH.

Host (oblation, from *hostia*, victim, sacrifice), the name given in the Romish Church to the bread or wafers used in the celebration of the Eucharist. It is unleavened, thin, flat, and of circular form, and has certain emblematic devices, as the crucifixion, the Lamb, or some words, or initials of words, having reference to the sacrifice, impressed on it. The Greek and other Oriental churches, as well as the various Protestant churches, celebrate the Eucharist by using leavened bread, only differing from ordinary bread in being of a finer quality; and one of the grounds of separation from the West alleged by Michael Cerularius was the Western practice of using unleavened bread. "The Greek and Protestant controversialists allege that in the early Church ordinary or leavened bread was always used, and that our Lord himself, at the Last Supper, employed the same. Even the learned cardinal Bona and the Jesuit Sirmond are of the same opinion; but most Roman divines, with the great Mabillon at their head, contend for the antiquity of the use of the unleavened bread, and especially for its conformity with the institution of our Lord, inasmuch as at the paschal supper, at which 'he took bread, and blessed, and brake it,' none other than the unleavened was admissible (Exod. xii, 8, 15; Lev. xxiii, 5). (See Klee, *Dogmatik*, iii, 190.)"—Chambers. At the Council of Florence it was left at the option of the churches to use leavened or unleavened bread. "Romanists worship the host under a false presumption that they are no longer bread and wine, but transubstantiated into the real body and blood of Christ, who is, on each occasion of the celebration of that sacrament, *offered* up anew as a *victim* (hostia) by the so-called 'priests.' Against this error the XXXIst Article of Religion is expressly directed, and also these words in the consecration prayer of the Communion Service of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 'By his *one* oblation of himself *once* offered,' etc., that Church pointedly declaring in both those places that the minister, 'so far from offering any sacrifice himself, refers' the people 'to the sacrifice already made by another'" (Eden). After the Council of Trent had determined that, upon consecration, the bread and wine in the sacrament are changed into the Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, and that though the Saviour always sits at the right hand of God in heaven, he is, notwithstanding, in many other places sacramentally present, this decision follows: "There is, therefore, no room to doubt that all the faithful in Christ are bound to venerate this most holy sacrament, and to

render thereto the worship of *latria*, which is due to the true God, according to the constant usage of the Catholic Church. Nor is it the less to be thus adored that it was instituted by Christ the Lord." We learn that, in conformity with this instruction, as the Missal directs, the priest, in every mass, as soon as he has consecrated the bread and wine, with bended knees adores the sacrament. He worships what is before him on the paten and in the chalice, and gives to it the supreme worship, both of mind and body, that he would pay to Christ himself. With his head bowing towards it, and his eyes and thoughts fixed on it and directed towards it, he prays to it as to Christ: "Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us. Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us. Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, give us peace." The following is a translation from the rubric of the Missal: "Having uttered the words of consecration, the priest, immediately falling on his knees, adores the consecrated host; he rises, shows it to the people, places it on the corporale, and again adores it." When the wine is consecrated, the priest, in like manner, "falling on his knees, adores it, rises, shows it to the people, puts the cup in its place, covers it over, and again adores it." The priest, rising up after he has adored it himself, lifts it up as high as he can conveniently, and, with his eyes fixed upon it, shows it, to be devoutly adored by the people; who, having notice also, by ringing the mass-bell, as soon as they see it, fall down in the humblest adoration to it, as if it were God himself. If Christ were visibly present, they could not bestow on him more acts of homage than they do on the host. They pray to it, and use the same acts of invocation as they do to Christ himself. The host is also worshipped when it is carried through the street in solemn procession, either before the pope, or when taken to some sick person, or on the feast of Corpus Christi. The person who, in great churches, conveys the sacrament to the numerous communicants, is called *bajulus Dei*, the porter or carrier of God. This idolatrous custom of the Church of Rome was not known till the year 1216; for it was in 1215 that transubstantiation, by the Council of Lateran, under pope Innocent III, was made an article of faith; and we also find in the Roman canon law that it was pope Honorius who ordered, in the following year, that the priests, at a certain part of the mass service, should elevate the host, and cause the people to prostrate themselves in worshipping it. See Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christl. Archäol.* viii, 275 sq.; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, bk. ii, ch. iv, v; Brown, *Expos. of the* 39 *Articles*, p. 606, 731, n.; Neale, *Introd. East. Church*, ii, 516; Siegel, *Christ. Alterth.* i, 30; Bingham, *Christ. Antiq.* ii, 819; Farrar, s. v. Adoration; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxviii, p. 73; and the articles AZYMITES; LORD'S SUPPER; MASS; TRANSUBSTANTIATION. (J. H. W.)

Hostage (תַּעֲרוּבָה, *taarubah'*, *suretyship*), a person delivered into the hands of another as a security for the performance of some engagement. See PLEDGE. Conquered kings or nations often gave hostages for the payment of their tribute, or for the continuance of their subjection; thus Jehoash, king of Israel, exacted hostages from Amaziah, king of Judah (2 Kings xiv, 14; 2 Chron. xxv, 24). See WAR.

Hotchkin, EBENEZER, a Presbyterian missionary to the Indians, was born at Richmond, Mass., March 19, 1803. He was sent as an assistant missionary to the Choctaw nation in 1828, and spent the rest of his life laboring among them. He died at the residence of his brother, the late Rev. John Hotchkin, at Lenox, Mass., Oct. 28, 1867. Hotchkin was not only a minister, but also an instructor, and was active in the management of boarding and other schools.—Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1868, p. 334 sq.

Hot Cross-Buns, a kind of muffin or biscuit, with the figure of the cross impressed upon them, quite generally used in England by the adherents of the Church of England for breakfast on Good Friday. These biscuits are said to be derived from the Ecclesiastical Eulogiæ (q. v.), formerly given as a token of friendship, or sent to the houses of those who were hindered from receiving the host.—See Staunton, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, p. 377.

Ho'tham (Heb. *Chotham'*, חוֹתָם, a *seal* or signet-ring, as in Exod. xxviii, 12, etc.; Sept. Χωθάμ, Vulg. *Hotham*), the name of two men.

1. One of the sons of Heber, the grandson of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 32). B.C. cir. 1658. He is probably the same with HELEM, whose sons are enumerated in verse 35, and grandsons in verses 36, 37.

2. An Aroerite, and father of Shama and Jehiel, two of David's champions (1 Chron. xi, 44, where the name is Anglicized "Hothan," after the Sept. Χωθάν). B.C. 1046.

Ho'than (1 Chron. xi, 44). See HOTHAM 2.

Ho'thir (Heb. *Hothir'*, הוֹתִיר, *preserver;* Sept. Ἰωεθιρί, Ἰεθιρί), the thirteenth son of Heman (q. v.), who, with eleven of his kinsmen, had charge of the twenty-first division of Levitical singers (1 Chron. xxv, 4, 28). B.C. 1014. See GIDDALTI.

Hottentots, the aboriginal inhabitants of Cape Colony, in Southern Africa. They are divided into three large tribes: 1. the Nama, or Namaqua; 2. the Kora (Korana, Keraqua); and, 3. the Saab, or Bushmen (Bosjesmans). In modern times they have been pushed northwards, partly by European immigrants, partly by the Betchuanas and Kaffres. The Nama, or Namaqua, live as nomads along the Orange River, in Great Namaqualand, which is an independent country, with about 100,000 square miles, and only 40,000 inhabitants, and Little Namaqualand, which is a part of Cape Colony. The Kora, or Korana, were about fifty years ago very numerous in the vicinity of the Vaal and Hart rivers; now they dwell as nomads on both sides of the Upper Orange River, both in Cape Colony and in the Orange Free State (q. v.). The Saab, or Bushmen, live scattered, partly in the northern districts of Cape Colony, partly in the desert Kalahary. In Cape Colony there were, according to the census of 1865, 81,598 Hottentots, by the side of 181,592 Europeans, and 100,536 Kaffres, in a total population of 496,381. Little is known of the Hottentots' religion further than that they believe in a good and an evil spirit, hold festivals on the occasion of the new and full moon, and look upon certain spots as the abode of departed spirits. They have no regular priest, nor anything like an established worship, although they render especial homage to a small, shining bug. They have magicians for whom they have great respect. The *Bastards*, or *Griquas*, resulting from the amalgamation of Hottentots and Europeans, appear much more susceptible of mental and intellectual culture; they also form a distinct race, and a colony of 6000 of them, established at the Cat River in 1826, has been quite successful, and numbered in 1870 about 20,000, nearly all Christians. They are partly nomads, partly agriculturists. The Hottentots in Cape Colony and the Griquas no longer speak the Hottentot language, but a Dutch dialect, strongly mixed with Hottentot and Kaffre words. The Hottentot language is not related to any other, and is especially different from the large South African family of languages. The words are mostly monosyllabic, and usually end in a vowel or nasal sound. Among the consonants, *l*, *f*, and *v* are wanting. There are many diphthongs. Non-Africans find it impossible to imitate the gutturals which the Hottentots breathe with a hoarse voice from a hollow chest, as well as the four clicking sounds which are produced by a lashing of the tongue against the palate, and which in writing are represented by lines and points (ǀ = dental; ! = palatal; ǂ = cerebral; ǁ, lateral). Modern linguists enumerate four dialects: 1. that of the Nama; 2. that of the Kora; 3. that

of the eastern Hottentots, or Gonaquas; 4. the dead dialects of the colonial Hottentots. The substantives have three genders, masculine, feminine, and common; and three numbers, singular, dual, and plural. There are no cases; the adjective and verb are not inflected. The prepositions are usually placed after the words which they govern. The language of the Bushmen differs from that of the other Hottentots. By the Dutch conquerors of the country of the Hottentots the poor inhabitants were considered unworthy of Christianity, and even many members of the colonial churches discountenanced and prevented all missionary enterprises. The first missionary among the Hottentots began his operations in 1709, but he ceased them after a few weeks. In 1737, the Moravian missionary, G. Schmidt, gained an attentive hearing; but when, after a few years, the fruit of his labors appeared, he was compelled by the colonial government to leave. During the next fifty years no missionary was allowed to visit the Hottentots. In 1792 the Moravians succeeded in re-establishing their mission, but not until the country passed into the hands of the English did the missionaries find the necessary protection, under which their station at Baviaanskloof (at present called Genadendal) became very flourishing. The work grew steadily, and (since 1818) has extended from the Hottentots to the Kaffres. The Moravians, even as early as 1798, were joined by the London Missionary Society. The missionary Von der Kemp established in the eastern part of the colony a mission among the Hottentots, and the latter labored among the Bushmen. In Little Namaqualand the mission was likewise begun by the London Society, and continued by the Rhenish Missionary Society, which, after the emancipation of the Hottentots, established a number of stations in the eastern districts. Several thousands of Griquas settled on the Cat River, where the station Philipton, with several out-stations, arose. Among the Koras missions have been established (since 1834) by the Berlin Missionary Society. More recently, a number of other missionary societies, of almost all the churches represented in Cape Colony, have taken part in the missions among the Hottentots. Beyond the limits of Cape Colony, the London Mission Society was the first to establish (1805) missions in Great Namaqualand. Subsequently the field was occupied by the Wesleyan Methodists and the Rhenish Missionary Society. Several stations established by the former in the northern parts of the country were again abandoned (Concordiaville and Wesleyvale, 1845-53), but in 1869 they still had three districts in the south—Nisbethbath, Hoole's Fountain, and Jerusalem—all of which were occupied by native helpers, and occasionally visited by a Wesleyan missionary from Little Namaqualand. More extensive is the work of the Rhenish Society, which in 1842 established its first out-station at Bethania, and gradually advanced northwards as far as the Zwachaub. Their labors, especially at Bethania, have been very successful, and Great Namaqualand may now be regarded as a Christianized country. See Tindall (Wesleyan missionary), *Two Lectures on Great Namaqualand and its Inhabitants;* Moodie, *The Record, or a Series of official Papers relative to the Condition and Treatment of the native Tribes in South Africa* (Capetown, 1838 sq., 5 vols.). A Grammar of the Hottentot language has been prepared by Tyndall (Capetown, 1857), and a work on etymology by Wallmann (Berlin, 1857). On the history of the missions among the Hottentots, see Grundemann, *Missionsatlas* (Gotha, 1867). (A. J. S.)

Hottinger, Johann Heinrich, 1, a celebrated Swiss theologian and scholar, born at Zürich March 10, 1620. He studied theology and the Oriental languages at Zürich, Geneva, Groningen, and Leyden. In 1642 he became professor of Church History at Zürich, and in 1643 added to it a professorship at the Carolinum. In 1655 he became professor of Oriental languages at Heidelberg, but in 1661 he returned to Zürich. In 1666, after the decease of Hoornbeck (q. v.), the University of Leyden urged Hottinger to come as his successor. He finally consented, by advice of the Swiss government, to serve that university a few years. While making his arrangements preparatory to his journey, he was drowned in the Limmat, June 5, 1667. Hottinger occupies a distinguished place among the philologists of the 17th century, who labored to promote the knowledge of the Shemitic languages. He was one of the first to bring to public notice a number of Syriac and Arabic works by giving extracts from them and biographies of their authors. He also gave a powerful impulse to the study of Oriental languages by establishing at his own expense an Arabic printing-office at Heidelberg while professor in that city. The great aim of his writings was to establish the interpretation of Scripture on a more thoroughly historical and grammatical foundation; yet he rather furnished the means for such a system than established it himself. His works consist chiefly of compilations, and were valuable from the fact that they were from sources previously not generally known. He seldom gives an exegesis, but when he does it is based on grammatical and historical considerations rather than on dogmatical. His principal works are, *Exercitationes Antimorinianæ de Pentateucho Samarit.* (1644):—*Erotemata linguæ sanctæ* (1647; 2d edition, 1667):—*Grammatica Chaldæo-Syriaca* (1658):—*Hist. orientalis de Muhammedismo, Saracenismo, Chaldaismo* (Zur. 1650):—*Historia ecclesiast. Novi Test.* (1651-67, 9 vols.), of which Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* i, 21) says that it is a counterpart of the Magdeburg Centuries. "It is less original and vigorous, but more sober and moderate:"—*Jus Hebræorum* (1655):—*Smegma orientale oppositum sordibus barbarismi* (1657):—*Bibliotheca orientalis* (Heidelb. 1658):—*Thesaurus philol.* (Zur. 1649):—*Wegweiser, dadurch man versichert werden mag, wo heut zu Tage der wahre katholische Glaube zu finden sei* (1647-49, 3 vols.):—*Cursus theologicus* (1660).—Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, s. v.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 331; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxv, 236 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 287 sq.; Hirzel, *J. H. Hottinger der Orientalist d. 17 Jahrhunderts;* Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* ii, 525 sq.; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vii, 63.

Hottinger, Johann Heinrich, 2, a Swiss Protestant theologian, grandson of the preceding, was born at Zürich Dec. 5, 1681. He studied theology at the universities of Zürich, Geneva, and Amsterdam, and in 1704 was appointed professor of philosophy at Marburg. In 1705 he became professor of Hebrew antiquities, and in 1710 professor of theology. To strictly Calvinistic views he added most of Cocceius's principles, and from this mixture resulted a system of his own, which he set forth in a treatise on dogmatics, entitled *Typus Doctrinæ Christianæ* (Francf. ad Main, 1714, 8vo). This work created great excitement; the author was accused of inculcating mystical doctrines, and was obliged to resign his position in 1717. Hottinger retired to Frankenthal, where he became pastor of the Reformed Church. In 1721 he was appointed professor of theology at Heidelberg, where he died April 7, 1750. The most important of his later writings are *Disquisitio de Revelationibus extraordinariis in genere et de quibusdam hodiernis vulgo dictis inspiratis in specie* (1717, 8vo), in which he treats of the prophets of the Cevennes, who were just then attracting great attention in Germany. —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 239; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1868, p. 31. (J. N. P.)

Hottinger, Johann Jakob, 1, son of Johann Heinrich, No. 1, was born at Zürich Dec. 1, 1652. He studied theology at Zürich and Basle, and became, in 1680, pastor of Stallikon, near Zürich. In 1686 he was appointed dean of the cathedral of Zürich, and in 1698 professor of theology in the university of that place. He died Dec. 18, 1735. Hottinger labored earnestly to establish a union of the Protestant churches, and with that view published his *Diss. irenica de veritatis et charitatis in ecclesiæ Protestantium connubio* (1721). He was an ardent opponent of the Roman Church, and wrote

against it his *Dissertatio sæcularis de necessaria majorum ab ecclesia Romana secessione* (1719). His principal other works are, *Helvetische Kirchengeschichte* (1698–1729, 4 vols. 4to):—*Ueber d. Zustand der Seele nach dem Tode* (1715):—*Die christliche Lehre v. d. heilsamen Gnade Gottes* (1716):—*Historia formulæ consensus* (1723):—*Fata doctrinæ de prædestinatione et gratia Dei* (1727), etc.—Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 290 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxv, 238 sq.; Walch, *Biblioth. Theolog.* (see Index); Fuhrmann, *Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 354; Gass, *Dogmengeschichte*, iii, 78 sq.

Hottinger, Johann Jakob, 2, nephew of a grandson of the foregoing, and also a distinguished theologian, was born at Zürich May 18, 1783. He was appointed professor of history at the university of his native place in 1844, and died there May 18, 1859. His principal works are *Gesch. d. Schweizer. Kirchentrennung* (Zür. 1825–27, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Huldreich Zwingli u. s. Zeit* (ibid. 1841, 8vo). He also edited, in connection with Vögeli, Bullinger's *Reformationsgesch.* (vol. i–iii, Frauenf. 1840, 8vo). See Pierer, *Univ. Lexikon*, viii, 358; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 239; Brockhaus, *Conv. Lex.* viii, 108.

Houames is the name of a Mohammedan sect of roving licentious Arabians, who dwell in tents, as is the custom of the Arabians. "They have a particular law, by which they are commanded to perform their ceremonies and prayers under a pavilion, without any light, after which they lie with the first woman they can meet." Some followers of this sect are living concealed at Alexandria and other places. They are not tolerated by their fellow-countrymen, and are burnt alive if discovered. The name given them signifies in Arabic *wicked*, *lascivious*, or *abominable persons*. See Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* i, 495. (J. H. W.)

Houbigant, Charles François, a French priest of the Oratory, and an eminent Biblical scholar, was born at Paris in 1686. He joined his order in 1704, and soon became distinguished for his great attainments. He lectured successively on belles-lettres at Jeuilly, on rhetoric at Marseilles, and on philosophy at Soissons, and was called to Paris in 1722 to conduct the conferences of St. Magloire. His devotion to the duties required by these new offices produced a serious illness, which terminated in total deafness. Being thus incapacitated for public duty, he devoted all his time to study, applying himself especially to the Oriental languages. Towards the close of his long career, his intellectual faculties became impaired in consequence of a fall. He died at Paris October 31, 1783. In 1772 he founded a school for girls at Avilly, where he had a country residence, and at his death he left an annual income of 175 francs to that institution. His principal amusement was to set in type and print his works himself, and for that purpose he established a printing-room in his country house. He wrote *Racines de la Langue Hébraïque* (Paris, 1732, 8vo) in verse, in imitation of the *Racines-Grecques* of Rort-Royal. In the preface Houbigant defends Masclef's system, and attempts to prove the uselessness and danger of vowel points in the study of Hebrew:—*Prolegomena in Scripturam Sacram* (Paris, 1746, 4to). In this work he follows Cappel, seeking to prove that the original text of the O. T. has undergone alterations which, without touching on points of dogma or of morals, tend to obscure the sense; and he gives rules by which these faults, due mostly to the carelessness of copyists, may be discovered and corrected:—*Conférences de Metz.* In this work, published without name of place or date, he gives a popular *exposé* of the principles of criticism developed in the preceding work:—*Psalmi Hebraici mendis quam plurimis expurgati* (Leyden, 1748, 16mo), the text corrected according to the principles laid down by the author in his *Prolegomena*:—*Biblia Hebraica cum notis criticis et versione Latina ad notas criticas facta; accedunt libri Græci qui deutero-canonici vocantur, in tres classes distributi* (Paris, 1753 and 1754, 4 vols. fol.). This work, which cost its author twenty years' labor, was published by the Congregation of the Oratory at an expense of 40,000 francs. It is very carefully executed, and is printed in two columns, one containing the text and the other the translation. The text, printed without vowel points, is but a reprint of Van der Hooght's edition of 1705. The corrections proposed by Houbigant (who makes no account of the *Keri* and *Kethib* of the Masorites), are placed either in the margin or in the form of tables at the end of each volume. The corrections of the Pentateuch are taken from the Samaritan Codex, to which Houbigant, as well as Morin, attached undue importance; others are taken from various MSS. belonging tc the Congregation of the Oratory, or to the Imperial Library of Paris, but are not fully indicated by him; a large number, finally, are merely conjectural, and derived from the application of his principles of criticism contained in the *Prolegomena*. These corrections have not received the approbation of competent judges. Houbigant appears not to have had a very clear idea of the relative value of his authorities, and he has been accused of want of thoroughness in his knowledge of Hebrew, as well as of arbitrariness in his corrections. The Latin translation was published separately, under the title *Veteris Testamenti versio nova* (Paris, 1753, 5 vols. 8vo); the critical notes and *Prolegomena* have also been printed separately, under the title *Notæ Criticæ in universos Veteris Testamenti libros, cum Hebraice tum Græce scriptos, cum integris Prolegomenis, ad exemplar Parisiense denuo recensæ* (Francf. ad Main, 1777, 2 vols. 4to). Houbigant translated bishop Sherlock's *Sermons* and Leslie's *Method with the Deist* into French. He left a large number of MSS. which were never published. See Cadry, *Notice sur la Vie et les Ouvrages du P. Houbigant* (in the *Magasin Encyclopédique*, May, 1806); G. W. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Schrifterklär.* iv, 154–156, 264–270, 465, 466; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 241 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ii, 158; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* vii, 168; viii, 50.

Houdayer, Julien, a French theologian, was born at Noyen in 1562. In 1595 he was appointed rector of the Sorbonne, and later filled several positions of distinction in the Roman Catholic Church of France. He died Nov. 28, 1619. His only theological work is *Du Devoir des Curés* (Le Mans, 1612, 12mo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 247.

Houdry, Vincent, a French Jesuit preacher and religious writer, was born at Tours January 22, 1631. He entered the order in 1644, preached some thirty years, and then devoted his time to writing only. He died March 29, 1729. His principal works are *Sermons sur tous les sujets de la Morale Chrétienne* (Paris, 1696, etc., 20 vols. 12mo):—*Traité de la manière d'imiter les bons prédicateurs* (Par. 1702, 12mo); and most especially *Bibliothèque des Prédicateurs: contenant les principaux sujets de la morale Chrét.* (Par. 1712, etc., 23 vols. 4to).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 258; Chandon and Delandine, *Nouv. Dict. Hist.* xvi, 313.

Houel, Nicolas, a French philanthropist of the 16th century. He founded at Paris the *Maison de la Charité Chrétienne* in 1578. Two years later he published his *Avertissement et déclaration de l'Institution de la Charité Chrétienne* (Par. 1580, 8vo).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 258 sq.

Hough (עִקֵּר, *akker'*, Piel of עָקַר, to *extirpate*), a method employed by the ancient Israelites to render useless the captured horses of an enemy (Josh. xi, 6; comp. Gen. xlix, 6), as they were not allowed or able to use that animal (so also 2 Sam. viii, 4; 1 Chron. xviii, 4). It consisted in *hamstringing*, i. e. severing "the tendon Achilles" of the hinder legs (Sept. νευροκοπεῖν; compare *'akar;* Syr. the same, Barhebr. p. 220). The practice is still common in Arab warfare (Rosenmüller, *Institut. juris Moham. circa bellum*, § 17). See Horse.

Hough, John, D.D., **1**, a distinguished English divine, born in Middlesex in 1651, and educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, of which he was elected president in 1687, in spite of the mandamus of king James II, who endeavored to procure the election to the headship of the college first of Anthony Farmer, and then of Dr. Samuel Parker (q. v.), bishop of Oxford, both Roman Catholics in belief, and neither of them fellows of the college, as the statute required. Lord-commissioners having been sent to enforce the royal mandates on the students, Hough, together with twenty-six out of the twenty-eight fellows of the college, courageously protested against their arbitrary proceedings, and refused to deliver the keys of the college. Finally, in Oct. 1687, Dr. Parker was by main force installed in Hough's place. "The nation, as well as the university, looked on all this proceeding with a just indignation. It was thought an open piece of robbery and burglary, when men authorized by no legal commission came forcibly and turned men out of their possession and freeholds" (bishop Burnet). "The protest of Hough was everywhere applauded; the forcing of his door was everywhere mentioned with abhorrence." Less than a year after, James II, under the pressure of political events, thought it prudent, however, to retrace his steps, and to conciliate Hough and his adherents. The former was restored to his position as president. After the Revolution, Hough became successively bishop of Oxford in 1690; of Lichfield and Coventry in 1699; and finally, after refusing the archbishopric of Canterbury, bishop of Worcester in 1717. He died in 1743. Hough wrote *Sermons and Charges*, published with a *Memoir of his Life*, by William Russell, B.D. etc. (Oxf. 1821); and other occasional sermons.—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1554; Macaulay, *History of England*, vol. ii; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 897; McMasters, *Biog. Ind. to Hume's History of England*, p. 363 sq.; Stoughton (John), *Eccles. Hist. of England* (Lond. 1870), ii, 133 sq.

Hough, John, D.D., **2**, a Congregational minister, was born in Stamford, Conn., August 17, 1783. He graduated at Yale in 1802, then studied divinity, and was sent in 1806 as missionary to Vermont, where he was ordained pastor at Vergennes in 1807. This pastorate he resigned in 1812, and became professor of languages in Middlebury College, Vt. Here he remained twenty-seven years, occupying several chairs in turn. He left in 1839, and was some time in the service of the Colonization Society. In 1841 he was installed pastor at Windham, Ohio. He obtained a dismission in 1850, on account of failing eyesight, which finally became blindness. He died at Fort Wayne, Indiana, July 17, 1861. Hough was eminently successful and popular as an instructor. He published three sermons, preached at ordinations (1810, 1823, 1826), and was one of the editors of "The Adviser, or Vermont Evangelical Magazine."—*Congreg. Quart.* iii, 378; Wilson, *Presbyt. Historical Almanac*, 1862, p. 186.

Houghtaling, J. B., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Northeast, Dutchess Co., N. Y., Oct. 9, 1797; studied law for five years, from 1813; was converted about 1817, and entered the itinerant ministry in 1828. He was appointed agent of the Troy Conference Academy in 1835, and, on account of poor health, took a supernumerary relation in 1847, which he retained until his death in 1856 or 7. He was a very useful preacher and an excellent pastor. His business abilities were fine, and he was for many years secretary of the Troy Conference, and twice assistant secretary of the General Conference.—*Minutes of Conferences*, vi, 353. (G. L. T.)

Hour (Chald. שָׁעָה, *shaah'*, a *moment*, prop. a *look*, i. q. "the wink of an eye" [Germ. *Augenblick*]; Greek ὥρα), a term first found in Dan. iii, 6; iv, 19, 33; v, 5; and occurring several times in the Apocrypha (Judith xix, 8; 2 Esd. ix, 44). It seems to be a vague expression for a short period, and the frequent phrase "in the same hour" means "immediately:" hence we find בְּשָׁעָה substituted in the Targum for בְּרֶגַע, "in a moment" (Numb. xvi, 21, etc.). The corresponding Gr. term is frequently used in the same way by the N.-T. writers (Matt. viii, 13; Luke xii, 39, etc.). The word *hour* is sometimes used in Scripture to denote some determinate season, as "mine *hour* is not yet come," "this is your *hour*, and the power of darkness," "the *hour* is coming," etc. It occurs in the Sept. as a rendering for various words meaning time, just as it does in Greek writers long before it acquired the specific meaning of our word "hour." *Saah* is still used in Arabic both for an hour and a moment.

The ancient Hebrews were probably unacquainted with the division of the natural day into twenty-four parts. The general distinctions of "morning, evening, and noonday" (Psa. lv, 17; comp. Gen. xv, 12; xviii, 1; xix, 1, 15, 23) were sufficient for them at first, as they were for the early Greeks (Homer, *Il.* xxi, 3, 111); afterwards the Greeks adopted five marked periods of the day (Jul. Pollux, *Onom.* i, 68; Dio Chrysost. *Orat.* in *De Glor.*), and the Hebrews parcelled out the period between sunrise and sunset into a series of minute divisions distinguished by the sun's course, as is still done by the Arabs, who have stated forms of prayers for each period (Lane's *Mod. Eg.* vol. i, ch. iii). See DAY.

The early Jews appear to have divided the day into *four* parts (Neh. ix, 3), and even in the N. T. we find a trace of this division in Matt. xx, 1-5. There is, however, no proof of the assertion sometimes made, that ὥρα in the Gospels may occasionally mean a space of three hours. It has been thought by some interpreters (see Wolfii *Curæ in N. T.* ad John xix, 14) that the evangelist John always computes the hours of the day after the Roman reckoning, i. e. from midnight to midnight (see Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* ii, 79; Aul. Gell. *Noct. Att.* iii, 2); but this is without support from Hebrew analogy, and obliges the gratuitous supposition of a reckoning also from midday (against John xi, 9).

The Greeks adopted the division of the day into twelve hours from the Babylonians (Herodotus, ii, 109; comp. Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 334). At what period the Jews became first acquainted with this way of reckoning time is unknown, but it is generally supposed that they, too, learned it from the Babylonians during the Captivity (Wähner, *Ant. Hebr.* § v, i, 8, 9). They *may* have had some such division at a much earlier period, as has been inferred from the fact that Ahaz erected a sun-dial in Jerusalem, the use of which had probably been learned from Babylon. There is, however, the greatest uncertainty as to the meaning of the word מַעֲלוֹת (A. V. "degrees," Isa. xxxviii, 8). See DIAL. It is strange that the Jews were not acquainted with this method of reckoning even earlier, for, although a purely conventional one, it is naturally suggested by the months in a year. Sir G. Wilkinson thinks that it arose from a less obvious cause (Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 334). In whatever way it originated, it was known to the Egyptians at a very early period. They had twelve hours of the day and of the night (called *Nau* = hour), each of which had its own genius, drawn with a star on its head. The word is said by Lepsius to be found as far back as the fifth dynasty (Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 135). The night was divided into twelve equal portions or hours, in precisely the same manner as the day. The most ancient division, however, was into three watches (*Ant.* lxiii, 6: xc, 4)—the first, or beginning of the watches, as it is called (Lam. ii, 19); the middle watch (Judg. vii, 19); and the morning watch (Exod. xiv, 24). See WATCH. When Judæa became a province of Rome, the Roman distribution of the night into four watches was introduced; to which division frequent allusions occur in the New Testament (Luke xii, 38; Matt. xiv, 25; xiii, 35), as well as to that of hours (Matt. xxv, 13; xxvi, 40; Mark xiv, 37; Luke xvii, 59; Acts xxiii, 23; Rev. iii, 3). See COCK-CROWING.

There are two kinds of hours, viz. (1.) the astronomical or equinoctial hour, i. e. the twenty-fourth part of a civil day, which, although "known to astronomers, was not used in the affairs of common life till towards the end of the 4th century of the Christian æra" (Smith, *Dict. of Classical Antiq.* s. v. Hora); and (2.) the natural hour (such the Rabbis called זמניות, καιρικαί, or temporales), i. e. the twelfth part of the natural day, or of the time between sunrise and sunset. These are the hours meant in the New Test., Josephus, and the Rabbis (John xi, 9; Acts v, 7; xix, 31; Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 4, 3), and it must be remembered that they perpetually vary in length, so as to be very different at different times of the year. Besides this, an hour of the day would always mean a different length of time from an hour of the night, except at the equinox. From the consequent uncertainty of the term there arose the proverbial expression "not all hours are equal" (R. Joshua *ap.* Carpzov, *App. Crit.* p. 345). At the equinoxes the third hour would correspond to nine o'clock; the sixth would *always* be at noon. To find the exact time meant at other seasons of the year, we must know when the sun rises in Palestine, and reduce the hours to our reckoning accordingly (Jahn, *Biblic. Arch.* § 101). In ancient times the only way of reckoning the progress of the day was by the length of the shadow—a mode of reckoning which was both contingent on the sunshine, and served only for the guidance of individuals. See SHADOW. By what means the Jews calculated the length of their hours—whether by dialling, by the *clepsydra* or water-clock, or by some horological contrivance, like what was used anciently in Persia (Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 6), and by the Romans (Martial, viii, *Epig.* 67; Juv. *Sat.* x, 214), and which is still used in India (*Asiat. Researches*, v, 88), a servant notifying the intervals—it is now impossible to discover (see Buttinghausen, *Specimen horarum Heb. et Arab.* Tr. ad Rh. 1758). Mention is also made of a curious invention called צרור שָׁעָה, by which a figure was constructed so as to drop a stone into a brazen basin every hour, the sound of which was heard for a great distance, and announced the time (Otho, *Lex. Rab.* s. v. Hora).

For the purposes of prayer, the old division of the day into four portions was continued in the Temple service, as we see from Acts ii, 15; iii, 1; x, 9. The stated periods of prayer were the third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day (Psa. xlv, 17; Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 4, 3). The Jews supposed that the third hour had been consecrated by Abraham, the sixth by Isaac, and the ninth by Jacob (Kimchi; Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* ad Acts iii, 1). It is probable that the canonical hours observed by the Romanists (of which there are eight in the twenty-four) are derived from these Temple hours (Goodwin, *Moses and Aaron*, iii, 9). See HOURS, CANONICAL.

The Rabbis pretend that the hours were divided into 1080 חלקים (minutes), and 56,848 רגעים (seconds), which numbers were chosen because they are so easily divisible (Gem. Hier. *Berachoth*, 2, 4; in Reland, *Ant. Hebr.* iv, 1, § 19). See TIME.

Hour-glass Stand, a frame of iron for the hour-glass, often placed near the pulpit after the Reformation in England. They were almost universally introduced in churches during the 16th century, and continued in use until about fifty years ago, to regulate the length of sermons. Some of them are yet to be seen, as at Wolvercot and Beckley, in Oxfordshire, and Leigh Church, in Kent. One was recently set up in the Savoy Chapel.—Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, p. 127; Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 317.

Hour-glass Stand at Leigh Church, Kent.

Houris, a designation by Europeans of those imaginary beings whose company in paradise, according to the Mohammedans' belief, is to form the principal felicity of the believers. The name, derived from *hûr al oyûn*, signifies black-eyed. They are represented in the Koran as most beautiful virgins, not created of clay, like mortal women, but of pure musk, and endowed with immortal youth, and immunity from all disease. See the Koran, chap. lv, lvi (Sale's translation); and the *Prel. Disc.* s. 4; Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Liter. and Art*, ii, 153.

Hours, CANONICAL, signifies, in ecclesiastical usage, the daily round of prayers and praise in some churches, both ancient and modern. The ancient order of these "hours" is as follows:

1. *Nocturns* or *Matins*, a service performed before day-break (properly a night service), called *vigils* by the Council of Carthage (398), but afterwards the first hour after dawn; mentioned by Cyprian as midnight and matins, and by Athanasius as nocturns and midnight (Psa. cxix, 62–147; Acts xvi, 25). Cassian and Isidore say this season was first observed in the 5th century, in the monastery of Bethlehem, in memory of the nativity.

2. *Lauds*, a service performed at daybreak, following the matin shortly, if not actually joined on to it, mentioned by Basil and the Apostolical Constitutions.

3. *Prime*, a service performed at about six o'clock A.M., "the first hour," mentioned by Athanasius (Psa. xcii, 2; v, 3; lix, 16).

4. *Tierce* or *Terce*, a service performed at 9 A.M., "the third hour;" mentioned by Tertullian with Sexts and Nones (see below), as commemorating the time when the disciples were assembled at Pentecost (Acts ii, 15).

5. *Sext*, a service performed at noonday, "the sixth hour," commemorating Peter's praying (Acts x, 19).

6. *Nones*, a service performed at 3 P.M., "the ninth hour," commemorating the time when Peter and John went up to the Temple (Acts iii, 1).

7. *Vespers*, a service performed in the early evening; mentioned by Basil, Ambrose, and Jerome, and by the Apostolical Constitutions (which we cite below), to commemorate the time when Christ instituted the Eucharist, showing it was the eventide of the world. "This hour is called from evening, according to St. Augustine, or the evening star, says St. Isidore." It was also known as the office and the hour of lights, as, until the 8th or 9th century, was usual in the East and at Milan; also when the lamps were lighted (Zech. xiv, 7). "The Roman custom of saying Vesper after Nones then came into use in the West" (Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 316).

8. *Compline*, the last evening or "bedtime service" (Psa. cxxxii, 3); first separated from Vespers by Benedict.

The office of Lauds was, however, very rarely separated from that of Matins, and these eight hours of prayer were therefore practically only seven, founded on David's habit (Psa. lv, 17; cxix, 62).

The Apostolical Constitutions (viii, 34) mention the hours as follows: "Ye shall make prayer in the morning, giving thanks, because the Lord hath enlightened you, removing the night, and bringing the day; at the third hour, because the Lord then received sentence from Pilate; at the sixth, because he was crucified; at the ninth, because all things were shaken when the Lord was crucified, trembling at the audacity of the impious Jews, not enduring that the Lord should be insulted; at evening giving thanks, because he hath given the night for rest from labor; at cock-crowing, because that hour gives glad tidings that the day is dawning in which to work the works of light." Cassian likewise mentions the observation of Tierce, Sext, and Nones in monasteries. Tertullian and Pliny speak of Christian services before daylight. Jerome names Tierce, Sext, Nones, Vespers, and Lauds; also Augustine—for the two latter hours, however, substituting "Early Vigil." Archdeacon Freeman, of the Church of England, gives (*Principles of Div. Serv.* i, 219 sq.) the following explanation, viz. that these offices, "though neither of apostolic nor

early post-apostolic date as Church services, had, nevertheless, probably existed in a rudimentary form, as private or household devotions, from a very early period, and had been received into the number of recognised public formularies previous to the reorganization of the Western ritual after the Eastern model." "Various reasons have been assigned for a deeper meaning in the hours; one is, that they are the thanksgiving for the completion of creation on the seventh day. Another theory beautifully connects them with the acts of our Lord in his passion: Evensong with his institution of the Eucharist, and washing the disciples' feet, and the going out to Gethsemane; Compline with his agony and bloody sweat; Matins with his appearance before Caiaphas; Prime and Tierce with that in the presence of Pilate; Tierce also with his scourging, crown of thorns, and presentation to the people; Sext with his bearing the cross, the seven words, and crucifixion; Nones with his dismission of his Spirit, descent into hell, and rout of the devil; Vespers with his deposition from the cross and entombment; Compline with the setting of the watch; Matins with his resurrection" (Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* p. 317). Of the origin of these "hours," Bingham (*Antiquities of the Christ. Church*, bk. xiii, ch. ix, p. 661 sq.) says that "they who have made the most exact inquiries can find no footsteps of them in the first three ages, but conclude that they came first into the Church with the monastic life" (compare also Pearson, *Prælect. in Act. Apost. num.* 3, 4). It is observable further, that most of the writers of the fourth age, who speak of six or seven hours of prayer, speak of the observances of the monks only, and not of the whole body of the Church. Thus Jerome, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Cassian, Cassiodorus, and most other writers of the early Christian Church, speak but of three hours of prayers; thus, also, even Chrysostom himself, who, however, when "speaking of the monks and their institutions (*Homil.* 14 in 1 Tim. p. 1599), gives about the same number of canonical hours as others do." Yet it is very likely even that in some Eastern churches these hours of prayers might have been practised in the 4th century, and quite certain that the different churches observing the hours varied greatly both as to the number of the hours and the service in their first original. "At the time of the Reformation, the canonical hours were reduced in the Lutheran Church to two, morning and evening; the Reformed Church never observed them" (Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Literat. and Art*, ii, 152). In the Church of England these services were, at the time of the English Reformation, used as distinct offices only by stricter religious persons and the clergy. At the revision of the liturgy of that Church under Edward VI, it was decided to have "only two solemn services of public worship in the day, viz. *Matins*, composed of matins, lauds, and prime; and *Evensong*, consisting of vespers and compline." In the Greek Church, Neale (*Essays on Liturgiology and Church Hist.*, Essay i, p. 6 sq.) says, "There are eight canonical hours; prayers are actually, for the most part, said three times daily—matins, lauds, and prime, by aggregation early in the morning; tierce, sexts, and the liturgy (communion) later; nones, vespers, and compline, by aggregation in the evening." So, also, is it in the West. "Except in monastic bodies," says the same writer (p. 46 sq.), "the breviary as a church office is scarcely ever used as a whole. You may go, we do not say from church to church, but from cathedral to cathedral of Central Europe, and never hear matins save at high festivals. In Spain and Portugal it is somewhat more frequent, but there, as everywhere, it is a clerical devotion exclusively . . . . Then the lesser hours are not often publicly said except in cathedrals, and then principally by aggregation, and in connection with mass. . . . . In no national Church under the sun are so many matin services said as in our own." It may not be out of place here to add that seven hours formed the basis of the "Primers" (q. v.). "English editions of these, set forth by authority in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and of queen Elizabeth, show that the English reformers did not wish to discourage the observance of the ancient hours of prayer. As late as 1627, by command of Charles I, bishop Cosin published a 'Collection of Private Devotions in the practice of the ancient Church, called the Hours of Prayer, as they were after this manner published by authority of queen Elizabeth, 1560,' etc." See, besides the authorities already referred to, Procter, *Prayer Book*, chap. i; Blunt (the Rev. J. H.), *Dict. of Doctrinal and Hist. Theol.* (Lond. 1870), i, 315; Siegel, *Christl.-Kirchl. Alterthümer*, i, 270 sq.; iv, 65 sq. Compare CANONICAL; BREVIARY. (J. H. W.)

Hours of our Lady, the title of a devotion instituted by pope Urban II at the Council of Clermont in 1095.—Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 318.

House (בַּיִת, *ba'yith*, which is used with much latitude, and in the "construct" form בֵּית, *beyth*, Anglicized "Beth," [q. v.] enters into the composition of many proper names; Gr. οἶκος, or some derivative of it), a dwelling in general, whether literally, as house, tent, palace, citadel, tomb, derivatively as tabernacle, temple, heaven, or metaphorically as family. See PALACE.

I. *History and Sources of Comparison.*—Although, in Oriental language, every tent (see Gesen. *Thes.* p. 32) may be regarded as a house (Harmer, *Obs.* i, 194), yet the distinction between the permanent dwelling-house and the tent must have taken rise from the moment of the division of mankind into dwellers in tents and builders of cities, *i. e.* of permanent habitations (Gen. iv, 17, 20; Isa. xxxviii, 12). The agricultural and pastoral forms of life are described in Scripture as of equally ancient origin. Cain was a husbandman, and Abel a keeper of sheep. The former is a settled, the latter an unsettled mode of life. Hence we find that Cain, when the murder of his brother constrained him to wander abroad, built a town in the land where he settled. At the same time, doubtless, those who followed the same mode of life as Abel, dwelt in tents, capable of being taken from one place to another, when the want of fresh pastures constrained those removals which are so frequent among people of pastoral habits. We are not required to suppose that Cain's town was more than a collection of huts. See CITY. Our information respecting the abodes of men in the ages before the Deluge is, however, too scanty to afford much ground for notice. The enterprise at Babel, to say nothing of Egypt, shows that the constructive arts had made considerable progress during that obscure but interesting period; for we are bound in reason to conclude that the arts possessed by man in the ages immediately following the Deluge existed before that great catastrophe. See ANTEDILUVIANS.

Oriental Hut.

The observations offered under ARCHITECTURE will preclude the expectation of finding among this Eastern people that accomplished style of building which Vitruvius requires, or that refined taste by which the Greeks and Romans excited the admiration of foreign nations. The tents in which the Arabs now dwell are in all probability the same as those in which the Hebrew patriarchs spent their lives. It is not likely that what the Hebrews observed in Egypt, during their long sojourn in that country, had in this respect any direct influence upon their own subsequent practice in Palestine. See TENT. Nevertheless, the information which may be derived from the figures of houses and parts of houses in the Egyptian

tombs is not to be overlooked or slighted. We have in them the *only* representations of ancient houses in that part of the world which now exist; and however different may have been the state architecture of Egypt and Palestine, we have every reason to conclude that there was considerable resemblance in the private dwellings

Model of an ancient Egyptian three-storied House, in calcareous stone. (In the British Museum.)

Ancient Assyrian House (Kouyounjik).

of these neighboring countries. The few representations of buildings on the Assyrian monuments may likewise be of some assistance in completing our ideas of Hebrew dwellings. The Hebrews did not become dwellers in cities till the sojourn in Egypt and after the conquest of Canaan (Gen. xlvii, 3; Exod. xii, 7; Heb. xi, 9), while the Canaanites, as well as the Assyrians, were from an earlier period builders and inhabitants of cities, and it was into the houses and cities built by the former that the Hebrews entered to take possession after the conquest (Gen. x, 11, 19; xix, 1; xxiii, 10; xxxiv, 20; Numb. xi, 27; Deut. vi, 10, 11). The private dwellings of the Assyrians and Babylonians have altogether perished, but the solid material of the houses of Syria, east of the Jordan, may perhaps have preserved entire specimens of the ancient dwellings, even of the original inhabitants of that region (Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 195, 196; C. C. Graham in "Camb. Essays," 1859, p. 160, etc.; comp. Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p. 171, 172).

II. *Materials and general Character.*—There is no reason to suppose that many houses in Palestine were constructed with wood. A great part of that country was always very poor in timber, and some parts of it had scarcely any wood at all. But of stone there was no want, and it was consequently much used in the building of houses. The law of Moses respecting leprosy in houses (Lev. xiv, 33-40) seems to prove this, as the characteristics there enumerated could only occur in the case of stone walls. Still, when the Hebrews intended to build a house in the most splendid style and in accordance with the taste of the age, as much wood as possible was used. Houses in the East were frequently built of burnt or merely dried clay bricks, which were not very durable (Job iv, 19; Matt. vii, 26). Such were very liable to the attacks of burglars (Job xxiv, 16; Matt. vi, 19; xxiv, 16. See Hackett's *Illust. of Script.* p. 94). The better class of houses were built of stone, the palaces of squared stone (1 Kings vii, 9; Isa. ix, 10), and some were of marble (1 Chron. xxix, 2). Lime or gypsum (probably with ashes or chopped straw) was used for mortar (Isa. xxxiii, 12; Jer. xliii, 9); perhaps also asphaltum (Gen. xi, 3). A plastering or whitewashing is often mentioned (Lev. xiv, 41, 42; Ezek. xiii, 10; Matt. xxiii, 27); a wash of colored lime was chosen for palaces (Jer. xxii, 14). The beams consisted chiefly of the wood of the sycamore, from its extreme durability (Isa. ix, 10); the acacia and the palm were employed for columns and transverse beams, and the cypress for flooring-planks (1 Kings vi, 15; 2 Chron. iii, 5). The fir, the olive-tree, and cedars were greatly esteemed (1 Kings vii, 2; Jer. xxii, 14); but the most precious of all was the almug-tree: this wood seems to have been brought through Arabia from India (1 Kings x, 11, 12). Wood was used in the construction of doors and gates, of the folds and lattices of windows, of the flat roofs, and of the wainscoting with which the walls were ornamented. Beams were inlaid in the walls, to which the wainscoting was fastened by nails to render it more secure (Ezra vi, 4). Houses finished in this manner were called ceiled houses and ceiled chambers (Jer. xxii, 14; Hag. i, 4). The lower part of the walls was adorned with rich hangings of velvet or damask dyed of the liveliest colors, suspended on hooks, and taken down at pleasure (Esth. i, 6). The upper part of the walls was adorned with figures in stucco, with gold, silver, gems, and ivory; hence the expressions "ivory houses," "ivory palaces," and "chambers ornamented with ivory" (1 Kings xxii, 39; 2 Chron. iii, 6; Psa. xlv, 8; Amos, iii, 15). Metals were also employed to some extent, as lead, iron, and copper are mentioned among building materials; but especially gold and silver for various kinds of solid, plated, and inlaid work (Exod. xxxvi, 34, 38). The ceiling, generally of wainscot, was painted with great art. In the days of Jeremiah these chambers were ceiled with costly and fragrant wood, and painted with the richest colors (Jer. xxii, 14). (See each of these parts and materials in their alphabetical place.) The splendor and magnificence of an edifice seems to have been estimated in a measure by the size of the square stones of which it was constructed (1 Kings vii, 9-12). In some cases these were of brilliant and variegated hues (1 Chron. xxix, 2). The foundation stone, which was probably placed at the corner, and thence called the corner stone, was an object of peculiar regard, and was selected with great care from among the others (Psa. cxviii, 22; Isa. xxviii, 16; Matt. xxi, 42; Acts iv, 11; 1 Pet. ii, 6). The square stones in buildings, as far as we can ascertain from the ruins which yet remain, were held together, not by mortar or cement of any kind, except a very small quantity indeed might have been used, but by cramp irons. Walls in some cases appear to have been covered with a composition of chalk and gypsum (Deut. xxvii, 2; comp. Dan. v, 5; Acts xxiii, 3. See Chardin's *Voyages*, ed. Langles, vol. iv). The tiles dried in the sun were at first united by mud placed between them, afterwards by lime mixed with sand to form mortar. The latter was used with burnt tiles (Lev. xiv, 41, 42; Jer. xliii, 9). For the external decoration of large buildings marble columns were employed (Cant. v, 15). The Persians also took great delight in marble. To this not only the ruins of Persepolis testify, but the Book of Esther, where mention is made of white, red, and black marble, and likewise of veined marble. The Scriptural allusions to houses receive no illustration from the recently discovered monuments of the Mesopotamian mounds, as no private houses, either of Assyria or Babylonia, have been preserved; owing doubtless to their having been constructed of perishable mud walls, at most inclosed only with thin slabs of alabaster (Layard's *Nineveh*, ii, 214). See TEMPLE.

The Hebrews at a very ancient date, like the Orientals, had not only summer and winter rooms (Jer. xxxvi, 22; see Chardin, iv, 119), but palaces (Judg. iii, 20; 1 Kings vii, 2-6; Amos iii, 15). The houses, or palaces so called, made for summer residence, were very spacious. The lower stories were frequently under ground. The front of these buildings faced the north, so as to secure the advantage of the breezes, which in summer blow from that direction. They were supplied with a current of fresh air by means of ventilators, which consisted of perforations made through the upper part of the northern wall, of considerable diameter externally, but diminishing in size as they approached the inside of the wall. See DWELLING.

Houses for jewels and armor were built and furnished under the kings (2 Kings xx, 13). The draught-house (מַחֲרָאוֹת; κοπρών; *latrinæ*) was doubtless a public latrine, such as exists in modern Eastern cities (2 Kings x, 27; Russell, i, 34).

Leprosy in the house was probably a nitrous efflorescence on the walls, which was injurious to the salubrity of the house, and whose removal was therefore strictly

enjoined by the law (Lev. xiv, 34, 55; Kitto, *Phys. Geogr. of Pal.* p. 112).

III. *Details of Hebrew Dwellings.*—In inferring the plan and arrangement of ancient Jewish or Oriental houses, as alluded to in Scripture, from existing dwellings in Syria, Egypt, and the East in general, allowance must be made for the difference in climate between Egypt, Persia, and Palestine, a cause from which would proceed differences in certain cases of material and construction, as well as of domestic arrangement.

1. The houses of the rural poor in Egypt, as well as in most parts of Syria, Arabia, and Persia, are for the most part mere huts of mud, or sun-burnt bricks. In

Hut of a Greek peasant formed of mud imbedding sticks and straw. (From Fellowes's *Lycia.*)

some parts of Palestine and Arabia stone is used, and in certain districts caves in the rock are used as dwellings (Amos v, 11; Bartlett, *Walks*, p. 117). See CAVE. The houses are usually of one story only, viz. the ground floor, and sometimes contain only one apartment. Sometimes a small court for the cattle is attached; and in some cases the cattle are housed in the same building, or the people live on a raised platform, and the cattle round them on the ground (1 Sam. xxviii, 24; Irby and Mangles, p. 70; Jolliffe, *Letters*, i, 43; Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p. 170; Burckhardt, *Travels*, ii, 119). In Lower Egypt the oxen occupy the width of the chamber farthest from the entrance: it is built of brick or mud, about four feet high, and the top is often used as a sleeping-place in winter. The windows are small apertures high up in the walls, sometimes grated with wood (Burckhardt, *Travels*, i, 241; ii, 101, 119, 301, 329; Lane, *Mod. Egyptians*, i, 44). The roofs are commonly, but not always, flat, and are usually formed of a plaster of mud and straw laid upon boughs or rafters; and upon the flat roofs, tents or "booths" of boughs or rushes are often raised to be used as sleeping-places in summer (Irby and

Modern Nestorian House, with stages on the roof for sleeping.

Mangles, p. 71; Niebuhr, *Descr.* p. 49, 53; Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 112; *Nineveh*, i, 176; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 280; *Travels*, i, 190; Van Egmont, ii, 32; Malan, *Magdala and Bethany*, p. 15). To this description the houses of ancient Egypt, and also of Assyria, as represented in the monuments, in great measure correspond (Layard, *Mon. of Nin.* pt. ii, pl. 49, 50; Wilkinson, *Ancient Eg.* i, 13; Martineau, *East. Life*, i, 19, 97). In the towns the houses of the inferior kind do not differ much from the above description, but they are sometimes of more than one story, and the roof-terraces are more carefully constructed. In Palestine they are often of stone (Jolliffe, i, 26). In the inferior kinds of Oriental dwellings, such as are met with in villages and very small towns, there is no central court, but there is generally a shaded platform in front. The village cabins and abodes of the peasant-

Ordinary Houses at Beyrout.

ry are, of course, of a still inferior description; and, being the abodes of people who live much in the open air, will not bear comparison with the houses of the same class in Northern Europe, where the cottage is the *home* of the owner. (See Jahn, *Bibl. Archæol.* translated by Prof. Upham, pt. i, ch. ii.)

2. The difference between the poorest houses and those of the class next above them is greater than between these and the houses of the first rank. The prevailing plan of Eastern houses of this class presents, as was the case in ancient Egypt, a front of wall, whose blank and

Front of an ancient Egyptian Residence.

mean appearance is usually relieved only by the door and a few latticed and projecting windows (*Views in Syria*, ii, 25). The privacy of Oriental domestic habits would render our plan of throwing the front of the house towards the street most repulsive. The doorway or door bears an inscription from the Koran as the ancient Egyptian houses had inscriptions over their doors, and as the

Israelites were directed to write sentences from the Law over their gates. See MEZUZAH. Over the door is usually the kiosk (sometimes projecting like a bay-window), or screened balcony, probably the "summer parlor" in which Ehud smote the king of Moab (Judg. iii, 20), and the "chamber on the wall." which the Shunammite prepared for the prophet (2 Kings iv, 10). Besides this, there may be a small latticed window or two high up the wall, giving light and air to upper chambers, which, except in times of public celebrations, is usually closed (2 Kings ix, 30; Shaw, *Travels*, p. 207; Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 27). The entrance is usually guarded within from sight by a wall or some arrangement of the passages. In the passage is a stone seat for the porter and other servants (Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 32; Chardin, *Voy.* iv, 111). See DOOR.

Entrance to a house in Cairo. (From Lane's *Mod. Egyptians*.)

The buildings which form the house front towards an inner square or court. Small houses have one of these courts, but superior houses have two, and first-rate houses three, communicating with each other; for the Orientals dislike ascending stairs or steps. It is only when the building-ground is confined by nature or by fortifications that they build high houses, but, from the loftiness of the rooms, buildings of one story are often as high as houses of three stories among ourselves. If there are three or more courts, all except the outer one are much alike in size and appearance; but the outer one, being devoted to the more public life of the occupant, and to his intercourse with society, is materially different from all the others. If there are more than two, the second is devoted chiefly to the use of the master, who is there attended only by his eunuchs, children, and females, and sees only such persons as he calls from the third or interior court, in which they reside. In the history of Esther, she incurs danger by going from her interior court to that of the king, to invite him to visit her part of the palace; but she would not, on any account, have gone to the outermost court, in which the king held his public audiences. Some of the finest houses in the East are to be found at Damascus, where in some of them are seven such courts. When there are only two courts, the innermost is the *harem*, in which the women and children live, and which is the true domicile of the master, to which he withdraws when the claims of business, of society, and of friends have been satisfied, and where no man but himself ever enters, or could be induced to enter, even by strong persuasions (Burckhardt, *Travels*, i, 188; Van Egmont, ii, 246, 253; Shaw, p. 207; Porter, *Damascus*, i, 34, 37, 60; Chardin, *Voyages*, vi, 6; Lane, *Modern Eg.* i, 179, 207). See below.

Entering at the street door, the above-named passage, usually sloping downwards, conducts to the outer court; the opening from the passage to this, as before observed, is not opposite the gate of entrance, but by a side turn, to preclude any view from the street into the court when the gate is opened. This open court corresponds to the Roman *impluvium*, and is often paved with marble. Into this the principal apartments look, and are either open to it in front, or are entered from it by doors. An awning is sometimes drawn over the court, and the floor strewed with carpets on festive occasions (Shaw, p. 208). Around part, if not the whole, of the court is a veranda, often nine or ten feet deep, over which, when there is more than one floor, runs a second gallery of like depth, with a balustrade (Shaw, p. 208). The stairs to the upper apartments or to the roof are often shaded by vines or creeping-plants, and the courts, especially the inner ones, planted with trees. The court has often a well or tank in it (Psa. cxxviii, 3; 2 Sam. xvii, 18; Russell, *Aleppo*, i, 24, 32; Wilkinson, i, 6, 8; Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 32; *Views in Syria*, i, 56). See COURT.

On entering the outer court through this passage we find opposite to us the public room, in which the master receives and gives audience to his friends and clients. This is entirely open in front, and, being richly fitted up, has a splendid appearance when the first view of it is obtained. A refreshing coolness is sometimes given to this apartment by a foutain throwing up a jet of water in front of it. This is the καταλυμα, or *guest-chamber*, of Luke xxii, 11; not necessarily an ἀνάγαιον, or *upper chamber*, as in verse 12. A large portion of the other side of the court is occupied with a frontage of lattice-work filled with colored glass, belonging to a room as large as the guest-chamber, and which in winter is used for the same purpose, or serves as the apartment of any visitor of distinction, who cannot, of course, be admitted into the interior parts of the house. The other apartments in this outer court are comparatively small, and are used for the accommodation of visitors, retainers, and servants. See GUEST-CHAMBER.

Court of a House at Antioch.

In the better class of houses in modern Egypt, the above ground-floor room is generally the apartment for male visitors, called *mandarah*, having a portion of the floor sunk below the rest, called *durká'ah*. This is often paved with marble or colored tiles, and has in the centre a fountain. The rest of the floor is a raised platform called *líwán*, with a mattress and cushions at the back on each of the three sides. This seat or sofa is called *díwán*. Every person, on entrance, takes off his shoes on the *durká'ah* before stepping on the *líwán* (Exod. iii, 5; Josh. v, 15; Luke vii, 38). The ceilings over the *líwán* and *durká'ah* are often richly panelled and ornamented (Jer. xxii, 14). See DIVAN.

Bearing in mind that the reception-room is raised above the level of the court (Chardin, iv, 118; *Views in Syria*, i, 56), we may, in explaining the circumstances of the miracle of the paralytic (Mark ii, 3; Luke v, 18), suppose, 1. either that our Lord was standing under the veranda, and the people in front in the court. The bearers of the sick man ascended the stairs to the roof of the house, and, taking off a portion of the boarded covering of the veranda, or removing the awning over the impluvium, τὸ μέσον, in the former case let down the bed *through* the veranda roof, or in the latter, *down by way of* the roof, διὰ τῶν κεράμων, and deposited it before the Saviour (Shaw, p. 212). 2. Another explanation presents itself in considering the room where the company were assembled as the ὑπερῷον, and the roof opened for the bed to be the true roof of the house (Trench, *Miracles*, p. 199; Lane, *Modern Eg.* i, 39). 3.

And one still more simple is found in regarding the house as one of the rude dwellings now to be seen near the Sea of Galilee, a mere room "ten or twelve feet high, and as many or more square," with no opening except the door. The roof, used as a sleeping-place, is reached by a ladder from the outside, and the bearers of the paralytic, unable to approach the door, would thus have ascended the roof, and, having uncovered it (ἐξορύξαντες), let him down into the room where our Lord was (Malan, *l. c.*). See below.

Besides the *mandarah* some houses in Cairo have an apartment called *mak'ad*, open in front to the court, with two or more arches, and a railing; and a pillar to support the wall above (Lane, i, 38). It was in a chamber of this kind, probably one of the largest size to be found in a palace, that our Lord was arraigned before the high-priest at the time when the denial of him by Peter took place. He "turned and looked" on Peter as he stood by the fire in the court (Luke xxii, 56, 61; John xviii, 24), while he himself was in the "hall of judgment," the *mak'ad*. Such was the "porch of judgment" built by Solomon (1 Kings vii, 7), which finds a parallel in the golden alcove of Mohammed Uzbek (Ibn Batuta, *Travels*, p. 76, ed. Lee). See PRÆTORIUM. The circumstance of Samson's pulling down the house by means of the pillars, may be explained by the fact of the company being assembled on tiers of balconies above each other, supported by central pillars on the basement; when these were pulled down, the whole of the upper floors would fall also (Judg. xvi, 26; see Shaw, p. 211). See PILLAR.

Part of the Court of a House in Cairo, with *Mak'ad* (Lane).

When there is no second floor, but more than one court, the women's apartments (Arabic *harem* or *haram*, *secluded* or *prohibited*, with which may be compared the Hebrew Armon, אַרְמוֹן, Stanley, *S. and P.* App. § 82), are usually in the second court; otherwise they form a separate building within the general inclosure, or are above on the first floor (*Views in Syria*, i, 56). The entrance to the harem, as observed above, is crossed by no one but the master of the house and the domestics belonging to the female establishment. Though this remark would not apply in the same degree to Jewish habits, the privacy of the women's apartments may possibly be indicated by the "inner chamber" (חֶדֶר, ταμιεῖον; *cubiculum*), resorted to as a hiding-place (1 Kings xx, 30; xxii, 25; see Judg. xv, 1). Solomon, in his marriage with a foreigner, introduced also foreign usage in this respect, which was carried further in subsequent times (1 Kings vii, 8; 2 Kings xxiv, 15). The harem of the Persian monarch (בֵּית נָשִׁים; ὁ γυναικών; *domus feminarum*) is noticed in the book of Esther (ii, 3). See WOMAN.

Interior of a House (*Harem*) in Damascus.

Sometimes the *diwán* is raised sufficiently to allow of cellars underneath for stores of all kinds (ταμιεῖα, Matt. xxiv, 26; Russell, i, 32). This basement is occupied by various offices, stores of corn and fuel, places for the water-jars to stand in, places for grinding corn, baths, kitchens, etc. In Turkish Arabia most of the houses have underground cellars or vaults, to which the inhabitants retreat during the midday heat of summer, and there enjoy a refreshing coolness. We do not discover any notice of this usage in Scripture. But at Acre the substructions of very ancient houses were some years ago discovered, having such cellars, which were very probably subservient to this use. In the rest of the year, these cellars, or *serdaubs*, as they are called, are abandoned to the bats, which swarm in them in scarcely credible numbers (Isa. ii, 20).

The kitchens are always in this inner court, as the cooking is performed by women, and the ladies of the family superintend or actually assist in the process. The kitchen, open in front, is on the same side as the entrance from the outer court; and the top of it forms a terrace, which affords a communication between the first floor of both courts by a private door, seldom used but by the master of the house and attendant eunuchs. There are usually no fireplaces except in the kitchen, the furniture of which consists of a sort of raised platform of brick, with receptacles in it for fire, answering to the "boiling-places" (מְבַשְּׁלוֹת; μαγειρεῖα; *culinæ*) of Ezekiel (xlvi, 23; see Lane, i, 41; Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 249). In these different compartments the various dishes of an Eastern feast may be at once prepared at charcoal fires. This place being wholly open in front, the half-tame doves, which have their nests in the trees of the court, often visit it, in the absence of the servants, in search of crumbs, etc. As they sometimes blacken themselves, this perhaps explains the obscure passage in Psa. lxviii, 13, "Though ye have lien among the *pots* [but Gesenius renders "sheepfolds"], ye shall be as the wings of a dove covered with silver," etc.

Besides the *mandarah*, there is sometimes a second room, either on the ground or the upper floor, called *ká'ah*, fitted with *diwáns*, and at the corners of these rooms portions taken off and inclosed form retiring rooms (Lane, i, 21; Russell, i, 31, 33). While speaking of the interior of the house, we may observe, that on the *diwán*, the corner is the place of honor, which is never quitted by the master of the house in receiving strangers (Russell, i, 27; Malan, *Tyre and Sidon*, p. 38). When there is an upper story, the *ka'ah* forms the most important apartment, and thus probably answers to the ὑπερῷον, which was often the "guest-chamber" (Luke

Ka'ah of a House in Cairo. (Lane.)

xxii, 12; Acts i, 13; ix, 37; xx, 8; Burckhardt, *Travels*, i, 154). The windows of the upper rooms often project one or two feet, and form a kiosk or latticed chamber, the ceilings of which are elaborately ornamented (Lane, i, 27; Russell, i, 102; Burckhardt, *Trav.* i, 190). Such may have been the "chamber in the wall" (עֲלִיָּה, *ὑπερῷον*, *cœnaculum*, Gesen. p. 1030) made, or rather set apart for Elisha by the Shunammite woman (2 Kings iv, 10, 11). So, also, the "summer parlor" of Eglon (Judg. iii, 20, 23; but see Wilkinson, i, 11), the "loft" of the widow of Zarephath (1 Kings xvii, 19). The "lattice" (שְׂבָכָה, *δικτυωτός*, *cancelli*) through which Ahaziah fell perhaps belonged to an upper chamber of this kind (2 Kings i, 2), as also the "third loft" (*τρίστεγον*) from which Eutychus fell (Acts xx, 9; compare Jer. xxii, 13). See UPPER ROOM. The inner court is entered by a passage and door similar to those on the street, and usually situated at one of the innermost corners of the outer court. The inner court is generally much larger than the former. It is for the most part paved, excepting a portion in the middle, which is planted with trees (usually two) and shrubs, with a basin of water in the midst. That the Jews had the like arrangement of trees in the courts of their houses, and that the birds nested in them, appears from Psa. lxxxiv, 2, 3. They had also the basin of water in the inner court or *harem*, and among them it was used for bathing, as is shown by David's discovering Bathsheba bathing as he walked on the roof of his palace. The arrangement of the inner court is very similar to that of the outer, but the whole is more open and airy. The buildings usually occupy two sides of the square, of which the one opposite the entrance contains the principal apartments. They are upon what we should call the first floor, and open into a wide gallery or veranda, which in good houses is nine or ten feet deep, and covered by a wooden penthouse supported by a row of wooden columns. This terrace or gallery is furnished with a strong wooden balustrade, and is usually paved with squared stones, or else floored with boards. In the centre of the principal front is the usual open drawing-room, on which the best art of the Eastern decorator is expended. Much of one of the sides of the court front is usually occupied by the large sitting-room, with the latticed front covered with colored glass, similar to that in the outer court. The other rooms, of smaller size, are the more private apartments of the mansion.

No ancient houses had chimneys. The word so translated in Hos. xiii, 3, means a hole through which the smoke escaped; and this existed only in the lower class of dwellings, where raw wood was employed for fuel or cooking, and where there was an opening immediately over the hearth to let out the smoke. In the better sort of houses the rooms were warmed in winter by charcoal in braziers (Jer. xxxvi, 22; Mark xiv, 54; John xviii, 18), as is still the practice (Russell, i, 21; Lane, i, 41; Chardin, iv, 120), or a fire of wood might be kindled in the open court of the house (Luke xxii, 55). See FIRE.

There are usually no doors to the sitting or drawing-rooms of Eastern houses: they are closed by curtains, at least in summer, the opening and shutting of doors being odious to most Orientals. The same seems to have been the case among the Hebrews, as far as we may judge from the curtains which served instead of doors to the tabernacle, and which separated the inner and outer chambers of the Temple. The outer doors are closed with a wooden lock (Lane, i, 42; Chardin, iv, 123; Russell, i, 21). See LOCK; CURTAIN.

The windows had no glass; they were only latticed, and thus gave free passage to the air and admitted light, while birds and bats were excluded. In winter the cold air was kept out by veils over the windows, or by shutters with holes in them sufficient to admit light (1 Kings vii, 17; Cant. ii, 9). The apertures of the windows in Egyptian and Eastern houses generally are small, in order to exclude heat (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* ii, 124). They are closed with folding valves, secured with a bolt or bar. The windows often project considerably beyond the lower part of the building, so as to overhang the street. The windows of the courts within also project (Jowett, *Christian Res.* p. 66, 67). The lattice is generally kept closed, but can be opened at pleasure, and is opened on great public occasions (Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* i, 27). Those within can look through the lattices, without opening them or being seen themselves; and in some rooms, especially the large upper room, there are several windows. From the allusions in Scripture we gather, that while there was usually but one window in each room, in which invariably there was a lattice (Judg. v, 28, where "a window" is in Heb. "*the* window;" Josh. ii, 15; 2 Sam. vi, 16, in Heb. "*the* window;" 2 Kings ix, 30, do.; Acts xx, 9, do.), there were sometimes several windows (2 Kings xiii, 17). The room here spoken of was probably such an upper room as Robinson describes

Latticed Windows of a House in Cairo.

above with many windows (*Res.* iii, 417). Daniel's room had several windows, and his lattices were opened when his enemies found him in prayer (Dan. vi, 10). The projecting nature of the window, and the fact that a divan, or raised seat, encircles the interior of each, so that usually persons sitting in the window are seated close to the aperture, easily explains how Ahaziah may have fallen through the lattice of his upper chamber, and Eutychus from his window-seat, especially if the lattices were open at the time (2 Kings i, 2; Acts xx, 9). See WINDOW.

There are usually no special bedrooms in Eastern houses, and thus the room in which Ishbosheth was murdered was probably an ordinary room with a *diwân*, on which he was sleeping during the heat of the day (2 Sam. iv, 5, 6; Lane, i, 41). See BEDCHAMBER.

The stairs to the upper apartments are in Syria usually in a corner of the court (Robinson, iii, 302). When there is no upper story the lower rooms are usually loftier. In Persia they are open from top to bottom, and only divided from the court by a low partition (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 10; Chardin, iv, 119; Burckhardt, *Travels*, i, 18, 19; *Views in Syria*, i, 56). This flight of stone steps conducts to the gallery, from which a plainer stair leads to the house-top. If the house be large, there are two or three sets of steps to the different sides of the quadrangle, but seldom more than one flight from the terrace to the house-top of any one court. There is, however, a separate stair from the outer court to the roof, and it is usually near the entrance. This will bring to mind the case of the paralytic, noticed above, whose friends, finding they could not get access to Jesus through the people who crowded the court of the house in which he was preaching, took him up to the roof, and let him down in his bed through the tiling to the place where Jesus stood (Luke v, 17–26). If the house in which our Lord then was had more than one court, he and the auditors were certainly in the outer one; and it is reasonable to conclude that he stood in the veranda addressing the crowd below. The men bearing the paralytic, therefore, perhaps went up the steps near the door; and finding they could not even then get near the person of Jesus, the gallery being also crowded, continued their course to the roof of the house, and, removing the boards over the covering of the gallery, at the place where Jesus stood, lowered the sick man to his feet. But if they could not get access to the steps near the door, as is likely, from the door being much crowded, their alternative was to take him to the roof of the next house, and there hoist him over the parapet to the roof of the house which they desired to enter. (See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 64.) See STAIRS.

The roof of the house is, of course, flat. It is formed by layers of branches, twigs, matting, and earth, laid over the rafters, and trodden down; after which it is covered with a compost that acquires considerable hardness when dry. Such roofs would not, however, endure the heavy and continuous rains of our climate; and in those parts of Asia where the climate is more than usually moist, a stone roller is usually kept on every roof, and after a shower a great part of the population is engaged in drawing these rollers over the roofs. It is now very common, in countries where timber is scarce, to have domed roofs; but in that case the flat roof, which is indispensable to Eastern habits, is obtained by filling up the hollow intervals between the several domes, so as to form a flat surface at the top. These flat roofs are often alluded to in Scripture, and the allusions show that they were made to serve the same uses as at present. In fine weather the inhabitants resorted much to them to breathe the fresh air, to enjoy a fine prospect, or to witness any event that occurred in the neighborhood (2 Sam. xi, 2; Isa. xxii, 1; Matt. xxiv, 17; Mark xiii, 15). The dry air of the summer atmosphere enabled them, without injury to health, to enjoy the bracing coolness of the night-air by sleeping on the house-tops; and in order to have the benefit of the air and prospect in the daytime, without inconvenience from the sun, sheds, booths, and tents were sometimes erected on the house-tops (2 Sam. xvi, 22). See HOUSE-TOP.

The roofs of the houses are well protected by walls and parapets. Towards the street and neighboring houses is a high wall, and towards the interior court-yard usually a parapet or wooden rail. "Battlements" of this kind, for the prevention of accidents, are strictly enjoined in the law (Deut. xxii, 8); and the form of the battlements of Egyptian houses suggest some interesting analogies, if we consider how recently the Israelites had quitted Egypt when that law was delivered. See BATTLEMENT.

1 2 3

Ancient Battlements: 1, 2. Assyrian; 3. Egyptian.

In the East, where the climate allows the people to spend so much of their time out of doors, the articles of furniture and the domestic utensils have always been few and simple. See BED; LAMP; POTTERY; SEAT; TABLE. The rooms, however, although comparatively vacant of movables, are far from having a naked or unfurnished appearance. This is owing to the high degree of ornament given to the walls and ceilings. The walls are broken up into various recesses, and the ceiling into compartments. The ceiling, if of wood and flat, is of curious and complicated joinery; or, if vaulted, is wrought into numerous coves, and enriched with fretwork in stucco; and the walls are adorned with arabesques, mosaics, mirrors, painting, and gold, which, as set off by the marble-like whiteness of the stucco, has a truly brilliant and rich effect. There is much in this to remind one of such descriptions of splendid interiors as that in Isa. liv, 11, 12.—Smith; Kitto; Fairbairn. See CEILING.

Flat-roofed Houses at Gaza.

IV. *Me'aphori al'y.*—The word house has some figurative applications in Scripture. Heaven is considered as the house of God (John xiv, 2): "In my Father's house are many mansions." Here is an evident allusion to the Temple (q. v.), with its many rooms, which is emphatically styled in the Old Testament "the House of the Lord." The grave is the

house appointed for all the living (Job xxx, 23; Isa. xiv, 18). House is taken for the body (2 Cor. v, 1): "If our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved;" if our bodies were taken to pieces by death. The comparison of the body to a house is used by Mr. Harmer to explain the similes, Eccles. xii, and is illustrated by a passage in Plautus (*Mostell.* i, 2). The Church of God is his house (1 Tim. iii, 15): "How thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, that is, the Church of the living God." In the same sense, Moses was faithful in all the house of God as a servant, but Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we (Christians). But this sense may include that of household, persons composing the attendants or retainers to a prince, etc. This intimate reference of house or dwelling to the adherents, intimates, or partisans of the householder, is probably the foundation of the simile used by the apostle Peter (1 Pet. ii, 5): "Ye (Christians), as living stones, are built up into a spiritual house." Gen. xliii, 16: "Joseph said to the ruler of his house;" i. e. to the manager of his domestic concerns. Isa. xxxvi, 3: "Eliakim, who was over the house, or household;" i. e. his steward. Gen. xxx, 30: "When shall I provide for mine own house also?" i. e. get wealth to provide for my family (see 1 Tit. v, 8). Gen. vii, 1: "Enter thou and all thy *house* (family) into the ark." Exod. i, 21: "And it came to pass, because the midwives feared God, that he made them *houses;*" i. e. he prospered their families. So also in 1 Sam. ii, 35; 2 Sam. vii, 27; 1 Kings xi, 38. Thus the Lord plagued Pharaoh and his house (Gen. xii, 17). "What is my house, that thou hast brought me hitherto?" (2 Sam. vii, 18). So Joseph (Luke i, 27; ii, 4) was of the house of David, but more especially he was of his royal lineage, or family; and, as we conceive, in the direct line or eldest branch of the family, so that he was next of kin to the throne, if the government had still continued in possession of the descendants of David (see also 1 Tim. v, 8). 2 Sam. vii, 11: "Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee a house;" i. e. he will give thee offspring, who may receive and may preserve the royal dignity. Psa. xlix, 12: "Their inward thought is that their *houses* shall continue forever;" i. e. that their posterity shall always flourish.—Calmet; Wemyss. See HOUSEHOLD.

House of Bishops. See CONVOCATION.

House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. See CONVOCATION.

House of God, a name frequently given to the edifice in which Christians assemble for the worship of God, not because God *dwells there* by any visible or special presence, as of old he "dwelt between the cherubims," but because it is *dedicated to God*, and set apart for his service. It is thus synonymous with the word "church" in that modern use of it by which it signifies a building (Eden). See BETHEL; HOUSE; TEMPLE.

House of Prayer, places where persons assemble to pray, and to receive religious instruction, but where the sacraments are not administered. It is the general name of the Protestant churches in Hungary, and was such in Silesia under the Austrian rule, to distinguish them from the Roman Catholic places of worship. It is also used in Germany to designate the churches of such sects as are not officially recognised, as the Moravians, etc. The synagogues are also called houses of prayer (Isa. lvi, 7).—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* s. v. See PROSEUCHÆ.

Household (usually same in the orig. as "house"), the members of a family residing in the same abode, including servants and dependants, although in Job i, 3 a distinction (not observed in the A. V.) is intimated by the term עֲבֻדָּה, *abuddah,'* lit. *service* ("*servants,*" Gen. xxvi, 24), between the *domestics* and the בַּיִת, *bay'ith*, or proper family of the master of the house; and some have thought a like difference to be denoted between the Greek term *οἰκία* (lit. *residence*) and οἶκος of the N. T., which are both indiscriminately rendered "house" and "household" in the Engl. Version. This latter view is confirmed by the improbability that any of the immediate imperial family (Nero's) should have been included in the converts to Christianity expressed in the phrase *they of Cæsar's household* (οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας, Phil. iv, 22). See CÆSAR.

Householder (*οἰκοδεσπότης*, *master of the house*, as rendered Matt. x, 25; Luke xiii, 25; xiv, 21), the male head of a family (Matt. xiii, 27, 52; xx, 1; xxi, 23). There are monographs on the parable Matt. xx, by Feuerlein, *De scriba proferente e thesauro nova et vetera* (Alt. 1730); Bagewitz, *De scriba docto* (Rost. 1720). See GOODMAN OF THE HOUSE.

Housel, "the old Saxon name for the Eucharist, supposed by some to be from the Gothic '*hunsa*,' a victim."—Eadie, *Eccles. Dictionary*, p. 315.

House-top (גָּג, *gag*, δῶμα), the flat roof of an Oriental house, for such is usually their form, though there are sometimes domes over some of the rooms. The flat portions are plastered with a composition of mortar, tar, ashes, and sand, which in time becomes very hard, but when not laid on at the proper season is apt to crack in winter, and the rain is thus admitted. In order to prevent this, every roof is provided with a roller, which is set at work after rain. In many cases the terrace roof is little better than earth rolled hard. On ill-compacted roofs grass is often found springing into a short-lived existence (Prov. xix, 13; xxvii, 15; Psa. cxxix, 6, 7; Isa. xxxvii, 27; Shaw, p. 210; Lane, i, 27, Robinson, iii, 39, 44, 60). See GRASS.

Modern Egyptian House-tops.

In no point do Oriental domestic habits differ more from European than in the use of the roof (Hackett, *Illustra. of Scripture*, p. 71 sq.). Its flat surface is made useful for various household purposes (Josh. ii, 6), as drying corn, hanging up linen, and preparing figs and raisins (Shaw, p. 211; Burckhardt, *Trav.* i, 191; Bartlett, *Footsteps of our Lord*, p. 199). The roofs are used almost universally as places of recreation in the evening, and often as sleeping-places at night (2 Sam. xi, 2; xvi, 22; Dan. iv, 29; 1 Sam. ix, 25, 26; Job xxvii, 18; Prov. xxi, 9; Shaw, p. 211; Russell, i, 35; Chardin, iv, 116; Layard, *Nineveh*, i, 177). They were also used as places for devotion, and even idolatrous worship (Jer. xxxii, 29; xix, 13; 2 Kings xxiii, 12; Zeph. i, 5; Acts x, 9). At the time of the Feast of Tabernacles booths were erected by the Jews on the tops of their houses, as in the present day huts of boughs are sometimes erected

on the house-tops as sleeping-places, or places of retirement from the heat in summer time (Neh. viii, 16; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 280). As among the Jews the seclusion of women was not carried to the extent of Mohammedan usage, it is probable that the house-top was made, as it is among Christian inhabitants, more a place of public meeting both for men and women, than is the case among Mohammedans, who carefully seclude their roofs from inspection by partitions (Burckhardt, *Trav.* i, 191; compare Wilkinson, i, 23). The Christians at Aleppo, in Russell's time, lived contiguous, and made their house-tops a means of mutual communication to avoid passing through the streets in time of plague (Russell, i, 35). In the same manner, the house-top might be made a means of escape by the stairs by which it was reached without entering any of the apartments of the house (Matt. xxiv, 17; x, 27; Luke xii, 3). Both Jews and heathens were in the habit of wailing publicly on the house-tops (Isa. xv, 3; xxii, 1; Jer. xlviii, 38). The expression used by Solomon, "dwelling upon the house-top" (Prov. xxi, 9), is illustrated by the frequent custom of building chambers and rooms along the side and at the corners of the open space or terrace which often constitutes a kind of upper story (Hackett, *ut sup.* p. 74). Or it may refer to the fact that booths are sometimes constructed of branches and leaves upon the roof,

Ancient Egyptian flat Roof supported by a Balustrade.

which, although of cramped dimensions, furnish a cool and quiet retreat, not unsuitable as a relief from a clamorous wife (Pococke, *Travels*, ii, 69). It is obvious that such a place would be convenient for observation (Isa. xxii, 1), and for the proclamation of news (Luke xii, 3; comp. Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 51). See ROOF.

Protection of the roof by parapets was enjoined by

Ancient Assyrian flat-roofed Houses, with Parapets and pillared covering.

the law (Deut. xxii, 8). The parapets thus constructed, of which the types may be seen in ancient Egyptian houses, were sometimes of open work, and it is to a fall through or over one of these that the injury by which Ahaziah suffered is sometimes ascribed (Shaw, p. 211). To pass over roofs for plundering purposes, as well as for safety, would be no difficult matter (Joel, ii, 9). In ancient Egyptian, and also in Assyrian houses, a sort of raised story was sometimes built above the roof, and in the former an open chamber, roofed or covered with awning, was sometimes erected on the house-top (Wilkinson, i, 9; Layard, *Mon. of Nin.* ii, pl. 49, 50).—Smith. See HOUSE.

Houssay, Brother JEAN DU, a distinguished member of an order of hermits who lived on Mount Valerian, near Paris, was born at Chaillot in 1539. These pious men formed a community of their own, distinct from the outer world, and took the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Houssay died Aug. 3, 1609.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 271. See VALERIAN MONKS. (J. H. W.)

Housta, BAUDOIN DE, an Augustine monk, was born at Toubise in the early part of the 18th century, and distinguished himself greatly by his piety and erudition. He is especially celebrated as the would-be critic of Fleury's work on ecclesiastical history, which he attacked in a work entitled *Mauvaise foi de M. Fleury, prouvée par plusieurs passages des Saints Pères, des conciles et d'auteurs ecclésiastiques qu'il a omis, tronqués ou infidèlement traduits dans son histoire* (Malines, 1733, 8vo). Of course the monk, from his narrow and biased stand-point, was unable to comprehend the greatness of Fleury and the liberality of his views, and he endeavored to ridicule Fleury, and stamp him as an infidel. Housta died at Enguien in 1760.—Chaudon and Delandine, *Nouv. Dict. Hist.* vi, 315 sq.; Fuller, *Dict. Hist.* ix, 45. (J. H. W.)

Houteville, ALEXANDRE CLAUDE FRANÇOIS, a French theologian, was born at Paris in 1688, became a member of the Congregation of the Oratory in 1704, and remained such for some eighteen years. He was then appointed secretary to cardinal Dubois. In 1722 he published *La Vérité de la religion Chrétienne prouvée par les faits* (Paris, 4to; new ed. Paris, 1749, 4 vols. 12mo), "which had a wonderful though scarcely deserved popularity at one time" (Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 198), and provoked considerable controversy. In 1723 he was made abbé of St. Vincent du Bourg-sur-Mer, in the diocese of Bordeaux. In 1728 he published *Essai philosophique sur la Providence*. In 1740 he published a second edition of his *Vérité de la religion Chrétienne* (Paris, 3 vols. 4to). This edition, greatly enlarged, contains a *historical and critical discourse upon the method of the principal authors who wrote for and against Christianity from its beginning* (which was translated and published separately, with a *Dissertation on the Life of Apollonius Tyanæus, and some Observations on the Platonists of the latter School*, Lond. 1739, 8vo). "It contains little information concerning the authors or the events, but a clearly and correctly written analysis of their works and thoughts" (Farrar, *Crit. History of Free Thought*, p. xv). In 1742 he was honored with the appointment of "perpetual secretary" to the French Academy. He died Nov. 8, 1742.—*Biographie Univ.* xx, 620 sq.; Chaudon and Delandine, *Nouv. Dict. Hist.* vi, 316; *Dict. Hist.* ix, 45 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hovel or **Housing** is a term applied to a canopy or niche.—Wallcot, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 318.

Hovey, JONATHAN PARSONS, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Waybridge, Vt., Oct. 10, 1810. He received a collegiate education at Jacksonville, Ill., and South Hanover, Ind. He studied theology at Auburn Seminary, and was ordained for the ministry March, 1837. He was settled four times: first at Gaines, N. Y.; then at Burdette, N. Y.; then at Richmond, Va.; and from September, 1850, for thirteen years, in New York

City. "His church occupied a difficult field. It was surrounded by German Catholics, and by those who valued little, though they greatly needed, the institutions of the Gospel. Here he labored with signal fidelity and usefulness. Several revivals were enjoyed during his ministry, and many additions were made to the Church." During our late civil war Dr. Hovey served as chaplain of the 71st Regiment New York State Volunteers, and continued with them during their entire period of service, at the expiration of which he returned again to his charge in New York City. He died there Dec. 16, 1863.—Wilson's *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1864, p. 305 sq.; Rev. Dr. Field, in the *Christian Intelligencer*, Dec. 24, 1863.

How, Samuel B., D.D., was born in 1788, graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1710, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1813. He was settled successively in Presbyterian churches at Salisbury, Pa., 1813-15; Trenton, N. J., 1815-21; and New Brunswick, N. J., 1821-23. From 1823 to 1827 he was pastor of the Independent Church at Savannah, Ga., then for a year in New-York, whence he was called to the presidency of Dickinson College, Pa., 1830-31. In 1832 he accepted the charge of the First Reformed Dutch Church in New Brunswick, N. J., but resigned on account of ill health in 1861. In all these positions his fine classical scholarship and solid and extensive theological learning were studiously maintained and conspicuously displayed. Devout, conscientious, a Christian gentleman in the best sense of the term, a most faithful preacher and pastor, fearless and independent, zealous and successful, as a minister he was remarkable for scriptural instruction and pious fervor. His ideal of the ministry was lofty, and his life was the best commentary upon it. In 1855 he published an elaborate pamphlet entitled *Slave-holding not sinful*, which grew out of the request of the North Carolina Classis of the German Reformed Church to be united with the Reformed Dutch Church. The important and excited discussion which followed in the General Synod of the latter body ended in a decided refusal to comply with the application. Dr. How's pamphlet was answered in the same form by the Rev. Hervey D. Ganse and others, and it was long before the interest produced by it died away. Dr. How published also several occasional sermons of eminent ability. He was a frequent contributor to religious periodicals, especially in relation to the pending theological controversies of his time. The last seven years of his life were spent in retirement from public service. He preached when his health would permit. He dwelt among his own people, a model of Christian virtues and of ministerial excellence. He died in 1868.—Corwin's *Manual Ref. Church*, p. 118; *Christian Intelligencer;* Rev. R. H. Steele, D.D., *Hist. of Ref. D. Ch. New Brunswick* (1869). (W. J. R. T.)

Howard, Bezaleel, D.D., a Unitarian Congregational minister, was born at Bridgewater, Mass., Nov. 22, 1753. He entered Harvard College in 1777, and, after graduation in 1781, engaged in teaching, pursuing at the same time a course of theological study. In 1783 he was appointed tutor at Harvard. In November, 1784, he was called as minister to the First Church and Society in Springfield, Mass., and was ordained April 27, 1785. He continued in this position until September, 1803, when impaired health obliged him to discontinue his work; but his resignation was not accepted by the Church until Jan. 25, 1809, when his successor was ordained. In 1819 he associated himself with a new Unitarian Church which had been formed from members of his old congregation, and he continued with them till his death, Jan. 20, 1837. In 1824 Harvard College conferred the degree of D.D. upon him. The Rev. Daniel Waldo, in a sketch of Dr. Howard (in Sprague's *Annals of the Am. Pulpit*, viii, 181 sq.), says that the theological views of Dr. Howard had been Arminian until his latest years, when he came to believe "the sole supremacy of the Father. He, however, held to the doctrine of the atonement, in the sense of propitiation or expiation, with the utmost tenacity; and he regarded the rejection of it as a rejection of Christianity. His views of the character of the Saviour were not, perhaps, very accurately defined: he seemed to regard him as a sort of eternal emanation from Deity; not a creature in the strict sense, on the one hand, nor yet the supreme God on the other." He published a sermon delivered at the ordination of the Rev. Antipas Steward (1793). (J. H. W.)

Howard, John, one of the most eminent of modern Christian philanthropists, was born at Hackney in 1726. His father apprenticed him to a wholesale grocer, but died when his son was about nineteen years of age, leaving him in possession of a handsome fortune, and young Howard, who was in weak health, determined to make a tour in France and Italy. On his return he took lodgings in Stoke Newington, where his landlady —a widow named Loidore—having nursed him carefully through a severe illness, he, out of gratitude, married her, though she was twenty-seven years his senior. She, however, died about three years after the marriage, and he now conceived a desire to visit Lisbon, with a view to alleviate the miseries caused by the great earthquake in 1756. On his voyage he was captured by a French privateer, carried a prisoner to Brest, and subsequently removed into the interior, but was finally permitted to return to England on the promise of inducing the government to make a suitable exchange for him. This was effected, and Howard retired to a small estate he possessed at Cardington, near Bedford, and there, in April, 1758, he married Miss Henrietta Leeds. It is mentioned as a characteristic trait that he stipulated before marriage "that, in all matters in which there should be a difference of opinion between them, his voice should rule." For seven years he was chiefly engaged in the task of raising the physical and moral condition of the peasantry of Cardington and its neighborhood by erecting on his own estate better cottages, establishing schools, and visiting and relieving the sick and the destitute; in his benevolent exertions he was assisted by his wife. She died March, 1765, and Howard from that time lost his interest in his home and its occupations. He lived some years at Cardington in seclusion, then made another Continental tour, and in 1773 was nominated sheriff of Bedford. The sufferings which he had endured and witnessed during his own brief confinement as a prisoner of war struck deep into his mind, and, shocked by the misery and abuses which prevailed in the prisons under his charge, he attempted to induce the magistrates to remedy the more obvious of them. The reply was a demand for a precedent, and Howard at once set out on a tour of inspection. But he soon found that the evil was general, and he set himself diligently to work to inquire into the extent and precise nature of the mischief, and, if possible, to discover the true remedy for the evil. He visited, in two journeys, most of the town and county jails of England, and accumulated a large mass of information, which, in March, 1774, he laid before the House of Commons. This was the commencement of prison reform in England. Once actively engaged, he became more and more devoted to this benevolent pursuit. He travelled repeatedly over the United Kingdom, and at different periods to almost every part of Europe, visiting the most offensive places, relieving personally the wants of the most wretched objects, and noting all that seemed to him important either for warning or example. The first fruit of these labors was *The State of the Prisons in England and Wales, with an Account of some Foreign Prisons* (1777). "As soon as it appeared, the world was astonished at the mass of valuable materials accumulated by a private unaided individual, through a course of prodigious labor, and at the constant hazard of life, in consequence of the infectious diseases prevalent in the scenes of his inquiries. The cool good sense and moderation of his

narrative, contrasted with that enthusiastic ardor which must have impelled him to his undertaking, were not less admired, and he was immediately regarded as one of the extraordinary characters of the age, and as the leader in all plans for ameliorating the condition of that wretched part of the community for whom he interested himself" (Aikin). In 1778 he undertook another tour, revisited the celebrated Rasp-houses of Holland, and continued his route through Belgium and Germany into Italy, whence he returned through Switzerland and France in 1779. In the same year he made another survey of Great Britain and Ireland. In these tours he extended his views to the investigation of hospitals. The results were published in 1780, in an *Appendix to "The State of the Prisons in England and Wales,"* etc. Having travelled over nearly all the south of Europe, in 1781 he visited Denmark, Sweden, Russia, and Poland, and in 1783 he went through Spain and Portugal, continuing at intervals his home inquiries, and published in 1784 a second appendix, together with a new edition of the original work, in which the additional matter was comprised. The importance, both in prisons and hospitals, of preventing the occurrence or spread of infectious diseases, produced in Mr. Howard a desire to witness the working and success of the Lazaretto system in the south of Europe, more especially as a safeguard against the plague. Danger or disgust never turned him from his path, but on this occasion he went without even a servant, not thinking it right, for convenience sake, to expose another person to such a risk. Quitting England in 1785, he travelled through the south of France and Italy to Malta, Zante, and Constantinople, whence he returned to Smyrna, while the plague was raging, for the purpose of sailing from an infected port to Venice, where he might undergo the utmost rigor of the quarantine system. He returned to England in 1787, resumed his home tours, and in 1789 published the result of his late inquiries in another important volume, entitled *An Account of the principal Lazarettos in Europe, etc., with additional Remarks on the present State of the Prisons in Great Britain and Ireland.* The same summer he renewed his course of foreign travels, meaning to go into Turkey and the East through Russia. He had, however, proceeded no farther than the Crimea when a rapid illness, which he himself believed to be an infectious fever, caught in prescribing for a lady, put an end to his life on the 20th of January, 1790. He requested that no other inscription should be put upon his grave than simply this, "Christ is my hope." He was buried at Dauphiny, near Cherson, and the utmost respect was paid to his memory by the Russian government. The intelligence of his death caused a profound feeling of regret in his native country, and men of all classes and parties vied in paying their tribute of reverence to his memory. A marble statue by Bacon of "the philanthropist" was erected in St. Paul's Cathedral by a public subscription.

Mr. Howard's piety was deep and fervent, and his moral character most pure and simple. His literary acquirements were small, neither were his talents brilliant; but he was fearless, single-minded, untiring, and did great things by devoting his whole energies to one good object. The influence of disinterestedness and integrity is remarkably displayed in the ready access granted to him even by the most absolute and most suspicious governments, in the respect invariably paid to his person, and the weight attached to his opinion and authority. He was strictly economical in his personal expenses, abstemious in his habits, and capable of going through great fatigue; both his fortune and his constitution were freely spent in the cause to which his life was devoted. The only blemish which has ever been suggested as resting upon his memory is in connection with his conduct to his son. Mr. Howard was a strict, and has not escaped the charge of being a severe, parent. The son, unhappily, in youth fell into dissolute habits, which being carefully concealed from the father, and consequently unchecked, brought on a disease which terminated in insanity. He survived his father nine years, dying on the 24th of April, 1799; but he remained till his death a hopeless lunatic. The question of Howard's alleged harshness to his son has been thoroughly investigated and effectually disproved. (See Dixon's *Life of Howard.*) That his devotion to the great philanthropic object to which he gave up his life may not have interfered with his paternal duties, it is, of course, impossible to affirm; but that John Howard was an affectionate and kind-hearted father, as well as a single-minded benefactor to his species, there can now be no reasonable doubt. See *English Cyclopædia;* Aiken, *Character and Services of John Howard* (London, 1792, 8vo); Brown, *Memoirs of John Howard* (Lond. 1818, 4to); Dixon, *John Howard and the Prison World of Europe* (London, 1850, 12mo; reprinted, with an introduction, by the Rev. R. W. Dickinson, D.D., N. Y. 1854, 18mo); Field, *Life of John Howard* (Lond. 1850, 8vo); Skeats, *History of the Free Churches of England*, p. 479.

Howard, John, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of Roman Catholic ancestry in Onslow County, North Carolina, in 1792. His early education was limited, as his father died shortly after the birth of John, and he was placed in a store at the age of twelve. He was converted in 1808, and entered the ministry in 1818 at Georgetown. In 1819 he joined the South Carolina Conference, and was stationed at Sandy River Circuit. In 1820 he was appointed to Georgetown, 1821 to Savannah, 1822 to Augusta, and 1823 and 1824 to Charleston. He located from 1825 till 1828, when he was appointed to the Washington and Greensborough Circuits. In 1829 and 1830 he labored on the Appalachee Circuit. In 1831 he joined the Georgia Conference, then forming, and for three years became presiding elder of the Milledgeville District. From 1834 to the time of his death in 1836, he was agent for the "Manual Labor School" of the Conference. "Mr. Howard's ministry, especially in Savannah, Augusta, and Charleston, was attended with marked success. He labored with great fidelity, not only in the pulpit, but with penitents at the altar, being alike fervent in his prayers and appropriate in his counsels. As a pastor, too, he was always on the alert to promote the best interests of his people. Whenever there was darkness to be dissipated, or grief to be assuaged, or sinking hope to be encouraged, or evil of any kind to be removed, there he was sure to be present as an angel of mercy."—Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vii, 614 sq.

Howard, Simeon, D.D., a Unitarian Congregational minister, was born at Bridgewater, Maine, April 29, 1733, and educated at Harvard College, where he graduated with distinguished honor in 1758. After a course of theological study, pursued while himself engaged in teaching, he accepted a call to a church at Cumberland, Nova Scotia. In 1765 he returned to Cambridge as a resident graduate student, and was elected tutor the year following. In 1767 he accepted the pastorate of West Church, Boston, and was ordained May 6, 1768. During the Revolution his congregation suffered greatly, and having made many friends during his residence in Nova Scotia, he proposed that his congregation should emigrate with him thither, which they did. After about one year and a half he returned to Boston, and again served his congregation there, receiving only such compensation for his services as he was fully satisfied they could afford to give in their destitute circumstances. He died in the midst of his labors among them, August 13, 1804. The degree of D.D. was conferred on him by Edinburgh University. He was an overseer and fellow of Harvard, and a member of most of the American societies for the promotion of literary, charitable, and religious objects, and an officer of several of them. Dr. Howard was "bland and gentle in his manner, calm and equable in his temper, cheerful without levity, and serious without gloom. . . . His

parishioners loved him as a brother, and honored him as a father; his brethren in the ministry always met him with a grateful and cordial welcome; and the community at large reverenced him for his simplicity, integrity, and benevolence." Dr. Howard published *Sermons* (1773, 1777, 1778, 1780):—*Christians have no Cause to be ashamed of their Religion* (sermon, 1779):—*Ordination Sermon* (1791).—Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, viii, 65.

Howe, Bezaleel, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Tower Hill, Dutchess County, N. Y., July 14, 1781. In early life he was a student of Paine and Rousseau, and for several years a professed infidel; but the unhappy death of a notorious infidel of his acquaintance was the means of his conversion, and in 1823 he entered the New York Conference, in which he labored with great zeal and success until his death, June 25, 1854. He was fond of study, and his piety and abilities honored and edified the Church.—*Min. of Conferences*, v, 533. (G. L. T.)

Howe, Charles, a distinguished English diplomatist under Charles II, was born in Gloucestershire in 1661. Being of a strong religious turn, he finally forsook public life, and retired into the country, where he wrote his *Devout Meditations* (8vo: 2d ed. Edinb. 1752, 12mo; Lond. 1824, 12mo, and often), of which the poet, Dr. Edward Young, says, "I shall never lay it far out of my reach, for a greater demonstration of a sound head and sincere heart I never saw." Howe died in 1745.—*Lond. Gentl. Mag.* vol. lxiv; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 902; Gorton, *Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Howe, John, a Nonconformist divine, and one of the greatest of English theologians, who is often called the "Platonic Puritan," was born May 17, 1630, at Loughborough, in Leicestershire, where his father was the incumbent of the parish church; but, having become a Nonconformist, he was ejected from his living, and retired to Ireland. He soon, however, returned to England, and settled in the town of Lancaster, where John received his rudimentary instruction from his father. He was afterwards educated at Christ College, Cambridge, but removed to Brazenose College, Oxford, of which he became the bible-clerk in 1648, and where he for the second time took his degree of B.A. in 1649. He was made a demy of Magdalen College by the parliamentary visitors, and was afterwards chosen a fellow. In July, 1652, he took the degree of M.A. After having been ordained by a Nonconformist divine, assisted by others, he became a minister at Great Torrington, in Devonshire. In 1654 Cromwell appointed him his domestic chaplain. He gave some offence to the protector by one of his sermons, in which he censured certain opinions about divine impulses and special impressions in answer to prayer, but retained his situation till Cromwell's death, and afterwards till the deposition of Richard Cromwell. He then resumed and continued his ministry at Great Torrington till the Act of Uniformity, August, 1662, obliged him to restrict his preaching to private houses. He went to Ireland in 1671, where he resided as chaplain to the family of lord Massarene, enjoying there the friendship of the bishop of that diocese. Howe was granted liberty to preach in all the churches under the jurisdiction of this bishop. He wrote at this time his *Vanity of Man as Mortal*, and began his greatest work, *The Living Temple*, below referred to. In 1675 he accepted an invitation to become the minister of a congregation in London. During the year 1680 he engaged in a controversy with Drs. Stillingfleet and Tillotson on the question of nonconformity, and it is said that Dr. Stillingfleet, who had provoked the controversy by a discourse which he preached before the lord mayor and aldermen of London on "The Mischief of Separation," was subdued when he read Howe's reply, and confessed that he discoursed "more like a gentleman than a divine, without any mixture of rancor, or any sharp reflections, and sometimes with a great degree of kindness towards him, for which, and his prayers for him, he heartily thanked him" (Rogers's *Life of Howe*, p. 183). In August, 1685, he went to the Continent with lord Wharton, and in 1686 became one of the preachers to the English church at Utrecht. When James II published his "declaration for liberty of conscience," Howe returned to London, and at the Revolution, the year following, he headed the deputation of dissenting ministers who presented their petition to the throne. In 1689 he again pleaded the cause of the Nonconformists in an anonymous pamphlet entitled *The Case of the Protestant Dissenters represented and argued.* In 1691 he became involved in the Antinomian controversy by a recommendation which he gave to the works of Dr. Crisp. He soon, however, cleared his reputation by a strong recommendation of Flavel's *Blow at the Root*, a work against Antinomianism, then in the course of publication. In 1701 he became entangled in a controversy with the Puritan De Foe (q. v.) on account of one of Howe's members, who had been elected lord mayor, and who, in order to qualify himself for that office, had taken the Lord's Supper in an Established church. The manner in which Howe answered (*Some Considerations of a Preface to an Inquiry*, etc.) the objections of De Foe, who opposed communion in the Established Church by Nonconformists, is to be regretted by all who venerate the name of John Howe. He died April 2, 1705. Among the Puritans, John Howe ranks as one of the most eminent. He was also unquestionably a man of great general learning. "The originality and compass of Howe's mind, and the calmness and moderation of his temper, must ever inspire sympathy and awaken admiration in reflective readers: his Platonic and Alexandrian culture commends him to the philosophical student, and the practical tendency of his religious thinking endears him to all Christians" (Stoughton [John], *Eccles. Hist. of Engl.* ii, 422, 423). "Perhaps it may be considered as no unfair test of intellectual and spiritual excellence that a person can relish the writings of John Howe; if he does not, he may have reason to suspect that something in his head or heart is wrong. A young minister who wishes to attain eminence in his profession, if he has not the works of John Howe, and can procure them in no other way, should sell his coat and buy them; and, if that will not suffice, let him sell his bed and lie on the floor; and if he spends his days in reading them, he will not complain that he lies hard at night" (Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters*, i, 437). "Howe seems to have understood the Gospel as well as any uninspired writer, and to have imbibed as much of its spirit. There is the truest sublimity to be found in his writings, and some of the strongest pathos; yet, often obscure, generally harsh, he has imitated the worst parts of Boyle's style. He has a vast number and variety of uncommon thoughts, and is, on the whole, one of the most valuable writers in our language, or, I believe, in the world" (Dr. Doddridge). "I have learned more from John Howe than from any other author I ever read. There is an astonishing magnificence in his conceptions" (Robert Hall). "This great man was one of the few who have been venerated as much by their contemporaries as by their successors. Time, which commonly adds increased lustre to the memory of the good, has not been able to magnify any of the qualities for which Howe was so conspicuous. His strong and capacious intellect, his sublime elevation of thought, his flowing eloquence, the holiness of his life, the dignity and courtesy of his manners, the humor of his conversation, won for him from the men of his own time the title of 'the great Howe'" (Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, p. 169). Howe's most important works are, *The Living Temple* (many editions; first in 1676), in which he proves the existence of God and his conversableness with men, and which occupies one of the highest places in Puritan theology:—*The Redeemer's Tears over lost Souls* [Luke xix, 41, 42], *with an Appendix on the Blasphemy against*

the Holy Ghost (Lond. 1684; often reprinted), in which Howe does not, unlike many high Calvinistic theologians, enter at all into the predestination controversy, but confines himself to a solution of the question of God's omniscience and man's responsibility:—*Inquiry concerning the Trinity*, etc.:—*Office and Work of the Holy Spirit*. These, with his *Sermons* and other writings, are to be found in his *Collected Works, with Life by Dr. Calamy* (1724, 2 vols. folio); and in *The whole Works of the Rev. John Howe, M.A.*, edited by Hunt (London, 1810–22, 7 vols. 8vo, with an eighth vol., containing a Memoir and additional works), and again in *The Works of the Rev. John Howe, M.A., as published during his life, comprising the whole of the two folio volumes, ed. 1724, with a Life of the Author*, by the Rev. J. P. Hewlett (London, 1848, 3 vols. 8vo). There is also an edition of his Works in 1 vol. imp. 8vo (London, 1838), and an American edition (Phila. 2 vols. imp. 8vo). See also Wilson, *Selections from Howe, with his Life* (Lond. 1827, 2 vols. 12mo); Taylor, *Select Treatises of John Howe* (1835, 12mo); Rogers, *Life of John Howe, with an Analysis of his Writings* (Lond. 1836, 12mo); Dunn, *Howe's Christian Theology* (Lond. 1836, 12mo); *English Cyclopædia;* Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 902; *Quarterly Review* (Lond.), xxxvi, 167; *Literary and Theological Review*, iv, 538; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1862, p. 676; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* vi, 198 sq. (J. H. W.)

Howe, Joseph, a Congregational minister, born at Killingly, Connecticut, January 14, 1747, was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1765, the first in his class. By recommendation of the president of his college he was appointed principal of a public school at Hartford, at that time the most important institution of that class in the colony. He was licensed to preach in 1769, and was appointed tutor at Yale in the same year. He held this position, preaching quite frequently, until called to the New South Church, Boston, in 1772, where he was ordained May 19, 1773. At the outbreak of the Revolution (1775) he fled to Norwich, where he remained only a short time, as his health had become enfeebled. He went to New Haven, and on his return stopped at Hartford, where he died, Aug. 25, 1775.—Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i, 707 sq.

Howe, Josiah, an English divine of the 17th century, born at Crendon, Bucks County, was educated at Oxford, and obtained a fellowship at Trinity College, of that University, in 1637. He found great favor with Charles I, at whose command he was admitted to the degree of bachelor of divinity in 1646. After the ruin of the royal house he was ejected from his fellowship, but was restored to his preferment after the restoration of the monarchy. He died in 1701. See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. iii; Gorton, *Biog. Dict.* ii, s. v.

Howe, Nathaniel, a Congregational minister, was born in Ipswich, Mass., Oct. 6, 1764. He graduated at Harvard College in 1786, and was ordained pastor at Hopkinton Oct. 5, 1791, where he labored until his death, Feb. 15, 1837. He published *An Attempt to prove that John's Baptism was not Gospel Baptism, being a Reply to Dr. Baldwin's Essay on the same Subject* (1820):—*A Catechism with miscellaneous Questions, and a Chapter of Proverbs for the Children under his parochial Care.* See Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 307; *North American Review*, iv, 93–97.

Howell, Horatio S., a Presbyterian minister, born near Trenton, N. J., in 1820, was educated at Princeton College, and the Union Theological Seminary, N. Y. In 1846 he was ordained pastor of East Whiteland Church, Pa. He subsequently became pastor of the Church at Elkton, Md., and at the Delaware Water Gap, Pa. While he was laboring at this latter place the Rebellion broke out. He at once entered the army as chaplain of the 90th Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers. His reputation as chaplain was pre-eminent for arduous, zealous, and judicious devotion. He was killed at the battle of Gettysburg, Pa., July 1, 1863.—Wilson, *Pres. Hist. Almanac*, 1864.

Howell, Lawrence, a distinguished Nonjuror, was born soon after the Restoration, about 1660. He studied at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1684, and M.A. in 1688. Having entered the Church, he was ordained in 1712 by the nonjuring bishop, Dr. Hickes, who had taken the title of suffragan bishop of Thetford. He soon after published a pamphlet entitled *The Case of Schism in the Church of England truly stated*, for which he was committed to Newgate, convicted, and condemned to three years' imprisonment, besides whipping, a fine of £500, and degradation. This latter part was remitted him, however, by the king. He died in Newgate in 1720. Whatever his errors, the punishment appears to have been disproportionate to his offence. He was a man of extensive learning and great capacity. He wrote *Synopsis Canonum S.S. Apostolorum et Conciliorum Œcumenicorum et Provincialium ab Ecclesia Græca receptorum* (1708, fol.):—*Synops. Canon. Eccles. Lat.* (1710–1715, fol.):—*A View of the Pontificate from its supposed beginning to the end of the Council of Trent*, etc. (Lond. 1716, 8vo):—*Desiderius, or the original Pilgrim; a divine Dialogue* (from the Spanish) (Lond. 1717, 12mo):—*A complete History of the Holy Bible*, with additions by Rev..Geo. Burder (Lond. 1806, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Certain Queries proposed by Roman Catholics*, etc. (Lond. 1716); etc.—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1563; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 199; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 313 sq. (J. N. P.)

Howell, Robert Boyte Crawford, D.D., a prominent Baptist preacher in Tennessee, was born in Wayne County, North Carolina, March 10, 1801. He pursued his literary and theological studies in Columbian College, also the study of medicine, but without intending its practice. With this preparation, he entered upon the duties of the ministry in the Episcopal Church, of which his family were communicants; but, quite unexpectedly to his friends, he soon joined the Baptists, travelling fourteen miles to reach the nearest Baptist church for this purpose, Feb. 6, 1821. Five days afterwards he received license to preach the doctrines of the Baptist Church. At Washington he performed, in connection with his theological studies, the duties of a city missionary, and for a year after the completion of his course he was a missionary in Virginia. He then accepted a call to the pastorate of the Cumberland Street Baptist Church in Norfolk. He was ordained Jan. 27, 1827. A revival immediately followed, as the fruits of which he baptized about 200 within a few months. His labors continued here for eight years. In 1834 he removed to Nashville, Tenn. The First Baptist Church had been dispersed by the Rev. Alexander Campbell and his disciples, but under Mr. Howell's labors it was revived and built up. He established, and for some time edited a religious newspaper. He exerted more influence in the support of missions than any other minister of the denomination in Tennessee. After the organization of the Southern Baptist Convention, he was elected and re-elected its president. In 1850 he removed to Richmond, Va., where, in addition to the charge of a church, he was a trustee of Richmond College, and of the Richmond Female Institute, a member of the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission, Publication, and Sunday-school Boards, and of the Virginia Baptist Mission and Educational Board. In 1857 he yielded to an urgent call to reoccupy his former field of labor in Nashville. There, besides efficiently promoting all the State Baptist organizations, he was, by appointment of the Legislature, a trustee of the Institution for the Blind, and in other educational trusts. His labors were arduous; in addition to which, he performed a considerable amount of literary work, including some of his most useful books. He died April 5, 1868, greatly honored and lamented. Dr. Howell was a man of commanding presence and dignified address, warm and genial in his manners. His labors as a

preacher of the Gospel were abundant and successful, and some of his published works had a wide circulation in this country, and were republished in England. He was the author of *Evils of Infant Baptism:—The Cross:—The Covenants:—The Early Baptists of Virginia:—On Communion:—The Deaconship:—The Way of Salvation.* He left several works in manuscript, among them, "The Christology of the Pentateuch," an enlargement of "The Covenants," and "The Family." He was also a frequent contributor to the periodicals of his Church. (L. E. S.)

Howgill, FRANCIS, a noted preacher of "the Friends," was born about 1638 in Westmoreland, England. He was brought up and educated in the Church of England, but withdrew from the national Church after graduation in the university, and joined the Independents, among whom he held an eminent position as minister. In 1652 he became an adherent to the doctrines of George Fox, the Quaker. Two years later, he set out with two others of the Society of Friends to preach their doctrines for the first time at London. He even went before the protector Cromwell, to seek his influence in aid of the Quakers, who were then greatly persecuted, both in the country and at London; but he does not seem to have been successful in his effort. He escaped, however, after this interview, all personal molestation as long as he continued preaching in London. He and his friends next went to Bristol, where they met with much better success. "Multitudes flocked to hear them, and many embraced their doctrine." The clergy became alarmed, and Howgill and his colaborers were summoned before the magistrates, and commanded to leave the city immediately. Considering themselves entitled to remain, as "free-born Englishmen," they tarried in the city, and continued to meet with success. In 1663 we find Howgill at Kendal, again summoned before the justices of the place, who tendered him the oath of allegiance, and on his conscientious refusal of it committed him to prison, in which he remained until his death, Jan. 20, 1688. Howgill wrote a copious treatise against oaths while in prison. He also published *The Dawnings of the Gospel Day, and its Light and Glory discovered* (Lond. 1676, fol.). See Neale, *History of the Puritans* (Harper's edit.), ii, 413, 420; Gough, *Hist. of the Quakers*, i, 112, 126, 144, etc.; ii, 31, 96 sq., 236 sq. (J. H. W.)

Howie, JOHN, a Scotch Presbyterian, was born at Lochgoin Nov. 14, 1735. His father died when John was only one year old, and he was removed to his grandparents' at Blackhill, where he received a limited education. In 1766 he returned to the farm of Lochgoin, to pursue the study of Church history and religious biography, to which he had devoted much of his time for several years. In 1767 his early religious impressions assumed the form of decided piety, and he determined to serve the Church by preparing the book for which he is celebrated, *The Scotch Worthies.* "It is a work of no inconsiderable labor; for, though the biographical information he had procured, and with which his powerful memory was richly stored, must have greatly facilitated the task, yet, living remote from cities, and almost shut out from the abodes of civilized life, the difficulty of correspondence and the want of books must have tended not a little to render his task both painful and irksome. Under all these disadvantages, however, did Mr. Howie, in the seclusion of Lochgoin, bring the work to a successful termination. The first edition appeared in 1774, and a second, greatly enlarged, in 1785 (new edit., revised, corrected, and enlarged, with a preface and notes by Wm. McGavin, Edinb. and N. Y., 1853, 8vo). Like the 'Pilgrim's Progress,' it has been long so extensively popular with all classes of the community, that it has secured for itself a position from which it will never be dislodged, as long as Presbyterianism, and a religious attachment to the covenanted work of Reformation, continue to engage the attention of the natives of Scotland." Besides this work, Mr. Howie published, 1. a collection of *Lectures and Sermons*, by some of the most eminent ministers, preached during the stormiest days of the Persecution:—2. *An Alarm to a secure Generation:*—3. *Faithful Contendings displayed*; an account of the suffering remnant of the Church of Scotland from 1681-1691:—4. *Faithful Witness-bearing exemplified:*—5. *Patronage Anatomized*, a work which, next to the "Scots' Worthies," must be regarded as superior to all his other writings:—6. *Vindication of the Modes of handling the Elements in the Lord's Supper before giving Thanks;* written during the controversy on this subject among the Antiburgher seceders:—7. *Clarkson's plain Reasons for Dissenting*, with a preface and notes, and an abstract of the principles of the Reformed presbytery regarding civil government:—8. *Preface to Mr. Brown of Wamphray's Looking-glass of the Law and the Gospel.* Howie died in Sept. 1791. "He was, indeed, a marked character, whether at home, in the public market, or at church; and wherever he went, the fame of his piety and varied acquirements contributed greatly to his influence" (Biogr. Sketch prefixed to the Amer. edition of his "Scotch Worthies").—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 905. (J. H. W.)

Howley, WILLIAM, D.D., an English prelate, was born at Ropley, Hampshire, in 1765. He was educated at Winchester school, and in 1783 went to New College, Oxford. He was elected fellow in 1785, became canon of Christ Church in 1804, regius professor of divinity in 1809, bishop of London in 1813, and, finally, archbishop of Canterbury in 1828. He died in 1848. His principal works are *Sermon* [on Isa. liv, 13] (London, 1814, 8vo):—*Sermon* [on Psa. xx, 7, 8] (Thanksgiving, when the eagles taken at Waterloo were deposited in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall) (Lond. 1816, 4to):—*A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London at the Visitation of* 1818 (Lond. 1818, 8vo):—*A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London in July,* 1826 (Lond. 1826, 4to).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1564.

Howson, JOHN, an English divine, born in London in 1556, was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He filled successively the vicarate of Bampton, in Oxfordshire, the rectorate at Brightwell, in Berkshire, and then became fellow of Chelsea College, and canon of Hereford. In 1619 he was appointed bishop of Oxford, and was transferred to the bishopric of Durham in 1628. He was also at one time vice-chancellor of Oxford. While in this position "he exerted himself against those Puritans who opposed the discipline and ceremonies, but was afterwards a more distinguished writer and preacher against popery." He died in 1631. Howson was the author of a number of sermons (published 1597-1661); and four of his polemical discourses against the supremacy of St. Peter were published by order of king James I, "to clear the aspersions laid upon him (Howson) of favoring popery" (1622, 4to). See Hook, *Eccles. Biogr.* vi, 202; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 908.

Hoyer, ANNA, a German enthusiast, was born at Goldenbüttel, near Eiderstadt (Schleswig), in 1584. Her maiden name was OWEN. In 1599 she married a nobleman called Hoyer, and when he died she retired to one of her estates, where she devoted herself to belles-lettres and poetry. Becoming acquainted with an alchemist named Teting, who attended her during a sickness, she was soon fascinated by the views of the mystic, whom she took into her house, and considered as a prophet. She afterwards joined the Anabaptists, and thought herself inspired. Her ardor in making proselytes caused her to lose nearly her whole fortune, and, leaving her country, she went to Sweden, where she found a protector in queen Eleonora Maria, who presented her with an estate on which she resided until her death in 1656. Her views, derived from Paracelsus, David Joris, Schwenckfeld, Weigel, and other mystics, are expressed in indifferent verses in her *Works*

(Amsterd. 1650). Some of her writings were directed against the Lutherans. See J. G. Feuchtking, *Gynecœum hæret. fanat.* p. 356 sq.; Arnold, *Kirchen-u. Ketzerhist.* iii, 10, 14; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 319.

Hozai (Heb. *Chozay'*, חוֹזָי, *seer;* Sept. οἱ ὁρῶντες, Vulg. *Hozai*, Auth. Vers. "the seers," marg. "Hosai"), a prophet or seer, the historiographer of Manasseh, king of Judah (2 Chron. xxxiii, 19). B.C. p. 642. The Jews are of opinion that Hosai and Isaiah are the same person; the Sept. takes Hosai in a general sense for prophets and seers: the Syriac calls him *Hanan*, the Arabic *Saphan.*—Calmet, s. v. Bertheau (*Chronik.* Einleit. p. 35) conjectures that חוזי is here a corrupt rendering for חוזים, as in ver. 18; but for this there is only the authority of a single Codex and the Sept. (Davidson, *Revision of Heb. Text*, p. 221, b). See CHRONICLES.

Hrabanus. See RABANUS.

Hroswitha. See ROSWITHA.

Hu, the most eminent god of the Celtic religion, originally the founder of the religion of the Druids. See vol. ii, p. 180.

Huarte, JUAN, the representative of Spanish philosophy in the Middle Ages, was a Frenchman by birth, and born about 1530. He was educated at the University of Huesca, and afterwards devoted himself to the study of medicine and philosophy. The work to which he owes his great reputation is entitled *Examen de Ingenios, para las sciencias donde se muestra la differencia de habilidades que hay en los hombres, y el genero de letras quecada uno responde en particular officina plantiniana* (1593; sm. 8vo, Pamplon. 1575, and often). This work aims to show, "by marvellous and useful secrets, drawn from true philosophy, both natural and divine, the gifts and different abilities found in man, and for what kind of study the genius of every man is adapted, in such a manner that whoever shall read this book attentively will discover the properties of his own genius, and be able to make choice of that science in which he will make the greatest improvement." It has been translated into English by Carew and Bellamy, under the title *Trial of the Wits;* into German by Lessing (*Prüfung der Köpfe*), and into many other languages. Huarte has been severely reproached for having published as genuine a spurious letter of Lentulus, the proconsul, from Jerusalem, in which a description of the Saviour's person is given. He died near the close of the 16th century. See Antonio, *Biblioth. Hispana nova*, i, 543; Bayle, *Histor. Dict.* iii, 528; Ticknor, *History of Spanish Lit.* iii, 189; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 333 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hubald. See HUCBALD.

Hubbard, Austin Osgood, a Congregational minister, was born in Sunderland, Mass., Aug. 9, 1800. He was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1824. He pursued his theological studies under the direction of the Presbytery of Baltimore, teaching at the same time in the academy at Franklin, Md. He was licensed to preach in 1826, and labored as a missionary some two years in Frederick County, Md. From 1831 to 1833 he was at Princeton Theological Seminary in further theological studies, and preaching to vacant churches in the vicinity. In 1833, during Dr. Alexander's absence in Europe, Mr. Hubbard was appointed assistant professor of Biblical Literature. In 1835 he went to Melbourne, C. E., and labored as a missionary. In 1840 he removed to Hardwick, Vt., and was installed pastor of the Congregational Church in that place July 7th, 1841. In 1845 he was called to Barnet, Vt., and preached there until 1851. In 1855 he accepted a call to Craftesbury, Vt., where he remained until the death of his wife in the fall of 1857, when he became mentally and physically prostrated, and he was removed to the Vermont Insane Asylum in March, 1858, where he died Aug. 24th, 1858. He published *Five Discourses on the moral Obligation and the particular Duties of the Sabbath* (Harm., N. H., 1843, 16mo). "Fervent piety and thorough scholarship combined to render him a faithful and able minister of the New Testament. His views of divine truth were clear and strong, his manner of presenting them forcible and impressive. His sermons were logical, and weighty with matter."—*Congregational Quarterly*, i, 412 sq.

Hubbard, John, an English divine and adherent of the "Independents," was born about 1692. He was at first assistant at a church in Stepney, and after the decease of Dr. Taylor succeeded him as pastor of a congregation at Deptford. This position he held for twenty-two years with distinguished skill, fidelity, and diligence. In 1740 he was appointed to the divinity chair of the academy of the Independents at London. "He applied himself to the duties of this office with exemplary diligence, and the most pleasing hopes were entertained of many years of usefulness; but they were extinguished by his decease in July, 1743." He published *Two Sermons at Coward's Lecture* (London, 1729, 8vo). Nine of his sermons are in the Berry Street (Coward's Lecture) *Sermons* (2d ed. 2 vols. 8vo, 1739).—Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters* (2d edit.), ii, 219 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 909.

Hubbard, William, a Congregational minister, was born in England in 1621, and came to this country with his parents in 1630. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1642, a member of the first class. He is said to have pursued a course of theological studies with the Rev. Mr. Cobbet, of Ipswich, whom he also assisted in the pulpit. He was ordained about 1656. In 1685 Mr. Cobbet died, and Hubbard became his successor. In 1686 he served as assistant to the Rev. John Dennison, grandson of Major General Dennison, who was also a graduate of Harvard (1684). In 1689 Dennison died, and, about three years after, the Rev. John Rogers, son of the president of Harvard, became Hubbard's colleague. In 1703, enfeebled by age, Hubbard was obliged to resign his charge, and the people voted him sixty pounds as a gratuity. He died Sept. 14, 1704. His writings were mainly on the history of New England, and he left a work in MS. which has been of service to American historians. He published a *Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians from 1607–1677, with a Discourse* (Bost. 1677, 4to):—*Sermons* (1676, 1682, 1684):—and, in connection with the Rev. John Higginson, of Salem, *Testimony to the Order of the Gospel in the Churches* (1701). Hubbard is represented by his contemporaries to have been "for many years the most eminent minister in the county of Essex, equal to any in the province for learning and candor, and superior to all his contemporaries as a writer."—Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit*, i, 148 sq.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 909.

Hubberthorn, RICHARD, a celebrated Quaker of the 17th century, was at first a preacher in the Parliament's army, but he afterwards joined the Quakers, and, in accordance with their principles of peace, quitted the army. After preaching some nine years, he was imprisoned on account of his religious belief, and died from the effects at Newgate, June 17, 1662. Hubberthorn was one of the Quakers liberated by king Charles upon his marriage with Catharine of Braganza, who ordered "the release of Quakers and others in jail in London and Middlesex for being present at unlawful assemblies, who yet profess all obedience and allegiance, provided they are not indicted for refusing the oath of allegiance, nor have been ringleaders nor preachers at their assemblies, hoping thereby to reduce them to a better conformity." Just before this event, Hubberthorn, together with George Fox, had addressed the king and demanded the liberation of their suffering brethren.—Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, ii, 418; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of England*, i, 275.

Huber, Johann Ludwig, a German author who at first studied theology, but afterwards devoted his time

mainly to the study of jurisprudence, deserves our notice on account of his *Versuche mit Gott zu reden* (sacred songs) (Reusl. 1775; Tübing. 1787). He died at Stuttgardt in 1800.

Huber, Kaspar. See HUBERINUS.

Huber, Maria, a celebrated mystic, was born at Geneva in 1694. She retired into solitude in 1712, to indulge in contemplation and mysticism. She afterwards returned to live in Geneva, joined the Roman Church, and died at Lyons in 1759. She is generally named as a deist, yet her opinions partook rather of extreme mysticism than of infidelity. Her principal works are *Lettres sur la religion essentielle à l'homme* (Amsterd. 1738; Lond. 1739, 2 vols.), in which "she traces all religion to the moral necessities of the heart, and considers revelation a mere auxiliary to natural theology, a means of interpreting it to our own consciousness" (Hagenbach, *Germ. Rationalism*, p. 55 sq.):—*Recueil de diverses pièces servant de supplément aux Lettres sur la religion*, etc. (Berl. 1754, 2 vols.; Lond. 1756):—*Le monde fou préféré au monde sage, divisé en trois parties, faisant* 24 *promenades* (whence the work is sometimes styled *Promenades*) (Amst. 1731 and 1744):—*Le Système des théologiens anciens et modernes, sur l'état des âmes séparées des corps* (Amst. 1731, 1733, 1739):—*Reduction du Spectateur Anglais à ce qu'il renferme de meilleur*, etc. (Par. 1753, 12mo). Senebier considers her as the author of the *Histoire d'Abassay* (1753, 8vo), which is generally attributed to Miss Fauque. See Senebier, *Hist. littér. de Genève*, iii, 84; Haag, *La France Protestante;* Pierer; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 344.

Huber, Samuel, a German theologian, was born at Berne in 1547. He studied theology in Germany, and became pastor at Burgdorf. He was much given to controversy, especially in behalf of the Lutheran doctrine on the Lord's Supper. Censured for a speech he made on the 15th of April, 1588, he nevertheless continued to attack the doctrines of the Reformed Church, and was, in consequence, first imprisoned, and then exiled. In July, 1588, he went to Tübingen, where he joined the Lutheran Church. He became pastor of Doredingen, and in 1592 professor at Wittenberg. His belief in free grace, and in the universality of the atonement, brought him into antagonism with Hunnius, Leyser, and Gesner (1592); the breach between them was not healed by public discussions held at Wittenberg and Regensburg in 1594. Huber has been wrongly charged with teaching the doctrine of universal salvation. He was a determined opponent of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, and held that the words "decree" and "election" were equivalent to "gracious invitation," which God extends to all men without distinction. "But, to make their calling and election sure, they must repent and believe." Driven out of Hesse-Cassel in 1594, he resided for some time at Jena, Helmstädt, and Goslar. He died March 25, 1624. The most important among his numerous works are *Christum esse mortuum pro peccatis omnium hominum* (Tübing. 1590):—*Beständiges Bekenntniss* (1597):—*Anti-Bellarminus* (Gosl. 1607, 6 vols.). See *Acta Huberiana* (Tüb. 1597; Lüb. 1598); Götze, *Acta Hub.* (Lüb. 1707); Schmid, *Lebensbeschreibung* (Helmst. 1708); Pfaff, *Introd. in Hist. Liter. Theol.* pt. ii, bk. iii, p. 431; Arnold, *Ketzerhistorie*, i, 952; Mosheim, *Ch. History*, iii, 158.

Huberinus (HUBER), KASPAR, a Bavarian monk, afterwards a convert to Protestantism, was born near the close of the 15th century. He became a Protestant preacher in 1525 at Augsburg, and was appointed to a church at that place in 1527. He was a zealous opponent of the Anabaptists, who were quite numerous at Augsburg about that time, and he also engaged in the Berne disputations on the ministration of the sacrament. He was in favor of the Lutheran doctrine on this point, and in 1535 he went to Wittenberg, to consult with Luther personally, and to regain for Augsburg the celebrated Urbanus Rhegius (q. v.). Huberinus was also actively engaged in introducing the Reformation in the Pfalz, and in the territory of Hohenlohe. In 1551 he returned to Augsburg as preacher, but as he alone of the Protestant preachers at Augsburg had accepted the Interim (q. v.), he was obliged to leave the city in 1552, and died of grief at Oehringen Oct. 6, 1553. Huberinus wrote quite extensively; among other works, we have from his pen *Tröstlicher Sermon v. d. Urstende Christi* (1525):—*Schlussreden v. d. rechten Hand Gottes u. d. Gewalt Christi* (1529); etc. See Keim, *Schwäb. Ref. Gesch.* p. 273, 278; Döllinger, *Reformation*, ii, 576; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 296; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* p. 372; Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 569. (J. H. W.)

Hubert, Léonard, a Belgian theologian, flourished about the year 1490. He was at first a Carmelite monk, afterwards he became bishop of Darie, then suffragan of the bishop of Liege, and finally "inquisitor" of Liege. He wrote quite extensively. His most celebrated works are *De Immunitate Ecclesiastica:* — *Sermons*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 354.

Hubert, Mathieu, a distinguished French Roman Catholic, born at Chatillon in 1640, was a priest of the Congregation of the Oratory, and one of the most brilliant preachers of his country and Church. He died at Paris in 1717. He published *Sermons* (Paris, 1725, 6 vols. 12mo).—Feller, *Dict. Hist.* ix, 49 sq.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 202; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 355. (J. H. W.)

Hubert (HUBERTUS), ST., son of Bertrand, duke of Guienne, was high in office under Theodoric, king of the Franks, having been a great sportsman, and, according to tradition, converted by a stag which bore a shining cross between his antlers, and which spoke, entreating him to turn from his gay life and serve the Church. He at once entered the Church, succeeded his religious instructor, Lambert (Lamprecht), as bishop of Lüttich in 708, and died in 727. His body was in 827 transferred to the Benedictine convent of Andain, in the Ardennes, which thence received the name of St. Hubertus, and it is here he is said to have had the abovementioned vision. Tradition also holds that his relics, by virtue of the *golden key of St. Hubert*, which he received from St. Peter, can cure hydrophobia, etc. The 3d of November (*St. Hubert's day*) marks the end of the hunting season, and was celebrated by great hunts (St. Hubert's chase).—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 570; *Theolog. Univ. Lex.* i, 372.

Hubert, Order of St., the oldest and highest order of Bavaria, was founded in 1444, and often reformed, the last time in 1808. The sign of the order is a golden cross on a shield, in the middle of which is the picture of St. Hubertus (q. v.). It is borne on a golden chain.

Hubertine Annalist, an anonymous writer of the chronicles of St. Hubert's monastery, flourished about the middle of the 11th century. In his *Chron. St. Hub. Andaginensis* the style of Sallust is imitated. Bethmann (L. C.) and Wattenbach (W.) issued a new edition of it in Pertz, *Script.* viii, 565-630, and the following opinion of the author is expressed by them: "Satis habeamus nosse, auctorem operis fuisse virum inter medias res versatum, acrem judicio, veritatis studiosum: hoc enim totum ejus dicendi genus, hoc simplex et sincera rerum narratio suadent."—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 296 sq.

Hübmayer or **Hübmeyer** (HÜBMÖR), BALTHASAR, one of the most learned of the Anabaptists, was born at Friedberg, near Augsburg, Bavaria, in 1480. He studied theology and philosophy at Freiburg with Eck, and in 1512 went with his teacher to Ingolstadt, where he became preacher and professor. In 1516 he went to Regensburg, where his ministrations led to the expulsion of the Jews; but, having openly expressed sentiments favorable to the Reformation, he was himself obliged to leave Regensburg, and taught school for some time in Schaffhausen. In 1522 he was appointed pastor to Waldshut, where he came under the influence of

Münzer, and embraced the Anabaptist views. He wrote several works in support of his new views, more particularly upon baptism and the sacraments; but the ground which he took against his early coadjutor and intimate friend Zwingle provoked a violent reply from the latter, and caused the estrangement of the two friends. Driven to Zürich in 1525 by the Austrian persecution at Waldshut, he was branded as a heretic by Zwingle, and, after suffering imprisonment, finally fled from the Austrian territory (1526). He preached a short time at Constance, and then journeyed to Moravia. In 1528 he was arrested, probably at Brünn, by the Austrian authorities, and was burned at the stake in Vienna (March 10). His wife, who steadfastly adhered to Hübmayer's views, was imprisoned with him, and suffered martyrdom by drowning. Hübmayer is now conceded by all historians to have been a man of very exalted character, and, although a fanatic in religion, it is certain that he never favored the extreme views of some of the Anabaptists. See Brown, *Memorials of Baptist Martyrs*, p. 106 sq.; *Baptist Quarterly Review*, 1869 (July), p. 333; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 203; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 298 sq.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* i, 372. (J. H. W.)

Huby, Vincent, a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Hennebon, in the Bretagne, May 15, 1608. He entered the order of the Jesuits in 1643, and contributed greatly to the growth of this order. He died March 24, 1693. He wrote a number of ascetic works, which have been edited by abbé Lenoir Duparc, and published under the title *Œuvres spirituelles* (Paris, 1753, 1761, 1769; Lyons and Paris, 1827, 12mo); also by the abbé Baudrand (Paris, 1767, 12mo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 361.

Huc, Evariste Régis, a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Toulouse Aug. 1, 1813. He was educated in his native city, and entered the order of St. Lazarus, and in 1839 was sent as missionary to China. After about three years of missionary labor in the northern districts of China, he started with father Gabet, in the fall of 1844, to explore the wilds of Tartary and christianize Thibet, according to the directions of the apostolic vicar of Mongolia. Accompanied by a single Chinese convert, a young lama, they reached the lama convent of Kounboun, where they acquired the dialect of Thibet. Towards the end of September, 1845, they joined a caravan from China, with which they went to Lhassa, the capital of Thibet. Here they were permitted to remain on their declaration that they had come only for the purpose of preaching the religion of Christ. But they had barely settled when the Chinese ambassador commanded them to leave the country. They were put in charge of a Chinese escort, and carried back a journey of nearly 2000 miles to the extreme south, and arrived in October, 1846, at Macao. Here they were subjected to a trial by the Chinese tribunals, and were finally permitted to return to the station from which they had originally started on this journey. Huc, whose health completely failed him, returned to Toulouse in 1849, and gave an account of this journey in his *Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet, et la Chine, pendant les années* 1844, 1845, *et* 1846 (Paris, 1850, 2 vols. 8vo). This book met with great success, and was translated into various languages (English by Hazlitt, Lond. 1851, 2 vols.; and New York, 1853). It owed its great success partly to its description of a country heretofore unknown, and also to its lively style. In this work the abbé also pointed out the similarities between the Buddhist and Roman Catholic ceremonials, and for it was punished by seeing his book placed on the "Index" (comp. Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, i, 187, note). By order of the emperor, he then published *L'Empire Chinois, faisant suite à l'ouvrage intitulé "Souvenir d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie et le Thibet"* (Par. 1854, 2 vols. 8vo). This work was crowned by the Academy. There are several editions of it, and it was also translated into English (N. York, 1855, 2 vols. 12mo). His last work, *Le Christianisme en Chine, en Tartarie, et au Thibet* (Paris, 1857, 3 vols. 8vo, with map), contains a vast amount of historical information; but its chief topic is the propagation of Romanism in China. Huc thinks that "the Gospel will soon take in Asia the place now occupied by the philosophy of Confucius, the traditions of the Buddhists, and the endless legends of the Vedas; finally, that Brahma, Buddha, and Mohammed will disappear to make room for the true God," etc. Huc died in Paris March 31, 1860. See Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, v, 445; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 361; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1855; *Christian Examiner*, January to May, 1858. (J. H. W.)

Hucarius, an English deacon who flourished in the 11th century. He wrote one hundred and eight homilies, "which were extant in Leland's time in Canterbury College (now Christ Church), Oxford, but which appear to be no longer in existence. In the prologue to this book, Hucarius stated his name and country, but nothing more is known of him." He is said to have made an extract from the penitential work of archbishop Egbert of York, of the 8th century, as an introduction to the homilies. See Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* (Anglo-Sax. Period), p. 426; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xxi, 604; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* i, 372. (J. H. W.)

Hucbald, also called Hucbold, Hugbald, Ubald, and Hubald, a celebrated monk, was probably born about 850, and was educated by his learned relative Milo (q. v.) in the monastery of St. Amandus in Flandern. After Milo's death, Hucbald succeeded him as teacher and presiding officer of the school of this monastery. About 893, archbishop Fulco, of Rheims, called Hucbald to that city, to preside over the cathedral school there. He died in 930. He distinguished himself greatly in music, and was the first to establish the laws of harmony (diaphonia). His lives of some of the saints are considered valuable, especially *Vita S. Lebuini, Vita Aldegundis, Vita Rictrudis.* See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 342; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 297 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hudson, John, D.D., an English philologist and theologian, was born at Widehope in 1662, and was educated at Queen's College, Oxford. He obtained the degree of Master of Arts in 1684, and shortly afterwards that of Doctor of Divinity. In 1701 he was appointed librarian of the Bodleian library at Oxford, and died Nov. 27, 1719. He is chiefly known on account of his *Geographiæ Veteris Scriptores Græci minores*, etc. (Oxford, 1698, 1703, 1712, 3 vols. 8vo), and his edition of Josephus, entitled *Flavii Josephi Opera* (Oxf. 1720, 2 vols. fol.), which appeared shortly after his death.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 372 sq.

Huel, Joseph Nicolas, a French philosopher, was born at Mattaincourt June 17, 1690. After the completion of his studies at Paris he took orders, and was made curate of Rameux. He is said (Barbier, *Dict. des Anonymes*) to be the author of *Essai philosophique sur la crainte de la Mort*, and of *Moyen de rendre nos religieuses utiles et de nous exempter des dots qu'elles exigent* (1750), in which important reforms of the religious houses of the Roman Catholic Church are advocated. His special aim was the employment of the inmates of convents in instructing the youth of the land, instead of spending a life of idleness, partly, if not wholly, at the expense of the state. The book was suppressed, but reprinted eleven years after, without, however, awakening any general interest in this reformatory movement. Huel died at Romeux Sept. 3, 1769.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxv, 377 sq.; Classe, *Remarques bibliographiques sur Huel*, in the *Mémoires de l'Académie de Nancy* (1856), p. 251. (J. H. W.)

Huesca, Council of (*Concilium Oscense*), a council held at Huesca, in Spain, in 598, of which only two canons are extant. One orders that the diocesan synods, composed of the abbots, priests, and deacons of the diocese, be held annually, in which the bishop shall exhort his clergy upon the duties of frugality and con-

tinence: the other that the bishop shall inform himself whether the priests, deacons, and subdeacons observe the law of continence (tom. v, Conc. 1604).—Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 266.

Huesca, Durando de, a celebrated member of the Albigenses (q. v.), flourished in the first half of the 13th century. He at length yielded to Romish influences, and returned to that Church, in which he founded a religious community under the name of "Poor Catholics." In 1207 he went to Rome, and obtained the remission of his heresy from Innocent III, and was by this pope declared the superior of his fraternity. The members of this community lived on alms, applied themselves to study and teaching, kept Lent twice a year, and wore a habit of white or gray, with shoes open at the top, but distinguished by some particular mark from those of the Poor Men of Lyons (Insabatati). "The new order spread so rapidly that in a few years it had numerous convents both south and north of the Pyrenees. But, although they professed to devote themselves to the conversion of heretics, and Huesca wrote some books with that view, they soon incurred the suspicion of the bishops, who accused them of favoring the Vaudois (q. v.), and concealing their heretical tenets under the monastic garb. They had sufficient influence to maintain themselves for some time, and even to procure letters from his holiness, exhorting the bishops to endeavor to gain them by kindness instead of alienating their minds from the Church by severe treatment; but their enemies at last prevailed, and within a short time no trace of their establishments was to be found."—McCrie, *Reformation in Spain*, p. 36 sq.; *Hist. Gén. de Languedoc*, iii, 147 sq. (J. H. W.)

Huet, François, a distinguished French philosopher, was born Dec. 26, 1814, at Villeau, France. He was for a time professor at the University of Ghent, and distinguished himself greatly by his efforts to reform modern philosophy upon the principles of Bordas-Demoulin, who aimed to conciliate all the political and social influences of the Revolution with the religious traditions of ancient Gallicanism. His last years were spent in educating the young prince of Servia. He died suddenly, while on a visit at Paris, July 1, 1869. His principal works are *Recherches sur la vie, les ouvrages et les doctrines de Henri de Gand* (1838, 8vo):—*Le Cartésianisme ou la véritable renovation des sciences* (1843, 2 vols. 8vo), crowned by the French Academy:—*Le Régne social du Christianisme* (1853, 8vo):—*Essais sur la Réforme Catholique* (1856, 8vo), written in connection with Bordas-Demoulin:—*La science de l'esprit, principes de philosophie pure et appliquée* (2 vols. 8vo, 1864).—Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemporains*, p. 907; Brockhaus, *Unsere Zeit*, 5th year, vol. ii (1869), 237.

Huet (Huetius), **Pierre Daniel**, a French scholar, and ecclesiastic, was born at Caen Feb. 8, 1630. He was educated at the Jesuit school of Caen, and was originally intended for the profession of the law; but the perusal of the "Principles" of Des Cartes and Bochart's "Sacred Geography" turned his attention to general literature, and he became a zealous pupil of these distinguished men. In 1652 he accompanied Bochart to Sweden. Here he discovered and transcribed the MS. of Origen, which subsequently became the basis of his celebrated edition of that Church father. He was solicited by the queen to settle in her dominions, but he refused the offer, and returned to France. In 1664 he published an essay *De Interpretatione*, and in 1668 his edition of Origen's *Commentaria in Sac. Script.* (Rouen, 2 vols. fol.; Cologne, 1685, 3 vols. fol.), with a learned introduction, entitled *Origeniana*, since reprinted in the Benedictine edition of Origen. He thus acquired so great a reputation that he was honored with the degree of doctor of law, and shortly after was appointed subtutor to the dauphin. He also took a leading part in editing the Delphini edition of the Latin classics. In 1674 he was elected a member of the French Academy; and having taken orders in 1676, he was appointed in 1678 to the abbey of Aunay, near Caen. In 1685 he was made bishop of Soissons, but he never entered on this position, and was transferred to the see of Avranches in 1692. Desirous of devoting his time to study, he resigned his bishopric in 1699, and obtained the abbey of Fontenay, near Caen. In 1701 he removed to Paris, and resided at the Jesuits' house. He died Jan. 26, 1721. His other principal works are *Demonstratio Evangelica* (Paris, 1679, often reprinted). "This work, which is the great monument of Huet's literary reputation, was the result of various conversations with the eminent Rabbi Manasseh ben-Israel at Amsterdam. It begins with a set of definitions on the genuineness of books, history, prophecy, the Messiah, and the Christian religion. Then follow two postulates and four axioms. The propositions occupy the rest of the book, and in the discussion of these the demonstration consists" (Kitto):—*De la situation du Paradis Terrestre* (Par. 1691, 12mo):—*Commentarius de rebus ad auctorem pertinentibus* (Amst. 1718, 12mo), "his autobiographical memoirs—a model of pure Latinity, as well as the most interesting record of the history of his time." It was translated by John Aikin, M.D. (London, 1810, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Censura Philosophiæ Cartesianæ* (Par. 1689, 1694, 12mo):—*Quæstiones Alnetanæ de Concordia Rationis et Fidei* (Caen, 1690). The two last-named works are aimed at the Cartesian philosophy, to which Huet had adhered in his earlier days, and against which he appears in these works as one of the most formidable opponents:—*Traité philosophique de la faiblesse de l'Esprit Humain* (Amsterd. 1723, 8vo), "which, according to Voltaire, was regarded by many as a refutation of his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, and has caused him to be classed among sceptics." All the works of Huet were published in a collected form in 1712, and an additional volume, entitled *Huetiana*, in the year following his death (1722). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 387 sq.; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; *Quarterly Rev.* (Lond.), iv, 103 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 449 sq.; Morell, *Hist. of Mod. Philosophy*, p. 195 sq., 523. (J.H.W.)

Hüffel, Johann Jakob Ludwig, a German divine, was born May 6, 1784 at Gladenbach, in Hesse, and educated at the universities of Giessen and Marburg. In 1817 he was appointed minister at Friedberg, in 1825 senior professor in the theological seminary at Herborn, and in 1829 prelate of Baden and religious counsellor of the duke of Baden. He died July 26, 1856. Besides a collection of sermons (Giessen, 1817–29), Hüffel published *Wesen u. Beruf d. evang. Geistlichen* (ibid. 1821, 4th edit. 1843):—*Stunden christl. Andacht* (1844):—*Briefe ü. d. Unsterblichkeit* (2d edit. Karlsruhe, 1832). The same subject is still further treated in a later work, entitled *Die Unsterblichkeit auf's neue beleuchtet* (2d edit. 1838):—*Der Pietismus geschichtlich beleuchtet* (Heidelb. 1849).—*Theol. Univers. Lex.* i, 372; Pierer, *Univers. Lex.* viii, 581.

Hufnagel, Wilhelm Friedrich, a German theologian, was born at Hall, Swabia, June 15, 1754, and educated at the universities of Altorf and Erlangen. In 1779 he was appointed professor extraordinary of philosophy at Erlangen, and in 1782 he was transferred to the chair of theology as regular professor. In 1788 he received the pastorate of the university church, and was made overseer of the seminary for preachers. In 1791 he removed to Frankfort-on-the-Main as preacher of one of the oldest churches of that city. He died Feb. 7, 1830. Hufnagel was distinguished both as a preacher and as a theologian, but he was especially at home in the Shemitic languages. His publications, aside from his *Sermons* (1791–96), are *Variarum lectionum e Bibliis a Nisselio curatis excerptarum specimen* (1777):—*Salomos hohes Lied geprüft, übersetzt u. erläutert* (1784):—*Nov. Biblioth. theol.* (i, 1782–3):—*Bearbeit. d. Schriften d. A. T. nach ihrem Inhalt u. Zweck* (1784), in which he took a rationalistic position:—*Hiob neu übers. m. Anm.* (1781):

—*Dissertatio de Psalmis prophetias Messian. continentibus* (2 pts. 1784).—*Biographie Universelle*, xxvii, 428; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 339 sq.; Döring, *Gelehrt. Theol. Deutschl.* i, 767 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hug, Johann Leonhard, an eminent German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Constance June 1, 1765, and educated at Freiburg University. In 1789 he took priest's orders, and in 1791 was appointed professor of Old-Testament exegesis at his alma mater. In 1792 the New-Testament exegesis was added to the duties of his chair. To fit himself more thoroughly for his professional duties, he visited the great libraries and universities of Central Europe. Though a Roman Catholic, he was too well acquainted with sacred criticism, and, like the celebrated Dr. Jahn, too impartial to be very greatly influenced in his views as a Biblical scholar and critic by his ecclesiastical connections. He wrote *Erfindung d. Buchstabenschrift* (Ulm, 1801):—*Einleitung in d. Schriften d. Neuen Testaments* (Stuttg. 1808, 2 vols.; 4th ed. 1847). This work, in which he attempts to vindicate and sustain the genuineness of all the books commonly regarded as canonical, has been translated into French and English (*Introduction to the New Testament*, by Wait, Lond. 1827, 2 vols. 8vo; far better by Fosdick, Andover, Mass., 8vo), and is considered one of the ablest works of the kind. *Untersuchungen über den Mythus d. berühmtesten Völker d. alten Welt* (Freib. 1812):—*Ueber d. Hohe Lied* (ibid. 1813-1818):—*De conjugii Christiani vinculo indissolubili comment. exeget.* (ib. 1816), in which he took ground against *civil* marriages:—*Katechismus* (ib. 1836):—*De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina comment.* (ib. 1818):—*Gutachten über d. Leben Jesu von D. F. Strauss* (ib. 1840-1844, 2 vols.). Hug was also one of the editors, with Hirscher (q. v.) and others, of the *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Theologie* (Bonn, 1839-42). See Maier, *Gedächtnissrede auf Hug* (Freiburg, 1847); *Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschland*, v, 518 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, xix, 658; Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, v, 449 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 340; Haag, *Hist. d. Dogmas Chrét.* i, § 112; Werner, *Geschichte d. Katholischen Theol.* p. 527 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Géner.* xxv, 400. (J. H. W.)

Hugg, Isaac, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Gloucester, now Camden County, New Jersey, about 1814. But little is known of his early life. He was converted in 1841, licensed to preach about 1844, and joined the New Jersey Conference in 1845. Thenceforward he filled with zeal and efficiency the several positions assigned him, being in many places eminently useful. On Rome and Wantage Circuit, on Cedarville charge and elsewhere, he had extensive and powerful revivals of religion, and founded the first Methodist society at the village of Cranberry, N. J., consisting at first of seven members, which, before the year closed, increased to fifty. About 1855, while laboring on Vernon Circuit, he had his hip dislocated by a fall from his carriage, which caused him a great deal of suffering, and in the spring of 1864, being pressed by increasing affliction, he was obliged to take a superannuated relation, and settled at Pointville, in Burlington County. Here he labored as he had ability, being greatly beloved by the people. He died suddenly, while preparing to re-enter the active work of the ministry, April 5, 1866. "Hugg was emphatically a good man: the poor knew well how to prize him, and the children everywhere loved him. He was a good preacher, and, when health permitted, a faithful pastor."—*New Jersey Conf. Minutes*, 1867.

Hugh. See Hugo.

Hughes, George, B.D., an English Nonconformist, was born in Southwark in 1603, and educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. He became fellow of Pembroke College, then lecturer at Allhallows, London, and afterwards minister of Tavistock. During the Rebellion he obtained the living of St. Andrew's, Plymouth, but was ejected for nonconformity in 1662. He died in 1667. Hughes was a divine of good natural capacity and learning, and an exact critic for his time. His principal works are: *An Analytical Exposition of the whole Book of Genesis, and of the first twenty-three Chapters of Exodus, wherein the various readings are observed*, etc. (1672, fol.):—*Aphorisms, or Select Propositions of the Scriptures, shortly determining the Doctrine of the Sabbath* (1670, sm. 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1568.

Hughes, Jabez, an English divine, born in 1685, was educated at Cambridge University, and afterwards became fellow of Jesus College. He is chiefly known as the editor of Chrysostom's treatise περὶ ἱερωσύνης, or *On the Priesthood* (Cambr. 1710, 8vo; 2d edit. in Greek and Latin, with notes and a preliminary dissertation against the pretended *Rights of the Church*, etc., 1712, 8vo). He died in 1731.—*New Gen. Biog. Dict.* vii, 276; *Lond. Gent. Mag.* xlviii, 583, 673.

Hughes, John, an English divine, was born in 1682, educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, and afterwards became a fellow of the university. But little is known of his life. He died in 1710. Among his works we find *Dissertationes in quibus Auctoritas Ecclesiastica, quatenus à civili sit distincta, defenditur contra Erastianos* (Cambridge, 1710, 8vo; and in English by Hilk. Bedford, Lond. 1711, 8vo):—*St. Chrysostom's Treat. on the Priesthood* (Cambr. 1710, 8vo; 2d edit., with notes, etc., 1712, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 911; Lowndes, *Brit. Liter.* p. 535 sq.

Hughes, John, an American Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Ireland in 1798, and emigrated to this country in 1817, his father having preceded him about two years. At first he went to a florist to learn the art of gardening, but a few years later he entered the Theological Seminary of St. Mary's at Emmittsburgh, Md., teaching also at the same time. In 1825 he was ordained priest in Philadelphia, and settled over a parish of that city. In 1837 he was appointed coadjutor of bishop Dubois, of New York, and immediately after his consecration in 1838, he assumed the virtual administration of the diocese, but he was not made bishop until 1842. In 1850 New York was raised to the dignity of an archiepiscopal see, and archbishop Hughes went to Rome to receive the pallium at the hands of the pope. He died January 3, 1864. Even before his elevation to the episcopacy he had gained among his coreligionists some distinction as a champion of his Church by a controversy, in 1830 and 1834, with Dr. John Breckinridge, on the question, "Is the Protestant religion the religion of Christ?" Some years later he had another celebrated controversy with Dr. Nicholas Murray, of Elizabeth, who, under the name of "Kirwan," published a series of able and interesting articles against the Roman Catholic Church. "Both controversies increased his reputation among his coreligionists; but non-Catholics were not struck by his arguments in favor of Roman Catholicism, and he failed to attract anything like the attention, or produce anything like the impression, which writings of real ability, such as those of Möhler in Germany, and of Brownson and Hecker, are always sure to command." As archbishop, in the administration of the property of the Church, and the use which he made of it for the spreading of his Church, he displayed a talent rarely found. An immense property gradually accumulated in his hands, which enabled him to increase largely the number of Roman Catholic churches, schools, and other denominational institutions. Thus, in 1841, he opened the Roman Catholic St. John's College, at Fordham, New York, to which he afterwards added the Theological Seminary of St. Joseph. The archbishop sustained a celebrated controversy on this subject with Erastus Brooks, editor of the New York *Express*, and at that time a state senator, who had stated in an address in the senate chamber that the archbishop owned property in New York to the amount of $5,000,000. A long discussion took place, and this time the ability with which the archbishop defended his statements and his position

was acknowledged alike by Protestants and Romanists. But he opened a breach between the Romanists and Protestants by his unauthorized demands in the School Question, to the effect that the Common Council of New York City should designate seven of the public schools as Catholic schools, and when this was denied both by the Common Council and the Legislature, bishop Hughes advised the Catholics to run, at the next political campaign, an independent ticket. He defended his cause with great ability, but failed to convince Protestants generally of the fairness of the demand to grant to the Roman Catholic community an exceptional prerogative, which was neither possessed nor claimed by any Protestant body. He also opposed the reading of the Protestant version of the Bible in the common school, in which he was not quite so successful as in his other efforts in behalf of Romanism. Archbishop Hughes's political influence in the United States was very great, and he was honored by all sects in a manner unknown in any other Protestant country. Thus, in 1847, he was invited by both houses of Congress to deliver a lecture in the hall of the House of Representatives in Washington, and after the outbreak of the Rebellion (1862) he was even intrusted with a semi-official mission to France. As a writer archbishop Hughes has done but little, except by the discussions above alluded to. These were all published in book form (Phila. 1836, 8vo). He also published a number of his sermons and addresses. Since his decease his "works" have been collected by Lawrence Kehoe (N. Y. 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1865).—*N. Y. Tablet*, Jan. 1864; *Methodist*, Jan. 9, 1864; *An. Amer. Cyclop.* 1868, p. 429. (J. H. W.)

Hughes, Joseph, D.D., an eminent Baptist divine, was born in London Jan. 1, 1769. In 1784 he became a member of the Baptist Church, and entered the Baptist College at Bristol, where he remained as a student till 1787. He studied also three years at Aberdeen, where he passed M.A. in 1790. In 1791 he became classical tutor in the Baptist College; 1792 to 1796 he was assistant minister at Broadmead Chapel, Bristol; and in 1796 he became pastor of the Baptist Chapel, Battersea. When the "Religious Tract Society" was formed in 1799, he was chosen its first secretary, and he retained this office until his death, Oct. 12, 1833. His industry in official work was enormous, and a great part of the success of the Tract Society is due to his labors. He also took a large part in the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and was its first secretary, retaining the office until his death. His personal history is largely that of this great organization. See Leifchild, *Memoir of the Rev. J. Hughes* (Lond. 1834, 12mo); *Jubilee Volume of the Religious Tract Society*; Owen, *History of the British and Foreign Bible Society*; Timpson, *Bible Triumphs* (1853, 12mo).

Hugo, a friar of the order of the *Minimi*, and a doctor of theology, was born at Prato, near Florence, in the latter half of the 13th century. He was a man of remarkable austerity, and imposed upon himself the most severe mortifications. He died in Tartary after the year 1312. Among his works, which remain in MS., are a *letter* to the Minimi of Prato, a treatise *De Vita Contemplativa*, and *De Perfectione Statuum*.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxv, 451.

Hugo of Amiens, or of Rouen, a distinguished Roman Catholic divine, was born at Amiens, France, towards the close of the 11th century, and was educated at Laon under the celebrated Anselm. He entered the Benedictine monastery of Clugny, and became prior of the monastery of Limoges in 1113. On account of his great learning and uncommon talent he was transferred as prior to the monastery at Lewes, in England, and in 1125 was appointed abbot of Reading Abbey by Henry I, the founder. In 1129 Hugo was elected archbishop of Rouen, over which see he presided until his death, Nov. 11, 1164. He was quite prominent in the history of celibacy during his day. While archbishop of Rouen, he sought to convert an obscure sect in Brittany, in all likelihood a branch of the Petrobrussians, whose doctrines were "a protest against the overwhelming sacerdotalism of the period, by an elaborate denunciation of their tenets, among which he enumerates promiscuous licentiousness and disregard of clerical celibacy." Indeed, Hugo was distinguished among his contemporaries not only as a theologian, but also as a statesman. "It was he who, in 1139, at the Council of Winchester, saved king Stephen from excommunication by the English bishops." He wrote *Dialogi de Summo Bono Libri vii* (published by Martène in his *Thesaur. Anecdotum*, v, 895), a work of especial interest both to the theologian and the philosopher on account of the views which it sets forth on moral philosophy:—*De Hæresibus*, printed by D'Achery as an appendix to the works of Guibert de Nogent, is a work levelled against the heretics of his day, and affording valuable materials on the history of the Church in the 12th century:—*De Fide Catholica*, containing an explication of the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer, published by Martene and Durand in their *Thesaurus Anecdotum*, vol. v, and in their *Veterum Scriptorum Collectio*, vol. ix. See Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxvii, 409 sq.; Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 372 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxv, 439 sq.; Gorton, *Biog. Dict.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Hugo of Angoulême flourished in the 10th century. As soon as he had become the incumbent of the see of Angoulême (March 21, 973) he sought also to assume the temporal government over his diocese, and became entangled in controversies with count Arnold, the prince of that country, against whom he even waged war. It is thought that Hugo finally withdrew from the bishopric, retired to the abbey of St. Cibard, and died in obscurity in 990. He is said to have left several works, but they have not yet come to light.—*Hist. Litt. de la France*, vol. viii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 428.

Hugo of Besançon was born towards the close of the 10th century, and was appointed archbishop of Besançon, as successor of archbishop Gaucher of Salins, in 1031. Immediately on assuming the charge of the see he dismissed the canons of St. Anatole of Salins, and gave this church to the monks of St. Bénigne of Dijon; but he afterwards repented of the change, and reinstated the chapter of St. Anatole in 1048. He is said to have been an industrious prelate, and to have enjoyed the confidence of his pope and of his emperor. Under the emperor Henry III he was arch-chancellor. He also assisted at the coronation of king Philip I of France. He died July 27, 1066.—Dunod de Carnage, *Histoire de l'église de Besançon*, i, 29 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 429.

Hugo of Breteuil was born near the opening of the 11th century, and was educated as a theologian at the school in Chartres. He was made bishop of Langres by king Robert some time in the first months of 1031. Conducting himself in a manner unworthy of his high position in the Church, he was finally accused of adultery and homicide, and other even more atrocious crimes, and was brought to trial before a council at Rheims. At first he braved the accusations, and sought to defend himself; but, finding that the proof against him was impossible of contradiction, he finally fled, and was punished with excommunication. To *expiate* his crimes he went on foot to Rome, where he procured an audience with pope Leo IX, and obtained pardon. On his return home he died at Biterne, France, March 16, 1051. He is the author of an interesting letter *On the Errors of Bérenger* (published as an appendix to the works of Lanfranc).—*Hist. Litt. de la France*, vii, 438; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 428 sq.

Hugo of Castro-Novo (*Newcastle*), an English theologian, flourished, according to Wadding (*Annal. Min.* iii), about 1310. He belonged to the order of the *Minimi*, and was an ardent defender of the philosophy

of Duns Scotus. He is said to have been the author of *De Victoria Christi contra Antichristum* (printed in 1471). But his most important work is *De Laudibus B. Mariæ* (published 1697, 1698, 1704). It comprises twelve books, the first of which is a simple paraphrase of the angelical salutation (Luke i, 26 sq.). The third book treats of the carnal prerogatives of Mary, the fourth of her virtues, the sixth of the names by which she is known, the seventh and eighth of the celestial and terrestrial objects to which she is ordinarily compared, etc. —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 450 sq.

Hugo of Champfleuri, a French prelate, was born in the early part of the 12th century. Of his early life but little is known. In 1151 he was appointed chancellor of France, and in 1159 he was elected bishop of Soissons, retaining, however, his position in the state, from both of which, for unknown reasons, he was deposed in 1171. He died Sept. 4, 1175.—*Hist. Litt. de la France*, xiii, 536; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 445.

Hugo of Citeaux, a French Roman Catholic theologian who flourished in the 12th century, was a disciple of St. Bernard and abbé of Trois Fontaines. In 1150 he was made bishop of Ostie and cardinal by pope Eugene III. He died in 1158. Hugo wrote a narrative of the death of pope Eugene III, and several other works. He was a prelate of great merit and piety. See *Encyclop. Théologique* (Dict. des Cardinaux), xxxi, 1083.

Hugo of Clugny. See Clugny.

Hugo Falcandus. See Falcandus.

Hugo of Farfa. See Farfa.

Hugo de Fleury or de St. Marie (oftentimes called *St. Benoit sur Loire*), a celebrated Benedictine monk of the abbey of Fleury, on the Loire, flourished about the middle of the 11th century. His *Chronicon*, a history of religion and of the Church, prepared after the manner of his day, viz. consisting of notices of popes, martyrs, and other saints, Church fathers, persecutions, heresies, etc., a work of great celebrity, was probably never brought down by him later than 855, and the continuation from that date to 1034 was in all likelihood prepared by other Benedictine monks (Münster, 1638, 4to). He wrote also *De la Puissance Royale, et de la Dignité Sacerdotale* (found in the Miscellanea of Baluze). —Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxiv, 501 sq.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 206. (J. H. W.)

Hugo de Fouilloi, a distinguished French theologian, canon of St. Augustine, was born in the early part of the 12th century. In 1149 he was chosen abbé by the regular canons of St. Denis of Rheims, but he declined this high office. On the decease of the person selected in his stead in 1153, however, he consented to accept the honor. He abdicated in 1174, and his death is supposed to have occurred shortly after. He is said to be the author of a number of works, but as they were not written under his own name, and as some were even printed as the productions of others, it is difficult now to determine them. He is generally believed to be the author of *De Claustro Animæ*, a work often attributed to Hugo St. Victor:—*De Arca Noe mystica Descriptio*:—*De Arca Noe moralis interpretatio*:—*De vanitate rerum mundanarum*, etc.—Oudin, *Script. Eccles.*; *Histoire Litt. de la France*, xiii, 492 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 442 sq.

Hugo of Flavigny, a French Church historian, was born at Verdun about the year 1065. While yet a youth he entered the convent of St. Vitonius at Verdun, where he studied under the abbot Rodolph. In consequence of some persecutions, Hugo and the other members of his order removed to Flavigny. In 1097 he was elected abbot of his convent, and in 1111 he exchanged this abbey for that of St. Vannes. According to some, he died there as early as 1115, but according to others he left this convent for St. Dijon about 1115, and the time of his death is much later. Hugo wrote a chronicle extending from the birth of Christ to the year 1102, divided into two parts, under the title *Chronicon Virdunense, a quibusdam dictum Flaviniacense* (in Ph. Labbei *Bibliotheca Nova*, tom. i). The first part of this work, which closes with the 10th century, is trifling and erroneous, but the second part contains much important information on the ecclesiastical history of France in the 11th and 12th centuries.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 433; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 308.

Hugo of Frazan or Trasan, tenth abbé of Clugny (q. v.), who flourished in the 12th century, became abbé in 1157 or 1158. Taking sides with the anti-pope Victor IV, he was excommunicated by pope Alexander III, and driven from the abbey. He died after the year 1166. Several works are attributed to him, but without good reason.—*Hist. litt. de la France*, xiii, 571 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 442.

Hugo (St.) of Grenoble was born at Chateauneuf, in the Dauphiny, and became a priest at Valence. In 1080 he was appointed bishop of Grenoble, but he only accepted the position after considerable hesitancy, and even left the bishopric some time after, and retired to the abbey of Chaise-Dieu, in Clermont, as a Benedictine monk. By order of pope Gregory VII, however, he returned again to Grenoble. He died there April 1, 1139. He was declared saint two years after by pope Innocent II. Hugo was a very pious man, and especially rigid in the enforcement of the vow of celibacy. During fifty-three years, spent in the active duties of his bishopric, it is said he never saw the face of a woman except that of one aged mendicant. See *Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschl.* v, 530 sq.; Lea, *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 238.

Hugo of Langres. See Berengarius.

Hugo of Lincoln, was born in 1140 at Gratianopolis, Burgundy, and was first a regular canon, and later a Carthusian monk. When Henry II founded the Carthusian monastery at Witham, in Somersetshire, he invited Hugo to accept the priorship of this new foundation. After many entreaties by Reginal, bishop of Bath, Hugo consented. He was also made bishop of Lincoln by Henry II. He died in Nov. 1200, and was canonized at Rome in 1221. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxv, 448; Wheatly, *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 75; Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdot. Celib.* p. 296. (J. H. W.)

Hugo, archbishop of Lyons, was born about the middle of the 11th century, and was one of the most distinguished supporters of the Romish Church, in her efforts to exalt the papacy, during the last half of the 11th century, when Gregory VII and the emperor Henry were arrayed against each other. He was the papal legate (under pope Urban II) at the Council of Autun, A. D. 1094, who pronounced the ban on king Philip of France for the repudiation of his lawful wife Bertha. Hugo died Oct. 7, 1106. His only works are his letters, which, according to the *Hist. Lit. de la France* (ix, p. 303), are very valuable to the historian of the 12th century. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iv, 123; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 429 sq.

Hugo of Macon, a French ecclesiastic, was born about the close of the 11th century, and was educated by his cousin St. Bernard. He was appointed abbé of Pontigny, as the representative of which he appeared in 1128 at the Council of Troyes. In August, 1136, he was elected bishop of Auxerre, and was consecrated the January following. He was an attendant at the Council of Sens, which condemned the doctrines of Abelard (q. v.); also in 1148 at the Council of Rheims, where he combated the opinions of Gilbert de la Porrée. He stood high in the estimate of popes and princes. After his death, Oct. 10, 1151, the manner in which he disposed of the immense fortunes which he had amassed by great avariciousness, and which, instead of being bequeathed for distribution among the poor of his diocese, were given to his nephew, greatly annoyed his friends, and his cousin, the pious St. Bernard, finally had the will

annulled by pope Eugene III. He is said to have written several books, but there are no writings extant which can be definitely claimed as his.—*Hist. Litt. de la France*, xii, 408; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 438.

Hugo OF MONCEAUX, a distinguished French divine, was born in the early part of the 12th century. He was first monk at Vézelay, then abbé of St. Germain (1162). He was consecrated by pope Alexander III, April 21, 1163. The pretensions of bishop Maurice, of Paris, to assist in the ceremony were energetically opposed by Hugo, and this occasioned a controversy, of which a summary was published by Hugo. It forms a very interesting document of his time (printed in the collection of Andre Duchesne, vol. iv). In the same year (May 19) Hugo assisted at the Council of Tours, where he continued the controversy with Maurice, which was finally brought before the pope, who decided in favor of the monk. In 1165 (Aug. 22) Hugo was one of the abbés who presided at the baptism of the royal infant, later Philip Augustus. He was also about this time intrusted with various ecclesiastical offices, and in 1179 he attended the Council of Latran. He died Mar. 27, 1182.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxv, 446; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xiii, 615; *Gallia Christiana*, vii, col. 442. (J. H. W.)

Hugo OF NONANT, an English divine, was born at Nonant, in Normandy, in the first half of the 12th century, and was educated at Oxford University. About 1173 he became archdeacon of Lisieux, and, towards 1185, bishop of Coventry. He was the Romish legate to England during the administration of the bishops of Durham and of Ely, in the absence of Richard to the East, and his influence caused the removal of these bishops in 1191. Only three years later he was himself driven from his see, but he was permitted in 1195 to return again, on paying a fine of 5000 marks silver to the royal treasury. He died in April, 1198, during a voyage, or, more probably, while in exile a second time. The recital of the disgrace of the bishop of Ely was written down by Hugo, and has been published by Roger of Hoveden (*Script. Rer. Ang.* p. 702). It is a very violent pamphlet.—*Hist. Litt. de la France*, xv; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 447.

Hugo DE PAGANIS. See KNIGHT TEMPLARS.

Hugo OF POITIERS, a monk of Vézelay, of whose life but little is known, flourished in the 12th century. He wrote a history of the monastery of Vézelay, which has been published by D'Achery in his *Spicilegium*, iii. He is also supposed by some to be the author of the *Chronique des Comtes de Nevers*, inserted by Labbe in his *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Manuscrits*. He died about 1161.—*Hist. Litt. de la France*, vii, 668 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gén.* xxv, 439.

Hugo OF PORTO was born about the middle of the 11th century. He was archdeacon of Compostelle until the bishopric of Porto was established in 1114, when Hugo was elected to this see. He was a member of several Church councils in 1122–25. He died about 1125. Of his writings, the *History of the Church of Compostelle*, which has never been printed, is of especial value for the history of his diocese.—*Histoire Litt. de la France*, xi, 115; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 435. (J. H. W.)

Hugo OF RHEIMS, son of count Herbert of Vermandois, flourished in the 10th century. He was elected archbishop of Rheims when not quite five years old, and installed as head of the Church in that city by the power of his father; but only six years later Hugo was succeeded by the monk Artold or Artaud. Herbert, dissatisfied with this appointment, made Artold prisoner, and called a synod at Soissons, which confirmed his son Hugo in the archbishopric. After Herbert's death Artold was liberated, and great contentions arose between the two incumbents of the same see. In 947 a synod was held at Verdun; but this, as well as another held at Mousson in 948, proved of no avail, as Hugo had secured for himself the intercession of the pope, who decreed that Hugo should hold the archbishopric. The friends of Artold finally resolved to hold a national synod, when Hugo was deposed and Artold installed. See Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxii, 252 sq.

Hugo OF RIREMONT, a French theologian of the 12th century, of whose life but little is known, was the author of *Epistola de Natura et Origine Animæ* (in Martène, *Anecdota*, i, 368), which is based on the real and supposed works of Augustine. Of Aristotle's treatise *On the Soul* he seems to have been unaware.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 447; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xi, 113.

Hugo OF SANCTO CARO (*Hugh of St. Cher*), sometimes also called HUGO DE S. THEODORICO, an eminent French theologian, was born at St. Cher (whence his surname), a suburb of Vienne, France, about 1200. He studied theology and canon law at Paris, and in 1224 joined the Dominicans in the convent of St. Jacques (whence he is also called HUGO DE ST. JACOBO), and in 1227 was made "provincial" of this order in France. He also taught theology in Paris, and was connected with several scientific undertakings. He was one of the commissioners who examined and condemned the *Introdoctorius in Evang. œtern.* of the Franciscan Gerhard, which developed the fanatical doctrines of Alb. Joachim of Flore (q. v.), and was active in the controversy of William de St. Amour with the mendicant orders. In 1245 he was made cardinal by Innocent IV, and died at Orvieto in 1263. The reputation of Hugo, however, rests chiefly upon his *Biblical* studies and writings. In 1236 he executed a revision of the text of the Latin Vulgate, an immense labor for that age. A copy of this work, preserved in the Nuremberg Library, has this title: "*Liber de correctionibus novis super Biblia, ad sciendum quæ sit verior et communior litera*, Reverendisimi patris et domini D. Hugonis, sacræ Rom. eccl. presbyteri cardinalis, sacræ theologiæ professoris et de ordine prædicatorum." His principal published works are *Postillæ in universa Biblia*, a sort of brief commentary, prepared, however, without sufficient acquaintance with the original languages of the Bible (Basil, 1487, etc.):—*Speculum ecclesiæ* (Lyons, 1554). But his most important service to Biblical literature was his conception of the plan of a *Concordance*, which he executed, with the aid of many monks of his order, in his *Sacrorum Bibl. Concordantiæ* (latest ed. Avignon, 1786, 2 vols. 4to). It is an alphabetical index of all the words in the Vulgate, and has formed the model of all Concordances to the Bible. It had the effect also of bringing the division into chapters and verses into general use. See Quétif et Echard, *Scriptores ordinis prædicatorum*, i, 194 sq.; *Hist. Littér. de la France*, xix, 38 sq.; Richard Simon, *Nouvelles observations sur le texte et les versions du N. Test.* ii, 128; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. vi; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 450; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 340.

Hugo OF ST. VICTOR, said to have been count of Blankenburg, was born at Ein, near Ypres, about 1097, and educated in the convent of Hammersleben, near Halberstadt. When eighteen years of age he went to Paris, and joined the Augustines of St. Victor. He next became professor of theology, and his success as a teacher and writer was very brilliant. He died at Paris about 1141. Hugo was the most spiritual theologian of his time, and the precursor of the later Mystics. He recommended the use of the Bible for private devotion, and urged also its study on priests and teachers. He followed the theology of Augustine so strictly, and expounded it so successfully, that he was called *Augustine the Second*, and *the Mouth of Augustine*. "In Hugo we see the representative of a school distinguished in the 12th century for its hearty religious spirit, and its tendency to practical reform; a school which, though it united more or less the mystico-contemplative with the speculative element, yet constantly kept up the contest

with the predominant dialectic tendency of the times. If, in Abelard, we see those spiritual tendencies which had been harmoniously united by Anselm, brought into conflict with each other, we see them once more reconciled in Hugo, but with this difference, that in him the dialectical element is not so strong as it was in Anselm. In his doctrinal investigations, he often has reference to, and contends against Abelard, though without mentioning his name. The empirical department of knowledge generally, and in theology the study of the older Church teachers, and of the Bible, was made specially prominent by Hugo, in opposition to one-sided speculation and innovating influences. His principle was, 'Study everything; thou wilt afterwards see that nothing is superfluous.' Adopting the definition of faith in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he remarks, 'Faith is called the substance of things invisible, because that which, as yet, is not an object of open vision, is by faith, in a certain sense, made present to the soul —actually dwells in it. Nor is there anything else whereby the things of God could be demonstrated, since they are higher than all others; nothing resembles them which could serve us as a bridge to that higher knowledge.' Hence he declared that, in regard to the essence of true faith, much more depends on the degree of devotion than on the extent of knowledge; for divine grace does not look at the amount of knowledge united with faith, but at the degree of devotion with which that which constitutes the object of faith is loved" (compare Trench, *Sac. Lat. Poetry*, p. 54). In the struggle then raging between scholasticism (Bernhard) and mysticism (Abelard), Hugo inclined rather to mysticism; but, instead of favoring exclusively the one, he aimed rather at combining the two antagonistic doctrines, and giving birth to a new system, containing the better elements of both. It is for this reason that we oftentimes find one or the other of these doctrines quite promiscuously advocated in his writings. A tolerably accurate idea of Hugo's own doctrines, and of the peculiarities of his system, may be obtained by a study of his *Summa sententiarum*. In man, says he, there is a threefold eye: the *bodily* eye, for visible things; the eye of *reason*, which enables man to see his own soul and its faculties; and the eye of *contemplation*, to view divine things. But by sin the eye of contemplation has become blinded, so that faith, which has the advantage of realizing without seeing, comes in its stead, and is the organ of the knowledge of the superterrestrial; while the eye of reason is not so greatly obscured as to excuse man's ignorance of divine things. Thus he acutely distinguishes between what is possible to be known *ex ratione*, the "necessaria" (natural laws), and what *secundum rationem*, the "probabilia," as well as what lies *supra rationem*, the "mirabilia" (divine things), and what must be acknowledged to be *contra rationem*, the "incredibilia." Subject to knowledge are the *necessaria*, subject to faith the *probabilia* and *mirabilia*. Faith, he continues, is supported by reason, reason is perfected by faith. The certainty of faith is superior to opinion, but not to knowledge; still *scire quod ipsum sit* must precede faith; after faith comes *intelligere quid ipsum sit*. Purity of heart and prayer lead upon the steps of *cogitatio*, *meditatio*, and *contemplatio*, gradually to this higher intuition, which affords a real foretaste of heaven itself (compare Ebrard, *Hdbuch. d. Kirch. u. Dogmen-Gesch.* ii, 220). In his *De sacramentis fidei*, treating of redemption, he regards man as the end of creation, and God as the end of man. In the doctrine of the attributes of God, he considers, like Abelard, power, wisdom, and goodness as primary, but contradicts Abelard in his view that what God does is the limit of his omnipotence. With Anselm, he seeks to exhibit the doctrine of the Trinity by analogy with the human spirit. Spirit, wisdom, and love, says he, correspond to the three divine persons; but, while human wisdom and affection are liable to changes, the divine are not. On the doctrine of the will, he modified Augustine slightly. He distinguishes, in order to harmonize the freedom of man with the omnipotence of God, between willing *per se*, and the fixing of the will upon something definite; making the former free, and the latter bound by the moral government of God. God is consequently not *auctor ruendi*, but only *ordinator incedendi*. Hugo was also the first to advance distinctly the idea of *gratia superaddita*. Grace is both *creatrix* and *salvatrix*; of these, the creatrix involved the power to be free from sin, but positively to do good required *gratia apposita*. After the fall, *gratia operans* had to be added to *gratia co-operans*. The essence of original sin he holds to consist in ignorance and concupiscence. To the doctrine of the sacraments Hugo was the first of the scholastics to give definiteness. Unsatisfied with Augustine's definition of them as *sacræ rei signum*, he says, in his *Summa*, that the sacrament is *visibilis forma invisibilis gratiæ, in eo collatæ*. In his *De sacramentis fidei* he defines it still more distinctly as "a corporeal, actually perceptible element, which, by virtue of the divine institution, exhibits, and really contains, symbolically, invisible grace." He also distinguishes three classes of sacraments: the first, those on which salvation especially depends (Baptism and the Lord's Supper); the second, those which are not necessary to salvation, but yet useful for sanctification—the number of these is indefinite; and, thirdly, that which serves to qualify for the administration of the other sacraments—priestly ordination. To the first class, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, he gave not only especial prominence, but he laid particular stress on their careful observance. Of course he believed in transubstantiation, calling the mode of the change *transitio*, but he considered it a means of communion with Christ. The best edition of his collected works is the first—*Opera Omnia*, stud. Badii Ascensii et J. Parvi (Paris, 1526, 3 vols. fol.). The later editions are Venice, 1588; Cologne, 1617; Rouen, 1648: all in 3 vols. See Neander, *Ch. History*, iv, 401 sq.; Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, 12th century; Oudin, *Comment. de Script. Eccles.* t. ii, p. 1138; Schmid, *Mysticismus d. Mittelalters* (Jena, 1824); Liebner, *Monographie über Hugo* (Leips. 1832). A number of the writings attributed to Hugo are probably not his, and others of his real writings remain unedited. The task of selecting what are and what are not his genuine works has been undertaken by M. Hauréau, of Paris, who will doubtless do it full justice. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 436 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 308 sq.; Maurice, *Mediæval Philos.* p. 144 sq.; Tiedemann, *Geist. der speculat. Philos.* iv, 289 sq.; Tennemann, *Gesch. d. Philos.* viii, 206 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxiv, p. 392 sq.; xxix, 274 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogmas*, ii, 467 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hugo Aicelin DE BILLOM, or HUGO SÉQUIN, was born at Billom, in Auvergne, about 1230, was educated at the college of the Church of St. Sirène, and afterwards entered the monastery at Clermont. He preached at various places with great success, and was awarded, on account of his superior scholarship, the doctorship of divinity by the University of Paris, where he was afterwards professor of theology. In 1285 Hugo went to Rome, and was appointed by pope Honorius IV master of his palace. Nicolas IV made him cardinal, May 15, 1288. He died at Rome Dec. 29, 1297. He is said to have written works on the *beatific vision*, an apologetical work against the corrupters of the doctrines of St. Thomas, *On Jeremiah*, a volume of *Sermons*, etc. See Echard, *Scriptores ordinis Prædicatorum*, i, 450 sq.; *Encyclop. Théolog.* xxxi, 1091 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 450.

Hugo, Ethérien, a Tuscan theologian of the 12th century, contemporary of pope Alexander III, to whom he dedicated the principal of his works, lived some time at the court of Constantinople, and was highly esteemed by the emperor Comnenus. On the occasion of his conference with the Greek theologians he wrote his treatise *De Hæresibus quas Græci in Latinos devolvunt*, also

known under the title of *De Immortali Deo*, libri iii. It is published in the Lyons edition of the *Library of the Fathers*, vol. xxii, col. 1198. The same collection contains also a treatise of Hugo on the *State of the Soul separated from the Body*.—Dupin, *Bibl. des Auteurs ecclés. du douzième siècle;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 448.

Hugo Grotius. See GROTIUS.

Hugo, Herman, a distinguished Jesuit, born at Brussels in 1588, wrote several historical and theological works. He is celebrated on account of his *Pia desideria emblematibus illustrata* (1624, 8vo; 1629, 12mo; translated into English as *Divine Addresses*, by Edmund Arkwater, 3d edit. corrected, Lond. 1702, 8vo). He died of the plague at Rheinberg Sept. 10, 1629. See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* ii, 1572; *Nouv. Dict. Hist.* p. 336.

Hugociano, FRANÇOIS, a distinguished Roman Catholic prelate, according to some was an Englishman by birth, but according to others was born at Pisa in the first half of the 14th century. By an acquaintance which he formed with pope Boniface IX he was able to procure the archbishopric of Bordeaux in 1389, and some time after he was also made Boniface's legate to Gascogne, the kingdoms of Navarre, Castile, Leon, and Aragon. In 1405 he was made cardinal by pope Innocent VII, and was employed by the papal chair in several theological controversies. He was especially prominent at the Council of Pisa in 1409. He died at Florence Aug. 14, 1412. See *Encyclop. Théol.* xxxi, 1082 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hugonet, PHILIBERT, a distinguished Roman Catholic prelate who flourished in the 15th century, was educated at the universities of Dijon, Turin, and Padua, and succeeded his uncle in the bishopric of Macon. He was made cardinal in 1473 by pope Sixtus IV, and died at Rome in 1484. See *Encyclop. Théol.* xxxi, 1083; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 426.

Huguceio of Pisa. See GLOSSATORES.

Huguenots, originally a nickname applied to the partisans of the Reformation in France. The origin of this word is rather obscure. Some derive it from *Huguon*, a word applied in Touraine to persons who walk at night in the street—the early French Protestants, like the early Christians, having chosen that time for their religious assemblies. Others derive it from a faulty pronunciation of the German *Eidgenossen*, signifying *confederates*, on account of the connection between the French Protestants and the Swiss confederates, who maintained themselves against the tyrannical attempts of Charles III, duke of Savoy, and were called *Eignots*. Others derive it from the part which the French Protestants took in sustaining Henry IV, the descendant of *Hugues* Capet, to the throne of France against the Guises. Another derivation is from the subterraneous vaults in which they held their assemblies, outside the walls of Tours, near a gate called Fourgon, an alteration from *feu Hugon*. This last derivation is strengthened by the fact that they were originally called "Huguenots of Tours." Still others derive it from the name of a very small coin of the time of Hugues, to denote the vile condition of the Protestants. Thus the distinguished German philologist, Prof. Mahn, of Berlin, in his *Etymologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Romanischen Sprachen*, gives no less than fifteen supposed derivations, but inclines himself to the opinion that the word Huguenot was originally applied as a nickname to the early French Protestants, and that it was derived from *Hughues*, the name of some heretic or conspirator, and was formed from it by the addition of the French diminutive ending *ot*, like Jacot, Margot, Jeannot, etc.

At the very commencement of the Reformation in Germany, adherents of the cause of the Reformers sprang up in France, then under the government of Francis I. Under the powerful support which these French Reformers found in Margaret of Navarre, sister of the king, as early as 1523 Melchior Wolmar, a Swiss, preached the Gospel in the south of France, and Lutheran societies, at this time calling themselves Gospellers (q. v.), were organized by Gerhard Roussel and Jacob Lefévre. See FABER. The circulation of Lefévre's New Testament by the thousand throughout France by peddlers from Switzerland, where copies were printed by Farel (q. v.), still further increased the number of the Reformers, and finally led to the promulgation of an ordinance by the Sorbonne, obtained from the king, for the *suppression of printing* (Feb. 26, 1535). In 1533, Calvin (q. v.), who had been invited to Paris by the rector of the University, began to preach the new doctrines in that and other cities, and by his efforts greatly furthered the success of the French Protestants, who now began to be known by the name of Huguenots. Indeed, so numerous had they become, that to exterminate, if possible, by force, their doctrine before it should spread further, the Church resorted, by consent of the king, in 1545, to a massacre in the Vaudois of Provence, which was accompanied by horrors impossible to describe. The new-view religion, however, made rapid progress in spite of all persecutions, and men of rank, of learning, and of arms ranged themselves in its defence. "The heads of the house of Bourbon, Antoine, duke of Vendôme, and Louis, prince of Condé, declared themselves in its favor. The former became the husband of the celebrated Jeanne d'Albret, queen of Navarre, daughter of the Protestant Margaret of Valois, and the latter became the recognised leader of the Huguenots. The head of the Coligny family took the same side. The Montmorencies were divided; the Constable halting between the two opinions, waiting to see which should prove the stronger, while others of the family openly sided with the Reformed. Indeed, it seemed at one time as if France were on the point of turning Protestant." The Huguenots had become strong enough to hold a synod as early as 1559, and in 1561 cardinal De Sainte-Croix, becoming alarmed, wrote the pope, "The kingdom is already half Huguenot," while the Venetian ambassador Micheli reported to his government that no province in France was free from Protestants. The Roman Catholic clergy, in influence at court, now decided to drive Henry II to a more determined opposition against the Huguenots by assuring him that his life was threatened. Cardinal de Lorraine, the head of the Church in France, declared to him that, "if the secular arm failed in its duty, all the malcontents would throw themselves into this detestable sect. They would first destroy the ecclesiastical power, and the royal power would come next." The immediate consequence was a royal edict, in 1559, declaring the crime of heresy punishable by death, and forbidding the judges to remit or mitigate the penalty. The fires of persecution, which had for a time been smouldering, again burst forth. The provincial Parliaments, at the instigation of the Guises, established *Chambres ardentes* for the punishment of Protestants; and executions, confiscations, and banishments became the order of the day throughout France. The death of Henry II, and the accession of Francis II, did not modify in the least the existing state of affairs. More violent measures, even, were taken, none of which succeeded in eradicating the great eyesore of the adherents of the prevalent Church, whose office had now become that of the executioner and hangman. The Protestants could endure these persecutions no longer, and resolved on open revolt. Protected by Antoine de Bourbon, king of Navarre, by the Condés, the Colignys, and also by such Romanists as were politically opposed to the Guises, the Huguenots formed a strong opposition. Having chosen Louis de Condé for their leader, they decided, Feb. 1, 1560, at Nantes, to address a petition to the king, and, in case it were rejected, to put down the Guises by force of arms, capture the king, and make the prince of Condé governor of the kingdom. The carrying out of this plan was intrusted to Georges

de Barri de la Renaudie, a nobleman from Perigord. The conspiracy, however, was discovered through the treachery of count Louis de Sancerre, and the court was removed to Amboise. Some of the Huguenots followed it in arms, whence the whole affair became known as the conspiracy of Amboise. They were defeated, however, by the forces of the Guises, and 1200 of them, taken as prisoners, were executed. The Guises now aimed at the introduction of the Inquisition in France; but, at the instigation of the noble chancellor l'Hôpital [see Hôpital], the king gave to Parliament, by the edict of Romorantin, in May, 1560, the right of deciding in matters of faith, leaving, however, to the bishops the privilege of discovering and pointing out heretics.

During the minority of Charles IX, who ascended the throne Dec. 5, 1560, a boy only ten years old, the strife between the parties which divided the court became more violent, as the chancellor de l'Hôpital, on the assembling of Parliament in Dec. 1560, had exhorted men of all parties "to rally round the young king; and, while condemning the odious punishments which had recently been inflicted on persons of the Reformed faith, announced the intended holding of a national council, and expressed the desire that henceforward France should recognise neither Huguenots nor papists, but only Frenchmen." Catharine de Medicis, the regent, who regarded it to her interest to balance the power of the two parties so as to govern both more easily, seconded the views of the chancellor. The two princes of Condé, who had been prisoners at Lyons after the affair of Amboise, were liberated. Antoine de Navarre was made constable of France, and a new edict was published in July, 1561, which granted full forgiveness to the Huguenots, who, it was stated, were no longer to be designated by such nicknames. Finally, a conference was appointed (Sept. 3) for both parties to meet with a view to conciliation. This conference is famous in history as the Conference of Poissy (q.v.). The Cardinal de Lorraine led the Roman Catholic theologians, but was signally defeated, especially by the arguments of Theodore Beza. The Huguenots, emboldened by their success, now adopted the Calvinistic Confession, and, thus united, rose more strongly against Romanism, counting among their friends Catharine herself, who had been forced to their side by the machinations of the Guises. January 17, 1562, a royal edict was issued, guaranteeing to the Protestants liberty of worship. The Guises and their partisans now became exasperated. On Christmas day, 1562, about 3000 Protestants of Vassy, in Champagne, met for divine worship, and to celebrate the sacrament according to the practices of their Church. Vassy was one of the possessions of the Guises, and the bishop of Châlons complaining to Antoinette de Bourbon, an ardent Roman Catholic, she threatened the Huguenots, if they persisted in their proceedings, with the vengeance of her son, the duke of Guise. Undismayed by this threat, the Protestants of Vassy continued to meet publicly, and listen to their preachers, believing themselves to be under the protection of the law, according to the terms of the royal edict. On March 1, 1563, while the Huguenots of Vassy, to the number of about 1200, were again assembled for divine worship in a barn—as they had shortly before been deprived of their churches by Catharine, who made this concession to Antoine de Navarre, in order to secure her support, still leaving them, however, free to assemble in the suburbs and in the country, on the estates of noblemen—they were attacked by a band of armed men, led by the duke of Guise, and massacred. For an hour they fired, hacked, and stabbed amongst them, the duke coolly watching the carnage. Sixty persons of both sexes were left dead on the spot, more than two hundred were severely wounded, and the rest contrived to escape. After the massacre the duke sent for the local judge, and severely reprimanded him for having permitted the Huguenots of Vassy to meet. The judge intrenched himself behind the edict of the king. The duke's eye flashed with rage, and, striking the hilt of his sword with his hand, he said, "The sharp edge of this will soon cut your edict to pieces" (Smiles, *Huguenots*, p. 48; comp. Davila, *Histoire des Guerres civiles de France*, ii, 379). This massacre was the match applied to the charge ready to explode. It was the signal to Catholic France to rise in mass against the heretics, and to Protestant France a warning for their lives. An army of Roman Catholics gathered, at the head of which were the duke of Guise, the constable of Montmorency, and marshal St. André, who seized the king and the regent under pretence of providing for their safety, proclaimed the Huguenots, who had at the same time been gathering at Orleans under Condé, rebels, and sent an army against them. Thus began *the first war of the Huguenots.* September 11, 1562, the royal troops, after much bloodshed, took Rouen, and December 19 a battle was fought at Dreux, in which, after a terrible struggle, the Protestants yielded. One of the leaders of the Romanists, marshal St. André, fell in battle; another, the constable of Montmorency, was made prisoner by the Huguenots, and the leader of the latter in turn fell into the hands of the Guises. An exchange of prisoners, however, was immediately effected. The duke of Guise now marched against Orleans, but was assassinated in his own camp, Feb. 18, 1563, before he had been able to attack this great stronghold of the Protestants. The queen mother, realizing the loss which the Romanists, to whose side she had been forced by policy, had sustained in the death of the duke of Guise, and informed of a threatened invasion of the English on the coast of Normandy, concluded the peace of Amboise, March 19, by which the Protestants were again granted the privileges of the edict of 1562, with several additions. The armies now united, and made common cause against the English. As soon, however, as Catharine thought herself able to dispense with the aid of the Huguenots, whom she both feared and hated, and on whose destruction she was resolved, she again restricted the privileges conceded them in the edict of Amboise, formed a close alliance with Spain for the extirpation of heresy, and made attempts to secure the imprisonment, and death if possible, of Condé and of the admiral Coligny (q. v.). The Huguenots now became alarmed, and their leaders adopted the resolution, Sept. 29, 1567, to secure, at the castle of Morceaux, the king's person, in whose name Catharine de Medicis was acting. The court, having received information of this decision, fled to Paris. Condé immediately followed, and, laying siege to the city, opened *the second war of the Huguenots.* After a siege of one month, Condé and the constable Montmorency met for battle, November 10, 1567, at St. Denis. Here 2700 Huguenots fought against no less than 20,000 royal troops. But so well did the Huguenots maintain their ground, that the victory was undecided. The superior force of the royal troops led Condé to fall back into Lorraine, where he was re-enforced by 10,000 German warriors, under prince John Casimir. Condé with these forces now threatened Paris (Feb. 1568), and Catharine, in her fright, at once offered a treaty of peace, which was contracted at Longjumeau March 27, 1568, re-establishing the terms of the treaty of Amboise, generally known as the *petite paix* (little peace) of Longjumeau. Notwithstanding this treaty, which both parties seem to have signed only because they felt under compulsion, Catharine continued all manner of persecutions against the Protestants. "The pulpits, encouraged by the court, resounded with the horrid maxim that faith need not be kept with heretics, and that to massacre them was just, pious, and useful for salvation" (De Thou, *Vie de Coligny*, p. 350). In less than three months more than 3000 Protestants were either assassinated or executed. L'Hôpital, the friend of peace, and the upholder of the rights of all citizens without distinction of creed, who had become obnoxious to Rome and her adherents, was dismissed or forced to resign, and the seizure of Condé and Coligny resolved upon. Fortunately, however, for the Protestants, some of the

royal officers were unwilling to be instruments in the massacre likely to ensue upon such an act, and Condé and Coligny received warning to flee for their lives. Rochelle, one of the strongholds of the Protestants, which had baffled all the attacks and plans of Catharine, was open to receive them, and thither they consequently directed their steps for safety, closely pursued by the royal blood-hunters. Measures had also been planned for entrapping the other leading Protestants, but they all failed in the execution. "The cardinal of Chatillon, an adherent to the Protestant cause, who was at his see (Beauvais), escaped into Normandy, took the disguise of a sailor, and crossed over to England in a small vessel, and there became of great service to the Protestant cause by his negotiations. The queen of Navarre, warned in time by Coligny, also hastened to Rochelle with her son and daughter, contributing some money and four thousand soldiers. The chiefs-in-general took the defensive, and immediately raised levies in their different provinces. The guerrillas maintained by these persons kept the Catholic army in full employment, and preserved Rochelle from a general attack till proper measures had been taken for its defence." Catharine, outwitted in her diabolical attempts, now resolved to cajole the Huguenots into submission, and to this end published an edict declaring the willingness of the government to protect the Protestants in future, as well as to render them justice for the past. But so completely was this edict at variance with her conduct that it passed unnoticed. Enraged at this, she now promulgated several edicts against the Protestants, revoking every edict that had ever been published in their favor, and forbade, under the penalty of death, the exercise of any other religion than the Roman Catholic. This sudden revocation of all former edicts made her acts a public declaration that she was resolved on a war of religion, and the Huguenots, fortified in their strongholds, and with assistance which they had obtained from Germany and England, now began the *third religious war.* On March 13, 1569, the two contending armies met in battle at Jarnac, near La Rochelle, in which the Catholics, headed by the duke of Anjou, later Henry III, defeated the Protestants, making prince Condé a prisoner, whom they afterwards, on recognition in the camp, murdered in cold blood. The Protestants being thus left without a leader, the command was intrusted to Coligny. But the admiral, ever unselfish in his motives, finding that the army had become greatly dispirited by their recent reverses, urged Jeanne D'Albret, queen of Navarre, to give them her son as princely leader. She at once hastened to Cognac, where the army was encamped, and presented her son, prince Henry of Bearn, afterwards Henry IV, then in his 16th year, and Henry, son of the lately fallen Condé, still younger, as the leaders of the cause, under the guidance of Coligny. Having obtained further re-enforcements from Germany, the Huguenots now laid siege to Poitiers, but on Oct. 3, 1569, were again defeated in a battle at Moncontour. Still sustained by means from England, Switzerland, and Germany, the Huguenots were enabled to take Nîmes in 1569, to free prince Henry of Navarre and the eldest Henry of Condé in La Rochelle, to beat the royal army at Luçon and Arnay-le-Duc in 1570, to besiege Paris, and, finally, to dictate (Aug. 8, 1570) the terms of the peace of St. Germain-en-Laye, by which they were to hold La Rochelle, La Charité, Montauban, and Cognac for two years, and were guaranteed liberty of worship outside of Paris, equality before the law, admission to the universities, and a general amnesty. "Under the terms of this treaty, France enjoyed a state of quiet for about two years, but it was only the quiet that preceded the outbreak of another storm."

Having failed to crush the Protestants in the open field Catharine, now sought to accomplish her object by treachery and by a general massacre. In her artful way she contrived a marriage between her own daughter Margaret of Valois, sister of the king, and Henry of Bearn, king of Navarre, the proclaimed leader of the Huguenots. Jeanne d'Albret, the mother of Henry of Bearn, and even the admiral Coligny, heartily concurred in the projected union, in the hope that it would be an important step towards a close of the old feud; but many of the Protestant leaders mistrusted Catharine's intentions, especially after her late attempt to assassinate Coligny, and they felt inclined to withdraw. None the less, as the preparations for the royal nuptials were in progress, the Reformers took courage, and resorted in large numbers to Paris to celebrate the great, and to them so promising, event. Catharine now felt that her favorable moment had come. On the day after the marriage, which had been celebrated with great pomp, and was followed by a succession of feasts and gayeties, in which the principal members of the nobility, Protestant as well as Romanist, were participating, and while the fears of the Huguenots were completely disarmed, a private council was held by Catharine and the king, in which it was decided that on a given night all the Protestants should be murdered, with the exception of Henry of Bearn and the young prince of Condé. For the head of Coligny the king offered a special price of 50,000 crowns; but the attempt made upon his life failed to prove fatal to Coligny, and the hypocritical Charles even professed sorrow for the injury he sustained. See COLIGNY. The night of August 24, 1572, was appointed for the massacre. About twilight in the morning of the 24th, as the great bell of the church of St. Germain was ringing for early prayers, to open the festival of St. Bartholomew's day, Charles, his mother, and the duke of Anjou sat in a chamber of the palace to give the signal for the massacre. A pistol-shot fired from one of the windows of the palace called out 300 of the royal guard, who, wearing, to distinguish themselves in the darkness, a white sash on the left arm and a white cross in their hats, rushed out into the streets, shouting "For God and the king!" and commenced the most perfidious butchery recorded in history. The houses of the Huguenots were broken in, and all who could be found murdered, the king himself firing from his windows on those who passed in the street. Some 5000 Huguenots, among them their great and noble leader, the admiral Coligny (q. v.), were thus killed in Paris; while many Roman Catholics met with the same fate at the hands of personal enemies, under the plea of their being inclined to Protestantism. The next day orders were sent to the governors of the provinces to follow the example of the capital. A few only had the manliness to resist this order, and in the space of sixty days some 70,000 persons were murdered in the provinces. See BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY. Those who escaped took refuge in the mountains and at La Rochelle. Henry of Navarre was compelled to sign a recantation. The prince of Condé became a Roman Catholic, and Charles IX declared in Parliament that Protestantism was extinct in France. "Catharine de Medicis wrote in triumph to Alva (the ignominious commmander of Philip's troops in the Netherlands), to Philip II of Spain, and to the pope, of the results of the three days' dreadful work at Paris. When Philip heard of the massacre, he is said to have laughed for the first and only time in his life. Rome was thrown into a delirium of joy at the news. The cannon were fired at St. Angelo; Gregory XIII and his cardinals went in procession from sanctuary to sanctuary to give God thanks for the massacre. The subject was ordered to be painted, and a medal was struck to celebrate the atrocious event, with the pope's head on one side, and on the other an angel, with a cross in one hand and a sword in the other, pursuing and slaying a band of flying heretics. The legend it bears, '*Ugonottorum Strages*, 1572,' briefly epitomizes the terrible story." The festival of St. Bartholomew was also ordered to be yearly celebrated in commemoration of the event. Not satisfied with these demonstrations at Rome, Gregory sent cardinal Orsini on a special mission to Paris to congratulate the king

His passage was through Lyons, where 1800 persons had been killed, the bodies of many of whom had been thrown into the Rhone to horrify the dwellers near that river below the city (Smiles, *Huguenots*, p. 60).

Although deprived so suddenly of their leaders, and greatly weakened by the slaughter of great numbers of their best and bravest men, the Protestants gathered together in their strong places, and prepared to defend themselves by force against force. "In the Cevennes, Dauphiny, and other quarters, they betook themselves to the mountains for refuge. In the plains of the south fifty towns closed their gates against the royal troops. Wherever resistance was possible it showed itself." Thus opened *the fourth war of the Huguenots*. The duke of Anjou, at the head of the Romanists, marched against the forts in the hands of the Huguenots. He attacked La Rochelle, but was repulsed, and obliged to retire from the siege, after losing nearly his whole army. The duke of Anjou becoming king of Poland, peace was concluded June 24, 1573, and the Protestants received as security the towns of Montauban, Nîmes, and La Rochelle, besides enjoying freedom of conscience, though not of worship, throughout the kingdom. Charles IX falling ill, the so-called *Conspiration des politiques* was formed by the Huguenots, with a section of the Roman Catholic nobility, to depose the queen and the Guises, and to place on the throne the chief of the Romanists, the duke of Alençon, the youngest son of Catharine and of Francis II, who, from political motives, made common cause with the Huguenots. The leaders made arrangements with Henry of Navarre and the prince of Condé, Protestant princes, for the humiliation of Austria, and only a premature rising of the Protestants defeated the plan. Some of the conspirators were executed, D'Alençon and Henry of Navarre were arrested, and Condé fled to Germany, where he returned to Protestantism, saying that his abjuration had been obtained from him by violence.

The *fifth war of the Huguenots* began under Henry III, the former duke of Alençon, who became king of France in 1574. In this war the Roman Catholics lost several strong towns, and were repeatedly defeated by the Huguenots. The prince of Condé returned to France with a German army under the orders of John Casimir, and in March, 1576, was joined by the duke of Alençon, who was at enmity with the king. In the south, Henry of Navarre was making rapid progress. The court became alarmed, and finally concluded the peace of Beaulieu, May 8, 1576, granting the Huguenots again a number of places of security, and freeing them from all restrictions in the exercise of their religion, also the promise to indemnify the German allies of the Huguenots for the war expenses. The Guises, thus frustrated in their political designs, instigated the inhabitants of Peronne, under the leadership of Humiéres, to organize an association called the *Holy League* (q. v.), in 1576, for the defence of the interests of Romanism. The league rapidly increased, was supported by the king, by Spain, and the pope, and finally led to the *sixth war of the Huguenots*. The states, however, refusing to give the king money to carry it on, and the Roman Catholics being divided among themselves, the peace of Bergerac was signed in September, 1577. The conditions were the same as on the former occasions; but Catharine, in her anxiety to diminish the growing power of the Guises, entered into a private treaty with Henry of Navarre (at Nerac), and thus the Protestants were put in possession of a few more towns.

The *seventh war of the Huguenots*, called at court the *Guerre des amoureux*, was occasioned by the Guises, who instigated the king to demand back the towns given to the Protestants as securities, and to violate the treaty in various ways. Condé answered by taking Lafère in November, 1579, and Henry by taking Cahors in April, 1580. The duke of Anjou intending to employ the royal forces in the Netherlands, and the Huguenots having met with several disastrous encounters with the Romanists, peace was concluded again at Flex, Sept. 12, 1580, and the Huguenots were permitted to retain their strongholds six years longer. A comparatively long interval of peace for France now followed.

But when the duke of Anjou (formerly of Alençon) died in 1584, leaving Henry of Navarre, a Protestant, heir presumptive to the throne, the "Holy League" sprang again into existence under the influence of the adherents of the Guises, the strict Roman Catholic members of the Parliament, the fanatical clergy, and the ultra conservative party. The states, especially the sixteen districts of Paris (whence the association also took the name of *Ligue des Seize*), took an active part in it. Henry, duke of Guise, finally concluded a treaty with Spain, signed at the castle of Joinville January 3, 1585, creating a strong opposition to the succession of Henry of Navarre to the throne, and aimed even against Henry III, who seemed inclined to favor his brother-in-law. At the same time the Guises sought, though not altogether successfully, the approbation of pope Gregory XIII to the declaration of cardinal of Bourbon as heir to the throne, under the pretense that, as a faithful Catholic, he would aid his Church in extirpating heresy. The real object of the duke of Guise, however, in proposing so old an incumbent for the throne, was to obtain for himself the crown of France, which seemed by no means a chimerical attempt, as he had received strong assurances of support from Spain. With the assistance of soldiers and funds sent him by his Spanish ally, the duke succeeded in taking several towns, not only from the Huguenots, but also from the king. Henry III, hesitating to send an army against the duke of Guise promptly, was finally obliged to sign the edict of Nemours, July 7, 1585, by which all modes of worship except that of the Roman Catholic Church were forbidden throughout France. All Huguenot ministers were given one month, and the Huguenots six months, to leave the country, and all their privileges were declared forfeited. Though put under the ban as heretics by pope Sixtus V, Henry of Navarre and the prince of Condé prepared to resist the execution of the royal edict by force of arms. With the aid of money from England, and an army of 30,000 men sent from Germany, they took the field in 1587, and began the *eighth war of the Huguenots*, called also, from the names of the leaders, the *war of the three Henrys*. The Huguenots gained the battle of Coutras, Oct. 8, 1587, but were subsequently defeated, and their German allies were obliged to leave the country. The duke of Guise was left master of the field. He was not slow to grasp the power of the state, and obliged the king to sign the edict of reunion of Rouen, July 19, 1588, for the forcible submission of the Huguenots, and the exclusion of Henry of Navarre from the succession to the throne. The king, to whom it now became evident that the duke of Guise's aim was to secure the throne for himself, feigned acquiescence in the demand, called a Parliament at Blois in order to gain time, and there caused both of the Guises to be murdered (Dec. 23, 1588). Both Protestants and Roman Catholics were indignant at this act of treachery; the Parliament denounced the king as an assassin, and Charles of Guise, duke of Mayenne, who had escaped the massacre, made himself master of several provinces, marched on Paris, and took the title of lieutenant general of the kingdom. Catharine having died in 1589, Henry III made a treaty with Henry of Navarre, but was himself assassinated in the camp of St. Cloud by the monk Jacques Clement, August 1, 1588. Henry of Navarre, a Protestant in belief, now succeeded to the throne under the title of Henry IV. His first step was to conquer for himself the possessions which had been wrested from his kingdom by the league and the Spaniards. But finding that he could obtain security of life and permanent possession of his dominion only by becoming a Roman Catholic, he abjured the faith of his fathers in the church of St. Denis, July 25, 1593. The duke of Mayenne, supported by Spain, still continued

the war against the king, but the latter having obtained absolution from the pope in 1595, notwithstanding the efforts of the Jesuits, who had sold their influence to Spain, many forsook the league to join the royal standard, and the duke of Mayenne was finally obliged to make peace with the king. On April 15, 1598, Henry IV granted to the Protestants, for whom he ever cherished great affection, the celebrated *Edict of Nantes* (q. v.), consisting of ninety-one articles, by which the Huguenots were allowed to worship in their own way throughout the kingdom, with the exception of a few towns; their ministers were to be supported by the state; inability to hold offices was removed; their poor and sick were to be admitted to the hospitals; and, finally, the towns given them as security were to remain in their hands eight years longer. Pope Clement VIII became enraged at the concessions, and wrote Henry that "a decree which gave liberty of conscience to all was the most accursed that had ever been made." His influence was also used to induce Parliament to refuse its approval to the edict, but it was finally registered in spite of Romish craftiness, Feb. 25, 1599.

After repeated attempts upon the life of the king, who had made himself especially obnoxious to the Jesuits, he was eventually assassinated by Ravaillac May 14, 1610. Henry's second wife, Mary of Medicis, and her son Louis XIII, still a minor, now assumed the government. The edicts of toleration were by them also ratified; but, notwithstanding this public declaration on their part, they were practically disregarded and violated. When prince Henry II of Condé rose against the king in Nov. 1615, the Protestants sided with him. By the treaty of Loudon, May 4, 1616, their privileges were confirmed; but, at the instigation of the Jesuits, a new edict of 1620 restored Roman Catholicism as the official religion of Bearn, and decided that the Huguenots should be deprived of their churches. The latter resisted, headed by the princes of Rohan and Soubise, and the war commenced anew (in 1621), but this time proved unfavorable to the Protestants; yet at the peace of Montpellier, Oct. 21, 1622, the edict of Nantes was confirmed, and the Protestants only lost the right of holding assemblies. In 1622, Louis XIII called Richelieu, whom the pope had lately created cardinal, to his councils. The power of the chancellor once firmly established, he determined to crush the Huguenots, whose destruction he considered essential to the unity and power of France, not so much on account of their religion, as on account of their political influence at home, and particularly abroad. He accordingly paid little attention to the stipulations of the treaty which the king had made with the Huguenots, and provoked them to rebellion by all possible means. In 1625, while the government was involved in difficulties in Italy, the Protestants improved the opportunity and rose in arms. Their naval force, under Soubise, beat the royal marine in several engagements, and cardinal Richelieu found himself under the necessity of offering conditions of peace, which this time the Protestants very unwisely refused to accept. The cardinal now resolved to reduce La Rochelle, their stronghold. A powerful army was assembled and marched on the doomed place, Richelieu combining in himself the functions of bishop, prime minister, and commander-in-chief. The Huguenots of Rochelle defended themselves with great bravery for more than a year, during which they endured the greatest privations. But their resistance was in vain; even a fleet which the English had induced Charles I to send, under the command of the duke of Buckingham, to their assistance, was defeated off the Island of Rhé, Nov. 8, 1627. On the 28th of Oct. 1628, Richelieu rode into Rochelle by the king's side, in velvet and cuirass, at the head of the royal army, after which he proceeded to perform high mass in the church of St. Margaret, in celebration of his victory (compare Smiles, *Hug.* p. 118). The loss of La Rochelle was the death-blow to the Huguenots as a political power. As it was followed by the loss of all their other strongholds, Nismes, Montauban, Castres, etc., they were now left defenceless, and entirely dependent on the will of their conqueror. Richelieu, however, acting in a wise and tolerant spirit, refrained from pushing the advantages which he had gained to extremes, and advised the publication of an edict which should grant the Protestants freedom of worship, no doubt actuated to this course by considerations of state policy, as he had just entered into a league with the Swedes and Germans, and needed the good-will of his Protestant subjects as much as that of the Romanists. June 27, 1629, peace was concluded at Alais, and in the same year an edict followed, called "the Edict of Pardon," granting to the Protestants the same privileges as the edict of Nantes, with exception of their strongholds, which were demolished, they ceasing to have political influence, and becoming distinguished as a party only by their religion. The reign of Louis XIII closed in 1629, and his successor, Louis XIV, as well as cardinal Mazarin, the successor of Richelieu, who had died a short time before Louis, confirmed to the Protestants the rights and privileges granted them; and although they suffered from a gradual defection of nobles, who, finding them no longer available for purposes of faction, now rejoined the old Church, they nevertheless enjoyed comparative freedom from persecution.

The death of Mazarin in 1661 forms another epoch in the history of the Protestants. New edicts were published, intended to damage their financial interests, and to become impediments to the free exercise of their religion. Thus, in 1662, an edict forbade them to inter their dead except at daybreak or at nightfall. Another decree in 1663 excused new converts from payment of debts previously contracted with their fellow-religionists. In 1665 their children were allowed to declare themselves Roman Catholics—if boys, at fourteen; if girls, at twelve years of age; parents either to continue to provide for their apostate children, or to apportion to them a part of their possessions. In 1679 it was decreed that converts who had relapsed into Protestantism should be banished, and their property confiscated. In 1680 Huguenot clerks and notaries were deprived of their employments, intermarriages of Protestants and Roman Catholics were forbidden, and the issue of such marriages declared illegitimate, and incapable of succession. In 1681, to strike terror to the hearts of the Protestants, a royal declaration granted the right to Huguenot children to become converts at the age of *seven* years. "The kidnapping of Protestant children was actively set on foot by the agents of the Roman Catholic priests, and their parents were subjected to heavy penalties if they ventured to complain. Orders were issued to pull down Protestant places of worship, and as many as eighty were shortly destroyed in one diocese. The Huguenots offered no resistance. All that they did was to meet together and pray that the king's heart might yet be softened towards them. Blow upon blow followed. Protestants were forbidden to print books without the authority of magistrates of the Romish communion. Protestant teachers were interdicted from teaching anything more than reading, writing, and arithmetic. Such pastors as held meetings amid the ruins of the churches which had been pulled down, were compelled to do penance with a rope round their necks, after which they were to be banished the kingdom. Protestants were prohibited from singing psalms on land or water, in workshop or in dwellings. If a priestly procession passed one of their churches while the psalms were sung, they must stop instantly, on pain of fine or imprisonment to the officiating minister." In short, from the pettiest annoyance to the most exasperating cruelty, nothing was wanting on the part of the "most Christian king" and his abettors. The intention apparently was to provoke the Huguenots into open resistance, so as to find a pretext for a second massacre of St. Bartholomew.

In 1683, Colbert, who had been Louis's minister for several years, and who, convinced that the strength of

states consisted in the number, the intelligence, and the industry of their citizens, had labored in all possible ways to prevent the hardships which Louis, led by his mistress, Madame de Maintenon, and his Jesuit confessor, Père la Chaise, was inflicting on the Protestants, was removed by death. Military executions and depredations against the Protestants now began throughout the kingdom. "Pity, terror, and anguish had by turns agitated their minds, until at length they were reduced to a state of despair. Life was made almost intolerable to them. All careers were closed against them, and Protestants of the working class were under the necessity of abjuring or starving. The mob, observing that the Protestants were no longer within the pale of the law, took the opportunity of wreaking all manner of outrages on them. They broke into their churches, tore up the benches, and, placing the Bible and hymn-books in a pile, set the whole on fire; the authorities usually lending their sanction on the proceedings of the rioters by banishing the burned-out ministers, and interdicting the further celebration of worship in the destroyed churches" (Smiles, *Huguenots*, p. 135-6). Bodies of troops which had been quartered upon the Protestants to harass them, now made it a business to convert the Protestants. Accompanied by Jesuits, they passed through the southern provinces, compelling the inhabitants to renounce their religion, demolishing the places of worship, and putting to death the preachers. Hundreds of thousands of Protestants, unwilling to renounce their religion, fled to Switzerland, the Netherlands, England, and Germany. In vain was it attempted to restrain this self-expatriation by cordons along the borders. Many Protestants also made an insincere profession of Roman Catholicism. These, on the slightest appearance of relapse, were put to death. On October 23, 1685, Louis at last revoked the edict of Nantes. This revocation enacted the demolition of all the remaining Protestant temples throughout France; the entire proscription of the Protestant religion; the prohibition of even private worship under penalty of confiscation of body and property; the banishment of all Protestant pastors from the kingdom within fifteen days; the closing of all Protestant schools; the prohibition of parents from instructing their children in the Protestant faith; the obligation, under penalty of a heavy fine, of having their children baptized by the parish priest, and educating them in the Roman Catholic religion; the confiscation of the property and goods of all Protestant refugees who failed to return to France within four months; the penalty of the galleys for life to all men, and of imprisonment for life to all women detected in the act of attempting to escape from France. "Such were a few of the dastardly and inhuman provisions of the edict of Revocation. It was a proclamation of war by the armed against the unarmed—a war against peaceable men, women, and children—a war against property, against family, against society, against public morality, and, more than all, against the right of conscience." But when we take into consideration the private character of the king, how completely he was controlled by abandoned women and their friends, the Jesuits, who both feared and hated Protestantism, because, if successful, it would have been a death-blow to their own wicked association, we cannot wonder that "great was the rejoicing of the Jesuits on the revocation of the edict of Nantes," and that "Rome sprang up with a shout of joy to celebrate the event," and that "Te Deums were sung, processions went from shrine to shrine, and the pope sent a brief to Louis, conveying to him the congratulations and praises of the Romish Church."

The edict of Revocation was carried out with rigor; and but one feeling now possessed the minds of the Reformed, to make their escape from that devoted land. Disguised in every form which ingenuity could suggest, by every outlet that could anywhere be made available, through every hardship to which the majority were most unaccustomed, the crowd of fugitives pressed forward eagerly from their once dearly-loved country. It is impossible to estimate with accuracy the number of the refugees. Sismondi (*Hist. de France*) computed that the total number of those who emigrated ranged from 300,000 to 400,000, and he was further of opinion that a like number perished in prison, on the scaffold, at the galleys, and in their attempts to escape; and Weiss (in his *History of the French Protestant Refugees*) thinks the number no less than 300,000 of those who departed the French kingdom. Vauban wrote, only a year after the Revocation, that France had lost 60,000,000 of francs in specie, 9000 sailors, 12,000 veterans, 600 officers, and her most flourishing manufactures; and Fénelon thus described the last years of the reign of Louis XIV: "The cultivation of the soil is almost abandoned; the towns and the country are becoming depopulated. All industries languish, and fail to support the laborers. France has become as but a huge hospital without provisions." The hospitable shores of England, which had long before this period furnished an asylum to the fugitive Huguenots, were now eagerly sought, and the Huguenots met with kindness and assistance from the English government. To Holland, also, and to Denmark, the best talent of the land, the most skilful artisans, directed their steps, and many great branches of industry of France, by the folly of a king who had taken his mistress as his first state counsellor, received their death-blow. The industry of some places was for a time completely prostrated. Indeed, more than a century really passed before they were restored to their former prosperity, "and then only to suffer another equally staggering blow from the violence and outrage which accompanied the outbreak of the French Revolution." In fact, this last terrible event may justly be considered not only as a providential retribution, but likewise a natural penalty for the civil wrongs inflicted upon the Protestants, since these cruel measures exiled from the country a large part of its piety and intelligence, by which alone that catastrophe might have been averted.

From the vicinity of Nismes, where the Huguenots had always been very numerous, thousands, unwilling either to abjure their faith or to leave their native country, betook themselves to the mountains of the Cevennes, and continued the exercise of their religion in secret. These, and the mountaineers of the Cevennes, among whom sprang up a sect which displayed a remarkable fanatical enthusiasm, under the name of Camisards (q. v.), finally commenced to wage war against the royal forces, which was called the *War of the Cevennes*, or the *Camisard War*. It was successfully carried on until 1706, when, in consequence of the war of succession with Spain, they were allowed a respite, the royal troops being otherwise employed. Their number now rapidly augmented, especially in Provence and Dauphiny, and thus, notwithstanding all the persecutions which the Protestants had suffered, about two millions continued to adhere to their religion (Charles Coquerel, *Hist. des Églises du Désert*, Par. 1841, 2 vols.).

A partial repose which the Huguenots now enjoyed for more than ten years greatly increased their numbers, especially in Provence and Dauphiny; but in 1724, Louis XV, who had ascended the throne in 1715, at the instigation of the ever-conspiring Jesuits, issued a very severe ordinance against them. The spirit of the age, however, was too much opposed to persecution to suffer the edict to work the mischief intended. The governors of several provinces tolerated the Protestants, and as early as 1743 they resumed their assemblies in the mountains and woods, and celebrated their *Mariages du désert*. In 1744 new edicts were issued against them, requiring upon those who had been baptized or married in the *desert* (as it was called) a repetition of the rite by the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church. Even the Roman Catholics themselves soon became loud in opposition against these violent measures, and the persecution gradually ceased. Men like Montesquieu and Voltaire successfully advocated mild treatment, and it

must be conceded that the Protestants owed much of the toleration they afterwards met with to Voltaire's treatise on the subject, written in 1763, and to his procuring the release of John Calas (q. v.). Their position was still further improved on the accession of Louis XVI to the throne (1774). In 1787 an edict was issued (which the Parliament, however, registered only in 1789) by which the validity of Protestant baptisms and marriages was recognised, though subject to some purely civil regulations; they were given cemeteries for the burial of their dead, were allowed to follow their religion privately, and granted the rights of citizenship, with the exception of the right of holding any official position.

After the breaking out of the French Revolution in 1789, a motion was made in the General Assembly to admit the Protestants to equal rights with the Roman Catholics: this motion was at first rejected, but finally carried. A decree of 1790 restored the Protestants to the possession of all the rights and property they had lost subsequently to the revocation of the edict of Nantes. The "Code Napoleon" placed the Protestants equal in their civil and political rights with the Roman Catholics, as, in fact, they had already been for more than fifteen years; and though, after the restoration of the Bourbons, especially in 1815 and 1816, the priests succeeded in exciting the populace of the department of the Gard to rise and murder the Protestants, the authorities conniving at the crime, still they remained equal to the Roman Catholics in the eye of the law. The spirit of persecution, however, continued, though in a somewhat weaker form, both among the people and the government of the Bourbons, even in that of the Orleans family, though, after the July Revolution of 1830, the reformed charter of France had proclaimed universal freedom of conscience and of worship, a principle which was reasserted in 1848. (For the present state of Protestantism in France, see FRANCE.)

The descendants of the Huguenots long kept themselves a distinct people in the countries to which their fathers had fled, and entertained hopes of a return to their country; but as time passed on these hopes grew fainter, while by habit and interest they became more united to the nations among whom it fell to their lot to establish a new home. The great crash of the first Revolution finally severed all the ties that bound them to their native land. They either changed their names themselves by translating them, or they were changed by the people among whom they resided by mispronunciation. Thus, in England, "the Lemaîtres called themselves Master; the Leroys, King; the Tonneliers, Cooper; the Lejeunes, Young; the Leblancs, White, the Lenoirs, Black; the Loiseaus, Bird. Thenceforward the French colony in London no longer existed. At the present day, the only vestige of it that remains is in the Spitalfields district, where a few thousand artisans, for the most part poor, still betray their origin, less by their language than by their costume, which bears some resemblance to that of the corresponding class in Louis XIV's time. The architecture of the houses they inhabit resembles that of the workmen of Lille, Amiens, and the other manufacturing towns of Picardy. The custom of working in cellars, or in glazed garrets, is also borrowed from their original country" (Weiss, p. 283, 284). In our own country also, where the Huguenots settled at an early day, their descendants may be found, particularly in New York, Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas; and, as in England, they have become naturalized, and their names have been changed, until it has become difficult to recognise them. "Their sons and grandsons, little by little, have become mingled with the society which gave a home to their fathers, in the same way as in England, Holland, and Germany. As their Church disappeared in America, the members became attached to other evangelical denominations, especially the Episcopal, Reformed Dutch, Methodist, and Presbyterian. The French language, too, has long since disappeared with their Church service, which used to call to mind the country of their ancestors. French was preached in Boston until the close of the last century, and at New York the Huguenot services were celebrated both in French and English as late as 1772. Here, at the French Protestant church, which succeeded the Huguenot years since, the Gospel was preached in the same language in which the prince of French pulpit orators, Saurin, used to declare divine truth two centuries ago. The Huguenot church at Charleston, South Carolina, alone has retained in its primitive purity, in their public worship, the old Calvinistic liturgy of its forefathers. The greater part of the exiled French families have long since disappeared, and their scattered communities have been dissolved by amalgamation with the other races around them. These pious fugitives have become public blessings throughout the world, and have increased in Germany, Holland, and England the elements of power, prosperity, and Christian development. In our land, too, they helped to lay the firm corner-stones of the great republic whose glory they most justly share" (G. P. Disosway, *The Huguenots in America*, as Appendix to Harper's edition of Smiles's *Huguenots*, p. 442). See Beza, *Hist. des Églises réformées en France* (Antw. 1580, 3 vols); Thuane, *Historia sui temporis* (Paris, 1620, and often, 7 vols.); Davila, *Storia delle guerre civili di Francia* (Venice, 1630); St. Aignon, *De l'état des Protestants en France* (Paris, 1808; 2d ed. 1818); Lacretelle, *Histoire de France pendant les guerres de la religion* (Paris, 1814, 1815, 4 vols.); Benoit, *Histoire de l'édit de Nantes* (Delft, 1693, 2 vols.); Rulhière, *Éclaircissements historiques sur les causes de la Révocation de l'Édit de Nantes* (Par. 1788, 2 vols.); Court de Gebelin, *Hist. des troubles des Cevennes* (Villefranche, 1760, 2 vols.); Browning, *Hist. of the Huguenots* (Lond. 1828, 2 vols.)· Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lexikon*, viii, 129 sq.; Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, viii, 583 sq.; Weiss, *History of the French Protestant Refugees;* Coquerel, *Histoire des Églises du désert* (Paris, 1857, 2 vols. 8vo); Felice, *Histoire des Protestants de France;* Peyrat, *Histoire des Pasteurs du Désert* (Paris, 2 vols. 8vo); Crowe, *History of France* (London, 1867, 1869, 5 vols.); Smiles, *The Huguenots* (3d edit. London, 1869); *Lond. Rev.* July, 1855; Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 450 sq. For special biographies, Haag, *La France Protestante* (Par. 8 vols. 8vo); Michelet, *Louis XIV et la Révocation de l'Édit de Nantes* (Paris, 1860, 8vo); Michelet, *Guerres de Religion* (Par. 1857, 8vo); Drion, *Histoire Chronol. de l'Église Protestante de France* (2 vols. 12mo); Smedley, *History of the Reformed Religion in France* (London, 1827, 3 vols.); Athanase Coquerel fils, *Les Forçats pour la foi* (Paris, 1868). (J. H. W.)

Hugues. See HUGO.

Huguet, MARC ANTOINE, a French prelate, was born at Moissac in 1757. He entered the sacred order in his youth, and became curate of a little village in Auvergne. In 1791 he was elected bishop of Creuse. During the French Revolution he was a member of the Legislature, and of the National Convention, and voted for the death of the king. Complicated in several popular disturbances, and conspiring against the established government, he was arrested in 1795, and imprisoned at Ham for several months. Engaging in another conspiracy which failed to accomplish its object, he was again arrested, condemned to death, and executed Oct. 6, 1769.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 466.

Huish, ALEXANDER, a learned English divine, who flourished in the 17th century, was fellow of Magdalen College, rector of Beckington and Hornblotton, Somersetshire. He published *Lectures on the Lord's Prayer* (Lond. 1626, 4to). He was also a very superior scholar of exegesis, and a prominent assistant on Walton's *Polyglot Bible.* His services were highly commented upon by bishop Walton himself. See Wrangham, *Proleg.* ii, 203; Todd, *Life of Walton*, p. 269 sq.; Stoughton (John), *Eccles. Hist. of Engl.* (London, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 332; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 58.

Huisseau, Jacques d', 1, a French theologian, was born in the latter half of the 16th century. He entered the monastery at Marmoutiers, and was made great prior of his order in 1594. Refusing in 1604 admission to Matthieu Renusson, visitor of the order of St. Benoît for the province of Tours, he was deposed from his position, deprived of all power, and excommunicated. He, however, succeeded in regaining his position. At the time of his death, Sept. 24, 1626, he was provincial of the Benedictine congregation of exempts in France. He published, for the use of his abbey, a collection of prayers, entitled *Enchiridion Precum* (Tours, 1607):—*Supplément à la Chronique des Abbés de Marmoutiers* (1615):—*Chronique des Prieurs* (1625). This last-named work Huisseau translated himself into Latin.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 468 sq.

Huisseau, Jacques d', 2, another French minister and theologian, who flourished in the 17th century. But little is known of his early life. He was professor of theology at Saumur, and rendered himself famous by his *La disciple des Églises Reformées de France, avec un recueil des observations et questions sur la plupart des articles tiré des actes des synodes nationaux* (1650, 4to, probably published at Saumur; Geneva, 1666, 4to; Bionne, near Orleans, 1675, 12mo). The great success which followed this work estranged from him many of his acquaintances and associates in the Church, who envied his prospects, and who even presented complaints against him in 1656, meeting, however, with no encouragement from the superiors of Huisseau. In 1670 he published *La Réunion du Christianisme, ou la matiere de rejoindre les Chrétiens dans une seule Confession de foi* (Saumur, 12mo). It favored the union of all who believed in Christ as the God or man Saviour, and was attacked by La Bastide in his *Remarques sur un livre intitulé "La Réunion,"* etc. (1670, 12mo), and it was condemned by the Synod of Anjou. Huisseau endeavored to explain his views, but the synod declined to give him a hearing, and finally deposed him from the priesthood. He emigrated to England, and was reinstated as minister without being obliged to retract. He died there before 1690, about 70 years of age.—*Biographie Universelle,* lxvii, 441.

Huit, Ephraim, a dissenting English minister, of whose early life but little is known. He was minister for some time at Roxhall, Warwickshire, and finally emigrated to this country, and settled in New England. He became minister of a congregation at Windsor, Conn., and died in 1644. Huit published, in his mother country, *Prophecie of Daniel explained* (Lond. 1643, 4to).—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors,* i, 913.

Huk'kok (Hebrew *Chukkok',* חֻקֹּק, *incised;* Sept. Ἰκώκ v. r. Ἰακανά, Vulg. *Hucusa*), a town on the border of Naphtali, near Zebulon, not far from Jordan, west of Aznoth-Tabor, and in the direction of Asher (Josh. xix, 34); elsewhere written Hukok (חוּקֹק, *Chukok',* 1 Chron. vi, 75; Sept. Ἰακάκ, Vulg. *Hucac*); but probably, in this latter passage, erroneously for Helkath (Josh. xxi, 35; comp. xix, 25). Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Icoc), as well as Benj. of Tudela (ii, 421), allude to it. It is doubtless identical with the modern small village *Yakuk,* between the plain of Genesareth and Safed (Robinson's *Researches,* iii, App. p. 133; *Biblioth. Sac.* 1843, p. 80), said to contain the grave of Habakkuk (see new edit. of *Researches,* iii, 81; and comp. Schwarz, *Palestine,* p. 182).

Hu'kok (1 Chron. vi, 75). See Hukkok.

Hul (Heb. *Chul,* חוּל, *a circle;* Sept. Οὖλ), the name of the second son of Aram (B.C. cir. 2414), who appears to have given name to an Aramæan region settled by him (Gen. x, 23; 1 Chron. i, 17). Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 4) places it (Οὖλον, as Havercamp corrects for Ὄτρος) in Armenia, comparing it with the district *Cholobotene,* according to the conjecture of Bochart (*Phaleg,* ii, 9). Michaelis, taking the word in the sense of a *hollow* or valley (*Spicileg.* ii, 135), understands *Cœle-Syria* (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 7, 1; 1 Macc. iii, 13); and Schultens (*Parad.* p. 282) refers it to the southern part of Mesopotamia, from the signification *sand.* More probable seems the identification proposed by Rosenmüller (*Alterthum.* i, 2, p. 253) with the district now called *Huleh,* around the lake Merom, at the upper sources of the Jordan (Burckhardt, *Trav.* i, 87), which, although a small tract and no proper part of Aramæa, seems to be supported by the rendering of Saadias (compare Schwarz, *Palestine,* p. 41, note). According to Dr. Robinson, the name el-Huleh, as used by the present inhabitants, belongs strictly to the northern part of the basin in which the lake lies, but is commonly extended to embrace the whole; its different quarters fall within various jurisdictions, and have special names (*Researches,* iii, 342). A great portion of this northern tract near the lake is now an impassable marsh, probably in consequence of the choking up of the streams by rubbish (*Bibliotheca Sacra,* 1846, p. 200, 201). The remainder is a very fertile plain, forming a valley near Banias (Robinson's *Researches,* new ed. iii, 396–398). Traces of the name Hul or Huleh appear in the district *Ulatha* (Οὐλάθα) around Paneas, mentioned by Josephus as originally belonging to Zenodorus, and bestowed by Augustus upon Herod (*Ant.* xv, 10, 3; comp. *Wars,* i, 20, 4). See Merom.

Hulda or **Holda** (the *friendly,* or benignant), a German goddess, known in the old legends as "Frau Holle," was originally the goddess of marriage and fecundity, worshipped and invoked by maids and wives; she sent bridegrooms to the former and children to the latter. She was represented as a beautiful white woman, surrounded by great numbers of children, in her favorite haunts in the depths of the sea or the hearts of hills. She was also the patroness of agriculture and domestic life, with its manifold employments. Later she appears in the fairy tales of Hesse and Thuringia—probably written by Christian priests—as an old and ugly woman, with a long nose, large teeth, coarse hair, and a companion of the wild and the roaming. But even in these last tales traces of kind and pleasant ways are left. —Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 480; Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 453. (J. H. W.)

Hul'dah (Hebrew *Chuldah',* חֻלְדָּה, *weasel;* Sept. Ὀλδὰν, Josephus Ὀλδά, *Ant.* x, 4, 2), wife of Shallum, a prophetess, who, in the reign of Josiah, abode in that part of Jerusalem called the Mishneh, where the book of the law was discovered by the high-priest Hilkiah. B.C. 623. This prophetess was consulted respecting the denunciations which it contained. She then delivered an oracular response of mingled judgment and mercy; declaring the not remote destruction of Jerusalem, but promising Josiah that he should be taken from the world before these evil days came (2 Kings xxii, 14–20; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 22–28). Huldah is only known for this circumstance. She was probably at this time the widow of Shallum, a name too common to suggest any information; he is said to have been "keeper of the wardrobe," but whether the priestly or the royal wardrobe is uncertain. If the former, he must have been a Levite, if not a priest. See Harhas. As to her residence בַּמִּשְׁנֶה, in the Mishneh, which the A.V. renders "in the college," there is no ground to conclude that any school or college of the prophets is to be understood. The name means *second* or *double;* and many of the Jews themselves (as Jarchi states) understood it as the name of the suburb lying between the inner and outer wall of Jerusalem; perhaps i. q. "the lower city," or *Acra* (q. v.). It is safest to regard it as a proper name denoting some quarter of Jerusalem about which we are not certain, and, accordingly, to translate *in the Mishneh,* for which we have the precedent of the Septuagint, which has ἐν τῇ Μασενᾷ. The place of her residence is mentioned probably to show why she, being at hand, was resorted to on this urgent occasion, and not Jere-

miah, who was then probably away at his native town Anathoth, or at some more distant place. There were gates of the temple in the middle of the southern wall, called "the gates of Huldah" (Mishna, tit. *Middoth*, i, 3), which, if they were so named from any connection with the prophetess, may indicate her residence on Ophel. See SHALLUM; JOSIAH.

Huldericus, AUGUSTENSIS EPISCOPUS, who flourished in 860, was a scholar of Adalbert, and descended from the counts of Kilbury and Dillengen. He is known by his letter addressed to pope Nicholas against the celibacy of the clergy (*Epistola de Cleri cœlibatu*). It was translated into English, and published about the time of the Reformation (in 16mo), without date.—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica;* Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Literature*, ii, 531.

Huldrich, JEAN JACQUES, a Swiss theologian, born at Zürich in 1683, belonged to a family of which several members have distinguished themselves as theologians and philologists. See HULDERICUS. He devoted much of his time to the acquisition of Hebrew, and went to the universities of Holland to pursue a course of study in the Oriental languages. On his return to his native place in 1706 he was made pastor of the House of Orphans. In 1710 he was appointed professor of moral science at the Gymnasium of Zürich. His scholarship was of a superior order, and he was frequently solicited to accept a professorship at the universities of Heidelberg and Groningen. He died at Zürich May 25, 1731. He published *Historia Jeschua Nazareni, a Judæis blaspheme corrupta, ex manuscripto hactenus inedito Heb. et Lat., cum notis* (Leyd. 1705, 8vo):—*Gentilis Obtrectator, sive de calumniis gentilium in Judæos commentarius* (Zürich, 1744, 4to), a collection of sermons, etc.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 470 sq.

Hull, HOPE, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born March 13, 1763, in Worcester County, on the eastern shore of Maryland. His early education was rather neglected, and he was apprenticed to a carpenter at Baltimore. In this city he was converted, and entered the itinerancy in 1785. He was first appointed to Salisbury, North Carolina. With the exception of a brief period spent in New England, his time was given to the introduction of Methodism in the Southern States. His last appointment was the Savannah Circuit, Georgia. In 1794 he travelled with bishop Asbury, and located in 1795. He died October 4, 1818, at Athens, Ga. Hull possessed wonderful power over those who came within his influence, and was one of the most eloquent ministers in the Methodist Episcopal Church in his day. His piety was deep, and many were converted under his labors. During his active work in the ministry, he secured for himself a pretty good education, and was at one time able even to assume the duties of teacher of Latin. He was also one of the first and strongest supports of the University of Georgia, which was founded during his residence at Athens.—Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, chap. ix; Boehm, *Histor. Reminisc.* p. 366; Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit*, vii, 112 sq. (J. H. W.)

Huln, GUILLAUME, a Roman cardinal, born at Étain, in the diocese of Verdun, in the latter half of the 14th century. He was at one time archdeacon of Verdun, and later of Metz. He was an attendant at the Council of Basle in 1440, and was one of the supporters of the antipope (Amadeus of Savoy) Felix V, who gave him the cardinal's hat. Nicholas V confirmed the cardinal after the schism Dec. 19, 1449. He died at Rome Oct. 28, 1455.—Migne, *Dict. Theol.* xxxi, 1092.

Hulot, HENRI LOUIS, a French theologian, was born at Avenay March 1, 1757. He was professor first at the seminary, then at the University of Rouen, where he was obliged to resign at the outbreak of the Revolution, and to flee from persecution which threatened him. He went to Gand, where he was made grand-vicar, until the entrance of the French into the Netherlands in 1794 forced him again to flee. He went successively to Münster, Erfurt, Dresden, and Augsburg. When he was permitted to return to his native land, he was appointed curate of the parish of Avançon, and later of Antigny. After twenty years of assiduous labor at this parish, he was made canon, and finally grand vicar and official at Rheims. He died Sept. 1, 1829. His principal writings are *Lettre aux catholiques de Reims* (in Latin and French, Gand, 1793, 8vo):—*Lettre des prêtres Français à l'évêque de Gand:*—*Collect. des brefs du pape Pie VI* (Augsb. 1796):—*Lettres à M. Schrofenberg, évêque de Freysingue et de Ratisbonne, en faveur des prêtres Franç.* (1796, 8vo):—*État des Cathol. Angl.* (1798, 8vo):—*Salisburgensis cujusdem religiosi delecta castigatio, seu vindiciæ cleri Gallicani exulis* (1800, 8vo):—*Gallicanorum Episcoporum dissensus innocuus* (1801, 8vo):—*Sedis apostolicæ Triumphus, seu sedes apostolica, protectore deo, semper invicta* (Laon, 1836, 8vo). Several controversial works and sermons were left in MS.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 479.

Hulse, JOHN, was born at Middlewich in 1708. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; obtained a small curacy in the country; and, upon the death of his father in 1753, withdrew to his paternal inheritance in Cheshire, where, owing to his delicate state of health, he lived in retirement until his death, Dec. 14, 1790. He bequeathed estates in order to found two divinity scholarships in St. John's College, the Hulsean Prize Essay, and to endow the offices of "Christian Advocate" and "Christian Preacher" in the University of Cambridge. The duties of the "Christian Preacher," or Hulsean Lecturer, according to this appointment, were to deliver and print twenty sermons every year, either upon the evidences of Christianity, or the difficulties of Holy Scripture. The funds being inadequate, the lectures were not commenced until 1820, and in 1830 the number of sermons to be delivered in a year was reduced to eight. In 1860 the office of "Christian Advocate" was changed to a professorship, called the Hulsean Professorship of Divinity. Bishop Ellicot was the first incumbent in the new chair. At present the office of the Hulsean Lecturer or Preacher is annual, and the duty of the lecturer to preach not less than four, nor more than six sermons in the course of the year. Among the most important of the Hulsean sermons are the following: Blunt (J. J.), *Principles for the proper Understanding of the Mosaic Writings*, 1832 (Lond. 1833, 8vo); Alford, *The Consistency of the Divine Conduct in revealing the Doctrines of Redemption*, 1841 (Cambridge, 1842, 8vo); Trench, *The Fitness of the Holy Scripture for unfolding the Spiritual Life of Man*, 1845 (Cambridge, 1845, 8vo); Trench, *Christ the Desire of all Nations*, 1846 (Cambridge, 1846, 8vo); Wordsworth, *On the Canon of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and on the Apocrypha*, 1847 (Lond. 1848, 8vo); Wordsworth, *Lectures on the Apocalypse, critical, expository, and practical*, 1848 (Lond. 1849, 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1573; Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 453; Farrar, *Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 207.

Hulsean Lectures. See HULSE, JOHN.

Hülsemann, JOHANN, a German theologian, was born in Ostfriesland in 1602, and was educated at the universities of Wittenberg and Leipzig. In 1629 he was appointed professor of theology at the University of Wittenberg; he was also a member of the "Leipziger Convent" of 1630, and of the "Colloquium" at Thorn in 1645, where he performed the office of *moderator theologorum Augustanæ confessionis*. In 1646 he was called as professor of systematic theology to the University of Leipzig. He died in 1661. In connection with his son-in-law, Calovius (q. v.), he carried on the controversy against Calvinism as a strictly orthodox Lutheran. An able polemic and a thoroughly educated theologian, who in many respects may be compared to the scholastics of the 16th century, Hülsemann distinguished in his attacks against Calvinism (in his work *Calvinismus irreconciliabilis*, Witt. 1644, Lpz. 1646), incited

by bishop Joseph Hall's *Roma irreconciliabilis*, the fundamental articles and the presuppositions from the possible inferences. His most celebrated work is *Breviarum theolog. exhibens præcipuas fidei controversias* (1640, and often), and in an enlarged form, *Extensio breviarii theologici* (1655, 1657).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 304 sq.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* i, 372; Gass, *Protest. Dogmat.* i, 318 sq.; ii, 38 sq.; Tholuck, *Geist. d. luther. Theol. Wittenberg's*, p. 164 sq.

Human Depravity. See DEPRAVITY.

Humanists (from the Latin *literæ humaniores*, polite letters) was the name assumed in the beginning of the 16th century by a party which, with Erasmus and Reuchlin at their head, was especially devoted to the cultivation of classical literature, and which, as not unfrequently happens in the enthusiasm of a new pursuit, was arrayed in opposition to the received system of the schools, not alone in the study of the classical languages, but even in philosophy, and eventually in theology. See Chambers, *Cyclop.* vol. v.; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 406 sq.; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 35, 127.

Humanitarians. I. A name given to those several classes of anti-Trinitarians who believe that Christ was nothing more than a mere man, born according to the usual course of nature, and one who lived and died according to the ordinary circumstances of mankind. As such are generally regarded the early Judaizing sects of Ebion, Cerinthus, and Carpocrates; but this classification is by no means justified, especially as regards the Ebionites (q. v.), who taught that at the baptism in the Jordan the Messianic calling first arose in Jesus, and that at this time a higher spirit joined itself to him, investing him with miraculous powers, that left him only at the hour of his departure from this world. The earliest recorded author of the purely humanitarian theory is generally regarded as Theodotus (q. v.) of Byzantium (A.D. 196), surnamed the Tanner, who, having denied Christ in time of persecution, defended himself afterwards by declaring that, in so doing, "he had denied not God, but man." A contemporary of Theodotus, Artemon (q. v.), in like manner believed in God the creator, but held that Christ was a mere man, born of a virgin, however, and superior to the prophets, and asserted that such had been the universal belief of Christians till the time of Zephyrinus, 202 (comp. Liddon, *Our Lord's Divinity* [Bampton Lect. 1866], p. 425). These opinions must of course be distinguished from the doctrines of the Arian sects, even the lowest schools of which admit the pre-existence of Christ, and his pre-eminence among the creatures of God. See ALOGI; ARIANS; ARTEMONITES; SOCINIANS; UNITARIANS.

II. The name Humanitarian is also sometimes applied to the disciples of St. Simon (the successor of Babœuf, who flourished under Napoleon I), and in general to those who look to the perfectibility of human nature as their great moral and social dogma, and ignore altogether the dependence of man upon supernatural aid, believing in the all-sufficiency of his own innate powers. A party of Communists who arose in France about 1839 also took the name from the newspaper *L'humanitaire*, their organ.—Buck, *Theol. Dict.*; Pierer, *Univers. Lex.*; Chambers, *Cyclop.*; Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, i, 259. See COMMUNISM.

Humanity, the exercise of the social and benevolent virtues; a fellow-feeling for the distresses of another. It is properly called humanity because there is little or nothing of it in brutes. The social affections are conceived by all to be more refined than the selfish. Sympathy and humanity are universally esteemed the finest temper of mind, and for that reason the prevalence of the social affections in the progress of society is held to be a refinement of our nature.

HUMANITY AND CHRISTIANITY. See CHRISTIANITY.

HUMANITY OF CHRIST. See CHRIST, PERSON OF; CHRISTOLOGY; INCARNATION.

Human Sacrifices. See SACRIFICE.

Human Soul. See SOUL.

Humbert (by some improperly called HUBERT), a French cardinal, was born probably towards the close of the 10th century. He entered the order of the Benedictines at Moyen-le-Moutier in 1015. In 1049 pope Leo IX, who had been bishop of Toul, the diocese in which the monastery of Moyen-le-Moutier was situated, called Humbert to Rome, and he was first created archbishop of Sicily, and in 1051 cardinal bishop of Silva Candida. Humbert is believed to be the first Frenchman who received the cardinal's hat. He was intimately associated with the pope, was admitted to all his councils, and was the Roman ambassador to Constantinople to effect a union with the Eastern or Greek Church. Under pope Victor III he was made chancellor and librarian at the Vatican, which offices he continued to hold under the pontifical successors Etienne III, Nicolas II, and Alexander II. He was at the head of the party opposed to Berenger, and obliged him to make a confession of faith at the synod at Rome in 1059. He died about 1063. He wrote a number of works, among others a treatise against the Simonians (published by Martene in his *Anecdota*), and a narrative of his embassy to Constantinople. This narrative and two other polemical works against the Greek Church have been printed several times, especially in the *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Baronius. All his writings have been collected and printed by Migne, vol. cxliii (1853), p. 929-1278.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 483; Migne, *Encyclop. Théol.* xxxi, 1092 sq.

Humbert, general of the order of Dominican monks, was born at Romans, France, about 1200. He was early sent to Paris to be educated as a clergyman, and soon became prominent as an assistant preacher to the celebrated Jourdan. He entered the order in 1224, and was made priest at Lyons. In 1242 he was elected "provincial" of Tuscany, in 1244 "provincial" of France, and in 1254 general of his order. In 1263, however, he abdicated this high position, and retired as a simple monk, first to a monastery at Lyons, and later to a like institution at Valencia. The patriarchate of Jerusalem was offered him in 1264, but he declined it. He died July 14, 1277. He wrote *Officium Ecclesiasticum universum tam nocturnum quam diurnum, ad usum ordinis prædicatorum*:—*Expositio super regulam St. Augustini*:—*Expositio super Constitutiones ordinis fratrum prædicatorum*, not quite complete:—*Liber de instructione officialium ordinis fratrum prædicatorum* (printed several times; the best edition, Lyons, 1515):—*De Eruditione Prædicatorum*, also entitled *De Arte prædicandi*, has been inserted in the *Collection of the Church Fathers*, vol. xxv:—*Liber de Prædicatione Crucis*, an appeal to the Christians against infidels:—*Liber de eis quæ tractanda videbantur in Concilio generali Lugduni celebrando*, of which extracts were published by Martène in his *Thesaurus Anecdot.* vol. vii, etc.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxv, 483 sq.

Humbert, a French theologian, was born at Gendrex, near Paris, about the middle of the 13th century. In July, 1296, he was elected abbé of Prulli, in the diocese of Sens, and he died there March 14, 1298. He wrote several theological and philosophical works, all of which remain unprinted. His most important work is *Sententiæ super libros Metaphysicæ Aristotelis*, a commentary on Aristotle's metaphysics.—Hoefer, *Nouveau Biog. Générale*, xxv, 485; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xxi, 86.

Humble Access, PRAYER OF, is a phrase in some churches for a divine supplication made by the priest kneeling at the altar before the consecration.

Hume, DAVID, the most notable man of letters and speculation in Scotland during the last century. He was almost equally eminent as a metaphysician, a historian, and a political essayist. He was born at Edinburgh April 26 (O. S.), 1711. On his father's side he

was related to the earls of Home or Hume, and through his mother he was the grandson of Sir David Falconer, lord president of the court of justice. His father was not rich, but he was an independent proprietor, owning the estate of Ninewells, in Berwickshire. But David was the younger son, and was entitled to only a small share of his father's substance. He was left an orphan in his infancy, and, with his brother and one sister, depended on the sole care of his excellent mother. He passed without special note through the University, and was designed for the Scotch bar, but he had no taste for the profession; and having spent seven years at home at Ninewells, after leaving college, ostensibly engaged in studying the sages of the law, he visited Bristol in 1733 with some mercantile aspirations. Thence, after a few months of disgust, he passed over into France, and took up his abode first at Rheims, and afterwards at La Flêchi. Here he devoted himself to philosophy for life, and composed his *Treatise of Human Nature*. It was in a discussion with one of the Jesuit fathers of La Flêchi that the celebrated argument against miracles flashed upon his mind. The *Treatise of Human Nature* was published in 1737, after his return to England. He says himself of it, "It fell dead-born from the press." The family home at Ninewells was again his shelter, and here he renewed his studies and extended his speculations. In 1742 he published the first part of his *Essays, Moral and Political*, which, in his opinion, met with considerable favor. Still, he had obtained no assured provision in life. He was disappointed in an application for a professorship in the University of Edinburgh, and in 1745 he accepted the charge of the marquis of Annandale. With him he resided twelve unpleasant months, but he derived some emolument from the association. In 1746 he became secretary to general St. Clair, whom in 1747 he attended on his military embassy to Vienna and Turin. The *Inquiry concerning the Human Understanding*—a recast of the first part of his first treatise—was published while he was at Turin. In 1749 he resought his old refuge at Ninewells, and occupied himself with the composition of his *Political Discourses*, and his *Inquiry into the principles of Morals*. The former constituted the second part of his essays; the latter was a revision and modification of the second part of his *Treatise of Human Nature*, which has always been better known in Germany than in England. In 1751, on the marriage of his brother, he abandoned the family seat, and, in company with his sister, made a new home in Edinburgh. He applied for a chair in the University of Glasgow, but again failed. In 1752 he accepted the post of librarian to the Advocates' Library in Edinburgh, but transferred nearly all his small salary to the blind poet, Blacklock. He now engaged in the composition of his *History of England*, which had attracted his regards some years before. The partisan temper in which it is designed is revealed by the period which he first took up. He plunged *in medias res*, or, rather, he commenced nearly at the end, and worked backwards. From its publication Hume experienced such hostility and disappointment that he would have changed his name and retired to the Continent if he had not been prevented by the occurrence of the Seven Years' War. The first volume of the *History of England* appeared in 1754; the second in 1756 or 1757. Between the two was published the *Natural History of Religion* (8vo), which was answered by bishop Hurd. The *History of the House of Tudor* came out in two volumes in 1759; and in 1761, two volumes, containing the early history of England, completed the work, which, before its conclusion, was recognised as an English classic, and still is justly so regarded. If the work encountered various and violent opposition, it gradually achieved eminent popularity, and rendered the author "not only independent, but opulent." Being now "turned of fifty," he resolved to spend the remainder of his life in philosophical dignity and comfortable retirement. The resolve was of no long duration. The marquis of Hertford invited Hume, with whom he was personally unacquainted, to become his secretary of legation at the French court. The distinguished philosopher and historian was received with marked attentions and flatteries by the eminent persons assembled at Paris. It was the period when the union of infidel sentiments with literary renown had become the rage in the most brilliant *salons*. After two years lord Hertford was recalled, but Hume remained as *chargé d'affaires* till 1766, and received a pension of £400 for his diplomatic services. The "canny Scot" had become a rich old bachelor, and was able to extend his patronage and aid to Rousseau on his arrival in England, and even to procure for him the offer of a pension from the crown. These favors ended in a quarrel between the protected and the protector, of which an account was given by the latter in a pamphlet. About this time Hume became under-secretary of state, and held the office for two years, returning to Edinburgh in 1769. Here he passed the remaining years of his life, with the exception of a brief visit to Harrowgate and Bath, and it was shortly before setting out on this journey, undertaken for the restoration of his declining health, that he wrote his *Autobiography*. He had been attacked with diarrhœa in the spring of 1775, and succumbed to the disease on Sunday, Aug. 25, 1776. He was serene in life, he was equally serene in death. If Christianity had no consolations for an expiring foe, the grave presented no terrors to the man who had cavilled about all religion. Yet few persons will assent to the unmeasured eulogy of Adam Smith, who "considered him, both in his life, and since his death, as approaching as nearly to the idea of a perfectly wise and virtuous man as perhaps the nature of human frailty will permit." But Smith, notwithstanding this testimony, refused to publish the *Dialogues on Natural Religion*, though a special legacy of £200 was attached to such publication. They were not given to the world until 1779, and then by the agency of Hume's nephew. His *Life, written by himself, with a Letter from Adam Smith giving an Account of his Death*, appeared in 1777 (Lond. 8vo). A better view of the life and the character of Hume than this edition of his autobiography is given in the *Autobiography of Alexander Carlyle* (Edinb. and N. Y. 1860).

The philosophy of Hume underwent three revisions, with, however, scarcely any essential change. It has been customary to enlarge upon the acumen and logical precision of Hume, but these qualifications resolve themselves, on close scrutiny, into mere dialectical subtlety. If his artifices imposed upon others, he was often the victim of them himself, and he was crushed to the earth beneath the ruins of the systems which he overthrew. Hume's fundamental thesis is that all *human* knowledge (no pun is designed) consists of *impressions* and *ideas*. *Impressions* are the direct perceptions of sense: *ideas* are only the relics or signs of former impressions. *Impressions* are always particular, and incapable of variation: *ideas* are consequently the unalterable spectres of former sensations. The theory of Locke is accepted and simplified by discarding the office of reflection. The theory of Berkeley is accepted and expanded by applying his argument against matter to mind, and denying all evidence of the existence of either. The result is a thoroughly Pyrrhonistic doubt. The application of these postulates, for postulates they are, generated the whole philosophy of Hume. There are only two objects of knowledge—the relations of ideas, and the relations of impressions or facts. The former relations are concerned with unchanging signs, and are therefore simple, and readily discerned by the discursion of thought; but the latter always involve the principle of *cause* and *effect*, because due to some exciting influence. The relation of cause and effect is nothing more than the habitual succession of events; because all our complex conceptions are linked together only by customary association, and it is impossible that particular objects should produce a general idea. General ideas are, indeed, im-

possibilities, for all abstractions are only vague images of particulars. Ideas may represent either realities or phenomena, but no investigations can reach beyond the phenomenon to the reality. This reality is a pure delusion—a figment; it is only the name arbitrarily given to a system of connected impressions and ideas. There is neither reality nor substance, neither matter nor mind; at least, there is nothing to authorize the assertion of their existence except as factitious phenomena. The connection of phenomena, or of the conceptions corresponding with them, is accepted as truth in consequence of a primordial tendency of the mind, called belief. This belief, however, imports nothing more than the tenacity of certain notions in consequence of the vivacity of the impressions by which they are produced. The credibility of facts is thus resolved into their apprehensibility, and becomes merely a question of probabilities. This constitution of belief, and this complexion of knowledge, result from the mode in which the materials of thought are obtained. They are gathered by observation and experience, and are distinguished into two, and only two classes, according to their relative strength—*impressions* and *ideas;* the former being the primary and more forcible perceptions; the latter being the derivative and weaker, and being only copies of impressions. Further than this it is impossible to carry speculation. The mind, the instrument of thought, lies beyond; but its nature is discernible only in its operations, and these constitute its whole nature so far as any attainable knowledge is concerned. Thus the human mind is the mould and measure of all knowledge, and yet that mind is itself only a problematical phenomenon. A good-humored scepticism is accordingly the sole result of philosophy.

From this brief and imperfect synopsis of Hume's doctrine—so well summed up by Mackintosh: "He aimed at proving, not that nothing was known, but that nothing could be known"—it is easy to recognise the mode in which he reached its most startling applications. He might assert the moral sense, but the assertion was nugatory, for there could be no foundation for morals, nor anything more valid than expediencies growing out of particular impressions and their observed sequences. He might admit the possibility, even the probability, of divine intelligence, but could not tell whether it was "*ane or mair*," since revelation could not be substituted for sensible perceptions. The scheme had no room for the admission of miracles, as they were unsupported by ordinary experience, and human testimony was fallacious. All this mischievous error is the appropriate fruit of the tree on which it hangs. Many refutations of these positions have been attempted, and a vigorous warfare has been waged on the principles supposed to form the foundation of this philosophy; but too little attention has been paid to the ambiguity of the terms employed, and to the vacillation with which they are used by the conjuror. A strict definition of "miracles" and "experience," and a rigid adherence to such definition, will reduce the celebrated argument against miracles to a bald *petitio principii,* or to a manifest absurdity. Hume endeavored to prove that "no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle," and the reasoning employed for this purpose is, that "a miracle being a violation of the laws of nature, which a firm and unalterable experience has established, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can be; whereas our experience of human veracity, which (according to him) is the sole foundation of the evidence of testimony, is far from being uniform, and can, therefore, never preponderate against that experience which admits of no exception." This boasted and plausible argument has, with equal candor and acuteness, been examined by Dr. Campbell, in his *Dissertation on Miracles,* who justly observes that, so far is experience from being the sole foundation of the evidence of testimony, that, on the contrary, testimony is the sole foundation of by far the greater part of what Mr. Hume calls firm and unalterable experience; and that if, in certain circumstances, we did not give an implicit faith to testimony, our knowledge of events would be confined to those which had fallen under the immediate observation of our own senses. Hume maintained that a miracle is contrary to experience; but, in reality, it is only different from ordinary experience. That diseases should *generally* be cured by the application of medicine, and *sometimes* at the mere word of a prophet, are facts not inconsistent with each other in the nature of things themselves, nor irreconcilable according to our ideas. Each fact may arise from its own proper cause; each may exist independently of the other; and each is known by its own proper proof, whether of sense or testimony. To pronounce, therefore, a miracle to be false, because it is different from ordinary experience, is only to conclude against its existence from the very circumstance which constitutes its specific character; for if it were not different from ordinary experience, where would be its singularity? or what proof could be drawn from it in attestation of a divine message? See MIRACLES.

The importance and value of Hume's political essays have rarely been appreciated. They are the best of all his productions, but they have been almost disregarded in the estimation of his genius. They exercised a considerable but unacknowledged influence on the age nearest his own. It is impossible to ignore the obligations of the Constitution of the United States to the essay on the Idea of a Perfect Commonwealth. Lord Brougham does no more than justice to the author when he declares that "Mr. Hume is, beyond doubt, the author of the modern doctrines which now rule the world of science, which are to a great extent the guide of practical statesmen; . . . for no one deserving the name of legislator pretends to doubt the soundness of the theory." Many of the intellectual vices, as all the excellences of Hume—his speculative audacity, his regard for material comfort and independence, his want of enthusiasm, the restriction of his view to observation and experience, his acceptance of expediency as a principle, his acquaintance with courts and with affairs of state, his knowledge of history, his philosophic habits, his slow progress from pinched to easy circumstances, all favored proficiency in this branch of inquiry. Many of these characteristics were, however, adverse to his career as an historian. True, in Hume's *History of England,* the vigorous, easy, and unaffected style, the vivacity of the delineations, the arrangement of the topics, the disposition of the personages, the variety and penetration of the reflections, are all admirable. The narrative is always fascinating, if the expression is rarely idiomatic, sometimes ungrammatical, and often provincial. But to the highest merits of history it possesses no claim. It is hastily, carelessly, and inaccurately composed; it is incurious of truth; it disregards authentic sources of information from indolence and indifference; it is equally partial and prejudiced. In form, it is a model of historical art, but not of the art in its highest conception; in substance and in spirit it displays nearly every sin and corruption which a historian should abhor. His writings called forth many antagonists, and, in fact, may be said to have given rise to the Scotch metaphysical school of *Common Sense,* so called, of which the best exposition, and, at the same time, the best answer to Hume's scepticism, is to be proved by Reid's *Complete Works, with Notes by Sir William Hamilton* (Edinburgh, 1846, 8vo). Beattie's *Essay on Truth,* and Oswald's *Appeal to Common Sense* (Edinb. 1772, 2 vols.), were also written in reply to Hume.

See *The Philosophical Works of David Hume, including all the Essays, and exhibiting the more important Alterations and Corrections in the successive Editions published by the Author* (Edinburgh and Boston, 1854, 4 vols. 8vo); Burton, *Life and Letters of David Hume* (Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); *Letters of eminent Persons addressed to David Hume* (Edinb. and Lond. 1820, 4to);

Brougham, *Lives of Men of Letters and of Science* (London, 1845, 8vo); Tennemann, *Manual History of Philos.* § 376; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Morell, *Hist. of Mod. Philosophy*, pt. i, ch. iii; Sir Wm. Hamilton, *Lect. on Metaphysics;* Mackintosh, *Hist. of Ethical Philos.* p. 146 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 914 sq.; Lewes, *History of Philos.* ii, 305 sq.; Tennemann, *Gesch. d. Philos.* xi, 425 sq.; Ritter, *Christl. Philos.* viii, 6, 7, ch. ii; Cousin, *Hist. de la Philos. moderne*, Leçon xi; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 148 sq.; *Edinb. Rev.* Jan. 1847; *Quart. Review*, lxxiii, 292; lxxvii, 40; 1844, p. 315 sq.; *Blackwood's Magazine* (on the argument against miracles), xlvi, 91 sq.; June, 1869; *Brit. Review*, Aug. 1847, p. 288; 1868, p. 77 sq.; *New Englander*, i, 169, 172; ii, 212; iv, 405; xviii, 168; *North American Review*, lxxix, 536 sq.; *Christ. Remembrancer*, Oct. 1868, p. 272; *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* Oct. 1865, p. 826 sq.; *Contemp. Review*, May, 1869, art. vi, reprinted in the *Amer. Presbyt. Rev.* July, 1869, art. viii. (G. F. H.)

Humerale. See AMICE.

Humiliāti, a monastic order founded about 1134 by some Italian noblemen whom the emperor Henry II had sent as hostages to Germany. In 1151 they were transformed into canons of St. Benedict, and as such received the sanction of pope Innocent III in 1200. A corresponding order of nuns was afterwards organized in Milan by a lady named Blassoni (whence they were also called *Nuns of Blassoni*). Notwithstanding the numerous disorders they occasioned, these nuns did great good as nurses, etc.; their rule was adopted in some ninety-eight convents, but they were finally suppressed by Pius V in 1571. A few convents, without particular attention to dress and observances of the old order, still remain in Italy. The habit of the order consisted in a white dress and cloak, to which a white scapulary was afterwards added; also a small hood. The nuns' dress was white, with gray under-garments, or vice versa.—Pierer, *Univers. Lexikon*, viii, 609; Fehr, *Allgem. Gesch. der Mönchsorden* (Tüb. 1845), p. 132 sq.; Helyot, *Geschichte d. Klöster u. Ritterorden*, vi, 179 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iii, 347; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 396 sq. (J. H. W.)

Humiliation OF CHRIST (in the language of the older Reformed theologians, the *status humiliationis sive exinanitionis*), the "humbling of himself" (Phil. ii, 8) to which the son of God submitted in accomplishing the redemption of mankind. As to the question whether the Logos, at the incarnation, voluntarily divested himself of his divine self-consciousness in order to develop himself in purely human form, see KENOSIS. On the question of his descent into Hades, see HELL, DESCENT INTO. For monographs on this subject, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 34; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 113.

The humiliation of Christ is generally set forth by theologians as shown in his birth, his circumstances, temptation, sufferings, and death. 1. *In his birth:* he was born of a *woman*—a sinful woman; though *he* was without sin (Gal. iv, 4); of a *poor* woman (Luke ii, 7, 24); in a poor country village (John i, 46); in a stable—an abject place; of a nature subject to infirmities (Heb. ii, 9), hunger, thirst, weariness, pain, etc. 2. In his *circumstances:* laid in a manger when he was born, lived in obscurity for a long time, probably worked at the trade of a carpenter, had not a place where to lay his head, and was oppressed with poverty while he went about preaching the Gospel. 3. It appeared in his *reputation:* he was loaded with the most abusive railing and calumny (Isa. liii), the most false accusations (Matt. xxvi, 59, 67), and the most ignominious ridicule (Psa. xxii, 6; Matt. xxii, 68; John vii, 35). 4. In his *soul:* he was often tempted (Matt. iv, 1, etc.; Heb. ii, 17, 18; iv, 15); grieved with the reproaches cast on himself, and with the sins and miseries of others (Heb. xii, 3; Matt. xi, 19; John xi, 35); was burdened with the hidings of his Father's face, and the fears and impressions of his wrath (Psa. xxi, 1; Luke xxii, 43; Heb. v, 7). 5. In his *death:* scourged, crowned with thorns, received gall and vinegar to drink, and was crucified between two thieves (Luke xxiii; John xix; Mark xv, 24, 25). 6. In his *burial:* not only was he born in another man's house, but he was buried in another man's tomb; for he had no tomb of his own, or family vault to be interred in (Isa. liii, 10, etc.; Matt. xiii, 46). The humiliation of Christ was necessary, 1. To execute the purpose of God, and covenant engagements of Christ (Acts ii, 23, 24; Psa. xl, 6, 7, 8); 2. To fulfil the manifold types and predictions of the Old Testament; 3. To satisfy the broken law of God, and procure eternal redemption for us (Isa. liii; Heb. ix, 12, 15); 4. To leave us an unspotted pattern of holiness and patience under suffering.—Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s. v. For a summary of the views of the Reformed theologians on the humiliation of Christ, see Heppe, *Dogmatik der Evang.-Reform. Kirche* (Elberfeld, 1861), Locus xix. See also Hase, *Evang.-Prot. Dogmatik*, § 155, 156; Gill, *Body of Divinity*, vol. ii; Robert Hall, *Works*, vol. iii; Knapp, *Theology*, § 95–97. See JESUS CHRIST.

Humility (Lat. *humilitas;* from *humus*, the ground), as a Christian grace, is the opposite of "highmindedness." It was unknown to the ancient heathen moralists; the word *humilis*, with them, indicated baseness of mind.

1. The believer is indeed "exalted" to a higher stage of manhood by his union with Christ, and becomes, moreover, a "king and priest unto God." But he never "exalts" himself. Whatever he has, he owes (and feels that he owes) not to himself, but to the love of God, his creator; to the grace of Christ, his redeemer; and to the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, his sanctifier. He perceives all his blessings only in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. If he looks upon himself, he finds that all he is or has is but what has been mercifully vouchsafed to him; if he looks upon his individual *ego*, apart from these privileges, he finds only a weak, impotent personality, corrupted by sin and error, and unworthy of such great privileges. If he rejoices in the possession of Christian graces, he rejoices in them as having been given him (1 Cor. iv, 7), and considers at the same time the merits of others (Rom. xii, 3: "For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think *of himself* more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith"). Conscious of the gifts he has received, he yet praises the grace which has given them to him (Rom. xv, 17, 18: "I have therefore whereof I may glory through Jesus Christ, in those things which pertain to God. For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me." Phil. iv, 11–13: "I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content. I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound: everywhere and in all things I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." 2 Cor. iii, 5: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God." 1 Cor. iii, 5–7: "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then, neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase"). The best Christians are but unprofitable servants, and unworthy instruments of the grace of God (Luke xvii, 10: "So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all these things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do"). The feeling of obligation for all one is or has, and of shortcoming in the use of those gifts which we cannot even praise ourselves for having well employed, is a mark of *humility*.

2. "To consider this grace a little more particularly, it may be observed, 1. That humility does not oblige a

man to wrong the truth or himself by entertaining a meaner or worse opinion of himself than he deserves. 2. Nor does it oblige a man, right or wrong, to give everybody else the preference to himself. A wise man cannot believe himself inferior to the ignorant multitude, nor the virtuous man that he is not so good as those whose lives are vicious. 3. Nor does it oblige a man to treat himself with contempt in his words or actions: it looks more like affectation than humility when a man says such things in his own dispraise as others know, or he himself believes, to be false; and it is plain also that this is often done merely as a bait to catch the praises of others. Humility consists, 1. In not attributing to ourselves any excellence or good which we have not. 2. In not overrating anything we do. 3. In not taking an immoderate delight in ourselves. 4. In not assuming more of the praise of a quality or action than belongs to us. 5. In an inward sense of our many imperfections and sins. 6. In ascribing all we have and are to the grace of God. True humility will express itself, 1. By the modesty of our appearance; the humble man will consider his age, abilities, character, function, etc., and act accordingly; 2. By the modesty of our pursuits: we shall not aim at anything above our strength, but prefer a good to a great name. 3. It will express itself by the modesty of our conversation and behavior: we shall not be loquacious, obstinate, forward, envious, discontented, or ambitious. The advantages of humility are numerous: 1. It is well-pleasing to God (1 Pet. iii, 4). 2. It has great influence on us in the performance of all other duties, praying, hearing, converse, etc. 3. It indicates that more grace shall be given (James iv, 6; Psa. xxv, 9). 4. It preserves the soul in great tranquillity and contentment (Psa. lxix, 32, 33). 5. It makes us patient and resigned under afflictions (Job i, 22). 6. It enables us to exercise moderation in everything. To obtain this excellent spirit, we should remember, 1. The example of Christ (Phil. ii, 6, 7, 8); 2. That heaven is a place of humility (Rev. v, 8); 3. That our sins are numerous, and deserve the greatest punishment (Lam. iii, 39); 4. That humility is the way to honor (Prov. xvi, 18); 5. That the greatest promises of good are made to the humble (Isa. lvii, 15; lvi, 2; 1 Pet. v, 5; Psa. cxlvii, 6; Matt. v, 5)" (Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s. v.). "It has been deemed a great paradox in Christianity that it makes humility the avenue to glory. Yet what other avenue is there to wisdom, or even to knowledge? Would you pick up precious truths, you must bend down and look for them. Everywhere the pearl of great price lies bedded in a shell which has no form or comeliness. It is so in physical science. Bacon has declared it, *Natura non nisi parendo vincitur;* and the triumphs of science since his days have proved how willing Nature is to be conquered by those who will obey her. It is so in moral speculation. Wordsworth has told us the law of his own mind, the fulfilment of which has enabled him to reveal a new world of poetry: *Wisdom is ofttimes nearer when we stoop than when we soar.* That it is so likewise in religion we are assured by those most comfortable words, *Except ye become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.* Moreover, the whole intercourse between man and man may be seen, if we look at it closely, to be guided and regulated by the same pervading principle; and that it ought to be so is generally recognised, instinctively, at least, if not consciously. As I have often heard said by him, who, among all the persons I have conversed with to the edification of my understanding, had the keenest practical insight into human nature, and best knew the art of controlling and governing men, and winning them over to their good—the moment anybody is satisfied with himself, everybody else becomes dissatisfied with him; whenever a person thinks much of himself, all other people give over thinking about him. Thus it is not alone in the parable that he who takes the highest room is turned down with shame to the lowest, while he who sits down in the lowest room is bid to go up higher." See Hare, *Guesses at Truth*, i, 242; Krehl, *Handwörterbuch des N. Test.*, s. v. Demuth; Grove, *Moral Philosophy*, ii, 286; Whately, *Dangers to Christian Faith*, p. 38; Conybeare, *Sermons*, p. 141.

Humphrey, LAWRENCE, an English Protestant divine and philologian, was born at Newport-Pagnell, Buckinghamshire, about 1527. He was educated at Cambridge, where he applied himself especially to the classics. After becoming fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and professor of Greek in the university, he entered the Church. In 1555 he left England in consequence of the persecutions to which Protestants were subject, and remained a while in Zürich. After the death of queen Mary he returned home and resumed his professorship. He became successively professor of theology at Queen's College in 1560, president of Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1561, dean of Gloucester in 1570, and dean of Winchester in 1580. He died February 1, 1589. He was a man of conciliatory manners, and of great piety and learning; of great purity of character, moderate and conscientious, and to this he owed his last preferments. He was a good linguist, and a very skilful controvertist. He wrote *Epistola de Græcis literis et Homeri lectione et imitatione* (printed in the first part of Junius's *Cornucopiæ*, Basle, 1558, fol.):—*De religionis conservatione et reformatione, deque Primatu Regum* (Basle, 1559, 8vo):—*Obadias Propheta, Hebraice et Latine, et Philo "De Judice," Græce et Latine*, at the end of the preceding treatise:—*Optimates, sive de nobilitate ejusque antiqua origine, natura, officiis, disciplina* (Basle, 1561, 8vo, with a Latin translation of Philo's treatise *De Nobilitate*):—*Joannis Juelli, episcopi Salisburiensis, Vita et Mors* (London, 1573, 4to):—*Jesuitismi pars prima, sive praxis Romanæ curiæ contra respublicas et principes* (Lond. 1582, 8vo):—*Jesuitismi pars secunda, Puritano Papismi seu doctrinæ Jesuiticæ aliquot rationibus ab Edm. Campiano comprehensæ et a Johanne Duræo defensæ Confutatio* (London, 1584, 8vo), etc. See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses* (vol. i); Chalmers, *Gen. Biog. Dictionary;* Chauffepié, *Dict. Hist.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 543; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 918; Neal, *History of the Puritans* (see Index); Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, vi, 207 sq. (J. N. P.)

Hum'tah (Heb. *Chumtah'*, חֻמְטָה, prob. from the Syr. *fortress*, otherwise *place of lizards;* Sept. Ἀμματά v. r. Εὐμά and Χαμματά; Vulg. *Athmatha*), a town in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Aphekah and Hebron (Josh. xv, 54), apparently in the district lying immediately west of Hebron (Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.). It is not mentioned by any other ancient writer (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 723) except Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἀματά, Ammatha). There is some resemblance between the name and that of *Kimath* (Κιμάθ), one of the places added in the Vat. text of the Sept. to the list in the Heb. text of 1 Sam. xxx, 27-31. It possibly corresponds with the ruined site marked as *Sabzin* (or *Ramet el-Almeh*) on Van de Velde's *Map* at 1¾ miles north of Hebron, just west of the Jerusalem road.

Hundred (as a division of the Heb. people). See HOST.

Huneric. See VANDALS.

Hungarian Confession (*Confessio Hungarica*), the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Church in Hungary. It was drawn up in 1557 and 1558 by the Synod of Czenger (hence also called *Confessio Czengeriana*), and published in 1570 in Debreczin. It is strongly Calvinistic, especially in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and it was on that account not adopted by the Reformed churches of Poland. (A. J. S.)

Hungary, a kingdom in Eastern Europe, which has for several centuries been united with the empire of Austria. It has 82,839 square miles, and its population was, according to the census of 1857, 9,900,785. Connected with it, as dependencies of the crown of Hungary,

are Transylvania (q. v.), Croatia, and Slavonia. This whole division, which is sometimes called the Trans-Leithanian division of the empire, sometimes simply Hungary, has 124,000 square miles, and, according to the official census of 1857, 13,768,813 inhabitants. According to the official census of Dec. 31, 1869, the total population of the countries subject to the Hungarian crown amounted to 15,429,238, of which Hungary proper had about 11,109,000; Transylvania, 2,109,000; Croatia and Slavonia, 1,015,000; the Military Frontier, 1,195,000.

I. *History.*—The Hungarians, a Scythian tribe, were, as it seems, akin to and allies of the Chazari, who in the first century of the Christian æra had left their original seats, the plateaus of Central Asia, and had founded in the course of time a powerful empire on the Tauric peninsula. At the close of the 9th century the Hungarians (Magyars) were living on the north-eastern frontier of this empire, which they defended under their own chiefs against the powerful neighboring nations. After the destruction of this empire, the Magyars, who were unable to resist singly the onset of other tribes, crossed the Dnieper, and settled (884) near the mouth of the Danube, between the Rivers Bugh and Szereth. The imperial throne of Constantinople was at that time occupied by Leo the Wise, who called the bravery of his new neighbors to his aid against Simeon, the chief of the Bulgarians. The call was cheerfully accepted by Arpad, the son of the Magyar duke Almos. Simeon was conquered, and his country laid waste. The renown of the Magyars soon induced king Arnulf, of Germany, to ask them for aid against Szvatoplugk, the grand prince of Moravia. Again they accepted the invitation, entered Upper Pannonia, which then belonged to the Moravian empire, and obtained a complete victory; after that they returned to their homes. These, however, had in the meanwhile been invaded and terribly devastated by the Bulgarians, and the Magyars therefore concluded to settle permanently in Pannonia, from which they had just returned as victors. The occupation of the country began in 894; it was completed in 900. The country, distributed among seven tribes and 108 families, was converted into a military state. Their bravery and their renown caused many people of the districts which they had traversed, and many soldiers of foreign countries, to join them. Thus strengthened, they were able to undertake expeditions as far as the North Sea, the South of France into Italy, and to the Black Sea. But repeated defeats by the kings and emperors of Germany put a stop to their conquests and gave a different direction to their energies. The frontiers of their new country were more definitely marked and fortified, and many more foreign colonists drawn into the country.

The large number of Christian slaves, the connection with the emperors of Constantinople, but in particular the efforts of duke Geysa (972–997), and of his Christian wife Sarolta (Caroline), gradually prepared the introduction of Christianity. Geysa made peace with all his neighbors, and at the diet which he assembled recommended a hospitable reception of foreign visitors and the introduction of Christianity. Geysa himself was baptized by bishop Pilgrin of Passau, who, even during the reign of Tacsony, the father of Geysa, had begun to show a warm interest in the conversion of Hungary. Besides him, the emperor Otto I and bishop Adalbert of Prague showed a great zeal for the Christianization of the Magyars. Thus the Roman Catholic Church obtained the ascendency over the few missions which under former chiefs had been established by missionaries of the Greek Church. Adalbert, in 994, baptized, at Gran, Voik, the son of Geysa, who received the name of Stephen. Immediately after his accession to the throne, Stephen made it the first object of his rule to secure the complete victory of Christianity; nor did he hesitate for this end to employ force. He issued at once an order that all Magyars must receive baptism, and that all Christian slaves must be set free. This decree filled those Magyars who were opponents of Christianity with the utmost indignation against the young king and against the Germans who surrounded him. Kuppa, a relative of Stephen and duke of the Sumegians, put himself at the head of the malcontents, but at Veszprim he was totally defeated and killed; and henceforth all serious opposition to the Christianization of Hungary ceased. Stephen himself traversed the country in every direction, encouraging the people to become Christians, and threatening with severe punishments all who would refuse to obey this order. He established schools in his residence, called many monks as teachers, established ten richly-endowed bishoprics, introduced the tithe, and made the prelates the first estate of the empire. For these labors Stephen received from pope Sylvester II a crown, which has since then constituted the upper part of the *sacra regni Hungariæ corona*, while its lower part consists of a crown which the Greek emperor Manuel Dukas gave to Geysa. With this crown Stephen received from the pope a patriarchal cross and the title of apostolic king. Thus Hungary became a kingdom, the chief supports of which, according to the Constitution given by Stephen, were to be the clergy and the nobility. The following kings enlarged the privileges of the clergy, who thus, in the course of time, became richer than in any other European country. After the death of Stephen several more efforts were made by the native pagan party to displace both Christianity and the German party at the court, which was regarded as the chief support of Christianity. But all these attempts utterly failed, and paganism soon became extinct. The frontiers of the empire were enlarged by the conquest of Croatia and Slavonia in 1089, and that of Dalmatia in 1102; at home the clergy extorted from the weak Andrew II (1202–35) a favorable Concordat. In 1437 Hungary fell for the first time to the house of Hapsburg. In 1526 the line of independent kings of Hungary became extinct by the death of king Louis II. A large portion of Hungary was subjugated by the Turks, and remained a Turkish province for more than a century; the remainder was long rent by civil wars, which ended in connecting the country permanently with the crown of Hapsburg.

When the first knowledge of the Reformation reached Hungary, the Diet of 1528 issued a cruel decree that the Lutherans and all favorers of Lutheranism should be captured and burned. But amidst the disorder which followed the death of Louis II the Reformation spread, and gained a firm footing in spite of the cruel prohibitory laws. Probably the first to preach in favor of the Reformation was Thomas Preussner, of Kaesmark, who is said to have publicly announced his concurrence in the views of Luther. A great impression was made by the Augsburg Confession, as the grandees who accompanied king Ferdinand to the Diet of Augsburg brought back a favorable account of the Lutheran Reformation. Several scholars went to Wittenberg to study under Luther, among whom were Devay, Quendel, Stöckel, Andrew Fischer, Leutscher, Bogner, Transylvanus, Radan, Siklosy, and Kopaczy. The further progress of the Reformation was very quiet, only a few bishops and magnates trying to employ force. Prince Zápolya, who contested with king Ferdinand the possession of Hungary, issued a severe edict against the Protestants, and the parish priest of Libethen was in 1527 burned as a favorer of the Reformation; but as the majority of the towns, nearly the whole nobility, and many of the most powerful magnates were favorable to the Reformation, the persecution of Protestantism soon ceased. Many of the priests then joined the Reformation with their entire congregations; in other instances the congregations waited until the death of the Catholic pastor, and then called an evangelical successor. The evangelical pastors continued for a long time to pay tribute to the bishops, and were protected by the latter in their rights and privileges, provided they would remain faithful to the Augsburg Confession, and not join the detest-

ed Sacramentarians (Calvinists). In 1549 the royal free cities of Upper Hungary had their Confession of Faith drawn up by Leonhard Stöckel in the sense of the Augsburg Confession, and presented it to king Ferdinand. This Confession was approved and confirmed not only by the king, but also by the primate Nicholas Olah and the bishop Verantius, with several Catholic prelates, as bishop Kechéry of Veszprim, bishop Thurzo of Neutra, and bishop Dudich, who had attended the Council of Trent as representatives of Ferdinand. King Ferdinand himself appeared to be favorable to the Protestants, for he permitted the election of the foremost patron of the Reformation, Thomas Nadasdy, as palatine of Hungary. Still more auspicious was the reign of the mild Maximilian, who tried to gain the Protestants by wise concessions. Thus they found time to develop their Church Constitution, to hold synods, and to regulate their Church and school affairs under the protection of the evangelical magnates. A large majority of the inhabitants belonged to the evangelical faith; only three magnates continued to be Roman Catholic, and probably Protestantism would have forever established its ascendency had not the Protestants themselves been split into Lutherans and Calvinists, who seemed to hate each other more than other religious denominations. Thus weakened by internal dissensions, the Protestants suffered greatly from the persecutions which began against them under the reign of Rudolphus. The Jesuits, who had come for a short time to Hungary in 1561, at the invitation of the primas Nicholas Olah, but had been unable to do any thing under the tolerant reign of Maximilian, returned, and began to display a great activity for the restoration of the old Church. Jacob Barbian of Belgioso took from the Protestants a number of churches, and the complaints of the people against these acts of violence remained without effect. Rudolphus, instead of redressing the grievances, made to the laws passed by the Hungarian Diet an addition, which declared the grievances of the Protestants to be unfounded and their conduct scandalous, and which confirmed all the former laws against them. Boczkai, the prince of Transylvania, rose against this law, and was joined every where by malcontents. Soon he was master of all Transylvania and of Northern Hungary. Basta, the imperial general, was defeated, and Rudolphus compelled to conclude, in 1606, the peace of Vienna, which assured the Protestants throughout the empire of religious liberty, and promised that the emperor would never allow any violation of this provision. To the provision was, however, added this clausula, "without any injury to the Catholic religion." When the articles of the Vienna treaty of peace were, in 1608, read to the Diet at Pressburg, the bishop of Veszprim protested in the name of the clergy against the religious liberty granted to the Protestants; but the firmness of archduke Matthias overcame the opposition of all the Catholics, and the treaty of peace was unanimously ratified by all save cardinal Forgacz. Nevertheless, Rudolphus declared the resolutions of the Diet invalid. This breach of faith cost him the throne; his brother Matthias was crowned king of Hungary on November 8, 1608, two days after the evangelical count Illeshazy had been elected palatine by a large majority. Through the liberality of Illeshazy, who was in possession of immense riches, the Protestants received a large number of churches and schools. Illeshazy died the next year (May 6, 1609); but his successor, count George Thurzo, was an equally zealous Protestant. Under his presidency, a synod was held in March, 1610, at Sillein, in the comitat of Trentshin, at which the Protestant churches were organized into three superintendentships, the duties of superintendents, seniors, and inspectors defined, and many rules adopted for the regulation of Church government and Church discipline. The resolutions of the synod, which were printed by order of the palatine, and circulated among all the Protestant congregations of the country, aroused the Catholic clergy to extraordinary efforts against the further spreading of Protestantism. Unfortunately, palatine Thurzo died soon, and the Catholics found a leader of rare ability in the Jesuit Pazmany, who succeeded in causing within a short time more than fifty of the first noble families to return to the Catholic Church. They, in turn, compelled hundreds of thousands of their subjects to leave the Protestant churches. At the diets the Roman Catholics again obtained the ascendency; the resolutions of 1608 were, it is true, several times confirmed, but the government did not respect the decrees of the diets, and the persecutions of Protestants continued. For a time the Reformed prince Bethlen, of Transylvania, extorted by his victories from king Ferdinand II promises of redress, but none of these promises were kept. At the Diet of 1637, the Protestants, under the name of the Evangelical Estates (*Status et Ordines Evangelici*), presented their grievances in writing; but the Diet contented itself with a new confirmation of former laws, and gave to the Jesuits the first landed property in the kingdom. The discontent of the Protestants was supported by Racoczy, prince of Transylvania, who invaded Hungary at the head of 10,000 men, and finally compelled Ferdinand III to conclude the peace of Linz, 1645, in which the Protestants again obtained the free exercise of their religion, the use of bells, and the permission to build towers and to keep their own cemeteries. But the Catholic clergy refused to recognise the provisions of this treaty, and soon the reign of Leopold I brought on the sorest trials for Protestantism. The complaints of the Protestants regarding the constant violations of their rights were not listened to; they were ordered not to bring their grievances before the Diet, but before the courts. Several Protestant noblemen entered, therefore, into a conspiracy for the separation of Hungary from Austria, but the plot was discovered, and all who had taken part in it sentenced to death. The Jesuits used this as a pretext for the most violent measures against Protestants. Archbishop Szelepczenyi summoned the evangelical ministers of the mountain towns before his court at Pressburg, where they were charged with being accomplices of the Turks, with seditious sermons, revolutionary sympathies, abuse of the Catholic host, opening of the prisons, sale of Catholic priests to the Turks. The preachers were all sentenced to death; but the emperor pardoned them on the condition that they should renounce their titles of preachers and pastors, not discharge the duties connected with such a title, keep no schools, not preach either secretly or publicly, and sign a declaration acknowledging their guilt. Whosoever should refuse to sign this declaration must leave Hungary within thirty days. In the next year all the evangelical preachers, even those who lived under Turkish dominion, were summoned to Pressburg. The latter did not come; but those living under the sceptre of Leopold made their appearance, 250 of the Confession of Augsburg and 57 of the Helvetic Confession. The majority signed the demanded declaration; those who refused were imprisoned; the most obstinate, about 29 in number, were sent to the galleys. The Swedish government, the dukes of Saxony, Brandenburg, and Luneburg, remonstrated with the emperor in favor of the prisoners, but not until about a year later did they recover their liberty. A great massacre of Protestants was soon after (1657) committed at Eperies by the imperial general Caraffa, who pretended to have discovered a wide-spread conspiracy, and caused the execution of a large number of prominent men, among whom were many of the leaders of the Protestants. The peace of Carlovics, in 1699, restored to Hungary all the districts, with the only exception of that of Temesvar, which for more than a hundred years had been under the rule of the Turks. At home, the continued discontent of the people led to a new insurrection, headed by Francis Racoczy, which was suppressed in 1711 by the peace of Szathmar. This peace again reaffirmed the rights which had been granted to Protestants. New complaints of disturb-

ances of Protestant worship induced Charles VI (as king of Hungary, Charles III) to appoint a royal commission, on the recommendation of which it was decreed that the evangelical preachers should be superintended by Catholic archdeacons; that the ministerial functions of the preachers of the two Protestant Confessions must be limited to those churches (at most two in each comitat) in which a resolution of the Diet of Oedenburg, held in 1681, expressly authorized the Protestants to hold divine service; that the Protestants, when elected to office, must take their oaths with an invocation of the blessed Virgin and all the saints; and that all Protestants must take part in the celebration of the Catholic festivals and in the public processions. The establishment of a royal chancellory and stadtholdership, which in the name of the sovereign had to promulgate and execute the imperial laws, was unfavorable to the Protestants, as a majority of the councillors were taken from the ranks of the bishops, magnates, and noblemen. Thus the Protestants were annoyed by this board in every possible way. Conversions from Catholicism to Protestantism were strictly forbidden; Catholics were forbidden to attend a Protestant school, and the Protestant youth to study at foreign schools; members of one Protestant denomination were not allowed to visit the divine service of the other; Protestant books were submitted to Protestant censors, their trials of divorce to Catholic judges. Maria Theresa expressed personal sympathy with the oppressed condition of Protestants, but pretended to be unable to do any thing for them on account of her coronation oath and the laws of the country. An essential amelioration in the condition of Protestants was effected under Joseph II, who, in 1781, by the edict of toleration, granted to all the Protestants of his dominions freedom of conscience and of religion, and the right of public worship. Now a new æra in the history of Protestantism began. A large number of new churches and schools were established, hundreds of clergymen were called. Protestants became eligible to every office; the religious oath was abolished; the Protestant superintendents were allowed to visit the churches, and persons living in mixed marriages to bring up their children in the evangelical faith, as well as to select for them any school they chose; the press was to be free and unfettered. Leopold II also showed a firm disposition to be just toward the Protestants. The Diet of 1791 was petitioned by the Protestants to sanction the royal decree which had granted them religious freedom. Notwithstanding a violent opposition on the part of the bishops, the diet granted the request, chiefly moved by the eloquent plea of the Catholic count Aloysius Batthyáni. Accordingly, the 26th article of religion of 1791 provides that the Protestants of both Confessions shall enjoy the free exercise of their religion; that they shall not be forced to attend processions, masses, or other ceremonies; that in ecclesiastical affairs they shall be subordinate only to their own ecclesiastical superiors; that they may build churches and schools, elect preachers and teachers; that they shall not have to contribute to the building of Catholic churches and schools. The Protestants at once hastened to perfect their ecclesiastical constitution. In the same year (1791), a synod of both the Protestant churches was held at Ofen and Pesth, at which long-pending controversies between the clergy and prominent laymen were settled, and the establishment of a general Consistory proposed. The protest of a few evangelical clergymen, as well as that of the Catholic clergy and the early death of the sovereign, prevented the resolutions of this diet from receiving the royal sanction. During the reign of Francis I the rights of the Protestants were often encroached upon, especially in the case of mixed marriages. The Diet of 1843 to 1844 interfered, however, in favor of the Protestants, and enlarged, in its provisions concerning mixed marriages and the right of joining the Protestant Church, the law of 1791. The fulness of equal rights was finally secured to Protestants by a law of 1848. In consequence of the failure of the Hungarian War of Independence in 1848 and 1849, these rights were, however, for a time suspended. The imperial commander, baron Haynau, himself a Protestant, abolished the offices of general inspector and the district inspectors for the Church of the Augsburg Confession, and that of curators for the Church of the Helvetic Confession. The holding of conventions was forbidden, and only after a time the holding of "senioral conventions" allowed when attended by an imperial commissioner. After repeated petitions and representations, the minister of public worship and instruction, on August 21, 1856, laid the draft of a law on the reorganization of the Constitution of the Protestant churches before the superintendents. The latter declined this draft, and unanimously asked for the convocation of the General Synod. On September 1, 1859, an imperial patent was published, which undertook, on the ground of the law of 1791, to give to the Protestant churches a new Constitution. Nearly the entire evangelical Church of both Confessions protested against the legality of this imperial patent, claiming for the Church the right to make herself the necessary changes in her Constitution on the legal basis of the law of 1791. Only a few congregations of the Lutheran Slovacks, numbering together about 54 congregations, accepted the patent. All the efforts to break the opposition of the Protestants failed; and when, in 1867, the Austrian government concluded to make peace with Hungary, the patent of 1859, and all the decrees accompanying it, were repealed. The two Protestant churches were assured that they would be at liberty to rearrange their Church matters in a constitutional way. At the General Convention of the Confession of Augsburg, which was held in Pesth in September, the reunion of the Lutheran Slovacks who had accepted the patent with the remainder of the Church was consummated. In December, 1867, a General Convention of the two Protestant churches was held under the presidency of baron Nicholas Vay, in order to acquaint the Hungarian Diet with the wishes and opinion of the churches concerning religious and school questions. The Convention resolved, 1, that the affairs of the Protestants be regulated by general laws, and not by special laws for each of the two denominations; 2, that no privileges be granted to any on account of religion; 3, that the equality pronounced in the 20th article of the law of 1848 extend to all denominations; 4, that the Church with regard to the state be autonomous, and that to the state belong only the right of supreme inspection and of protection. Other liberal resolutions were adopted by this and by a later Convention respecting a change of religion, mixed marriages, divorces, schools, and endowment. The majority of the Diet showed itself just toward the Protestants, and their chief demands were fulfilled. The reconciliation which took place in 1867 between the people of Hungary and the emperor of Austria gave to Hungary a greater independence than it had ever enjoyed before. A special ministry was appointed for the countries of the Hungarian crown, which also had their own diet, and retained only a few points of administration in common with the remainder of the monarchy. One of the most important reforms, introduced into Hungary in consequence of the new Constitution, was the declaration of the autonomy of all the religions recognized in Hungary, and the transfer of the extensive rights in ecclesiastical affairs, which had formerly been connected with the Hungarian crown, to elective assemblies representing the several religious denominations. The first assemblies of those churches, which had thus far been without them, were convoked by the government; they fixed the mode of election for the subsequent assemblies. Thus, with the other denominations, the Roman Catholic Church received an autonomy congress, the only elective assembly of this kind in the Church, and regarded with great distrust by the ultramontane party. It consists of all the bishops, and of chosen delegates of the lower clergy

and the laity. The preliminary congress was held on June 24, 1869, and consisted of 157 members.

II. *Statistics.*—According to the last official census of 1857, the religious statistics of the countries belonging to the Hungarian crown were as follows:

	Catholics.		Non-United Greek.	Protestant.		Unitarians.	Other Sects.	Jews.
	Latin.	Greek.		Augsburg Confession.	Helvetic Confession.			
Hungary	5,158,013	827,702	1,106,588	795,930	1,553,368	964	97	[illegible]93,105
Croatia and Slavonia	720,893	1,844	129,737	885	4,425	31	..	5,041
Transylvania	228,095	551,994	623,055	195,861	265,976	48,040	..	14,152
Military Frontier	448,708	5,535	587,288	15,864	4,274	4	..	404

According to an official calculation, the Hungarian countries had, in 1880, 7,558,558 Latin Catholics, 1,559,628 Greek Catholics, 5133 Armenian Catholics, 2,589,319 Oriental or Non-United Greeks, 3,144,759 Evangelicals, 54,922 Unitarians, 553,641 Israelites, 3603 belonging to other sects.

The Roman Catholic Church has four archbishops, those of Gran (who is primate of all Hungary), Kalocza, Erlau, and Agram. The archbishopric of Gran, which was founded by St. Stephen, had in 1870 ten suffragan sees, namely, the Latin bishoprics of Veszprim, Neusohl, Waitzen, Neutra, Stahlweissenburg, Fünfkirchen, Steinamanger, Raab, and the United Greek sees of Muncacz and Eperies. The archdiocese of Colocza (and Bacz) has the Latin suffragan sees of Czanad, Gran Wardein, and Transylvania. The suffragans of the archbishop of Erlau are the bishops of Zips, Rosenau, Kaschau, and Szathmar. Agram, which had formerly been a suffragan of Gran, and was constituted an archbishopric on Dec. 20, 1852, embraces Croatia and Slavonia, and has as suffragans the Latin bishoprics of Zengg-Modruss and Diacovar (Bosnia-Syrmium), and the Greek bishop of Creutz.

The Greek Catholic (United Greek) Church has, besides the bishops of Muncacz, Eperies, and Creutz, who have already been mentioned, an archbishop (since 1853) at Fogaras, who has as suffragans the bishops of Lugos, Gran Wardein, and Szamos-Ujvar.

The Oriental, or Non-United Greek Church, has for the Servian nationality a patriarch at Carlovicz, and suffragan sees at Alt-Ofen, Arad, Temesvar, Neusatz, Pakratz, and Carlstadt; for the Roumanian nationality, a metropolitan of Transylvania.

The Church of the Augsburg Confession (evangelical Lutherans) has four superintendencies (Cis-Danubian, Trans-Danubian, Montan District, and Theiss District); the superintendencies are subdivided into seniorats, the latter into congregations. The Church of the Helvetic Confession has likewise four superintendencies, which are also subdivided into seniorats and congregations. Transylvania has one Lutheran and one Reformed superintendent. Each congregation of the two Protestant churches chooses its own pastors and a presbytery, which is presided over in the Church of the Augsburg Confession by a local inspector, and in the Church of the Helvetic Confession by a curator, in common with the pastor. The congregations belonging to one seniorat choose a senior and a senioral inspector (Lutheran), or subcurator (Reformed). In the Reformed seniorats, the senior presides in the senioral conventions; in the Lutheran Church, the inspector. The superintendents and the superintendential inspectors (Lutheran) or curators (Reformed) are chosen for lifetime by all the congregations. The superintendential conventions, which are held annually, and composed of all the seniors, and of one clerical and one lay deputy from each seniorat, are presided over by the superintendent in common with the superintendential inspector or curator. The Protestants of the Helvetic Confession are all Magyars, with the exception of eight German congregations; to the Church of the Augsburg Confession belong about 200,000 Germans, 200,000 Magyars, and 400,000 Slavs.

The Unitarians in Transylvania have a superintendent (bishop) and Supreme Consistory at Clausenburg, 104 parishes, and 120 ministers.

Hungary has a national university at Pesth, 48 Catholic and 39 Protestant gymnasia. The number of elementary schools amounted (1864) in Hungary to 11,452, in Transylvania to 1793, in Croatia and Slavonia to 490, in the Military Frontier to 907. A large number of communities were in 1869 still without a school. There are also five normal schools at Pesth, Sgezedin, Neuhäusel, Miskolcz, and Grosskanizsa.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xvi, 636; Mather, *Kirchl. Chronik*, 1867 and 1869; Neher, *Kirchl. Geogr. u. Statistik*, i, 216 sq.; Wiggers, *Kirchl. Statistik*, ii, 123. (A. J. S.)

Hunger (רָעָב, *raah'*; πεινάω) AND THIRST are the symbols of affliction. Thus in Deut. viii, 3, "He humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger," where the latter is the instrument of the former. So Deut. xxxii, 24, "They shall be burnt with hunger;" i. e. they shall be tormented or afflicted. So to *fast* is often called to *afflict one's soul*, as in Lev. xvi, 29-31; Isa. lviii, 5. In Aristophanes (*Aves*) hunger is proverbially used for great misery. See 1 Cor. iv, 11; 2 Cor. xi, 27; Phil. iv, 12. In our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, *to hunger and thirst* signifies to long for and relish the Gospel (Matt. v, 6; Luke vi, 21), but elsewhere to be in want of hearing God's word; that is, to be hindered by persecution from worshipping God in peace (Psa. xxiii; Eccles. xxiv, 19; John iv, 13, 14; vi, 35; Amos viii, 11; Ezek. vii, 26). See FAMINE.

Hunnius, Ægidius, an eminent German Lutheran theologian, was born at Winenden, in Würtemberg, Dec. 21, 1550, and studied theology at Tübingen, where he afterwards became first tutor, and deacon in 1574. In 1576 he went to Marburg as professor and preacher. Here his strict adherence to the doctrine of ubiquity in the Eucharist, and his advocacy of the Formula of Concord, sowed the germ of the separation of the Hessian Church. In 1592 he became professor at the Universisity of Wittenberg, where he opposed the moderate views of Melancthon. In 1594 he accompanied the duke Frederick William to the Imperial Diet at Regensburg, where his influence opposed the union of the different evangelical free cities. In 1595 he sustained a sharp controversy with Samuel Huber (q. v.) on the doctrines of election and predestination, and in 1602, at the Conference of Ratisbon, he was one of the principal opponents of the Jesuits Gretzer and Tanner. He died April 4, 1603. His principal works are, *Confession v. d. Person Christi* (1577, 1609); also in Latin, *De persona Christi* (1585):—*Calvinus Judaïzans* (1593):—*Antiparæus* (1594 and 1599):—*Josephus*, a drama (1597). His works in Latin have been collected and published by Garthius (Wittenb. 1607-9, 5 vols. folio). See Hutter, *Lebensbeschreibung* (1603); Adami, *Vitæ Theologorum;* Ersch und Gruber, *Encyklopädie;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 554; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 316 sq.; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 140; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* iii, 534 sq.

Hunnius, Nikolaus, son of Ægidius Hunnius, was born at Marburg July 11, 1585. He studied philology, philosophy, and theology at Wittenberg, where he began lectures on theology and philosophy in 1609. In 1612 he went as superintendent to Eilenburg, and in 1617 returned to Wittenberg as professor, in the place of Hutter (q. v.). In 1623 he became head pastor of the Church of Mary at Lübeck, and superintendent of the Church in the same city the following year. He died April 12, 1643. He resembled his father as well in his attachment to the Lutheran orthodoxy as in his learning and controversial powers. He devised the plan of a *Collegium Irenicum*, which was called, after him, "Collegium Hunnianum," and which was to form a supreme tribunal in all theological disputes. He was also distinguished as an able opponent of Popery. His principal works are, *Ministerii Lutherani divini adeoque le-*

gitimi demonstratio (Wittenb. 1614):—*Examen errorum Photinianorum* (1618, 1620): — *Epitome credendorum* (Wittenberg, 1625; 18 eds., and translated into Dutch, Swedish, and Polish):—*Διάσκεψις theol. de fundamentali dissensu doctrinæ evangel. Lutheranæ et Calvinianæ* (Wittenb. 1626):—*Bedenken ob u. wie d. in d. Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche d. schwebende Religionstreitigkeit. beilegen od. fortstellen u. endigen mögen* (Lüb. 1632, 1638, 1666, 1667):—*Anweisung zum rechten Christenthum* (Lüb. 1637 and 1643). See Heller, *Lebensbeschreibung* (1843); Pierer, *Universal Lex.* vol. viii; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 321 sq.; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 201.

Hunolt, Franz, a distinguished Roman Catholic pulpit orator, was born in the duchy of Nassau towards the close of the 17th century. He was a member of the Jesuit order, and his *Sermons* (Cologne, 1737, 6 vols. fol., and often) gave him rank as one of the best preachers of the 18th century. He died at Trier in 1746.—Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* xii, 606.

Huns (Latin *Hunni*), a nation of Asiatic origin, and in all likelihood of Mongolian or Tartar stock, therefore akin to, and perhaps to be identified with, the *Scythians* and the *Turks*, were, according to De Guignes (*Hist. des Huns*), whose theory was accepted by Gibbon, and is now entertained by all competent critics, lineal descendants from the *Hiong-now* nation, "whose ancient seat was an extensive but barren tract of country immediately to the north of the great wall of China. About the year B.C. 200 these people overran the Chinese empire, defeated the Chinese armies in numerous engagements, and even drove the emperor Kao-ti himself to an ignominious capitulation and treaty. During the reign of Vou-ti (B.C. 141-87) their power was very much broken. Eventually they separated into two distinct camps, one of which, amounting to about 50,000 families, went southwards, while the other endeavored to maintain itself in its original seat. This, however, it was very difficult for them to do; and eventually the most warlike and enterprising went west and north-west in search of new homes. Of those that went north-west, a large number established themselves for a while on the banks of the Volga." About the earlier part of the 4th century they crossed this river, and advanced into the territories of the Alani, a pastoral people dwelling between the Volga and the Don. The incursion was resisted with much bravery and some effect, until at length a bloody and decisive battle was fought on the banks of the Don, in which the Alan king was slain, and his army utterly routed, and the vast majority of the survivors agreed to join the invaders. They next encountered successfully the aged leader of the Goths, who claimed as his dominions the land situated between the Baltic and the Euxine, and then his successor Withimir, whom they slew in battle. The Goths still remaining placed themselves under the protection of the emperor Valens, who in 376 gave permission to a great number of them to cross the Danube, and settle in the countries on the other side as auxiliaries to the Roman arms against further invasion. The Huns thus became the occupants of all the old territories of the Goths; and when these, not long afterwards, revolted against Valens, the Huns also crossed the Danube, and joined their arms to those of the Goths in hostilities against the Roman empire. In the wars that followed, the Huns were less conspicuous than the Goths, their former enemies. In the 5th century they were strengthened by fresh hordes of their brethren, and they determined to gain further conquests. In the reign of Theodosius, under their king Attila (q. v.), they were even strong enough to receive an annual tribute from the Romans to secure their empire against external injury. With Attila's death, however, in 454, their power was totally broken. A few feeble sovereigns succeeded him, but there was now strife everywhere among the several nations that had owned the firm sway of Attila, and the Huns never regained their power. Many of them took service in the armies of the Romans, and others again joined fresh hordes of invaders from the north and east, which were undoubtedly tribes related to them, especially the Avares, whom they joined in great numbers, and hence perhaps the reason why, at this period of their history, they are frequently called *Hunnavares.* They now made themselves masters of the country known by us as Lower Austria. But the Slaves (Slavonians?) in Bohemia and Moravia regained their territory in the 8th century, and many of the Hunnavares were made slaves, and were thus brought to a knowledge of Christianity. Their inclinations, however, led them to oppose most fiercely all the inroads of Christianity, and they transformed Christian churches into heathen temples wherever they were successful in gaining territory. About 791 Charlemagne waged war against the Avares, as the Huns were then called, in which many of them were slain, and but few weak tribes remained. About the year 799 they were finally conquered, and their power broken. Charles himself regarded this war as a sort of crusade or holy war, and sent to the pope and the Church all the tribute paid him by the vanquished foe. The first great convert to Christianity was one of their princes, called Tudem, who sent a legation to Charlemagne in 795, with the declaration that he would become tributary to him and accept the Christian religion. He was baptized at Aix-la-Chapelle in 796, but shortly after his return to his tribe he abjured the newly-accepted faith. King Pepin paid particular attention to the conversion of the Huns, in whose behalf Alcuin (q. v.) also was greatly interested. By peopling the territory assigned to them with Germans, especially Bavarians, and by founding several monasteries and cathedrals, the subsequent Christian princes furthered Christianity among them, until they became amalgamated with the Germans.

The Huns are said to have been of a dark complexion, almost black; deformed in their appearance, of uncouth gesture, and shrill voice. The ancient descriptions unmistakably ally them to the Tartars. "They were distinguished from the rest of the human species by their broad shoulders, flat noses, and small black eyes deeply buried in the head; and, as they were almost destitute of beards, they never enjoyed either the manly graces of youth or the venerable aspect of age. A fabulous origin was assigned worthy of their form and manners—that the witches of Scythia, who, for their foul and deadly practices, had been driven from society, had copulated in the desert with infernal spirits, and that the Huns were the offspring of this execrable conjunction" (Gibbon). See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 397 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 462; Appleton, *Am. Cyclop.* ix, 318; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Milman's ed.), vol. vi (see Index). (J. H. W.)

Hunt, Aaron, an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of Episcopal parents at Eastchester, N. Y., March 28, 1768, and emigrated to New York City at seventeen. Here he was converted in 1789, and licensed to preach in 1790. He was first employed as assistant to Dr. Wm. Phœbus on the Long Island Circuit. In 1791 he entered the New York Conference, and was sent to Fairfield Circuit. In a few years his labors were extended all through the state of Connecticut, on the east as well as on the west side of the river by that name, and into adjoining states, exploring new ground, and contending with opposition and difficulties common to Methodist ministers of those times. After this we find him laboring on various circuits in the state and city of New York, having charge of the whole work in that great city. He was sixty-seven years in the ministry, thirty-seven of which he was an effective laborer in the regular itinerant work; and whether located, supernumerary, or superannuated, he continued to labor and preach as he had opportunity, and health would permit, until March, 1855. He died at Sharon, Conn., April 25, 1858. See *Minutes of Conferences*, vii, 158; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism.*

Hunt, Absalom, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Virginia Dec. 4, 1773, and emigrated when a boy to East Tennessee, and later removed to Fleming Co., Kentucky. He was licensed as a local preacher about 1793. In 1815 he joined the Kentucky Conference on trial, and was sent to the Madison Circuit. He was next appointed to the Lexington Circuit, and two years afterwards successively to the Hinkstone, Limestone, Mt. Sterling, and Fleming Circuits. In 1823 he was superannuated, but returned at the next session of the Conference, and was sent to the Liberty Circuit. From 1825-28 he served as supernumerary at Paris, Lexington, and Hinkstone, and then returned to the superannuated list, finding his health inadequate to the active work of the ministry. He died February 21, 1841. Hunt was a "natural orator," and, "though comparatively illiterate and unpolished, such was his native good sense, his deep acquaintance with the human heart, his quick perception of the characters of men, and the unaffected kindness of his manners, that he was not only generally popular as a preacher, but was often the admired favorite with the learned and the refined."—*Methodist Monthly*, 1850; Redford, *Methodism in Kentucky*, ii, 346 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hunt, Christopher, a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Tarrytown, N. Y., near the opening of our century; graduated at Rutgers College in 1827, and at New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1830. He was settled at Clarkstown, N. Y., 1830-2; at Nassau, N. Y., 1832-7; and at Franklin St., N. York, 1837-9. Bereft of both parents when very young, he made his home an orphan asylum, where Christian kindness and spiritual training were blessed to him. He was an earnest, devoted preacher, a man of comprehensive views, and well qualified by natural endowments, as well as by divine grace, for the large and important charge in which he ended his ministry. His memory is ardently cherished among the churches which he served. He fell in the prime of life, a victim of pulmonary disease. His last words were, "All is well."—Corwin's *Manual of the Reformed Dutch Church*, p. 119. (W. J. R. T.)

Hunt, Jeremiah, D.D., a learned English dissenter, was born in London June 11, 1678. He studied first in that city under Mr. Thomas Rowe, and afterwards at Edinburgh and Leyden. On his return to England he preached at Tunsted, near Norwich. He received the degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh in 1707, and died Sept. 5, 1744. Dr. Lardner preached his funeral sermon, which contained a biographical sketch. Dr. Benson edited Hunt's sermons, which are elaborate and exact compositions, but not interesting. His principal works are *An Essay towards explaining the History and Revelations of Scripture in their several Periods*, pt. i; to which is added a *Dissertation on the Fall of Man* (Lond. 1731, 8vo):—*Sermons and Tracts* (Lond. 1748, 4 vols. 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1580.

Hunt, John, a Congregational minister, was born at Northampton Nov. 20, 1744, and was educated at Harvard (class of 1764). From 1765-69 he taught a grammar school at his native place. While in this position he was converted, and having pursued a theological course in his last years of teaching, he was licensed to preach in 1769. Only two years later he was called to the old South Church, Boston, as associate of the Rev. John Bacon (q. v.). In 1775, while on a visit to his home, he died (Dec. 20). Though young even when he died, Hunt had already acquired a great reputation as a ready speaker and a superior thinker. He published two of his *sermons* (1771).—Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, i, 686 sq.

Hunt, John, a Wesleyan missionary to the Fiji Islands, and a model of Christian excellence, was born at Hykeham Moor, near Lincoln, England, June 13, 1812. His early education was very limited, and John was brought up to assist his father on a farm, over which he was bailiff or overseer. When seventeen years old he was converted, and joined the Wesleyan society, to whose service he resolved to devote all his powers. He began at once to preach, and by close application acquired considerable knowledge. In 1835 he received the recommendation from a Quarterly Meeting to join Conference, and in May, 1836, he was accepted by that body as a "preacher on trial." His intention was to preach a short time at home, and, after sufficient preparation, go to Africa as a missionary. Upon examination at London before the Missionary Committee, he was found to be so far beyond the average standard that it was decided that Hunt should be sent to the theological institution at Hoxton. In 1838, when it became the task of the Missionary Committee at London to determine the future course of Hunt, the wants of Fiji seemed to press upon them, and they overruled the original design of sending him to Africa. He was ordained March 27, and sailed, with his lately-wedded bride, April 29, 1838, and they entered on their work at Rewa Jan. 3, 1839. His only object was to do successfully the work for which he was sent. He labored earnestly to acquire a thorough mastery of the language of the natives, and soon met with such success as has rarely crowned the work of a Christian missionary. Indeed, he became a living example to all missionaries through those islands. "Neither distance nor danger delayed or daunted him. In one of his tours he preached the Gospel to five different nations and kingdoms, who had never before seen a missionary. He died in the midst of his labors, Oct. 4, 1848. Besides a translation of the New Testament for the Fijis, Hunt wrote a work on *Entire Sanctification*, "the matured thoughts of a Christian profoundly submissive to divine teachings; written amidst the most robust labors of untiring activity, prompted by the principle of holiness; and himself able, through grace, to illustrate the truths he taught by his spirit and life. The book will live; for it is a thorough discussion of the doctrine of holy Scripture, untinctured with mysticism, free from enthusiastic extravagance, and not burdened, like some recent writings, with extraneous matters interesting only to the writer." See Rowe, *Life of John Hunt* (Lond. 1860, 12mo). (J. H. W.)

Hunt, Robert, a very pious and devoted clergyman of the Church of England, and one of the petitioners for the charter granted by king James I to the "London Company" April 10, 1606, emigrated for this country as preacher of the first colony to Virginia Dec. 19, 1606. The history of Mr. Hunt's life previous to this time is not known, neither is it definitely known whether he spent the remainder of his life in Virginia, though this is generally supposed to have been the case, nor is the time of his death at all ascertained. During his connection with the colony their church was burned, and with it Mr. Hunt's library, but he lived to see at last the church rebuilt (1608).—Hawks, *Rise and Progress of the Prot. Episc. Ch. in Va.* p. 17 sq.

Hunt, Thomas, D.D., a distinguished English Hebraist, was born in 1696. He studied at the University of Oxford, where he took the degree of M.A. in 1721. He was one of the first fellows of Hertford College, and applied himself especially to philosophical researches in the O. Test. He greatly assisted Walton in publishing the London Polyglot. In 1738 he was called to the chair of Arabic founded by Laud. In 1747 he became professor of Hebrew at Oxford; in 1740 he was made fellow of the Royal Society of London, and received the degree of D.D. in 1744. He died at Oxford October 31, 1774. Hunt wrote *De Benedictione patriarchæ Jacobi* (Oxford, 1724, 4to):—*De antiquitate, elegantia et utilitate Linguæ Arabicæ* (Oxford, 1739, 4to):—*De Usu Dialectorum Orientalium*, etc. (Oxford, 1748):—*Observations on several Passages of the Book of Proverbs, with two Sermons* (Oxf. 1775, 4to), his best and a most valuable work, published after the author's death, under the care of Kennicott. (J. N. P.)

Hunter. See HUNTING.

Hunter, Henry, D.D., a Scotch Presbyterian divine, born at Culross, Perthshire, in 1741, was educated at the University of Edinburgh. In 1766 he became minister of South Leith, and in 1771 minister of the Scotch Church, London Wall, London. He died at Bristol Hot Wells, October 27, 1802. Hunter was a man of learning, and an eloquent writer. His principal works are *Sermons, collected and republished in their respective order*, etc. (Lond. 1795, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Sacred Biography, or the History of the Patriarchs;* being a course of lectures delivered at the Scotch Church, London Wall (6th ed. Lond. 1807, 5 vols. 8vo). This work has often been reprinted both in England and America, and has had great popularity. It is, to a large extent, an unacknowledged translation from Saurin's *Discours Historiques*. Hunter edited several other French books, and excelled in this line of labor. After his death appeared a collection of his *Sermons and other Pieces, with a Sketch of his Life and Writings* (Lond. 1804, 2 vols. 8vo). See Jones, *Christian Biography*, s. v.; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1582; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 922.

Hunter, Humphrey, a Presbyterian minister and patriot, was born near Londonderry, Ireland, May 14, 1755. His widowed mother came to this country when Humphrey was only four years old. During the Revolution he served our nation in the struggle for independence, first as a private, and later, for a short time, as lieutenant, against the Cherokee Indians. He finally decided to prepare himself for a literary career, and to this end pursued a course of study at the Queen's Museum, afterwards called Liberty Hall Academy, at Charlotte, N. C. After the surrender of Charlestown he re-enlisted, and was taken prisoner at the battle of Camden. He succeeded in making his escape from the enemy, and took a gallant part in the battle at Eutaw Springs. After this he resumed his studies at Mount Zion College, Minnsborough, S. C., and graduated in 1787. Two years later he was ordained for the ministry, and in 1805 was installed as pastor over the Steele Creek Church, N.C., where he remained until his death, Aug. 21, 1827. (J. H. W.)

Hunter, William, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in the County of Tyrone, Ireland, May 5, 1755. When about twenty-four years old he was converted, and joined the Wesleyan Methodist Society, and shortly after his connection with the Church began to preach. He became personally acquainted with Mr. Wesley, and felt so drawn towards him that he decided to accompany him from place to place, to profit by the godly life of the founder of Methodism. In May, 1790, he emigrated to this country, and settled in Delaware. He was admitted on trial in the travelling connection in 1793, was ordained deacon in 1794, and in 1796 an elder. He successively travelled Chester, Bristol, Dover, Cecil, Kent, Queen Anne's, Strasburg, Dauphin, and Lancaster circuits. For two years he labored as a missionary in Pennsylvania, and during four years he presided on the Schuylkill District. In 1814 he was returned superannuated, but in 1816 he again resumed his labors. In 1819 he was returned supernumerary, and from 1822 to 1827 continued, and so remained, till his death at Coventry, Pa., Sept. 27, 1833. In the various appointments he filled in the Church "he was acceptable and useful as a preacher, and discharged the duties of his vocation with simplicity and fidelity."—*Minutes of Conf.*

Hunting (צַיִד, Gr. ἄγρα). The pursuit and capture of beasts of the field was one of the first means of sustenance to which the human race had recourse. In process of time, however, when civilization had made some progress, when cities were built and lands cultivated, hunting was carried on not so much for the food which it brought as for the recreation it gave and its conduciveness to health. Hunting has always borne somewhat of a regal character, and in Persia immense parks (παράδεισοι) were inclosed for nurturing and preserving beasts of the chase. The monarch himself led the way to the sport, not only in these preserves, but also over the wide surface of the country, being attended by his nobles, especially by the younger aspirants to fame and warlike renown (Xenoph. *Cyr.* viii, 1, 38). Scenes of this character are abundantly portrayed on the Assyrian and Babylonian monuments recently discovered by Botta and Layard. The king is represented as pursuing not only smaller game on horseback, but also engaged in the chase of more formidable animals, such as lions and wild bulls, in the chariot (Layard's *Nineveh*, 1st ser. ii, 328). See LION. This was especially a favorite employment of princes, and Darius caused to be engraved on his tomb an epitaph recording his proficiency as an archer and hunter (Strabo, xv, 212).

Ancient Assyrian Huntsman.

Royal Lion-hunt. From the Assyrian Monuments.

In the Bible we find hunting connected with royalty as early as in Gen. x, 9. The great founder of Babel was in general repute as "a mighty hunter before the Lord." See NIMROD. The patriarchs, however, are to be regarded rather as herdsmen than hunters, if respect is had to their habitual mode of life. The condition of the herdsman ensues next to that of the hunter in the early stages of civilization, and so we find that even Cain was a keeper of sheep. This, and the fact that Abel is designated "a tiller of the ground," would seem to indicate a very rapid progress in the arts and pursuits of social life. The same contrast and similar hostility we find somewhat later in the case of Jacob and Esau; the first "a plain man dwelling in tents," the

second "a cunning hunter, a man of the field" (Gen. xxv sq.). The account given of Esau in connection with his father seems to show that hunting was, conjointly with tillage, pursued at that time as a means of subsistence, and that hunting had not then passed into its secondary state, and become an amusement.

In Egypt the children of Israel doubtless were spectators of hunting carried on extensively and pursued in different methods, but chiefly, as appears probable, with a view rather to recreation than subsistence (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* vol. iii). Wild oxen are represented on the Egyptian sculptures as captured by means of the lasso, but dogs appear to have been usually employed in the chase. See Dog. That the land of promise into which the Hebrews were conducted on leaving Egypt was plentifully supplied with beasts of the chase appears clear from Exod. xxiii, 29, "I will not drive them out in one year, lest the land become desolate and the beast of the field multiply against thee" (comp. Deut. iii, 22). Also from the regulation given in Lev. xvii, 15, it is manifest that hunting was practised after the settlement in Canaan, and was pursued with the view of obtaining food. Prov. xii, 27 proves that hunting animals for their flesh was an established custom among the Hebrews, though the turn of the passage may serve to show that at the time it was penned sport was the chief aim. If hunting was not forbidden in the "year of rest," special provision was made that not only the cattle, but "the beast of the field," should be allowed to enjoy and flourish on the uncropped spontaneous produce of the land (Exod. xxiii, 11; Lev. xxv, 7). Harmer (iv, 357) says, "There are various sorts of creatures in the Holy Land proper for hunting; wild boars, antelopes, hares, etc., are in considerable numbers there, and one of the Christian kings of Jerusalem lost his life (*Gesta Dei*, p. 887) in pursuing a hare." That the lion and other ravenous beasts of prey were not wanting in Palestine many passages of the Bible make obvious (1 Sam. xvii, 34; 2 Sam. xxiii, 20; 1 Kings xiii, 24; Harris, *Natural History of the Bible;* Kitto's *Pictorial Palestine*). The lion was even made use of to catch other animals (Ezek. xix, 3), and Harmer long ago remarked that as in the vicinity of Gaza, so also in Judæa, leopards were trained and used for the same purpose (Harmer, iv, 358; Hab. i, 8). That lions were taken by pitfalls as well as by nets appears from Ezek. xix, 4, 8 (Shaw, p. 172). In the latter verse the words of the prophet, "and spread their net over him" (comp. 2 Sam. xxii, 6), allude to the custom of inclosing a wide extent of country with nets, into which the animals were driven by hunters (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, iii, 4). The

Ancient Egyptian Hunter carrying Home the Game.

spots thus inclosed were usually in a hilly country and in the vicinity of water-brooks; whence the propriety and force of the language of Psa. xlii, 1, "As the (hunted) hart panteth after the water-brooks." These places were selected because they were those to which the animals were in the habit of repairing in the morning and evening. Scenes like the one now supposed are found portrayed in the Egyptian paintings (Wilkinson). Hounds were used for hunting in Egypt, and, if the passage in Josephus (*Ant.* iv, 8, 9) may be considered decisive, in Palestine as well. From Gen. xxvii, 3, "Now take thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow," we learn what arms were employed at least in capturing game. Bulls, after being taken, were kept at least for a time in a net (Isa. li, 20). Various missiles, pitfalls, snares, and gins were made use of in hunting (Psa. xci, 3; Amos iii, 5; 2 Sam. xxiii, 20). See the various animals and means of capture enumerated above in their alphabetical place. That hunting continued to be followed till towards the end of the Jewish state appears from Josephus (*War*, i, 20, 13), where the historian speaks of Herod as "ever a most excellent hunter, for in one day he caught forty wild beasts." The same passage makes it clear that horses were employed in the pursuits of the chase (compare Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 7, 7; xvi, 10, 3). See Chase.

The prophets sometimes depict war under the idea of hunting: "I will send for many hunters," says Jeremiah, "and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks" (xvi, 16), referring to the Chaldæans, who held the Jews under their dominion, or, according to others, to the Persians, who set the Hebrews at liberty. Ezekiel also (xxxii, 30) speaks of the kings, who were persecutors of the Jews, under the name of hunters. The psalmist thanks God for having delivered him from the snares of the hunters [Eng. trans. "fowler"] (Psa. xci, 3). Micah complains (vii, 2) that every one lays ambuscades for his neighbor, and that one brother hunts after another to destroy him. Jeremiah (Lam. iii, 52) represents Jerusalem as complaining of her enemies, who have taken her, like a bird, in their nets. See Net.

Huntingdon, Selina, Countess of, a lady distinguished in the religious history of the 18th century, was born Aug. 24, 1707, and was one of the three daughters and co-heirs of Washington Shirley, earl of Ferrers. Selina, the second daughter, married, in 1728, Theophilus Hastings, earl of Huntingdon, a nobleman of retired habits, with whom she appears to have had a very happy life till his sudden death, on the 13th of October, 1746, of a fit of apoplexy. She had many children, four of whom died in youth or early manhood. It was probably these domestic afflictions which disposed this lady to take the course so opposite to that which is generally pursued by the noble and the great. She became deeply religious. It was at the time when the preachers and founders of Methodism, Wesley and Whitefield, were rousing in the country, by their exciting ministry, a spirit of more intense devotion than was generally prevalent, and leading men to look more to what are called the distinguishing truths of the Gospel than to its moral teachings, to which the clergy had for some time chiefly attended in their public ministrations. She found in these doctrines matter of consolation and delight, and she sought to make others participate with her in the advantages they were believed by her to afford. The character of her religion, as well as of her mind, was too decided to allow it to shrink from prominence; on the contrary, her high soul compassionated the fearful condition of the wealthy and noble, and she boldly sought to spread the influences of Methodism, not only through the highest aristocracy of the realm, but to the royal family itself. She took Whitefield under her especial patronage, defied all ecclesiastical order, and even engaged him to hold services in her own residence, which she invited her friends of the nobili-

ty to attend. She persuaded the highest ladies of the court to listen to the preaching of the great evangelists, with an influence more or less powerful upon some, and a saving change in others. Among the former were the celebrated duchess of Marlborough and the duchess of Buckingham; among the latter the duchess of the celebrated Chesterfield, lady Ann Frankland, and lady Fanny Shirley, the theme of the admiring muse of Pope. She numbered among her friends some of the most venerated personages of English history: Watts, Doddridge, Romaine, Venn, and the sainted Fletcher. When Mr. Wesley and his conference of preachers came to the conclusion that they had "leaned too much to Calvinism," lady Huntingdon, who had imbibed from Whitefield the Calvinism by him imported from New England, received the impression, erroneous but inveterate, that Mr. Wesley denied the doctrine of justification by faith, and insisted upon the saving merit of works. Her relative, Rev. Walter Shirley, with the small remnant of Calvinistic preachers, called for recantation. A controversy arose, in which the virulent Toplady was chief champion of Calvinism, and love and truth, on the Arminian side, found their model in Fletcher. Each party went on, in spite of the break, in spreading the essential truths of the Gospel maintained by both. Lady Huntingdon and Mr. Wesley never again met on earth; but when, near the close of her own career, she read the dying ascription made by Mr. Wesley of his salvation to the blood of the Lamb, and when she learned from Wesley's fellow-traveller, Bradford, that such had ever been the tenor of his preaching, her soul melted, and, bursting into tears, she lamented that the unhappy separation had ever taken place. Whitefield made no attempt to found a separate sect, but the countess chose to assume a sort of leadership among his followers, and to act herself as the founder of a sect, and those who might properly have been called Whitefieldian Methodists came to be known as "the countess of Huntingdon's Connection." On Whitefield's death in 1777 she was appointed by will sole proprietrix of all his possessions in Georgia (U. S. A.), and a result of this was the organization of a mission to America. But the countess had also at her own command a considerable income during the forty-four years of her widowhood, and, as her own personal expenses were few, she established and supported, with the assistance of other opulent persons, members of her own family, or other persons who were wrought upon as she was, a college at Trevecca, in Wales, for the education of ministers; built numerous chapels, and assisted in the support of the ministers in them. She died June 17, 1791, and the number of her chapels at the time of her death is stated to have been sixty-four, the principal of which was that at Bath, where she herself frequently attended. She created a trust for the management of her college and chapels after her death. The college was soon after removed to Cheshunt, Herts, where it still flourishes; but her chapels have, for the most part, become in doctrine and practice almost identical with those of the Congregational or Independent body, the chief distinction being in the use of a portion at least of the "Book of Common Prayer," though, where not expressly directed in the trust-deed, that practice has in many instances been abandoned. In 1851 there were, according to the census, 109 chapels belonging to the countess of Huntingdon's Connection in England and Wales. See *English Cyclopædia; Methodist Quarterly Review*, January, 1858, p. 162; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, i, 167; *Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon* (Lond. 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); Mudge, *Lady Huntingdon portrayed* (New York, 1857, 12mo); Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, p. 388 sq.

Huntingford, George Isaac, D.D., an English prelate, was born in Winchester in 1748, and was educated at Winchester School and at New College, Oxford. In 1772 he became master of Westminster School; in 1789, warden of Winchester School; in 1802, bishop of Gloucester; and in 1815 bishop of Hereford. He died in 1832. Besides several Greek and Latin class-books, he published *Thoughts on the Trinity, with Charges*, etc. (2d edit. Lond. 1832, 8vo); and a number of occasional sermons and charges. See *Gentleman's Magazine*, June and Dec. 1832; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1584; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 924.

Huntington, Joseph, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in 1735, at Windham, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1762, and was ordained pastor of the First Church, Coventry, Conn., June 29, 1763, where he died Dec. 25, 1794. In 1780 he was made a member of the board of overseers of Yale College. He published *A Plea before the Ecclesiastical Council at Stockbridge in the Case of Mrs. Fiske, excommunicated for marrying a profane Man* (1779):—*An Address to his Anabaptist Brethren* (1783):—*Thoughts on the Atonement of Christ* (1791):—*Calvinism improved* (post, 1796); and a few occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, i, 602.

Huntington, Joshua, a Congregational minister, was born Jan. 31, 1786, at Norwich, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1804, entered the ministry in Sept. 1806, and was ordained co-pastor of the Old South Church, Boston, May 18, 1808, where he labored until his death, Sept. 11, 1819. He was one of the founders of the "American Educational Society," and President of the "Boston Society for the Religious and Moral Instruction of the Poor" from its formation in 1816.—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 501.

Huntington, Robert, D.D., a distinguished English theologian and Orientalist, was born in February, 1636, at Deorhyrst, in Gloucestershire, where his father, of the same names, was parish clergyman. He was educated at the free-school of Bristol, was admitted in 1652 a portionist of Merton College, Oxford, received his bachelor's degree in 1658, and was shortly after elected to a fellowship in that college. He took his degree of master of arts in 1663, and, having then applied himself with great success to the study of the Oriental languages, he was in 1670 appointed to the situation of chaplain at Aleppo. From 1677 to 1682 he travelled in the East, and a short time after his return, in 1683, was appointed provost or master of Trinity College, Dublin, receiving about this time the degree of D.D.; he resigned this position in 1691, and once more returned to England. In August, 1692, he was presented by Sir Edward Turner to the rectory of Great Hallingbury, in Essex; and while there he married a sister of Sir John Powell, one of the justices of the King's Bench. In 1701 he was elected bishop of Raphoe, but he died before consecration, Sept. 2, of this year. Dr. Huntington is principally distinguished for the numerous Oriental manuscripts which he procured while in the East and brought with him to England. Besides those which he purchased for archbishop Marsh and bishop Fell, he obtained between six and seven hundred for himself, which are now in the Bodleian Library, to which he first presented thirty-five of them, and then sold the rest in 1691 for the small sum of £700. Huntington, however, missed the principal object of his search, the very important Syriac version of the epistles of St. Ignatius, a large portion of which was recovered in 1843 by Mr. Tattam from one of the very monasteries in Nitria which Huntington had visited in the course of his inquiries. Several of Huntington's letters, which are addressed to the archbishop of Mount Sinai, contain inquiries about the manuscript of St. Ignatius, and the same earnest inquiries are made in his letters to the patriarch of Antioch. See *Vita H. et epistolæ*, edited by Thomas Smith (Lond. 1704, 8vo); *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 924; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 224; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* i, 1585. (J. H. W.)

Huntington, William, a Calvinistic Methodist preacher, was born in 1744. He passed his early life in menial service and dissipation, but after conversion he

entered the ministry, and became a popular preacher in London. On his books he took the title of S. S., or *Sinner Saved.* He died in 1813. A review of his works by Southey will be found in the *Quarterly Review*, xx, 462. His writings have been collected and published: *Works* (London, 1820, 20 vols. 8vo, and his select works, edited by his son, 6 vols. 8vo, 1838, and reprinted in 1856):—*Contemplations on the God of Israel*, in a series of letters to a friend (Sleaford, 1830, 12mo):—*The Law established by the Faith of Christ*, a sermon on Rom. iii, 31 (Lond. 1786, 8vo):—*The Epistle of Faith* (Lond. 1789, 8vo):—*The Kingdom of Heaven taken by Prayer*, with *Life* of the author (Andover, 1832, 32mo):—*The wise and foolish Virgins described*, the substance of two sermons on Matt. xxv, 3, 4 (Lond. 1803, 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1586.

Hunyad, Johannes Corvinus. See Hungary.

Hupfeld, Hermann, D.D., a German theologian, and one of the most distinguished Hebraists of Europe, son of the clergyman Bernhard Karl Hupfeld, who died at Spangenburg, Hesse, in 1823, was born March 31, 1796, at Marburg, and educated at the university of his native place, under the especial protection of the great Orientalist Arnoldi (q. v.). After preaching a short time as assistant to the first Reformed preacher of Marburg, he accepted in 1819 the position as third teacher at the gymnasium at Hanau. He resigned in 1822 on account of impaired health, and, after a summer's journey through Switzerland, and the use of mineral waters at the springs of two watering-places in Würtemberg, he went first to his father's house at Spangenburg to resume his theological studies and to prepare for the ministry, and later to the University of Halle, where he became acquainted with Gesenius, and was led to a more thorough study of the Scriptures, especially the Old Testament. In 1824 he began to lecture at the university, and prepared an elaborate essay on the Ethiopic language (*Exercitationes Æthiopicæ*, Leipzig, 1825), which was favorably received and commented upon in the *Heidelberger Jahrbücher* and the *Hallische Literatur Zeitung.* In 1825 he was appointed extraordinary professor of theology at the University of Marburg, and in 1827, after Hartmann's death, professor *ordinarius* of the Oriental languages, retaining the chair of theology, which was made a regular professorship in 1830. During the Revolution of 1830 he was on the side of those who favored a reform of the ecclesiastical constitution of Hesse, and strongly opposed the conservative minister Hassenpflug. In 1843 he went to Halle as the successor of Gesenius, by whose influence Hupfeld had received the degree of D.D. in 1834. During the revolution of 1848 he was active in the interests of a popular form of government, and urged the establishment of a German empire on a historical basis. He died April 24, 1866. In theology, Hupfeld was called orthodox in Germany, but in America he would be much more likely to have been classed with "Liberals." On inspiration, for instance, he held that only certain portions of the sacred writings are of divine origin, and that the Spirit reveals to all sincere readers the real character of such passages. In criticism, he belonged to the school of his friend De Wette (q. v.). "His researches were extensive, but guarded in their deductions by his caution. In the elaboration of his works he was extremely fastidious. A *connoisseur* in work, he could not go on if the machinery were not exact, if one slight element were lacking to harmony and completeness. This sensibility sometimes impeded the activities of a mind whose powers of acquisition and production were immense. In his department he was among the first scholars of his day. Few burial-grounds, indeed, inclose the ashes of two such *savans* as Hupfeld and his predecessor Gesenius. At the close of his arduous life, when in his seventy-first year, his mental vigor showed no decline, his diligence no slackening. As a religious man, Hupfeld belonged to the Pietists, who correspond in the religious scale with our strict evangelical Christians. He was a devout man, though not after our stamp of devotion. It is doubtful whether he knew anything by experience of our immediate conversion. Probably he was never in a prayer-meeting; and he looked upon revivals as questionable, if not objectionable measures. Of devotional methods and exercises, then, he had limited knowledge; but he believed, nevertheless, 'with the heart unto righteousness.' He lived as all Christians must live, by faith" (*N. Y. Methodist*, 1866, No. 313). Hupfeld left mere monographs, the results of most careful inquiry on certain points bearing on the subjects to which he devoted his later years, and but few books proper. Thus, in 1841, he commenced a Hebrew grammar, in which he attempted to pursue the same course in the Shemitic as Grimm did in the Germanic language, viz. the development of the Hebrew *genetically* by a consideration of its sounds. Only a few sheets of the work were published, under the title *Kritisches Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache und Schrift* (Cassel, 1841). His most important works are, *Ueber d. Begriff u. d. Methode d. bibl. Einleit.* (Marb. 1844):—*De antiquioribus apud Judæos accentuum scriptoribus* (Halle, 1846 and 1847, 2 vols.):—*De primit. et vera festorum apud Hebræos ratione* (1851, 1852, 1858, 1865, 2 vols.):—*Quæst. in Jobeidos locos* (1853):—*Die Quellen d. Genesis* (Berl. 1835):—*Die Psalmen, übersetzt u. erklärt* (1855–62, 4 vols. 8vo; of a 2d ed., begun in 1867 by Dr. Edward Riehm, 3 vols. are now [1870] published):—*Die heutige theosoph. u. mytholog. Theologie und Schrifterklärung* (Berlin, 1861). A biography of Hupfeld was published by Dr. Riehm (*Dr. Hermann Hupfeld*, Halle, 1867). See *Theol. Univ. Lex.* i, 374; Pierer, *Universal Lex.* viii, 631; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1868, i, 184 sq.; *Jahrb. deutsch. Theolog.* 1868, iv, 758 sq.; *Bib. Sac.* 1866, p. 673 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hu'pham (Heb. *Chupham'*, חוּפָם, according to Gesenius perh. *coast-man*, according to Fürst *screened;* Sept. omits, but some eds. have Ὀφάμ; Vulg. *Hupham*), a person apparently mentioned as one of the sons of Benjamin (Numb. xxvi, 39); elsewhere less correctly called Huppim (Gen. xlvi, 24). His descendants are called Huphamites (Hebrew *Chuphami'*, חוּפָמִי, Sept. omits, but some eds. Ὀφαμί, Vulg. *Huphamitæ*, Numb. xxvi, 39). B.C. 1856. The name *Huppim* being in the plur. (Heb. *Chuppim'*, חֻפִּים, *coverings;* Sept. omits in Gen. xlvi, 21, but some copies have Ὀφμίν or Ὀφιμίμ as a son of Bela; Vulg. *Ophim*), suggests the possibility that it is a contraction for *Huphamites.* See Shuppim. The only other passages where it occurs are 1 Chron. vii, 12 (Sept. Ἀφείμ, Vulg. *Hapham*) and 15 (Sept. Ἀφφείμ, Vulg. *Happhim*), in both which it has the same fraternity with Shuppim, and in the latter mention is made of a sister Maachah as married to Machir, the son of Manasseh by a concubine, while in the former Huppim and Shuppim are expressly called the sons of Ir, apparently a son of Benjamin additional to the three mentioned in ver. 6, but probably not the Iri mentioned in ver. 7. Hence results the probability that Hupham, whose descendants are thus spoken of, was a grandson of Benjamin, and consequently a son of one of his five sons expressly named in order in 1 Chron. viii, 1, 2, but whether of the fourth or fifth is uncertain. See Benjamin.

Hu'phamite (Numb. xxvi, 39). See Hupham.

Hup'pah (Heb. *Chuppah'*, חֻפָּה, a *covering* or bridal canopy, as in Psa. xix, 6; also *protected*, as in Isa. iv, 5; Sept. Ὀφφά v. r. Ὀπφά, and even Ὀχχοφφά), the head of the thirteenth of the twenty-four classes into which David divided the priests (1 Chron. xxiv, 13). B.C. 1014.

Hup'pim (Gen. xlvi, 21; 1 Chron. vii, 12). See Hupham.

Hur (Heb. *Chûr*, חוּר, a *hole*, as of a viper, Isa. xi, 8; also a narrow and filthy subterranean *prison*, Isa. xlii, 22; comp. the "black hole" of Calcutta; otherwise *noble;* Sept. Ὥρ, Οὔρ, but Σούρ in Neh. iii, 9; Josephus Ὅρος and Οὔρης), the name of five men.

1. A son of Caleb (Judah's great-grandson through Hezron), the first one by his second wife Ephrath, and grandfather of Bezaleel (q. v.), the famous artificer, through Uri (1 Chron. ii, 19, 50; iv, 1, 4; comp. ii, 20; 2 Chron. i, 5; Exod. xxxi, 2; xxxv, 30; xxxviii, 22). B.C. between 1856 and 1658. By some (after Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 6, 1) he has been confounded with the following.

2. The husband of Miriam, the sister of Moses, according to Josephus (*Ant.* iii, 2, 4). During the conflict with the Amalekites he assisted Aaron in sustaining the arms of Moses in that praying attitude upon which the success of the Israelites was found to depend (Exod. xvii, 10–12); and when Moses was absent on Sinai to receive the law, he associated Hur with Aaron in charge of the people (Exod. xxiv. 14). B.C. 1658.

3. The fourth named of the five princes or petty kings of Midian (מַלְכֵי מִדְיָן), who were defeated and slain shortly before the death of Moses by the Israelites, under the leadership of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar (Numb. xxxi, 8; Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 7, 1). B.C. 1618. In Josh. xiii, 21 these five Midianites are termed נְסִיכֵי סִיחוֹן, the *vassals of Sihon*, and are also described as יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ, *dwellers in the land*, which Keil (ad loc.) explains as meaning that they had for a long time dwelt in the land of Canaan with the Moabites, whereas the Amorites had only recently effected an entrance. After the defeat of Sihon these chieftains appear to have made common cause with Balak, the king of Moab (Numb. xxii, 4, 7), and to have joined with him in urging Balaam to curse the Israelites. The evil counsel of Balaam having been followed, and the Israelites in consequence seduced into transgression (Numb. xxxi, 16), Moses was directed to make war upon the Midianites. The latter were utterly defeated, and "Balaam also, the son of Beor, they slew with the sword." See SIHON.

4. A person whose son (Ben-Hur) was Solomon's purveyor in Mount Ephraim (1 Kings iv, 8). Josephus calls him *Ures* (Οὔρης), and makes him to have been himself military governor of the Ephraimites (*Ant.* viii, 2, 3). B.C. ante 995.

5. Father of Rephaiah, which latter is called "ruler of the half part of Jerusalem" after the exile, and repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 9). B.C. ante 446.

Hu′rai (Heb. *Churay′*, חוּרַי, Chald. perhaps *linen-worker*, otherwise *noble;* Sept. Οὐρί, Vulg. *Hurai*), a native of the valleys ("brooks") of Mount Gaash, one of David's heroes (1 Chron. xi, 32); called less correctly in the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii. 30) HIDDAI. B.C. 1046.

Hu′ram (*a*, 1 Chron. viii. 5; *b*, 1 Chron. xiv, 1, marg.; 2 Chron. ii, 3, 11, 12; viii, 2, 18; ix, 10, 21; *c*, 2 Chron. ii, 13; iv, 11, 16). See HIRAM.

Hurd, RICHARD, D.D., an eminent English prelate, was born at Congreve, Staffordshire, in 1720. He was admitted at Emanuel College, Cambridge, in 1733. In 1750, by recommendation of his friend, bishop Warburton (q. v.), he became one of the Whitehall preachers, and in 1757 rector of Thurcaston. He afterwards became successively rector of Folkton, Yorkshire, in 1762, preacher of Lincoln's Inn in 1765, archdeacon of Gloucester in 1767, and finally bishop of Lichfield and Coventry in 1775, whence he was translated to Worcester in 1781. In 1783 he was offered the archbishopric of Canterbury, which he declined. He died in 1808. His *Sermons* (5 vols. 8vo), distinguished by elegant simplicity of style, perspicuity of method, and acuteness of elucidation, are to be found, with his other miscellaneous writings, in his *Works* (London, 1811, 8 vols. 8vo). His most important contribution to theology is his *Introduction to the Study of the Prophecies* (1772, 8vo; 1788, 2 vols. 8vo; 1839, edited by Bickersteth, 12mo). This was the first of the "Warburtonian Lectures." Notwithstanding the polemical cast of some of these sermons, the clear exposition of the general principles of prophecy and of the claims which this portion of the sacred Scriptures has on the serious and unprejudiced attention of thoughtful readers, conveyed in perspicuous and even elegant language, has secured a large amount of popularity for the work even up to recent times (Kitto, *Bib. Cyclop.* ii, 343). He also edited *The Works of Warburton* (1788, 7 vols.), and published a *Life of Warburton* (Lond. 1794, 4to). See Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 925; *Quarterly Review* (London), vii, 383; Hallam, *Lit. Hist. of Europe* (4th edit., Lond. 1854), iii, 475; *Life and Writings of Hurd*, by Francis Kilvert (Lond. 1860); *Christ. Remembrancer*, 1860, p. 262; *North British Rev.* May, 1861, art. iv; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 225 sq.

Hurdis, JAMES, an English divine, was born at Bishopstone, Sussex, in 1763, and was educated first at Chichester School and next at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. In 1782 he was chosen demy of St. Mary Magdalene College, and some time after was made a fellow. In 1785 he became curate of Burwash, in Sussex, and in 1791 was presented to the living of his native place. In 1793 he was elected to the professorship of poetry, having previously published some poems of great excellence. He took the degree of B.D. in 1794, and that of D.D. in 1797. He died Dec. 23, 1801. Besides poetical works, Hurdis published several works of interest to the Biblical student. They are: *Select Critical Remarks upon the English Version of the first ten Chapters of Genesis* (Lond. 1793, 8vo):—*A short critical Disquisition upon the true Meaning of the Word* תַּנִּינִם (Gen. i, 21) (ibid. 1790, 8vo), in which he contends that this word, wherever it occurs, signifies *crocodile*. "His remarks on the various passages in which it is found are, to say the least, very ingenious." He also wrote *Twelve Dissertations on the Nature and Occasion of Psalm and Prophecy* (ibid. 1800).—Kitto, *Bib. Cycl.* ii, 343; Hook, *Eccl. Biogr.* vi, 227 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 925.

Hurdwar (more accurately HARDWAR, i. e. *Gate of Hari*), also called GANGADWARA (*Ganges Gate*), an Indian city, is celebrated on account of the pilgrimages which are made to it. More than two million people from all parts of India resort to this place to take the sacred bath in the Ganges (q. v.), that flows by the side of it. As in Mecca, the occasion is also improved for business purposes, and great fairs are held annually in April.—Brockhaus, *Conv. Lex.* viii, 167–8.

Hu′ri (Heb. *Churi′*, חוּרִי, according to Gesenius perhaps *linen-worker*, like Arab. *Hariri;* so also Fürst; Sept. Οὐρί, Vulg. *Huri*), son of Jaroah and father of Abihail of the descendants of Gad in Bashan (1 Chron. v, 14). B.C. ante 781.

Huris. See HOURIS; MOHAMMEDANISM.

Hurrion, JOHN, an English Independent minister, was born about 1675. He became pastor of a congregation at Denton, Norfolk, in 1696. In 1724 he removed to London as minister to a congregation in Hare Court, and died in 1731. He employed his time greatly in study, chiefly of the Church fathers. His style is natural, unaffected, and manly. His writings include a *Treatise on the Holy Spirit* (1734, 8vo), and a large number of sermons and lectures, all of which have been collected and published under the title *The whole Works of John Hurrion, now first collected; to which is prefixed the Life of the Author* (Lond. 1823, 3 vols. 12mo).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1587; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 926; *Lond. Evang. Mag.* Jan. 1827.

Hurter, Friedrich Emanuel von, a Swiss theologian who became a convert to Romanism, was born at Schaffhausen March 19, 1787. He studied Protestant theology at the University of Göttingen, became pastor of a country congregation in his native canton, 1824, first pastor of the city of Schaffhausen, 1835, antistes (chief of the clergy of the canton) and dean of the synod. His intimate association with some of the ultramontane Roman Catholics, and the great attention paid him by

communicants of the Church of Rome on a journey through Bavaria and Austria, brought on him the stigma of Cryptocatholicism, and he was requested by his colleagues at Schaffhausen to define his position to the Reformed Church in which he held orders. As the declaration which Hurter made gave dissatisfaction to his Protestant friends and brethren in the ministry, he resigned his position in 1841, and in June, 1844, made open declaration of his abjuration from the Reformed and adherence to the Romish Church. He now devoted his time mainly to the study of history, and in 1845 accepted a call to Vienna as imperial historiographer. Under the liberal ministry of Pillersdorf he had to resign this position, but recovered it in 1851, when he was also ennobled. He died at Gratz Aug. 27, 1865. His works of especial interest to the theologian are, *Geschichte des Papstes Innocenz III u. s. Zeitalter* (Hamb. 1834–42, 4 vols. 8vo) :—*Befeindung d. Kathol. Kirche in d. Schweiz* (Schaffh. 1840) :—*Geburt u. Wiedergeburt* (ibid. 1845, 4 vols. 8vo; 4th ed. 1867, etc.) :—*Geschichte Ferdinand II und seiner Eltern* (Schaffhaus. 1850–64, 11 vols.). The researches made for his history of Innocent III, the Roman Catholics claim, led to Hurter's conversion to their Church.—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 633; Werner, *Gesch. der Kathol. Theol.* p. 521 sq.

Hurter, Johann Georg, a German Pietist and philanthropist, was born in the latter half of the 17th century. Of his early history we know but little. He was pastor of a church at Schaffhausen from 1704. He is often called "an Augustus Hermann Francke in miniature" on account of the school and orphan-houses which he built without possessing the necessary means, relying solely, like Francke, on providential help. His first undertaking was the building of a school-house for the instruction of the children of his own scattered congregation, who were obliged to go a long way to the town school, and of whom many could not get there at all. "In December, 1709, seventy children, with their pastor, Hurter, at their head, celebrated, with prayer and thanksgiving, their entrance into their new house." The contributions which he had received for the undertaking had been so numerous and so ready that on the completion of the school-house he decided to build an orphan asylum. One benevolent man laid the corner-stone by a gift of 200 florins. To make a beginning, one of the rooms in the school-house was set apart for the reception of orphans, and in July, 1711, a widow with seven children was received. The contributions multiplied, and with them the children. Hurter contributed even much of his own means; and when in 1716 he, with other Pietists, was rewarded for his service by deposition from the ministry, he modestly secluded himself in a little room in his orphan asylum, and there spent the latter years of his life. He died in 1721.—This article is based altogether on Hurst's translation of Hagenbach, *Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries* (N. York, Scribner and Co., 1869, 2 vols. 8vo), i, 181.

Hurwitz, Hyman, a distinguished Jewish scholar, of whose early life but little is known, was, up to the time of his death (about 1850), professor of Hebrew in the University College, London. He is best known as the author of *Vindiciæ Hebraicæ, or A Defence of the Hebrew Scriptures* (Lond. 1820, 8vo), which, at the time of its appearance, was highly commented upon by the *London Quarterly Review*, and by Horne in his *Bibl. Bib.* Hurwitz also published a volume of *Hebrew Tales*, collected chiefly from the Talmud, to which he pays a very high tribute, and of which, while endeavoring to free it from the objection so frequently made to some of its indecent passages and many contradictions, he says, "I do not hesitate to avow my doubts whether there exists any uninspired work of equal antiquity that contains more interesting, more various and valuable information, than that of the still-existing remains of the ancient Hebrew sages." In 1807 Hurwitz began the publication of text-books for the study of the Hebrew language, which are considered among the best extant in the English language. They were, *Elements of the Hebr. Lang.* pt. i, Orthography (Lond. 1807, 8vo; 4th ed. 1848, 8vo) :—*Etymology and Syntax of the Hebr. Lang.* (4th ed. 1850, 8vo) :—*Hebrew Grammar* (4th ed. 1850, 8vo).—Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Lit.* p. 183 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 926.

Husband (prop. אִישׁ or אֱנוֹשׁ, a *man*, ἀνήρ; also בַּעַל, *master*, חָתָן, *spouse* [in Exod. iv, 24, the phrase "bloody husband" has an allusion to the matrimonial figure in the covenant of circumcision (q. v.)], etc.), a married man, the house-band, or band which connects the whole family, and keeps it together. Johnson (*Engl. Dict.* s. v.) refers the term to the Runic, house-*bonda*, master of the house; but several of his instances seem allied to the sense of binding together, or assembling into union. So we say, *to husband* small portions of things, meaning to collect and unite them, to manage them to the greatest advantage, etc., which is by associating them together; making the most of them, not by dispersion, but by union. A man who was betrothed, but not actually married, was esteemed a husband (Matt. i, 16, 20; Luke ii, 5). A man recently married was exempt from going out to war (Deut. xx, 7; xxiv, 5). The husband is described as the head of his wife, and as having control over her conduct, so as to supersede her vows, etc. (Numb. xxx, 6–8). He is also the guide of her youth (Prov. ii, 17). Sarah called her husband Abraham lord, a title which was continued long after (Hos. ii, 16) [*baali*, my lord]. The apostle Peter seems to recommend it as a title implying great respect, as well as affection (1 Pet. iii, 6). Perhaps it was rather used as an appellation in public than in private. Our own word master [*Mr.*] (and so correlatively mistress) is sometimes used by married women when speaking of their husbands; but the ordinary use made of this word to all persons, and on all occasions, deprives it of any claim to the expression of particular affection or respect, though it was probably in former ages implied by it or connected with it, as it still is in the instances of proprietors, chiefs, teachers, and superiors, whether in civil life, in polite arts, or in liberal studies. See Marriage.

Husbandman (properly אִישׁ אֲדָמָה, *man of the ground;* γεωργός), one whose profession and labor is to cultivate the ground. It is among the most ancient and honorable occupations (Gen. ix, 20; xxvi, 12, 14; xxxvii, 7; Job i, 2: Isa. xxviii, 24–28; John xv, 1). All the Hebrews who were not consecrated to religious offices were agriculturists. Husbandmen at work are depicted on the ancient monuments of Egypt. It was remarked by the members of the French Commission that there is a great similarity between the joyless looks of the husbandmen on the monuments and the sombre countenances of the modern fellahs, whose toil is so miserably remunerated. In reference to the husbandmen of Syria, Dr. Bowring says, "The laboring classes, if left to themselves, and allowed unmolested to turn to the best account the natural fertility and richness of the country, would be in a highly favorable condition. But this cannot be considered as the case when their services may be and are called for as often as the government require them, and for which they are always inadequately paid; they are likewise frequently sent from one part of the country to another wholly without their consent. The fellah, or peasant, earns little more than a bare subsistence. In Syria a great proportion of the labor is done by females, and they are constantly seen carrying heavy burdens, and, as in Egypt, a large portion of their time is employed in fetching water from the wells for domestic use. They bring home the timber and brushwood from the forests, and assist much in the cultivation of the fields."—Bastow. See Hireling.

God is compared to a husbandman (John xv, 1; 1

Cor. iii, 9); and the simile of land carefully cultivated, or of a vineyard carefully dressed, is often used in the sacred writings. The art of husbandry is from God, says the prophet Isaiah (xxviii, 24-28), and the various operations of it are each in their season. The sowing of seed, the waiting for harvest, the ingathering when ready, the storing up in granaries, and the use of the products of the earth, afford many points of comparison, of apt figures, and similitudes in Scripture. See HUSBANDRY.

Husbandry (in Heb. by circumlocution אֲדָמָה, the *ground;* Gr. prop. γεωργία, 2 Macc. xii, 2; also γεώργιον, a *plot* of tilled ground, 1 Cor. iii, 9). The culture of the soil, although coeval with the history of the human race (Gen. ii, 15; iv, 2; ix, 20), was held of secondary account by the nomade Hebrews of the early period (Gen. xxvi, 12, 14; xxxvii, 7; see Job i, 3; comp. Harmer, i, 88 sq.; Volney, *Travels*, i, 291; Burckhardt, *Beduin*. p. 17; see Michaelis, *De antiquitatibus œcon. patriarch.* i, Halle, 1728, and in Ugolini *Thesaurus*, xxiv, etc.), but by the Jewish lawgiver it was elevated to the rank of a fundamental institution of national economy (Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, i, 249 sq.), and hence became assiduously and skilfully practiced in Palestine (comp. 1 Sam. xi, 5; 1 Kings xix, 19; 2 Chron. xxvi, 10; Prov. xxxi, 16; Ecclus. vii, 15; also Isa. xxvii, 27, and Gesenius, ad loc.), as it continues in a good degree to be at the present day in the East. Upon the fields, which were divided (if at all) according to a vague land-measuse termed a yoke (צֶמֶד, 1 Sam. xiv, 14), and occasionally fenced in (see Knobel, *Zu Jesaias*, p. 207), were mostly raised wheat, barley, flax, lentils (2 Sam. xxiii, 11), garlic, and sometimes spelt, beans, a kind of *durra* or *holcus* (דֹּחַן), cummin, fennel, cucumbers, etc. (Isa. xxviii, 25). See these and other vegetables in their alphabetical place; for the later periods, compare the Mishna, *Chilaim*, i. The fertility of Palestine (q. v.), especially in many parts, made the cultivation tolerably easy, and it was gradually increased by the clearing away of forests (Jer. iv, 3), thus enlarging the arable plains (נִיר, *novale*; comp. Prov. xiii, 23); the hills (2 Chron. xxvi, 10; Ezek. xxxviii, 6, 9) being formed into terraces (compare Niebuhr, *Beschreib.* 156; Burckhardt, *Trav.* i, 64), upon which the earth was kept by a facing of stones, while the low grounds and flats along streams were intersected by ditches (פַּלְגֵי מַיִם, Prov. xxi, 1; comp. Psa. i, 13) for drainage (comp. Mishna, *Moed Katon*, i, 1; Niebuhr, *Beschr.* 156; *Trav.* i, 356, 437; Harmer, ii, 331 sq.), or, more usually, irrigation by means of water-wheels (Mishna, *Peah*, v, 3). The soil was manured (דֹּמֶן) sometimes with dung (compare Jer. ix, 22; 2 Kings ix, 37), sometimes by the ashes of burnt straw or stubble (Isa. v, 24; xlvii, 14; Joel ii, 5). Moreover, the keeping of cattle on the fields (Pliny, xviii, 53), and the leaving of the chaff in threshing (Korte, *Reisen*, p. 433), contributed greatly to fertilization. For breaking up the surface of the ground (חָרַשׁ, also נָגַב), ploughs (מַחֲרֵשָׁה?), probably of various construction, were used ("Syria tenui sulco arat:" Pliny, xviii, 47; comp. Theophrast. *Caussæ plant.* iii, 25; on אִתִּים Joel iv, 10, see Credner, ad loc.). The latter, like the harrows, which were early used for covering the seed (Pliny, xviii, 19, 3; see Harduin, ad loc.), were drawn by oxen (1 Kings xix, 19 sq.; Job i. 14; Amos vi, 12) or cows (Judg. xiv, 18; *Baba Mez.* vi, 4), seldom by asses (Isa. xxx, 24; comp. xxxii, 20; Varro, ii, 6, 8, "Ubi levis est terra"), but never with a yoke of the two kinds of animals together (Deut. xxii, 10), as is now customary in the East (Niebuhr, *Beschreib.* p. 156): the beasts were driven with a cudgel (מַלְמָד, goad). (Delineations of Egyptian agriculture may be seen in Wilkinson, 2d ser. i, 48; Rosellini, *Mon. civ.* table 32, 33.) See each of the above agricultural implements in its alphabetical place. The furrows (מַעֲנָה, תֶּלֶם), among the Hebrews, probably ran usually lengthwise and crosswise (Pliny, xviii, 19; Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 155). The sowing occurred, for winter grain, in October and November; for summer fruit, in January or February; the harvest in April. The unexceptionable accounts of fifty-fold and hundred-fold crops (Gen. xxvi, 12 [on the reading here, see Tuch, ad loc.]; Matt. xiii, 8 sq.; compare Josephus, *War*, iv, 8, 3; Herod. i, 193; Pliny, xviii, 47; Strabo, xv, 731; xvi, 742; Heliod. *Æth.* x, 5, p. 395; Sonnini, *Trav.* ii, 306; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 123; Burckhardt, i, 463; yet see Ruppel, *Abyss.* i, 92; Niebuhr, *Beschreib.* p. 151 sq.) seem to show that the ancients sowed (planted, i. e. deposited the grain, שׂוּם, Isa. xxviii, 25) in drills, and with wide spaces between (Niebuhr, *Beschreib.* p. 157; Brown's *Travels in Africa*, p. 457), as Strabo (xv, 731) expressly says was the case among the Babylonians. (See further under the above terms respectively; and comp. generally Ugolini, *Comment. de re rustica vet. Heb.*, in his *Thesaur.* xxix; H. G. Paulsen, *Nachrichten vom Ackerbau der Morgenländer*, Helmstädt, 1748; id. *Ackerbau d. Morgenländer*, Helmstädt, 1748; Norbery, *De agricultura orient.*, in his *Opusc. Acad.* ii, 474 sqq.; P. G. Purmann, 5 *progr. de re rustica vet. Hebr.* Franckf. 1787; also the *Calendar. Palæst. œconom.* by Buhle and Walch, Götting. 1784; Reynier, *L'Economie rurale des Arabes;* Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians;* Layard's *Nineveh*, 1849; his *Nineveh and Babylon*, 1853; Kitto's *Physical Hist. of Palest.* 1843.) See AGRICULTURE.

The legal regulations for the security and promotion of agriculture among the Israelites (compare Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 23 sq.) were the following: *a.* Every hereditary or family estate was inalienable (Lev. xxv, 23); it could indeed be sold for debt, but the purchaser held only the usufruct of the ground; hence the land itself reverted without redemption at the year of jubilee to its appropriate owner (Lev. xxv, 28), whether the original possessor or his heirs-at-law; and at any time during the interval before that period it might be redeemed by such person on repayment of the purchase-money (Lev. xxv, 24). See LAND; JUBILEE. *b.* The removal of field-lines marked by boundary-stones ("*termini*") was strongly interdicted (Deut. xix, 14; compare xxvii, 17; Prov. xxii, 28; Hos. v, 10), as in all ancient nations (comp. Plato, *Leg.* viii, p. 843 sq.; Dougtæi, *Analect.* i, 110; since these metes were established with religious ceremonies, see Pliny, xviii, 2; compare Ovid, *Fasti*, ii, 639 sq.); yet no special penalty is denounced in law against offenders. For any damage done to a field or its growth, whether by the overrunning of cattle or the spreading of fire (Exod. xxii, 5 sq.), full satisfaction was exacted (Philo, *Opp.* ii, 339 sq.). But it was not accounted a trespass for a person to pluck ears of grain from a stranger's field with the naked hand (Deut. xxiii, 26; Matt. xii, 1; Luke vi, 1). This last prescription, which prevails likewise among the Arabs in Palestine (Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 419, 430), was also extended to the gleanings (לֶקֶט, comp. Robinson's *Res.* iii, 9) and to the corners of the field (see Mishna, *Peah*, i, 2, where these are computed at a sixtieth part of the field), which were left for the poor, who were in like manner to share in the remnants of the produce of vineyards and fruit-trees. See GLEANING. *c.* Every seventh year it was ordained that all the fields throughout the entire land should lie fallow, and whatever grew spontaneously belonged to the poor (Lev. xxv, 4 sq.). See SABBATICAL YEAR. *d.* Various seeds were not allowed to be planted in the same field (Lev. xix, 19; Deut. xxii, 9). These beneficent statutes, however, were not uniformly observed by the Israelites (before the Exile). Covetous farmers not only suffered themselves to remove their neighbor's land-mark (Hos. v, 10; comp. Job xxiv, 2), but even kings bought large tracts of land (*latifundia*) together (Isa. v, 8; Mic. ii, 2), so that the entailment and right of redemption of the original possessor appear to have fallen into disuse; neither was the Sabbatical year regularly observed (Jer. xxxiv, 8 sq.). (For fur-

ther agricultural details, see Jahn's *Bibl. Archæol.* chap. iv.) See FARM.

Hüsgen, JOHANN, a German Roman Catholic divine, was born at Giesenkirchen, near Cologne, in 1769. In 1792 he became vicar and teacher at his native place, and after filling different vicarages, was appointed superintendent over the Roman Catholic schools at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1816, in 1825 general vicar to archbishop Spiegel of Desenberg and dean in Cologne, and in 1835, upon the death of the archbishop, presiding officer of the archiepiscopacy pro tem, in which offices he greatly distinguished himself by his kind and conciliatory spirit towards all sects. He died in 1841.—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 635.

Hu'shah (Hebrew *Chushah'*, חוּשָׁה, *haste;* Sept. Ὡσάν, Vulg. *Hosa*), son of Ezer and grandson of Hur, of the family of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 4); whence probably the patronymic HUSHATHITE (Heb. *Chushathi'*, חוּשָׁתִי, Sept. Ἀσωθί, Οὐσαθί), 2 Sam. xxi, 18; 1 Chron. xi, 29; xx, 4. He seems to be the same person called SHUAH in 1 Chron. iv, 11. Comp. HUSHAN. B.C. post 1612.

Hu'shai (Heb. *Chushay'*, חוּשַׁי, *quick;* Sept. and Josephus [*Ant.* vii, 9, 2] Χουσί), called "the Archite" (q. v.) (comp. Josh. xvi, 2) and "the king's companion," i. e. *vizier* or intimate adviser (1 Chron. xxvii, 33), a post which he doubtless attained by his eminent services to David in defeating (B.C. cir. 1023) the plots of Ahithophel, in league with the rebellious Absalom (2 Sam. xv, 32, 37; xvi, 16–18; xvii, 5–15). See DAVID. Baanah, Solomon's vicegerent in Asher, was doubtless the son of the same (1 Kings iv, 16).

Hu'sham (Heb. *Chusham'*, חוּשָׁם, but defectively חֻשָׁם in Gen. xxxvi, 34, 35, *hasty;* Sept. Ἀσώμ and Ἀσόμ), a Temanite, successor of Jobab and predecessor of Bedad among the native princes of Mount Seir before the usurpation of the Edomites (Gen. xxxvi, 34, 35; 1 Chron. i, 45). B.C. long ante 1093, and probably ante 1618.

Hu'shathite (2 Sam. xxi, 18; xxiii, 27; 1 Chron. xi, 29; xx, 4; xxvi, 11). See HUSHAH.

Hu'shim (Heb. *Chushim'*, חוּשִׁים, or defect. חֻשִׁים in Gen. xlvi, 23; 1 Chron. vii, 12, *haste;* Sept. Ὡσίμ, but Ἀσόμ in Gen. xlvi, 23, and Ἀσόβ in 1 Chron. vii, 12), the name of two men and one woman.

1. A son of Dan (Gen. xlvi, 23); more properly called SHUHAM (Numb. xxvi, 42). "Hushim figures prominently in the Jewish traditions of the recognition of Joseph, and of Jacob's burial at Hebron. See the quotations from the Midrash in Weil's *Bib. Legends*, p. 88, note, and the Targum Pseudojon. on Gen. l, 13. In the latter he is the executioner of Esau"

2. A name given as that of "the *sons* of Aher" or Aharah, the third son of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii, 12; comp. viii, 1), and therefore only a plur. form for *Shuham* (see the foregoing name, and compare the fact that the following is a fem. appellation) as a representative of his brethren. Comp. HUPHIM, and see BENJAMIN. B.C. post. 1856.

3. One of the wives of Shaharaim, of the tribe of Benjamin, in the country of Moab, by whom he had Ahitub and Elpaal (1 Chron. viii, 8, 11). B.C. cir. 1618.

Husk (זַג, *zag*, the *skin* of a grape, so called as being *transparent*, Numb. vi, 4; צִקְלוֹן, *tsiklôn'*, a *sack* for grain, so called from being *tied* together at the mouth, 2 Kings iv, 42) occurs also in Luke xv, 16 as a rendering of κεράτιον (from its *horned* extremities), in the parable of the prodigal son, where it is said that "he would fain have filled his belly with the *husks* that the swine did eat; and no man gave [even this poor provender, so Meyer, ad loc.] unto him." In the Arabic Version of the New Testament, the word *kharûb*, often written *kharnûb*, is given as a synonym of *keratia*. According to Celsius, the modern Greeks have converted the Arabic name into χάρουβα, and in a similar form it has passed into most European languages. Though with us little more than its name is known, the carob-tree is extremely common in the south of Europe, in Syria, and in Egypt. (See Thomson, *Land and the Book*, i, 21.) The Arabs distinguish it by the name of *Kharnûb shami*—that is, the Syrian Carob. The ancients, as Theophrastus and Pliny, likewise mention it as a native of Syria. Celsius states that no tree is more frequently mentioned in the Talmud (Mishna, i, 40; iv, 164; vi, 494), where its fruit is stated to be given as food to cattle and swine: it is now given to horses, asses, and mules. During the Peninsular War the horses of the British cavalry were often fed on the beans of the carob-tree. Both Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xv, 23) and Columella (vii, 9) mention that it was given as food to swine (comp. Mishna, *Shaab.* xxiv, 2), yet was sometimes eaten by men (Horace, *Epist.* ii, 1, 123; Juv. xi, 58; Pers. iii, 55; Sonnini, *Travels in Greece*, p. 26). By some it has been thought, but apparently without reason, that it was upon the husks of this tree that John the Baptist fed in the wilderness: from this idea, however, it is often called St. John's Bread and Locust-tree. *Ceratia* or *Ceratonia* is the name of a

Ceratonia Siliqua.

tree of the family of leguminous plants, of which the fruit used to be called *Siliqua edulis* and *Siliqua dulcis.* By the Greeks, as Galen and Paulus Ægineta, the tree is called κερατία, κερατωνία, from the resemblance of its fruit to κέρας, a horn; also συκῆ αἰγυπτία, or *Egyptian fig* (Theophr. *Plant.* i, 18). The carob-tree grows in the south of Europe and north of Africa, usually to a moderate size, but it sometimes becomes very large, with a trunk of great thickness, and affords an agreeable shade. It has been seen by travellers near Bethlem (Rauwolf, *Travels*, p. 458; Schubert, iii, 115), and elsewhere (Robinson's *Researches*, iii, 54). Prof. Hackett saw it growing around Jerusalem, and the fruit exposed for sale in the market at Smyrna; and he describes its form and uses (*Illustra. of Scripture*, p. 129, Bost. 1855). Wilde, being in the plain near Mount Carmel, observed several splendid specimens of the carob-tree. On the 15th of March he noticed the fruit as having been perfected. The husks were scattered on the ground, where some cattle had been feeding on them. It is an evergreen, and puts forth a great many

branches, covered with large pinnated leaves. The blossom is of a reddish or dark purple color, and is succeeded by large, slender pods or capsules, curved like a horn or sickle, containing a sweetish pulp, and several small, shining seeds. These pods are sometimes eight or ten inches long, and an inch and a half broad; the color is dark brown, and the seeds which they contain are about the size of an ordinary dry pea, not perfectly round, flattened, hard and bitter, and of a dark red color. The quantity of pods borne by each tree is very considerable, being often as much as 800 or 900 pounds weight; they are of a subastringent taste when unripe, but when come to maturity they secrete within the husks and around the seeds a sweetish-tasted pulp. When on the tree the pods have an unpleasant odor, but when dried upon hurdles they become eatable, and are valued by poor people, and during famine in the countries where the tree is grown, especially in Spain and Egypt, and by the Arabs. They are given as food to cattle in modern, as we read they were in ancient times, but at the best can only be considered very poor fare. (See Celsius, i, 227; Oedmann, vi, 137 sq.; Salmas. *Exercit. Plin.* p. 45 sq.; Hasselquist, *Travels*, p. 531; Arvieux, *Voyage*, p. 206 sq.; *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v. Ceratonia.)

Huss, John (more properly *Hus*, the other mode of spelling his name being a mere usage which has established itself in the English language), was the illustrious Bohemian reformer before the Reformation, and the precursor of the Church of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren.

I. *Sketch of his Life.*—He was born July 6, 1369, or, according to some authorities, 1373, at Husinec, a small market-town of Bohemia, on the Planitz. His parents were common people, but in good circumstances for their station in life. Very little is known of his early years. He entered the University of Prague, and took his first degree in 1393. The development of his mind was slow, but his behavior was distinguished by the strictest probity and the most genuine godliness. In his intercourse with others he was modest and kind. A spirit of melancholy gave a subdued tone to his bearing. He was a tall man, with a thin, pale, sad face. His public career began in 1398, when he was appointed a professor in the university. In 1401 he became dean of its theological faculty, and in 1402 its rector. At the same time he was pastor of the Bethlehem Chapel at Prague, erected by John de Milheim (1391), in order to give the people an opportunity of hearing the Gospel in their native tongue, and in this position he exerted great influence. Multitudes flocked to his chapel, among them Queen Sophia, who also chose him for her confessor. His sermons were not oratorical, but lucid, fervent, and simple, displaying a thorough knowledge of the Bible, and leaving an indelible impression upon the minds of the people. It was from the pulpit of this church that he set forth the truth with such force as to make Rome tremble. The Reformation, which Huss may be said to have inaugurated, may be dated from the 28th of May, 1403, when the doctrines of John Wickliffe were publicly condemned in a meeting of the faculties and doctors of the university, in spite of the efforts of Huss and his friends to prevent such a decision. The formation of two parties was the result; the one in favor of reform, the other opposed to it. At the head of the first stood Huss, who labored with zeal and boldness, uncovering the putrid sores of the Church, and particularly the gross immoralities of the clergy. For a time Zybnek, the archbishop of Prague, recognised the honesty of Huss's intentions. But soon disagreements occurred between them; and when thousands of students left the university because of a new distribution of votes on academical occasions (1409), which Huss had been mainly instrumental in bringing about, the archbishop openly arrayed himself on the side of his enemies. An opportunity soon offered for showing Zybnek's ill will. The clergy of Prague laid before him formal accusations of heresy against Huss, which the latter met with counter accusations against Zybnek. Both appealed to the pope. In response, Alexander V conferred extraordinary powers on the archbishop to root out heresies from his diocese. Accordingly, the latter prohibited preaching in private chapels; caused more than 200 volumes of Wickliffe's writings to be committed to the flames, amidst the chanting of the *Te Deum;* and excommunicated Huss (July 18, 1410). In this emergency king Wenzel came to the rescue, commanding Zybnek to reimburse the owners for the loss of their books, and annulling the ban against Huss. Nor was the prohibition touching chapels carried out. Meantime Alexander died, and was succeeded by John XXIII, an atrocious wretch, formerly a pirate, and now the embodiment of vice. To him, Wenzel, the queen, many nobles, and Huss himself appealed for redress. But the new pope adhered to the policy of his predecessor, confirmed the acts of Zybnek, and cited Huss before his tribunal in person. The king, however, sent two advocates to Bologna, where the papal court had its seat, to plead Huss's cause, and they were joined by three more delegated by Huss himself. But they effected only a transfer of the suit to other hands; while an attempt on the part of Zybnek, at Prague, to lay an interdict upon the city, caused an open rupture between him and the king, who coerced him by violent means. At last, in the summer of 1411, the archbishop yielded, and a pacification, including Huss, was brought about. But in September of the same year Zybnek died, and was succeeded by Albicus, a weak and miserly old man, who received, in the following spring (1412), a papal bull commanding a crusade against Ladislaus, king of Naples, an adherent of the anti-pope, and offering plenary indulgence to all who would take part in it, or contribute money towards its prosecution. The publication of this bull put a sudden end to the peace which had been patched up in the Church of Bohemia. Huss regarded the bull as an infamous document, contrary to all the principles of the Holy Scriptures, and at once publicly took this stand. A number of his friends, on the contrary, maintained that the will of the pope must be obeyed under all circumstances; they accordingly broke with him, and went over to the anti-reform party. Several of them afterwards became his most embittered foes; and one of them, Stephen de Palec, was the chief instigator of his subsequent condemnation at Constance. In nothing terrified by his adversaries, however, Huss continued to preach against the bull, and held a public disputation upon it in the *aula* of the university; on which occasion his friend and coadjutor, Jerome of Prague, delivered an address of such fervid eloquence that the students formed a fantastical procession the next day, bearing as many copies of the document as they could find to the outskirts of the city, where they were heaped up and burned. Huss took no part in these proceedings. King Wenzel now became alarmed. He had a reputation to support in Romish Christendom, and issued a decree making any further revilement of the pope or the papal bull punishable with death. In consequence, three young men were executed, who, on the following Sunday, publicly gave the lie to a priest while advocating the plenary indulgence offered by the pope. Huss buried them in the Bethlehem Chapel, with all the rites of the Church, and extolled them as martyrs. When John XXIII was informed of these events, he excommunicated the Reformer a second time, ordered his arrest, commanded his chapel to be razed to the ground, and laid an interdict upon the whole city of Prague. Wenzel again interfered, saved Huss from arrest, and prevented the chapel from being destroyed: but, as the ban was every where published, and the interdict rigidly enforced, he advised Huss to leave the city for a time. Huss obeyed, and, after having affixed a protest to the walls of his chapel, appealing from the corrupt Romish tribunal to the only incorruptible and infallible Judge, Jesus Christ, he retired to the Castle of Kozi Hradek (December, 1412). There, and subsequently at the Castle of Krakowec, he remained until August, 1414, engaged

in literary labors, which resulted in some of the most important both of his Latin and Bohemian works, carrying on a voluminous correspondence, and preaching to the people of the neighboring villages.

Meanwhile a general council of the Church had been called to meet at Constance on the 1st of November, 1414, under the auspices of Sigismund, a brother of Wenzel, and designated emperor. This monarch invited Huss to attend, that his cause might be examined and peace given to the Bohemian Church. He pledged himself to grant him a safe-conduct, and to send him back unharmed, even in the event of his not submitting to the council. Modern Romish historians try to disprove the reality of such a promise. But it is incontrovertible. The instrument which Sigismund actually furnished says: "Ut ei transire, stare, morari, *redire* libere permittatis." Huss joyfully obeyed the summons, for it was the great wish of his heart to defend his doctrines in the presence of the assembled representatives of Latin Christendom, and to unite with them in reforming the Church, for which purpose the Council had been specially convened. Leaving Prague on the 11th of October, with testimonials of orthodoxy from the papal inquisitor and the archbishop, and accompanied by an escort of nobles whom the king appointed to defend him, he traveled through Bohemia and Germany, held disputations upon his doctrines in all the towns where he passed a night, and arrived at Constance on the 3d of November. The next three weeks he spent in strict seclusion. Sigismund had not yet come, and the pope had temporarily suspended the sentence of excommunication, besides giving him the most solemn pledges for his personal safety. But Stephen de Palec and others among his Bohemian enemies began so persistently to incite the ecclesiastics against him, that he was arrested on the 28th of November, and on the 6th of December he was cast into the dungeon of the Dominican monastery. When Sigismund reached the city, Huss's escort vainly attempted to secure his release. The emperor was persuaded by the priests that it would be wrong to keep faith with a heretic. Huss not only remained a prisoner, but, after the lapse of three months, was conveyed to the Castle of Gottlieben, where a mere hole, so low that he could not stand upright in it, was assigned him as his cell, and where his feet were fastened to a block with heavy irons, and at night his right arm was chained to the wall. In this miserable plight he remained from the end of March to the beginning of June, in spite of the unceasing efforts of his friends, and the solemn protest of the whole Bohemian nation.

Huss had three hearings before the council; the first on the 5th of June (1415), the second on the 7th, and the third on the 8th. For the most part they were stormy debates, or irregular philippics against him. He was not permitted to explain and defend his doctrines. An immediate and explicit recantation was required of him, which he declined giving, unless convicted of heresy by the testimony of Christ and his apostles. After the last hearing several weeks elapsed, in which every conceivable effort was made to induce him to recant. But he remained firm, and calmly prepared for death. On Saturday, July 6, he was once more cited before the council, condemned as a heretic, degraded from the priesthood, and delivered into the hands of the secular power for execution. The proper officers immediately conveyed him to the outskirts of the city, where, at about ten o'clock in the morning, he was burned alive at the stake, while the council continued in session. He suffered with the heroism of the early martyrs. His ashes were cast into the Rhine. A simple monument, erected by the present generation of his countrymen, marks the spot. Erasmus pithily said: "Joannes Hus exustus, non convictus." The tradition of a peasant woman bringing a fagot to the pile, and moving him to exclaim "O sancta simplicitas!" is very doubtful; the other tradition of a prophecy with regard to Luther, under the image of a swan, uttered by Huss on his way to execution, lacks all historic basis. Jerome of Prague (q. v.), who had stood faithfully by the side of Huss, and, on the death of his friend, himself led the followers of the lamented Huss, soon suffered the same fate. The disturbances which then followed we treat under HUSSITES.

II. *Huss's Literary Labors.*—Besides the many letters which Huss wrote, and which clearly set forth his theological views, he was the author of fifteen Bohemian, and a large number of Latin works. Of the former, among which his *Postills* and *Treatise on Simony* are particularly important, several have, unfortunately, never been translated, and others remain in manuscript. Of the latter, his *Tractatus de Ecclesia* deserves to be particularly mentioned, together with the polemical treatises against Palec and Stanislaus, that form its supplements (*Historia et Monumenta Joannis Hus*, i, 243–331, ed. of 1715). Other of his Latin works are of an exegetical character. He also composed numerous hymns and didactic hexameters. Many of his hymns were adopted by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, and some of them are still in use in the Moravian Church. Moreover, he carefully revised the old Bohemian version of the Bible, which had been translated as early as the 13th century; and, quite recently, Palacky, the great Bohemian antiquary and historian, has discovered a catechism in that language, which he supposes to be from the pen of Huss, and which, no doubt, formed the basis for the catechism of the Brethren, published in 1522. As a writer of his mother language the merits of Huss cannot be overestimated. He purified it; fixed etymological and syntactical rules, and invented a new system of orthography, distinguished by its simplicity and precision. It was brought into general use by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren in the sixteenth century, since which time it has remained the acknowledged standard. Ulrich von Hutten was the first to publish the Latin works of Huss. The edition by O. Brunfels (Strasb. 1525, 4to, with woodcuts), is very scarce. A more complete edition appeared at Nuremberg in 1558, entitled *Historia et Monumenta Joannis Huss atque Hieronymi Pragensis*, in two fol. volumes. Still more complete is the edition of 1715, which came out at the same place with the same title. A small but very important volume of his sermons, translated from a copy of the Bohemian *Postills*, brought to Herrnhut by the Moravian refugees, appeared at Görlitz in 1855. Its title reads as follows: *Johannes Hus Predigten über die Sonn- und Fest-tags-Evangelien des Kirchenjahrs. Aus der Böhmischen in die Deutsche Sprache übersetzt von Dr. Johannes Nowotny.* They are pre-eminently sermons for the times, and abound in polemics. His letters have been translated into English (Edinb. 1859, 1 vol.) and other modern languages. A collection of his writings in Bohemian was begun by Erben (Prague, 1864, etc.).

III. *Huss's Theological Views, and the Principles of his Reformation.*—The views of Huss were moulded by the writings of two men in particular; the one Matthias of Janow, a Bohemian, the other Wickliffe, the English Reformer. He was attracted by the latter, inasmuch as Wickliffe always traced the truth up to its source in the New Testament, and desired to renew Christianity in its apostolic sense. Hence he made him his guide in those principles which he had, first of all, learned from Janow, but which Wickliffe developed more fully and consistently. Not having passed through the same conflict which brought Luther into the inner sanctuary of divine grace, through Christ, and justification by faith, he did not turn his attention so much to doctrine as to practice, and set forth the Saviour of the world rather from the standpoint of that perfect law whereof he is the author, than from that of his redeeming work. As a necessary consequence, he insisted more upon the reformation of the Church in regard to life than in regard to its unsound and corrupt dogmatical views. This was the weak point of his Reformation, bringing it to a premature end, and him to the stake. In order to success, an absolute reform of the dogmas of the Church was essential. Huss

did not see this, because he had formed no plan of operations antagonistical to Rome. He advanced, not in obedience to a systematic process inwardly developed, but under the influence of outward circumstances. While Christ was the centre of his own faith, and he held to Christ's Word alone as the norm of the faith of all, he did not, on that account, reject Romish dogmas until he became conscious of a contradiction between them and the Scriptures. The more any theological question was made prominent by the circumstances of the times, the more clearly he apprehended the truth in its evangelical import. Upon some points, however, as, for instance, the seven sacraments, and transubstantiation in the Lord's Supper, he never changed the views which were his by education. No outward impulse was given him to investigate these points in a reformatory spirit. So also he allowed, with certain qualifications and great caution, prayers for the dead, although he did not deem them of any importance; also confession to a priest and absolution, though none, he said, could forgive sins but God only; and he was, at first, satisfied with the holy communion in one kind. When this latter usage, however, grew to be a subject of dispute between the national and the Romish party in Bohemia, he emphatically endorsed the position of Jacobellus of Mies, who was the great advocate of the cup. For an exposition of his views on the Church, as set forth in the work mentioned above, see Neander's *Kirchengeschichte*, vi, 395, etc., or Torrey's *Translation*, v, 299, as also Gillett's *Life and Times of Huss*, i, 244, etc. In general, it may be said that it was not until his trial before the council that he recognised the necessity of breaking with the Church of Rome in order to effect a reformation. If he had been able, at that time, to escape from the hands of his enemies and return to Bohemia, he would have been the Luther of the world, and Protestantism would have begun its enlightening course a century earlier. See REFORMATION. While Huss failed to bring about a general reformation, his principles, developed and purified, found an ecclesiastical form forty-two years later in the Church of the Brethren, and have, through that channel, come down to the present day as a power in Christendom. See MORAVIANS.

IV. *Literature.*—For a study of the life of Huss, in addition to the histories of the Council of Constance, the most important works are: *Lebensbeschreibung des M. Johannes Hus von Hussinecz*, von Aug. Zitte, Weltpriester (Prague, 1790); an anonymous history, in German, "*Of the manner in which the Holy Gospel, together with John Huss, was condemned in the Council of Constance by the Pope and his faction*," written by an eye-witness, and published in 1548; Becker's *Life of Huss;* Kœhler's *Huss und seine Zeit; Hist. of the Hussites*, by Cochleius; Hodgson, *Reformers*, p. 123 sq.; Neander's *Kirchengeschichte*, vi; Gillett's *Life and Times of John Huss;* and especially Palacky, F., *Geschichte von Böhmen*, iii, pt. i, c. iii–v; Palacky, F., *Documenta Mag. J. Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam in Conc. Constant. actam, etc., nunc ex ipsis fontibus hausta* (Prag. 1869); Bonnechose (Emile de), *Les Réformations avant la Réforme* (Paris, 1847, 2 vols. 12mo); *Good Words*, Jan. 6, 1866, p. 21 sq.; Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, ii, 79 sq.; Zitte, *Lebenbeschreib. d. Mag. J. Huss* (Prag. 1789–95, 2 vols.); Wendt, *Gesch. v. Huss und d. Hussiten* (Magdeb. 1845); Helfert, *Huss u. Hieronymus* (Prag. 1853); Böhringer, *D. Kirche Christi v. ihre Zeugen* (ultramontane) (Zür. 1858, vol. ii, pt. iv); Krummel, *J. Huss* (Darmst. 1863); Höfler, *Mag. J. Huss* (Prague, 1864); *Contemp. Rev.* April and July, 1869; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1863, iv; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 1864, p. 176. (E. DE S.)

Hussey, ROBERT, B.D., an eminent minister of the Church of England, was born at Sunderland, Kent, Oct. 7, 1801. He studied at Christ Church, Oxford, and graduated in 1825 with great credit. He discharged for a while the office of proctor, and was afterwards appointed one of the public examiners in the classical school. In 1837 he took the degree of B.D. In 1842 he was appointed regius professor of ecclesiastical history, which position he held until his death, December 2, 1858. Hussey possessed an immense fund of information, to which his numerous works on all kinds of subjects bear full testimony. The principal of these are: *Sermons, mostly academical*, with a preface containing a refutation of the theory founded upon the Syriac fragment of the epistles of St. Ignatius (Oxf. 1849, 8vo):—*The Papal Supremacy, its Rise and Progress, traced in three Lectures* (Lond. 1851, 8vo). This little work demonstrates that "the papal system grew up and increased by means of usurpation and frequent acts of oppression, favored by the weakness of other parts of the Church, and the vices of ages." He had previously prepared for the University Press an edition of *Homer's Odyssey* (Oxf. 1827):—also the Latin text of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of England*, with short notes (Oxf. 1846):—and the Greek text of Socrates's *Ecclesiastical History* (1844). In 1853 he edited again for the University Press another edition of Socrates, and this time not a mere text-book for his lectures, but an elaborate edition, with a Latin version, notes, and index, forming three volumes 8vo. In 1854 he published a sermon, by request, on *University Prospects and University Duties*, and in 1856 an ordination sermon on *The Atonement*. An edition of Sozomen was suspended by his death.

Hussites, a general name for the followers of JOHN HUSS (q. v.). The Council of Constance, in its dealings with Huss, seems to have forgotten that the adherents to his cause were not the handful of men who had gathered around their friend and teacher in his last hours, but were scattered throughout Bohemia and Moravia. No sooner had the news of the execution of Huss reached them than disturbances became the order of the day. Everywhere in the two kingdoms named the life of the priests was in danger. The archbishop of Albicus (q. v.) himself was obliged to flee for his life. King Wenceslaus, of Bohemia, was indignant at the action of the council, and the queen hesitated not to espouse openly the cause of the Hussites. September 3, 1415, the Diet of Bohemia addressed a manifesto to the council, full of reproaches and threats; and September 5 it voted that every landowner should be free to have the doctrines of Huss preached on his estate. Fearful of the danger threatened, the priesthood, and, indeed, all strict adherents of the Romish Church, formed (October 1) a league (Herrenbund), vowing obedience to the council and fidelity to the Romish Church. Encouraged by these associations, deemed strong enough not only to oppose successfully any further attacks on Romanists, but even any further inroads of the heretics among the people, the council assumed a more authoritative position. Not satisfied with the mischief it had already done, it now threatened all adherents of Huss with ecclesiastical punishments. Jerome of Prague (q. v.), the friend and disciple of Huss, was the first to suffer. He was summoned before the council, summarily tried and condemned, and, like his master, burned at the stake (May 30, 1416). The 452 signers of a protest against the execution of Huss were the next summoned before the bar of the council to answer for their heretical conduct. Indeed, had not the emperor Sigismund interfered, the king and queen of the Bohemians would have been added to this number. But the execution of Jerome, following that of Huss, was too great an outrage in the eyes of the Bohemians not to destroy the last vestige of respect for the body by whose order these atrocious deeds were committed. The threats of the council became to them a mere *brutum fulmen*. They treated them with contempt.

Meanwhile, the adherents of Huss had divided into two parties, the moderate and the extreme. The moderate party, led by the University of Prague, took the name of *Calixtines* (q. v.), who derived their name from the chalice (*calix*), holding that communion in both kinds was essential to the sacrament; the extreme party were called the *Taborites*, from the mountain Tabor (now Austin), which was originally their headquarters. Here, where Huss himself had formerly preached, they

assembled in the open air, sometimes to the number of over 40,000, and partook of communion under both kinds on tables erected for the occasion. The Calixtines preserved the belief in purgatory, praying for the dead, images of the saints, holy water, etc.; but in March, 1417, they declared openly for the right of all to receive communion in both kinds. In consequence of this declaration, all the privileges of the university were suspended by the council, and the forcible abolition of the heresy demanded by pope Martin V. In the early part of 1419, king Wenceslaus, unwilling to lose the favor of either party, and fearing the wrath of Rome, decreed the restoration of Roman Catholic priests to their former offices. But no sooner had the Romanists learned of the enactments in their favor than they attacked the Hussites, and began all manner of persecutions against them. February 22, 1418, Martin V issued a bull against the followers of Wickliffe and Huss. All who should be found "to think or teach otherwise than as the holy Roman Catholic Church thinks or teaches;" all who held the doctrines, or defended the characters of Huss or Wickliffe, were to be delivered over to the secular arm for punishment as heretics. The document is a model from which bigoted intolerance and persecution might copy and exhausts the odium of language in describing the character of the objects of its vengeance. They are "schismatic, seditious, impelled by Luciferian pride and wolfish rage, duped by devilish tricks, tied together by the tail, however scattered over the world, and thus leagued in favor of Wickliffe, Huss, and Jerome. These pestilent persons had obstinately sown their perverse dogmas, while at first the prelates and ecclesiastical authority had shown themselves to be only dumb dogs, unwilling to bark, or to restrain, according to the canons, these deceitful and pestiferous heresiarchs." These intolerant measures added strength to the party whom it was their object to extirpate. The Bohemians, threatened at home by a feeble and vacillating king, and abroad by the official emissaries of the papal pontiff, felt themselves obliged to gather in numbers for self-defence, and chose Nicholas of Hussinecz (q. v.) and John Zisca (q. v.) as their leaders. They also prepared an answer to the bull, and circulated it far and wide. It was entitled "*A faithful and Christian Exhortation of the Bohemians to Kings and Princes, to stir them up to the zeal of the Gospel*," and was signed by four of their leading captains. "It is honorable at once to their courage, their prudence, their Christian intelligence, and their regard for the supreme authority of the Word of God." Their first aim was to secure, if possible, the capital of the kingdom. July 30, Zisca entered the old city, or that part of the city in which resided the reformers, and prepared for an assault on the new city, joined by the inhabitants of the old. His aim, however, for the present, was only to intimidate the papal party. After Zisca had gained the city, some of his men sought entrance in churches to observe their religious rites. They were denied admission to some of them, and the consequence was a forcible entrance, and the summary execution of the fanatic priests. With the council of the city also they experienced trouble. While a number of the Hussites were in a procession from one of the churches, their minister, bearing the chalice, was struck by a stone which had been thrown from one of the windows of the state-house. The Hussites became enraged. Under the command of Zisca himself, the state-house was stormed. Seven of the councillors, who had been unable to make their escape, were thrown from the upper windows and impaled on the pikes of the soldiers below. The king, when the news reached him, became so excited that he died of a fit of apoplexy. General anarchy now ensued. The Hussites, undisputed masters of Prague, restored the forms of civil government by the appointment of four magistrates to hold office until the next general election, and then withdrew, under Zisca, to Pilsen. The queen Sophia sought not only to secure the aid of the emperor Sigismund against these armed heretics, but even endeavored to influence the citizens of Prague to admit Sigismund as the successor of Wenceslaus. The people appealed to Zisca for aid against the probable invasion of the city by Sigismund. November 4, 1419, Zisca re-entered the city. The emperor, involved in a war with the Turks, neglected at first to attend to Bohemia. Finally, in 1420, he besieged Prague, but was driven from his positions.

Widely differing in their political and religious sentiments, the Hussites became daily more divided. Some favored the Calixtines, others the Taborites, and between these two parties strong jealousies were constantly springing up. In the old town of Prague the Calixtines prevailed, in the new the Taborites held sway, and, finding it thus difficult to satisfy and please all parties, and even fearing a union of the Calixtines with the Royalists, Zisca finally withdrew to the country. During the siege the Praguers had presented to the emperor, as conditions of submission and adherence to him as subjects, four articles (*Articles of Prague*). These were stipulations for, 1, the free and untrammeled preaching of the Word of God, throughout the kingdom of Bavaria, by evangelical preachers; 2, the free use of communion in both kinds by all true Christians who had not committed mortal sin; 3, the keeping of all priests and monks out of any temporal power, and obliging them to live according to the example of Christ and the apostles; 4, the punishment of all mortal sins, and of all disorders contrary to the law of God committed by the priests. The Taborites, however, presented no less than twelve articles, namely, the suppression of all unnecessary churches, altars, images, etc.; the application of capital punishment for other sins, such as drinking in taverns, luxury in clothes or in the style of living, etc. But the continued persecutions of the Hussites, and the unqualified approval of them by Sigismund, ever united the two parties for common defence. March 1, 1420, Martin V invited a regular crusade against them, incited thereto in a great measure, no doubt, by Sigismund, who felt himself too weak to gain the kingdom with his army. The Hussites were now to be dealt with as "rebels against the Roman Church, and as heretics;" and the emperor exerted himself for the publication of this bull throughout his dominions. Even more than the previous documents of like character, it shows the blind zeal and persecuting bigotry of Rome. A Christian, not a heathen people, were now, however, to be the objects of its vengeance —"a people whose great heresy was that they made the Word of God their supreme authority, and contended for the institutions of the Gospel in their primitive simplicity and integrity." To animate his followers with greater fervor in the execution of the bull, the pope, "by the mercy of Almighty God, and the authority of the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, as well as by the power of binding and loosing bestowed by God upon himself, granted to those who should enter upon the crusade, or to such even as should die upon the road, *plenary pardon of their sins, . . . and eternal salvation;*" and to such as could not go in person, but contributed to it in any wise, *full remission of their sins.* Thus "all Christendom, with its generals and armies, was summoned to crush out the heresies of men whom the council chose to burn rather than refute." "But the result disappointed all human expectations. The forces of the empire dashed and shattered themselves against the invincible resolution and desperate courage of a band of men sustained by religious enthusiasm, and conducted by able generals."

Measures for defence were at once taken by the Hussites. The citizens of Prague, who had frequently been divided, now united against the common foe. Calixtine and Taborite were ready to join hands in a league of mutual defence. Never was there a more signal defeat than the imperial forces now sustained, although their army was 140,000 to 150,000 strong. Prague was the first city freed from the beleaguering enemy; but the great battle which decided the fate of the Imperialists was

fought at Galgenberg or Witkow, known thereafter as the Ziscaberg (Hill of Zisca). Yet the opposition of the Taborites to all hierarchical pomp, and the threatened ruin of some of the most splendid structures of Prague, inclined the Calixtines, as soon as the danger had passed, to accept the terms of peace which Sigismund seemed very anxious to grant, provided, however, they could induce the emperor at the same time to remove the stigma of heresy which rested on the four "Articles of Prague." This they failed to accomplish, and peace was further delayed. A second and third attempt of Sigismund at pacification met with no better success. An effort was now made to compromise the differences between the Calixtines and Taborites. But the greatest obstacle to this was found to be their political rather than religious views. The question who should wear the crown of Bohemia was a matter of no little importance, and each party seemed anxious to secure it for one of their number. A convention of the states was held at Czaslau, July, 1421, to determine the matter. A regency was appointed of twenty members, taken from the different orders of the nation. Zisca appeared in it in the first rank of the nobles. It was resolved, with remarkable unanimity, that the four Articles of Prague should be universally received. Sigismund was declared incapable of reigning over Bohemia, and the crown was offered to the king of Poland. He refused, however, to accept it. Withold, grand duke of Lithuania, was next chosen; he also declined, but recommended Sigismund Corybut, his brother, to the Bohemian barons, and accompanied him to Prague, where they both, by partaking of the communion of the cup, sealed their adherence to the faith of the Calixtines, who held now the supremacy at Prague, and who had revived their old hostility against the Taborites. The nation divided into two "fierce parties, embittered by prejudice and mutual aggressions," so that the opposition to Corybut became irreconcilable, even although Zisca himself espoused his cause, as the Taborites were unwilling to follow their leader blindly. A diet held at Prague in November, 1421, to determine the question, brought it no nearer to its solution, while it effected the estrangement of Zisca from the Calixtines, who now regarded him and his followers as their enemies. An army was gathered against them; but, as often before, the Taborites were victorious, and the Calixtines severely beaten. Another attempt proved even less favorable to them, and, thus driven to desperation, Zisca now attempted to crush the Calixtines, who were virtually leagued with the Imperialists. After various victories over his enemies, Zisca appeared before Prague September 11, 1423, and invested the city, suffering no one to issue forth from its gates. When everything was ready to storm the city, a deputation of the Calixtines appeared before him and offered terms of submission, which he readily accepted. Zisca entered Prague with great honors, and was intrusted with the exercise of paramount authority. The emperor's hopes of being king of Bohemia had of late been based upon the divisions of the nation, and, baffled by this new agreement between the Hussites, he now sought to win them over by liberal concessions. He offered to Zisca the government of the kingdom, and asked for himself only the wearing of the crown.

"But, at this culminating point of Zisca's fortunes, death overtook him (October 11, 1424). He lived to foil the purposes of Sigismund, and died at the moment when his death was, in some respects, another defeat to his hopes." Zisca's death left the Taborites without any real leader. Their success they chiefly owed to him, and some of them, to indicate their deep sense of the loss they had suffered, took the name of *Orphanites* (q. v.). Others were absorbed by the Horebites (q. v.), while still others retained their old name, and chose St. Procopius "the Great" (q. v.) as their leader. The Orphanites, however, had relapsed to a belief in transubstantiation: they observed the fasts, honored the saints, and their priests performed worship in robes, all which the strict Taborites continued to reject. Among the Orphanite leaders, Procopius "the Lesser" was the most eminent. Vainly did the pope, assisted by the emperor, preach another crusade against the Hussites, who sallied out from Bohemia in troops to make invasions into neighboring countries, and, considering always Bohemia as their home, and other places as the land of the Philistines, treated the latter accordingly. Bands of robbers of all nations soon joined them. Frederick "the Valiant" made war against them, and entered Bohemia in 1425, and again in 1426, with 20,000 men, but was repulsed, on the second occasion suffering a terrible defeat at the battle of Ausch, June 15. A panic now seized all Germany, which was increased by the storming of Miess and Tachow by the Hussites in 1427. Another crusade, instigated against them by the emperor Sigismund in the same year, met with no better success than before.

At the opening of 1428, a Convention was called at Beraun to bring about, if possible, a general pacification of the nation. But so varying were the views of the different sects, especially the doctrines of free-will, justification, and predestination, that the Convention was broken up without accomplishing anything. In 1429, the Orphanites, assisted by a portion of the Taborites, made a great invasion into Saxony and Silesia. They took Dresden, marched along the Elbe to Magdeburg, then turned into the province of Brandenburg, and finally returned to Bohemia by way of Silesia, distributing themselves into different bands in various places, and adopting names according to their fancy. Some were known as *Collectors*, some as "Small Caps" (*Petit Chapeaus*, says L'Enfant), some as *Little Cousins*, others as *Wolf-bands*. In the spring of 1430 they were ready to undertake another invasion. With 20,000 cavalry, 30,000 infantry, and 3000 chariots, and with Procopius and other able generals at their head, they repeated the invasion of the countries that had been visited the previous year. Dividing into several bands, they desolated or reduced to ashes more than a hundred towns and villages, beat a Saxon army at Grimma, then went to Franconia, and returned home through Lower Bavaria. Meanwhile the pope had been busy with his bigots crying a new crusade against the Hussites. November 1, 1429, a diet had been summoned to meet at Vienna, but the delay of Sigismund in reaching the place had caused its transfer to Presburg. Here the deliberations were protracted for eight months, and at length nearly all the prelates and princes of the empire were brought together, either in person or by ambassadors. "It was finally resolved to make still another invasion of Bohemia. The papal legate came provided for the emergency. He had brought with him a bull of Martin V, ordaining a crusade, which was now opportunely to be published. Indulgences were profusely promised to those who should engage in the enterprise, or contribute to its promotion. Those who should fast and pray for its success should have a remission of penance for sixty days. From other vows interfering with enlistments in the holy war, a dispensation should be freely bestowed." Great efforts were made to insure the successful issue of this, the sixth invasion of Bohemia by the Imperialists (or the third papal crusade urged by Martin V). June 24, 1431, was the time appointed for it. But, before it was undertaken, the emperor, to test the spirit of the Bohemians, made again propositions for the crown. The Orphanites were the only Hussites that opposed him. The Calixtines and Taborites returned a deputation of four to confer with Sigismund. But, even before this deputation had returned to Prague, the Hussites became distrustful, and the most cautious and moderate among them felt satisfied that the emperor only intended to mislead them into a state of security, and then surprise and conquer them. "The old leagues and confederations were revived. Old feuds were forgotten. The barons of Bohemia and Moravia, the Calixtines of Prague, and the indomitable Taborites and

Orphanites, again united to repel the invader. In a few weeks 50,000 infantry, 7000 cavalry, and 3600 chariots were gathered." The crusading force also had been collecting, and now numbered 80,000 (some say 130,000) men, under the command of the elector of Brandenburg. This army, immense as it was, and powerful and invincible as it seemed, was, like its predecessors, completely routed at Tausch, August 14, 1431, and the hopes of the Imperialists of subjecting the Bohemians by force of arms effectually crushed. Sigismund now most earnestly endeavored to make peace, and intrusted the negotiations to the Council of Basle (which met December, 1431). The Bohemians were invited, promised a safe-conduct, and freedom to remain at Basle, to act, decide, treat, and enter into arrangements with the council; also "perfect liberty to celebrate in their houses their peculiar forms of worship; that in public and in private they should be allowed from Scripture and the holy doctors to advance proof of their *four Articles*, against which no preaching of the Catholics should be allowed while they remained within the city." But even with these proffered favorable conditions the Bohemians at first kept aloof, mistrusting the sincerity of the offers made them; yet in 1432 they consented to send envoys to the council. It was in the beginning of the next year (January 4, 1433) that the Bohemian deputation, numbering 300, was chosen from the most noble in the land, and with Procopius "the Great," the colleague of Zisca, the hero of many battles, the leader of many invasions, at its head. On the 16th of January the Bohemian deputation appeared before the council, and presented the four Articles of Prague as the basis of negotiations. After discussing them for fifty days, the parties had been brought no nearer together, and the Bohemians, growing impatient, prepared for their return to Prague. Towards the close of the same year, however, the council sent envoys to Prague, and finally the Treaty of Prague was concluded, November 30, 1433, known in history as the *Compactata*, stipulating first for the restoration of peace and the abolition of ecclesiastical censorship, then for the admission of the four Articles of Prague, modified as follows: 1, the eucharist to be administered equally under one or both kinds; 2, that preaching should be free, but only permitted to regularly ordained ministers; 3, that priests should have no possessions, but should be permitted to administer upon them; 4, that sin should be punished, but only by the regularly constituted authorities. The Taborites disapproved the proceedings; a diet, held at Prague in 1434, in which the Calixtines acknowledged the authority of the pope, brought the difficulty to a crisis, and the Calixtines, joined by the Roman Catholics, defeated the Taborites near Böhmischbrod, May 30, 1434. The two Procopiuses were killed. The Taborites were now driven to their strongholds, which they were obliged to surrender one by one. In another diet, held at Prague in 1435, all Bohemians acknowledged Sigismund for their king, he granting them, on his part, very advantageous conditions for their country and sect. The Romish Church, in accepting the four Articles, having conceded to them the use of the cup in the eucharist, and many other privileges, they were finally absolved from ecclesiastical interdict, and the emperor came to Prague August 23, 1436. The Taborites submitted gradually, and the thus united Hussites took the name of *Utraquists* (q. v.).

Sigismund, however, did not keep the promises he had made on ascending the throne of Bohemia, but rather used every means to restore the Roman Catholic faith in that country. The chief of the Hussites, John Rokyzan, whom the emperor himself had at first confirmed in the office of archbishop, came to be in danger of his life. This created new disturbances, which continued until the death of Sigismund in 1437. The Roman Catholic party now elected Albrecht of Austria king, but the Hussites chose Casimir of Poland. The former finally prevailed; but at his death, in October, 1439, during the minority of his son Ladislaus, two governors were appointed (in 1441), the one a Roman Catholic, the other a Hussite, to govern the kingdom. In 1444, George de Podiebrad was the Hussite governor chosen, and in 1450 he assumed the sole control. This change created no disorder, as the Roman Catholics, who were busily engaged undermining the Hussite doctrine and gaining over its adherents, were anxious to avoid an open conflict with them. At the death of Ladislaus in 1457, George himself was elected king. In order to conciliate the pope, he caused himself to be crowned by Roman Catholic bishops, and swore obedience to the Church and to the pope. During his reign the Calixtines enjoyed full religious liberty; and when Pope Pius II declared the treaty abolished in 1462, George sent the papal legates to prison without further forms. For this he was put under the ban, and finally deposed by the pope in 1463.

"Meanwhile the warlike Taborites had disappeared from the scene. They no longer formed a national party. But the feeble remnants of that multitude which had once followed the standards of Zisca and Procopius still clung to their cherished faith, and, with the Word of God as their only supreme authority, the *United Brethren* (q. v.) appear as their lineal representatives. How, from such an origin, should have sprung a people whose peaceful virtues and missionary zeal have been acknowledged by the world, is a problem only to be solved by admitting that, in the faith of the old Taborites, however they may have been guilty of fanatical excesses, there was to be found that fundamental principle of reverence for the authority of Scripture alone which they bequeathed as a cherished legacy to those who could apply and act upon it in more favorable circumstances and in more peaceful times." The successor of George, Ladislaus of Poland, who came to the government in 1471, held fast to the conditions of the treaty, though himself a Roman Catholic. In 1485 he concluded the peace of Kuttenberg, according to which the Utraquists and Subunists (Roman Catholics who communed but in one kind) were promised equal toleration; and in 1497 he gave the Utraquists the right to appoint an administrator of the archbishopric of Prague as their ecclesiastical chief. When the Reformation began in Germany, it was gladly hailed by both the Calixtines and the Bohemian Brethren, and in 1524 they decided to continue, under the guidance of Luther, the reform begun by Huss. A large part of them now divided themselves into Lutherans and Calvinists, and in 1575 both these united with the Bohemian Brethren in a joint confession, and became a strictly Protestant denomination. They were permitted to enjoy religious liberty until 1612, when they were subjected to many restrictions by the emperor Matthias, and to still more by the emperor Rudolph in 1617. This was the first cause of the Thirty-years' War, and it was only under Joseph II that the Calixtines recovered their religious liberty. See Cochläus, *Hist. Hussitarum* (Mayence, 1549, fol.); Theobald, *Hussitenkrieg* (Wittenberg, 1609; Nuremb. 1623; Bresl. 1750, 3 vols.); *Geschichte d. Hussiten* (Lpz. 1784); Schubert, *Geschichte d. Hussitenkriegs* (Neustadt, 1825); Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, viii, 636; Köppen, *Der alt. Huss. Brüderkirche* (Lpz. 1845); *The Reformation and Anti-Reformation in Bohemia* (London, 1849, 2 vols. 8vo); Palacky, *Geschichte v. Böhmen* (1845, 3 vols.), vol. iii; *Beziehungen u. Verhältniss d. Waldenser z. d. ehemaligen Sekten in Böhmen* (Prag. 1869); *Vorläufer d. Hussitenthums in Böhmen* (new edit. 1869); Jean Gochlée and Theobaldus, *Hist. de la Guerre des Hussites;* Neander, *Church Hist.* v, 172; Gindely, *Gesch. d. Böhmischen Brüder* (Prague, 1857, 2 vols. 8vo); and especially Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss* (Boston, 1863, 2 vols. 8vo), from which extracts have frequently been made in this article. Roman Catholic—Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iii, 348 sq.; *Gesch. Kaiser Sigmunds* (Hamb. 1838-45, 4 vols. 8vo). See Huss. (J. H. W.)

Hutcheson, Francis, called by Mackintosh the

"father of speculative philosophy in Scotland," was the son of a Presbyterian minister in Ireland, and was born Aug. 8, 1694. He entered the University of Glasgow in 1710, and afterwards became minister of a Presbyterian church in the north of Ireland; but, preferring the study of philosophy to theology, he was induced to open a private academy at Dublin. The publication of some of his works soon procured him the friendship of many distinguished persons, and in 1729 he was called as professor of moral philosophy to the University of Glasgow. He died in 1747. His principal works are, *Philosophiæ moralis institutio compendiaria, ethices et jurisprudentiæ naturalis elementa continens* (Glasgow, 1742, 12mo):—*A short Introduction to Moral Philosophy, containing the Elements of Ethics and the Law of Nature*, translated (Glasgow, 1747, sm. 8vo):—*An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of Passions and Affections* (3d ed. Glasg. 1769, sm. 8vo):—*Synopsis metaphysicæ, Ontologiam et Pneumatologiam complectens* (editio sexta, Glasg. 1774, small 8vo):—*An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, in two treatises (5th edit. corrected, London, 1753, 8vo):—*Letters between the late Mr. Gilbert Burnet and Mr. Hutcheson concerning the true Foundation of Virtue or Moral Goodness*, etc. (London, 1735, 8vo). After his death, his *System of Moral Philosophy* was published by his son, Francis Hutcheson, M.D., with a sketch of his life and writings by Dr. William Leechman (Glasg. 1755, 2 vols. 4to). "In his *metaphysical* system Hutcheson rejected the theory of innate ideas and principles, but insisted upon the admission of certain universal propositions, or, as he terms them, metaphysical axioms, which are self-evident and immutable. These axioms are primary and original, and do not derive their authority from any simpler and antecedent principle. Consequently, it is idle to seek a criterion of truth, for this is none other than reason itself, or, in the words of Hutcheson, 'menti congenita intelligendi vis.' Of his ontological axioms two are important: Everything exists really; and no quality, affection, or action is real, except in so far as it exists in some object or thing. From the latter proposition, it follows that all abstract *affirmative* propositions are hypothetical, that is, they invariably suppose the existence of some object without which they cannot be true. Truth is divided into logical, moral, and metaphysical. Logical truth is the agreement of a proposition with the object it relates to; moral truth is the harmony of the outward act with the inward sentiments; lastly, metaphysical truth is that nature of a thing wherein it is known to God as that which actually it is, or it is its absolute reality. Perfect truth is in the infinite alone. The truth of finite things is imperfect, inasmuch as they are limited. It is, however, from the finite that the mind rises to the idea of absolute truth, and so forms to itself a belief that an absolute and perfect nature exists, which, in regard to duration and space, is infinite and eternal. The soul, as the thinking essence, is spiritual and incorporeal. Of its nature we have, it is true, but little knowledge; nevertheless, its specific difference from body is at once attested by the consciousness. It is simple and active; body is composite and passive. From the spiritual nature of the soul, however, Hutcheson does not derive its immortality, but makes this to rest upon the goodness and wisdom of God." In *moral* philosophy he was the first to use the term "moral sense" to denote "the faculty which perceives the morality of actions," and he held it to be an essential part of human nature. "He allows the appellation of good to those actions alone which are disinterested and flow from the principle of benevolence. The last has no reference to expediency nor personal advantages, nor even to the more refined enjoyments of moral sympathy, the obligations of reason and truth, or of the divine will. It is a distinct and peculiar principle, a moral sentiment or instinct of great dignity and authority, and its end is to regulate the passions, and to decide, in favor of virtue, the conflict between the interested and disinterested affections. On this foundation Hutcheson erected all the superstructure of the moral duties." See *English Cyclopædia;* Mackintosh, *History of Ethical Philosophy*, p. 126; Tennemann, *Manual History of Philosophy*, § 350; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 406; Morell, *History of Mod. Phil.* p. 179 sq.; M'Cosh, *Intuitions of the Mind*, p. 92, 248, 411 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 926.

Hutcheson, George, an English Biblical scholar, of whose early life but little is known, flourished about the middle of the 17th century. He was a minister first at Colomonell, and later at Edinburgh, but was ejected for nonconformity about 1660. In 1669 he preached at Irvine, though he continued steadfastly to oppose the use of the Episcopal liturgy. He died in 1678. He wrote, *Exposition of the twelve Minor Prophets* (Lond. 1655, sm. 8vo):—*Exposit. of John* (1657, fol.):—*Exposition of Job* (1669, fol.):—*Forty-five Sermons on the 130th Psalm* (Edinb. 1691, 8vo).—Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 345; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 927. (J. H. W.)

Hutchinson, Anne, an American religious enthusiast, and founder of a party of Antinomians (q. v.) in the New England colony, emigrated from Lincolnshire, England, to Boston in 1636. She claimed to be a medium of divine revelation, and, being "a woman of admirable understanding, and profitable and sober carriage, she won a powerful party in the country, and her enemies could never speak of her without acknowledging her eloquence and ability." She held that the Holy Spirit dwells in every believer, and that the revelation of the Spirit is superior to the ministry of the word. As her doctrines affected not only the religious, but also the political professions of the people, great controversies ensued; a synod was finally called, in which her teachings were condemned, and she and her associate leaders were banished from the colony. Anne and her friends now obtained from the chief of the Narragansetts permission to reside in Rhode Island. Here "they set up a community on the highly commendable principle that no one was to be 'accounted a delinquent for doctrine.'" After the decease of her husband (who shared her opinions), she removed to a Dutch settlement in the colony of New York. In 1643, she and her whole family of fifteen persons were taken prisoners by the Indians, and all but one daughter barbarously murdered. See Bancroft, *Hist. of the United States*, i, 388 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 472; *American Presb. Rev.* 1860, p. 225. (J. H. W.)

Hutchinson, John, 1, a Puritan colonel in the Parliamentary army during the time of the English Civil War, was born at Nottingham in 1617. He was a nonconformist (Baptist), and, being of a religious turn of mind, much of his time was given to the study of theology. At the outbreak of the Civil War he sided with the Parliament, and was appointed governor of Nottingham Castle. At the trial of the king (Charles I) he concurred in the sentence pronounced on him, having first "addressed himself to God by prayer." Cromwell's conduct after this unfortunate affair Hutchinson disapproved; and while various sentiments are entertained on his political conduct, "none question his integrity or piety." At the Restoration he suffered the general fate of the Republicans, and died in prison, Sept. 11, 1664. See Neale, *Hist. of the Puritans* (Harper's edit.), ii, 378 sq.; Appleton's *Am. Cyclop.* ix, 396.

Hutchinson, John, 2, inventor of a theory of hermeneutics which gave rise to much discussion in the 17th century, and still has a few adherents, was born in 1674, at Spennithorne, in Yorkshire. After private education, he became, at the age of 19, steward to Mr. Bathurst, and afterwards to the duke of Somerset, who bestowed upon him many marks of confidence, and finally procured for Hutchinson a sinecure appointment of £200 per annum from the government. His time was now mainly devoted to religious study. He also made a large and valuable collection of fossils. In 1724 he published the first part of a curious work entitled *Moses's Princip-*

ia, in which he attempted to refute the doctrine of gravitation as taught in the *Principia* of Newton. In the second part of this work, which appeared in 1727, he continued his attack upon the Newtonian philosophy, and maintained, on the authority of Scripture, the existence of a *plenum*. From this time to his death he published yearly one or two volumes in further elucidation of his views, which evince extensive knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures. He died August 28, 1737.

"According to Hutchinson, the Old Testament contains a complete system of natural history, theology, and religion. The Hebrew language was the medium of God's communication with man; it is therefore perfect, and consequently, as a perfect language, it must be coextensive with all the objects of knowledge, and its several terms are truly significant of the objects which they indicate, and not so many arbitrary signs to represent them. Accordingly, Hutchinson, after Origen and others, laid great stress on the evidence of Hebrew etymology, and asserted that the Scriptures are not to be understood and interpreted in a literal, but in a typical sense, and according to the radical import of the Hebrew expressions. By this plan of interpretation, he maintained that the Old Testament would be found not only to testify fully to the nature and offices of Christ, but also to contain a perfect system of natural philosophy." His editors give the following compendium of the Hutchinsonian theory: "The Hebrew Scriptures nowhere ascribe motion to the body of the sun, or fixedness to the earth; they describe the created system to be a *plenum* without any *vacuum*, and reject the assistance of gravitation, attraction, or any such occult qualities, for performing the stated operations of nature, which are carried on by the mechanism of the heavens in their threefold condition of fire, light, and spirit, or air, the material agents set to work at the beginning: the heavens, thus framed by Almighty wisdom, are an instituted emblem and visible substitute of Jehovah Elohim, the eternal three, the coequal and co-adorable Trinity in Unity: the unity of substance in the heavens points out the unity of essence, and the distinction of conditions the triune personality in Deity, without confounding the persons or dividing the substance. From their being made emblems, they are called in Hebrew *Shemim*, the names, representatives, or substitutes, expressing by their names that they are emblems, and by their conditions or offices what it is they are emblems of." As an instance of his etymological interpretation, the word *Berith*, which our translation renders *Covenant*, Hutchinson construes to signify "he or that which purifies," and so the purifier or purification "for," not "with," man. From similar etymologies, he drew the conclusion "that all the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish dispensation were so many delineations of Christ, in what he was to be, to do, and to suffer, and that the early Jews knew them to be types of his actions and sufferings, and that, by performing them as such, were in so far Christians both in faith and practice." All his writings are collected in *The Philosophical and Theological Works of the late truly learned John Hutchinson, Esq.* (Lond. 1749, 3d edit. 12 vols. 8vo).

"Hutchinson's philological and exegetical views found numerous followers, who, without constituting a doctrinal sect, came to be distinguished as 'Hutchinsonians.' In their number they reckoned several distinguished divines in England and Scotland, both of the Established Church and of Dissenting communities. Among the most eminent of these were bishop Horne, and his biographer, Mr. William Jones; Mr. Romaine, and Mr. Julius Bates, to whom the duke of Somerset, on the nomination of Mr. Hutchinson, presented the living of Sutton, in Sussex; Mr. Parkhurst, the lexicographer; Dr. Hodges, provost of Oriel; and Dr. Wetherell, master of University College, Oxford; Mr. Holloway, author of *Letter and Spirit;* and Mr. Lee, author of *Sophron, or Nature's Characteristics of Truth.* The principles of Mr. Hutchinson are still entertained by many divines without their professing to be followers of Mr. Hutchinson, but the number of professing Hutchinsonians is now very small." See *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Jones of Noyland, *Works*, vols. iii and xii; Bishop Horne, *Works*, vol. vi (ed. 1809); Bate, *Defence of Hutchinson* (Lond. 1751, 8vo); Spearman, *Abstract of Hutchinson's Works* (Edinb. 1755, 12mo); Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 345.

Hutchinsonianism. See HUTCHINSON, JOHN, 2.

Hutten, ULRICH VON, a German knight and Reformer, was born April 20 (or 22), 1488, at Castle Steckelberg, in Hesse-Cassel, and entered the monastery of Fulda in 1498, intending to become a monk, but fled in 1504 to Erfurt, where he continued his theological studies for a while. In 1505 he went to Cologne, and the following year to Frankfort on the Oder, where the new university had recently been established. Here he applied himself to the study of philology and poetry. From Frankfort he went to Greifswald, and afterwards to Rostock, where he lectured on philosophy. In 1510 he went to Wittenberg, and thence to Vienna, where he remained until 1512. He afterwards visited Pavia and Bologna, studied law, and devoted himself particularly to the humanities and poetry. What he saw in Italy had the effect of making him an enlightened opponent of popery. Later he joined the army of the emperor Maximilian, and returned to Germany in 1517. Taking part in Reuchlin's quarrel against the Dominicans of Cologne, he wrote against the state of the Romish Church, and particularly against the pontiff. Bolder, and more open in the expression of his opinions than most men of his age, he did much to prepare the way for the Reformation, though he sympathized with Luther only in his attack upon the pope, his great aim being not so much to change the Church as to free Germany from the tyranny of which popery was the basis. In 1522 he made an alliance with Franz von Sickingen, who was chosen chief of the nobility of the Upper Rhine at Landau. In that year, as the German princes did not approve of Sickingen's plan of freeing Germany from the Romish rule, he appealed to the States, and endeavored to make them side with the nobility against the princes. But Sickingen succumbed in 1523, and Hutten was obliged to flee from Germany. In Switzerland, his former friend Erasmus withdrew from him, and the Council of Zürich drove him out of their territory. He then retired to the island of Ufnau, on the lake of Zürich, where he died, Aug. 29, 1523. Hutten has been very variously judged, according to the different stand-points of his critics; yet it is certain that he was honest in his convictions, and, though not a partisan of the Reformation from any religious feeling, he did all he could to free his native land from the subjection to the papacy. For that end he gave Luther all the aid in his power. He was one of the authors of the greater part of the *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum*, and most of his writings were satires against the pope, the monks, and the clergy. Several editions of his works have been published; the principal are Münch's (Berlin, 1821-23, 6 vols.) and Ed. Böcking's (Lpz. 1859 sq., 7 vols.). See *Epistolæ U. ab Hutten ad R. Crocum* (Leipzig, 1801); Böcking, *Ein Verzeichniss der Schriften Hutten's, Index bibliographicus Huttenianus* (Leipz. 1858); Schubart, *Biographie* (Lpz. 1791); Tischer, *Biographie* (Lpz. 1803); Panzer, *Ulrich von Hutten, in literarischer Hinsicht* (Nürnburg, 1798); Giess, *H. v. sein Zeitalter* (1813); E. von Brunnow, *Ulrich von H.* (Lpz. 1842, 3 vols.); Bürck, *Ulrich v. H.* (Dresden u. Lpz. 1846); David Friedrich Strauss, *Ulrich v. H.* (Lpz. 1857, 2 vols.); *Revue Germanique*, March, 1858; *Eclectic Review* (Lond.), July, 1858, p. 54 sq.; Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, vol. viii; Hase, *Ch. History*, § 314. *Ulrich von Hutten*, transl. from Chauffour-Kestner's *Études sur les Réformateurs du 16me siècle*, by A. Young (Lond. 1863); Lecky, *Hist. of Rationalism*, ii, 188; Hardwick, *Reformation*, p. 32 sq.; *National Magazine*, 1858, p. 243 sq.; *Lond. Quart. Rev.* 1857 (April); 1867 (April).

Hutter, Elias, a German Hebraist, was born at

Görlitz in 1554, studied the Oriental languages in the universities of Jena and Leipzig, and became in 1579 Hebrew teacher of the elector August of Saxony. He next resided successively in different parts of Germany, set up a printing establishment in Nuremberg, and finally retired to Augsburg, where he died (others say he died at Frankfort) in 1605. His reputation as a linguist he established by editing several Polyglot Bibles. The first of them, *Opus quadripartitum Script. Sacra* (Hamb. 1596), contained the O. T. in Hebrew and three other versions. In 1599 he published at Nuremberg the New Test. in twelve different versions, and in 1602 his *Nov. Test. Harmon. Ebr. Gr. Lat. et Germ.* At present, however, Hutter's works are more curious than useful. Among them is a Hebrew Bible in remarkably bold and large letter, in which the *serviles* are distinguished by hollow type, and the defective radicals interlined in small characters, as in Bagster's edition of the Psalms.—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 646 sq.; Kitto, *Biblical Cyclop.* ii, 346.

Hutter, Leonhard, a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Nellingen, near Ulm, in January, 1563, studied philosophy, philology, and theology at Strasburg, Leipzig, Heidelberg, and Jena; became private tutor in the latter university in 1594, and in 1596 professor at Wittenberg, where he died, Oct. 23, 1616. He was a zealous upholder of Lutheran orthodoxy. His *Compendium locorum theologicorum* (Wittenb. 1610, etc.), prepared by order of the elector Christian, took the place of Melancthon's *Loci* as a text-book, and was translated into several languages (into German by Holstenius [Lüb. 1611], and by Hutter himself [1613, etc.] into Swedish [Stock. 1618]), and commented on by Cundisius (Jena, 1648, etc.), Glassius (1656), Chemnitz (1670), Lachmann (1690), etc. It has lately been reproduced by Hase under the title *Hutterus redivivus* (Berl. 1854), and translated into English, under the title of *Compend of Lutheran Theology*, by the Rev. H. E. Jacobs and the Rev. G. F. Spieker (Phila. 1868, 8vo). He carried out the *Compendium* further in his *Loci communes theolog.* (Wittenb. 1619, fol., etc.). He also wrote against John Sigismund of Brandenburg, who had embraced Calvinism, his *Calvinista aulico-politicus* (Wittenb. 1609-14, 2 vols.), and against Hospinian's *Concordia discors* another work, entitled *Concordia concors* (Wittenb. 1614). His other writings are *De Voluntate Dei circa æternum prædestinationis salvandorum Decretum* (Wittenb. 1605, 4to):—*Explicatio libri Christianæ concordantiæ* (Wittenberg, 1608, 8vo; twice reprinted):—*Irenicum vere Christianum, sive tractatus de synodo et unione evangelicorum non fucata concilianda* (Rost. 1616, 4to; 1619, folio), against the plan of fusion between the Lutheran and Reformed churches of Pareus, and especially against the latter's *Irenicum.* See J.C.Erdmann, *Lebensbesch. u. Literarische Nachricht. v. d. Wittenberg Theologen seit* 1502 *bis* 1802 (Wittenberg, 1804); Bayle, *Dict. Hist.;* J. G. Walch, *Bibl. Theologica Selecta;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 655; *Univ. Lex.* i, 376; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 238.

Hutton, James, a preacher of the Moravian Brethren, was born in London in 1715. He was the son of a clergyman, and served an apprenticeship to a printer and a bookseller; but, coming under the influence of Mr. Wesley's preaching, he was awakened, and was converted under the labors of the distinguished Moravian, Peter Böhler. Soon after his conversion he visited the brethren at Hernhut, and became a devoted disciple and servant of count Zinzendorf, under whose direction he henceforth devoted all his time and energy to the unity of the Moravian brotherhood in England. "His counsel and aid were afforded it in all its complicated plans of government and projects of usefulness; he held, as years rolled on, every lay office in it, and preached and ministered as a deacon; he was the soul of its missionary labors as a 'society for the furtherance of the Gospel;' he defended it in its distresses; helped it by his energy and skill through all its heavy financial embarrassments; travelled for it over Europe; and, towards the close of his life, became, as it were, its representative to the court and people of England." He died in 1795. Hutton was a man of great piety and indomitable energy. The history of the Moravian Brethren in the second half of the 18th century is eminently the history of his own life. See *Memoirs of James Hutton, comprising the annals of his life, and connexion with the United Brethren*, by Daniel Benham (Lond. 1856, 8vo); *Lond. Qu. Rev.* viii, 239 sq.

Huyghens, Gummarus, a Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher, was born at Liere or Lyre (Brabant) Feb. 1631. When only twenty-one years of age he was appointed professor of philosophy at Louvain, and here he distinguished himself greatly. In 1668 he was honored with the doctorate of theology, and in 1677 was made president of the college of pope Adrian VI. He died at Louvain Oct. 27, 1702. Huyghens wrote a number of works, of which the best are *Conferentias theologicas*, in 3 vols.; *Breves observat., or a course of divinity*, in 15 vols. 12mo. As he refused to favor the peculiar views of some of the French moralists, and opposed the celebrated four articles of the French clergy (1682), he was involved in great controversies.—Jöcher, *Allgem. Gelehrten Lex.* ii, 1794; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 239. (J. H. W.)

Huz (Gen. xxii, 21). See Uz.

Huzoth. See Kirjath-huzoth.

Huz'zab (Hebrew *Hutstsab'*, הֻצַּב), rendered as a proper name in the Auth. Version of Nah. ii, 7, is either Hoph. præt. of נָצַב, to *place* firmly, and so the clause may be translated, "And *it is fixed!* she is led away captive," i. e. the decree is confirmed for the overthrow of Nineveh (so the margin, and most interpreters; see Lud. de Dieu; the Sept. and Vulg. both confound with מַצָּב, *καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις* [military station] *ἀπεκαλύφθη, et miles captivus abductus est;* the Talmud and Hebrew interpreters, confounding with הַצָּב, render "the queen sitting on her couch"); or, rather, of צָבַב, to *flow*, by Chaldaism, and the meaning will then be (with Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1147, who joins the word to the last of the preced. verse), "the palace shall be dissolved *and made to flow down,*" i. e. the palaces of Nineveh, inundated and undermined by the waters of the Tigris, shall dissolve and fall in ruins (comp. Diodorus, ii, 26). Mr. Rawlinson supposes (*Herod.* i, 570, note) that *Huzzab* may mean "the *Zab* country," or the fertile tract east of the Tigris, watered by the Upper and Lower *Zab* rivers (*Zab Ala* and *Zab Asfal*), the A-*diab*-ênê of the geographers. This province—the most valuable part of Assyria—might well stand for Assyria itself, with which it is identified by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* v, 12) and Ammianus (xxiii, 6). The name *Zab*, as applied to the rivers, is certainly very ancient, being found in the great inscription of Tiglath Pileser I, which belongs to the middle of the 12th century B.C.; but in that case the name would hardly be written in Heb. with צ.

Hwiid, Andreas Christian, a Danish Orientalist, was born Oct. 20, 1749, at Copenhagen. He was highly educated, and enjoyed great advantages by travel in foreign countries. Thus from 1777 to 1780 he spent in Germany, especially at Göttingen, where he studied under the celebrated Michaelis and Heyne, and in Italy, where he enjoyed the society of several cardinals, although a Protestant in belief. On his return he was appointed professor at the Royal College. He died May 3, 1788. Hwiid wrote *Specimen ineditæ Versionis Arabico-Samaritanæ Pentateuchi* (Rom. 1780, 4to):—*Libellus criticus de indole codicis MSS. N. T. biblioth. Cæsareo-Vindobonensis* (Cop. 1785).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxv, 688.

Hyacinth. See Jacinth.

Hyacinthus de Janua, a Capuchin monk of distinction, who flourished in the first half of the 17th cen-

tury, was named after his native city, Genoa. He was general preacher of his order, and enjoyed the confidence of Maximilian to such an extent that in 1622 he was charged by Gregory XV with a special commission to the Spanish court. He translated Castiglio's history of the Dominican order into Italian (Palermo, 1626, 2 vols. fol.).—Jöcher, *Allgem. Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1795; Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, ii, 485.

Hyæna. See HYENA.

Hyatt, JOHN, a Calvinistic Methodist preacher of considerable talent, was born at Sherborne, in Dorsetshire, in 1767. He became minister of a congregation at Mere, Wiltshire, in 1798, but removed in 1800 to one at Frome, Somersetshire, and soon afterwards to Tottenham Court Chapel and the Tabernacle, London. Here he was co-pastor with the Rev. Matthew Wilks until his death in 1826. His principal works are, *Christian Duty and Encouragement in Times of Distress* (2d edit. Lond. 1810, 8vo):—*Sermons on select Subjects* (2d ed. London, 1811, 8vo):—*Sermons on various Subjects*, edited by his son, Charles Hyatt, with memoir of the author by the Rev. John Morison, etc. (2d ed. Lond. 1828, 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 1597.

Hydas'pès (Ὑδάσπης), a river noticed in Judith i, 6, in connection with the Euphrates and Tigris, mentioned by Arrian (*Ind.* 4) and Strabo (xv, 697), which flowed westwards into the Indus, and is now called *Jelum* (Rawlinson, *Herod.* i, 558). The well-known Hydaspes of India is too remote to accord with the other localities noticed in the context. We may perhaps identify it with the *Choaspes* or *Eulæus* of Susiana, which was called *Hydaspes* by the Romans (Voss, *ad Justin.* ii, 14).

Hyde, Alvan, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Feb. 2, 1768, at Norwich, Conn. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1788, entered the ministry in June, 1790, and was ordained pastor in Lee June 6, 1792, where he remained until his death, Dec. 4, 1833. Hyde published *Sketches of the Life of the Rev. Stephen West, D.D.* (1818):—*An Essay on the State of Infants* (1830); and several occasional *Sermons*.—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 300; *Theol. Rev.* v, 544.

Hyde, Edward, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Norwich, Conn., March 31, 1786. He was converted in 1803, entered the New England Conference in 1809, was presiding elder on Boston District in 1822–26, and again in 1830, and meantime four years on New London District, and in 1831 was appointed steward of the Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, where he remained until his death, March 16, 1832. His indefatigable and successful labors were very valuable to the Church.—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 162; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, ii, cxlii; *Funeral Sermon*, by Dr. Fisk. (G. L. T.)

Hyde, Lavius, a Congregational minister, was born in Franklin, Conn., Jan. 29, 1789. He lost his father while quite young, and was prepared for college by his brother, the Rev. Alvan Hyde, D.D. He graduated at Williams College in 1813, and afterwards pursued a course of theological studies at Andover. In 1818 he was ordained minister over a church in Salisbury, Conn.; in 1823 he changed to Bolton, Conn., served subsequently at Ellington, Wayland, and Becket, Mass., and finally again at Bolton. At the age of seventy he retired from the active work of the ministry, and removed to Vernon, Conn., where he died, April 3, 1865. He wrote a biography of his brother, Alvan Hyde, and edited Nettleton's *Village Hymns*.—Appleton, *Am. Annual Cyclop.* 1865, p. 636.

Hyde, Thomas, D.D., a learned English divine and Orientalist, was born in Shropshire in 1636. He was educated at King's College, Cambridge. In 1653 he went to London, and rendered essential service in the preparation of Walton's Polyglot Bible. He was admitted fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, in 1659, and afterwards became keeper of the Bodleian Library. In 1666 he became prebendary of Salisbury, in 1678 archdeacon of Gloucester, Arabic professor in 1691, and finally regius professor of Hebrew and canon of Christ Church in 1697. He died in 1703. His principal work is *Historia religionis veterum Persarum eorumque Magorum, ubi etiam nova Abrahami et Mithræ, et Vestæ, et Manetis*, etc. (Oxonii, 1700, 4to; 2d edit., revised and augmented by Hunt and Costar, under the title *Veterum Persarum, Parthorum et Medorum Religionis Historia*, Lond. 1760, 4to, illustrated). The work evinces great research and considerable acumen in sifting the ancient Greek writers and some Persian works posterior to the Hegira, but, in consequence of the want of the most essential documents, such as the sacred books of the ancient Persians, which were then unknown in Europe, Hyde necessarily fell into some errors. Thus he maintains that Monotheism prevailed at first in Persia, was afterwards mixed with Sabæism, was brought back to its original purity by Abraham, and was finally lost again by being connected with the worship of the heavenly bodies. The incorrectness of the opinion has since been shown by abbot Foucher (in *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1759), and especially by Anquetil Duperron, who brought to France the sacred books of the Persians. Hyde's other writings are collected in *Syntagma dissertationum, quas olim auctor doctissimus Thomas Hyde, S.T.P., separatim edidit*, accesserunt nonnulla ejusdem opuscula hactenus inedita, etc., omnia diligenter recognita, a Gregorio Sharpe, LL.D. (Oxonii, 1767, 2 vols. 4to). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, i, 1598; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 691; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 239; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 930.

Hydroparastătæ (ὑδροπαραστάται, *aquarii*, "offerers of water"), a name given to the Encratites (q. v.) because they avoided wine, and even in the Lord's Supper used nothing but water. See Theodoret, *Hær. Fab.* i, c. xx; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xv, ch. ii, § 7.

Hyemantes (*winterers*, or *tossed by a winter blast*), an epithet given by the Latin fathers to demoniacs.—Neale's *Introd. to the Hist. of the Eastern Ch.* i, 209. See ENERGUMENS; EXORCIST.

Hyena (ὕαινα, Ecclesiasticus xiii, 18) does not occur in the A. V. of the canonical Scriptures, but is probably denoted by צָבוּעַ (*tsabu'ä, streaked* or *ravenous*, only Jer. xii, 9; so Sept. ὕαινα, but Vulg. *avis discolor*, and Auth. Vers. "speckled bird"), as the context and parallelism of the preceding verse require; an identification disputed by some, on the ground that the animal is not mentioned by ancient authors as occurring in Western Asia before the Macedonian conquest, and was scarcely known by name even in the time of Pliny; it has since been ascertained, however, that in Romaic or modern Greek the word *krokalos* and *glanos* have been substituted for the ancient term *hyena*, and that the animal is still known in those regions by names cognate with the Hebrew (see Rüppel, *Abyss.* i, 227; Shaw, *Trav.* 154; Kämpfer, *Amœn.* 411 sq.; Russell's *Aleppo*, ii, 65 sq.; comp. Pliny, viii, 44; xi, 67). The only other instance in which it occurs is as a proper name, Zeboim (1 Sam. xiii, 18, "the valley of hyenas," Aquila; Neh. xi, 34). See ZEBOIM. The Talmudical writers describe the hyena by no less than four names, of which *tsabua* is one (Lewysohn, *Zool.* § 119). Bochart (*Hieroz.* ii, 163 sq.) and Taylor (*continuation of Calmet*) have indicated what is probably the true meaning in the above passage in Jer., of עַיִט צָבוּעַ, *ait tsabua, the striped rusher*, i. e. the hyena, turning round upon his lair—introduced after an allusion in the previous verse to the lion calling to the beasts of the field (other hyenas and jackals) to come and devour. This allusion, followed up as it is by a natural association of ideas with a description of the pastor, feeder, or rather consumer or devourer of the vineyard, treading down and destroying the vines, renders the natural and poetical picture complete; for

the hyena seeks burrows and caverns for a lair; like the dog, it turns round to lie down; howls, and occasionally acts in concert; is loathsome, savage, insatiable in appetite, offensive in smell, and will, in the season, like canines, devour grapes. The hyena was common in ancient as in modern Egypt, and is constantly depicted on monuments (Wilkinson, i, 213, 225); it must, therefore, have been well known to the Jews, as it is now very common in Palestine, where it is the last and most complete scavenger of carrion (Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 62 sq.). Though cowardly in his nature, the hyena is very savage when once he attacks, and the strength of his jaws is such that he can crunch the thigh-bone of an ox (Livingstone's *Travels*, p 600).

"*Tsabua*, therefore, we consider proved to be, generically, the hyena; more specifically, the *Canis hyæna* of Linn., the *Hyæna vulgaris* of more recent naturalists, the *fodh* of Barbary, the *dub, dubbah, dabah, zubah*, and *kaftaar* of modern Shemitic nations; and, if the ancients understood anything by the word, it was also their *trochus*. The striped species is one of three or four—all, it seems, originally African, and, by following armies and caravans, gradually spread over Southern Asia to beyond the Ganges, though not as yet to the east of the Bramapootra. It is now not uncommon in Asia Minor, and has extended into Southern Tartary; but this progress is comparatively so recent that no other than Shemitic names are well known to belong to it. The head and jaws of all the species are broad and strong; the muzzle truncated; the tongue like a rasp; the teeth robust, large, and eminently formed for biting, lacerating, and reducing the very bone; the neck stiff;

Hyena.

the body short and compact; the limbs tall, with only four toes on each foot; the fur coarse, forming a kind of semi-erectile mane along the back; the tail rather short, with an imperfect brush, and with a fetid pouch beneath it. In stature the species varies from that of a large wolf to much less. Hyenas are not bold in comparison with wolves, or in proportion to their powers. They do not, in general, act collectively; they prowl chiefly in the night; attack asses, dogs, and weaker animals; feed most willingly on corrupt animal offal, dead camels, etc.; and dig into human graves that are not well protected with stakes and brambles. The striped species is of a dirty ashy buff, with some oblique black streaks across the shoulders and body, and numerous cross-bars on the legs; the muzzle and throat are black, and the tip of the tail white." (See *Penny Cyclopædia*, s. v.) See JACKAL; WOLF; BEAR.

Hyginus, considered as the eighth or tenth bishop of Rome, appears to have held that station from A.D. 137 to 141. According to the *Liber pontificalis*, he was a native of Athens, and before his election to the see of Rome taught philosophy. Nothing is known of his life, and the *Liber pontif.* merely says of him, "Clerum composuit et distribuit gradus." The Pseudo Decretals [see DECRETALS] ascribe to him a number of rules on Church discipline, and he is said to have introduced the customs of godfathers and Church consecrations, but this is doubtful. The Martyrologies give some the 10th, others the 11th of January, 142, as the date of his death. Some critics deny his having been more than a simple confessor. A certain Hyginus, bishop of Cordova, is said to have been the first opponent of Priscillian (q. v.). See Papebroch, *Acta Sanctorum;* Tillemont, *Mémoires;* Baillet, *Vies des Saints;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 705; Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. ii.

Hyksōs (Ὑκσώς, correctly explained [comp. Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 297] by Josephus [*Apion*, i, 14] as being compounded of the Egyptian *hyk*, "king," and *sōs*, "shepherd" or "Arab," i. e. *nomade*), a race who invaded Egypt, and constituted the 15th and one or two of the following dynasties, according to Manetho (see Kenrick, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, ii, 152 sq.), especially as preserved by Josephus (*ut supra*): "In the reign of king Timaus there came up from the east men of an ignoble race, who had the confidence to invade our country, and easily subdued it without a battle, burning the cities, demolishing the temples, slaying the men, and reducing the women and children to slavery." They made Salatis, one of themselves, king: he reigned at Memphis, and made the upper and lower region tributary. Of the 17th dynasty also were forty-three shepherd kings, called Hyksos, who reigned, perhaps contemporaneously with the preceding, at Diospolis. In the 18th dynasty of Diospolis a rising took place, and the shepherd kings were expelled out of the other parts of Egypt into the district of Avaris, which they fortified. Amosis besieged and compelled them to capitulate; on which they left Egypt, in number 240,000, and "marched through the desert towards Syria, and built the city of Jerusalem." The last few words seem to render it probable that Manetho confounded the Hyksos with the Israelites, which is the less surprising, since the Hyksos were, as he rightly calls them, *Phœnicians* of the ancient, if not original race which inhabited Phœnicia, or Palestine (taken in its widest sense), before the conquest of the country by the Hebrews. Chronological considerations seem to refer the time of the dominion of the Hyskos to the period of Abraham and Joseph (say from B.C. 2000 to 1500). When Joseph went into the land he found the name of shepherd odious—which agrees with the hypothesis that places the irruption of the shepherd kings anterior to his time; and possibly both the ease with which he rose to power and the fact that Jacob turned towards Egypt for a supply of food when urged by want may be readily accounted for on the supposition that a kindred race held dominion in the land, which, though hated by the people, as being foreign in its origin and oppressive in its character, would not be indisposed to show favor to members of the great Shemitic family to which they themselves belonged. The irruption into Egypt, and the conquest of the country on the part of the Phœnician shepherds, seems to have been a consequence of the general pressure of population from the north-east towards the south-west, which led the nomade Shemitic tribes first to overcome the original inhabitants of Palestine, and, continuing in the same line of advance, then to enter and subdue Egypt. The invasion of the Hyksos is indeed to be regarded as the result of the movement from the Euphrates westward of the most powerful and (comparatively) most civilized people then found in Western Asia, who in their progress subdued or expelled in the countries through which they not improbably were urged by a pressure from other advancing tribes, nation and tribe one after another, driving them down towards the sea, and compelling those who dwelt along the shores of the Mediterranean to seek shelter and safety in the islands of that sea and other distant parts. To conquerors and aggressors of the character of these shepherd hordes Egypt would offer special attractions. They continued sweeping onwards, and at last entered and conquered Egypt, establishing there a new dynasty, which was hateful because foreign, and because of a lower degree of culture than the Egyptians themselves had reached. Nor would these shepherds be less odious because, coming from the east and immediately from the deserts of Arabia, they were from the

quarter whence the mild and cultivated Egyptians had long been wont to suffer from the predatory incursions of the wild nomade tribes (*Die Phönizier*, by Movers, Bonn, 1841; Bertheau, *Geschichte der Israeliten*, Göttingen, 1842), between whom and the agricultural natives of the country different pursuits, habits, and tastes would naturally engender animosities. This feeling of alienation exists at the present day. The Arab is still a depressed and despised being in Egypt. Bowring, in his *Report* on the country, remarks, "It is scarcely allowable even to send a message to a person in authority by an Arab servant" (p. 7). The expulsion of the shepherds seems to have been strangely confounded by Josephus, after Manetho, with the Exodus of the Israelites. The shepherds were conquerors, rulers, and oppressors; the Israelites guests and slaves. The shepherds were expelled, the Israelites were delivered. Josephus elsewhere (*Apion*, i, 26) gives from Manetho a narrative of another event which wears a much nearer likeness to the Exodus (although Josephus expressly combats such an identification) in the case of a king Amenophis, who was ordered by the gods to cleanse Egypt of a multitude of lepers and other unclean persons; many of whom were drowned, and others sent in great numbers to work in the quarries which are on the east side of the Nile. After a time they were permitted to establish themselves in Avaris, which had been abandoned by the shepherds. They then elected a ruler, Osarsiph, whose name was afterwards changed to that of Moses. This chief "made this law for them, that they should not worship the Egyptian gods, but should kill the animals held sacred by the Egyptians; nor were they to have intercourse with any but such as were members of their own body—in all respects aiming to oppose the customs and influence of the nations. These, sending for aid to the shepherds who had settled in Jerusalem, and having received troops to the number of 200,000 men, were met by Amenophis, the king, with a yet larger force, but not attacked. On a subsequent occasion, however, they were assailed by the Egyptians, beaten, and driven to the confines of Syria." Lysimachus gives an account not dissimilar to this, adding that, under the leadership of Moses, these mixed hordes settled in Judæa (Cory's *Ancient Fragments*). The account which Diodorus gives of the migration of the Israelites from Egypt to Palestine is of a similar tenor. The deviations from the sacred narrative may easily be accounted for by Egyptian ignorance, vanity, and pride. (See Akers's *Biblical Chronology*, chap. v). It is also apparent that Josephus considerably travesties the original narrative of Manetho (Kenrick, *Egypt*, ii, 159). The expulsion of the Hyksos seems to have taken place about two centuries after the Exode (q. v.)

If, as we have some reason to believe, and as the reader may see satisfactorily established in Movers and Bertheau (*ut supra*), a race of the Shemitic family, coming down from the upper (Aram) country into the lower (Canaan), in course of time subjugated Egypt and established their dominion, maintaining it for some five hundred years, such a historical event must have had a marked influence on the religion of the land. These invaders are described (Herod. ii, 128) as enemies to the religion of Egypt, who destroyed or closed the temples, broke in pieces the altars and images of the gods, and killed the sacred animals. Their influence on the Egyptian religion was probably not unlike that of the Persians on the Grecian, having for its aim and effect to discountenance and destroy a low and degrading system of idolatry; for the worship of the heavenly bodies, to which the Phœnician equally with the Persian invaders were given, was higher in its character and effects than the service of the ordinary gods of Greece, and still more so than the degrading homage paid by the Egyptians to the lowest animals. By this means the Shemitic religion exerted on the native Egyptian religion a decided and improving influence, which may be seen and traced in that element of the religion of Egypt which contains and presents the worship of the heavenly bodies. The two systems, that of the Egyptians before it received inoculation from the East, and that of the Eastern invaders, agreed in this, that they were both the worship of the powers of nature; but they differed in this, and an important difference it was, that the Egyptians adored the brute creation, the Phœnicians the host of heaven.—Kitto. (See *Stud. und Krit.* 1839, ii, 393, 408; Saalschütz, *Forschungen*, abth. iii, 1849; Schulze, *De fontibus historiæ Hyksorum*, Berlin, 1848; Uhlemann, *Israeliten und Hyksos in Ægypten*, Lpz. 1856.) See EGYPT; SHEPHERD-KINGS.

Hylaret, MAURICE, a French theologian, was born at Angoulême Sept. 5, 1539. In 1551 he entered the order of the "Cordeliers." About 1552 he went to Paris to continue his studies, and returned to Angoulême in 1557 to be ordained for the priesthood. He now devoted his time exclusively to the study of theology, and in 1562 was made a professor of philosophy, and a short time later a professor of theology. In 1566 he made himself quite conspicuous by a public controversy with the Calvinist Godet. In 1568 he was called to the Sorbonne, and was honored with the doctorate two years later. Henceforward he preached much, and the celebrity he gained as a pulpit orator procured him a position as preacher at Orleans in 1572. He died in December, 1591. His works are, *Sacræ Decades quinquepartitæ, conciones quadragesimales, atque Paschales numero quinquaginta* (Lyons, 1591, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Concionum per adventum Enneades sacræ quatuor, homilias triginta sex complectentes, e quibus viginti septem priores Joelem prophet. explicant, novem vero posteriores Evangelia adventus et festorum per id tempus occurrentium explicant* (Paris, 1591, 8vo):—*Homiliæ in Evangelia dominicalia per totum annum* (Paris, 1604, 2 vols. 8vo). Dupin also ascribes to Hylaret *De non conveniendo cum hæreticis et de non ineundo cum hæretica a viro catholico conjugio* (Orl. 1587).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 707 sq.

Hylè (ὕλη, *matter*) was, according to the doctrines of the Manichæans (q. v.), the Lord of darkness. They held that the world is governed by *two* primary principles, viz. "a subtle and a gross sort of matter, or *light* and *darkness*, separated from each other by a narrow space," over each of which presides an *eternal* Lord. God they termed the Lord of the *world of Light;* Hyle the Lord of the *world of darkness;* and both of these worlds, "although different in their natures, have some things in common. Each is distributed into five opposing elements, and the same number of provinces; both are equally eternal, and, with their respective lords, self-existent, both are unchangeable, and exist forever; both are of vast extent, yet the *world of light* seems to fill more space than the *empire of darkness*. The condition of the two *lords* presiding over the two kinds of matter is equal, but they are totally unlike in their natures and dispositions. The *Lord of Light*, being himself happy, is beneficent, a lover of peace and quietness, just and wise; the *Lord of darkness*, being himself very miserable, wishes to see others unhappy, is quarrelsome, unwise, unjust, irascible, and envious. Yet they are equal in the eternity of their existence, in their power to beget beings like themselves, in their unchangeableness, and in their power and knowledge; and yet the King of light, or God, excels the Prince of darkness, or the Dæmon, in power and knowledge."—Mosheim, *Ch. Hist. of the first three Centuries*, ii, § 41, p. 275; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, i, 118, 127, 181, etc.

Hylozoism (ὕλη, *wood*, used by ancient philosophers to signify the abstract idea of *matter;* and ζωή, *life*) is a term for the atheistical doctrine which teaches that life and matter are inseparable. But the forms which have grown out of this doctrine have been rather variable. Thus "Strato of Lampsacus held that the ultimate particles of matter were each and all of them possessed of life," approaching, of course, in this sense,

to pantheism; but "the Stoics, on the other hand, while they did not accord activity or life to every distinct particle of matter, held that the universe, as a whole, was animated by a principle which gave to it motion, form, and life." The followers of Plotinus, who held that the "soul of the universe" animated the least particle of matter; or, in other words, while they admitted a certain material or plastic life, essential and substantial, ingenerable and incorruptible, attributed all to matter, especially favored the Stoical doctrine, and "Spinoza asserted that all things were alive in different degrees ('omnia quamvis diversis gradibus animata tamen sunt')." All the various forms of this doctrine evidently mistake *force* for *life*. According to Leibnitz, Boscovich, and others, "Matter is always endowed with force. Even the *vis inertiæ* ascribed to it is a force. Attraction and repulsion, and chemical affinity, all indicate activity in matter; but life is a force always connected with organization, which much of matter wants. Spontaneous motion, growth, nutrition, separation of parts, generation, are phenomena which indicate the presence of life, which is obviously not coextensive with matter." See Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philos.* (edited by Krauth), p. 219 sq.; Cudworth, *Intellect. System*, i, 106 sq., 144 sq., etc.; Hallam, *Hist. of Europe*, iv, 188.

Hymen, or **Hymenæus**, in Grecian mythology, is the god of marriage. Originally the word seems to have denoted only the bridal song of the companions of the bride, sung by them as she went from her father's house to that of the bridegroom. The god Hymen is first mentioned by Sappho. "The legends concerning him are various; but he is generally said to be a son of Apollo and some one of the Muses. He is represented as a boy with wings and a garland, a bigger and graver Cupid, with a bridal-torch and a veil in his hands." —Chambers, *Encyclop.* v, 494.

Hymenæ'us (Ὑμέναιος, *hymeneal*), a professor of Christianity at Ephesus, who, with Alexander (1 Tim. i, 20) and Philetus (2 Tim. ii, 18), had departed from the truth both in principle and practice, and led others into apostasy (Neander, *Pflanz.* i, 475). The chief doctrinal error of these persons consisted in maintaining that "the resurrection was past already." The precise meaning of this expression is by no means clearly ascertained: the most general, and perhaps best founded opinion is, that they understood the resurrection in a figurative sense of the great change produced by the Gospel dispensation. See below. Some have suggested that they attempted to support their views by the apostle's language in his Epistle to the Ephesians (νεκροὺς—συνεζωποίησεν—συνήγειρεν, etc., ii, 1-5); but this is very improbable; for, if such misconception of his language had arisen, it might easily have been corrected; not to say that one of them appears to have been personally inimical to Paul (2 Tim. iv, 14). and would scarcely have appealed to him as an authority. Most critics suppose that the same person is referred to in both the epistles to Timothy by the name of Hymenæus (see Heidenreich, *Pastoralbr.* i, 111). Mosheim, however, contends that there were two. He seems to lay great stress on the apostle's declaration in 1 Tim. i, 20, "Whom *I have delivered unto Satan*, that they may learn not to blaspheme." But, whatever may be the meaning of this expression, the infliction was evidently designed for the benefit and restoration of the parties (comp. 1 Cor. v, 5), and was therefore far from indicating their hopeless and abandoned wickedness. See below. Nor do the terms employed in the second epistle import a less flagrant violation of the Christian profession than those in the first. If in the one the individuals alluded to are charged with having "discarded a good conscience" and "made shipwreck of faith," in the other they are described as indulging "in vain and profane babblings, which would increase to more ungodliness," as "having erred concerning the truth," and "overthrowing the faith" of others. These can hardly be said to be "two distinct characters, having nothing in common but the name" (Mosheim's *Commentaries*, i, 304-306). For other interpretations of 2 Tim. ii, 18, see Gill's *Commentary*, ad loc., and Walchii *Miscellanea Sacra*, i, 4; *De Hymenæo Phileto*, Jen. 1735, and Amstel. 1744. Two points referred to above require fuller elucidation.

1. *The Error of Hymenæus.*—This was one that had been in part appropriated from others, and has frequently been revived since with additions. What initiation was to the Pythagoreans, wisdom to the Stoics, science to the followers of Plato, contemplation to the Peripatetics, that "knowledge" (γνῶσις) was to the Gnostics. As there were likewise in the Greek schools those who looked forward to a complete restoration of all things (ἀποκατάστασις, see Heyne, ad Virg. *Ecl.* iv, 5; comp. *Æn.* vi, 745), so there was "a regeneration" (Tit. iii, 5; Matt. xix, 28), "a new creation" (2 Cor. v, 17; see Alford, ad loc.; Rev. xxi, 1), "a kingdom of heaven and of Messiah or Christ" (Matt. xiii; Rev. vii)—and herein popular belief among the Jews coincided—unequivocally propounded in the N. T.; but *here* with this remarkable difference, viz., that in a great measure it was present as well as future—the same thing in germ that was to be had in perfection eventually. "The kingdom of God is within you," said our Lord (Luke xvii, 21). "He that is spiritual judgeth all things," said Paul (1 Cor. ii, 15). "He that is born of God cannot sin," said John (1 Ep. iii, 9). There are likewise two deaths and two resurrections spoken of in the N. T.; the first of each sort, that of the soul to and from sin (John iii, 3-8), "the hour which now is" (ibid. v, 24, 25, on which see Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xx, 6); the second, that of the body to and from corruption (1 Cor. xv, 36-44; also John v, 28, 29), which last is prospective. Now, as the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was found to involve immense difficulties even in those early days (Acts xvii, 32; 1 Cor. xv, 35: how keenly they were pressed may be seen in Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xxii, 12 sq.), while, on the other hand, there was so great a predisposition in the then current philosophy (not even extinct now) to magnify the excellence of the soul above that of its earthly tabernacle, it was at once the easier and more attractive course to insist upon and argue from the force of those passages of Holy Scripture which enlarge upon the glories of the spiritual life that now is, under Christ, and to pass over or explain away allegorically all that refers to a future state in connection with the resurrection of the body. In this manner we may derive the first errors of the Gnostics, of whom Hymenæus was one of the earliest. They were spreading when John wrote; and his grand-disciple, Irenæus, compiled a voluminous work against them (*adv. Hær.*). A good account of their full development is given by Gieseler, *E. H.*, Per. i, Div. i, § 44 sq. See RESURRECTION.

2. *The Sentence passed upon him.*—It has been asserted by some writers of eminence (see Corn. à Lapide, ad 1 Cor. v, 5) that the "delivering to Satan" is a mere synonym for ecclesiastical excommunication. Such can hardly be the case. The apostles possessed many extraordinary prerogatives, which none have since arrogated. Even the title which they bore has been set apart to them ever since. The shaking off the dust of their feet against a city that would not receive them (Matt. x, 14), although an injunction afterwards given to the Seventy (Luke x, 11), and one which Paul found it necessary to act upon twice in the course of his ministry (Acts xiii, 51, and xviii, 6), has never been a practice since with Christian ministers. "Anathema," says Bingham, "is a word that occurs frequently in the ancient canons" (*Antiq.* xvi, 2, 16), but the form "Anathema Maranatha" is one that none have ever ventured upon since Paul (1 Cor. xvi, 22). As the apostles healed all manner of bodily infirmities, so they seem to have possessed and exercised the same power in inflicting them—a power far too perilous to be continued when the manifold exigencies of the apostolical age had passed away. Ananias and Sapphira both fell down dead at the rebuke of Peter (Acts v, 5, 10); two words from the

same lips, "Tabitha, arise," sufficed to raise Dorcas from the dead (ibid. ix, 40). Paul's first act in entering upon his ministry was to strike Elymas the sorcerer with blindness, his own sight having been restored to him through the medium of a disciple (ibid. ix. 17, and xiii, 11), while soon afterwards we read of his healing the cripple of Lystra (ibid. xiv, 8). Even apart from actual intervention by the apostles, bodily visitations are spoken of in the case of those who approached the Lord's Supper unworthily, when as yet no discipline had been established: "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and a good number (*ἱκανοί*, in the former case it is *πολλοί*) sleep" (1 Cor. xi, 30).

On the other hand, Satan was held to be the instrument or executioner of all these visitations. Such is the character assigned to him in the book of Job (i, 6-12; ii, 1-7). Similar agencies are described 1 Kings xxii, 19-22, and 1 Chron. xxi, 1. In Psa. lxxviii, 49, such are the causes to which the plagues of Egypt are assigned. Even our Lord submitted to be assailed by him more than once (Matt. iv, 1-10; Luke iv, 13 says, "Departed from him *for a season*"); and "a messenger of Satan was sent to buffet" the very apostle whose act of delivering another to the same power is now under discussion. At the same time, large powers over the world of spirits were authoritatively conveyed by our Lord to his immediate followers (to the Twelve, Luke ix, 1; to the Seventy, as the results showed, ibid. x, 17-20). See SATAN.

It only remains to notice five particulars connected with its exercise, which the apostle himself supplies: 1. That it was no mere prayer, but a solemn authoritative sentence pronounced in the name and power of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. v, 3-5); 2. That it was never exercised upon any without the Church: "Them that are without God judgeth" (ibid. v, 13), he says in express terms; 3. That it was "for the destruction of the flesh," *i. e.* some bodily visitation; 4. That it was for the improvement of the offender: that "his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (ibid. v, 5): and that "he might learn not to blaspheme" while upon earth (1 Tim. i, 20); 5. That the apostle could in a given case empower others to pass such sentence in his absence (1 Cor. v, 3, 4). See ANATHEMA.

Thus, while the "delivering to Satan" may resemble ecclesiastical excommunication in some respects, it has its own characteristics likewise, which show plainly that one is not to be confounded or placed on the same level with the other. Nor again does Paul himself deliver to Satan all those in whose company he bids his converts "not even to eat" (1 Cor. v, 11). See an able review of the whole subject by Bingham, *Ant.* vi, 2, 15. See EXCOMMUNICATION.

Hymn (Ὕμνος). This term, as used by the Greeks, primarily signified simply a *song* (comp. Homer, *Od.* viii, 429; Hesiod, *Op. et Dies*, 659; Pindar, *Ol.* i, 170; xi, 74; *Isthm.* iv, 74; *Pyth.* x, 82; Æsch. *Eum.* 331; Soph. *Antig.* 809; Plato, *Republ.* v, 459, E, etc.); we find instances even in which the cognate verb *ὑμνεῖν* is used in a bad sense (*φαύλως ἐκλαμβάνεται*, Eustath. p. 634; comp. Soph. *Elect.* 382; *Œd. Tyr.* 1275; Eurip. *Med.* 425); but usage ultimately appropriated the term to songs in praise of the gods. We know that among the Greeks, as among most of the nations of antiquity, the chanting of songs in praise of their gods was an approved part of their worship (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi, 633, ed. Sylburg.; Porphyr. *de Abstin.* iv, sec. 8; Phurnutus, *De Nat. Deor.* c. 14; Alex. ab Alex. *Gen. Dies*, iv, c. 17, s. f.; Spanheim in *not. ad Callimachum*, p. 2; comp. Meiners, *Geschichte aller Religionen*, c. 13); and even at their festive entertainments such songs were sometimes sung (Athen. *Deipnos.* xiv, xv, 14; Polyb. *Hist.* iv, 20, ed. Ernesti). Besides those hymns to different deities which have come down to us as the composition of Callimachus, Orpheus, Homer, Linus, Cleanthes, Sappho, and others, we may with confidence refer to the choral odes of the tragedians as affording specimens of these sacred songs, such of them, at least, as were of a lyric character (Snedorf, *De Hymnis Vet. Græc.* p. 19). Such songs were properly called *hymns*. Hence Arrian says distinctly (*De Exped. Alex.* iv, 11, 2), *ὕμνοι μὲν ἐς τοὺς θεοὺς ποιοῦνται, ἔπαινοι δὲ ἐς ἀνθρώπους*. So also Phavorinus: *ὕμνος, ἡ πρὸς θεὸν ᾠδή*. Augustine (*in Psa. lxxii*) thus fully states the meaning of the term: "Hymni laudes sunt Dei cum cantico. Hymni cantus sunt, continentes laudes Dei. Si sit laus, et non sit Dei, non est hymnus. Si sit laus et Dei laus, et non cantatur, non est hymnus. Oportet ergo ut si sit hymnus, habeat haec tria, et *laudem* et *Dei* et *canticum*." See CHANT.

"Hymn," as such, is not used in the English version of the O. T., and the noun only occurs twice in the N. T. (Eph. v, 19; Col. iii, 16), though in the original of the latter the derivative verb (*ὑμνέω*) occurs in four places ("sing a hymn," Matt. xxvi, 30; Mark xiv, 26; "sing praises," Acts xvi, 25; Heb. ii, 12). The Sept., however, employs it freely in translating the Hebrew names for almost every kind of poetical composition (Schleusn. *Lex.* *ὕμνος*). In fact, the word does not seem to have in the Sept. any very special meaning, and hence it calls the Heb. book of *Tehillim* the book of *Psalms*, not of *Hymns*; yet it frequently uses the noun *ὕμνος* or the verb *ὑμνέω* as an equivalent of *psalm* (e. g. 1 Chron. xxv, 6; 2 Chron. vii, 6; xxiii, 13; xxix, 30; Neh. xii, 24; Psa. xl, 1, and the titles of many other psalms). The word *psalm*, however, generally had for the later Jews a definite meaning, while the word *hymn* was more or less vague in its application, and capable of being used as occasion should arise. If a new poetical form or idea should be produced, the name of *hymn*, not being embarrassed by a previous determination, was ready to associate itself with the fresh thought of another literature. This seems to have actually been the case. See SONG.

Among Christians the hymn has always been something different from the psalm; a different conception in thought, a different type in composition. See HYMNOLOGY. The "*hymn*" which our Lord sung with his disciples at the Last Supper is generally supposed to have been the latter part of the *Hallel*, or series of psalms which were sung by the Jews on the night of the Passover, comprehending Psa. cxiii-cxviii; Psa. cxiii and cxiv being sung before, and the rest after the Passover (Buxtorfii *Lex. Talm.* s. v. הלל, quoted by Kuinöl on Matt. xxvi, 30; Lightfoot's *Heb. and Talm. Exercitations* on Mark xiv, 26; *Works*, xi, 435). See HALLEL. But it is obvious that the word *hymn* is in this case not applied to an individual psalm, but to a number of psalms chanted successively, and altogether forming a kind of devotional exercise which is not unaptly called a hymn. The prayer in Acts iv, 24-30 is not a hymn, unless we allow non-metrical as well as metrical hymns. It may have been a hymn as it was originally uttered; but we can only judge by the Greek translation, and this is without metre, and therefore not properly a hymn. In the jail at Philippi, Paul and Silas "sang hymns" (A. V. "praises") unto God, and so loud was their song that their fellow-prisoners heard them. This must have been what we mean by singing, and not merely recitation. It was, in fact, a veritable singing of hymns. It is remarkable that the noun *hymn* is only used in reference to the services of the Greeks, and in the same passages is clearly distinguished from the psalm (Eph. v, 19; Col. iii, 16), "psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs." It has been conjectured that by "psalms and hymns" the poetical compositions of the Old Testament are chiefly to be understood, and that the epithet "spiritual," here applied to "songs," is intended to mark those devout effusions which resulted from the spiritual gifts granted to the primitive Church; yet in 1 Cor. xiv, 26, a production of the latter class is called "a psalm." Josephus, it may be remarked, used the terms *ὕμνοι* and *ᾠδαί* in reference to the Psalms of David (*Ant.* vii, 12, 3). See PSALM.

It is probable that no Greek version of the Psalms, even supposing it to be accommodated to the Greek

metres, would take root in the affections of the Gentile converts. It was not only a question of metre, it was a question of *tune;* and Greek tunes required Greek hymns. So it was in Syria. Richer in tunes than Greece, for Greece had but eight, while Syria had 275 (Benedict. *Pref.* vol. v, *Op. Eph. Syr.*), the Syrian hymnographers revelled in the varied luxury of their native music; and the result was that splendid development of the Hymn, as moulded by the genius of Bardesanes, Harmonius, and Ephraem Syrus. In Greece, the eight tunes which seem to have satisfied the exigencies of Church music were probably accommodated to fixed metres, each metre being wedded to a particular tune; an arrangement to which we can observe a tendency in the *Directions about tunes and measures* at the end of our English version of the Psalms. This is also the case in the German hymnology, where certain ancient tunes are recognised as models for the metres of later compositions, and their names are always prefixed to the hymns in common use. See MUSIC.

It is worth while inquiring what profane models the Greek hymnographers chose to work after. In the old religion of Greece the word *hymn* had already acquired a sacred and liturgical meaning, which could not fail to suggest its application to the productions of the Christian muse. So much for the *name.* The special *forms* of the Greek hymn were various. The Homeric and Orphic hymns were written in the epic style, and in hexameter verse. Their metre was not adapted for singing; and therefore, though they may have been recited, it is not likely that they were sung at the celebration of the mysteries. We turn to the Pindaric hymns, and here we find a sufficient variety of metre, and a definite relation to music. These hymns were sung to the accompaniment of the lyre, and it is very likely that they engaged the attention of the early hymn-writers. The dithyramb, with its development into the dramatic chorus, was sufficiently connected with musical traditions to make its form a fitting vehicle for Christian poetry; and there certainly is a dithyrambic savor about the earliest known Christian hymn, as it appears in Clem. Alex. p. 312, 313, ed Potter.

The first impulse of Christian devotion was to run into the moulds ordinarily used by the worshippers of the old religion. This was more than an impulse—it was a necessity, and a twofold necessity. The new spirit was strong; but it had two limitations: the difficulty of conceiving a new musico-poetical literature; and the quality so peculiar to devotional music, of lingering in the heart after the head has been convinced and the belief changed. The old tunes would be a real necessity to the new life; and the exile from his ancient faith would delight to hear on the foreign soil of a new religion the familiar melodies of home. Dean Trench has indeed labored to show that the reverse was the case, and that the early Christian shrank with horror from the sweet but polluted enchantments of his unbelieving state. We can only assent to this in so far as we allow it to be the second phase in the history of hymns. When old traditions died away, and the Christian acquired not only a new belief, but a new social humanity, it was possible, and it was desirable too, to break forever the attenuated thread that bound him to the ancient world. Thus it was broken; and the trochaic and iambic metres, unassociated as they were with heathen worship, though largely associated with the heathen drama, obtained an ascendant in the Christian Church. In 1 Cor. xiv, 26, allusion is made to *improvised* hymns, which, being the outburst of a passionate emotion, would probably assume the dithyrambic form. But attempts have been made to detect fragments of ancient hymns conformed to more obvious metres in Eph. v, 14; James i, 17; Rev. i, 8 sq.; xv, 3. These pretended fragments, however, may with much greater likelihood be referred to the swing of a prose composition unconsciously culminating into metre. It was in the Latin Church that the trochaic and iambic metres became most deeply rooted, and acquired the greatest depth of tone and grace of finish. As an exponent of Christian feeling they soon superseded the accentual hexameters; they were used mnemonically against the heathen and the heretics by Commodianus and Augustine. The introduction of hymns into the Latin Church is commonly referred to Ambrose. But it is impossible to conceive that the West should have been so far behind the East: similar necessities must have produced similar results; and it is more likely that the tradition is due to the very marked prominence of Ambrose as the greatest of all the Latin hymnographers.

The trochaic and iambic metres, thus impressed into the service of the Church, have continued to hold their ground, and are, in fact, the 7's, S.M., C.M., and L.M. of our modern hymns, many of which are translations, or, at any rate, imitations of Latin originals. These metres were peculiarly adapted to the grave and sombre spirit of Latin Christianity. Less ecstatic than the varied chorus of the Greek Church, they did not soar upon the pinion of a lofty praise so much as they drooped and sank into the depths of a great sorrow. They were subjective rather than objective; they appealed to the heart more than to the understanding; and, if they contained less theology, they were fuller of a rich Christian humanity. (See Deyling, *Obss. Sacr.* iii, 430; Hilliger, *De Psal. Hymn. atque odar. sac. discrimine,* Viteb. 1720; Gerbert, *De cantu et musico,* Bamb. et Frib. 1774, 2 vols. 4to; Rheinwald, *Christl. Archäol.* p. 262.) Our information respecting the hymnology of the first Christians is extremely scanty: the most distinct notice we possess of it is that contained in Pliny's celebrated epistle (*Ep.* x, 97): "*Carmen Christo quasi deo, dicere secum invicem.*" (See Augusti, *Handbuch der Christlichen Archäologie,* ii, 1-160; Walchii, *Miscellanea Sacra,* i, 2; *De hymnis ecclesiæ Apostolicæ,* Amstel. 1744; and other monographs cited in Volbeding, *Index Programmatum,* p. 133).

Hymnar or **Hymnal** is the name by which is designated a Church book containing hymns. Such a hymnar, according to Gennadius, was compiled by Paulinus of Nola (q. v.).—Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* p. 320; Augusti, *Christl. Archäol.* iii, 710 sq.

Hymnarium. See HYMNAR.

Hymnology. "Poetry and its twin sister music are the most sublime and spiritual arts, and are much more akin to the genius of Christianity, and minister far more copiously to the purposes of devotion and edification than architecture, painting, and sculpture. They employ word and tone, and can speak thereby more directly to the spirit than the plastic arts by stone and color, and give more adequate expression to the whole wealth of the world of thought and feeling. In the Old Testament, as is well known, they were essential parts of divine worship; and so they have been in all ages, and almost all branches of the Christian Church. Of the various species of religious poetry, the hymn is the earliest and most important. It has a rich history, in which the deepest experiences of Christian life are stored. But it attained full bloom (as we will notice below) in the evangelical Church of the German and English tongue, where it, like the Bible, became for the first time truly the possession of the people, instead of being restricted to priest or choir" (Schaff, *Ch. History*). "A hymn is a lyrical discourse to the feelings. It should either excite or express feeling. The recitation of historical facts, descriptions of scenery, narrations of events, meditations, may all tend to inspire feeling. Hymns are not to be excluded, therefore, because they are deficient in lyrical form or in feeling, if experience shows that they have power to excite pious emotions. Not many of Newton's hymns can be called poetical, yet few hymns in the English language are more useful" (Beecher, *Preface to the Plymouth Collection*). The hymn, as such, is not intended to be didactic, and yet it is one of the surest means of conveying "sound doctrine," and

of perpetuating it in the Church. The Greek and Latin fathers well understood this. Bardesanes (see below) "diffused his Gnostic errors in Syriac hymns; and till that language ceased to be the living organ of thought, the Syrian fathers adopted this mode of inculcating truth in metrical compositions. The hymns of Arius were great favorites, and contributed to spread his peculiar doctrines. Chrysostom found the hymns of Arian worship so attractive that he took care to counteract the effect of them as much as possible by providing the Catholic Church with metrical compositions. Augustine also composed a hymn in order to check the errors of the Donatists, whom he represents as making great use of newly-composed hymns for the propagation of their opinions. The writings of Ephraem Syrus, of the 4th century, contain hymns on various topics, relating chiefly to the religious questions of the day which agitated the Church." Yet a mere setting forth of Christian doctrine in verse does not constitute a hymn; the thoughts and the language of the Scriptures must be reproduced in a lyrical way in order to serve the needs of song. The most popular and lasting hymns are those which are most lyrical in form, and at the same time most deeply penetrated with Christian life and feeling. Nor can *hymns*, in the proper sense of the word, be other than popular. The Romish Church discourages congregational worship, and therefore she produces few hymns, notwithstanding the number of beautiful religious compositions which are to be found in her offices, and the fine metrical productions of the Middle Ages, of which more in a later portion of this article. Hymns for Protestants, being "composed for congregational use, must express all the varieties of emotion common to the Christian. They must include in their wide range the trembling of the sinner, the hope and joy of the believer; they must sound the alarm to the impenitent, and cheer the afflicted; they must summon the Church to an earnest following of her Redeemer, go down with the dying to the vale of death, and make it vocal with the notes of triumph; they must attend the Christian in every step of his life as a heavenly melody. There can be nothing *esoteric* in the hymn. Besides this, the hymn, skilfully linked with music, becomes the companion of a Christian's solitary hours. It is the property of a good lyric to exist in the mind as a spiritual presence; and thus, as a 'hidden soul of harmony,' it dwells, a soul in the soul, and rises, often unsought, into distinct consciousness. The worldly Göthe advised, as a means of making life less commonplace, that one should 'every day, at least, hear a little song or read a good poem.' Happier he who, from his abundant acquaintance with Christian lyrics, has the song within him; who can follow the purer counsel of Paul, and 'speak to *himself* in hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody *in his heart* to the Lord' (Eph. v, 19)" (*Methodist Quarterly*, July, 1849). For the vocal execution of hymns as a part of Church service, see SINGING; and for their instrumental accompaniments, see MUSIC.

On the question of the use of hymns of *human composition* in the Church, there were disputes at a very early period. The Council of Braga (Portugal), A.D. 563, forbade the use of any form of song except psalms and passages of Scripture (Canon xii). On this subject, Bingham remarks that it was in ancient times "no objection against the psalmody of the Church that she sometimes made use of psalms and hymns of human composition, besides those of the sacred and inspired writers. For though St. Austin reflects upon the Donatists for their psalms of human composition, yet it was not merely because they were human, but because they preferred them to the divine hymns of Scripture, and their indecent way of chanting them, to the grave and sober method of the Church. St. Austin himself made a psalm of many parts, in imitation of the 119th Psalm; and this he did for the use of his people, to preserve them from the errors of Donatus. It would be absurd to think that he who made a psalm himself for the people to sing should quarrel with other psalms merely because they were of human composition. It has been demonstrated that there always were such psalms, and hymns, and doxologies composed by pious men, and used in the Church from the first foundation of it; nor did any but Paulus Samosatensis take exception to the use of them; and he did so not because they were of human composition, but because they contained a doctrine contrary to his own private opinions. St. Hilary and St. Ambrose made many such hymns, which, when some muttered against in the Spanish churches because they were of human composition, the fourth Council of Toledo made a decree to confirm the use of them, together with the doxologies 'Glory be to the Father,' etc., 'Glory be to God on high,' threatening excommunication to any that should reject them. The only thing of weight to be urged against all this is a canon of the Council of Laodicea, which forbids all ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμούς, all private psalms, and all uncanonical books to be read in the Church. For it might seem that by private psalms they mean all hymns of human composition. But it was intended rather to exclude apocryphal hymns, such as went under the name of Solomon, as Balzamon and Zonaras understand it, or else such as were not approved by public authority in the Church. If it be extended further, it contradicts the current practice of the whole Church besides, and cannot, in reason, be construed as any more than a private order for the churches of that province, made upon some particular reasons unknown to us at this day. Notwithstanding, therefore, any argument to be drawn from this canon, it is evident the ancients made no scruple of using psalms or hymns of human composition, provided they were pious and orthodox for the substance, and composed by men of eminence, and received by just authority, and not brought in clandestinely into the Church" (*Orig. Eccles.* bk. xiv, ch. i).

The Christian Church, in all periods, has been accustomed, as we have already stated, to use *psalms* and *hymns* in public worship. The psalms are portions of the Psalms of David; the hymns are human compositions. On the history of singing in worship generally, see PSALMODY, under which head will also be given an account of the standard hymn-books in the several evangelical denominations.

I. *Ancient Hymns.*—A few hymns have come down to us from very remote antiquity. "Basil cites an evening hymn from an unknown author, which he describes as in his time (4th century) very ancient, handed down from the fathers, and in use among the people. Dr. J. Pye Smith considers it the oldest hymn extant. The following is his translation of it: "Jesus Christ, Joyful light of the holy! Glory of the Eternal, heavenly, holy, blessed Father! Having now come to the setting of the sun, beholding the evening light, we praise the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit of God. Thou art worthy to be praised of sacred voices, at all seasons, O Son of God, who givest life. Wherefore the universe glorifieth thee!" (Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. xvi, § 5). From the letter of the elder Pliny to Trajan we know that as early as the beginning of the 2d century the Christians praised Christ as their God in songs; and from Eusebius (*Eccles. Hist.* v, 28) we learn that there existed a whole multitude of such songs. But the oldest hymn to Christ, remaining to us complete from the period of persecution, is that of Clemens Alexandrinus (q. v.). It is given in full, Greek and Latin, in Coleman (*l. c.*): see also Piper, *Clementis Hymnus in Salvatorem* (Götting. 1835), and Bull, *Defensio fidei Nicænæ*, § 111, ch. ii, cited by Coleman. "Though regarded as a poetical production, it has little claim to consideration; it shows the strain of the devotion of the early Christians: we see in it the heart of primitive piety laboring to give utterance to its emotions of wonder, love, and gratitude, in view of the offices and character of the Redeemer. It is not found in the later offices of the Church, because, as is supposed, it was thought to re-

semble, in its measure and antiphonal structure, the songs used in pagan worship" (Coleman, *Prim. Church*, p. 370). The oldest Christian hymn-writers, however, were mostly Gnostics in their doctrines, and they seem to have used their songs as "a popular means of commending and propagating their errors." The first of these was Bardesanes, in the Syrian Church of the 2d century, who wrote in imitation of the Psalms 150 hymns, *with Gnostic additions*. Valentinus of Alexandria belongs also to the oldest hymn-writers (comp. Münter, *Odæ Gnosticæ*, Copenh. 1712). The *Gloria in Excelsis* (q. v.), which is still retained in use, is ascribed to the third century. See ANGELICAL HYMN.

1. *Oriental and Greek.*—The *Therapeutæ* in Egypt sang in their assemblies old hymns transmitted by tradition. When, under Constantine the Great, Christianity became the religion of the state, the hymns acquired the importance of regular liturgical Church songs. Ephraem Syrus (q. v.), in the 4th century, who may be considered as the representative of the whole Syrian hymnology, sought to bring the heretical hymns of the Gnostics into disuse. In the Eastern Church the hymns of Arius had, by their practical Christian spirit, acquired more popularity than the orthodox hymns, which consisted mostly of an assemblage of dogmatic formulas. To oppose this tendency, Gregory of Nazianzum and Synesius composed a number of new orthodox hymns, but, not being adapted to the comprehension of the people generally, these did not become popular, and thus failed to answer the purpose of the writers. Sacred poetry in general began to decline among the Greeks; and as in the next century the strife concerning the adoration of Mary and the saints began, the orthodox hymns became mere songs of praise to these. Such are the hymns of Cosmas, bishop of Majumena (780); Andreas, bishop of Crete (660–732); Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople (634–734); John Damascenus in the 8th century, and Theophanes, metropolitan of Nicæa, and Josephus, deacon of Constantinople, in the 9th.

In the history of hymnology, Schaff distinguishes three periods, both in the Greek and Latin Church poetry: (1.) that of formation, while it was slowly throwing off classical metres and inventing its peculiar style, down to about 650; (2.) that of perfection, down to 820; (3.) that of decline and decay, to 1400, or to the fall of Constantinople. "The first period, beautiful as are some of the odes of Gregory Nazianzen and Sophronius of Jerusalem, has impressed scarcely any traces on the Greek office books. The flourishing period of Greek poetry coincides with the period of the image controversies, and the most eminent poets were at the same time advocates of images; pre-eminent among them being John of Damascus, who has the double honor of being the greatest theologian and the greatest poet of the Greek Church. The flower of Greek poetry belongs, therefore, to a later division of our history. Yet, since we find at least the rise of it in the 5th century, we shall give here a brief description of its peculiar character. The earliest poets of the Greek Church, especially Gregory Nazianzen in the 4th, and Sophronius of Jerusalem in the 7th century, employed the classical metres, which are entirely unsuitable to Christian ideas and Church song, and therefore gradually fell out of use. Rhyme found no entrance into the Greek Church. In its stead the metrical or harmonic prose was adopted from the Hebrew poetry and the earliest Christian hymns of Mary, Zacharias, Simeon, and the angelic host. Anatolius of Constantinople (†458) was the first to renounce the tyranny of the classic metre and strike out a new path. The essential points in the peculiar system of the Greek versification are the following: The first stanza, which forms the model of the succeeding ones, is called in technical language *Hirmos*, because it draws the others after it. The succeeding stanzas are called *Troparia* (stanzas), and are divided, for chanting, by commas, without regard to the sense. A number of troparia, from three to twenty or more, form an *Ode*, and this corresponds to the Latin *Sequence*, which was introduced about the same time by the monk Notker in St. Gall. Each ode is founded on a *hirmos*, and ends with a *troparion* in praise of the holy Virgin. The odes are commonly arranged (probably after the example of such Psalms as the 25th, 112th, and 119th) in acrostic, sometimes in alphabetic order. Nine odes form a *Canon*. The older odes on the great events of the incarnation, the resurrection, and the ascension, are sometimes sublime; but the later long canons, in glorification of unknown martyrs, are extremely prosaic and tedious, and full of elements foreign to the Gospel. Even the best hymnological productions of the East lack the healthful simplicity, naturalness, fervor, and depth of the Latin and of the evangelical Protestant hymn.

"The Greek Church poetry is contained in the liturgical books, especially in the twelve volumes of the Menæa, which correspond to the Latin Breviary, and consist, for the most part, of poetic or half poetic odes in rhythmic prose. These treasures, on which nine centuries have wrought, have hitherto been almost exclusively confined to the Oriental Church, and, in fact, yield but few grains of gold for general use. Neale has latterly made a happy effort to reproduce and make accessible in modern English metres, with very considerable abridgments, the most valuable hymns of the Greek Church. We give a few specimens of Neale's translations of hymns of St. Anatolius, patriarch of Constantinople, who attended the Council of Chalcedon (451). The first is a Christmas hymn, commencing in Greek: Μέγα καὶ παράδοξον θαῦμα.

'A great and mighty wonder,
  The festal makes secure:
The Virgin bears the Infant
  With Virgin-honor pure.

The Word is made incarnate,
  And yet remains on high:
And cherubim sing anthems
  To shepherds from the sky.

And we with them triumphant
  Repeat the hymn again:
"To GOD on high be glory,
  And peace on earth to men!"

While thus they sing your Monarch,
  Those bright angelic bands,
Rejoice, ye vales and mountains!
  Ye oceans, clap your hands!

Since all He comes to ransom,
  By all be He adored,
The Infant born in Bethlehem,
  The Saviour and the LORD!

Now idol forms shall perish,
  All error shall decay,
And CHRIST shall wield His sceptre,
  Our LORD and GOD for aye.'

Another specimen of a Christmas hymn by the same, commencing ἐν Βηθλεέμ:

'In Bethlehem is He born!
Maker of all things, everlasting God!
  He opens Eden's gate,
Monarch of ages! Thence the fiery sword
  Gives glorious passage; thence,
The severing mid-wall overthrown, the powers
  Of earth and Heaven are one;
Angels and men renew their ancient league,
  The pure rejoin the pure,
In happy union! Now the Virgin-womb
  Like some cherubic throne
Containeth Him, the Uncontainable:
  Bears Him, whom while they bear
The seraphs tremble! bears Him, as He comes
  To shower upon the world
The fulness of His everlasting love!'

One more on Christ calming the storm, ζοφερᾶς τρικυμίας, as reproduced by Neale:

'Fierce was the wild billow,
  Dark was the night;
Oars labor'd heavily;
  Foam glimmer'd white;
Mariners trembled;
  Peril was nigh;
Then said the God of God,
  "Peace! It is I."

Ridge of the mountain-wave,
  Lower thy crest!

Wail of Euroclydon,
Be thou at rest!
Peril can none be—
Sorrow must fly—
Where saith the Light of light,
"Peace! It is I."
Jesu, Deliverer!
Come Thou to me:
Soothe Thou my voyaging
Over life's sea!
Thou, when the storm of death
Roars sweeping by,
Whisper, O Truth of truth!
"Peace! It is I."'"

2. *Latin Church.*—Of far more importance to the Christian Church than the Greek are the Latin hymns produced in the earlier ages, or the period covering the 4th to the 16th centuries. Though smaller in compass, Latin hymnology far surpasses the Greek "in artless simplicity and truth, and in richness, vigor, and fulness of thought, and is much more akin to the Protestant spirit. With objective churchly character it combines deeper feeling and more subjective appropriation and experience of salvation, and hence more warmth and fervor than the Greek. It forms in these respects the transition to the evangelical hymn, which gives the most beautiful and profound expression to the personal enjoyment of the Saviour and his redeeming grace. The best Latin hymns have come through the Roman Breviary into general use, and through translations and reproductions have become naturalized in Protestant churches. They treat, for the most part, of the great facts of salvation and the fundamental doctrines of Christianity" (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 585). But many of them, like the later productions of the Greek Church, are devoted to the praises of Mary and the martyrs, and are vitiated with all manner of superstitions. One of the oldest writers of Latin hymns is Hilary of Poitiers (Pictaviensis), who died in 368. Banished to Phrygia, he was incited by hearing the singing of Arian hymns to compose some for the orthodox Church, and among these productions his *Lucis largitor splendide* is the most celebrated. There is no doubt that the authorship of a great many hymns is spurious, especially in the case of Ambrose (q. v.), bishop of Milan, who died in 397, and who is generally considered the proper father of Latin Church song. Among his genuine productions we find the grand hymns *O lux beata trinitas; Veni redemptor gentium; Deus creator omnium,* etc. The so-called Ambrosian song of praise, *Te deum laudamus,* "by far the most celebrated hymn," formerly ascribed to Ambrose, "which alone would have made his name immortal," and which, with the *Gloria in excelsis,* is "by far the most valuable legacy of the old Catholic Church poetry, and which will be prayed and sung with devotion in all parts of Christendom to the end of time," he is said to have composed for the baptism of Augustine. But it is now agreed by our best critics that this hymn was written at a later date (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 592). Another distinguished hymn-writer of the Middle Age was Augustine, "the greatest theologian among the Church fathers († 430), whose soul was filled with the genuine essence of poetry." He is said to have composed the resurrection hymn, *Cum rex gloriæ Christus;* the hymn on the glory of Paradise, *Ad perennis vitæ fontem Mens sitivit arida,* and others. Damascus, bishop of Rome († 384), who is said to have been the author of the rhyme of which we spoke above, is perhaps not less celebrated than the preceding names. Very prominently rank also Prudentius, in Spain († 405), whom Neale calls "the prince of primitive Christian poets," the author of *Jam mæsta quiesce querela,* and others; Paulinus of Nola; Sedulius, who composed two Christmas hymns, *A solis ortus cardine* and *Hostis Herodes impie;* Enodius, bishop of Pavia († 521); and Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers (about 600), who wrote the passion hymns, *Pange lingua gloriosi Prœlium certaminis* and *Vexilla regis prodeunt.* These hymns (the text and translations of most of which are given by Schaff, *l. c.*) soon became popular, and though many of them, long in use in the Church, were not to be set aside, still the Council of Toledo (633) recommended the use only of such hymns as those of Hilary, Ambrose, etc., in public worship. Gregory the Great, who introduced a new system of singing into the Church [see GREGORIAN CHANT], also composed hymns, among others the *Rex Christe factor omnium; Primo dierum omnium,* generally regarded as his best, etc. After him the most noteworthy hymn-writers are Isidorus, bishop of Sevilla; Eugenius, Ildefonsus, and Julianus, bishops of Toledo; and Beda Venerabilis. Charlemagne (8th century), who introduced the Gregorian chant into France and Germany, also attempted sacred poetry, and is said to be the author of the Pentecost hymn, *Veni creator spiritus,* though others ascribe it, and perhaps on better grounds, to Rhabanus Maurus. Alcuin and Paulus Diaconus also composed hymns. Although Christianity, during that century and the next, spread through France, Germany, and northwards, yet Latin hymns remained in exclusive use during the whole of the Middle Ages, as the clergy alone took an active part in divine worship. In the 9th century appeared some noteworthy hymn-writers. Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, whose *Gloria laus et honor tibi* was always sung on Palm Sunday; Rhabanus Maurus; Walafrid Strabo, the first German hymn-writer; Notker († 912), who introduced the use of sequences and recitatives in the hymns, and composed the renowned alternate chant, *Media vita in morte sumus.* During the 10th and 11th centuries sacred poetry was cultivated by the Benedictines of Constance, among whom Hermann of Veringen († 1054) was especially distinguished. King Robert of France wrote the Pentecost hymn, *Veni sancte spiritus;* Petrus Damiani wrote also penitential hymns. To the 11th century belongs the alternate hymn to Mary entitled *Salve Regina mater misericordiæ.* In the 12th century hymn-writing flourished, particularly in France, where we notice Marbord (1123); Hildebert of Tours; Petrus Venerabilis; Adam of St. Victor; Bernard of Clairvaux, author of the *Salve ad faciem Jesu,* and the hymn beginning *Salve caput cruentatum;* Abelard, writer of the Annunciation hymn, *Mittit ad virginem;* and Bernard of Cluny, author of "The Celestial Country," about A.D. 1145. It was, moreover, a practice of conventual discipline to connect hymns with all the various offices of daily life: thus there were hymns to be sung before and after the meals, on the lighting of lamps for the night, on fasts, etc. In the 13th century the sentimentalism of the Franciscans became a rich source of poetry, and the Latin hymns perhaps attained their highest perfection under writers of that order. Francis of Assisi himself wrote sacred poetry. Among the Franciscan hymn-writers are especially to be noticed Thomas of Celano (after 1255), author of the grand Judgment hymn, *Dies iræ dies illa* [see DIES IRÆ]; Bonaventura; Jacoponus, who wrote the *Stabat mater dolorosa* and *Stabat mater speciosa.* See STABAT MATER. Among the Dominicans, Thomas Aquinas distinguished himself by his *Pange lingua gloriosi* and *Lauda Sion Salvatorem.* After attaining this eminence Latin hymns retrograded again during the 14th and 15th centuries, and became mere rhymed pieces. The mystics Henry Suso (q. v.) and Thomas à Kempis (q. v.) alone deserve mention among the writers of good hymns.

On hymns of the Ancient and Middle Ages, see Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xiii, chap. v, and bk. xiv, chap. i; Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus, sive hymnorum, etc., collectio amplissima* (Leipz. 1841-56, 5 vols. 8vo); a good selection in Königsfeld, *Lat. Hymnen und Gesänge,* in which the Latin and German versions are printed face to face, with an Introd. and notes by A. W. von Schlegel (Bonn, 1847, 12mo, and second collection 1865, 12mo); Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry, chiefly Lyrical, with Notes,* etc. (2d ed. Lond. 1864, 18mo); Coleman, *Apostolic and Primitive Church,* ch. xii; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity,* ch. xvi; Walch, *De Hymnis Eccles. Apostolicæ* (Jena, 1837); Rambach, *Anthologie Christl. Gesänge* (Alto-

na, 1817–33); Björn, *Hymni Vet. Patrum Christ. Eccles.* (Hafn. 1818); Kehrein, *Lateinische Anthologie* (Frankf. 1840); (Ultramontane) Mone, *Lat. Hymnen des Mittelalters* (Freib. 1853 sq., 3 vols. 8vo); Moll, *Hymnarium* (Halle, 1861, 18mo); Wackernagel, *Das deutsche Kirchenleid* (Lpz. 1864–65, 2 vols.), part of vol. i, p. 9–362; Chandler, *Hymns of the Primitive Church* (Lond. 1837); Neale, *Hymns of the Eastern Church* (3d edit. London, 1866); *Mediæval Hymns and Sequences* (3d ed. London, 1867); *The Voice of Christian Life in Song, or Hymns and Hymn Writers of many Lands and Ages* (N.Y. 1864, 12mo); Miller, *Our Hymns, their Authors and Origin* (Lond. 1866, 12mo); Koch, *Gesch. d. Kirchenl.* (2d edit. Stuttgart, 1852 sq., 4 vols., especially, i, 10–30); Edilestand du Meril, *Poésies populaires Latines antérieures au douzième siècle* (Paris, 1843); Fortlage, *Gesänge Christl. Vorzeit* (Berlin, 1844); Milman, *Latin Christianity*, viii, 302 sq.; Hill, *English Monasticism*, p. 324–373 (on mediæval books and hymns); Rheimvald, *Kirchl. Archäol.* p. 262 sq.; Augusti, *Handb. der christl. Archäol.* ii, 106 sq.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 384 sq.; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquités*, p. 475 sq.; *Christ. Examiner*, xxviii, art. i; *Christian Remembrancer*, xliv, art. iv; *N. Amer. Rev.* 1857, art. iv; and on the first six centuries a very excellent article, first published in the *British and Foreign Ev. Rev.* (Oct. 1866), in Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 575 sq.

II. *Modern Hymnography.*—1. *German.*—The origin of German hymns, which are without question the richest of any in modern tongues, may be traced to the 9th century. But the history of German hymnology, strictly speaking, does not begin earlier than the Reformation. For "it was not until the people possessed the Word of God, and liberty to worship him in their own language, that such a body of songs could be created, though vernacular hymns and sacred lyrics had existed in Germany throughout the Middle Ages. It was then that a great outburst of national poetry and music took place which reflected the spirit of those times; and on a somewhat smaller scale the same thing has happened both before and since that time, at every great crisis in the history of the German people." The most marked of these periods are, besides the Reformation, the 12th and 13th centuries, or the Crusading period, and the latter part of the 17th, and 18th centuries. The earliest attempts at German hymns are traced to the 9th century. For some centuries preceding the Roman Church had abandoned congregational singing, and the hymns formed part of the liturgical service performed by the priests and the canonical singers. In some churches, however, the people still continued "the old practice of uttering the response *Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison*, at certain intervals during the singing of the Latin hymns and psalms, which finally degenerated into a confused clamor of voices. The first attempt to remedy this was made by adding, soon after Notker, who originated the Latin Sequence or Prose, a few German rhymes to the *Kyrie Eleison*, "from the last syllables of which these earliest German hymns were called *Leisen*." But as they were never used in Mass service, but were confined to popular festivals, pilgrimages, and the like, they did not come into general use, and it may be said that the real employment of *Leisen* (or *Leiche*, as they were also called) did not begin before the 12th century. At that time they had become the common property of the German people, and hymns in the vernacular were freely produced, among them the oldest German Easter hymn, *Christus ist uferstanden*, attributed to Sperrvogel, which has descended to our own day as a verse of one of Luther's best hymns:

Christ the Lord is risen,
Out of death's dark prison;
Let us all rejoice to-day,
Christ shall be our hope and stay:
Kyrie eleison.
Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia!

Several of the great Latin hymns were also translated into German, and although their use in the Church was more or less restricted, and was always regarded with suspicion by the more papal of the clergy, yet they continued to be favored by the people, as is fully evinced by the quantity of sacred verse written from this time onwards. Thus Wackernagel, in his work on religious poetry, prior to the Reformation (*Das deutsche Kirchenlied v. d. ältest. Zeit bis zu Anfang d. 17ten Jahrhundert*), exhibits nearly 1500 specimens, and the names of no less than 85 different poets, with many anonymous authors. Among the writers named we find not a few of the celebrated knightly minne-singers, as Hartmann von der Aue, Wolfram von Eschenbach, Walther von der Vogelweide, and others. But the German sacred songs of this time, like the old Latin hymns, were confined to addressing the saints, and, above all, the Virgin Mary. "The former class is not very important, either as to number or to quality; but the *Marien-Lieder*, and, in a minor degree, *Annen-Lieder* (hymns to Mary and to Anne), constitute a very large and well-known class among the poems of the ante-Reformation times in Germany. . . . They form a sort of spiritual counterpart to the minne-songs or love-songs addressed to his earthly lady by the knight. It was easy to transfer the turn of expression and tone of thought from the earthly object to the heavenly one, and the degree to which this is done is to us very often startling. . . . The honors and titles belonging to our Lord Jesus Christ are attributed to his mother; God is said to have created the world by her, and to have rested in her on the seventh day; she is said to have risen from the grave on the third day, and ascended into heaven; she is addressed not only as a persuasive mediator with her Son, but as herself the chief source of mercy and help, especially in the hour of death and at the day of judgment. By degrees, her mother is invested with some of her own attributes; for it is said, if Christ would obey his own mother, ought not she much more to obey hers? So a set of hymns to Anne sprang up, in which she is entreated to afford aid in death, and obtain pardon for the sinners from Christ and Mary, who will refuse her nothing" (Winkworth, *Christian Singers of Germany*, p. 96, 97). See HYPERDULIA. It is no wonder that in the face of such extravagances Wackernagel is constrained to say that the existence of so many godless hymns addressed to the Virgin and the saints, or teaching the whole doctrine of indulgences, is an indisputable testimony to the degeneracy into which the nation had fallen, rendering the Reformation necessary; and that the existence of so many breathing an unstained Christianity is at the same time a witness to the preservation of so much true religion as made the Reformation at all possible. The use of German hymns was taken up by the heretical sects that began to spring up under the persecuting influence of Rome. The German Flagellants, the Bohemians, the Waldenses, and the Mystics, who all encouraged the study of the Scriptures, of course favored the singing of German hymns; and they contributed not a few sacred songs themselves to those already existing. Thus the Mystic Tauler (q. v.) (to whom was long attributed the *Theologia Germania*, in all probability the work of Nicholas of Basle) wrote several hymns, which became widely known. His best, perhaps, are the following:

WHAT I MUST DO.

"From outward creatures I must flee,
And seek heart-oneness deep within,
If I would draw my soul to Thee,
O God, and keep it pure from sin," etc.

ONLY JESUS.

"O Jesu Christ, most good, most fair,
More fragrant than May's flowery air,
Who Thee within his soul doth bear,
True cause for joy hath won!
But would one have Thee in his heart,
From all self-will he must depart;
God's bidding only where thou art
Must evermore be done.
Where Jesus thus doth truly dwell,
His presence doth all tumults quell,
And transient cares of earth dispel
Like mists before the sun," etc.

A marked improvement, however, took place in German hymnology during the 15th century, especially near its close. The chief hymn-writer of this period was Henry of Laufenberg, who was particularly active in transforming secular into religious songs, as was frequent at this time; he also translated for the Germans many of the old Latin hymns. One of the best specimens of a religious song transformed we cite here. The original was "Innsbruck, I must forsake thee."

FAREWELL.

O world, I must forsake thee,
And far away betake me,
To seek my native shore:
So long I've dwelt in sadness,
I wish not now for gladness,
Earth's joys for me are o'er.

Sore is my grief and lonely,
And I can tell it only
To Thee, my Friend most sure!
God, let Thy hand uphold me,
Thy pitying heart enfold me,
For else I am most poor.

My refuge where I hide me,
From Thee shall naught divide me,
No pain, no poverty:
Naught is too bad to fear it,
If Thou art there to share it;
My heart asks only Thee.

Many of these transformed hymns were preserved, like the one above cited, through the Reformation. Another very popular hymn, *Den liebsten puelen den ich han der ist in des Himels Trone*, was transformed from the song "Den liebsten puelen den ich han der liegt beim Wirt im Keller." Of the transformation of ballads by the minnesingers into hymns to Mary and Anne we have already spoken. We return, therefore, to Laufenberg, and cite one of his hymns, which well deserves to be called not only one of the best of his age, but one of the loveliest sacred songs that has ever been written. We copy the first stanza of it from Mrs. Winkworth (p. 93):

CRADLE SONG.

Ah Jesu Christ, my Lord most dear,
As Thou wast once an infant here,
So give this little child, I pray,
Thy grace and blessings day by day:
Ah Jesu, Lord divine,
Guard me this babe of mine!

Laufenberg also wrote and widely introduced the use of many hymns in mixed Latin and German, a kind of verse which was the favorite amusement of the monks, and which had acquired considerable popularity at his time. The best known of these productions was a Christmas carol, dating from the 14th century, *In dulci jubilo, Nu singet und seid fro*. Peter Dresdensis was generally, but erroneously, regarded as the author of these perhaps properly termed "Mixed Hymns." "His real work, however, lay in the strenuous efforts he made to introduce hymns in the vernacular more freely into public worship, especially into the service of the Mass," from which they had, as we have already had occasion to observe, been excluded. But these efforts met with violent opposition from the Church, and the use of hymns in the vernacular still continued to be almost exclusively confined to festivals and like occasions. Among these vernacular hymns are particularly celebrated "*Ein Kindelein so löbelich*," "*Christ fure zu Himmel*," "*Gott sei gelobet und gebenedeist*," "*Wir danken dir lieber Herre*," etc. After the invention of the art of printing, the followers of Huss, who had formed themselves into a separate and organized Church of their own in 1467 (Bohemian and Moravian Brethren), and who made it one of their distinctive peculiarities to use hymns in the vernacular, as their service was mainly conducted in their mother tongue, especially their prayers, gave new encouragement to the writing of German hymns. In 1504, Lucas, then chief of the Bohemians, collected 400 of the most popular of the German hymns and had them printed. This is "the first example of a *hymn-book* composed of original compositions in the vernacular to be found in any Western nation which had once owned the supremacy of Rome." Previous to this time, towards the close of the 15th century, there existed two or three collections of German versions of the *Latin* hymns and sequences, but they are of very inferior merit.

The Reformation in the 16th century marks the next æra in the history of German hymnology. The introduction of the vernacular into the liturgy of the Church gave an impulse to the German language that was only eclipsed by Luther's translation of the Bible for the edification and education of the entire German people. But it was Luther's aim not only to furnish his followers the Book of books, but also to introduce everywhere the singing of such hymns as already existed in the vernacular, and by the creation of a taste among the people for German sacred song to promote its cultivation. Of this he set himself the best example. As in the cause of religion he knew how to enlist a large circle of eminent men and scholars to carry out his great designs, so also, with a true appreciation of sacred art, both in poetry and song, he soon gathered about him many friends, who became the compilers of several collections of hymns, that were issued from the press at remarkably short intervals. See PSALMODY. Luther himself, besides translating anew many of the Latin hymns, "which he counted among the good things that God's power and wonderful working had kept alive amid so much corruption," and, besides transforming or reproducing some four of the early German hymns, composed some twenty-one in the vernacular, most of which are known in our own day by most of the Protestant nations of the globe, and some of which are particular favorites even with the English-speaking people. The special object of the composition of these hymns, into which Luther threw "all his own fervent faith and deep devotion," was undoubtedly "to give the people a short, clear confession of faith, easy to be remembered. For the doctrines which Luther propagated were yet too new to be well understood by all as he desired them to be. He wished men to know what they professed. Protestantism meant the profession of a faith by *choice*, and not by compulsion; a belief that was cherished by the confessor, and not a blind following after the teacher. He required a comprehension of his great doctrines of justification by faith, of the one Mediator between God and man, which gave peace to the conscience by delivering it from the burden of the past sins, and a new spring of life to the soul by showing men that their dependence was not on anything in themselves, on no works of their own performance, but on the infinite love and mercy of God, which he had manifested to all mankind in his Son; of his doctrine of the universal priesthood of all believers, which put a new spirit into the Church, by vindicating for every member of it his right and duty to offer for himself the sacrifice of praise and prayer, and to study for himself God's word in the Scriptures" (comp. Winkworth, p. 105). One of Luther's hymns best known to us is that founded on the 46th Psalm, the famous "Marseillaise of the Reformation," as Heine called it. He is generally supposed to have written it on his way to the Diet of Worms. Some, however, think that it was composed at the close of the second Diet of Spire (1529). It has been again and again translated. Mrs. Winkworth gives us the following:

THE STRONGHOLD.

A sure stronghold our God is he,
A trusty shield and weapon;
Our help he'll be, and set us free,
Whatever ill may happen.
That old malicious foe
Intends us deadly woe;
Armed with the strength of hell,
And deepest craft as well,
On earth is not his fellow.

Through our own force we nothing can,
Straight were we lost forever,
But for us fights the proper Man,
By God sent to deliver.

Ask ye who this may be?
Christ Jesus named is he,
Of Sabaoth the Lord,
Sole God to be adored;
'Tis he must win the battle.

And were the world with devils filled,
All eager to devour us,
Our souls to fear should little yield;
They cannot overpower us.
Their dreaded prince no more
Can harm us as of yore;
Look grim as e'er he may,
Doomed is his ancient sway,
A word can overthrow him.

Still shall they leave that world its might,
And yet no thanks shall merit;
Still is he with us in the fight
By his good gifts and Spirit.
E'en should they take our life,
Goods, honor, children, wife,
Though all of these were gone,
Yet nothing have they won—
God's kingdom ours abideth!

Another hymn of Luther's which has gained a world-wide circulation is the one that was written by him on the burning of two martyrs for their faith at Brussels in 1523, and which was translated, or, rather, transformed by D'Aubigne in his *History of the Reformation*, beginning,

"Flung to the heedless winds,
Or on the waters cast,
Their ashes shall be watched,
And gathered at the last," etc.

As an example of the songs he transformed most successfully, we quote the old ditty,

"O thou naughty Judas!
What hast thou done,
To betray our Master,
God's only Son!
Therefore must thou suffer
Hell's agony,
Lucifer's companion
Must forever be.
Kyrie, Eleison!"

This Luther changed to the following:

"'Twas our great transgression
And our sore misdeed
Made the Lord our Saviour
On the cross to bleed.
Not then on thee, poor Judas,
Nor on that Jewish crew,
Our vengeance dare we visit—
We are to blame, not you.
Kyrie, Eleison!

"All hail to thee, Christ Jesus,
Who hungest on the tree,
And bor'st for our transgressions
Both shame and agony.
Now beside thy Father
Reignest thou on high;
Bless us all our lifetime,
Take us when we die!
Kyrie, Eleison!"

(*Christian Examiner*, 1860, p. 239 sq.)

Of the friends whom Luther was successful in enlisting as writers for his new hymn-books we have space here to mention only the most prominent names. One of them, Justus Jonas, was a colleague of Luther and Melancthon at the University of Wittenberg. His special service was the transformation of the Psalms into metrical German versions, "choosing, as one can well understand, those which speak of David's sufferings from his enemies, and his trust in God's deliverance." One of his best is on the 124th Psalm, beginning thus:

"If God were not upon our side,
When foes around us rage;
Were not Himself our Help and Guide,
When bitter war they wage:
Were He not Israel's mighty Shield,
To whom their utmost crafts must yield,
We surely must have perished."

Another of Luther's colaborers was Paul Eber, whose hymns have "a tone of tenderness and pathos which is much less characteristic of this period than the grave, manly trustfulness of Luther and Jonas." But they became very extensively known, and during the trying period of the Thirty-years' War they were constantly heard both in public and around the family hearth-stone. A special favorite at that time was the one, composed when the imperial armies were besieging Wittenberg (1547), beginning:

"When, in the hour of utmost need,
We know not where to look for aid,
When days and nights of anxious thought
Nor help nor comfort yet have brought,
Then this our comfort is alone,
That we may meet before Thy throne,
And cry, O faithful God, to Thee,
For rescue from our misery."

Two of Eber's hymns for the dying have been great favorites by the side of death-beds and at funerals, not only among the German Protestants, but also among the Roman Catholics. The one is *Herr Jesu Christ, wahr Mensch und Gott* (Lord Jesus Christ, true man and God); the other is the following childlike expression of perfect trust, beautifully rendered by Mrs. Winkworth (p. 121):

DEATH IN THE LORD.

"I fall asleep in Jesu's arms,
Sin washed away, hushed all alarms,
For his dear blood, his righteousness,
My jewels are, my glorious dress,
Wherein before my God I stand
When I shall reach the heavenly land.

With peace and joy I now depart,
God's child I am with all my heart:
I thank thee, Death: thou leadest me
To that true life where I would be.
So cleansed by Christ I fear not Death,
Lord Jesu, strengthen thou my faith!"

But Luther and his associates were only the founders of the new German hymnology, which soon spread over a much more extended field. Hymn-writers became common all over the land, and their number is legion, so that it is almost impossible for us, in our limited space, to give more than a brief account of the most distinguished, and the names only of those of lesser note. Thus Nicholas Decius, a converted monk, produced a translation of the *Gloria in Excelsis* ("Allein Gott in der Höh', sei Ehr," *All glory be to God on high*), which, with its noble chorale, soon came into use all over Germany. Paul Speratus (von Spretten), the chaplain of the duke of Prussia, is perhaps the most noted of all the hymnologists of this period, and is best known as the author of the hymn on the doctrine of *Justification by faith:*

"Salvation hath come down to us
Of freest grace and love,
Works cannot stand before God's law,
A broken reed they prove;
Faith looks to Jesus Christ alone,
He must for all our sins atone,
He is our one Redeemer."

This, in Luther's day, was as popular among the Germans as one of his own hymns. Indeed, it is said that when Luther first heard it sung by a beggar on the roadside he gave him the last coin he had. Princes also became sacred poets, such as the margrave of Brandenburg and Hesse, known as the author of

"Grant me, eternal God, such grace
That no distress
May cause me e'er to flee from Thee," etc.

The elector John of Saxony was also, at that time, counted among hymn-writers, but it now appears that he never wrote any hymns himself, although he was passionately fond of them. Hans Sachs (1494–1576), the celebrated and popular poet of this period, also wrote sacred verse, and figures not less prominently than the persons whose names we have already mentioned. The most famous of his hymns he wrote during the siege of Nuremberg, his native city, in 1561: "Why art thou thus cast down, my heart?" (*Warum betrübst du dich mein Herz?*). He wrote also a very beautiful hymn on the explicit confidence in the saving merits of Christ, entitled "The Mediator," which is translated by Mrs. Winkworth (*Christ. Sing.* p. 134). Among the Bohemian Brethren, who, as is well known, were on intimate terms with the Lutherans, Michael Weiss is distinguished both as the translator of Bohemian hymns into German, and as the author of a number of beautiful German hymns. Two of them, "Once he came in

blessing," and the well-known "Christ, the Lord, is risen again" (*Christus ist erstanden von des Todes Banden*), translated into English by Mrs. Winkworth, may be found in her *Lyra Germanica*, ii, 62, and in Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 15, 259. Not less worthy of notice, though perhaps not quite so prominent in their day, are Johann Matthesius († 1561) and Nicholas Hermann († 1561). The former wrote, among others, the beautiful morning hymn, "My inmost heart now raises" (*Aus meines Herzen's Grunde*), which was a favorite with king Gustavus Adolphus. Hermann's hymns are to be found in nearly all German hymn-books. Among his best hymns are *Lobt Gott ihr Christen allzugleich*, and *Wenn mein Stündlein vorhanden ist*. Mrs. Winkworth gives Matthesius's "Miner's Song" (p. 144) and Hermann's "Hymn for the Dying."

In the latter half of the 16th, and even at the opening of the 17th century, a gradual decline is manifest in the quality of the hymns, though the quantity continued. They were now no longer the spontaneous production of men of all classes, moved to worship God in songs of praise, but the work of professional hymnologists. "Still this period, too, has some very good and fine hymns, but a marked change of tone is perceptible in most of them; they are no longer filled with the joyful welcome of a new day: they more often lament the wickedness of the age, and anticipate coming evil times, or the end of the world itself." Most prominent among the hymn-writers of this period are the following: (1.) Ambrose Lobwasser, who translated the French Psalter of Marot and Beza; but the literary merit of the work was rather mediocre. "It does not rise above the level of a sort of rhymed prose, and it furnished an unfortunate model for a flood of very prosaic rhymed paraphrases of doctrinal statements or passages of Scripture, which became wonderfully numerous at this time." (2.) Bartholomæus Ringwaldt (1530-98) is the author of the hymn, in England erroneonsly attributed to Luther, "Great God, what do I see and hear," which was written in imitation of the "*Dies iræ, dies illa*." He really deserves to be placed first among the hymnologists of this period. It is incorporated in the *New Congregational Hymn-book* (London), No. 420. His hymns partake of the penitential style, by which, as above remarked, this period is characterized. One of his best on "Penitence" Mrs. Winkworth has clothed in English dress (p. 149). (3.) Nicolaus Selnecker (1530-92), author of *Gleich wie sein Haus der Vogel baut*, based on the 84th Psalm. (4.) Louis Helmboldt, the poet laureate of the emperor Maximilian, who wrote "The true Christian's Vade-Mecum" (*From God shall naught divide me*, Mrs. Winkworth, p. 154), which is contained in all German hymn-books, "and has rooted itself among the people." To this period belong also Martin Schalling (1532-1608), among whose hymns *Herzlich lieb hab' ich Dich o Herr* ("O Lord, I love thee," in Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 609) is best known; Kaspar Melissander ("Herr, wie du willst, so schick's mit mir"), Mart. Moller, Mart. Behemb, Mart. Rutilius ("Ach, Herr u. Gott, wie gross u. schwer!"), Joh. Pappus ("Ich hab mein Sach' Gott heimgestellt"), and more especially Philip Nicolai (1556-1608), who was the first to reintroduce, after the Reformation, the mystical union of Christ with the soul in his hymns, whence they have often been called the "Hymns of the Love of Jesus." His two best hymns have gained a remarkable popularity, "and are indeed admirable for their fervor of emotion and mastery over difficult but musical rhythms." They are, *Wachet auf, ruft uns die Stimme* ("Wake, awake, for night is flying," in Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 382; in the *New Congregational Hymn-book*, No. 749), and *Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern* ("How lovely shines the Star," *Christ in Song*, p. 551), which latter especially "became so popular that its tunes were often chimed by city bells, lines and verses were printed from it by way of ornament on the common earthenware of the country, and it was invariably used at weddings and certain festivals." All German hymn-books still contain it, though in a somewhat modified form.

The tempest of war which for thirty years swept over Germany, and caused a tale of disasters from which it would seem society could have never recovered, even promoted, or at least did not impede in any way, the literary and intellectual activity of the German mind; and this period is not only recognised as having been signalized by "a great outburst of religious song," but as having produced the most famous hymnologists of Germany. First among these stands the great Martin Opitz (1597-1639), of the Silesian school of German poets, who greatly improved all German poetry. He wrote many versions of some of the epistles, and of many of the Psalms, and of the Song of Solomon. But his original versions are by far the best; e. g. his morning hymn, "O Light, who out of Light wast born" (Winkworth, p. 173). Next to him we find Paul Fleming (q. v.) (1609-40), author of "In allen unseren Thaten." But most famous at this time were undoubtedly Johann von Rist (q. v.) (1607-67), Johann Heermann (q. v.) (1685-1647), and, a little later, Paul Gerhard (q. v.) (1606-76), who was the greatest of them all, "the prince of German hymnists." Rist wrote as many as 600 to 700 religious poems and hymns, "intended to supply every possible requirement of public worship or private experience." His best are perhaps "Werde munter mein Gemüthe," "Auf, auf ihr Reichsgenossen," and "Werde Licht, du Volk der Heiden" (translation in Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 118). Heermann's best hymns are "Herzliebster Jesu, was hast du verbrochen" (*Christ in Song*, p. 171), "Jesu, deine tiefe Wunden," "Zion Klage mit Angst u. Schmerzen" (Winkworth, p. 198), "Früh Morgens da die Sonn' aufgeht" (*Christ in Song*, p. 263), and "O Jesu Christe, wahres Licht" (*Christ in Song*, p. 116). Very beautiful is the following (transl. by Mrs. Winkworth):

IN TEMPTATION.

"Jesu, victor over sin,
Help me now the fight to win.
Thou didst vanquish once, I know,
Him who seeks my overthrow;
So to Thee my faith will cleave,
And her hold will never leave,
Till the weary battle's done,
And the final triumph won;
For I too through Thee may win,
Victory over death and sin."

In Gerhard's hands the German hymn reached its highest perfection, and his name is to the German justly dearer than that of any other save Luther. His hymns are "pervaded by a spirit of the most cheerful and healthy piety—a piety which shows itself not merely in direct devotion to God and to Christ, but in a pure and childlike love of nature, and good will towards men. They exemplify Coleridge's lines:

'He prayeth best who loveth best
All things both great and small;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all.'

They have the homely simplicity of Luther's, and a strength like his, if not quite equal to it, with a versatility, smoothness, and literary finish not to be found in Luther's, and unsurpassed in any period of German hymnology" (*Christian Examiner*, 1860, p. 247). Gerhardt has been aptly considered "the typical poet of the Lutheran Church, as Herbert is of the English;" but it must not be thought that he was by any means a voluminous writer. On the contrary, he only wrote altogether about 120 hymns. His life and writings have been dwelt upon so much in detail that we can do no better here than leave him with a few words of tribute so ably paid by Mrs. Winkworth: "His hymns seem to be the spontaneous outpouring of a heart that overflows with love, trust, and praise; his language is simple and pure; if it has sometimes a touch of homeliness, it has no vulgarism, and at times it rises to a beauty and grace which always gives the impression of being unstudied, yet could hardly have been improved by art.

His tenderness and fervor never degenerate into the sentimentality and petty conceits which were already becoming fashionable in his days, nor his penitence and sorrow into that morbid despondency . . . for which the disappointments of his own life might have furnished some excuse." Other hymn-writers of this period are Andreas Gryphius (1616–64), of the same country as Opitz, and, like him, also a great writer of secular literature; Martin Rinkart (q. v.), the writer of *Nun danket alle Gott* ("Let all men praise the Lord"); Simon Dach (q. v.), author of *Ich bin ja Herr in Deiner Macht;* Heinrich Albertus (1604–68), whose best hymn is considered to be *Gott d. Himmels u. d. Erden;* Georg Weissel (first half of the 17th century), who wrote *Macht hoch die Thür, die Thor macht weit* (in *Christ in Song*, p. 17); the electoress Louisa Henrietta of Brandenburg, who composed in 1649, after the death of her first husband, the hymn *Jesus, meine Zuversicht*, well known in the English dress, "Jesus, my Redeemer, lives" (see *Christ in Song*, p. 265); Ernst Chr. Homburg (1605–81), whose hymns were published together under the title *Geistliche Lieder* (Naumb. 1758). Perhaps his best hymn is *Jesu, meines Lebens Leben*, or "Christ, the life of all the living" (*Christ in Song*, p. 183); another, hardly less beautiful, is his well-known "Man of Sorrows." Johann Frank (1618–77), "who ranks only second to Gerhardt as a hymn-writer, and, with him, marks the transition from the earlier to the later school of German religious poetry," published his sacred songs under the title of *Geistliches Zion* (Guben, 1764). One of his best is *Schmücke dich o liebe Seele*, "Deck thyself, my soul" (Winkworth, *Lyra Germanica*, ii, 133; Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 590). We add here only Georg Neumark (q. v.) (1621–81), for a time professor of poetry and poet laureate at the University of Königsberg, whose most famous hymn is *Wer nur den lieben Gott lässt walten*, "Leave God to order all thy ways" (*Lyra Germanica*, p. 152); J. M. Meyfarth (1590–1642), *Jerusalem du hochgebaute Stadt*, translated in the *Christian Examiner*, lxix, 254 ("Jerusalem, thou high-built, fair abode"), and in *Lyra Germanica*, ii, 285); Friedrich v. Spee (1591 or 1595–1635), a Roman Catholic, who labored earnestly to introduce vernacular hymns into the divine service of his Church, wrote *Auf, auf, Gott will gelobet sein;* Johann Jacob Balde (1603–68), also a Roman Catholic, but he wrote mostly in Latin (his sacred poems being published under the title of *Carmina Lyrica*); Georg Phil. Harsdörfer (1607–58), of Southern Germany; A. H. Buchholz (1607–71); Johann Olearius (1611–84), belonging to a family who in this century were hymn-writers of some note.

Angelus Silesius (1624–77) (as a Lutheran, Johann Scheffer) wrote beautiful hymns, 205 of which were published under the title of *Heilige Seelenlust, oder Geistliche Hirtenlieder* (Bresl. 1657, and often). Particularly excellent are his *Ich will dich lieben meine Stärke* ("Thee will I love, my strength, my tower"), and *Liebe, die Du mich zum Bilde* ("O Love, who formedst me," in Schaff, *Christ in Song*, p. 414; *Christian Examiner*, lxix, 245). Angelus was the founder of the so-called second Silesian School of poets, as Opitz is regarded as the leader of the first. They wrote both secular and religious poetry, but the latter far excels the former. To this school belonged Homburg, mentioned above; the two countesses of Schwarzburg Rudolfstadt; Knorr v. Rosenroth (1636–89), who wrote the lovely little hymn, *Morgenglanz der Ewigkeit* ("Dayspring of eternity"); Christian Scriver, author of *Jesu, meiner Seele Leben*, and others; Sigismund v. Birken (1626–81), who, with Harsdörfer, already noticed, belonged to the sentimental school; Gottfried Wilhelm Sacer (1635–99), G. Hoffmann, B. Prätorius, Johann Neunherz, Kaspar Neumann, who wrote *Auf mein Herz des Herrn*, also Tug, *O Gott von dem wir Alles haben*, and many others.

In striking contrast with the formal and unspiritual hymns of the second Silesian school stand the poetical writings of the so-called Pietists, originating with Spener, "who for nearly a hundred years exerted a most powerful influence both on the religious and social life of Germany." The representatives of this school are Philip Jacob Spener (1635–1705); his friend and associate, August Hermann Francke (1663–1727), the founder of the Halle Orphan Asylum; Anastasius Freylinghausen, a son-in-law of Franke, who wrote 44 hymns, and published (1704) a collection which remained for some generations the favorite collection for private reading among pious persons in Germany. To the same period belong J. C. Schade; Fr. von Canitz; Joachim Neander (1640–80), of the Reformed Church, who wrote *Lobe den Herrn den Mächtigen;* Johann C. Schütz, author of *Sei Lob u. Ehr dem höchsten Gut;* Christian Titius; Adolph Drese; Sam. Rodigast, who composed in 1675 the world-renowned *Was Gott thut, das ist wohlgethan* ("Whate'er my God ordains is right"); J. Ad. Hasslocher; Christ. Pressovius; Laur. Laurenti, whose best hymn Dr. Schaff designates *Ermuntert euch ihr Frommen* ("Rejoice all ye believers," in *Christ in Song*, p. 383); J. B. Freistein; C. Günther, *Halt im Gedächtniss Jesum Christ;* Sal. Liskovius; J. T. Breithaupt; J. Lange; J. D. Herrnschmid; Christ. F. Richter; J. G. Wolf; Chr. A. Bernstein; Chr. J. Koitsch; J. Tribechovius; J. J. Winkler; J. H. Schröder; J. E. Schmidt; P. Lackmann; J. Chr. Lange; L. A. Gotter; B. Crasselius, *Heiligster Jesu Heiligungsquelle;* M. Müller; A. Hinkelmann; H. G. Neuss; A. Creutzberg; J. Muthmann; Ernst Lange (1650–1727), *Im Abend blinkt der Morgenstern*, or "The wondering sages trace from far" (*Christ in Song*, p. 120); L. J. Schlicht; C. H. von Bogatzky, the celebrated author of the "Golden Treasury" (*Das goldene Schatzkästlein*), also one of the compilers of the "Cothen Hymn-book;" J. J. Rambach; T. L. K. Allendorf; L. F. F. Lehr; J. S. Kunth; E. G. Woltirsdorf, and many others. There were also the Würtembergers, the best representatives of the pietism of South Germany, of whom Albert Bengel (1687–1732) may be looked upon as a prominent leader, though as a hymn-writer he was far excelled by another great light of this section of Germany, Philip Friedrich Hiller (1699–1769), who took Paul Gerhardt for his model. He published several volumes of hymns, of which the "Casket of Spiritual Songs" (*Geistliches Liederkästlein*), containing only his own sacred songs, "obtained very wide popularity," and is "still the commonest book in Würtemberg next to the Bible itself" (Winkworth, p. 283 sq.). Here deserve mention, also, J. R. Hedinger, S. Urlsperger, F. O. Hiller, Ph. H. Weissensee, E. L. Fischer, J. Chr. Storr, Ph. D. Burk, Chr. Fr. Ottinger, Chr. K. L. von Pfeil, J. T. von Moser, and still others.

The school of Spener developed the Mystics and Separatists, who also furnished a number of contributors to hymnology; but, although some of them were quite able, the influence of the new schools, as a whole, on hymnology "was, for the most part, simply mischievous, and their hymn-books contain about the worst specimens to be found—poor as poetry, fiercely intolerant towards their fellow-Christians, and full of a fantastic and irreverent adoration of the Redeemer" (Winkworth, *Christian Singers of Germany*, p. 290). The only hymnologists who really deserve praise are Gottfried Arnold (1666–1714) and Gerhard Tersteegen (1697–1769). The former, although an extensive writer on Church History, etc., is, indeed, best remembered in our day by his hymns, of which he wrote 130, and among them several of very great beauty. Perhaps the best of Arnold's hymns is his deeply thoughtful "How bless'd to all thy followers, Lord, the road," etc. Tersteegen (q. v.), who, although he never actually separated from the Reformed Church to which he belonged, was none the less "a Mystic of the purest type," wrote more than 100 hymns; but he has become especially familiar to English-speaking Christians by the English dress which Wesley gave to two of his best hymns—"Lo! God is here; let us adore," and "Thou hidden love of God, whose height," etc. Lesser lights of these schools are J. Dippel, J. W. Petersen, G. Arnold, and others.

Here also, finally, deserve notice the hymn-writers of the Moravians, who have had no despicable influence on hymnology. Of especial credit are a few of count Zinzendorf's hymns, who, unfortunately, cared more for their quantity than their quality; he wrote more than 2000, many of which, naturally enough, found a place in English hymn-books. His own sect has inserted 128. Charles Wesley also translated some of them. Among his best are "Jesus, still lead on" (*Jesu geh voran*), and "Jesus, thy blood and righteousness" (*Christi Blut u. Gerechtigkeit*). We might also mention in the same connection J. Nitschmann, Chr. David, L. J. Dober, F. von Watteville, A. G. Spangenberg, Louisa von Hayn, and others.

By the end of the century the influence of pietism had made itself felt even among the so-called "orthodox," who imitated the Pietists in producing many hymns which may be counted among the best written at this time. Of the representatives of this school we name a few: Benjamin Schmolke, who wrote more than 1000 hymns, many of which have been translated into English. Among his best we count "Welcome victor in the strife" (*Wilkommen Held im Streite*), and "Heavenward doth our journey tend" (*Himmelan geht unsre Bahn*). Wolfgang G. Dessler wrote *Wie wohl ist mir o Freund der Seelen* (*Christ in Song*, p. 491, 555, 342); and Salomon Frank, *Schmücke dich, o liebe Seele* ("Deck thyself, my soul," in *Lyra Germanica*, ii, 133; *Christ in Song*, p. 590). Here deserve mention, also, Erdmann Neumeister, B. Marperger, J. G. Hermann, J. Chr. Wentzel, F. Fabricius, P. Busch, J. Lehmus, and others; of the Reformed Church: J. J. Spreng, C. Zollikofer, and, later, J. E. Lavater.

Modern German Hymnologists.—Towards the close of the 18th century Germany was waking to a new æra in literature. But the philosophic, or, as some acutely call it, "the critical doubting" religion of this period by no means affected hymnology favorably, "for really good hymns must have in them something of the nature of the popular song; they must spring from a cordial, unquestioning faith, which has no misgivings about the response it will evoke from other hearts." The influence of the Leibnitz-Wolfian philosophy, and of Gottsched's school of poetry, caused the sacred songs to be of a dry, stiff, and artificial style. "Even the classical hymns, though consecrated by association, could no longer satisfy the more pedantic taste of the age, and there sprang up a perfect mania for altering them, and for making new collections of such modernized versions. . . . These alterations generally consisted in diluting the old vigor, substituting 'virtue' for 'holiness' or 'faith,' 'the Supreme Being' for 'our faithful God,' and so on," so that these modified hymns may be said to have been changed from *religious* to *moral* songs. See PSALMODY. One, however, whose songs, on account of their "rational piety and quiet good taste," deserve especial praise, is Christian Fürchtegott Gellert (q. v.). Other hymnologists of this time, for the mention of whose names we have only space here, are J. A. Schlegel, J. F. von Cronegk, J. P. Uz, J. F. Löwen, J. S. Diterich, J. S. Patzke, J. F. Feddersen, B. Münter, J. F. Mudre, H. C. Heeren, J. A. Hermes, F. W. Loder, J. Eschenburg, J. Chr. Fröbing, S. G. Bürde, Chr. F. Neander, B. Haug, Christ. G. Göz, and others. The pathetical direction was taken by Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock (q. v.), in his *Aufersteh'n, ja aufersteh'n*. He was followed by J. A. Cramer, a very popular hymnologist, and a friend of Gellert and Klopstock, G. P. Funk, C. W. Ramler, Chr. Chr. Sturm, A. H. Niemeyer, Chr. F. Dan, Schubart, and others.

But the one really "great step" that was made in German hymnology at this time was the official sanction of the use of vernacular hymns in the Roman Catholic churches of South Germany and Austria. Naturally enough, many of the Roman Catholic hymns of the period are translations from the Latin; many of the original compositions follow closely in style both Gellert and Klopstock; nay, the productions of several Protestant hymnologists, especially those of the two last-named poets, were even used in the Roman Catholic Church, of course often in a somewhat modified and even distorted form. Of their own hymn-writers, the following deserve especial mention: J. M. Sailer (bishop of Ratisbon), J. M. Fenneberg, J. H. C. von Wessenberg, J. Sperl, and J. Franz. Here deserve notice also the Moravians, Chr. Gregor, H. von Bruiningk, C. von Wobeser, G. H. Loskiel, J. J. Bossart, and others; the Würtemburgers, C. F. Hartmann, W. L. Hosch, Chr. Ad. Daun, M. Hahn, Christ. G. Pregizer; in other German provinces, C. Liebich, Matth. Claudius, J. G. Schöner; and in the Reformed Church, H. Annoni, F. A. Krummacher, Jung-Stilling, G. Menken; the forerunner of the latest period is Friedrich von Hardenberg (Novalis).

Present German Hymnology.—The most modern period begins with the war of liberation (1813-15), and with the reawakening of a genuine religious life, which, after all, is slowly gaining the upper hand over that generally supposed dominating scepticism. Although in the modern productions the subjective greatly predominates, and they are still rather the work of art instead of popular songs, yet they do not quite attain to the force and condensed pregnancy of the classic hymns, so that there is very apparent in them a striving after objectivity, and "they have at least much sweetness, earnestness, and simplicity." To the Romantic school of which Novalis was mentioned belong E. M. Arndt, M. von Schenkendorf, Fr. H. de la Motte Fouqué, Louise Hensel, and Fr. Rückert. Of the other latest Lutheran hymnologists, whose most prominent representatives are Alb. Knapp, Vict. Strauss, J. C. Ph. Spitta, Chr. R. H. Puchta, C. A. Döring, deserve mention here: Chr. C. J. Aschenfeld, J. F. Bahnmaier, Chr. G. Barth, J. Bentz, Ed. Eyth, F. A. Feldhoff, G. W. Fink, W. R. Freudenthal, C. von Grüneisen, W. Hey, Christ. G. Kern, J. Fr. Möller, Chr. F. H. Sachse, R. Stier, and Chr. H. Zeller; among the Reformed, J. P. Lange. Among the Moravians, the highest rank in this period belongs to J. B. von Albertini, one of their bishops, whose hymns, it is said, Schleiermacher asked to have read to him in his dying hours. C. B. Garve here deserves also high encomiums as a hymnologist. Among the Roman Catholics, whose prominent model is Spee, "with all the defects, no less than the beauties of style," the Virgin serving as the most usual theme, M. von Diepenbrock deserves especial mention. The extent of German hymnology may be inferred from the fact that the Evangelical Church alone has produced no less than 80,000 hymns. See PSALMODY. (J. H. W.)

2. *English.*—The sacred poetry of England antedates by many generations its true hymnology. The author of *England's Antiphon* (George Macdonald) devotes an interesting chapter to the sacred lyrics of the 13th century, in which he gives specimens of genuine devotional song from the Percy Society publications, taken from MSS. in the British Museum, and ascribed to the reign of Edward I. "Mary at the Cross," "The Mourning Disciple," and the "Canonical Hours" of William of Shoreham furnish illustrations of most tender and scriptural verse, but are written in a dialect that needs frequent translation into modern English. The "Miracle Plays" were originally introduced by the Normans after the Conquest, and are written in Norman French, but in 1338 the pope permitted them to be translated into English. In this 14th century "the father of English poetry," Geoffrey Chaucer, gave a new voice to Christian song. It was full two hundred years from his advent before England produced another really great poet. But the age of Elizabeth, as if to make up for the barrenness of preceding centuries, is remarkable for the great number of its writers of sacred verse, as well as for its other literary prodigies. In a selection made and edited by Edward Farr, Esq., for the "Parker Society," consisting chiefly of devotional poems, he has given the names and brief biographical notices of no less than one hundred and thirty-seven different authors. Among the illustrious writers of sacred verses in this æra we find queen Elizabeth, archbishop Parker, Edmund Spenser, George

Gascoigne, Michael Drayton, Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Philip Sidney, the Fletcher brothers—Giles and Phineas, Dr. Donne, George Withers, lord Bacon, the countess of Pembroke (sister of Sir Philip Sidney, and joint author with him of a version of the Psalms). Later still we find quaint old Philip Quarles, and Robert Southwell, the martyr monk, and their contemporary, sweet George Herbert. The great dramatists of that golden age have left here and there some outbursts of deep religious poetry and song, which at least show forth their obligations to the Bible and to the Christianity of the period. Haywood, Shirley, and Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Shakespeare, greatest of all, swell the hymnic chorus. But the dramatic gave way gradually to lyric poetry, and in the succeeding century we have an increasing number of devout poets, of whom the immortal Milton must always be the chief. Yet the singular fact remains that during all these ages there was "nothing like a People's Hymn-book in England." It is true that Christian worship was not without its temple songs. The Psalms of David, the *Te Deum*, the *Magnificat*, the *Glorias*, and the "Song of the Angels," the "Ambrosian Hymn," and some of the hymns of the Middle Ages, were chanted in the churches and cathedrals. But the so-called hymns of Spenser and Milton, and of minor writers, never entered into the Christian heart, life, and worship of British Christianity. Germany possessed a classic literature of this sort a century and a half before England had a hymnal. The rude version of the Psalms by Sternhold and Hopkins, the smoother but insipid version of Brady and Tate which superseded it, and the more faithful Scottish version, which was the work of an English Puritan (Rouse), were sung by those whose stern revolt against Romanism led them to reject even what was really good and scriptural in her order of worship and liturgical books. The faults of the age are conspicuous in its poetry. It is intellectual, metaphysical, reflective, literary, full of "quips, and cranks, and wanton wiles;" cumbrous and overdone. With very few exceptions, there is nothing that people would care to sing, or could sing, for there is little of that emotional element which goes out in musical expression. The rhymes are rude and irregular, and the very art of the poetry seems to defy any attempts to set it to popular music. For "people cannot think and sing; they can only feel and sing." Even Milton's magnificent hymn, "On the Morning of Christ's Nativity," is not adapted to common Sabbath worship; and there are few of George Herbert's verses that survive in the songs of the sanctuary.

The period succeeding this revival of literature produced some Christian poets of note, and a few hymns which survive their authors. Bunyan, and Baxter, and Jeremy Taylor all wrote verses, but their prose had more of poetry in it than their attempts at song. Among those whose good old hymns have stood the test of time, we must not forget the Rev. John Mason, of Water-Stratford, who died in 1694, author of "Come, dearest Lord, and feed thy sheep, on this sweet day of rest," "Now from the altar of our hearts," "What shall I render to my God?" etc. He published a volume of "Spiritual Songs" in 1686. Dr. Watts borrowed much from him. The good non-juror, bishop Ken (1637-1711), bequeathed to Christendom his famous "Morning and Evening Hymns," and that matchless doxology, "Praise God, from whom all blessings flow." Next comes Joseph Addison, whose elegant version of the nineteenth Psalm, commencing "The spacious firmament on high," first appeared in the *Spectator* in 1712, at the close of an article on "the right means to strengthen faith;" and about the same time was published his sweet paraphrase of the twenty-third Psalm. Perhaps the most familiar of his hymns is that beginning "When all thy mercies, O my God." See ADDISON.

The Reformation in England did not, as in Germany, grow by the spontaneous utterance of popular Christian song. That was left for the period of the great evangelical revival which crowned the last century with its blessings. All that had been done before was as the broad and deep foundation-work, rude and unchiselled, but strong and essential to the majestic superstructure which has risen upon it. The stream of Christian verse flowed on in its old channels until the publication of the Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Watts began a new æra in English hymnology. The poet Montgomery says that "Dr. Watts may almost be called the inventor of hymns in our language, for he so far departed from all precedent that few of his compositions resemble those of his forerunners, while he so far established a precedent to all his successors that none have departed from it otherwise than according to the peculiar turn of mind of the writer, and the style of expressing Christian truth employed by the denomination to which he belonged." Dissenter as he was, his Psalms and Hymns are so catholic in their spirit that many of them have been adopted by all denominations of Protestant Christians in their Sabbath worship. His *Divine Songs for Children*, and some of his Psalms, will live while the language endures. The defects of his style are obvious in many of his lyrics, which evince haste and negligence, faulty rhymes, and a prosing feebleness of expression. Yet he broke bravely through the mannerisms of preceding ages, and inaugurated a style of Christian hymnology which has alike enriched the evangelical poetry of the English tongue, and filled the temples and homes of the race that speaks that language with the most delightful praises of the Most High. His example was soon followed with success by others. But to him belongs the undisputed honor of being the great precentor of the immense chorus which he will forever lead in these glorious harmonies. His first hymn was given to the Church under circumstances of prophetic interest. He had complained to some official in the Independent church of Southampton, of which his father was a deacon, "that the hymnists of the day were sadly out of taste." "Give us something better, young man," was the reply. The young man did it, and the Church was invited to close its evening service with a new hymn, which commenced,

"Behold the glories of the Lamb
Amidst His Father's throne;
Prepare new honors for His name,
And songs before unknown."

From that time his ever-ready muse gave forth, in strains which are almost divine, "harmonies" for his Saviour's name, and "songs before unknown." We need only indicate a few of the first lines: "When I survey the wondrous cross," "My God, the spring of all my joys," "When I can read my title clear," "Come, ye that love the Lord," "Come, let us join our cheerful songs," "He dies, the friend of sinners dies." His "Cradle Hymn" has taught countless mothers and children to sing of Jesus, and the angels and manger of Bethlehem: "Hush, my dear, lie still and slumber." It was while looking out from his quiet chamber window at Southampton "upon the beautiful scenery of the harbor and river, and upon the green glades of the New Forest on its farther bank, that the idea suggested itself of the image of the heavenly Canaan," which he soon embodied in those sweetest of all his verses, "There is a land of pure delight," etc. See WATTS.

Only seven years before the first edition of Watts's Hymns was given to the world, Philip Doddridge was born (1702); and before the death of his great predecessor, whose verses cheered his own dying hours in a distant land, he had published most of his sweetest hymns. Some of these are imperishable, for they have become part of the spiritual life of our Protestant Christianity. Many of them grew out of and were appended to his sermons, which he crystallized into such hymns as "Thine earthly Sabbaths, Lord, we love" (Heb. iv, 9), "Jesus, I love thy charming name" (1 Pet. v, 7). His *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*, which was written at the suggestion of Dr. Watts, and has been

translated into the leading languages of Europe, and his *Family Expositor of the New Testament*, are monuments of his wonderful religious power and usefulness. But his hymns will be sung where his larger works are never heard of, and the world will never cease to echo the strains of such songs as "Awake, my soul, stretch every nerve!" "Hark, the glad sound, the Saviour's come!" "Grace, 'tis a charming sound," "Ye golden lamps of heaven, farewell!" See DODDRIDGE.

The most voluminous and successful of all English hymnists is the Rev. Charles Wesley. Over seven thousand psalms and hymns were written by his facile pen; and these were merely the by-play of a tireless itinerant evangelist, who, with his more celebrated brother John, himself also a hymn-writer of no mean powers, preached the Gospel in the Old and New worlds, and gave a new style to Christian song. Their history, labors, persecutions, and triumphs are so well known that we need only mention their sainted names. John Wesley was the author or translator of several excellent hymns, and a capital critic on hymnology. Of Charles Wesley's hymns a large number have taken a more than classic place in our poetic literature. The Christian Church will never cease to sing "Oh love divine, how sweet thou art!" "Jesus, lover of my soul," "Hark! the herald angels sing," "The earth with all its fulness owns," "Come, let us join our friends above." Dr. Watts said of Charles Wesley's inimitable rendering of the wrestling of Jacob at Peniel with the angel, "That single poem, 'Wrestling Jacob,' is worth all the verses which I have ever written." Doubtless much of the power of his hymns is attributable to the circumstances which gave rise to them, and to his facility in giving them the most fresh and vivid forms of expression. On the last projecting rock on Land's End, Cornwall, he stood and wrote that memorable hymn, "Lo! on a narrow neck of land," etc. His judgment hymn, commencing "Stand, the omnipotent decree," and two others, were written and published in 1756, just after the destruction of the city of Lisbon by an earthquake. "Glory to God, whose sovereign grace," was written for the Kingswood colliers, whose wonderful conversion, under the preaching of Whitefield and the Wesleys, was among the miracles of grace which attended their apostolic ministry. "Oh for a thousand tongues, to sing my great Redeemer's praise," commemorates his own spiritual birth, and was written in response to a German friend, the Moravian Peter Boehler, who said to him, when hesitating to confess publicly his conversion, "If you had a thousand tongues you should publish it with them all." Another powerful accessory of the Wesleyan hymns was the music with which many of them were accompanied. The great composer Handel set some of them to noble tunes, the MSS. of which are still preserved in the library of Cambridge University. But their greatest interest and success doubtless comes from their scriptural character, their immense range over all varieties of Christian experience, and their intimate relation to the great revival of religion of which these remarkable men and their compeers were the leading instruments. (A striking illustration of all these features is given in the hymn—at once expository and experimental—of which we have space for only part of one stanza:

> "'Tis mystery all—the Immortal dies!
> Who can explore his strange design? * * *
> 'Tis mercy all! let earth adore:
> Let angel minds inquire no more.")

They were among the providential and gracious developments of a period whose influences, at the end of a hundred years, are yet only beginning to show forth the high praises of their Master. See WESLEY, JOHN and CHARLES.

We have given more space to these celebrated hymn-writers because of their historical relations to the new æra of devotional and sanctuary song which they introduced. From that period the number, variety, and excellence of the contributions to our Christian lyrics has increased, until the hymnology of the English tongue is second only to that of Germany in volume and diversity. The literary character of these productions has been raised to a higher standard, and their scriptural and experimental value has been tested both by their denominational uses, and by that truly catholic spirit which has made them the property of the Church Universal. Inferior compositions have been gradually dropped, and replaced by others of undoubted merit, until the collections of the various Christian churches have overflowed with the very best hymns of all ages. The most remarkable evidence of these statements is found in the recent attention given to the history and literature of our sacred poetry by English and American writers, who have patiently explored the whole field, and have garnered its treasures in many admirable collections. Referring our readers to these accessible publications, we can devote the limited space left in this article only to brief notices of the principal contributors to the volume of divine praises since the Wesleys died.

Of their contemporaries, we can never forget Augustus Toplady (1741-1778), and his almost inspired hymn, "Rock of Ages, cleft for me," and others of his excellent collection. See TOPLADY. Nor will the churches cease to sing the magnificent strains of his theological opponent, Thomas Olivers (1725-1799), in his judgment hymn, beginning "Come, immortal King of glory." See OLIVERS. Along with them came William Williams (1717-1791), the Methodist "Watts of Wales," singing "O'er the gloomy hills of darkness," and "Guide me, oh thou great Jehovah;" and John Cennick, the devout Moravian, to whom we are indebted for two of the finest hymns ever written—"Rise, my soul, and stretch thy wings," and "Lo! he comes with clouds descending." The latter has been erroneously attributed to Olivers, in whose judgment hymn are stanzas which it resembles in some respects, but a close inspection shows them to be entirely different productions. Cennick's hymn first appeared in a "Collection of Sacred Hymns" in 1752. See CENNICK. Next in order appeared the collection of hymns by the Rev. Benjamin Beddome (1717-1795), a Baptist clergyman, whom a London congregation could not tempt to leave his little flock at Bourton, where he labored fifty-two years, and preached and sang of Jesus. He was the author of "Did Christ o'er sinners weep?" "Faith, 'tis a precious grace," "Let party names no more," etc. Thomas Haweis, chaplain to the countess of Huntington, a theological author of note, and one of the founders of the London Missionary Society (1739-1820), was the author of over two hundred and fifty hymns, some of which are favorites still; but to the countess herself, the patron and friend of Whitefield, and Berridge, and Romaine, we are indebted for such undying hymns as "Oh! when my righteous judge shall come," "We soon shall hear the midnight cry." She died in 1791, at the age of eighty-four, having devoted her fortune and life to the cause of Christ. Some of the sweetest hymns for the Church and the home which this age produced were written by the daughter of a Baptist clergyman at Broughton, Miss Anne Steele (1716-1778). She withheld her name from her poems, but the English-speaking Christian world still sings from its myriad hearts and tongues, "Father, whate'er of earthly bliss," "Jesus, my Lord, in thy dear name unite All things my heart calls great, or good, or sweet," etc.; "Come, ye that love the Saviour's name;" and some of her sacramental hymns are fine specimens of Christian song.

The next hymn-book of importance that appeared in Great Britain was the *Olney Hymns*, which is the joint production of those gifted and illustrious men, so different in their characters and lives, and yet so united in the love of Christ—the Rev. John Newton and William Cowper. To this book Newton furnished two hundred and eighty-six hymns, and Cowper sixty-two. It was published first in 1779, before Cowper's reputation as a poet was made. The hymns were written between 1767 and 1779, and doubtless would have contained

more of Cowper's contributions but for a return of his insanity. The history of these noble coworkers for Christ is too well known to require more than this allusion. Their deep personal experiences are written in many of their delightful verses, and reflected in the Christian life of succeeding generations. Who that remembers Newton's marvellous conversion, and his subsequent life of piety and distinguished usefulness, until his death at the age of eighty-two (1807), will not appreciate the fervor with which he sang,

> "Amazing grace! how sweet the sound
> That saved a wretch like me;"
> or "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds
> In a believer's ear;"
> or "Sometimes a light surprises
> The Christian while he sings;"
> or "Day of judgment, day of wonders,
> Hark! the trumpet's awful sound?"

See NEWTON, JOHN. And the English language itself must die before Cowper's plaintive music ceases to vibrate through believers' souls in those almost perfect hymns in which he wrote out and yet veiled the strange, sweet, and attractive experiences of his own religious life: "To Jesus, the crown of my hope," "Far from the world, O Lord, I flee," "Oh! for a closer walk with God," "There is a fountain filled with blood," "God moves in a mysterious way." It has been well said by Dr. Cheever that "if Cowper had never given to the Church on earth but a single score of those exquisite breathings of a pious heart and creations of his own genius, it had been a bequest worth a life of suffering to accomplish." See COWPER.

It was long before another bard arose to take up the lyre which this gentle singer laid down. A few strains come floating through the succeeding years, such as Robinson's "Come, thou fount of every blessing," and "Jesus, and can it ever be, a mortal man ashamed of thee!" written in 1774 by Thomas Green of Ware, then a precocious boy of only ten years! Of female hymnists we have at this period Mrs. Barbauld (1743-1825) and Jane Taylor, both of whom left some sweet hymns for the sanctuary. The former will be best remembered by her beautiful lines on the death of a believer—"Sweet is the scene when Christians die;" the latter by her *Hymns for Infant Minds*. To them we must add Miss Hannah More (1744-1833), whose practical Christian prose writings possess a masculine vigor and Biblical earnestness, and whose poetry, although not of the highest order, yet often overflows with melody and tender feeling. Her Christmas hymn, "Oh! how wondrous is the story of our Redeemer's birth," is a favorable specimen. Among the minor poets of this period we mention Dr. John Ryland, born in 1753, author of "In all my Lord's appointed ways," "Lord, teach a little child to pray," "Sovereign Ruler of the skies," "O Lord, I would delight in thee;" and the Rev. John Logan, who died in 1788, at the age of forty, a Scottish preacher famed for his eloquence, who wrote such hymns as "Where high the heavenly temple stands," "Oh, city of the Lord, begin the universal song," "Oh God of Bethel! by whose hand thy people still are fed," "The hour of my departure's come," etc. To the poet of the poor, Rev. George Crabbe, we are indebted for those delightful lines, "Pilgrim, burdened with thy sin, come the way to Zion's gate;" and to Rev. Samuel Medley, a Baptist minister of Liverpool (1738-1799), for the stirring lyrics, "Mortals, awake! with angels join," and "Awake, my soul, in joyful lays." The name of Henry Kirke White (1785-1808) will ever live in the splendid hymn in which he sang the story of the birth of the Redeemer and of his own conversion, "When marshalled on the mighty plain." From his pen also flowed those characteristic hymns beginning "The Lord our God is full of might," "O Lord, another day is flown," "Through sorrow's night and danger's path." See HENRY K. WHITE. The coronation hymn, "All hail the power of Jesus' name," was written by the Rev. Edward Perronet, an English dissenting clergyman, who died at Canterbury in 1792, exclaiming, "Glory to God in the height of his divinity, glory to God in the depth of his humanity, glory to God in his all-sufficiency, and into his hands I commend my spirit!" The grand tune which has always been associated with these lines was composed for them by a Mr. Shrubsole, a friend of the author, and organist at the chapel of Spa Fields, London, 1784-1806. We can only allude in a sentence to the well-known occasional hymns of the great poets, Pope and Dryden, Wordsworth, Campbell, Moore, Southey, and some of their associates.

But the Church Universal owes a greater debt to James Montgomery (1771-1854). No man since the days of Cowper has added so many admirable versions of the Psalms and noble hymns to the English language as this gifted Moravian, whose prolific muse never ceased to lavish its treasures until, at fourscore years, he went up higher. His paraphrase of the seventy-second Psalm, commencing "Hail to the Lord's anointed," is a classic full of the old Hebrew fire and of the best modern missionary spirit. His "Thrice holy" (Isa. vi, 3), beginning "Holy, holy, holy Lord," seems to blend the voices of "saints and seraphim" in one glorious prophetic anthem. Of his other hymns we need only name the Hallelujah, "Hark! the song of Jubilee;" the Christmas choruses, "Angels from the realms of glory," and "Hail to the Lord's anointed;" the song of heaven, "Forever with the Lord;" the hymn on the death of an aged minister, "Servant of God, well done," written in memory of his friend, Rev. Thomas Taylor; and that on the decease of the Rev. John Owen, secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, "Go to the grave in all thy glorious prime." His verses, "Prayer is the soul's sincere desire," "Oh! where shall rest be found?" "What are these in bright array?" are only a few of the priceless gems which he has set in the crown of our Christian praises. See MONTGOMERY, JAMES.

In this later period of English hymnology many and very sweet have been the singers and their sacred songs. There is Henry F. Lyte, the rector of Brixham (1793-1847), author of "Jesus, I my cross have taken," and of those delightful "hymns from beneath the cloud," "My spirit on thy care, blest Saviour, I recline," and the last that he ever wrote, "Abide with me, fast falls the eventide." It was of his *Tales in Verse* that professor Wilson, in the "Noctes Ambrosianæ," wrote, "Now that is the right kind of religious poetry. He ought to give us another volume." That volume soon came, entitled *Poems, chiefly religious*. The female hymnists increase in number and in power in this period. Mrs. Felicia Hemans, Caroline Bowles, and others of great repute, lead the way with their sweet music. We have learned to sing "Nearer, my God, to thee," from Miss Sarah F. Adams, who died in 1849 in her old home, Dorsetshire; and Charlotte Elliott, of Torquay, struck a new chord for all the world when she wrote, in 1836, those inimitable verses, "Just as I am, without one plea." She is the author of several volumes, and furnished one hundred and seventeen hymns to *The Invalid's Hymn-book*, the last edition of which she supervised. Mrs. Barret Browning, Mrs. Charles, of "Schonberg Cotta" fame, Miss Adelaide Proctor, Mary Howitt, and the Brontë sisters—Charlotte, Emily, and Anne, Isabella Craig, and Mrs. Craik, formerly Miss Mulock, author of *John Halifax, Gentleman*, are among the later chief singers of their sex whose verses have enriched our hymnals. Sir John Bowring, born in 1792, author of "In the cross of Christ I glory," "Watchman, tell us of the night;" the dean of St. Paul's, Dr. Henry Hart Milman, archbishop Trench, John Keble, with his *Christian Year*, the poet leader of the Anglican Catholic movement in the English establishment, Alexander Knox, Allan Cunningham, Robert Pollok, bishop Heber, with his glorious advent, and judgment, and missionary hymns, Bernard Barton, the Quaker poet, canon Wordsworth, and the late dean Alford, of Westminster Abbey,

Faber, the devout Romish hymnist, and Dr. John H. Newman, once of Oxford and now of Rome, Robert Murray M'Cheyne, and John R. M'Duff, the Scottish preachers, with Horatius Bonar, of Kelso, author of the delightful *Hymns of Faith and Hope*, many of which are already familiar as household words, and Edward H. Bickersteth, whose poem "Yesterday, to-day, and forever" is "one of the most remarkable of the age"—all these, and more whom we cannot even name, swell the majestic volume of our most recent British sacred song. It is not any exaggeration to say that many of their hymns will compare favorably with the best that preceded them, and that some of them can never die while their mother tongue is the vehicle of Christian praise.

3. *American.*—Poetry was not cultivated in our heroic age for its own sake, and the singers were few and far between. The churches mostly used the psalms and hymns which they brought with them from the Old World until after the Revolutionary War. President Davies (1724–1761) left some poems, among which his lines on the birth of an infant, and the noble hymn commencing "Great God of wonders! all thy ways," are most familiar. The celebrated Dr. Timothy Dwight, at the request of the Congregational ministers of Connecticut, revised the psalms of Dr. Watts, and added over twenty of his own versifications to the volume. Of all that he wrote, however, none have such beauty and vitality as his rendering of Psalm cxix, "How precious is the Book divine!" Psalm cxxxvii, "I love thy kingdom, Lord;" and of Psalm cl, "In Zion's sacred gates." These are universal favorites. In his preface to that admirable volume, *Christ in Song*, Dr. Philip Schaff says, "The Lyra Sacra of America is well represented. Although only about thirty years old, it is far richer than our British friends are aware of." Abundant proof of its richness is furnished in the *Hymns of Immanuel*, which the author has gathered into this remarkable collection of Christological poetry, a number of which were furnished by their authors for this work. It is scarcely necessary in these pages to quote at any length those hymns which have been adopted into nearly all of the recent books of praise for the various denominations. We shall therefore only refer to the most noted authors, and give parts of some of the hymns which seem destined to secure a permanent place in our American hymnals. The earlier poets—Percival, Pierpont, Henry Ware, Jr., Richard H. Dana, Washington Alston, John Neal, N. P. Willis, Brainard, J. W. Eastburn, Carlos Wilcox, Hillhouse, with Bryant, Longfellow, Tuckerman, and Whittier, who are still living—have all made occasional contributions to the stock of popular hymns, chiefly of the Unitarian and Universalist bodies. The clergy of the American churches have probably been the most fertile contributors to this department of sanctuary worship during this period.

The late bishop Doane (q. v.), of New Jersey, wrote some very beautiful hymns, which long ago passed beyond the body of which he was a champion into the hymnals of other churches. His evening hymn is worthy of comparison even with that of good bishop Ken: "Softly now the light of day." There is a trumpet-like music in his majestic lines on the Banner of the Cross which reminds us of Heber and Milman: "Fling out the banner! let it float," etc. The same Church has also given us Dr. W. A. Muhlenbergh's well-known hymn, "I would not live alway," and other delightful verses from his now patriarchal muse. Another bishop, Dr. Arthur Cleveland Coxe, among his fine Christian ballads and poems, has rendered into verse, with more spirit and power than any other English writer, those words of Christ, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock."

To the late Dr. James W. Alexander (q. v.) we owe the best version in our language of Gerhardt's imperishable hymn, "Oh sacred head! now wounded." One of the most chaste and fervid of our hymn-writers was the late Dr. George W. Bethune (q. v.), author of "It is not death to die," "Oh Jesus, when I think of thee, thy manger, cross, and crown," and many other well-known lyrics. The Rev. Dr. Alexander R. Thompson, of the Reformed Church, New York, has published some admirable original hymns for Christmas and Easter, and very spirited translations from ancient and mediæval hymns. We specify only his version of the "Aurora cœlum purpurit," which, with others from his pen, are given in full in Schaff's *Christ in Song*. Quite in another line, but not less happy, is a new hymn by the Rev. Hervey D. Ganse, a popular clergyman of the same Church in New York City. It is the story of Bartimæus, so sweetly told that we regret we have not space for at least a part of it. There are no more delightful hymns in the language than those of the Rev. Ray Palmer, D.D., a Congregational clergyman, author of *Hymns of my holy Hours*, *Hymns and sacred Pieces*, and many sacred poems. That "selectest and most perfect of our modern hymns," "My faith looks up to thee," etc., was composed in 1830. It has been translated into Arabic, Tamil, Tahitian, the Mahratta, and other languages, and seems destined to follow the Cross over the whole world. Among his other hymns are those beginning "Jesus, these eyes have never seen that radiant form of thine," "Alone with thee! alone with thee! O friend divine," "O Jesus! sweet the tears I shed," "Jesus! thou joy of loving hearts," etc.

The Rev. Russell S. Cook (q. v.) wrote and sent to Miss Elliott, the author of "Just as I am, without one plea," a counterpart to her own sweet hymn, so beautiful and complete that it seems almost as if the same pen had given them both to the world: "Just as thou art! without one trace," etc. It has since been incorporated with Sir Roundell Palmer's *Book of Praise* and several American hymn-books.

It would be inexcusable, in a summary like this, to omit a hearty tribute of acknowledgment to the female hymn-writers of our country. First among these, Mrs. Sigourney, who may be called the Hannah More of America, has an established place among these honored authors, although most of her poetry was written in blank verse, or in metre not adapted to Church music. Yet her anniversary hymns for Sunday-schools and missionary meetings have been very popular. Her verses are full of a tender, devotional spirit, and expressed in chaste and beautiful language. Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, in some of her *Religious Poems*, published in 1867, has caught the spirit of the inspired word, and rendered its utterances into verse with singular felicity. We may instance the fine hymns commencing "When winds are raging in the upper ocean," "Life's mystery—deep, restless as the ocean," "That mystic word of thine, O sovereign Lord," and the one entitled "Still, still with thee." The Cary sisters, Phœbe and Alice, have added a few graceful and touching hymns to our Lyra Americana, and have been particularly successful in their writing for the young. That favorite and delightful hymn (which reminds us of Cowper's sensitive strains), "I love to steal a while away from every cumbering care," was written by Mrs. Phœbe H. Brown after being interrupted while at prayer. On giving up her only son to preach Christ to the heathen, she wrote that sweet missionary hymn beginning

"Go, messenger of love, and bear
Upon thy gentle wing
The song which seraphs love to hear,
And angels joy to sing."

Many a revival of religion has been sought and promoted in the use of her familiar strains,

"O Lord, Thy work revive
In Zion's gloomy hour."

These are but specimens of a few of our best female hymnists. Many others we cannot even mention, to whom the whole Church owes a debt of gratitude for "psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs," in which they have taught her to "make melody unto the Lord." For additional literature, see PSALMODY. (W. J. R. T.)

Hypapante. See CANDLEMAS.

Hypatia OF ALEXANDRIA, born in the latter half of the 4th century, was the daughter of Theon the younger, by whom she was instructed in mathematics and philosophy, and professed, like her father, the old heathen doctrines, of which she was one of the most eloquent advocates. So eminent did she become in the ancient philosophy that, in the early part of the 5th century, she publicly lectured on Aristotle and Plato, both at Athens and Alexandria, with immense success. Socrates (Wells's translation, 1709, of the Latin of Valesius) thus narrates her history: "There was a woman at Alexandria by name Hypatia. She was daughter to Theon the philosopher. She had arrived to so eminent a degree of learning that she excelled all the philosophers of her own times, and succeeded in that Platonic school derived from Plotinus, and expounded all the precepts of philosophy to those who would hear her. Wherefore all persons who were studious about philosophy flocked to her from all parts. By reason of that eminent confidence and readiness of expression wherewith she had accomplished herself by her learning, she frequently addressed even the magistrates with a singular modesty. Nor was she ashamed of appearing in a public assembly of men, for all persons revered and admired her for her eximious modesty. Envy armed itself against this woman at that time; for because she had frequent conferences with Orestes [the prefect of Alexandria], for this reason a calumny was framed against her among the Christian populace, as if she hindered Orestes from coming to a reconciliation with the bishop. Certain persons therefore, of fierce and overhot minds, who were headed by one Peter, a reader, conspired against the woman, and observed her returning home from some place; and, having pulled her out of her chariot, they dragged her to the church named Cæsareum, where they stripped her and murdered her. And when they had torn her piecemeal, they carried all her members to a place called Cinaron, and consumed them with fire. This fact brought no small disgrace upon Cyrillus and the Alexandrian Church" (*Hist. Eccles.* bk. vii, c. 15). The death of Hypatia occurred in 415. Suidas (Ὑπατία), iii, 533, puts the guilt of Hypatia's death more directly upon Cyril; but his account is by the best authorities, Gibbon of course excepted, not thought to be trustworthy (comp. Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 943). There is a spurious epistle attributed to Hypatia, addressed to Cyril, in favor of Nestorius (Baluze, *Concilia*, i, 216). Toland wrote a sketch of Hypatia (Lond. 1730, 8vo), and Kingsley has recently made her story the subject of a novel ("*Hypatia*"). See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* anno 415; Wernsdorf, *Diss. Acad. de Hypatia* (1747); *English Cyclopædia;* Ménage, *Hist. Mul. Philosoph.* p. 52; Münch, *Hypatia*, in his *Vermischt. Schriften* (Ludwigsb. 1828), vol. i; Schaff, *Ch. History*, ii, 67; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, iv, 502 sq.

Hypatius OF GANGRA, a distinguished member of the Council of Nice, of whose life but little is known, was stoned to death March 31, 327, in a pass near Gangra, by a gang of Novatian ruffians, in all probability on account of the opposition which he had manifested towards the Novatians (q. v.) at the council. See Stanley, *History of the Eastern Church*, p. 266.

Hyperbole. Any one who carefully examines the Bible must be surprised at the very few hyperbolic expressions which it contains, considering that it is an Oriental book. In Eastern Asia the tone of composition is pitched so high as to be scarcely intelligible to the sober intellect of Europe, while in Western Asia a medium seems to have been struck between the ultra-extravagance of the far East and the frigid exactness of the far West. But, even regarded as a book of Western Asia, the Bible is, as compared with almost any other Western Asiatic book, so singularly free from hyperbolic expressions as might well excite our surprise, did not our knowledge of its divine origin permit us to suppose that even the style and mode of expression of the writers were so far controlled as to exclude from their writings what, in other ages and countries, might excite pain and offence, and prove an obstacle to the reception of divine truth. See INSPIRATION. Nor is it to be said that the usage of hyperbole is of modern growth. We find it in the oldest Eastern writings which now exist; and the earlier Rabbinical writings attest that, in times approaching near to those in which the writers of the New Testament flourished, the Jewish imagination had run riot in this direction, and has left hyperboles as frequent and outrageous as any which Persia or India can produce. See TALMUD.

The strongest hyperbole in all Scripture is that with which the Gospel of John concludes: "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that the world itself could not contain all the books that should be written." This has so much pained many commentators that they have been disposed to regard it as an unauthorized addition to the sacred text, and to reject it accordingly—a process always dangerous, and not to be adopted but on such overwhelming authority of collated manuscripts as does not exist in the present case. Nor is it necessary, for as a hyperbole it may be illustrated by many examples in sacred and profane authors. In Numb. xiii, 33, the spies who had returned from searching the land of Canaan say that they saw giants there of such a prodigious size that they were in their own sight but as grasshoppers. In Deut. i, 28, cities with high walls about them are said to be "walled up to heaven." In Dan. iv, 7, mention is made of a tree whereof "the height reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof unto the end of all the earth:" and the author of Ecclesiasticus (xlvii, 15), speaking of Solomon's wisdom, says, "Thy soul covered the whole earth, and thou filledst it with parables." In Josephus (*Ant.* xiv, 22) God is mentioned as promising to Jacob that he would give the land of Canaan to him and his seed; and then it is added, "they shall fill the whole sea and land which the sun shines upon." Wetstein, in his note on the text in John, and Basnage, in his *Histoire des Juifs* (iii, 1-9; v, 7), have cited from the ancient Rabbinical writers such passages as the following: "If all the seas were ink, and every reed was a pen, and the whole heaven and earth were parchment, and all the sons of men were writers, they would not be sufficient to write all the lessons which Jochanan composed;" and concerning one Eliezer, it is said that "if the heavens were parchment, and all the sons of men writers, and all the trees of the forest pens, they would not be sufficient for writing all the wisdom which he was possessed of." Homer, who, if not born in Asia Minor, had undoubtedly lived there, has sometimes followed the hyperbolic manner of speaking which prevailed so much in the East: thus, in the *Iliad* (xx, 246, 247), he makes Æneas say to Achilles, "Let us have done with reproaching one another, for we may throw out so many reproachful words on one another that a ship of a hundred oars would not be able to carry the load." Few instances of this are to be found in Occidental writers; yet it is observed that Cicero (*Phil.* ii, 44) has "Præsertim quum illi eam gloriam consecuti sint, quæ vix cœlo capi posse videatur," and that Livy (vii, 25) says, "Hæ vires populi Romani, quas vix terrarum capit orbis." See bishop Pearce's *Commentary on the four Evangelists*, 1777, etc. Modern examples of equal hyperbole may be found cited in almost any work on rhetoric.

Hypercalvinism. See CALVINISM; ULTRA-CALVINISM.

Hyperdulia (ὑπέρ, *above;* δουλία, *worship, service*), the worship of the Virgin Mary in the Roman Church. The Romanists speak of three kinds of adoration, namely, *latria*, *hyperdulia*, and *dulia*. "The adoration of *latria*," they say, "is that which is due to God alone, and is given on account of his supremacy; *hyperdulia* is worship paid to the Virgin on account of what

the Papists call the maternity of God, and other eminent gifts, and her supereminent sanctity; *dulia* is worship paid to saints on account of their sanctity." These distinctions are too refined for the common people; and it is greatly to be feared that multitudes worship the Virgin *instead* of God, or take her as a mediator *instead* of Christ. The prayer-books of the Roman Church are not free from the charge of encouraging a belief in the mediation of Mary. A book in common use, called *The Sacred Heart of Jesus and of Mary*, which is published with an indult of pope Pius in favor of its use, contains the following passages: "Come, then, hardened and inveterate sinner, how great soever your crimes may be, come and behold. Mary stretches out her hand, opens her breast to receive you. *Though insensible to the great concerns of your salvation, though unfortunately proof against the most engaging invitations and inspirations of the Holy Ghost*, fling yourself at the feet of this powerful advocate." Again (p. 256): "Rejoice, O most glorious Virgin, such is thy favor with God, such the power of thy intercession, that the whole treasury of heaven is open to thee and at thy disposal. When thou art pleased to intercede in favor of a sinner his case is in sure hands; there is no danger of refusal on the part of Heaven when thy mediation appears in his behalf." "Thou art the great mediatrix between God and man, obtaining for sinners all they can ask and demand of the blessed Trinity." Another book in common use, *The Glories of Mary, Mother of God*, prepared by Liguori (q. v.), is full of similar passages. We extract only the following prayer: "O holy Virgin! deign to manifest your generosity towards me, a miserable sinner. If you grant me your aid, what can I fear? No, I shall no longer apprehend either my sins, since you can repair them; or the devils, since you are more powerful than hell; or your Son, justly irritated, since one word from you will appease him. I shall only fear myself, and that, forgetting to invoke you, I may be lost. But this will not be the case. I promise you to-day to recur to you in all my wants, and that, during life and at my death, your name and remembrance shall be the delight of my soul. Amen." See Cumming and French, *Protestant Discussion* (London, 1856, 12mo), p. 288 sq.; Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca, Venerat. Sanct.* § 34–39; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, bk. iv, ch. iv. See MARIOLATRY.

Hyperius, ANDREW GERHARD, an eminent Protestant theologian of the 16th century, was born at Ypres, Belgium, May 16, 1511. His family name was *Gerhard*, but he assumed the name *Hyperius* from his birthplace. His father directed his first studies, after which Hyperius attended the University of Paris during the years 1528–35. After completing his studies he made a short stay at Louvain, then travelled through the Netherlands, and visited Germany. On his return he was deprived of a benefice which had been obtained for him, on the ground that he had embraced the doctrines of the Reformation. He went to England, where he remained four years with the son of William Mountjoy, a friend of Erasmus, studying at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The persecutions directed against the Protestants after Cromwell's death compelled him, in 1541, to leave England, and he purposed going to Strasburg, attracted by the reputation of Bucer; but his friend Geldenhauer, professor of theology at Marburg, persuaded him to remain in the latter city, and he succeeded his friend in 1542 as professor. He died at Marburg Feb. 1, 1564. To profound and extensive learning Hyperius joined great intellectual powers, and a remarkably mild, yet straightforward disposition. Greatly in advance of his times as a scholar, he held deep and correct views on the system with which theological researches and studies should be conducted in striking contrast with the arbitrary proceedings of the exegetes of the 16th century, as well as the scholastic theories of contemporary theologians. His views have become the basis of modern scientific theology. He had also a clearer and more practical notion of preaching than the other preachers of his time, who, instead of expounding Christian doctrines to their hearers in view of edifying them, brought abstract discussions or irritating controversies into the pulpit. Hyperius wrote *De formandis Concionibus sacris, seu de interpretatione Scripturarum populari, Libri ii* (Dort, 1555, 8vo; latest ed., augmented, and containing a biography of the author, Halle, 1781, 8vo). It is the first complete work on Homiletics, and one of the best:—*De theologo, seu de ratione studii theologici, Lib. iv* (Basle, 1556, 8vo; often reprinted): this is a work of great merit, which may have had the most favorable effect on theological study, had not the largeness of views and the Zuinglian opinion of the author in regard to the Eucharist rendered it suspicious in the eyes of the orthodox Lutheran party. Laurentius Villavincentius, an Augustinian monk of Xeres, in Andalusia, made great use of this as well as of the preceding work, or, rather, caused them to be reprinted almost word for word, as his own production, with the exception of passages too favorable to Protestantism, in a work he published at Antwerp in 1565, and the plagiarism was not detected until half a century later:—*Elementa Christianæ religionis* (Basle, 1563, 8vo):—*Topica theologica* (Wittemb. 1565, 8vo; Basle, 1573, 8vo):—*Methodi Theologiæ, sive præcipuorum Christianæ religionis locorum communium, Libri iii* (Basle, 1566, 1568, 8vo). This work was to have had three more parts, but it was left incomplete:—*Opuscula Theologica varia* (Basle, 1570, 2 vols. 8vo). His exegetical works are among the most valuable productions in that department by the Reformers, and were frequently used by Bloomfield in his notes on the New Testament. His most important work in this department, a *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (*Comment. in Epistolas ad Timoth., Titum, et Philem.* 1582; *Comment. in Pauli Epistolas*, 1583; *Comment. in Epist. ad Hebræos*, 1585), was published after his death by Mylius (Zürich, 1582–8, 4 vols. folio), and under the care of J. Andreas Schmidt (Helmstadt, 1704, 8vo). In it "Hyperius pursues the grammatico-historical method of interpretation, examining the meaning of the words, carefully tracing the connection of the passage, taking note of the analogy of Scripture, and so arriving at the true sense of the place. Not until he has thus done justice to the exegesis does he proceed to the dogmatical or practical use of the passage. He also frequently gives citations from the fathers to show the agreement of his conclusions with the understanding of the ancient Church" (Kitto). A collection of small pamphlets had been previously published separately; among them, *De Sacræ Scripturæ Lectione et Meditatione* (Basle, 1581, 8vo). See Boissard, *Icones Virorum Illustrium*, pars iii; Melch. Adam, *Vitæ Germanorum Theologorum*; Bayle, *Dict. Hist.*; J. M. Schröckh, *Lebensbesch. berühmt. Gelehrten*, vol. i, and *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* vol. v; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 71; *Mercersb. Rev.* 1857, p. 271 sq.; *Ch. Monthly*, June, 1866; M'Crie, *Reform. in Spain*, p. 382; Hauck, *Jahrb. d. Theol.* ii, 255. (J. H. W.)

Hypocrisy (ὑπόκρισις; but in James v, 12, two words, ὑπὸ κρίσιν, as the A. V. justly) is the name for the successful or unsuccessful endeavor of a person to impart to others, by the expression of his features or gestures, by his outward actions, and, in fine, by his whole appearance, a favorable opinion of his principles, his good intentions, love, unselfishness, truthfulness, and conscientiousness, while in reality these qualities are wanting in him. It is, therefore, a peculiar kind of untruthfulness, which has its definite aims and means. It is precisely because these aims refer to the moral qualifications of the subject, because he speaks and acts as if an honest man, that hypocrisy has found room and opportunity in social life, in commerce and industry, in politics, and, above all, in the field of revealed religion. This may appear paradoxical, because this, as well as the religion of the old covenant, places man before the face of an almighty Being who sees the heart, and who

penetrates human thought even from its very beginning; who perceives clearly its development and ripening; so that the hypocrite, even if he should succeed in deceiving men, can certainly have no benefit from his acts in the end. On the other hand, because religion consists not entirely in the performance of outward actions, but makes the worth of the person dependent on the righteous state of his heart and mind, it creates the greater desire in him to acquire the reputation of really having these qualities; and because these qualities, though they are of a purely spiritual nature, yet can only be manifested by outward acts, which, since they are material, strike the eye of the world, and may be enacted without the possession of the genuine mental and moral state, it results that there is here such a wide field for hypocritical actions. We infer, therefore, from what we have said, that there is less opportunity for hypocrisy in heathenism than in Judaism; in Catholicism than in Protestantism. For wherever the principal weight is laid on the outward action, on the *opus operatum*, there one experiences far less the inclination to cover the inconsistency of the inner world by the outer world; while, on the other hand, where every thing depends on the inward state, and where, with the mere enactment of outward ceremony, God and conscience cannot be appeased, there originates in the unregenerate man the temptation to do what may give him at least the semblance of a quality which he really does not possess. When a frivolous, reckless fellow kneels at the Catholic altar to perform by feature and gesture his devotions, no one would think of accusing him of hypocrisy; while a Protestant, in a similar case, could not escape this judgment. Still, this does not fully solve the paradox how the hypocrite can hope to carry on his false game, while he knows very well that before the God of truth no one can pass for righteous who possesses simply the semblance of righteousness, but does not connect therewith the belief in its power. It must here be remembered that, in the one case, the person endeavors to acquire for himself, in the community to which he belongs, the epithet of a pious man; and, if he is satisfied herewith, then, in regard to his future state, in view of that day which will bring every thing to light, he is either thoughtless and careless, or else totally unbelieving. When his earthly scene has ended, the curtain drops for him, and all is over. But in another case the person is animated by the hope that, in virtue of those outward acts by which he thinks to do good, his praying, almsgiving, etc., he may prevail before God; this is the true Phariseeism, which dims the faculty of knowing God, and not only deceives men, but counterfeits truth itself, and thereby cheats itself worst of all. A special means of detecting the real hypocrite is his unmerciful judgment over others. This has its ground in the fact that by such expressions he not only seeks to confirm his own standing, but it is also a self-deceit into which he falls; the more he finds to blame in others, the more confident he grows of his own worth, and the more easily he appeases his conscience in regard to the inconsistency of his moral state with his actions, and the incongruity of his secret with his open ways. Ethics finds among the different gradations of sin a certain state of hypocrisy which is far worse than absolute subjection to sin, inasmuch as in the latter state there may exist at least the earnest desire in the individual to rid himself of his faults, although he no longer possesses the power to do so; the hypocrite, on the other hand, is quite contented with himself, and has no desire whatever to repent of the sin so deeply lodged in his heart, but merely endeavors to hide it from God and men, in order to be able to gratify his sinful inclinations the more securely under the cover of an assumed sanctity. In certain respects the frivolous sinner is far better than the hypocrite, inasmuch as the former has at least no desire to deceive any one about his condition, and does not present himself to the world otherwise than he really is. This formal truthfulness in the open sinner, however, is counterbalanced by the fact that the hypocrite recognises at least a divine law and judgment; he is still alive to the consciousness of the incongruity of his state of mind and heart with this divine law; but yet hypocrisy, as a permanent untruthfulness, as a systematic deceit, as a life in dissimulation, must gradually annihilate all sense of its own condition. Thus, in the issue, publicans and harlots are nearer to the kingdom of heaven than Pharisees. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 643 sq. See HYPOCRITE.

Hypocrite (Greek ὑποκριτής) signifies one who *feigns* to be what he is not; who puts on a false person, like actors in tragedies and comedies. It is generally applied to those who assume appearances of a virtue without possessing it in reality. Our Saviour accused the Pharisees of hypocrisy. Hypocrisy is vain and foolish, and, though intended to cheat others, is, in truth, deceiving ourselves. No man would flatter or dissemble if he thought that he was seen and discovered. All his hypocrisy, however, is open to the eye of God, from whom nothing can be hid. The ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, and he seeth all his doings; there is no darkness nor shadow of death where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves. Whoever dissembles, and seems to be what he is not, thinks that he ought to possess such a quality as he pretends to; for to counterfeit and dissemble is to assume the appearance of some real excellence. But it is best for a man to be in reality what he would seem to be. It is difficult to personate and act a false part long, because, where truth does not exist, nature will endeavor to return, and make a discovery. Truth carries its own light and evidence with it, and not only commends us to every man's conscience, but to God, the searcher of our hearts. Hence sincerity is the truest wisdom, for integrity has many advantages over all the artful ways of dissimulation and deceit. On the contrary, a dissembler must be always upon his guard, lest he contradict his own pretences. He acts an unnatural part, and puts a continual force and restraint upon himself. Truth always lies uppermost, and will be apt to make its appearance; but he who acts sincerely has an easy task, and needs not invent pretences before, or excuses after, for what he says or does. Insincerity is difficult to manage; for a liar will be apt to contradict at one time what he said at another. Truth is always consistent with itself, needs nothing to assist it, and is always near at hand; but a lie is troublesome; it sets a man's invention upon the rack, and is frequently the occasion of many more. Truth and sincerity in our words and actions will carry us through the world, when all the arts of cunning and deceit shall fail and deceive us. In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, plainness and sincerity will appear the most perfect beauty; the craftiness of men, who lie in wait to deceive, will be stripped of all its colors; all specious pretences, all the methods of deceit, will then be disclosed before men and angels, and no artifice to conceal the deformity of iniquity can there take place. Then the ill-designing men of this world shall with shame be convinced that the upright simplicity which they despised was the truest wisdom, and that those dissembling and dishonest arts which they so highly esteemed were in reality the greatest folly.

Hypocrites have been divided into four sorts: 1. The *worldly* hypocrite, who makes a profession of religion, and pretends to be religious merely from worldly considerations (Matt. xxiii, 5); 2. The *legal* hypocrite, who relinquishes his vicious practices in order thereby to merit heaven, while at the same time he has no real love to God (Rom. x, 3); 3. The *evangelical* hypocrite, whose religion is nothing more than a bare conviction of sin; who rejoices under the idea that Christ died for him, and yet has no desire to live a holy life (Matt. xiii, 20; 2 Pet. ii, 20); 4. The *enthusiastic* hypocrite, who has an imaginary sight of his sin and of Christ; talks of remarkable impulses and high feelings; and thinks himself very wise and good while he lives in the most scan-

dalous practices (Matt. xiii, 39; 2 Cor. xi, 14).—Robinson, *Theol. Dictionary;* Buck, *Theol. Dictionary;* Warner, *System of Morality*, iii, 323; Grove, *Moral Philosophy*, ii, 253; Gilfillan, *Essays on Hypocrisy* (1825); Ellis, *Self-Deceiver discovered* (1731); Edwards, *Works* (see Index). See HYPOCRISY.

Hyponoia (ὑπόνοια, *under sense*), a term applied to the *hidden meaning* supposed by some to underlie the language of Scripture. If by this is understood a signification totally different from the plain statements, the theory is to be condemned as savoring of mysticism (q. v.); but if it is only intended to designate the collateral and ulterior application of language which has likewise a more obvious or literal import, it may be received to a limited degree. See DOUBLE SENSE. The Scriptures themselves authorize such a view of the deeper significance of Holy Writ, especially of prophecies, which necessarily await their fulfilment in ord(r to their complete elucidation (1 Pet. i, 11); and the apostle John accordingly invites his readers to the close examination of his symbols, under which, for prudential considerations, was couched a somewhat enigmatical allusion (Rev. xiii, 18). See INTERPRETATION. To infer from this, however, that the sacred writers were not themselves aware of the meaning of what they uttered or penned is to take an unworthy and false view of their intelligent instrumentality (Stier, *Words of Jesus*, i, 432 sq., Am. ed.). See INSPIRATION.

Hypopsalma. See ACROSTIC.

Hypostăsis (from ὑπό, *under*, and ἵστημι, to *stand;* hence *subsistence*), a term used in theology to signify *person.* Thus the orthodox hold that there is but one nature or essence in God, but three hypostases or persons. This term is of very ancient use in the Church. Cyril, in a letter to Nestorius, employs it instead of πρόσωπον, *person*, which did not appear to him sufficiently expressive. The term occasioned great dissensions, both among the Greeks and Latins. In the Council of Nicæa, *hypostasis* was defined to mean essence or substance, so that it was heresy to say that Christ was of a different hypostasis from his Father. Custom, however, altered its meaning. In the necessity they were under of expressing themselves strongly against the Sabellians, the Greeks used the word *hypostasis*, the Latins *persona*, which proved a source of great disagreement. The barrenness of the Latin language allowed them only one word by which to translate the two Greek ones οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, and thus prevented them from distinguishing essence from hypostasis. An end was put to these disputes by a synod held in Alexandria about A.D. 362, at which Athanasius assisted, when it was determined to be synonymous with πρόσωπον. After this time the Latins made no great scruple in saying *tres hypostases*, or the Greeks three persons.—Farrar. See TRINITY; HOMOUSIAN.

Hypostatical Union, the *subsistence* (ὑπόστασις) of two natures in *one* person, in Christ. While the reality of such a union is established by the Scriptures, and is on that account maintained by our Church (see 2d Article of Religion, "So that two whole and perfect natures," etc.), it is to be lamented that many intricate and fruitless metaphysical questions have been debated among different sects of Christians as to the divine nature of our Lord, and the *manner* of the union between the Deity and a man—the parties engaged in these questions being too often hurried into presumptuous as well as unprofitable speculations—on points as far beyond the reach of the human intellect as colors to a man born blind; and forgetting that the union of the soul and body of any one among us can neither be explained nor comprehended by himself or any other, and appears the more mysterious the more we reflect upon it (Eden). See TRINITY; CHRIST, PERSON OF; MONOPHYSITES; NESTORIANS.

Hypothetical Baptism is a phrase sometimes used to denote, in the Church of England, a baptism administered to a child of whom it is uncertain whether it has already been baptized or not. The rubric states that "if they who bring the infant to the church do make such uncertain answers to the priest's questions as that it cannot appear that the child was baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," then the priest, on performing the baptism, is to use this form of words, viz.: "If thou art not already baptized, N——, I baptize thee in the name," etc.

Hypothetical Universalism. See HYPOTHETICI.

Hypothetĭci, a name given to the followers (French Protestants) of Amyraut, who, while they asserted a *gratia universalis*, none the less ought not to be classed with modern Universalists, as they simply taught that God desires the happiness of all men, *provided they will receive his mercy in faith*, and that none can obtain salvation without faith in Christ. See AMYRAUT; CAMERON; UNIVERSALISM.

Hypsistarians (worshippers of the θεὸς ὕψιστος, or "Most High God," as such), a sect mentioned by Gregory of Nazianzum, whose father was a member of it before his conversion to Christianity. They are represented as combining in their doctrines the elements of Judaism and paganism. They assigned a place to fire and light in their worship, but rejected circumcision and the worship of images; they kept the Sabbath, and abstained from the eating of certain kinds of meats. Gregory of Nyssa also mentions the Hypsistarii, to whom he gives the surname Ὑψιστιανοί. He says that, like the Christians, they acknowledge only one God, whom they call ὕψιστον or παντοχράτορα, but are distinguished from them in not considering him as *Father.* All that subsequent writers have said of this sect is derived from the above statements. The Hypsistarii do not appear to have extended outside of Cappadocia, and they seem to have existed but a short time there, for no mention is made of them either before or after the 4th century. Contrary to the statement of the ancient writers, who described them as Monotheists, Böhmer concludes from the remark made by Gregory concerning his father, ὑπ' εἰδώλοις πάρος ἦεν ζώων, that, though the Hypsistarii worshipped but one God, they did not formally deny the existence of more. It is not to be wondered at, in view of the scanty information we possess concerning this sect, that very great differences of opinion should exist in regard to them. Mosheim considers them as belonging to the Gnostic school; J. J. Wetstein (in *Prolegom.* I., *N. T.* p. 31, 38) and D. Harenberg consider them as identical with the *Cœlicolæ* (q. v.), regarding them as descendants from the worshippers of Thor; others trace a resemblance between their doctrines and those of Zoroaster. That they were not a Christian sect is proved by the fact of Gregory of Nazianzum's father having belonged to it before his becoming a Christian. Ullmann considers them as Eclectics, combining the elements of Judaism with the Persian religion, while Böhmer looks upon them as identical with the Euphemites, which Neander (*Ch. Hist.* ii, 507) also thinks probable. Their morals are represented as having been very good. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 380 sq.; Walch, *Hist. d. Ketzereien*, ii, 180 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xiii, 278 sq.; C. Ullmann, *De Hypsistariis* (Heidelb. 1833); G. Böhmer, *De Hypsistariis* (Berol. 1834).

Hyrcānus (Ὑρκανός, see HIRCANUS), the name of two of the high-priests and kings of the Maccabæan line of the Jews. See MACCABEES.

1. JOHN HYRCANUS, the son of Simon Maccabæus, who sent him with his brother Judas to repel Cendebæus, the general of Antiochus VII, B.C. 137. On the assassination of his father and two brothers, John ascended the throne, B.C. 135. During the first year of his reign Jerusalem was besieged by Antiochus Sidetes,

and at length Hyrcanus was obliged to submit. The walls of Jerusalem were destroyed, and a tribute imposed upon the city. Hyrcanus afterwards accompanied Antiochus in his expedition against the Parthians, but returned to Jerusalem before the defeat of the Syrian army. After the defeat and death of Antiochus, B.C. 130, Hyrcanus took several cities belonging to the Syrian kingdom, and completely established his own independence. He strengthened his power by an alliance with the Romans, and extended his dominions by the conquest of the Idumæans, whom he compelled to submit to circumcision and to observe the Mosaic law; and also by taking Samaria, which he levelled to the ground, and flooded the spot on which it had stood. The latter part of his reign was troubled by disputes between the Pharisees and Sadducees. Hyrcanus had originally belonged to the Pharisees, but had quitted their party in consequence of an insult he received at an entertainment from Eleazar, a person of importance among the Pharisees. By uniting himself to the Sadducees, Hyrcanus, notwithstanding the benefits he had conferred upon his country by his wise and vigorous government, became very unpopular with the common people, who were mostly attached to the Pharisees. Hyrcanus died B.C. 106, and was succeeded by his son Aristobulus (Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 7 sq.; *War*, i, 2; 1 Macc. xv, xvi; Justin, xxxvi, 1; Diodorus, *Exc. Hæsch.* xxxiv, 1; Plut. *Apophth.* p. 184 sq.; Eusebius, *Chron. Arm.* p. 94, 167). See Smith, *Dict. of Classical Biography*, s. v. See ANTIOCHUS.

2. HYRCANUS II, son of Alexander Jannæus, and grandson of the preceding. On the death of his father (B.C. 78) he was appointed high-priest by his mother Alexandra, who ruled Judæa herself for the next nine years. After her death (B.C. 69), his younger brother, Aristobulus, a braver and more energetic man, seized the government, and forced Hyrcanus to withdraw into private life. Induced by the Idumæan Antipater, and aided by Aretas, king of Arabia Petræa, he endeavored to win back his dominions, but was not successful until Pompey began to favor his cause. After some years of tumultuous fighting, Aristobulus was poisoned by the partisans of Ptolemy (B.C. 49), and Hyrcanus, who had for some time possessed, if he had not enjoyed, the dignity of high-priest and ethnarch, was now deprived of the latter of these offices, for which, in truth, he was wholly incompetent. Cæsar (B.C. 47), on account of the services rendered to him by Antipater, made the latter procurator of Judæa, and thus left in his hands all the real power, Hyrcanus busying himself only with the affairs of the priesthood and Temple. Troubles, however, were in store for him. Antipater was assassinated, and Antigonus, son of Aristobulus, with the help of the Parthian king, Orodes I, invaded the land, captured Hyrcanus by treachery, cut off his ears, and thus disqualified him for the office of high-priest, and carried him off to Seleucia, on the Tigris. Some years later, Herod, son of his old friend Antipater, obtained supreme power in Judæa, and invited the aged Hyrcanus home to Jerusalem. He was allowed to depart, and for some time lived in ease and comfort, but, falling under suspicion of intriguing against Herod, he was put to death (B.C. 30) (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 16; xiv, 1-13; *War*, i, 5-11; Dio Cass. xxxvii, 15, 16; xlviii, 26; Diod. xl, *Ex. Vet.* p. 128; Oros. vi, 6; Euseb. *Chron. Arm.* p. 94). See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s. v. See HEROD.

Hyssop (אֵזוֹב, *êzôb'*, of uncertain etymology; Gr. ὕσσωπος), a plant difficult to define, especially as the similarity of the above terms has early led to their confusion. As the ὕσσωπος of Greek authors is generally acknowledged to be the common hyssop (*Hyssopus officinalis* of botanists), it has been inferred that it must also be the plant of the Old Testament, as well as that referred to in the New Testament. This inference has not, however, been universally acquiesced in; for Celsius enumerates no less than eighteen different plants which have been adduced by various authors as the hyssop of Scripture. The chief difficulty arises from the fact that in the Sept. the Greek ὕσσωπος is the uniform rendering of the Hebrew *êzôb*, and that this rendering is indorsed by the apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix, 19, 21), when speaking of the ceremonial observances of the Levitical law. Whether, therefore, the Sept. made use of the Greek ὕσσωπος as the word most nearly resembling the Hebrew in sound, as Stanley suggests (*S. and Pal.* p. 21, note), or as the true representative of the plant indicated by the latter, is a point which, in all probability, will never be decided. Botanists differ widely even with regard to the identification of the ὕσσωπος of Dioscorides. The name has been given to the *Satureia Græca* and the *S. Juliana*, to neither of which it is appropriate, and the hyssop of Italy and South France is not met with in Greece, Syria, or Egypt. Daubeny (*Lect. on Rom. Husbandry*, p. 313), following Sibthorpe, identifies the mountain hyssop with the *Thymbra spicata*, but this conjecture is disapproved of by Kühn (*Comm. in Diosc.* iii, 27), who in the same passage gives it as his opinion that the Hebrews used the *Origanum Ægypticum* in Egypt, the *O. Syriacum* in Palestine, and that the hyssop of Dioscorides was the *O. Smyrnæum*. The Greek botanist describes two kinds of hyssop, ὀρεινή and κηπευτή, and gives πεσαλέμ as the Egyptian equivalent. The Talmudists make the same distinction between the wild hyssop and the garden-plant used for food. The hyssop is of three species, but only one of these is cultivated for use. The common hyssop is a shrub, with low bushy stalks, growing a foot and a half high; small, pear-shaped, close-setting, opposite leaves, with several smaller ones rising from the same joint; and all the stalks and branches terminated by erect, whorled spikes of flowers, of different colors in the varieties. They are very hardy plants, and may be propagated either by slips or cuttings, or by seeds. The leaves have an aromatic smell, and a warm, pungent taste. It is a native of the South of Europe and the East.

Hyssopus Officinalis.

The first notice of the scriptural plant occurs in Exod. xii, 22, where a bunch of hyssop is directed to be dipped in blood and struck on the lintels and the two side-posts of the doors of the houses in which the Israelites resided. It is next mentioned in Lev. xiv, 4, 6, 52, in the ceremony for declaring lepers to be cleansed; and again in Numb. xix, 6, 18, in preparing the water of separation. To these passages the apostle alludes in Heb. ix, 19: "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves, and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people." From this text we find that the Greek name ὕσσωπος was considered synonymous with the Hebrew *ezob;* and from the preceding that the plant must have been leafy, and large enough to serve for the purposes of sprinkling, and that it must have been found in Lower Egypt, as well as in the country towards Mount Sinai, and onwards to Palestine. From the following passage we get some information respecting the habits and the supposed properties of the plant. Thus, in 1 Kings iv, 33, it is said, "Solomon spoke of trees, from the cedar-tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out

of the wall;" and in the penitential psalm of David (li, 7), "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." In this last passage, it is true, the word is thought by some commentators to be used in a figurative sense; but still it is possible that the plant may have possessed some general cleansing properties, and thus come to be employed in preference to other plants in the ceremonies of purification. It ought, at all events, to be found growing upon walls, and in Palestine. In the account of the crucifixion of our Saviour, the evangelist John says (xix, 29), "Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar, and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon *hyssop*, and put it to his mouth." In the parallel passages of Matthew (xxvii, 48) and Mark (xv, 36) it is stated that the sponge filled with vinegar was put upon a reed or stick. To reconcile these statements, some commentators have supposed that both the sponge and the hyssop were tied to a stick, and that one evangelist mentions only the hyssop, because he considered it as the most important; while, for the same reason, the other two mention only the stick; but the simplest mode of explaining the apparent discrepancy is to consider the hyssop and the stick to be the same thing—in other words, that the sponge was affixed to a stick of hyssop.

Of the different plants adduced by Celsius as having more or less claims to be regarded as the hyssop of Scripture, some belong to the class of ferns, as *Capillus Veneris*, maiden-hair, and *Ruta muraria*, or wall-rue, because they will grow upon walls; so also the *Polytrichum*, or hair-moss, the *Kloster hyssops*, or pearlwort, and *Sagina procumbens* are suggested by others, because, from their growing on rocks or walls, they will answer to the passage in 1 Kings iv, 33, and from their smallness contrast well with the cedar of Lebanon, and are a proof of the minute knowledge of Solomon. Some again contend for species of wormwood, as being, from their bitterness, most likely to have been added to the vinegar in the sponge, that it might be more distasteful to our Saviour. The majority, however, have selected different kinds of fragrant plants belonging to the natural family of *Labiatæ*, several of which are found in dry and barren situations in Palestine, and also in some parts of the desert. (See Rauwolf, *Trav.* p. 59, 456; Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 554, 517; Burckhardt, *Trav.* ii, 913; Robinson, *Researches*, i, 162, 157.) Of these may be mentioned the rosemary, various species of lavender, of mint, of marjoram, of thyme, of savory, of thymbra, and others of the same tribe, resembling each other much in character as well as in properties; but it does not appear that any of them grow on walls, or are possessed of cleansing properties; and, with the exception of the rosemary, they are not capable of yielding a stick, nor are they found in all the required situations. If we look to the most recent authors, we find some other plants adduced, though the generality adhere to the common hyssop. Sprengel (*Hist. Rei Herb.* i, 14) seems to entertain no doubt that the *Thymbra spicata* found by Hasselquist on the ruins about Jerusalem is the hyssop of Solomon, though Hasselquist himself thought that the moss called *Gymnostomum truncatum* was the plant. Lady Calcott asks "whether the hyssop upon which St. John says the sponge steeped in vinegar was put, to be held to the lips of Christ upon the cross, might not be the hyssop attached to its staff of cedar-wood, for the purposes of sprinkling the people, lest they should contract defilement on the eve of the Sabbath, which was a high-day, by being in the field of execution" (*Scripture Herbal*, p. 208). Rosenmüller, again, thinks that the Hebrew word *ezob* does not denote our hyssop, but an aromatic plant resembling it, the wild marjoram, which the Germans call *Dosten*, or *Wohlgemuth*, the Arabs *Zatar*, and the Greeks *Origanum*. In the *Pictorial Bible* (i, 161), Mr. Kitto observes "that the hyssop of the sacred Scriptures has opened a wide field for conjecture, but in no instance has any plant been suggested that, at the same time, has a sufficient length of stem to answer the purpose of a wand or pole, and such detergent or cleansing properties as to render it a fit emblem for purification;" and he suggests it as probable that "the hyssop was a species of *Phytolacca*, as combining length of stem with cleansing properties, from the quantity of potash which is yielded by the ashes of the American species, *P. decandra*, of this genus." *P. Abyssinica* grows to the size of a shrub in Abyssinia. Winer (*Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Ysop) observes that the Talmudists distinguish the hyssop of the Greeks and Romans from that mentioned in the law. He then adduces the *Origanum*, mentioned in the quotation from Rosenmüller, as the *ezob* of the Hebrews; but concludes by observing that a more accurate examination is required of the hyssops and *Origana* of that part of Asia before the meaning of the Hebrew term can be considered as satisfactorily determined. Five kinds of hyssop are mentioned in the Talmud. One is called אזוב simply, without any epithet: the others are distinguished as Greek, Roman, wild hyssop, and hyssop of Cochali (Mishna, *Negaim*, xiv, 6). Of these, the four last mentioned were profane, that is, not to be employed in purifications (Mishna, *Parah*, xi, 7). Maimonides (*de Vacca Rufa*, iii, 2) says that the hyssop mentioned in the law is that which was used as a condiment. According to Porphyry (*De Abstin.* iv, 7), the Egyptian priests on certain occasions ate their bread mixed with hyssop; and the *zaatar*, or wild marjoram, with which it has been identified, is often an ingredient in a mixture called *dukkah*, which is to this day used as food by the poorer classes in Egypt (Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 200). It is not improbable, therefore, that this may have been the hyssop of Maimonides, who wrote in Egypt; more especially as R. D. Kimchi (*Lex.* s. v.), who reckons seven different kinds, gives as the equivalent the Arabic *zaatar*, origanum, or marjoram, and the German *Dosten* or *Wohlgemuth* (Rosenmüller, *Handb.*). With this agrees the Tanchum Hieros. MS. quoted by Gesenius. So in the Judæo-Spanish version, Exod. xii, 22 is translated "y tomarédes manojo de *origano*." This is doubtless the species of "hyssop" (*zaatar*) shown to Dr. Thomson, who describes it as "having the fragrance of thyme, with a hot, pungent taste, and long slender stems" (*Land and Book*, i, 161). But Dioscorides makes a distinction between origanum and hyssop when he describes the leaf of a species of the former as resembling the latter (comp. Plin. xx, 67), though it is evident that he, as well as the Talmudists, regarded them as belonging to the same family. In the Syriac of 1 Kings iv, 33, hyssop is rendered by *lûfô*, "houseleek," although in other passages it is represented by *zûfô*, which the Arabic translation follows in Psa. li, 9, and Heb. ix, 19, while in the Pentateuch it has *zaatar* for the same. Patrick (on 1 Kings iv, 33) was of opinion that *êzôb* is the same with the Ethiopic *azub*, which represents the hyssop of Psa. li, 9, as well as ἡδύοσμον, or mint, in Matt. xxiii, 23. The monks on Jebel Musa give the name of hyssop to a fragrant plant called *ja'deh*, which grows in great quantities on that mountain (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* i, 157). It has been reserved for the ingenuity of a German to trace a connection between Æsop, the Greek fabulist, and the *êzôb* of 1 Kings iv, 33 (Hitzig, *Die Sprüche Salomo's*, Einl. § 2). (See Celsius, *Hierobot.* i, 407 sq.; comp. Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 589; Plenk, *Plant. Med. tab.* 465; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 284 sq.; Faber, in Keil's *Analect.* i, 3 sq.; Geiger, *Pharmaceut. Bot.* i, 491; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* i, 57 sq.; Sprengel, *ad Dioscor.* ii, 506 sq.; Prosp. Alpin. *Plant. Ægypt.* c. 20; Spencer, *Leg. Rit.* ii, 15, 4; and the Talmudical, classical, and other authorities there cited.)

The latest result is that of Dr. J. F. Royle (communicated in a paper read before the Royal Asiatic Society, and published in their journal for November, 1844), who infers, first, that any plant answering to all that was required should be found in Lower Egypt (Exod. xii, 22); in the desert of Sinai (Lev. xiv, 4, 6, and 52; Numb. xix, 6, 18); in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (John xix, 29); secondly, that it should be a plant growing on walls or

rocky situations (1 Kings iv, 33); and, finally, that it should be possessed of some cleansing properties (Psa. li, 7), though it is probable that in this passage it is used in a figurative sense. It should also be large enough to yield a stick, and it ought, moreover, to have a name in the Arabic or cognate languages similar to the Hebrew name. After a careful and minute examination of all the ancient and modern testimony in the case, he finds all these circumstances united in the caper-plant, or *Capparis spinosa* of Linnæus. See CAPER-PLANT. The Arabic name of this plant, *asuf*, by which it is sometimes, though not commonly described, bears considerable resemblance to the Hebrew. It is found in Lower Egypt (Forskal, *Flor. Eg.-Arab.*; Plin. xiii, 44). Burckhardt (*Trav. in Syr.* p. 536) mentions the *aszef* as a tree of frequent occurrence in the valleys of the peninsula of Sinai, "the bright green creeper which climbs out of the fissures of the rocks" (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 21, etc.), and produces a fruit of the size of a walnut, called by the Arabs *Felfel Jibbel*, or mountain-pepper (Shaw, *Spec. Phytogr. Afr.* p. 39). Dr. Royle thought this to be undoubtedly a species of *capparis*, and probably the caper-plant. The *Capparis spinosa* was found by M. Bové (*Rel. d'un Voy. Botan. en Eg.*, etc.) in the desert of Sinai, at Gaza, and at Jerusalem. Lynch saw it in a ravine near the convent of Mar Saba (*Exped.* p. 388). It is thus met with in all the localities where the *ezob* is mentioned in the Bible. With regard to its habitat, it grows in dry and rocky places, and on walls: "quippe quum capparis quoque seratur *siccis* maxime" (Plin. xix, 48). De Candolle describes it as found "in muris et rupestribus." The caper-plant was believed to be possessed of detergent qualities. According to Pliny (xx, 59), the root was applied to the cure of a disease similar to the leprosy. Lamarck (*Enc. Botan.* art. Caprier) says, "Les capriers . . . sont regardés comme . . . antiscorbutiques." Finally, the caper-plant is capable of producing a stick three or four feet in length. Pliny (xiii, 44) describes it in Egypt as "firmioris ligni frutex," and to this property Dr. Royle attaches great importance, identifying, as he does, the ὑσσώπῳ of John xix, 29 with the καλάμῳ of Matthew and Mark. To this identification, however, Dr. G. E. Post (in the Am. ed. of Smith's *Bibl. Dict.*) justly objects that the caper-plant has a thorny stem, and is too straggling and otherwise unsuitable in form for the uses designated; and, moreover, that its Arab. name really has little affinity with the Heb. *ezob*. He therefore returns to Celsius's idea of the *Labiatæ*, or marjoram tribe, specially the *Origanum maru* (Arab. *Zuphâ*), which grows on the walls of terraces, has a long slender stem, or cluster of stems, with a bushy top, a fragrant odor, and a bitter but wholesome flavor. With this agrees one of the Arabic and Syriac renderings above noted.

Hystaspes (Ὑστάσπης, also HYSTASPAS, i. e. *Hydaspes*), a prophetico-apocalyptic work among the early Christians, thought to contain predictions of Christ and the future of his kingdom, so called from a Persian savant (Magus), Hystaspes, under whose name it was circulated. As in the case of the Sibyllines (q. v.), the work in question seems to have been an attempt made by the early Church fathers to find in the religion and philosophical systems of the heathen predictions of and relations to the Christian religion. The first mention of these *vaticinia Hystaspis* we find in two passages of Justin (*Apolog.* i, 20, cap. 21, p. 66 c, ed. Otho, i, p. 180, and cap. 44, p. 82 c, ed. Otho, p. 226). According to the first passage, the destruction of the world is predicted by Hystaspes as it is foretold by the Sibylla (Καὶ Σίβυλλα καὶ Ὑστάσπις γενήσεσθαι τῶν φθαρτῶν ἀνάλωσιν διὰ πυρὸς ἔφησαν). In the second passage Justin asserts that the bad dæmons, in their efforts to prevent man's knowing the truth, succeeded in establishing a law which forbids the reading of the βίβλοι Ὑστάσπου ἢ Σιβύλλης ἢ τῶν προφητῶν under penalty of death; but the Christians, notwithstanding this law, not only read the books themselves, but even incited the heathen to study them. More particular information in regard to their contents is given us by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, v, 6, § 43, ed. Potter, p. 761). But so varying have been the interpretations of this passage that it is difficult to determine definitely whether the book is of older origin than the first half of the 2d century. To this opinion Wagenmann (in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.*) inclines. The information which Clement furnishes us is: 1. There existed in the 2d century a βίβλος Ἑλληνική, a work written in Greek, and circulated in Christian and heathen circles, entitled ὁ Ὑστάσπης. 2. The Christians found in it, even more plainly than in the books of the Sibyllines, references to Christ and the future of his kingdom, and especially a reference to Christ's divine sonship, to the sufferings which awaited him and his followers, to the inexhaustible patience of the Christians, and the final return of Christ. The third and last of the Church fathers who make mention of the Hystaspes is Lactantius. He speaks of it in three different passages (*Instit.* div. vii, cap. 15, cap. 18; *Epitom.* ii, 69). In the first passage Lactantius speaks of the Hystaspes in connection with the Sibyl, and in the two other passages he speaks of it in connection with the Sibyl and Hermes Trismegistus. According to the first passage, Hystaspes, like the Sibyl, predicts the extinction of the empire and name of Rome. According to the second passage (cap. 18), the troubles and warfares which shall precede the final day of the world have been prophesied of by the *prophetæ ex Dei spiritu*; also by the *vates ex instinctu dæmonum*. For instance, Hystaspes is said to have predicted and described the *iniquitas sæculi hujus extremi*, how a separation of the just from the unjust shall take place, how the pious, amid cries and sobs, will stretch out their hands and implore the protection of Jupiter (*imploraturos fidem Jovis*), and how Jupiter will look down upon the earth, hear the cry of men, and destroy the wicked.

With regard to the person of Hystaspes, who is said to be the author of the work containing these predictions, Justin and Clement of Alexandria have left us no information, and we depend, therefore, solely on Lactantius, according to whom he was an old king of the Medes, who flourished long before the Trojan war, and after whom was named the river Hystaspes. In all probability, Lactantius here thinks of the father of king Darius I, known to us from the writings of Herodotus, Xenophon, and other Greek authors, but to whom the prophetic talents of Hystaspes were entirely foreign. Ammianus Marcellinus (xxiii, 6), who flourished in the 4th century of our æra, informs us that one Hystaspes had studied astronomy with the Brahmas of India, and had even informed the Magi of his ability to know the future. Agathias, the Byzantine historian of the 6th century, knows of a Hystaspes who was a contemporary with Zoroaster, but he does not dare to assert that this Hystaspes was the same as the one spoken of as the father of Darius I. See PARSISM. In view of the uncertainty of the authorship, it is wellnigh impossible to determine fully the origin, contents, form, and tendency of the *Vaticinia Hystaspis*. We know not even whether it emanated from Jewish, Christian, or heathen writers, although all our present knowledge points to the last as its probable origin. That the author was a Gnostic, as Huetius thinks (*Quæst. Alnet.* I, iii, ep. 21, p. 230), is possible, but cannot be definitely stated, nor at all proved; beyond this, the only answer left us to all questions that might be put is a *non liquet*. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xix, 660 sq.; Walch, *De Hystaspe ejusque vaticiniis*, in the *Comment. Societ. Gotting. hist. et phil.* (1779), ii, 1-18; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græc.* i, 93 sq.; Lücke, *Einleitung in d. Offenb. Joh.* (2d ed. 1848), p. 237; Reuss, *Geschichte d. heil. Schrift. d. N. T.* (4th edit. 1864), p. 270; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 176 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hyttavanes, in the mythology of the Finns, is the name of the god of the chase, especially of hares.—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 693.

I.

Iamblichus. See JAMBLICHUS.

Ibarra, JOAQUIN, a Spanish printer celebrated for his magnificent editions of the Bible and Arabic liturgies, was born at Saragossa in 1725, and died at Madrid in 1785. His printing-house was established at the latter place.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 724.

Ibas (Ἴβας), bishop of Edessa, in Syria, from 435 to 457, distinguished himself by the translation of the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia into the Syriac. His lenient policy towards the Nestorians, and the fact that he distributed the translation of Theodore extensively throughout Persia and Syria, caused several priests of his diocese to accuse him before the emperor Theodosius II, and before the archbishops of Antioch and Constantinople, for favoring Nestorianism. The emperor appointed the bishops Uranius of Himera, Photius of Tyre, Eusthate of Berytus, and the prefect of Damascus a commission to try him. Two Synods, held respectively at Berytus and Tyre in 448, failed to convict him, and he was left undisturbed until the Robber-Synod of Ephesus (A.D. 449), when he was finally deposed from his diocese. He appealed to the Council of Chalcedon, and was restored to his bishopric in 451. Long after his death, in 553, the fifth general Council of Constantinople condemned him as a Nestorian, in spite of the efforts of pope Vigilius. The principal ground for this accusation was a letter written by him to the Persian bishop Maris, in which he blames his predecessor, Rabulas, for having condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia. The greater part of this letter is contained in the *Recueil des Conciles*, iv, 661. See Baronius, *Annales*, an. 448, 449, 451, 553; Dupin, *Biblioth. ecclés. du 5me Siècle;* Cave, *Hist. littér.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxv, 727: Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s. v. Chalcedon; Neander, *Church History*, ii, 538–552.

Ibbetson, JAMES, D.D., an English divine, was born in 1717, and educated at Exeter College, Oxford. He filled successively the rectorate of Bushey, in Hertfordshire, and the archdeaconry of St. Alban's, and died in 1781. His works are, *Epistola ad Phil-Hebræos Oxonienses* (1746):—*Short History of the Province of Canterbury;* and several other theological treatises and sermons.—Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 241.

Ibbot, BENJAMIN, D.D., a learned English divine, born at Beachamwell, Norfolk, in 1680, was educated at Clare Hall and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. He became treasurer of Wells Cathedral and rector of St. Vedast, London, in 1708; was some time after appointed rector of St. Paul, Shadwell; chaplain of George I in 1716; and, finally, prebendary of Westminster in 1724. He died April 15, 1725. His principal works are, *A Course of Sermons preached for the Boyle Lecture* (1713, 1714), in which he refutes the infidel objections of Collins (Lond. 1727, 8vo):—*Thirty-six Discourses on practical Subjects* (Lond. 1776, 2 vols. 8vo); and a translation of Puffendorf's *De Habitu Religionis Christianæ ad vitam civilem* (1719). See Chalmers, *Gen. Biog. Dict.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxv, 727; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, ii, 1601.

Iberians, an Asiatic nation inhabiting the Caucasian isthmus, described by Virgil, Horace, and Lucan as a warlike, cruel, and uncivilized people, while Strabo speaks of them as a very quiet and religious people. Rufinus and Moses of Chorene relate that, during the reign of the emperor Constantine, the great Christina, probably a Christian woman (some call her Nino, others Nunia), was made prisoner by the Iberians, and became a slave. Her piety soon won for her the esteem and consideration not only of her master, but of the Iberians generally; and being on one occasion asked to cure a sick child of royal rank, she told the people that Christ, her God, alone could effect the cure. She prayed for the child, and it recovered. She is next said to have cured the queen by her prayers. The king, Miraus, and his queen were converted, and did their utmost to spread Christianity through their dominions. The country has since remained Christian, though the true religion was long mixed with many old superstitions. Some claim that Christina was from Byzantium, on the ground that Procopius (v, 9) mentions an old convent preserved in Jerusalem, and rebuilt by Justinian in the 6th century, which was called Iberian or Iwerian. Moses of Chorene, moreover, says that she was an Armenian, and that teachers were demanded of the Armenian bishop Gregory, not of Rome. The Iberians spread Christianity among the surrounding nations. Their country is now called *Georgia* (q. v.), and they hold ecclesiastical relations with the Greek Church (q. v.).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, s. v.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* vi, 27 sq.

Ibex, the ancient name of the *Bouquetin* or *Steinbok* of the Alps, an animal generally thought to be designated by the Heb. יָעֵל, *yaël'* (always in the plur., A. V. "wild goats"), represented as well known, and inhabiting the highest and most inaccessible steeps (see Job xxxi, 1; Psa. civ, 18). Several species have been described by naturalists as inhabiting the different mountain ranges of the East (e. g. Arabia, Forskäl, *Descrip. Anim.* præf. 4; Ruppell, *Abyss.* i, 126; and Palestine, Seetzen, xviii, 435), all of them slightly varying from the European form (*Capra ibex*), and known among the Arabs by the general name of *beden.* Among the Sinai mountains the chase is pursued in much the same manner and under much the same circumstances as that of the chamois in the Alps and the Tyrol. The hunters exercise great vigilance and hardihood, taking vast circuits to get above their quarry, and especially aiming to surprise them at early day. Like most mountain quadrupeds that are gregarious, they have a leader who acts as sentinel, and gives the alarm on the occurrence of any suspicious sight, sound, or smell, when the whole flock makes off for a loftier peak. Their numbers are said to have much decreased of late years; for the Arabs report them so abundant fifty years ago, that if a stranger sought hospitality at a Bedouin's tent, and the owner had no sheep to kill, he would without hesitation take his gun and go confidently to shoot a *beden.* The flesh is excellent, with a flavor similar to

Caucasian Ibex.

that of venison. The Bedouins make water-bottles of their skins, as of those of the domestic goats, and rings of their horns, which they wear on their thumbs. Dogs easily catch them when surprised in the plains, but in the abrupt precipices and chasms of the rocks the ibex is said to elude pursuit by the tremendous leaps which it makes. It is likely that this species is identical with that which bears the name of *poseng* (*Caprus ægagrus*), and which inhabits all the loftier ranges that traverse Asia, from the Taurus and Caucasus to China. It is very robust, and much larger than any domestic goat; its general color iron-gray, shaded with brown, with a black line down the back and across the withers, and a white patch on the crupper. The horns of the male are very large, compressed, and slightly diverging as they arch over the back; their front side makes an obtuse edge, and is marked by a series of knobs, with deep hollows between. See WILD GOAT; HIND, etc.

Ib'har (Heb. *Yibchar'*, יִבְחָר, *chosen;* Sept. Ἰβεάρ, Ἰεβαάρ [cod. Vat. Ἐβεάρ, Ἐβαάρ]; Josephus Ἰεβάρ, *Ant.* vii, 3, 3), one of the sons of David (by a secondary wife, 1 Chron. iii, 9) born to him in Jerusalem, mentioned next after Solomon and before Elishua (2 Sam. v, 15; 1 Chron. iii, 6; xiv, 5). B.C. post 1044. See DAVID.

Ibis, a genus of birds of the family *Ardeidæ*, or, according to some ornithologists, of *Scolopacidæ*, and perhaps to be regarded as a connecting link between them. The bill is long, slender, curved, thick at the base; the point rather obtuse; the upper mandible deeply grooved throughout its length. The face, and generally the greater part of the head, and sometimes even the neck, are destitute of feathers, at least in adult birds. The neck is long. The legs are rather long, naked above the tarsal joint, with three partially united toes in front and one behind; the wings are moderately long; the tail is very short. The Sacred or Egyptian ibis (*Ibis religiosa*) is an African bird, two feet six inches in length, although the body is little larger than that of a common fowl. It was one of the birds worshipped by the ancient Egyptians, and called by them *Hab* or *Hib*, and by the modern Egyptians *Abu-Hannes* (i. e. Father John). It is represented on the monuments as a bird with long beak and legs, and a heart-shaped body, covered with black and white plumage. It was supposed, from the color of its feathers, to symbolize the light and shade of the moon, its body to represent the heart: its legs described a triangle, and with its beak it performed a medical operation; from all which esoterical ideas it was the avatar of the god Thoth or Hermes (q. v.), who escaped in that shape the pursuit of Typhon, as the hawk was that of Ra, or Horus, the sun. Its feathers were supposed to scare, and even kill, the crocodile. It appeared in Egypt at the rise, and disappeared at the inundation of the Nile, and was thought, at that time, to deliver Egypt from the winged and other serpents which came from Arabia in certain narrow passes. As it did not make its nest in Egypt, it was thought to be self-engendering, and to lay eggs for a lunar month. According to some, the basilisk was engendered by it. It was celebrated for its purity, and only drank from the purest water, and the most strict of the priesthood only drank of the pools where it had been seen; besides which, it was fabled to entertain the most invincible love of Egypt, and to die of self-starvation if transported elsewhere. Its flesh was thought to be incorruptible after death, and to kill it was punishable with death. Ibises were kept in the temples, and unmolested in the neighborhood of cities. After death they were mummied, and there is no animal of which so many remains have been found at Thebes, Memphis, Hermopolis Magna, or Eshmun, and at Ibiu or Ibeum, fourteen miles north of the same place. They are made up into a conical shape, the wings flat, the legs bent back to the breast, the head placed on the left side, and the beak under the tail; were prepared as other mummies, and wrapped up in linen bandages, which are sometimes plaited in patterns externally. At Thebes they are found in linen bandages only; well preserved at Hermopolis in wooden or stone boxes of oblong form, sometimes in form of the bird itself, or the god Thoth; at Memphis, in conical sugar-loaf-shaped red earthenware jars, the tail downwards, the cover of convex form, cemented by lime. There appear to be two sorts of embalmed ibises—a smaller one of the size of a corncrake, very black, and the other black and white—the *Ibis Numenius*, or *Ibis religiosa*. This last is usually found with its eggs, and sometimes with its insect food, the *Pimelia pilosa*, *Akis reflexa*, and portions of snakes, in the stomach. (Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs*, v, 7, 217; Passoloegua, *Catalogue Raisonné*, p. 255; Pettigrew, *History of Mummies*, p. 205; *Horapollo*, i, c. 30, 36.)

Sacred Ibis.

Ib'leäm (Heb. *Yibleäm'*, יִבְלְעָם, *people-waster;* Sept. Ἰαβλαάμ, Ἰεβλαάμ [but some codd. occasionally omit]), a city (with suburban towns) within the natural precincts of Issachar, but (with five others) assigned to Manasseh (Josh. xvii, 11, where it is mentioned between Beth-shean and Dor), but from which the Israelites were unable to expel the Canaanites (Judg. i, 27, where it is mentioned between Dor and Megiddo); lying near the pass of Gur, in the vicinity of Megiddo, where Jehu slew Ahaziah (2 Kings ix, 27). It was assigned as a Levitical city to the family of Kohath (1 Chron. vi, 70, where it is less correctly called BILEAM, and mentioned along with Aner as lying within Manasseh); compare Josh. xxi, 25, where it is called GATH-RIMMON (apparently by error; see the Sept., and comp. 1 Chron. vi, 69). According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 148), it is the modern village *Jabla*, south-west (north-west) of Beth-shean, and about two English miles south of the village Kefrah; but no map has this place, and the indications require a different position. See GUR. The site is probably represented by that of *Jelameh*, a small village about two and a half miles north of Jenin (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 161).

Ibn-Aknin, JOSEPH BEN-JEHUDAH, called in Arabic *Abulhagag Jussuff Ibn-Jahja Ibn-Shimun Alsabti Almaghrebi*, a Jewish philosoper and commentator of some note, was born at Ceuta (Arab. *Sebta*), in Arabia, about 1160. His first religious training was, at least to all outside appearances, in the Mohammedan religion, but he was at a very early age also taught Hebrew, and instructed in the Talmud and Hebrew Scriptures, so that, as soon as he arrived at years of maturity, he might forsake the religion forced upon him by the law of the country that gave him birth, and return to the faith of his forefathers. About 1185, having previously decided in favor of the Jewish religion, he fled to Alexandria, and there became a zealous disciple of the great Moses Maimonides, whose attention had been called to Ibn-

Aknin by a scientific work of his, and by his *Makamen*, which he had sent to Maimonides. Although he remained with this celebrated Jewish savant only a little over a year, then removing to Aleppo to practice medicine, he had nevertheless endeared himself so much to him that Maimonides loved him as his own son, and ever afterwards labored to promote the interests of his beloved disciple, and the philosophical work *Moreh-Nebochim* (*Doctor perplexorum*), which Maimonides (q. v.) published in 1190, is often asserted to have had for its principal aim the removal of certain sceptical opinions which Ibn-Aknin cherished at that time. In 1192, notwithstanding the frequent counsels of Maimonides to the contrary, Ibn-Aknin went to Bagdad, and there founded a Rabbinic college. After the decease of his great master he figured quite prominently at the court of the sultan Azzahir Ghasi of Damascus, and he delivered lectures at the high schools on medicine and philosophy. He died about 1226. Besides a number of works on medicine and metaphysics, he wrote *Commentary on the Song of Songs* (in Arabic), now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Pococke, p. 189). He espouses the notion of the Talmud, that the Song of Songs is *the most sacred* of all the twenty-four canonical books of the O. T., and accordingly explains it allegorically as representing the relationship of God to his people Israel. "There are," he says, "three different modes of explaining this book: 1. The *literal*, which is to be found in the philologians or grammarians, e. g. Saadia, Abu Sacharja Jahja ben-David el Fasi (Chajug), Abulwalid Ibn Ganach of Saragossa (Ibn-Ganach), the Nagid R. Samuel Ha-Levi ben-Nagdilah, Abu-Ibrahim ben-Baran (Isaac ben-Joseph), Jehudah ben-Balaam (Ibn-Balaam), and Moses Ibn-Gikatilla Ha-Cohen (Gikatilla); 2. The *allegorical*, to be found in the Midrash Chasit, the Talmud, and in some of the ancient interpretations; and, 3. The *philosophical* interpretation, which regards this book as referring to *the active intellect* [νοῦς ποιητικός], here worked out for the first time, and which, though the last in point of time, is the first of all in point of merit. These three different explanations correspond, in reverse order, to the three different natures of man, namely, to his physical, vital, and spiritual natures." Ibn-Aknin always gives the first and second explanations first, and then the philosophical interpretation. The commentary is invaluable to the history of Biblical literature and exegesis, inasmuch as all the interpreters therein enumerated have, with the exception of Saadia, hitherto not been known as commentators of the Song of Songs. These expositors form an important addition to the history of interpretation given by Ginsburg (*Historical and Critical Commentary of the Song of Songs*, Longman, 1857). See Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vi, 354, 362; vii, 7, 43; Jost, *Geschichte d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten*, ii, 457; iii, 11; Kitto, *Cyclop. Biblical Liter.* ii, 349 sq.; the ably written monograph of Munk, *Notice sur Joseph b.-Jehuda* (Paris, 1842); and the very elaborate article of Steinschneider, in Ersch und Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyklopädie*, s. v. Joseph Ibn-Aknin.

Ibn-Balaam, Jehudah (in Arabic *Jahja Abu-Zakaria*), a very distinguished Jewish philologian and commentator, was born at Seville, in Spain, about 1030. He was especially prominent as a defender of the authority of the Massora (q. v.). He died about 1100. His works (in Hebrew) are: 1. *On the Accents of the Bible*, edited by Jo. Mercer (*De accentibus scripturæ prosaicis*, Paris, 1565). Some portions of this book Heidenheim (q. v.) incorporated in his מִשְׁפְּטֵי הַטְּעָמִים:—2. *On the poetical Accents of Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms* (Paris, 1556). It has recently been re-edited, with remarks of the most ancient grammarians upon these peculiar accents, notes, and an introduction, by J. G. Polak (Amsterdam, 1858):—3. *On the denominative Verbs in the Hebrew Language.* The denominatives are arranged in alphabetical order, and commented upon in Arabic. This work has not yet been published, but specimens of it, in Hebrew, have been printed by Leopold Dukes in the *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1846, No. 42:—4. *A Treatise on the Hebrew Particles*, in alphabetical order. This work, too, has not as yet been printed, but specimens of it have been published both by Dukes and Fürst in the *Literaturblatt des Orients*, Nos. 29 and 42:—5. *A Treatise on the Hebrew Homonyms*, in alphabetical order, of which extracts have been published by Dukes in the *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1846, No. 4:—6. *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, written in Arabic. Though this work has long been known through Aben-Ezra, who quotes it in his commentary on Gen. xlix, 6; Exod. v, 19, yet it is only lately (1851) that Dr. Steinschneider discovered a MS. in the Bodleian Library containing a commentary on *Numbers* and *Deuteronomy*. "Ibn-Balaam always gives the grammatical explanation of the words first; he then enters into a minute disquisition on Saadia's translation and exposition of the Pentateuch, which he generally rejects, then explains the passage according to its context, and finally sets forth the Halachic and the judicial interpretation of the Talmud. A specimen of this commentary, which is extremely important to the Hebrew text and the Massora, has been communicated by Adolph Neubauer in the *Journal Asiatique* of December, 1861. It is on Deut. v, 6, upon which Ibn-Balaam remarks, 'As to the different readings of the two Decalogues (i. e. Exod. xx, 2-17, and Deut. v, 6-21), Saadia is of opinion that they contain two different revelations. He entertains the same view respecting those Psalms which occur twice, with some verbal variations (e. g. Psa. xiv and liii), and respecting the different readings of the Babylonian and Palestinian codices.' We thus learn of a remarkable variation between the Western and Eastern codices which is not mentioned elsewhere, namely, that the words ביום ההוא (Zech. xiv, 2) are omitted in the latter; we discover why the Syriac version has not these words; and we, moreover, see in what light Saadia and others regarded the various readings" (Ginsburg in Kitto):—7. *Commentary on the Psalms*, frequently quoted by Aben-Ezra:—8. *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, which, according to Ibn-Aknin (q. v.), who quotes it, gives a literal exposition of this book:—9. *Commentary on Isaiah*, quoted by Joseph Albo (*Ikarim*, sec. i, 1). "Ibn-Balaam, here, contrary to the generally received opinion, explains away the Messianic prophecies, and interprets Isa. xi as referring to Hezekiah. From Aben-Ezra's quotation on Zech. ix, 7 and Dan. x, 1, it seems as if he had also written commentaries on these books. Ibn-Balaam is one of the most liberal interpreters, and quotes Christian commentators and the Koran in his expositions." See Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vi, 83 sq.; Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums u. s. Sekten*, ii, 406; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 81; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1292-1297; *He-Chaluz* (Lemberg, 1853), ii, 60 sq.; Leopold Dukes, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der ältesten Auslegung und Spracherklärung des Alten Testamentes* (Stuttgart, 1844), ii, 186 sq.; Geiger, in the *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, 1862, p. 292 sq.

Ibn-Baruch, Baruch, a Jewish philosopher and commentator, flourished at Venice in the 16th century. But little is known of the history of his life. He published a twofold commentary on Ecclesiastes, called both קֹהֶלֶת יַעֲקֹב (*the Congregation of Jacob*) and קֹדֶשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל (*Holy Israel*) (Venice, 1599), the first of which is discursive and diffuse, and the second exegetical and brief. "Based upon the first verse, 'the words of Coheleth, son of David, king in Jerusalem,' he maintains that two persons are speaking in its book, a sceptic named *Coheleth*, and a believer called *Ben-David*, and accordingly treats the whole as a dialogue, in which these two characters are shown to discuss the most important problems of moral philosophy, and the philosophic systems of Greece and Arabia are made to furnish

the two heroes of the dialogue with the necessary philosophic materials."—Ginsburg in Kitto. The *Quæstiones disputatæ de Anima* of Thomas Aquinas, which were translated into Hebrew by Ali Xabillo, are used in this work both to put objections into the mouth of the sceptic and to furnish the believer with terse replies (comp. also *Commentary*, 65, a; 71, b; 96, a; 97, c; 117, a; 118, b; 119, a). It is a very valuable aid to the study of Jewish philosophy. See Jellineck, *Thomas v. Aquino i. d. jüd. Lit.* (Lpz. 1853), p. ii (13) and vii. (J. H.W.)

Ibn-Caspi or **Caspe**, JOSEPH BEN-ABBA MARI (also called *Bonafoux de l'Argentière*), an able Jewish writer, was born of a wealthy family about 1280 at Argentière, in France. He removed while quite young to Tarascon, and devoted his time mainly to Biblical studies. When only seventeen years old, he published as a result commentaries on Aben-Ezra's exposition of the Pentateuch, and on Ibn-Ganach's grammatical work. When about thirty years old he extended his range of study to metaphysical subjects, and thereafter became an ardent admirer of Maimonides, whose method of interpretation he also adopted. Indeed, so far was he carried away in his admiration for the great philosopher that he emigrated to Egypt, having decided to study under the descendants of Maimonides. But he failed to meet there that great fountain of knowledge which he supposed the followers of the second great Moses capable of supplying, and, after a few months' travel in Egypt and the East, he returned to France. In 1327 he again set out on a journey to promote his studies by a residence at foreign high-schools, and he visited Catalonia, Mallorca, Aragonia, and Valencia, and at one time even desired to go to Fez, having been informed that in that African city several noted Jewish scholars resided, whose instructions he coveted. Towards the latter part of 1332 Ibn-Caspi returned to his native country, and devoted himself to the production of a number of valuable exegetical works. He died about 1340. In all he wrote some thirty-six works, most remaining to us only in MS. form, of which lists may be found in S. Jellineck, דברים עתיקים, vol. ii, 1846; Delitzsch and Zunz, *Catal. MS.;* and in Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 147. Besides a commentary on Maimonides's *More Nebochim*, his most valuable works are, שרשות כסף (or שרשות only, the word כסף, *silver*, being an allusion to his own name, כספי, which is found in the titles of all his works) (*small silver chains* or *roots*), a Hebrew Dictionary, which is one of his most interesting and important works. "He starts from the principle that every root has only one general idea as its basis, and logically deduces from it all the other shades of meaning. A copy of this work in MS., 2 vols. 4to, is in the Paris library, and another in the Angelica at Rome. Abrabanel frequently quotes it in his commentary on the Pentateuch (comp. p. 7), on Isaiah (comp. xlv, 3; lxvi, 17), etc.; Wolf gives a specimen of it (*Bibliotheca Hebræa*, i, 1543); Richard Simon used the Paris MS. (*Hist. Crit.* lib. i, cap. xxxi), and Leopold Dukes printed extracts from it (*Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1847, p. 486):—A Commentary on Proverbs, the Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes. "Of the commentary on Proverbs, which is one of Ibn-Caspi's most valuable contributions to Biblical exegesis, the beginning and end have been published by Werblumer (comp. קבוצת כסף, 1846, p. 19, etc.); an analysis of the commentary on Ecclesiastes is given by Ginsburg (compare *Historical and Critical Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, Longman, 1861, p. 60, etc.), and the brief commentary on, or, rather, introduction to the Song of Songs, which was published in 1577, but which is rarer than the MSS., has been reprinted with an English translation by Ginsburg in his *Historical and Critical Commentary on the Song of Songs* (London, 1857, p. 47, etc.):"—מטות כסף (*silver staves*), or commentary on eight prophets, in which he attacks with great severity those who explain these prophecies as referring to the Messiah [see IBN-DANAN]:—גביע כסף (*a silver cup*), or commentary on the miracles and other mysteries found in the Pentateuch, Prophets, and Hagiographa. His principles of interpretation he laid down clearly in his commentary on the Proverbs above mentioned in these words: "The sacred Scriptures must be explained according to their plain and literal sense; and a recondite meaning can as little be introduced into them as into Aristotle's writings on logic and natural history. Only where the literal meaning is not sufficient, and reason rejects it, a deeper sense must be resorted to. If we once attempt to allegorize a simple and intelligible passage, then we might just as well do it with the whole contents of the Bible." "The logical division of sentences is the most indispensable and best auxiliary to the right understanding of the Bible, and the criterion to the proper order of the words are the *Massora* and the *accents*." It is evident from this extract that Ibn-Caspi anticipated the hermeneutical rules of modern criticism at a time when the schoolmen and the depositaries of Christian learning were engaged in hair-splitting and in allegorizing every fact of the Bible. It is greatly to be regretted that most of his exegetical works are left unpublished. See Ginsburg, in Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 351 sq.; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 361 sq.; Kirchheim, *Werblumer's Edition of Ibn-Caspi's Commentary on Maimonides's More Nebochim* (Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1848), p. 10 sq.; Leopold Dukes, in the *Literaturb. des Orients*, 1848; and Schneider, in Ersch u. Gruber's *Allgem. Encyklop.* sec. ii, xxxi, 58 sq.

Ibn-Chajim, AARON, a Jewish commentator, was born at Fez, Africa, about 1570. But little is known of his personal history. His works are, a *Commentary on Joshua* (Venice, 1608-9), from which a selection was made by Frankfurter (q. v.) in his great Rabbinic Bible:—a commentary on Sifra (tradition of Leviticus), published under the title of *The Oblation of Aaron* (Venice, 1609-11):—*The Rules of Aaron*, a treatise on R. Ishmael's (q. v.) thirteen rules for interpreting the O.-T. Scriptures (Ven. 1609, Dres. 1712).—Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 352.

Ibn-Danan, SAADIA BEN-MAIMON, a Jewish writer of some distinction, was Rabbi to the congregation at Granada previous to the cession of this country by the Moors to Ferdinand and Isabella, and the expatriation of the Jews. He was born in the first half of the 15th century, and flourished at Granada from 1460 to 1502. He was especially given to the study of the Talmud and history, and as a result of the former we have several works on the interpretation of the O.-T. Scriptures, and the elucidation of the language of the original. His exegetical works are, a *Commentary on Isaiah* liii, 13 (MS. Michael, 412), in which he takes ground against Ibn-Caspi (q. v.):—a *Hebrew Lexicon* (written in Arabic). This work, which he is thought to have completed in 1468, also remains only in MS. form, but an extract from it has been printed by Pinsker in his *Likute Kadmonioth* (Vienna, 1860), p. 74. His historical works are, *A short History of the Jews to the Days of Moses Maimonides* (פאר הדור), which he originally intended for his own pupils, of whom he seems to have had a number. See Grätz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, viii, 345 sq.; Edelmann, *Chemda Genusa*, Introd. p. xvii sq., and Text, p. 13 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 352. (J. H. W.)

Ibn-Daud. See CHAJUG.

Ibn-Djanah. See IBN-GANACH.

Ibneï'ah (Heb. *Yibneyah'*, יִבְנְיָה, *Jehovah will build* him up; Sept. Ἰεβναά), a son of Jeroham, who, with other Benjamites, returned to Jerusalem after the Captivity (1 Chron. ix, 8). B.C. 536.

Ibn-Ezra. See ABEN-EZRA.

Ibn-Ganach, ABULWALID MERWAN or JONAH

DJANAH (in Hebrew called *Jonah*), one of the most distinguished Jewish scholars of the Middle Ages, was born at Cordova about 995. While yet a boy he evinced his fondness for Hebrew by writing verses in that language, but as he continued in his studies he determined to devote his whole life to the advancement of the Hebrew as a philological study, and even abandoned the practice of medicine, which he had chosen as his profession after his removal to Saragossa in 1015, whither he had been forced by the persecutions which the Jews of Cordova suffered at the hand of Al-Mostain Suleiman since his occupation of that place in 1013. He soon acquired a proficiency which even in our day has not been excelled, and he deserves greater praise than any other Jewish scholar on account of the impulse he gave both to his contemporaries and to his immediate successors (among them the two Kimchis and Aben-Ezra), who have frequently acknowledged their obligations to him. The thorough manner in which he conducted his investigations enabled him to accomplish much more than his illustrious predecessor Chajug (q. v.), and by his criticism of Chajug's works, in which he readily acknowledged all that was meritorious, he frequently encountered the ardent followers of that great master, and became entangled in a number of controversies, which finally resulted beneficially to Hebrew philology. He died about 1050. His first great work in linguistics is his *Kitâb el-Tankieh* ("book of inquiry"), written in Arabic (the native tongue in his day of that part of Spain), consisting of two great parts, the first, *Kitâb el-Luma'* ("book of variegated fields"), treating at length of Hebrew grammar, and the second, *Kitâb el-Azûl* ("book of roots"), a Hebrew Dictionary, which was afterwards translated into Hebrew by several Jewish scholars, but of which only the translations made by Ibn-Parchon and by Ibn-Tibbon are preserved. The original is at Oxford (MS. Ure, No. 456, 457), and was extensively used by Gesenius in his *Thesaurus*. Specimens of it which Gesenius gave in his *Dict. of the Heb. Lang.* were translated by Dr. Robinson, and published in the *Amer. Bib. Repository*, 1833. That part of this work which refers to Hebrew grammar was published by Kirchheim (Frankf. a. M. 1856, 8vo). "This gigantic work is the most important philological production in Jewish literature of the Middle Ages. The mastery of the science of the Hebrew language in all its delicate points which Ibn-Ganach therein displays, the lucid manner in which he explains every grammatical difficulty, and the sound exegetical rules which he therein propounds, have few parallels up to the present day. He was not only the creator of the Hebrew syntax, but almost brought it to perfection. He was the first who pointed out the ellipses and the transposition of letters, words, and verses in the Hebrew Bible, and explained in a simple and natural manner more than two hundred obscure passages, which had up to his time greatly perplexed all interpreters, by showing that the sacred writers used abnormal for normal expressions (compare ספר הרקמה, ch. xxviii; Aben-Ezra's *Commentary on Daniel* i, 1, and ספר צחות, ed. Lippmann, p. 72, note). Though his faith in the inspiration of the Hebrew Scriptures was absolute, yet he maintained that, being addressed to men, they are subject to the laws of language, and hence urged that the abnormal expressions and forms in the Bible are not to be ascribed to the ignorance of transcribers and punctuators, nor to wilful corruption, but are owing to the fact that the sacred writers, being human, paid the tribute of humanity." But also in metaphysics Ibn-Ganach was no tyro, and he speaks of Plato and Aristotle like one who had studied them diligently. He wrote a work on logic, Aristotelian in principle, and strenuously opposed the efforts of his contemporaries, especially Ibn-Gebirol, in their metaphysical investigations on the relation of God to the world, holding that these inquiries only endangered the belief in the Scriptures. See Munk, *Notice sur A. M. Ibn-Djanâh* (Paris, 1851); Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vi, 25 sq., 205 sq.; Fürst, *Hebr. Dict.* Introd. p. xxx sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* ii, 354 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 315.

Ibn-Gebirol or Gabirol, SALOMON BEN-JEHUDAH, a very distinguished Jewish philosopher, commentator, and grammarian, as well as hymnologist, was born at Malaga, in Spain, about 1021. When only nineteen years of age he evinced his great skill as a poet, and his thorough acquaintance with Hebrew grammar by writing a grammar of the Hebrew language in Hebrew verse. It has never been printed entire, but parts of it have been published by Parchon in his *Hebrew Lexicon* (Paris, 1844), and by Leop. Dukes, in his *Shire Shelomo* (Hannov. 1858). About 1045 Ibn-Gebirol published his first philosophical work, which was translated by Ibn-Tibbon into Hebrew, entitled תִּקּוּן מִדּוֹת הַנֶּפֶשׁ (published in 1550 and often). He propounds in this work "a peculiar theory of the human temperament and passions, enumerates twenty propensities corresponding to the four dispositions multiplied by the five senses, and shows how the leaning of the soul to the one side may be brought to the moral equipoise by observing the declarations of Scripture, and ethical sayings of the Talmud, which he largely quotes, and which he intersperses with the chief sayings of 'the divine' Socrates, his pupil Plato, Aristotle, the Arabic philosophers, and especially with the maxims of a Jewish moral philosopher called Chefez Al-Kute, who is the author of an Arabic paraphrase of the Psalms in rhyme (Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature* [Lond. 1857], p. 101)." But as this work contained also personal allusions to some leading men of Saragossa, he was expatriated in 1046. After travelling from one place to another, he finally found a protector in the celebrated Samuel Ha-Nagid, a Jew also, then prime minister of Spain, and he was enabled to continue his philosophical studies, as the result of which he produced *The Fountain of Life*, his greatest work. Fragments of a Hebrew translation and an entire Latin version of it were published by Munk in his *Mélanges de philosophie Juive et Arabe* (Paris, 1857-59). He died in 1070. The influence which Ibn-Gebirol exerted on Arabian and Jewish philosophy cannot be too highly estimated. He certainly deserves to be called "the Jewish Plato," as Grätz chooses to name him; but the assertion that he was the *first* philosopher of the Middle Ages, and that his philosophical treatises were used by the scholastic philosophers, is an error, as Lewis (*History of Philosophy*, ii, 63) fully proves, although Munk, and after him Grätz, fell into the same mistake, as also Ginsburg, the writer of the article on Ibn-Gebirol in Kitto (*Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 356). From frequent quotations in Aben-Ezra's commentaries, it seems that Ibn-Gebirol must also have written some expositions of the Old-Test. Scriptures, though none such are known to us at present existing. Ibn-Gebirol also had a natural talent for verse-making. One of his hymns, entitled *The royal Diadem*, "a beautiful and pathetic poetical composition of profound philosophical sentiments and great devotion, forms an important part of the divine service on the evening preceding the great Day of Atonement with the devout Jews to the present day." See Grätz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, vi, 31 sq.; Sachs, *Religiöse Poesie d. Juden i. Spanien* (Berl. 1845), p. 3 sq., 213, etc.; Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie der Mittelalters*, p. 222; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 320 sq.

Ibn-Giath, ISAAC BEN-JEHUDAH, a Jewish Rabbi of a very distinguished family who resided in Lucena, not far from Cordova, was born about 1030. He was a very able philosopher and hymnologist, and well conversant with the Talmud. He is said to have written a *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, which has not as yet come to light. From the frequent quotations made from it by the best interpreters and lexicographers, it appears that it contained important contributions to the critical exposition of this difficult book. From the references to his writings made by Aben-Ezra (comp. comment. on Deut. x, 7; Psa. cxlvii, 3), Kimchi (Lexicon, under articles

שרק, צנח, עמת, סור, נבע, זכר), and Solomon ben-Melech (comment. on 2 Sam. xxii, 36), it is evident that Ibn-Giath must have also written some other exegetical and grammatical treatises, and that he materially contributed to the development of Biblical exegesis. His devotional poetry, which is rather inferior to Ibn-Gebirol's (q. v.), is used in the Jewish service to the present day. He died in 1089. See Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie d. Mittelalters*, p. 225 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 332 sq.; Sachs, *Die Religiöse Poesie d. Juden in Spanien* (Berlin, 1845), p. 46, etc., 255, etc.; Landshut, *A'mude Aboda* (Berl. 1857), fasciculus i, 111, etc.; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vi, 74.

Ibn-Gikatilla. See JOSEPH IBN-CHIQUITILLA.

Ibni'jah (Heb. *Yibniyah'*, יִבְנִיָּה, i. q. *Ibneiah;* Sept. Ἰεβανααί), the father of Reuel, which latter was the grandfather of the Meshullam, another Benjamite, who settled in Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (1 Chron. ix, 8). B.C. long ante 536.

Ibn-Jachja, David, a Jewish scholar, was born about 1440. He was a Rabbi at Lisbon, in Portugal, and had gained great celebrity by his scholarship when he was suddenly accused of giving aid to the Spanish Maranes (q. v.), who, having witnessed the *peculiar* practices of the Spanish disciples of Christ, preferred to return to the faith of their fathers. Ibn-Jachja was condemned to death, and barely escaped the punishment by a flight to Naples. Later, he removed to Constantinople, and taught the sciences. He died in 1504. His works are, *Leshon Limmodim*, a large Hebrew grammar; and *Shekel Hakkodesh*, on the metric and poetical laws of the new Hebrew dialect. See Carmoly, *Die Jachjiden*, p. 17; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, ix, 3; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Lit.* p. 462; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 2 sq.

Ibn-Jachja, Gedalja, a Jewish historian, was born at Imola about 1515. He deserves mention here on account of his work *Shalsheleth Hakkabala*, or *Chain of Tradition* (Zolkiew, 1804). It is a history of the Jews, and is divided into three parts, of which part first only is the *Shalsheleth*, or literary chronicle of rabbinism; the other parts treat not only of history proper, but include also natural history, pneumatology, and economics. He died about 1587.—Carmoly, *Die Jachjiden*, p. 33 sq.; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, ix, 435; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Lit.* p. 452; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 3.

Ibn-Jachja, Joseph b.-David, a distinguished Jewish commentator, was born at Florence in 1494. His ancestors were citizens of Spain, but had fled from the Iberian Peninsula on account of the religious persecutions which the Jews had to suffer, especially under John II. His education he received first at Verona, then at Imola and Padua, and he settled at Imola. He died, exhausted by excessive studies, in 1539. His works are, commentaries on the *Song of Songs*, *Ruth*, *Lamentations*, *Ecclesiastes*, and *Esther; Psalms*, *Proverbs*, and *Daniel* (transl. into Latin by Constantin l'Empereur [Amsterdam, 1633], with the Hebrew text and a refutation of anti-Christian passages). A special feature of these commentaries, which are all inserted in Frankfurter's Rabbinical Bible, is the midrashic lore contained in them, which is valuable to the historico-critical exegetist. Ibn-Jachja wrote also *Torah*, or "*The Law of Light*" (Bologna, 1538), a very valuable work on the theology of Judaism, in which he rejects the introduction of philosophy in the consideration of religious topics. See Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, ix, 235; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Lit.* p. 452; Jost, *Israelitische Annalen*, ii, 393 sq.; Ersch u. Gruber's *Allgem. Encyklop.* sec. ii, xxxi, 81 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* ii, 356; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 4.

Ibn-Jaish, BARUCH, a Jewish scholar, flourished at Cordova, in Spain, in the 15th century. He wrote commentaries on the Song of Songs (*The blessed Fountain*, etc., Constantinople, 1576), and on Ecclesiastes and Job (*The blessed Fountain of Job and Ecclesiastes*, Constantinople, 1576). "He generally gives the literal explanation of every passage according to the context, and tries to solve the grammatical difficulties of the text."—Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Literature*, ii, 357; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 12.

Ibn-Kastor. See ITZCHAKI.

Ibn-Koreish, JEHUDAH, one of the earliest Jewish lexicographers, flourished in the latter half of the 9th century at Tuhart or Tahort, in Africa, and was one of the first who wrote on comparative philology. He was thoroughly conversant not only with the Berber tongue, but also with the three Shemitic languages; he had carefully studied the traditions of the Jews and the Mohammedans, and was eminently qualified to write on the Hebrew language. and introduce frequent comparisons with the other Shemitic tongues. His works are, אֶגְרוֹן, a *Hebrew Lexicon* in alphabetical order, but with that peculiar arrangement which all works of this class were subject to at that time, viz. each group of words belonging to a letter was accompanied by introductions, one on those words which have only the letter in question for a radical theme, and another on the changes of that letter. The work has been lost, but its existence is attested by the fact that not only the author himself refers to it in another of his works, but also the great scholars of his and subsequent periods;—*Risâlet* (Heb. רסאלה), or a letter addressed to his Jewish brethren at Fez, in which he exhorts them to continue the study of the Aramaic Targum, and of the Aramaic as well as the Shemitic languages, without a thorough knowledge of which the Old-Test. Scriptures can only be imperfectly comprehended. After the introduction he divided the work into three parts. In Part I he arranged in alphabetic order all difficult Hebrew words that could only be properly understood from the Chaldee paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan ben-Uziel. Part II contained an explanation of Biblical Hebrew words found also in the Mishna and the Talmud. In Part III he instituted a comparison with the Arabic of all analogous Hebrew roots, forms of expressions, prefixes and suffixes, etc. This work is certainly a very important contribution to Hebrew philology, and it is only to be regretted that we do not possess it completely, since the first part breaks up with letter כ, and does not begin again till letter ת, from which Fürst (*Hebr. Dict.* vol. xxiii) infers that the author intended it only as a continuation of his (lost) *Hebrew Dictionary*. It has lately been published in the Arabic under the title *Epistola de studii Targum utilitate et de linguæ Chaldaicæ, Misnicæ, Talmudicæ, Arabicæ, vocabulorum item nonnullorum barbaricorum convenientia cum Hebræa;* ediderunt J. J. L. Bargès et D. R. Goldberg (Paris, 1857). The introduction, with specimens from the work, have been published in Arabic, with a German translation by Schnurrer, in Eichhorn's *Allgem. Bibliothek d. Biblisch. Literatur* (Lpz. 1790), iii, 951 sq.; the introduction has also been published with a German translation by Wetstein in the *Literaturblatt des Orients* (1845), iii, 2; and extracts are given by Ewald and Dukes, *Beiträge zur Geschichte d. Aeltesten Auslegung und Spracherklärung d. A. Test.* (Stuttgart, 1844), i, 116-23; ii, 117, 118. He wrote also סֵפֶר דִקְדּוּק, a Hebrew grammar, which Aben-Ezra used in the preparation of his own work. See, besides the works already referred to, Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, v, 293; Kitto, *Cyclop. Biblical Lit.* ii, 357; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 203.

Ibn-Latif or **Allatif**, ISAAC BEN-ABRAHAM, a Jewish philosopher, was born in Southern Spain about 1270. But little is known of his personal history. He devoted much of his time to the study of the Cabala, and became one of its most celebrated exponents in Spain. With greater correctness than Cabalists who preceded him, he advocated the doctrine that the worlds of spirit and of matter are closely allied, and likewise God and

his creation. The divine is in everything, and everything in the divine. He also believed in the power of prayer, but that man, in order to be accepted of God, must approach at least perfection; hence the most perfect of men, the prophets, interceded by prayer for the people. The development of the self-revelation of the divinity in the world, of the spirits, spheres, and bodies, Ibn-Latif explains by mathematical formulas. He died about 1290. Of his works, which are quite numerous, the following have been printed: *Iggereth hat-To-shubah*, replies to the questions of Judah ben-Naason (Prague, 1839, 8vo):—a Heb. *Commentary on Ecclesiastes* (Constantinople, s. a. 8vo). See Grätz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, vii, 220; Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, ii, 224; Carmoly, *Revue Orientale*, i, 61 sq.

Ibn-Librat. See DUNASH.

Ibn-Saktar. See ITZCHAKI.

Ibn-Sargado, AARON, also called AARON HA-COHEN BEN-JOSEPH, a Jewish scholar, flourished in Bagdad towards the middle of the 10th century. He was a wealthy merchant, but very fond of study, and, taking ground against Saadia (q. v.), for whose deposition from the "Gaonate" he expended large sums of money, shortly after Saadia's decease he was elected Gaon (spiritual head) of the academy at Pumbadita (943), and by his zeal for learning and his great wealth greatly furthered the interests of this academy at the expense of the Suran school, over which Saadia had presided. Ibn-Sargado, during the eighteen years of his presidency, devoted himself not only to the exposition of the O.-Test. Scriptures, but also quite extensively to the study of philosophy (comp. Munk, *Guide des égarés*, i, 462). He wrote a philosophical work and a *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, but they are not as yet known to us. From the fragments of the latter preserved by Aben-Ezra (Gen. xviii, 28; xxxiv, 30; xlix, 6, 7; Exod. x, 12; Lev. xviii, 6), we see that, though abiding by the traditional explanation of the Hebrew Scriptures, Ibn-Sargado was by no means a slavish follower of ancient opinions. See Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, v, 335 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bib. Lit.* ii, 357; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* iii, 246; Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* (1862), p. 297; Zunz, in Geiger's *Zeitschrift*, vol. iv (Stuttg. 1839), p. 389, etc.

Ibn-Saruk. See MENACHEM.

Ibn-Shoeib, JOEL, a Jewish commentator, flourished at Tudela in the latter half of the 15th century. But little is known of his personal history. His works show him to have been a man of considerable culture and great liberality of mind. He wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch, entitled *The Holocaust of Sabbath* (Ven. 1577); on the Psalms, entitled *Fearful in Praises* (Salonaica, 1568-69); on the Song of Songs, entitled *A brief Exposition* (Sabionetta, 1558); and an *Exposition of Lamentations* (Venice, 1589). In his commentary on the Psalms he maintained that pious Gentiles would have a share in the world to come, which, when we consider the severe persecutions they inflicted at this time on the Jews, is by no means a small concession on the part of Ibn-Shoeib.—Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bib. Lit.* ii, 358; Zunz, *Zur Gesch. u. Literatur* (Berl. 1845), p. 384. (J. H. W.)

Ibn-Sitta (בן זיטא), a distinguished Jew, flourished at Irak towards the close of the 9th century. He wrote a commentary on the Scriptures, of which fragments only are left. Such we find in Aben-Ezra (on Exod. xxi, 24, 35; xxii, 28). Saadia Gaon thought Ibn-Sitta of sufficient importance to refute his interpretations, while Aben-Ezra exercises his withering sarcasm upon him.—Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* ii, 358; Pinsker, *Likkute Kadmonioth* (Vienna, 1860), p. 43; Fürst, *Gesch. d. Karäerthums* (Lpz. 1862), p. 100, 173.

Ibn-Thofeil, an Arabian philosopher who flourished in the 12th century, wrote a work in which the existence of God is proved in so able a manner that the arguments remain unrefuted to this day. It was translated into Persian, Hebrew, and Latin. The last-named, by Ed. Pococke, was entitled *Philosophus autodidactus, sive epistola Abi Jaafor Ebn-Tophaïl de Hai Ebn-Yokdham* (Oxf. 1671 and 1700, 4to; and also in English by S. Ockley, Lond. 1708, 1731, 8vo, and other modern languages).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 752.

Ibn-Tibbon, Jehudah ben-Saul, a Jewish scholar of Spanish descent, was born at Lunel, France, about 1120. He was educated a physician, but his ardent love for the study of Hebrew led him to abandon the practice of his profession, and he devoted himself mainly to the translation into Hebrew of some of the most valuable works of able Jews written in Arabic. He died about 1190. His translations are *The Duties of the Heart* of Joseph b.-Bechai, the *Ethics* of Ibn-Gebirol, the *Kusari* of Judah Ha-Levi, the *Moral Philosophy* of Saadia Gaon, and the grammatical and lexicographical work of Ibn-Ganach (q. v.). All his translations bear his own pedantic character; they are literal, and therefore clumsy, and we can hardly see why he should have gained the surname of *prince of translators*, unless it was for the service which he rendered by presenting the Jews translations of works not otherwise accessible to them. He is also said to have written a work on the purity of the Hebrew language (סוד צחות הלשון), which is lost. See Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* ii, 358; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana* (col. 1374–76); Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vi, 241; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* iii, 401 sq.

Ibn-Tibbon, Samuel, son of the preceding, was born about 1160. He was educated by his father both in the Hebrew and cognate languages, and followed him in the practice of medicine. He was wild and even reckless in his youth, but finally became interested in his studies, and evinced greater skill as a translator than his father. He died about 1230. Besides translating philosophical works both of Jewish and heathen authors, among whom were Aristotle and Alfarabi, he wrote a commentary on Ecclesiastes (פירוש קהלת), which exists in MS. in several of the European libraries; and a commentary on Gen. i, 1-9, entitled מאמר יקוו המים (Presburg, 1837), being a dissertation on the creation.—Grätz *Gesch. d. Juden*, vi, 242; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bib. Lit.* ii, 358; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* iii, 402 sq.

Ibn-Tumart, ABDALLAH, a religious enthusiast, flourished in the second half of the 12th century in Northern Africa. He appeared before the simple-minded hordes of Barbary, and preached against the Sunnitical doctrine of the Mohammedan orthodoxy [see SUNNITES], and the literal interpretation of the verses of the Koran, and the Mohammedan belief that God feels and acts like man. His followers, on account of their belief in the strict unity of God without corporeal representation (*Tauchid*), called themselves *Almowachids*, or *Almohads*. Ibn-Tumart they recognised as *Mahdi*, or the God-sent Imam of Islam. Like Mohammed, he went forth to conquer by the sword the territories of the Almoravids, and his doctrine soon found followers throughout North-west Africa. See MOHAMMEDANS. (J. H. W.)

Ib'ri (Heb. *Ibri'*, עִבְרִי, an *Eberite* or "Hebrew;" Sept. has Ὠβδί v. r. Ἀβαί), the last named of "the sons of Merari by Jaaziah," i. e., apparently a descendant of Levi in the time of David (1 Chron. xxiv, 27). B.C. 1014.

Ibum is a name for the Jewish ceremony of the marriage of a childless widow by the brother of the deceased husband. See LEVIRATE LAW.

Ib'zan (Heb. *Ibtsan'*, אִבְצָן, from אָבַץ, to *shine*, hence *illustrious*; but accord. to Gesen. perh. *of tin*, or *grievous*, from the Chald.; Sept. Ἐβεσάν v. r. Ἀβαισσάν; Joseph. Ἀψάνης, *Ant.* v, 7, 13), the tenth "judge of Israel" (Judg. xii, 8–10). He was of Bethlehem,

probably the Bethlehem of Zebulun (so Michaelis and Hezel), and not of Judah (as Josephus says). He governed seven years, B.C. 1249-1243. The prosperity of Ibzan is marked by the great number of his children (thirty sons and thirty daughters), and his wealth by their marriages—for they were all married. Some have held, with little probability, that Ibzan was the same with Boaz.—Kitto.

Icard, CHARLES, a French Protestant divine, was born at St. Hippolyte, Languedoc, in February, 1636. He attended school at Anduze, Orange, and Nîmes, and concluded his theological studies at Geneva from 1655-58, and in 1659 went to Paris. After ordination by the provincial synod of Ay he was appointed pastor of La Norville, where he remained until 1668, when he accepted a pastorship at Nîmes. Under the influence of the persecutions which heralded the approaching revocation of the edict of Nantes, the Protestants, at the suggestion of Claude Brousson, formed a central committee for the protection of their general interests, and Icard was chosen to represent it at the Synod of Lower Languedoc, assembled at Uzès in 1632. In the mean time, the population of a part of Vivarais and Lower Languedoc having risen in arms to resist the persecution, the insurrection was extinguished in blood, and the members of the central committee, accused of being the instigators, were proceeded against with the utmost severity. Icard succeeded in reaching Geneva, and thence went to Neufchatel for greater security. While on his way, at Yverdun, he learned that he had been condemned, June 26, 1682, as contumacious, to die on the rack. He remained as pastor at Neufchatel until 1688, when he went to Bremen, and supplied a French congregation there. He died June 9, 1715. Icard wrote two *Sermons, Avis salutaire aux Eglises réformées de France* (Amst. 1685, 12mo), exhorting the Protestants not to give way under persecution. He also edited an edition of the *Institutions de Calvin* (first two books, Bremen, 1696, 1697, 4to; the whole, Bremen, 1713, fol.); and an edition of the *Entretiens d'un Père et de son Fils sur le Changement de Religion, par Josué de La Place.* See Hossat, *Détail abrégé de la Vie de Charles Icard* (in *Hist. crit. de la République des Lettres* (1717), xiv, 283-301; Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* xxv, 768.

Ice (קֶרַח, *ke'rach*, so called from its *smoothness*, Job vi, 16; xxviii, 29; elsewhere *cold*, "frost," Gen. xxxi, 40; Jer. xxxvi, 30; i. e. ice, Job xxxvii, 10; but "*crystal*" in Ezek. i, 32; or קֹרַח, *ko'rach*, id., poet. for *hail*, Psa. cxlvii, 17). See the above terms, and *climate* under PALESTINE.

Iceland, an island belonging to Denmark, situated between the North Atlantic and the Arctic Oceans, distant 130 miles from the south-east coast of Greenland, and about 850 miles west of Norway, extending between lat. 63° 24′ and 66° 33′ N., and long. 13° 31′ and 24°. The area is 39,756 square miles, of which only 15,300 are cultivated. The total population of Iceland was, according to the statistics of 1888, about 72,000 souls.

As early as 795 the eastern coast of Iceland was inhabited by some Irish monks, but it did not receive a settled population until 860, when king Harald Harfagr, of Norway, after conquering the other kings, made himself sole sovereign of the country, and induced large numbers of the malcontents to emigrate to Iceland. Nearly all the new-comers were pagans, and thus the republic which was established by them was thoroughly pagan. The legislation of Ulfliot (about 927) created the Althing, an assembly of the wisest men of all districts, which met annually to discuss the affairs of the country, and to give the necessary laws. The first Christian missionary among the Icelanders was Thorvaldr Kodransson (981-985), with the same Vidförli ("who has made wide journeys"), who was supported by Frederick, according to the legend, a Saxon bishop. With great vigor the missionary work was subsequently continued by king Olaf Tryggvason of Norway, who not only tried by persuasion, bribery, and intimidation to gain for the Christian religion all the Icelanders who came to Norway, but also sent missionaries to Iceland, and supported their labors by the whole influence which he could command. The first to go was the Icelander Stefnir Thorgilsson (996-997), followed by the Saxon priest Dankbrand, who, after many adventures, had become court chaplain of the king (997-999); two noble Icelanders, the "White Gizur," and Hjalti Skegjason, succeeded finally in effecting a compromise with the pagan chief functionary of the island, Thorgair of Ljosavatu, according to which Christianity was made the state religion of Iceland, while many reservations were made in favor of paganism (1000). The whole people were then baptized, part of them reluctantly, yet without open resistance. A few years later, king Olaf Haraldsson caused the last remnants of paganism to be effaced from the laws. Some traces, however, of the former religion remained in the faith and usages of the Christian Icelanders, particularly in their Church constitution. During the pagan period the erection and possession of a temple had been a private affair; as there was no separate order of priests, divine worship had been held in every temple by its owner; subsequently, when the political constitution of the island was regulated (965), a limited number (thirty-nine) of temples obtained a political importance, and every Icelander was obliged to connect himself with the owner of the principal temple as his subject, and to pay a contribution for the maintenance of the temple. Private temples were maintained beside the public, and the latter remained likewise the private property of the chiefs. The idea of chief temples ceased with the introduction of Christianity; but erection, dotation, and maintenance of the temples remained a private affair. The law only provided that the erection of a church involved the duty of maintaining it; and the clergy could compel the dotation of a church by delaying its consecration until dotation was provided for. Otherwise the administration of the property of the church by its owner was very arbitrary, and he had only to take care of the maintenance of the church and of the holding of divine worship. He either could take orders himself or hire another priest. In the former case the priest was more of a peasant, merchant, or a judge than a clergyman; in the latter he was financially dependent upon the owner of the temple, and, like other servants, obliged to perform domestic or military services. Iceland received its own and native bishop in 1055, having up to that time been only visited by missionary bishops. The bishop enjoyed the benefit of the old temple duties; otherwise he had to live out of his own means. Under the second bishop, Gizur, the see was endowed, and permanently established at Skalahold; subsequently (about 1106) a second see was established at Holar, to which was given the jurisdiction of the northern district, while the three other districts remained subject to the bishop of Skalahold. The bishops were elected by the people; the priests by the owners of the several churches. Thus the clergy were less independent than in other countries, and consequently less powerful. Their influence somewhat increased when bishop Gizur, in 1097, prevailed upon the National Assembly to introduce the tithe, and when the bishops Thorlakr Runolfson and Retill Thorsteinson, by compiling the Church laws, gained a firm basis (1123: it was published in 1776 by Grim Joh. Thorkelin, under the title *Jus ecclesiasticum vetus, sive Thorlaco-Ketillianum*, or *Kristinrettr hinn gamli*). Still the condition of the Icelandic Church continued to remain in many particulars different from that of other churches. Lay patronage was recognised to its fullest extent; no celibacy separated the clergy from the people; even the bishops were generally married. The bishops, though they had a seat in the National Assembly, had no separate ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and marriage and other affairs were regulated contrary to Church law.

The Church of Iceland was at first subordinate to the archbishopric of Bremen and Hamburg; when the archbishopric of Lund was established (1103), Iceland was transferred to it; finally, it was transferred to the new archbishopric of Nidaros. About the middle of the 13th century the island became subject to the crown of Norway, and was consequently affected by the war between Church and State which took place in that country. This chiefly concerned the patronage of laymen, and ended with the adoption of a new Church law introduced about 1297 by bishop Arni. (This Church law was published in 1777 by Grim Joh. Thorkelin, under the title *Jus ecclesiasticum novum sive Arnæanum*, or *Kristinnrettr inn nyi*.)

The inner condition of the people was anything but satisfactory, as immorality and other vices appear to have prevailed to a large extent among the laity as well as among the clergy. The convents which had arisen since the 12th century fully participated in the general degeneration. Externally all classes of the people showed a strong attachment to the Church of Rome, and three natives of the island obtained a place among the saints of the Church—Thorlakr, Jon, and Gudmundr; the last named, however, was not formally canonized.

The Reformation soon found a number of adherents; among the earliest and most devoted was Oddr Gottschalksson, the author of the first translation of the New Testament into Icelandic (printed at Roeskilde, 1540). The Danish government, of which Iceland formed a dependency since the union of Norway with Denmark (1397), endeavored to introduce the Reformation, which in 1536 had been declared to be the religion of the state by the Diet of Copenhagen, by force; but the bishops, especially bishop Arason of Holar, made a determined, and at length an armed opposition, which, however, finally (1550) ended in his capture and execution. This put an end to the Church of Rome in Iceland, and in the next year (1551) the Reformation was fully carried through.

The real improvement in the condition of the Church was, however, only gradual. Many of the customs of the mediæval Church, such as the use of the Latin language at divine service, maintained themselves for a long time; and the same was the case with the ignorance and the immorality of the clergy and the people. But gradually these defects were remedied by the establishment of learned schools in connection with the two cathedrals (1552); by the establishment of a printing-press at Holar by the excellent bishop Gudbrandr Thorlakson (1574); and in particular by the new translation of the Bible by this bishop, a service that contributed largely to a thorough reform of the Church, which now belongs to the best-educated portions of the Protestant world.

As regards the present constitution of the Church of Iceland, it resembles in its principal features that of Denmark, yet not without preserving some of its own peculiarities. The sovereign is the chief bishop (*summus episcopus*), who exercises his authority partly through the bishops, partly through secular officers. The bishops, in the election of whom the people take part, occupy the position of superintendents, and still have an extended jurisdiction. At the close of the 18th century the see of Skalahold was transferred to Reykjavik, and somewhat later (1825) a cathedral was established at Langarnes, near Reykjavik. The episcopal see of Holar had previously (in 1801) been abolished, and the whole island placed under one bishop. Next to the bishops are the provosts, whose office was in the Middle Ages chiefly of a financial nature, and therefore sometimes occupied by laymen. Since the Reformation (1573-1574) the dignity has been wholly of an ecclesiastical character, and includes the right and duty of superintending large districts. On the whole, there are 19 provosts, each of whom is placed over a number of parishes. The pastors were at first appointed by the bishops, contrary to the provisions of the Danish Church constitution, but since 1563 they have been elected, in accordance therewith, by the congregation, under the superintendence of the provost. To the royal bailift was reserved the right of investing the pastor elect with his office. Subsequently the manner of appointment was somewhat modified, the appointing power being given to the bailiff, and a right of co-operation to the bishop. To the king of Denmark was reserved the right of sanctioning the appointment to one of the forty-seven benefices, whose yearly income is from 40 to 100 dollars annually. Only five of the 299 churches yield an income higher than 100 dollars. Some clergymen have an income of no more than five dollars annually. All have therefore to depend for their support chiefly on fees and on the proceeds of the lands connected with the churches. See Maurer, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vii, 90; Finnus Johannæus, *Histor. Eccles. Islandiæ* (tom. iv, Havniæ, 1772-78; extending to the year 1740, and continued till 1840 under the same title by Petur Peturson, Copenhagen, 1841); Münter, *Kirchengesch. von Denmark u. Norwegen*, vol. i-iii (Leipzig, 1823-33); Maurer, *Die Bekehrung des norweg. Stammes zum Christenthume* (Munich, 1855-56, 2 vols.); Harbon, *Om reformationen i Island* (Copenh. 1843). (A. J. S.)

Ich'abod (Heb. *I-kabôd'* אִי־כָבוֹד, *Where* is the *glory?* i. q. There is *no glory*, i. e. *inglorious;* Sept. Ἰωχαβήδ v. r. Ἐχαβώδ, and even Οὐαιχαβώδ, etc.), the son of Phinehas and grandson of Eli. The pains of labor came upon his mother when she heard that the ark of God was taken, that her husband was slain in battle, and that these tidings had proved fatal to his father Eli. They were death-pains to her; and when those around sought to cheer her, saying, "Fear not, for thou hast borne a son," she only answered by giving him the name of I-chabod, adding, "The glory is departed from Israel" (1 Sam. iv, 19-22). B.C. 1125. The name again occurs in 1 Sam. xiv, 3, where his son Ahitub is mentioned as the father of the priest Ahiah.

Ichthys (Greek, *ἰχθύς*, a *fish*), in Christian archæology a symbol of Christ. The word is found on many seals, rings, lamps, and tombstones belonging to the earliest Christian times. It is formed of the initial letters of our Saviour's names and titles in Greek: Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Θεοῦ Ὑιός, Σωτήρ, *Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour.* Tertullian speaks of Christians accustomed to please themselves with the name *pisciculi*, "fishes," to denote that they were born again into Christ's religion by water. He says, "Nos pisciculi secundum ἰχθύν, nostrum Jesum Christum, in aquâ nascimur" (*De Bapt.* i, 2). See FISH. Baptismal fonts were often ornamented with the figure of a fish; several such remain in French cathedrals. Optatus, bishop of Milesia, in the 4th century, first pointed out the word ἰχθύς as formed of the initials of Christ's titles as above given, and from that time forward "Oriental subtlety repeated to satiety" religious similitudes drawn from the sea. Julius Africanus calls Christ "the great fish taken by the fish-hook of God, and whose flesh nourishes the whole world." Augustine says that "ἰχθύς is the mystical name of Christ, because he descended alive into the depths of this mortal life—into the abyss of waters" (*De Civit. Dei*). See Didron, *Christian Iconography*, i, 344 sq.; Münter, *Sinnbilder d. alt Christen* (Alt. 1825); Augusti, *Archäol.* i, 121 sq.; Pearson, *On the Creed;* Riddle, *Christ. Antiquit.* p. 184. See ICONOGRAPHY.

Ico'nium (Ἰκόνιον, of unknown derivation), a town, formerly the capital of Lycaonia (according to Ptol. v, 6, 16; but Phrygia according to Strabo, xii, 568; Xenoph. *Anab.* i, 2, 19; Pliny, v, 25; and even Pisidia according to Ammian. Marcel. xiv, 2), as it is now, by the name of *Koniyeh*, of Karamania, in Asia Minor. It is situated in N. lat. 37° 51′, E. long. 32° 40′, about 120 miles inland from the Mediterranean. It was on the

great line of communication between Ephesus and the western coast of the peninsula on one side, and Tarsus, Antioch, and the Euphrates on the other. We see this indicated by the narrative of Xenophon (*l. c.*) and the letters of Cicero (*ad Fam.* iii, 8; v, 20; xv, 4). When the Roman provincial system was matured, some of the most important roads intersected one another at this point, as may be seen from the map in Leake's *Asia Minor*. These circumstances should be borne in mind when we trace Paul's journeys through the district. Iconium was a well-chosen place for missionary operations. The apostle's first visit was on his first circuit, in company with Barnabas; and on this occasion he approached it from Antioch in Pisidia, which lay to the west. A.D. 44. From that city he had been driven by the persecution of the Jews (Acts xiii, 50, 51). There were Jews in Iconium also; and Paul's first efforts here, according to his custom, were made in the synagogue (xiv, 1). The results were considerable both among the Hebrew and Gentile population of the place (ibid.). We should notice that the working of miracles in Iconium is emphatically mentioned (xiv, 3). The intrigues of the Jews again drove him away; he was in danger of being stoned, and he withdrew to Lystra and Derbe, in the eastern and wilder part of Lycaonia (xiv, 6). Thither also the enmity of the Jews of Antioch and Iconium pursued him; and at Lystra he was actually stoned and left for dead (xiv, 19). After an interval, however, he returned over the old ground, revisiting Iconium, and encouraging the Church which he had founded there (xiv, 21, 22). A.D.47. These sufferings and difficulties are alluded to in 2 Tim. iii, 11; and this brings us to the consideration of his next visit to this neighborhood, which was the occasion of his first practically associating himself with Timothy. Paul left the Syrian Antioch, in company with Silas (Acts xv, 40), on his second missionary circuit; and, travelling through Cilicia (xv, 41), and up through the passes of Taurus into Lycaonia, approached Iconium from the east, by Derbe and Lystra (xvi, 1, 2). Though apparently a native of Lystra, Timothy was evidently well known to the Christians of Iconium (xvi, 2); and it is not improbable that his circumcision (xvi, 3) and ordination (1 Tim. i, 18; iv, 14; vi, 12; 2 Tim. i, 6) took place there. On leaving Iconium, Paul and his party travelled to the north-west; and the place is not mentioned again in the sacred narrative, though there is little doubt that it was visited by the apostle again in the early part of his third circuit (Acts xviii, 23). From its position it could not fail to be an important centre of Christian influence in the early ages of the Church. The curious apocryphal legend of St. Thecla, of which Iconium is the scene, must not be entirely passed by. The "Acta Pauli et Theclæ" are given in full by Grabe (*Spicil.* vol. i), and by Jones (*On the Canon*, ii, 353-411); and in brief by Conybeare and Howson (*St. Paul*, i, 197). The Church planted at this place by the apostle continued to flourish (Hierocles, p. 675) until, by the persecutions of the Saracens, and afterwards of the Seljukians, who made it one of their sultanies, it was nearly extinguished. But some Christians of the Greek and Armenian churches, with a Greek metropolitan bishop, are still found in the suburbs of the city, not being permitted to reside within the walls.

Koniyeh is situated at the foot of Mount Taurus (Mannert, vi, 1, p. 195 sq.), upon the border of the lake Trogitis, in a fertile plain, rich in valuable productions, particularly apricots, wine, cotton, flax, and grain. The circumference of the town is between two and three miles, and beyond these are suburbs not much less populous than the town itself, which has in all about 30,000 inhabitants, but according to others 80,000. The walls, strong and lofty, and flanked with square towers, which, at the gates, are placed close together, were built by the Seljukian sultans of Iconium, who seem to have taken considerable pains to exhibit the Greek inscriptions, and the remains of architecture and sculpture belonging to the ancient Iconium, which they made use of in building the walls. The town, suburbs, and gardens are plentifully supplied with water from streams which flow from some hills to the westward, and which, to the north-east, join the lake, which varies in size with the season of the year. In the town carpets are manufactured, and blue and yellow leathers are tanned and dried. Cotton, wool, hides, and a few of the other raw productions which enrich the superior industry and skill of the manufacturers of Europe, are sent to Smyrna by caravans. The most remarkable building in Koniyeh is the tomb of a priest highly revered throughout Turkey, called Hazrit Mevlana, the founder of the Mevlevi Dervishes. The city, like all those renowned for superior sanctity, abounds with dervishes, who meet the passenger at every turning of the streets, and demand paras with the greatest clamor and insolence. The bazaars and houses have little to recommend them to notice. (Kinneir's *Travels in Asia Minor;* Leake's *Geography of Asia Minor;* Arundell's *Tour in Asia Minor;* Niebuhr, *Trav.* i, 113, 149; Hassel, *Erdbeschr. Asiens*, ii, 197; Rosenmüller, *Bib. Geog.* i, 1, p. 201, 207; Hamilton's *Researches in Asia Minor*, ii, 205 sq.; etc. For the early and Grecian history of this place, and the fanciful etymologies of the name, see Anthon's *Class. Dict.* s. v.)

Coin of Iconium.

Iconoclasm, or IMAGE-BREAKING (*εἰκών, image; κλάζειν, to break*), is a name for the struggle in the Christian Church in the Middle Ages, which, as its name indicates, had for its object the destruction of all images used for worship in the churches. From the age of Constantine the reverence for pictures and images constantly increased, as they were supposed to possess a certain sanctity or miraculous power; and at so early an age as that of Augustine we hear him confess that many had fallen into the superstition of adoring pictures rather than the Deity. But the Iconoclastic controversy assumed a more serious aspect in the 8th century, when the emperor Leo III, the Isaurian (717-741), who, previous to his accession to the throne, had associated much with Jews and Mohammedans, on taking the side of the Iconoclasts in the tenth year of his reign, issued an edict against the use of images in churches. He was influenced, no doubt, by a desire to draw into the Christian Church the Mohammedans and Jews, who, aside from their simple theistic faith, were debarred from joining the Christians by an aversion to the use of images. But the people—who felt that "it swept away from their churches objects hallowed by devotion, and supposed to be endowed with miraculous agency; objects of hope and fear, of gratitude and immemorial veneration"—rose up in masses against the edict, and violent disturbances, especially at Constantinople, where the patriarch himself sided with them, were of daily occurrence. The superior power of the government, however, soon made itself felt, the pictures were destroyed, the insurrectionists slain or banished, and order restored, after a fearful massacre. Yet, notwithstanding all the penalties which, by order of Leo, were inflicted on the opponents of Iconoclasm, champions in favor of the use of images in churches rose up. Among them was the great John of Damascus (q. v.), who, after adducing the ordinary arguments for images with greater elegance and ingenuity than any other writer of his day, went forth in bitter invectives against the Iconoclasts as enemies of Christ, the Virgin, and the saints. "Pictures are standing memorials of triumph over the devil; whosoever destroys them is a friend of

the devil, a Manichæan, and a Docetist." The pope himself, Gregory III, put all the opposers of images under ban; but, despite this and other efforts on his part, Leo's successor, Constantinus Copronymus, went even further than Leo. Having obtained the condemnation of image-worship in the Synod of Constantinople in A.D. 754, he enforced it against the clergy and the most noted of the monks. Many monks, who, together with the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, were in favor of the images, and were unwilling to subscribe to the decrees of the council, were cruelly persecuted. The emperor Leo IV also enforced this law; but his widow, Irene, one of the basest of women, used the tendency of the people in favor of image-worship to enable her to ascend the throne. With the aid of the newly-elected patriarch of Constantinople, Terasios, she called a synod at Nicæa in 787, wherein the adoration of images by prostration, kissing, and incensing was re-established. Matters remained in this state during the reigns of the emperors Nicephorus and Michael (802–813), although there still were Iconoclasts to be found. But as, during the strife, the adoration of images had passed into the grossest idolatry, Leo V (813-821) caused it to be abolished by the Synod of Constantinople, and punished those who persisted in it (mostly monks, with Theodoros Studita at their head). Michael II (821–824), who overthrew Leo, tolerated the worship of images without thereby satisfying the image-worshippers; but Theophilus, his son (829-842), on his sole accession to the government, renewed all the edicts against them. After his death, his widow restored image-worship in 842, and instituted the festival of the Orthodoxy, which is yet kept by the Greek Church in remembrance of this restoration (see Buddæus, *De festo orthodoxo*, Jena, 1726). The Greek Christians have since retained images in their churches, but without worshipping them. The Latins also decided that the images should be retained, but not worshipped; while the French Church declared most positively against image-worship in the Synod of Gentiliacum in 767, and in 790 Charlemagne presented to the Council of Nicæa a memorial, *De impio imaginum cultu* (*Libri Carolini*). Thereupon images were allowed to be retained for purposes of education only. At the Synod of Frankfort in 794, Charlemagne, with the assent of the English Church, caused image-worship to be condemned. After the 9th century the popes were gradually more inclined towards image-worship, and it soon became general throughout the West. The Roman Catholic Church continued to favor the practice, and the Council of Trent decided formally in its twenty-fifth session that the images of Christ, of the holy Virgin, and of other saints are to be placed in churches; that they ought to receive due veneration, not because they have any divinity or virtue in them, but because honor is thus reflected upon those whom they represent; so that the people, by kissing the images, bowing to them, etc., pray to Christ and honor the saints whom the images represent. This image-worship led to pilgrimages to the shrines of saints great in repute for their power. The Greek Church admits only the painted and raised images, not carved figures, like the Church of Rome. All the Christian sects in the East are given to image-worship with the exception of the Nestorians, the Christians of St. Thomas, and the Russian Roskolniki. The German Reformers, although opposing image-worship, held somewhat different opinions on the subject: thus Luther tolerated images as an ornament, and also as edifying mementoes, and condemned the destruction of the images and the altars at Wittenberg in 1522. The Swiss Reformers opposed images in any shape or for any purpose, and had them taken out of all the churches—often with great violence, as in the Netherlands. They are not even now tolerated in the Reformed Church, nor in the particular denominations that have sprung from it. Mohammedanism proscribes image-worship; it even forbids the reproduction of the image of any living being, though it be not for the purpose of worshipping it. See Wessenberg, *Die christlichen Bilder, ein Beforderungs mittel d. christl. Sinnes* (Constanz, 1827, 2 vols.); Schlosser, *Gesch. der Bilderstürmenden Kaiser* (Frankf. ad. M. 1812); Marx, *Der Bilderstreit der Byzantinischen Kaiser* (Trier, 1839); *Ketzer Lex.* ii, 287; Milman's Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of Rom. Emp.* v, 10 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, ii, 293 sq.; Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, s. v. Bilder; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* book viii, ch. viii; Butler, *Eccles. Hist.* (Phila. 1868), i, 360 sq.; Ranke, *History of the Popes*, i, 19–25. See IMAGE-WORSHIP. (J. H. W.)

Iconoclasts. See ICONOCLASM.

Iconodulists. See IMAGE-WORSHIP.

Iconography (εἰκών, *image*, and γράφω, *I describe*), the science of so-called "Christian art" in the Middle Ages. It includes, therefore, the history and description of images, pictures, mosaics, gems, emblems, etc. There exist in our day many exquisite specimens of Christian iconography, which are preserved in libraries and museums, and are invaluable to us in determining the exact history of this "Christian art." The character of the illustrations, the form of the letters, suffice to determine the age and country where the work was produced. Thus a comparison of MSS. of Eastern and Western Europe brings before us the several stages which mark the growth of Christian iconography. See ILLUMINATION, ART OF. The most important modern work on the subject is Didron, *Manuel d'Iconographie Chrétienne* (Paris, 1845, 8vo); trans. into English, *Christian Iconography*, vol. i (London, 1851, 12mo). Older works are, Paleotti, *De imag. sacr. et profanis* (Ingolst. 1594, 4to); Molanus, *De Pict. et Imagg. Sacris* (Louv. 1570); *De Historia Sacr. Imagg. et Picturarum* (1619, 12mo); Münter, *Sinnbilder der Alten Christen* (Altona, 1825, 2 vols. 4to); Wessenberg, *Die Christl. Bilder* (Constance, 1827). See IMAGE-WORSHIP. (J. H. W.)

Iconolatry (εἰκών, *image*, and λατρεία, *worship*), the worship or adoration of images. Hence image-worshippers are called *Iconolatræ*, or Iconolaters. See IMAGE-WORSHIP.

Iconomachy. See ICONOCLASM.

Iconostăsis (εἰκονόστασις) is that part of an Eastern church which corresponds to the *altar-rails* in English churches. It is often mistaken for the rood-screen (q. v.), which in its general arrangement it resembles, only (the mysteries being absolutely to be veiled from the eyes of the people) the panels are solid to the top. The rood-screen separates nave and choir; the iconostasis, however, separates choir and bema. "It has three doors; that in the centre conducting directly to the *bema;* that to the right to the *diaconicon;* that of the left to the *prothesis*, through which, of course, the great entrance is made. On the right of the central door, on entering, is the icon of our Lord; on the left, that of the mother of God; the others are arranged according to the taste or devotion of the architect or founder." The earliest iconostasis is believed to be the one remaining in the Arian crypt-church of Tepekerman, in the Crimea, which probably dates from about A.D. 350.—Neale, *Hist. Eastern Church*, Introd. i, 191 sq.

Ida, first abbess of the convent of Argensoles, flourished in the first half of the 13th century. She was a remarkable woman, very learned, and acknowledged to have disputed on the most intricate theological questions with great ability. She died in 1226. Her life was written by a monk of Citeaux, but remains in MS. form. —*Histoire Litt. de la France*, xviii, 251; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 174.

Id'alah (Heb. *Yidalah'*, יִדְאֲלָה, probably *exalted;* Sept. Ἰαδηλά), a city near the western border of Zebulon, mentioned between Shimron and Bethlehem (Josh. xix, 15). According to Schwarz, it is called *Chirii* in the Talmud, and is identical with the village *Kellah al-*

Chirê, six English miles south-west of Shimron or Semunie (*Palestine*, p. 172). He doubtless refers to the place marked on Robinson's map as *Kulat el-Kireh*, in the valley of the Kishon, south-west of Semunieh or Simonias; a position not improbable, especially if marked by the ruins on the north side of the river. Dr. Robinson, who afterwards visited it, calls it "*Jeida*, a miserable village with no traces of antiquity" (*Later Researches*, p. 113); but Van de Velde shows that it actually has many marks, although now much obliterated, of being an old site (*Memoir*, p. 322).

Idacius or **Idathius**, surnamed CLARUS, a Spanish prelate, was born in the first half of the 4th century. After his accession to the bishopric of Emerida he distinguished himself by the intemperate zeal with which, together with Ithacius (q. v.), bishop of Ossonoba, he opposed the heresy of Priscillian (q. v.). He wrote a refutation of the latter's doctrine under the title *Apologeticus*, which is now lost. In 388, after the death of the emperor Maximus, who had persecuted the Priscillianists, Idacius resigned his bishopric. Having subsequently attempted to regain it, he was exiled, and died about the year 392. According to Sulpitius Severus, Idacius's conduct was less severely judged by his contemporaries than that of Ithacius. The writings ascribed to him are given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. v. See Sulpitius Severus, *Historia Sacra;* Isidore of Seville, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis;* Antonio, *Bibl. Hispana vetus*, i, 172; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxix, 775; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 111 sq.; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* i, 214 sq. See PRISCILLIANISTS.

Idacius OF LAMEGO (*Lamecensis*), who became bishop of Gallicia in 427, distinguished himself by his opposition to the Manichæans, whom he sought to drive from Spain. He is supposed to have died in 469. He is the author of a history, a continuation of the Chronicles of St. Hieronymus, beginning with the year 379 and ending with 468. The assertion that this work originated with Pelagius, bishop of Osiedo, in the 12th century, is by no means satisfactorily proved. It has often been printed and annotated, as by Sirmond, *Opp.* vol. ii; Bouquet, *Scriptt. Franc.* vol. i; and best by Florez Espann. *Sagrada*, iv, 345 sq. He is also supposed to be the author of *Fasti consulares.*—Aschbach, *Kirch.-Lex.* iii, 402.

Id'bash (Heb. *Yidbash'*, יִדְבָּשׁ, prob. *honeyed;* Sept. Ἰγαβής v. r. Ἰεβδάς, Vulg. *Jedebos*), a descendant of Judah, who, with his two brothers and a sister (*the Tselelponite*), are said (1 Chron. iv, 3, according to the Auth. Vers.) to be "of the father of Etam," probably meaning of the lineage of the founder of that place, or perhaps they were themselves its settlers. B.C. cir. 1612. See JEZREEL 2.

Id'do, the name of several men in the Old Testament, of different forms in the Hebrew.

1. *Iddo'* (עִדּוֹ, *timely*, or born to a *festival;* Sept. Ἀδδί, Vulg. *Addo*), a Levite, son of Joah and father of Zerah (1 Chron. vi, 21); called more accurately perhaps ADAIAH in ver. 41.

2. *Yiddo'* (יִדּוֹ, *lovely;* Sept. Ἰαδδαΐ, Vulg. *Jaddo*), son of Zechariah, and David's viceroy of the half tribe of Manasseh east (1 Chron. xxvii, 21). B.C. 1014.

3. *Iddo'* (עִדּוֹא, a prolonged form of No. 1; Sept. Ἀδδώ, Vulg. *Addo*), the father of Ahinadab, which latter was Solomon's purveyor in the district of Mahanaim (1 Kings iv, 14). B.C. cir. 995.

4. *Iddo'* (עִדּוֹ, same as first name, 2 Chron. xii, 15; xiii, 22; Sept. Ἀδδώ, Vulg. *Addo*) or *Yedo'* (יֶעְדּוֹ, 2 Chron. ix, 29, margin, but *Yedi'*, יֶעְדִּי, text; both less accurate forms for the last name; Sept. has Ἰωήλ, Vulg. *Addo*, A. Vers. "Iddo"), a prophet of Judah, who wrote the history of Rehoboam and Abijah; or rather, perhaps, who, in conjunction with Seraiah, kept the public rolls during their reigns (2 Chron. xii, 15); and who in that capacity recorded certain predictions against Jeroboam (2 Chron. ix, 29; although Bertheau, ad loc., and Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.*, 3d ed., i, 216, think this a different person). B.C. post 953. It seems from 2 Chron. xiii, 22 that he named his book מִדְרָשׁ, *Midrash*, or "Exposition." Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 9, 1) states that this Iddo (Ἰαδών) was the prophet who was sent to Jeroboam at Bethel, and consequently the same that was slain by a lion for disobedience to his instructions (1 Kings xiii); and many commentators have followed this statement.—Kitto. He is also identified with Oded (see Jerome on 2 Chron. xv, 1).

5. *Iddo'* (עִדּוֹ, same name as last, Zech. i, 1, elsewhere עִדּוֹא, id.; but עִדְּיא, *Iddi'*, apparently by error, in Neh. xii, 16; Sept. Ἀδδώ, but Ἀδαΐας in Neh. xii, 4, and Ἀδαδαΐ in Neh. xii, 16; Vulg. *Addo*, but *Adaja* in Neh. xii, 16), the father of Barachiah and grandfather of the prophet Zechariah (Zech. i, 1, 7; comp. Ezra v, 1; vi, 14; Neh. xii, 16). He was one of the chief priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 4). B.C. 536.

6. *Iddo'* (אִדּוֹ, *mishap;* Sept. omits, Vulg. *Eddo*), chief of the Jews of the Captivity established at Casiphia, a place of which it is difficult to determine the position. It was to him that Ezra sent a requisition for Levites and Nethinim, none of whom had yet joined his caravan. Thirty-eight Levites and 250 Nethinim responded to his call (Ezra viii, 17-20). B.C. 459. It would seem from this that Iddo was a chief person of the Nethinim, descended from those Gibeonites who were charged with the servile labors of the tabernacle and Temple. This is one of several circumstances which indicate that the Jews, in their several colonies under the Exile, were still ruled by the heads of their nation, and allowed the free exercise of their worship.

7. See JADAN.

Idealism (from *idea*) is a term given to several systems of philosophy, and therefore varying in its signification according to the meaning which they severally attach to the word *idea*. Until the 17th century, when Descartes came forward with his *Discourse on Method* (1637), it had the signification which Plato gave to it, and was understood to refer to the Platonic doctrine of eternal forms (ἰδέαι) existing in the divine mind, according to which the world and all sensible things were framed. "Plato agreed with the rest of the ancient philosophers in this—that all things consist of matter and form, and that the matter of which all things were made existed from eternity without form; but he likewise believed that there are eternal forms of all possible things which exist without matter, and to those eternal and immaterial forms he gave the name of ideas. In the Platonic sense, then, *ideas* were the patterns according to which the deity fashioned the phenomenal or ectypal world" (Reid, *Intellectual Powers*, Ess. i, chap. ii). The word was used in this sense not only in philosophy, but also in literature, down to the 17th century, as in Spenser, Shakspeare, Hooker, and Milton. Thus Milton, in his *Paradise Lost:*

> "God saw his works were good,
> Answering his fair *idea*."

Sir William Hamilton, who informs us that the change of signification of *idea* was first introduced by David Buchanan in 1636, one year earlier than Descartes, says in his *Discussions*, p. 70: "The fortune of this word is curious. Employed by Plato to express the real forms of the intelligible world, in lofty contrast with the unreal images of the sensible, it was lowered by Descartes, who extended it to the objects of our consciousness in general. When, after Gassendi, the school of Condillac had analyzed our highest faculties into our lowest, the *idea* was still more deeply degraded from its high original. Like a fallen angel, it was relegated from the sphere of divine intelligence to the atmosphere of human sense, till at last *ideologie* (more correctly *idealogie*), a

word which could only *properly* suggest an *à priori* scheme, deducing our knowledge from the intellect, has in France become the name peculiarly distinctive of that philosophy of mind which exclusively derives our knowledge from the senses." Instead of employing the terms *image*, *species*, *phantasm*, etc., with reference to the mental representation of external things, as had previously been done, Descartes adopted the word *idea*. In this use of the word he was followed by other philosophers, as Leibnitz and Locke, who desired the word to stand for "whatever is the object of the understanding when a man thinks." Hence the mental impression that we are supposed to have when thinking of the sun, without seeing the actual object, is called our idea of the sun. The idea is thus in contrast with the sensation, or the feeling that we have when the senses are engaged directly or immediately upon the thing itself. The sensation is the result of the pressure of the object, and declares an external reality; the impression persisting after the thing has gone, and recoverable by mental causes without the original, is the idea. Although the word in this application may be so guarded as to lead to no bad consequences, Reid (*Intell. Pow.* Ess. i, chap. i) most vehemently protested against its use in such a sense, holding that it gave countenance to the setting up of a new and fictitious element in the operations of the mind. But this raises the great question of metaphysics, namely, the exact nature of our knowledge of an external world. Bishop Berkeley (q. v.), however, must be regarded as the true representative of modern idealism. He held that "the qualities of supposed objects cannot be perceived distinct from the mind that perceives them; and these qualities, it will be allowed, are all that we can know of such objects. If, therefore, there were external bodies, it is impossible we should ever know it; and if there were not, we should have exactly the same reason for believing there were as we now have. All, therefore, which really exists is spirit, or 'the thinking principle'—ourselves, our fellow-men, and God. What we call ideas are presented to us by God in a certain order of succession, which order of successive presentation is what we mean by the laws of nature." This mode of speculation of bishop Berkeley, which he defended with so much acuteness, and which Lewis (*Hist. of Phil.* ii, 283) now goes forth to defend, claiming that the bishop's critics misunderstood him, he held to be the only possible true view of our nature and the government of God. But there is no question that, whatever benefits it may have bestowed upon the bishop and his immediate disciples, it has been found, practically, to lead to *scepticism*. "By taking away the grounds of a belief which is both natural and universal, and which cannot, at first, be even doubted without a severe exercise of thought, it shook men's faith in all those primary truths which are at once the basis of their knowledge and the guides of their conduct. It *seemed* to throw distrust on the evidence of the senses, as if really invalidated the spontaneous conclusions which every man inevitably forms from that evidence." This theory is conclusively proved by the conduct of Hume; for, if a main pillar of the edifice could so easily be shaken, what was there to hinder from throwing down the whole fabric? Beginning where Berkeley began, Hume proceeded much farther, and left unassailed hardly one article of human faith. He denied the reality not only of the object perceived, but of the mind perceiving. He reduced all thinking existence to a succession of rapidly fleeting ideas, each one being known only at the instant of its manifestation to consciousness, and then fading away, leaving no surely recognisable trace of itself on the memory, and affording no ground for an anticipation of the future. We do not even know, he maintains, that any one thing depends upon another in the relation of an effect to its cause. We know no true cause whatever, and our only idea of power is a fiction and a blunder. The conclusion of the whole matter, according to his philosophy, is, not the mere negation of this or that positive belief, but universal distrust of the human faculties, considered as means for the acquisition of truth. They contradict each other, and leave nothing certain except that nothing can be known. See HUME; REID. The German philosophers Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, who are often classed among the idealistic school, used the word *idea* in the Platonic or transcendental sense. Hegel, on the other hand, modified the use of the word to such an extent that his idealism does not only deserve to be called *absolute*-idealism, but much more properly pantheistic, no less than the doctrine of the Eleatics anciently, or of Spinoza in modern times. It is thus apparent, from the looseness of the application of the word *idea*, and the danger of its not conveying a *definite* signification, that we need a general word in the English language which may more accurately express the contrast to sensation or to actuality. But, as no better has yet been found, it is difficult to avoid the use of *ideality*, "being what is common to memory and to imagination, and expressing the mind as not under the present impression of real objects, but as, by its own tenacity and associating powers, having those objects to all practical ends before its view. Thus all our sensations, whether of sight, hearing, touch, taste, or smell, and all the feelings that we have in the exercise of our moving energies, become transformed into ideas when, without the real presence of the original agency, we can deal with them in the way of pursuit or avoidance, or can discriminate and compare them, nearly as if in their first condition as sensation." Sir W. Hamilton, in his *Lectures on Logic* (i, 126), has endeavored to avoid employing the word, but other writers on mental philosophy have freely adopted it in the above acceptation. See Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 510 sq.; Krauth's Fleming, *Vocab. of Philos.* p. 222 sq.; Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Lit. and Art*, ii, 189; Morell, *History of Philos.* p. 55 sq.; Lewis, *Hist. of Philos.* (enlarged ed.), see Index; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 422; M'Cosh, *Intuitions of the Mind*, p. 317 sq.; Morell's Tennemann, *Hist. of Philos.* see Index; *N. A. Rev.* No. lxxvi, p. 60 sq.; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* xx, 298 sq. See NIHILISM; REALISM. (J. H. W.)

Idiōtæ (*ἰδιῶται*, *private men*), a term applied by some early writers to laymen in distinction from ministers (*κλῆροι*). Chrysostom (*Homil.* 35) and Theodoret (*Comm.* in 1 Cor.) employ the word in this signification, and show that the apostle Paul (1 Cor. xiv, 16) thus designates a private person, whether learned or unlearned. So also Origen, *Contra Cels.* vii, p. 334. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. i, ch. v, § 6. See LAITY.

Idiŏtēs (Gr. *ἰδιότης*) is a term sometimes used in the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity of the Godhead to designate the *property* (Lat. *proprietas*) of each divine person. This must, however, not be confounded with the divine *attributes* (eternity, omnipresence, omnipotence, etc.), for they are inherent in the divine *essence*, and are the common possession of all the divine hypostases, while the idiotes, on the other hand, is a peculiarity of the *hypostasis*, and therefore cannot be communicated or transferred from one to another.—Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 679. See TRINITY.

Idle (רְמִיָּה, *slothful*, also *deceitful*; רָפָה, to *be weak*, in Niph. to *be lazy*, Exod. v, 8, 17; עַצְלוּת, *indolence*, Prov. xxxi, 27; שִׁפְלוּת, *remissness*, Eccles. x, 18; שָׁקַט, to *rest*, Ezek. xvi, 49; *ἀργός*, *not working*, literally, Matt. xx, 3, 6; 1 Tim. v, 13; *unfruitful*, 2 Pet. i, 8; *stupid*, Tit. i, 12; morally, Matt. xii, 36; *λῆρος*, an "*idle tale*," Luke xxiv, 11). Of the foregoing instances of the use of this word, the only one requiring special consideration is Matt. xii, 36. "I say unto you, that *every idle word* that men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment," where there has been considerable difference of opinion as to the interpretation of *ῥῆμα ἀργόν*, translated "idle word." To the ordinary explanation, which makes the phrase here

equivalent to vain, and hence *wicked* language, J. A. H. Tittman, in an extended criticism (*On the principal Causes of Forced Interpret. of the N. T.*, printed in the *Amer. Bib. Repos.* for 1831, p. 481–484), objects that it violates the native meaning of the word, which rather denotes an empty, inconsiderate, and hence insincere conversation or statement, appealing to the context, which is aimed at the hypocrital Pharisees. On the other hand, the usual interpretation is supported by the actual occurrence of πονηρόν, *wicked*, in the parallel verse 35, and by the usage of other Greek writers, e. g., Symmachus in Lev. xix, 7, for פִּגּוּל, where Sept. ἄθυτον; Xenoph. *Mem.* i, 2, 57; Cicero, *de Fat.* 12. (See Kuinöl, ad loc.) The term is probably intended to be of wide signification, so as to include both these senses, namely, *levity* and *calumny*, as being both species of untruth and heedlessly uttered, yet productive of mischief.

Idleness, aversion from labor. The idle man is, in every view, both foolish and criminal. He lives not to God. Idleness was not made for man, nor man for idleness. A small measure of reflection might convince every one that for some useful purpose he was sent into the world. Man is placed at the head of all things here below. He is furnished with a great preparation of faculties and powers. He is enlightened by reason with many important discoveries; even taught by revelation to consider himself as ransomed by the death of Christ from misery, and intended to rise to a still higher rank in the universe of God. In such a situation, thus distinguished, thus favored, and assisted by his Creator, does he answer the end of his being if he aim at no improvement, if he pursue no useful design, if he live for no other purpose than to indulge in sloth, to consume the fruits of the earth, and spend his days in a dream of vanity? Existence is a sacred trust, and he who thus misemploys and squanders it away is treacherous to its author. Look around, and you will behold the whole universe full of active powers. Action is, so to speak, the genius of nature. By motion and exertion, the system of being is preserved in vigor. By its different parts always acting in subordination to each other, the perfection of the whole is carried on. The heavenly bodies perpetually revolve. Day and night incessantly repeat their appointed course. Continual operations are performing on the earth and in the waters. Nothing stands still. All is alive and stirring throughout the universe. In the midst of this animated and busy scene, is man alone to remain idle in his place? Belongs it to him to be the sole inactive and slothful being in the creation, when in so many ways he might improve his own nature, might advance the glory of the God who made him, and contribute his part to the general good? The idle live not to the world and their fellow-creatures any more than to God. If any man had a title to stand alone, and to be independent of his fellows, he might consider himself as at liberty to indulge in solitary ease and sloth, without being responsible to others for the manner in which he chooses to live. But there is no such person in the world. We are connected with each other by various relations, which create a chain of mutual dependence that reaches from the highest to the lowest station in society. Without a perpetual circulation of active duties and offices, which all are required to perform in their turn, the order and happiness of the world could not be maintained. Superiors are no more independent of their inferiors than these inferiors of them. Each have demands and claims upon the other; and he who, in any situation of life, refuses to act his part, and to contribute his share to the general stock of felicity, deserves to be proscribed from society as an unworthy member. "If any man will not work," says Paul (2 Thess. iii, 10), "neither shall he eat." If he will do nothing to advance the purposes of society, he has no right to enjoy its benefits.

The idle man lives not to himself with any more advantage than he lives to the world. Though he imagines that he leaves to others the drudgery of life, and betakes himself to enjoyment and ease, yet he enjoys no true pleasure. He shuts the door against improvement of every kind, whether of mind, body, or fortune. Sloth enfeebles equally the bodily and the mental powers. His character falls into contempt. His fortune is consumed. Disorder, confusion, and embarrassment mark his whole situation. Idleness is the inlet to licentiousness, vice, and immorality. It destroys the principles of religion, and opens a door to sin and wickedness. Every man who recollects his conduct must know that his hours of idleness always proved the hours most dangerous to virtue. It was then that criminal desires arose, guilty passions were suggested, and designs were formed, which, in their issue, disquiet and embitter his whole life. Habitual idleness, by a silent and secret progress, undermines every virtue in the soul. More violent passions run their course and terminate. They are like rapid torrents, which foam, and swell, and bear down everything before them; but, after having overflowed their banks, their impetuosity subsides, and they return, by degrees, into their natural channel. Sloth resembles the slowly-flowing putrid stream, which stagnates in the marsh, produces venomous animals and poisonous plants, and infects with pestilential vapors the whole surrounding country. Having once tainted the soul, it leaves no part of it sound, and, at the same time, it gives not to conscience those alarms which the eruptions of bolder and fiercer emotions often occasion. Nothing is so great an enemy to the lively and spirited enjoyment of life as a relaxed and indolent habit of mind. He who knows not what it is to labor, knows not what it is to enjoy. The happiness of human life depends on the regular prosecution of some laudable purpose or object, which keeps awake and enlivens all our powers. Rest is agreeable, but it is only from preceding labors that rest acquires its true relish. When the mind is suffered to remain in continued inaction, all its powers decay: it soon languishes and sickens; and the pleasures which it proposed to obtain from rest terminate in tediousness and insipidity. See Blair, *Sermons*, Sermon xxxix; Warner, *System of Divinity and Morality*, iii, 151; Logan, *Sermons*, Sermon iv; Robinson, *Theological Dictionary*, s. v.

Idol, properly an outward object adored as divine, or as the symbol of deity. See IDOLATRY.

I. *Classification of Scriptural terms having physical reference to such objects.*—As a large number of different Hebrew words have been rendered in the A. V. either by idol or image, and that by no means uniformly (besides one or more in Greek more uniformly translated), it will be of some advantage to attempt to discriminate between them, and assign, as nearly as the two languages will allow, the English equivalents for each. See IMAGE.

(I.) Abstract terms, which, with a deep moral significance, express the degradation associated with idolatry, and stand out as a protest of the language against its enormities.

(i.) General terms of *doubtful* signification.—1. אֱלִיל, *ĕlil'*, is thought by some to have a sense akin to that of שֶׁקֶר, *she'ker*, "falsehood," with which it stands in parallelism in Job xiii, 4, and would therefore much resemble *âven*, as applied to an idol. It is generally derived from the unused root אָלַל, to *be empty* or vain. Delitzsch (on Hab. ii, 18) derives it from the negative particle אַל, *al*, "die Nichtigen;" but according to Fürst (*Handw.* s. v.) it is a diminutive of אֵל, "god," the additional syllable indicating the greatest contempt. In this case the signification above mentioned is a subsidiary one. The same authority asserts that the word denotes a small image of the god, which was consulted as an oracle among the Egyptians and Phœnicians (Isa. xix, 3; Jer. xiv, 14). It is certainly used of the idols of Noph or Memphis (Ezek. xxx, 13). In strong contrast with Jehovah, it appears in Psa. xc, 5; xcvii, 7, the

contrast probably being heightened by the resemblance between *ĕlilim* and *ĕlôhim.* A somewhat similar play upon words is observable in Hab. ii, 18, אֱלִילִים אִלְּמִים, *ĕlilim illĕmim,* A.V. "dumb idols." See EL.

2. גִּלּוּלִים, *gillûlim',* also a term of contempt, of uncertain origin (Ezek. xxx, 13), but probably derived from גָּלַל, to *roll,* as *dung,* hence *refuse.* The Rabbinical authorities, referring to such passages as Ezek. iv, 2; Zeph. i, 17, have favored the interpretation given in the margin of the A.V. to Deut. xxix, 17, "dungy gods" (Vulg. "sordes," "sordes idolorum," 1 Kings xv, 12). Jahn, connecting it with גָּלַל, *gâlal,* "to roll," applies it to the stocks of trees of which idols were made, and in mockery called *gillûlim,* "rolling things" (*a volvendo,* he says, though it is difficult to see the point of his remark). Gesenius, repudiating the derivation from the Arabic *jalla,* "to be great, illustrious," gives his preference to the rendering "stones, stone gods," thus deriving it from גַּל, *gal,* "a heap of stones;" and in this he is followed by Fürst, who translates *gillûl* by the German "Steinhaufe." The expression is applied, principally in Ezekiel, to false gods and their symbols (Deut. xxix, 17; Ezek. viii, 10, etc.). It stands side by side with other contemptuous terms in Ezek. xvi, 36; xx, 8, as, for example, שֶׁקֶץ, *shekets,* "filth," "abomination" (Ezek. viii, 10), and cognate terms. See DUNG. May not גִּלּוּלִים mean *scarabæi,* the commonest of Egyptian idols? The sense of dung is appropriate to the dung-beetle; that of rolling is doubtful, for, if the meaning of the verb be retained, we should, in this form, rather expect a passive sense, "a thing rolled;" but it may be observed that these grammatical rules of the sense of derivatives are not always to be strictly insisted on, for Sidon, צִידוֹן, though held to signify "the place of fishing," is, in the list of the Noachians, the name of a man, "the fisherman," Ἀλιεύς, of Philo of Byblus. That a specially-applicable word is used may perhaps be conjectured from the occurrence of אלילים, which, if meaning little gods, would aptly describe the pigmy PTEH-SEKER-HESAR, Ptah-Sokari-Osiris, of Memphis. Ezekiel uses the term גלולים of the idols of Egypt which the Israelites were commanded to put away at or about the time of the Exodus, but did not, and seem to have carried into the Desert, for the same word is used, unqualified by the mention of any country, of those worshipped by them in the Desert (xx, 7, 8, 16, 18, 24); it is, however, apparently employed also for all the idols worshipped in Canaan by the Israelites (ver. 31; xxiii, 37). Scarabæi were so abundant among the Egyptians and Phœnicians that there is no reason why they may not have been employed also in the worship of the Canaanitish false gods; but it cannot be safely supposed, without further evidence, that the idols of Canaan were virtually termed scarabæi. See BEETLE.

(ii.) General terms of *known* signification.—3. אָוֶן, *â'ven,* rendered elsewhere "nought," "vanity," "iniquity," "wickedness," "sorrow," etc., and only once "idol" (Isa. lxvi, 3). The primary idea of the root seems to be *emptiness,* nothingness, as of breath or vapor; and, by a natural transition, in a moral sense, wickedness in its active form of mischief; and then, as the result, sorrow and trouble. Hence *âven* denotes a vain, false, wicked thing, and expresses at once the essential nature of idols, and the consequences of their worship. The character of the word may be learnt from its associates. It stands in parallelism with אֶפֶס, *e'phes* (Isa. xli, 29), which, after undergoing various modifications, comes at length to signify "nothing;" with הֶבֶל, *he'bel,* "breath" or "vapor," itself applied as a term of contempt to the objects of idolatrous reverence (Deut. xxxii, 21; 1 Kings xvi, 13; Psa. xxxi, 6; Jer. viii, 19; x, 8); with שָׁוְא, *shâv,* "nothingness," "vanity;" and with שֶׁקֶר, *she'ker,* "falsehood" (Zech. x, 2): all indicating the utter worthlessness of the idols to whom homage was paid, and the false and delusive nature of their worship. It is employed in an abstract sense, to denote idolatry in general, in 1 Sam. xv, 23. There is much significance in the change of name from Bethel to Beth-aven, the great centre of idolatry in Israel (Hos. iv, 15). See BETH-AVEN.

4. שִׁקּוּץ, *shikkûts',* "filth," "impurity," especially applied, like the cognate שֶׁקֶץ, *she'kets,* to that which produced ceremonial uncleanness (Ezek. xxxvii, 23; Nah. iii, 6), such as food offered in sacrifice to idols (Zech. ix, 7; comp. Acts xv, 20, 29). As referring to the idols themselves, it primarily denotes the obscene rites with which their worship was associated, and hence, by metonymy, is applied both to the objects of worship and also to their worshippers, who partook of the impurity, and thus "became loathsome like their love," the foul Baal-Peor (Hos. ix, 10). See ABOMINATION.

5. In the same connection must be noticed, though not actually rendered "image" or "idol," בֹּשֶׁת, *bô'sheth,* "shame," or "shameful thing" (A.V. Jer. xi, 13; Hos. ix, 10), applied to Baal or Baal-Peor, as characterizing the obscenity of his worship. See BAAL-PEOR.

6. אֵימָה, *eymâh',* "horror" or "terror," and hence an object of horror or terror (Jer. l, 38), in reference either to the hideousness of the idols or to the gross character of their worship. In this respect it is closely connected with—

7. מִפְלֶצֶת, *miphle'tseth,* a "fright," "horror," applied to the idol of Maachah, probably of wood, which Asa cut down and burned (1 Kings xv, 13; 2 Chron. xv, 16), and which was unquestionably the Phallus, the symbol of the productive power of nature (Movers, *Phön.* i, 571; Selden, *de Dis Syr.* ii, 5), and the nature-goddess Ashera. Allusion is supposed to be made to this in Jer. x, 5, and Epist. of Jer. 70. In 2 Chron. xv, 16 the Vulg. render "simulacrum Priapi" (comp. Horace, "furum avi-umque maxima *formido*"). The Sept. had a different reading, which it is not easy to determine. They translate, in 1 Kings xv, 13, the same word both by σύνοδος (with which corresponds the Syriac *'idô,* "a festival," reading, perhaps, עֲצֶרֶת, *'ă·sereth,* as in 2 Kings x, 20; Jer. ix, 2) and καταδύσεις, while in Chronicles it is εἴδωλον. Possibly in 1 Kings xv, 13 they may have read מְצֻלָּתָה, *metsullâthâh,* for מִפְלַצְתָּה, *miphlatstâh,* as the Vulg. *specum,* of which "simulacrum turpissimum" is a correction. See GROVE.

(II.) We now come to the consideration of those words which more directly apply to the images or idols as the outward symbols of the deity who was worshipped through them.

(i.) Terms indicating the *form* of idols.—8. סֶמֶל or סֵמֶל, *sê'mel,* with which Gesenius compares as cognate מָשָׁל, *mâshâl,* and צֶלֶם, *tselem;* the Lat. *similis* and Gr. ὁμαλός, signifies a "likeness," "semblance." The Targum in Deut. iv, 16 gives צוּרָא, *tsûrâ,* "figure," as the equivalent, while in Ezek. viii, 3, 5 it is rendered by צְלֵם, *tselam,* "image." In the latter passages the Syriac has *koimtô,* "a statue" (the στήλη of the Septuagint), which more properly corresponds to *matstsêbâh* (see No. 13, below); and in Deut. *genês,* "kind" (=γένος). The passage in 2 Chron. xxxiii, 7 is rendered "images of four faces," the latter words representing the one under consideration. In 2 Chron. xxxiii, 15 it appears as "carved images," following the Sept. τὸ γλυπτόν. On the whole, the Gr. εἰκών of Deut. iv, 16; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 7, and the "simulacrum" of the Vulg. (2 Chron. xxxiii, 15) most nearly resemble the Heb. *semel.* See CARVED.

9. צֶלֶם, *tse'lem* (Chald. *id.* and צְלֵם, *tselam'*), is by all lexicographers, ancient and modern, connected with צֵל, *tsêl,* "a shadow." It is the "image" of God in which man was created (Gen. i, 27; comp. Wisd. ii, 23), distin-

guished from דְּמוּת, *demûth*, or "likeness," as the "image" from the "idea" which it represents (Schmidt, *De Imag. Dei in Hom.* p. 84), though it would be rash to insist upon this distinction. In the N. T. *εἰκών* appears to represent the latter (Col. iii, 10; compare the Sept. at Gen. v, 1), as *ὁμοίωμα* the former of the two words (Rom. i, 23; viii, 29; Phil. ii, 7), but in Heb. x, 1, *εἰκών* is opposed to *σκία* as the substance to the unsubstantial form, of which it is the perfect representative. The Sept. render *demûth* by *ὁμοίωσις*, *ὁμοίωμα*, *εἰκών*, *ὅμοιος*, and *tselem* most frequently by *εἰκών*, though *ὁμοίωμα*, *εἴδωλον*, and *τύπος* also occur. But, whatever abstract term may best define the meaning of *tselem*, it is unquestionably used to denote the visible forms of external objects, and is applied to figures of gold and silver (1 Sam. vi, 5; Numb. xxxiii, 52; Dan. iii, 1), such as the golden image of Nebuchadnezzar, as well as to those painted upon walls (Ezek. xxxiii, 14). "Image" perhaps most nearly represents it in all passages. Applied to the human countenance (Dan. iii, 19), it signifies the "expression," and corresponds to the *ἰδέα* of Matt. xxviii, 3, though *demûth* agrees rather with the Platonic usage of the latter word. See GRAVEN.

10. תְּמוּנָה, *temûnâh'*, rendered "image" in Job iv, 16; elsewhere "similitude" (Deut. iv, 12), "likeness" (Deut. v, 8): "form," or "shape" would be better. In Deut. iv, 16 it is in parallelism with תַּבְנִית, *tabnith'*, literally "build;" hence "plan" or "model" (2 Kings xvi, 10; compare Exod. xx, 4; Numb. xii, 8).

11. עָצָב, *atsab'*, עֶצֶב, *e'tseb* (Jer. xxii, 28), or עֹצֶב, *ó'tseb* (Isa. xlviii, 5), "a figure," all derived from a root עָצַב, *atsab*, "to work" or "fashion" (akin to חָצַב, *chatsab*, and the like), are terms applied to idols as expressing that their origin was due to the labor of man. The verb in its derived senses indicates the sorrow and trouble consequent upon severe labor, but the latter seems to be the radical idea. If the notion of sorrow were most prominent, the words as applied to idols might be compared with *âven* above. Isa. lviii, 3 is rendered in the Peshito Syriac "idols" (A. V. "labors"), but the reading was evidently different. In Psa. cxxxix, 24, דֶּרֶךְ עֹצֶב is "idolatry."

12. צִיר, *tsir*, once only applied to an idol (Isa. xlv, 16; Sept. *νῆσοι*, as if אִיִּים, *iyim*). The word usually denotes "a pang," but in this instance is probably connected with the roots צוּר, *tsûr*, and יָצַר, *yâtsar*, and signifies "a shape" or "mould," and hence an "idol."

13. מַצֵּבָה, *matstsêbâh'*, anything set up, a "statue" (=נְצִיב, *netsib*, Jer. xliii, 13), applied to a memorial stone like those erected by Jacob on four several occasions (Gen. xxviii, 18; xxxi, 45; xxxv, 14, 20) to commemorate a crisis in his life, or to mark the grave of Rachel. Such were the stones set up by Joshua (Josh. iv, 9) after the passage of the Jordan, and at Shechem (xxiv, 26), and by Samuel when victorious over the Philistines (1 Sam. vii, 12). When solemnly dedicated they were anointed with oil, and libations were poured upon them. The word is applied to denote the obelisks which stood at the entrance to the temple of the sun at Heliopolis (Jer. xliii, 13), two of which were a hundred cubits high and eight broad, each of a single stone (Herod. ii, 111). It is also used of the statues of Baal (2 Kings iii, 2), whether of stone (2 Kings x, 27) or wood (id. 26), which stood in the innermost recess of the temple at Samaria. Movers (*Phön.* i, 674) conjectures that the latter were statues or columns distinct from that of Baal, which was of stone and conical (p. 673), like the "meta" of Paphos (Tacit. *H.* ii, 3), and probably, therefore, belonging to other deities, who were his *πάρεδροι* or *σύμβωμοι*. The Phœnicians consecrated and anointed stones like that at Bethel, which were called, as some think, from this circumstance, *Bætylia*. Many such are said to have been seen on Mt. Lebanon, near Heliopolis, dedicated to various gods, and many prodigies are related of them (Damascius in Photius, quoted by Bochart, *Canaan*, ii, 2). The same authority describes them as aërolites, of a whitish and sometimes purple color, spherical in shape, and about a span in diameter. The Palladium of Troy, the black stone in the Kaaba at Mecca, said to have been brought from heaven by the angel Gabriel, and the stone at Ephesus "which fell down from Jupiter" (Acts xix, 35), are examples of the belief, anciently so common, that the gods sent down their images upon earth. In the older worship of Greece, stones, according to Pausanias (vii, 22, § 4), occupied the place of images. Those at Pharæ, about thirty in number, and quadrangular in shape, near the statue of Hermes, received divine honors from the Pharians, and each had the name of some god conferred upon it. The stone in the temple of Jupiter Ammon ("umbilico maxime similis"), enriched with emeralds and gems (Curtius, iv, 7, § 31); that at Delphi, which Saturn was said to have swallowed (Pausan. *Phoc.* 24, § 6); the black stone of pyramidal shape in the temple of Juggernaut, and the holy stone at Pessinus, in Galatia, sacred to Cybele, show how widely spread and almost universal were these ancient objects of worship. See PILLAR.

Closely connected with these "statues" of Baal, whether in the form of obelisks or otherwise, were

14. חַמָּנִים, *chammanim'*. rendered in the margin of most passages "sun-images." The word has given rise to much discussion. In the Vulg. it is translated thrice *simulacra*, thrice *delubra*, and once *fana*. The Sept. gives *τεμένη* twice, *εἴδωλα* twice, *ξύλινα χειροποίητα*, *βδελύγματα*, and *τὰ ὑψηλά*. With one exception (2 Chron. xxxiv, 4, which is evidently corrupt), the Syriac has vaguely either "fears," i. e. objects of fear, or "idols." The Targum in all passages translates it by חֲנִיסְנְסַיָּא, *chanisnesaya'*, "houses for star-worship" (Fürst compares the Arab. *Chunnas*, the planet Mercury or Venus), a rendering which Rosenmüller supports. Gesenius preferred to consider these *chanisnesaya* as "veils" or "shrines surrounded or shrouded with hangings" (Ezek. xvi, 16; Targ. on Isa. iii, 19), and scouted the interpretation of Buxtorf—"statuæ solares"—as a mere guess, though he somewhat paradoxically assented to Rosenmüller's opinion that they were "shrines dedicated to the worship of the stars." Kimchi, under the root חמן, mentions a conjecture that they were trees like the *Asherim*, but (s. v. חמם) elsewhere expresses his own belief that the Nun is epenthetic, and that they were so called "because the sun-worshippers made them." Aben-Ezra (on Lev. xxvi, 30) says they were "houses made for worshipping the sun," which Bochart approves (*Canaan*, ii, 17), and Jarchi that they were a kind of idol placed on the roofs of houses. Vossius (*De Idol.* ii, 353), as Scaliger before him, connects the word with Amanus or Omanus, the sacred fire, the symbol of the Persian sun-god, and renders it *pyræa* (comp. Selden, ii, 8). Adelung (*Mithrid.* i, 159, quoted by Gesenius on Isa. xvii, 8) suggested the same, and compared it with the Sanscrit *homa*. But to such interpretations the passage in 2 Chron. xxxiv, 4 is inimical (Vitringa on Isa. xvii, 8). Gesenius's own opinion appears to have fluctuated considerably. In his notes on Isaiah (*l. c.*) he prefers the general rendering "columns" to the more definite one of "sun-columns," and is inclined to look to a Persian origin for the derivation of the word. But in his Thesaurus he mentions the occurrence of *Chamman* as a synonym of Baal in the Phœnician and Palmyrene inscriptions in the sense of "Dominus Solaris," and its after application to the statues or columns erected for his worship. Spencer (*De Legg. Hebr.* ii, 25), and after him Michaelis (*Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr.* s. v.), maintained that it signified statues or lofty columns, like the pyramids or obelisks of Egypt. Movers (*Phön.* i, 441) concludes with good reason that the sun-god Baal and the idol "Chamman" are not essentially different. In his discussion of *Chammanim* he

says, "These images of the fire-god were placed on foreign or non-Israelitish altars, in conjunction with the symbols of the nature-goddess Asherah, or σύμβωμοι (2 Chron. xiv, 3, 5; xxxiv, 4, 7; Isa. xvii, 9; xxvii, 9), as was otherwise usual with Baal and Asherah." They are mentioned with the Asherim, and the latter are coupled with the statues of Baal (1 Kings xiv, 23; 2 Kings xxiii, 14). The *chammanim* and statues are used promiscuously (compare 2 Kings xxiii, 14, and 2 Chron. xxxiv, 4; 2 Chron. xiv, 3 and 5), but are never spoken of together. Such are the steps by which he arrives at his conclusion. He is supported by the Palmyrene inscription at Oxford, alluded to above, which has been thus rendered: "This column (חמנא, *Chammânâ*), and this altar, the sons of Malchu, etc., have erected and dedicated to the sun." The Veneto-Greek Version leaves the word untranslated in the strange form ἀκάβαντες. From the expressions in Ezek. vi, 4, 6, and Lev. xxvi, 30, it may be inferred that these columns, which perhaps represented a rising flame of fire and stood upon the altar of Baal (2 Chron. xxxiv, 4), were of wood or stone. See ASHERAH.

15. מַשְׂכִּית, *maskith'*, occurs in Lev. xxvi, 1; Numb. xxiii, 52; Ezek. viii, 12: "device," most nearly suits all passages (compare Psa. lxxiii, 7; Prov. xviii, 11; xxv, 11). This word has been the fruitful cause of as much dispute as the preceding. The general opinion appears to be that אֶבֶן מ' signifies a stone with figures graven upon it. Ben-Zeb explains it as "a stone with figures or hieroglyphics carved upon it," and so Michaelis; and it is maintained by Movers (*Phön.* i, 105) that the *bætylia*, or columns with painted figures, the "lapides effigiati" of Minucius Felix (c. 3), are these "stones of device," and that the characters engraven on them are the ἱερὰ στοιχεῖα, or characters sacred to the several deities. The invention of these characters, which is ascribed to Taaut, he conjectures originated with the Seres. Gesenius explains it as a stone with the image of an idol, Baal or Astarte, and refers to his *Mon. Phœn.* p. 21-24, for others of a similar character. Rashi (on Lev. xxi, 1) derives it from the root שׂכך, to cover, "because they cover the floor with a pavement of stones." The Targum and Syriac, Lev. xxvi, 1, give "stone of devotion," and the former, in Numb. xxxiii, 52, has "house of their devotion" where the Syriac only renders "their objects of devotion." For the former the Sept. has λίθος σκοπός, and for the latter τὰς σκοπιὰς αὐτῶν, connecting the word with the root שָׂכָה, "to look," a circumstance which has induced Saalschütz (*Mos. Recht*, p. 382-385) to conjecture that *eben maskith* was originally a smooth elevated stone employed for the purpose of obtaining from it a freer prospect, and of offering prayer in prostration upon it to the deities of heaven. Hence, generally, he concludes it signifies a stone of prayer or devotion, and the "chambers of imagery" of Ezek. viii, 7 are "chambers of devotion." The renderings of the last mentioned passage in the Sept. and Targum are curious as pointing to a various reading, מַשְׂכִּיתוֹ, or, more probably, מִשְׁכָּבוֹ. See IMAGERY.

16. תְּרָפִים, *terâphim'*. See TERAPHIM.

(ii.) The terms which follow have regard to the material and *workmanship* of the idol rather than to its character as an object of worship.

17. פֶּסֶל, *pe'sel*, usually translated in the Authorized Version "graven or carved image." In two passages it is ambiguously rendered "quarries" (Judg. iii, 19, 26), after the Targum, but there seems to be no reason for departing from the ordinary signification. In the majority of instances the Sept. has γλυπτόν, once γλύμμα. The verb is employed to denote the finishing which the stone received at the hands of the masons after it had been rough-hewn from the quarries (Exod. xxxiv, 4; 1 Kings v, 32). It is probably a later usage which has applied *pesel* to a figure cast in metal, as in Isa. xl, 19; xliv, 10. (More probably still, *pesel* denotes by anticipation the molten image in a later stage, after it had been trimmed into shape by the caster.) These "sculptured" images were apparently of wood, iron, or stone, covered with gold or silver (Deut. vii, 25; Isa. xxx, 22; Hab. ii, 19), the more costly being of solid metal (Isa. xl, 19). They could be burned (Deut. vii, 5; Isa. xlv, 20; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 4), or cut down (Deut. xii, 3) and pounded (2 Chron. xxxiv, 7), or broken in pieces (Isa. xxi, 9). In making them, the skill of the wise iron-smith (Deut. xxvii, 15; Isa. xl, 20) or carpenter, and of the goldsmith, was employed (Judg. xvii, 3, 4; Isa. xli, 7), the former supplying the rough mass of iron beaten into shape on his anvil (Isa. xliv, 12), while the latter overlaid it with plates of gold and silver, probably from Tarshish (Jer. x, 9), and decorated it with silver chains. The image thus formed received the further adornment of embroidered robes (Ezek. xvi, 18), to which possibly allusion may be made in Isa. iii, 19. Brass and clay were among the materials employed for the same purpose (Dan. ii, 33; v, 23). (Images of glazed pottery have been found in Egypt [Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* iii, 90; comp. Wisd. xv, 8].) A description of the three great images of Babylon on the top of the temple of Belus will be found in Diod. Sic. ii, 9 (compare Layard, *Nin.* ii, 433). The several stages of the process by which the metal or wood became the "graven image" are so vividly described in Isa. xliv, 10-20, that it is only necessary to refer to that passage, and we are at once introduced to the mysteries of idol manufacture, which, as at Ephesus, "brought no small gain unto the craftsmen." See SHRINE.

18. נֶסֶךְ or נֵסֶךְ, *ne'sek*, and מַסֵּכָה, *massekah'*, are evidently synonymous (Isa. xli, 29; xlviii, 5; Jer. x, 14) in later Hebrew, and denote a "molten" image. *Massekah* is frequently used in distinction from *pesel* or *pesilim* (Deut. xxvii, 15; Judg. xvii, 3, etc.). The golden calf which Aaron made was fashioned with "the graver" (חֶרֶט, *cheret*), but it is not quite clear for what purpose the graver was used (Exod. xxxii, 4). The *cheret* (comp. χαράττω) appears to have been a sharp-pointed instrument, used like the *stylus* for a writing implement (Isa. viii, 1). Whether then Aaron, by the help of the *cheret*, gave to the molten mass the shape of a calf, or whether he made use of the graver for the purpose of carving hieroglyphics upon it, has been thought doubtful. The Syr. has *tûpsô* (τύπος), "the mould," for *cheret*. But the expression וַיָּצַר, *vay-yatsar*, decides that it was by the *cheret*, in whatever manner employed, that the shape of a calf was given to the metal. See MOLTEN.

(iii.) In the New Test. the Greek of idol is εἴδωλον, which exactly corresponds with it. In one passage εἰκών is the "image" or head of the emperor on the coinage (Matt. xxii, 20). See also ALISGEMA.

II. *Actual Forms of Idols.*—Among the earliest objects of worship, regarded as symbols of deity, were the meteoric stones which the ancients believed to have been the images of the gods sent down from heaven. See DIANA. From these they transferred their regard to rough unhewn blocks, to stone columns or pillars of wood, in which the divinity worshipped was supposed to dwell, and which were consecrated, like the sacred stone at Delphi, by being anointed with oil, and crowned with wool on solemn days (Pausan. *Phoc.* 24, § 6). Tavernier (quoted by Rosenmüller, *Alt. and N. Morgenland*, i, § 89) mentions a black stone in the pagoda of Benares which was daily anointed with perfumed oil, and such are the "Lingams" in daily use in the Siva worship of India (compare Arnobius, i, 30; Min. Felix, c. 3). Such customs are remarkable illustrations of the solemn consecration by Jacob of the stone at Bethel, as showing the religious reverence with which these memorials were regarded. Not only were single stones thus honored, but heaps of stone were, in later times at least,

considered as sacred to Hermes (Homer, *Od.* xvi, 471; comp. the Vulg. at Prov. xxvi, 8, "Sicut qui mittit lapidem in acervum Mercurii"), and to these each passing traveller contributed his offering (Creuzer, *Symb.* i, 24). The heap of stones which Laban erected to commemorate the solemn compact between himself and Jacob, and on which he invoked the gods of his fathers, is an instance of the intermediate stage in which such heaps were associated with religious observances before they became objects of worship. Jacob, for his part, dedicated a single stone as his memorial, and called Jehovah to witness, thus holding himself aloof from the rites employed by Laban, which may have partaken of his ancestral idolatry. See JEGAR-SAHADUTHA.

Of the forms assumed by the idolatrous images we have not many traces in the Bible. Dagon, the fish-god of the Philistines, was a human figure terminating in a fish [see DAGON]; and that the Syrian deities were represented in later times in a symbolical human shape we know for certainty. See also NISROCH. The Hebrews imitated their neighbors in this respect as in others (Isa. xliv, 13; Wisd. xiii, 13), and from various allusions we may infer that idols in human forms were not uncommon among them, though they were more anciently symbolized by animals (Wisd. xiii, 14), as by the calves of Aaron and Jeroboam, and the brazen serpent which was afterwards applied to idolatrous uses (2 Kings xviii, 4; Rom. i, 23). When the image came from the hands of the maker it was decorated richly with silver and gold, and sometimes crowned (Epist. Jer. 9), clad in robes of blue and purple (Jer. x, 9), like the draped images of Pallas and Hera (Müller, *Hand. d. Arch. d. Kunst*, § 69), and fastened in the niche appropriated to it by means of chains and nails (Wisd. xiii, 15), in order that the influence of the deity which it represented might be secured to the spot. So the Ephesians, when besieged by Crœsus, connected the wall of their city by means of a rope to the temple of Aphrodite, with a view to insuring the aid of the goddess (Herod. i, 26); and for a similar object the Tyrians chained the stone image of Apollo to the altar of Hercules (Curt. iv, 3, § 15). Some images were painted red (Wisd. xiii, 14), like those of Dionysus and the Bacchantes, of Hermes, and the god Pan (Pausan. ii, 2, § 5; Müller, *Hand. d. Arch. d. Kunst*, § 69). This color was formerly considered sacred. Pliny relates, on the authority of Verrius, that it was customary on festival days to color with red-lead the face of the image of Jupiter, and the bodies of those who celebrated a triumph (xxxiii, 36). The figures of Priapus, the god of gardens, were decorated in the same manner ("*ruber* custos," Tibull. i, 1, 18). Among the objects of worship enumerated by Arnobius (i, 39) are bones of elephants, pictures, and garlands suspended on trees, the "rami coronati" of Apuleius (*de Mag.* c. 56).

When the process of adorning the image was completed, it was placed in a temple or shrine appointed for it (*οἰκία*, Epist. Jer. 12, 19; *οἴκημα*, Wisd. xiii, 15; *εἰδωλεῖον*, 1 Cor. viii, 10; see Stanley's note on the latter passage). In Wisd. xiii, 15, *οἴκημα* is thought to be used contemptuously, as in Tibull. i, 10, 19, 20, "Cum paupere cultu Stabat in *exigua* ligneus *æde* deus" (Fritsche and Grimm, *Handb.*), but the passage quoted is by no means a good illustration. From these temples the idols were sometimes carried in procession (Epist. Jer. 4, 26) on festival days. Their priests were maintained from the idol treasury, and feasted upon the meats which were appointed for the idols' use (Bel and the Dragon, 3, 13). These sacrificial feasts formed an important part of the idolatrous ritual, and were a great stumbling-block to the early Christian converts. They were to the heathen, as Prof. Stanley has well observed, what the observance of circumcision and the Mosaic ritual were to the Jewish converts, and it was for this reason that Paul especially directed his attention to the subject, and laid down the rules of conduct contained in his first letter to the Corinthians (viii-x). See IDOLATRY.

Idolatry is divine honor paid to any created object. It is thus a wider term than *image-worship* (q. v.). For many old monographs on the various forms of ancient idolatry, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 108 sq. See GODS, FALSE; BEAST-WORSHIP.

We find the idea of idolatry expressed in the O. T. by כָּזָב (a *lie*, Psa. xlv, 5; Amos ii, 4), or שָׁוְא (*nullity*), and still oftener by תּוֹעֵבָה (*abomination*). In after times the Jews designated it as עֲבוֹדָה זָרָה (*foreign worship*). Thus we see that it had no name indicative of its nature, for the Biblical expressions are more a monotheistic qualification of divine worship than a definition of it; the last Hebrew expression, however, shows idolatry as not being of Jewish origin. The word *εἰδωλολατρεία* in the N. T. is entirely due to the Septuagint, which, wherever any of the heathen deities are mentioned, even though designated in the sacred text only as אֱלִילִים (*nothings*), translates by *εἴδωλον*, an *idol;* a practice generally followed by later versions. A special sort of idolatry, namely, the actual adoration of images (*Idololatria*) thus gave name to the whole species (1 Cor. x, 14; Gal. v, 20; 1 Pet. iv, 3). Subsequently the more comprehensive word *εἰδολατρεία* (*idolatria*, instead of *idololatria*) was adopted, which included the adoration and worship of other visible symbols of the deity (*εἶδος*) besides those due to the statuary art.—Herzog.

I. *Origin of Idolatry.*—In the primæval period man appears to have had not alone a revelation, but also an implanted natural law. Adam and some of his descendants, as late as the time of the Flood, certainly lived under a revealed system, now usually spoken of as the patriarchal dispensation, and Paul tells us that the nations were under a natural law (Rom. ii, 14, 15). "Man in his natural state must always have had a knowledge of God sufficient for the condition in which he had been placed. Although God 'in times past suffered all nations [or, rather, 'all the Gentiles,' *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*] to walk in their own ways, nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness' (Acts xiv, 17). 'For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, [even] his eternal power and godhead' (Rom. i, 20). But the people of whom we are speaking 'changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things,' 'and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever' (Rom. i, 21-25). Thus arose that strange superstition which is known by the term *Fetishism* [or low nature-worship], consisting in the worship of animals, trees, rivers, hills, and stones" (Poole, *Genesis of the Earth and of Man*, 2d ed. p. 160, 161). Paul speaks of those who invented this idolatry as therefore forsaken of God and suffered to sink into the deepest moral corruption (Rom. i, 28). It is remarkable that among highly-civilized nations the converse obtains; moral corruption being very frequently the cause of the abandoning of true religion for infidelity. — Kitto. That theory of human progress which supposes man to have gradually worked his way up from barbaric ignorance of God to a so-called natural religion is contradicted by the facts of Biblical history.

Nothing is distinctly stated in the Bible as to any antediluvian idolatry. It is, however, a reasonable supposition that in the general corruption before the Flood idolatry was practised. There is no undoubted trace of heathen divinities in the names of the antediluvians; but there are dim indications of ancestral worship in the postdiluvian worship of some of the antediluvian patriarchs. It has been supposed that the SET or SUTEKH of the Egyptian Pantheon is the Hebrew *Seth*. The Cainite Enoch was possibly commemorated as Annacus or Nannacus at Iconium, though, this name being

identified with Enoch, the reference may be to Enoch of the line of Seth. It is reasonable to suppose that the worship of these antediluvians originated before the Flood, for it is unlikely that it would have been instituted after it. Some Jewish writers, grounding their theory on a forced interpretation of Gen. iv, 26, assign to Enos, the son of Seth, the unenviable notoriety of having been the first to pay divine honors to the host of heaven, and to lead others into the like error (Maimon. *De Idol.* i, 1). R. Solomon Jarchi, on the other hand, while admitting the same verse to contain the first account of the origin of idolatry, understands it as implying the deification of men and plants. Arabic tradition, according to Sir W. Jones, connects the people of Yemen with the same apostasy. The third in descent from Joktan, and therefore a contemporary of Nahor, took the surname of *Abdu Shams*, or "servant of the sun," whom he and his family worshipped, while other tribes honored the planets and fixed stars (Hales, *Chronol.* ii, 59, 4to ed.). Nimrod, again, to whom is ascribed the introduction of Zabianism, was after his death transferred to the constellation Orion, and on the slender foundation of the expression "Ur of the Chaldees" (Gen. xi, 31) is built the fabulous history of Abraham and Nimrod, narrated in the legends of the Jews and Mussulmans (Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash*, i, 23; Weil, *Bibl. Leg.* p. 47-74; Hyde, *Rel. Pers.* c. 2).

II. *Classification of Idolatry.*—All unmixed systems of idolatry may be classified under the following heads; all mixed systems may be resolved into two or more of them. We give in this connection general illustrations of these species of false worship as evinced by the nations associated with the Jewish people, reserving for the next head a more complete survey of the idolatrous systems of the most important of these nations separately.

1. Low nature-worship, or *fetishism*, the worship of animals, trees, rivers, hills, and stones. The fetishism of the negroes is thought to admit of a belief in a supreme intelligence: if this be true, such a belief is either a relic of a higher religion, or else is derived from the Muslim tribes of Africa. Fetishism is closely connected with magic, and the Nigritian priests are universally magicians.

Beast-worship was exemplified in the calves of Jeroboam and the dark hints which seem to point to the goat of Mendes. There is no actual proof that the Israelites ever joined in the service of Dagon, the fish-god of the Philistines, though Ahaziah sent stealthily to Baalzebub, the fly-god of Ekron (2 Kings i). Some have explained the allusion in Zeph. i, 9 as referring to a practice connected with the worship of Dagon; comp. 1 Sam. v, 5. The Syrians are stated by Xenophon (*Anab.* i, 4, § 9) to have paid divine honors to fish. In later times the brazen serpent became the object of idolatrous homage (2 Kings xviii, 4). But whether the latter was regarded with superstitious reverence as a memorial of their early history, or whether incense was offered to it as a symbol of some power of nature, cannot now be exactly determined. The threatening in Lev. xxvi, 30, "I will put your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols," may fairly be considered as directed against the tendency to regard animals, as in Egypt, as the symbols of deity. Tradition says that Nergal, the god of the men of Cuth, the idol of fire according to Leusden (*Phil. Hebr. Mixt.* diss. 43), was worshipped under the form of a cock; Ashima as a he-goat, the emblem of generative power; Nibhaz as a dog; Adrammelech as a mule or peacock; and Anammelech as a horse or pheasant.

The singular reverence with which trees have in all ages been honored is not without example in the history of the Hebrews. The terebinth at Mamre, beneath which Abraham built an altar (Gen. xii, 7; xiii, 18), and the memorial grove planted by him at Beersheba (Gen. xxi, 33), were intimately connected with patriarchal worship though in after ages his descendants were forbidden to do that which he did with impunity, in order to avoid the contamination of idolatry. Jerome (*Onomasticon*, s. v. Drys) mentions an oak near Hebron which existed in his infancy, and was the traditional tree beneath which Abraham dwelt. It was regarded with great reverence, and was made an object of worship by the heathen. Modern Palestine abounds with sacred trees. They are found "all over the land covered with bits of rags from the garments of passing villagers, hung up as acknowledgments, or as deprecatory signals and charms; and we find beautiful clumps of oak-trees sacred to a kind of beings called Jacob's daughters" (Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, ii, 151). See GROVE. As a symptom of the rapidly degenerating spirit, the oak of Shechem, which stood in the sanctuary of Jehovah (Josh. xxiv, 26), and beneath which Joshua set up the stone of witness, perhaps appears in Judges (ix, 37) as "the oak (not 'plain,' as in the A. V.) of soothsayers" or "augurs." This, indeed, may be a relic of the ancient Canaanitish worship; an older name associated with idolatry, which the conquering Hebrews were commanded and endeavored to obliterate (Deut. xii, 3).

2. *Shamanism*, or the magical side of fetishism, the religion of the Mongolian tribes, and apparently the primitive religion of China.

3. High *nature-worship*, the worship of the sun, moon, and stars, and of the supposed powers of nature. The old religion of the Shemitic races consisted, in the opinion of Movers (*Phön.* i, c. 5), in the deification of the powers and laws of nature; these powers being considered either as distinct and independent, or as manifestations of one supreme and all-ruling being. In most instances the two ideas were co-existent. The deity, following human analogy, was conceived as male and female: the one representing the active, the other the passive principle of nature; the former the source of spiritual, the latter of physical life. The transference of the attributes of the one to the other resulted either in their mystical conjunction in the hermaphrodite, as the Persian Mithra and Phœnician Baal, or the two combined to form a third, which symbolized the essential unity of both. (This will explain the occurrence of the name of Baal with the masculine and feminine articles in the Sept.; comp. Hos. xi, 2; Jer. xix, 5; Rom. xi, 4. Philochorus, quoted by Macrobius [*Sat.* iii, 8], says that men and women sacrificed to Venus or the Moon, with the garments of the sexes interchanged, because she was regarded both as masculine and feminine [see Selden, *De Dis Syr.* ii, 2]. Hence *Lunus* and *Luna.*) With these two supreme beings all other beings are identical; so that in different nations the same nature-worship appears under different forms, representing the various aspects under which the idea of the power of nature is presented. The sun and moon were early selected as outward symbols of this all-pervading power, and the worship of the heavenly bodies was not only the most ancient, but the most prevalent system of idolatry. Taking its rise, according to a probable hypothesis, in the plains of Chaldæa, it spread through Egypt, Greece, Scythia, and even Mexico and Ceylon; and it is worthy of notice that even the religion of remote India presupposes a grand symbolic representation of the divine by the worship of these great physical powers (compare Lassen, *Ind. Alterth.* i, 756 sq.; Roth, *Geschichte der Religionen*). See HINDUISM. It was regarded as an offence amenable to the civil authorities in the days of Job (xxxi, 26–28), and one of the statutes of the Mosaic law was directed against its observance (Deut. iv, 19; xvii, 3); the former referring to the star-worship of Arabia, the latter to the concrete form in which it appeared among the Syrians and Phœnicians. It is probable that the Israelites learned their first lessons in sun-worship from the Egyptians, in whose religious system that luminary, as Osiris, held a prominent place. The city of On (Bethshemesh or Heliopolis) took its name from his temple (Jer. xliii, 13), and the

wife of Joseph was the daughter of his priest (Gen. xli, 45). The Phœnicians worshipped him under the title of "Lord of heaven," בַּעַל שָׁמַיִם, *Baal-shâmayim* (*βεελσάμην*, acc. to Sanchoniatho in Philo Byblius), and Adon, the Greek Adonis, and the Tammuz of Ezekiel (viii, 14). See TAMMUZ. As Molech or Milcom, the sun was worshipped by the Ammonites, and as Chemosh by the Moabites. The Hadad of the Syrians is the same deity, whose name is traceable in Benhadad, Hadadezer, and Hadad or Adad, the Edomite. The Assyrian Bel or Belus is another form of Baal. According to Philo (*De Vit. Cont.* § 3), the Essenes were wont to pray to the sun at morning and evening (Joseph. *War*, ii, 8, 5). By the later kings of Judah, sacred horses and chariots were dedicated to the sun-god, as by the Persians (2 Kings xxiii, 11; Bochart, *Hieroz.* pt. i, bk. ii, c. xi; Selden, *De Dis Syr.* ii, 8), to march in procession and greet his rising (R. Solomon Jarchi on 2 Kings xxiii, 11). The Massagetæ offered horses in sacrifice to him (Strabo, xi, p. 513), on the principle enunciated by Macrobius (*Sat.* vii, 7), "like rejoiceth in like" ("similibus similia gaudent;" compare Herod. i, 216), and the custom was common to many nations.

The moon, worshipped by the Phœnicians under the name of Astarte (Lucian, *de Dea Syra*, c. 4), or Baaltis, the passive power of nature, as Baal was the active (Movers, i, 149), and known to the Hebrews as Ashtaroth or Ashtoreth, the tutelary goddess of the Zidonians, appears early among the objects of Israelitish idolatry. But this Syro-Phœnician worship of the sun and moon was of a grosser character than the pure star-worship of the Magi, which Movers distinguishes as Upper Asiatic or Assyro-Persian, and was equally removed from the Chaldæan astrology and Zabianism of later times. The former of these systems tolerated no images or altars, and the contemplation of the heavenly bodies from elevated spots constituted the greater part of its ritual.

But, though we have no positive historical account of star-worship before the Assyrian period, we may infer that it was early practiced in a concrete form among the Israelites from the allusions in Amos v, 26, and Acts vii, 42, 43. Even in the desert they are said to have been given up to worship the host of heaven, while Chiun and Remphan, or Rephan, have on various grounds been identified with the planet Saturn. It was to counteract idolatry of this nature that the stringent law of Deut. xvii, 3 was enacted, and with a view to withdrawing the Israelites from undue contemplation of the material universe, Jehovah, the God of Israel, is constantly placed before them as Jehovah Sabaoth, Jehovah of Hosts, the king of heaven (Dan. iv, 35, 37), to whom the heaven and heaven of heavens belong (Deut. x, 14). However this may be, Movers (*Phön.* i, 65, 66) contends that the later star-worship, introduced by Ahaz and followed by Manasseh, was purer and more spiritual in its nature than the Israelito-Phœnician worship of the heavenly bodies under symbolical forms, as Baal and Asherah; and that it was not idolatry in the same sense that the latter was, but of a simply contemplative character. He is supported, to some extent, by the fact that we find no mention of any images of the sun or moon or the host of heaven, but merely of vessels devoted to their service (2 Kings xxiii, 4). But there is no reason to believe that the divine honors paid to the "Queen of Heaven" (Jer. vii, 18; xlix, 19; or, as others render, "the frame" or "structure of the heavens") were equally dissociated from image-worship. Mr. Layard (*Nin.* ii, 451) discovered a bas-relief at Nimroud which represented four idols carried in procession by Assyrian warriors. One of these figures he identifies with Hera, the Assyrian Astarte, represented with a star on her head (Amos v, 26), and with the "queen of heaven," who appears on the rock-tablets of Pterium "standing erect on a lion, and crowned with a tower, or mural coronet," as in the Syrian temple of Hierapolis (*ib.* p. 456; Lucian, *de Dea Syra*, 31, 32). But, in his remarks upon a figure which resembles the Rhea of Diodorus, Layard adds, "The representation in a human form of the celestial bodies, themselves originally but a type, was a corruption which appears to have crept at a later period into the mythology of Assyria; for, in the more ancient bas-reliefs, figures with caps surmounted by stars do not occur, and the sun, moon, and planets stand alone" (*ib.* p. 457, 458).

The allusions in Job xxxviii, 31, 32 are too obscure to allow any inference to be drawn as to the mysterious influences which were held by the old astrologers to be exercised by the stars over human destiny, nor is there sufficient evidence to connect them with anything more recondite than the astronomical knowledge of the period. The same may be said of the poetical figure in Deborah's chant of triumph, "the stars from their highways warred with Sisera" (Judg. v, 20). In the later times of the monarchy, Mazzaloth, the planets, or the zodiacal signs, received, next to the sun and moon, their share of popular adoration (2 Kings xxiii, 5); and the history of idolatry among the Hebrews shows at all times an intimate connection between the deification of the heavenly bodies and the superstition which watched the clouds for signs, and used divination and enchantments. It was but a step from such culture of the sidereal powers to the worship of Gad and Meni, Babylonian divinities, symbols of Venus or the moon, as the goddess of luck or fortune. Under the latter aspect the moon was reverenced by the Egyptians (Macrob. *Sat.* i, 19); and the name Baal-Gad is possibly an example of the manner in which the worship of the planet Jupiter, as the bringer of luck, was grafted on the old faith of the Phœnicians. The false gods of the colonists of Samaria were probably connected with Eastern astrology: Adrammelech Movers regards as the sun-fire—the solar Mars, and Anammelech the solar Saturn (*Phön.* i, 410, 411). The Vulg. rendering of Prov. xxvi, 8, "Sicut qui mittit lapidem in *acervum Mercurii*," follows the Midrash on the passage quoted by Jarchi, and requires merely a passing notice (see Selden, *de Dis Syris*, ii, 15; Maim. *de Idol.* iii, 2; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* s. v. מרקולים).

4. Hero-worship, the worship of deceased ancestors or leaders of a nation. Of pure hero-worship among the Shemitic races we find no trace. Moses, indeed, seems to have entertained some dim apprehension that his countrymen might, after his death, pay him more honors than were due to man, and the anticipation of this led him to review his own conduct in terms of strong reprobation (Deut. iv, 21, 22). The expression in Psa. cvi, 28, "The sacrifices of the *dead*," is in all probability metaphorical, and Wisd. xiv, 15 refers to a later practice due to Greek influence. The Rabbinical commentators discover in Gen. xlviii, 16 an allusion to the worshipping of angels (Col. ii, 18), while they defend their ancestors from the charge of regarding them in any other light than mediators, or intercessors with God (Lewis, *Orig. Hebr.* v, 3). It is needless to add that their inference and apology are equally groundless. With like probability has been advanced the theory of the dæmon-worship of the Hebrews, the only foundation for it being two highly poetical passages (Deut. xxxii, 17; Psa. cvi, 37). It is possible that the Persian dualism is hinted at in Isa. xlv, 7.

5. *Idealism*, the worship of abstractions or mental qualities, such as justice, a system never found unmixed. This constituted the mythology of the Greeks and Romans, as also of the Scandinavians. See MYTHOLOGY.

III. *Idolatry of certain ancient Heathen Nations in Detail.*—All idolatry is in its nature heathenish, and it has in all ages been a characteristic mark of heathendom, so that to the present day the vivid description of Rom. i remains the most striking portraiture of heathen peoples. We have space in this article for a systematic view only of those early nations whose contact with the Hebrew race was the means of the *importation* of idolatry among the chosen people. See POLYTHEISM.

1. *Mesopotamian Mythology.*—The original idolatrous

condition of the kindred of Abraham (q. v.) himself in the great plain of Aram is distinctly alluded to in Judg. xxiv, 2. According to Rawlinson (Essay in his *Herod.*), the Pantheons of Babylon and Nineveh, though originally dissimilar in the names of the divinities, cannot as yet be treated separately. The principal god of the Assyrians was Asshur, replaced in Babylonia by a god whose name is read Il or Ra. The special attributes of Asshur were sovereignty and power, and he was regarded as the especial patron of the Assyrians and their kings. It is the Shemitic equivalent of the Hamitic or Scythic Ra, which suggests a connection with Egypt, although it is to be noticed that the same root may perhaps be traced in the probably Canaanitish Heres. Next to Asshur or Il was a triad, consisting of Anu, who appears to have corresponded to Pluto, a divinity whose name is doubtful, corresponding to Jupiter, and Héa or Hoa, corresponding in position and partly in character to Neptune. The supreme goddess Mulita or Bilta (Mylitta or Beltis) was the wife of the Babylonian Jupiter. This triad was followed by another, consisting of Æther (Iva?), the sun, and the moon. Next in order are "the five minor gods, who, if not of astronomical origin, were at any rate identified with the five planets of the Chaldæan system." In addition, Sir H. Rawlinson enumerates several other divinities of less importance, and mentions that there are "a vast number of other names," adding this remarkable observation: "Every town and village, indeed, throughout Babylonia and Assyria appears to have had its own particular deity, many of these no doubt being the great gods of the Pantheon disguised under rustic names, but others being distinct local divinities." Sir H. Rawlinson contents himself with stating the facts discoverable from the inscriptions, and does not theorize upon the subject further than to point out the strong resemblances between this Oriental system and that of Greece and Rome, not indeed in the Aryan ground-work of the latter, but in its general superstructure. If we analyze the Babylonian and Assyrian system, we discover that in its present form it is mainly cosmic, or a system of high nature-worship. The supreme divinity appears to have been regarded as the ruler of the universe, the first triad was of powers of nature, the second triad and the remaining chief divinities were distinctly cosmic. But beneath this system were two others, evidently distinct in origin, and too deep-seated to be obliterated, the worship of ancestors and low nature-worship. Asshur, at the very head of the Pantheon, is the deified ancestor of the Assyrian race; and, notwithstanding a system of great gods, each city had its own special idolatry, either openly reverencing its primitive idol, or concealing a deviation from the fixed belief by making that idol another form of one of the national divinities. In this separation into its first elements of this ancient religion, we discover the superstitions of those races which, mixed, but never completely fused, formed the population of Babylonia and Assyria, three races whose three languages were yet distinct in the inscribed records as late as the time of Darius Hystaspis. These races were the primitive Chaldæans, called Hamites by Sir H. Rawlinson, who undoubtedly had strong affinities with the ancient Egyptians, the Shemitic Assyrians, and the Aryan Persians. It is not difficult to assign to these races their respective shares in the composition of the mythology of the countries in which they successively ruled. The ancestral worship is here distinctly Shemitic: the name of Asshur proves this. It may be objected that such worship never characterized any other Shemitic stock; that we find it among Turanians and Aryans: but we reply that the Shemites borrowed their idolatry, and a Turanian or Aryan influence may have given it this peculiar form. The low nature-worship must be due to the Turanians. It is never discerned except where there is a strong Turanian or Nigritian element, and when once established it seems always to have been very hard to remove. The high nature-worship, as the last element, remains for the Aryan race. The primitive Aryan belief in its different forms was a reverence for the sun, moon, and stars, and the powers of nature, combined with a belief in one supreme being, a religion which, though varying at different times, and deeply influenced by ethnic causes, was never deprived of its essentially cosmic characteristics. See ASSYRIA.

2. *Egyptian.*—The strongest and most remarkable peculiarity of the Egyptian religion is the worship of animals (see Zickler, *De religione bestiarum ab Ægyptiis consecratarum*, Lips. 1745; Schumacker, *De cultu animalium inter Ægyptios et Judæos*, Wolfenb. 1773), trees, and like objects, which was universal in the country, and was even connected with the belief in the future state. No theory of the usefulness of certain animals can explain the worship of others that were utterly useless, nor can a theory of some strange anomaly find even as wide an application. The explanation is to be discovered in every town, every village, every hut of the negroes, whose fetishism corresponds perfectly with this low nature-worship of the ancient Egyptians.

Connected with fetishism was the local character of the religion. Each nome, city, town, and probably village, had its divinities, and the position of many gods in the Pantheon was due rather to the importance of their cities than any powers or qualities they were supposed to have. For a detailed account of the Egyptian deities, with illustrative cuts, see Kitto's *Pictorial Bible*, note on Deut. iv, 16; compare also EGYPT.

The Egyptian Pantheon shows three distinct elements. Certain of the gods are only personifications connected with low nature-worship. Others, the great gods, are of Shemitic origin, and are connected with high nature-worship, though showing traces of the worship of ancestors. In addition, there are certain personifications of abstract ideas. The first of these classes is evidently the result of an attempt to connect the old low nature-worship with some higher system. The second is no doubt the religion of the Shemitic settlers. It is essentially the same in character as the Babylonian and Assyrian religion, and, as the belief of a dominant race, took the most important place in the intricate system of which it ultimately formed a part. The last class appears to be of later invention, and to have had its origin in an endeavor to construct a philosophical system.

In addition to these particulars of the Egyptian religion, it is important to notice that it comprised very remarkable doctrines. Man was held to be a responsible being, whose future after death depended upon his actions done while on earth. He was to be judged by Osiris, ruler of the West, or unseen world, and either rewarded with felicity or punished with torment. Whether these future states of happiness and misery were held to be of eternal duration is not certain, but there is little doubt that the Egyptians believed in the immortality of the soul.

The religion of the Shepherds, or Hyksos, is not so distinctly known to us. It is, however, clear from the monuments that their chief god was SET, or SUTEKH, and we learn from a papyrus that one of the Shepherd-kings, APEPI, probably Manetho's "Apophis," established the worship of SET in his dominions, and reverenced no other god, raising a great temple to him in Zoan, or Avaris. SET continued to be worshipped by the Egyptians until the time of the 22d dynasty, when we lose all trace of him on the monuments. At this period, or afterwards, his figure was effaced in the inscriptions. The change took place long after the expulsion of the Shepherds, and was effected by the 22d dynasty, which was probably of Assyrian or Babylonian origin; it is, therefore, rather to be considered as a result of the influence of the Median doctrine of Ormuzd and Ahriman than as due to the Egyptian hatred of the foreigners and all that concerned them. Besides SET, other foreign divinities were worshipped in Egypt—the god RENPU, the goddesses KEN, or KETESH, ANTA, and

ASTARTA. All these divinities, except ASTARTA, as to whom we have no particular information, are treated by the Egyptians as powers of destruction and war, as SET was considered the personification of physical evil. SET was always identified by the Egyptians with Baal; we do not know whether he was worshipped in Egypt before the Shepherd-period, but it is probable that he was.

This foreign worship in Egypt was probably never reduced to a system. What we know of it shows no regularity, and it is not unlike the imitations of the Egyptian idols made by Phœnician artists, probably as representations of Phœnician divinities. The gods of the Hyksos are foreign objects of worship in an Egyptian dress. See HYKSOS.

3. *Idolatry of Canaan and the adjoining Countries.*—The centre of the idolatry of the Palestinian races is to be sought for in the religion of the Rephaites and the Canaanites. We can distinctly connect the worship of Baal and Ashtoreth with the earliest kind of idolatry; and, having thus established a centre, we can understand how, for instance, the same infernal rites were celebrated to the Ammonitish Molech and the Carthaginian Baal. The most important document for the idolatry of the Hittites is the treaty concluded between the branch of that people seated on the Orontes and Rameses II. From this we learn that SUTEKH (or SET) and ASTERAT were the chief divinities of these Hittites, and that they also worshipped the mountains and rivers and the winds. The SUTEKHS of several forts are also specified. See HITTITES. SET is known from the Egyptian inscriptions to have corresponded to Baal, so that in the two chief divinities we discover Baal and Ashtoreth, the only Canaanitish divinities known to be mentioned in Scripture. The local worship of different forms of Baal well agrees with the low nature-worship with which it is found to have prevailed. Both are equally mentioned in the Bible history. Thus the people of Shechem worshipped Baal-berith, and Mount Hermon itself seems to have been worshipped as Baal-Hermon, while the low nature-worship may be traced in the reverence for groves, and the connection of the Canaanitish religion with hills and trees. The worst feature of this system was the sacrifice of children by their parents—a feature that shows the origin of at least two of its offshoots.

The Bible does not give a very clear description of Canaanitish idolatry. As an abominable thing, to be rooted out and cast into oblivion, nothing is needlessly said of it. The appellation Baal, ruler, or possessor, implies supremacy, and connects the chief Canaanitish divinity with the Syrian Adonis. He was the god of the Canaanitish city Zidon, or Sidon, where "Ashtoreth, the abomination of the Zidonians," was also specially worshipped. In the Judge-period we read of Baalim and Ashteroth in the plural, probably indicating various local forms of these divinities, but perhaps merely the worship of many images. The worship of Baal was connected with that of the groves, which we take to have been representations of trees or other vegetable products. See HIGH PLACE. In Ahab's time a temple was built for Baal, where there was an image. His worshippers sacrificed in garments provided by the priests; and his prophets, seeking to propitiate him, were wont to cry and cut themselves with swords and lances. Respecting Ashtoreth we know less from Scripture. Her name is not derivable from any Shemitic root. It is equivalent to the Ishtar of the cuneiform inscriptions, the name of the Assyrian or Babylonian Venus, the goddess of the planet. The identity of the Canaanitish and the Assyrian or Babylonian goddess is further shown by the connection of the former with star-worship. In the Iranian languages we find a close radical resemblance to Ashtoreth and Ishtar in the Persian, Zend *stara*, Sansk. *stra*, ἀστήρ, *stern*, all equivalent to our "star." This derivation confirms our opinion that the high nature-worship of the Babylonians and Assyrians was of Aryan origin. As no other Canaanitish divinities are noticed in Scripture, it seems probable that Baal and Ashtoreth were alone worshipped by the nations of Canaan. Among the neighboring tribes we find, besides these, other names of idols, and we have to inquire whether they apply to different idols or are merely different appellations.

Beginning with the Abrahamitic tribes, we find Molech, Malcham, or Milcom (מֹלֶךְ, מַלְכָּם, מִלְכֹּם) spoken of as the idol of the Ammonites. This name, in the first form, always has the article, and undoubtedly signifies the *king* (הַמֹּלֶךְ, equivalent to הַמֶּלֶךְ), for it is indifferently used as a proper name and as an appellative with a suffix (comp. Jer. xlix, 1, 3, with Amos i, 15). Milcom is from Molech or its root, with ם formative, and Malcham is probably a dialectic variation, if the points are to be relied upon. Molech was regarded by the Ammonites as their king. When David captured Rabbah, we are told that "he took Malcham's crown from off his head, the weight whereof [was] a talent of gold with the precious stones: and it was [set] on David's head" (2 Sam. xii, 30; comp. 1 Chron. xx, 2). The prophets speak of this idol as ruler of the children of Ammon, and doomed to go into captivity with his priests and princes (Jer. xlix, 1, 3; Amos i, 15). The worship of Molech was performed at high places, and children were sacrificed to him by their parents, being cast into fires. This horrible practice prevailed at Carthage, where children were sacrified to their chief divinity, Baal, called at Tyre "Melcarth, lord (Baal) of Tyre" מלקרת בעל צר (Inscr. Melit. Biling. ap. Gesen. *Lex.* s. v. בעל), the first of which words signifies *king of the city*, for מֶלֶךְ קֶרֶת. There can therefore be no doubt that Molech was a local form of the chief idol of Canaan, and it is by no means certain that this name was limited to the Ammonitish worship, as we shall see in speaking of the idolatry of the Israelites in the Desert.

We know for certain of but one Moabitish divinity, as of but one Ammonitish. Chemosh appears to have held the same place as Molech, although our information respecting him is less full. Moab was the "people of Chemosh" (Numb. xxi, 29; Jer. xlviii, 46), and Chemosh was doomed to captivity with his priests and princes (Jer. xlviii, 7). In one place Chemosh is spoken of as the god of the king of the children of Ammon, whom Jephthah conquered (Judg. xi, 24); but it is to be remarked that the cities held by this king, which Jephthah took, were not originally Ammonitish, and were apparently claimed as once held by the Moabites (21–26; comp. Numb. xxi, 23–30), so that at this time Moab and Ammon were probably united, or the Ammonites ruled by a Moabitish chief. The etymology of Chemosh is doubtful, but it is clear that he was distinct from Molech. There is no positive trace of the cruel rites of the idol of the Ammonites, and it is unlikely that the settled Moabites should have had the same savage disposition as their wild brethren on the north. There is, however, a general resemblance in the regal character assigned to both idols and their solitary position. Chemosh, therefore, like Molech, was probably a form of Baal. Both tribes appear to have had other idols, for we read of the worship, by the Israelites, of "the gods of Moab, and the gods of the children of Ammon" (Judg. x, 6); but, as there are other plurals in the passage, it is possible that this may be a general expression. Yet, in saying this, we do not mean to suggest that there was any monotheistic form of Canaanitish idolatry. There is some difficulty in ascertaining whether Baal-Peor, or Peor, was a Moabitish idol. The Israelites, while encamped at Shittim, were seduced by the women of Moab and Midian, and joined them in the worship of Baal-Peor. There is no notice of any later instance of this idolatry. It seems, therefore, not to have been national to Moab, and, if so, it may have been borrowed, and Midianitish, or else local, and Canaanitish. The former idea is supported by the apparent connection of prostitution, even of women of rank, with the worship of

Baal-Peor, which would not have been repugnant to the pagan Arabs; the latter finds some support in the name Shittim, *the acacias*, as though the place had its name from some acacias sacred to Baal, and, moreover, we have no certain instance of the application of the name of Baal to any non-Canaanitish divinity. Had such vile worship as was probably that of Baal-Peor been national in Moab, it is most unlikely that David would have been on very friendly terms with a Moabitish king.

The Philistine idolatry is connected with that of Canaan, although it has peculiarities of its own, which are indeed so strong that it may be questioned whether it is entirely or even mainly derived from the Canaanitish source. At Ekron, Baal-zebub was worshipped, and had a temple, to which Ahaziah, the wicked son of Ahab, sent to inquire. This name means either *the lord of the fly*, or *Baal the fly*. It is generally held that he was worshipped as a driver-away of flies, but we think it more probable that some venomous fly was sacred to him. The use of the term Baal is indicative of a connection with the Canaanitish system. The national divinity of the Philistines seems, however, to have been Dagon, to whom there were temples at Gaza and at Ashdod, and the general character of whose worship is evident in such traces as we observe in the names Caphar-Dagon, near Jamnia, and Beth-Dagon, the latter applied to two places, one in Judah and the other in Asher. The derivation of the name Dagon, דָּגוֹן, as that of a fish-god, is from דָּג, *a fish*. Gesenius considers it a diminutive, "little fish," used by way of endearment and honor (*Thes.* s. v.), but this is surely hazardous. Dagon was represented as a man with the tail of a fish. There can be no doubt that he was connected with the Canaanitish system, as Derceto or Atargatis, the same as Ashtoreth, was worshipped under a like mixed shape at Ashkelon (*αὔτη δὲ τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον ἔχει γυναικός, τὸ δ' ἄλλο σῶμα πᾶν ἰχθύος*, Diod. Sic. ii, 4). In form he is the same as the Assyrian god supposed to correspond to the planet Saturn. The house of Dagon at Gaza, which Samson overthrew, must have been very large, for about 3000 men and women then assembled on its roof. It had two principal, if not only, pillars in the midst, between which Samson was placed and was seen by the people on the roof. The inner portion of some of the ancient Egyptian temples consisted of a hypæthral hall, supported by two or more pillars, and inner chambers. The overthrow of these pillars would bring down the stone roof of the hall, and destroy all persons beneath or upon it, without necessarily overthrowing the side-walls.

The idolatry of the Phœnicians is not spoken of in the Bible. From their inscriptions and the statements of profane authors we learn that this nation worshipped Baal and Ashtoreth. The details of their worship will be spoken of in the article PHŒNICIA.

Syrian idols are mentioned in a few places in Scripture. Tammuz, whom the women of Israel lamented, is no doubt Adonis, whose worship implies that of Astarte or Ashtoreth. Rimmon, who appears to have been the chief divinity of the Syrian kings ruling at Damascus, may, if his name signifies *high* (from רָמַם), be a local form of Baal, who, as the sun-god, had a temple at the great Syrian city Heliopolis, now called Baalbek.

The book of Job, which, whatever its date, represents a primitive state of society, speaks of cosmic worship as though it was practiced in his country, Idumæa or northern Arabia. "If I beheld a sun when it shined, or a splendid moon progressing, and my heart were secretly enticed, and my hand touched my mouth, surely this [were] a depravity of judgment, for I should have denied God above" (xxxi, 26-28). See Poole, *Genesis of the Earth and of Man*, 2d ed. p. 184. This evidence is important in connection with that of the ancient prevalence of cosmic worship in Arabia, and that of its practice by some of the later kings of Judah.—Kitto.

4. Much indirect evidence on this subject might be supplied by an investigation of *proper names*. Mr. Layard has remarked, "According to a custom existing from time immemorial in the East, the name of the supreme deity was introduced into the names of men. This custom prevailed from the banks of the Tigris to the Phœnician colonies beyond the Pillars of Hercules; and we recognise in the Sardanapalus of the Assyrians, and the Hannibal of the Carthaginians, the identity of the religious system of the two nations, as widely distinct in the time of their existence as in their geographical position" (*Nineveh*, ii, 450). The hint which he has given can be but briefly followed out here. Traces of the sun-worship of the ancient Canaanites remain in the nomenclature of their country. Beth-Shemesh, "house of the sun;" En-Shemesh, "spring of the sun," and Ir-Shemesh, "city of the sun," whether they be the original Canaanitish names or their Hebrew renderings, attest the reverence paid to the source of light and heat, the symbol of the fertilizing power of nature. Samson, the Hebrew national hero, took his name from the same luminary, and was born in a mountain village above the modern 'Ain Shems (En-Shemesh: Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, ii, 361). The name of Baal, the sun-god, is one of the most common occurrence in compound words, and is often associated with places consecrated to his worship, and of which, perhaps, he was the tutelary deity. Bamoth-Baal, "the high places of Baal;" Baal-Hermon, Beth-Baal-Meon, Baal-Gad, Baal-Hamon, in which the compound names of the sun-god of Phœnicia and Egypt are associated, Baal-Tamar, and many others, are instances of this. [That temples in Syria, dedicated to the several divinities, did transfer their names to the places where they stood, is evident from the testimony of Lucian, an Assyrian himself. His derivation of Hiera from the temple of the Assyrian Hera shows that he was familiar with the circumstance (*De Dea Syr.* c. i). Baisampsa (=Bethshemesh), a town of Arabia, derived its name from the sun-worship (Vossius, *De Theol. Gent.* ii, c. 8), like Kir-Heres (Jer. xlviii, 31) of Moab.] Nor was the practice confined to the names of places: proper names are found with the same element. Esh-baal, Ish-baal, etc., are examples. The Amorites, whom Joshua did not drive out, dwelt on Mount Heres, in Aijalon, "the mountain of the sun." See TIMNATH-HERES. Here and there we find traces of the attempt made by the Hebrews, on their conquest of the country, to extirpate idolatry. Thus Baalah or Kirjath-Baal, "the town of Baal," became Kirjath-Jearim, "the town of forests" (Josh. xv, 60). The Moon, Astarte or Ashtaroth, gave her name to a city of Bashan (Josh. xiii, 12, 31), and it is not improbable that the name Jericho may have been derived from being associated with the worship of this goddess. See JERICHO. Nebo, whether it be the name under which the Chaldæans worshipped the Moon or the planet Mercury, enters into many compounds: Nebu-zaradan, Samgar-nebo, and the like. Bel is found in Belshazzar, Belteshazzar, and others. Were Baladan of Shemitic origin, it would probably be derived from Baal-Adon, or Adonis, the Phœnician deity to whose worship Jer. xxii, 18 seems to refer; but it has more properly been traced to an Indo-Germanic root. Hadad, Hadadezer, Benhadad, are derived from the tutelar deity of the Syrians, and in Nergalsharezer we recognise the god of the Cushites. Chemosh, the fire-god of Moab, appears in Carchemish, and Peor in Beth-Peor. Malcom, a name which occurs but once, and then of a Moabite by birth, may have been connected with Molech and Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites. A glimpse of star-worship may be seen in the name of the city Chesil, the Shemitic Orion, and the month Chisleu, without recognising in Rahab "the glittering fragments of the sea-snake trailing across the northern sky." It would, perhaps, be going too far to trace in Engedi, "spring of the kid," any connection with the goat-worship of Mendes, or any relics of the wars of the giants in Rapha and Rephaim. Fürst, indeed, recognises in Gedi, Venus or Astarte, the

goddess of fortune, and identical with Gad (*Handw.* s. v.). But there are fragments of ancient idolatry in other names in which it is not so palpable. Ishbosheth is identical with Eshbaal, and Jerubbesheth with Jerubbaal, and Mephibosheth and Meribbaal are but two names for one person (comp. Jer. xi, 13). The worship of the Syrian Rimmon appears in the names Hadad-Rimmon, and Tabrimmon; and if, as some suppose, it be derived from רִמּוֹן, *Rimmôn*, "a pomegranate-tree," we may connect it with the towns of the same name in Judah and Benjamin, with En-Rimmon and the prevailing tree-worship. It is impossible to pursue this investigation to any length: the hints which have been thrown out may prove suggestive. See each of these names in its place.

5. *Idolatrous Usages.*—Mountains and high places were chosen spots for offering sacrifice and incense to idols (1 Kings xi, 7; xiv, 23), and the retirement of gardens and the thick shade of woods offered great attractions to their worshippers (2 Kings xvi, 4; Isa. i, 29; Hos. iv, 13). It was the ridge of Carmel which Elijah selected as the scene of his contest with the priests of Baal, fighting with them the battle of Jehovah as it were on their own ground. See CARMEL. Carmel was regarded by the Roman historians as a sacred mountain of the Jews (Tacit. *Hist.* ii, 78; Sueton. *Vesp.* 7). The host of heaven was worshipped on the housetop (2 Kings xxiii, 12; Jer. xix, 3; xxxii, 29; Zeph. i, 5). In describing the sun-worship of the Nabatæi, Strabo (xvi, 784) mentions two characteristics which strikingly illustrate the worship of Baal. They built their altars on the roofs of houses, and offered on them incense and libations daily. On the wall of his city, in the sight of the besieging armies of Israel and Edom, the king of Moab offered his eldest son as a burnt-offering. The Persians, who worshipped the sun under the name of Mithra (Strabo, xv, 732), sacrificed on an elevated spot, but built no altars or images. See MOUNT.

The priests of the false worship are sometimes designated Chemarim, a word of Syriac origin, to which different meanings have been assigned. It is applied to the non-Levitical priests who burnt incense on the high places (2 Kings xxiii, 5) as well as to the priests of the calves (Hos. x, 5); and the corresponding word is used in the Peshito (Judg. xviii, 30) of Jonathan and his descendants, priests to the tribe of Dan, and in the Targum of Onkelos (Gen. xlvii, 22) of the priests of Egypt. The Rabbis, followed by Gesenius, have derived it from a root signifying "to be black," and without any authority assert that the name was given to idolatrous priests from the black vestments which they wore. But white was the distinctive color in the priestly garments of all nations from India to Gaul, and black was only worn when they sacrificed to the subterranean gods (Bähr, *Symb.* ii, 87, etc.). That a special dress was adopted by the Baal-worshippers, as well as by the false prophets (Zech. xiii, 4), is evident from 2 Kings x, 22 (where the rendering should be "*the* apparel"): the vestments were kept in an apartment of the idol temple, under the charge probably of one of the inferior priests. Micah's Levite was provided with appropriate robes (Judg. xvii, 11). The "foreign apparel" mentioned in Zeph. i, 8, doubtless refers to a similar dress, adopted by the Israelites in defiance of the sumptuary law in Numb. xv, 37-40. See CHEMARIM.

In addition to the priests, there were other persons intimately connected with idolatrous rites, and the impurities from which they were inseparable. Both men and women consecrated themselves to the service of idols: the former as קְדֵשִׁים, *kedêshim*, for which there is reason to believe the A.V. (Deut. xxiii, 17, etc.) has not given too harsh an equivalent; the latter as קְדֵשׁוֹת, *kedêshôth*, who wove shrines for Astarte (2 Kings xxiii, 7), and resembled the ἑταίραι of Corinth, of whom Strabo (viii, 378) says there were more than a thousand attached to the temple of Aphrodite. Egyptian prostitutes consecrated themselves to Isis (Juvenal, vi, 489; ix, 22-24). The same class of women existed among the Phœnicians, Armenians, Lydians, and Babylonians (Herod. i, 93, 199; Strabo, xi, p. 532; Epist. of Jerem. ver. 43). They are distinguished from the public prostitutes (Hos. iv, 14), and associated with the performances of sacred rites, just as in Strabo (xii, p. 559) we find the two classes co-existing at Comana, the Corinth of Pontus, much frequented by pilgrims to the shrine of Aphrodite. The wealth thus obtained flowed into the treasury of the idol temple, and against such a practice the injunction in Deut. xxiii, 18 is directed. Dr. Maitland, anxious to defend the moral character of Jewish women, has with much ingenuity attempted to show that a meaning foreign to their true sense has been attached to the words above mentioned; and that, though closely associated with idolatrous services, they do not indicate such foul corruption (*Essay on False Worship*). But if, as Movers, with great appearance of probability, has conjectured (*Phön.* i, 679), the class of persons alluded to was composed of foreigners, the Jewish women in this respect need no such advocacy. That such customs existed among foreign nations there is abundant evidence to prove (Lucian, *De Syra Dea*, c. 5); and from the juxtaposition of prostitution and the idolatrous rites against which the laws in Lev. xix are aimed, it is probable that, next to its immorality, one main reason why it was visited with such stringency was its connection with idolatry (compare 1 Cor. vi, 9). See HARLOT.

But besides these accessories there were the ordinary rites of worship which idolatrous systems had in common with the religion of the Hebrews. Offering burnt sacrifices to the idol gods (2 Kings v, 17), burning incense in their honor (1 Kings xi, 8), and bowing down in worship before their images (1 Kings xix, 18) were the chief parts of their ritual, and, from their very analogy with the ceremonies of true worship, were more seductive than the grosser forms. Nothing can be stronger or more positive than the language in which these ceremonies were denounced by Hebrew law. Every detail of idol-worship was made the subject of a separate enactment, and many of the laws, which in themselves seem trivial and almost absurd, receive from this point of view their true significance. We are told by Maimonides (*Mor. Neb.* c. 12) that the prohibitions against sowing a field with mingled seed, and wearing garments of mixed material, were directed against the practices of idolaters, who attributed a kind of magical influence to the mixture (Lev. xix, 19; Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* ii, 18). Such, too, were the precepts which forbade that the garments of the sexes should be interchanged (Deut. xxiii, 5; Maimonides, *De Idol.* xii, 9). According to Macrobius (*Sat.* iii, 8), other Asiatics, when they sacrificed to their Venus, changed the dress of the sexes. The priests of Cybele appeared in women's clothes, and used to mutilate themselves (Creuzer, *Symb.* ii, 34, 42): the same custom was observed "by the Ithyphalli in the rites of Bacchus, and by the Athenians in their Ascophoria" (Young, *Idol. Cor. in Rel.* i, 105; comp. Lucian, *De Dea Syra*, c. 15). To preserve the Israelites from contamination, they were prohibited for three years after their conquest of Canaan from eating of the fruit-trees of the land, whose cultivation had been attended with magical rites (Lev. xix, 23). They were forbidden to "round the corner of the head," and to "mar the corner of the beard" (Lev. xix, 27), as the Arabians did in honor of their gods (Herod. iii, 8; iv, 175). Hence the phrase קְצוּצֵי פֵאָה (literally), "shorn of the corner," is especially applied to idolaters (Jer. ix, 26; xxv, 23). Spencer (*De Leg. Hebr.* ii, 9, § 2) explains the law forbidding the offering of honey (Lev. ii, 11) as intended to oppose an idolatrous practice. Strabo describes the Magi as offering in all their sacrifices libations of oil mixed with honey and milk (xv, p. 733). Offerings in which honey was an ingredient were made

to the inferior deities and the dead (Homer, *Od.* x, 519; Porph. *De Antr. Nymph.* c. 17). So also the practice of eating the flesh of sacrifices "over the blood" (Lev. xix, 26; Ezek. xxxiii, 25, 26) was, according to Maimonides, common among the Zabii. Spencer gives a double reason for the prohibition: that it was a rite of divination, and divination of the worst kind, a species of necromancy by which they attempted to raise the spirits of the dead (comp. Horace, *Sat.* i, 8). There are supposed to be allusions to the practice of necromancy in Isa. lxv, 4, or, at any rate, to superstitious rites in connection with the dead. The grafting of one tree upon another was forbidden, because among idolaters the process was accompanied by gross obscenity (Maimon. *Mor. Neb.* c. 12). Cutting the flesh for the dead (Lev. xix, 28; 1 Kings xviii, 28), and making a baldness between the eyes (Deut. xiv, 1), were associated with idolatrous rites, the latter being a custom among the Syrians (Sir G. Wilkinson in Rawlinson's *Herod.* ii, 158 note). The thrice-repeated and much-vexed passage, "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk" (Exod. xxiii, 19; xxxiv, 26; Deut. xiv, 21), interpreted by some as a precept of humanity, is explained by Cudworth in a very different manner. He quotes from a Karaite commentary which he had seen in MS.: "It was a custom of the ancient heathens, when they had gathered in all their fruit, to take a kid and boil it in the dam's milk, and then in a magical way go about and besprinkle with it all the trees, and fields, and gardens, and orchards; thinking by this means they should make them fructify, and bring forth again more abundantly the following year" (*On the Lord's Supper*, c. 2). Dr. Thomson mentions a favorite dish among the Arabs called *lebn immû*, to which he conceives allusion is made (*The Land and the Book*, i, 135). The law which regulated clean and unclean meats (Lev. xx, 23–26) may be considered both as a sanitary regulation and also as having a tendency to separate the Israelites from the surrounding idolatrous nations. It was with the same object, in the opinion of Michaelis, that while in the wilderness they were prohibited from killing any animal for food without first offering it to Jehovah (*Laws of Moses*, art. 203). The mouse, one of the unclean animals of Leviticus (xi, 29), was sacrificed by the ancient Magi (Isa. lxvi, 17; Movers, *Phön.* i, 219). It may have been some such reason as that assigned by Lewis (*Orig. Hebr.* v, 1), that the dog was the symbol of an Egyptian deity, which gave rise to the prohibition in Deut. xxiii, 18. Movers says (i, 404) the dog was offered in sacrifice to Moloch, as swine to the moon and Dionysus by the Egyptians, who afterwards ate of the flesh (Herod. iii, 47; Isa. lxv, 4). Eating of the things offered was a necessary appendage to the sacrifice (compare Exod. xviii, 12; xxxii, 6; xxxiv, 15; Numb. xxv, 2, etc.). Among the Persians the victim was eaten by the worshippers, and the soul alone left for the god (Strabo, xv, 732). "Hence it is that the idolatry of the Jews in worshipping other gods is so often described synecdochically under the notion of feasting. Isa. lvii, 7, 'Upon a high and lofty mountain thou hast *set thy bed*, and thither wentest thou up to offer sacrifice;' for in those ancient times they were not wont to sit at feasts, but lie down on beds or couches. Ezek. xxiii, 41; Amos ii, 8, 'They laid themselves down upon clothes laid to pledge by every altar,' i. e. laid themselves down to eat of the sacrifice that was offered on the altar; compare Ezek. xviii, 11" (Cudworth, *ut supra*, c. 1; comp. 1 Cor. viii, 10). The Israelites were forbidden "to print any mark upon them" (Lev. xix, 28), because it was a custom of idolaters to brand upon their flesh some symbol of the deity they worshipped, as the ivy-leaf of Bacchus (3 Macc. ii, 29). According to Lucian (*De Dea Syra*, 59), all the Assyrians wore marks of this kind on their necks and wrists (comp. Isa. xliv, 5; Gal. vi, 17; Rev. xiv, 1, 11). Many other practices of false worship are alluded to, and made the subjects of rigorous prohibition, but none are more frequently or more severely denounced than those which peculiarly distinguished the worship of Molech. It has been attempted to deny that the worship of this idol was polluted by the foul stain of human sacrifice, but the allusions are too plain and too pointed to admit of reasonable doubt (Deut. xii, 31; 2 Kings iii, 27; Jer. vii, 31; Psa. cvi, 37; Ezek. xxiii, 39). Nor was this practice confined to the rites of Molech; it extended to those of Baal (Jer. xix, 5), and the king of Moab (2 Kings iii, 27) offered his son as a burnt-offering to his god Chemosh. The Phœnicians, we are told by Porphyry (*De Abstin.* ii, c. 56), on occasions of great national calamity sacrificed to Kronos one of their dearest friends. Some allusions to this custom may be seen in Micah vi, 7. Kissing the images of the gods (1 Kings xix, 18; Hos. xiii, 2), hanging votive offerings in their temples (1 Sam. xxxi, 10), and carrying them to battle (2 Sam. v, 21), as the Jews of Maccabæus's army did with the things consecrated to the idols of the Jamnites (2 Macc. xii, 40), are usages connected with idolatry which are casually mentioned, though not made the objects of express legislation. But soothsaying, interpretation of dreams, necromancy, witchcraft, magic, and other forms of divination, are alike forbidden (Deut. xviii, 9; 2 Kings i, 2; Isa. lxv, 4; Ezek. xxi, 21). The history of other nations—and, indeed, the too common practice of the lower class of the population of Syria at the present day—shows us that such a statute as that against bestiality (Lev. xviii, 23) was not unnecessary (comp. Herod. ii, 46; Rom. i, 26). Purificatory rites in connection with idol-worship, and eating of forbidden food, were visited with severe retribution (Isa. lxvi, 17). It is evident, from the context of Ezek. viii, 17, that the votaries of the sun, who worshipped with their faces to the east (ver. 16), and "put the branch to their nose," did so in observance of some idolatrous rite. Movers (*Phön.* i, 66) unhesitatingly affirms that the allusion is to the branch Barsom, the holy branch of the Magi (Strabo, xv, p. 733), while Hävernick (*Comm. zu Ezech.* p. 117), with equal confidence, denies that the passage supports such an inference, and renders, having in view the lament of the women for Tammuz, "Sie entsenden den Trauergesang zu ihren Zorn." The waving of a myrtle branch, says Maimonides (*De Idol.* vi, 2), accompanied the repetition of a magical formula in incantations. An illustration of the use of boughs in worship will be found in the Greek *ἱκετηρία* (Æsch. *Eum.* 43; *Suppl.* 192; *Schol.* on Aristoph. *Plut.* 383; Porphyr. *De Ant. Nymph.* c. 33). For detailed accounts of idolatrous ceremonies, reference must be made to the articles upon the several idols. See SACRIFICE.

IV. *History of Idolatry among the Jews.*—1. The first undoubted allusion to idolatry or idolatrous customs in the Bible is in the account of Rachel's stealing her father's teraphim (Gen. xxxi, 19), a relic of the worship of other gods, whom the ancestors of the Israelites served "on the other side of the river, in old time" (Josh. xxiv, 2). By these household deities Laban was guided, and these he consulted as oracles (נִחַשְׁתִּי, Gen. xxx, 27, A. V. "learned by experience"), though without entirely losing sight of the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor, to whom he appealed when occasion offered (Gen. xxxi, 53), while he was ready, in the presence of Jacob, to acknowledge the benefits conferred upon him by Jehovah (Gen. xxx, 27). Such, indeed, was the character of most of the idolatrous worship of the Israelites. Like the Cuthæan colonists in Samaria, who "feared Jehovah and served their own gods" (2 Kings xvii, 33), they blended in a strange manner a theoretical belief in the true God with the external reverence which, in different stages of their history, they were led to pay to the idols of the nations by whom they were surrounded. For this species of false worship they seem, at all events, to have had an incredible propension. On their journey from Shechem to Bethel, the family of Jacob put away from among them "the gods of the *foreigner*:" not the teraphim of Laban, but the gods of the Canaanites through whose land they passed, and the amulets

and charms which were worn as the appendages of their worship (Gen. xxxv, 2, 4). See JACOB.

During their long residence in Egypt, the country of symbolism, they defiled themselves with the idols of the land, and it was long before the taint was removed (Josh. xxiv, 14; Ezek. xx, 7). To these gods Moses, as the herald of Jehovah, flung down the gauntlet of defiance (Kurtz, *Gesch. d. Alt. B.* ii, 39), and the plagues of Egypt smote their symbols (Numb. xxxiii, 4). Yet, with the memory of their deliverance fresh in their minds, their leader absent, the Israelites clamored for some visible shape in which they might worship the God who had brought them up out of Egypt (Exod. xxxii). The Israelites, as dwellers in the most outlying and separate tract of the Shemitic part of Lower Egypt, are more likely to have followed the corruptions of the Shepherd-strangers than those of the Egyptians, more especially as, saving Joseph, Moses, and not improbably Aaron and Miriam, they seem to have almost universally preserved the manners of their former wandering life. There is scarcely a trace of Egyptian influence beyond that seen in the names of Moses and Miriam, and perhaps of Aaron also, for the only other name besides the former two that is certainly Egyptian, and may be reasonably referred to this period, that of Harnepher, evidently the Egyptian HAR-NEFRU, "Horus the good," in the genealogies of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 36), probably marks an Egyptian taken by marriage into the tribe of Asher, whether a proselyte or not we cannot attempt to decide. There has been a difference of opinion as to the golden calf, some holding that it was made to represent God himself, others maintaining that it was only an imitation of an Egyptian idol. We first observe that this and Jeroboam's golden calves are shown to have been identical in the intention with which they were made, by the circumstance that the Israelites addressed the former as the God who had brought them out of Egypt (Exod. xxxii, 4, 8), and that Jeroboam proclaimed the same of his idols (1 Kings xii, 28). We next remark that Aaron called the calf not only god, but the LORD (Exod. xxxii, 5); that in the Psalms it is said "they changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth hay" (cvi, 20); that no one of the calf-worshipping kings and princes of Israel bears any name connected with idolatry, while many have names compounded with the most sacred name of God; and that in no place is any foreign divinity connected with calf-worship in the slightest degree. The adoption of such an image as the golden calf, however, shows the strength of Egyptian associations, else how would Aaron have fixed upon so ignoble a form as that of the God who had brought Israel out of Egypt? Only a mind thoroughly accustomed to the profound respect paid in Egypt to the sacred bulls, and especially to Apis and Mnevis, could have hit upon so strange a representation; nor could any people who had not witnessed the Egyptian practices have found, as readily as did the Israelites, the fulfilment of their wishes in such an image. The feast that Aaron celebrated, when, after eating and drinking, the people arose, sang, and danced naked before the idol, is strikingly like the festival of the finding of Apis, which was celebrated with feasting and dancing, and also, apparently, though this custom does not seem to have been part of the public festivity, with indecent gestures. See GOLDEN CALF. The golden calf was not the only idol which the Israelites worshipped in the Desert. The prophet Amos speaks of others. In the Masoretic text the passage is as follows: "But ye bare the tent [or *tabernacle*] of your king and Chiun your images, the star of your gods [or YOUR GOD], which ye made for yourselves" (v, 26). The Sept. has Μολόχ for "your king," as though their original Heb. had been מַלְכָּם instead of מַלְכְּכֶם, and Ῥαιφάν for Chiun, besides a transposition. In the Acts the reading is almost the same as that of the Sept., "Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them" (vii, 43). We cannot here discuss the probable causes of these differences except of the more important ones, the substitution of Moloch for "your king," and Raiphan or Remphan for Chiun. It should be observed, that if the passage related to Ammonitish worship, nothing would be more likely than that Molech should have been spoken of by an appellative, in which case a strict rendering of the Masoretic text would read as does the A. V.; a freer could follow the Sept. and Acts; but, as there is no reference to the Ammonites or even Canaanites, it is more reasonable to suppose that the Sept. followed a text in which, as above suggested, the reading was מַלְכָּם, Malcham, or "your king." The likelihood of this being the true reading must depend upon the rest of the passage. Remphan and Chiun are at once recognised as two foreign divinities worshipped together in Egypt, RENPU, probably pronounced REMPU, and KEN, the former a god represented as of the type of the Shemites, and apparently connected with war, the latter a goddess represented naked standing upon a lion. They were worshipped with KHEM, the Egyptian god of productiveness, and the foreign war-goddess ANATA. Excluding KHEM, who is probably associated with KEN from her being connected, as we shall see, with productiveness, these names, RENPU, KEN, and ANATA, are clearly not, except in orthography, Egyptian. We can suggest no origin for the name of RENPU. The godddes KEN, as naked, would be connected with the Babylonian Mylitta, and as standing on a lion, with a goddess so represented in rock-sculptures at Maltheiyyeh, near Nineveh. The former similarity connects her with generation; the latter, perhaps, does so likewise. If we adopt this supposition, the name KEN may be traced to a root connected with generation found in many varieties in the Iranian family, and not out of that family. It may be sufficient to cite the Greek γίν-ομαι, γυν-ή: she would thus be the goddess of productiveness. ANATA is the Persian Anaïtis. We have shown earlier that the Babylonian high nature-worship seems to have been of Aryan origin. In the present case we trace an Aryan idolatry connected, from the mention of a star, with high nature-worship. If we accept this explanation, it becomes doubtful that Molech is mentioned in the passage, and we may rather suppose that some other idol, to whom a kingly character was attributed, is intended. Here we must leave this difficult point of our inquiry, only summing up that this false worship was evidently derived from the shepherds in Egypt, and may possibly indicate the Aryan origin of at least one of these tribes, almost certainly its own origin, directly or indirectly, from an Aryan source.

The next was a temporary apostasy. The charms of the daughters of Moab, as Balaam's bad genius foresaw, were potent for evil: the Israelites were "yoked to Baal-Peor" in the trammels of his fair worshippers, and the character of their devotions is not obscurely hinted at (Numb. xxv). The great and terrible retribution which followed left so deep an impress upon the hearts of the people that, after the conquest of the promised land, they looked with an eye of terror upon any indication of defection from the worship of Jehovah, and denounced as idolatrous a memorial so slight as the altar of the Reubenites at the passage of Jordan (Josh. xxii, 16).

2. It is probable that during the wanderings, and under the strong rule of Joshua, the idolatry learnt in Egypt was so destroyed as to be afterwards utterly forgotten by the people. But in entering Palestine they found themselves among the monuments and associations of another false religion, less attractive indeed to the reason than that of Egypt, which still taught, notwithstanding the wretched fetishism that it supported, some great truths of man's present and future, but of a religion which, in its deification of nature, had a strong hold on the imagination. The genial sun, the refreshing moon, the stars, at whose risings or settings fell the longed-for rains, were naturally reverenced in that land of green hills and valleys, which were fed by the water of heaven. A

nation thrown in the scene of such a religion and mixed with those who professed it, at that period of national life when impressions are most readily made, such a nation, albeit living while the recollection of the deliverance from Egypt and the wonders with which the Law was given was yet fresh, soon fell away into the practices that it was strictly enjoined to root out. In the first and second laws of the Decalogue, the Israelites were commanded to worship but one God, and not to make any image whatever to worship it, lest they and their children should fall under God's heavy displeasure. The commands were explicit enough. But not alone was idolatry thus clearly condemned: the Israelites were charged to destroy all objects connected with the religion of the inhabitants of Canaan. They were to destroy utterly all the heathen places of worship, "upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree." They were to "overthrow" the "altars" of the heathen, "break their pillars," "burn their groves, hew down the graven images of their gods, and destroy the names of them out of that place" (Deut. xii, 2, 3), a passage we cite on account of the fulness of the enumeration. Had the conquered nations been utterly extirpated, their idolatry might have been annihilated at once. But soon after the lands had been apportioned, that separate life of the tribes began which was never interrupted, as far as history tells us, until the time of the kings. Divided, the tribes were unable to cope with the remnant of the Canaanites, and either dwelt with them on equal terms, reduced them to tribute, or became tributaries themselves. The Israelites were thus surrounded by the idolatry of Canaan; and since they were for the most part confined to the mountain and hilly districts, where its associations were strongest, they had but to learn from their neighbors how they had worshipped upon the high hills and under every green tree. From the use of plural forms, it is probable that the Baals and Ashtoreths of several towns or tribes were worshipped by the Israelites, as Baal-Peor had been, and Baal-berith afterwards was. It does not seem, however, that the people at once fell into heathen worship: the first step appears to have been adopting a corruption of the true religion.

During the lives of Joshua and the elders who outlived him, indeed, they kept true to their allegiance; but the generation following, who knew not Jehovah, nor the works he had done for Israel, swerved from the plain path of their fathers, and were caught in the toils of the foreigner (Judg. ii). From this time forth their history becomes little more than a chronicle of the inevitable sequence of offence and punishment. "They provoked Jehovah to anger . . . and the anger of Jehovah was hot against Israel, and he delivered them into the hands of spoilers that spoiled them" (Judg. ii, 12, 14). The narratives of the book of Judges, contemporaneous or successive, tell of the fierce struggle maintained against their hated foes, and how women forgot their tenderness and forsook their retirement to sing the song of victory over the oppressor. By turns, each conquering nation strove to establish the worship of its national god. During the rule of Midian, Joash, the father of Gideon, had an altar to Baal, and an Asherah (Judg. vi, 25), though he proved but a lukewarm worshipper (ver. 31). Even Gideon himself gave occasion to idolatrous worship; yet the ephod which he made from the spoils of the Midianites was perhaps but a votive offering to the true God (Judg. viii, 27). It is not improbable that the gold ornaments of which it was composed were in some way connected with idolatry (comp. Isa. iii, 18-24), and that, from their having been worn as amulets, some superstitious virtue was conceived to cling to them even in their new form. But, though in Gideon's lifetime no overt act of idolatry was practised, he was no sooner dead than the Israelites again returned to the service of the Baalim, and, as if in solemn mockery of the covenant made with Jehovah, chose from among them Baal-Berith, "Baal of the Covenant" (comp. Ζεὺς ὅρκιος), as the object of their special adoration (Judg. viii, 33). Of this god we know only that his temple, probably of wood (Judg. ix, 49), was a stronghold in time of need, and that his treasury was filled with the silver of the worshippers (ix, 4). Nor were the calamities of foreign oppression confined to the land of Canaan. The tribes on the east of Jordan went astray after the idols of the land, and were delivered into the hands of the children of Ammon (Judg. x, 8). But they put away from among them "the gods of the foreigner," and with the baseborn Jephthah for their leader gained a signal victory over their oppressors. The exploits of Samson against the Philistines, though achieved within a narrower space and with less important results than those of his predecessors, fill a brilliant page in his country's history. But the tale of his marvellous deeds is prefaced by that ever-recurring phrase, so mournfully familiar, "the children of Israel did evil again in the eyes of Jehovah, and Jehovah gave them into the hand of the Philistines." Thus far idolatry is a national sin. The episode of Micah, in Judg. xvii, xviii, sheds a lurid light on the secret practices of individuals, who, without formally renouncing Jehovah, though ceasing to recognise him as the theocratic king (xvii, 6), linked with his worship the symbols of ancient idolatry. The house of God, or sanctuary, which Micah made in imitation of that at Shiloh, was decorated with an ephod and teraphim dedicated to God, and with a graven and molten image consecrated to some inferior deities (Selden, *De Dis Syris*, synt. i, 2). It is a significant fact, showing how deeply rooted in the people was the tendency to idolatry, that a Levite, who, of all others, should have been most sedulous to maintain Jehovah's worship in its purity, was found to assume the office of priest to the images of Micah; and that this Levite, priest afterwards to the idols of Dan, was no other than Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Moses. Tradition says that these idols were destroyed when the Philistines defeated the army of Israel and took from them the ark of the covenant of Jehovah (1 Sam. iv). The Danites are supposed to have carried them into the field, as the other tribes bore the ark, and the Philistines the images of their gods, when they went forth to battle (2 Sam. v, 21; Lewis, *Orig. Hebr.* v, 9). But the *Seder Olam Rabba* (c. 24) interprets "the captivity of the land" (Judg. xviii, 30), of the captivity of Manasseh; and Benjamin of Tudela mistook the remains of later Gentile worship for traces of the altar or statue which Micah had dedicated, and which was worshipped by the tribe of Dan (Selden, *De Dis Syr.* synt. i, 2; Stanley, *S. and Pal.* p. 398). In later times the practice of secret idolatry was carried to greater lengths. Images were set up on the corn-floors, in the wine-vats, and behind the doors of private houses (Isa. lvii, 8; Hos. ix, 1, 2); and to check this tendency the statute in Deut. xxvii, 15 was originally promulgated. It is noticeable that they do not seem during this period to have generally adopted the religions of any but the Canaanites, although in one remarkable passage they are said, between the time of Jair and that of Jephthah, to have forsaken the Lord, and served Baalim, and Ashtaroth, and the gods of Syria, Zidon, Moab, the children of Ammon, and the Philistines (Judg. x, 6), as though there had then been an utter and profligate apostasy. The cause, no doubt, was that the Canaanitish worship was borrowed in a time of amity, and that but one Canaanitish oppressor is spoken of, whereas the Abrahamites of the east of Palestine, and the Philistines, were almost always enemies of the Israelites. Each time of idolatry was punished by a servitude, each reformation followed by a deliverance. Speedily as the nation returned to idolatry, its heart was fresher than that of the ten tribes which followed Jeroboam, and never seem to have had one thorough national repentance.

3. The notices of their great wars show that the enmity between the Philistines and the Israelites was too great for any idolatry to be then borrowed from the for-

mer by the latter, though at an earlier time this was not the case. Under Samuel's administration a fast was held, and purificatory rites performed, to mark the public renunciation of idolatry (1 Sam. vii, 3-6). Saul's family were, however, tainted, as it seems, with idolatry, for the names of Ishbosheth or Esh-baal, and Mephibosheth or Merib-baal, can scarcely have been given but in honor of Baal. From the circumstances of Michal's stratagem to save David, it seems not only that Saul's family kept teraphim, but, apparently, that they used them for purposes of divination, the Sept. having "liver" for "pillow," as if the Hebr. had been כָּבֵד instead of the present כְּבִיר. See PILLOW. The circumstance of having teraphim, more especially if they were used for divination, lends especial force to Samuel's reproof of Saul (1 Sam. xv, 23). During the reign of David idolatry in public is unmentioned, and no doubt was almost unknown. See DAVID.

The earlier days of Solomon were the happiest of the kingdom of Israel. The Temple worship was fully established, with the highest magnificence, and there was no excuse for that worship of God at high places which seems to have been before permitted on account of the constant distractions of the country. But the close of that reign was marked by an apostasy of which we read with wonder. Hitherto the people had been the sinners, their leaders reformers; this time the king, led astray by his many strange wives, perverted the people, and raised high places on the Mount of Corruption, opposite God's temple. He worshipped Ashtoreth, goddess of the Zidonians, Chemosh, the god of the Moabites, and Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites, building high places for the latter two, as well as for all the gods of his strange wives. Solomon, no doubt, was very tolerant, and would not prevent these women from following their native superstitions, even if they felt it a duty to burn their and his children before Molech. Foreign idolatry was openly imitated. Three of the summits of Olivet were crowned with the high places of Ashtoreth, Chemosh, and Molech (1 Kings xi, 7; 2 Kings xxiii, 13), and the fourth, in memory of his great apostasy, was branded with the opprobrious title of the "Mount of Corruption." Calamity speedily followed this great apostasy: the latter years of Solomon were troubled by continual premonitions of those political reverses which were the inevitable penalty of this high-treason against the theocracy. This is clearly brought out by the marked and frequent denunciations of the later prophets. See SOLOMON.

Rehoboam, the son of an Ammonitish mother, perpetuated the worst features of Solomon's idolatry (1 Kings xiv, 22-24); and in his reign was made the great schism in the national religion—when Jeroboam, fresh from his recollections of the Apis worship of Egypt, erected golden calves at Bethel and at Dan, and by this crafty state policy severed forever the kingdoms of Judah and Israel (1 Kings xii, 26-33). To their use were temples consecrated, and the service in their honor was studiously copied from the Mosaic ritual. High-priest himself, Jeroboam ordained priests from the lowest ranks (2 Chron. xi, 15); incense and sacrifices were offered, and a solemn festival appointed, closely resembling the feast of tabernacles (1 Kings xii, 23, 33; comp. Amos iv, 4, 5). See JEROBOAM. The worship of the calves, "the sin of Israel" (Hos. x, 8), which was apparently associated with the goat-worship of Mendes (2 Chron. xi, 15; Herod. ii, 46) or of the ancient Zabii (Lewis, *Orig. Hebr.* v, 3), and the Asherim (1 Kings xiv, 15; A.V. "groves"), ultimately spread to the kingdom of Judah, and centred in Beersheba (Amos v, 5; vii, 9). At what precise period it was introduced into the latter kingdom is not certain. The Chronicles tell us how Abijah taunted Jeroboam with his apostasy, while the less partial narrative in 1 Kings represents his own conduct as far from exemplary (1 Kings xv, 3). Asa's sweeping reform spared not even the idol of his grandmother Maachah, and, with the exception of the high places, he removed all relics of idolatrous worship (1 Kings xv, 12-14), with its accompanying impurities. His reformation was completed by Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 6). See each king in alphabetical order.

The successors of Jeroboam followed in his steps, till Ahab, who married a Zidonian princess, at her instigation (1 Kings xxi, 25) built a temple and altar to Baal, and revived all the abominations of the Amorites (1 Kings xxi, 26). For this he attained the bad pre-eminence of having done "more to provoke Jehovah, the God of Israel, to anger than all the kings of Israel that were before him" (1 Kings xvi, 33). Compared with the worship of Baal, the worship of the calves was a venial offence, probably because it was morally less detestable, and also less anti-national (1 Kings xii, 28; 2 Kings x, 28-31). See ELIJAH. Henceforth Baal-worship became so completely identified with the northern kingdom that it is described as walking in the way or statutes of the kings of Israel (2 Kings xvi, 3; xvii, 8), as distinguished from the sin of Jeroboam, which ceased not till the Captivity (2 Kings xvii, 23), and the corruption of the ancient inhabitants of the land. The idolatrous priests became a numerous and important caste (1 Kings xviii, 19), living under the patronage of royalty, and fed at the royal table. The extirpation of Baal's priests by Elijah, and of his followers by Jehu (2 Kings x), in which the royal family of Judah shared (2 Chron. xxii, 7), was a death-blow to this form of idolatry in Israel, though other systems still remained (2 Kings xiii, 6). But, while Israel thus sinned and was punished, Judah was morally more guilty (Ezek. xvi, 51). The alliance of Jehoshaphat with the family of Ahab transferred to the southern kingdom, during the reigns of his son and grandson, all the appurtenances of Baal-worship (2 Kings viii, 18, 27). In less than ten years after the death of that king, in whose praise it is recorded that he "sought not the Baalim," nor walked "after the deed of Israel" (2 Chron. xvii, 3, 4), a temple had been built for the idol, statues and altars erected, and priests appointed to minister in his service (2 Kings xi, 18). Jehoiada's vigorous measures checked the evil for a time, but his reform was incomplete, and the high places still remained, as in the days of Asa, a nucleus for any fresh system of idolatry (2 Kings xii, 3). Much of this might be due to the influence of the king's mother, Zibiah of Beersheba, a place intimately connected with the idolatrous defection of Judah (Amos viii, 14). After the death of Jehoiada, the princes prevailed upon Joash to restore at least some portion of his father's idolatry (2 Chron. xxiv, 18). The conquest of the Edomites by Amaziah introduced the worship of their gods, which had disappeared since the days of Solomon (2 Chron. xxv, 14, 20). After this period, even the kings who did not lend themselves to the encouragement of false worship had to contend with the corruption which still lingered in the hearts of the people (2 Kings xv, 35; 2 Chron. xxvii, 2). Hitherto the temple had been kept pure. The statues of Baal and the other gods were worshipped in their own shrines; but Ahaz, who "sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus, which smote him" (2 Chron. xxviii, 23), and built altars to them at every corner of Jerusalem, and high places in every city of Judah, replaced the brazen altar of burnt-offering by one made after the model of "*the* altar" of Damascus, and desecrated it to his own uses (2 Kings xvi, 10-15).

The conquest of the ten tribes by Shalmaneser was for them the last scene of the drama of abominations which had been enacted uninterruptedly for upwards of 250 years. In the northern kingdom no reformer arose to vary the long line of royal apostates; whatever was effected in the way of reformation was done by the hands of the people (2 Chron. xxxi, 1). But even in their captivity they helped to perpetuate the corruption. The colonists, whom the Assyrian conquerors placed in their stead in the cities of Samaria, brought with them their own gods, and were taught at Bethel, by a priest of the captive nation, "the manner of the god of the

land," the lessons thus learnt resulting in a strange admixture of the calf-worship of Jeroboam with the homage paid to their national deities (2 Kings xvii, 24-41). Their descendants were in consequence regarded with suspicion by the elders who returned from the captivity with Ezra, and their offers of assistance rejected (Ezra iv, 3). See SAMARITANS.

The first act of Hezekiah on ascending the throne was the restoration and purification of the Temple, which had been dismantled and closed during the latter part of his father's life (2 Chron. xxviii, 24; xxix, 3). The multitudes who flocked to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover, so long in abeyance, removed the idolatrous altars of burnt-offering and incense erected by Ahaz (2 Chron. xxx, 14). The iconoclastic spirit was not confined to Judah and Benjamin, but spread throughout Ephraim and Manasseh (2 Chron. xxxi, 1), and to all external appearance idolatry was extirpated. But the reform extended little below the surface (Isa. xxix, 13). Among the leaders of the people there were many in high position who conformed to the necessities of the time (Isa. xxviii, 14), and under Manasseh's patronage the false worship, which had been merely driven into obscurity, broke out with tenfold virulence. Idolatry of every form, and with all the accessories of enchantments, divination, and witchcraft, was again rife; no place was too sacred, no associations too hallowed, to be spared the contamination. If the conduct of Ahaz in erecting an altar in the temple court is open to a charitable construction, Manasseh's was of no doubtful character. The two courts of the Temple were profaned by altars dedicated to the host of heaven, and the image of the Asherah polluted the holy place (2 Kings xxi, 7; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 7, 15; comp. Jer. xxxii, 34). Even in his late repentance he did not entirely destroy all traces of his former wrong. Tradition states that the remonstrances of the aged Isaiah (q. v.) only served to secure his own martyrdom (Gemara on *Yebamoth*, iv). The people still burned incense on the high places; but Jehovah was the ostensible object of their worship. The king's son sacrificed to his father's idols, but was not associated with him in his repentance, and in his short reign of two years restored all the altars of the Baalim and the images of the Asherah. With the death of Josiah ended the last effort to revive among the people a purer ritual, if not a purer faith. The lamp of David, which had long shed but a struggling ray, flickered for a while, and then went out in the darkness of Babylonian captivity. See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

It will be useful here to recapitulate the main varieties of the idolatry which so greatly marred the religious character of this monarchical period of the Jewish state. It has been a question much debated whether the Israelites were ever so far given up to idolatry as to lose all knowledge of the true God. It would be hard to assert this of any nation, and still more difficult to prove. That there always remained among them a faithful few, who in the face of every danger adhered to the worship of Jehovah, may readily be believed, for even at a time when Baal-worship was most prevalent there were found seven thousand in Israel who had not bowed before his image (1 Kings xix, 18). But there is still room for grave suspicion that among the masses of the people, though the idea of a supreme Being—of whom the images they worshipped were but the distorted representatives—was not entirely lost, it was so obscured as to be but dimly apprehended. And not only were the ignorant multitude thus led astray, but the priests, scribes, and prophets became leaders of the apostasy (Jer. ii, 8). Warburton, indeed, maintained that they never formally renounced Jehovah, and that their defection consisted "in joining foreign worship and idolatrous ceremonies to the ritual of the true God" (*Div. Leg.* b. v, § 3). But one passage in their history, though confessedly obscure, seems to point to a time when, under the rule of the judges, "Israel for many days had no true God, and no teaching priest, and no law" (2 Chron. xv, 3). The correlative argument of Cudworth, who contends from the teaching of the Hebrew doctors and rabbis "that the pagan nations anciently, at least the intelligent amongst them, acknowledged one supreme God of the whole world, and that all other gods were but creatures and inferior ministers," is controverted by Mosheim (*Intell. Syst.* i, 4, § 30, and notes). There can be no doubt that much of the idolatry of the Hebrews consisted in worshipping the true God under an image, such as the calves at Bethel and Dan (Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 8, 5; *δαμάλεις ἐπωνύμους τῷ θεῷ*), and by associating his worship with idolatrous rites (Jer. xli, 5) and places consecrated to idols (2 Kings xviii, 22). From the peculiarity of their position they were never distinguished as the inventors of a new pantheon, nor did they adopt any one system of idolatry so exclusively as ever to become identified with it (so the Moabites with the worship of Chemosh [Numb. xxi, 29]); but they no sooner came in contact with other nations than they readily adapted themselves to their practices, the old spirit of antagonism died rapidly away, and intermarriage was one step to idolatry.

a. Sun-worship, though mentioned with other kinds of high nature-worship, as in the enumeration of those suppressed by Josiah, seems to have been practiced alone as well as with the adoration of other heavenly bodies. In Ezekiel's remarkable vision of the idolatries of Jerusalem, he saw about four-and-twenty men between the porch and the altar of the Temple, with their backs to the Temple and their faces to the east, worshipping the sun (Ezek. viii, 16). Josiah had before this taken away "the horses that the kings of Judah had given to the sun, at the entering in of the house of the Lord," and had "burned the chariots of the sun with fire" (2 Kings xxiii, 11). The same part of the temple is perhaps here meant. There is nothing to show whether these were images or living horses. The horse was sacred to the sun among the Carthaginians, but the worship of the visible sun instead of an image looks rather like a Persian or an Arab custom. See SUN.

b. In the account of Josiah's reform we read of the abolition of the worship of Baal, the sun, the moon, Mazzaloth, also called Mazzaroth (Job xxxviii, 32), which we hold to be the mansions of the moon [see ASTRONOMY], and all the host of heaven (2 Kings xxiii, 5). Manasseh is related to have served "all the host of heaven" (xxi, 3). Jeremiah speaks of "the houses of Jerusalem, and the houses of the kings of Judah," as to be defiled, "because of all the houses upon whose roofs they have burned incense unto all the host of heaven, and have poured out drink-offerings unto other gods" (Jer. xix, 13). In this prophet's time the people of Judah and Jerusalem, among other abominations, made cakes for "the queen of heaven," or "the worship of heaven:" a different form justifying the latter reading. The usual reading is מְלֶכֶת, *queen*, which the Sept. once follows, the Vulg. always; some copies give מְלֶאכֶת, *worship*, that is, "a deity or goddess." The former reading seems preferable, and the context in two passages in Jeremiah shows that an abstract sense is not admissible (xliv, 17, 18, 19, 25). In Egypt, the remnant that fled after the murder of Gedaliah were warned by the prophet to abandon those idolatrous practices for which their country and cities had been desolated. The men, conscious that their wives had burned incense to false gods in Egypt, declared that they would certainly burn incense and pour out drink-offerings to the queen of heaven, as they, their fathers, their kings, and their princes had done in a time of plenty, asserting that since they had left off these practices they had been consumed by the sword and by famine: for this a fresh doom was pronounced upon them (ch. xliv). It is very difficult to conjecture what goddess can be here meant: Ashtoreth would suit, but is never mentioned interchangeably; the moon must be rejected for the same reason. Here we certainly see a strong resem-

blance to Arab idolatry, which was wholly composed of cosmic worship and of fetishism, and in which the mansions of the moon were reverenced on account of their connection with seasons of rain. This system of cosmic worship may have been introduced from the Nabathæans or Edomites of Petra, from the Sabians, or from other Arabs or Chaldæans. See QUEEN OF HEAVEN.

c. Two idols, *Gad*, גַּד, or Fortune, and *Meni*, מְנִי, or Fate, from מָנָה, *he* or *it divided, assigned, numbered*, are spoken of in a single passage in the later part of Isaiah (lxv, 11). Gesenius, depending upon the theory of the post-Isaian authorship of the later chapters of the prophet, makes these to be idols worshipped by the Jews in Babylonia, but it must be remarked that their names are not traceable in Babylonian and Assyrian mythology. Gesenius has, however, following Pococke (*Spec. Hist. Arabum*, p. 93), compared Meni with *Manah*, a goddess of the pagan Arabs, worshipped in the form of a stone between Mekkeh and El-Medîneh by the tribes of Hudheyl and Khuzaah. But El-Beydawî, though deriving the name of this idol from the root *mana*, "he cut," supposes it was thus called because victims were slain upon it (*Comment. in Coran.* ed. Fleischer, p. 293). This meaning certainly seems to disturb the idea that the two idols were identical, but the mention of the sword and slaughter as punishments of the idolaters who worshipped Gad and Meni is not to be forgotten. Gad may have been a Canaanitish form of Baal, if we are to judge from the geographical name Baal-gad of a place at the foot of Mount Hermon (Josh. xi, 17; xii, 7; xiii, 5). Perhaps the grammatical form of Meni may throw some light upon the origin of this idolatry. The worship of both idols resembles that of the cosmic divinities of the later kings of Judah. See MENI.

d. In Ezekiel's vision of the idolatries of Jerusalem he beheld a chamber of imagery in the Temple itself, having "every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and [or *even*] all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall round about," and seventy Israelitish elders offering incense (Ezek. viii, 7-12). This is so exact a description of an Egyptian sanctuary, with the idols depicted upon its walls, dimly lighted, and filled with incense-offering priests, that we cannot for a moment doubt that these Jews derived from Egypt their fetishism, for such this special worship appears mainly, if not wholly to have been. See IMAGERY, CHAMBER OF.

e. In the same vision the prophet saw women weeping for Tammuz (ver. 13, 14), known to be the same as Adonis, from whom the fourth month of the Syrian year was named. This worship was probably introduced by Ahaz from Syria. See TAMMUZ.

f. The *image of jealousy*, סֶמֶל הַקִּנְאָה, spoken of in the same passage, which was placed in the Temple, has not been satisfactorily explained. The meaning may only be that it was an image of a false god, or there may be a play in the second part of the appellation upon the proper name. We cannot, however, suggest any name that might be thus intended. See JEALOUSY, IMAGE OF.

g. The brazen serpent, having become an object of idolatrous worship, was destroyed by Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii, 4). See BRAZEN SERPENT.

h. Moloch-worship was not only celebrated at the high place Solomon had made, but at Topheth, in the valley of the sons of Hinnom, where children were made to pass through the fire to the Ammonitish abomination. This place, as well as Solomon's altars, Josiah defiled, and we read of no later worship of Moloch, Chemosh, and Ashtoreth. See MOLOCH.

i. For the supposed divinity אחד of Isa. lxvi, 17 (compare Meier, *De uno deo Assyriorum*, Helmst. 1734), see ACHAD.

The new population placed by the king of Assyria in the cities of Samaria adopted a strange mixture of religions. Terrified at the destruction by lions of some of their number, they petitioned the king of Assyria, and an Israelitish priest was sent to them. They then adopted the old worship at high places, and still served their own idols. The people of Babylon made Succoth-benoth; the Cuthites, Nergal; the Hamathites, Ashima; the Avites, Nibhaz and Tartak; and the people of Sepharvaim burned their children to their native gods, Adrammelech and Anammelech. Nergal is a well-known Babylonian idol, and the occurrence of the element *melech* (king) in the names of the Molechs of Sepharvaim is very remarkable (2 Kings xvii, 24-41).

4. The Babylonian Exile was an effectual rebuke of the national sin. It is true that even during the captivity the devotees of false worship plied their craft as prophets and diviners (Jer. xxix, 8; Ezek. xiii), and the Jews who fled to Egypt carried with them recollections of the material prosperity which attended their idolatrous sacrifices in Judah, and to the neglect of which they attributed their exiled condition (Jer. xliv, 17, 18). One of the first difficulties, indeed, with which Ezra had to contend, and which brought him wellnigh to despair, was the haste with which his countrymen took them foreign wives of the people of the land, and followed them in all their abominations (Ezra ix). The priests and rulers, to whom he looked for assistance in his great enterprise, were among the first to fall away (Ezra ix, 2; x, 18; Neh. vi, 17, 18; xiii, 23). Still, the post-exilian prophets speak of idolatry as an evil of the past, Zechariah foretelling the time when the very names of the false gods would be forgotten (xiii, 2). In Malachi we see that a cold formalism was already the national sin, and such was ever after the case with the Jewish people. The Babylonian Exile, therefore, may be said to have purified the Jews from their idolatrous tendencies. How this great change was wrought does not appear. Partly, no doubt, it was due to the pious examples of Ezra and Nehemiah; partly, perhaps, to the Persian contempt for the lower kinds of idolatry, which insured a respect for the Hebrew religion on the part of the government; partly to the sight of the fulfilment of God's predicted judgments upon the idolatrous nations which the Jews had either sought as allies or feared as enemies. See EXILE.

5. Years passed by, and the names of the idols of Canaan had been forgotten, when the Hebrews were assailed by a new danger. Greek idolatry under Alexander and his successors was practised throughout the civilized world. The conquests of Alexander in Asia caused Greek influence to be extensively felt, and Greek idolatry to be first tolerated and then practised by the Jews (1 Macc. i, 43-50, 54). Some place-hunting Jews were base enough to adopt it. At first the Greek princes who ruled Palestine wisely forbore to interfere with the Hebrew religion. The politic earlier Ptolemies even encouraged it; but when the country had fallen into the hands of the Seleucidæ, Antiochus Epiphanes, reversing his father's policy of toleration, seized Jerusalem, set up an idol-altar to Jupiter in the Temple itself, and forbade the observance of the law. Weakly supported by a miserable faction, he had to depend wholly upon his military power. The attempt of Antiochus to establish this form of worship was vigorously resisted by Mattathias (1 Macc. ii, 23-26), who was joined in his rebellion by the Assidæans (ver. 42), and destroyed the altars at which the king commanded them to sacrifice (1 Macc. ii, 25, 45). The erection of synagogues has been assigned as a reason for the comparative purity of the Jewish worship after the Captivity (Prideaux, *Conn.* i, 374), while another cause has been discovered in the hatred for images acquired by the Jews in their intercourse with the Persians. The Maccabæan revolt, small in its beginning, had the national heart on its side, and, after a long and varied struggle, achieved more than the nation had ever before effected since the days of the Judges. Thenceforward idolatry was to the Jew the religion of his enemies, and naturally made no perverts.

6. The early Christians were brought into contact with idolaters when the Gospel was preached among the Gentiles, and it became necessary to enact regulations for preventing scandal by their being involved in pagan practices, when joining in the private meals and festivities of the heathen (1 Cor. viii). But the Gentile converts do not seem to have been in any danger of reverting to idolatry, and the cruel persecutions they underwent did not tend to lead them back to a religion which its more refined votaries despised. It is, however, not impossible that many who had been originally educated as idolaters did not, on professing Christianity, really abandon all their former superstitions, and that we may thus explain the very early outbreak of many customs and opinions not sanctioned in the N. T.

V. *Ethical Views respecting Idolatry.*—That this is a cardinal sin, and, indeed, the highest form, if not essential principle of all sin, as aiming a direct blow at the throne of God itself, is evident from its prohibition in the very fore-front of the Decalogue. Hence the tenacity with which the professors of all true religion in every age have opposed it, under every disguise and at whatever cost. It has always and naturally been the associate of polytheism, and those corrupt forms of Christianity, such as the Roman and Greek Churches, which have endeavored to apologize for the adoration of pictures, images, etc., on the flimsy pretext that it is not the inanimate objects themselves which are revered, but only the beings thus represented, are but imitators in this of the sophistry of certain refined speculators among the grosser heathen, e. g. of Egypt, Greece, etc., who put forth similar claims. See IMAGE-WORSHIP.

Three things are condemned in Scripture as idolatry: 1. The worshipping of a false God; 2. the worshipping of the true God through an image; 3. the indulgence of those passions which draw the soul away from God, e. g. covetousness, lust, etc. The Israelites were guilty of the first when they bowed the knee to Baal; of the second when they set up the golden calves; and both Israelites and Christians are often guilty of the third.

1. *Light in which Idolatry was regarded in the Mosaic Code, and the penalties with which it was visited.*—If one main object of the Hebrew polity was to teach the unity of God, the extermination of idolatry was but a subordinate end. Jehovah, the God of the Israelites, was the civil head of the state. He was the theocratic king of the people, who had delivered them from bondage, and to whom they had taken a willing oath of allegiance. They had entered into a solemn league and covenant with him as their chosen king (comp. 1 Sam. viii, 7), by whom obedience was requited with temporal blessings, and rebellion with temporal punishment. This original contract of the Hebrew government, as it has been termed, is contained in Exod. xix, 3-8; xx, 2-5; Deut. xxxix, 10-xxx; the blessings promised to obedience are enumerated in Deut. xxviii, 1-14, and the withering curses on disobedience in verses 15-68. That this covenant was strictly insisted on it needs but slight acquaintance with Hebrew history to perceive. Often broken and often renewed on the part of the people (Judg. x, 10; 2 Chron. xv, 12, 13; Neh. ix, 38), it was kept with unwavering constancy on the part of Jehovah. To their kings he stood in the relation, so to speak, of a feudal superior: they were his representatives upon earth, and with them, as with the people before, his covenant was made (1 Kings iii, 14; xi, 11). Idolatry, therefore, to an Israelite was a state offence (1 Sam. xv, 23), a political crime of the gravest character, high-treason against the majesty of his king. It was a transgression of the covenant (Deut. xvii, 2), "*the* evil" pre-eminently in the eyes of Jehovah (1 Kings xxi, 25, opp. to הַיָּשָׁר, "*the* right," 2 Chron. xxvii, 2). But it was much more than all this. While the idolatry of foreign nations is stigmatized merely as an abomination in the sight of God, which called for his vengeance, the sin of the Israelites is regarded as of more glaring enormity, and greater moral guilt. In the figurative language of the prophets, the relation between Jehovah and his people is represented as a marriage bond (Isa. liv, 5; Jer. iii, 14), and the worship of false gods, with all its accompaniments (Lev. xx, 56), becomes then the greatest of social wrongs (Hos. ii; Jer. iii, etc.). This is beautifully brought out in Hos. ii, 16, where the heathen name Baali, my master, which the apostate Israel has been accustomed to apply to her foreign possessor, is contrasted with Ishi, my man, my husband, the native word which she is to use when restored to her rightful husband, Jehovah. Much of the significance of this figure was unquestionably due to the impurities of idolaters, with whom such corruption was of no merely spiritual character (Exod. xxxiv, 16; Numb. xxv, 1, 2, etc.), but manifested itself in the grossest and most revolting forms (Rom. i, 26-32).

Regarded in a moral aspect, false gods are called "stumbling-blocks" (Ezek. xiv, 3), "lies" (Amos ii, 4; Rom. i, 25), "horrors" or "frights" (1 Kings xv, 13; Jer. l, 38), "abominations" (Deut. xxix, 17; xxxii, 16; 1 Kings xi, 5; 2 Kings xxiii, 13), "guilt" (abstract for concrete, Amos viii, 14, אַשְׁמָה, *ashmâh;* comp. 2 Chron. xxix, 18, perhaps with a play on *Ashima*, 2 Kings xvii, 30); and with a profound sense of the degradation consequent upon their worship, they are characterized by the prophets, whose mission it was to warn the people against them (Jer. xliv, 4), as "shame" (Jer. xi, 13; Hos. ix, 10). As considered with reference to Jehovah, they are "other gods" (Josh. xxiv, 2, 16), "strange gods" (Deut. xxxii, 16), "new gods" (Judg. v, 8), "devils—not God" (Deut. xxxii, 17; 1 Cor. x, 20, 21); and, as denoting their foreign origin, "gods of the foreigner" (Josh. xxiv, 14, 15). Their powerlessness is indicated by describing them as "gods that cannot save" (Isa. xlv, 20), "that made not the heavens" (Jer. x, 11), "nothing" (Isa. xli, 24; 1 Cor. viii, 4), "wind and emptiness" (Isa. xli, 29), "vanities of the heathen" (Jer. xiv, 22; Acts xiv, 15); and yet, while their deity is denied, their personal existence seems to have been acknowledged (Kurtz, *Gesch. d. A. B.* ii, 86, etc.), though not in the same manner in which the pretensions of local deities were reciprocally recognised by the heathen (1 Kings xx, 23, 28; 2 Kings xvii, 26). Other terms of contempt are employed with reference to idols, אֱלִילִים, *ĕlilim* (Lev. xix, 4), and גִּלּוּלִים, *gillûlim* (Deut. xxix, 17), to which different meanings have been assigned, and many which indicate ceremonial uncleanness. See IDOL.

Idolatry, therefore, being from one point of view a political offence, could be punished without infringement of civil rights. No penalties were attached to mere opinions. For aught we know, theological speculation may have been as rife among the Hebrews as in modern times, though such was not the tendency of the Shemitic mind. It was not, however, such speculations, heterodox though they might be, but overt acts of idolatry, which were made the subjects of legislation (Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, § 245, 246). The first and second commandments are directed against idolatry of every form. Individuals and communities were equally amenable to the rigorous code. The individual offender was devoted to destruction (Exod. xxii, 20); his nearest relatives were not only bound to denounce him and deliver him up to punishment (Deut. xiii, 2-10), but their hands were to strike the first blow when, on the evidence of two witnesses at least, he was stoned (Deut. xvii, 2-5). To attempt to seduce others to false worship was a crime of equal enormity (Deut. xiii, 6-10). An idolatrous nation shared a similar fate. No facts are more strongly declared in the Old Test. than that the extermination of the Canaanites was the punishment of their idolatry (Exod. xxxiv, 15, 16; Deut. vii; xii, 29-31; xx, 17), and that the calamities of the Israelites were due to the same cause (Jer. ii, 17). A city guilty of idolatry was looked upon as a cancer of the state; it

was considered to be in rebellion, and treated according to the laws of war. Its inhabitants and all their cattle were put to death. No spoil was taken, but everything it contained was burnt with itself; nor was it allowed to be rebuilt (Deut. xiii, 13-18; Josh. vi, 26). Saul lost his kingdom, Achan his life, and Hiel his family for transgressing this law (1 Sam. xv; Josh. vii; 1 Kings xvi, 34). The silver and gold with which the idols were covered were accursed (Deut. vii, 25, 26). Not only were the Israelites forbidden to serve the gods of Canaan (Exod. xxiii, 24), but even to mention their names, that is, to call upon them in prayer or any form of worship (Exod. xxiii, 13; Josh. xxiii, 7). On taking possession of the land they were to obliterate all traces of the existing idolatry; statues, altars, pillars, idol-temples, every person and every thing connected with it, were to be swept away (Exod. xxiii, 24, 32; xxxiv, 13; Deut. vii, 5, 25; xii, 1-3; xx, 17), and the name and worship of the idols blotted out. Such were the precautions taken by the framer of the Mosaic code to preserve the worship of Jehovah, the true God, in its purity. Of the manner in which his descendants have "put a fence" about "the law" with reference to idolatry, many instances will be found in Maimonides (*De Idol.*). They were prohibited from using vessels, scarlet garments, bracelets, or rings, marked with the sign of the sun, moon, or dragon (*ib.* vii, 10); trees planted or stones erected for idol-worship were forbidden (viii, 5, 10); and, to guard against the possibility of contamination, if the image of an idol were found among other images intended for ornament, they were all to be cast into the Dead Sea (vii, 11).—Smith. See ANATHEMA.

2. *New-Test. Definitions on the Subject.*—(1.) The name "idolater" is given not only to persons who worship heathen gods, but also such as worship idols of their own. Acts xvii, 16: "Now, while Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit was stirred within him when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry." 1 Cor. v, 10, 11: "Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world. But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an *idolater*, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner: with such a one no not to eat." 1 Cor. vi, 9: "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters." 1 Cor. x, 7: "Neither be ye *idolaters*, as were some of them." Rev. xxi, 8: "But the fearful .... and *idolaters* .... shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone."

(2.) The term idolatry is figuratively used to designate *covetousness*, which takes Mammon for its god (Matt. vi, 24; Luke xvi, 13). Col. iii, 5: "Mortify, therefore, your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is *idolatry*." Hence it is said (Ephes. v, 5), "For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an *idolater*, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God." St. Paul further designates all evil concupiscence in general by the name of idolatry; e. g. Phil. iii, 19: "Whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things;" comp. Rom. xvi, 18, "For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." The same is said (2 Tim. iii, 4) of those who are "lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God." According to Rom. i, 21, idolatry takes its source in the impurity of the will, or in the heart, not in the mind; it is consequently a result of the abuse of human free agency. It is said, in the above-mentioned passage, "Because that when they knew God they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened." The not glorifying and the not praising manifest the badness of the will or heart. In the Book of Wisdom (xiv, 14) it is said that idolatry came into the world through the "idle vanity of man." Idolatry and sin have consequently the same origin, namely, the misuse of moral freedom. They therefore assist each other, yet, at the same time, present separately a difficult problem for reason to understand. To some extent idolatry may be considered as the theoretical, and sin as the practical effect of evil, which, in its complete manifestation, embraces both the mind and the heart, but takes its source exclusively in the latter; for all evil results from the will, by its own free action, separating itself from the divine will.—Krehl, *Handwörterbuch des N. T.* p. 12.

3. *In the later Christian Church.*—The fathers generally define idolatry, from Rom. i, 23, as a "taking away from God the glory which belongs to him" (Tertull. *De Idololatria*, c. 11), or "divine honor given to another" (Cyprian; Hilar. Diac.); sometimes, also, as a transferring of prayer from the Creator to the creature (Gregor. Naz.). Christian writers in general had no doubt on the subject (see Finnicus Maternus, *De errore profanarum religionum*, ed. Münter, c. 1-5). When Clement of Alexandria regards astonishment at the light emitted by the heavenly bodies, thankfulness towards the inventor of agriculture, consciousness of sin, a personification of effects, etc., as the origin of myths, he does not mean to consider them as the original source of idolatry, but only of its contemporary forms. From the primitive worship of the heavens as the abode of the invisible God, according to the oldest traditions, the worship of the different nations, as they became disseminated over the globe, and divided geographically and otherwise, turned to other symbols. Again, nations preserving the remembrance, and, so to speak, living under the influence of their founders and heroes, as soon as they forgot the true God, made these the objects of their veneration and worship. Thus they came to worship their progenitors (as in China) and their heroes, which latter worship is by some (Boss, for instance) considered as the only source of mythology. How from thence they passed to the worship of symbolic animals, thence to anthropomorphism, and finally to the adoration of statues as images of the deity, has been best explained by Creuzer in his *Symbolik u. Mythologie d. alten Völker* (3d edit. i, 5 sq.). The fathers did not fail to perceive the influence which the original tradition of the true God had on the development of the symbolism and myths of the heathen religious systems. Lactantius (*De falsa relig.* i, 11) considers the *consensus gentium* in the belief in gods as a proof that they are touched by them. The early Protestant theologians had especially to contend against naturalism, which asserted that "the recognition of one supreme God is innate in man," and denied our knowledge of the unity of God being due either to revelation or to tradition, since it is found at the foundation of the learned polytheistic systems. They considered all further developments in these systems as resulting from intentional additions made in support of their hierarchy by an interested priesthood, or by rulers from motives of policy (see Herbert of Cherbury, *De relig. gentilium*, p. 6, 168 sq.). These views were ably opposed by Gerhard Jo. Vossius (*De theologia gentili et physiologia Christiana*, i, 3 sq.), Van Dale (*De origine et progressu idololatriæ*, i, 2, 3), Selden (*De diis Syris* [Lips. 1662], p. 25 sq.). They however meant, as did also Farmer (*The general Prevalence of the Worship of Human Spirits in the Ancient Heathen Nations* [Lond. 1783]), that the dæmons, whether evil spirits or departed human souls, had very early become the objects of veneration on the part of the heathen. The Jews came gradually to the idea that the heathen deities were not nonentities, as the prophets had stated them to be, but really existing evil spirits, a view which was continued by the fathers, especially in relation to the so-called oracles. The earliest German theologians also admitted this doctrine of a worship of dæmons. This, however, was gradually discarded after the researches of S. J. Baumgarten (*Gesch. d. Re-*

ligionsparteien, p. 176 sq.), and idolatry is now generally considered as the result of a sophisticated tradition. Rationalism, based on Pelagian principles, either embraced the views of the naturalists, or else those of Heyne, J. H. Boss, etc., who maintain, the former that the myths and idolatry were either the natural consequences of historical events or the peculiar garb of philosophical ideas (historical and philosophical mythicism), while the latter derives idolatry partly from the universal wisdom whose higher thoughts assumed that form in order to be the more readily appreciated by the people, and partly from the interests of the priesthood; he considers, also, the tradition of real heroes as an abundant source. Others (like Lobeck, etc.) see in the mythology of the heathen but a childish play of the imagination. But the opinion which most generally obtained is that behind the outward form of mythology is hidden a real philosophical or religious idea, and that personalities and historical facts are only erroneously introduced into it (Buttmann; G. Hermann). Finally, others considered idolatry in its full development as the result of the intentional manœuvres of the priesthood (so Fr. Creuzer, in the first editions of his *Symbolik*), or of a hierarchical system of nature, which amounts nearly to the same (K. O. Müller, *Prolegom. zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie*, p. 316–344). The latter considers the very origin and nature of the gods, and consequently of idolatry, as the result of an unconscious popular necessity, which from the first was connected or identified with illusion, instead of remaining a true and special idea. From this view—whose only defect is its too great disregard of the original religion—it is easy to come to those which govern the newer systems of religious philosophy, such as are upheld by Hegel (*Vorlesungen ü. Religionsphilosophie*), according to which religion has received a steady development from an earthly basis, so that idolatry was but one of its first forms, and not at all an estrangement from God, but a necessary part of the progress towards him. This view of it completely makes away with idolatry by the presumed connection of all religions arriving by successive developments at absolute religion. This view is supported by Hinrichs (*D. Religion im innern Verhältnisse z. Wissenschaft* [Heidelb. 1821], p. 141 sq.) and Kraft (*D. Religionen aller Völker in philosophischer Darstellung* [Stuttg. 1848]). Feuerbach and other extreme Rationalists even consider religion itself as a sickly ideal phenomenon in human life.

We must rank under idolatry all adoration not addressed to the one invisible God of the Bible, or such adoration of him as is rendered in any manner not conforming to the revelations of the Bible. It results partly from additions and the influence of the world, partly from the original traditional command to seek God, which seeking, when unaided by him (in revelation), ends in error, so that, unconsciously, it is worldly existence that is apprehended instead and in the place of God. The mode of this apprehension varies in different nations, according to their geographical, historical, and intellectual circumstances, and may degenerate into the adoration of the most vain and arbitrary objects (fetishes) which priests or sorcerers may set up. Between the original symbolic and the most abject idolatry there are various stages. While the majority of the heathen are either on the brink or in the midst of fetishism, the more enlightened part look upon the idols only as symbols, sometimes of several deities, and sometimes of one God.

Idolatry was formerly considered as divided into two distinct classes, real and comparative; the former was absolute polytheism—the belief in the real divinity of the images—while the latter was either (Baumgarten) the worship of the several deities as subordinate to one, or (G. H. Vossius) the considering of the images worshipped as mere symbols of the invisible God. In Col. iii, 5 we find a metaphorical use made of the word idolatry to express undue attachment to earthly possessions and advantages. The same name has also been given, with good reason, to the use made of images in the Roman and Greek Churches.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v. Abgötterei. On this last point, see MARIOLATRY; SAINT-WORSHIP, etc.

Idu'el (Ἰδουῆλος), the second named of the leading Jews sent by Ezra to procure the aid of the priests in the return from exile (1 Esd. viii, 43); evidently the ARIEL (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra viii, 16).

Idumæ'a (Ἰδουμαία), the Gr. form of the Heb. name *Edom*, as found in the Sept., the N. Test., and Josephus. According to Josephus (*Ant.* ii, 1, 1), however, it is only a more agreeable mode of pronouncing what would otherwise be Ἀδῶμα (comp. Jerome on Ezek. xxv, 12). In the Sept. we sometimes meet with Ἐδώμ, but more generally with Ἰδουμαία (the people being called Ἰδουμαῖοι), which is the uniform orthography in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. iv, 15, 29, 61; v, 3; vi, 31; 2 Macc. xii, 32), as well as in Mark iii, 8, the only passage in the N. T. where it occurs. Our Auth. Vers. has in three or four places (Isa. xxxiv, 5, 6; Ezek. xxxv, 15; xxxvi, 5) substituted for Edom "Idumæa," which is the name employed by the writers of Greece and Rome, though it is to be noted that they, as well as Josephus, include under that name the south of Palestine, and sometimes Palestine itself, because a large portion of that country came into possession of the Edomites of later times.

The Heb. אֱדֹם, Edom, as the name of the people, is *masculine* (Numb. xxii, 20); as the name of the country, *feminine* (Jer. xlix, 17). We often meet with the phrase אֶרֶץ אֱדֹם, *Erets-Edom*, "the Land of Edom," and once with the poetic form שְׂדֵה אֱדֹם, *Sedeh-Edom*, "the Field of Edom" (Judg. v, 4). The inhabitants are sometimes styled בְּנֵי אֱדֹם, *Beney-Edom*, "the Children of Edom," and poetically בַּת אֱדֹם, *Bath-Edom*, "the Daughter of Edom" (Lam. iv, 21, 22). A single person was called אֲדֹמִי, *Adomi*, "an Edomite" (Deut. xxiii, 8), of which the feminine אֲדֹמִית, *Adomith*, occurs in 1 Kings xi, 1.

1. *Origin of the Name.*—The name was derived from Isaac's son *Edom*, otherwise called Esau, the elder twin-brother of Jacob. See ESAU. It signifies *red*, and seems first to have been suggested by his appearance at his birth, when "he came out all *red*," i. e. covered with red hair (Gen. xxv, 25), and it was afterwards more formally and permanently imposed on him on account of his unworthy disposal of his birthright for a mess of red lentiles (Gen. xxv, 30): "And Esau said to Jacob, Feed me, I pray thee, *from the red, that red* (מִן־הָאָדֹם הָאָדֹם הַזֶּה), for I am faint; therefore was his name called *Red*" (Edom; אֱדוֹם). In the East it has always been usual for a chief either to give his name to the country which he conquers, or over which he rules, or to take a name from it. Esau, during the life of his father, seized the mountainous region occupied by the Horites. He had two names; but one of them was peculiarly applicable to the newly-acquired territory. The mountains of Seir were remarkable for their *reddish* color; hence, doubtless, the name *Edom*, "red," was given to them. Esau is called "the father of Edom," giving to it his name and ruling over it (Gen. xxxvi, 43); and the country, in a very few cases, is also called "the mount of Esau" (Obad. 8, 9, 19).

The original name of the country was *Mount Seir*, and it was probably so called from *Seir*, the progenitor of the Horites (Gen. xiv, 6; xxxvi, 20–22), though the signification of this name, *rugged*, may have been the cause of its adoption, as the mountains are singularly rough and rugged. And so says Josephus (*Ant.* i, 20, 3): "Esau named the country 'Roughness' from his own hairy roughness." Part of the region is still called Esh-*Sherah*, in which some find a trace of *Seir*, but the two words have no etymological relation. The name Seir continued to be applied to Edom after its occupation by the descendants of Esau, and even down to the close of the O.-T. history (see Josh. xi, 17; 2 Chron. xx,

10: Ezek. xxv, 8, etc.). The aborigines were called Horites (Sept. Χοῤῥαῖοι; Gen. xiv, 6); that is, *Troglodytes*, or "cave-dwellers," from the nature of their habitations. See HORITE. The mountains of Edom, as all travellers know, are filled with caves and grottoes hewn in the soft sandstone strata.

2. *Situation and Boundaries.*—Edom proper, or Idumæa, is situated on the south-eastern border of Palestine, extending from it to the northern extremity of the Elanitic Gulf. It was bounded on the west by the great valley of the Arabah, on the south by a line drawn due east from the modern fortress of Akabah, on the east by the desert of Arabia, and on the north by the ancient kingdom of Moab. Its length from north to south was about 100 miles, and its breadth averaged 20. These boundaries are nowhere directly defined, but we can ascertain them from various incidental references in Scripture. When the Israelites encamped at Kadesh-barnea they were close to the border of Edom (Numb. xx), and Mount Hor is said to be within its border (xxxiii, 37). Hence, as Kadesh was situated in the valley of the Arabah, and as Mount Hor is only a few miles to the east of it, we conclude that the Arabah is the western boundary. The Israelites asked, but were refused, a passage through either Edom or Moab, so as to go direct from Kadesh to the east side of the Jordan (Numb. xx, 14-20; Judg. xi, 17, 18). In consequence of this refusal, they were obliged to march south along the Arabah to Ezion-geber, and thence eastward by the wilderness round the territories of Edom and Moab (id. with Numb. xxi, 4). Hence we conclude that Edom and Moab occupied the whole region along the east side of the valley of the Arabah, from the Dead Sea to the Elanitic Gulf. Edom was wholly a mountainous country, as may be inferred from the names given to it in the Bible and by ancient writers (Deut. i, 2; ii, 5; Josephus, *Ant.* ii, 1, 2; Eusebius, *Onomast.* s. v. Idumæa). The foot of the mountain range, therefore, may be regarded as marking its eastern border. On the north it appears to have been separated from Moab by the "brook Zered" (Deut. ii, 13, 14, 18; Numb. xxi, 12), which is probably identical with the modern wady el-Ahsy. These views are corroborated by other and independent testimony. In the Samaritan Pentateuch the word *Gabla* is substituted for *Seir* in Deut. xxxii, 2; and Eusebius and Jerome state that Idumæa was in their time called *Gebalene*, which is a Greek (Γεβαληνή) corruption of the Hebrew *Gebal*, "mountain" (*Onomast.* id. et s. v. Seir), and is retained to this day in the Arabic form *Jebâl*. The modern province of Jebâl is bounded on the west by the Arabah, and on the north by wady el-Ahsy (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 151; Burckhardt, *Trav. in Syria*, p. 410). We may safely conclude from this that the ancient province had the same boundaries, as it had the same name. Thus Josephus writes (*Ant.* v, 1, 22): "The lot of Simeon included that part of Idumæa which bordered upon Egypt and Arabia;" and, though this is true, it does not contradict the language of Scripture—"I will not give you of their land, no, not so much as a footbreadth, because I have given Mount Seir unto Esau for a possession" (Deut. ii, 5). Not a footbreadth of Edom Proper, or Mount Seir, was ever given by divine sanction to the Jews.

Josephus divides Idumæa into two provinces, Gobolitis and Amalekitis (*Ant.* ii, 1, 2). The former embraced Idumæa Proper, being identical, as the name would indicate, with "*Mount* Seir;" the other embraced a portion of Southern Palestine, with the desert plain south of it, which was originally occupied by the Amalekites (Numb. xiii, 29), and subsequently, as we shall see, by the Edomites. Pliny places Idumæa to the south of Palestine, bordering upon Egypt (*Hist. Nat.* v, 14). Strabo (xvi, 2, 36, p. 760) states that the Idumæans were originally Nabathæans, but, being driven out thence, they joined themselves to the Jews. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.

3. *History.*—The first mention of Mount Seir is in Gen. xiv, 6, where the confederate kings are said to have smitten the "Horites in their Mount Seir." B.C. cir. 2080. These Horites appear to have been a tribe of the gigantic aborigines of Western Asia, so called from dwelling in caves (Gen. xxxvi, 20-30). They were a pastoral people, divided into tribes like the modern Bedawin, having independent chiefs called Allûph (אַלּוּף, ver. 29). Esau's marriage with the daughters of Canaan alienated him from his parents, and he then obtained a settlement among the Horites, where he acquired power and wealth as early as the time of Jacob's return from Padan-aram (Gen. xxvii, 46). Probably his close alliance with Ishmael tended to increase his influence in his adopted country (xxviii, 9; xxxii, 3 sq.). Though then established in Edom, Esau had still some part of his flocks in Western Palestine, in connection with those of his father; but on the return of Jacob he removed all his property from Canaan and dwelt in Mount Seir (xxxvi, 6-8). He gradually subdued and finally exterminated, or perhaps rather supplanted, the Horites (Deut. ii, 12, 22), and a distinct tribe of his descendants, the Amalekites, leaving Edom, took possession of the desert plateaus south of Canaan (Gen. xxxvi, 12; Exod. viii, 14 sq.). The earliest form of government among the Edomites was, like that of the Horites, by *chiefs* (in the A. V. rendered "dukes," but manifestly the same as the modern Arab *sheiks*), exercising independent authority over distinct tribes (Gen. xxxvi, 15-19). It appears, however, that the various tribes were, at least in times of general war, united under one leader, to whom the title of king (מֶלֶךְ) was given. The names of eight of these kings (only one of whom is spoken of as related to any other, Anah, the son of Zibeon) are mentioned in Gen. xxxvi, 31-39, who are said to have reigned in Edom "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," that is, apparently before the time of Moses (see Deut. xxxiii, 5; Exod. xviii, 16-19). Most of the large nomad tribes of Arabia have now an acknowledged chief, who is styled *emir*, and who takes the lead in any great emergency, while each division of the tribe enjoys independence under its own *sheik* on all ordinary occasions. Such would seem to have been the case with the Edomites, and this affords an easy solution of the apparent confusion in the account given by Moses, Gen. xxxvi, 31-43; and again in Exod. xv, 15, where it is said "the *dukes* of Edom shall be amazed," and Judg. xi, 17, where Moses is represented as having sent "messengers from Kadesh unto the *king* of Edom." The primitive and pastoral character of the people is incidentally brought out by the circumstance that this Anah, though a chieftain's son, was in the habit of tending his father's asses (Gen. xxxvi, 24). It was when thus employed that he found in the wilderness הַיֵּמִם, *ha-yemim*, rendered in the Eng. Vers. by "the mules," but meaning more probably "the hot springs." There is in the country to the south-east of the Dead Sea (which formed part of the Seirite possessions) a place, *Callirhoë*, celebrated among the Greeks and Romans for its warm baths, which has been visited by modern travellers (Josephus, *War*, i, 33, 5; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v, 5, 17; Legh's *Travels*).

Though the Israelites and Edomites were closely related, and though the former were commanded "not to abhor an Edomite, for he is thy brother" (Deut. xxiii, 7), yet the bitterest enmity appears to have existed between them at every period of their history, as a perpetuation of the unbrotherly feud between their progenitors. When the Israelites asked permission to pass through the territory of Edom on their way to Canaan, they were rudely refused. B. C. 1619. The road by which it was sought to penetrate the country was termed "the *king's* highway" (ver. 17), supposed by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, ii, 556; but see a different explanation in De Saulcy's *Narrative*, i, 392; comp. 273, 276) to be wady el-Ghuweir, for it is almost the only valley that affords direct and easy passage through those

mountains. From a comparison of these incidents it may be inferred that the change in the form of government took place during the wanderings of the Israelites in the Desert, unless we suppose, with Rosenmüller, that it was only this north-eastern part of Edom which was now subject to a monarch, the rest of the country remaining under the sway of its former chieftains. But whether the regal power at this period embraced the whole territory or not, perhaps it did not supplant the ancient constitution, but was rather grafted on it, like the authority of the Judges in Israel, and of Saul, the first king, which did not materially interfere with the government that previously existed. It further appears, from the list of Idumæan kings, that the monarchy was not hereditary, but elective (for no one is spoken of as the son or relative of his predecessor); or probably that chieftain was acknowledged as sovereign who was best able to vindicate his claim by force of arms. Every successive king appears to have selected his own seat of government: the places mentioned as having enjoyed that distinction are Dinhabah, Avith, Pagu or Pai. Even foreigners were not excluded from the throne, for the successor of Samlah of Masrekah was Saul, or Shaul, "of Rechoboth, on the river." The word *Rechoboth* means, literally, *streets*, and was a not uncommon name given to towns; but the emphatic addition of "the river" points evidently to the Euphrates, and between Rakkah and Anah, on that river, there are still the remains of a place called by the Arabs Rachabath Malik Ibn-Tauk. In the age of Solomon we read of one Hadad, who "was of the king's seed in Edom" (1 Kings xi, 14); from which some have conjectured that by that period there was a royal dynasty of one particular family; but all that the expression may imply is that he was a blood relation of the last king of the country. Hadad was the name of one of the early sovereigns "who smote Midian in the field of Moab" (Gen. xxxvi, 35).

The country was attacked by Saul with partial success (1 Sam. xiv, 47). A few years later David overthrew the Edomites in the "valley of Salt," at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 109), and put garrisons in their cities (2 Sam. viii, 14; 1 Chron. xviii, 11-13; 1 Kings xi, 15. Comp. the inscription of Psa. lx, and v, 8, 9; cviii, 9, 10, where "the strong city" may denote Selah or Petra). Then were fulfilled the prophecies in Gen. xxv, 23, and xxvii, 40, that the "elder should serve the younger;" and also the prediction of Balaam (Numb. xxiv, 18), that Edom and Seir should be for possessions to Israel. Solomon created a naval station at Ezion-geber, on the Elanitic Gulf, from whence his ships went to India and Eastern Africa (1 Kings ix, 26; 2 Chron. viii, 18). Towards the close of his reign an attempt was made to restore the independence of the country by one Hadad, an Idumæan prince, who, when a child, had been carried into Egypt at the time of David's invasion, and had there married the sister of Tahpanhes the queen (1 Kings xi, 14-23). See HADAD. If Edom then succeeded in shaking off the yoke, it was only for a season, since in the days of Jehoshaphat, the fourth Jewish monarch from Solomon, it is said "there was no king in Edom; a deputy was king;" i. e. he acted as viceroy for the king of Judah. For that the latter was still master of the country is evident from the fact of his having fitted out, like Solomon, a fleet at Ezion-geber (1 Kings xxii, 47, 48; 2 Chron. xx, 36, 37). It was, no doubt, his deputy (called *king*) who joined the confederates of Judah and Israel in their attack upon Moab (2 Kings iii, 9, 12, 26). Yet there seems to have been a partial revolt of the Edomites, or at least of the mountaineers of Seir, even in the reign of Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xx, 22); and under his successor, Jehoram, they wholly rebelled, and "made a king over themselves" (2 Kings viii, 20, 22; 2 Chron. xxi, 8, 10). From its being added that, notwithstanding the temporary suppression of the rebellion, "Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah unto this day," it is probable that the Jewish dominion was never completely restored. Amaziah, indeed, invaded the country, and having taken the chief city, Selah or Petra, he, in memorial of the conquest, changed its name to Joktheel (q. d. subdued of God); and his successor, Uzziah, retained possession of Elath (2 Kings xiv, 7; 2 Chron. xxv, 11-14; xxvi, 3). But in the reign of Ahaz, hordes of Edomites made incursions into Judah, and carried away captives (2 Chron. xxviii, 17). About the same period, Rezin, king of Syria, expelled the Jews from Elath, which was thenceforth occupied by the Edomites (2 Kings xvi, 6, where for *Syrians*, ארומים, we ought to read *Edomites*, אדומים, De Rossi, *Variæ Lectiones*, ii, 247). Now was fulfilled the other part of Isaac's prediction, viz., that in course of time Esau "should take his brother's yoke from off his neck" (Gen. xxvii, 40). It appears from various incidental expressions in the later prophets that the Edomites employed their recovered power in the enlargement of their territory in all directions. They spread as far south as Dedan in Arabia, and northward to Bozrah in the Hauran; though it is doubtful if the Bozrah of Scripture may not have been a place in Idumæa Proper (Isa. xxxiv, 6; lxiii, 1; Jer. xlix, 7, 8-20; Ezek. xxv, 13; Amos i, 12). During the decline of the Jewish power, and wars of Judah and Israel, the Edomites gradually enlarged their possessions. When Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem, the Edomites joined him and took an active part in the plunder and slaughter which followed. Their cruelty at that time is specially referred to in Psa. cxxxvii, and was the chief cause of those dreadful prophetic curses which have since been executed upon their country (Jer. xlix, 17; Lam. iv, 21; Ezek. xxv, 13, 14; Obad. 10-21). From the language of Malachi (i, 2, 3), and also from the accounts preserved by Josephus (*Ant.* x, 9, 7), it would seem that the Edomites did not wholly escape the Chaldæan scourge; but instead of being carried captive, like the Jews, they not only retained possession of their own territory, but became masters of the south of Judah, as far as Hebron (1 Macc. v, 65, comp. with Ezek. xxxv, 10; xxxvi, 5). Probably as a reward for the assistance afforded by them to the Chaldæans, the Edomites were permitted to settle in Southern Palestine, and in the country lying between it and the borders of Egypt. The name Idumæa was now given to the whole country, from the valley of the Arabah to the Mediterranean (Joseph. *Ant.* v, 1, 22; Strabo, xvi, 2), and from Eleutheropolis to Elath (Jerome, *Comment. in Obad.*). Hence arose the mistakes of Roman writers, who sometimes give the name Idumæa to all Palestine, and even call the Jews Idumæans (Virgil, *Georg.* iii, 12; Juvenal, viii, 160).

While the Edomites thus extended their conquests westward, they were driven out of their own country by the Nabathæans (q. v.), who, leaving the nomad habits of their ancestors, settled down amid the mountains of Edom, engaged in commerce, and founded the little kingdom of *Arabia Petræa*. Some of their monarchs took the name Aretas (2 Macc. v, 8; Joseph. *Ant.* xv, 1, 2), and some Obodas (Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 5, 1). One of them was that Aretas whose daughter Herod Antipas married (Matt. xiv, 3, 4); and it was the same king of Arabia who captured Damascus, and held it at the time of Paul's conversion (Acts ix, 25; 2 Cor. xi, 32). Idumæa was taken by the Romans in A.D. 105, and under their paternal government the enterprising inhabitants increased greatly in wealth and power. A lucrative transport trade between India, Persia, and the Levant was in their hands. Roads were constructed across the desert of Arabia, through the defiles of Edom, and westward and northward to the Mediterranean and Palestine. Traces of them still remain, with ruinous military stations at intervals, and fallen milestones of the times of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius (*Peutinger Tables;* Laborde's *Voyage;* Burckhardt's *Syria*, p. 374, 419; Irby and Mangles's *Travels*, p. 371, 377, 1st ed.). The magnificent rock-temples, palaces, and tombs of Petra were then constructed, which still continue to be the wonder and admiration of Eastern travellers. They are not the

works of the Edomites, but of the descendants of *Nebaioth*, Ishmael's oldest son and Esau's brother-in-law (Gen. xxv, 13; xxxvi, 3; Joseph. *Ant.* i, 12, 4; Diod. Sic. 19.)

On the revival of Jewish power under the Asmonæans, that part of Southern Palestine to which the name Idumæa had been given by classic writers was seized, and about B.C. 125 they were finally subdued by John Hyrcanus, who compelled them to submit to circumcision and other Jewish rites, with a view to incorporate them with the nation (1 Macc. v, 3, 65; 2 Macc. x, 16; xii, 32; Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 9, 1; 15, 4). The amalgamation, however, of the two races seems never to have been perfected. The country was governed by Jewish prefects, and one of these, an Idumæan by birth, became procurator of Judæa, and his son was Herod the Great, "king of the Jews" (Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 8, 6; xiii, 9, 2; xiv, 1, 3 and 8; xv, 7, 9; xvii, 11, 4). Not long before the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, 20,000 Idumæans were called in to the defence of the city by the Zealots, but both parties gave themselves up to rapine and murder (Joseph. *War*, iv, 4, 5; 5, 1; vii, 8, 1). This is the last mention made of the Edomites in history. The author of a work on Job, once ascribed to Origen, says that their name and language had perished, and that, like the Ammonites and Moabites, they had all become Arabs. In the second century Ptolemy limits the name Idumæa to the country west of the Jordan.

In the first centuries of the Christian æra Edom was included in the province of *Palæstina Tertia*, of which Petra was metropolis (S. Paulo, *Geogr. Sac.* p. 307; Reland, *Palæst.* p. 218). After the Mohammedan conquest its commercial importance declined, its flourishing port and inland cities fell to ruin. The Mohammedans were the instruments by which the fearful predictions of the Scripture were finally fulfilled. The Crusaders made several expeditions to Edom, penetrating it as far as to Petra, to which they gave the name "Valley of Moses" (*Gesta Dei per Francos*, p. 518, 555, etc.), a name still existing in the Arabic form *Wady Mûsa*. On a commanding hill some twelve miles north of Petra they built a fortress, and called it *Mons Regalis;* its modern name is Shobek (*ib.* p. 611). The Crusaders occupied and fortified Kerak, the ancient Kir Moab, and raised it to the dignity of an episcopal see, under the impression that it was Petra (*ib.* p. 812, 885, 1119). From the age of the Crusaders until the present century nothing was known of Idumæa. No traveller had passed through it, and as a country it had disappeared from history. Volney heard some vague reports of its wonders from Arabs. Seetzen also heard much of it in the year 1806, but he was unable to enter it. Burckhardt was the first to traverse the country. In 1812 he travelled from Kerak south by Shobek to Petra (*Trav. in Syr.* p. 377 sq.; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 165). In 1828, Laborde, proceeding northward from Akabah through the defiles of Edom, also visited Petra, and brought away a portfolio of splendid drawings, which proved that the descriptions of Burckhardt had not been exaggerated. Many have since followed the footsteps of the first explorers, and a trip to Petra now forms a necessary part of the Eastern traveller's grand tour.

4. *Physical Geography.*—Idumæa embraces a section of a broad mountain range, extending in breadth from the valley of the Arabah to the desert plateau of Arabia. "Along the base of the range on the side of the Arabah, are low calcareous hills. To these succeed lofty masses of igneous rock, chiefly porphyry; over which lies the red and variegated sandstone in irregular ridges and abrupt cliffs, broken by deep and wild ravines. The latter strata give the mountains their most striking features" (Porter, *Handb. for S. and Pal.* i, 44). "The first thing that struck me," says Stanley, "in turning out of the Arabah up the defiles that lead to Petra was, that we had suddenly left the desert. Instead of the absolute nakedness of the Sinaitic valleys, we found ourselves walking on grass, sprinkled with flowers, and the level platforms on each side were filled with sprouting corn; and this continues through the whole descent to Petra, and in Petra itself. The next peculiarity was when, after having left the summit of the pass, or after descending from Mount Hor, we found ourselves insensibly encircled with rocks of deepening and deepening red. Red, indeed, even from a distance, the mountains of 'red' Edom appear, but not more so than the granite of Sinai; and it is not till one is actually in the midst of them that this red becomes crimson, and that the wonder of the Petra colors fully displays itself" (*Sin. and Pal.* p. 88). The ravines which intersect these sandstone mountains are very remarkable. Take them as a whole, there is nothing like them in the world, especially those near Petra. "You descend from wide downs . . . and before you opens a deep cleft between rocks of

Ravine in Idumæa.

red sandstone rising perpendicularly to the height of one, two, or three hundred feet. This is the *Sik.* . . . . Follow me, then, down this magnificent gorge—the most magnificent, beyond all doubt, which I have ever beheld. The rocks are almost precipitous, or rather they would be if they did not, like their brethren in all this region, overlap, and crumble, and crack, as if they would crash over you" (*ib.* p. 90). Such are the ravines of Idumæa, and the dark openings of the numerous tombs and grottoes which dot their sides; and the sculptured façades here and there hewn out in their gorgeously colored cliffs add vastly to their picturesque grandeur. The average elevation of the sandstone range is about 2000 feet. Immediately on its eastern side, and indeed so close to it as to make up part of one great range, is a parallel ridge of limestone, attaining a somewhat higher elevation, and extending unbroken far to the north and south. The latter sinks with a gentle slope into the desert of Arabia. The deep valleys and the little terraces along the mountain sides, and the broad downs upon their summits, are covered with rich soil, in which trees, shrubs, and flowers grow luxuriantly. While Edom is thus wild, rugged, and almost inaccessible, the deep glens and flat terraces along the mountain sides are covered with rich soil, from which trees, shrubs, and flowers now spring up luxuriantly. No contrast could be greater than that between the bare, parched plains on the east and west, and the ruddy cliffs, and verdant, flower-spangled glens and terraces of Edom. This illustrates Bible topography, and reconciles seemingly discordant statements in the sacred volume. While the posterity of Esau dwelt amid rocky fastnesses and on mountain heights, making their houses like the eyries of eagles, and living by their sword (Jer. xlix,

16; Gen. xxvii, 40), yet Isaac, in his prophetic blessing, promised his disappointed son that his dwelling should be "of the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above" (Gen. xxvii, 39). But many critics are of opinion (e. g. Vater, De Wette, Geddes, Von Bohlen) that מִשְׁמַנֵּי should there be rendered *from*, i. e. "far away from, or destitute of," the fatness of the earth, etc.; and it is immediately added, "for thou shalt live by thy sword:" and it does not appear that Idumæa was ever particularly noted for its fertility. Some other passages of Scripture are also illustrated by a glance at the towering precipices and peaks of Edom. The border of the Amorites was from "the ascent of scorpions (*Akrabbim*), from the rock"—that is, from the rocky boundary of Edom (Judg. i, 36). We read that Amaziah, after the conquest of Seir, took ten thousand of the captives to the "top of the cliff," and thence cast them down, dashing them all to pieces (2 Chron. xxv, 11, 12).

5. *Present State of the Country.*—Idumæa, once so rich in its flocks, so strong in its fortresses and rock-hewn cities, so extensive in its commercial relations, so renowned for the architectural splendor of its temples and palaces—is now a deserted and desolate wilderness. Its whole population is contained in some three or four miserable villages; no merchant would now dare to enter its borders; its highways are untrodden, its cities are all in ruins. The predictions of God's Word have been fulfilled to the very letter (see Estländer, *Vaticinia Jesaiæ in Idumæos*, Aboæ, 1825). "Thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof. . . . When the whole earth rejoiceth I will make thee desolate. . . . . Thou shalt be desolate, O Mount Seir, and all Idumæa, even all of it. . . . Edom shall be a desolation; every one that goeth by it shall be astonished" (Isa. xxxiv, 13; Ezek. xxxv, 14; Jer. xlix, 17). Idumæa is now divided into two districts, *Jebâl*, including the northern section as far as wady el-Ghuweir, and *Esh-Sherah*, embracing the southern part (Burckhardt, *Trav. in Syria*, p. 410; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 154). Burckhardt mentions a *third* district, *Jebal Hesma;* but Robinson says that though there is a sandy tract, el-Hismah, with mountains around it, on the east of Akabah, it does not constitute a separate division. The site of the ancient capital Bozrah is now marked by the small village of Busaireh, and Petra, the Nabathæan capital, is well known as wady Musa.

The whole of this region is at present occupied by various tribes of Bedouin Arabs. The chief tribe in the *Jebal* is the Hejaya, with a branch of the Kaabineh, while in *esh-Sherah* they are all of the numerous and powerful tribe of the Haweitat, with a few independent allies. The Bedouins in Idumæa have of late years been partially subject to the pacha of Egypt, paying an annual tribute, which, in the case of the Beni Sukhr, is one camel for two tents. The fellahin, or peasants, are half Bedouin, inhabiting the few villages, but dwelling also in tents; they too pay tribute to the Egyptian government, and furnish supplies of grain.

6. The character of the Edomites was drawn by Isaac in his prophetic blessing to Esau—"By thy sword shalt thou live" (Gen. xxvii, 40). War and rapine were the only professions of the Edomites. By the sword they got Mount Seir—by the sword they exterminated the Horites—by the sword they long battled with their brethren of Israel, and finally broke off their yoke—by the sword they won Southern Palestine—and by the sword they performed the last act in their long historic drama, massacred the guards in the Temple, and pillaged the city of Jerusalem.

Little is known of their religion, but that little shows them to have been idolatrous. It is probable that Esau's marriage with the "daughters of Canaan," who "were a grief of mind" to his father and mother (Gen. xxvi, 34, 35), induced him to embrace their religion; and when Esau and his followers took possession of Mount Seir, they seem to have followed the practice common among ancient nations of adopting the country's gods, for we read that Amaziah, king of Judah, after his conquest of the Edomites, "brought the gods of the children of Seir, and set them up to be his gods" (2 Chron. xxv, 14, 15, 20). Josephus also refers both to the idols (one of which he named *Kozè*) and priests of the Idumæans (*Ant.* xv, 17, 9).

7. *Literature.*—With respect to the striking fulfilment of the prophetic denunciations upon Edom, we need only refer the reader to the well-known work of Keith, who frequently errs, however, in straining the sense of prophecy beyond its legitimate import, as well as in seeking out too literally minute an accomplishment. On Idumæa generally, see C. B. Michaelis, *Dis. De Antiquiss. Idumæor. Hist.* in Pott and Ruperti's *Sylloge Comment. Theologic.* part vi, p. 121; J. D. Michaelis, *Comment. de Troglodytis Seiritis*, in the *Syntagma Commentt.*, part i, p. 194. For the ancient geography, Reland's *Palæstina;* Forster's *Geography of Arabia;* Ritter's *Palästina und Syrien.* For the history and commerce, Nolde, *Hist. Idumææ*, Frank. 1726; Vincent's *Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients*, vol. ii. For modern geography, the travels of Burckhardt, Laborde, Wilson, Stanley, and Porter's *Handb. for Syria and Pal.;* but especially, *Sketches of Idumea and its present Inhabitants*, by Dr. E. Robinson, in the *Amer. Bib. Repository* for April, 1833, p. 247, and his *Bib. Researches*, ii, 551. See EDOMITE, etc.

Idumæ'an (Ἰδουμαῖος), an inhabitant of the land of Idumæa (q. v.) (2 Macc. x, 15, 16).

I'gal (Heb. *Yigal'*, יִגְאָל, *avenger*), the name of three men.

1. (Sept. Ἰγάλ, Vulg. *Igal*, Eng. Vers. "Igal.") Son of Joseph, and commissioner on the part of Issachar to explore the land of Canaan (Numb. xiii, 7). He of course perished with his nine falsehearted companions on their return (Numb. xiv, 37). B.C. 1657.

2. (Sept. Ἰγαάλ, Vulg. *Igaal*, A. V. "Igal.") Son of Nathan of Zobah, and one of David's famous warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 36). B.C. 1046. In the parallel list of 1 Chron. the name is given as "*Joel* the brother of Nathan" (xi, 38, Ἰωήλ). Kennicott, after a minute examination of the passage, both in the original and in the ancient versions, decides in favor of the latter as most likely to be the genuine text (*Dissertation*, p. 212-214).

3. (Sept. Ἰωήλ, Vulg. *Jegaal*, A. V. "Igeal.") One of the sons of Shemaiah, of the descendants of Zerubbabel (1 Chron. iii, 22). The number "six" there given is that of the grandchildren of Shechaniah (see Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gosp.* p. 17). B.C. ante 406.

Igdali'ah (Heb. *Yigdalyah'*, but only in the prolonged form, *Yigdalya'hu*, יִגְדַּלְיָהוּ, whom *Jehovah will make great;* Sept. Γοδολίας, Vulg. *Jegedalia*), the father of Hanan, into the chamber of which latter Jeremiah brought the Rechabites to propose the test of their temperance (Jer. xxxv, 4). B.C. ante 606.

Ig'eäl (1 Chron. iii, 22). See IGAL 3.

Ignatian Epistles. See IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH.

Ignatius OF ANTIOCH, one of the apostolical fathers (q. v.), called also *Theophorus* (ὁ Θεοφόρος), a title which he explained to the emperor Trajan as meaning "one who has Christ in his heart." We have no trustworthy accounts of the life and ministry of Ignatius. The chief authority is the *Martyrium Ignatii* (see below), but even those who assert the genuineness of that work admit that it is greatly interpolated. There are several unsupported stories in the fathers, e. g. that Ignatius was the child whom Christ took into his arms (Mark ix, 36), that he had seen Christ, etc. Abulpharagius (*Dynast.* vii, 75, ed. Pococke, 1663) was understood to assert that Ignatius was born at Nura, in Sardinia or Cappadocia, but Mr. Cureton (see below) shows that the words used have no such reference. The *Martyrium* (c. 3) asserts that he was, along with Polycarp, a hearer of St. John. Chrysostom says that he was nominal bishop of Antioch by the laying on of the hands of the apostles themselves,

but Eusebius fixes the date of his ordination at A.D. 69, when several of the apostles were dead. According to the same historian, he was the second successor of St. Paul, Evodius having been the first. The Apostolic Constitutions, on the other hand, say that Ignatius and Evodius held the office together, Evodius by appointment from Peter, Ignatius from Paul. So say, also, Baronius and Natalis Alexander, making, however, Evodius bishop of the Jews, and Ignatius of the Gentiles. "Of the episcopate of Ignatius we know little. He appears to have been over-earnest in insisting upon the prerogatives of the clergy, especially the bishops. The *Martyrium Ignatii* represents him as anxious for the steadfastness of his flock during the persecution said to have taken place in Domitian's reign, and incessant in watching and prayer and in instructing his people, fearing lest the more ignorant and timid among them should fall away. On the cessation of the persecution he rejoiced at the little injury the church at Antioch had sustained. When the emperor Trajan, elated with his victories over the Dacians and other nations on the Danubian frontier, began to persecute the Church, the anxiety of Ignatius was renewed, and, eager to avert the violence of persecution from his flock, and to obtain the crown of martyrdom, he offered himself as a victim, and was brought before the emperor, then at Antioch on his way to the eastern frontier to attack the Armenians and Parthians. The conference between Trajan and the bishop is given in the *Martyrium Ignatii;* it ended in an order of the emperor that Ignatius should be taken to Rome, and there thrown to the wild beasts. He was led thither by a long and tedious route, but was allowed to have communication with his fellow-Christians at the places at which he stopped. He was thrown to the wild beasts in the Roman amphitheatre, at the feast distinguished as ἡ τρισκαιδεκάτη, 'the feast of the thirteenth' (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s. v. Saturnalia). Such parts of him as remained were collected by his sorrowing friends, and taken back to Antioch, where in Jerome's time they were resting in the cemetery outside the gate toward Daphne. From thence they were removed by the emperor Theodosius II to the Church of Ignatius (previously known as the Tychæum, or Temple of Fortune), in the city of Antioch (Evagr. *Hist. Eccl.* i, 16). Their subsequent removals are uncertain. The martyrdom of St. Ignatius is commemorated by the Roman Church on the 1st of February; by the Greek Church on the 20th of December, the correct anniversary of his martyrdom." The year of Ignatius's death has been much disputed. Many of the best writers (following the *Martyrium Ignatii*) place it in A.D. 107; but, as it is now generally conceded that Trajan did not visit the East till 114, and as he probably spent the winter 114–115 at Antioch, the best critics agree on A.D. 115 as the most probable date.

Epistles of Ignatius.—On his way from Antioch to Rome, Ignatius is said to have written seven epistles. These are enumerated both by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii, 36) and Jerome (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 16). At present, however, there are fifteen epistles extant, all ascribed to Ignatius. Seven of these are considered by many to be genuine, namely, 1. Πρὸς Ἐφεσίους, *Ad Ephesios;* 2. Μαγνησιεῦσιν, *Ad Magnesianos;* 3. Τραλλιανοῖς, *Ad Trallianos;* 4. Πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, *Ad Romanos;* 5. Φιλαδελφεῦσιν, *Ad Philadelphenos;* 6. Σμυρναίοις, *Ad Smyrnæos;* and, 7. Πρὸς Πολύκαρπον, *Ad Polycarpum.* The titles of these epistles agree with the enumeration of Eusebius and Jerome. There are found two recensions of them—a longer, now regarded as an interpolated one, first published by Pacæus (1557), and a shorter form, which is considered as tolerably uncorrupted. Many doubt the genuineness of either (see below). Two ancient Latin versions are extant, corresponding in a great degree to the two forms or recensions of the Greek text: the larger, known as the common (*vulgata*) version, the other first discovered and published by archbishop Usher (1644) (see below). The epistles to the Ephesians, Romans, and Polycarp were published, with a translation, in a still shorter Syriac version, by Cureton (1845). Many of the interpolations found in the larger form are of passages from the N. T.

Five other epistles, though extant in Greek, are regarded by nearly all classes of critics as spurious, namely, 8. Πρὸς Μαρίαν εἰς Νεάπολιν τὴν πρὸς τῷ Ζαρβῷ, or Πρὸς Μαρίαν Κασσοβολίτην, or ἐκ Κασοβήλων, or Κασταβαλῖτιν, or ἐκ Κασταβάλων, *Ad Mariam, Neapolim, quæ est ad Zarbum,* or *Ad Mariam Cassobolitam,* variously written *Castabulitam,* or *Castabulensem,* or *ex Cossobelis,* or *Chassaoboiorum,* or *Chasabolorum,* or *Castabolorum;* 9. Πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Ταρσῷ, *Ad Tarsenses;* 10. Πρὸς Ἀντιοχεῖς, *Ad Antiochenos;* 11. Πρὸς Ἥρωνα, διάκονον Ἀντιοχείας, *Ad Heronem Diaconum Antiochiæ;* 12. Πρὸς Φιλιππησίους, *Ad Philippenses.* Some copies add to the title of this last epistle the words περὶ Βαπτίσματος, *De Baptismate,* an addition which by no means describes the contents. Of four of these spurious epistles two ancient Latin versions are extant, the common version, and that published by Usher. Of that to the Philippians there is but one version, namely, the common. The epistle to Polycarp in the common Latin version is defective, containing only about one third of what is in the Greek text. There is also extant, both in the Greek and in the two Latin versions, an epistle of Mary of Cassobelæ (called also Προσήλυτος, *Proselyta*) to Ignatius, to which his letter professes to be an answer.

The remaining three epistles ascribed to Ignatius are found only in Latin. They are very short, and have long been given up as spurious. They are, 13. *S. Joanni Evangelistæ;* 14. *Ad Eundem;* and, 15. *Beatæ Virgini.* With these is found a letter of the Virgin to Ignatius, *Beata Virgo Ignatio,* professing to be an answer to his letter. This also is given up as spurious.

The controversy respecting the genuineness of these writings began at an early period. In A.D. 1495 the three Latin epistles and the letter of the Virgin were printed at Paris, subjoined to the *Vita et Processus S. Thomæ Cantuarensis Martyris super Libertate Ecclesiastica.* In A.D. 1498, three years after the appearance of these letters, another collection, edited by J. Faber, of Staples (Stapulensis), was printed at Paris in folio, containing the common Latin version of eleven letters, that of Mary of Cassobelæ not being among them. They were published with some of the works ascribed to Dionysius Areopagita and an epistle of Polycarp. These eleven epistles were reprinted at Ven. 1502; Paris, 1515; Basel, 1520; and Strasburg, 1527. In 1516 the preceding fourteen epistles, with the addition of the letter to Mary of Cassobelæ, were edited by Symphorianus Champerius of Lyons, and published at Paris in 4to, with seven letters of St. Antony, commonly called the Great. In A.D. 1557, the twelve epistles of Ignatius, in Greek, were published by Valentinus Paceus, or Pacæus, in 8vo, at Dillingen, in Suabia on the Danube, from an Augsburg MS. They were reprinted at Paris, 1558, with critical emendations. The same twelve Greek epistles, from another MS. from the library of Gaspar a Nydpryck, were published by Andreas Gesner, with a Latin version by Joannes Brunner, Zürich, 1559, folio. In these editions the Greek text of the seven epistles was given in the larger form, the shorter form, both in Greek and Latin, being as yet undiscovered. The genuineness of these remains was now called in question. The authors of the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses* were the first to express their doubts, though with caution and moderation. Calvin, in his *Institutiones* (i, 3), declared that "nothing could be more silly than the stuff (*næniæ*) which had been brought out under the name of Ignatius, and rendered the impudence of those persons more insufferable who had set themselves to deceive people by such phantoms (*larvæ*)." The controversy grew warm, the Roman writers and the Episcopalians commonly contending for the genuineness of at least a part of the epistles, and the Presbyterians denying it. The three epis-

tles not extant in Greek were the first given up, but the rest were stoutly contended for. Several, however, distinguished between the seven enumerated by Eusebius and the rest, and some contended that even those which were genuine were interpolated. While the controversy was in this state, Vedelius, a professor at Geneva, published an edition (*S. Ignatii quæ extant Omnia*, Geneva, 1623, 4to) in which the seven genuine were arranged apart from the other five epistles; he marked, also, in the genuine epistles, the parts which he regarded as interpolations. In 1644 archbishop Usher's (4to, Oxford) edition of the epistles of Polycarp and Ignatius appeared. It contained, 1. *Polycarpiana Epistolarum Ignatianarum Sylloge* (Polycarp's Collection of the Epistles of Ignatius), containing Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians and six of the supposed genuiue epistles of Ignatius; 2. *Epistolæ B. Ignatio adscriptæ a Mediæ Ætatis Græcis Sex* (Six Epistles ascribed to St. Ignatius by the Greeks of the Middle Age). The epistle of Polycarp was included in this class, with the five spurious epistles extant in Greek. The common Latin version was also printed with these in parallel columns, and the three epistles which are extant only in Latin were subjoined; 3. A Latin version of eleven epistles (that to the Philippians being omitted) from the two MSS. obtained by Usher, and now first printed. This corresponds, in the main, to the shorter text of the so-called genuine epistles. The work of Usher contains also a valuable introduction and notes to the epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, the Apostolical Constitutions, and the Canons ascribed to Clement of Rome. In 1646 the epistles of Ignatius were published by Isaac Vossius (4to, Amst.), from a MS. in the Medicean Library at Florence. The MS., which is not accurately written, and is mutilated at the end, is valuable as the only one containing the shorter recension of the genuine epistles; it wants, however, that to the Romans, which was given by Vossius in the longer form, as in the former editions. The five spurious epistles, and that of Mary of Cassobelæ to Ignatius, from the Medicean MS., the text of which differs materially from that previously published; the three Latin epistles; Usher's Latin version of the eleven Greek epistles; and the common version of that to the Philippians, were all given by Vossius. In 1647 Usher published his *Appendix Ignatiana*, containing the Greek text of the seven epistles, and two Latin versions of the *Martyrium Ignatii*. He gave the Medicean text of six of the epistles; that to the Romans was the common text, with the interpolations expunged, as determined by a collation of the epistle contained in the *Martyrium*, both in the Greek of Symeon Metaphrastes and the Latin version published by Usher. After the controversy had been carried on for some time, and great progress had been made towards the settlement of the text, the most formidable attack on the genuineness of the epistles was made by Daillé (Dallæus), one of the most eminent of the French Protestants, in his work *De Scriptis quæ sub Dionysii Areopagitæ et Ignatii Antiocheni circumferentur Libri duo* (Gen. 1666, 4to). The works of Ignatius form the subject of the second book. This attack of Daillé called forth the *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ* of bishop Pearson (Cambridge, 1672, 4to), which was long supposed to have settled the controversy. But it has recently been reopened with fresh vigor and interest. Archbishop Usher, in his edition of the Ignatian Epistles published at Oxford in 1644, declared that he could not venture to promise that the genuine Ignatius could be recovered without the aid of another Greek text, which he hoped to obtain from a MS. in the Medicean Library at Florence, or at least without the aid of a Syriac copy, which he did not despair of procuring from Rome. The Medicean MS. was published, but the difficulties remained the same. The Syriac version, which was then looked to as affording the only probable clew to the solution, eluded the most diligent and anxious search for a period of 200 years. It was reserved for the Rev. William Cureton, a canon of Westminster, to supply this clew. Mr. Cureton discovered, among a most important collection of Syriac MSS., procured for the British Museum by archdeacon Tattam, in the year 1843, from the monastery of St. Mary Deipara of the Syrians, in the Desert of Nitria, three entire epistles, which he published in the year 1845. This publication naturally excited great attention on the part of those who felt an interest in the subject, and called forth severe strictures from some who seemed to consider that to remove any part of the seven epistles of Ignatius was to take away so much from the foundations of episcopacy. The form which the controversy now took led to the publication, in 1849, by Mr. Cureton, of the *Corpus Ignatianum*, in which the editor brought together *a complete Collection of the Ignatian Epistles—genuine, interpolated, and spurious; together with numerous Extracts from them, as quoted by Ecclesiastical Writers down to the Tenth Century*, and accompanied by a full history of the controversy from its commencement. Mr. Cureton's conclusion was that the three epistles which he published were the only genuine productions of Ignatius in the series bearing his name. If this did not "take away so much from the foundations of episcopacy," it is because the supposed testimony of a most venerable apostolic father is not one of its foundations, for certainly the three letters are as bare of prelatic allusion as any of Paul's. But the matter did not rest here. Several critical reviews of this position appeared, the most important of which was by Uhlhorn, in the 21st volume of the *Zeitschrift f d. hist. Theol.*, in which a long and learned examination of the question, under the title *Das Verhältniss d. syrischen Recension d. ignatianischen Briefe zu d. kürzern griechischen, u. d. Authentie d. Briefe überhaupt* (translated into English, in a somewhat condensed form, by the Rev. Henry Browne, in the *Theol. Critic* [1852]), is entered into, which finally asserts that "the seven letters, according to the shorter Greek recension, are the genuine productions of Ignatius of Antioch." Another *Translation of the Epistles of Ignatius (together with Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, and the Apologies of Justin Martyr and Tertullian)*, with notes, and an account of the present state of the question respecting the epistles of Ignatius, by the Rev. Temple Chevallier, B.D. (8vo), appeared in 1852. In 1859 the question was again opened, and again in the *Zeitsch. fur hist. Theol.*, by Dr. R. A. Lipsius, who, in a paper entitled *Ueber die Aechtheit der syrischen Recension der ignatianischen Briefe*, goes over the ground again with all the learning of his predecessors in the same field, but more at length, examining in detail, and with great critical acumen, the arguments which have been adduced by both sides in this discussion. Dr. Lipsius adopts all the reasoning of the learned editor of the *Corpus Ignatianum*, and arrives at the same conclusion, namely, that the three letters to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans, in the form in which they appear in the Syriac recension, are the genuine letters of Ignatius, but that the present recension of the seven letters are from a later hand, in which the three genuine letters have been remodelled, and to these three four new ones added. It is a circumstance not to be overlooked that this full adoption of Mr. Cureton's views has appeared in the same journal which gave to the world Uhlhorn's lucubrations, and speaks highly for the honest desire of its conductors to promote the cause of truth, and that only. Bunsen also adopted the views of Cureton in his *Die drei echten und vier unechten Briefe des Ignatius* (Hamburg, 1847, 8vo), and his conclusions have been admitted by some eminent Presbyterian authorities (see *Bibl. Repos.* July, 1849); but Dr. Killen, the Irish Presbyterian, in his *Ancient Church* (Belfast and N.Y. 1859, 8vo), condemns all the epistles as worthless and spurious. He remarks that "it is no mean proof of the sagacity of the great Calvin that upwards of three hundred years ago he passed a sweeping sentence of condemnation on these Ignatian epistles. At the time many were startled by the boldness of his language, and it was thought that he was somewhat pre-

cipitate in pronouncing such a decisive judgment. But he saw distinctly, and he therefore spoke fearlessly. There is a far more intimate connection than many are disposed to believe between sound theology and sound criticism, for a right knowledge of the Word of God strengthens the intellectual vision, and assists in the detection of error wherever it may reveal itself. Had Pearson enjoyed the same clear views of Gospel truth as the reformer of Geneva, he would not have wasted so many precious years in writing a learned vindication of the nonsense attributed to Ignatius. Calvin knew that an apostolic man must have been acquainted with apostolic doctrine, and he saw that these letters must have been the production of an age when the pure light of Christianity was greatly obscured. Hence he denounced them so emphatically; and time has verified his deliverance. His language respecting them has been often quoted, but we feel we cannot more appropriately close our observations on this subject than by another repetition of it, 'There is nothing more abominable than that trash which is in circulation under the name of Ignatius.'" Dr. Killen's positive arguments against the genuineness of *all* the epistles are, 1. The style is suspicious; 2. The epistles ignore God's Word, which is never done by any of the genuine writings of the early fathers; 3. They contain chronological blunders; 4. They use words in meanings which they did not acquire till long after the time of Ignatius; 5. They abound in puerilities, vaporing, and mysticism; 6. They manifest an unhallowed and insane desire for martyrdom. Baur and Hilgenfeld also hold them all not to be genuine, but think that the seven of the shorter Greek recensions were the first to be forged after A.D. 150, and that the Syriac three are simply fragmentary translations from the Greek. With Uhlhorn agree also many able and sound critics of the Romanists and Protestants, as Möhler, Hefele, and Gieseler.

The most complete edition of Ignatius is that contained in the *Patres Apostolici* of Cotelerius, the second edition of which, by Le Clerc (Amst. 1724, 2 vols. folio), contains all the genuine and spurious epistles (Greek and Latin), with the epistles of Mary of Cassobelæ and of the Virgin, the two ancient Latin versions (the common one and Usher's), the *Martyrium Ignatii*, the *Dissertationes* (i.e. the Introduction) of Usher, the *Vindiciæ* of Pearson, a *Dissertatio de Ignatianis Epistolis* by Le Clerc, and variorum notes. A useful edition of the genuine epistles, with those of Clement of Rome and Polycarp, and the *Martyria* of Ignatius and Polycarp, was published by Jacobson (Oxford, 1838, 2 vols. 8vo). There are versions in several languages of modern Europe, including two English translations, an old one by archbishop Wake (*Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers*, Lond. 1693, 8vo), and a modern one by Clementson (1827, 8vo). Wake's translation has been repeatedly published.

The *Martyrium Ignatii*, which is our chief authority for the circumstances of Ignatius's death, professes to be written by eye-witnesses, the companions of his voyage to Rome, supposed to be Philo, a deacon of Tarsus or some other church in Cilicia, and Rheus Agathopus, a Syrian, who are mentioned in the epistles of Ignatius (*Ad Philadelph.* c. 11; *Ad Smyrneos*, c. 13). Usher adds to them a third person, Gaius, but on what authority we know not, and Gallandius adds Crocus, mentioned by Ignatius (*Ad Romanus*, c. 10). The account, with many interpolations, is incorporated in the work of Symeon Metaphrastes (Dec. A.D. 20), and a Latin translation from him is given by Surius, *De Probatis Sanctor. Vitis*, and in the *Acta Sanctorum*, under the date of the 1st of February. The *Martyrium* was first printed in Latin by archbishop Usher, who gave two distinct versions from different MSS. The Greek text was first printed by Ruinart, in his *Acta Martyrum Sincera* (Par. 1689, 4to), from a MS. in the Colbertine library, and in a revised edition in Le Clerc's Cotelerius. It is given by Jacobson and by most of the later editors of the epistles. Its genuineness is generally recognised, but it is thought to be interpolated. See the remarks of Grabe, quoted by Jacobson at the end of the *Martyrium*. A considerable fragment of an ancient Syriac version of the *Martyrium* of Ignatius has been published by Mr. Cureton.

See Smith, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s. v.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* anno 117; Lardner, *Credibility of Gospel History*; *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1849; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, p. 197–200; Böhringer, *Kirchengesch. in Biog.* i, 7 sq.; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* i, 53 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 269, 295, 631; Cureton, *Corpus Ignatianum* (Lond. 1849, 8vo); Milton, *Prose Works*, i, 78 sq.; *N. Y. Review*, i, 367; Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* April, 1850; *New Englander*, Nov. 1849; *Quarterly Review*, Dec. 1850; Lipsius, in *Zeitsch. f. histor. Theol.* 1856, Heft 1; Uhlhorn, in *Herzog's Real-Encyklop.* vi, 623 sq.; *Brit. and For. Rev.* xxxiii, 640 sq.; *Am. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1867, p. 137 sq.; *Princet. Rep.* 1849, p. 378 sq.; *Amer. Quart. Church Review*, Jan. 1870, p. 563 sq. See also EPISTLES.

Ignatius, patriarch OF CONSTANTINOPLE, flourished about the beginning of the 9th century. The schism of the Greek and Roman churches, which began under Photius (q. v.), who persecuted Ignatius and usurped his see, gives importance to his life. The following account of him is (necessarily) chiefly from Roman sources, and must be taken with allowance. He was born in 799, and was the son of the emperor Michael Curopalates; his mother, Procopia, was the daughter of the emperor Nicephorus. On the revolt of Leo the Armenian, Michael surrendered to him the throne, which he had occupied for the short period of a year and nine months only, and embraced monastic life. His sons followed the example of their father, and the youngest, Nicetas, then aged fourteen, changed his name to Ignatius. The new emperor, in order not to be disturbed in the possession of power, separated the several members of the family of Michael, and caused his two sons, Eustratius and Nicetas, to be made eunuchs. During the reign of the three emperors, Leo, Michael II, and Theophilus, the young men were allowed to enjoy in tranquillity the monastic life to which they had devoted themselves. Ignatius was admitted into the order of priesthood by Basil, bishop of Paros, in the Hellespont, a prelate who had suffered great persecution in opposing the Iconoclasts, and to whom Ignatius was much attached. On the death of Theophilus, the empress Theodora was declared regent in the name of her son, Michael III. Being opposed to the Iconoclasts, she banished John, the patriarch of Constantinople, and caused Methodius to be elected in his place. Four years after, on the death of Methodius, the patriarchal dignity was bestowed upon Ignatius. But he did not long enjoy this honor. Bardas, the brother of the empress, whom he had excommunicated on account of his scandalous excesses, having obtained considerable influence on the mind of the young emperor Michael, whose vices he flattered and encouraged, induced him to take the reins of government, and to compel his mother to withdraw to a convent, and to accept the vows. Ignatius, when summoned to lend his authority to this unfilial act, did not content himself with remonstrating against it, but gave a stern refusal. He was, in consequence, banished to the isle of Terebinthos, and deprived of his see, which he had held for eleven years. Photius, a eunuch related to Bardas, and a person of considerable learning, who favored the Iconoclasts, was by the will of the emperor, but without the consent of the Church, appointed to the patriarchate of Constantinople. For the controversy of Photius with the Church of Rome and its issue, see PHOTIUS. All means employed to induce Bardas to resign remaining ineffective, his death was finally determined upon, and he was murdered in 866. Basil the Macedonian now became possessed of the supreme power. One of the first acts of his reign was to banish Photius and recall Ignatius, who was triumphantly reinstated in his patriarchal dignity Nov. 3, 867. At his suggestion a council was assembled at Constantinople, which ranks in the Roman Church as the eighth œcu-

menical. It was presided over by the legate of pope Adrian II, and in it Photius and his partisans were excommunicated, and their opinions condemned. From this time Ignatius was allowed to rule the Greek Church without opposition. He died Oct. 23, 878, on which day the Greek and Roman churches still celebrate his memory. He was buried in the church of St. Sophia, but his remains were afterwards transferred to that of St. Michael, near the Bosphorus. The details of his life are principally drawn from Nicetas David, who had known him personally. Ignatius wrote Βίος Ταρασίου τοῦ πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, the Greek text of which remains unpublished, but a Latin translation of it is to be found in Surius, *De probatis Sanctorum Vitis*, and in the *Acta Sanctorum* (Feb. 25), iii, 576:—Βίος τοῦ ἁγίου Νικηφόρου, πατριάρχου Κωνστ., the Greek text of which is contained in the *Acta Sanctorum* (March 12), ii, 704, Append. He also wrote other works, among them an abridgment of fifty-three fables from Babrius in Iambic verses, each fable containing only four verses. These were published at first under the name of Gabrias, Gabrius, or Babrius, in the Aldine *Æsop* (Venice, 1505), and afterwards under the author's real name (Ignatius Magister), in Ritterhusius's *Phedrus*, and Nevelet's *Mythologia Æsopica.* — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxv, 795; *English Cyclopædia;* Smith, *Dict. of Biography;* Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 52, 96; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 558 sq.; Hardwicke, *Ch. Hist.* (Middle Ages), p. 195 sq.

Ignatius Loyola. See Loyola.

Ignis Purgatorius. See Purgatory.

Ignorance, the want of knowledge or instruction. It is often used to denote illiteracy. Mr. Locke observes that the causes of ignorance are chiefly three: 1, want of ideas; 2, want of a discoverable connection between the ideas we have; 3, want of tracing and examining our ideas. As respects religion, ignorance has been distinguished into three sorts: 1. An *invincible* ignorance, in which the will has no part. It is an insult upon justice to suppose it will punish men because they were ignorant of things which they were physically incapable of knowing. 2. There is a *wilful* and *obstinate* ignorance; such an ignorance, far from exculpating, aggravates a man's crimes. 3. A sort of voluntary ignorance, which is neither entirely wilful nor entirely invincible, as when a man has the means of knowledge, and does not use them.—Locke, *On the Understanding*, ii, 178; Grove, *Moral Philosophy*, ii, 26, 29, 64; Watts, *On the Mind;* Henderson's Buck, *Theolog. Dict.* s. v. See Knowledge.

Ignorantines (Latin, *Fratres Ignorantiæ;* French, *Frères Ignorantins*), also known as the *Congregation of Christian Instruction and Christian Schools*, is the name of a Jesuitical foundation for the gratuitous instruction of poor children in sacred as well as secular learning, which was founded in France in the early part of the 18th century (1724) by the abbé de la Salle. As the object is to confine the instruction to such branches as do not conflict with, but even favor, the religious views of the Roman Catholics, virtually preparing the young, by the exclusion of all books by Protestants, to remain true to the church of their fathers, they have gradually been introduced into every Catholic country of Europe. In France this society shared at the Revolution the fate of all the other religious bodies; but, under the name of *Brothers of the Christian Schools*, they were recalled, and re-established under Napoleon in 1806. They are now exceedingly numerous in France, Italy, and in some parts of Bohemia and Germany. Many branches exist also in England and Ireland. In the latter country they have large educational establishments, with a series of school-books specially designed for Roman Catholics. The Ignorantines wear a dress very similar to that of the Jesuits.—Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 517; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 632.

Igumen or **Hegumen** is the title of an abbey in the male monasteries of the Greek Church, more especially in Russia.

Ihre, Johann von, a Swedish philologian, was born March 3, 1707, at Lund, and educated at the universities of Upsala, Greifswald, Jena, and Halle. At the last-named high-school he afterwards lectured for a time on the Oriental languages, then travelled extensively in Germany, Holland, England, and France, and on his return to his native country was appointed librarian at Upsala University. In 1737 he was appointed professor of poetry, and the year following professor of rhetoric, which he remained for forty years. He died Nov. 26, 1780. He distinguished himself greatly by his thorough investigations into the philological merits of his mother tongue, and by his labors on the Gothic version of Ulfilas, the results of which are left us in *Scripta versionem Ulphilanam et ling. Mæso-gothicam illustrantia*, which were collected and edited by A. F. Büsching (Berl. 1773, 4to). This collection (which is very rare, as only 131 copies were printed) contains, 1. *Ulphilas illustratus*, a series of critical observations on the readings of the *Codex Argenteus*, with a preface, in which he attempts to prove "that the letters of the Codex were produced by an encaustic process, the surface of the parchment having been covered with wax, on which silver-leaf was laid, and the form of the letter stamped thereon with a hot iron;" 2. *Fragmenta vers. Ulph.*, containing the portions of the Epistle to the Romans published by Knittel, with annotations; 3. *Dissertatio de originibus Ling. Lat. et Gr. inter Mæsogothos reperiundis;* 4. *De verbis Mæsogoth; Analecta Ulphil.*, i, *de Cod. Argent. et litt. Goth.*, ii, *de nominibus subst. et adject. Mæsogoth.;* 5. *De Ling. Cod. Arg.;* 6. *Specimen Gloss. Ulphil., cum præfationibus.* An Appendix to the work contains tracts by other writers. He wrote also *De usu LXX interpretum in N. T.* (Upsal. 1730):—*De usu accentuum Hebræorum* (ibid. 1733). See Kitto, *Cyclopædia Bib. Lit.* ii, 377; Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.*, Adelung's *Add.* ii, 2270 sq.

I. H. S. is an inscription or monogram which has probably been used by the Christian Church from an early date among the sacred symbols on church furniture, and in painted windows of the house of God, but its use has by no means been confined to ecclesiastical buildings. On tombs, roofs, and walls of houses, on books, and on other possessions of Christians, this monogram has been, and is even now, frequently impressed, especially among the adherents of the Roman, Greek, and Anglican churches. The interpretations which have been given of this mystic title are threefold. One is that they are the initials of the words "*In Hoc Signo*," borrowed from the luminous cross which it is said was miraculously displayed in the sky before Constantine and his army. Others make them the initials of the words "*Jesus Hominum Salvator*," especially the Jesuits, who use it for their badge and motto in the form I.H.S.; and still another, that they are the first three letters of the Greek ΙΗΣΟΥΣ, Jesus. This last opinion has been espoused by the late "Cambridge Camden Society" in a work which they published on this subject: *Argument for the Greek Origin of the Monogram I. H. S.* (London, 1841). The earliest Christian emblems found also seem to confirm this opinion, as they are in every case written in the Greek language, and "the celebrated monogram inscribed by Constantine's order on the *labarum*, or standard of the cross, was undoubtedly Greek." Eusebius (*Eccles. Hist.*), in describing the famous standard, says, "A long spear, overlaid with gold, formed the figure of the cross by means of a piece laid transversely over it. On the top of the whole was fixed a crown, formed by the intertexture of gold and precious stones; and on this two letters indicating the name of Christ symbolized the Saviour's title by means of its first characters, the letter P being intersected by a X exactly in its centre; and these letters the emperor was in the habit of wearing on his helmet at a later period." In regard to the shape of the letter S being Roman, and

not Greek, *The Church*, a paper of the Church of England in Canada, says, "It might easily have become corrupted (i. e. the Greek Σ into a Latin S)—it would not, indeed, have been intelligible except to a few of the best scholars unless it were corrupted—and so could scarcely have escaped transmutation when the knowledge of the Greek tongue, which we are certified was the case, perished, or very nearly so, during the Middle Ages in the Western Church."—Staunton, *Eccl. Dict.* p. 382; Blunt, *Eccles. Dict.* i, 375. See LABARUM.

I'im (Heb. *Iyim'*, עִיִּים, *ruins*, as in Jer. xxvi, 18, etc.), the name of two places.

1. (Sept. Αὐείμ, Vulg. *Iim.*) A city in the extreme south of Judah, mentioned between Baalah and Azem (Josh. xv, 29), and therefore doubtless included within the territory set off to Simeon, as the associated places were (Josh. xix, 3), which afford the only means for a conjectural position nearly midway from the Dead Sea towards the Mediterranean.

2. (Sept. Γαΐ, Vulg. *Ijeabarim*, both reading the same as in the preceding verse.). One of the stations of the Israelites not long before reaching the Jordan (Numb. xxxiii, 45); usually called fully IJE-ABARIM (ver. 44).

Ijar. See IYAR.

Ij'è-ab'arim (Hebrew *Iyeh' ha-Abarim'*, עִיֵּי הָעֲבָרִים, *ruins of the Abarim*, or regions beyond; Sept. Ἀχαγαί, but in Numb. xxxiii, 44 simply Γαΐ; Vulg. *Jeabarim* and *Ijeabarim*), the forty-seventh station of the Israelites on approaching Canaan, described as being between Oboth and Dibon-gad, "in the border of Moab" (Numb. xxxiii, 44), or between Oboth and the brook Zered, "in the wilderness which is before (i. e. *east* of) Moab, towards the sun-rising" (Numb. xxi, 11), and therefore not far from *Aineh*, a little south of wady el-Ahry, which forms the southern boundary of the Moabitish territory, and lies near the southern end of the range of Abarim, that give this compound form to the name (simply IIM in Numb. xxxiii, 44), to distinguish it from the Iim of Judah (Josh. xv, 29). See ABARIM.

I'jon (Heb. *Iyon'*, עִיּוֹן, place of *ruins;* Sept. Ἀΐν, Αἰάν, Αἰων), a frontier city of the kingdom of Israel, mentioned as being captured, along with Abel-Beth-Meholah and other places in Naphtali, first by Benhadad of Syria (1 Kings xv, 20; 2 Chron. xvi, 4), and afterwards by Tiglath-pileser of Assyria (2 Kings xv, 29). The associated names and circumstances render the supposition of Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, iii, 346) very probable, that this locality corresponds to a large ruin-covered hill called *Tell Debbin* (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 335), in the present Merj Ayun (meadow of *fountains*), a fine meadow tract between wady et-Teim and the Litany, north of Lake Huleh (comp. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1846, p. 204, 214; new edition of *Researches*, iii, 375; Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 36).

Iken, KONRAD, a German Protestant theologian and Hebraist, born at Bremen Dec. 25, 1689, was professor of theology at the gymnasium of that city, and pastor of one of the Reformed churches. He died June 30, 1753. Iken wrote, *Antiquitates Hebraicæ* (Brem. 1730, 4to, 5th ed., annotated by J. H. Schacht, 1810, 8vo):—*Thesaurus Nov. Theolog.-Philol. Dissertationum exegeticarum ex Musæo Th. Hasæi et Conrad. Ikenii* (Leyden, 1732, 2 vols. fol.):—*De tempore celebratæ ultimæ Cœnæ paschalis Christi* (Bremen, 1735 and 1739, 8vo); this work and the following are directed against G. F. Gude (q. v.):—*Dissertatio quæ contra Gudium demonstratur Cœnam Christi σταυρώσιμον vere paschalem fuisse* (Bremen, 1742, 8vo):—*Tractatus Talmudicus de cultu quotidiano Templi, quem versione Latina donatum et notis illustratum eruditorum examini subjicit Conrad. Ikenius* (Bremen, 1736, 4to):—*Symbolæ litterariæ ad incrementum scientiarum omnis generis, a variis amicis collatæ* (Bremen, 1744–49, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Harmonia historiæ perpessionum J. Christi* (Bremen, 1743, 4to; 2d ed. Utrecht, 1758, 4to):—*Dissertationes philol.-theolog. in diversa sac. cod. utriusque instrumentalia loca* (Leyden, 1749, 4to; 2d ed. augmented, pub. by J. H. Shacht, Utrecht, 1770, 4to):—*De Institutis et Cærimoniis Legis Mosaicæ ante Mosen* (Bremen, 1752, 2 parts, 4to).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 8 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bib. Lit.* ii, 377. (J. N. P.)

Ik'kesh (Heb. *Ikkesh'*, עִקֵּשׁ, *perverse*, as in Psa. ci, 4, etc.; Sept. Ἐκκίς, Ἐκκής, Ἐκκῆς), the father of Ira the Tekoite, which latter was one of David's famous warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 26; 1 Chron. xi, 28), and captain of the sixth regiment of his troops (1 Chron. xxvii, 9). B.C. ante 1046.

Ikonobortsi is the name of a small sect of Russian dissenters who are opposed to paintings, both in churches and in private houses. See RUSSIA.

Ikriti, SHEMARJA BEN-ELIAH, a Jewish philosopher and commentator, originally from Rome, flourished at Negroponte towards the close of the 13th and the opening of the 14th century. His father Eliah was a distinguished scholar of the island of Crete, whence he derived his name. Shemarja devoted his early years to the study of philosophical writings, but later he gave his time almost exclusively to the study of exegesis, as the result of which he translated and wrote commentaries on all the books of the O. T., with the exception of Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. His edition of *Genesis*, to which, according to his own statement, he devoted no less than twenty-five years, he dedicated, with other works of his, to king Robert of Naples (in 1328). The main object of writing these commentaries, which have never yet been published, was to reconcile the Rabbanites and Karaites. Himself a Rabbanite, he held that the Karaites were in the wrong to set aside altogether the Talmudical traditions; and the Rabbanites, he asserted, missed the mark also by not only assigning the first place to the Talmud, but by disregarding the Bible (comp. *Ozar Nechmad*, Vien. 1857, ii, 93). But, whatever his success may have been with the Rabbanites, he certainly failed to convince the Karaites, who read his works extensively, that the Talmudical Hagada contained a deep meaning unrevealed to the superficial student, or to persuade them that the Bible and Talmud both deserved a philosophical interpretation. Another aim which Shemarja is said to have had in writing his commentaries was the union of the followers of Maimonides (q. v.) with the old orthodox school. He also wrote a Logic, after the Greek style, and a Hebrew Grammar. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 318 sq.; Carmoly, in Jost's *Annalen* (1839), p. 69, 155; Dukes, *Shir Shelomo* (Hannov. 1858), ii, 4; Kitto, *Cyclopædia Bibl. Liter.* ii, 377; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* iii, 27 sq. (J. H. W.)

I'lai (Heb. *Ilay'*, עִילַי, i. q. Chald. עִלַּי, *supreme;* Sept. Ἠλί), an Ahohite, and one of David's chief heroes (1 Chron. xi, 29), called ZALMON in the parallel list (2 Sam. xxiii, 28). B.C. 1046.

Ildefonsus, ST., archbishop of Toledo, was born in that city in 607. He studied under Isidore of Seville, became monk, then abbot of the convent of Agli, near Toledo, and was finally made archbishop of his native city in 658. According to Julian of Toledo, Ildefonsus composed a large number of works, most of which, however, were left unfinished. The only writings supposed to be authentic that we now possess under his name are, *De illibata b. Virginis virginitate* (in the *Biblioth. Patr.*, Lugd., xii):—two books, *De cognitione baptismi et de itinere deserti quo pergitur post baptismum*, a rule of faith and conduct for converts:—a continuation of Isidorus's *De viris illustribus*, beginning with Gregory the Great, and containing notices of thirteen other writers, mostly Spanish bishops (in Fabricius, *Bibl. eccles.* p. 60 sq.). One of his successors in the see of Toledo, St. Julian (680–690), added to this a *Vita Ildefonsi Toletani*, from which almost all our information concerning Ildefonsus is derived. Two letters of his, with answers by Quirinus bishop of Barcelona, are found in D'Achéry, *Spicil.* The

Adoptianists (q. v.), in the 8th century, quoted the writings of *Eugenius, Ildefonsus, Julianus, Toletanæ sedis antistites*, as favoring their peculiar views (see Alcuin, *Opp.* ii, 568). See the Bollandists, Jan. 23d; Gregorio Mayans, *Vida de S. Ildefonso* (Valentia, 1727, 12mo); Baronius, *Annales*, 667, No. 5, 6; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Jan. 23d.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 633; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 811 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 581.

Ilgen, Karl David, an eminent German theologian, was born February 26, 1763, at the village of Sehna, in Prussian Saxony. When fourteen years old he was able to enter the second class in the gymnasium of Naumburg; but his parents being unable to give him any further help, he was from that time obliged to depend on his own exertions alone. His struggle for subsistence strengthened his mind, and in 1783, with a good elementary education, he entered the University of Leipzig. Here were written his first essays, which are to be found in the collection of his works entitled *Opuscula philologica* (Erford, 1797, 2 vols.). He applied himself with particular zeal to the study of the Oriental languages, especially the Hebrew. In 1789 he was called to the rectorship of the Academy of Naumburg, and so distinguished himself as an instructor that five years afterwards he was called as professor of Oriental languages to Jena, and there he was finally transferred to the chair of theology. In spite of his eminent attainments, his bluntness and dryness of manner prevented his being as efficient in his new sphere of action as he might otherwise have been. His learning was better displayed in his writings than in his lectures. He began to write a work on the "Historical Documents of the Temple of Jerusalem," for which he intended to make a thorough investigation of all the Jewish sayings, traditions, and fables, and to compare them with what historical knowledge we possess on the same points, so as to secure a history of the Jews, their political institutions, their mode of divine worship, their moral, religious, and intellectual state, such as would truly have deserved the name of a *critically correct* history;" but, through the agency of G. Hermann, this work was interrupted by a call as rector to Pforte (in Prussian Saxony) (1802). He held this position for twenty-nine years, and fulfilled its duties with distinguished ability. In 1816 he was appointed counsellor of the Consistory. In 1831 he was compelled to ask for his discharge, and retired to Berlin, where he died September 17, 1834. All that he has left us of any value, besides the *De Jobi antiquissimi carminis Hebr. natura atque virtute* (Leips. 1789), is a few philosophical treatises which he wrote during his rectorship at Pforte.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 633 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bib. Lit.* ii, 378.

Ilive, Jacob, an English infidel, born in 1710, was both a printer and a type-founder by trade. In 1733 he published a discourse to prove the plurality of worlds. He maintained that earth is a hell, and that the souls of men are fallen angels. Before and after this publication he lectured publicly on the same topic. In the same year, 1733, he published another work, entitled *A Dialogue between a Doctor of the Church of England and Mr. Jacob Ilive upon the subject of the Oration.* In 1751 he published what claimed to be a translation of *The Book of Jasher*, which he attributed to a certain Alcuin of Brittany, although he was himself the real author (see Horne's *Bibl. Bib.*). Another pamphlet, entitled *Modest Remarks on Bishop Sherlock's Sermons*, caused him to be condemned to two years' imprisonment. During his forced residence at Clerkenwell Bridewell, he wrote *Reasons offered for the Reformation of the House of Correction in Clerkenwell.* Ilive, however, did some real service to Biblical statistics in publishing a second edition of Calasio, *Concordantiæ Sacrorum Bibliorum* (Lond. 1747, 4 vols. fol.). See Gough, *Brit. Topography*; Wilson, *Hist. of Dissenting Churches*; Chalmers, *Gen. Biog. Dict.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 814; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* ii, 1605. (J. N. P.)

Illatio is a term used in old rituals of the Mass for *præfatio.*

Illescas, Jacob de (יעקיב דילישקאש), a Jewish philosopher and commentator, flourished in the 14th century at Illecas, not far from Madrid, whence his family derived their name. He wrote a *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (contained in Frankfurter's great *Rabbinic Bible*) in an allegorical, cabalistic sense, with many valuable grammatical explanations of difficult passages. He also paid particular attention to obscure passages of Rashi and Aben-Ezra's expositions on this portion of the Hebrew Scriptures, and freely quotes other celebrated Jewish literati, as Lekach Tob, Joseph, Tam, Bechor Shor, Jehudah the Pious, Isaac of Vienna, Moses de Coney, Aaron, Eljakim, the Tosafoth, etc. See Kitto, *Cyclop. Biblical Liter.* ii, 378; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 91.

Illgen, Christian Friedrich, a German theologian, was born at Chemnitz, in Saxony, Sept. 16, 1786, studied at the University of Leipzig, where he first lectured, and then became extraordinary professor of philology in 1818, of theology in 1823, ordinary professor of theology in 1825, and finally canon. He was particularly distinguished for his knowledge of theological history. He died Aug. 4, 1844. His principal works are, *Lälius Socinus, Leben* (Lpz. 1814 and 1826, 2 parts, 4to):—*Memoria utriusque catechismi Lutheri* (Leipzig, 1829–30):—*Historia collegii philobiblici* (1836–40):—*Abhandlung ü. den Werth der christlichen Dogmengeschichte* (1817); and a collection of *Predigten: die Verklärung d. irdischen Lebens durch d. Evangelium* (1823). He founded the Historical Theological Society, and from 1825 to the time of his death he edited the *Zeitschrift für hist. Theol.* See S. Bruno Lindner, *Erinnerungen an Dr. Illgen* in the *Zeitschrift f. d. historische Theologie* (1845), p. 3; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxv, 814; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 635.

Illuminated (*φωτιζόμενοι*) was a term used in the early Christian Church for the baptized. See Baptism. The apostle Paul writes in two places (Heb. vi, 4; x, 32) of those who were *ἅπαξ φωτισθέντες*; and the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 372), in its third canon, calls the newly baptized *προσφάτως φωτισθέντας*. Justin Martyr, in his second *Apology*, explains the name to refer to the *spiritual* knowledge acquired by those who were baptized, and there was probably an association between the term and the ritual use of lights in the baptismal service.—Blunt, *Cyclop. of Theol.* i, 323. By some, however, the title "illuminated" is supposed to have been given to those newly baptized in the early Church, because a lighted taper was put into their hands as a symbol of their enlightenment. See Lights. (J. H. W.)

Illuminăti, a name assumed at different periods by sects of Mystics or Enthusiasts and Theosophs, who claim a greater degree of illumination or perfection than other men.

1. The first sect known under this name was a party of mystic enthusiasts who made their appearance in Spain about 1575, and who also bore the name of *Alumbrados* or *Alombrados.* They considered prayer as such an efficacious means of union with God that the soul of man could by it become entirely identified with the nature of God, so that its actions would therefore be really the actions of God himself; and they further held that for such persons good works, the sacraments, etc., are superfluous as a means of sanctification. (We invite here to a comparison of the doctrines of this sect with the Jesuits, when first instituted by Ignatius Loyola. See Ranke, *History of the Popes*, transl. by Mrs. Austin, i, 190.) They were persecuted by the Inquisition, and then disappeared from Spain; but in 1623 they reappeared in France, under the name of *Guerinets*, a sect very similar to the Alombrados of Spain, a sort of Illuminati, but who, in addition to the mystic belief of the Alombrados, believed in a special revelation of perfecti-

bility, made to one of their number, a friar, whose name was Bouquet. But they also soon became extinct, and were no longer known in France in 1635.

Another very similar sect arose in Belgium.

2. But the name of "Illuminati" was really first given to an association of Deists and Republicans which was founded May 1, 1776, by Adam Weishaupt, professor of canon law at the University of Ingolstadt. This "order," which, by its founder, was first called the *Order of the Perfectibilists*, was established on a masonic foundation like that of the organization of the Jesuits. They announced as their aim to elevate mankind to the highest possible degree of moral purity, and to lay the foundation for the reformation of the world by organizing an association of the best men to oppose the progress of moral evil. Practically, however, the "order" soon evinced tendencies dangerous alike to Church and State. In their opposition to religious and political Jesuitism, which at that time, in Roman Catholic Germany, imposed unbearable restraints on the human mind, they aimed at nothing less than revolutionizing religion, abolishing Christianity in order to substitute reason in its place, deposing all civil powers, and establishing a nominal republican government. Weishaupt himself, however, was a very honorable man, actuated by the purest motives, and zealous for the religious and political improvement of mankind. The most active disciple, through whose influence the society increased with extraordinary rapidity, was the baron Adolph von Knigge, who joined the Illuminati in 1780. The baron maintained that Christianity was not so much a popular religion as a system exclusively applicable to the elect, and that, introduced by the Mystics, it had found its form of highest development in Freemasonry. Only a small number of the elect were allowed an insight into the ultimate object of the new organization, but the whole system was made profusely attractive to a certain class of minds by mysterious ceremonies and forms. The order aimed steadfastly at obtaining the control of the higher offices in Church and State; and, although liberty and equality were proclaimed as its fundamental principles, it sought absolute supremacy. With a view to reach that end, Weishaupt, who had himself been a Jesuit, finally made use of the same means by which the Jesuits had been so successful. Thus he sought to win over to his side all persons of any influence; to surround rulers with members of the order; to make proselytes of men weak in mind but strong of purse, while at the same time he excluded such as, on account of their pride or their strength of character, would be unlikely to prove pliant subjects, or whose want of discretion might injure the order. Strict, unquestioning, and blind obedience was made the first duty of every member; every one was under the direct control of his immediate superiors, and knew in fact, no other members of the order. Aside from this, each member was subject to a private supervision, which extended to the head of the society; "and the Illuminati were soon involved in a system of mutual espionage, confession, and the like, essentially inconsistent with true freedom, but calculated to place the threads all in one hand, by which the holy legion was to be led on, as it was imagined, to the benefaction of mankind." Only such persons as were distinguished for prudence, wisdom, complete abnegation for self, and zeal for the interest of the society, were admitted to the higher degrees, wherein the mysteries of the higher order were revealed to them, while those of the lower degrees hardly suspected their existence. These mysteries related to religion, on which subject they were of the character of naturalism and free-thinking; and to politics, in regard to which the aim was to replace monarchy by republicanism and socialism. An active correspondence was kept up between the chiefs and the members of the order in the different districts where lodges were established. It was carried on by means of a cipher, generally of the usual figures; but the higher orders also made use of other signs. The months were designated by particular names; thus January became *Dimeh*, February *Benmeh;* and Germany was called the *Orient*, Bavaria *Achaia*, Munich *Athens*. The order was represented by ⊙, a lodge by ▭. The letters addressed to a superior were marked Q. L., i. e. *Quibus licet*, to open the letter; if the letter was addressed to one of the higher chiefs, it was marked *Soli;* and if to one still superior, *Primo*. Each one of the Illuminati was, besides, known in the order by some particular name. Thus the founder went by the ominous appellation of Spartacus; Knigge by that of Philo, etc. The attractions which the order presented by its mysterious secret forms, and the extraordinary energy and Jesuitical acumen which the leaders brought to bear on their undertaking, soon swelled its numbers, and, during its most prosperous period, the association consisted of over 2000 members, among them some of the most prominent names of Germany, and even princes, who, however, could only be initiated into the lower orders, as the higher mysteries of the order inculcated republicanism. The head-quarters of the order were in Bavaria, which, with Suabia and Franconia, formed the first province of the association in Germany, and it was not only established in all the principal cities of Germany, but also gained a foothold in France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Poland, Hungary, and Italy.

As regards its interior organization, the order was established on the basis of the Society of Jesus, of which, as we have already observed, Weishaupt had once been a member. In 1777 he had joined the freemasons. From the first it had been his aim to connect his new society with freemasonry, for the purpose of giving it a firmer foundation, and with the ultimate object of finally absorbing the latter in the former. Knigge's activity and enterprise finally succeeded in bringing the Illuminati to be considered as freemasons by the craft, but this step made new enemies for the Illuminati, and ultimately caused their overthrow. Knigge modelled the material organization of the society after that of freemasonry, dividing the members into three classes, each of which was again composed of several degrees. The first, a preparatory class, was composed of novices, Minervites, and *Illuminati minores*. Any man eighteen years of age could become a novice, and on his conduct depended his promotion to the next degree, which could be effected after one, two, or three years. The second class, or that of freemasons, embraced apprentices, masons, and master-masons, besides the two higher grades of *Illuminatus major* and of *Illuminatus dirigens*, or Scottish knights. These latter had the control of the Minervite lodges. The third class, or that of the "Mysteries," was divided into higher and lesser mysteries; the latter embraced the priests and the regents, or members to whom had been imparted the mysterious aims of the society in regard to religion and politics. The initiation to the degree of regent was conducted with great solemnity, and was very impressive. The adepts of the higher mysteries were also of two degrees, the *Magnus* and the *Rex*, to whom the principles of naturalism, republicanism, and socialism were further developed. These were the Areopagites of the order, and had no superiors but the secret council, presided over by the general of the order (Weishaupt), which composed the highest court of appeal for all members of the order.

A jealous feeling and contention for leadership which sprang up between Weishaupt and Knigge, and a difference of opinion of the two greatest heads of the society on many points of organization and discipline, hastened the decline of the order, especially after Knigge had left it (July 1, 1784). As soon as the State and Church-disturbing tendency, which for a time had remained hidden, became known, the order was vehemently denounced. June 22, 1784, the elector of Bavaria issued an edict for its suppression. But the society continued to exist in secret. When, however, the authorities had succeeded in obtaining further evidences of the danger-

ous tendency of the order by securing some of the papers of the association (which they published), they punished the members by fine, imprisonment, and exile. Many quit the country, among them Weishaupt (Feb. 16, 1785), on whose head a price had been set. He fled to Gotha (some say Halle), and resided there until his death, Nov. 18, 1830. Edicts were again published by the elector of Bavaria, March 2 and August 16, 1785, which, by the severe punishment which it threatened to members, caused the rapid decline of the order, and they disappeared altogether towards the close of the last century (eighteenth). "Great importance was at one time attached to the order of the Illuminati, whose secret influence was regarded as a principal cause of many of the political events of the time of the French Revolution, and the works of Abbé Barruel and of Professor Robison of Edinburgh upon this subject were eagerly read, but the highly exaggerated character of their views is now generally acknowledged." See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 636; Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 519; *Grosse Absichten d. Ordens d. Illuminaten*, etc., *von vier ehemaligen Mitgliedern* (Munich, 1786); *Nachtrag z. d. grossen Absichten* (Mun. 1786); *Grundsätze, Verfassung u. Schicksale d. Illuminatenordens in Bayern* (1786); Weishaupt, *Apologie d. Illuminaten* (Frank. 1786); same, *Einleitung z. meiner Apologie* (Frank. 1787); same, *Das verbesserte System d. Illuminaten*, etc. (Frank. 1787); Philo's (Knigge's) *Endliche Erklärung und Antwort*, etc. (Hannov. 1788); *Die neuen Arbeiten d. Spartacus u. Philo in d. Illuminatenorden*, etc. (1794); Voss, *Ueber d. Illuminatenorden* (1799); *Einige Originalschriften d. Illuminatenordens*, etc., *auf höchsten Befehl z. Druck befördert*(Münch. 1787); *Nachtrag v. weiteren Originalschriften, und der Illuminatensekte überhaupt*, etc. (Münch. 1787); Henke, *Kirchengesch.* vii, 206 sq.; *Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol.* vi, art. ii; Ersch und Gruber, *Allgem. Encyklop.* sect. ii, xvi, 206 sq.; Kahnis, *German Protestantism*, p. 59 sq. See MYSTICS. (J. H. W.)

Illuminatio (*sacramentum illuminationis*). See ILLUMINATED.

Illumination, ART OF. The art of illuminating manuscripts with gold and color seems to prevail in countries where the art of printing is unknown. It has been erroneously supposed to have been originated by Christianity; it is certain, however, that under its sway it was brought to its known perfection. The time when the Christians first adapted the art of illumination it is impossible to determine definitely, but it most probably dates from the time when the ancient fashion of rolled manuscripts (comp. the article THORAH), which the Jews still preserve, was changed for the present book form. The earliest specimens extant are from the first half of the 2d century; and we find St. Jerome, no later than the 4th century, complaining of the abuse of filling up books with ornamental capital letters of an enormous size. In the 5th century many of the MSS. were illuminated, especially copies of the Gospels and other Scriptures. They were written on a blue ground in silver, with the name of God in gold. By the influence of Byzantine luxury there were even produced some copies on a *gilded* ground in letters of black. One of the best specimens of the perfection to which the art had been brought in that century is the *Codex Argenteus*, or copy of the Gothic (Ulphilas's) version of the N. T. in letters of silver, with the initials in gold, now preserved in the royal library at Upsala. It is also supposed that at that time the various schools of illumination originated. "Rome had succumbed to barbarian violence, and her arts, though decaying, still exerted an influence in this new style of painting, then in its infancy. That influence was naturally stronger in Italy, and therefore the early illuminations of the Italian school bear traces of the old Roman style. In France the same influence was manifest, mixed up with national peculiarities, and this school was consequently called the Franco-Roman." But, remarkable as it may appear, it is now found that Ireland was far in advance of other nations in the knowledge of this art, as she was generally in advance of them in the scale of civilization. "Her fame had extended over Europe, her monasteries were adorned with men of great piety and learning, who were the trainers of the leading spirits of the age. She was the first to break through the dense darkness of the times, and, as she gave Christianity to Scotland, so she also imparted to the Saxons the art of illumination." The first illuminator seems to have been Dagæus, abbot of Iniskeltra, who flourished in the second half of the 6th century. Of English illumination, the finest specimen extant is from the 10th century, the celebrated "Benedictional" by St. Ethelwold, bishop of Winchester, written and painted between 963 and 984. In the 13th century, and even down to its decline three centuries later, the art was greatly furthered by Bonaventura's series of meditations on the life of Christ, which gave minute descriptions of the several scenes of which it treated, and thus formed a sort of ideal. During the Byzantine period it was mainly the Scriptures, the works of the fathers, and books for Church service generally that were illuminated. Later, volumes for private devotion were also thus enriched, until, at the close of the 15th century, the art of illumination was generally applied not only to books, but to MSS. of almost any sort. The invention of printing seemed to sound its death-knell, and it is not to be wondered at that the monks, who, being cut off from secular business, and having found employment by the application of this art, then made a strong resistance to the introduction of an art that would deprive them, sooner or later, of their own employment. But the popular mind had become so accustomed to the illumination of works, that its extinction was much more gradual than had been anticipated, and the earliest printed books were not only illuminated, but the printers even attempted, by a process of their art, to supersede manual labor. Perhaps the latest effort of this kind was an edition of the Liturgy, brought out in 1717 by John Short, entirely engraved on copper plates. "The pages were surrounded by borders, and embellished with pictures and decorated initial letters." See Hill, *English Monasticism*, ch. xii, where may also be found the details of the work as it was carried on for centuries in the various monasteries of Europe.—Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Literature, and Art*, ii, 193 sq.

Illuminism. See ILLUMINATI; RATIONALISM.

Illyés, ANDREAS, a Hungarian prelate, was born at Szont-Gyoergy, in Transylvania, in the first half of the 17th century, and educated at Rome. On his return to his native country he filled several positions of trust, then went to Posen as canon, and later became bishop of Weissenburg. On account of the political disturbances in Transylvania he removed to Vienna. The time of his death is not generally known. He published *Verbum adverbiarum*, 74 sermons in Hungarian (Vienna, 1693, 4to):—*Vitæ sanctorum* (ibid. 1693), in Hungarian (Tyrnan, 1705, and often), etc.—Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Add. ii, 2276.

Illyrica, COUNCIL OF (*Concilium Illyricum*), held in the year 375, according to Ceillier and Hefele, by order of the emperor Valentinian. It was attended by a large number of bishops, who met to consider the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the three divine persons, as it had been set forth at Nicæa. They issued a synodal letter to the churches of Asia, etc., confirming the doctrine with great emphasis, and they further decreed that the homousiastical trinity doctrine should be everywhere taught, and all those who should reject it be punished by anathema. See Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* i, 716 sq.; Landon, *Man. of Councils*, p. 266 sq. See ARIANISM.

Illyr'icum (Ἰλλυρικόν, lit. *Illyrian*, but the word is of unknown though prob. native etymology), or *Illyria*, a country lying to the north-west of Macedonia, and answering nearly to that which is at present called *Dal-*

matia; by which name, indeed, the southern part of Illyricum itself was known, and whither St. Paul informs Timothy that Titus had gone (2 Tim. iv, 10). The apostle Paul, in his third great missionary journey, after traversing Asia Minor and Macedonia, tells the Church of Rome that "round about unto Illyricum (κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ) I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ" (Rom. xv, 19). The exact meaning of the passage is somewhat doubtful. The κύκλος may be joined with Jerusalem, and signify its *neighborhood* (as Alford, ad loc.); or it may be joined with the μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ, and denote the *circuit* of the apostle's journey "as far as Illyricum" (an expression warranted by the indefinite phrase of Luke, "those parts," Acts xx, 2). Through the southern part of Illyria proper ran the great road called *Via Egnatia*, which connected Italy and the East, beginning at Apollonia and Dyrrhachium, passing through Thessalonica and Philippi, and terminating at the Hellespont (*Antonini Itinerarium*, ed. Wessel., p. 317). Along this road Paul may have travelled on his third journey till he reached that region on the shore of the Adriatic which was called Illyricum. From Dyrrhachium he may have turned north into that district of Illyricum then called Dalmatia, and may have founded the churches subsequently visited by Titus (2 Tim. iv, 10). Afterwards he may have gone southwards by Nicopolis to Corinth. (But see Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul*, i, 389; ii, 128, 1st ed.) Illyricum is a wild and bare mountainous region. A ridge of rugged limestone mountains runs through it from north to south, affording a fitting home for a number of wild tribes, who now, as in ancient times, inhabit the country. The coast-line is deeply indented, and possesses some excellent harbors (Grote, *History of Greece*, vol. iv; Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro*). Its boundaries were not very distinct; Pliny (iii, 28) and Strabo (vii, 313) placing it east of the Adriatic Gulf, while Ptolemy (ii, 17) divides it into Liburnia, Iapodia, and Dalmatia (compare Mannert, vii, 306). The earliest notices state that certain tribes called Ἰλλύριοι inhabited the mountainous region along the coast between Epirus and Liburnia (Scylax, ch. xix sq.). On the invasion of the country by the Goths, these tribes were scattered eastward and northward, and gave their name to a wider region; and this was probably the geographical import of the name as used by Paul. At a later period Illyricum became one of the four great divisions of the Roman empire, and embraced the whole country lying between the Adriatic, the Danube, the Black Sea, and Macedonia (Gibbon's *Roman Empire*, chap. i). The best ancient description of it is that of Appian (*Bell. Illyr.*), and among moderns that of Cramer (*Ancient Greece*, i, 29 sq.). See DALMATIA. (For its history, see Anthon's *Class. Dict.* s. v.)—Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.;

Illyricus. See FLACIUS (MATTHIAS).

Image (prop. צֶלֶם, *tse'lem; εἰκών*; but also designated by various other Hebrew terms; often rendered "graven image," "molten image," etc.). See IDOL. For the interpretation of the colossal statue of Nebuchadnezzar's dream (Dan. ii, 31), see DANIEL, BOOK OF.

Image-breakers. See ICONOCLASTS.

Image of God. The notion of the "image of God in man" is one of the fundamental conceptions of Christian theology. It takes its root in the Mosaic account of creation, where we find God saying (Gen. i, 26), "Let us make man, בְּצַלְמֵנוּ and כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ, in our image, after our likeness." This first expression is again used in the next verse, where the act of creation is recorded, and subsequently also, ix, 6, after sin had entered the world. There is consequently no further difference between צֶלֶם and דְּמוּת than that the one is the concrete, the other the abstract expression of the same idea. This is also seen in comparing v, 3 and ix, 6. The two synonymes are in fact used for the sake of emphasis, q. d. *in exact resemblance of us.*

"No one doubts that the phrase 'image of God' denotes in general a *likeness of God;* but the opinions of theologians have always been different respecting the particular points of resemblance which Moses intended to express by the phrase. Nor is this strange, since Moses does not explain what he means by it, and it is used in very different significations in the Bible, a fact that has not been sufficiently noticed. The common opinion is, that this phrase denotes certain excellences which man originally possessed, but which he lost, in part at least, by the fall. The principal texts cited in behalf of this opinion are Gen. i, 26; compare ii, 15 sq.: and from the N. Test., Col. iii, 19; compare Eph. iv, 24, where a *renewal* after the image of God is mentioned, which is understood to mean a *restoration* of this image, implying that man must have lost it; also 2 Cor. xi, 3. Against this common opinion it may be objected that the image of God is described in many passages as existing after the fall, and as still discoverable in men; as Gen. ix, 6; James iii, 9; 1 Cor. xi, 6, 7, and especially Gen. v, 1-3, from which it appears that Seth, being made in the likeness of Adam, must have had the same image of God, whatever it was, which Adam possessed" (Knapp, *Christian Theology*, bk. i, art. vi, sec. 53, p. 168).

In the works of the fathers we find great diversity of opinion concerning this image of God (Gregor. Nyss. *De homin. opif* c. iv, v, or. xvi). Some of the early Latin fathers also maintained a bodily likeness to God (Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* v, 6). The Audæans (q. v.) admitted only the physical resemblance (Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* iv, 9), while Augustine and the Church of Alexandria rejected it altogether (Clemens, *Strom.* ii, 19). They also agreed in making the divine image, in a moral point of view, to consist in uprightness before God, and in the harmony between the higher and the lower faculties of the soul; as also physically in the immortality of the body, and the mastership over all other creatures. Others admit a confirmation and strengthening of the image of God in man by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, which they consider not only as a gift of free grace, but also as necessary to the completeness of man (Cyr. Alex. *Thes.* xxxiv, *dial.* vi). These different parties make great use of the distinction between the two expressions *imago* and *similitudo;* the scholastics maintaining that by the *imago* (which, though weakened by the fall, was still extant) is to be understood the essence of the innate, natural attributes of the spirit, especially reason and liberty; and by the *similitudo* (which was obliterated by the fall) the moral nature of man, which was agreeable to God, or, in other words, the thorough unison with the divine will originating in the divine grace (Hugo Vict. *De Sacram.* l. i, p. 6, c. ii; Petr. Lomb. *Sent.* l. ii, dist. 16, D.). The creed of Trent makes no positive mention concerning the image of God, but the *Catechismus Romanus* considers it as consisting in the peculiar inherent dispositions of the human soul, for after its definitions concerning Adam's body it says, "Quod autem ad animam pertinet, eum (hominem) ad imaginem et similitudinem suam formavit liberumque ei arbitrium tribuit," which, however, does not satisfactorily explain in what relation this *liberum arbitrium* (free will) stands with regard to the *imago dei* (image of God) in the soul. It also leaves undecided the question whether the consequent submission of the desires to the dictates of reason is also to be considered as forming part of this image of God. From the word *addidit* we can only infer that the *originalis justitiæ admirable donum* is something independent, not inherent (*Cat. Rom.* i, 2, 19). The Romish theologians still endeavor to maintain the distinctions made by the scholastics between *imago* and *similitudo.* "The 'original justice' is further considered as a supernatural gift, which man possesses by a special grace, so that it is made to counterbalance the natural division between the higher and the lower forces (the spirit and the flesh, reason and sensuality), thus directing the forces towards God, and introducing the *similitudo* in the *imago* (Bellarmine, *De Grat. Prim. Hominis,*

v, 5). Thus the Roman Catholic Church starts in its theory from the present state of man, as resulting from the fall, in regard to which state communion with God is something *superadded.* Some Romanist theologians distinguish between original *justice* and original *holiness* (communion with God), maintaining the former to be the attribute of pure nature as it came from the hand of the Creator, and holding the latter to be exclusively the gift of superadded and supernatural grace. The evangelical Church, on the contrary, by considering the image of God as belonging to Adam's true nature, as he came from the hands of his Creator, obtains a doctrine at once more clear, more simple, and more true (*Apol.* i, 17; comp. *Form. Concord. sol. decl.* i, 10). It considers habitual communion with God as a state natural to man, and belonging to his normal organization before the fall, not as a special particular gift. It maintains, further, that this original image of God was lost by the fall of man.

"But in the papal anthropology, man, as he comes from God, is imperfect. He is not created sinful indeed, but neither is he created holy. To use the papal phrase, he is created *in puris naturalibus;* without positive righteousness and without positive unrighteousness. The body is full of natural carnal propensities, and tends downwards. The soul, as rational and immortal, tends upwards. But there is no harmony between the two *by creation.* An act subsequent to that of creation, and additional to it, is necessary to bring this harmony about; and this is that act by which the gift of original righteousness is *superadded* to the gifts of creation. In and by this act the higher part is strengthened to acquire and maintain dominion over the lower, and a positive perfection is imparted to human nature that was previously lacking in it. Original righteousness is thus, in reference to the created and natural characteristics of man, a *supernatural* gift.

"The second peculiarity in the papal anthropology consists in the tenet that *apostasy involves the loss of a supernatural, but not of a natural gift.* By the act of transgression, human nature lapses back into that condition of conflict between the flesh and the spirit in which it was created. In losing its original righteousness, therefore, it loses nothing with which it was endowed by the *creative* act, but only that superadded gift which was bestowed subsequently to this. The supremacy of the higher over the lower part is lost by the Adamic transgression, and the two parts of man, the flesh and the spirit, fall into their *primitive* and *natural* antagonism again. Original righteousness being a supernatural gift, original sin is the loss of it, and, in reality, the restoration of man to the state in which he was created" (Shedd, *Hist. of Doct.* ii, 146).

The "image," or likeness of God, in which man was made, has, by some, been assigned exclusively to the body; by others simply to the soul; others, again, have found its essence in the circumstance of his having "*dominion*" over the other creatures. As to the body, it is not necessary to take up any large space to prove that in no instance can that literally bear the image of God, that is, be "like" God. Descant ever so much or ever so poetically upon man's upright and noble form, this has no more likeness to God than a prone or reptile one: God is incorporeal, and has no bodily shape to be the antitype of anything material. Not more tenable is the notion that the image of God in man consisted in the "dominion" which was granted to him over this lower world. Limited dominion may, it is true, be an image of large and absolute dominion; but man is not said to have been made in the image of God's dominion, which is accident merely, for, before any creatures existed, God himself could have no dominion but in the image and likeness of God himself, of something which constitutes *his nature.* Still further, man, according to the history, was evidently made in the image of God, *in order* to his having dominion, as the Hebrew connective particle ("and") imports. He who was to have dominion must necessarily be made before he could be invested with it, and therefore dominion was consequent to his existing in the "image" and "likeness" of God, and could not be that image itself.

The attempts which have been made to fix upon some *one* essential quality in which to place that "image" of God in which man was created, are not only uncalled for by any scriptural requirement, but are even contradicted by various parts of Scripture, from which alone we must derive our information on this subject. It is in vain to say that this "image" must be something essential to human nature, something only which cannot be lost. We shall, it is true, find that revelation places it in what is essential to human nature; but that it should comprehend nothing else, or one quality only, has no proof or reason; and we are, in fact, taught that it comprises also what is not essential to human nature, and what may be lost and be regained. As to both, the evidence of Scripture is explicit.

(1.) When God is called "the Father of spirits," a likeness is certainly intimated between man and God in the *spirituality* of their nature. This is also implied in the striking argument of Paul with the Athenians: "Forasmuch, then, as we are the *offspring* of God, we ought not to think that the godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone graven by art, and man's device;" plainly referring to the idolatrous statues by which God was represented among heathens. If likeness to God in man consisted in bodily shape, this would not have been an argument against human representations of the Deity; but it imports, as Howe well expresses it, that "we are to understand that our resemblance to him, as we are his offspring, lies in some higher, more noble, and more excellent thing, of which there can be no figure, as who can tell how to give the figure or image of a thought, or of the mind or thinking power?" In spirituality, and consequently immateriality, this image of God in man, then, in the first particular, consists.

(2.) The sentiment expressed in Wisdom ii, 23, is evidence that, in the opinion of the ancient Jews, the image of God in man comprised *immortality* also: "For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity;" and though other creatures, and even the body of man, were made capable of immortality, and at least the material human frame, whatever we may think of the case of animals, would have escaped death, had not sin entered the world, yet, without running into the absurdity of the "natural immortality" of the human soul, that essence must have been constituted immortal in a high and peculiar sense, which has ever retained its prerogative of eternal duration amidst the universal death, not only of animals, but of the bodies of all human beings. See IMMORTALITY.

(3.) To these correspondences we are to add that of *intellectual powers,* and we have what divines have called, in perfect accordance with the Scriptures, the *natural* image of God in his creature, which is essential and ineffaceable. He was made capable of *knowledge,* and he was endowed with liberty of *will.*

(4.) This natural image of God, in which man was created, was the foundation of that *moral image* by which also he was distinguished. Unless he had been a spiritual, knowing, and willing being, he would have been wholly incapable of moral qualities. That he had such qualities eminently, and that in them consisted the image of God, as well as in the natural attributes just stated, we have also the express testimony of Scripture. "Lo this only have I found, that God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions." There is also an express allusion to the moral image of God, in which man was first created, in Col. iii, 10, "And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him;" and in Eph. iv, 24, "Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." This also may be finally argued from the satisfaction with which the historian of the creation represents the Creator as viewing

the works of his hands "as very good." This is pronounced with reference to each individually as well as to the whole: "And God saw *everything* that he had made, and behold, it was very good." But as to man, this goodness must necessarily imply moral as well as physical qualities. Without them he would have been imperfect as *man;* and, had they existed in him, in their first exercises, perverted and sinful, he must have been an exception, and could not have been pronounced "very good."—Watson, *Institutes*, ii, 9-13.

From this point of view we may arrive at a correct apprehension of the idea of the divine image. God, as an absolute spirit, whose essential element of life is love, cannot but manifest himself in an eternal object of this love, of the same essence with himself. This is the Son, the eternal, absolute, immanent image of God. But as God, by virtue of his unfathomable, overflowing love, calls also forth (or creates) other beings, to whom he wills to impart his blissful life by the establishing of his kingdom, he, the type of all perfection, cannot create them but after his own image, as he sees it from all eternity in the Son. This *created* image of God is man in his primitive condition. Man was the real object of God's creative activity, as is seen in God's special decision with regard to his creation (Gen. i, 26; comp. Psa. viii), and mankind are called to be the real population of his kingdom. The whole universe (and even in some sense the angels, Heb. i, 14) was only created for man, which is the reason why he was not created till all other things were ready for him. The faculties which other creatures present only in a limited, disconnected manner, were in him (as the μικρόκοσμος) united into a harmonious whole; moreover, in him alone (as the μικρόθεος), of all creatures, was the personal spiritual life of God mirrored; and by direct inspiration of the divine breath of life, the spirit was infused, by which he became a spiritual, self-conscious, free, and individual soul. Man was created God's image in his individualism. As God is not an abstract, but a real spirit, full of the living powers which created the world, so the image of God in man embraced his whole nature. It extended also to the body as the outward image, the dwelling and organ of the soul. Man was created the image of God in the totality of his being. But, while man was thus made the image of God to himself, he was also made the image of God to the world before which he stands as the representative of God, a relation by which the mastery over the outer world ascribed to him in Scripture (Gen. i, 28-30) is shown to have an inner foundation. Thus far the image of God was innate in man and inalienable. This innate state, however, bespoke a corresponding *habitual* state. Inasmuch as God the Spirit is love, man was destined to a life of love, and was at once brought into it by communion with God. From the heart, however, as the centre of individual life, the power of love manifests itself in the direction of knowledge as truth and wisdom (objective and subjective directions), and in the direction of the will, as freedom and sanctity (formal and material directions), yet so that these spiritual conditions in their original working produced a state partly of untried innocence and partly of unfolding development. To the body, the image of God procured immortality (*posse non mori*), as the outward dissolution of the forces (death) is but the result of an inward dissolution of the principle of life. With regard to the world, however, man obtained by it a power, in consequence of which the world becomes subject to him by love, and not by force; and by his knowledge of its nature (Gen. ii, 19, 20), he is enabled to carry out God's will in it.

This habitual resemblance to God, which, with the image of God innate in man's nature, formed the natural, original state of man, was *lost by sin*, as the life of love, coming from God, which formed its basis, was destroyed by selfishness coming from the heart of man. It could only be restored by the absolute image of God the Son, source of the life of love for the world, assuming himself the form of man. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, made flesh, is the real, personal restoration of the image of God in humanity. Since in the flesh he overcame sin for us by his death, and raised our nature to glory in his resurrection, man can again become partaker of the righteousness and spiritual glory which belong to him. By the Holy Spirit, which fills our hearts with love for God, the image of God is restored in us in truth and uprightness. See C. Sartorius, *D. Lehre v. d. heiligen Liebe* (Stuttg. 1843), i, 34 sq.); J. T. Beck, *D. christl. Lehrwissenschaft nach den bibl. Urkunden* (Stutt. 1841), i, § 19; H. Martensen, *D. christl. Dogmatik* (Kiel, 1850), p. 156; J. Chr. K. Hofmann, *Der Schriftbeweis* (Nördlingen, 1851), i, 248-254; G. Thomasius, *Christi Person u. Werk* (Erlangen, 1853), i, 147-224; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iii, 614; Knapp, *Theology*, sect. 53 et sq.; Winer, *Comparat. Darstellung*, p. 33; Watson, *Institutes*, vol. ii, ch. i; *Critici Sacri*, "*De Imagine Dei*," i, 40; Fawcett, *Sermons*, p. 234; Dwight, *Theology*, i, 345; South, *Sermons*, i, 45; Grinfield, *Inquiry into the Image of God in Man* (Lond. 1837, 8vo); Harness, *Sermons on the Image of God* (Lond. 1841, 8vo); *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vii, 409; Jackson, Thos., *Original State of Man*, in *Works* ix, 1; Van Mildert, *Works*, v, 143; Harris, *Man Primeval* (N. Y. 1851, 12mo).

Image of Jealousy. See JEALOUSY, IMAGE OF.

Imagery (מַשְׂכִּית, *maskith'*, an *image*, as rendered Lev. xxvi, 1; or *picture*, as rendered Numb. xxxiii, 52), only in the phrase "*chambers of his imagery*" (Ezek. viii, 12). The scenes of pictorial representation referred to by this phrase are connected with an instructive passage in the history of Ezekiel and the Jewish exiles, who were stationed in Assyria, on the banks of the Chebar. At one of their interesting prayer-meetings for the restoration of Israel, which had been held so often and so long without any prospect of brighter days, and when the faith and hopes of many of the unfortunates were waxing dim and feeble, Ezekiel, in presence of his friends, consisting of the exiled elders of Judah, was suddenly rapt in mystic vision, and graciously shown, for his own satisfaction, as well as that of his pious associates, the reasons of God's protracted controversy with Israel, and the sad necessity there was for still dealing hardly with them. Transported by the Spirit (not bodily, indeed, nor by external force, but in imagination) to the city and Temple of Jerusalem, he there saw, as plainly as if it had been with the eye of sense, atrocities going on within the precincts of the holy place—the perpetration of which in the very capital of Judæa, the place which God had chosen to put his name there, afforded proof of the woful extent of national apostasy and corruption, and was sufficient to justify, both to the mind of the prophet and his circle of pious associates, the severity of the divine judgments on Israel, and the loud call there was for prolonging and increasing, instead of putting a speedy end to, the dire calamities they had so long been suffering (Ezek. viii). See EZEKIEL.

The first spectacle that caught his eye as he perambulated, in mystic vision, the outer court of the Temple —that court where the people usually assembled to worship—was a colossal statue, probably of Baal, around which crowds of devotees were performing their frantic revelries, and whose forbidden ensigns were proudly blazoning on the walls and portals of the house of him who had proclaimed himself a God jealous of his honor (ver. 3; Lowth, ad loc.). Scarcely had the prophet recovered from his astonishment and horror at the open and undisguised idolatry of the multitude in that sacred inclosure, when his celestial guide bade him turn another way, and he would see greater abominations. Leading him to that side of the court along which were ranged the houses of the priests, his conductor pointed to a mud wall (ver. 7), which, to screen themselves from observation, the apostate servants of the true God had raised; and in that wall was a small chink, by widening which

he discovered a passage into a secret chamber, which was completely impervious to the rays of the sun, but which he found, on entering it, lighted up by a profusion of brilliant lamps. The sides of it were covered with numerous paintings of beasts and reptiles—the favorite deities of Egypt; and with their eyes intently fixed on these decorations was a conclave of seventy persons, in the garb of priests—the exact number, and, in all probability, the individual members of the Sanhedrim, who stood in the attitude of adoration, holding in their hands each a golden censer, containing all the costly and odoriferous materials which the pomp and magnificence of the Egyptian ritual required. "There was every form of creeping things and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel portrayed round about." The scene described was wholly formed on the model of Egyptian worship; and every one who has read the works of Wilkinson, Belzoni, Richardson, and others, will perceive the close resemblance that it bears to the outer walls, the sanctuaries, and the hieroglyphical figures that distinguished the ancient mythology of Egypt (see Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note ad loc.). What were the strange and unsightly images engraven on the walls of this chamber discovered by Ezekiel, and that formed the objects of the profane reverence of these apostate councillors, may be known from the following metrical description, which the late Mr. Salt, long the British consul in Egypt, has drawn of the gods worshipped by the ancient idolatrous inhabitants of that country ("Egypt," in Hall's *Life of Salt*, ii, 416). Those who have prosecuted their researches among the rubbish of the temples, he says, have found in the deeply-sequestered chambers they were able to reach—

> "The wildest images, unheard of, strange,
> That ever puzzled antiquarians' brains:
> Genii, with heads of birds, hawks, ibis, drakes,
> Of lions, foxes, cats, fish, frogs, and snakes,
> Bulls, rams, and monkeys, hippopotami,
> With knife in paw, suspended from the sky;
> Gods germinating men, and men turned gods,
> Seated in honor, with gilt crooks and rods;
> Vast scarabæi, globes by hands upheld,
> From chaos springing, 'mid an endless field:
> Of forms grotesque, the sphinx, the crocodile,
> And other reptiles from the slime of Nile."

Interior of the Temple at Medinet-Abu.

In order to show the reader still further how exactly this inner chamber that Ezekiel saw was constructed after the Egyptian fashion, we subjoin an extract from the work of another traveller, descriptive of the great temple of Edfû, one of the admirable relics of antiquity, from which it will be seen that the degenerate priests of Jerusalem had borrowed the whole style of the edifice in which they were celebrating their hidden rites—its form, its entrance, as well as its pictorial ornaments on the walls—from their idolatrous neighbors of Egypt: "Considerably below the surface of the adjoining building," says he, "my conductor pointed out to me a *chink in an old wall*, which he told me I should creep through on my hands and feet; the aperture was not two feet and a half high, and scarcely three feet and a half broad. My companion had the courage to go first, thrusting in a lamp before him: I followed. The passage was so narrow that my mouth and nose were almost buried in the dust, and I was nearly suffocated. After proceeding about ten yards in utter darkness, the heat became excessive, the breathing was laborious, the perspiration poured down my face, and I would have given the world to have got out; but my companion, whose person I could not distinguish, though his voice was audible, called out to me to crawl a few feet further, and that I should find plenty of room. I joined him at length, and had the inexpressible satisfaction of standing once more upon my feet. We found ourselves in a *splendid apartment of great magnitude*, adorned with an incredible profusion of sacred *paintings and hieroglyphics*" (Madden's *Travels in Turkey, Egypt, etc.*; see also Maurice, *Indian Antiq.* ii, 212). In the dark recesses of such a chamber as this, which they entered like the traveller through a hole in the outer wall, and in which was painted to the eye the grotesque and motley group of Egyptian divinities, were the chief men at Jerusalem actually employed when Ezekiel saw them. With minds highly excited by the dazzling splendor, and the clouds of fragrant smoke that filled the apartment, the performers of those clandestine rites seem to have surpassed even the enthusiastic zeal of their ancestors in the days of Moses, when, crowding round the pedestal of the golden calf, they rent the air with their cries of "These be thy gods, O Israel!" Beneath a calmer exterior, the actors in the scene pointed out to Ezekiel concealed a stronger and more intense passion for idolatry. Every form of animal life, from the noblest quadruped to the most loathsome reptile that spawned in Egypt, received a share of their insane homage; and the most extraordinary feature of the scene was that the individual who appeared to be the director of these foul mysteries, the master of ceremonies, was Jaazaniah, a descendant of that zealous scribe who had gained so much renown as the principal adviser of the good king Josiah, and whose family had for generations been regarded as the most illustrious for piety in the land. The presence of a scion of this venerated house in such a den of impurity struck the prophet as an electric shock, and showed, better than all the other painful spectacles this chamber exhibited, to what a fearful extent idolatry had inundated the land. See IDOLATRY.

It might have been supposed impossible for men to have sunk to a lower depth of superstition than that of imitating the Egyptians in worshipping the monsters of the Nile, or the vegetable produce of their fields and gardens, had not the prophet been directed to turn yet again, and he would see greater abominations that they did. "Then he brought me to the gate of the Lord's house, which was towards the north; and behold, there sat women weeping for Tammuz" (ver. 14). This, the principal deity of the Phœnicians, and who was often called also by that people Adoni, that is, My Lord, became afterwards famous in the Grecian mythology under the well-known name of Adonis; and the circumstance of his being selected for the subject of their most beautiful fiction by so many of the classic poets is a sufficient proof of the great popular interest his name and ritual excited among the idolaters of the ancient

world. It is said to have originated in a tragic adventure that befell an intrepid and beautiful prince of Phœnicia, who was killed while hunting a wild boar, by which that land was infested, and whose untimely death in the cause of his country was bewailed in an annual festival held to commemorate the disastrous event. During the seven days that the festival lasted, the Phœnicians appeared to be a nation of mourners; and in every town and village a fictitious representation of Tammuz was got up for the occasion, and the whole population assembled to pour forth their unbounded sorrow for his hapless fate, more especially at Byblos, in Syria, where a temple was erected in honor of this national deity. A strange imposture was practised to influence the public lamentations. There was in this temple a gigantic statue of the god, the eyes of which were filled with lead, which, on fire being applied within, of course melted and fell in big drops to the ground, a signal for the loud wailings of the by-standers, whose eyes, in sympathetic imitation, were dissolved in tears. Conspicuous among the crowd on such occasions, a band of mercenary females directed the orgies; and, in conformity with an ancient custom of bewailing the dead on anniversaries at the *doors of houses* (Potter's *Grecian Antiq.* bk. iv, ch. iii), others took their station at the *gate*, with their faces directed northwards, as the sun was said to have been in that quarter of the heavens at the time when Tammuz died. These violent efforts in mourning were always followed by scenes of the most licentious and revolting revelry, which, though not mentioned, are manifestly implied among the "greater abominations" which degraded this other group of idolaters. See TAMMUZ.

Besides the hieroglyphics of Egypt and the orgies of Tammuz, there was another form of superstition still, which in Jerusalem, then almost wholly given to idolatry, had its distinguished patrons. "Turn thee yet again," said his celestial guide to the prophet, "and thou shalt see greater abominations than these" (ver. 16). So he brought him "unto the inner court of the Lord's house, and behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five-and-twenty men, with their backs towards the temple of the Lord, and their faces towards the east: and they worshipped the sun towards the east." Perhaps of all the varieties of superstition which had crept in among the Hebrews in that period of general decline, none displayed such flagrant dishonor to the God of Israel as *this* (Clem. Alexandrinus, *Strom.* vii, 520); for, as the most holy place was situated at the west end of the sanctuary, it was impossible for these twenty-five men to pay their homage to the rising sun without turning their backs on the consecrated place of the divine presence; and accordingly this fourth circle is introduced last, as if their employment formed the climax of abominations —the worst and most woful sign of the times. Could stronger proofs be wanted that the Lord had not forsaken Israel, but was driven from them? This was the lesson intended, and actually accomplished by the vision; for while the prophet was made aware by this mystic scene of the actual state of things among his degenerate countrymen at home, he saw himself—and instructed the pious circle around him to see—a proof of the long-suffering and the just severity of God in deferring to answer their fervent and long-continued prayers for the emancipation of their country. See SUN.

Image-worship, the adoration of artificial representations of real or imaginary objects. See IDOLATRY.

I. *Image-worship among the Jews.*—It has always been a tendency of the human mind, untaught by true revelation, to embody the invisible deity in some visible form, and especially in the human form. This led to representations of God, or of the gods, as conceived by the mind, in painting or statuary, under all kinds of shapes, such as men, monsters, animals, etc. In the course of time these representations came to be considered as being themselves the gods, and to be worshipped in temples and on altars. The Jews, as worshippers of *one* God, were by the law of Moses forbidden to make any image of Jehovah; but the people, corrupted by the example of the Egyptians, compelled Aaron to erect a golden calf in the Desert. After their entrance into Canaan, as the worship of Jehovah was not yet fully organized and accessible to all, they made use in their household devotions of images of the Invisible, and that practice became quite general; but, as the civil and religious organization of the Jews became more developed, this practice fell gradually into disuse, and it was no longer tolerated under David and Solomon. After the separation between Judah and Israel, Rehoboam restored the use of images in the latter kingdom for political motives, erecting golden calves in Dan and Bethel. In the kingdom of Judah the worship of images found, however, but few partisans. After the captivity of Babylon we find no traces of it.

II. *In the Christian Church.*—Images were unknown in the worship of the primitive Christians; and this fact was, indeed, made the ground of a charge of atheism on the part of the heathen against the Christians. The primitive Christians abstained from the worship of images, not as the Romanists pretend, from tenderness to heathen idolaters, but because they thought it unlawful in itself to make any images of the deity. Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Origen were even of opinion that, by the second commandment, painting and engraving were unlawful to a Christian, styling them evil and wicked arts (Tertullian, *de Idol.* c. iii; Clem. Alexand. *Admon. ad Gent.* p. 41; Origen, *contra Celsum*, vi, 182). Some of the Gnostic sects, especially the Basilidians (q. v.) and the Carpocratians (q. v.), made effigies of Christ, St. Paul, etc. See GNOSTICS. This example of professed philosophers was not without its influence on the Church, and it was seconded by a similar usage among the Manichæans (q. v.), and by the steady pressure of heathen ideas and habits upon Christianity. Emblems, such as the dove, the fish, the anchor, vine, lamb, etc., engraved on seals, formed the first step; then came paintings representing Biblical events, saints or martyrs, etc., which were placed in the vestibule of the church. Yet this practice was unfavorably regarded by the synods of the 4th century. When, however, in the same century, Christianity was proclaimed the religion of the state, many distinguished persons embraced it, and its ceremonial became more imposing; and in the 5th century the use of painting, sculpture, and jewelry became general for the decoration of the churches. This resulted in the adoption of a regular system of symbolic religious images. Paulinus of Nola (q. v.) was chiefly instrumental in introducing these practices in the West, and, as the images were at first chiefly used in books intended for the instruction of the poor and the laity [see BIBLIA PAUPERUM], who were too ignorant to read, they probably did more good than harm at the time; but as the teachers of the Church became gradually more accommodating in their relations with the heathen, holding out greater privileges to them, and allowing them to retain their old usages while conforming to the outward forms of Christianity, the worship of images became so general that it had to be repeatedly checked by laws. In the 6th century it had grown into a great abuse, especially in the East, where images were made the object of especial adoration: they were kissed, lamps were burned before them, incense was offered to them, and, in short, they were treated in every respect as the heathen were wont to treat the images of their gods. Some of the heads of the Church encouraged these practices from motives of policy, while the more enlightened and evangelical portion strongly opposed them. This gave rise to the Iconoclasts (q. v.).

Neander describes the origin of the use of images in churches as follows: "It was not in the Church, but in the family, that religious images first came into use among the Christians. In their daily intercourse with

men, the Christians saw themselves everywhere surrounded by the objects of pagan mythology, or, at least, by objects offensive to their moral and Christian sentiments. Representations of this sort covered the walls in shops, and were the ornaments of drinking-vessels and seal-rings, on which the pagans frequently had engraved the images of their gods, so that they might worship them when they pleased. It was natural that, in place of these objects, so offensive to their religious and moral sentiments, the Christians should substitute others more agreeable to them. Thus they preferred to have on the goblets the figure of a shepherd carrying a lamb on his shoulder, which was the symbol of our Saviour rescuing the repentant sinner, according to the Gospel parable. Clement of Alexandria says, in reference to the seal-rings of the Christians, 'Let our signets be a dove (the symbol of the Holy Spirit), or a fish, or a ship sailing towards heaven (the symbol of the Christian Church and of the individual Christian soul), or a lyre (the symbol of Christian joy), or an anchor (the symbol of Christian hope); and he who is a fisherman will not be forgetful of the apostle Peter, and of the children taken from the water; for no images of gods should be engraved on the rings of those who are forbidden all intercourse with idols; no sword or bow on the rings of those who strive after peace; no goblets on the rings of those who are the friends of sobriety.' Yet religious emblems passed from domestic use into the churches perhaps as early as the end of the 3d century. The walls of them were painted in this manner. The Council of Elvira, in the year 303, opposed this innovation as an abuse, and forbade 'the objects of worship and adoration to be painted on the walls'" (Neander, *Church History*, i, 292).

III. *Image worship in the Roman Catholic Church.*—The Romanists deny the charge of worshipping images, or idolatry, which has often been and is still made against them by Protestants. They have always carefully refrained from such doctrinal *definitions* on the subject as would fully convict the Church of idolatry. In this respect the course of the Romish Church is similar to its procedure with regard to the doctrine of *good works*, which it presents in such a manner as might lead one to think that it strictly asserts the merits of Christ as alone rendering our works useful, whilst *in practice* the believer is pointed to good works as the means of salvation. So, with regard to prayers to the Virgin and the saints, it draws a clear distinction between the *adoration* and the *worship* of saints, but practically the prayers of the Roman Catholics are more generally addressed to the saints than to Christ. The same takes place with regard to images. The Council of Trent (Sess. xxv, *De invocatione Sanctorum*, etc.) states "that the images of Christ and of the ever virgin Mother of God, and in like manner of other saints, are to be kept and retained, and that *due honor and veneration* is to be awarded to them. Not that it is believed that any divinity or power resides in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped, or that any benefit is to be sought from them, or any confidence placed in images, as was formerly done by the Gentiles, who fixed their hope in idols. But the honor with which they are regarded is referred to those who are represented by them; so that we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose likenesses these images bear, when we kiss them, and uncover our heads in their presence, and prostrate ourselves." The council quotes on this subject the second Synod of Nicæa. To this "honor and veneration" belong the solemn consecration of the images, offering up incense before them, the special prayers accompanying these ceremonies as contained in the *Pontificale Romanum*, other prayers for private use to be repeated before the images, and the indulgences granted to those who fulfil that duty, etc. All this shows that the Romish Church, while rejecting in form the *doctrine* of image worship, has introduced the *practice* among the people. The masses do not and cannot understand the subtle distinction made by the Church, and not always strictly observed even by the clergy. The Church knows of this evil, but places it among things she tolerates for the sake of charity, though she does not approve them. Yet some Roman Catholic theologians appear to have come very close indeed to the same conception as the masses on this point. Thomas Aquinas expressed his views of images in a dilemma: "A picture considered in itself is worthy of no veneration, but if we consider it as an image of Christ it may be allowable to make an internal distinction between the image and its subject, and *adoratio* and *latria* are as well due to it as to Christ" (iii *Sent.* dist. 9, qu. 1, art. 2, 3; *Summa*, qu. 23, art. 4, 5). Bonaventura drew a correct conclusion from the principle: "Since all veneration shown to the image of Christ is shown to Christ himself, then the image of Christ is also entitled to be prayed to" (*Cultus latriæ*, l. iii, dist. 9, art. 1, qu. 2). Bellarmine says that "the images of Christ and the saints are to be adored not only in a figurative manner, but quite positively, so that the prayers are directly addressed to them, and not merely as the representatives of the original (Ita ut ipsi [imagines] terminent venerationem, ut in se considerantur et non ut vicem gerunt exemplaris). The image itself is in some degree holy, namely, by its likeness to one holy, its consecration and its use in worship; from whence it follows that the images themselves are not entitled to the same honor as God, but to less" (*De Imaginibus*, l. ii, c. x), i. e. the difference between the divine worship and image worship is one of degree or quantity, not of nature or quality. Such theories, although far overstepping the limits of the decree of Trent, are yet freely permitted by the Romish Church; it neither openly admits nor officially condemns them, and thus leaves an opening for all possible degrees of idolatry, over which many an honest Roman Catholic priest mourns in secret.

History shows that the first tendency to image-worship was the result of a slow but continued degeneracy. The same arguments now used by the Romish Church to defend image-worship were rejected by the Christians of the first three centuries when used in the defence of idol-worship. The heathen said, We do not worship the images themselves, but those whom they represent. To this Lactantius answers (*Inst. Div.* lib. ii, c. 2), "You worship them; for, if you believe them to be in heaven, why do you not raise your eyes up to heaven? why do you look at the wood and stone, and not up, where you believe the originals to be?" The ancient Church rejected the use of all images (*Synod of Elvira*, 305, c. 36: "Placuit, picturas in ecclesiis esse non debere, ne quod colitur aut adoratur, in parietibus depingatur"). The early Christians evidently feared that pictures in their churches would eventually become objects of prayer. The admission of images into the church in the 4th and 5th centuries was justified on the theory that the ignorant people could learn the facts of Christianity from them better than from sermons or books. But the people soon lost sight of this use of the images, and made *them* the objects of adoration. This took place earlier in the East than in the West; but the abuse gained ground in the latter region in a short time. Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, broke several images, and had them taken out of the church, because he found that the people prayed to them. Gregory the Great proclaims that he does not allow any praying to (*adorari*) the images, and adds to this that Paulinus of Nola and Nilus had already said that paintings were placed in the church only in order that the uneducated might read on the walls what they were unable to read in books (lib. ix, ep. 105). He also laid down, as a general principle, in his letter to Secundinus, that it was expedient to use the visible to represent the invisible (lib. ix, ep. 52). But he shows evidently that he is not speaking of a mere objective representation of Deity, for he says that he prostrates himself (*prosternimus*) before the images, making the well-known Roman Catholic condition that

he thus really prays to Christ. The second Council of Nicæa (A.D. 787) decreed the validity of image-worship, and anathematized all who opposed it. The Frankish Church, on the other hand, though it did not forbid the use of images in the church, formally declared against their being worshipped. Charlemagne opposed to the decrees of the synod the so-called Caroline books (q. v.), in which it is expressly said that images are allowed in the church, but not to be prayed to, only to excite the attention on the subjects they commemorate, and to adorn the walls. "For," as it says further on, "if some enlightened persons, who do not pray to the image itself, but to him it represents, should pray *before* the image, it would mislead the ignorant, who pray only to what they see before their eyes" (lib. iii, 16). The Synod of Frankfort (summoned by Charlemagne, A.D. 794, and consisting of 300 bishops) and the Synod of Paris (825) solemnly condemned image-worship. The latter council even ventured to reject the pope's contrary opinion in very strong terms. During the whole of the 9th century the matter was thus at rest, Claudius of Turin, Agobard, and other of the most important theologians of that period approving the action of the synods. Jonas of Orleans, an opponent of Claudius, expressly says, in his *De cultu imaginum*, that images are placed in the church "solummodo ad instruendas nescientium mentes." The Council of Trent, as cited above, recommends images as means of instructing the people, and to incite the faithful to imitate the saints; but in later times the Romish Church has added to this what the Frankish Church of the 8th and 9th centuries had so wisely rejected.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* ii, 233–235. The fluctuations of opinion and variations of discipline in the Romish Church on the subject of image-worship are well exhibited by Faber (*Difficulties of Romanism*, p. 10 et sq.). See White, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 8: Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, chap. xiii, § 14; Spanheim, *Hist. Imaginum*, Opera, tom. ii; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.*, book viii, ch. viii; Tenison, *On Idolatry*, p. 269 sq.; Winer, *Comp. Darstellung*, iii, 1. See also articles ICONOCLASTS; ICONOGRAPHY; GREEK CHURCH; ROMAN CHURCH.

Imagination (Lat. *imaginatio*). "The meaning of this word enters into many relationships, and is thereby rendered difficult to define. The principal meaning is doubtless what connects it with poetry and fine art, from which the other significations branch off. The simplest mode of explaining this complicated relationship will be to state in separation the different constituents of the power in question. We shall then see why and where it touches upon other faculties, which still require to be distinguished from it.

"1. Imagination has for its objects the *concrete*, the real, or the individual, as opposed to abstractions and generalities, which are the matter of science. The full coloring of reality is implied in our imagination of any scene of nature. In this respect, there is something common to imagination and memory. If we endeavor to imagine a volcano, according as we succeed, we have before the mind everything that a spectator would observe on the spot. Thus, sensation, memory, and imagination alike deal with the fulness of the actual world, as opposed to the abstractions of science and the reasoning faculties.

"The faculty called *conception*, in one of its meanings, has also to do with this concrete fulness, although, in what Sir William Hamilton deems the original and proper meaning of that word, this power is excluded. In popular language, and in the philosophy of Dugald Stewart, conception is applied to the case of our realizing any description of actual life, as given in history or in poetry. When we completely enter into a scene portrayed by a writer or speaker, and approach the situation of the actual observer, we are often said to *conceive* what is meant, and also to imagine it; the best word for this signification probably is 'realize.'

"2. It is further essential to imagination in its strictest sense that there should be some original construction, or that what is imagined should not be a mere picture of what we have seen. Creativeness, origination, invention, are names also designating the same power, and excluding mere memory, or the literal reproduction of past experience. Every artist is said to have imagination according as he can rise to new combinations or effects different from what he has found in his actual observation of nature. A literal, matter-of-fact historian would be said to be wanting in the faculty. The exact copying of nature may be very meritorious in an artist, and very agreeable as an effect, but we should not designate it by the term imagination. There are, however, in the sciences, and in all the common arts, strokes of invention and new constructions, to which it might seem at first sight unfair to refuse the term in question, if originality be a leading feature in its definition. But still we do not usually apply the term imagination to this case, and for a reason that will appear when we mention the next peculiarity attaching to the faculty.

"3. Imagination has for its ruling element some *emotion* of the mind, to gratify which all its constructions are guided. Here lies the great contrast between it and the creativeness of science and mechanical invention. These last are instrumental to remote objects of convenience or pleasure. A creation of the imagination comes home at once to the mind, and has no ulterior view.

"Whenever we are under the mastery of some strong emotion, the current of our thoughts is affected and colored by that emotion; what chimes in with it is retained, and other things kept out of sight. We also form new constructions that suit the state of the moment. Thus, in fear, we are overwhelmed by objects of alarm, and even conjure up spectres that have no existence. But the highest example of all is presented to us by the constructions of fine art, which are determined by those emotions called *æsthetic*, the sense of beauty, the pleasures of taste; they are sometimes expressly styled 'pleasures of the imagination.' The artist has in himself those various sensibilities to an unusual degree, and he carves and shapes his creations with a view to gratifying them to the utmost. Thus it happens that fine art and imagination are related together, while science and useful art are connected with our reasoning faculties, which may also be faculties of invention. It is a deviation from the correct use of language, and a confounding of things essentially distinct, to say that a man of science stands in need of imagination as well as powers of reason; he needs the power of *original construction*, but his inventions are not framed to satisfy present emotions, but to be instrumental in remote ends, which in their remoteness may excite nothing that is usually understood as emotion. Every artist exercises the faculty in question if he produces anything original in his art.

"The name 'Fancy' has substantially the meanings now described, and was originally identical with imagination. It is a corruption of *fantasy*, from the Greek *φαντασία*. It has now a shade of meaning somewhat different, being applied to those creations that are most widely removed from the world of reality. In the exercise of our imagination we may keep close to nature, and only indulge the liberty of recombining what we find, so as to surpass the original in some points, without forcing together what could not co-exist in reality. This is the sober style of art. But when, in order to gratify the unbounded longings of the mind, we construct a fairy-land with characteristics altogether beyond what human life can furnish, we are said to enter the regions of fancy and the fantastical.

"The 'ideal' and 'ideality' are also among the synonymes of imagination, and their usual acceptation illustrates still further the property now discussed. The 'ideal' is something that fascinates the mind, or gratifies some of our strong emotions and cravings, when reality is insufficient for that end. Desiring something to admire and love beyond what the world can supply, we strike out a combination free from the defects of com-

mon humanity, and adorned with more than excellence. This is our 'ideal,' what satisfies our emotions, and the fact of its so doing is the determining influence in the construction of it." See IDEALISM.

Imani is the name of the third sacred book of laws of the Turks, containing the directions for a reasonable conduct of life.—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 830.

Imaum or **Imân** is the title of a person belonging to a class of the Mohammedan Ulema (q. v.) or priestly body, but not set apart from the rest of the world like the clergy or priesthood, with whom he is usually classed. He is not ordained, nor is any sacred character conferred upon him. The name is Arabic, and signifies "he who is at the head." In this sense it is applied even to the sultan, "Imaum ul-Muslemin," or simply "Imaum," and is given to the most honored teachers of Mohammedanism, who in the first centuries of the Hegira developed and settled the opinion and law of Islam, as "those whose teachings are followed." The imaum, whose instruction generally extends only to the understanding of the Koran, calls the Moslem to prayer from the top of minarets, performs the rites of circumcision, marriage, burial, etc., and presides over the assembly of the faithful at prayers, except at the solemn noon prayers on Friday, which are under the superintendence of the khatib, a higher minister ("who is also called, from that circumstance, the *Imaum ul-Jumâ*, or Friday Imân"). He is elected to his office by the people, and confirmed by the authorities, to whom he remains subject in all civil ana criminal matters; but he certainly enjoys many privileges; among others, he cannot be made to suffer death punishment as long as he retains his office as imaum. In spiritual affairs he becomes independent. He can resign his office and return to the laity whenever he chooses. The imaums are greatly revered by the people. For striking an imaum a Turkish layman is punished with the loss of one of his hands, but a Christian with death. In dress he is distinguished from the laity by a turban somewhat broader, made of different material, by a long beard, and by long sleeves in his coat (tunic). See Taylor, *History of Mohammedanism*, ch. viii; Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 830. (J. H. W.)

Imitation OF CHRIST. See EXAMPLE.

Im'la (Heb. *Yimla'*, יִמְלָא, *replenisher;* Sept. Ἰεμλά), the father of Micaiah, which latter was the prophet who ironically foretold the defeat of the allied kings of Judah and Israel against Ramoth-Gilead (2 Chron. xviii, 8, 9). In the parallel passage (1 Kings xxii, 8, 9) his name is written IMLAH (Heb. *Yimlah'*, יִמְלָה, *id.;* Sept. Ἰαμβλά). B.C. ante 896.

Im'lah (1 Kings xxii, 8, 9). See IMLA.

Immaculate Conception OF THE VIRGIN MARY, a doctrine early broached in the Roman and Greek churches, that the Virgin Mary was conceived without the stain of original sin. Bernard, in the 12th century, rejected this doctrine in opposition to the canons of Lyons, but it was not much agitated until (1301) the Franciscan Duns Scotus took strong grounds in favor of the doctrine, and henceforward it became a subject of vehement controversy between the Scotists and Thomists. The Dominicans espoused the cause of the Thomists, who impugned the dogma; the Franciscans that of the Scotists, who defended it. Sixtus IV, himself a Franciscan, in 1483 declared himself in favor of toleration on the point. The Council of Trent (Sess. v) declared that the doctrine of the conception of all men in sin was not intended to include the Virgin. The controversy was revived in the University of Paris towards the close of the 16th century. During the pontificates of Paul V and Gregory XV, such was the dissension it occasioned in Spain, that both Philip and his successor sent special embassies to Rome in the vain hope that this contest might be terminated by a bull. The dispute ran so high in that kingdom that, in the military orders of St. James, of the Sword, of Calatrava, and of Alcantara, the knights, on their admission, vowed to maintain the doctrine. In 1708, Clement XI appointed a festival to be celebrated throughout the Church in honor of the immaculate conception. It is firmly believed in the Greek Church, in which the feast is celebrated under the name of the Conception of St. Anne; but it was not till 1854 that it was made a dogma in the Roman Catholic Church.

"Pope Pius IX, during his whole pontificate, has showed himself the most devoted of the worshippers of Mary. In his exile at Gaeta in 1849 he addressed his famous 'Encyclical on the Mystery of the Immaculate Conception' (Feb. 2) to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops of the whole Catholic Church, affirming the existence of 'an ardent desire throughout the Catholic world that the apostolic see should at length, by some solemn judgment, define that the most holy Mother of God, the most loving mother of us all, the immaculate Virgin Mary, had been conceived without original sin.' 'These desires,' he adds, 'have been most acceptable and delightful to us, who, from our earliest years, have had nothing dearer, nothing more at heart, than to revere the most blessed Virgin Mary with an especial piety and homage, and the most intimate affections of our heart, and to do everything which might seem likely to procure her greater glory and praise, and to amplify her worship.' A commission was appointed for the examination of the question, under the presidency of cardinal Fornarini; cardinal Lambruschini produced his tract, and Perrone the work *De Immaculato B. V. Mariæ conceptu;* Passaglio also wrote a large essay, and the results of these investigations were issued by the Propaganda press (2 vols. 4to). The special commission reported, in a full conclave of the Sacred College, May 27, 1854. Answers had come from 602 bishops, all favorable to the dogma, though 52 doubted the opportuneness, and four the possibility of a decision. The 'special congregation' demanded the definition with alacrity and zeal. A consistory of consultation was proclaimed, and held at Rome Nov. 4, 1854; it was not a general council, nor was any authority attributed to it. Fifty-four cardinals, 46 archbishops, and about 400 bishops are reported to have been present at these deliberations; 576 votes are said to have been cast for the dogma, and only four against it; among the latter were the archbishop de Sibour, of Paris, on the ground that the pope had no power to decide such a question; and also the bishop Olivier, of Evreux, lately deceased, who sent in his vote by proxy. On the 8th of December, in St. Peter's, in the midst of the celebration of the 'Conception,' in the presence of more than 200 ecclesiastical dignitaries, and in answer to a petition presented by the Sacred College of the Cardinals, the supreme pontiff, with a 'tremulous' voice, read in Latin the following decree: 'We declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been *revealed by God*, and therefore should firmly and constantly be believed by the faithful.' The cannon of the castle of St. Angelo, the joyful chime of all the bells of Rome, the enthusiastic plaudits of the assembled thousands, the magnificent illumination of St. Peter's church, and the splendor of the most gorgeous festive rites, gave response to the infallible decree. It was a grand pageant, befitting an idolatrous enthusiasm. The pope himself, with 'trembling joy,' crowned the image of the Virgin; medals of Australian gold were struck, and distributed in her honor. 'Rome,' say the beholders, 'was intoxicated with joy.' An infallible voice had spoken; a new article of faith was announced by 'divine' authority; the people rejoiced in hope that Mary would be yet more 'propitious,' that her 'prevalent intercession would give peace and plenty, would stay the power of infidelity, put an end to insurrection, and crown

Rome with higher honor and success.' The controversy of seven hundred years is brought to a final decision; Rome is committed irrevocably to the worship of the 'Virgin mother of God, conceived without original sin.' 'Roma locuta est,' and doubt is now heresy. The work begun by the third general council at Ephesus in 431, proclaiming Mary 'the mother of God,' is declared to be consummated by the papal decree of Dec. 8, 1854, asserting the privilege of her immaculate conception on the authority of Peter's chair." For an account of the history of the dogma, and a full discussion of its theological merits, see Smith, in *Methodist Quarterly Review*, April, 1855. See also *The Official Documents connected with the Definition of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception* (Lat. and Eng.), published with the approbation of the Abp. of Baltimore (Balt. 1856, 8vo). See CONCEPTION.

Theology of the Doctrine.—The theology of the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary has been the subject of many distinguished writers in the Roman, Greek, and Protestant churches. The greatest difficulties which the advocates of the doctrine have to contend against are really the following three: 1. It lacks the evident support of the Holy Scriptures. 2. It lacks the authority of the early Church, and may well be termed "a comparative novelty in theology." 3. It is directly and most distinctly opposed to the doctrine of original sin.

As to the first, the scriptural arguments advanced by the advocates, they are certainly very slight and untenable, and have been virtually yielded by the best of the Roman Catholic authorities, such as Perrone (*De Immac. B. V. Mariæ conceptu, etc.*, p. 35 sq., 57 sq., 112 sq.). There are only two passages which the best and most learned of Rome have adduced. The first of these is Gen. iii, 15, the πρωτευαγγέλιον of divine revelation: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it (she) shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." "The argumentation here is curious. The received Vulgate reading, not found, however, in all the copies, is 'ipsa,' *she;* while the Hebrew reads הוא, he, or it; Jerome, too, reads 'ipse;' Sixtus V's edition of the Septuagint reads αὐτός." The best Roman critics (see De Rossi's criticism in Pusey's *Eirenicon*, ii, 385) discard the reading as it stands in the received Vulgate. Perrone, however, contends that it is indifferent which reading is adopted, because, at any rate, Mary could not have had the power to conquer the serpent except through Christ. But how does this prove the immaculate conception—give to the dogma "a firm foundation?" Simply for the reason that in these words a "special privilege is conferred upon Mary," and that special privilege could "only have been the immunity from original sin." But the privilege conferred is solely, even on the author's own ground, that she should be in some way a means of subduing Satan, and that she was this as the mother of our Lord. To assert that, in order to be the mother of Christ, she must be free from original sin, is purely to beg the whole question. The "Letters Apostolic" of Pius IX upon the dogma sanction infallibly the application of the clause "bruise thy head" to Mary, who, the pope says, "has crushed the serpent's head with her *immaculate foot.*" Another passage adduced, upon which Perrone lays less stress than on the one already cited, is the angelic salutation Luke i, 28, comp. 30, coupled with the words spoken by Elizabeth, Luke i, 42: "Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women . . . Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favor with God . . . Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb." They argue that the greeting Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη, translated in the Vulgate by —— —— *gratia plena*, means fulness of grace in a sense that necessitates exemption, from the very beginning of existence, from any possible taint of sin, and that the same meaning must necessarily be allowed to the expression "blessed art thou among women" (comp. Liebermann, *Instit. Theol.* ii, 833; Perrone, *Prælect. Theol.* ii, 651). Roman Catholic writers assign, however, no reason why these words should be so interpreted. "They are, in fact, uncritically and illogically forced into the service of the doctrine, and, as in the case of the 'Protevangelium' of the O. T., they offer no real support of it whatever." As for other passages of a mystical type which are used as a secondary evidence, they would be of value only as confirming and illustrating any in which the fact was directly and undoubtedly stated. Certain it is that in the gospels Mary is represented *as she is*, and not as an immaculate being; that neither in the Acts nor in the Epistles, notwithstanding Paul's minute description of Christ's scheme of salvation, is she mentioned at all. The great trouble, in short, with Roman Catholic theologians, is that they transfer the sayings of the prophets and of the apostles concerning Jesus Christ, and all the passages which point to *one* mediator between God and man, virtually to Mary, the mother of Christ, instead of assigning this position to Christ, the Son of God.

The comparative novelty of the doctrine in theology is proved by history. There is not one great teacher of the Christian Church who, before the breaking out of the controversy between Lyons and Bernard in 1140—that is, for the first eleven centuries of our æra—was favorable to the doctrine as now propagated by the Church of Rome. "The question does not exist for them; they know nothing of this specific doctrine; they speak in respect to original sin and the need of redemption in such a way as to prove that the immaculate conception of Mary could not have been any part of their creed. Their praises of the Virgin are often immoderate; they defend her perpetual virginity (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 78; Jerome, *adv. Helvidianum*, etc.); many of them believe that she was 'sanctified' in the womb; most of them declare that she never was guilty of actual sin; but they do not know anything about her exemption from all infection of original sin. Augustine defends her only against the charge of actual sin (*De Natura et Gracia*, c. 36): 'Excepta sancta Virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus, *cum de peccatis agitur*, haberi volo quæstionem.' This passage is quoted in favor of the dogma, but it plainly refers only to actual transgression, and it is contained in a reply to the position of Pelagius, that there were saints who had not sinned. In his treatise on the *Remission of Sins* (bk. ii, ch. xxiv, § 38), this greatest of the Latin fathers says explicitly that Christ alone was without sin: 'Solus ergo ille etiam, homo factus, manens Deus, peccatum nullum habuit unquam;' nor does he intimate any exception. In his work *De Genesi, ad lit.* c. 18, n. 32, he speaks of 'the body of Christ as taken from the flesh of a woman, who was conceived of a mother with sinful flesh;' and he indicates a clear distinction between Mary's nature and Christ's nature in this respect. Augustine's followers make similar statements. Eusebius Emissenus (supposed by some to be Hilary) on the 'Nativity' says, 'From the bond of the old sin is not even the mother of the Redeemer free.' Fulgentius writes, 'The flesh of Mary, which was conceived in unrighteousness in a human way, was truly sinful flesh;' and he adds that 'this flesh is in itself truly sinful,' referring to Paul's use of the term 'flesh' to designate our common hereditary sinfulness. Others of the fathers make use of similar statements, irreconcilable with a belief in the immaculate conception. (See Perrone, p. 40 sq. Bandellus, *De Singulari Puritate et Prærogativa Conceptionis Christi* [1470], a work by a Dominican, contains some four hundred testimonies against the dogma from the fathers: see also the work of the cardinal Turrecamata, *De Veritate Conceptionis* [1550]). It is, indeed, true that the fathers do not often speak directly upon the point in question; but this is for the simple reason, conclusive against the claim of universality, that they did not know anything

about it. The doctrine is declared, A.D. 1140, by Bernard, to be a 'novelty;' and he says that the festival is 'the mother of presumption, the sister of superstition, and the daughter of levity' (Ep. 174, *ad Canon Lugd.* § 5 sq.; comp. *Serm.* 78 *in Cant.*). Others of the earlier fathers speak of Mary in such a way as is absolutely irreconcilable with the idea that they believed in her immaculate conception. Hilary (Psa. cxix, lib. 3, § 12; comp. *Tracts for the Times*, No. 79, p. 36) declares that she is exposed to the fire of judgment. Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Basil the Great, and Chrysostom, do not hesitate to speak of faults of Mary, of her being rebuked by Christ. 'If Mary,' says Origen, 'did not feel offence at our Lord's sufferings, Jesus did not die for her sins;' Chrysostom ascribes to her 'excessive ambition at the marriage festival at Cana;' Basil thinks that she, too, 'wavered at the time of the crucifixion;' all of which statements are utterly inconsistent, not only with the dogma of the immaculate conception, but also with a belief in her perfect innocency (comp. Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* § 99, note 30, with the references to Irenæus, iii, 18; Tertullian, *De Carne Christi*, 7; Origen, *in Lucam Hom.* 17; Basil, *Ep.* 260 (317); Chrysostom, *Hom.* 45 in *Matt.*, *Hom.* 21 *in John*). Tertullian, *De Carne Christi*, § xvi, declares that 'Christ, by putting on the flesh, made it his, and *made it sinless*;' Irenæus, that 'Christ made human nature pure *by* taking it;' Athanasius, on the 'Incarnation,' teaches the same doctrine, that 'Christ sanctified his own body,' and that 'he hath purified the body, which was in itself corruptible.' Of course, the body he assumed was not in and of itself sinless. Gregory of Nazianzum, and John of Damascus (730), teach expressly that the Virgin was sanctified by the Holy Ghost. If Christ, by assuming human nature in Mary, 'made it sinless,' it was not so before his incarnation" (Smith, *ut sup.*). The view which some hold on the title of θεοτόκος, given to Mary at the Council of Ephesus, we think bears so wholly on the incarnation of Christ that we refrain from introducing it here. See also NESTORIANISM. Of the numberless passages from the fathers which set forth the doctrine of the universality of sin, and the universal need of redemption through Christ, without making the Virgin Mary the exception, we will speak under the third head. An additional source of evidence is afforded us by the early liturgies of offices of the Church. "They exalt Mary and her conception, but they do never call it an 'immaculate' conception. It is only in the latest years that the term 'immaculate' has been introduced into the Western offices of the highest authority. The offices themselves, in honor of the Virgin, did not become current in the West till the 11th century. In the office for her birth, in the ancient churches, it is read that 'she was *sanctified* from the stain of sin;' in one of the German liturgies, 'that she was born with a propensity to sin;' in the Roman Church itself, the office spoke of the '*sanctification* of the Virgin.' This silence, and the late alteration of these offices, are conclusive as to the non-existence of the dogma. In the year 791 (al. 796) a council was held at Friuli (Concilium Forojuliense), called by Paulinus (Paulus), patriarch of Aquileia, during the pontificate of Adrian I, to consider the Trinity and the Incarnation, in respect to the procession of the Holy Spirit, and 'Adoptianism,' that is, the opinion maintained by archbishop Elipandus of Toledo, and others, that Christ in his human nature was the Son of God only by 'adoption.' A long and explicit Confession of Faith was published by this council, in the course of which it is said, '*Solus enim sine peccato natus est homo*, quoniam solus est incarnatus de Spiritu Sancto et immaculata Virgine novus homo. Consubstantialis Deo Patri in sua, id est, divina; consubstantialis etiam matri, *sine sorde peccati*, in nostra, id est, humana natura' (Harduin, *Acta Concil.* 1714, iv, 856, C.). If the belief in the immaculate *conception* of the Virgin had been any part of the orthodoxy of the times, it would have been impossible for a council to have spoken in this way of Christ, as '*alone born without sin*;' and the 'immaculateness' ascribed to the Virgin cannot possibly, in the connection, be interpreted of her conception, or even of her birth; for, if it could, then Christ could not be said to be the 'only' one of men *born* without sin" (professor Smith, *ut sup.*).

No better does the case fare in the mediæval Church. "The amount of the argument and the result of the testimony here are, that the doctrine was first invented in the 12th century, that it was opposed by the greatest and best of the scholastics, and that it made its way, in spite of this opposition, through the force of popular superstition, and from the necessary working out of the inherent tendencies of a system of creature-worship. Some of the mediæval testimony we have already adduced; we add only the most important citations. Anselm (1070), though cited for the immaculate conception, teaches in his *Cur Deus Homo* (ii, 16) that Mary was *conceived* in sin: 'Virgo tamen ipsa, unde assumptus est, est *in iniquitatibus concepta, et in peccatis concepit eam mater ejus, et cum originali peccato nata est*, quoniam et ipsa in Adam peccavit, in quo omnes peccaverunt.'" (See also the close of that chapter and the next, ii, 17.) We thus notice that, up to the time of Bernard, that is, for the first eleven centuries of our era, no writer of the Church used such strong language about the holiness of the Virgin Mary as he did in his letter to the canons of Lyons (1140) already referred to. He writes: "The mother of God was, without doubt, sanctified before she was born; nor is the holy Church in error in accounting the day of her nativity holy. I think that even a more abundant blessing of sanctification descended on her, which not only sanctified her birth, but also preserved her life from all sin, as happened to none other of the children of men. It was befitting, indeed, that the queen of virgins should pass her life in the privilege of a singular sanctity, and free from all sin, who, in bearing the Destroyer of all sin and death, obtained for all the gift of life." There is certainly, even here, no advocacy of the immaculate conception of Mary. Exactly similar views were held by Peter Lombard, whose *Four Books of Sentences* were "the theological text-book of the Middle Ages," and "upon which all the great scholastics made their comments and built their systems. He says (*Liber Sentent.* iii, distinct. iii) of the flesh of Mary, which our Lord assumed, that it was 'previously obnoxious to sin, like the other flesh of the Virgin, but by the operation of the Spirit it was cleansed.' . . . 'The Holy Spirit, coming into Mary, purified her from sin, and from all desire of sin.'" Very explicit is also the testimony of Alexander of Hales, the irrefragable doctor and master of St. Bonaventura, the commentator on Lombard: "It was necessary that the blessed Virgin, in her generation, should contract sin from her parents; she was sanctified in the womb." Bonaventura, the seraphic doctor, the glory of the Franciscans, who died in 1274, and was canonized in 1482, is exhaustless in the praise of Mary in his *Speculum* and *Corona*. He sanctifies her veneration in the most rapturous terms. Yet on this question he is also decided, explicitly declaring that "the sanctification of the Virgin was *after* she had contracted original sin;" she was "sanctified in the womb" (lib. iii, dist. iii, p. 1, qu. 2, 3). Albertus Magnus, who taught in Cologne 1260 to 1280, made the same avowals. Bonaventura was the pupil of Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus of Bonaventura, and next succeeds the greatest of all the scholastic theologians, Thomas Aquinas, "the angelic doctor," who died in 1274, was canonized in 1323, and in 1567 was declared by Pius V to be "teacher of the Church." In his *Summa Theologiæ*, p. iii, qu. 27, art. i, it stands, "Mary was sanctified in the womb." Art. 2. "*Not before the infusion of the soul;* for if she had been she would not have incurred the stain of original sin, and would not have needed the redemption of Christ." Art. 3. The complete deliverance from original sin was only given her when she conceived Christ ("Ex prole redundaverit in matrem

totaliter fomite subtracto"). About the festival of the Conception, he says that the Roman Church does not observe it herself, yet it tolerates the custom of other churches: "Unde talis celebritas non est totaliter reprobanda." Such is the testimony of the most eminent mediæval divines, to which we need not add names of less weight. It is not to be wondered at that, in the face of the difficulties to be encountered by the modern defenders of the immaculate conception, cardinal Perrone, "the general rector of the Roman College," and "the prince of contemporary theologians," is led to argue that if these scholastic divines had reasoned correctly from what they conceded about the birth of the Virgin, they would have made her conception immaculate; also, that what they teach can all be best explained in harmony with the doctrine; or, if not so, that they taught what they did as private teachers; as also that they were ignorant of antiquity; and again, that their views on original sin were such as allowed them to speak as they did; in fine, that they did not have any guidance from an infallible decision in what they uttered; and that while they were wrangling in the schools, the dogma was making its way among the people. All this goes to show that the mediæval *testimony* is against it; that, as far as the Middle Ages are concerned, only isolated opinions are for the doctrine, and the weight of authority is against it. The only distinct argumentative attempt which Perrone makes to parry the force of their authority and arguments is the assertion that these doctors of the schools, when they speak of the conception of Mary, have reference to what he calls the first, or active conception, and not to the passive, or the infusion of the soul into the seed. But this explanation is irrelevant, for two reasons; one is, that many of these doctors do not make this distinction, and, of course, they include both parts of the conception in their statement. They make the distinction between "conception" and "sanctification," and say that all that precedes sanctification belongs to the "conception," and is infected with original sin; this, of course, includes the "passive" conception. Another reason that invalidates this mode of explanation is, that some of these doctors do make the very distinction in question, and yet maintain that the whole conception, both active and passive, was in original sin. Thus Alexander of Hales says that "the Virgin after her nativity, *and after the infusion of the soul into the body*, was sanctified;" Bonaventura asserts that the infusion of grace may have been soon *after the infusion of the soul*, and Aquinas declares expressly that the cleansing can only be from original sin; that the fault of original sin can only be in a rational creature, and, therefore, that *before the infusion of the rational soul* the Virgin was not sanctified. In fact, this mode of meeting the difficulty can only be carried through by supposing that the mediæval divines believed that original sin could exist in the mere fleshly material derived from parents, an opinion widely abhorrent to their well-known views. We may therefore well say that the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary, the mother of Christ, is a "novelty in theology," for the historical records of antiquity are silent; in the Middle Ages the great authorities are divided; and in modern times, as our historical sketch has shown, there have been perpetual contests and divisions. Twenty years ago hardly a single name of eminence among the Roman Catholics of Germany would have pronounced in its favor. Spain, it is true, continued her devotions, but France was indifferent, until the Ultramontane party began to gain power, and to look about for the means of arousing popular feeling in behalf of the papacy.

There remains for us now only to consider the doctrine as opposed to the doctrine of original sin. The very necessity for a miraculous conception in the case of him who was to be without sin [see INCARNATION] is in itself a proof that every person conceived in a natural manner must be conceived in sin [see NATURE, HUMAN], and the Bible is too express and unmistakable on this point, that all are conceived in sin [see ORIGINAL SIN]. In the position which the Roman Catholic Church thus assumes, we encounter again the vital defects of her theology on original sin, that semi-Pelagianism against which all the Protestant Confessions have protested as unscriptural. "The Roman Catholic doctrine puts the essence of original sin solely in defect; makes it negative; asserting that it is only the want of that righteousness in which Adam was created; this is, in scholastic usage, the 'formal' part, or the very essence of original sin. Concupiscence is *not* of the nature of sin. This is the doctrine of original sin, which Perrone expressly lays down in the opening of his treatise (p. 2, 3 sq.), 'that the essence of original sin is in the defect of grace or of original righteousness.' This is the only view of the matter with which the dogma of the immaculate conception can possibly be reconciled. If this view is false—if original sin, as Protestants hold, according to the Scriptures, be positive and not negative, and come by descent, then the conclusion is irresistible that Mary, by descent, must have had a part therein. The dogma of her immaculate conception is possible only with a false view of the nature of the 'sin of birth.' Augustine could not have held it, nor could Aquinas. The dogma is conceived in a defective notion of original sin. Yet again, even with this defective view of original sin, the dogma is involved in difficulties and internal conflicts by what it asserts and implies as to the origin of the soul of Mary. The theory on which it rests is, that Mary's soul was directly created by God. It declares that the Virgin Mary, 'at the first instant of her conception,' was preserved immaculate. What is meant by 'conception' here? It is the so-called 'passive conception,' or the infusion of the soul into the seed, the union of the soul of Mary with the body, prepared beforehand in the 'active conception.' Whence, now, this soul? It was '*created*.' The 'Letters,' in another passage, say that Mary was the 'tabernacle *created* by God himself.' Pius IX also cites the formula of Alexander VII as having 'decretive' authority, and that formula declares 'that Mary's soul, at the first instant of *creation and of infusion* into the body,' was preserved free from original sin. This hypothesis of 'creatianism' is also the only hypothesis consonant with the doctrine. But now put these two positions together, namely, that original sin consists essentially in privation; that is, in the defect of original justice; and that Mary's soul was directly created by God, and we arrive at the following difficulties and dilemmas. The position is this: When Mary's soul was created and infused into her body, she was by grace preserved free from original sin. Would the original sin, from which she was kept, have come to her from her body or from her soul?—for it must have come from one or the other. If one says that it would have come from the soul, this involves the consequence that God usually creates original sin in the soul before it is united with the body, and, of course, before it is connected with Adam by descent. If one says, on the other hand, that original sin would have come to Mary from her 'active conception,' that is, from her prepared body, then it was already there, in germ and seed, before the infusion of the soul. God either creates the human soul with original sin, or the original sin is from the parents. If the former, we have original sin without any connection with Adam; if the latter, Mary must have been really possessed of it. But it may be said original sin consists in defect, privation, and that the dogma means that God created Mary's soul perfectly holy. This raises another difficulty; for it is also asserted that he created her thus holy on the ground of Christ's merits, and that, had it not been for Christ's merits, she would have shared the sin of the race. This creation, now, must have been either through the race (the connection with Adam) or above the race, either mediate or immediate. If through the race or mediate, then she must have had a part in its sinfulness; if above the race, or an immediate creation, then there

is no theological or rational ground for saying that, as far as her creation was concerned, she was liable to sin, or could be saved from it through Christ's merits. Nor can any relief be found by conjoining the two points, and asserting that the exemption from original sin concerns the time or point of *union* of the soul with the seed, the conjunction of the active with the passive conception. For the still unanswered question here is, and must be this: In the union of the soul with the body, from which of the two, soul or body, would the original sin have come, if grace had not prevented?—for it must have come from one or the other. If from the soul, then you have original sin without any connection with Adam; if from the body, then original sin must already have been there; if from both together, this simply dodges the question, or else resolves original sin into some act consequent upon the union—that is, into actual transgression. Nor is the matter helped by saying that original sin is essentially negative, privative; for the privation has respect to either the soul or the body, or to both conjoined, and the same dilemmas result. The 'Letters Apostolic,' in other passages, speak of the dogma in this wise: that the 'Blessed Virgin was free from all contagion of *body*, soul, and mind;' that she had 'community with men only in their nature, but not in their fault;' and that 'the flesh of the Virgin taken from Adam did not admit the stain of Adam, and on this account that the most blessed Virgin was the tabernacle created by God himself, formed by the Holy Spirit.' These expressions imply that the fault in the case could have been a fault of 'nature;' that the contagion might have been of the 'body;' that the 'stain from Adam' would, under other circumstances, have come to her through the 'flesh.' But in her 'active conception,' before the infusion of the soul and of grace, the 'nature,' the 'body,' the 'flesh,' were already extant, ere the 'passive conception' took place: were they with or without the fault? If with the fault, then you have original sin; if without, then it would follow that the flesh, the body, the nature, *before* the passive conception, had been already delivered from the bondage of corruption. In short, if original sin come from the race, from the 'active conception,' then Mary must have had it; if it come from the 'passive conception,' then God is its direct author in every individual case. This dogma of the immaculate conception, then, contains contradictory elements; it rests on a false view of original sin. Even that false view cannot well be reconciled: it assumes the theory that souls are directly created, and here again it involves itself in inextricable difficulties in relation to original sin. It is opposed to Scripture, to tradition, and it is self-opposed."

In conclusion, there is left to us only the present attitude of the Roman pontiff, who, since his declaration of infallibility, more than ever, is forced into a position which puts the matter of papal infallibility in a disagreeable dilemma and dualism. "The decree of Pius IX is in opposition to the express declarations of preceding pontiffs; pope is arrayed against pope; infallibility is discordant with infallibility. Not only has 'a probable opinion become improbable,' but Peter's chair is divided against itself; and how, then, can that kingdom stand? The Jansenist Launoy, in his *Præscriptions*, has collected the opinions adverse to, or irreconcilable with the dogma, of seven of the successors of St. Peter, who never change. From pope Leo (440–461), the greatest and most learned of the early bishops of Rome, he cites four passages in which Leo declares that Christ alone 'was innocent in his birth,' alone was 'free from original sin,' and that Christ received from his mother 'her nature, but not her fault;' and he asserts that Mary obtained '*her own purification through her conception of Christ*.' This is wholly averse to the dogma. Innocent III, who called the Lateran Council in 1213, in a sermon on the 'Assumption of Christ,' comparing Eve and Mary, writes: 'Illa fuit sine culpa producta, sed in culpa produxit; hæc autem fuit *in culpa producta*, sed sine culpa produxit.' Gregory says (590–604), 'John the Baptist was conceived in sin; Christ *alone* was conceived without sin.' Innocent V (1276), in his *Commentary on the Master of Sentences:* 'Non convenit tantæ Virgini ut *diu morata sit* in peccato;' and he adds that she was sanctified quickly after the animation (that is, of the body by the soul), *although not in the very moment*. This is directly against the dogma. John XXII or Benedict XII (c. 1340) says that Mary 'passed at first *from a state of original sin* to a state of grace.' Clement VI (1342–52), 'I suppose, according to the common opinion as yet, that the blessed Virgin was in original sin' *modica morula*, 'because, according to all, she was *sanctified* as soon as she could be *sanctified*.'

"Thus the papacy, in committing itself to this new and idolatrous dogma, is in hostility to Scripture, to universal consent, and also to itself. It explains the sense of Scripture by tradition; and it explains the sense of tradition by an infallible expositor, and that infallible expositor contradicts itself. The new dogma makes *the whole of the early Church* to have been ignorant of a truth which is now declared to be necessary to the faith; it makes Leo, Innocent III, Innocent V, and Clement V to have taught heresy; it puts the greatest scholastic divines under the ban; and, while doing this, it declares that what is now decreed has always been of the faith of the Church, and that it is a part of the revelation of God, given through Christ and the apostles, and handed down by constant succession and general consent."

See Smith, in *Meth. Qu. Rev.* April, 1855; *Christian Remembrancer*, Oct. 1855, p. 419; Jan. 1866, p. 175; July, 1868, p. 134; *Westminster Rev.* April, 1867, p. 155 sq.; Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, i, 103; Neander, *Chr. Dogmas*, ii, 599; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes Chrétiennes*, i, 291 sq., 435 sq.; Cramp, *Text-book of Popery*, p. 104 sq.; Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, p. 8, 208; Preuss, *Die römische Lehre v. d. unbefleckten Empfängniss a. d. Quellen dargestellt u. a Gottes Wort widerlegt* (Berlin, 1865); Blunt, *Theol. Encyclop.* i, 328 sq. See also MARY; MARIOLATRY.

Immaculate-Conception Oath is among the Roman Catholics the assurance by oath of a belief in and support of the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. It was introduced by the Sorbonne in consequence of the disputes on this subject between the Franciscans and Dominicans [see IMMACULATE CONCEPTION], as a test oath for admission to an academical degree. The Jesuits made this a test oath also for other privileges.—*Theol. Univ. Lex.* i, 404. (J. H. W.)

Immanent Activity OF GOD, the pantheistical tenet that God does not exist outside of the world, as a free personal (transcendental) being, but inside of it, as the highest unity of the world, because God cannot, according to it, be conceived of without the world. Saisset (*Mod. Pantheism*, ii, 91) thus sums it up: "He (God) creates the world within himself, and thenceforth there is no separation of the Creator and the creature, for the creature is still the Creator considered in his eternal and necessary action." See PANTHEISM.

Imman′uël (Heb. *Immanuêl′*, עִמָּנוּאֵל, sometimes separately עִמָּנוּ אֵל, *God with us*, as it is interpreted Matt. i, 23, where it is written Εμμανουήλ, as in the Sept., and Anglicized "Emmanuel;" the Sept. however, in Isa. viii, 8, translates it *μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός*; Vulg. *Emmanuel*), a figurative name prescribed through the prophet for a child that should be born as a sign to Ahaz of the speedy downfall of Syria (B.C. cir. 739: see 2 Kings xvi, 9) and violent interregnum of the kingdom of Israel (B.C. 737–728; see 2 Kings xv, 30; comp. xvii, 1), before the infant should become capable of distinguishing between wholesome and improper kinds of food. The name occurs only in the celebrated verse of Isaiah (vii, 14), "Behold, a [rather *the*] virgin shall conceive

and bear a son, and shall call his name *Immanuel*," and in another passage of the same prophet (Isa. viii, 8), where the ravaging army of the Assyrians is described as ere long to "fill the breadth of thy land, O *Immanuel*," i. e. Judæa, with evident allusion to the former declaration. See AHAZ. In the name itself there is no difficulty; but the verse, as a whole, has been variously interpreted. From the manner in which the word God, and even Jehovah, is used in the composition of Hebrew names, there is no such peculiarity in that of Immanuel as in itself requires us to understand that he who bore it must be in fact God. Indeed, it is used as a proper name among the Jews at this day. This high sense has, however, been assigned to it in consequence of the application of the whole verse, by the evangelist Matthew (i, 23), to our divine Saviour. Even if this reference did not exist, the history of the Nativity would irresistibly lead us to the conclusion that the verse—whatever may have been its intermediate signification—had an ultimate reference to Christ. See ISAIAH. The state of opinion on this point has been thus concisely summed up by Dr. Henderson in his note on the text: "This verse has long been a subject of dispute between Jews and professedly Christian writers, and among the latter mutually. While the former reject its application to the Messiah altogether—the earlier Rabbins explaining it of the queen of Ahaz and the birth of his son Hezekiah, and the later, as Kimchi and Abarbanel, of the prophet's own wife—the great body of Christian interpreters have held it to be directly and exclusively a prophecy of our Saviour, and have considered themselves fully borne out by the inspired testimony of the evangelist Matthew. Others, however, have departed from this construction of the passage, and have invented or adopted various hypotheses in support of such dissent. Grotius, Faber, Isenbiehl, Hezel, Bolten, Fritzsche, Pluschke, Gesenius, and Hitzig, suppose either the then present or a future wife of Isaiah to be the עַלְמָה, *almah* [rendered 'virgin'], referred to. Eichhorn, Paulus, Hensler, and Ammon are of opinion that the prophet had nothing more in view than an ideal virgin, and that both she and her son are merely imaginary personages, introduced for the purpose of prophetic illustration. Bauer, Cube, Steudel, and some others, think that the prophet pointed to a young woman in the presence of the king and his courtiers. A fourth class, among whom are Richard Simon, Lowth, Koppe, Dathe, Williams, Von Meyer, Olshausen, and Dr. J. Pye Smith, admit the hypothesis of a double sense (q. v.): one, in which the words apply primarily to some female living in the time of the prophet, and her giving birth to a son according to the ordinary laws of nature; or, as Dathe holds, to some virgin, who at that time should miraculously conceive; and the other, in which they received a secondary and plenary fulfilment in the miraculous conception and birth of Jesus Christ." (See the monographs enumerated by Volbeding, *Index*, p. 14; and Fürst, *Bib. Jud.* ii, 60; also Hengstenberg, *Christol. des A. T.* ii, 69, and the commentators in general; compare the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, iii, 538.) This last seems to us the only consistent interpretation. That the child to be so designated was one soon to be born and already spoken of is clear from the entire context and drift of the prophecy. It can be no other than the Maher-shalal-hash-baz (q. v.), the offspring of the prophet's own marriage with the virgin prophetess, who thus became an eminent type of the Messiah's mother (Isa. viii, 18). See VIRGIN.

Immanuel, BEN-SALOMON ROMI, a Jewish philosopher, commentator, and poet, was born at Rome about 1265. Endowed with great natural ability, and with a fondness for study, he soon made himself master of Biblical and Talmudic, as well as of Grecian and Latin literature. He was a contemporary of Dante, and, being much given to a cultivation of the same art in which Dante immortalized his name, "the two spirits, kindred, and yet different in many respects, formed a mutual and intimate attachment." He died about 1330. Immanuel wrote commentaries on the whole Jewish Bible, excepting the minor prophets and Ezra. They are enriched not only by valuable grammatical and archæological notes, but contain also some able remarks on the nature and spirit of the poetical books. "It is greatly to be regretted that of all his exegetical works, which are in different public libraries of Europe, the *Commentary on Proverbs* and *Some Glosses on the Psalms* are the only ones as yet published, the former in Naples in 1486, and the latter in Parma in 1806. The introduction of his commentary on the Song of Songs has been published, with an English translation, by Ginsburg: *Historical and Critical Commentary on the Song of Songs* (Lond. 1857, p. 49–55)" (Ginsburg in Kitto). He wrote also some philosophical treatises, and translated for his Jewish brethren the philosophical writings of Albertus the Great, Thomas Aquinas, and other celebrated philosophers. See Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vii, 307 sq.; Geiger, *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift*, 1839, iv, 194 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 92 sq. (J. H. W.)

Immateriality is a quality of God and of the human soul. The immateriality of God denotes that he forms an absolute contrast to *matter;* he is simple, and has no parts, and so cannot be dissolved; *matter*, on the other hand, is made up of parts into which it can be resolved. God is also free from the limitations to which matter is subject, i. e. from the limits of space and time. The immateriality of God is therefore the basis of the qualities of eternity, omnipresence, and unchangeableness. Thus the immateriality of the soul includes likewise simplicity as another of its qualities. This, of course, does not absolutely set it above the limitations of space and time, since the soul needs the body for a necessary organ of its life; nor does it set aside any further development, but it certainly includes indestructibility, and thus serves as a proof of immortality (q. v.). The *materiality* of the soul was asserted by Tertullian, Arnobius, and others, during the first three centuries. Near the close of the fourth, the immateriality of the soul was maintained by Augustine, Nemesius, and Mamertus Claudianus. See Guizot, *History of Civilization*, i, 394; Krauth, *Vocab. of Philos.* p. 245. See also IMMENSITY OF GOD; SOUL, TRADUCTION OF.

Immediate Imputation OF SIN. See IMPUTATION.

Immensity of God is explained by Dr. J. Pye Smith (*First Lines of Christ. Theol.* p. 138) to be the *absolute necessity of being*, considered in relation to space. "There is with God no diffusion nor contraction, no extension nor circumspection, or any such *relation to space* as belongs to limited natures. God is equally near to, and equally far from, every point of space and every atom of the universe. He is universally and immediately *present*, not as a body, but as a spirit; not by motion, or penetration, or filling, as would be predicated of a diffused fluid, or in any way as if the infinity of God were composed of a countless number of finite parts, but in a way *peculiar* to his own spiritual and perfect nature, and of which we can form no conception." In the passages of Job xi, 7–9; 1 Kings viii, 27 (2 Chron. vi, 18); Psa. cxxxix, 7–13; Isa. lxvi, 1; Jer. xxiii, 23, 24; Amos ix, 2, 3; Matt. vi, 4, 6; Acts xvii, 24, 27, 28; also Isa. xl, 12–15, 21, 22, 25, 26, "the representations are such as literally indicate a kind of diffused and filling subtile material; but this is the condescending manner of the Scriptures, and is evidently to be understood with an exclusion of material ideas. Metaphysical or philosophical preciseness is not in the character of scriptural composition, nor would it ever suit the bulk of mankind; and *no language* or *conceptions* of men can reach the actual expression of the truth, or be any other than analogical. When the Scriptures speak of "God *being in heaven*," they mean his supremacy in all perfection, and his universal dominion."

Immensity and omnipresence, again, are distinguished in that "the former is *absolute*, being the necessary in-

herent perfection of the Deity in itself, as infinitely exalted above all conception of space; and that the latter is relative, arising out of the position of a created world. The moment that world commenced, or the first created portion of it, there *was* and *ever* remains the divine presence (*συνουσία*, *adessentia*)."

The qualities of *extension* and *divisibility* are those of *body*, not of a pure, proper, highest *spirit*. "Socinus and his immediate followers denied a proper ubiquity, immensity, or omnipresence to the essence or substance of the Deity, and represented the universal presence of God spoken of in Scripture as denoting only the acts and effects of his power, favor, and aid." Des Cartes and his followers held "that the essence of the Deity is *thought*, and that it has *no* relation to space." See J. Pye Smith, *First Lines of Christian Theology*, edited by W. Farrar (2d ed. Lond. 1861); Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, 20; Bretschneider, *Dogmatik*, i, 396 sq. See OMNIPRESENCE OF GOD.

Im'mer (Heb. *Immer'*, אִמֵּר, *talkative*, or, according to Fürst, *high*; Sept. Ἐμμήρ), the name of several priests, mostly near the time of the Exile.

1. The head of the sixteenth sacerdotal division, according to David's appointment (1 Chron. xxiv, 14). B.C. 1014.

2. The father of Pashur, which latter so grossly misused the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. xx, 1). B.C. ante 607. By many the name is regarded here as put patronymically for the preceding.

3. One whose descendants to the number of 1052 returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 37; Neh. vii, 40). He is very possibly the same with the father of Meshillemoth (Neh. xi, 13) or Meshillemith (1 Chron. ix, 12), certain of whose descendants took a conspicuous part in the sacred duties at Jerusalem after the Exile; and probably the same with the one some of whose descendants divorced their Gentile wives at the instance of Ezra (Ezra x, 20). B.C. much ante 536. By some he is identified with the two preceding.

4. One who accompanied Zerubbabel from Babylon, but was unable to prove his Israelitish descent (Ezra ii, 59; Neh. vii, 61). B.C. 536. It does not clearly appear, however, that he claimed to belong to the priestly order, and it is possible that the name is only given as that of a place in the Babylonian dominions from which some of those named in the following verses came.

5. The father of Zadok, which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem opposite his house (Neh. iii, 29). B.C. ante 446. He was, perhaps, the same as No. 3.

Immersion, the act of plunging into water, especially the person of the candidate in Christian baptism, as performed by the Baptist (q. v.) denomination, and occasionally by others. There are two controversies that require to be noticed under this head.

I. *Is this mode or act essential to the validity of the ordinance itself?*—The affirmative of this question is maintained by those denominationally styled "Baptists," and is denied by nearly all other classes of Christians. For the arguments on both sides, see the article BAPTISM.

II. *Are the terms "immerse," "immersion," etc. preferable or more correct in a version of the Scriptures, than "baptize," "baptism," etc.?*—The affirmative of this question is taken by many, but not by all Baptists, and it is approved, to some extent at least, by certain scholars in most other denominations, while the negative is held by the vast majority of Bible readers. The change was actually made by Dr. Campbell in his work on the Gospels, and recently a systematic effort has been made on a large scale to give currency to the alteration by the translations put forth under the auspices of the American (Baptist) Bible Union. See BIBLE SOCIETIES, 5. The arguments for this rendering are set forth in all their strength by Dr. Conant, in a note to his translation of Matthew, at ii, 6, as follows (to each of which we subjoin the counter arguments):

"i. This word expressed a particular act, viz. *immersion* in a fluid or any yielding substance. See the Appendix to this volume, sections i-iii." The Appendix thus referred to is Dr. Conant's treatise *On the Meaning and Use of Baptizein*, etc. The proofs there given, however, do not seem to sustain this precise point; the passages cited do indeed show that βαπτίζειν means to *whelm* or envelop with a liquid, but do not indicate any uniform *method*, such as dipping, plunging; nor do they necessarily imply motion on the part of the subject *into* the fluid, as "immersion" clearly does.

"ii. The word had no other meaning; it expressed this act, either literally or in a metaphorical sense, through the whole period of its use in Greek literature. Append. sect. iii." This assertion is palpably refuted by the fact that Dr. Conant himself, in but a part of these very quotations here appealed to, has ventured to render βαπτίζειν by "immerse;" for he is very frequently constrained to translate it "immerge," "submerge," "dip," "plunge," "imbathe," "whelm," etc. These words, it is true, have the same general signification; but, supposing that they were in every case suitable renderings (which in many cases they are not), yet they do not establish the identical point in dispute, namely, the exclusive translation by "immerse," etc., as if "the word had no other meaning."

"iii. Its grammatical construction with other words, and the circumstances connected with its use, accord entirely with this meaning, and exclude every other. Append. sect. iii, 2." On the contrary, the prepositions and cases by which it is followed, being generally *in* with the *dative*, indicate precisely the opposite conclusion; insomuch that in even the comparatively few instances where "immerse" can be given as a rendering at all, it is scarcely allowable except by the ambiguity "immersed *in*," which in English is used for "immersed *into*." In the Greek language, as every scholar knows, no such imprecision exists.

"iv. In the age of Christ and his apostles, as in all periods of the language, it was in common use to express the most familiar acts and occurrences of every-day life; as, for example, *immersing an axe in water*, to harden it; *wool in a dye*, to color it; an *animal in water*, to drown it; a ship *submerged* in the waves; rocks *immersed* in the tide; and (metaphorically) *immersed in cares, in sorrow, in ignorance, in poverty, in debt, in stupor and sleep*, etc. Append. sect. iii, 1." Rather these examples should be rendered, an axe *tempered by* cold water, wool *tinged with* dye, *drowned in* water, *sunk by* the waves, *covered with* the tide, *overwhelmed with* cares, etc. The *familiarity* of the word is another matter, belonging to the next argument.

"v. There was nothing sacred in the word itself, or in the act which it expressed. The idea of sacredness belonged solely to the relation in which the act was performed. Append. sect. iv, 7." This fact is no good reason why, when it is manifestly employed in such sacred relations, it should not be rendered by a term appropriate to such a sacredness. This argument applies only to those passages in which the word occurs in a secular sense; about these there is no dispute.

"vi. In none of these respects does the word *baptize*, as used by English writers, correspond with the original Greek word." This has already been met in substance above. The remainder of the arguments, with one exception, need not be reproduced, as they are of a *doctrinal* character, aimed at the *odium theologicum*, which is a method of reasoning inconclusive, if not unworthy in a philological question.

"xi. In rendering the Greek word by *immerse*, I follow the example of the leading vernacular versions, made from the Greek, in the languages of Continental Europe, and also of the critical versions made for the use of the learned." Facts, however, do not support this claim with any uniformity. The modern versions, of course, render according to the theological leanings of their authors, and, were they unanimous, they could not be permitted to decide a question of this kind *by au-*

thority. The best and oldest guides, the early Latins, freely transfer the term *baptizo*, giving it a regular termination like other native verbs; they rarely, if ever, render by "immergo," "immersio," etc., but usually give "tingo," or, at most, "mergo." See Dale, *Classic Baptism* (Philad. 1867), which thoroughly reviews the instances of the use of βαπτίζω. In a subsequent volume, *Judaic Baptism* (Philad. 1870), Dr. Dale meets the whole controversy in question, and proves conclusively the incorrectness of translating βαπτίζω by "immerse."

There are other positive arguments against the substitution of "immerse" as an equivalent to βαπτίζειν: 1. The word is no more English than "baptize;" one is of Latin derivation, and the other Greek, while neither is of Saxon origin. Yet both are perfectly intelligible, and it is pretty certain that, but for the advantage which "immerse" gives to one party in polemics, it would never have been thought worth while to make the exchange. 2. "Immerse," as a compound word, does not correspond etymologically with the Greek. There is nothing answering to the "*in-*" in βαπτίζω; it should have been ἐμβαπτίζω (which seldom occurs), or, rather, εἰσβαπτίζω (which is never used at all, obviously on account of the incongruity between the native force of the primitive, and the *motion* inherently implied in εἰς). 3. The outrageous awkwardness of such phrases as "he will immerse you in holy spirit and fire" (sic Conant), rendered necessary by this change, is a sufficient critical objection to the proposed rendering, were there no other argument against it. A theory that breaks down in this shocking manner the moment it is applied deserves only a summary rejection. 4. These translators are consistent with themselves in rejecting the expression "John the Baptist," calling him instead *John the Immerser*. But they ought to go one step further, and themselves abjure the title of "Baptists," which they pre-eminently arrogate, and should name themselves appropriately "the Immersionists." It is highly creditable that the mass of that large denomination are not disposed to be drawn into this specious innovation.

Immolation (Lat. *immolatio*) is the name of a ceremony performed in the sacrifices of the Romans. It consisted in throwing some sort of corn or frankincense, together with the *mola* or salt cake, and a little wine, on the head of the victim. See Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Lit., and Art*, ii, 197. See SACRIFICE. (J. H. W.)

Immorality. See MORALS.

Immortality is the perpetuity of existence after it has once begun (Lat. *immortalitas, not dying*). "'If a man die, shall he live again?' is a question which has naturally agitated the heart and stimulated the intellectual curiosity of man, wherever he has risen above a state of barbarism, and commenced to exercise his intellect at all." Without such a belief, Max Müller (*Chips from a German Workshop*, i, 45) well says, "religion surely is like an arch resting on one pillar, like a bridge ending in an abyss." It is very gratifying, therefore, to the believer, and a fact worthy of notice, that the affirmative on this question is assumed more or less by all the nations of earth, so far as our information reaches at the present day, although, it is true, their views often assume very vague and even materialistic forms.

I. *Ideas of rude Nations.*—We concede that the views of most rude heathen nations, both ancient and modern, respecting the state of man after death are indeed dark and obscure, as well as their notions respecting the nature of the soul itself, which some of them regard as a kind of aerial substance, resembling the body, though of a finer material. Still it is found that the greater part of mankind, even of those who are entirely uncultivated, though they may be incapable of the higher philosophical idea of the personal immortality of the soul, are yet inclined to believe at least that the soul survives the body, and continues either forever, or at least for a very long time. This faith seems to rest in uncultivated nations, or, better perhaps, races, 1, upon the *love of life*, which is deeply planted in the human breast, and leads to the wish and hope that life will be continued even beyond the grave; 2, upon *traditions* transmitted from their ancestors; 3, upon *dreams*, in which the dead appear speaking or acting, and thus confirming both wishes and traditions. See NECROMANCY.

1. *Hindus.*—In the sacred books of the Hindus called the Veda, "immortality of the soul, as well as personal immortality and personal responsibility after death, is clearly proclaimed" (Müller, *Chips*, i, 45). (We have here a refutation of the opinion that has hitherto been entertained, that the goal of Hinduism is absorption [q. v.] into the Universal Spirit, and therefore loss of individual existence, and that the Hindus as well as Brahmans believe in the trasmigration [q. v.] of the soul, and a refutation by a writer who is most competent to speak. Professor Roth, another great Sanscrit scholar, in an article in the *Journal of the German Oriental Society* [iv, 427], corroborates Prof. Müller in these words: "We here [in the Veda] find, not without astonishment, beautiful conceptions on immortality expressed in unadorned language with childlike conviction. If it were necessary, we might find here the most powerful weapons against the view which has lately been revived and proclaimed as new, that Persia was the only birthplace of the idea of immortality, and that even the nations of Europe had derived it from that quarter. As if the religious spirit of every gifted race was not able [which Müller (ii, 267) holds] to arrive at it by its own strength.") Thus we find these passages: "He who gives alms goes to the highest place in heaven; he goes to the gods" (Rv. i, 125, 56). "Even the idea, so frequent in the later literature of the Brahmans, that immortality is secured by a son, seems implied, unless our translation deceives us, in one passage of the Veda (vii, 56, 24): 'O Maruts, may there be to us a strong son, who is a living ruler of men; through whom we may cross the waters on our way to the happy abode; then may we come to your own house!' One poet prays that he may see again his father and mother after death (Rv. i, 24, 1); and the fathers are invoked almost like gods, oblations are offered to them, and they are believed to enjoy, in company with the gods, a life of never-ending felicity (Rv. x, 15, 16). We find this prayer addressed to Soma (Rv. ix, 113, 7): 'Where there is eternal light, in the world where the sun is placed, in that immortal, imperishable world place me, O Soma! Where king Vaivasvata reigns, where the secret place of heaven is, where these mighty waters are, there make me immortal! Where life is free, in the third heaven of heavens, where the worlds are radiant, there make me immortal! Where wishes and desires are, where the bowl of the bright Soma is, where there is food and rejoicing, there make me immortal! Where there is happiness and delight, where joy and pleasure reside, where the desires of our desire are attained, there make me immortal!'"

2. *Chinese.*—While it is true that Confucius himself did not expressly teach the immortality of the soul, nay, that he rather purposely seems to have avoided entering upon this subject at all, taking it most probably like Moses, as we shall see below, simply for granted (comp. Müller, *Chips*, i, 308), it is nevertheless implied in the worship which the Chinese pay to their ancestors. Another evidence, it seems to us, is given by the absence of the word death from the writings of Confucius (q. v.). When a person dies, the Chinese say "he has returned to his family." "The spirits of the good were, according to him (Confucius), permitted to visit their ancient habitations on earth, or such ancestral halls or places as were appointed by their descendants, to receive homage and confer benefactions. Hence the duty of performing rites in such places, under the penalty, in the case of those who, while living, neglect such duty, of their spiritual part being deprived after death of the supreme bliss flowing from the homage of de

scendants" (Legge, *Life and Teachings of Confucius*, Philadelphia, 1867, 12mo).

3. *Egyptians.*—Perhaps we may say that the idea of immortality assumed a more definite shape among the Egyptians, for they clearly recognised not only a *dwelling-place of the dead*, but also a future judgment. "Osiris, the beneficent god, judges the dead, and, 'having weighed their heart in the scales of justice, he sends the wicked to regions of darkness, while the just are sent to dwell with the god of light.' The latter, we read on an inscription, 'found favor before the great God; they dwell in glory, where they live a heavenly life; the bodies they have quitted will forever repose in their tombs, while they rejoice in the life of the supreme God.' Immortality was thus plainly taught, although bound up with it was the idea of the preservation of the body, to which they attached great importance, as a condition of the soul's continued life; and hence they built vast tombs, and embalmed their bodies, as if to last forever."

4. *Persians.*—In the religion of the Persians, also, at least since, if not previous to the time of Zoroaster, a prominent part is assigned to the existence of a future world, with its governing spirits. "Under Ormuz and Ahriman there are ranged regular hierarchies of spirits engaged in a perpetual conflict; and the soul passes into the kingdom of light or of darkness, over which these spirits respectively preside, according as it has lived on the earth well or ill. Whoever has lived in purity, and has not suffered the *divs* (evil spirits) to have any power over him, passes after death into the realms of light."

5. *American Indians.*—The native tribes of the lower part of South America believe in two great powers of good and evil, but likewise in a number of inferior deities. These are supposed to have been the creators and ancestors of different families, and hence, when an Indian dies, his soul goes to live with the deity who presides over his particular family. These deities have each their separate habitations in vast caverns under the earth, and thither the departed repair to enjoy the happiness of being eternally drunk (compare Tyler, *Researches into the early History of Mankind, and the Development of Civilization*, Lond. 1868). Another American tribe of Indians, the *Mandans*, have with their belief in a future state connected this tradition of their origin: "The whole nation resided in one large village under ground near a subterraneous lake. A grape-vine extended its roots down to their habitation, and gave them a view of the light. Some of the most adventurous climbed up the vine, and were delighted with the sight of the earth, which they found covered with buffalo, and rich with every kind of fruit. Returning with the grapes they had gathered, their countrymen were so pleased with the taste of them that the whole nation resolved to leave their dull residence for the charms of the upper region. Men, women, and children ascended by means of the vine; but when about half the nation had reached the surface of the earth, a corpulent woman who was clambering up the vine broke it with her weight, and closed upon herself and the rest of the nation the light of the sun. Those who were left on earth expect, when they die, to return to the original seats of their forefathers, the good reaching the ancient village by means of the lake, which the burden of the sins of the wicked will not enable them to cross" (Tyler). The *Choctaw* tribe's belief in a future state is equally curious. "They hold that the spirit lives after death, and that it has a great distance to travel towards the west; that it has to cross a dreadful, deep, and rapid stream, over which, from hill to hill, there lies a long, slippery pine log, with the bark peeled off. Over this the dead have to pass before they reach the delightful hunting-grounds. The good walk on safely, though six people from the other side throw stones at them; but the wicked, trying to dodge the stones, slip off the log, and fall thousands of feet into the water which is dashing over the rocks" (see Brinton, p. 233 sq.).

6. *Polynesians.*—The natives of Polynesia "imagine that the sky descends at the horizon and incloses the earth. Hence they call foreigners 'palangi' or 'heaven-bursters,' as having broken in from another world outside. According to their views, we live upon the ground floor of a great house, with upper stories rising one over another above us, and cellars down below. There are holes in the ceiling to let the rain through, and as men are supposed to visit the dwellers above, the dwellers from below are believed to come sometimes up to the surface, and likewise to receive visits from men in return."

7. *New Hollanders.*—The native tribes of Australia believe that all who are good men, and have been properly buried, enter *heaven* after death. "Heaven, which is the abode of the two good divinities, is represented as a delightful place, where there is abundance of game and food, never any excess of heat or cold, rain or drought, no malign spirits, no sickness or death, but plenty of rioting, singing, and dancing for evermore. They also believe in an evil spirit who dwells in the nethermost regions, and, strange to say, they represent him with horns and a tail, though one would think that, prior to the introduction of cattle into New Holland, the natives could not have been aware of the existence of horned beasts" (Oldfield).

8. *Greenlanders.*—"The Greenlander believes that when a man dies his soul travels to Torngarsuk, the land where reigns perpetual summer, all sunshine, and no night; where there is good water, and birds, fish, seals, and reindeer without end, that are to be caught without trouble, or are found cooking alive in a huge kettle. But the journey to this land is difficult; the souls have to slide five days or more down a precipice, all stained with the blood of those who have gone down before. And it is especially grievous for the poor souls when the journey must be made in winter or in tempest, for then a soul may come to harm, or suffer the other death, as they call it, when it perishes utterly, and nothing is left. The bridge Es-Sirat, which stretches over the midst of the Moslem hill, finer than a hair, and sharper than the edge of a sword, conveys a similar conception." Tyler, on whose works we mainly rely for the information here conveyed on rude nations, traces the idea of a bridge in Java, in North America, in South America, and he also shows how in Polynesia the bridge is replaced by canoes, in which the dead were to pass the great gulf. It is noteworthy that the Jews, also, when they first established a firm belief in immortality, imagined a bridge of hell, which all unbelievers were to pass.

II. *Ideas of more cultivated Nations.*—Wherever pagan thought and pagan morality reach the highest perfection, we find their ideas of the immortality of the soul gradually approaching the Christian views. The first trace of a belief in a future existence we find in Homer's *Iliad* (xxiii, 103 sq.), where he represents that Achilles first became convinced that souls and shadowy forms have a real existence in the kingdom of the shades (Hades) by the appearance to him of the dead Patroclus in a dream. These visions were often regarded as divine by the Greeks (comp. *Il.* i, 63, and the case of the rich man and Lazarus in Luke xvi, 27). Compare also the article HADES. But, while in the early Greek paganism the idea of the future is everywhere melancholic, Hades, or the realms of the dead, being to their imagination the emblem of gloom, as may be seen from the following: "Achilles, the ideal hero, declares that he would rather till the ground than live in pale Elysium," we find that, with the progress of Hellenic thought, a higher idea of the future is found to characterize both the poetry and philosophy of Greece, till, in the Platonic Socrates, the conception of immortality shines forth with a clearness and precision truly impressive. "For we must remember, O men," said Socrates, in his last speech, before he drained the poison cup, "that it depends upon the immortality of the soul

whether we have to live to it and to care for it or not. For the danger seems fearfully great of not caring for it. [Compare Locke's statement: If the best that can happen to the unbeliever be that he be right, and the worst that can happen to the believer be that he be wrong, who in his madness would dare to run the venture?] Yea, were death to be the end of all, it would be truly a fortunate thing for the wicked to get rid of their body, and, at the same time, of their wickedness. But now, since the soul shows itself to us immortal, there can be for it no refuge from evil, and no other salvation than to become as good and intelligible as possible." More clearly are his views set forth in the *Apology* and the *Phædo*, in language at once rich in faith and in beauty. "The soul, the immaterial part, being of a nature so superior to the body, can it," he asks in the *Phædo*, "as soon as it is separated from the body, be dispersed into nothing, and perish? Oh, far otherwise. Rather will this be the result. If it take its departure in a state of purity, not carrying with it any clinging impurities of the body, impurities which during life it never willingly shared in, but always avoided, gathering itself into itself, and making the separation from the body its aim and study—that is, devoting itself to true philosophy, and studying how to die calmly; for this is true philosophy, is it not?—well, then, so prepared, the soul departs into that invisible region which is of its own nature, the region of the divine, the immortal, the wise, and then its lot is to be happy in a state in which it is freed from fears and wild desires, and the other evils of humanity, and spends the rest of its existence with the gods." This view, or better doctrine of the immortality of the soul, held by Socrates and his disciple Plato, implied a double immortality, the past eternity as well as that to come. They certainly offer a very striking contrast to the popular superstitions and philosophy of their day, which in many respects recall the views held by the Hindus. The people, especially those who held the most enlarged views up to this time, had "entertained what might be termed a doctrine of *semi-immortality*. They looked for a continuance of the soul in an endless futurity, but gave themselves no concern about the eternity which is past. But Plato considered the soul as having already eternally existed, the present life being only a moment in our career; he looked forward with an undoubting faith to the changes through which we must hereafter go" (Draper, *Intell. Development of Europe*, p. 118; compare below, Philosophical Argument).

III. *Ideas of the Jewish Nation.*—1. It has frequently been asserted that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is not taught in the O. T. The Socinians in the 16th and 17th centuries took this ground. Some have gone so far as to construe the supposed silence of the O.-T. Scriptures on this subject into a formal denial of the possibility of a future life, and have furthermore fortified their positions by selecting some passages of the Old Testament that are rather obscure, e. g. Eccles. iii, 19 sq.; Isa. xxxviii, 18; Psa. vi, 6; xxx, 10; lxxxviii, 11; cxv, 17; Job vii, 7-10; x, 20-22; xiv, 7-12; xv, 22. In the most odious manner were these objections raised by the "Wolfenbüttel Fragments" (see the fourth fragment by Lessing, *Beiträge z. Gesch. u. Lit. a. d. Wolfenbüttelschen Bibliothek*, iv, 484 sq.). Bishop Warburton, on the other hand, derived one of his main proofs of the divine mission of Moses from this supposed silence on the subject of immortality. "Moses," he argues, "being sustained in his legislation and government by immediate divine authority, had not the same necessity that other teachers have for a recourse to threatenings and punishments drawn from the future world, in order to enforce obedience." In a similar strain argues professor Ernst Stähelin in an article on the immortality of the soul (in the *Foundations of our Faith*, Lond. and N. York, 1866, 12mo, p. 221 sq.): "Moses and Confucius did not expressly teach the immortality of the soul, nay, they seemed purposely to avoid entering upon the subject; *they simply took it for granted.* Thus Moses spoke of the tree of life in Paradise, of which if the man took he should live forever, and called God the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, thus implying their continued existence, since God could not be a God of the dead, but only of the living; and Confucius, while in some respects avoiding all mention of future things, nevertheless enjoined honors to be paid to departed spirits (thus assuming their life after death) as one of the chief duties of a religious man." Another evidence of the belief of the Jews at the time of Moses and in subsequent periods in the immortality of the soul, as a doctrine self-evident, and by them universally acknowledged and received, is the fact that the Israelites and their ancestors resided among the Egyptians, a people who, as we have seen above, had cherished this faith from the remotest ages (comp. Herodotus, ii, 123, who asserts that they were the first who entertained such an idea). It is further proved that the Jews believed in immortality, (*a*) from the laws of Moses against *Necromancy* (q. v.), or the invocation of the dead, which was very generally practised by the Canaanites (Deut. xviii, 9-12), and which, notwithstanding these laws, is found to have been prevalent among the Jews even at the time of king Saul (1 Sam. xxviii), and later (Psa. cvi, 28, and the prophets); (*b*) from the name which the Jews gave to the kingdom of the dead, שְׁאוֹל (ᾅδης), which so frequently occurs in Moses as well as subsequent writings of the O. T. That Moses did not in his laws hold up the punishments of the future world to the terror of transgressors is a circumstance which redounds to his praise, and cannot be alleged against him as a matter of reproach, since to other legislators the charge has been laid that they were either deluded or impostors for pursuing the very opposite course. Another reason why Moses did not touch the question of the immortality of the soul is that he did not intend to give a system of theology in his laws. But so much is clear from certain passages in his writings, that he was by no means ignorant of this doctrine. Compare Michaelis, *Argumenta pro Immortalitate Animi e Mose Collecta*, in the *Syntagm. Comment.* i (Göttingen, 1759); Lüderwald, *Unters. von d. Kenntniss eines künftigen Lebens i. A. Test.* (Helmstädt, 1781); Semler, *Beantwortung d. Fragen d. Wolfenbüttelschen Ungenannten;* Seiler, *Observ. ad psychologiam sacram* (Erlang. 1779).

"The following texts from the writings of Moses may be regarded as indications of the doctrine of immortality, viz. Gen. v, 22, 24, where it is said respecting Enoch, that because he lived a pious life *God took him*, so that he was no more among men. This was designed to be the reward and consequence of his pious life, and it points to an invisible life with God, to which he attained without previously suffering death. Gen. xxxvii, 35, Jacob says, 'I will go down to "the grave" (שְׁאוֹל) unto my son.' We have here distinctly exhibited the idea of a place where the dead dwell connected together in a society. In conformity with this idea we must explain the phrase *to go to his fathers* (Gen. xv, 15), or *to be gathered to his people* [more literally, *to enter into their habitation or abode*] (Gen. xxv, 8; xxxv, 29; Numb. xx, 24, etc.). In the same way many of the Indian savages (as we have already seen) express their expectation of an immortality beyond the grave. Paul argues from the text Gen. xlvii, 9, and similar passages where Jacob calls his life a *journey*, that the patriarchs expected a life after death (Heb. xi, 13-16; yet he says, very truly, πόῤῥωθεν ἰδόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας). In Matt. xxii, 23, Christ refers, in arguing against the Sadducees, to Exod. iii, 6, where Jehovah calls himself the God of Isaac and Jacob (i. e. their protector and the object of their worship), long after their death. It could not be that their ashes and their dust should worship God; hence he concludes that they themselves could not have ceased to exist, but that, as to their souls, they still lived (comp. Heb. xi, 13-17). This passage was in-

terpreted in the same way by the Jews after Christ (Wetstein, ad loc.). In the subsequent books of the O. T. the texts of this nature are far more numerous. Still more definite descriptions are given of שְׁאוֹל, and the condition of the departed there; e. g. Isa. xiv, 9 sq.; also in the Psalms and in Job. Even in these texts, however, the doctrine of the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked in the kingdom of the dead is not so clearly developed as it is in the N. T.; this is true even of the book of Job. All that we find here with respect to this point is only obscure intimation, so that the Pauline πόῤῥωθεν ἰδόντες is applicable, in relation to this doctrine, to the other books of the O. T. as well as to those of Moses. In the Psalms there are some plain allusions to the expectation of reward and punishment after death, particularly Psa. xvii, 15; xlix, 15, 16; lxxiii, 24. There are some passages in the prophets where a *revivification of the dead* is spoken of, as Isa. xxvi, 19; Dan. xii, 2; Ezek. xxvii; but, although these do not teach a *literal* resurrection of the dead, but rather refer to the restoration of the nation and land, still these and all such figurative representations presuppose the proper idea that an invisible part of man survives the body, and will be hereafter united to it. Very clear is also the passage Eccles. xii, 7, 'The body must return to the earth from whence it was taken, but the spirit to God who gave it,' evidently alluding to Gen. iii, 19. See SHEOL.

"From all this we draw the conclusion that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was not unknown to the Jews before the Babylonian exile. It appears also from the fact that a general expectation existed of rewards and punishments in the future world, although in comparison with what was afterwards taught on this point there was at that time very little definitely known respecting it, and the doctrine, therefore, stood by no means in that near relation to religion and morality into which it was afterwards brought, as we find it often in other wholly uncultivated nations. Hence this doctrine is not so often used by the prophets as a motive to righteousness, or to deter men from evil, or to console them in the midst of suffering. But on this very account the piety of these ancient saints deserves the more regard and admiration. It was in a high degree unpretending and disinterested. Although the prospect of what lies beyond the grave was, as Paul said, the promised blessing which they saw only from afar, they yet had pious dispositions, and trusted God. They held merely to the general promise that God their Father would cause it to be well with them even after death (Psa. lxxiii, 26, 28, 'When my strength and my heart faileth, God will be the strength of my heart, and my portion forever'). But it was not until after the Babylonian captivity that the ideas of the Jews on this subject appear to have become enlarged, and that this doctrine was brought by the prophets, under the divine guidance, into a more immediate connection with religion. This result becomes very apparent after the reign of the Grecian kings over Syria and Egypt, and their persecutions of the Jews. The prophets and teachers living at that time (of whose writings, however, nothing has come down to us) must therefore have given to their nation, time after time, more instruction upon this subject, and must have explained and unfolded the allusions to it in the earlier prophets. Thus we find that after this time, more frequently than before, the Jews sought and found in this doctrine of immortality and of future retribution, consolation, and encouragement under their trials, and a motive to piety. Such discourses were therefore frequently put in the mouths of the martyrs in the second book of Maccabees, e. g. vi, 26; vii, 9 sq.; comp. xii, 43–45; see also the Book of Wisdom, ii, 1 sq.; and especially iii, 1 sq., and the other apocryphal books of the O. T. At the time of Christ, and afterwards, this doctrine was universally received and taught by the Pharisees, and was, indeed, the prevailing belief among the Jews, as is well known from the testimony of the N. T., of Josephus, and also of Philo. Tacitus also refers to it in his history, 'Animas prælio aut suppliciis peremptorum æternas putant.' Consult an essay comparing the ideas of the apocryphal books of the O. T. on the subjects of immortality, resurrection, judgment, and retribution, with those of the N. T., written by Frisch, in Eichhorn's *Bibliothek der Biblischen Literatur*, b. iv; Ziegler, *Theol. Abhandl.* pt. ii, No. 4; Flugge, *Geschichte des Glaubens an Unsterblichkeit*, etc., pt. i. The Sadducees, boasting of a great attachment to the O. T., and especially to the books of Moses, were the only Jews who denied this doctrine, as well as the existence of the soul as distinct from the body" (Knapp, *Theology*, § cxlix). (See Johannsen, *Vet. Heb. notiones de rebus post mortem*, Hafn. 1826.) See RESURRECTION.

2. Among the modern Jews, the late celebrated Jewish savant and successor to Rénan at the Sorbonne, professor Munk, regarded as one of the strongest evidences which the O. T. affords for a doctrine of the immortality of the soul the expression "He was gathered to his people," so frequent in the writings of the O. T. The Rev. D. W. Marks, in a series of *Sermons* (Lond. 5611 = 1851), p. 103 sq., says of it: "It has generally been supposed that 'to be gathered to one's people' is an ordinary term which the sacred historian employs in order to convey the idea that the person to whom it is applied lies buried in the place where the remains of the same family are deposited. But whoever attentively considers all the passages of the Bible where this expression occurs will find, says Dr. Munk, that being 'gathered to one's ancestors' is expressly distinguished from the rite of sepulture. Abraham is 'gathered unto his people,' but he is buried in the cave which he bought near Hebron, and where Sarah alone is interred. This is the first instance where the passage 'to be gathered to one's people' is to be met with; and that it cannot mean that Abraham's bones reposed in the same cave with those of his fathers is very clear, since the ancestors of the patriarch were buried in Chaldæa, and not in Canaan. The death of Jacob is related in the following words: 'And when Jacob had finished charging his sons, he gathered up his feet upon the bed, and he expired, and was gathered unto his people' (Gen. xlix, 33). It is equally certain that the phrase 'he was gathered unto his people' cannot refer to the *burial* of the patriarch, because we learn from the next chapter that he was embalmed, and that the Egyptians mourned for him seventy days; and it is only after these three score and ten days of mourning are ended that Joseph transports the remains of his father to Canaan, and inters them in the cave of Machpelah, where the ashes of Abraham and Isaac repose. When the inspired penman alludes to the actual burial of Jacob he uses very different terms. He makes no mention then of the patriarch 'being gathered to his people,' but he simply employs the verb קָבַר, 'to bury:' 'And Joseph went up to bury his father.' The very words addressed by Jacob on his deathbed to his sons, 'I am about to be gathered unto my people; bury me with my fathers,' afford us sufficient evidence that the speaker, as well as the persons addressed, understood the expression 'being gathered to one's people' in a sense totally different from that of being lodged within a tomb. But a stronger instance still may be advanced. The Israelites arrive at Mount Hor, near the borders of Edom, and immediately is issued the divine command, 'Aaron shall be gathered unto his people, for he shall not come into the land which I have given to the children of Israel. . . . Strip Aaron of his garments, and clothe in them Eleazar his son. And Aaron shall be gathered, and there he shall die.' No member of his family lay buried on Mount Hor; and still Aaron is said to have been there 'gathered to his people.' Again, Moses is charged to chastise severely the Midianites for having seduced the Israelites to follow the abominable practices of בעל פעור ('Baal Peor'); and, this act accomplished, the legislator is told 'that he will be gathered unto his people.' This passage cer-

tainly cannot mean that Moses was to be gathered in the grave with any of his people. The Hebrew lawgiver died on Mount Abarim; and the Scripture testifies 'that no one ever knew of the place of his sepulchre;' and still the term to be gathered to his people is there likewise employed. Sufficient instances have now been cited to prove that האסף אל עמיו is to be understood in a different sense from the rite of sepulture, and that the Hebrews in the times of Moses *did* entertain the belief in another state of existence, where spirit joined spirit after the death of the body.

"But, although the position here assumed seems very tenable, it is nevertheless true that the Israelites certainly did not have a very *clear* conception of the future existence of the soul, and 'that life and immortality' were not brought to light *very distinctly* before Christ came, for whom the office was reserved of making clearly known many high matters before but obscurely indicated" (*Journal of Sacred Literature*, viii, 179).

IV. *New-Testament Views.*—When Jesus Christ appeared in this world, the Epicurean philosophy (q. v.), the fables of poets of a lower world, and the corruption which was prevalent among the nations had fully destroyed the hope, to say nothing of a belief, in future existence. It was left for him to declare the existence of the soul after death, even though the "earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved" (2 Cor. v, 1), with great certainty and very explicitly, not only by an allusion to the joys that await us in the future world, and to the dangers of retribution and divine justice (Matt. x, 28), but also in refutation of the doctrines of the unbelieving Sadducees (Matt. xxii, 23 sq.; Mark xii, 18 sq.; Luke xx, 28 sq.). Jesus Christ, said Paul, "hath abolished death, and hath brought life and *immortality* to light" (2 Tim. i, 10), and "will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life" (ἀφθαρσίαν) (Rom. ii, 6 sq.). The original for eternal life here used (ἀφθαρσία) denotes nothing else than the immortality of the soul, or a continuation of the substantial being, of man's person, of the *ego*, after death, by the destruction of the body (comp. Matt. x, 28; Luke xii, 4). See the article ETERNAL LIFE; and on the origin of the soul, and its pre-existence to the body, the article SOUL.

It is evident from the passages cited that Christ and his apostles did more to illustrate and confirm the belief in the immortality of the soul, as cherished at the present day, than had been done by any nation, even the Jews included. "He first gave to it that high practical interest which it now possesses;" and it is owing to Christianity that the doctrine of the soul's immortality has become a common and well-recognised truth—no mere result of speculation, as are those of the heathen and Jewish philosophers, nor a product of priestly invention—but a light to the reason, and a guide to the conscience and conduct. "The aspirations of philosophy, and the materialistic conceptions of popular mythology, are found in the Gospel transmuted into a living, spiritual, and divine fact, and an authoritative influence, not only touching the present life, but governing and directing it."

V. *Christian Views.*—In the early Christian Church the views on the immortality of the soul were very varied. There were none that actually denied, far from it, nor even any that doubted its possibility. "But some of them, e. g. Justin, Tatian, and Theophilus, on various grounds, supposed that the soul, though mortal in itself, or at least indifferent in relation to mortality or immortality, either acquires immortality as a promised reward, by its union with the spirit and the right use of its liberty, or, in the opposite case, perishes with the body. They were led to this view partly because they laid so much stress on freedom, and because they thought that likeness to God was to be obtained only by this freedom; and partly, too, because they supposed (according to the trichotomistic division of human nature) that the soul (ψυχή) receives the seeds of immortal life only by the union with the spirit (πνεῦμα), as the higher and free life of reason." This view was also afterwards introduced into the Greek Church by Nicholas of Methone (compare Hagenbach, *Doctrines*, ii, 16). "And, lastly, other philosophical hypotheses concerning the nature of the soul doubtless had an influence. On the contrary, Tertullian and Origen, whose views differed on other subjects, agreed on this one point, that they, in accordance with their peculiar notions concerning the nature of the soul, looked upon its immortality as essential to it" (Hagenbach, i, 158). "The schoolmen of the Middle Ages in the Western Church considered the immortality of the soul a *theological truth;* but their chief leaders, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, were at issue on the question whether reason furnishes satisfactory proof of that doctrine. . . . As Anselm of Canterbury had inferred the existence of God himself from the idea of God, so Thomas Aquinas proved the immortality of the soul, in a similar manner, by an *ontological* argument: 'Intellectus apprehendit esse absolute et secundum omne tempus. Unde omne habens intellectum naturaliter desiderat esse semper, naturale autem desiderium non potest est inane. Omnis igitur intellectualis substantia est incorruptibilis' (compare Engelhardt, *Dogmengesch.* ii, 123 sq.). On the other hand, Scotus, whose views were more nearly allied to those of the Nominalists, maintained: 'Non posse demonstrari, quod anima sit immortalis' (*Comm. in M. Sentent.* bk. ii, dist. 17, qu. i; comp. bk. iv, dist. 43, qu. 2). Bonaventura, on the contrary, asserted: 'Animam esse immortalem, auctoritate ostenditur et ratione' (*De Nat. Deor.* ii, 55). Concerning the further attempts of Moneta of Cremona (13th century), William of Auvergne (bishop of Paris from 1228 to 1249), and Raimund Martini (*Pugio Fidei* adv. Maur. p. i, ch. iv), to prove the immortality of the soul, compare Münscher, *Dogmengeschichte*, ed. by Von Colln, p. 92 sq." (Hagenbach). On the views since the Reformation, see SOUL, IMMORTALITY OF.

VI. *Philosophical Argument.*—There are many writers, both in philosophy and theology, who deny that the immortality of the soul can be proved apart from revelation. E. Stähelin (*Foundations of our Faith*, p. 232) says: "We might take up a line of argument used by philosophy both in ancient and modern times—from Socrates down to Fichte—to prove the immortality of the inner being; an argument derived from the assertion that the soul, being a unity, is, as such, incapable of decay, it being only in the case of the complex that a falling to pieces, or a dissolution, is conceivable." "But," he continues, "the abstruse nature of this method leads us to renounce a line of argument from which, we freely confess, we expect little profitable result. For, after all, what absolute proof have we of this unity of the soul? Can we subject it to the microscope or the scalpel, as we can the visible and tangible? It must content us for the present simply to indicate that the instinct and consciousness of immortality have nothing to fear from the most searching examination of the reason, but find far more of confirmation and additional proof than of contradiction in the profoundest thinking. Further, that this instinct and consciousness do actually exist, and are traceable through all the stages and ramifications of the human race, . . . is confirmed to us by our opponents themselves . . . that there is in man something which is deeper and stronger than the maxims of a self-invented philosophy, namely, the divinely-created nobility of his nature, the inherent breath of life, breathed into him by God, the relation to the Eternal, which secures to him eternity." Watson (*Institutes*, ii, 2) goes even further, and declares that nowhere else but in the Bible is there any "indubitable declaration of man's immortality," or "any facts or principles so obvious as to enable us confidently to infer it. All *observation* lies directly against the doctrine of man's immortality. He *dies*, and the probabilities of a future life which have been established upon the unequal dis-

tribution of rewards and punishments in this life, and the capacities of the human soul, are a presumptive evidence which has been adduced, as we shall afterwards show, only by those to whom the doctrine had been transmitted by tradition, and who were therefore in possession of the *idea;* and even then, to have any effectual force of persuasion, they must be built upon antecedent principles furnished only by the revelations contained in holy Scripture. Hence some of the wisest heathens, who were not wholly unaided in their speculations on these subjects by the reflected light of these revelations, confessed themselves unable to come to any satisfactory conclusion. The doubts of Socrates, who expressed himself the most hopefully of any on the subject of a future life, are well known; and Cicero, who occasionally expatiates with so much eloquence on this topic, shows, by the skeptical expressions which he throws in, that his belief was by no means confirmed."

The first attempt of a philosophical tenet on the doctrine of immortality is offered in Plato's *Phædo.* On it the New Platonics reared their structure, adorned with many fanciful additions. All scientific attempts throughout the Middle Ages, and up to our own day, have been modified views, allied more or less to Platonism. In opposition to these, the French materialism of the 18th century attempted to destroy, or at least undermine, the belief in immortality. Not less materialistic is the position of the Pantheists, headed by Spinoza. "These hold that the World-Soul, which, in their opinion, produces and fills the universe, also fills and rules man; nay, that it is only in him that it reaches its special end, which is self-consciousness, and attains to thought and will. It is true, they go on to say, that at the death of the individual this World-Soul retreats from him, just as the setting sun seems to draw back its rays into itself; and that self-consciousness now sinks once more into the great, unconscious, undistinguished spirit-ocean of the whole." The answer to this ridiculous position has been best given by M'Cosh (*Intuitions of the Mind,* p. 392 sq.): "We can *conceive* of air thus rushing into air, and of a bucketful of water losing itself in a river; and why? because neither air nor water ever had a separate and conscious personality. The soul, as long as it exists, must retain its personality as an essential property, and must carry it along with it wherever it goes. The moral conviction clusters round this personal self. The being who is judged, who is saved or condemned, is the same who sinned and continued in his sin, or who believed and was justified when on earth."

Kant, Locke, and other metaphysicians, on the other hand, like some theologians, as we have seen above, also exclude the immortality of the soul from the province of natural theology. "They deem it impossible to prove our future existence from the creation, or even from the admitted attributes of the Creator, and are thus in singular opposition to the ancient Platonists, who regarded the eternal continuance of our being as the more obvious doctrine of natural theology, and inferred from it the divine existence as the less direct intimation of nature. It is said that much of the reasoning employed by pagan writers to prove the immortality of the soul is unsound. This is a fact, and yet by no means invalidates their right to believe in the conclusion which they deduced illogically. There are many truths, the proof of which lies so near to us that we overlook it. Believing a proposition firmly, we are satisfied with the mere pretence of an argument for its support; and searching in the distance for proofs which can only be found in immediate contact with us, we discover reasons for the belief which, long before we had discovered them, was yet fully established in our own minds; and yet we deem these reasons sufficient to uphold the doctrine, although, in point of fact, the doctrine does not make trial of their strength by resting upon them. If they were the props on which our belief was in reality founded, their weakness would be obvious at once; but, as they have nothing to sustain, their insufficiency is the less apparent; our belief continues, notwithstanding the frailness of the arguments which make a show of upholding it, and thus the very defects of the proof illustrate the strength of the conclusion, which remains firm in despite of them. That the immortality of the soul has been firmly believed in by men destitute of a written revelation will not be denied by fair-minded scholars. It probably would never have been doubted had not some learned, though injudicious controversialists, as Leland and others, deemed it necessary to magnify the importance of the Bible by undervaluing the attainments of heathen sages. The singular attempt of Warburton to prove that the authority of the Mosaic writings is evinced by their not teaching the doctrine of a future state led him to an equally paradoxical attempt to show that the phraseology of pagan sages furnishes no valid evidence of their belief in the soul's immortality. But each of these efforts was abortive; and if each had been successful, such a kind of success would have resulted in even greater evils than have come from the want of it. The fact, then, that our existence in a future world has been an article of faith among pagan philosophers indicates that this doctrine is an appropriate part of natural theology. But, even if it had not been thus believed by heathens, it ought to have been; and the arguments which convince the unaided judgment of its truth are also reasons for classifying the doctrine among the teachings of nature. These arguments may be conveniently arranged under six different classes: first, the *metaphysical,* which prove that the mind is entirely distinct from the body, and is capable of existing while separate from it; that the mind is not compounded, and will not therefore be dissolved into elementary particles; that, being imperceptible, it cannot perish except by an annihilating act of God (comp. Dr. M'Cosh's argument above cited); secondly, the *analogical,* which induces us to believe that the soul will not be annihilated, even as matter does not cease to exist when it changes its form; thirdly, the *teleological,* which incline us to think that the mental powers and the tendencies so imperfectly developed in this life will not be shut out from that sphere of future exertion for which they are so wisely adapted; fourthly, the *theological,* which foster an expectation that the wisdom of God will not fail to complete what otherwise appears to have been commenced in vain, that his goodness will not cease to bestow the happiness for which our spiritual nature is ever longing, and that his justice will not allow the present disorders of the moral world to continue, but will rightly adjust the balances, which have now for a season lost their equipoise; fifthly, the *moral,* which compel us to hope that our virtues will not lose their reward, and to fear that our vices will not go unpunished in the future world, which seems to be better fitted than the present for moral retribution; and, sixthly, the *historical,* the general belief in a future state of rewards and punishments, the expectations of dying men, the premonitions of the guilty, and the tenacious hopes of the beneficent. All these arguments are in favor of our unending existence, and there are none in opposition to it; and it is an axiom that whatever has existed and now exists, will, unless there be special proof to the contrary, continue to exist" (*Bibliotheca Sacra,* May, 1846, art. ii).

The *natural proofs* of the immortality of the soul are treated very skilfully by professor Chace, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for February, 1849. First he analyzes the Phædo of Plato, and finds it to contain the following arguments for immortality: 1. From the capacity and desire of the soul for knowledge, beyond what in this life is attainable; 2. From the law of contraries, according to which, as rest prepares for labor, and labor for rest; as light ends in darkness, and darkness in light; so life, leading to death, death must, in turn, terminate in life; 3. From the reminiscences of a previous existence, which the soul brings with it into the present life; 4. From

the simple and indivisible nature of the soul; only compound substances undergo dissolution; 5. From the essential vitality of the soul itself. He adds that although these arguments did not amount, in the estimation of Socrates, "to an absolute proof of the doctrine, he thought them sufficient not only to deprive death of all its terrors, but to *awaken* in the mind of a good man, when approaching death, the calm and cheerful hope of a better life." These arguments, however, are far behind the present state of science. The second and third rest on purely imaginary foundations; the fourth and fifth are inconclusive; and the first only, we grant, has a real, though subordinate value. Cicero adds to these arguments one from the *consensus gentium*, a universal prevalence of a belief in immortality. Of Butler's argument for immortality in the *Analogy*, the professor remarks that it is perhaps less fortunate than any other part of that great work. "Both of the main arguments employed by him are no less applicable to the lower animals than to man, and just as much prove the immortality of the living principle connected with the minutest insect or humblest infusoria as of the human soul. It is not a little remarkable that this fact, which in reality converts the attempted proof into a *reductio ad absurdum* of the principles from which it is drawn, should not have awakened in the cautious mind of Butler a suspicion of their soundness, and led him to seek other means of establishing the truth in question. These he would have found, and, as we think, far better suited to his purpose, in the facts and principles so ably and so fully set forth in his chapters on the moral government of God, and on probation considered as a means of discipline and improvement. Indeed, we have always been of the opinion that these two chapters contain the only real and solid grounds for belief in a future life which the work presents; the considerations adduced in the one particularly appropriated to that object serving at furthest only to answer objections to the doctrine." Professor Chace founds his own argument chiefly upon the gradual and progressive development of life in our planet, from the epoch of its earliest inhabitant down to the present hour, which development, taken in connection with the capacities and endowments of the soul, indicates, on the part of the Creator, a purpose to continue it in being.

See, besides the authorities already referred to, Marsilius Ficinus, *De Immortalitate Animæ* (Par. 1641, fol.); an extract of it is given in Buhle, *Gesch. d. neueren Philosophie*, ii, 171 sq.; Spalding, *Bestimmung des Menschen* (Leips. 1794); Struvius, *Hist. Doct. Græcorum et Romanorum, de Statu Animarum post mortem* (Alten, 1803, 8vo); Meier, *Philosophische Lehre v. Zustand der Seele;* Mendelssohn, *Phædon* (Berlin, 1821); Hamann, *Unsterblichkeit* (Leips. 1773, 8vo); Jacobi, *Philos. Beweis. d. Unsterblichkeit* (Dessau, 1783); Fichte (J. G.), *Destination of Man* (tr. by Mrs. R. Sinnett, London, 1846, 12mo); Jean Paul Richter, *Das Campaner-Thal.* (Frankf. 1797, 8vo); Olshausen, *Antiq. Patrum de Immortalitate Sententiæ* (Regiom. 1827, 4to); Herrick, *Sylloge Scriptorum de Immortalitate*, etc. (Regensb. 1790, 8vo); Knapp, *Theology*, § 149; Hüffell, *Ueber d. Unsterblichkeit d. menschlichen Seele* (Carlsruhe, 1832); Hase, *Evangel. Protest. Dogmatik*, § 82, 84; Duncan, *Evidence of Reason for Immortality* (1779, 8vo); Tillotson, *Sermons*, ix, 309; Hale, Sir Matthew, *Works*, i, 331; Stanhope, *Boyle Lectures* (1702, 4to, serm. 3); Foster, *Sermons*, i, 373; Sherlock, *Works*, i, 124; Dwight, *Sermons*, i, 145; Channing, *Works*, iv, 169; Chalmers, *Works*, x, 415; Drew, *on Immortality* (Philadel. 1830, 12mo); Newman, *The Soul* (Lond. 1849, 12mo); *Quarterly Review*, Aug. 1834, p. 35; *New York Review*, i, 331; Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*, p. 209–212; Robert Hall, *Works*, i, 189; ii, 373; Howe, *Works*, 8vo ed., p. 193; *Amer. Bible Repository*, x, 411; *Christian Spectator*, viii, 556; *New Englander*, ix, 544 sq.; xi, 362 sq.; xiv, 115 sq., 161 sq.; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* July, 1864, p. 515; Oct. 1863, p. 685; July, 1860, p. 510; Jan. 1865, p. 133; *Bib. Sacra*, 1860, p. 810 sq.; *Baptist Quart. Rev.* 1870, April, art. v; *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, April, 1870, art. i; Schalberg (Dr. J.), *Unsterblichkeit o. d. pers. Fortdauer d. Seele n. d. Tode* (3d edit. Naumberg, 1869); Egomet, *Life and Immortality* (Lond. 1860); Schott, *Sterben u. Unsterblichkeit* (Stuttg. 1861); Dumesnil, *L'Immortalité* (Paris, 1861); Naville, *La Vie Eternelle* (Par. 1863); Huber, *Idee d. Unsterblichkeit* (Munich, 1864); Baguenault de Puchesse, *L'Immortalité* (Par. 1864); Pfaff, *Ideen e. Arztes ü. d. Unsterblichkeit d. Seele* (Dresden, 1864); Wilmarshof, *Das Jenseits* (Lpz. 1863); Nitzsch, *System of Christian Doctrine* (see Index); Pye Smith, *First Lines of Christ. Theol.* p. 144, 352, 357; Saisset, *Modern Pantheism* (Edinburgh, 1863, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 140 sq., 263; ii, 36 sq.; Alger, *History of Future Life* (3d ed. Phila. 1864); Schneider, *Die Unsterblichkeitsidee*, etc. (Regensb. 1870, 8vo); Brinton, *Myths of the New World* (N. Y. 1868, 12mo). (J. H. W.)

Immovable Feasts. See FEASTS.

Immunities OF THE CLERGY. See IMMUNITY.

Immunity, ECCLESIASTICAL. In ecclesiastical jurisprudence a distinction is made between ecclesiastical immunity (*immunitas ecclesiastica*) and the immunity of the Church (*immunitas ecclesiæ*). The latter is the right of refuge or asylum (q. v.), the former denotes the exemption of the Church from the general obligations of the community. The ministers of religion have at all times and in all countries enjoyed particular privileges and liberties. This was the case with the priests of pagan Rome, whose privileges were transferred to the Christian clergy by Constantine. Among these privileges we notice particularly exemption from taxes (*census*), from menial service (*munera sordida*), etc. To this was added also the privilege of separate spiritual jurisdiction. See JURISDICTION, ECCLESIASTICAL. These immunities belonged to the members of the clergy, their wives, children, domestics, and to the goods of the Church, but did not extend to their private property, or to persons entering the clergy simply to free themselves from civil charges. In 532 Justinian added to these privileges that of guardianship, permitting presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons to act as guardians or trustees, but not extending the privilege to bishops or monks (*Nov.* cxxiii, cap. 5; *Anth. Presbyteros C.* cit. i, 3). The ancient Germans also granted great privileges to their priests. Julius Cæsar considered them as the next class to the nobility, and said, "Magno (Druides) sunt apud eos honore" (*De bello Gallico*, lib. vi, cap. 13). "Druides a bello abesse consueverunt, neque tributa una cum reliquis pendunt, militiæ vocationis omniumque rerum habent immunitatem" (*ib.* cap. 14). When Germany was Christianized, the clergy preserved the same privileges, besides those granted them by the Roman law, which was recognised as the standard (*secundum legem Romanum ecclesia vivit* [*Lex Ribuaria*, tit. lviii, § 1, etc.]). The stipulation of the third Council of Toledo in 589, can. 21 (c. 69, can. xii, qu. ii) that the auditors, bishops, and clergy should not be subject to compulsory services, was also granted afterwards (*Capitulare* a. 744, cap. 7; compare Benedict's *Capitularien-sammlung*, lib. iii, cap. 290). The protection which the Church granted to all who connected themselves with it soon became a source of great profit; it was known in the 6th century under the name of *mitium*, or *mittium legitimum* (Roth, *Gesch. d. Beneficialwesens* [Erlangen, 1850], p. 163 sq.). To this right of protection of the Church was subsequently added that of collecting and appropriating to its own use the taxes which would otherwise have been levied on its protegés by the fiscal officers: this right was called *emunitas*, and was conferred by the kings. These fiscal taxes included fines, etc., of which the holders of immunities became the recipients. In after times the Church obtained also the right of assembling armies, which was called *territorium* (see *Formulæ Andegavenses*, 4, 8, 21, 22, etc.), and which laid the foundation of the subsequent ecclesiastical principalities (see Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutchlands*, vol. ii, § 97; Waitz, *Deutsche*

Verfassungsgeschichte, ii, 290 sq., 570 sq.). These immunities were further specified in the laws of the French kingdom (see *Capitula synodi Vernensis* a. 755, c. 19, 28; *Cap. Motens.* a 756, c. 8, etc.), as were also those of the individual members of the clergy, and of the Church properties. St. Louis decided that each church should have a piece of land (*mansus*) free from all taxations, etc. (*Capit.* a. 816, c. 10, 25; can. xxiii, qu. viii). Such properties subject to taxes as did come into the hands of the Church did not, however, become free on that account, unless by an especial favor of the king (*Capit. iii, Caroli M.* a. 812, c. 11; *Capit. iv, Ludov.* a. 819, c. 2). The immunities were, however, greatly abused, and lost their importance, notwithstanding the decisions of the Council of Trent, Sess. xxv, cap. 20 ("Ecclesiæ et ecclesiarum personarum immunitatem Dei ordinatione et canonicis sanctionibus constitutam esse"), and the bull *In cœna Domini* (q. v.). To what extent the properties of the clergy and of the Church are now free has been settled by subsequent decrees. As a rule, the clergy are free from the general taxes, and from the personal duties of private citizens. The candidates for priests' orders and students in theology are usually exempt from military service. The churches and their property enjoy generally the same privileges as the government buildings and state property. Personal immunity from taxes, military services, etc., is regularly granted to the clergy, as also to teachers, in Protestant as well as in Roman Catholic countries. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 642; Gosselin, *Power of the Pope* (see Index); Augusti, *Handbuch d. christ. Archäol.* i, 303 sq.

Immutability, the divine attribute of unchangeableness indicated in the great title of God, I AM. So James i, 17: "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Psa. xxxiii, 11: "The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations;" cii, 25-27: "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end." God is immutable as to his essence, being the one necessary being. He is immutable also in ideas and knowledge, since these are eternal. "If we consider the nature of God, that he is a self-existent and independent Being, the great Creator and wise Governor of all things; that he is a spiritual and simple Being, without parts or mixture such as might induce a change; that he is a sovereign and uncontrollable Being, whom nothing from without can affect or alter; that he is an eternal Being, who always has and always will go on in the same tenor of existence; an omniscient Being, who, knowing all things, has no reason to act contrary to his first resolves; and in all respects a most perfect Being, who can admit of no addition or diminution; we cannot but believe that, both in his essence, in his knowledge, and in his will and purposes, he must of necessity be unchangeable. To suppose him otherwise is to suppose him an imperfect being; for if he change it must be either to a greater perfection than he had before or to a less; if to a greater perfection, then was there plainly a defect in him, and a privation of something better than what he had or was; then, again, was he not always the *best*, and consequently not always God: if he change to a lesser perfection, then does he fall into a defect again; lose a perfection he was possessed once of, and so ceasing to be the best being, cease at the same time to be God. The sovereign perfection of the Deity, therefore, is an invincible bar against all mutability; for, whichever way we suppose him to change, his supreme excellency is nulled or impaired by it. We esteem changeableness in men either an imperfection or a fault: their natural changes, as to their persons, are from weakness and vanity; their moral changes, as to their inclinations and purposes, are from ignorance or inconstancy, and therefore this quality is no way compatible with the glory and attributes of God" (Charnock, *On the Divine Attributes*).

"Various speculations on the divine immutability occur in the writings of divines and others, which, though often well intended, ought to be received with caution, and sometimes even rejected as bewildering or pernicious. Such are the notions that God knows everything by *intuition;* that there is no succession of ideas in the divine mind; that he can receive no new idea; that there are no affections in God, for to suppose this would imply that he is capable of *emotion;* that if there are affections in God, as love, hatred, etc., they always exist in the same degree, or else he would suffer change: for these and similar speculations, reference may be had to the schoolmen and metaphysicians by those who are curious in such subjects; but the impression of the divine character, thus represented, will be found very different from that conveyed by those inspired writings in which God is not spoken of *by men*, but speaks of *himself;* and nothing could be more easily shown than that most of these notions are either idle, as assuming that we know more of God than is revealed; or such as tend to represent the divine Being as rather a necessary than a free agent, and his moral perfections as resulting from a blind physical *necessity* of nature more than from an essential moral excellence; or, finally, as unintelligible or absurd. The true immutability of God consists, not in his adherence to his *purposes*, but in his never changing the *principles* of his administration; and he may therefore, in perfect accordance with his preordination of things, and the immutability of his nature, purpose to do, under certain conditions dependent upon the free agency of man, what he will not do under others; and for this reason, that an immutable adherence to the *principles* of a wise, just, and gracious government requires it. Prayer is in Scripture made one of these conditions; and if God has established it as one of the principles of his moral government to accept prayer in every case in which he has given us authority to ask, he has not, we may be assured, entangled his actual government of the world with the bonds of such an eternal predestination of particular events as either to reduce prayer to a mere form of words, or not to be able himself, consistently with his decrees, to answer it, whenever it is encouraged by his express engagements." See Watson, *Institutes*, i, 401; ii, 492; Perrone, *Tractatus de Deo*, part ii, ch. ii; Knapp, *Theology*, § 20; Graves, *Works*, iii, 283; Dorner, in *Jahrbuch f. deutsche Theologie*, 1859, 1860 (see Index). See also ATTRIBUTES; GOD.

Im'na and **Im'nah**, the name of several men, of different form in the original, which is not accurately observed in the English Version.

1. Hebrew YIMNA' (יִמְנָע, *restrainer;* Sept. Ἰμανά, Vulg. *Jemna*, Auth. Vers. "Imna"), one of the sons apparently of Helem, the brother of Shamer, a descendant of Asher, but at what distance is not clear (1 Chron. vii, 35). B.C. prob. cir. 1618. See HOTHAM.

2. Hebrew YIMNAH' (יִמְנָה, *fortunate;* Sept. in Gen. xlvi, 17, Ἰεμνά, Vulg. *Jamne*, Auth. Vers. "Jimnah;" in Numb. xxvi, 44, Ἰαμίν and Ἰαμινί, *Jemna* and *Jemnaitæ*, "Jimna" and "Jimnites;" in 1 Chron. vii, 30, Ἰεμνά, *Jemna*, "Imnah"), the first-named of the sons of Asher, and founder of a family who bore his name. B. C. 1874.

3. (Same Hebrew name as last; Sept. Ἰεμνά, Vulg. *Jemna*, Auth. Vers. "Imnah"). The father of Kore, which latter was the Levite in charge of the east gate of the Temple, and appointed by Hezekiah over the free-will offerings (2 Chron. xxxi, 14). B. C. 726.

Impanation (Latin, *impanatio;* from *in* and *panis*, bread; otherwise *assumptio*), a name given to one of the many different shades of the doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucha-

rist. The theory was first presented in the 12th century by Ruprecht of Deutz in the following shape (*Opera* ed. Col. 1602, i, 267; *Comm. in Exod.* ii, 10): "As God did not alter human nature when he incarnated divinity in the womb of the Virgin Mary, uniting the Word and the flesh into one being, so he does not alter the substance of the bread and the wine in the Eucharist, which still retain the material properties by which they are known to our senses (*sensibus subactum*), while by his Word he brings them (the component elements) into combination with the identical body and the identical blood of Christ. As the Word descended from on high (*a summo*), not to become flesh, but to assume the flesh (*assumendo carnem*), so are the bread and wine, from their inferior (*ab imo*) position, raised into becoming flesh and blood of Christ, without, therefore, being transmuted (*non mutatum*) in such a manner as to acquire the taste of flesh or the appearance of blood, but do, on the contrary, imperceptibly become identical with both in their essence, partaking of the divine and human immortal substance, which is in Christ. It is not the effect of the Holy Ghost's operation (*affectus*) to alter or destroy the nature of any substance used for his purpose, but, on the contrary, to add to that substance some qualities which it did not at first possess" (*De Opp. Spirit.* s. iii, p. 21, 22). In his work *De divinis Officiis* (ii, 9; *Opp.* ii, 762), he says: "The Word of the Father comes in between the flesh and the blood which he received from the womb of the Virgin, and the bread and wine received from the altar, and of the two makes a joint offering. When the priest puts this into the mouth of the believer, bread and wine are received, and are absorbed into the body; but the Son of the Virgin remains whole and unabsorbed in the receiver, united to the Word of the Father in heaven. Such as do not believe, on the contrary, receive only the material bread and wine, but none of the offering." His contemporary, Alger, or Adelher, of Lüttich, writing in defense of the dogma of transubstantiation (l. iii, *De sacram. corp. et sang. D.* in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* t. xxi, Lugdun. 1677), was the first to make use of the expression *impanatio* in this sense (p. 251), "In pane Christum *impanatum* sicut Deum in carne personaliter incarnatum." Before him, however, Guitmund of Aversa had, in 1190, used the same word to express the probable meaning of Berengar (*Bibl. Max. Patr.* Lugdun. xviii, 441), whose supporters are sometimes called *Adessenarii* (q. v.) (from *adesse*, to be present).

The doctrine of impanation was afterwards, in the Reformation period, but wrongly, attributed to Osiander by Carlstadt. Some Roman Catholic writers, e. g. Bellarmine (*Dissert. de impan. et consubstant.* Jenæ, 1677), Du Cange, and others, accused Luther of having revived the old error of impanation. The *Formula Concordiæ* (1577) declares that the "mode of union between the body of Christ and the bread and wine is a mystery," and does not decide positively what that mode is, but only negatively what it is not. "It is not a *personal* union, nor is it *consubstantio*; still less is it a union in which change of substance is wrought (*transubstantiatio*), nor a union in which the body and blood of Christ are included in the bread and wine (*impanatio*), but a union which exists only in this sacrament, and therefore is called *sacramentalis*." See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 644; Knapp, *Theology*, § 146; and the articles LORD'S SUPPER; CONSUBSTANTIATION; TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Impeccabilès, a name given to certain heretics in the ancient Church, who boasted that they were incapable of sin, and that there was no need of repentance; such were some of the Gnostics, Priscillianists, etc. See IMPECCABILITY.

Impeccability, the state of a person who *cannot sin*, or who, by grace, is delivered from the possibility of sinning. Some speculations have appeared in the world upon the supposed peccability of the human nature of Christ, founded chiefly on certain expressions in the Epistle to the Hebrews (iv, 15) and elsewhere, asserting that Christ was "in all points tempted like as we are." It is argued, on the other hand, that as the Scripture has been silent on this point, it is both needless and presumptuous to attempt to draw any inferences from such expressions as that above cited; and that we should acquiesce in, and be satisfied with, the declaration that "in him is no sin" (1 John iii, 5). See Art. xv of Church of England, "Of Christ alone without sin." Impeccability, or, at least, sinless perfection, has also been claimed for every true child of God upon the authority of 1 John iii, 9, though improperly, the word "cannot" requiring to be taken (as in many other passages of Scripture) in such a latitude as to express, not an *absolute impossibility* of sinning, but "a strong disinclination," in the renewed nature, to sin "in such a manner and to such a degree as others."—Eden, *Theol. Dict.* s. v.; Ullmann, *Sinlessness of Jesus* (Edinb. 1858, 12mo), p. 46; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes Chrét.* (see Index). See CHRIST, SINLESSNESS OF; PERFECTION; SANCTIFICATION.

Imperiali, Laurent, a Roman Catholic prelate of whose early life nothing is known, was born about the year 1612, and was created cardinal in 1652 by pope Innocent X. He died Sept. 21, 1673.—Migne, *Encyclop. Théol.* xxxi, 1094.

Imperiali, Joseph René, an Italian prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, was born at Oria, April 26, 1651. Descending from a high family, and enjoying the intercession of great prelates, he took orders in his Church, and was rapidly promoted. In 1690 Innocent XI created him cardinal, and he was sent as ambassador to Ferrara. At the papal conclave in 1730 he came within one vote of being elected the incumbent of the papal throne. He died Jan. 15, 1737.—Hoefer, *Nour. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 833; Migne, *Encyclop. Théol.* xxxi, 1094 sq.

Implicit Faith. See FAITH.

Impluvium, anciently a large area or spot of ground between the great porch of the church and the church itself. Because uncovered and exposed to the air, it was called *atrium* or *impluvium*. Eusebius called it *αἴθριον*. "In this court or church-yard was the station of the energumens (q. v.), and that class of penitents called *προσκλαίοντες* or *flentes*. These persons were commonly entitled *χειμάζοντες* or *χειμαζόμενοι*, from the circumstance of their standing in the open air, exposed to all changes of the weather" (Riddle, *Christian Antiq.* p. 725 sq.). The practice of burning their dead in the impluvium was initiated in the 4th century, but it did not become general until after the 6th century. There were also frequently buildings auxiliary to the church edifice placed in the impluvium, such as the baptisteries, places where the candidates of the Church were instructed and prepared for baptism, etc. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Importunity (*ἀναίδεια*) IN PRAYER, an important element of success (Luke xi, 8), as evincing earnestness, a faith that takes no denial, and especially a perseverance that continues to intercede until the request is granted (compare Luke xviii, 1; 1 Thess. v, 17). See PRAYER.

Imposition of Hands, a ceremony used by most Christian churches in ordination, and by others in confirmation. The expressions generally used in the Scriptures for the rite of *imposition of hands* are: שׂ֫ים, or שִׁית (סמך), with יד, עַל, etc., in the O. T.; and *ἐπιτίθημι, τίθημι χεῖρα τινί, ἐπί τινα, ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν* in the N. T. See HAND.

I. *Origin and symbolical Meaning of the Act.*—The practice of the imposition of hands as a symbolical act is of remote antiquity. It is "a natural form by which benediction has been expressed in all ages and among all people. It is the act of one superior either by age or spiritual position towards an inferior, and by its very form it appears to bestow some gift, or to manifest a de-

sire that some gift should be bestowed. It may be an evil thing that is symbolically bestowed, as when guiltiness was thus transferred by the high-priest to the scape-goat from the congregation (Lev. xiv, 21); but, in general, the gift is of something good which God is supposed to bestow by the channel of the laying on of hands." The principle of the practice seems to rest on the importance of the hand itself, both in the bodily organism and in the moral activity of man, in its power and in its action. Thus we find the hand raised in anger, extended in pity, the avenging hand, the helping hand, etc. In Greek a distinction exists between the hand extended to shelter or protect (χεῖρα ὑπερέχειν), and the hand held out imploringly (χεῖρας ἀνασχεῖν); consequently between the powerful, directing hand of God, and the imploring hand of man. The *Biblical* signification of the imposition of hands rests, in general, on the consideration of the hand as the organ of *transmission*, both in the real and in the symbolical sense. This results from the fact that not only did the party offering sacrifice bless the offering by the imposition of hands, but by the same act he, as sinner, imparted to it also his sins and his curse (see Lev. i, 4; iii, 2; viii, 14 sq.; xvi, 21, 24). Bähr (*Symbolik d. mosaischen Cultus*, ii, 339) rejects this idea of transmission of sin by the laying on of hands on the expiatory victim; he considers it only as a symbol of "renunciation of one's own," and argues from the fact of a like imposition of hands in the case of thanksgiving offerings. According to Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, ii, 1, p. 155), the imposition of hands in sacrifices signified the power of the party offering it over the life of the victim. Baumgarten, on the contrary (*Commentar z. Pentateuch*, i, 2, p. 180), and Kurtz (*Das mosaische Opfer*, p. 70; *Gesch. d. A. B.* p. 332), maintain the idea of transmission. The imposition of hands on all offerings presents no difficulty when we adhere to the general notion of transmission; the thanksgiving offering is by it made the recipient of the giver's feelings. This idea of transmission is especially manifest in the imposition of hands in consecration or blessing. Thus, "in the Old Testament, Jacob accompanies his blessing to Ephraim and Manasseh with imposition of hands (Gen. xlviii, 14); Joshua is ordained in the room of Moses by imposition of hands (Numb. xxvii, 18; Deut. xxxiv, 9); cures seem to have been wrought by the prophets by imposition of hands (2 Kings v, 11); and the high-priest, in giving his solemn benediction, stretched out his hands over the people (Lev. ix, 22). The same form was used by our Lord in blessing, and occasionally in healing, and it was plainly regarded by the Jews as customary or befitting (Matt. xix, 13; Mark viii, 23; x, 16). One of the promises at the end of Mark's Gospel to Christ's followers is that they should cure the sick by laying on of hands (Mark xvi, 18); and accordingly we find that Saul received his sight (Acts ix, 17), and Publius's father was healed of his fever (Acts xxviii, 8) by imposition of hands."

II. *Classification of Biblical Uses.*—More particularly, the imposition of hands, in the O. T., may be divided into (1) the patriarchal-typical laying on of hands in blessing; (2) the legal-symbolical, in consecration to office; and (3) the prophetico-dynamical in healing. The former (see Gen. xlviii, 14) is a sort of typical transmission of a promised hereditary blessing continued, through the party thus blessed, on his posterity; the second (see Exod. xxix, 10; Numb. xxvii, 18) is a legal figurative imparting of the rights of office, and a promise of the blessing attached to it; the third is the transmission of a miraculous healing power for the restoration of life (2 Kings iv, 34). Yet in the latter case we must notice that the prophet put his hands on the hands of the child, and covered it with his whole body. Thus this transmission points us, in its yet imperfect state, to the N. Test. The N.-T. imposition of hands is symbolical of the transmission of spirit and life. Here, as in the O. T., we find three uses: (1) the spiritual-patriarchal imposition of hands by our Lord and the apostles; (2) the spiritual-legal, or official imposition of hands; (3) the healing imposition of hands. Christ lays his hands on the sufferers, and they are cured. But the bodily gifts he thus transmits are joined to spiritual gifts; he cures under the condition of faith (Mark vi, 5). The more the people become imbued with the idea that the curative effects are connected with the material imposition of hands, the more he operates without it (Mark v, 23, 41; vii, 32). Sometimes he healed only by a word. The full grant of his Spirit and of his calling he represented in a real, but symbolical manner, when he extended his hands over his apostles in blessing at the Mount of Olives (Luke xxiv, 50). This imposition of the hands of the Lord on his apostles, in connection with the imparting of his Spirit, is the source of the *apostolical* imposition of hands. It was also originally a blending of the symbol and its fulfilment (see Acts viii, 17), as well as of the bodily and spiritual imparting of life (Acts ix, 17). From this general imposition of hands, under which Christians received the baptism of the Spirit, came the official, apostolic imposition of hands (Acts xiii, 3; 1 Tim. iv, 14). At the same time, the example of Cornelius (Acts x) shows that the apostolical imparting of the Holy Spirit was not restricted to the forms of official or even general imposition of hands.

III. *Ecclesiastical Uses.*—In the early Church, the imposition of hands was practised in receiving catechumens, in baptism, in confirmation, and in ordination. Cyprian derives its use from apostolical practice (*Ep.* 72, *ad Stephan.*; *Ep.* 73, *ad Jubæan.*); so also does Augustine (*De Bapt.* iii, 16). That the imposition of hands in receiving catechumens was different from that used in baptism, etc., is shown by Bingham (bk. x, ch. i). Its use in baptism was general as early as Tertullian's time (Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. xix, § 4). This probably gave rise to confirmation. After that rite was introduced, imposition of hands became its chief ceremony. It was generally performed by the bishop, but elders were authorized to do it in certain cases, in subordination to the bishop. See CONFIRMATION.

In ordination, the imposition of hands was an essential part of the ceremony from an early period, but not in the ordination of any class below deacons. See ORDINATION.

In the modern Church, imposition of hands is considered by the Romanists as an essential part of the sacraments of baptism, ordination, and confirmation (*Concil. Trident.* Sess. xxiii). "As in the ancient Church this rite existed in two forms—the actual laying on of hands, which was called *chirothesia;* and the extending the hand over or towards the person, which was styled *chirotonia*—so in the Roman Catholic Church the former is retained as an essential part of the sacraments of confirmation and holy orders; the latter is employed in the administration of the priestly absolution. Both forms are familiarly used in blessing. In the mass, also, previous to the consecration of the elements of bread and wine, the priest extends his hands over them, repeating at the same time the preparatory prayer of blessing" (Wetzer's *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iv, 853). The Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church employ it as a symbolical act, in confirmation and ordination; the Methodist Episcopal, the Presbyterian, and Congregational churches employ it only in ordination. Great stress is also laid on the performance of this rite in the Greek Church. In the Russo-Greek Church there exist some sects *without priests*, "because in their idea the gift of consecration by laying on of hands, which had continued from the apostles down to Nicon (q. v.), had been lost by the apostacy of Nicon, and of the clergy seduced by him, and thus all genuine priesthood had become impossible" (Eckardt, *Modern Russia*, p. 261 sq., London, 1870, 8vo). It is particularly pleasing to notice the many ingenious devices of these sects to provide for a priesthood descended from the apostles, in order to

enable at least the performance of the rite of marriage, which they do not legalize unless performed by an *accepted* priest. The Jews assert that the laying on of hands, together with the Sanhedrim, ceased after the death of Rabbi Hillel, the "prince," who flourished in the 4th century. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 504; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. ii, ch. xxii; bk. iii, ch. i; bk. xii, ch. iii; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, p. 122, 369, 411; *Apost. and Primit. Ch.* (Phila. 1869, 12mo), p. 185 sq.; Augusti, *Handb. d. Archäologie*, iii, 222; Hall, *Works*, ii, 876; B. Baur, in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1865, p. 343 sq.; Rothe, *Anfänge d. christl. Kirche*, p. 161, etc. For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index*, p. 74, 145. See BENEDICTION.

Impost (Lat. *impositus*) is an architectural term for the horizontal mouldings or capitals *on the top* of a pilaster, pillar, or pier, from which an arch springs. "In classical architecture the form varies in the several orders; sometimes the entablature of an order serves for the impost of an arch. In Middle-Age architecture imposts vary according to the style; on pillars and the small shafts in the jambs of doorways, windows, etc., they are usually complete *capitals*." See Parker, *Concise Glossary of Architecture*, p. 128; Wolcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 325.

Barton Seagrave, cir. 1160.

Impostor, RELIGIOUS, a name appropriately given to such as pretend to an extraordinary commission from heaven, and who terrify the people with false denunciations of judgments. Too many of these have abounded in almost all ages. They are punishable in some countries with fine, imprisonment, and corporeal punishment.

Impostoribus. See IMPOSTORS, THE THREE.

Impostors, THE THREE (*Impostoribus, De tribus*). Towards the end of the 10th century a rumor became current that there had appeared a book under the above title, in which the author attempted to prove that the world had been grossly deceived three times (by the founders of the three principal religions). In the latter part of the 13th century this supposed work attracted great attention among theologians and *savans*, particularly on account of the mystery which shrouded its origin, its author, and even its contents, for it was not only wellnigh impossible to procure a copy of the book, but even the contents were hardly known definitely to anybody. Towards the close of the 16th century the rumors concerning this book were again set on foot. The most extravagant ideas prevailed, and the authorship of the unknown work was in turn attributed to the emperors Frederick I and II, Averrhoes, Petrus a Vineis, Alphonso X, king of Castile, Boccaccio, Poggio, L. Aretin, Pomponazzio, Machiavelli, Erasmus, P. Aretino, Ochinus, Servetus, Rabelais, Gruetus, Barnaud, Muret, Nachtigall, Giordano Bruno, Campanella, Milton, etc. It is no wonder that soon a number of books, entirely different from each other, made their appearance, each claiming to be the original work. The four most important were: 1. Vincentii Panurgi *Epistola ad cl. virum Joannem Baptistum Morinum de tribus impostoribus* (Paris, 1644); 2. *De tribus Nebulonibus* (namely, Thomas Aniello, Oliver Cromwell, Julius Mazarinus); 3. *History of the three famous Impostors* (Lond. 1667); 4. Christiani Kortholdi *Liber de tribus magnis impostoribus* (nempe Eduardo Herbert de Cherbury, Thoma Hobbes, et Benedicto de Spinosa) (Kiloni, 1680). In 1716 an unknown person of Haag claimed to possess the original in his library, and that it was the work of Petrus a Vineis, containing the thoughts of the emperor Frederick II, and written in 1230. Several copies of this work appeared soon after in French; the owner claimed to have made a vow not to copy the book, which, however, did not prevent him from translating it. A German *chevalier d'industrie* named Ferber finally published a work under the title of *De tribus impostoribus, des trois imposteurs* (Francfort sur le Main, 1721), but it was found to be only the work *L'Esprit de Spinoze* (which had been published in MS. at the beginning of the 18th century) under a new name. In the mean time there appeared a Latin work of the same title, the MS. of which bears the date of 1598. This may be the original work, though probably the date has been altered, as it bears internal evidence of having been written about 1556 or 1560. Nothing is known of its author, except that, judging from the bad Latin in which it is written, he could not have belonged to the educated classes. Some think that the original title could hardly have been *De tribus impostoribus*, as it does not call either of the founders of the three religions—Moses, Christ, Mohammed—outright impostors, but that the real title must have been *De imposturis religionum.* The existing MSS. present two different recensions: one, the shortest, bears the latter title; the other, which is longer, and is evidently an enlarged and altered edition, has the title *De tribus impostoribus.* Yet, with the exception of a few unimportant passages, the two are essentially alike.

The author attacks the morality of the Jews and of the Christians, saying that Abraham wished to honor God by offering up human sacrifices, and that the Christians wickedly pray for the destruction of their enemies; that polygamy is permitted by Moses, and even by some of the passages of the N. T., etc. "That twice two make four is so self-evident that there is no necessity of bringing all the mathematicians together to demonstrate it; but religions are so diversified that they do not agree either in the premises, the arguments, or the conclusions, and any one brought up in one of them is likely to continue to believe his own, whatever it be, the only true religion, to the exclusion of all others." Hence the author rejects equally the Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan religions, and proposes that every point of belief should be established by a system of witnesses and counter-witnesses, forming a regular *processus in infinitum.* See Rosenkranz, *Der Zweifel am Glauben* (Halle, 1830); F. W. Genthe, *De impostura relig. breve compendium* (Lpz. 1833); Prosper Marchand, *Dict. Historique*, i, 312 sq.; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 212 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* bk. iii, cent. xiii, pt. i, ch. ii, p. 284, note 5; Herzog, *Theol. Encyklop.* vi, 645; *Am. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1862, p. 164 sq. (J. H. W.)

Impotency, the want of procreative power, is, according to the ecclesiastical law of the Roman Catholic Church, a good ground for either of the two parties annulling the marriage, if the impotency existed at the time the contract was entered into (cap. 2, 3, 4, X, *De frigidis*, 4, 15). But the defect must not only be proved by competent medical advisers, but also pronounced by them as incurable (cap. iv, 14, X, *De probationibus*, ii, 19; cap. 5, 6, 7, X, *De frigidis*, iv, 15; *Resolutio* 96 to *Sess.* 24 of the Tridentine Council of 1731, 1732, in the Leipzig edition by Richter, p. 258 sq.). If any doubt arises the marriage contract continues in force three years longer, to further test the impotency of the person so accused. At the expiration of this additional term of trial the oath of one or both of the parties is necessary to obtain permission for separation. The oldest ecclesiastical laws of the Protestants follow in the main

these practices (compare Göschen, *Doctrina de matrimonio*, note 6, p. 102-106; Eichhorn, *Kirchenrecht*, ii, 348; Permanender, *Kirchenrecht*, p. 697; Walter, *Kirchenrecht*, p. 305). In Great Britain this practice is sanctioned by the civil law of the land (compare Chambers, *Encyclop.* v, 527). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iii, 474. See also MATRIMONY. (J. H. W.)

Imprecation, an appeal to God, invoking his curse upon (1) either one's self or (2) another. For the former, see OATH. The latter, which occurs frequently in the so-called "imprecatory Psalms" (see Edwards, *On the Divine Imprecations*, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, i, 97; *Presb. Quart. Rev.* App. 1861; *British and For. Ev. Rev.* July, 1864; Heine, *Abus. Ps. cix, imprec.* Helmst. 1739), is justified partly by the atrocity of some of the crimes execrated (e. g. that of Doeg), and partly by the fact of special authority in the act of inspiration. See ACCURSED; CANAANITES, DESTRUCTION OF; PSALMS.

Imprisonment. See PRISON; PUNISHMENTS.

Improperia (Lat. *taunts*). (1.) Reproaches of Jesus against the Jewish people. See CAPERNAUM; JERUSALEM. (2.) In the Roman Catholic ritual, certain verses which reproach the Jews with ingratitude, and which, while the priest and other ecclesiastics present kiss the cross, are chanted by two singers personifying Christ, in such a manner that after each verse one chorus replies in the Greek and another in the Latin, praises to God; or the accusation as uttered by the priests is repeated on the part of the choir.—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 838. (J. H. W.)

Impropriation, in Great Britain, a parsonage or ecclesiastical living, the profits of which are in the hands of a layman; in which case it stands distinguished from *appropriation*, which is where the profits of a benefice are in the hands of a bishop, college, etc., though the terms are now used promiscuously in England.

Impulse. The desires or sensations of the soul are manifested by impulses, which tend either to the realization of some idea, the acquirement of something exterior to ourselves, or the repulsion of something disagreeable or hurtful. The impulses accompanying divers thoughts and feelings may, according to their expression, be corporeal, spiritual, or intellectual. We must be careful how we are guided by impulses in religion. "There are many," as one observes, "who frequently feel singular impressions upon their minds, and are inclined to pay a very strict regard unto them. Yea, some carry this point so far as to make it almost the only rule of their judgment, and will not determine anything until they find it *in their hearts to do it*, as their phrase is. Others take it for granted that the divine mind is notified to them by sweet or powerful impressions of some passages of sacred writ. There are others who are determined by visionary manifestations, or by the impressions made in dreams, and the interpretations they put upon them. All these things, being of the same general nature, may very justly be considered together; and it is a matter of doubt with many how far these things are to be regarded, or attended to by us, and how we may distinguish any divine impressions of this kind from the delusions of the tempter, or of our own evil hearts. But whoever makes any of these things his rule and standard, forsakes the divine word; and nothing tends more to make persons unhappy in themselves, unsteady in their conduct, or more dangerously deluded in their practice, than paying a random regard to these impulses, as notifications of the divine will."—Buck, *Theolog. Dictionary*, s. v.; Kant, *Grundlegung z. Metaphysik der Sitten* (pref. p. 10, 63); *Evang. Kirchenzeitung* (1853, No. 15); Ersch u. Gruber, *Encyklopädie*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, ii, 126. See ENTHUSIASM; PROVIDENCE.

Impurity, want of that regard to decency, chastity, or holiness which our duty requires. Impurity, in the law of Moses, is any legal defilement. Of these there were several sorts: some were voluntary, as the touching a dead body, or any animal that died of itself; or any creature that was esteemed unclean; or touching things holy by one who was not clean, or was not a priest; the touching one who had a leprosy, one who had a gonorrhœa, or who was polluted by a dead carcass, etc. Sometimes these impurities were involuntary, as when any one inadvertently touched bones, or a sepulchre, or anything polluted; or fell into such diseases as pollute, as the leprosy, etc. The beds, clothes, and movables which had touched anything unclean, contracted also a kind of impurity, and in some cases communicated it to others. These legal pollutions were generally removed by bathing, and lasted no longer than the evening. The person polluted plunged over head in the water, and either had his clothes on when he did so, or washed himself and his clothes separately. Other pollutions continued seven days, as that which was contracted by touching a dead body. Some impurities lasted forty or fifty days, as that of women who were lately delivered, who were unclean forty days after the birth of a boy, and fifty after the birth of a girl. Others, again, lasted till the person was cured. Many of these pollutions were expiated by sacrifices, and others by a certain water or lye made with the ashes of a red heifer sacrificed on the great day of expiation. When the leper was cured, he went to the Temple and offered a sacrifice of two birds, one of which was killed, and the other set at liberty. He who had touched a dead body, or had been present at a funeral, was to be purified with the water of expiation, and this upon pain of death. The woman who had been delivered offered a turtle and a lamb for her expiation; or, if she was poor, two turtles, or two young pigeons. These impurities, which the law of Moses has expressed with the greatest accuracy and care, were only figures of other more important impurities, such as the sins and iniquities committed against God, or faults committed against our neighbor. The saints and prophets of the Old Testament were sensible of this; and our Saviour, in the Gospel, has strongly inculcated that they are not outward and corporeal pollutions which render us unacceptable to God, but such inward pollutions as infect the soul, and are violations of justice, truth, and charity. See UNCLEANNESS.

Imputation, in the O. T. חָשַׁב, in the N. T. λογίζομαι, is employed in the Scriptures to designate any action, word, or thing, as accounted or reckoned to a person; and in all these it is unquestionably used with reference to one's *own* doings, words, or actions, and not with reference to those of a *second* person (comp. Gen. xv, 6; Psa. cv, 31; Numb. xxv, 6; xviii, 27; 2 Sam. xix, 19; Psa. xxxi, 2; Lev. vii, 18; xvii, 4; Prov. xxvii, 14; 2 Cor. v, 19; 2 Tim. iv, 16; Rom. iv, 3-23; Gal. iii, 6; Jas. ii, 23). The word *imputation* is, however, used for a certain theological theory, which teaches that (1) the sin of Adam is so attributed to man as to be considered, in the divine counsels, as his own, and to render him guilty of it; (2) that, in the Christian plan of salvation, the righteousness of Christ is so attributed to man as to be considered his own, and that he is therefore justified by it. See FALL OF MAN.

I. "Whatever diversity there may exist in the opinions of theologians respecting imputation, when they come to express their own views definitely, they will yet, for the most part, agree that the phrase *God imputes the sin of our progenitors to their posterity*, means that *for the sins committed by our progenitors God punishes their descendants*. The term *to impute* is used in different senses. (*a*.) It is said of a *creditor*, who charges something to his debtor as debt, e. g. Philem. ver. 18. (*b*.) It is transferred to human *judgment* when any one is punished, or declared deserving of punishment. *Crime* is regarded as a *debt*, which must be cancelled partly by actual restitution and partly by punishment. (*c*.) This now is applied to God, who imputes sin when he pronounces men guilty, and treats them accordingly, i. e.

when he actually punishes the sin of men (חָשַׁב עָוֹן, λογίζεσθαι ἁμαρτίαν, Psa. xxxii, 2). The one punished is called נְשָׂא עָוֹן, in opposition to one to whom חָשַׁב לִצְדָקָה, who is *rewarded* (Psa. cvi, 31; Rom. iv, 3)" (Knapp, *Theology*, § 76).

1. The stronghold of the doctrine of imputation, with those who maintain the high Calvinistic sense of that tenet, is Rom. v, 12-19. "The greatest difficulties with respect to this doctrine have arisen from the fact that many have treated what is said by Paul in the fifth of Romans—a passage wholly popular, and anything but formally exact and didactic—in a learned and philosophical manner, and have defined terms used by him in a loose and popular way by logical and scholastic distinctions. Paul shows, in substance, that all men are regarded and punished by God as sinners, and that the ground of this lies in the act of one man; as, on the contrary, deliverance from punishment depends also upon one man, Jesus Christ. If the words of Paul are not perverted, it must be allowed that in Rom. v, 12-14 he thus reasons: The cause of the universal mortality of the human race lies in Adam's transgression. He sinned, and so became mortal. Other men are regarded and treated by God as punishable, because they are the posterity of Adam, the first transgressor, and consequently they too are mortal. Should it now be objected, that the men who lived from Adam to Moses might themselves have personally *sinned*, and so have been punished with death on their own account, it might be answered that those who lived before the time of Moses had no express and positive law which threatened the punishment of sin, like those who lived after Moses. The positive law of Moses was not as yet given; they could not, consequently, be punished on account of their own transgressions, as no law was as yet given to them (ver. 14). Still they must die, like Adam, who transgressed a positive law. Hence their mortality must have another cause, and this is to be sought in the imputation of Adam's transgression. In the same way, the ground of the justificatión of man lies not in himself, but in Christ, the second Adam.

"We find that the passage in Rom. v was never understood in the ancient Grecian Church, down to the 4th century, to teach *imputation* in a strictly philosophical and judicial sense; certainly Origen, and the writers immediately succeeding him, exhibit nothing of this opinion. They regard *bodily death* as a *consequence* of the sin of Adam, and not as a *punishment*, in the strict and proper sense of this term. Thus Chrysostom says, upon Rom. v, 12, Ἐκείνου πεσόντος (Ἀδάμ), καὶ οὐ μὴ φαγόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, γεγόνασιν ἐξ ἐκείνου θνητοί. Cyril (*Adv. Anthropom.* c. 8) says, Οἱ γεγονότες ἐξ αὐτοῦ (Ἀδάμ), ὡς ἀπὸ φθαρτοῦ, φθαρτοὶ γεγόναμεν.

"The *Latin* Church, on the other hand, was the proper seat of the strict doctrine of imputation. There they began to interpret the words of Paul as if he were a scholastic and logical writer. One cause of their misapprehending so entirely the spirit of this passage was, that the word *imputare* (a word in common use among civilians and in judicial affairs) had been employed in the Latin versions in rendering ver. 13 of Rom. v; and that ἐφ' ᾧ (ver. 12) had been translated *in quo*, and could refer, as they supposed, to nobody but Adam. This opinion was then associated with some peculiar philosophical ideas at that time prevalent in the West, and from the whole a doctrine *de imputatione* was formed, in sense wholly unknown to the Hebrews, to the N. T., and to the Grecian Church. This clearly proves that the Grecian teachers, e. g. those in Palestine, took sides with Pelagius against the teachers of the African Church.

2. "Many have inferred the justice of imputation from the supposition that Adam was not only the *natural* or *seminal*, but also the *moral* head of the human race, or even its *representative* and *federal* head. They suppose, accordingly, that the sin of Adam is imputed to us on the same principle on which the doings of the head of a family, or of the plenipotentiary of a state, are imputed to his family or state, although they had no personal agency in his doings. In the same way they suppose Christ took the place of all men, and that what he did is *imputed* to them. According to this theory, God entered into a *league* or *covenant* with Adam, and so Adam represented and took the place of the whole human race. This theory was invented by some schoolmen, and has been adopted by many in the Romish and Protestant Church since the 16th century, and was defended even in the 18th century by some Lutheran theologians, as Pfaff of Tübingen, by some of the followers of Wolf (e. g. Carpzov, in his *Comm. de Imputatione facti proprii et alieni*), and by Baumgarten, in his *Dogmatik*, and disputation '*de imputatione peccati Adamitici*.' But it was more particularly favored by the Reformed theologians, especially by the disciples of Cocceius, at the end of the 17th and commencement of the 18th century, e. g. by Witsius, in his *Œconomia fœderum*. They appeal to Hos. vi, 7, 'They transgressed the covenant, like Adam,' i. e. broke the divine *laws*. But where is it said that Adam was the federal head, and that his transgression is imputed to them? On this text Morus justly observes, 'Est mera comparatio Judæorum peccantium cum Adamo peccante.' Other texts are also cited in behalf of this opinion.

"But, for various reasons, this theory cannot be correct. For (*a*.) the descendants of Adam never empowered him to be their representative and to act in their name. (*b*.) It cannot be shown from the Bible that Adam was informed that the fate of all his posterity was involved in his own. (*c*.) If the transgression of Adam is imputed, by right of covenant, to all his posterity, then, in justice, all their transgressions should be again imputed to him as the guilty cause of all their misery and sin. What a mass of guilt, then, would come upon Adam! But of all this nothing is said in the Scriptures. (*d*.) The imputation of the righteousness of Christ cannot be alleged in support of this theory; for this is imputed to men only by their own will and consent. This hypothesis has been opposed, with good reason, by John Taylor, in his work on original sin."

3. "Others endeavor to deduce the doctrine of imputation from the *scientia media* of God, or from his foreknowledge of what is conditionally possible. The sin of Adam, they say, is imputed to us because God foresaw that each one of us would have committed it if he had been in Adam's stead, or placed in his circumstances. Even Augustine says that the sin of Adam is imputed to us *propter consensionem*, or *consensum præsumptum*. This theory has been advanced, in modern times, by Reusch, in his *Introductio in Theologiam revelatam*, and in Bremquell's work *Die gute Sache Gottes, bei Zurechnung des Falls* (Jena, 1749). But it is a new sort of justice which would allow us to be punished for sins which we never committed, or never designed to commit, but only might possibly have committed under certain circumstances. Think a moment how many sins we all should have committed if God had suffered us to come into circumstances of severe temptation. An innocent man might, by this rule, be punished as a murderer because, had he lived at Paris on St. Bartholomew's night, in 1572, he might, from mistaken zeal, have killed a heretic."

II. "Since none of these hypotheses satisfactorily explain the matter, the greater part of the moderate and Biblical theologians of the Protestant Church are content with saying, what is manifestly the doctrine of the Bible, that the imputation of Adam's sin consists in the prevailing *mortality* of the human race, and that this is not to be regarded as *imputation* in the strict judicial sense, but rather as the consequence of Adam's transgression" (Knapp, *Theology*, § 76).

III. "The enlightened advocates of imputation do after all disclaim the actual *transfer* of Adam's sin to his posterity. They are well aware that the human mind

cannot be forced up to such a point as this. But they do still urgently contend for the idea that all Adam's posterity are *punished* for his sin, although they did not, in fact, commit it; and that in this sense, therefore, they are all guilty of it. Turretin's view is, that Adam's sin imputed is the ground or cause why men are born with original sin *inherent*, i. e. with natural depravity; and this is, in his view, the *punishment* inflicted because of Adam's sin imputed to them. And with him many others agree. But Calvin, Edwards, Stapfer, and others, reject the doctrine of the real imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, while they maintain that native inherent depravity is the consequence of it, which is chargeable to us as sin. This Turretin declares to be no *imputation* at all, i. e. a real rejection of his doctrine. Rejecting these views of Turretin, then, Edwards, in order to account for it how all men came to be born with *inherent* sin, labors to show that there is a *physical and psychological unity* between Adam and all his posterity. According to him, this would account for the *commencement* of native depravity, and when commenced it is imputed to us as sin, and therefore punishable, on legal ground, with temporal and eternal evil. But Turretin makes all to be *punishment* from the outset, and that on the ground of the sin of Adam, which is actually imputed to his descendants" (Stuart *on Romans*, v, 19, p. 592). Dr. H. B. Smith, in an article in the *Christian Union*, takes the advanced ground that while it must be conceded "that there is a proper interpretation," and that Adam's posterity do inherit, "by virtue of their union with him, certain penal consequences of the great apostasy," *man can be "delivered" from these evils by "divine grace," and "that for original sin, without actual transgression, no one will be consigned to everlasting death"* [italics are ours]. In an article in the *Princeton Theological Essays* (i, 138 sq.), a member of the Presbyterian Church takes even more liberal ground. "We know that it is often asserted that Augustine and his followers held the personal unity of Adam and his race. . . . . Let it be admitted that Augustine did give this explanation of the ground of imputation. Do we reject the doctrine because we reject the reason which he gives to justify and explain it? . . . . It is no special concern of ours what Augustine held on this point. . . . . Any man who holds that there is such an ascription of the sin of Adam to his posterity as to be the ground of their bearing the punishment of that sin, holds the doctrine of imputation, whether he undertakes to justify this imputation merely on the ground that we are the children of Adam, or on the principle of representation, or of *scientia media;* or whether he chooses to philosophize on the nature of unity until he confounds all notions of personal identity, as President Edwards appears to have done."

IV. The question of the imputation of Christ's active obedience to believers is very skilfully treated by Watson (*Theological Institutes*, pt. ii, chap. xxiii), himself a believer in the doctrine of imputation in a modified way. We give here a summary of his statement of the subject.

There are three opinions as to imputation.

(I.) The high Calvinistic, or Antinomian scheme, which is, that "Christ's *active* righteousness is imputed unto us as ours." In answer to this, we say, 1. It is nowhere stated in Scripture. 2. The notion here attached to Christ's *representing* us is wholly gratuitous. 3. There is no weight in the argument that, "as our sins were accounted his, so his righteousness was accounted ours;" for our sins were never so accounted Christ's as that he *did* them. 4. The doctrine involves a fiction and impossibility inconsistent with the divine attributes. 5. The acts of Christ were of a loftier character than can be supposed to be capable of being the acts of mere creatures. 6. Finally, and fatally, this doctrine shifts the meritorious cause of man's justification from Christ's "obedience unto death" to Christ's active obedience to the precepts of the law.

(II.) The opinion of Calvin himself, and many of his followers, adopted also by some Arminians. It differs from the first in not separating the active from the passive righteousness of Christ, for such a distinction would have been inconsistent with Calvin's notion that justification is simply the remission of sins. This view is adopted, with certain *modifications*, by Arminians and Wesley. But there is a slight difference, which arises from the different senses in which the word *imputation* is used: the Arminian employing it in the sense of accounting to the believer the benefit of Christ's righteousness; the Calvinist, in the sense of reckoning the righteousness of Christ as ours. An examination of the following passages will show that this latter notion has no foundation in Scripture: Psa. xxxii, 1; Jer. xxiii, 6; Isa. xlv, 24; Rom. iii, 21, 22; 1 Cor. i, 30; 2 Cor. v, 21; Rom. v, 18, 19. In connection with this last text, it is sometimes attempted to be shown that, as Adam's sin is imputed to his posterity, so Christ's obedience is imputed to those that are saved; but (Goodwin, *On Justification*), (1.) The Scripture nowhere affirms either the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, or of the righteousness of Christ to those that believe. (2.) To *impute* sin, in Scripture phrase, is to charge the guilt of sin upon a man, with a purpose to punish him for it. And (3.) as to the *imputation* of *Adam's sin to his posterity*—if by it is meant simply that the guilt of Adam's sin is charged upon his whole posterity, let it pass; but if the meaning be that all Adam's posterity are made, by this imputation, *formally* sinners, then the Scriptures do not justify it.

(III.) The imputation of *faith* for righteousness. (*a.*) *Proof* of this doctrine.—1. It is expressly taught in Scripture (Rom. iv, 3-24, etc.); nor is *faith* used in these passages by metonymy for the object of faith, that is, the righteousness of Christ. 2. The testimony of the Church to this doctrine has been uniform from the earliest ages—Tertullian, Origen, Justin Martyr, etc., down to the 16th century.

(*b.*) *Explanation* of the terms of the proposition that "faith is imputed for righteousness." 1. *Righteousness.* To be accounted *righteous* is, in the style of the apostle Paul, to be *justified*, where there has been personal guilt. 2. *Faith.* It is not faith generally considered that is imputed to us for righteousness, but faith (trust) in an atonement offered by another in our behalf. 3. *Imputation.* The non-imputation of sin to a sinner is expressly called "the imputation of righteousness without works;" the imputation of righteousness is, then, the non-punishment or pardon of sin; and by imputing faith for righteousness, the apostle means precisely the same thing.

(*c.*) The *objections* to the doctrine of the imputation of faith for righteousness admit of easy answer. 1. The papists err in taking the term justification to signify the making men morally just. 2. A second objection is, that if believing is imputed for righteousness, then justification is by works, or by somewhat in ourselves. In this objection, the term *works* is used in an equivocal sense. 3. A third objection is, that this doctrine gives occasion to boasting. But (1.) this objection lies with equal strength against the doctrine of imputed righteousness. (2.) The faith itself is the gift of God. (3.) The blessings which follow faith are given in respect to the death of Christ. (4.) Paul says that boasting is excluded by the law of faith.

(IV.) The theologians who assert the extreme doctrine of imputation are ably answered by the closing words of an article on this subject in Chambers's *Cyclopædia*, v, 529: "To *impute* sin is to deal with a *man as a sinner*, not on account of his own act, or at least not primarily on this account, but on account of the act of another; and to *impute* righteousness is to deal with man as righteous, not because *he is so*, but on account of the righteousness of Christ *reckoned as his*, and received by faith alone. The act of another stands in both cases for our own act, and we are adjudged—in the

one case condemned, in the other acquitted—not for what we ourselves have done, but for what another has done for us.

"This is a fair illustration of the tyranny which technical phrases are apt to exercise in theology as in other things. When men coin an imperfect phrase to express a spiritual reality, the reality is apt to be forgotten in the phrase, and men play with the latter as a logical counter, having a force and meaning of its own. *Imputation of sin* and *imputation of righteousness* have in this way come to represent legal or pseudo-legal processes in theology, through the working out of the mere legal analogies suggested by the word. But the true spiritual reality which lies behind the phrases in both cases is simple enough. *Imputation of sin* is, and can be nothing else than, the expression of the spiritual unity of Adam and his race. Adam 'being the root of all mankind,' the stock which has grown from this root must share in its degeneracy. The law of spiritual life, of historical continuity, implies this, and it requires no arbitrary or legal process, therefore, to account for the sinfulness of mankind as derived from a sinful source. We are sinners because Adam fell. The fountain having become polluted, the stream is polluted. We are involved in his guilt, and could not help being so by the conditions of our historical existence; but, nevertheless, his sin is not our sin, and cannot, in the strict sense, be imputed to us, for sin is essentially voluntary in every case—an act of self-will, and not a mere quality of nature; and my sin, therefore, cannot be another's, nor another's mine. In the same manner, the highest meaning of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ lies in the spiritual unity of the believer with Christ, so that he is one with Christ, and Christ one with him, and in a true sense he becomes a partaker of the divine nature. The notion of legal transference is an after-thought—the invention of polemical logic—and the fact itself is deeper and truer than the phrase that covers it. *The race one with Adam*, the *believer one with Christ*, are the ideas that are really true in the phrases *imputation of sin* and *imputation of righteousness*."

See Watson, *Institutes*, ii, 215, 241; Knapp, *Theology*, § 76, 115; Whitby, *De imputatione Peccati Adamitici;* Taylor, *Doctrine of Original Sin;* Wesley, *Sermons*, i, 171-4; Edwards, *On original Sin;* Walch, *De Obedientia Christi Activa* (Göttingen, 1754, 4to); Walch, *Neueste Religionsgeschichte*, iii, 311; *Princeton Rev.* April, 1860; Baird, *The First and Second Adam* (Philadelphia, 1860, 12mo); *Princeton Repertory*, 1830, p. 425; Whately, *Difficulties of St. Paul*, Essay vi; Stuart, *On Romans*, Excursus v, vi. See also the articles OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST; JUSTIFICATION.

Im'rah (Heb. *Yimrah'*, יִמְרָה, *refractoriness;* Sept. Ἰεμρά), one of the sons of Zophah, of the tribe of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 36). B.C. post 1612. See HOTHAM.

Im'ri (Heb. *Imri'*, אִמְרִי, *eloquent*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. omits either this or the preced. name, giving only Ἀμρί; Vulg. *Omrai*). The son of Bani, and father of Omri of Judah (1 Chron. ix, 4). B.C. much ante 536.

2. (Sept. Ἀμαρί, Vulg. *Amri*). The "father" of Zaccur, which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the Exile (Neh. iii, 2). B.C. ante 446.

Ina, king of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Wessex from 689 to 729, celebrated as the principal legislator of the Anglo-Saxons, deserves mention here on account of his enactments in favor of religious observances. He was the first in that portion of England who made the laws of Christianity the basis of all civil and social relations. Particular regard was paid to the observance of the Sabbath day; the rite of baptism was ordered to be performed on infants within thirty days after their birth, etc. His relation with the see of Rome was very intimate. He made several journeys to the Eternal City, and originated in his dominions the payment of the annual tribute of the "Peter's pence." See Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 310; Baxter, *Ch. Hist.* p. 93 sq. (J. H. W.)

Inability, in theology, is generally used to denote want of power to do the will of God. It is *natural* inability when the hinderance is physical; *moral* inability when the hinderance lies in the will. This distinction has special prominence in American theology, and has been the subject of a great deal of controversy between New-school and Old-school Calvinists, and also between Calvinists and Arminians. The New-school contend that man is naturally able to obey God, but morally unable. The Old-school deny both natural and moral ability. The Arminians deny natural and moral, but assert *gracious* ability on the part of man to accept Christ, and so to obey God.

The following paragraphs present well the Old-school view of the subject. "It has long been a boast, in certain quarters, that it is the glory of American theology that it has enabled us to hold fast to the doctrine of inability, and yet so to explain it as to make the sinner inexcusable, and to prevent him from abusing it to purposes of carnal apathy and desperation. This happy result, which the Bible ascribes to the Holy Ghost, is supposed to be accomplished by showing men that they have full *natural* ability to fulfil God's requirements; that they have no inability, but simply a want of will, or purpose, or inclination, to obey the Gospel, which they have full power to remove, *if they will.* While this language is used by many in a sense which, as explained by themselves, at all events coheres with the doctrine that man has lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation, it is used by others to express and vindicate the dogma that men are perfectly able to make themselves Christians at pleasure. This is Pelagianism, without even a decent disguise. Yet it is this very class who make the most of the distinction in question. They think it a convenient and safe shelter for their doctrines that man can make himself a new heart. This class claim that Edwards was the inventor of this distinction; that it is the distinguishing characteristic and special property of his followers; that therefore they are the true Edwardeans, because they are the patrons and inheritors of this his grand discovery in theology. It can easily be shown, however, 1. That whatever of truth is connected with this distinction was familiar to theologians not only before the time of Edwards, but from the time when the heresies of Pelagius first occasioned thorough discussion of the subject of sin and grace. 2. That Edwards did not regard himself as introducing any novel doctrines or discoveries on the subject. A formerly distinguished champion of New-school doctrines recently said in a public speech, with great truth, 'that the common idea that the power of Edwards's system lies in the distinction of natural and moral ability is a fallacy. This was well understood before his day. It lies in his views of spiritual light, which constitute the key to his whole treatise on the Religious Affections.' All who have read this treatise, or his sermons on the 'Natural Blindness of Men in Religion,' and on 'The Reality of Spiritual Light,' must concede the justness of this statement. The great principle of his work on the Affections is that 'they arise from divine illumination.' The amount of truth contained in the proposition that man is naturally able, but morally unable, to obey God's commands, may be thus stated: 1. Man is really unable to do things spiritually good without divine grace. But this inability is moral, because it pertains to our moral nature. It does not excuse, because it is our sin; and the greater it is, the greater is our sin. 2. This corruption and inability do not destroy any of the faculties of will, affection, or intelligence, which are essential to humanity, moral agency, or responsibility. They only vitiate the state and action of those faculties with reference to things moral and spiritual. All power remains which would

be requisite to the fulfilment of God's commands if we were holy. Any hinderance, or want of power or opportunity, which would prevent us from fulfilling any command of God if we were morally good, excuses the non-performance of it, and this alone. So far, then, as the assertion that we have natural ability is intended to express the fact that we have no disability but our sin, or that is excusable, it expresses an important truth. So far as it is used, or is adapted to convey the idea that we have ability to remove our sinful corruption without the prevenient and efficacious grace of God, or that our inability, though moral, is such that we can resume it by the strength of our own will, or that it is not by nature, it contains a dangerous error. It is not only contrary to Scripture and all Christian experience, but it is inconceivable that any state or act of the unregenerate will of man should make him a holy being. The corrupt tree cannot bring forth such good fruit. Nay, as all Christians find to their sorrow, they cannot, although partially sanctified, by any power of their wills, exclude all corruption from their souls. The flesh lusteth against the spirit, so that they *cannot* do the things that they *would*. When they *would* do good, evil is present with them. Though they love the law of God after the inward man, they have a law in their members warring against the law of their minds. How, then, is this indwelling corruption, having the entire mastery of the sinner, removable by his will? And does the phrase 'natural ability,' according to its natural import, fairly express, or, rather, does it not express more than the truth, in regard to the power of the sinner? Is it not, unless carefully explained, adapted to mislead him? That cannot properly be called ability to do things spiritually good, to purify our corrupt natures, which is not adequate to produce the result. Man has not such an ability, whatever adjectives we affix to the word. He has only the faculties which would enable him to do his duty if he were holy. Is it not best, in plain terms, to say so? Have we a right to do otherwise than speak the truth in love?'"—*Princeton Review*, July, 1854, No. x, p. 512 sq.

The Arminian doctrine is (1) that the unregenerate have complete ability, through the efficient grace of Christ, to comply with the conditions of justification as offered under the covenant of grace; (2) that the regenerate have ability, through the grace of Christ, to do the will of God, i. e. to avoid voluntary transgression thereof. The following criticism of the Arminian view, by an eminent New-England divine, with a comment on it, is taken from the *Christian Advocate*, Dec. 15, 1859. The parts in brackets are added by the commentator. "The Arminian theory of man's inability or want of power is the same [as the Calvinistic], excepting a vain attempt to conceal its revolting aspect by the still greater absurdity of what is called a gracious ability. The advocates of this theory plainly subvert and virtually deny the grace of God in their very attempt to magnify it; for if man has not ability or power to obey God without grace [divine operation, or 'favor to sinners'], then he does not sin in not obeying, since a being who cannot act morally right cannot act morally wrong. Such a being cannot be truly said to receive or to be capable of receiving grace, for grace is favor to sinners. Besides, what does the supposed grace of God [here evidently in the sense of *divine efficiency*] do? Does it give man *power to obey?* then man has power to obey, as he must have before he obeys. But even this is no security that he will obey. [What Arminian ever pretended that it is?] Adam sinned with this power. The grace [exercise of divine efficiency], then, does not meet the exigency of the case. [Is invariable obedience essential, then, to a proper human ability? In that case, what would become of Dr. Taylor's own theory?] Is it said he has power to use the grace [what does the word mean here?] furnished? But what power is this? Until man has *power to obey*, it is absolutely inconceivable that he should obey, for the act of obedience is *his own* act, done in the exercise of *his own* power to obey. Thus the grace of God [the Holy Ghost], according to this scheme, must, by a direct act of creation, impart some new essential mental faculty or power to the soul of man to qualify it to act morally right or wrong. Without the grace of God man has not a human soul, for he has not the true and essential nature of such a soul—the *power* requisite to moral action. [We have been wont to think of 'power' as an *attribute*, not as a '*nature*.'] He cannot be a sinner, and of course grace to him cannot be grace to a sinner. Grace is no more grace" (Taylor, *Lectures on the Moral Government of God*, ii, 123). The comment is as follows: "In the first place, Dr. Taylor falsely represents the Arminian as asserting the gracious ability of man, in general terms, to keep the divine law, whereas we only affirm this of the regenerate. In the second place, he continually shuffles in his use of the term grace, as will be seen by our bracketed insertions of equivalents, wherever the context fixes the sense. In the third place, we see no possible relevancy in his argument against a divinely imparted 'power to obey,' from the fact that the possession of this power does not insure its invariable exercise any more than it did in Adam's case. If the professor had inferred the impossibility of our theory of ability from the conceded fact that the earth revolves upon its axis, we should not have been more at loss to perceive the pertinency or logical force of the reasoning. Finally, he forgets that in the economy of redemption, '*ability to use grace*' is an '*ability to obey*.' God's prime requirement of a sinner is repentance and return to service; and in the arrangements of the remedial scheme under which we live, the sinner possesses a complete, though not a constitutional and independent 'ability to obey' this requirement." For the New-England view, see NEW-ENGLAND THEOLOGY. See also the articles ARMINIANISM; PELAGIANISM; GRACE. For a full discussion of the New-school theory, see Hodgson, *New Divinity Examined* (N. Y. 12mo); *Princeton Review*, July, 1854. See also *Amer. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1861; *Bib. Sacra*, 1863, p. 324 sq., 608 sq.; 1865, p. 503; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* xlix, 263; 1868, p. 610; *British Quart. Rev.* July, 1867; *New Englander*, 1868, p. 486, 490, 496-9, 511, 553.

In antis, a term for a temple which has upon the façade two columns, detached, standing between two *antæ* that terminate the side walls of it. Specimens are the temples at Rhamnus and Sunium.—Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Lit. and Art*, ii, 200.

Incantation (Lat. *incantatio; incanto*, to chant a magic formula, compound of *in*, intensive, and *canto*, to sing) denotes "one of the most powerful and awe-inspiring modes of magic (q. v.), viz., that resting on a belief in the mysterious power of words solemnly conceived and passionately uttered." "There is in the human voice, especially in its more lofty tones, an actual power of a very wonderful kind to stir men's hearts. When to this we add that poetic utterance is a special and exceptional gift; that the language of primitive nations is crude and unmanageable, the words being as difficult to weld together as pieces of cast iron; that it is only when the poet's mind has risen to unusual heat that he can fuse them into those rhythmical sequences that please the ear and hang together in the memory; that, in short, his art is a mystery to himself—an inspiration—we need not wonder at the feeling with which everything in the form of verse or metre was viewed. The singing or saying of such compositions which could thus stir the blood of the hearers they knew not how, what other effects might it not produce?" To the power which the superstitious belief of the people, up to and even through the Middle Ages, gave to incantations, especially when accompanied, as they generally were, with the concocting of drugs and other magical rites, there is hardly any end. "They could heal or kill. If they could not raise from the dead, they could make the dead speak, or 'call up spirits from the vasty

deep' in order to unveil the future. They could extinguish fire; darken the sun or moon; make fetters burst, a door or a mountain fly open; blunt a sword; make a limb powerless; destroy a crop, or charm it away into another's barn." It is especially the heathenish nations that in their prayers, whether for blessings or for curses, partake largely of the nature of magical incantations. "They are not supposed to act as petitions addressed to a free agent, but by an inherent force which even the gods cannot resist. This is very marked in Hinduism and Buddhism, but it actually pervades all superstitious worship, though sometimes quite disguised. 'They think they shall be heard for their much speaking.' For almost every occasion or operation of life there were appropriate formulas to be repeated in order to secure success; and many of these, with that reverence for antiquity and conservative tendency which always characterize superstition, continue to live in popular memory, although often the words are so old as to be unintelligible. Thus, among the Romans, in the days of Cato, incantations were common for curing dislocations, full of words the meaning of which had been lost. A form of words used to this day in Shetland for healing a sprain can be traced back to the 10th century. In its earliest form, as found in an old German manuscript, it narrates how their native gods, Woden and Baldur, riding out to hunt, Baldur's horse dislocated its foot, and how Woden, using charmed words, set bone to bone, etc., and so healed the foot. The repetition of this rhymed narration acted as a charm to heal other lamed horses. A modern version of this tradition, current in Norway even in our day, makes the accident happen to the horse of *Jesus*, and Jesus himself perform the cure—in Shetland, also, the Lord (Jesus) is substituted for Woden: and the formula is applied to the healing of persons' limbs as well as those of horses. The operation is thus described in R. Chambers's *Popular Rhymes of Scotland:* 'When a person has received a sprain, it is customary to apply to an individual practiced in casting the "wresting-thread." This is a thread spun from black wool, on which are cast nine knots, and tied round a sprained leg or arm. During the time the operator is putting the thread round the affected limb, he says, but in such a tone of voice as not to be heard by the bystanders, nor even by the person operated upon:

"'Our Lord rade,
His foal's foot slade;
Down he lighted,
His foal's foot righted.
Bone to bone,
Sinew to sinew,
Blood to blood,
Flesh to flesh.
Heal, in name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

See MAGIC; WITCHCRAFT.

Incapacity, in the ecclesiastical sense, is absolute unfitness for ordination. Thus women (Gen. iii, 16; 1 Tim. ii, 12; 1 Cor. xiv, 34, 35) and unbaptized persons are *incapacitated* from ordination. Baptism is essential to church membership, and therefore the basis of further advancement in the Church: "Cum baptismus sit fundamentum omnium sacramentorum ante susceptionem baptismi non suscipiatur aliud sacramentum" (c. 60, can. i, qu. i, Capit. Theodori Canterb.); also c. 1, x, *De presbytero non baptizato* (iii, 43); c. 3, x, eod. (Innocent III a. 1206); c. 2, *De cognatione spirituali* in vi (iv,3) Bonifacii VIII. So the early Church declared that he who has not received in due form the baptism of water is not a member of the visible church, and cannot therefore be ordained. The Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, in c. 19 (c. 52, can. i, qu. i), directs that the clergy of the Paulinists (who did not perform baptism regularly) and of other sects were to be rebaptized and ordained on their return to the Catholic Church, and that such persons as had been previously ordained, but not baptized, should at once receive baptism, and then be reordained (c. 112, dist. iv, *De consecr.* [Leo a. 458]; c. 60, can. i, qu. i; comp. *Capit.* lib. vi, c. 94, and other quoted passages), although, according to the decision of pope Innocent II (c. 2, x, *De presb. non bapt.;* c. 34, 151, dist. iv, *De consecr.*), the subordination of a baptized priest ordained by an unbaptized did not necessarily follow. See IRREGULARITY.

The incapacity of women for ordination was believed to be so fully authorized by the passages above cited from the Bible that it was never questioned by the Church. God had made woman subject to the rule of man; she could therefore not instruct a congregation likely to be composed also of men (*Conc. Carthag.* iv, a. 378, c. 36 in c. 29; dist. xxiii, c. 20; dist. iv, *De consecr.*). It is from this point of view that Tertullian regards this question when he says (*De velandis virginibus*, c. 8): "Non permittitur mulieri in ecclesia loqui, sed non docere, nec tingere, nec offerre, nec allius virilis muneris nedum sacerdotalis officiis sortem ubi vindicare." In a like strain argue Augustine (c. xvii, can. xxxiii, qu. v) and others. The early Church therefore declared that no woman should be ordained *presbytera* (vidua) (*Conc. Laodic.* a. 372, c. 11 in c. 19, dist. xxxii), nor diacona, or diaconissa (*Concil. Arausicanum* i, a. 441, can. xxvi; *Epaonense*, a. 517, can. xxi; *Aurelianense* ii, a. 533, can. xviii [ed. Brunc. ii, 126, 170, 187]; compare c. 23, can. xxvii, qu. i, *Novella Justiniani* vi, cap. 5); though educated and pious, they are not to teach in the congregations (*Conc. Carthag.* iv, a. 378, c. 36 in c. 29, dist. xxiii; c. 20, dist. iv, *De consecr.*). Abbesses were not to bless the nuns, to hear confessions, or to preach in public (c. 10, x, *De pœnit. et remiss.* [v, 38] Innocent III a. 1210).

The Evangelical Church teaches the necessity of baptism (Augsb. Conf. art. ix, etc.), and also that "the female sex was not ordained by God to rule, either in the Church, or in secular positions where a specially strong understanding and good counsel are requisite. But they are ordered to take care of their household, and to see after it diligently" (Luther, in Walch's *Werke*, ii, 1006). The ground which the Reformers took on this question was up to our day approved by the Protestant churches at large. Among the Friends, however, no such distinction has ever been recognised. Indeed, the tendency of the present age is to abolish the rule altogether, and females in several instances have actually been installed as pastors in this country, while in other cases their ability in the pulpit has been freely acknowledged even among evangelical denominations. Yet even this hardly satisfies the advocates of "women's rights" (q. v.). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 647. (J. H. W.)

Incardinārè, in the language of the Church of the Middle Ages, is the appointment of any *strange* bishop, presbyter, deacon, or a person of some other class of the priesthood, to this or that church, in which he was to perform services in part or exclusively, or even the appointment to one particular church. The election of a cardinal was also called *incardinare.*—Fuhrmann, *Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengesch*, ii, 435.

Incardinăti clerĭci, fugitive or foreign priests appointed to a church, in contrast with the appointment of a native and regular priest.—Pierer, *Universal Lexicon*, viii, 840.

Incarnation (Lat. *in*, and *caro*, flesh), the permanent assumption of a human form by a divine personage.

I. *False or Pretended Incarnations of Heathen Religions.*—The mythologies of most nations afford traces, although faint, of the idea of incarnation. If, as Vinet has suggested, there can be no religion without an incarnation, the pseudo-incarnations of false religions may be regarded as so many gropings for the truth, "if haply they might feel after him" who at some time should become incarnate. These incarnations express the deepest need of our common nature. Sin has so isolated man from God that he feels there is no hope of his restoration except "the gods come down in the likeness of men." This idea confronts us from all parts of the world, whether in the avatars of the Hindû, the election and worship of the Lama of Thibet, the metamorphoses of

the Greek and Roman mythologies, or the wilder worship of the aborigines of America. The earlier Christian apologists attributed these caricatures of the true incarnation to Satan, and alleged that "he invented these fables by imitating the truth." Neander makes the profound suggestion that "at the bottom of these myths is the earnest desire, inseparable from man's spirit, for participation in the divine nature as its true life—its anxious longing to pass the gulf which separates the God-derived soul from its original—its wish, even though unconscious, to secure that union with God which alone can renew human nature, and which Christianity shows us as a living reality. Nor can we be astonished to find the facts of Christianity thus anticipated in poetic forms (embodying in imaginative creations the innate yet indistinct cravings of the spirit) in the mythical elements of the old religions, when we remember that human nature itself, and all the forms of its development, as well as the whole course of human history, were intended by God to find their full accomplishment in Christ" (*Life of Christ*, chap. ii, sec. 12). The want that thus expresses itself in these fabled avatars lies at the foundation of idolatry. The unsatisfied nature of man demands that his Deity should be near him—should dwell with him. It first leads him to represent the Deity by the work of his own hands, and then to worship it (see Tholuck, *Predigten*, ii, 148). Or we may look upon these avatars as so many faint and distant irradiations of the holy light that shone upon the Garden through the first promise given to man. On the contrary, Kitto denies "that there is in Eastern mythology any incarnation in any sense approaching that of the Christian, and that least of all is there any where it has been most insisted on" (*Daily Bible Illust.* on John i, 14). Cocker, in his late work (*Christianity and Greek Philosophy*, N. Y. 1870, 8vo, p. 512), advances the theory that the idea of "a pure spiritual essence, without form and without emotion, pervading all and transcending all, is too vague and abstract to yield us comfort," and that therefore the need of an incarnation "became consciously or unconsciously '*the desire of nations*'" by "the education of the race" and "by the dispensation of philosophy. . . . The idea of an incarnation was not unfamiliar to human thought, *it was no new or strange idea to the heathen mind.* The numberless metamorphoses of Grecian mythology, the incarnations of Brahma, the avatars of Vishnu, and the human form of Krishna, had naturalized the thought (Young, *Christ of History*, p. 248)." See Dorner, *Lehre v. der Person Christi*, i, 7 sq.; *Biblioth. Sacra*, ix, 250; Weber, *Indische Studien*, ii, 411 sq.

Among the ancient Egyptians, Apis or *Hapi*, "the living bull," was esteemed to be the emblem and image of the soul of Osiris, who, as Pliny and Cicero say, was deemed a god by the Egyptians. "Diodorus derives the worship of Apis from a belief that the soul of Osiris had migrated into this animal; and he was thus supposed to manifest himself to man through successive ages;" while Strabo calls "Apis the same as Osiris" (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* abridgm. i, 290, 291). "About the time when Cambyses arrived at Memphis, Apis appeared to the Egyptians." Their great rejoicings led that prince to examine the officers who had charge of Memphis. These responded "that one of their gods had appeared to them—a god who, at long intervals of time, had been accustomed to show himself in Egypt" (Herod. iii, 27). Mnevis, the sacred bull of Heliopolis, was also a representative of Osiris, and with Apis, the sacred bull of Memphis, was worshipped as a god throughout the whole of Egypt. Ammianus says that Mnevis was sacred to the sun, while Apis was sacred to the moon (see Rawlinson's *Herod.* ii, 354, Engl. edition). Hardwick, however, adduces Wilkinson as regarding it "a merit of the old Egyptians that they did not *humanize* their gods; and yet he admits that their fault was rather the elevation of animals and emblems to the rank of deities." Hardwick denies that the idea of incarnation is to be found in the old Egyptian creed (*Christ and other Masters*, ii, 351). See APIS.

The mythology of the Hindûs presents a vast variety of incarnations, the inferior avatars that have appeared in various ages being innumerable. The object of the avatar is declared by Vishnu himself, who, in the form of Krishna, thus addresses Arjuna: "Both I and thou have passed many births; mine are known to me, but thou knowest not thine. Although I am not in my nature subject to birth or decay, and am the lord of all created beings, yet, having command over my own nature, I am *made evident* by my own power; and as often as there is a decline of virtue, and an insurrection of vice and injustice in the world, I make myself evident. Thus I appear from age to age for the preservation of the just, the destruction of the wicked, and the establishment of virtue" (*Bhagavad-Gita*, p. 40). With this declaration accord, for the most part, the objects of the ten more conspicuous avatars of this deity, although the details of them abound in puerilities and obscenity. In the *Matsya*, or Fish avatar, Vishnu took the form of a human being issuing from the body of a fish, for the recovery of the sacred books which had been stolen from Brahma by the dæmon Haysgriva. The *Kurma*, or Tortoise avatar, supported the earth sinking in the waters. The prayer of Brahma for assistance when the whole earth was *covered with water* called forth a third avatar of Vishnu, that of the *Varâha*, or Boar, of which Maurice says, "Using the practical instinct of that animal, he began to smell around that he might discover the place where the earth was submerged. At length, having divided the water and arriving at the bottom, he saw the earth lying a mighty and barren stratum; then he took up the ponderous globe (freed from the water), and raised it high on his tusk—one would say it was a beautiful lotus blossoming on the tip of his tusk" (*Hist. of Hindostan*, i, 575 sq.). There can be but little doubt that these three avatars are perversions of the Hindû traditions of the Deluge. The next incarnation burst forth from a pillar as a man-lion for the purpose of destroying a blaspheming monarch. The *Vâmana*, or Dwarf, in the next avatar, rebuked the pride of Maha Bali, the great Bali. In human form the divine *Parasurama*, in twenty pitched battles, extirpated the Kettri tribe to prepare for the Brahmin the way to empire. The seventh was very like that of the preceding, and for similar objects. *Rama Chandra*, however, was a great reformer and legislator. The eighth, that of *Krishna*, represents the Deity in human form trampling on the head of a serpent, while the serpent is biting his heel—a corruption of the promise to Eve. One object of the ninth incarnation, that of *Buddha*, is generally admitted to have been the abolition of sanguinary sacrifices. Whatever be the cause, "Buddhism stands conspicuous in the midst of heathendom as a religion without sacrificial cultus." Upon the tenth, the *Kalki* avatar, which is yet to take place, the destruction of the universe will ensue (see Maurice, *History of Hindostan*, passim; Hardwick, i, 278; *New Englander*, iii, 183-185). For the astounding events connected with the birth and infancy of Gotama (q. v.), see BUDDHA. See also Hardy's *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 140 sq. Compare AVATAR; HINDUISM.

Lamaism presents many features in common with Buddhism, so much so that it may be considered one of its outgrowths. It "differs fundamentally from Chinese Buddhism in the doctrine of hereditary incarnations. The great thought of some intelligence issuing from the Buddha world assuming the conditions of our frail humanity, and for a time presiding over some one favored group of Buddhist monasteries, had long been familiar to the natives of Tibet." In the latter half of the 15th century arose the idea of perpetual incarnations. "Then it was that one chief abbot, the 'perfect Lama,' instead of passing, as he was entitled to do, to his ultimate condition, determined for the benefit of mankind to sojourn longer on the earth, and be contin-

uously new-born. As soon as he was carried to his grave in 1473, a search was instituted for the personage who had been destined to succeed him. This was found to be an infant who established its title to the honor by appearing to remember various articles which had been the property of the lama just deceased, or, rather, were the infant's own property in earlier stages of existence. . . . So fascinating was the theory of perpetual incarnations that a fresh succession of rival lamas (also of the *yellow* order) afterwards took its rise in Teshu-lambu, while the Dalai lamas were enthroned in Lhassa; and at present every convent of importance, not in Tibet only, but in distant parts of Tartary, is claiming for itself a like prerogative. . . . The religion of Tibet is from day to day assuming all the characteristics of man-worship" (Hardwick, ii, 93 sq.). For the election of the successor of the lama, see also Huc's *Travels in Tartary*, ii, ch. vi, p. 197 sq.

The notion that prevailed in Egypt was similar, "save only that the symbolical bull was substituted for the literal man, and as Buddha is still held to be successively born in each infant lama, so the god Osiris was equally thought to be successively born in each consecrated Mnevis. Nor was the doctrine of a *human* incarnation by any means lost in that country. Diodorus gives a curious account of *an infant* in whose person Osiris was thought to have been born into the world in order that he might thus exhibit himself to mortals; and what Herodotus says of the Egyptian Perseus, who was the same divinity with Osiris, necessarily requires us to suppose that at certain intervals *a man* was brought forward by the priests as an incarnation of their god" (Diod. Sic. lib. i, p. 20; Herod. *Hist.* ii, ch. xci; G. S. Faber, *Eight Dissertations*, i, 61 sq.; see Wilkinson's note ad loc. cit. in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*). On the general subject, see also Faber's *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, vi, ch. vi; *Eight Dissertations*, i, 67 sq.

Under the head of classical metamorphoses it will be sufficient to refer to Baur in Baumgarten (on *Acts*, i, 446, transl.); to Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, Baucis et Philemon; and the name that Jupiter bore of Ζεὺς καταβάτης (Biscoe, *On the Acts*, p. 205).

"Passing over to the American continent, whether by way of Iceland to Labrador, or eastward from Asia, we find the wilderness, from the frozen shores of the Arctic Ocean to the Mexican Gulf, resounding with the deeds of a hero-god corresponding in character, history, and name with the Wodin and Buddha of the eastern continent. . . . His grandmother descended from the moon, which, in the symbolic language of the early traditions, always represents the Noachian ark. The only daughter of this Nokomis, in the bloom of her maidenhood, without the concurrence of mortal agency, and in a miraculous manner, gave birth to a son, who became conscious, as he advanced to manhood, that he was endowed with supernatural powers for the redemption of the world from evil. All his stupendous exploits were directed to that end. His name in the Indian dialects was *Bosho, Bozho*," etc. (*Meth. Quart. Rev.* 1859, p. 596; compare Schoolcraft's *Algic Res.* i, 135; and Kingsborough's *Mex. Antiq.* vi, 175). The remarkable story of the birth of Huitzilopochtli from a virgin mother is given by Squier, *American Archæological Res.* p. 196. For the reputed incarnations of the highest god, Tezcatlipoca, thought by Mr. Squier to be analogous to Buddha, Zoroaster, Osiris, Taut in Phœnicia, Odin in Scandinavia, etc., see Hardwick, ii, 152, with his remarks.—Brinton (Daniel G.), *Myths of the New World* (N. Y. 1868), 12mo), chap. ii and iv.

II. *Definition of "Incarnation" in the Christian Scheme.*—In the evangelical sense, incarnation is that act of grace whereby Jesus Christ, the Son of God, took upon himself the nature of man. "By taking only the nature of man, he still continueth one person, and changeth but the manner of his subsisting, which was before in the mere glory of the Son of God, and is now in the habit of our flesh" (Hooker, *Ecc. Pol.* v, § 52). In the assumption of our nature he became subject to the consequences of sin, except that he was without the *accident* of sin (see Ebrard, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v. Jesus Christ). "That Christ should have taken man's nature shows that corruption was not inherent in its existence in such wise that to assume the nature was to assume the sin" (Wilberforce, *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, p. 74). The essential features of the incarnation are peculiar to Christianity, and when we speak of the incarnation, that of Christianity is at once understood; for the incarnation of Vishnu as found in Krishna, which is admitted to be the most perfect of all heathen incarnations, and the only one to be compared with that of Christ according to Hardwick (*Christ and other Masters*, i, 291), "when purged from all the lewd and Bacchanalian adjuncts which disfigure and debase it, comes indefinitely short of Christianity." "Nothing can be more absurd than to compare the incarnations of this Indian deity with that of Christ. They are by their multiplicity alone tinctured with the pantheistic idea. The human personality is destitute of reality, since it is taken up and laid down as a veil or mask with which the divinity invested himself for a moment. Moreover, the degradation of the god is carried too far—he descended to evil, and participated in human corruption" (Pressensé, *Rel. before Christ*, p. 61). Although, therefore, the idea of the union of the divine and human natures was not foreign to heathenism, yet that the divine Logos should become flesh belonged to Christianity alone. False religions teach an apotheosis of man rather than a *proper* incarnation of the Deity. Judaism itself had never risen to the conception of an incarnate God. The antagonism between the Creator and the creature was too sharply defined to admit such an interpretation of the first promise as the incarnation has given. See Martensen, *Christ. Dogm.* § 128; Neander, *Church Hist.* (Clark), ii, 200 sq.; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* 29th week, evening.

The use of the term *incarnation* (later Latin) may be traced back to Irenæus, A.D. 180, as in the expression "Incarnatio pro nostra salute" (*Contra Hær.* i, 10).

III. *Theory.*—The doctrine of the incarnation is fundamental to Christianity, and is the basis upon which the entire fabric of revealed religion rests. It is presented to our faith from the plane of the miraculous, and is to be considered as the one all-comprehensive miracle of Christianity. It contains within itself essentially the entire series of miracles as taught in the Gospels. These miracles are the fruit, after its kind, which this divine tree brings forth. Faith sees in the fallen estate of so noble a being as man, and his restoration to purity, immortality, and God, objects commensurate with the sacrifice and humiliation that are implied in the incarnation, and accepts the doctrine as corresponding to the wants and necessities of human nature; but a divine revelation elevates our vision, and meets all objections founded upon the comparative insignificance of our race by indicating that in some mysterious manner the influences of the atonement may beneficially affect the entire universe. See Garbett, *Christ as Prophet*, i, 12; Kurtz, *Astron. and the Bible*, transl. p. 95 sq.; Calvin on *Col.* i, 20; Olshausen, Stier, and Harless on *Eph.* ii, 20.

The blending together of two natures implied in an incarnation presupposes some element of nature common to both. As far as we can see, "things absolutely dissimilar in their nature cannot mingle: water cannot coalesce with fire; water cannot mix with oil" (F. W. Robertson on Matt. v, 48). "Forasmuch as there is no union of God with man without that mean between both which is both" (Hooker), we see in the incarnation, reflected as in a mirror, the true nobility of man's nature, and the secret of the fact that the incarnation took place in the seed of Abraham rather than in angels. "For verily he taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold" (Heb. ii, 16, marginal read.). "The most common mode of presenting the doctrine is to say that the Logos assumed our fallen humanity. But by this, we are told, is not to be under-

stood that he assumed an individual body and soul, so that he became *a* man, but that he assumed generic humanity, so that he became *the* man. By generic humanity is to be understood a life-power, that peculiar law of life, corporeal and incorporeal, which develops itself outwardly as a body, and inwardly as a soul. The Son, therefore, became incarnate in humanity in that objective reality, entity, or substance in which all human lives are one. Thus, too, Olshausen, in his comment on John i, 14, says, 'It could not be said that the Word was made man, which would imply that the Redeemer was a man by the side of other men, whereas, being the second Adam, he represented the totality of human nature in his exalted comprehensive personality.' To the same effect he says, in his remarks on Rom. v, 15, 'If Christ were *a* man among other men, it would be impossible to conceive how his suffering and obedience could have an essential influence on mankind: he could then only operate as an example; but he is to be regarded, even apart from his divine nature, as *the* man, i. e. as realizing the absolute idea of humanity, and including it potentially in himself spiritually as Adam did corporeally.' To this point archdeacon Wilberforce devotes the third chapter of his book on *The Incarnation*, and represents the whole value of Christ's work as depending upon it. If this be denied, he says, 'the doctrines of atonement and sanctification, though confessed in words, become a mere empty phraseology.' In fine, Dr. Nevin, of America, in his *Mystical Presence*, p. 210, says, 'The Word became flesh; not a single man only, as one among many, but *flesh*, or humanity, in its universal conception. How else could he be the principle of a general life, the origin of a new order of existence for the human world as such?" (Eadie). This fine distinction, however, savors too much of transcendentalism to be capable of clear apprehension or general reception. It is sufficient to say that the divine Logos actually assumed a human body and soul, not precisely such as fallen men have, but like that of the newly-created Adam, or rather became himself the archetypal man after whom, as a pattern originally in the mind of Deity, the human race was primevally fashioned. See IMAGE OF GOD.

The question whether there would or could have been an incarnation without the fall of man has especially engaged the speculative minds of German divines, most of whom maintain the affirmative. "If, then, the Redeemer of the world stands in an eternal relation to the Father and to humanity—if his person has not merely a historical, not merely a religious and ethical, but also a metaphysical significance, sin alone cannot have been the ground of his revelation; for there was no metaphysical necessity for sin entering the world, and Christ could not be our Redeemer if it had been eternally involved in the idea that he should be our Mediator. Are we to suppose that what is most glorious in the world could only be reached through the medium of sin? that there would have been no room in the human race for the glory of the only-begotten One but for sin? If we start with the thought of humanity as destined to bear the image of God, with the thought of a kingdom of individuals filled with God, must we not necessarily ask, even if we for the moment suppose sin to have no existence, Where in this kingdom is the perfect God-man? No one of the individuals by himself expresses more than a relative union of the divine and human natures. No one participates more than partially in the "fulness of him that filleth all" (Eph. i, 23). All, therefore, point beyond themselves to a union of God and man, which is not partial and relative (ἐκ μέρους, 1 Cor. xii, 27), but perfect and complete" (Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, § 131). See also Müller, *Deutsche Zeitschrift*, 1853, No. 43; Philippi, *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre*, Einleitung; Ebrard, *Dogmatik*, ii, 95; *British and Foreign Ev. Rev.* in *Theol. Eclec.* iii, 267.

IV. *Objections* to the Bible doctrine of the incarnation worthy of consideration are more easily resolved, perhaps, than those against any other doctrine of Scripture, for they are mostly, if not altogether, to be comprehended under the head of its deep mysteriousness. Many writers, however, have adduced as parallel the mystery of creation, which is in itself the embodiment of thought in matter, and the existence of such a composite being as man, not to speak of mysteries with which our entire economy is crowded. *A priori*, it is not more difficult to conceive of the union of the divine with the human, or the taking up of the human into the divine, than to comprehend the incarnation of an immaterial essence such as that of the mind in a material form like that of the body. "If even in our time the idea of the incarnation of God still appears so difficult, the principal reason is, that the fact itself is too much isolated. It is always the impulse of spirit to embody itself, for corporeity is the end of the work of God; in every phenomenon an idea descends from the world of spirit and embodies itself here below. It may therefore be said that all the nobler among men are rays of that sun which in Christ rose on the firmament of humanity. In Abraham, Moses, and others, we already discover the coming Christ" (Olshausen on John i, 14).

The strictures of archbishop Whately with respect to the substance of Deity, etc., may hold good of dogmatism upon the incarnation: "But as to the *substance* of the supreme Being and of the human soul, many men were (and still are) confident in their opinions, and dogmatical in maintaining them: the more, inasmuch as in these subjects they could not be refuted by an appeal to experiment. . . . Philosophical divines are continually prone to forget that the subjects on which they speculate are *confessedly* and by their *own* account beyond the reach of the human faculties. This is no reason, indeed, against our believing anything clearly *revealed in Scripture;* but it *is* a reason against going beyond Scripture with metaphysical speculations of our own," etc. (*Cyclop. Brit.* i, 517, 8th ed.). On objections, consult Liddon, *Bampton Lecture*, lect. v; Sadler, *Emmanuel*, chaps. ii, v; Frayssinous, *Def. of Christianity*, ii, ch. xxv; Thos. Adams, *Meditations on Creed*, in *Works*, iii, 235; Martensen, *Christ. Dogmat.* § 132.

V. *History of Views*.—The true theory of the nature of Christ was of gradual development in the history of the Church. Not unlike the best and most enduring growths of nature, it sprang up and matured amid the conflicts of doubt and the tempests of faction. (See § VIII, below.) The efforts to harmonize the divine and human natures of Christ gave rise to a series of fluctuations of doubt, which illustrate in a signal manner the tendencies of the human mind to recoil from one extreme to another. The close of the 4th century (A.D. 381) witnessed the maturing of correct views as to the twofold nature in the one person of Christ, and their embodiment in the creed, which, subjected to the test of centuries, is still the expression and symbol of the faith of the Church. See CREED, NICENE and CONSTANTINOPOLITAN, vol. ii, p. 562.

"If we would correctly apprehend the ancient Church doctrine of the two natures, we must take φύσις in the abstract sense in which it was used. The divine nature consists in this, that Christ is God, the predicate '*God*' belongs to him; the human nature is this, that the predicate '*man*' is assigned to it. His divine nature is the divine essence which *subsists* in the Logos from eternity, and which in his becoming man he still *retained.* His human nature is the man's nature or mode of being and constitution, which *for itself does not subsist*, but which, as a *universal attribute*, exists in all other men, and, since his incarnation, also in him—the *natura hominum.* To have human feeling, will, and thought, and as a human soul to animate a human body, is human nature. We must, however, never think of human nature as a *concretum*, a *subsistens*, a son of Mary, with which the Son of God united himself, or mixed himself up" (Ebrard, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, s. v. Jesus Christ).

With the explanation thus given, we proceed to remark that the earliest controversies of the Church revolved around the physical nature of Christ. The result of those contests established the essential oneness of Christ's body with ours. The pungency of the arguments employed may be illustrated in the words of Irenæus (quoted by Hooker, *Eccl. Polity*, v, sec. 53): "If Christ had not taken flesh from the very earth, he would not have coveted those earthly nourishments wherewith bodies taken from thence are fed. This was the nature which felt hunger after long fasting, was desirous of rest after travel, testified compassion and love by tears, groaned in heaviness, and with extremity of grief melted away itself into bloody sweats." The earliest fathers, with the exception of Justin Martyr, held the opinion that Christ assumed only a human body, or, if he had a soul, it was animal, or, which was more common, they quite ignored the question of his human soul. The views of Justin, however, were colored by the Platonic philosophy, which led him to attribute to Christ body, soul, and spirit, but in such a mode of union with the Logos as to furnish the germs of the future error of Apollinaris the younger. Tertullian, about the end of the 2d century, first ascribed to Christ a proper human soul, and thus met and disposed of the difficulties which had arisen from the teaching that connected the Logos immediately with the body of Christ. The doctrine of the human soul of Christ was more fully developed and illustrated by Origen. But, in comparing the connection between the Logos and the human nature in Christ to the union of believers with Christ, he drew upon himself the objection that he made Christ a mere man. (See further, Knapp, *Lectures on Christian Theology*, sec. cii, note by the translator.) Ambrose (*De Incarnatione*, p. 76) may more properly serve as the connecting link between Tertullian and the Athanasian Creed, the latter setting forth the doctrine to which the Church was slowly attaining in the following words: "Perfectus Deus, perfectus homo, ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens." Thus Ambrose reasons: "Do we also infer division when we affirm that he took on him a reasonable soul, and one endowed with intellectual capacity? For God himself, the Word, was not to the flesh as the reasonable intellectual soul; but God the Word, taking upon him a reasonable intellectual soul, human, and of the same substance with our souls, the flesh also like our own, and of the same substance with that of which our flesh is formed, was also perfect *man*, but without any taint of sin. . . . Wherefore his flesh and his soul were of the same substance with our souls and our flesh." Questions in connection with the nature of the human soul of Christ came into greater prominence towards the close of the 4th century than ever before in the history of the Church. Apollinaris the younger revived the opinion which extensively prevailed in the primitive Church, that Christ connected himself only with a human body and an *animal* soul (Hase, *Ch. Hist.* sec. 104). "Two beings persisting in their completeness, he conceived, could not be united into one whole. Out of the union of the *perfect* human nature with the Deity one person never could proceed; and, more particularly, the rational soul of the man could not be assumed into union with the divine Logos so as to form *one* person" (Neander, iv, 119, Clarke's edition). From an early part of the 9th century, when the Adoptian tenets sank into oblivion, the Church enjoyed comparative rest. But, as might have been presumed, the era of scholastic theology, which was inaugurated at about the commencement of the 12th century, and continued into the 15th, although the attention of the schoolmen was more directed to other subjects, did not pass by one that so readily admitted the exercise of dialectic subtlety. The nominalism of Roscelinus, "which regarded the appellation *God*, that is common to the three persons, as a mere name, i. e. as the abstract idea of a genus" (Hagenbach), had perverted the true idea of Father, Son, and Spirit into that of three individuals or things, in contradistinction to one thing (*una res*). In response, Anselm argued that, as every universal is a mere abstraction, and particulars alone have reality, so "if only the essence of God in the Trinity was called *una res*, and the three persons not *tres res*, the latter could not be considered as anything real. Only the one God would be the *real;* all besides would become a mere nominal distinction, to which nothing real corresponded; and so, therefore, along with the Son, the Father and the Holy Ghost would also have become man" (Neander, viii, 92). "The daring assertions of Roscelinus exposed him to the charge of Tritheism, while those of Abelard exposed him to that of Sabellianism. The distinction which Gilbert of Poitiers drew between the *quo est* and the *quod est* gave to his doctrine the semblance of Tetratheism" (see Hagenbach, *History of Doct.* i, sec. 170). Though his starting-point was Realism, he arrived at the same goal as the Nominalist Roscelinus. "The Scholastics had much to say of the relation of number to the divine unity. Since Boethius had put forth the canon, 'Vere unum esse, in quo nullus sit numerus,' Peter the Lombard sought to avoid the difficulty by saying that number, in its application to God and divine things, had only a negative meaning; 'these are rather said to exclude what is not in God than to assert what is'" (*Theol. Lect.* by Dr. Twesten, transl. in *Bib. Sac.* iii, 770). "Considered as an act, according to Thomas Aquinas, the incarnation is the work of the whole Trinity; but in respect to its *terminus*, that is, the personal union of the divine and human nature, it belongs only to the Son; since, according to the doctrine of the Church, it is first and properly not the nature, but a person, and that the second person, which has assumed humanity." (For the accordance of this with the confession of faith of the eleventh Council at Toledo, A.D. 675, see *Bib. Sac.* iv, 50, note.) "Duns Scotus ascribed to the human nature of Christ a proper if not an independent existence. This fundamental view of the Middle Ages Luther also adopted, and designated the divinity and humanity as two 'parts;' and upon this he built his theory of the impartation of the divine attribute to the human" (Herzog).

The age of the Reformation contributed nothing or but little new on the subject of the incarnation. The most that it did was to repeat some of the more pestilent errors of the past, and in the mean time, through the conflicts of mind, bring into bolder relief the lineaments of truth. "Thus Caspar Schwenkfeld revived the docetico-monophysitic doctrine concerning the '*glorified* and *deified flesh*' of Christ. Menno Simonis, as well as other Anabaptists, supposed (like the Valentinians in the first period) that our Lord's birth was a mere phantom. Michael Servetus maintained that Christ was a mere man, filled with the divine nature, and rejected all further distinctions between his two natures as unscriptural, and founded upon scholastic definitions alone. Faustus Socinus went so far as to return to the view entertained by the Ebionites and Nazarenes" (Hagenbach, *History of Doct.* sec. 265). According to Dorner, "Servetus, resting on a pantheistic basis, could say that the flesh of Christ was consubstantial with God, but the same would hold true in reference to all flesh." Nevertheless, he did not say it in reference to all flesh. "In his opinion, Christ alone is the Son of God; nor is that name to be given to any one else" (Hagenbach, sec. 265). The controversies between Calvin and Servetus, in which were comprehended the erroneous views of the latter on the subject of the incarnation, at last culminated in his death at the stake. Much, however, as Calvin was blamed for calling the Son, considered in his essence, αὐτόθεος, still he was right, and is supported by Lutheran theologians. In another point of view, that is, considered in his personal subsistence, the Son cannot be called αὐτόθεος, but only the Father, since he alone is ἀγέννητος; but the ἀγεννησία of the person is not to be confounded with the absoluteness of the essence." (See further, Twesten, in

the *Bib. Sac.* iv, 39. For the differences, as respects the incarnation, between Luther and Zwingle, in which each failed to comprehend the stand-point of the other, see Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, art. Jesus Christ.)

VI. *Theophanies.*—It might have been expected, from a consideration of an event of such moment to our race as the incarnation, that, delayed so long in the history of the world, it would not have been without its adumbrations, like types in nature, mute prophecies of archetypal existence. The first prophecy of the incarnation was coeval with the fall. In terms succinct and yet clear, the announcement was made that from the seed of the woman should rise the hope of man. In analogy with nature the typical form was thus given, from which the grand archetyphal idea should be elaborated, until in the fulness of time that idea should be permanently embodied, and God become manifest in the flesh. "No sooner had the first Adam appeared and fallen than a new school of prophecy began, in which type and symbol were mingled with what had now its first existence on the earth—verbal enunciations; and all pointed to the second Adam, 'the Lord from heaven.' In him creation and the Creator meet in reality and not in semblance. On the very apex of the finished pyramid of being sits the adorable Monarch of all—as the Son of Mary, of David, of the first Adam, the created of God; as God and the Son of God, the eternal Creator of the universe; and these—the two Adams—form the main theme of all prophecy, natural and revealed. That type and symbol should have been employed with reference not only to the second, but, as held by men like Agassiz and Owen, to the first Adam also, exemplifies, we are disposed to think, the unity of the style of Deity, and serves to show that it was he who created the worlds that dictated the Scriptures" (Hugh Miller, in Fairbairn's *Typology*, vol. i, append. i). See also Hugh Miller, *Test. of Rocks*, lect. v; M'Cosh, *Typical Forms;* Agassiz, *Princ. of Zoology*, pt. i.

During the course of the preparatory dispensations, the divine Being disclosed himself to the more pious and favored of our race in the form of man, and with the title of "the Angel of Jehovah"—מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה The first of these appearances was to Hagar in her distress. The angel addressed her in the person of God, and she, in return, attributed to him the name of "Thou, God, seest me." The foremost of the three angels with whom Abraham conversed with respect to the cities of the plain (Gen. xviii) is called not fewer than eight times "Jehovah," and six times "Lord" (אֲדֹנָי). (See Hengstenberg, *Christol.* i, 112, transl.) In the destruction of the cities of the plain an unmistakable distinction is made between two persons, each of whom bears the same divine name: "Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven" (Gen. xix, 24). The full nature of the theophany to Jacob (Gen. xxxii, 24-30) is made manifest in Hos. xii, 3-5. The scene opens with the view of a man wrestling with Jacob, and closes with Jacob's calling the name of the place "Peniel, for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." "The prophet Hosea puts it beyond a doubt that this was a divine person by styling him not only an angel and God (אֱלֹהִים), but *Jehovah, God of hosts, Jehovah is his memorial.* Whilst, therefore, he was *a man* and *an angel*, or the *angel of the covenant*, he was also the *supreme Jehovah.* These titles and attributes belong to none other than the second person of the blessed Trinity, Christ the Saviour" (Davidson, *Sacred Hermeneutics*, p. 281). The "Angel of Jehovah" appears to Moses in a flame of fire from the bush, and still takes to himself the names of Deity, Elohim, and Jehovah (Exod. iii, 2-7); manifests himself to Manoah as man, and yet is recognised and worshipped as God, while he declares his name to be "Wonderful," the same as in Isa. ix, 6; and at the close of the Old-Testament canon (Mal. iii, 1) he is announced as the angel or messenger who should suddenly come to his Temple. (See also Exod. xiv, 19; xviii, 20; xxii, 34; xxiii, 23; Numb. xx, 16; comp. Exod. xxiii, 21; xxxiii, 2, 3, 14; Josh. vi, 2; v, 13-15, 22; Judg. vi, 11-22; xiii, 6-22; Isa. lxiii, 9.)

As to the nature of this mysterious personage, there have been those who have held, with Augustine, that the theophanies were "not direct appearances of a person in the Godhead, but self-manifestations of God through a created being" (see Liddon, *Bampton Lect.* ii, 87, note), among the latest defenders of which view are Hoffman (in his *Weissagung und Erfüllung*) and Delitzsch (on *Genesis*). On the other hand, the fathers of the Church prior to the Nicene Council were almost unanimous in the opinion that the "angel of Jehovah" is identical with *Jehovah* himself, not denoting an existence apart from himself, but only the mode of manifestation of the divine Logos, who subsequently became incarnate; and in this view the Church has generally acquiesced. (On the subject of theophanies, see Justin Martyr, *Apology;* Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* i, ch. ii; Kurtz, *Old Cov.* i, 181-201, transl.; an able article in the *Stud. u. Krit.* of 1840 by Nitzsch; E. H. Stahl, *Die Erscheinungen Jehovas u. Seiner Engel im A. T.*, in Eichhorn's *Bib. Rep.* vii, 156 sq.; Hänlein, *Ueber Theo. u. Christophanien*, in the *N. Theol. Journ.* ii, 1 sq., 93 sq., 277 sq.) See THEOPHANY.

VII. *The Logos.*—In the description of the incarnation given by the evangelist John there appears the term "Logos" in a sense new to the Scriptures, and among New-Testament writers peculiar to him. Much has been written on the origin of this word. The Targums, the best of which are generally attributed to the 1st century, may be regarded as embodying the sentiments of that age (Etheridge, *Heb. Lit.* p. 191). In these, for the name of Deity, "Jehovah," there is employed the paraphrase "Word of the Lord." "On this circumstance much argument has been built. Some have maintained that it supplies an indubitable ascription of personal existence to the *Word*, in some sense distinct from the personal existence of the supreme Father; that this *Word* is the *Logos* of the New Testament; and, consequently, that the phrase is a proof of a belief among the ancient Jews in the pre-existence, the personal operations, and the deity of the Messiah, 'the Word who became flesh, and fixed his tabernacle among us'" (J. Pye Smith, *Messiah*, bk. ii, sec. 11; compare Bertholdt, *Christol. Jud.* p. 130 sq.). Others have referred the origin of the word to Philo; but, as has been abundantly shown, the Logos of Philo has but little in common with that of the Gospel (Tholuck, *Comm.* ad loc. p. 61), and is but a nucleus of divine ideas, which lacks the essential element of personality. "Blinding as the resemblance between many of his ideas and modes of expression and those of Christianity may be to the superficial reader, yet the essential principle is to its very foundation diverse. Even that which sounds like the expressions of John has in its entire connection a meaning altogether diverse. . . . His system stalks by the cradle of Christianity only as a spectral counterpart. It appears like the floating, dissolving *fata Morgana* on the horizon, where Christianity is about to arise" (Dorner, *Lehre v. der Person Christi*, ii, 198, 342. Comp. Burton, *Bampton Lect.* note 93; Ritter, *Hist. of Philos.* transl. iv, 407-478; Liddon, *Bampton Lecture*, p. 93-108; Döllinger, *Heid. u. Judenthum*, x, 3; *Bib. Sacra*, vi, 173; vii, 13, 696-732; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 1851, p. 377; 1858, p. 110-129). See LOGOS.

VIII. *Heresies.*—The false theories that have gathered around the doctrine of the incarnation are manifold, and deny (1) that Christ was truly God, (2) that he was truly man, or (3) that he is God-man in one undivided and indivisible person. (See Wangemann, *Christliche Glaubenslehre*, p. 203; Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, 2 vols. 8vo.) Compare CHRISTOLOGY, III.

1. *Ebionism.*—This, the first heresy of importance, took its rise during the lifetime of the apostles, and received its designation, according to Origen, from אֶבְיוֹן,

poor, thus signifying, perhaps, the meagreness of their religious system, or, more properly, the poverty of its followers. They denied the divinity of Christ, but ascribed to him a superior legal piety and the elevated wisdom of a prophet. Eusebius says (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 7), "The common Ebionites themselves suppose that a higher power had united itself with the man Jesus at his baptism." The Ebionites, whose views are represented by the *Clementine Homilies*, differed from the former by asserting that Jesus had from the beginning been pervaded with the same power; in their opinion he ranks with Adam, Enoch, and Moses (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, i, 180). This error, which has been called, not improperly, the Socinianism of the age, revived and embodied the sentiments concerning the Messiah current among the Jews during his life. The views of the *Nazarenes*, who are generally regarded as a species of Ebionites, while they more nearly approached the orthodox faith, agreed with them in regarding Christ as only a superior man.

2. *Gnosticism.*—The Ebionitish heresy that rose within the infant Church, from its necessary association with Judaism, was paralleled by another (Gnosticism), which sprang from a similar contact with the pagan philosophy of the age. The assumption of a superior capacity for knowledge implied in the name the Gnostics bore (γνῶσις, 1 Cor. viii, 1; 1 Tim. vi, 20; Col. ii, 8), probably self-assumed, indicated the transcendental speculations which they ingrafted on the tender plant of Christianity. With respect to the nature of Christ, they held that the Deity had existed from all eternity in a state of absolute quiescence, but finally he begat certain beings or *æons* after his own likeness, of whom Christ was one; and that he was allied to the lower angels and the Δημιουργός, *Demiurge*, to whom this lower world was subject. Moreover, he had never in reality assumed a material body, but became united with the man Jesus at his baptism, and abode with him until the time of his death. (See Mosheim, *Commentaries on the first three Centuries*, sec. 62.) The tenets of Gnosticism can be traced even to the apostolical age. Simon Magus appears to have represented himself as an incarnation of the demiurgic power (Acts viii, 10). The ancient fathers regarded him as the father of the Gnostics (Irenæus, *adv. Hær.* i, 23). On the other hand, Tittmann (*De vestigiis Gnosticorum*, etc.) holds that nothing was known of the Gnostics until the 2d century. However, the opening chapter of St. John's Gospel seems to be directed against Gnostical perversions of the doctrine of the incarnation, which is not impossible if we admit the well-known tradition that Cerinthus disputed with that evangelist. (See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, iii, ch. xxviii.)

3. *Docetism.*—This was one of the forms of Gnosticism denying the reality of Christ's human nature, and representing whatever appertained to his human appearance to be a mere phantasm—δόκησις. Jerome tells us that while the apostles were still living there were those who taught that his body was no more than a phantom. This particular form of Gnostical error was censured by Ignatius in his *Epistles*, and therefore unquestionably arose early in the Church. (See Lardner, iii, 441.) "If the Son of God (said the Docetist) has been crucified for me merely in appearance, then am I bound down by the chains of sin in appearance; but those who speak are themselves a mere show." For modern Docetism, as illustrated in the mythical treatment of the doctrines of sacred history by Schelling, and the Rationalists generally, see Martensen, *Dogmatics*, p. 244.

4. *Monarchianism* (about A.D. 170), μοναρχία, so called either from its regard to the doctrine of the divine unity, or from a regard to Christ's dignity. (See Hase, sec. 90.) According to its teachings, Christ was a mere man, but born of the Virgin by the power of the Holy Spirit, and exalted to be the Lord of the whole Church. A certain efflux from the divine essence dwelt in Christ, and this constituted his personality, while this personality originated in the hypothesis of a divine power. (See Neander, ii, 349, Clark's ed.)

5. *Sabellianism* (about 258) taught that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were one and the same—so many different *manifestations* of the same being—three denominations in one substance. (See Hagenbach, i, 263.) Thus the personality of the Son was denied. His personality in the flesh did not exist prior to the incarnation, nor does it exist now, as the divine ray which had been incorporated in Christ has returned to its source. In the words of Burton, "If we seek for a difference between the theory of Sabellius and those of his predecessors, we are perhaps to say that Noetus supposed the whole divinity of the Father to be inherent in Jesus Christ, whereas Sabellius supposed it to be only a part, which was put forth like an emanation, and was again absorbed in the Deity. Noetus acknowledged only one divine Person; Sabellius divided this one dignity into three; but he supposed the Son and the Holy Ghost to have no distinct personal existence, except when they were put forth for a time by the Father." The views of Sabellius reappear in the dogmas of Schleiermacher (who regarded the eternal and absolute Monas as *unrevealed;* the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as God *revealed*), and in a modified form in the *Discourses on the Incarnation and Atonement* by Dr. Bushnell.

6. *Manichæism* (circa A.D. 274).—Mani or Manes, who was probably educated in the religion of Zoroaster, upon his adoption of the Christian faith, transferred to his Christ the Oriental views of incarnation. In this system the dualistic principle was more fully developed than in Gnosticism. He brought together as in a kaleidoscope the fantasies of Parseeism, Buddhism, and Chaldeeism, bits of philosophy alike brilliant and alike worthless. "From Gnosticism, or, rather, from universal Orientalism, he drew the inseparable admixture of moral and physical notions, the eternal hostility between mind and matter, the rejection of Judaism, and the identification of the God of the Old Testament with the evil spirit, the distinction between Jesus and the Christ, with the Docetism or unreal death of the incorporeal Christ." For a further admirable summary of his views, see Milman's *Latin Christ.* ii, 322 sq. The followers of Manes formed themselves into a Church A.D. 274, which possessed a hierarchical form of government, and consisted of two great classes, the perfect (*electi*) and catechumens (*auditores*). (See Hase, sec. 82.)

7. *Arianism* (about 318).—The 4th century witnessed the rise of the most formidable and persistent of all the forms of error as to the person of Christ. The teachings of Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, that the Son was of the same essence with the Father, developed the latent doubts of one of his presbyters, Arius, who rushed to the other extreme. Charging his bishop with Sabellianism, he maintained that the Son was not the *same* in substance (ὁμοούσιος), but *similar* (ὁμοιούσιος). He did not hesitate to accept the logical consequences of his dogma—that Christ, though the noblest of creatures, must, like all others, have been *created* from nothing. This deduction contains, as in a nut-shell, the entire heresy.

8. *Apollinarianism* (about A.D. 378).—Apollinaris the younger rejected the proper humanity of Christ. He adopted many of the sentiments of Noetus the Monarchian. From the postulate that as the person of Christ was one, therefore his nature must be one, he reasoned that there could be no human intellect or will, but that the functions of soul and body must be discharged by the Logos, which so commingled with the uncreated body of Christ that the two distinct natures formed one heterogeneous substance entirely *sui generis*. (See Harvey, *On the Creeds*, ii, 645.) "Both Noetus and Apollinaris denied that the Word was made man of the Virgin by the Holy Ghost; the earlier heretic teaching that there was no real hypostatic distinction in the Deity, the latter supposing that the flesh, as an eternally uncreated body, came down from heaven. Both denied

for the same reason, the inseparable union of two perfect natures in one person; both denied that Christ was perfect man: the Patripassian, no less than the Apollinarian, having considered that the divine nature supplied the place of a human soul" (Harvey, *Creeds*, ii, 649).

9. *Nestorianism* (about 428) furnished the knotted root from which sprang ultimately the antagonist heresies of the Monophysites and Monothelites. To the phrase θεοτόκος, *mother of God*, applied to the Virgin, Nestorius took exception, maintaining that Mary had given birth to Christ, and not to God. Thus arose the long-protracted controversy respecting the two natures of Christ (Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* vii, ch. xxxii). Nestorius maintained that a divine and human nature dwelt in Christ as separate entities, but in closest connection—συνάφεια; to use the figure of Wangemann, "as boards are glued together." His own admission, "Divido naturas sed conjungo reverentiam," justified the allegation brought against his doctrines that Christ is really a double being. The humanity of Christ was the temple for the indwelling (ἐνοίκησις) of Deity upon the separate basis of personality in his human nature.

10. *Monophysitism* (about 446).—The doctrine of Nestorius, that there must be two natures if there be two persons in Christ, led Eutyches, by the law of contrarieties, to an exact counterpart, that there is but one person in Christ, and this one person admits of but one nature. The logic was the same in both heresies. Liddon has properly said, "The Monophysite formula practically made Christ an unincarnate God;" for, according to Monophysitism, the human nature of Christ had been absorbed in the divine. "We get, as it were, a Christ with two heads: an image which produces the impression not merely of the superhuman, but of the monstrous, and which is incapable of producing any *moral* effect" (Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, sec. 136). Soon after the condemnation of this error by the fourth General Council at Chalcedon, it branched out into ten leading sects, whence it has been called "the ten-horned."

11. *Monothelitism* (about 625).—The controversy over the heresy of Monophysitism was prolonged for centuries. In the midst of the contest, the idle curiosity of the emperor Heraclius led him to propound the question to his bishops "Whether Christ, of one person but two natures, was actuated by a single or double will" (Waddington, *Ch. History*, i, 355). The question met with a ready response, but it was the response of error. It was said in reply that a multiplicity of wills must of necessity imply a multiplicity of willers. This is the postulate of Monothelitism. In maintenance of the unity of Christ's nature, they held that in him was only one will or energy, and that this was a divinely human will (ἐνεργεία θεανδρική). (For a statement of the orthodox view of the divine and human will of Christ, see Liddon's *Bampton Lect.* v, 392.) The sixth General Council at Constantinople, A.D. 680, decided in favor of the Dyothelitic doctrine, while it anathematized the Monothelites and their views.

12. *Adoptianism* (about 787).—The incessant and fierce strife of the early Church with respect to the nature of Christ finally culminated in the *Adoptian* controversy. According to the views of this sect, in his divine nature, Christ is the true Son of God; but as respects his human nature, he is the Son of God only by *adoption*—"his divinity according to the former was proper, but according to the latter nature nominal and titular" (Herzog, *Encyklop.*).

13. *Socinianism, Unitarianism, and Rationalism* present no new phase of heresy. They are simply resurrected forms of error that had again and again been refuted It may be questioned whether the inventive mind of German Neology has presented upon the incarnation any feature of error essentially new. The subtle minds of Arius, Sabellius, and other kindred philosophers of the early Church have explored every avenue of doubt, and left no new openings into which heretical error can possibly thrust itself. The most that modern speculations have done has been to revivify dead theories of the past, and clothe them with "the empty abstractions of impersonal idea." See CHRISTOLOGY, vol. ii, p. 282. As a fair illustration of the mystical speculations with which the metaphysical theology of modern Germany has overlaid the doctrine of the incarnation, we quote from Hegel (*Religionsphilosophie*, ii, 261): "That which first existed was the idea in its simple universality, the *Father;* the second is the particular, the idea in its manifestation, the *Son*—to wit, the idea in its external existence, so that the external manifestation is changed into the first, and known as the divine idea, the identity of the divine with the human. The third is this consciousness, God as the *Holy Spirit*, and this spirit in his existence is the Church." According to Lessing, "This doctrine (of the Trinity) will lead human reason to acknowledge that God cannot possibly be understood to be one by that reason to which all finite things are one; that his unity must also be a transcendental unity which does not exclude a kind of plurality." To Schelling "it is clear that the idea of Trinity is absurd, unless it be considered on speculative grounds. . . . The incarnation of God is an eternal incarnation;" and by Fichte the Son is regarded as God attaining to a consciousness of himself in man. See, farther, Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, ii, 384-420. Marheineke, who in theological obscurities was an apt disciple of his master Hegel, thus discourses of the incarnation (*Grundlehren d. Christlichen Dogmatik*, § 325, 326): "As spirit, by renouncing individuality, man is in truth elevated above himself, without having abandoned the human nature; as spirit renouncing absoluteness, God has lowered himself to human nature, without having abandoned his existence as divine Spirit. The unity of the divine and human nature is but the unity in that Spirit whose existence is the knowledge of the truth with which the doing of good is identical. This spirit, as God in the human nature, and man in the divine nature, is the God-man. The man wise in divine holiness, and holy in divine wisdom, is the God-man. As a historical fact, this union of God with man is manifest and real in the person of Jesus Christ; in him the divine manifestation has become perfectly human. The conception of the God-man, in the historical person of Jesus Christ, contains in itself two phases in one: First, that God is manifest only through man, and in this relation Christ is as yet placed on an equality with all other men; he is the Son of Man, and therein at first represents only the possibility of God becoming man; secondly, that in this man, Jesus Christ, God is manifest as in none other: this manifest man is the manifest God; but the manifest God is the Son of God, and in this relation Christ is God's Son: and this is the actual fulfilment of the possibility or promise; it is the reality of God becoming man." For farther quotations from German Rationalists, see Mansel, *Limits of Religious Thought*, p. 154-163, 378-383.

While, as respects the question of antecedency, the propriety of introducing Swedenborg in the company of Rationalists might be questioned, we regard his views on the incarnation as entitling him to consideration in this connection. "He taught that, instead of a trinity of *persons* (set forth in the symbols of the Church), we must hold a trinity of the *person*, by which he understood that that which is divine in the nature of Christ is the *Father*, that the divine which is united to the human is the *Son*, and the divine which proceeds from him is the *Holy Spirit*," etc. (Hagenbach, *Hist of Doct.* ii, 419). For the literature of Rationalism and its polemics, consult Hagenbach, *Encyclop. der Theologischen Wissenchaften*, p. 90-93. We cannot but suggest that all speculations upon the incarnation, which on the one hand rob Christ of his divinity as the true God, or on the other of his humanity as truly man, subject themselves to the severe strictures of Coleridge (*Works*, Am. edit. v, 552; comp. also v, 447): "That Socinianism is not a religion, but a theory, and that, too, a very perni-

cious theory, or a very unsatisfactory theory—pernicious, for it excludes all our deep and awful ideas of the perfect holiness of God, his justice, and his mercy, and thereby makes the voice of conscience a delusion, as having no correspondent in the character of the legislator; . . . . unsatisfactory, for it promises forgiveness without any solution of the difficulty of the compatibility of this with the justice of God; in no way explains the fallen condition of man, nor offers any means for his regeneration. 'If you will be good, you will be happy,' it says. 'That may be, but my will is weak; I sink in the struggle.'" We may even adduce the trenchant sarcasm of Hume, "To be a philosophical sceptic is the first step towards becoming a sound believing Christian," which, interpreted in plainer phrase, is, "He who comes to Christ must first believe he is NOT." (Consult Martensen, *Dogmatics*, § 137.)

IX. *Additional Texts illustrative of the Subject.*—1. *Prophecies of Christ incarnate.*—Gen. iii, 15, The seed of the woman, xlviii, 16, The angel; xlix, 10, Shiloh; Deut. xviii, 18, 19, The prophet like unto Moses; Job xix, 23–27, The Redeemer that liveth; xxxiii, 23, The Angel intercessor; Psa. ii, 6, 7, The Sonship declared; xvi, 10, 11, The Holy One free from corruption; xxii, The sufferings of the Messiah; xxiv, 7–10, Jehovah of glory, with 1 Cor. ii, 8; xlv, The perpetuity and glory of his kingdom; lxxii, xl, 6–10, A body prepared for the Messiah; cx, Messiah the Lord, Priest, Conqueror; cx, 1, with Matt. xxii, 42–45; Prov. viii, ix, חָכְמָה, Wisdom personified; Isa. vi, 1–3, As Lord of hosts, John xii, 41; Isa. vii, 14; viii, 10, The Virgin's child, named Immanuel; ix, 5, 6, Attributes of Deity ascribed to the child to be born; xi, 1–10, Messiah from the root of Jesse; xxxii, 1–5, The blessings of Christ's kingdom; xl, 3, As Jehovah, with Matt. iii, 3; xlii, 1–5, The office of Christ; xliv, 6, As Jehovah the first and the last, with Rev. i, 17; lii, 13–15; liii, The sufferings, death, and burial of Christ; Jer. xxiii, 5, 6; xxxiii, 15, 16, The Lord our righteousness, with 1 Cor. i, 30; Ezek. i, 26, The appearance of a man upon the throne; Dan. vii, 13, 14, The glory of the Son of Man; Joel ii, 28–32, Christ the Saviour, with Acts ii, 17, 21; Micah v, 2–4, The birthplace of Christ foretold; Hag. ii, 6–9, The desire of all nations; Zech. iii, 8; vi, 12, 13, The Branch; xii, 10; xiii, 1, The opening of a fountain for sin; xiii, 7, The shepherd to be smitten; Mal. iii, 1, The Lord to come to his Temple, with Luke ii, 27, etc.; Matt. i, 18–25; Luke i, 30–38; ii, Circumstances of Christ's birth; xxii, 43, David calling Christ Lord; Luke xxiv, 19, 44, Christ interpreting prophecy concerning himself.

2. *The divinity of Christ* in the New Test.—John i; iii, 13, 31; v, 17, 27, 31, 36; vi, 33–63; viii, 5, 6, 58; x, 24–38; xii, 41; xiv, 1, 6–14, 20; xvii, 3; xix, 36; xx, 28; Acts ii, 34; vii, 59, 60; x, 36; xx, 28; xiii, 33; Rom. i, 4; ix, 5; xi, 36; xiv, 10–12; 1 Cor. ii, 8; viii, 6; xv, 47; 2 Cor. iv, 4; Gal. iv, 4, 5; Eph. i, 10, 23; iv, 24; Phil. ii, 6–8, 9–11; iii, 21; Col. i, 3, 15–19; ii, 9, 10; iii, 10, 11; 1 Tim. iii, 16; Tit. ii, 13, with Hos. i, 7; Heb. i, 2–12; ii, 14–18; iii, 1–5; iv, 16; v, 7–9; ix, 11; x, 20; xiii, 8; Jas. ii, 7; 1 Pet. iii, 18; 2 Pet. i, 1; 1 John i, 1–3; iii, 8; iv, 2, 9, 14; v, 19, 20; Jude 4; Rev. i, 4–17; ii, 8; vii, 17; xxii, 1, 16, 34, etc.

3. *The humanity of Christ.*—Matt. i, 18; ii, 2; iv, 2; viii, 20, 24; xvi, 13; xxii, 42; xxvi, 67; xxvii, 26, 59, 60; Mark iv, 38; x, 47; xv, 46; Luke i, 31; ii, 7, 11, 21, 52; iii, 23; xxii, 64; xxiii, 11; John i, 14; iv, 2, 6, 7; vii, 27; xi, 33, 35; xii, 27; xix, 1, 28, 30; xx, 27; Acts ii, 22, 31; iii, 15, 22; xiii, 23; Rom. i, 3; Gal. iii, 16; iv, 4; Phil. ii, 7, 8; 2 Tim. ii, 8; Heb. ii, 14, 17; vii, 26, 28; 1 John i, 12; iii, 5; iv, 3; 2 John 7, etc.

X. *Literature.* — Athanasius, *De Incarnatione Dei Verbi et contra Arianos*, in *Opp.* (ed. Patavii, 1777), i, 695 sq.; Tertullian, *Opera* (1695, fol.), p. 307 sq.; Cyrill. Hierosol. *De Christo Incarnato*, in *Opera* (1763, fol.), p. 162 sq.; Cyrill. Alexandrinus, *De Incarnatione Unigeniti*, in *Opera* (1638, fol.), v, 1; Hilary, *De Trinitate* (Paris, 1631), bk. ii, p. 17 sq.; Chrysostom, *Homilia* ("In principio erat Verbum"), in *Opera*, xii, 571; Zanchius, *De Incarnatione Filii Dei*, in *Opera* (1619, folio), viii, 1; Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio in nativitatem Christi* (transl. by H. S. Boyd, in *The Fathers not Papists*, 1834); G. F. Baur, *Die Chr. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit u. Menschwerdung Gottes* (Tübingen, 1841); Johann Aug. Ernesti, *De Dignitate et Veritate Incarnationis Filii Dei*, in his *Opuscula Theologica* (1792); Gass, *Geschichte der Prot. Dogm.* i, 111 sq.; A. Hahn, *Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens* (1828), p. 448 sq.; Duguet, *Principes de la Foi Chrétienne*, and responses to Rénan's *Vie de Jesu*, by his countrymen Freppel, Bp. Plantier, and Poujoulat; J. A. Dorner, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre für die Person Christi*, i, passim; ii, 51 sq., 432–442, 591 sq. (transl. also in Clark's *Lib.*); Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk* (Erlangen, 1857); J. P. Lange, *Leben Jesu*, ii, 66 sq.; Karl Werner, *Geschichte der Apologetischen und Polemischen Literatur der Christlichen Theologie* (1861), i, 387 sq., 566 sq.; ii, 175 sq.; M. F. Sadler, *Emmanuel, or the Incarnation of the Son of God the Foundation of immutable Truth* (1867); John Owen, *Χριστολογία, or a Declaration of the glorious Mystery of the Person of Christ God and Man* (Lond. 1826), xii, 1–343; Pearson, *On the Creed;* Burnet, *On the* 39 *Articles*, Art. ii; Archbishop Usher, *Immanuel, or the Mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God* (Lond. 1648, fol.); Thos. Goodwin, *Christ the Mediator*, in *Works* (1681, fol.), iii, 1–427; R. J. Wilberforce, *Doct. of the Incarn. of our Lord Jesus Christ in its Relation to Mankind and the Church;* Edward Irving, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation opened* (in *Sermons*); Robt. Turnbull, *Theophany, or the Manifestation of God in Christ Jesus;* John Farrer, *Bampton Lecture* (1803), p. 59 sq.; Robert Fleming, *The Loganthropos, or a Discourse concerning Christ as the Logos* (Lond. 1705), vol. ii of *Christology;* Thomas Bradbury, *Mystery of Godliness considered in* 61 *Sermons* (Edinb. 1795); Wm. Sherlock, *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God* (Lond. 1691); Marcus Dods, *On the Incarnation of the Eternal Word*, with rec. notice by Dr. Thomas Chalmers (2d ed. 1849); *Bib. Rep.* 1832, p. 1; 1849, p. 636 sq.; Brownson's *Quart. Rev.* sec. series, iv, 136; v, 137 sq.; vi, 287 sq.; *Church Rev.* iv, 428 sq.; *Biblioth. Sacra*, xi, 729; xii, 52; xxiv, 41 sq. (an able art. on the theory of Incarnation, April, 1854); *Methodist Quart. Rev.* 1851, p. 114; 1866, p. 290; Kitto's *Journal of Sacred Literature*, first series, iii, 107–113; *Theological Eclectic*, ii, 184; Massillon, "Les caractères de la grandeur de Jesus Christ," in *Œuvres Completes*, vi, 107; on 1 Cor. ii, 7, 8; vii, 89; Bp. Stillingfleet, *Sermons* (1690), iii, 336; Bossuet, three Sermons, *Œuvres*, vii, 1; Bp. Atterbury, *Sermons*, iv, 61; Joseph Benson, *Sermons*, ii, 604; Archbp. Tillotson, (fol. ed.), i, 431; Bp. Beveridge, *Works*, ii, 564; Bp. Horne, *Disc.* i, 193; Bp. Van Mildert, *Works*, v, 359; J. H. Newman, *Sermons*, ii, 29; C. Simeon, *Works*, xix, 170; Richard Duke, *The Divinity and Humanity of Jesus Christ* (1730), p. 29; Thomas Arnold, *Sermon* on 1 Tim. iii, 16, at Rugby (1833) p. 111; W. A. Butler, *The Mystery of the Holy Incarnation* (Amer. ed.), i, 58; George Rawlinson, *Sermon* on John i, 11, p. 1; Riggenbach, *Sermon* on the Person of Jesus Christ, transl. in *Foundations of our Faith*, p. 100. For other sermons on the incarnation, see Darling's *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, col. 1059, 1063, 1064, 1546, 1547, 1595–1597; also Malcolm's *Theol. Index*, p. 234. Compare Stanley, *East. Ch.* p. 279, 352; *Baptist Quart.* 1870 (July); *Amer. Ch. Rev.* 1870, p. 82; *Am. Presb. Rev.* 1869, p. 324; *Bib. Sac.* 1870, p. 1; *Mercersb. Rev.* 1858, p. 419; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* 1861 (Jan., art. iv); 1866 (Jan.); 1868 (July); *Theol. Eclect.* iii, 167; *Bullet. Théol.* 1867 (Jan.), p. 23 sq. See also references to the subject, more or less extensive, in *Lives of Christ*, by Sepp, Kuhn, Baumgarten, Ewald, Van Osterzee, Neander, Jeremy Taylor, Ellicott, Pressensé, Young, Andrews; Lichtenstein's *Jesus Christus, Abriss seines Lebens*, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* vol. vi; also Bibliography of Life of Jesus in Hase's *Leben Jesu* (Lpz. 1854); also Literature under CHRISTOLOGY, vol. ii, p. 284. (J. K. B.)

Incartulāti, a term for the certificates of liberation given to serfs or slaves of churches and monasteries who were liberated.—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 841.

Incastratūra (*sepulcrum*) is a name in the Roman Catholic Church for a small place in the altar-stones set apart for the storage of saints' relics.—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 841.

Incensarium (or INCENSORIUM) is the name of the vessel used in the Romish and some of the Oriental churches for containing the incense to be burned. See INCENSE.

Incensation is the lighting and burning of the incense. See INCENSE.

Incense (קְטוֹרָה, *ketorah'*, Deut. xxxiii, 10; usually קְטֹרֶת, *keto'reth*, which is once applied likewise to the *fat* of rams, being the part always burned in sacrifice; once קִטֵּר, *kitter'*, Jer. xliv, 21; all forms of the verb קָטַר, prop. to *smoke*, hence to cause an odor by burning, often itself applied to the act of burning incense; Greek, θυμίαμα and cognate terms; sometimes לְבוֹנָה, *lebonah'*, Isa. xliii, 23; lx, 6; lxvi, 3; Jer. vi, 20; xvii, 26; xli, 5, *frankincense*, as elsewhere rendered), a perfume which gives forth its fragrance by burning, and, in particular, that perfume which was burned upon the Jewish altar of incense. (See Weimar, *De suffitu aromatum*, Jen. 1678.) See ALTAR. Indeed, the burning of incense seems to have been considered among the Hebrews so much of an act of worship or sacred offering that we read not of any other use of incense than this among them. Nor among the Egyptians do we discover any trace of burned perfume except in sacerdotal use; but in Persian sculptures we see incense burned before the king. The offering of incense has formed a part of the religious ceremonies of most ancient nations. The Egyptians burned resin in honor of the sun at its rising, myrrh when at its meridian, and a mixture called kuphi at its setting (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* v, 315). Plutarch (*De Is. et Os.* c. lii, lxxx) describes kuphi as a mixture of sixteen ingredients. "In the temple of Siva incense is offered to the Lingam six times in twenty-four hours" (Roberts, *Oriental Illust.* p. 368). It was also an element in the idolatrous worship of the Israelites (Jer. xi, 12, 17; xlviii, 35; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 25).

1. The incense employed in the service of the tabernacle was distinguished as קְטֹרֶת הַסַּמִּים (*ketôreth has-sammim; Exod.* xxv, 6, *incense of the aromas;* Sept. ἡ σύνθεσις τοῦ θυμιάματος; Vulg. *thymiamata boni odores;* A.V. "sweet incense"). The ingredients of the sacred incense are enumerated with great precision in Exod. xxx, 34, 35: "Take unto thee sweet spices, stacte (נָטָף, *nataph*), and onycha (שְׁחֵלֶת, *shecheleth*), and galbanum (חֶלְבְּנָה, *chelbenah*); these sweet spices with pure frankincense (לְבֹנָה, *lebonah*): of each shall there be a like weight. And thou shalt make of it a perfume, a confection after the art of the apothecary, tempered together, pure and holy." See each of these ingredients in its alphabetical place. All incense which was not made of these ingredients was called קְטוֹרָה זָרָה (*ketôrâh zârâh*), "strange incense," Exod. xxx, 9, and was forbidden to be offered. According to Rashi on Exod. xxx, 34, the above-mentioned perfumes were mixed in equal proportions, seventy manehs being taken of each. They were compounded by the skill of the apothecary, to whose use, according to Rabbinical tradition, was devoted a portion of the Temple, called, from the name of the family whose especial duty it was to prepare the incense, "the house of Abtines." So in the large temples of India "is retained a man whose chief business it is to distil sweet waters from flowers, and to extract oil from wood, flowers, and other substances" (Roberts, *Oriental Illust.* p. 82). The priest or Levite to whose care the incense was intrusted was one of the fifteen ממונים (*memûnnim*), or prefects of the Temple. Constant watch was kept in the house of Abtines that the incense might always be in readiness (Buxtorf, *Lexicon Talmud.* s. v. אבטינס). In addition to the four ingredients already mentioned, Jarchi enumerates seven others, thus making eleven, which the Jewish doctors affirm were communicated to Moses on Mount Sinai. Josephus (*War*, v, 5, 5) mentions thirteen. The proportions of the additional spices are given by Maimonides (*Cêle hammikdâsh*, ii, 2, § 3) as follows: of myrrh, cassia, spikenard, and saffron, sixteen manehs each; of costus, twelve manehs; cinnamon, nine manehs; sweet bark, three manehs. The weight of the whole confection was 368 manehs. To these was added the fourth part of a cab of salt of Sodom, with amber of Jordan, and an herb called "the smoke-raiser" (מעלה עשן, *maâleh âshân*), known only to the cunning in such matters, to whom the secret descended by tradition. In the ordinary daily service one maneh was used, half in the morning and half in the evening. Allowing, then, one maneh of incense for each day of the solar year, the three manehs which remained were again pounded, and used by the high-priest on the day of atonement (Lev. xvi, 12). A store of it was constantly kept in the Temple (Joseph. *War*, vi, 8, 3). The further directions are that this precious compound should be made or broken up into minute particles, and that it should be deposited, as a very holy thing, in the tabernacle "before the testimony" (or ark). As the ingredients are so minutely specified, there was nothing to prevent wealthy persons from having a similar perfume for private use: this, therefore, was forbidden under pain of excommunication: "Ye shall not make to yourselves according to the composition thereof: it shall be unto thee holy for the Lord. Whosoever shall make like unto that, to smell thereto, shall even be cut off from his people" (ver. 37, 38). So in some part of India, according to Michaelis (*Mosaisches Recht*, art. 249), it was considered high treason for any person to make use of the best sort of *calambak*, which was for the service of the king alone. The word which describes the various ingredients as being "tempered together" literally means *salted* (מְמֻלָּח, *memullach*). The Chaldee and Greek versions, however, have set the example of rendering it by *mixed* or *tempered*, as if their idea was that the different ingredients were to be mixed together, just as salt is mixed with any substance over which it is sprinkled. Ainsworth contends for the literal meaning, inasmuch as the law (Lev. ii, 13) expressly says, "With all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt." In support of this he cites Maimonides, who affirms that there was not anything offered on the altar without salt, except the wine of the drink-offering, and the blood, and the wood; and of the incense he says, still more expressly, that "they added to it a cab of salt." In accordance with this, it is supposed, our Saviour says, "Every sacrifice shall be salted with salt" (Mark ix, 49). Ainsworth further remarks: "If our speech is to be always with grace, seasoned with salt, as the apostle teaches (Col. iv, 6), how much more should our incense, our prayers unto God, be therewith seasoned!" It is difficult, however, to see how so anomalous a substance as salt could well be combined in the preparation; and if it was used, as we incline to think that it was, it was probably added in the act of offering. See SALT. The expression בַּד בְּבַד (*bad bebad*), Exod. xxx, 34, is interpreted by the Chaldee "weight by weight," that is, an equal weight of each (comp. Jarchi, ad loc.); and this rendering is adopted by our version. Others, however, and among them Aben-Ezra and Maimonides, consider it as signifying that each of the spices was separately prepared, and that all were afterwards mixed.

2. Aaron, as high-priest, was originally appointed to offer incense, but in the daily service of the second Temple the office devolved upon the inferior priests, from among whom one was chosen by lot (Mishna, *Yoma*, ii,

4; Luke i, 9) each morning and evening (Abarbanel, *On Lev.* x, 1). A peculiar blessing was supposed to be attached to this service, and in order that all might share in it, the lot was cast among those who were "new to the incense," if any remained (Mishna, *Yoma*, l. c.; Bartenora, *On Tamid*, v, 2). Uzziah was punished for his presumption in attempting to infringe the prerogatives of the descendants of Aaron, who were consecrated to burn incense (2 Chron. xxvi, 16-21; Joseph. *Ant.* ix, 10, 4). The officiating priest appointed another, whose office it was to take the fire from the brazen altar. According to Maimonides (*Tamid Umus*, ii, 8; iii, 5), this fire was taken from the second pile, which was over against the S.E. corner of the altar of burnt-offering, and was of fig-tree wood. A silver shovel (מַחְתָּה, *machtâh*) was first filled with the live coals, and afterwards emptied into a golden one, smaller than the former, so that some of the coals were spilled (Mishna, *Tamid*, v, 5; *Yoma*, iv, 4; comp. Rev. viii, 5). Another priest cleared the golden altar from the cinders which had been left at the previous offering of incense (Mishna, *Tamid*, iii, 6, 9; vi, 1).

The times of offering incense were specified in the instructions first given to Moses (Exod. xxx, 7, 8). The morning incense was offered when the lamps were trimmed in the holy place, and before the sacrifice, when the watchman set for the purpose announced the break of day (Mishna, *Yoma*, iii, 1, 5). When the lamps were lighted "between the evenings," after the evening sacrifice and before the drink-offerings were offered, incense was again burnt on the golden altar which "belonged to the oracle" (1 Kings vi, 22), and stood before the veil which separated the holy place from the Holy of Holies, the throne of God (Rev. viii, 4; Philo, *De Anim. idon.* § 3).

When the priest entered the holy place with the incense, all the people were removed from the Temple, and from between the porch and the altar (Maimonides, *Tamid Umus*, iii, 3; compare Luke i, 10). The incense was then brought from the house of Abtines in a large vessel of gold called כַּף (*caph*), in which was a phial (בזיך, *bazik*, properly "*a salver*") containing the incense (Mishna, *Tamid*, v, 4). The assistant priests who attended to the lamps, the clearing of the golden altar from the cinders, and the fetching fire from the altar of burnt-offering, performed their offices singly, bowed towards the ark of the covenant, and left the holy place before the priest, whose lot it was to offer incense, entered. Profound silence was observed among the congregation who were praying without (comp. Rev. viii, 1), and at a signal from the prefect the priest cast the incense on the fire (Mishna, *Tamid*, vi, 3), and, bowing reverently towards the Holy of Holies, retired slowly backwards, not prolonging his prayer that he might not alarm the congregation, or cause them to fear that he had been struck dead for offering unworthily (Lev. xvi, 13; Luke i, 21; Mishna, *Yoma*, v, 1). When he came out he pronounced the blessing in Numb. vi, 24-26, the "magrephah" sounded, and the Levites burst forth into song, accompanied by the full swell of the Temple music, the sound of which, say the Rabbins, could be heard as far as Jericho (Mishna, *Tamid*, iii, 8). It is possible that this may be alluded to in Rev. viii, 5. The priest then emptied the censer in a clean place, and hung it on one of the horns of the altar of burnt-offering. See CENSER.

On the day of atonement the service was different. The high-priest, after sacrificing the bullock as a sin-offering for himself and his family, took incense in his left hand, and a golden shovel filled with live coals from the west side of the brazen altar (Jarchi, *On Lev.* xvi, 12) in his right, and went into the Holy of Holies. He then placed the shovel upon the ark between the two bars. In the second Temple, where there was no ark, a stone was substituted. Then, sprinkling the incense upon the coals, he stayed till the house was filled with smoke, and, walking slowly backwards, came without the veil, where he prayed for a short time (Maimonides, *Yom hakkippur*, quoted by Ainsworth, *On Lev.* xvi; Outram, *De Sacrificiis*, i, 8, § 11). See ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

3. With regard to the symbolical meaning of incense, opinions have been many and widely different. While Maimonides regarded it merely as a perfume designed to counteract the effluvia arising from the beasts which were slaughtered for the daily sacrifice, other interpreters have allowed their imaginations to run riot, and vied with the wildest speculations of the Midrashim. Philo (*Quis rer. div. hær. sit.* § 41, p. 501) conceives the stacte and onycha to be symbolical of water and earth; galbanum and frankincense of air and fire. Josephus, following the traditions of his time, believed that the ingredients of the incense were chosen from the products of the sea, the inhabited and the uninhabited parts of the earth, to indicate that all things are of God and for God (*War*, v, 5, 5). As the Temple or tabernacle was the palace of Jehovah, the theocratic king of Israel, and the ark of the covenant his throne, so the incense, in the opinion of some, corresponded to the perfumes in which the luxurious monarchs of the East delighted. It may mean all this, but it must mean much more. Grotius, on Exod. xxx, 1, says the mystical signification is "sursum habenda corda." Cornelius à Lapide, on Exod. xxx, 34, considers it as an apt emblem of propitiation, and finds a symbolical meaning in the several ingredients. Fairbairn (*Typology of Scripture*, ii, 320), with many others, looks upon prayer as the reality of which incense is the symbol, founding his conclusion upon Psa. cxli, 2; Rev. v, 8; viii, 3, 4. Bähr (*Symb. d. Mos. Cult.* vol. i, c. vi, § 4) opposes this view of the subject on the ground that the chief thing in offering incense is not the producing of the smoke, which presses like prayer towards heaven, but the spreading of the fragrance. His own exposition may be summed up as follows. Prayer, among all Oriental nations, signifies calling upon the name of God. The oldest prayers consisted in the mere enumeration of the several titles of God. The Scripture places incense in close relationship to prayer, so that offering incense is synonymous with worship. Hence incense itself is a symbol of the name of God. The ingredients of the incense correspond severally to the perfections of God, though it is impossible to decide to which of the four names of God each belongs. Perhaps stacte corresponds to יְהוָֹה (*Jehovah*), onycha to אֱלֹהִים (*Elôhim*), galbanum to חַי (*chai*), and frankincense to קָדוֹשׁ (*kâdôsh*). Such is Bähr's exposition of the symbolism of incense, rather ingenious than logical. Looking upon incense in connection with the other ceremonial observances of the Mosaic ritual, it would rather seem to be symbolical, not of prayer itself, but of that which makes prayer acceptable, the intercession of Christ. In Rev. viii, 3, 4, the incense is spoken of as something distinct from, though offered with, the prayers of all the saints (comp. Luke i, 10); and in Rev. v, 8 it is the golden vials, and not the odors or incense, which are said to be the prayers of saints. Psa. cxli, 2, at first sight, appears to militate against this conclusion; but if it be argued from this passage that incense is an emblem of prayer, it must also be allowed that the evening sacrifice has the same symbolical meaning. See PERFUME.

INCENSE, CHRISTIAN. The use of incense in worship was not carried over from the Jewish to the Christian Church; yet it is still employed, with other superstitious usages, in the Romish Church, and in some of the Oriental churches. The incense used is either the resinous gum *olibanum*, brought from Arabia or the East Indies, or an imitation of it manufactured by the chemists. The latter is most common now.

1. It is certain that incense was not used in the first three ages of the Christian Church. Indeed the use of it was a mark of paganism, as is fully evinced by the

enactments of the Christian emperors against its use. "The very places or houses where it could be proved to have been done were, by a law of Theodosius, confiscated by the government" (comp. Gothof, *De Statu Pagan. sub. Christ. Imper.* leg. 12). A few grains of incense thrown by a devotee upon a pagan altar constituted an act of worship. The apologists for Christianity, Arnobius (*Contra Gent.* 2), Tertullian (*Apol.* 30), and Lactantius (i, 20), make distinct and separate statements that "Christians do not burn incense" like pagans. It appears likely that the use of incense was first begun in order to purify the air of the unwholesome chambers, caverns, etc., in which Christians were compelled to worship, just as candles were employed necessarily, even by day, in subterranean places. Even Romanist writers (e. g. Claude de Vert) assert this. Cardinal Bona, indeed (*Res Liturgic.* i, 25), seeks to derive the use of incense in worship from apostolical times, but his argument is worthless. The principal argument of the Romanists rests upon Rev. v, 8: "Golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints;" as if anything could be argued, for practical worship, from the highly symbolical language of that beautiful passage. Censers are not mentioned among the sacred vessels of the first four centuries. The first clear proof of the use of incense at the communion occurs in the time of Gregory the Great, in the latter part of the 6th century. After that period it became common in the Latin Church. Its *mystical representation* is, according to Roman Catholic authorities, (1) contrition (Eccles. xlv); (2) the preaching of the Gospel (2 Cor. ii, 14); (3) the prayers of the faithful (Psa. cxli, 2; Rev. v, 8-24); (4) the virtue of saints (Cant. iii, 6). See above. Incense is chiefly used in the solemn (or high) mass, the consecration of churches, solemn consecrations of objects intended for use in public worship, and in the burial of the dead. There are, however, also, minor incensations, and some of the monastic associations even differed in its use. Thus the Cistercians used incense only on festivals, while the Benedictines and Clugniacs introduced its use on most public occasions.

2. The *censer* (thuribulum) is a brazen pot holding coals on which the incense burns. The censer is held by three chains, varying in length, but generally about three feet long. When longer, the use of them by the boys who act as censer-bearers becomes quite a feat of gymnastics. During the mass, the incense is thrown over the altar and over the "sacrificing priests" by the deacon who serves, kneeling. The Roman writers justify this incensing of the priest on the theory that he represents Christ, and that therefore the homage, typified by the incense, is rendered to Christ through his representative at the altar. A curious rule with regard to "incensing" the pope is, that "when the pope is standing, the servitor who incenses him must stand; when the pope is sitting, the incenser must kneel." No symbolical or mystical meaning has been found for this odd rule: the real one doubtless is, that when the pope is standing, a kneeling boy could not so manipulate the censer as to make the incense reach the pontiff's nostrils. After the altar and officiating priest are incensed, the censer is thrown in the direction of the other priests present, and last of all towards the congregation. As incense is a mark of honor, and as "human vanity creeps in everywhere" (Bergier, s. v. Encens), kings, great men, and public officials are incensed separately, and before the mass of the people. See Bergier, *Dict. de Théologie*, ii, 423; Migne, *Dict. de Liturgie*, p. 535 sq.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* book viii, ch. vi, § 21; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, xxi, 12; Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 325 sq.; Adolphus, *Compendium Theologicum*, p. 74; Broughton, *Bibliotheca Hist. Sacra*, i, 527; Middleton, *Letter from Rome*, p. 15; Riddle, *Christian Antiq.* p. 599 sq.; Siegel, *Handb. der Christl.-Kirchl. Alterthümer*, ii, 441 sq. See CENSER.

Incest (Lat. *in*, not; *castus*, chaste), the crime of sexual commerce with a person within the degrees forbidden by the (Levitical) law (see Trier, *De legibus Mosaicis de incestu*, Frcft. a. Oder, 1726). See AFFINITY; CONSANGUINITY. "An instinct almost innate and universal," says Gibbon (*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, iv, 351), "appears to prohibit the incestuous commerce of parents and children in the infinite series of ascending and descending generations. Concerning the oblique and collateral branches, nature is indifferent, reason mute, and custom various and arbitrary. In Egypt, the marriage of brothers and sisters was admitted without scruple or exception; a Spartan might espouse the daughter of his father, an Athenian that of his mother; and the nuptials of an uncle with his niece were applauded at Athens as a happy union of the dearest relations. The profane lawgivers of Rome were never tempted by interest or superstition to multiply the forbidden degrees; but they inflexibly condemned the marriage of sisters and brothers, hesitated whether first cousins should be touched by the same interdict, revered the parental character of aunts and uncles, and treated affinity and adoption as a just imitation of the ties of blood. According to the proud maxims of the republic, a legal marriage could only be contracted by free citizens; an honorable, at least an ingenuous birth, was required for the spouse of a senator; but the blood of kings could never mingle in legitimate nuptials with the blood of a Roman; and the name of 'stranger' degraded Cleopatra and Berenice to live the *concubines* of Mark Antony and Titus." Vortigern, king of South Britain, equalled, or, rather, excelled the Egyptians and Persians in wickedness by marrying his own daughter. The queen of Portugal was married to her uncle; and the prince of Brazil, the son of that incestuous marriage, wedded his aunt. But they had dispensations for these unnatural marriages from *his holiness*. "In order," says Paley, "to preserve chastity in families, and between persons of different sexes brought up and living together in a state of unreserved intimacy, it is necessary, by every method possible, to inculcate an abhorrence of incestuous conjunctions; which abhorrence can only be upheld by the absolute reprobation of *all* commerce of the sexes between near relations. Upon this principle the *marriage*, as well as other cohabitation of brothers and sisters of lineal kindred, and of all who usually live in the same family, may be said to be forbidden by the law of nature. Restrictions which extend to remoter degrees of kindred than what this reason makes it necessary to prohibit from intermarriage are founded in the authority of the positive law which ordains them, and can only be justified by their tendency to diffuse wealth, to connect families, or to promote some political advantage." The Roman law calls incestuous connection *Incestus juris gentium*, while it designates as *Incestus juris civilis* the intercourse between other members of the families which it considers within the forbidden degrees. The principal law against incest, however, is the *Lex Julia de adulteriis coërcendis* of Augustus. Children born of incest (*liberi incestuosi*) are by it bastardized. The canon law extended the forbidden degrees very far, thus giving a more extended signification to the appellation of incest. By it a distinction was made between the *Incestus juris divini*, relating to such degrees of relationship as were already condemned by the Mosaic law, and the *Incestus juris humani*, relating only to such degrees within which marriage is forbidden by ecclesiastical laws. But as in the latter case dispensations can, in the Romish Church, always be obtained, this form of incest is merely considered an offense against the laws of the Church. The penal statute of Charles V concerning incest is based on the Roman law, but includes also cohabitation with a daughter-in-law, a step-daughter, and a mother-in-law. Consequently incest, properly so called, can only take place between ascendants and descendants, brothers and sisters, parents-in-law and children-in-law, step-parents and step-children. Prosecution for incest, however, is legal only in cases where persons have had sex-

ual intercourse without marriage; it is inapplicable where marriage has been contracted in good faith, and only afterwards the contractors become aware of their connection being incestuous. Modern law, which in the main is based on the Levitical, and from which the rule of the Roman law differs very little, prohibits marriage between relations within *three* degrees of kindred; computing the generations not from, but through the common ancestor, and accounting affinity the same as consanguinity. The issue, however, of such marriages are not bastardized unless the parents be divorced during their lifetime. Penalties are enacted for incest and unchastity varying from simple imprisonment to hard labor for a term of five or six years. Sexual intercourse between parties in different degrees of the collateral lines is in many cases considered only as punishable by the police regulations. The ascendants are generally punished more severely than the descendants. The modern Jews permit the marriage of cousins, and even of the uncle by a niece. See Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, viii, 841; Paley, *Moral Philosophy*, i, 316 sq.; Buck, *Theological Dictionary*, s. v.

INCEST, SPIRITUAL, an ideal crime committed between two persons who have a spiritual alliance, by means of baptism or confirmation. This ridiculous fancy was made use of as an instrument of great tyranny in times when the power of the pope was unlimited, even queens being sometimes divorced upon this pretence. *Incest spiritual* is also understood of a vicar or other beneficiary who holds two benefices, one whereof depends upon the collation of the other. Such spiritual incest renders both the one and the other of these benefices vacant.—Henderson's Buck.

Inchantment. See ENCHANTMENT.

Inchofer, MELCHIOR, a German Jesuit, was born at Vienna or at Günz (Hungary) in 1584. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1607, and studied philosophy, mathematics, and theology at Messina, where he afterwards instructed. In 1636 he went to Rome, and became a member of the Congregation of the Index and of the Holy Office, but was called from thence to the college at Macerata in 1646. He died in 1648 at Milan. His principal works are *Epistolæ B. Mariæ ad Messanenses veritas vindicata* (1629):—*Historia sacræ Latinitatis* (1636):—*Annales ecclesiastici regni Hungariæ* (1644) (incomplete). Under the pseudonyme of Eugenius Lavande Ninevensis he defended his order and its educational system against the attacks of Scioppius (Schopp), in refutation of whom he wrote several pamphlets (1638–1641). He was also believed to be the author of the *Monarchia Solipsorum* (Venice, 1652; French translation, Amst. 1722, 12mo); but Oudin proved, in an edition of Niceron, that this work is the production of count Scotti of Piacenza, who entered the order in 1616, but became discontented, and retired from it in 1645. See Niceron, *Mém. pour servir*, etc., xxxv, 322–346; xxxix, 165–230; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 648; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* iii, 563 sq.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* i, 405.

Incineratio is a name in the Romish Church for the consecration of a certain quantity of ashes, and the sprinkling of them over the heads of the officiating clergy and the worshipping congregation, with the following admonition, pronounced by the officiating priest: "Memento quod cinis es, et in cinerem reverteris" (Remember that dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return). The custom is believed to have originated with Gregory the Great (towards the close of the 6th century), but it was not fully established till towards the end of the 12th century, when it received the sanction of pope Celestine III. Gregory the Great is in all probability also the founder of Ash-Wednesday, which is supposed to derive its name from the above ceremonial service generally performed on that day. See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 667; Siegel, *Handb. d. Christ.-Kirchl. Alterth.* i, 141; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* p. 324. See ASHES; ASH-WEDNESDAY.

Incipientes (*beginners*) is one of the names by which the catechumens of the early Christian Church were called. See CATECHUMENS.

Inclination is the propensity of the mind to any particular object or action; a kind of bias by which it is carried towards certain actions previous to the exercise of thought and reasoning about the nature and consequences of them. Inclinations are of two kinds, natural or acquired. 1. *Natural* are such as we often see in children, who from their earliest years differ in their tempers and dispositions. Of one we may say he is naturally revengeful; of another, that he is patient and forgiving. 2. *Acquired* inclinations are such as are superinduced by custom, which are called habits, and these are either good or evil. See HABIT; WILL.

Incluse. See ANACHORETS.

In Cœna Domini (Lat. *at the Lord's Supper*, the opening words of the document) is the name of a celebrated papal bull. "It is not, as other bulls, the work of a single pope, but, with additions and modifications at various times, dates back from the Middle Ages; some writers tracing it to Martin V, others to Clement V, and some to Boniface VIII. Its present form, however, it received from the popes Julius II and Paul III, and, finally, from Urban VIII, in 1627, from that time it continued for a century and a half to be published annually on Holy Thursday," whence its name; afterwards Easter Monday was substituted. The contents of this bull have been a fertile subject of controversy. It may be briefly described as a summary of ecclesiastical censures, especially against all heretical sects, which are cursed in it by their several designations, their excommunication renewed, and the same punishment threatened to all who should be guilty of schism, sacrilege, usurpation of the rights of the Church or of the pope, forcible and unlawful seizure of Church property, personal violence against ecclesiastics, unlawful interruption of the free intercourse of the faithful with Rome, etc. The bull, however, although, as indicated, mainly dealing with offences against the Church, also denounces, under similar censures, the crimes of piracy, plunder of shipwrecked goods, forgery, etc. This bull, being regarded by most of the crowned heads of Europe as an infringement of their rights, was in the 17th century opposed by nearly all the courts, even the most Roman Catholic; and at length, in 1770, according to some authorities (e. g. Hase, *History of the Christian Church*), Clement XIV discontinued its publication. Janus (*Pope and Council*, p. 387), however, says that it is still treated in the Roman tribunals as having legal force, and, according to the accounts of some eminent travellers who have visited Rome, it appears that the sentence of excommunication is still read, though in a more simple form. Eliza von der Recke (*Tagebuch einer Reise durch einen Theil Deutschlands u. d. Italien*, Berlin, 1817, iv, 95), under date of April 6, 1806, relates that after the pope had blessed the people from the balcony of the church of St. Peter, "he read out a paper, then tore it, and threw the fragments down among the people. A great tumult then arose, every one striving to secure a piece of the paper, but I do not know for what purpose, for, as I was told, the paper contained nothing but the form of excommunication always pronounced on this occasion against all who are not Romanists. This concluded the festival." This is confirmed by what chancellor Göttling, of Jena, relates as having seen in his journey in 1828 (in Röhr, *Kritische Predigerbibliothek*, xi, 379 sq.). It thus seems proved that the bull itself, whose § xxi says: "Volentes præsentes nostros processus ac omnia et quæcunque his literis contenta, quousque alii huiusmodi processus a Nobis aut Romano-Pontifice pro tempore existente fiant aut publicentur, durare suosque effectus omnino sortiri," is not completely abolished yet. No pope has so far substituted a new bull for the old, and its principles concerning the cases re-

served for the pope are yet in full force. In the *Historisch-politische Blätter* of Phillips and Görres (Munich, 1847, vol. xxi) we find it stated that "*In foro conscientiæ*, the bull is only valid yet in so far as its stipulations have not in other acts been altered by the Church herself." Its efficiency *in foro externo*, so much desired by Rome, is everywhere opposed in self-defense by the civil powers. For the special history of this bull, and proofs of its present validity in the Romish Church, see Biber, *Bull in Cœna Domini*, transl. (Lond. 1848); Biber, *Papal Diplomacy and the Bull in Cœna Domini* (Lond. 1848); Lebret, *Geschichte d. Bulle* (Lpz. 1768, 4 vols.); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 843; Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 530; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformation*, iii, 266, 387; Janus, *Pope and Council*, p. 384 sq.; cardinal Erskine to Sir J. C. Hippisley, in *Rep. of Comm. of House of Commons on the Laws regarding the Regulation of the Roman Cath. subjects* (1816, p. 218). (J. H. W.)

Incommunicableness OF GOD. The divine attributes have been variously divided. One of the divisions sets the attributes of God forth as *communicable* and *incommunicable*. As the former are regarded such attributes as can be imparted from the Creator to the creature, e. g. goodness, holiness, wisdom, etc., and as the latter such are counted as cannot be imparted, as independence, immutability, immensity, and eternity. See Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. ii, i, 183 sq.; ii, 193 sq. See also the article GOD (Dogmatical Treatment of the Doctrine of), vol. iii, p. 907 sq.

Incomprehensibility OF GOD. This is a relative term, and indicates a relation between an object and a faculty; between God and a created understanding: so that the meaning of it is this, that no created understanding can comprehend God; that is, have a perfect and exact knowledge of him, such a knowledge as is adequate to the perfection of the object (Job xi, 7; Isa. xl).

God is incomprehensible, 1. As to the nature of his essence; 2. The excellency of his attributes; 3. The depth of his counsels; 4. The works of his providence; 5. The dispensation of his grace (Eph. iii, 8; Job xxxvii, 25; Rom. xi). The incomprehensibility of God follows, 1. From his being a spirit endued with perfections greatly superior to our own. 2. There may be (for anything we certainly know) attributes and perfections in God of which we have not the least idea. 3. In those perfections of the divine nature of which we have some idea, there are many things to us inexplicable, and with which, the more deeply and attentively we think of them, the more we find our thoughts swallowed up, such as his self-existence, eternity, omnipresence, etc. This should teach us, therefore, 1. To admire and reverence the divine Being (Zech. ix, 17; Neh. ix, 5); 2. To be humble and modest (Psa. viii, 1, 4; Eccl. v, 2, 3; Job xxxvii, 19); 3. To be serious in our addresses, and sincere in our behavior towards him. (Caryl, *On Job xxvii*, 25; Tillotson, *Sermons*, sermon clvi; Abernethy, *Sermons*, vol. ii, nos. 6, 7; Doddridge, *Lectures on Divinity*, lecture 59; Martensen, *Dogmatics*, p. 89; Buck, *Theolog. Dictionary*, s. v.) See GOD.

Incomprehensible. This word, as occurring in the English Prayer-book, is understood, at the present day, in a sense quite different from what was designed when it was first introduced into the formularies. Thus when, in the Athanasian Creed, it is said, "The Father incomprehensible," etc., the meaning is, "the Father is (*immensus*. i. e.) infinite," etc.: a Being not to be comprised (*comprehendendus*) within the limits of space.

Inconvertibility, the quality of both natures in Christ, which does not admit of a change of either into the other.

Incorpolītus, a title in monasteries of the priest who has the administration of the convent estates, the collection of interest and other moneys due the monastery, etc.

Incorporation. The *incorporation* of a church benefice consists in its being joined *quoad spiritualia et temporalia* with a spiritual corporation, such, for instance, as a convent or a monastery. We find many instances of such incorporations in the 9th century, and they were most generally the result of efforts to increase the revenues of the corporations. The modus operandi was to abolish the separate office connected with a benefice, and to give the temporal advantages to the corporation, which also added the spiritual offices connected therewith to its other duties, supplying them with ministerial services. For instance, a regular pastor (*parochus principalis*) was appointed, who committed the care of souls to a vicar appointed by himself, under sanction of the bishop. This vicar then filled the office of *cura animarum actualis*, whilst the convent or monastery had but a *cura habitualis*. The canon laws in such cases soon prescribed the appointment of permanent vicars (*vicarii perpetui*), although in many instances, especially in Germany, many convents appointed only temporary vicars, and even intrusted the care of souls to members of their order who did not reside in the parish. Essentially different from these "*pleno jure*" or "*utroque jure*" incorporations were exclusively temporal unions of the revenues of livings with spiritual corporations, which were also often designated as *incorporationes quoad temporalia*. In these cases the income only of the livings went to the convents, together with all the revenues accruing therefrom, they in exchange undertaking to give to the incumbent minister an adequate support (*portio congrua*). The spiritual office, *spiritualia*, remained unaffected by this arrangement, and was filled by the bishop, according to the wishes of the convent. The numerous abuses which were introduced in both these kinds of incorporations were denounced by the Council of Trent (Sess. 7, c. 7. *De reform.*). The council also forbade the union of parish churches with convents, monasteries, hospitals, etc. (Sess. 24, c. 13; Sess. 7, *De reform.* c. 6). In consequence of the secularization of convents and monasteries, the whole organization has mostly fallen into disuse; the parish administrators are about the only remains of the incorporation system. See Neller, *De juribus parochi primitivi* (in Schmid, *Thesaur. jur. eccl.* vi, 441 sq.); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 649.

Incorporeality OF GOD is his being without a body. That God is incorporeal is evident; for, 1. Materiality is incompatible with self-existence, and God, being self-existent, must be incorporeal. 2. If God were corporeal, he could not be present in any part of the world where body is; yet his presence is necessary for the support and motion of body. 3. A body cannot be in two places at the same time; yet he is everywhere, and fills heaven and earth. 4. A body is to be seen and felt, but God is invisible and impalpable (John i, 18). See Charnock, *Works*, i, 117; Gill, *Body of Divinity*, i, 45, 8vo; Doddridge, *Lectures on Divinity*, lect. 47. See GOD.

Incorruptibĭles, an extreme sect of Eutychians (q. v.), who held that the body of Christ was incorruptible, i. e. "that from the time that his body was formed it was not susceptible of any change or alteration; that he was not even subject to innocent passions or appetites, such as hunger or thirst, but that he ate without any occasion both before his death and after his resurrection." See APHTHARTODOCETÆ; MONOPHYSITES.

Incorrupticŏlæ. See INCORRUPTIBILES.

Incredulity. See INFIDELITY; UNBELIEF.

Incumbent, a clergyman in the Church of England who is in *present* possession of (*incumbit, is close to, rests upon, as its immediate occupant*) a benefice (Eden). Sir E. Coke, however, says that the title means that the clergyman "in possession of a benefice ought diligently to bend all his study to the care of his church."

Indefectibility OF THE CHURCH. This subject has already been alluded to in the article CHURCH, vol. ii, p. 325 (3); but Mr. Blunt (*Theol. Cyclop* i, 340) has

treated it so much at length that we insert his remarks on this subject, which he treats under the two heads of (1) *Perpetuity*, and (2) *Inerrancy* and *Infallibility*. The former, he argues, frees the Church from failure in succession of members; the latter two free it from failure in holding and declaring the truth. "Both these flow from the constitution and nature of the mystical body of Christ. The Scriptures which speak to this point are John xv; 1 Cor. vi, 15, 19; xii, 12; Eph. i, 23; iv, 12; v, 30; Col. i, 18, and cannot be explained away into metaphor. As Christ's natural body was incorruptible, and yet before the resurrection was liable to human infirmities (Matt. viii, 17), so his mystical body, yet unglorified, is liable in each one of its many members to sin and falling from grace; but nothing can touch the life of the body itself. As also the fulness of the Spirit dwelt in Christ, and Christ was the Truth, so the Spirit, by virtue of whose indwelling the body is one, and one with its Head, guides the Church into all truth."

I. *Perpetuity of the Church.*—"Plain promises of this are made in Isa. lxi, 8, 9; Dan. ii, 44; Matt. xvi, 18; xxviii, 20; John xiv, 16, 17. There are also arguments to be drawn for it from the consideration of God's counsel and purpose. The consummation of all things is delayed only till God's servants are sealed (1 Cor. xv, 28; Rev. vi, 9-11). When faith fails in the earth, the end will be (Luke xviii, 8). This is as regards God, in whose work we cannot suppose an interruption. So, too, as regards man. God will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. The Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth, could not fail without a failure of God's mercy. So long as there are men capable of salvation (and all men are capable of salvation, since Christ died for all), so long will the Church be preserved, that to it may be added both *οἱ σωζόμενοι* and *οἱ σωθησόμενοι*. The promises of God are given to the Church as a whole. Each branch of the Church is on its probation, as is each individual member. And the law of probation, the law of their participation in the promise, is the same: 'He that hath, to him shall be given.' To argue that because each particular church may fail, therefore the whole may fail, is not only a fallacy in logic, but a denial of Christ's power to impart to the whole that which he does not impart to each particular member."

II. *Inerrancy and Infallibility of the Church.*—"The foregoing promises and arguments show that the Church will not fail either by dying out or by apostasy. As the work of the Spirit will not fail in bringing sons to God, so it will never fail in providing that there shall always be a body persevering in the faith according to the election of grace. This is to be considered more particularly as regards truth of doctrine. For this, also, there are promises, e. g. John xvi, 13; 1 John ii, 27. The spirit which dwells in the Church is likewise declared to be the spirit of knowledge and understanding (Col. i, 9; ii, 3; iii, 10). Less cannot be implied in these words than that the Church shall always have a tenure of the truth sufficient for salvation. They show, further, that any doctrine which can be said to be the deliberately ascertained voice of the Church must be from God, whose Spirit is in the Church. But they cannot be pressed so far as to prove that the Church may not for a time hold such an error as does not directly deny the foundation of faith, or does not directly deny Christ. Even an error, which by logical consequence denies the foundation of faith, is not to be taken as such a denial. The consequence may not be perceived, and if perceived the premises would be at once rejected. The case is doubtless of great improbability, but its possibility must be conceded. When, then, can we say that the voice of the Church is sufficiently ascertained? This leads us on from the inerrancy, or *passive infallibility*, to the *active infallibility*, or declaration of the faith. No actual limits of time can be set for which, if a doctrine has been held, it must be considered as the ascertained decision of the Church. The circumstances of the Church may not be such as to lead to investigation. Ten years in one period may cause more sifting of the truth than a hundred years of another period. It is the condition of the Church militant to be always under trial, sometimes by persecution from the world, sometimes by blasts of contrary doctrine within itself. In different degrees these are blended, and with very different degrees of speed will the truth emerge. The degree of holiness also, and above all, will regulate the discovery and reception of truth. For knowledge and understanding in spiritual things are the flower and fruit; the plant itself is holiness springing from the root of faith. The certainty, then, of a doctrine enunciated by the Church is a growing certainty, varying in amount with the time the doctrine has been held, the degree of investigation to which it has been subjected, and the degree of holiness in the Church. Thus the decrees of a council which we may believe to be œcumenical can only be known to be the genuine voice of the Church by their *acceptance*. We may agree to the abstract proposition that a truly œcumenical council cannot err; but the proposition is of little practical value at the time of holding a council, for none can prove that the council has not in some respects failed of œcumenicity. The authority of its decisions rests on their acceptance. For the Spirit of God is given to the whole body of the Church; and that can only be known to be the true voice of the Church which is expressed by sufficient deliberation of generation after generation. In this sense the infallibility of the Church is a reasonable doctrine, and one, in fact, which it would be unreasonable for any Christian to disbelieve."

Indefectible Grace is, according to the Calvinists, grace which cannot be lost, or fail of its intended purpose, the salvation of those on whom it is bestowed, i. e. the elect, and is held to be irresistible by the person so elected, thus necessarily securing his salvation. See CALVINISM; ELECTION; GRACE; WILL.

Indelible Character. See CHARACTER, INDELIBLE.

Indemnity (Latin *indemnitas*, compensation) is in some churches a pension paid to the bishop in consideration of discharging or indemnifying churches, united or appropriated, from the payment of procurations, or by way of recompense for the profits which the bishop would otherwise have received during the time of the vacation of such churches.

Independence OF CHURCHES. "It is an admitted fact, as clearly settled as anything can be by human authority, that the primitive Christians, in the organization of their assemblies, formed them after the model of the Jewish synagogue. . . . They disowned the hereditary aristocracy of the Levitical priesthood, and adopted the popular government of the synagogue. . . . Their government was voluntary, elective, free, and administered by rulers or elders elected by the people. The ruler of the synagogue was the moderator of the college of elders, but only *primus inter pares*, holding no official rank above them. The people, as Vitringa (*De Synagoga*, lib. iii, pt. i, c. xv, p. 828-863) has shown, appointed their own officers to rule over them. They exercised the natural right of freemen to enact and execute their own laws, to admit proselytes, and to exclude at pleasure unworthy members from their communion. Theirs was 'a democratic form of government,' and is so described by one of the most able expounders of the constitution of the primitive churches (see Rothe, *Anfänge d. Christl. Kirche*, p. 14). Like their prototype, therefore, the primitive churches also embodied the principle of a popular government and of enlightened religious liberty" (Coleman, *Apostol. and Primit. Ch.* p. 43 sq.). The reason, however, why the primitive Christians had this peculiar organization, reintroduced in the modern Church by the Congregationalists, and in part also by the Presbyterians, is, that the members of the early Christian Church mostly came from the Jewish

Church, and naturally adopted methods of worship, government, etc., to which they were accustomed. But this by no means goes to prove that it was the intention of the early Christians to perpetuate their mode of government, but rather that, engaged as Christ and his disciples had been in founding a Church, needing no other bond than his own person, the mode of government to which they had been accustomed was chosen for the time being, "the disciples not having yet attained to a clear understanding of that call which Christ had already given them by so many intimations to form a Church entirely separated from the existing Jewish economy. . . . We are disposed to believe that the Church was at first composed entirely of members standing on an equality with one another, and that the apostles alone held *a higher* rank, and exercised a directing influence over the whole, which arose from the original position in which Christ had placed them in relation to other believers; so that the whole arrangement and administration of the affairs of the Church proceeded from them, and they were first induced by particular circumstances to appoint other church officers, as in the instance of deacons" (Neander, *Apostol. Kirche*, 3d edit. p. 31, 33; comp. p. 179, 195; also Rothe, *Anfänge*, p. 146 sq.; Acts vi, 1; xi, 30). Christ also evidently did make some provision for a government of his Church on earth independent of Jewish and pagan customs by constituting apostles, who should authoritatively command and teach. (See vol. ii, p. 328 sq.) The churches of the early Christians also, unlike the Jewish, were independent one of the other. History, sacred or profane, relating to this period, records not a single instance in which one church presumed to impose laws of its own upon another. The first traces of associations between several churches, from which councils can be said to have taken their origin, we find in the 2d century (Coleman, *De Rebus Christ.* sæc. i, § 48). Indications of this original independence are distinctly manifested even after the rise of the episcopacy. Every bishop had the right to form his own liturgy and creed, and to settle at pleasure his own time and mode of celebrating the religious festivals (compare Greiling, *Apostolische Christengemeine*, p. 16). Cyprian strongly asserts the right of every bishop to make laws for his own church. Indeed, it is to this original independence of the churches from each other, to the want of proper authorities to govern them, that Socrates (*Eccles. Hist.* lib. v, c. xxii) ascribes the endless controversies which agitated the Church in the early ages with regard to the observance of certain festivals, especially Easter. See, besides the authorities already cited, Sack, *Comment. ad Theol. Instit.* p. 141; Bunsen, *Hippolytus and his Age*, iii, 246; Dr. Hitchcock, in the *Amer. Presb. Rev.* Jan. 1867. See also EPISCOPACY, vol. iii, p. 263, 264, 266 (iv). (J. H. W.)

Independency OF GOD is his existence in and of himself, without depending on any other being. "His being and perfections," as Dr. Ridgely observes (*Body of Divinity*, p. 7), "are underived, and not communicated to him, as all finite perfections are by him to the creature. This attribute of independency belongs to all his perfections. 1. He is independent as to his knowledge. He doth not receive ideas from any object out of himself, as intelligent creatures do. This is elegantly described by the prophet, Isa. xl, 13, 14. 2. He is independent in power. As he receives strength from no one, so he doth not act dependently on the will of the creature (Job xxxvi, 23). 3. He is independent as to his holiness, hating sin necessarily, and not barely depending on some reasons out of himself inducing him thereto; for it is essential to the divine nature to be infinitely opposite to sin, and therefore to be independently holy. 4. He is independent as to his bounty and goodness. He communicates blessings not by constraint, but according to his sovereign will. Thus he gave being to the world, and all things therein, which was the first instance of bounty and goodness; and this not by restraint, but by his free will: 'for his pleasure they are and were created.' In like manner, whatever instances of mercy he extends to miserable creatures, he acts independently and not by force. He shows mercy, because it is his pleasure to do so (Rom. ix, 18). That God is independent, let it be further considered, 1. That all things depend on his power which brought them into and preserves them in being. If, therefore, all things depend on God, then it would be absurd to say that God depends on anything, for this would be to suppose the cause and effect to be mutually dependent on and derived from each other, which involves a contradiction. 2. If God be infinitely above the highest creatures, he cannot depend on any of them, for dependence argues inferiority (Isa. xl, 15, 17). 3. If God depend on any creature, he does not exist necessarily; and if so, then he might not have been; for the same will by which he is supposed to exist might have determined that he should not have existed, which is altogether inconsistent with the idea of a God. From God's being independent, we infer, 1. That we ought to conclude that the creature cannot lay any obligation on him, or do anything that may tend to make him more happy than he is in himself (Rom. xi, 35; Job xxii, 2, 3). 2. If independency be a divine perfection, then let it not in any instance, or by any consequence, be attributed to the creature: let us conclude that all our springs are in him, and that all we enjoy and hope for is from him, who is the author and finisher of our faith, and the fountain of all our blessedness." See GOD.

Independent Baptists. See BAPTISTS.

Independents, a name given to certain bodies of Christians who assert that each Christian congregation is *independent* of all others, and from all ecclesiastical authority except its own. Some writers inaccurately use this name as synonymous with "Congregationalists," forgetting that the latter do not claim the absolute independence of individual character. "The churches of New England are *congregational*. They do not approve the name of 'Independent,' and are abhorrent of such principles of independency as would keep them from giving an account of their matters to neighboring churches, regularly demanding it of them" (Mather). See CONGREGATIONALISTS.

I. *History.*—After the reformation of religion in England, the greater body of Protestants adopted the Episcopal form of Church polity, and this was finally established as the religion of the nation. But the smaller body of Protestants opposed episcopacy on the ground that it too nearly resembled the Roman Catholic form of Church polity, and these so-called Nonconformists (q. v.) came to be stigmatized by the derisive name of *Puritans*, which the followers of Novatian had borne in the third century. To this class (i. e. Noncomformists) belong the Independents, who claim that their system is substantially the same as that of the apostolic churches, which had been corrupted by the tendencies that culminated in papacy, and that traces of dissent from the episcopal power may be found in every age back to the 4th century (see Punchard, *History of Congregationalism*). They are supposed to have originated in England about the year 1581, under the leadership of Robert Brown, bearing thence the name of Brownists (q. v.); but Richard Fitz is generally named as the first pastor of the first Independent church in England (compare Skeats, *History of the Free Churches*, p. 23). The persecution which they were obliged to endure from the Established Church soon necessitated the emigration of these first Independents, and they removed to the Netherlands. Deserted by Brown, who conformed, and became an adherent of the Church of England, they chose as their leader John Robinson, to whom belongs the chief merit of a better organization of them. Brown, who, by the persecutions which, as a Nonconformist, he had to endure, had become greatly embittered, had, with hardly less bigotry than his persecutors, declared all other forms of Church government not only as inconsistent, but denounced them in the severest terms, even

branding them as *antichristian*. Robinson, however, while holding his own to be the most apostolical form, counselled recognition of all other forms and Christian fellowship, looking upon charity as the end of the commandments. The names also which they had hitherto borne were now exchanged for that of Independents. Robinson, in his Apology, having affirmed "Cœtum quemlibet particularem, esse totam, integram, et perfectam ecclesiam ex suis partibus constantem immediate et *independentem* [quoad alias eccl.] sub ipso Christo." In 1616, a friend and colaborer of Robinson, Henry Jacob, returned to the mother country, and organized an Independent Church at London, which has oftentimes, though incorrectly, been termed "the first Independent Church in England" (compare vol. ii, p. 476). "From this, as a nucleus, Independency gradually spread through England, and, in spite of the harsh measures of Laud and the court, came, in the middle of the 17th century, to occupy a dominant place among the powers by which the destinies of England were swayed."

A prominent place was occupied by the Independents at the Westminster Assembly, they taking an active part in the debates, especially on points of Church order; "debating all things," says Baillie, "which came within twenty miles of their quarters," and evidently astonishing the "churchmen" by their "great learning, quickness, and eloquence, together with their great courtesy and discretion in speaking." Skeats (*History of the Free Churches*, p. 52) asserts that at this "Assembly" the representatives of the Independents, some five or six in number, "prayed to be inducted into the proposed National Church, the conditions being that the power of ordination should be reserved to their own congregations, and that they might be subject, in Church censures, to Parliament, but not to any Presbytery." As they were unsuccessful in this attempt, however, it is believed that, though few in number, they yet prevented the Presbyterians from accomplishing at least their object, standing "in the breach against the advance of a new State Church, which, if better in many respects than the old (Episcopal), would have been worse in other respects." But it was only after the accession of Oliver Cromwell (himself an Independent) to the protectorate that the Independents gained the ascendency, and became "the most powerful and important religious body in England" (compare Murray, *Life of Samuel Rutherford*, chap. viii). The greatest statesmen of England were Independents; the army was Independent in the main; and Independent ministers held appointments as chaplains, or filled leading positions in the universities; among them, most prominently, John Owen, Thomas Goodwin, Nye, etc. To strengthen the union among themselves, an Assembly was decided to be held at the Savoy. Ministers and delegates of more than a hundred congregations thereupon convened, Sept. 29, 1658, and on Oct. 12 (a few weeks before Oliver Cromwell's death) they adopted and issued a confession of faith and discipline, which was named a "Declaration." Of this declaration the following were fundamental propositions: "A particular Church consists of officers and members: the Lord Christ having given to his called ones—united in Church order—liberty and power to choose persons fitted by the Holy Ghost to be over them in the Lord. The officers appointed by Christ to be chosen and set apart by the Church are pastors, teachers, elders, and deacons. The way appointed by Christ for the calling of any person unto the office of pastor, teacher, or elder in a church is that he be chosen thereunto by the common suffrage of the Church itself, and solemnly set apart by fasting and prayer, with the imposition of hands of the eldership of that Church, if there be any before constituted therein; and of a deacon, that he be chosen by the like suffrage, and set apart by prayer, and the like imposition; and those who are so chosen, though not set apart after that manner, are rightly constituted ministers of Jesus. The work of preaching is not so peculiarly confined to pastors and teachers but that others also, gifted and fitted by the Holy Ghost, and approved by the people, may publicly, ordinarily, and constantly perform it. Ordination alone, without election or consent of the Church, doth not constitute any person a church officer. A church furnished with officers, according to the mind of Christ, hath full power to administer all his ordinances; and where there is want of any one or more officers, those that are in the Church may administer all the ordinances proper to those officers whom they do not possess; but where there are no teaching officers at all, none may administer the seals, nor can the Church authorize any so to do. Whereas the Lord Jesus Christ hath appointed and instituted, as a means of edification, that those who walk not according to the rules and laws appointed by him be censured in his name and authority, every Church hath power in itself to exercise and execute all those censures appointed by him. The censures appointed by Christ are admonition and excommunication; and whereas some offences may be known only to some, those to whom they are so known must first admonish the offender in private; in public offences, and in case of non-amendment upon private admonition, the offence being related to the Church, the offender is to be duly admonished, in the name of Christ, by the whole Church through the elders; and if this censure prevail not for his repentance, then he is to be cast out by excommunication, with the consent of the members." These particulars respecting a declaration of faith but little known indicate the opinions entertained by the Independents, not only at the time of the Restoration, but, with some modification, afterwards; and here it may be added that if, in the theory of Presbyterianism, the ministry, as to the order of existence, precedes the Church, in the theory of Congregationalism, the Church, in that same order, precedes the minister; and in this significant fact may be found a key to some important differences between the two systems. Besides those rules which had reference to the internal order of the churches, there were these three relative to their dimensions, their co-operation, and the catholicity of their fellowship. "For the avoiding of differences, for the greater solemnity in the celebration of ordinances, and for the larger usefulness of the gifts and graces of the Holy Ghost, saints, living within such distances that they can conveniently assemble for divine worship, ought rather to join in one Church for their mutual strengthening and edification than to set up many distinct societies. In cases of difficulties or differences, it is according to the mind of Christ that many churches holding communion together do, by their managers, meet in a synod or council to consider and give advice; howbeit, these synods are not intrusted with any Church power, properly so called, or with any jurisdiction over the churches. Such reforming churches as consist of persons sound in the faith, and of conversation becoming the Gospel, ought not to refuse the communion of each other, so far as may consist with their own principles respectively, though they walk not in all things according to the same rules of Church order."

The conclusions at the Savoy meeting were not ecclesiastical canons, but simply united opinions. They had no binding force. They aspired to no higher character than that of counsel and advice. Lest this declaration should endanger their principles, the assembly took the precaution not to invest it with binding symbolical authority; and, to guard against the possibility of hierarchical schemes, they further enacted that no one should be ordained without having a call to some particular congregation. Similar precautions were also taken by them against all possible civil interference in ecclesiastical affairs, except cases in which Christian societies had laid themselves open to investigation by the civil authorities for the encouragement of civil disturbances (comp. art. CONGREGATIONALISTS, vol. ii, p. 480, II, 2). After the restoration of Charles II in 1660, and the re-establishment of episcopacy, the Indepen-

dents, like all other nonconforming "sects," suffered from illiberal enactments, especially from the "Act of Uniformity," which was passed in 1662. "Independents retired into obscurity for a while after the Restoration. The doors of buildings where they had been wont to assemble were nailed up, the pastors were driven out, flocks were scattered, the administration of ordinances could not take place, and meetings could not be held, and communities which had been prosperous under the Commonwealth diminished in number" (Stoughton, *Eccles. History of England* [*Church of the Restoration*], ii, 164). The Act of Uniformity, however, was the most severe of all enactments against dissenters. Some 2000 of the ablest and best of England's clergy were forced to leave the Church. "They included Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and not a few whom it would be difficult to reduce entirely under any of those denominations; both Calvinists and Arminians, with other divines scarcely belonging to either of those schools. In point of learning, eloquence, reasoning, and imagination the men varied; but under all their peculiarities lay a common faith of no ordinary character, a faith of that rare kind which makes the confessor. They believed in God, in Christ, in truth, in heaven; and in the controversy which they carried on they regarded themselves as fighting for a divine cause. . . . They believed that they were acting in the defence of the Gospel. A strong evangelical faith upheld their ecclesiastical opinions like the everlasting rocks which form the ribs and backbone of this grand old world. The Church of England suffered no small loss when she lost such men" (Stoughton). Yet, in spite of these persecutions, the Independents still continued to subsist until, in 1688, the Revolution, and in 1689 the "Act of Toleration," finally restored to them the enjoyment of liberty of worship.

Shortly after the publication of the Act of Toleration, efforts were made to bring about a union between the Presbyterians and the Independents (who by this time generally styled themselves Congregationalists), and in 1691 heads of agreement were drawn up (compare Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* v, 361-363). But "within a year from the formation of the union two discussions on points of doctrine and order arose. The first of these was excited by a Congregational minister holding high Calvinistic or rather Antinomian opinions, believing and preaching that repentance is not necessary to salvation, that the elect are always without sin, and always without 'spot before God.'" The controversy which this course provoked "threw eleven counties into disorder, and before a year had passed away the Congregationalists had begun to be weaned from the union" (Skeats; comp. also our article on HOWE, JOHN). From the position which the Independents assumed, it is curious to notice "that the Presbyterians, at this time, were more moderate Calvinists than the Congregationalists, and that the epithet of 'Baxterians' was not inappropriately applied to them; but as Baxterianism included the articles of the Church of England, and the confessions of Dort and Savoy, their moderation was certainly limited. What they did not believe was the doctrine of absolute reprobation, held in the sense that persons were condemned irrespective of their character and faith. They did not believe that sinners were pardoned without repentance. They did not believe that the Saviour so stood in the sinner's place that God ever looked upon him as a sinner. The last point was the point most vehemently debated in this controversy. The question was, Is there a change of persons, or only of person, in the redemption; and according as this was answered, and the sense in which the answer was understood, the controversialist was classed as an Arminian, or even Unitarian, on the one side, or as an Antinomian on the other. Mather went so far as to state that believers were as righteous as Christ himself, and the Congregational body supported Mather."

After the Revolution the Independents greatly increased in numbers and influence, especially during the middle of the last century, under "the extraordinary revival of religious zeal" which the earnest labors of Wesley and Whitefield occasioned. Many converts of these eminent preachers joined the Independents, favoring their views on Church government. Since the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, by which all civil abilities were removed from the Independents, and their right to social equality with their fellow-subjects was legally acknowledged, they have especially prospered, and their accessions have been so great that they have become the largest dissenting body in England except the Wesleyan Methodists. In 1831 a "Congregational Union of England and Wales" was formed, and their "Declaration of Faith, Order, and Discipline" was adopted in 1833. According to the report of 1889 the number of their churches in England, Ireland, and Wales, is given at 4726, of which 294 were vacant. The sittings provide for 1,563,919 persons. The Independents, who have always evinced great interest in education, at present have under their control in England eleven training colleges, with a staff of twenty-six professors. These are,

	Date of Formation.	No. of Students.
Western College, Plymouth	1752	16
Rotherham College	1756	24
Brecon College	1760	32
Cheshunt College	1768	39
Airedale College, Bradford	1784	35
Hackney College	1796	35
Lancashire College	1806	32
Spring Hill, Birmingham	1838	32
New College, London	1850	35
Cavendish Theological College, Manchester	1860	22
Cong. Institute, Nottingham	1861	50

II. *Doctrines.*—"In support of their scheme of Congregational churches, the Independents observe that the word ἐκκλησία, which we translate '*church*,' is always used in Scripture to signify either a *single congregation*, or the *place* where a single congregation meets. Thus that unlawful assembly at Ephesus, brought together against Paul by the craftsmen, is called ἐκκλησία, *a church* (Acts xix, 32, 39, 41). The word, however, is generally applied to a more sacred use, but still it signifies either the *body* assembling, or the *place* in which it assembles. The whole body of the disciples at Corinth is called *the Church*, and spoken of as coming together into *one place* (1 Cor. xiv, 23). The place into which they came together we find likewise called *a church*: 'When ye come together in the *church*—when ye come together into one place' (1 Cor. xi, 18, 20). Wherever there were more congregations than one, there were likewise more *churches* than one. Thus, 'Let your women keep silence in the *churches*,' ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (1 Cor. xiv, 34). The whole nation of Israel is indeed called a *church*, but it was no more than a single congregation, for it had but one place of public worship, namely, first the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple. The catholic Church of Christ, his holy nation and kingdom, is likewise a single congregation, having one place of worship, that is, heaven, where all the members assemble by faith and hold communion; and in which, when they shall all be fully gathered together, they will in fact be one glorious assembly. Accordingly we find it called 'the general assembly and church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven.' Besides these, the Independent can find no other description of a church in the New Testament; not a trace of a diocese or presbytery consisting of several congregations, all subject to one jurisdiction. The number of disciples in Jerusalem was certainly great before they were dispersed by the persecution in which Paul bore so active a part. Yet they are never mentioned as forming distinct assemblies, but as one assembly, meeting with its elders in one place—sometimes in the Temple, sometimes in Solomon's porch, and sometimes in an upper room. After the dispersion, the disciples who fled from Jerusalem, as they could no longer assemble in one

place, are never called a Church by themselves, or one church, but the *churches* of Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee (Acts ix, 31; Gal. i, 22). Hence the Independent concludes that in Jerusalem the words *church* and *congregation* were of the same import; and if such was the case there, where the Gospel was first preached, he thinks we may reasonably expect to find it so in other places. Thus, when Paul, on his journey, calls the elders of the Church of Ephesus to Miletus, he speaks to them as the joint overseers of a single congregation: 'Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers' (Acts xx, 28). Had the Church at Ephesus consisted of different congregations, united under such a jurisdiction as that of a modern presbytery, it would have been natural to say, 'Take heed to yourselves, and to the *flocks* over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers;' but this is a way of speaking of which the Independent finds no instance in the whole of the New Testament. The sacred writers, when speaking of all the Christians in a nation or province, never call them the *Church* of such a nation or province, but '*the churches* of Galatia' (Gal. i, 2), '*the churches* of Macedonia' (2 Cor. viii, 1), '*the churches* of Asia' (1 Cor. xvi, 19). On the other hand, when speaking of the disciples in a city or town who might ordinarily assemble in one place, they uniformly call them *a Church;* as, 'the Church of Antioch,' 'the Church at Corinth,' 'the Church of Ephesus,' and the like.

"In each of these churches or congregations there were bishops, sometimes called 'elders,' and deacons; and in every church there seems to have been more than one elder, and in some a great many, 'who all labored in word and doctrine.' Thus we read (Acts xiv, 23) of Paul and Barnabas ordaining elders (to be bishops and deacons) in every church; and (Acts xx, 17) of a company of elders in the Church of Ephesus, who were exhorted to 'feed the flock, and to take heed to themselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers.' But of such elders as are found in modern Presbyterian churches, who neither teach nor are fit to teach, the Independent finds no vestige in the Scriptures, nor in the earliest uninspired writers of the Christian Church. The rule or government of this presbytery or eldership in a church is not their own, but Christ's. They are not lords over God's heritage, nor can they pretend to more power over the disciples than the apostles possessed. But when the administration of the apostles in the Church of Jerusalem, and other churches where they acted as elders, is inquired into by an Independent, it does not appear to him that they did anything of common concern to the Church without the consent of the multitude; nay, it seems they thought it necessary to judge and determine in discipline, in presence of the whole Church (Acts vi, 1-6; xv, 22; 1 Cor. v, 3, 4, 5). Excommunication and absolution were in the power of the Church at Corinth, and not of the elders as distinguished from the congregation (1 Cor. v; 2 Cor. xi). The apostle, indeed, speaks of his delivering some unto Satan (1 Tim. i, 20); but it is by no means clear that he did it by himself, and not after the manner pointed out in 1 Cor. v, 4, 5; even as it does not appear, from his saying, in one epistle, 'that the gift was given unto Timothy by putting on of *his* hands,' that this was not done in the *presbytery* of a Church, as in the other epistle we find it actually was. The trying and judging of false apostles was a matter of the first importance, but it was done by the elders with the flock at Ephesus (Rev. ii, 2; Acts xx, 28); and that whole flock did, in the days of Ignatius, all partake of the Lord's Supper, and pray together in one place. Even the power of binding and loosing, or the power of the keys, as it has been called, was by our Saviour conferred, not upon a particular order of disciples, but upon the Church. 'If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the *Church*, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven,' etc. (Matt. xviii, 15-48). It is not said, if he shall neglect to hear the one or two, tell it to the elders of the Church; far less can it be meant that the offended person shall tell the cause of his offence to all the disciples of a presbytery or diocese consisting of many congregations. But he is required to tell it to that particular Church or congregation to which they both belong; and the sentence of that assembly, pronounced by its elders, is in a very solemn manner declared to be final, from which there lies no appeal to any jurisdiction on earth.

"With respect to the constituting of elders in any Church or congregation, the Independent reasons in the following manner: The officers of Christ's appointment were either ordinary and permanent in the Church, or they were extraordinary, and peculiar to the planting of Christianity. The extraordinary were those who were employed in laying the plan of the Gospel churches, and in publishing the New-Testament revelation. Such were the apostles, the chosen witnesses of our Saviour's resurrection; such were the prophets, inspired by the Holy Ghost for explaining infallibly the Old Testament by the things written in the New; and such were the evangelists, the apostles' ministers. These can be succeeded by none in what was peculiar to them, because their work was completed by themselves. But they are succeeded in all that was not peculiar to them by bishops and deacons, the only two ordinary and permanent orders of ministers in the Church. We have already seen that it belongs to the office of a bishop to feed the flock of Christ. The only question to be settled, then, is, How men are ordinarily called to that office? for about the office of the deacon there is little or no dispute. No man can now pretend to be so called of God to the ministry of the Word as were the apostles and other inspired elders, whom he chose to be the publishers of his revealed truth, and to whose mission he bore witness in an extraordinary manner. But what the apostles were to those who had the divine oracles from their mouths, that their writings are to us; and therefore, as no man can lawfully pretend to a call from God to make any addition to those writings, so neither can any man pretend to be lawfully called to the ministry of the Word already written, but in the manner which that word directs. Now there is nothing of which the New Testament speaks more clearly than of the characters of those who should exercise the office of bishop in the Church, and of the actual exercise of that office. The former are graphically drawn in the epistles to Timothy and Titus, and the latter is minutely described in Paul's discourse to the Ephesian elders, in Peter's exhortation to elders, and our Lord's commission to those ministers with whom he promised to be always present, even unto the end of the world. It is not competent for any man or body of men to add to or take from the description of a Gospel minister given in these places, so as to insist upon the necessity of any qualification which is not there mentioned, or to dispense with any qualification as needless which is there required. Neither has Jesus Christ, the only legislator to the Church, given to any ministers or people any power or right whatever to call, send, elect, or ordain to that office any person who is not qualified according to the description given in his law; nor has he given any power or right to reject the least of them who are so qualified, and who desire the office of a bishop or elder. Let a man have hands laid upon him by such as could prove an uninterrupted descent by imposition of hands from the apostles, let him be set apart to that office by a company of ministers themselves the most conformable to the Scripture character, and let him be chosen by

the most holy people on earth, yet, if he answer not the New-Testament description of a minister, he is not called of God to that office, and is no minister of Christ, but is indeed running unsent. No form of ordination can pretend to such clear foundation in the New Testament as the description of the persons who should be elders of the Church; and the laying on of hands is of small importance in the mission of a minister of Christ; for now, when the power of miracles has ceased, it is obvious that such a rite, by whomsoever performed, can convey no powers, whether ordinary or extraordinary. Indeed, it appears to have been sometimes used, even in the apostolic age, without any such intention. When Paul and Barnabas were separated to the particular employment of going out to the Gentiles, the prophets and teachers at Antioch 'prayed, and laid their hands on them.' But did this ceremony confer upon the apostles any new power or authority to act as ministers of Christ? Did the imposition of hands make those shining lights of the Gospel one whit better qualified than they were before to convert and baptize the nations, to feed the flock of God, to teach, rebuke, or exhort, with all long-suffering and patience? It cannot be pretended that there was any special virtue in this ceremony. Paul and Barnabas had undoubtedly received the Holy Ghost before they came to Antioch; and, as they were apostles, they were of course authorized to discharge all the functions of the inferior and ordinary ministers of the Gospel. As in this instance, however, the imposition of hands appears to have been a mark of recognition of the parties as qualified for the work to which they were appointed, so Independents usually impose the hands of the bishops with the same intent. In a word, whoever in his life and conversation is conformable to the character which the inspired writers give of a bishop, and is likewise qualified by his 'mightiness in the Scripture' to discharge the duties of that office, is fully authorized to administer the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, to teach, and exhort, and rebuke, with all long-suffering, and doctrine, and has all the call and mission which the Lord now gives to any man; while he who wants the qualifications mentioned has not God's call, whatever he may have, nor any authority to preach the Gospel of Christ, or to dispense the ordinances of his religion. From this view of the Independent principles, which is faithfully taken from their own writers, it appears that, according to them, even the election of a congregation confers upon the individual whom they may choose for their pastor no new powers, but only creates a new relation between him and a particular flock, giving him an exclusive right, either by himself or in conjunction with other pastors constituted in the same manner, to exercise among them that authority which he derives immediately from Christ, and which, in a greater or less degree, is possessed by every sincere Christian according to his gifts and abilities" (*Encyclop. Britannica*, xii, 370–372).

III. *Scottish, or New Independents.*—In Scotland Independency originated with John Glas (q.v.). The Baptists there, as elsewhere, are Independents. The regular Congregationalists are also numerous. See CONGREGATIONALISTS. Apart from these, there is a body called "New Independents." "In December, 1797, Robert Haldane (q.v.) formed a '*Society for Propagating the Gospel at Home.*' The object of this society was to send forth men to preach the Gospel in those parts of Scotland where they conceived that this blessing was not enjoyed in its purity, or where it was not regularly dispensed. Adopting the opinion that it is the duty of every Christian who knows the Gospel, and is duly qualified, to preach it to his fellow-sinners, James Haldane, brother of Robert, Mr. Aikman, and others, travelled through the greater part of Scotland, and preached. In a short time the Messrs. Haldane separated from the Church of Scotland, and soon after two other ministers of the National Church, Innes and Ewing, resigned their charges, and united with the Haldanes and their associates. A distinct society was soon formed, at the head of which were the Haldanes; and hence its members have been also called *Haldanites*, or *Haldanite Independents.* Large places of public worship, denominated *Tabernacles*, were erected, at Robert Haldane's expense, in the principal towns, where the Word of God was declared to numerous assemblies, both by these ministers and others from various denominations in England. At the expense chiefly, if not solely, of Robert Haldane, academies were also formed at Edinburgh, Dundee, and Glasgow, for the education of young men for the work of the ministry, who, when deemed qualified for preaching the Gospel, were to be employed as itinerants, under the inspection and countenance of the '*Society for Propagating the Gospel at Home.*' Thus a succession of teachers was secured.

"The *doctrines* of the Scottish Independents are Calvinistic, and they reject all articles of faith or creeds of human composition. They say that the Scriptures are a divine and infallible standard, and that consistent Independents dare not adopt any other. They insist that the Scriptures contain a full and complete model and system of doctrine, government, discipline, and worship, and that in them we may find a universal rule for the direction of Christians in their associated state, as well as all necessary instructions for the faith and practice of individuals. They require Scripture for everything, even for such things as could not be contained in Scripture. Hence they reject the authority of the civil magistrate in matters of religion, and receive the Scriptures, and nothing else, as binding in the worship of God. They conceive the Church of Christ, as exhibited in Scripture, to be an association which has no head on earth, and which, as a body, can receive no laws from any one, except from Christ alone. They consider a National Church as 'the very essence of Antichrist.' They lay it down as a fundamental principle that a Christian Church ought to consist of believers, or of those who give evidence of their knowing and believing the Gospel, united together on the profession of its truths, and walking agreeably to them. They differ from the more early Independents in admitting Christians of all religious denominations to communicate with them in the Lord's Supper, provided they have reason to think them real Christians, and in considering all association of ministers, for giving council and advice to the churches in matters of doubt, as unnecessary and unscriptural.

"As to *Church government*, they believe that the apostolical churches, according to the model of which it is their great and professed object to conform, were entirely independent, none of them being subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each one governed by its own rulers, and by no other laws than those written in the Word of God. They say that a true Church of Christ is a society formed for the same purpose as the churches planted by the apostles, and whose constitution is the same as theirs. A deviation in these particulars renders it unworthy of the name. According to them, when the word Church in Scripture, in its religious sense, does not denote a single congregation of saints, it always refers to the whole body or kingdom of Christ, part of which is in heaven and part on earth; which body does not constitute two churches, a visible and an invisible, but one church or family, consisting of different parts. They admit that all churches, that is, congregations, are connected together as being Christ's subjects, but they insist that they are dependent only on their King, in whose hands the supreme authority rests. While they teach that independent churches have no authority over each other, they allow that they may receive the advantage of each other's opinion on any matter of importance. They conceive that bishop and elder were, in apostolic times, synonymous terms; that the stated officers in all the churches then were elders and deacons, and, of course, that they are the only offices essential to a Church of Christ, and that there is no difference, in any respect, between elder and deacon, except in the offices to which

they are appointed. They insist that ordination is not represented in Scripture as *conveying* an office, or giving any person a right to discharge that office; it is only the manner of setting him apart to discharge the duties of his office. It gives him no jurisdiction in any church except in that which appointed him; and as soon as he lays down, or is removed from his office in that church, his ordination is at an end. They contend that there is a distinction of departments in the pastoral office, and that teaching and ruling are different branches of that office. Both elders and deacons are ordained by imposition of hands; and though ordination is part of the elder's province, yet, when churches are newly formed, or in other cases of necessity, they allow that the members, who have always the right of election, may ordain church officers for themselves, or, at least, set them apart to their respective offices.

"In *worship*, the New Independents do not differ much from other non-liturgical churches. They read a large but indefinite portion of the Scriptures at each meeting; in many of their chapels they use Dr. Watts's version of the Psalms; and in most of them they stand while singing. They adopt weekly communions; and, as they make no real distinction between clergy and laity, the want or absence of elders and deacons, on any occasion, in any of their chapels, is not thought a sufficient reason for preventing the administration of the holy communion on the first day of the week. They contend that, by the approved practice of apostolic churches, it is demonstrated to be the appointment of Christ that his churches *must* observe the Lord's Supper every first day of the week. A division has taken place among these Independents, chiefly in consequence of the adoption of *Baptist principles*, and the introduction of Church discipline, and of mutual exhortation and prayer by the brethren, into the public service on Sunday mornings." The New Independents increased rapidly, and possessed, as early as the opening of our century, some 86 churches. There are at present some 114 churches in connection with the New Independents. See Haldane, *View of Social Worship;* Adams, *Religious World*, iii, 260 sq.; Robinson, *Theological Dictionary*, s. v.; Kinniburgh, *Historical Survey of Congregationalism in Scotland;* and the articles HALDANE; CONGREGATIONALISTS. Some of the Scotch Independents have embraced the Morisonian doctrine. See MORISONIANS. See, besides the authorities already referred to, Fletcher, *History of Independency* (Lond. 1847, 4 vols. 12mo); Vaughan, *Hist. of English Nonconformity* (Lond. 1862); Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans* (see Index); Milner, *Ch. Hist.* i, 444; Burnet, *Hist. of his own Times* (see Index); Punchard, *History of Congregationalism*, vol. i, ii; Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters*, i, 171 sq.: ii, 251, 546; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 653 sq.; Brande and Cox, *Dict. of Science, Lit., and Art*, s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; *Cyclopædia Britannica*, s. v.

Index, the name given to certain catalogues of books and authors either wholly prohibited, or censured and corrected, by the Romish Church. An Index of the former kind is called *Index Librorum Prohibitorum;* of the latter, *Index Expurgatorius.* An *Index Prohibitorum* exists also in the Russo-Greek Church, to which, no doubt, is due the weakness of the Russian literary productions on theological subjects.

I. INDEX LIBRŌRUM PROHIBITŌRUM.—1. *Before the Reformation.*—Prohibitions of heretical or dangerous books are as old as the attempts of the popes to usurp universal supremacy. In fact, such prohibitions flow naturally from the theory that "out of the Church there is no salvation." It was Cyprian (q. v.) who first fully stated this theory; and even in his hands it logically led to the conclusion that all heretical opinions (i. e. such as differ from those announced by the Church authorities) must be punished and suppressed, if possible. As the claims of the hierarchy grew in magnitude, it became necessary to put down all doctrines that might diminish the power of the priesthood. To do this was a proof of zeal. This zeal was at first directed against heathen and Jewish writings, as it was feared that the reading of such might even endanger Christianity. The Council of Carthage (A.D. 400) forbade in *Can.* 16 the reading of heathen books. The Church, however, did not remain satisfied with forbidding heretical books, it commanded them to be burned. This was first attempted in connection with the writings of Arius, and became afterwards one of the practices of the Church. As heretical books, however, were sometimes published under ecclesiastical titles, such proceeding was in the 5th and 6th centuries declared by the Apostolic Canons (*Can.* 60) to be punishable by suppression of the work. The Synod of Elvira (813) decided in the same sense that all who circulated forbidden books should be *anathema* (*libelli famosi*). It even came to be held that any one who had read a forbidden book was guilty of all the heresies therein contained, and incapacitated for readmission into the Church until the performance of such penance as the Church enjoined. Especially did the hierarchy consider the reading of *translations of the Bible* as dangerous for the laity. Thus Gregory VII (1080) denounced the practice of reading the Bible in the vernacular in his letter to the king Wratislaw of Bohemia (in Mansi *SS. Conciliorum nova et ampliss. Collectio*, xx, 296). Innocent III. it is true, said (see his *Epistolarum libri xix*, in lib. ii, ep. cxli, p. 1199) that the searching of the Scripture is to be commended, not forbidden; but added: "Tanta est divinæ Scripturæ profunditas ut non solum simplices et illiterati, sed etiam prudentes et docti non plene sufficiant ad ipsius intelligentiam indagandam. Unde recte fuit olim in lege divina statutum, ut bestia, quæ montem tetigerit, lapidetur; ne videlicet simplex aliquis et indoctus præsumat ad sublimitatem Scripturæ sacræ pertingere vel etiam aliis prædicare." But the opposition to the papacy and to the Romish Church which immediately followed a more general reading of the Bible, soon led to placing the latter among the forbidden books, on a level with those condemned as heretical. The Concil. Tolosanum (1229) forbade the laity (c. 14) to even possess the O. or N. T. (see Hegelmaier, *Gesch. des Bibelverbots*, Ulm. 1783). When the Inquisition became established and prosperous, the enforcing of the rules relating to forbidden books was intrusted to it, and in the Conc. Biterrense (1246) we find (c. 36) a number of theological works mentioned which both the laity and clergy are forbidden to read. But the more the Church strove to render its position secure by such means, the more did influences quite to the contrary exert themselves to secure its overthrow, particularly the precursors of the Reformation, whose doctrines and writings struck at the most vital parts of the Romish organization. A Synod of London (1408) forbade the reading of Wycliffe's works when not previously approved. while the works of Huss were condemned as thoroughly heretical. The discovery of the art of printing gave a new impulse to the publication of dangerous books, and Alexander VI complained in his *Decretum de libris non sine censura imprimendis* (Raynald, *Annal.* ad a. 1501, no. 36) that heretical dogmas were extensively promulgated, especially in the provinces of Mayence, Cologne, Trieste, and Magdeburg. He recommended the bishops and vicars to carefully watch the appearance of any heretical works, and to enforce the fines and excommunications against the authors. As to the printers, he says: "Debent—ipsi merito compesci opportunis remediis, ut ab eorum impressione desistant, quæ fidei catholicæ contraria fore noscuntur vel adversa, aut in mentibus fidelium possunt verisimiliter scandalum generare." Pope Leo X, in the tenth session of the Lateran Council (May 4, 1515), stated in the decree *Inter sollicitudines* that no book should be published without the authorization of either the bishop, his legate, or the Inquisition, under penalty of excommunication. Any book issued in contravention of this regulation was to be sequestered and burnt.

2. *At and after the Reformation and the Council of*

Trent. — The Reformation gave rise to innumerable writings highly dangerous to the Romish Church, and, in spite of all orders to the contrary, they were widely circulated and eagerly read. In 1546 the University of Louvain, by order of Charles V, published a list (*Index*) of all such books as were considered dangerous to read, and consequently forbidden; a new edition of the list appeared in 1550, after the papal legate at Venice, John della Casa, had published one on his own account in 1549 (see Schelhorn, *Ergötzlichkeiten*, ii, 3). During the suspension of the Council of Trent, pope Paul IV had another list of forbidden works prepared in 1557 by a particular congregation, and this formed the first actual *Index librorum prohibitorum* of the Romish Church. It was republished, with additions, by Bergerius in 1559, under the title *Index auctorum et librorum, qui tanquam hæretici aut suspecti aut perversi ab Officio S. R. Inquisitionis reprobantur et in universa Christiana republica interdicuntur* (Romæ, 1557). In 1558, pope Paul forbade also to the clergy and students the reading of such heretical works as had been tolerated for their exclusive use by his predecessors or by the Inquisition. These orders, however, did not prove very successful in Italy, and utterly failed in other countries, though many of the works named in the Index were burnt. The writings especially condemned by Paul's Index were such as defended the civil governments against the encroachments of the Church, such as asserted the superiority of the authority of councils over that of popes and bishops, or such as attacked the theory and practice of the Romish Church in general. The Index divided the authors of forbidden books into three classes: 1, those of whom all the works were absolutely condemned; 2, those among whose works some only were condemned; 3, the authors of anonymous works, such as had appeared since 1519. At the end was appended a list of sixty-two printers of heretical works. The reading of books named in the Index was punishable by excommunication and by degrading penances.

The Council of Trent, in its 18th session, appointed a committee to prepare a new Index. This committee reported at the twenty-fifth session that they could not agree on account of the number and diversity of the books to be included in the Index, and recommended that the drawing up and enforcing of it should be left to the pope, which was agreed to. Pius IV then prepared a new Index, an enlarged edition of Paul IV's. The publication of this Index (which has often, but erroneously, been called *Index Tridentinus*) was accompanied by the bull *Dominici gregis custodiæ* (March 24, 1564), and by *ten rules*, which have been prefixed to all official Indexes published since that period. As these rules illustrate fully the whole spirit and tendency of the Romish system, in its relation to the freedom of literary and scientific progress, we give them here in full.

"(I.) All books condemned by the supreme pontiffs or General Councils before the year 1515, and not comprised in the present index, are nevertheless to be considered as condemned. (II.) The books of heresiarchs, whether of those who broached or disseminated their heresies prior to the year above mentioned, or of those who have been, or are, the heads or leaders of heretics, as Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Balthazar Pacimontanus, Swenchfeld, and other similar ones, are altogether forbidden, whatever may be their names, titles, or subjects. And the books of other heretics, which treat professedly upon religion, are totally condemned; but those which do not treat upon religion are allowed to be read, after having been examined and approved by Catholic divines, by order of the bishops and inquisitors. Those Catholic books are also permitted to be read which have been composed by authors who have afterwards fallen into heresy, or who, after their fall, have returned into the bosom of the Church, provided they have been approved by the theological faculty of some Catholic university, or by the general inquisition. (III.) Translations of ecclesiastical writers, which have been hitherto published by condemned authors, are permitted to be read, if they contain nothing contrary to sound doctrine. Translations of the *Old Testament* may also be allowed, but only to learned and pious men, at the discretion of the bishop; provided they use them merely as elucidations of the Vulgate version, in order to understand the Holy Scriptures, and not as the sacred text itself. But translations of the *New Testament*, made by authors of the first class of this index, are allowed to no one, since little advantage, but much danger, generally arises from reading them. If notes accompany the versions which are allowed to be read, or are joined to the Vulgate edition, they may be permitted to be read by the same persons as the versions, after the suspected places have been expunged by the theological faculty of some Catholic university, or by the general inquisitor. On the same conditions, also, pious and learned men may be permitted to have what is called 'Vatablus's Bible,' or any part of it. But the preface and Prolegomena of the Bibles published by Isidore Clarius are, however, excepted; and the text of his editions is not to be considered as the text of the Vulgate edition. (IV.) Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it, it is, on this point, referred to the judgment of the bishops or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priest or confessor, permit the reading of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety, they apprehend, will be augmented, and not injured by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary. Booksellers who shall sell, or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue, to any person not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the bishop to some pious use; and be subjected to such other penalties as the bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offence. But regulars shall neither read nor purchase such Bibles without a special license from their superiors. (V.) Books of which heretics are the editors, but which contain little or nothing of their own, being mere compilations from others, as lexicons, concordances (collections of), apothegms, or similes, indexes, and others of a similar kind, may be allowed by the bishops and inquisitors, after having made, with the advice of divines, such corrections and emendations as may be deemed requisite. (VI.) Books of controversy between the Catholics and heretics of the present time, written in the vulgar tongue, are not to be indiscriminately allowed, but are to be subject to the same regulations as Bibles in the vulgar tongue. As to those works in the vulgar tongue which treat of morality, contemplation, confession, and similar subjects, and which contain nothing contrary to sound doctrine, there is no reason why they should be prohibited; the same may be said also of sermons in the vulgar tongue, designed for the people. And if in any kingdom or province any books have been hitherto prohibited, as containing things not proper to be indiscriminately read by all sorts of persons, they may be allowed by the bishop and inquisitor, after having corrected them, if written by Catholic authors. (VII.) Books professedly treating of lascivious or obscene subjects, or narrating or teaching them, are utterly prohibited, as readily corrupting both the faith and manners of those who peruse them; and those who possess them shall be severely punished by the bishop. But the works of antiquity, written by the heathens, are permitted to be read, because of the elegance and propriety of the language; though on no account shall they be suffered to be read by young persons. (VIII.) Books, the principal subject of which is good, but in which some things are occasionally introduced tending to heresy and impiety, divination, or superstition, may be allowed, after they have been corrected by Catholic divines, by the authority of the general inquisition. The same judgment is also formed of prefaces, summaries, or notes taken from condemned authors, and inserted in the works of authors not condemned; but such works must not be printed in future, until they have been amended. (IX.) All books and writings of geomancy, hydromancy, aëromancy, pyromancy, onomancy, chiromancy, and necromancy, or which treat of sorceries, poisons, auguries, auspices, or magical incantations, are utterly rejected. The bishops shall also diligently guard against any persons reading or keeping any books, treatises, or indexes which treat of judicial astrology, or contain presumptuous predictions of the events of future contingencies and fortuitous occurrences, or of those actions which depend upon the will of man. But they shall permit such opinions and observations of natural things as are written in aid of navigation, agriculture, and medicine. (X.) In the printing of books and other writings, the rules shall be observed which were ordained in the tenth session of the Council of Lateran, under Leo X. Therefore, if any book is to be printed in the city of Rome, it shall first be examined by the pope's vicar and the master of the sacred palace, or other persons chosen by our most holy father for that purpose. In other places, the examination of any book or manuscript intended to be printed shall be referred to the bishop, or some skilful person whom he shall nominate, and the inquisitor of the city or diocese in which the impression is executed, who shall gratuitously, and without delay, affix their approbation to the work, in their own handwriting, subject, nevertheless, to the pains and censures contained

in the said decree; this law and condition being added, that an authentic copy of the book to be printed, signed by the author himself, shall remain in the hands of the examiner: and it is the judgment of the fathers of the present deputation, that those persons who publish works in manuscript, before they have been examined and approved, should be subject to the same penalties as those who print them; and that those who read or possess them should be considered as the authors, if the real authors of such writings do not avow themselves. The approbation given in writing shall be placed at the head of the books, whether printed or in manuscript, that they may appear to be duly authorized; and this examination and approbation, etc., shall be granted gratuitously. Moreover, in every city and diocese, the house or place where the art of printing is exercised, and also the shops of booksellers, shall be frequently visited by persons deputed by the bishop or his vicar, conjointly with the inquisitor, so that nothing that is prohibited may be printed, kept, or sold. Booksellers of every description shall keep a catalogue of the books which they have on sale, signed by the said deputies; nor shall they keep, or sell, nor in any way dispose of any other books without permission from the deputies, under pain of forfeiting the books, and being liable to such other penalties as shall be judged proper by the bishop or inquisitor, who shall also punish the buyers, readers, or printers of such works. If any person import foreign books into any city, they shall be obliged to announce them to the deputies; or if this kind of merchandise be exposed to sale in any public place, the public officers of the place shall signify to the said deputies that such books have been brought; and no one shall presume to give, to read, or lend, or sell any book which he or any other person has brought into the city, until he has shown it to the deputies, and obtained their permission, unless it be a work well known to be universally allowed. Heirs and testamentary executors shall make no use of the books of the deceased, nor in any way transfer them to others, until they have presented a catalogue of them to the deputies, and obtained their license, under pain of confiscation of the books, or the infliction of such other punishment as the bishop or inquisitor shall deem proper, according to the contumacy or quality of the delinquent. With regard to those books which the fathers of the present deputation shall examine, or correct, or deliver to be corrected, or permit to be reprinted on certain conditions, booksellers and others shall be bound to observe whatever is ordained respecting them. The bishops and general inquisitors shall, nevertheless, be at liberty, according to the power they possess, to prohibit such books as may seem to be permitted by these rules, if they deem it necessary for the good of the kingdom, or province, or diocese. And let the secretary of these fathers, according to the command of our holy father, transmit to the notary of the general inquisitor the names of the books that have been corrected, as well as of the persons to whom the fathers have granted the power of examination. Finally, it is enjoined on all the faithful, that no one presume to keep or read any books contrary to these rules, or prohibited by this index. But if any one read or keep any books composed by heretics, or the writings of any author suspected of heresy or false doctrine, he shall instantly incur the sentence of excommunication; and those who read or keep works interdicted on another account, besides the mortal sin committed, shall be severely punished at the will of the bishops" (Labbei *SS. Concilia*, xiv, 952–956).

This Index of Pius IV was published at Rome by Aldus Manutius (1564), and afterwards revised and enlarged by Gregory XIII, Sixtus V, Clement VIII (1595).

2. Index Expurgatorius.—Pope Sixtus V introduced a series of works which, after expunging certain obnoxious passages, could be allowed to be read. This list received the name of *Index librorum expurgandorum* or *expurgatorius*. It was first published by order of the duke Alba, under the style *Index expurgatorius librorum, qui hoc sæculo prodierunt* (Antwerp, 1751, and republished since). Other lists of prohibited books, on the model of that of Rome, were, however, published in other countries, especially in Spain (most of them under Philip II in Madrid, in 1577 and 1584) and in Italy. John Maria Brasichellen or Brasichelli (properly Wenzel of Brisigella) prepared, with the aid of the Dominican Tomas Malvenda, an Index styled *Index expurgatorius cura J. M. Brasichellani*, Mag. Palat. Romæ (1607), but this, far from being approved of at head-quarters, was itself put in the Romish *Index libr. prohib.* The Spanish inquisitor general, Antonio à Sotomajor, published a *Novissimus librorum prohibitorum et expurgandorum Index* (Madrid, 1648), which is highly praised for its completeness. The Romish Index was republished in 1818, but has since received, and is constantly receiving, numerous additions.

The Congregation of the Index was originally established by pope Pius V. It holds its sittings at Rome, and has the right of examining generally all books which concern faith, morals, ecclesiastical discipline, or civil society; on which it passes judgment, for suppressing them absolutely, or directing them to be corrected, or allowing them to be read with precaution, and by certain persons. Persons specially deputed by it may give permission to Romanists throughout the world to read prohibited books; and the penalty denounced against those who read or keep any books suspected of heresy or false doctrine is the greater excommunication; and those who read or keep works interdicted on any other account, besides the mortal sin committed, are to be severely punished at the will of the bishops. It is remarkable, however, that the Index is hardly in force at the present day, even in the most Romish-inclined countries. In Austria even, the faithful daughter of Rome, Maria Theresa forbade the publication, and it is not to be expected that either her liberal successors or the princes of other Roman Catholic countries, forced by the liberal spirit of the people to disobedient acts towards Rome, should permit the publication in their dominions. It can, therefore, hardly be said to be any longer virtually in force, though in some countries its publication is permitted by *special grant* from the government. Baudri, in an article on this subject in Aschbach (*Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 444, a Roman Catholic work), concedes this, and says that even the countries bound by a concordat to an enforcement of the decisions of the Congregation of the Index fail to do their duty, and that books are constantly published without regard and consideration of the agreement entered into with Rome (comp. Eckardt, *Modern Russia*, p. 246 sq.). See Mendham, *Literary Policy of the Church of Rome* (Lond. 1830, 8vo); Cramp, *Text-book of Popery* (London, 1851, 8vo), p. 419–428; Elliott, *Delineation of Popery*, bk. i; Gibbings, *Index Vaticanus, an exact Reprint of the Roman Index Expurgatorius* (London, 1837, 8vo); Peignot, *Dictionnaire critique littéraire et bibliographique des principaux livres condamnés au feu, supprimés ou censurés* (Paris, 1806); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 651; Eadie, *Ecclesiastical Encyclopædia*, s. v.; Buckley, *Canons and Decrees of Trent*, p. 284. See also Bible, Use of; Censorship of Books.

In'dia (Heb. *Hoddu'*, הֹדּוּ, for הֹנְדּוּ, i. e. *Hindu*, of Sanscrit origin; see Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* p. 366; Sept. Ἰνδική, Vulg. *India*), occurs in the Bible only in Esther i, 1; viii, 9, where the Persian king is described as reigning "from India unto Ethiopia, over a hundred and seven and twenty provinces;" the names of the two countries are similarly connected by Herodotus (vii, 9). It is found again, however, in the Apocrypha (compare Esther xiii, 1), where India is mentioned among the countries which the Romans took from Antiochus and gave to Eumenes (1 Macc. viii, 8). It is also with some reason conceived that in the list of foreign Jews present at the Pentecost (Acts ii, 9) we should read Ἰνδίαν, *India*, and not Ἰουδαίαν, *Judæa;* but the still more probable reading is Ἰδουμαίαν, *Idumæa*, if indeed the common reading ought to be changed at all (see Kuinöl, *Comment.* ad loc.). The Hebrew form "*Hoddu*" is an abbreviation of *Honadu*, which is identical with the indigenous names of the river Indus, "Hindu," or "Sindhu," and again with the ancient name of the country as it appears in the Vendidad, "Hapta Hendu." The native form "Sindus" is noticed by Pliny (vi, 23). The India of the book of Esther is not the peninsula of Hindostan, but the country surrounding the Indus—the *Punjâb*, and perhaps *Scinde*—the India which Herodotus describes (iii, 98) as forming part of the Persian empire under Darius, and the India which at a later period was conquered by Alexander the Great. The name occurs in the inscriptions of Persepolis and Nakhsh-i-Rustam, but not in those of Behistûn (Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 485). In 1 Macc. viii, 8, it is clear that India proper cannot be understood, inasmuch as this never belonged

either to Antiochus or Eumenes. At the same time, none of the explanations offered by commentators are satisfactory: the Eneti of Paphlagonia have been suggested, but these people had disappeared long before (Strabo, xii, 534): the India of Xenophon (*Cyrop.* i, 5, 3; iii, 2, 25), which may have been above the Carian stream named Indus (Pliny, v, 29; probably the Calbis), is more likely; but the emendation "Mysia and Ionia" for *Media and India* offers the best solution of the difficulty. See IONIA. A more authentic notice of the country occurs in 1 Macc. vi, 37, where Indians are noticed as the drivers of the war-elephants introduced into the army of the Syrian king (see also 1 Esdras iii, 2; Esther xvi, 1). See ELEPHANT.

But, though the *name* of India occurs so seldom, the people and productions of that country must have been tolerably well known to the Jews. There is undoubted evidence that an active trade was carried on between India and Western Asia: the Tyrians established their dépôts on the shores of the Persian Gulf, and procured "horns of ivory and ebony," "broidered work and rich apparel" (Ezek. xxvii, 15, 24), by a route which crossed the Arabian desert by land, and then followed the coasts of the Indian Ocean by sea. The trade opened by Solomon with Ophir through the Red Sea chiefly consisted of Indian articles, and some of the names even of the articles, *algummim*, "sandal wood," *kophim*, "apes," *tukkiim*, "peacocks," are of Indian origin (Humboldt, *Kosmos*, ii, 133); to which we may add the Hebrew name of the "topaz," *pitdah*, derived from the Sanscrit *pita*. There is a strong probability that productions of yet greater utility were furnished by India through Syria to the shores of Europe, and that the Greeks derived both the term κασσίτερος (compare the Sanscrit *kastira*), and the article it represents, "tin," from the coasts of India. The connection thus established with India led to the opinion that the Indians were included under the ethnological title of Cush (Gen. x, 6), and hence the Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic versions frequently render that term by India or Indians, as in 2 Chron. xxi, 16; Isa. xi, 11; xviii, 1; Jer. xiii, 23; Zeph. iii, 10. For the connection which some have sought to establish between India and Paradise, see EDEN.

The above intimations, and, indeed, all ancient history, refer not to the whole of Hindostan, but chiefly to the northern parts of it, or the countries between the Indus and the Ganges; although it is not necessary to assert that the rest of that peninsula, particularly its western coast, was then altogether unknown. It was from this quarter that the Persians and Greeks (to whom we are indebted for the earliest accounts of India) invaded the country; and this was consequently the region which first became generally known. The countries bordering on the Ganges continued to be involved in obscurity, the great kingdom of the Prasians excepted, which, situated nearly above the modern Bengal, was dimly discernible. The nearer we approach the Indus, the more clear becomes our knowledge of the ancient geography of the country; and it follows that the districts of which at the present day we know the least, were anciently best known. Besides, the western and northern boundaries were not the same as at present. To the west, India was not then bounded by the river Indus, but by a chain of mountains which, under the name of Koh (whence the Grecian appellation of the Indian Caucasus), extended from Bactria to Makran, or Gedrosia, inclosing the kingdoms of Candahar and Cabul, the modern kingdom of Eastern Persia, or Afghanistan. These districts anciently formed part of India, as well as, further to the south, the less perfectly known countries of the Arabi and Haurs (the Arabitæ and Oritæ of Arrian, vi, 21), bordering on Gedrosia. This western boundary continued at all times the same, and was removed to the Indus only in consequence of the victories of Nadir Shah. Towards the north, ancient India overpassed not less its present limit. It comprehended the whole of the mountainous region above Cashmir, Badakshan, Belur Land, the western boundary mountains of Little Bucharia, or Little Thibet, and even the desert of Cobi, so far as it was known. (See Heeren's *Historical Researches*, i, c. i, § 3, on Persian India; and Rennell's *Geography of Herodotus*. For other conjectures respecting the location of the Scriptural India, see Winer's *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Indien. For the history of ancient India, see Anthon's *Class. Dict.* s. v.)—Smith; Kitto.

INDIA, MODERN. The name is sometimes used of the two peninsulas west and east of the Ganges combined, to which even occasionally the Indian Archipelago is added; but, more commonly, it is applied either to the peninsula west of the Ganges (*East Indies*), or to the aggregate possessions of the British crown (the *Viceroyalty of India*, or the *Indian Empire*). The present form of government of the Indian Empire is established by the Act 21 and 22 Victoria, cap. 106, called an Act for the better Government of India, sanctioned Aug. 2, 1858. By the terms of this act, all the territories heretofore under the government of the East India Company are vested in the queen, and all its powers are exercised in her name; all territorial and other revenues, and all tributes and other payments, are likewise received in her name, and disposed of for the purposes of the government of India alone, subject to the provisions of this act. One of the queen's principal secretaries of state, called the Secretary of State for India, is invested with all the powers hitherto exercised by the company or by the Board of Control. The executive authority in India is vested in a governor general or viceroy, appointed by the crown, and acting under the orders of the Secretary of State for India. The governor general has power to make laws and regulations for all persons, whether British or native, foreigners or others, within the Indian territories under the dominion of the queen, and for all servants of the government of India within the dominions of princes and states in alliance with the queen. The Secretary of State for India is aided in the administration by a council of fifteen members, of whom seven are elected by the Court of Directors from their own body, and eight are nominated by the crown. The duties of the council of state are, under the direction of the secretary of state, to conduct the business transacted in the united kingdom in relation to the government of and the correspondence with India.

The total area and population of British India were, according to official returns of the year 1876, as follows:

Presidencies and Provinces under the Administration of	Population.	Area in Sq. Miles.
Governor-General of India:		
Ajmeer	316,032	2,661
Berar	2,231,565	17,500
Mysore	5,055,412	27,077
Coorg	168,312	2,000
Governor of		
Madras	31,672,613	138,856
Bombay	13,835,073	123,142
Lieutenant-Governor of		
Bengal	62,231,470	156,200
North-west Provinces	42,001,436	105,395
Punjab	17,611,498	104,975
Chief Commissioner of		
Central Provinces	8,201,519	84,048
British Burmah	2,747,148	88,556
Assam	4,132,019	55,384
Total	190,204,097	905,794

Feudatory States under	Population.	Area in Sq. Miles.
Governor-General of India	28,748,403	308,677
Governor of Madras	3,289,392	9,815
Governor of Bombay	9,298,612	67,370
Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal	2,212,909	38,217
Lieut.-Gov. of the N. W. Provinces	907,013	5,445
Lieutenant-Governor of Punjab	5,410,389	114,739
Chief Comm. of Central Provinces	1,049,710	29,749
Total	50,916,428	574,012
Total for British India	241,120,525	1,479,806

There has never been a regular census of the whole of India under British administration, but enumerations, more or less trustworthy, were made in the north-west-

ern and in the central provinces in the years 1865 and 1866. The census of the north-west provinces, taken Jan. 10, 1865, showed that this division of India had increased in prosperity within the decennial period 1856–1865, as reckoned by the number of houses and extension of cultivation. There were found to be 4.71 persons to a house or hut, and 7.06 to an inclosure, or family dwelling. The census further showed that there were 4½ millions of Mussulmans in the north-west provinces, or about one seventh of the total population, the other six sevenths being Hindus of the four chief castes: namely, Brahmins, 70 subdivisions; Kshatryas, 175 subdivisions; Vaisyas, 65 subdivisions; Sûdras, 230 subdivisions. The Sûdras were found to form the great bulk of the Hindus, being 18,304,309 in number; the Vaisyas numbered 1,091,250; the Kshatryas, 2,827,768; and the Brahmins, 3,451,692. The census of the central provinces, taken in 1866, showed that their population consisted of 6,864,770 Hindus, 1,995,663 Gonds and aboriginal tribes, 237,962 Mussulmans, 6026 Europeans and Eurasians, and 90 Parsees. The number of Mussulmans was much lower than had been expected. All the enumerations showed a high proportion of children to adults. Thus, while the percentage of children under 12 years of age was 29 in England, it was in many parts of India as high as 55. Among the reasons to account for such a result are mentioned the custom of polygamy, and, in particular, the desire of the Hindus to have male issue, which induces them to marry as many wives as they can afford to keep until a son is born. The religious statistics of the four largest cities were, according to the enumeration of 1881: Calcutta, total population, exclusive of Howrah, 684,658; of whom 62 per cent. were Hindûs, 32.2 Mohammedans, 4.4 Christians. About 20,000 were Europeans, and 20,000 Eurasians. In Madras the population was 405,848. Bombay had a population of 773,196. of whom less than 13,000 were British born. Lucknow had a population of 284,779. There is also a considerable admixture of Parsees and Indo-Europeans, or, as they are now usually styled, Eurasians, i. e. of mixed blood. Leaving out of account the native states, the following is given as the relative proportion of creeds and races in India: Hindus, 110,000,000; Mussulmans, 25,000,000; aborigines or non-Aryans, 12,000,000; Buddhists, 3,000,000; Asiatic Christians, 1,100,000. The English population amounted, according to the census of 1861, to 125,945 persons.

Christianity became known in India at an early period. There is an old tradition that one of the twelve apostles, St. Thomas, preached the Gospel to the people of India, but the tradition is not supported by any proofs. Cosmas Indicopleustes, who visited the country in the 6th century, found a large number of Christian congregations, with a bishop who was ordained in Persia. In consequence of this connection with Persia, the Christians of India, who, after the reputed founder of the Indian Church, were called Christians of St. Thomas, were drawn into the Nestorian movement, and subsequently received their bishop from the head of the Nestorian Church. Their territory extended from the southern point of the peninsula of Malabar as far as a few miles south of Calicut, and from the defiles of the Ghats as far as the sea. An Armenian or Syrian merchant, Thomas Canna, rearranged in the 9th century the ecclesiastical and political affairs of these Christians. Through his efforts they obtained from the kings of Malabar important privileges; in particular, an exempt jurisdiction in all except criminal cases. Their rank was equal to that of the nobility of Malabar, and they were in great demand for the armies of the Hindu princes. This finally induced them to attempt the establishment of a kingdom of their own, which was, however, of but short duration. After that their position was less favorable, and the Portuguese, who in 1498 landed, under Vasco de Gama, in the port of Calicut, were consequently regarded by them as their liberators. The first Portuguese missionaries were Franciscan monks, who were introduced in 1500 by Cabral. Dominican monks landed in 1503 with the two Albuquerques, but they confined themselves to a few convents, while the Franciscans were for about forty years the only Christian missionaries. It was, in particular, P. Antonio de Porto who in 1535 established on the island of Salsette a number of colleges, churches, and convents. In 1534 the first Roman Catholic bishopric for India was established at Goa; the first bishop, Albuquerque, was a Franciscan monk. But, although the convents of the Franciscans were so numerous that they constituted two provinces of the order, they soon ceased to make notable efforts for the propagation of Christianity, leaving the missionary field wholly to the new order of the Jesuits, who made their first appearance in India in 1542. Their number increased very rapidly, and soon they had in all the Portuguese colonies of India houses and colleges, which were divided into the two provinces of Goa and Cochin. Their success at first was very slow, but when the Portuguese viceroy Constantine de Braganza banished some of the most prominent Brahmans, the Jesuits in 1560 succeeded in baptizing nearly 13,000 persons in that city. In 1579 several Jesuits were called to the court of the great mogul, Akbar, who for a time showed an inclination to accept Christianity. Subsequently, however, he conceived the plan of founding a new religion himself, and the Jesuit mission, which at first promised grand results, was confined to the establishment of a few congregations in the empire of the great mogul. The Jesuits were more successful in their endeavors to unite the Christians of St. Thomas with the Roman Catholic Church. This union was accomplished in 1599, at the Synod of Dramper, by the archbishop of Goa, Alexius Menezes. The bishopric of Goa had in 1557 been made an archbishopric, with two suffragan sees at Cochin and Malacca, to which, in 1606, Meliapur was added. The Christians of St. Thomas received, in 1601, an episcopal see at Angamala, which in 1601 was raised to the archbishopric of Cranganor. The right of patronage over the ecclesiastical benefices was left to the king of Portugal, as he had to defray most of the expenses for the support of the churches and missionaries. A new impulse was given to the missions when, in 1606, the Jesuit P. Robert de Nobili, at Madura, conceived the novel plan of introducing Christianity by accommodating his mode of life entirely to the Indian customs. He called himself a Roman *sannyasi* (i. e. one who resigns everything), lived after the manner of the Brahmans, clothed his preaching of the Gospel in Indian figures of speech, and even retained among the new converts the difference of caste, allowing the converts to wear certain badges indicative of their caste. But he encountered a strong opposition, even among the members of his order, and a violent controversy began, which, after thirteen years, was decided by pope Gregory XV in favor of P. de Nobili, and the converts were permitted to wear the badges. After this the Roman Catholic Church made numerous converts. According to statements of the Indian Christians, P. de Nobili is said to have baptized about 100,000 persons belonging to all castes. The separation was carried through even with regard to churches and missionaries; the missionaries of the Brahmans being called Sannyasi, those of the Pariahs, Pandarams. The successors of Nobili, who were supported by the French missionaries of Pondichery, enlarged the missions and developed the system, but became consequently involved in new controversies, especially with the Capuchins (controversy of accommodation), which in 1704, by cardinal Tournon, who had been commissioned to examine the subject, and again by pope Benedict XIV in 1744, by the bull "*Omnium sollicitudinum,*" was decided against the Jesuits. These decisions not only put an end to the conversions, but the majority of the Indians who had been gained by the accommodation theories of the Jesuits again returned to their native religion. The suppression of the order of the Jesuits still more injured the Roman Catholic mis-

sions, which, moreover, suffered severely from the wars of Tippû Sahib. Long before this time the Jesuits had lost their missions among the Christians of St. Thomas, who in 1653 left the communion of Rome, and those in the vicinity of Cochin, as the Dutch from 1660 to 1663 had conquered nearly all the Portuguese possessions on the coast of Malabar. The Christians of St. Thomas were, however, a second time prevailed upon to unite with Rome by Italian Carmelites; and in 1698, through the mediation of the emperor Leopold I, one bishop and twelve missionaries of this order received permission to settle on the coast of Malabar. But this protection afforded to the Italian missionaries led to a serious quarrel between the Portuguese government, bishop, and missionaries and the Italians, as Portugal declined to forego its right of patronage, although it was neither able nor willing to exercise it. In 1838, Gregory XVI, by the bull "*Multa præclare*," abolished the former papal constitutions for the Church of India, and assigned to the several vicars apostolic their dioceses. The sees of Cranganor, Cochin, and Meliapur (St. Thomas) were suppressed. The diocese of Meliapur was transferred to the vicariate apostolic of Madras; the territory of the two other bishoprics to the vicariate of Malabar, which had been erected in 1659 for the Incalceate Carmelites, and the see of which is now at Verapoly. To it were also assigned the United Christians of St. Thomas, a population of about 200,000, with 330 priests and 160 ministers. The Portuguese of Goa now tried to make a schism. The archbishop of Goa, Jose da Silva y Torres, who had been consecrated in 1843, ordained, immediately after his arrival in Goa in 1844, no less than 800 priests, chiefly men without any education, and sent them into the territories of the vicars apostolic. They succeeded in obtaining control of a majority of the churches, and jurisdiction over a population of about 240,000 souls. A letter from pope Gregory XVI to the archbishop remained without effect. In 1848 Portugal consented to the transfer of the archbishop from Goa to Portugal, where he became coadjutor of the archbishop of Braga. But the bishop of Macao continued to perform episcopal functions in the dioceses of the vicars apostolic, denounced the latter, defied the letters of the pope, and at Goa within seven days ordained 536 priests. When Pius IX threatened the bishop of Macao with ecclesiastical censures, the Portuguese chambers complained of the attitude of Rome so severely that the papal nuncio was on the point of leaving the country. New negotiations between Rome and Portugal led, however, in 1859, to another compromise, and the opposition of the Portuguese priests in British India to the vicars apostolic appears to have died out. From the vicariate apostolic for Agra and Tibet, which was established in 1808, the vicariate of Patna was separated in 1845. Both vicariates are administered by missionaries of the Capuchin order. The French vicariate of Pondicherry was established in 1770; from it three new vicariates were formed in 1846, namely, Mysore, Coimbatûr, and Madura; the two former under priests of the Paris Seminary of Foreign Missions, and the latter under the Jesuits, who in 1836 had reoccupied this former field of their order. The vicariate of Vizigapatam was established in 1848 for the priests of the Congregation of St. Francis de Sales.

Protestant missions began at the commencement of the 18th century, when the Lutheran missionary Ziegenbaly was sent to the Danish coast of Tranquebar. Amidst the greatest difficulties which the foreign languages and the officers of the colony placed in his way, he founded schools, translated the Bible and the Catechism into the Tamil language, collected a congregation which rapidly increased, and laid the foundation of the Evangelical Church of India. A large portion of the councils either belonged to the lowest castes or were pariahs. In the course of the 18th century, the missionary work was carried on by the Missionary Society of Halle; at first with great zeal, which, however, gradually slackened under the influence of Rationalism. The last great missionary who was sent out from Halle was the apostolical Fr. Schwarz (q. v.), the results of whose work can still be traced. Gradually the Halle Society leaned on the English Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which at last took entire charge of these missions. With regard to the differences of castes, the first missionaries had been earnestly opposed to their continuance in the Christian churches; but this policy was subsequently changed, and the differences permitted to remain, on the ground that they were merely of a social character. In 1841 the Lutheran Missionary Society of Dresden began to gather up again the scattered remnants of the old missionary societies in Tranquebar, but in the prosecution of the work became involved in many difficulties with the other missionary societies which had taken charge of the Halle missions. This society is the only one among the missionary societies now laboring in India which undertakes to vindicate the social, though not the religious standing of the caste. The recent mission in India begins with the arrival of the Baptist missionary, W. Carey, at Calcutta (Nov. 1793). He encountered from the start the formidable and entirely unexpected opposition of the East India Company, which hoped for larger commercial profits if it spared the religious belief and practice of the Hindus and Mohammedans, and therefore not only discouraged the establishment of Christian missions, but supported and defended the religious institutions of the native religions. The few chaplains who were sent out to attend the spiritual needs of the English in India were like the European residents in general, drunkards, servants of the mammon, and worldlings; when, therefore, the Rev. Henry Martyn, one of the most zealous missionaries of that time, arrived in 1806 in Calcutta, and endeavored to kindle a missionary spirit, he provoked thereby such a storm of indignation that he had to confine himself for some time to the reading of the homilies of the Church of England. When Carey landed in India, permission was refused to him to stay within the territory of the British dominions, and he was compelled to seek refuge in the small Danish possession of Serampoor (a few miles from Calcutta). Here he was hospitably received by the governor, who himself was a pupil of Schwarz, and under his auspices he began the Baptist mission, which has become of so great importance for all India. Carey, who himself had mastered more than thirty Oriental languages, and the missionaries Marshman and Ward, caused the translation of the Bible into more than twenty languages of India, the compilation of grammars, dictionaries, school-books, and many learned works on the history, religions, and customs of India, new editions of the chief works of the native literatures, and thus, even where they did not succeed in forming new congregations, they smoothed the way for subsequent missionary labors. In 1803, the indefatigable Carey, who in 1800 had been appointed professor of Sanscrit and other Oriental languages at Fort William (Calcutta), was allowed to begin a mission in Calcutta, which was at first intended only for English, Portuguese, and Armenian Christians, but was soon joined by several converted Hindus and Mohammedans. Soon a converted Hindu, Krishna, appeared in public as a preacher, and by his impressive sermons organized the first native congregation in Bengal. This success of the Baptist mission encouraged a number of the chaplains of the government to labor for the removal of the obstacles which the East India Company placed in the way of Christianity. David Brown, Henry Martyn, Thomas Thomason, Daniel Corrie, and Claudius Buchanan, and many others, distinguished themselves by establishing schools and seminaries, by literary labors, by appointing native preachers and teachers, and, in general, by their great zeal on the missionary field. The translation of the Bible by H. Martyn, and the labors of the Mohammedan Abdul Messih, who was converted by him, were especially productive of great results. But more than all his predecessors, it was the Rev. Cl. Buchanan

who succeeded in overcoming those hindrances which had prevented the free propagation of Christianity throughout India. After having travelled through a large portion of the country, and acquired a minute knowledge of the people, he returned in 1807 to England, and by a number of works endeavored to gain public opinion for a radical change in the administration of India. His writings produced a great effect, and when, in 1813, the charter of the East India Company was renewed, the English Parliament passed resolutions which granted to all British subjects the right to establish schools and missions in India, and compelled the company to provide itself schools and seminaries for the instruction of the natives. This was followed by a number of other reforms, as the prohibition of burning of widows (1829), and of a further payment of temple and pilgrim taxes (1833 and 1840), and the admission of native Christians to the lower offices of administration. Full liberty for missionary operations was finally given in 1833, when a resolution of the British Parliament allowed all foreigners to settle in British India, and thus opened the field to all non-British missionary societies of the world.

The first bishopric of the English Church in India was established at Calcutta in 1814. The first bishop, Dr. Middleton, a rigid High-Churchman, was more noted for his quarrels with the ministers of other denominations than for missionary zeal. His successor, Heber (q. v.), on the contrary, though likewise a High-Churchman, was indefatigable in his devotion to the missionary cause, and sternly opposed the toleration of caste differences among the converts. His work was continued in the same way by his successor, Wilson (died 1858). In 1835 other bishoprics were established at Bombay and Madras, and the bishop of Calcutta received the title of Metropolitan of India.

In 1867 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland sent Dr. Norman M'Leod and Dr. Watson to inquire into the working of the missions there. The following facts are gleaned from later reports. The missionaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel are distributed among 84 principal stations, assisted by 70 unordained European agents, and 111 ordained and 3040 unordained native agents. 24,578 communicants, and 14,094 catechumens are connected with the churches, while there is a total of 75,152 baptized adherents. There are 718 schools, with 28,021 pupils. St. Thomas's College, in Ceylon, has recently been endowed by the society to the amount of £25,000.

The London Missionary Society has its most successful mission in Travancore, where 269 stations are filled. There are 45,176 adherents, of whom 5,192 are communicants. 285 day-schools are maintained, with 13,295 pupils. The native contributions for 1888 amounted to £1029. In South India there are 208 stations and out-stations supplied by 24 foreign and 14 native ordained pastors, assisted by 4 foreign and 104 native unordained workers. The adherents number 7619, of whom 1105 are communicants; 110 day-schools are maintained with 5726 pupils in attendance. Native contributions for 1888 amounted to £1220. In North India 24 ordained and 43 unordained workers supply 26 stations and out-stations. The number of communicants is 535; adherents 1872; day-schools 75, with 5266 pupils. £1234 were contributed by the natives in 1888. Benares has a mission college; Almora a college; Calcutta, Bangalore, Nagarkoil have higher institutions of learning. There is a medical mission at Neyoor.

The Church Missionary Society has in Madras large Tamil congregations, served by native pastors. It has also a mission to the Mohammedan population of that city. In 1820 Tinnevelly was entered by the society, and now there are more than 1000 villages in which there are Christians. Successful work is done in Travancore, Cochin, and among the Telegus. There are 88,000 Christians in all of South India. North India is also a field of the society. Divinity colleges are supported at Calcutta and Allahabad. A medical mission was started in the valley of the Kashmir in 1865, which is very successful. A divinity school was started at Poona, in Western India, in 1886. Ceylon, as the result of the society's work, has 6508 adherents; Trinity College, at Kandy, and important schools at Cotta and Jaffra. It has 92 stations, with 3548 members. It is now more liberal than formerly in regard to India, and is entering upon all kinds of aggressive work. Among the latest is a medical mission. Its work is now in a critical condition, owing to the great number professing conversion. Many of the churches and schools are self-supporting, and are themselves animated by a missionary spirit. This district is in juxtaposition with the South Travancore missions of the London Society, and with the Tinnevelly missions of the Propagation Society. Add the converts reported by these, and the 6000 of the American Board, and we have 8000 Tamil Christians within 150 miles of Cape Comorin. The Wesleyan Missionary Society devotes but a twelfth of its income to the Indian missions, which are, of course, among its smallest. It has stations at Madras and six other points in the Tamil country, seven or eight stations in the Canenere districts, 465 Church members in all, 5 native ministers, besides several candidates, and 3500 pupils in the schools.

The following are extracts from the late (1888) reports of some of the American societies. The *American Board* has the Marathi Mission, established in 1813, the Madura, established in 1834, and the Ceylon, established in 1816. The Marathi Mission has 7 stations, 102 out-stations, 12 preachers, 2 medical catechists, and with Bible readers and teachers, 255 native helpers. The native contributions amounted to $4779. The Theological Seminary, suspended in 1866, was reopened in 1888. There is a mission high-school and college at Admednagar, which had 311 pupils in 1887. The Madura Mission has 12 stations, 234 out-stations, 3233 church members, 11,881 adherents, 10 missionaries, 20 native pastors, 399 native workers of all classes, 138 common schools, with 3215 pupils, a collegiate theological institute, with 334 pupils; in all the mission 5680 pupils. A new feature is the employment of native evangelists by the native churches themselves for the outlying districts. The native contributions amounted to $6545. The Ceylon Mission has 7 stations, with 25 out-stations, 389 members, 8455 under instruction. Native contributions, $5752. This mission has had a wonderful educational work; the report claims that one in thirteen of the population are in school. Nearly all of the schools are managed by the missionaries. 329 have been educated at Jaffra College. The Presbyterian Church sustains the Lodiana and Furrukhabad Mission, with 17 stations, 28 American and 11 native missionaries, 30 American and 120 native teachers, 456 communicants, and 6194 scholars in the schools. Out-stations are increasing in numbers. Tours into different districts have been made as in former years. Various melas have been attended, among which was Hardwar. The number of people present at this place, according to government officials, was almost 3,000,000. For days some twenty preachers, native and foreign, preached to many thousands. Frequently many remained after the service to discuss some of the points set forth in the discourse. Cases of self-torture were fewer than usual. "The more revolting rites of Hindûism are evidently becoming obsolete." At this festival the brethren were "particularly struck with the marked increase in the knowledge of Christianity manifested by the pilgrims." The Sabbath-school and prayer-meeting are established at most of the stations, and in the Lodiana Mission the native Christians have contributed for religious and charitable objects, during the year, 670 rupees. Nearly 11,000,000 pages of publications of various kinds have been issued. A "medical mission" is connected with these missions, at which 1311 patients have been treated.

The (Dutch) Reformed Church has the Arcot Mis-

sion, organized in 1854. The mission occupies North and South Arcot, the united area of which is 19,925 square miles, with a population of 3,770,192; churches, 23; out-stations, 86; communicants, 1755; contributions of the native churches, $756 50. Besides the boarding-schools for girls at Vellore and Madavaalle, with 98 pupils, there are 8 caste girls' schools, with 586 scholars. The school formerly known as the Arcot Seminary will hereafter be called the Arcot Academy. It had 71 pupils in 1887. The Theological Seminary in the Arcot Mission, for which an endowment of $65,000 has been secured by Dr. Chamberlain, was opened in March, 1888, with 13 students. It has 7 scholarships provided by churches, and 9 provided by individuals. In addition to the regular services at stations and out-stations, the Gospel was preached during the year 1888 in 8978 places, to heathen audiences numbering 395,979; more than 14,000 tracts, books, etc., were distributed. In the hospital and dispensary at Arcot 5883 out-patients, and 475 in-patients were treated. The Rev. Dr. Scudder notes the change that has taken place in the attitude of the natives in the following terms: "As to the results, I have to mention that the temper of the people has been greatly mollified. This is, perhaps, one of the most wicked districts in Southern India. Its inhabitants used to hear the preached Word with souls full of rage —rage gleaming in their eyes and disfiguring their countenances. It does seem to us that there has been a marked change within the year. Earnest, anxious, sometimes longing looks are cast upon us now as we repeat the sweet story of the cross. Tracts, Gospel portions, the smallest leaves, are eagerly received, where formerly volumes, or books of poetry, or English publications were sought for. There are now no refusals, where before friendly offers were fairly spurned. There are quiet, calm inquiries, where before were angry oppositions, or worse, sullen silence."

The mission of the *Methodist Episcopal Church* in India was begun in 1856. The work is now in the form of three Annual Conferences, viz., the North India, the South India, and the Bengal, which have 71 foreign missionaries, 58 assistant missionaries, 535 other agents, 6517 members, 5770 probationers, 2 theological schools, with 57 students, 16 high-schools, with 134 teachers and 1973 scholars, 617 other day-schools with 18,505 scholars, and church property to the amount of 1,701,200 rupees. In the district of Bareilly there is a successful medical mission, one of the missionaries having charge of three government hospitals in the province of Kumaon, and a medical class of native Christian women having been established at Nynee Tal. The hospitals, schools, and orphanages under the care of the missionaries are disposing large numbers of the inhabitants in favor of Christianity.

"It is easy to see," says Bishop Kingsley, in a letter to the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, "that both Hindû idolatry and Mohammedanism are losing their hold on the minds of those who still show them an outward deference. I have talked with intelligent Hindûs with the red paint on their foreheads, indicating that they had faithfully attended to their religious rites, who nevertheless told me they had no faith in these mummeries, and felt the heathen yoke that was upon them an intolerable burden; deploring caste, and mourning over the degraded condition of their women. They will do utter violence to their doctrine of caste when it can be done without exposure. Mohammedans have made similar confessions to me, saying they felt at liberty, so far as any conscientious scruples were concerned, to violate the requirements of that religion. Besides all this, there seems to be a sort of foreboding in regard to many particulars that their ancient religion is about worn out. One is, that after about thirty years more the Sacred Ganges will lose its virtue.

In 1868 the statistics of the Roman Catholic Church in British, Portuguese, and French India were as follows:

British India.	Priests.	Catholics.	Catholic Schools.	Children.
1. Vic. Apostol. of Agra....	31	14,500	10	750
2. " " Bengal, Western..........	34	11,000	12	1,500
3. Vic. Apost. of Bengal, Eastern..........	9	6,710	7	250
4. Vic. Apostol. of Bombay, Northern...... / 5. Vic. Apostol. of Bombay, Southern......	51	21,320	28	1,890
6. Vic. Apost. of Canara or Mangalora.......	34	45,000	50	2,700
7. Vic. Apostol. of Coimbatûr..............	17	17,600	20	500
8. Vic. Apost. of Hyderabad................	8	6,645	7	300
9. Vic. Apost. of Madras.....	19	36,426	46	2,210
10. " " Madura.....	54	144,222	16	1,800
11. " " Mysore.....	23	21,500	26	1,200
12. " " Patna.......	22	8,000	8	300
13. " " Pondicherry	67	112,240	90	1,900
14. " " Quilon......	22	56,000	39	2,236
15. " " Verapoly, in Malabar..........	295	233,000	500	5,000
16. Vic. Apost. of Vizigapatam................	14	7,106	21	725
17. Vic. Apostol. of Malacca.	21	8,500	14	1,000
18. Archbishopric of Goa....				
	721	749,569	894	24,251

The statistics of Protestantism in India (inclusive of Burmah, Siam, and Ceylon), compiled from the latest reports, give the following results:

	Missionaries.	Helpers from other Lands.	Ordained Natives.	Unordained Native Preachers.	Other Native Helpers.	Communicants.	Pupils in Schools.
American Societies.							
American Board....	31	45	243	—	827	6,869	17,211
Presbyterian Board..	50	100	39	207	—	2,207	8,657
South. Presbyterians.	3	3	5	—	—	618	322
United Presbyterians	9	20	11	—	153	6,188	3,938
Reform. Dutch Board	8	10	4	—	246	1,696	3,320
American Evangelical Lutherans..	3	4	2	—	147	6,108	3,308
Baptist Miss. Union..	185	119	194	522	—	62,577	16,890
Am. Miss. Association	27	19	46	206	721	6,445	16,937
Am. Free Baptists...	7	—	—	—	—	654	3,058
Free-Will Baptists...	7	10	—	23	—	654	2,701
Canadian Baptists...	14	—	—	—	—	1,852	—
Methodist Episcopal Board.......	71	58	60	217	258	12,287	20,535
Germ. Ev. Synod....	4	9	—	—	—	200	—
Presbyteri'ns, Canada	5	1	26	—	79	—	306
European Societies.							
Church Miss. Society.	143	27	154	—	2,562	28,401	60,545
Soc. for Propagation of the Gospel....	66	70	111	—	3,040	24,578	28,021
London Miss. Soc....	50	18	43	276	—	7,428	27,435
Wesleyan Miss. Soc..	70	—	91	—	2,977	8,085	42,211
Baptist Miss. Soc....	63	127	—	—	—	5,543	7,255
General Baptists....	9	7	—	—	20	1,401	—
Church of Scotland..	11	4	7	—	100	740	4,904
Free Ch. of Scotland.	10	26	12	9	324	2,083	18,096
Irish Presbyterians..	10	11	2	—	91	315	3,449
Congregat'l Union (Indep. Churches)	7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unit. Presb., England	15	13	2	—	237	473	4,880
Unit. Presb., Scotland	11	17	2	—	277	485	4,579
Strict Baptists.....	6	8	5	—	22	390	509
Presbyterians. Engl..	11	24	8	57	60	1,921	316
Welsh Calv. Method..	10	11	24	58	—	5,134	6,903
Friends Mission.....	—	9	—	—	8	19	100
Basle Evangelical Missionary Soc...	51	73	17	—	328	4,941	5,330
Leipzig Evangelical Luth. Miss. Soc..	22	2	12	—	211	14,014	3,653
Gossner's Miss. Soc..	13	4	17	—	272	12,200	2,100
Hermannsburg Miss..	11	—	—	—	738	—	70
Danish Miss. Society.	4	1	3	—	16	114	92
Swedish Evangelic. National Society.	7	19	—	—	18	30	408
Total....	1024	869	1140	1575	13,732	226,650	318,099

Indian Caste. The social distinctions indicated by this term are much more numerous, fixed, and exclusive in India than anywhere else. The ancient Egyptians had similar ranks, but they were not so strictly hereditary, nor did they form such impassable barriers in ordinary intercourse. See EGYPT. The Hin-

dus, indeed, regard these as absolute, original, and permanent demarkations of *race* rather than of mere position or occupation.

1. *Origin.* — From a very early period the Hindu writers have propounded a great variety of speculations regarding the origin of mankind, and of the classes or castes into which their community is divided. The most commonly received of these explanations is that contained in the ancient story, of which Mr. Muir thinks no trace is found in the Rig Veda (excepting one in Purusha Sūkta), but which is found in the Santi Parva of the *Mahābhārata*, where a conversation occurs between Purūravas, the son of Ilā, and Matariswan, or Vāyu, the wind god. Purūravas asks, "Whence was the Brāhman, and whence were the other three castes produced, and whence is the superiority of the first?" and Vayu answers, "The Brahman was created from the mouth of Brahm, the Kshattriya from his arms, Vaisya from his thighs, and to serve these three castes the fourth caste was fashioned, and so the Sūdra sprung from his feet." The sacred books of the Hindus, however, contain no uniform or consistent account of the origin of castes, but offer "mystical, mythical, and rationalistic" explanations of it, or fanciful conjecture concerning it. In the *Harivamsa* (sec. 211, v. 11808 sq.), Janamījaya says, "I have heard the description of the Brahma Yug, the first of the ages; I desire now to be accurately informed about the Kshatriya Age," and he receives the following answer: "Vishnū, sprung from Brahm, exalted above the power of sense, and absorbed in devotion, becomes the patriarch Daksha, and creates numerous human beings. The beautiful Brahmans were formed from an unchangeable element (*akshara*), the Kshattriyas from a changeable substance (*kshara*), the Vaisyas from alteration (*vikāra*), and the Sūdras from a modification of smoke." Another account makes the Brahmans to have been fashioned with white, red, yellow, and blue colors. Thence creatures attained in the world the state of fourfold caste, being of one type, but with different duties. Still another account (Santi Parvati of the *Mahābhārata*, sec. 188, 189), after giving a statement of the creation of men, etc., propounds the following: "Desire, anger, fear, cupidity, grief, anxiety, hunger, fatigue, prevail in all; all have bodily secretions, with phlegm, bile, and blood; and the bodies of all decay—by what, then, is caste distinguished? . . . . There is no distinction of caste; the whole world is formed of Brahma; for, having been formerly created by him, it became separated into castes by means of works." In the *Bhagavat Purānā* we read that there was formerly only one Veda, one God, one caste. Sometimes the different castes are said to have sprung from the words Bhūh, etc.; from different Vedas; from different sets of prayers; from the gods; from nonentity; from the imperishable, the perishable, and other principles. They are sometimes made to be coeval with the creation, and as having different attributes involving different moral qualities, while in other places, as in the Epic poems, the creation of mankind is described without the least allusion to the separate production of the progenitors of the four castes. Sometimes all men are the offspring of Manu. Thus it is clear that the separate origin of the four castes could not have been an object of belief among the older Hindus, while the variety and inconsistency of these accounts help us not at all in determining its origin.

Many writers have claimed for caste a trans-Himalayan origin, while others have supposed that it originated with the successive waves of emigration within the plains of India. Professor Roth thus states this view: "When the Vedic people, driven by some political shock, advanced from their abodes in the Punjaub further and further south, and drove the aborigines into the hills, and took possession of the country lying between the Ganges, the Jumna, and the Vindhya Mountains, circumstances required and favored such an organization of society as was therein developed." On the other hand, Dr. Haug says: "From all we know, the real origin of caste appears to go back to a time anterior to the composition of the Vedic hymns, though its development into a regular system with insurmountable barriers can be referred only to the latest period of the Vedic times."

2. *Extent.*—But, whatever may have been its origin, it is now a complex and highly artificial system, multiform in shape, and often so blended with the ordinary usages of society and the minute division of labor to which the older civilizations tend, that it is very difficult to make a complete or satisfactory analysis of it. A close inspection of the census returns to the British government in the north-west provinces of India in 1866 shows that it is very much more variable than was formerly supposed. Sometimes the minuter divisions into classes seems to follow no other than the lines of the occupations of the people, and they are accordingly returned as belonging to the caste of tailors, or shopmen, etc., without other discrimination. This "Blue book" thus enrolled more than *three hundred* distinct castes within that political division. There is, however, after a general fashion, a maintenance of the general classifications, as (1) *Brahmans,* (2) *Kshattriyas,* (3) *Vaishyas,* and (4) *Sūdra;* below which is a yet more debased class, (5) known as *Pariahs,* or outcasts, to be found in all portions of the country. The four greater castes above named answer to priestly, warrior, agricultural, and artisan, or servant classes. We note in this census return hereditary priests, rope-dancers, sweepers, elephant-drivers, turban-winders, ear-piercers and cleaners, charmers, makers of crowns for idols, and even hereditary beggars and common blackguards.

3. *Rules.*—These castes are all hereditary, the son always following the occupation of the father, however overburdened some departments of occupation may become by the accidents of birth. No classes except the highest two are assumed to intermarry, and all eschew contact with a lower class. They do not eat together, nor cook for nor serve food to each other. This dislike of contact extends to their vessels and other utensils. The usages, however, seem often arbitrary. Smoking from the bowl of another's pipe may not be an offence if one can make a stem of his fist, but the stem or snake of the pipe must not be touched, or it is rendered worthless to all parties. It is in accordance with caste requirement that brass or copper utensils should be moved from place to place, but an earthen vessel once used for cooked food or water must not be transported to another locality. Loads may be carried on the head by some castes, on the back by some, and not at all by others. The poorest Hindu family do not wash their own clothes, yet the loin-cloth must always be washed by the wearer of it. If a Hindu were touched by a man of an inferior caste while eating, he would not only throw away all the food he had cooked, but would even spit out what might chance to be in his mouth at the instant.

The accumulation of motive for the preservation of caste purity is astounding. The slightest variation from custom is at once visited with punishment or fines, while the graver offences become the ground of expulsion literally from all human society, and of disabilities in business and disinheritance; and, believing in ancestor worship as the Hindu does, and that the happiness of his departed relatives is dependent on his performing the *manes,* the additional curse comes upon him of being disabled from performing these ceremonies because of caste impurity.

4. *Effects.*—The caste policy of India checks genius, yet as from the first the individual knows what his life-business is to be, he pursues it, and attains a skill in handicraft unequalled. The Indian system tends likewise to give permanence to institutions, but it unfortunately perpetuates evils also. It has been the great hinderance to all progress, civil, political, religious, or social, and has presented the greatest obstacles to the

progress of Christianity. The railroads and other European conveniences have by some been looked upon as likely to make great innovations on caste-usage. There is already a large and well-organized portion of the population known as Brahmists who wholly ignore castes. See HINDUS, MODERN.

There is much less of caste observance among what is considered to be an older population than the Hindu, such as the people inhabiting the Himalaya Mountains, and the "wild tribes" of Central India.

See Muir's *Sanskrit Texts*, vol. i (Lond. 1868); Colebrook's *Miscellaneous Essays;* Wilson's *Transl. Vishnû Purâna;* Müller, *Chips*, ii, 295 sq. (J. T. G.)

Indians, AMERICAN. Under this title may be included all the semi-civilized and wild tribes of North and South America, since the most thorough investigation shows that they were substantially the same people. In collating information concerning the Indian thought, it is important to distinguish between the forms it assumed before and after contact with Europeans.

1. *Sources of Knowledge.*—Notwithstanding the proverbial taciturnity of the North-American Indians, some information has been elicited by oral communication. Many of the tribes, also, have a species of records for their traditions. In some instances these seem to be little more than mnemonic signs, made on their skins, tents, clothing, mats, and rocks; but in others, as in Mexico, we find a series of symbols which are a species of idiographic writing, wherein signs stand for ideas, as the Arabic numerals do with us. Besides these there must have existed in some localities a phonetic alphabet prior to the coming of the white man. The only one *known*, however, is found with the Mayas, resident in the peninsula of Yucatan. It had "a well-understood alphabet of twenty-seven elementary sounds, the letters of which are totally different from those of any other nation, and evidently original with themselves."

2. *Origin.*—Much has been written on the origin of the Indian tribes, and their probable connection with the people of the Old World. Hardwick says, "If no ray of light whatever could be thrown upon the questions which concern the primitive populations of America; if no analogy to the case had existed in the spread of the Malayo-Polynesian tribes across the islands of the Eastern Archipelago and the Pacific Ocean; if the speech of the Americans had absolutely no affinities with other human dialects; if their traditions, meagre as these are, hinted nothing of a distant home and of a perilous migration; if insoluble enigmas were presented by the physical structure of the Americans, or if their moral powers and mental capacities were such as to exclude them from a place in the great brotherhood of men; if, lastly, no resemblance were found, I will not say in primary articles of belief, but in the memory of specific incidents, and in those minor forms of human thought and culture which will hardly bear to be explained on the hypothesis of 'natural evolution,' we might then, perhaps, have cause to hesitate in our decision" (*Christ and other Masters*, ii, 120 sq.). There is literally nothing, according to our ablest writers, either in the bodily structure or psychology of the American tribes to prove an independent origin, or even to beget suspicions touching a plurality of races; while, according to Mr. Squier, of the words known to have been in use in America one hundred and four coincide with words found in the languages of Asia and Australia, forty-three with those of Europe, and forty with those of Africa. In addition, however, to the migration suggested by the above quotations, two circumstances seem to point most clearly to a connection of our aboriginal Indians with the Malay, Mongol, or Tartar race: 1. The monosyllabic character of their languages; and, 2. The obvious similarity in complexion and general physical constitution. The case of the Aztecs, moreover, to say nothing of the Mexicans and Peruvians, indicates a degeneracy from an earlier civilization, like that of the Chinese and Japanese.

3. *Legends.*—The Indian myths of the creation, the deluge, the epochs of nature, and the last day, are numerous and clear, although it seems more difficult to ascertain here what does and what does not antedate European influence. "Before the creation," said the Muscogees, "a great body of water was alone visible. Two pigeons flew to and fro over its waves, and at last spied a blade of grass rising above the surface. Dry land gradually followed, and the islands and continents took their present shapes."

Many of the tribes trace their descent from a raven, "a mighty bird, whose eyes were fire, whose glances were lightning, and the clapping of whose wings was thunder. On his descent to the ocean the earth instantly rose, and remained on the surface of the water. This omnipotent bird then called forth all the variety of animals." The early Algonquin legends do not speak of any family who escaped the deluge, nor did the Dakotas, who firmly believed the world had been destroyed by water. Generally, however, the legends made some to have escaped by ascending some mountain, on a raft or canoe, in a cave, or by climbing a tree. The pyramids of Cholula, the mounds of the Mississippi Valley, the vast and elaborate edifices in the artificial hills of Yucatan, would seem to have direct reference to the hill on which the ancestors of these people escaped in past deluges, or from the realm of rains, called the Hill of Heaven. They mostly make the last destruction of the world to have been by water, though some few represent it to have been by fire.

4. *Religious Beliefs.*—It is generally believed that all approximations to monotheism observed among the tribes of the New World are little more than verbal. Their "Great Spirit," as the phrase stands among Europeans, is at best the highest member of a group of spirits. He may be a personification of the mightiest of all natural energies, but not a personality distinct from nature, and controlling all things by his sovereign will. He is devoid of almost everything which constitutes the glory of the God of revelation. In spite of whatever grandeur, goodness, or ubiquity he may be endowed with, he exercises no control over the lives of individuals or the government of the world. "There is no attempt," says Mr. Schoolcraft, "by the hunter-priesthood, jugglers, or powwows, which can be gathered from their oral tradition, to impute to the great, merciful Spirit the attribute of justice, or to make man accountable to him here or hereafter for aberrations from virtue, good-will, truth, or any moral right" (*Red Races*). Their ideas of God have been almost exclusively found to be connected with some natural phenomena, and the almost poetic way in which they look at it suggests that much of their religious thought received complexion from their hunter-life. For the most part, their conceptions of deity seem to have been connected with the phenomena of the meteorological or atmospheric world, and with their observations concerning light and fire. The highest good is generally symbolized as the storm-god or the sun-god, these being sometimes blended and sometimes distinct. We may see an illustration of them as united in their adoration of the four cardinal points of the compass, and in their notions of the sacred four birds, four mothers, or four primitive brothers, the progenitors of the human family. Their highest deity is always their highest ideal of civilization and of the arts of peace, and to him they always accord the better attributes of mankind. The god of light is often spoken of as the founder of the nation, sometimes as its progenitor, or introducing arts, sciences, and laws, and as having led them in their earliest wanderings. The sun-god is the dispenser of all radiance and fertility, the being by whose light and heat all creatures were generated and sustained, the highest pitch of excellence; and even when transformed into a god of battle, and worshipped with horrid and incongruous rites, or fed by human hecatombs, he never ceased to occupy the foremost rank among the good divinities. He was ever the

"father," "sustainer," "revivifier." Müller maintains that there were numerous subordinate hostile deities, who created discord, sickness, death, and every possible form of evil, and that in many cases these were reputed to be under the leadership of the moon, which was the parent of misfortune with some, and yet was the chief divinity of other of the warlike races, such as the Caribs.

The *Manito* or *Manédo* is alleged to have no personal meaning, but to be equivalent to "spirit," or "a spirit," perhaps somewhat akin to our thought of a guardian spirit. Schoolcraft thinks that, so far as a meaning distinct from an invisible existence attaches to it at all, the tendency is to a bad meaning, and that a bad meaning is distinctly conveyed in the inflection *osh* or *ish* (*Red Races*, p. 214). In considering this belief in *manitos* it is necessary to remember that the Indian conceives every department of the universe to be filled with invisible spirits, holding the same relation to matter that the soul does to the body, and in accordance with which, not only every man, but every animal, has a soul, and is endowed with a reasoning faculty. Dreams are a means of direct communication with the spiritual world, and are generally regarded as the friendly warnings of their personal *manitos*. No labor or enterprise is undertaken against their indications, whole armies being sometimes turned back by dreams of the officiating priest. Under the guidance of a particular spirit, names are commonly supposed to be bestowed. These personal spirits are invoked to give success in hunting. These manitos are, however, of varied ability, and there is a constant fear lest the manito of a neighbor may prove more powerful than one's own.

The mythological personages who are the heroes of Indian tales, and who are in some way associated with the highest good, as set forth above, may be represented by *Michabo* or Manibozho of the Algonquins, and *Quetzalcoatl*, the god of the air, the highest deity of the Toltecs. The same deity appears with more or less of modification among all the tribes, though under various names. It is *Isokeha* among the Iroquois, *Wasi* among the Cherokees, *Tamoi* with the Caribs. *Zamna* with the Mayas, *Nemqueteba* with the Muyscas, *Viracocha* among the Aymaras, etc. Among them all he appears as the one who taught them agriculture, the art of picture-writing, the properties of plants, and the secrets of magic; who founded their institutions, established their religions, and taught them government.

There were presentiments of a better time to come connected with the return of these heroes of their tales, which it is thought had much to do with the sudden collapse of the great empires of Mexico and Peru, of the Natchez and the Mayas before the Spaniards. Associated in their legends with the return of their gods and the better time was, in most cases, the notion of the coming of a white man of superior strength from the father of the sun.

5. *The Soul and a future Life.*—The immortality of the human soul is universally believed by the North-American Indians.

Among all the tribes *soul* is equivalent to breath, or the wind. The same person may have more than one soul: some say four, and others even more than this number. Generally, however, there is some distinction made in these souls. One may remain with the body, being attached to its earthly functions, and is absorbed in the elements, while another soul may pass away to the "Happy Hunting-grounds;" or, in other cases, one may watch the body, one wander about the world, one hover about the village, and another go to the spirit land. According to an author quoted by Mr. Brinton, certain Oregon tribes located a spirit "whenever they could detect a pulsation," the supreme one being in the heart, and which alone would go to the skies at death.

Among all the tribes, from the Arctic region to the tropics, the abode of the departed soul is declared to be where the highest good, i. e. where light comes from, or, in other words, in the sun-realm. Hence the soul is variously said to go at death towards the east, or towards the west, the place of the coming or departure of the light, or among some northern tribes, to whom the sun lay in a southern direction, the soul is said to go towards the south. It is in this realm of light or sphere of the sun-god that this permanent soul finds its ultimate home. "Spirituality is clogged with earthly accidents even in the future world. The soul hungers, and food must be deposited at the grave to supply its need. It suffers from cold, and the body must be wrapped about with clothes. It is in darkness, and a light must be kindled at the head of the grave. It wanders through plains and across streams, subject to the vicissitudes of this life, in quest of a place of enjoyment. Among some northern tribes a dog was slain on the grave, and there are indications of a like practice having obtained in Mexico and Peru." In other localities, and where the government was despotic, not only animals, but men, women, and children were often sacrificed at the tomb of the "cacique." There are traces of this on the Lower Mississippi. Among the Natchez Indians, when a chief died, "one or several of his wives and his highest officers were knocked on the head, and buried with him." There is the belief among many of them that the soul needs light, particularly for four nights or days after death, as it is either confined in the body, or "wandering over a gloomy marsh," or in some other perplexity which prevents its ascending to the skies. The natives of the extreme south, of the Pampas and the Patagonians, suppose the stars to be the souls of the departed.

According to some, there is but little trace, if any, of a clear conception of a system of rewards and punishments, as there certainly do not seem to have been very clear distinctions between vice and virtue, as in anywise related to a future world. The difference between the soul's comfort and discomfort in a future life, in so far as it is made a matter of degree at all, was made to depend, as in the Mexican mythology, on the mode of death. Women dying in childbirth were associated in the category of worth and merited happiness with warriors dying in battle. In Guatemala a violent death in any shape was sufficient to banish, in after-life, from the felicitous regions. The Brazilian natives divided the dead into classes, making those drowned, or killed by violence, or yielding to disease, to go into separate regions; but there seems to be no reason founded in morals connected with this. It is but just to say that others take a different view of this part of the subject from that here set forth. The abbé Em. Domenech, who spent seven years among these tribes, gives traditions which favor the doctrine of future rewards and punishments for the good or bad deeds of this life (p. 283). Other tribes, however, seem to know nothing of *punishments*. The Master of Life, or Merciful Spirit, will be alike merciful to all, irrespective of the acts of this life, or of any degree of moral turpitude. They see nowhere clear conceptions of virtue and vice even in this world. Sin, they say, is only represented at worst as a metaphorical going astray, as of one who loses his path in the woods, though this may suggest much more than this class of persons admit. That there is a moral sentiment is admitted in connection with their civil and social life, but not as connected with their future state. Their prayers are almost wholly for temporal, and not for moral blessings; but there may be found an assumption of moral qualities or ethical character in connection with their gods, as in the case of Quetzalcoatl above alluded to, who is the founder of their civil code, and who instituted the household, instilled patriotism, etc. The Mexicans had another place for the souls of those dying by lightning-stroke, dropsies, leprosies, etc., who could not go to the home of the sun, but who must go to the realm of the god of the rains and waters, called Tlalocan.

There are indications of the doctrine of *metempsychosis*, and also of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. The vast tumuli, though they were not all con-

nected with funeral rites, are summoned in testimony of this doctrine. The custom of collecting and cleansing the bones—usually once in eight or ten years—of those who had died in the tribe, and then burying them in a common sepulchre "lined with choice furs, and marked with a mound of wood, stone, or earth," was common east of the Mississippi. This has been supposed to be connected with the theory that a part of the soul, or one of the souls, dwelt in the bones, and that these seed-souls, so to speak, would one day germinate into living human beings. Parts of their mythology afford support to such a supposition. An Aztec legend is to the effect that when the human species had been destroyed from off the face of the world, it was restored by one of the gods descending to the realm of the dead, and bringing thence a bone of the perished race, which they sprinkled with blood, and on the fourth day it became a youth, the father of the present race.

6. *Funeral Rites.*—The mounds used for funeral services are found, for the most part, within walls of intrenched camps and fortified towns. On the top of these tumuli are altars of baked clay or stone, varying in length from a few inches to many yards. The mounds are found in very large numbers, and have an average height of eight or ten yards, being usually in the form of a simple cone, or of a pear or egg. The dead were frequently burned before they were buried, funeral urns having often been discovered, as also beds of charcoal. With the dead were generally interred the ornaments, arms, and other objects belonging to them during life. The mounds sometimes contain silver, brass, stone, or bone, beads, shells, pieces of silex, quartz, garnet, points of arrows, fossil teeth of sharks, sculptures of human heads, pottery, etc. The customs observed in the burial of their dead differ in the different tribes. They all, however, paint the corpse black. The feet of the corpses are turned to the rising sun. The Omahas swathe the bodies with bandages made of skins, and place them on the branches of a tree, with a wooden vase filled with dried meat by their side, which is renewed from time to time. The Sioux bury their dead on the summit of a hill or mountain, and plant on the tomb a cedar-tree, which may be seen from a distance. The Chinooks wrap the bodies of their dead in skins, bind their eyes, put little shells in their nostrils, and dress them in most beautiful clothes, and then place them in a canoe, which is allowed to drift on a lake, or river, or the Pacific Ocean. The Shoshones burn their dead, with everything belonging to them. Among other tribes of the West the warriors are buried on horseback, with bow, and buckler, and quiver, and pipe, and medicine-bag, tobacco, and dried meats. The Assiniboins suspend their dead by thongs of leather between the branches of great trees, or place them on high scaffoldings, to keep them from wild animals. The Ottawas sacrifice a horse on the tomb of the dead, strangling the animal by a noose. When a tribe emigrate, they carry with them, if possible, the bones of their dead which have been preserved, or bury them in a cave, or hill, or wood.

7. *Religious Usages.*—The Indians are alleged by Domenech to have had a few customs not wholly unlike some which obtained among the Jews. They have some feasts at which they are obliged to eat all that has been prepared for the banquet. They observe a feast of first-fruits, and have some forbidden meats, regarding some animals as impure. They observe the custom of sacrificing the first animal killed on the opening of great hunts, the animal being entirely eaten. They carry amulets under the name of medicine-bags, and accord a subordinate species of worship to idols of stone, wood, or baked clay. The amulets, lucky stones, and charms existed everywhere, and were a chief object of barter. In Yucatan and Peru pilgrimages to sacred shrines were so common as that, in some instances, "roads paved with cut stones" were constructed to facilitate the attendance on certain temples, and houses of entertainment constructed along the way.

The priesthood of the country has been considered by those long familiar with the subject to have done more than any other agency to keep these tribes from becoming civilized. They are often spoken of as medicine-men, and are variously styled by the Algonquins and Dakotas "those knowing divine things," "dreamers of the gods;" in Mexico, "masters or guardians of the divine things;" in Cherokee their title means "possessed of the divine fire;" in Iroquois, "keepers of the faith;" in Quichua, "the learned;" in Maya, "the listeners." As medicine-men, they tried to frighten the dæmon that possessed the patient; sucked and blew upon the diseased organ, sprinkled it with water, rubbed the parts with their hands, and made an image representative of the spirit of sickness, and knocked it to pieces. They were much skilled in tricks of legerdemain, setting fire to articles of clothing and instantly extinguishing the flames by magic. They summoned spirits to answer questions about the future, and possessed clairvoyant powers; and they were reputed to be even able to raise the dead. They consecrated amulets, interpreted dreams, cast horoscopes, rehearsed legends, performed sacrifices, and, in short, constituted the chief centre of the intellectual force of the people. They are thus a kind of priests, doctors, and charlatans, who perform penance, and submit to mutilation, fasting, and self-mortification. They observe with minute attention the shape and color of the clouds, their volume and direction, and their position relatively to the sun and horizon. Carnivorous birds are considered precursors of war; their flight indicates the time and place at which future battles will be fought; they go to and fro carrying messages for the spirit of battle. The priest is particularly important in the ceremony which is necessary to secure rain. The medicine lodge is used for nearly all ceremonies. See NORTH AMERICA, RELIGIONS OF.

8. *Present Location and Numbers.*—The large proportion of the Indians of the United States are now gathered within the Indian Territory, on "Reservations" assigned them by the United-States government. There are others, however, in Oregon, Alaska, New Mexico, etc. Within the Indian Territory they do not "live by fishing, hunting, and trapping, but cultivate the soil, are settled, and have attained a considerable degree and shown a susceptibility of genuine civilization."

According to the census of 1880 there were within the Indian territory, Cherokees, 19,720; Muscogees or Creeks, 15,000; Seminoles, 2667; Choctaws, 15,800; Chicasaws, 6000; Cheyennes, 4197; Arapahoes, 2258; Pawnee, 1241; Osage, 1896; Comanche, 1396; and 16,000 Navajo and 9060 Pueblo Indians in New Mexico. There were 4059 Chippewas and 1506 Oneidas in Wisconsin, and 9500 Chippewas in Michigan. Much of the land formerly assigned to the Indians has lately been purchased by the government and opened to settlers, and some of it has been occupied, so that there is a demand for the removal or condensation of the natives. See MISSIONS.

9. *Literature.*—Brinton, *Myths of New World* (N. Y. 1868); Waitz, *Anthropologie der Natur-Völker* (Leipzig, 1862-66); Catlin, *N. Am. Indians* (Lond. 1841); Müller, *Gesch. der Amerikanischen Ur-religionen* (Basel, 1855); Squier, *The Serpent Symbol of America* (N. York, 1851); Hawking, *Sketch of the Creek Country* (Georgia Hist. Soc. 1848); Schoolcraft, *Red Races of America* (N. Y. 1847); *Notes on the Iroquois* (Albany, 1848); *Hist. and Statist. Information prepared for the Indian Bureau of the U. S. Government* (Philad. 1851); Domenech, *Seven Years' Residence in the great Deserts of North America* (London, 1860, 2 vols. 8vo); Brainard, *A Journal among the Indians* (Philadel.); Prescott's *Conquest of Mexico*; Copway, *Traditional Hist. of the Ojibway Nation* (Lond. 1850); M'Coy, *Hist. of the Bapt. Indian Missions*; Mrs. Eastman, *Legends of the Sioux*; *History of the Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes from* 1529 *to* 1824 (N. Y. 1855); *Trans. Am. Ethn. Soc.* (1848); *Relations de la Nouvelle France* (Quebec, 1858); Mr. Duponceaux's *Report to Amer. Philos. Soc.* (1819, 8vo). (J. T. G.)

Indictio Festōrum Mobilium. See INDICTIO PASCHALIS.

Indiction (Latin *indictio*, a declaring) is a term which designates "a chronological system, including a circle of fifteen years: (1) the *Cæsarean*, used long in France and Germany, beginning on Sept. 24; (2) the *Constantinopolitan*, used in the East from the time of Anastasius, and beginning Sept. 1; and (3) the *Papal*, reckoned from Jan. 1, 313. The Council of Antioch, 341, first gives a documentary date, the 14th indiction. The computation prevailed in Syria in the fifth century, and is mentioned by Ambrose as existing at Rome. It is, however, asserted that in the West, the East, and Egypt, with the exception of Africa, the indictions, until the 16th century, were reckoned from Sept. 1, 312, and that they commenced in Egypt in the time of Constantine."—Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 327; see also Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ii, 141. See CYCLE.

Indictio Paschālis. It was an old custom in the Christian Church of the early ages to announce on Epiphany (q. v.) the days on which Easter would fall, and this announcement was called the *Indictio paschalis;* but as on the appointment of the days on which Easter should be observed depended the appointment of the movable feasts, this announcement was called the *Indictio festorum mobilium.* The first practices of this kind we find in the Alexandrian Church, but it soon became general throughout the Christian Church, even by ecclesiastical enactments. Thus the fourth Synod at Orleans (*Concil. Aurelian.* iv, c. 1) ordered its observance, and even the fifth Synod at Carthage (A.D. 401, *Concil. Carthag.* v, can. 7) ordered a written announcement, which was called *Epistola paschalis et heortastica.* See Bingham, *Antiquit. Ecclesiast.* ix, 85 sq.; Augusti, *Handbuch der Christl. Archäol.* i, 544; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 687. (J. H. W.)

Indifference, LIBERTY OF, a name sometimes given, by metaphysical and theological writers, to the power in the human mind of choosing between opposing motives, or of resisting or yielding to a given motive. The upholders of fatalism consider this "liberty of indifference" as a chimera. If we were indifferent, say they, to the motives which determine our actions, we should either not act at all, or we should act without motive, at hazard, and our actions would be effects without cause. But this is intentionally confounding indifference and insensibility. We are necessarily sensible to a motive when that motive induces us to act, but the question at issue is whether there is a necessary connection between such a motive and such volition; that is, whether, when such a motive induces us to will anything, we can or cannot will the contrary in spite of that motive, or whether we cannot prefer another motive to that by which we determine to act. As soon as it is supposed that we act from a motive, it cannot be supposed that this motive does not determine us to act, for the two suppositions would contradict each other; but it may be asked whether, before any supposition, our will was connected with the motive in such a manner as to render a contrary volition impossible. The advocates of moral liberty maintain that there is no physical or necessary connection between motives and volition, but only a moral connection, which does not prevent our resisting; in other words, that motives are the moral, not the physical causes of our actions. Because we are said to be *determined* by a motive, it does not follow that that motive acts, and we remain passive; it is absurd to suppose that an active faculty like volition could become passive under the influence of a motive, or that this motive, which after all is but an idea, a thought, could act upon us as we act upon a body we put in motion. This metaphysical question is intimately connected with another long discussed by theologians, namely, the mode of action of grace on us, and in what sense grace is to be understood as being the *cause* of our actions. Those who consider it as their *physical cause* must, to be consistent, suppose the same relation between grace and the action to which it led as between any physical cause and its effect. As, according to natural philosophy, the relation in the latter case is a necessary one, we cannot perceive how the action produced under the influence of grace can be free. For this reason, other theologians look upon grace only as the *moral cause* of our actions, and admit between this cause and its effects only a moral connection, such as exists between all free action and its motive. It is, indeed, God who acts in us through grace, but his operation is so similar to that of nature that we are often unable to distinguish between them. When we perform a good action under the influence of grace—a supernatural motive—we feel as active, as free, as well masters of our actions as when doing it from a natural motive, from temperament or interest. Why should we try to believe that God deceives our consciousness, acting upon us as though he left us free, while in reality he does not? Consciousness testifies to us that we can resist grace as readily as we resist our natural tastes and inclinations. Thus the testimony of conscience, that we are entirely free under the influence of grace, is complete. Let us not forget the saying of St. Augustine, that grace was given us, not to destroy, but to restore our free agency. The Pelagians erred in defining free agency to be *indifference* towards good and evil; they understood by this an equal inclination to either, an equal facility for choosing right or wrong (St. Augustine, *Op. imp.* l. 3, n. 109, 110, 117; *Letter of S. Prosper*, n. 4). They concluded from this that if grace destroyed this *indifference*, it would thereby destroy free agency. St. Augustine correctly affirms, in opposition, that in consequence of Adam's sin man is more inclined to evil than to good, and that he needs grace to restore the equilibrium. Those who accused St. Augustine of disregarding free will in maintaining the necessity of grace, misunderstood his doctrine as much as the Pelagians.—Bergier, *Dict. de Theologie*, iii, 394 sq. (Comp. Barrow, *Works*, ii, 47; Palmer, *Church of Christ*, i, 252–58, 321 sq.) See WILL.

Indifferentism (*indifferentismus*), a word much used

I. By the theologians of Germany to denote (1.) that state of mind which looks upon all religions (e. g. Christianity and Mohammedanism) as alike valuable or valueless in proportion as they agree with natural religion; (2.) that state of mind which, carelessly admitting the truth of Christianity, holds that all discussion as to its doctrines is unimportant. An astonishing number of books has been written upon this subject. See Buddeus, *Institt. Theol. Dogmat.* p. 60; Bretschneider, *System. Entwickelung*, p. 13; Schubert, *Institt. Theol. Polem.* i, 569; Sack, *Christliche Polemik*, p. 65; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 657; and a full list of books on the subject in Danz, *Universal-Wörterbuch*, p. 449 sq. See INTOLERANCE; LATITUDINARIANISM; TOLERATION.

II. The term is used also to denote that form of infidelity, or semi-infidelity, which holds that man is not responsible for his beliefs. "Gibbon, speaking of the paganism of ancient Rome, says, 'The various modes of worship which prevailed in the Roman world were all considered by the people as equally true, by the philosopher as equally false, and by the magistrate as equally useful.' The comment of some one is, 'After eighteen centuries of the Gospel, we seem unhappily to be coming back to the same point.' A very weakened sense of responsibility, or an actual denial of it, lies at the bottom of that indifferentism which is so extensively prevalent in the present age. On the Continent, especially in Germany and France, not only are opinions destructive of the sense of responsibility widely diffused among the masses, but in the case of vast multitudes, who would not wish to be counted the foes of Christianity, there is an utter absence of anything like the religious obligation of belief. There is also a great deal of this

kind of infidelity in England and America. It is stated, or implied, in much of our current popular literature, that a man's creed does not depend upon himself. This dogma pervades the writings of Mr. Emerson. Napoleon, one of his 'representative men,' of whom he tells 'horrible anecdotes,' must not, in his view, 'be set down as cruel, but only as one who knew no impediment to his will.' He depicts him as an 'exorbitant egotist, who narrowed, impoverished, and absorbed the power and existence of those who served him; and concludes by saying, 'it was not Bonaparte's fault.' He thus condemns and acquits in the same breath, sends forth from the same fountain sweet water and bitter. Mr. Theodore Parker makes each form of religion that has figured in the history of the world 'natural and indispensable.' 'It could not have been but as it was.' And, therefore, he finds truth, or the 'absolute religion,' in all forms; 'all tending towards one great and beautiful end' (*Discourse of Religion*, p. 81). Of course, the idea of the religious obligation of belief resting upon the individual conscience is here quite out of question. Mr. F. W. Newman, who is so fond of parting off things that most men connect together, would persuade us that there may be a true faith without a true belief, as if the emotional part of our nature was independent of the intellectual. 'Belief,' says he, 'is one thing, and faith another.' And he complains of those who, on religious grounds, are alienated from him because he has adopted 'intellectual conclusions' different from theirs—'the difference between them and him' turning merely 'on questions of learning, history, criticism, and abstract thought' (*Phases of Faith*, Preface). The philosophy is as bad here as the theology. In the view of common sense and Scripture, a living faith is as the doctrine believed. But Mr. Newman, in common with Mr. Parker and others, can lay down his offensive weapons when he wills, and take up a position on the low ground of indifference as to religious belief. *Then*, creeds become matters of mere moonshine, and responsibility is regarded as a fiction invented by priests. This is part of the bad theology of Mr. Bailey's 'Festus.' The hero of the poem is made to say,

"'Yet merit or demerit none I see
In nature, human or material,
In passions or affections good or bad.
We only know that God's best purposes
Are oftenest brought about by dreadest sins.
Is thunder evil, or is dew divine?
Does virtue lie in sunshine, sin in storm?
Is not each natural, each needful, best?'

The theory of this infidelity appears to be that man has no control over his belief, that he is no more responsible for his opinions than he is for his color or his height, and that an infidel or an atheist is to be pitied but not blamed. This, we are persuaded, is a piece of flimsy sophistry which no man should utter, and which would not be listened to for a moment in connection with any other subject than that of religion. It would be condemned in the senate and at the bar, it would be drowned in the tumult of the exchange and the market-place. Common sense, and a regard to worldly interests, would rise up and hoot down the traitor. Unfortunately, however, in the province of religion, the natural indisposition of the mind to things unseen and spiritual allies itself with the pleadings of the sophist, and receives his doctrine of irresponsibility with something like flattering unction. Nothing more than this is requisite to undermine the foundation of all religious belief and morals, to let open the floodgates of immorality, and to make the restraints of religion like the brittle flax or the yielding sand. In opposition to such latitudinarianism, we maintain that man is responsible for the dispositions which he cherishes, for the opinions which he holds and avows, and for his habitual conduct. This is going the whole length of Scripture, but no farther, which affirms that every one of us must give an account of himself unto God. And this meets with a response from amid the elements of man's moral nature, which sets its seal that the thing is true" (Pearson, *Prize Essay on Infidelity*, ch. v). (Comp. Baumgarten, *Gesch. der Religions-Partheien*, p. 102 sq.) See RESPONSIBILITY.

Indifferent things. (Comp. Harless, *System of Christian Ethics*, transl. by Morison and Findlay, Edinburgh, 1868, 8vo.) See ADIAPHORA.

Indigĕtēs (sc. DII), an epithet given by the Romans to the particular gods of each country, who, having been natives of those countries, were deified by their countrymen after death. Thus Romulus was one of the gods *Indigetes* of the Romans, and was worshipped under the name Quirinus. Æneas, though not a native of Italy, yet, as founder of the Roman name, was ranked among the gods *Indigetes*.—Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* i, 530.

Indignation, a strong disapprobation of mind, excited by something flagitious in the conduct of another. It does not, as Mr. Cogan observes, always suppose that excess of depravity which alone is capable of committing deeds of horror. Indignation always refers to culpability of conduct, and cannot, like the passion of horror, be extended to distress either of body or mind. It is produced by acts of treachery, abuse of confidence, base ingratitude, etc., which we cannot contemplate without being provoked to anger, and feeling a generous resentment.—Cogan, *On the Passions*; Buck, *Theol. Dictionary*, s. v. See ANGER.

Indra, one of the Hindu deities of the Vedic period of the Hindu religion, who also enjoyed a great legendary popularity in the Epic and Purânic periods. See HINDUISM. He is, so to speak, the Hindu Jupiter. He is quite frequently styled "Lord of heaven" (divaspati =*diespiter*). The name itself is of doubtful origin, meaning either (1) "blue" (as epithet of the firmament), or (2) "the illuminator," or (3) "the giver of rain" (compare Wuttke, *Gesch. des Heidenthums*, ii, 242). Max Müller (*Science of Language*, 2d series, p. 449) says the name "admits of but one etymology; i. e. it must be derived from the same root, whatever that may be, which in Sanscrit yielded *indu*, drop, sap. It meant originally the giver of rain, the *Jupiter pluvius*, a deity in India more often present to the mind of the worshipper than any other" (comp. Benfey, *Orient and Occident*, i. 49). "In that class of Rig-Veda hymns which there is reason to look upon as the oldest portion of Vedic poetry, the character of Indra is that of a mighty ruler of the bright firmament, and his principal feat is that of conquering the dæmon *Vritra*, a symbolical personification of the cloud which obstructs the clearness of the sky, and withholds the fructifying rain from the earth. In his battles with Vritra he is therefore described as 'opening the receptacles of the waters,' as 'cleaving the cloud' with his 'far-whirling thunderbolt,' as 'casting the waters down to the earth,' and 'restoring the sun to the sky.' He is, in consequence, 'the upholder of heaven, earth, and firmament,' and the god 'who has engendered the sun and the dawn.' And since the atmospherical phenomena personified in this conception are ever and ever recurring, he is 'undecaying' and 'ever youthful.' All the wonderful deeds of Indra, however, are performed by him merely for the benefit of the good, which, in the language of the Veda, means the pious men who worship him in their songs, and invigorate him with the offerings of the juice of the soma plant. See HINDUISM. He is, therefore, the 'lord of the virtuous,' and the 'discomfiter of those who neglect religious rites.' Many other epithets, which we have not space to enumerate, illustrate the same conception. It is on account of the paramount influence which the deeds of Indra exercise on the material happiness of man that this deity occupies a foremost rank in the Vedic worship, and that a greater number of invocations are addressed to him than to any other of the gods (comp. Max Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, i, 30–32, et al.). But to understand the gradual expansion of his mythical character, and his ultimate degradation to an inferior

position in the Hindu pantheon of a later period, it is necessary to bear in mind that, however much the Vedic poets call Indra the protector of the pious and virtuous, he is in their songs essentially a warlike god, and gradually endowed by imagination not only with the qualities of a mighty, but also of a self-willed king. The legends which represent him in this light seem, it is true, to belong to a later class of the Rig-Veda hymns, but they show that the original conception of Indra excluded from his nature those ethical considerations which in time changed the pantheon of elementary gods into one of a different stamp. Whether the idea of an incarnation (q. v.) of the deity, which, at the Epic and Purânic periods, played so important a part in the history of Vishnu, did not exercise its influence as early as the composition of some of the Vedic hymns in honor of Indra, may at least be matter of doubt. He is, for instance, frequently invoked as the destroyer of cities—of seven, of ninety-nine, even of a hundred cities —and he is not only repeatedly called the slayer of the hostile tribes which surrounded the Aryan Hindus, but some of the chiefs slain by him are enumerated by name. The commentators, of course, turn those 'robbers' and their 'chiefs' into dæmons, and their cities into celestial abodes; but as it is improbable that all these names should be nothing but personifications of clouds destroyed by the thunder-bolt of Indra, it is, to say the least, questionable whether events in the early history of India may not have been associated with the deeds of Indra himself, in like manner as, at the Epic period, mortal heroes were looked upon as incarnations of Vishnu, and mortal deeds transformed into exploits of this god.

"The purely kingly character of Indra assumes its typical shape in the *Aitareya-Brâhmana*, where his installation as lord of the inferior gods is described with much mystical detail; and from that time he continues to be the supreme lord of the minor gods, and the type of a mortal king. During the Epic and Purânic periods, where ethical conceptions of the divine powers prevail over ideas based on elementary impressions, Indra ceases to enjoy the worship he had acquired at the Vedic time, and his existence is chiefly upheld by the poets, who, in their turn, however, work it out in the most fantastical detail. Of the eight guardians of the world, he is, then, the one who presides over the east, and he is still the god who sends rain and wields the thunderbolt; but poetry is more engrossed by the beauty of his paradise, *Swarga*, the happy abode of the inferior gods, and of those pious men who attain it after death in consequence of having, during life, properly discharged their religious duties; by the charms of his heavenly nymphs, the *Apsarasas*, who now and then descend to earth to disturb the equanimity of austere penitents; by the musical performances of his choristers, the *Gandharvas;* by the splendor of his capital, *Amarâvati;* by the fabulous beauty of his garden, *Nandana*, etc. A remarkable trait in this legendary life of Indra is the series of his conflicts with Krishna (q. v.), an incarnation of Vishnu, which end, however, in his becoming reconciled with the more important god. As the god who is emphatically called the god of the hundred sacrifices (*Satakratu*), Indra is jealous of every mortal who may have the presumption of aiming at the performance of that number of sacrifices, for the accomplishment of such an intention would raise the sacrificer to a rank equal to that which he occupies. He is, therefore, ever at hand to disturb sacrificial acts which may expose him to the danger of having his power shared by another Indra. According to the Purânas, the reign of this god Indra, who is frequently called also *Sakra*, or the mighty, does not last longer than the first *Manwantara*, or mundane epoch. After each successive destruction of the world, a new Indra was created, together with other gods, saints, and mortal beings. Thus the Indra of the second Manwantara is *Vipaschit;* of the third, *Susânti;* of the fourth, *Sivi;* of the fifth, *Vibhu;* of the sixth, *Manojava;* and the Indra of the present age is *Purandara*" (Chambers, s. v.). In works of art, Indra is generally represented as riding on an elephant. In paintings, his eyes are veiled. See also Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, i, 173.

Induction (Lat. *inductio*, from *duco*, I lead) is a term in ecclesiastical law for the act by which a clergyman in the Church of England, having been presented to a benefice by its patron, is *brought in* to the possession of the freehold of the church and glebe. This is usually done by a mandate, under the seal of the bishop, addressed to the archdeacon, who either in person inducts the minister, or commissions some clergyman in his archdeaconry to perform that office. The archdeacon, or his deputy, inducts the incumbent, by laying his hand on the key of the church as it lies in the lock, and using this form: "I induct you into the real and actual possession of the rectory or vicarage of M., with all its profits and appurtenances." The church door is then opened; the incumbent enters, and generally tolls a bell, in token of having entered on his spiritual duties. In Scotland the Presbytery induct the minister.

Indulgence (Lat. *indulgentia*), in English history, is the title applied to a proclamation of Charles II (A.D. 1662), and especially to one of James II, April 4, 1687, announcing religious toleration to all classes of his subjects, suspending all penal laws against nonconformists, and abolishing religious tests as qualifications for civil office. The king's object was simply to favor Roman Catholics, and therefore neither the English Church nor the great body of the dissenters received the illegal stretch of prerogative with favor, and refused to believe that a "dispensing power" exercised by the king independently of Parliament could be of any lasting advantage. Howe and Baxter maintained this opinion. The same instrument was extended to Scotland, and divided the Covenanters into two parties. At first the king asked toleration for Papists only, but the Scottish Parliament, usually very obsequious, would not listen. He finally declared, as if Popery were already in the ascendant, that he would never use "force or invincible necessity against any man on account of his Protestant faith," and all this he did "by his sovereign authority, prerogative royal, and absolute power."—Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, i, 213; iii, 44 sq.; Skeats, *Hist. of Free Churches of England*, p. 77 sq.; Stoughton, *Eccl. Hist. of England since the Restoration*, ii, 296, et al.

Indulgences (Lat. *indulgentiæ*), the name of a peculiar institution in the Roman Church. The doctrine of indulgence, in its most plausible form, is stated by a Romanist writer as follows: "It is a releasing, by the power of the keys committed to the Church, the debt of temporal punishment which may remain due upon account of our sins, after the sins themselves, as to the guilt and eternal punishment, have been already remitted by repentance and confession" (*Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*, chap. x, quest. 1). The doctrine and practice of indulgence constitutes the very centre of the hierarchical theory of Romanism, and was, probably for that very reason, the first object of attack on the part of Luther in the beginning of the Reformation.

I. *Origin of the System.*—The early Church knew nothing of indulgences. The system seems to have originated in that of *penance* (q. v.), which, in the hands of the episcopacy, began to assume a corrupt form in the 3d century. The immediate object of penance was to restore an offender, not to communion with God, but to the communion of the Church. When an excommunicated person sought readmission, the bishop assigned him a penitential discipline (q. v.) of abstinence, mortification, and good works, after which he was taken back into fellowship by certain regular modes of procedure. The bishop had the power to abridge the period of probation, or to mitigate the severity of the penance, and in this power lies the germ of the doctrine of

indulgence (see Canons of *Council of Ancyra*, c. v). In course of time penitential discipline came to be applied, not merely to excommunicated persons, but to all delinquents within the pale of the Church; and penance came at last, in the hands of the schoolmen, to be a *sacrament*, with its systematic theory nicely fitting into the hierarchical system, of which, in fact, it became the very keystone. Nothing could so surely augment the power of the priesthood as the right of fixing penalties for sin, and making terms of forgiveness. "Just as, in early times, the penances of the excommunicated were frequently mitigated, so, in the course of the Middle Ages, an analogous mitigation was introduced with reference to the works of penance to which delinquents were subjected. Permission was given to exchange a more severe for a gentler kind of penance. Sometimes, in place of doing penance himself, the party was allowed to employ a substitute. And sometimes, in fine, instead of the actual penance prescribed, some service conducive to the interest of the Church and the glory of God was accepted. This last was the real basis of indulgence. Even here, however, the process was gradual. At first only personal acts performed for the Church were admitted. Then pecuniary gifts became more and more common, until at last the matter assumed the shape of a mere money speculation. Initiatively the abuse grew up in practice. Then came Scholasticism, and furnished it with a theoretical substratum; and not until the institution had thus received an ecclesiastical and scientific basis was a method of practice introduced which overstepped all limits. The first powerful impulse to the introduction of indulgences, properly so called, was given by the Crusades at the great Synod of Clermont in 1096. Urban II there promised to all who took part in the Crusade, which he proposed as a highly meritorious ecclesiastical work, plenary indulgence (*indulgentias plenarias*); and from that date for a period of two hundred years, this grace of the Church continued one of the most powerful means for renewing and enlivening these expeditions, although it was evident to unprejudiced contemporaries that the adventurers, when they crossed the ocean, did not undergo a change of character with the change of climate. The same favor was ere long extended to the military expeditions set on foot against the heretics in Europe, and at last, by Boniface VIII, in 1300, to the year of the Roman Jubilee. Subsequently to that date, several monastic orders and holy places likewise received from successive popes special privileges in the matter of indulgence" (Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, i, 236).

II. *Scholastic Doctrine of Indulgence.*—The practice of indulgence had been going on for some time when the Scholastic theologians took it up, and formed a speculative theory to justify it. Three great men contributed to this task: Alexander de Hales (q. v.), Albertus Magnus (q. v.), and Thomas Aquinas (q. v.). Alexander de Hales († A.D. 1245) laid a firm foundation for the theory in the doctrine, first fairly propounded by him, of the *Treasure of the Church* (*thesaurus ecclesiæ*). It runs as follows: "The sufferings and death of Christ not only made a sufficient satisfaction for the sins of men, but also acquired a superabundance of merit. This superfluous merit of Christ is conjoined with that of the martyrs and saints, which is similar in kind, though smaller in degree, for they likewise performed more than the divine law required of them. The sum of these supererogatory merits and good works forms a vast treasure, which is disjoined from the persons who won or performed them, exists objectively, and, having been accumulated by the Head and members of the Church, and intended by them for its use, belongs to the Church, and is necessarily placed under the administration of its representatives, especially the pope, who is supreme. It is therefore competent for the pope, according to the measure of his insight at the time, to draw from this treasure, and bestow upon those who have no merit of their own such supplies of it as they require. Indulgences and remissions are made from the supererogatory merits of Christ's members, but most of all from the superabundance of Christ's own, the two constituting the Church's spiritual treasure. The administration of this treasure does not pertain to all, but to those only who occupy Christ's place, viz. the bishops" (Alex. Hales, *Summa*, iv, qu. xxiii, art. ii). As regards the extent of indulgence, Alexander is of opinion that it reaches even to the souls in Purgatory, under the condition, however, that there shall be the power of the keys in the party who dispenses it; faith, love, and devotion in the party to whom it is dispensed; and a competent reason and a proper relation between the two (*l. c.* par. 5). He does not, however, suppose that in such cases indulgence is granted in the way of judicial absolution or barter, but in that of intercession ("per modum suffragii sive interpretationis").

Albert the Great († 1280), adopting the opinions of his predecessor, designates indulgence the remission of some imposed punishment or penance, proceeding from the power of the keys, and the treasure of the superfluous merits of the perfect. With respect to the efficacy of indulgence, Albert proposes to steer a middle course between two extremes. Some, he says, imagine that indulgence has no efficacy at all, and is merely a pious fraud, by which men are enticed to the performance of good works, such as pilgrimage and almsgiving. These, however, reduce the action of the Church to child's play, and fall into heresy. Others, carrying the contrary opinion further than is necessary, assert that an indulgence at once and unconditionally accomplishes all that is expressed in it, and thus make the divine mercy diminish the fear of judgment. The true medium is that indulgence has that precise amount of efficacy which the Church assigns to it (Alb. Magnus, *Sentent.* lib. iv, d. xx, art. 16).

Thomas Aquinas deduces the efficacy of indulgence directly from Christ. The history of the adulteress shows, he says, that it is in Christ's power to remit the penalty of sin without satisfaction, and so could Paul, and so also can the pope, whose power in the Church is not inferior to Paul's. Besides, the Church general is infallible, and, as it sanctions and practices indulgence, indulgence must be valid. This, Thomas is persuaded, all admit, *because there would be impiety* in representing any act of the *Church* as *nugatory*. *The reason of its efficacy*, however, *lies in the oneness of the mystical body*, within the limits of which there are many who, as respects works of penitence, have done more than they were under obligation to do; for instance, many who have patiently endured undeserved sufferings sufficient to expiate a great amount of penalties. In fact, *so vast is the sum* of these merits that it *greatly exceeds the measure of the guilt of all the living*, especially when augmented by *the merit of Christ*, which, although operative in the sacraments, is not in its operation confined to these, but, being infinite, extends far beyond them. The measure of the efficacy of indulgence—this St. Thomas reckons to be the truth—is determined by the measure of its cause. The procuring cause of the remission of punishment in indulgence is, however, solely the plenitude of the Church's merits, not the piety, labors, or gifts of the party by whom it is obtained; and therefore the quantity of the indulgence does not need to correspond with any of these, but only with the merits of the Church. In respect to *the party who ought to dispense indulgence*, St. Thomas asserts that no mere priest or pastor, but *only the bishop*, is competent for the duty. On the other hand, deacons and other parties not in orders, as, for example, *nuncios*, may grant indulgence if, either in an ordinary or extraordinary way, they have been intrusted with jurisdiction for the purpose. For indulgence does not, like sacramental acts, pertain to the power of the keys inherent in the *priesthood*, but to that power of the keys which belongs to *jurisdiction* (Aquinas, *Supplem. iii partes Summæ Theologice*, qu. xxv–xxvii).

III. *Opposition to Indulgences within the Church of Rome.*—Such a doctrine could not fail to offend truly pious souls even within the Church. Long before the Reformation the whole system was attacked by eminent doctors. One of its most powerful opponents was John of Wesel (q. v.), in the middle of the 15th century. A festival of jubilee, with vast indulgences, was proclaimed by pope Clement VI in 1450, and cardinal Cusanus visited Erfurt as a preacher of indulgence. This brought the subject practically before Wesel's mind, and he wrote a treatise against indulgences (*Adversus indulgentias:* see Walch, *Monum. Med. Ævi*, ii, fasc. i, 111–156). For a full account of it, see Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, i, 258 sq. The flagrant abuses connected with the sale of indulgences began to cause a reaction against the system even in the popular mind. In the 15th century, in particular, the disposal of them had become almost a common traffic; and a public sale of them was generally preceded by some specious pretext; for instance, the reduction of the Greeks under the yoke of the Romish Church, a war with heretics, or a crusade against the Neapolitans, etc. Too often the pretences for selling indulgences were in reality bloody, idolatrous, or superstitious. It was one of the charges brought against John XXIII at the Council of Constance, in 1415, that he empowered his legates to absolve penitents from all sorts of crimes upon payment of sums proportioned to their guilt. When such indulgences were to be published, the disposal of them was commonly farmed out; for the papal court could not always wait to have the money collected and conveyed from every country of Europe. And there were rich merchants at Genoa, Milan, Venice, and Augsburg who purchased the indulgences for a particular province, and paid to the papal chancery handsome sums for them. Thus both parties were benefited. The chancery came at once into possession of large sums of money, and the farmers did not fail of a good bargain. They were careful to employ skilful hawkers of the indulgences, persons whose boldness and impudence bore due proportion to the eloquence with which they imposed upon the simple people. Yet, that this species of traffic might have a religious aspect, the pope appointed the archbishops of the several provinces to be his commissaries, who in his name announced that indulgences were to be sold, and generally selected the persons to hawk them, and for this service shared the profits with the merchants who farmed them. These papal hawkers enjoyed great privileges, and, however odious to the civil authorities, they were not to be molested. Complaints, indeed, were made against these contributions, levied by the popes upon all Christian Europe. Kings and princes, clergy and laity, bishops, monasteries, and confessors, all felt themselves aggrieved by them; the kings, that their countries were impoverished, under the pretext of crusades that were never undertaken, and of wars against heretics and Turks; and the bishops, that their letters of indulgence were rendered inefficient, and the people released from ecclesiastical discipline. But at Rome all were deaf to these complaints; and it was not till the revolution produced by Luther that unhappy Europe obtained the desired relief (Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* cent. iii, sec. i, chap. i). Leo X, in order to carry on the expensive structure of St. Peter's Church at Rome, published indulgences, with a plenary remission to all such as should contribute towards erecting that magnificent fabric. The right of promulgating these indulgences in Germany, together with a share in the profits arising from the sale of them, was granted to Albert, elector of Mentz and archbishop of Magdeburg, who selected as his chief agent for retailing them in Saxony John Tetzel, a Dominican friar, of licentious morals, but of an active and enterprising spirit, and remarkable for his noisy and popular eloquence. Assisted by the monks of his order, he executed the commission with great zeal and success, but with no less indecency, boasting that he had saved more souls from hell by his indulgences than St. Peter had converted by his preaching. He assured the purchasers of them that their crimes, however enormous, would be forgiven; that the efficacy of indulgences was so great that the most heinous sins, even if one should violate (which was impossible) the mother of God, would be remitted and expiated by them, and the person freed both from punishment and guilt; and that this was the unspeakable gift of God, in order to reconcile men to himself. In the usual form of absolution, written by his own hand, he said: "May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by the merits of his most holy passion. And I, by his authority, that of his apostles Peter and Paul, and of the most holy pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first, from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred; then from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be: even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the holy see, and as far as the keys of the holy Church extend. I remit to thee all punishment which thou deservest in Purgatory on their account; and I restore thee to the holy sacraments of the Church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which thou possessedst at baptism: so that when thou diest the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the Paradise of delights shall be opened; and if thou shalt not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when thou art at the point of death. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." The terms in which the retailers of indulgences described their benefits, and the necessity of purchasing them, were so extravagant that they appear almost incredible. If any man, said they, purchase letters of indulgence, his soul may rest secure with respect to its salvation. The souls confined in Purgatory, for whose redemption indulgences are purchased, as soon as the money tinkles in the chest, instantly escape from that place of torment, and ascend into heaven. That the cross erected by the preachers of indulgences was equally efficacious with the cross of Christ itself. "Lo," said they, "the heavens are open: if you enter not now, when will you enter? For twelve pence you may redeem the soul of your father out of Purgatory; and are you so ungrateful that you will not rescue the soul of your parent from torment? If you had but one coat, you ought to strip yourself instantly and sell it, in order to purchase such benefit." It was these abuses, as much as any other one cause, which led to the Lutheran Reformation, and it was against these that Luther first directed his attacks. See LUTHER; REFORMATION.

III. *Present Doctrine and Practice of Indulgence.*—The following extracts show what has been, since the Council of Trent, and is now, the Romish doctrine of indulgence. The Council declared that "as the power of granting indulgences was given by Christ to the Church, and she has exercised it in the most ancient times, this holy synod teaches and commands that the use of them, as being greatly salutary to the Christian people, and approved by the authority of councils, shall be retained; and she anathematizes those who say they are useless, or deny to the Church the power of granting them; but in this grant the synod wishes that moderation, agreeably to the ancient and approved practice of the Church, be exercised, lest by too great facility ecclesiastical discipline be weakened" (*Conc. Trid.* Sess. xxv, *De Indulg.*). Pope Leo X, in his bull *De Indulgentiis*, whose object he states to be "that no one in future may allege ignorance of the doctrine of the Roman Church respecting indulgences and their efficacy," declares "that the Roman pontiff, vicar of Christ on earth, can, for reasonable causes, by the powers of the keys, grant to the faithful, whether in this life or in Purgatory, indulgences, out of the superabundance of the merits of Christ, and of the saints (expressly called a treasure); and that those who have truly obtained these indulgences are released from so much of the temporal punishment due for their act-

ual sins to the divine justice as is equivalent to the indulgence granted and obtained" (*Bulla Leon. X, adv. Luther*). Clement VI, in the bull *Unigenitus*, explains this matter more fully: "As a single drop of Christ's blood would have sufficed for the redemption of the whole human race," so the rest was not lost, but "was a treasure which he acquired in the militant Church, to be used for the benefit of his sons; which treasure he would not suffer to be hid in a napkin, or buried in the ground, but committed it to be dispensed by St. Peter and his successors, his own vicars upon earth, for proper and reasonable causes, for the total or partial remission of the temporal punishment due to sin; and for an augmentation of his treasure, the merits of the blessed mother of God, and of all the elect, who are known to come in aid." The *reasonable causes*, on account of which indulgences are given, are, where "the cause be pious, that is, not a work which is merely temporal, or vain, or in no respect appertaining to the divine glory, but for any work whatsoever which tends to the honor of God or the service of the Church, an indulgence will be valid." We see, occasionally, the very greatest indulgences given for the very lightest causes; as when a *plenary* indulgence is granted to all who stand before the gates of St. Peter, whilst the pope gives the solemn blessing to the people on Easter day; for "indulgences do not depend, for their efficacy, on consideration of the work enjoined, but on the infinite treasure of the merits of Christ and the saints, which is a consideration surpassing and transcending everything that is granted by an indulgence." In some cases "the work enjoined must not only be pious and useful, but bear a certain proportion with the indulgence; that is, the work enjoined must tend to an end more pleasing in the sight of God than the satisfaction remitted," "although it is not necessary that it be in itself very meritorious, or satisfactory, or difficult, and laborious (though these things ought to be regarded too), but that it be a means, apt and useful, towards obtaining the end for which the indulgence is granted." So "the large resort of people," before the gates of St. Peter, when the pope gives his solemn blessing, "is a means, apt and useful, to set forth faith respecting the head of the Church, and to the honor of the apostolic see, which is the end of the indulgence" (Bellarmine, *De Indulgentiis*, lib. i, can. 12). The first General Lateran Council granted "remission of sin to whoever shall go to Jerusalem, and effectually help to oppose the infidels" (can. xi). The third and fourth Lateran Councils granted the same indulgence to those who set themselves to destroy heretics, or who shall take up arms against them (see Labbe, x, 1523). Boniface VIII granted not only a full and larger, but the most full pardon of all sins to all that visit Rome the first year in every century. Clement V decreed that they who should, at the Jubilee, visit such and such churches, should obtain "a most full remission of all their sins;" and he not only granted a "plenary absolution of all sins to all who died on the road to Rome," but "also commanded the angels of Paradise to carry the soul direct to heaven." "Sincere repentance," we are told, "is always enjoined or implied in the grant of an indulgence, and is indispensably necessary for every grace" (Milner, *End of Controversy*, p. 304). But as the dead are removed from the possibility, so are they from the necessity of repentance; "as the pope," says Bellarmine, "applies the satisfactions of Christ and the saints to the dead, by means of works enjoined on the living, they are applied, not in the way of judicial absolution, but in the way of payment ('per modum solutionis'). For as when a person gives alms, or fasts, or makes a pilgrimage on account of the dead, the effect is, not that he obtains absolution for them from their liability to punishment, but he presents to God that particular satisfaction for them, in order that God, on receiving it, may liberate the dead from the debt of punishment which they had to pay. In like manner, the pope does not absolve the deceased, but offers to God, out of the measure of satisfaction, as much as is necessary to free them" (*Ib.*). Their object is "to afford succor to such as have departed real penitents in the love of God, yet before they had duly satisfied, by fruits worthy of penance, for sins of commission and omission, and are now purifying in the fire of Purgatory, that an entrance may be opened for them into that country where nothing defiled is admitted" (Bull Leo XII). "We have resolved," says pope Leo XII, in his bull of indiction for the universal jubilee in 1824, "in virtue of the authority given us by heaven, fully to unlock that sacred treasure, composed of the merits, sufferings, and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of his Virgin Mother, and of all the saints which the author of human salvation has intrusted to our dispensation. During this year of the jubilee, we mercifully give and grant, in the Lord, a plenary indulgence, remission, and pardon of all their sins to all the faithful of Christ, truly penitent, and confessing their sins, and receiving the holy communion, who shall visit the churches of blessed Peter and Paul," etc. "We offer you," says Ganganelli, in his bull *De Indulgentiis*, "a share of all the riches of divine mercy which have been intrusted to us, and chiefly those which have their origin in the blood of Christ. We will then open to you all the gates of the rich reservoir of atonement, derived from the merits of the Mother of God, the holy apostles, the blood of the martyrs, and the good works of all the saints. We invite you, then, to drink of this overflowing stream of indulgence, to enrich yourselves in the inexhaustible treasures of the Church, according to the custom of our ancestors. Do not, then, let slip the present occasion, this favorable time, these salutary days, employing them to appease the justice of God, and obtain your pardon." "The temporal punishment due to sin, by the decree of God, when its guilt and eternal punishment are remitted, may consist either of evil in this life, or of temporal suffering in the next, which temporal suffering in the next life is called purgatory; that the Church has received power from God to remit both of these inflictions, and this remission is called an indulgence" (Butler's *Book of the Rom. Cath. Ch.* p. 110). "It is the received doctrine of the Church that an indulgence, when truly gained, is not barely a relaxation of the canonical penance enjoined by the Church, but also an actual remission by God himself of the whole or part of the temporal punishment due to it in his sight" (Milner, *End of Controversy*, p. 305 sq.).

As to the present *practice* of indulgences, it subsists, with all its immoral tendencies, in full force to this day. It is true, however, that the abuses connected with the sale of indulgences are not so flagrant as in former times, especially in those countries where the Roman Church is destitute of political power. Where it has, the system is almost as bad as ever. It is said that, as lately as the year 1800, a Spanish vessel was captured near the coast of South America, freighted (among other things) with numerous bales of indulgences for various sins, the price of which, varying from half a dollar to seven dollars, was marked upon each. They had been bought in Spain, and were intended for sale in South America. Seymour tells us as follows: "This inscription is placed in that part of the Church which is of all the most public. It is placed over the holy water, to which all persons must resort, on entering the Church, before partaking of any of its services. It is as follows: '*Indulgence.*—The image of the most holy Mary, which stands on the high altar, spoke to the holy pope Gregory, saying to him, Why do you no longer salute me, in passing, with the accustomed salutation? The saint asked pardon, and granted to those who celebrate mass at that altar the deliverance of a soul from Purgatory, that is, the special soul for which they celebrate the mass.' There is nothing more frequently remarked by Protestants, on entering the churches of Rome, than the constant recurrence of the words '*indulgentia plenaria*,' a plenary indulgence attached to the masses offered there; and this is tantamount to the emancipa-

tion of any soul from Purgatory, through a mass offered at that altar. Instead of these words, however, the same thing is more plainly expressed in some churches. In the church Santa Maria della Pace, so celebrated for the magnificent fresco of the Sibyls by Raphael, there is over one of the altars the following inscription: '*Ogni messa celebrata in quest' altare libera un animod al' purgatorio*'—Every mass celebrated at this altar frees a soul from Purgatory. In some churches this privilege extends throughout the year, but in others it is limited to those masses which are offered on particular days. In the church of Sta. Croce di Gerusalemme this privilege is connected in an especial manner *with the fourth Sunday in Lent*. And this is notified by a public notice posted in the church close to the altar, setting forth that a mass celebrated there on that day releases a soul from Purgatory" (Seymour, *Evenings at Rome*).

Indulgences are now granted in the Romish Church on a very ample scale, especially to all contributors to the erection of churches, and to the funds of the *Propaganda* and other missionary societies, etc. In fact, almost any act of piety (so-called) entitles one to an indulgence: as, for instance, the worship of relics; the visiting of churches or special altars; participation in divine worship on great festivals, such as inauguration of churches, and, especially, taking part in pilgrimages. Indulgences which apply either to the whole Church are called general (*indulg. generalis*), while those that are confined to particular localities, as a bishopric, etc., are called particular (*indulg. particularis*). The most general indulgence is that of the Roman Catholic year of Jubilee (q. v.). The general indulgence is always made out by the pope himself, while the particular indulgences, either *plenariæ* or *minus plenæ*, are often among the privileges of divers localities, either for special occasions and various lengths of time, or occasionally forever. The papal indulgence is to be proclaimed by the bishop and two canons of the diocese receiving it. "Indulgences are divided into *plenary* and *non-plenary*, or *partial*, *temporary*, *indefinite*, *local*, *perpetual*, *real*, and *personal*. 1. A *plenary* indulgence is that by which is obtained a remission of *all* the temporal punishment due to sin, either in this life or in the next. 2. A *non-plenary* or *partial* indulgence is that which remits only a part of the temporal punishment due to sin: such are indulgences for a given number of days, weeks, or years. This sort of indulgence remits so many days, weeks, or years of penance, which ought to be observed agreeably to the ancient canons of the Church, for the sins which we have committed. 3. *Temporary* indulgences are those which are granted for a certain specified time, as for seven or more years. 4. *Indefinite* indulgences are those which are granted without any limitation of time. 5. *Perpetual* indulgences are those granted *forever*, and which do not require to be renewed after a given number of years. 6. A *general* indulgence is one granted by the pope to all the faithful throughout the world. 7. A *local* indulgence is attached to certain churches, chapels, or other places; it is gained by actually visiting such church or other building or place, and by observing scrupulously all the conditions required by the bull granting such indulgence. 8. A *real* indulgence is attached to certain movable things, as rosaries, medals, etc., and is granted to those who actually wear these articles with devotion; should the fashion of them cease, so that they cease to be deemed the same articles, the indulgence ceases. So long, however, as such articles continue, and are reputed to be the same, the indulgence continues in force, notwithstanding any accidental alteration which may be made in them, as the affixing of a new string or ribbon to a rosary. 9. A *personal* indulgence is one which is granted to certain particular persons, or to several persons in common, as to a confraternity or brotherhood. These privileged persons may gain such indulgences wherever they may happen to be, whether they are in health, in sickness, or at the point of death. 10. Other indulgences are termed *enjoined penances, pœnitentiæ injunctæ*. By them is conferred the remission of so much of the punishment which is due to sins at the judgment of God as the sinner would have to pay by canonical penances, or by penances enjoined in all their rigor by the priest. An indulgence produces its effect at the very moment when all the works prescribed in order to obtain it are performed. (Richard et Giraud, *Bibliothèque Sacrée*, xiii, 366 sq.) The scales of payment are peculiar, being made to meet a variety of cases, and they are so lenient that the payment of them can form no bar against the subsequent commission of the crime for which an indulgence has already been received."

IV. The "*Congregation of Indulgences*" (*Congregatio Cardinalium de indulgentiis et Sacris reliquiis*) assists the pope in managing the department of indulgences. It is one of the functions of this congregation to investigate the grounds of all applications on the part of bishops, dioceses, churches, etc., for indulgences, and to report thereon to the pope. See CONGREGATION, vol. ii, p. 475.

V. *Criticism of the Romish Doctrine of Indulgence.*—We cannot attempt to give in this place a full refutation of the Romish doctrine of indulgences, nor is it necessary. In her 22d Article, the Church of England formally condemns the Romish doctrine of indulgence as well as Purgatory (q. v.). The article was framed (1558) before the Council of Trent, which endeavored to remedy the worst abuses arising from the practice of such a doctrine, but which nevertheless virtually sanctioned the principles naturally involved in the system. In the Parker MS. of 1562 (the 25th session of the Council of Trent, which was held Dec. 3 and 4, 1563) appears the change of terms from *Scholasticorum doctrina* to *Doctrina Romanensium* (comp. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, part i, p. 207; Blunt, *Hist. of the Reformation*, A.D. 1514–1547, p. 444, 465). The English theologians held "(1) that temporal pain, the fruit of sin, is in its nature remedial and disciplinary, both to the sinner, and to others that they may see and fear; and (2) that as such it is not remissible by any sacrament or ordinance intrusted to the Church." The former proposition they support by Jer. ii, 19; Isa. iii, 9; by the examples of Moses and David; Numb. xx, 12; Deut. i, 37; 2 Sam. xii, 14. The following quotations cover, however, more nearly all the points: "Viewed even in its purest form, as stated by the most eminent doctors, and sanctioned by papal bulls, the doctrine of indulgence not only introduces a contradiction into the Catholic system, in respect that works of satisfaction, which were originally an integral part of the sacrament of penitence, are entirely disconnected with it, and viewed as a mere matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but it has this further radical defect pervading all its constituent parts, that moral and religious things, which can only be taken as spiritual magnitudes, are considered as material ones, *quality* being treated wholly as *quantity*, and, consequently, a standard of external computation and a sort of religious arithmetic applied, which involves contradiction. Even in order to establish the superabundance of the merit of Christ, it was affirmed that though a single drop of his blood would have sufficed for a universal atonement, yet the Saviour had shed *so much*, as if it were not the divine sacrifice of love on the part of the Son of God and man, and his atoning death in general, but his several outward sufferings and their quantity in which its value and importance consisted. In like manner, on the part of the saints, it was not their peculiar and more exalted moral and religious character, but their several works, and especially the *volume* rather than the worth of these, which was taken into account; and the whole was handled as something totally disconnected with their persons, as an objective fund, *a sum of ready money* in the Church's hands. According to the same category, the imputation of the merits of Christ and the saints was described as a purely external transference of a portion of that sum to one who needed it. For, although a penitent frame of mind was required of the sinner, *still*

it was not for the sake, nor according to the measure of that, that the merit of Christ and the saints was transferred to him, but solely for the sake of some service performed by him for the Church, and this performance, again, is quite an external and isolated work. At the same time, as respects the merits of the saints, the theory of indulgence rests on the supposition that a man, who is still human, although a saint, may not only possess a sufficiency of merit to answer his own need before God, but may likewise do more than the divine law demands of him, and thus acquire a surplus of merit for the use of others. Even this is a monstrous supposition, but still more monstrous perhaps is another, which invades the religious domain and the glory of God. In point of fact, the doctrine and practice of indulgences gives the Church a position as an absolutely unerring and omniscient judicial power. It identifies the tribunal of the Church with that of God, and the tribunal of the pope with that of the Church, thereby indirectly identifying *the pope's* with *God's*, so that the pope is raised to a position, in virtue of which, as the visible head of the mystical body of Christ, and as the dispenser of all penalties and graces, he decides the highest questions involving the salvation of the living and the dead, according to his mere pleasure. Granting, however, that the whole doctrine were well founded, the position assigned to the pope would be one elevated far above the reach of fancy, and could be designated only as that of a terrestrial god. What an infinite amount of obligation would it impose upon the papacy, and with what conscientiousness sharpened to the utmost ought the popes, if they were bold enough to believe that such plenitude of power had actually been lodged in the hands of any child of the dust, to have dispensed the lofty blessings committed to their trust! How carefully ought they to have guarded them from perversion and debasement! And yet what do we see? Abuse upon abuse, and profanation upon profanation, in an ascending scale, for more than two centuries, until at last moral indignation bursts like a tempest upon their impiety" (Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, i, 246). "Either the pope has the power of bringing souls out of Purgatory, or he has not. If he has not, the question is decided. If he has, what cruelty, then, for him to leave there whole millions of souls whom he might by a word bring out of it! Without going so far, why this strange inequality in the distribution of a treasure which is deemed inexhaustible? Why will a *pater* and an *ave* in my parish church avail only for five or six days' indulgence, when they avail for forty days in another church, before another Madonna or another cross? Why is the performance of the works paid, in such or such a congregation, with a plenary indulgence, and in this or that other with a mere indulgence for a time? Why—but we should never end with the contradictions with which this matter is beset. Yet let us give one—just one more. If plenary indulgence be not merely a lure, how comes it that masses continue to be said for the souls of those who received it when dying? Why that solemn *de profundis* repeated at Rome during the whole reign of a pope on the anniversary of the death of his predecessor? This is what Luther said in his theses, and the objection is not the less embarrassing for being old. The only means of getting out of the difficulty would be to accept the consequences of the system. You have only to regard as well and duly entered into heaven all who left this world with that infallible passport, and to refuse, therefore, to say a mass for them. And why is this not done? We have no need to explain. Between a mere act of inconsistency added to so many others and the drying up of the very best source of her revenues, could Rome ever hesitate? But if there be ground to ask, on the one hand, why the popes and the bishops have not, at least, the charity to grant everywhere, and to all, as many indulgences as they have a right to dispense, no less reason have we to be astonished at the low price they put upon them, and the incredible facilities offered to such as wish to acquire them. See, for instance, the statutes of the brotherhood (*confrérie*) well known under the name of the *Most Holy and Immaculate Heart of Mary*. By a brief of 1838, plenary indulgence is accorded to those who shall worthily confess on the day of their reception into the brotherhood; which is as much as saying to people, 'Come in among us, and all your previous sins will be wiped out.' Plenary indulgence, moreover, to such as shall confess themselves, and communicate at certain epochs of the year, and these are ten in number. Further, indulgence of five hundred days to whosoever shall devoutly be present at the mass of Saturday, and shall pray for the conversion of sinners. Though we should believe in indulgences, it strikes us that we could not but feel some scruples at seeing them lavished away in this manner. For a mass that shall have cost you half an hour, to be exempted from Purgatory for near a year and a half! For one confession, to be exempted from it altogether, although you may have deserved a thousand years of it! If not stopped by shame, these bold traffickers in salvation ought at least, one would think, to dread lest their wares should suffer depreciation in consequence of being given away for so little. True, they do not cost them anything, and there is no limit to purchases. Nobody, well knowing to how many years of Purgatory he may be condemned, can reasonably stop in adding to the amount of indulgences with which he is to appear at the bar of judgment. By placing himself on the most favorable conditions, and taking care to let no occasion be lost, a man of sixty might without difficulty have amassed them for above a million of years, over and above the plenary ones, each one of which ought to suffice, and with which one does not well see what the rest can signify" (Bungener, *Hist. of the Council of Trent*, p. 520, 521).

VI. For further literature and discussion of the subject, see Bp. Philpot's *Letters to Mr. Butler*, p. 151-153; Hales, *Analysis of Chronology*, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 1019-22; Mendham, *Spiritual Venality of Rome* (London, 1836, 12mo); Mendham, *Venal Indulgences and Pardons of the Church of Rome exemplified* (Lond. 1839, 12mo); Ferraris, *Bibliotheca Promta*, s. v.; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, book ii, ch. xiii; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* i, 67; Neander, *History of Doctrines*, ii, 594; Neander, *Church History*, iii, 52, 138; v, 180, 280; Mosheim, *Ch. History*, bk. iv, cent. xvi, § 1, ch. i and ii; D'Aubigné, *History of the Reformation*, bk. iii; Amort, *De Origine*, etc., *indulgentiarum* (Aug. Vind. 1735, fol.); Hirscher, *Lehre v. Ablass* (Tübing. 1844); Gieseler, *Church Hist.* ii, § 35, 81; Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s. v.; Eadie, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, s. v.; Cramp, *Text-book of Popery*, ch. xix; Bungener, *Hist. of the Council of Trent*, p. 518-530; Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, i, 235 sq.; Bergier, *Dict. de Théologie*, iii, 398.

Indult (Latin *indultus*, participle of *indulgeo*, I indulge) signifies in ecclesiastical law a peculiar form of dispensation granted by the pope from the requirements of the ordinary law. Thus the power of bestowing benefices is granted to cardinals or princes by an *indult* from the pope.

Industrial Schools. In Germany, Great Britain, France, and in the United States, efforts have of late years been made to combine with the general rudimentary education of the common school the teaching of the mechanical arts and of agriculture, and thus to afford the poorer classes the advantages of a literary and industrial education within a smaller limit than formerly, thereby greatly alleviating the wants which are so frequent among them. "In elementary schools for girls, industrial work, to the extent of sewing, shaping, knitting, and netting, has been almost universally introduced, and forms one of the most important and interesting features of female primary education, more especially in Great Britain; but the attempt to connect with

these subjects instruction in cooking, washing, and ironing has been tried as yet only to a limited extent, and has been only partially successful. In ragged schools, on the other hand, no department of the school-work seems to thrive better, partly because it enters so largely into the scheme of instruction, partly because the children are removed from the control of parents. In England the ragged schools are recognised by the Legislature as 'industrial schools,' and may be defined as schools in which the pupils are fed and clothed (wholly or partially), as well as taught the elements of an ordinary education, and the practice of some trade. By a statute passed in 1861, children under 14 found vagrant or begging or convicted of petty offences, may be sent by a magistrate to an industrial school that has been certified by the home secretary. Parents also, on paying for board and lodging a small sum, may place they children in industrial schools if they can show that they are unable to control them. The treasury may contribute to the maintenance of these schools on the representation of the home secretary. If a child abscond from the school before he is 15, the justices may send him back, or place him in a reformatory school (q. v.). In 1861 there were in England 23, and in Scotland 16 industrial schools, and the number of pupils attending was respectively 1574 in the former, and 1606 in the latter" (Chambers, s. v.). In Germany, these schools prove even a greater boon to the poorer classes than elsewhere, especially to orphans. By law every child is obliged to attend school until confirmation (about 14 years of age), and the acquirement of some trade enables children of 14 to begin work to advantage, and earn at least their own livelihoodt if they may not even aid in the support of their parents or other near relatives. It is to be hoped that in the United States the generous spirit of the different Christian societies will especially further this work, and make industrial schools numerous in all our large cities at least. (J. H. W.)

Indwelling Scheme, a name used by some English theologians to denote a theory derived from Col. ii, ix: "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;" which, according to some, asserts the doctrine of Christ's consisting of two beings; one the self-existent Creator, and the other a creature, made into one person by an ineffable union and *indwelling*, which renders the same attributes and honors equally applicable to both. See CHRISTOLOGY.

Indwelling Sin. See SIN.

Ineffabilis Deus. See IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

Inerrancy. See INDEFECTIBILITY.

Infallibility is the quality of being incapable either of being deceived, or of leading others astray. Romanists, while acknowledging that God alone is naturally infallible, maintain that he has been pleased to transmit this quality, to some undefined extent, to the Church and to the popes, so that they are infallible in their decisions on all points of doctrine.

I. INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.—The following is a condensed view of the infallibility of the Church of Rome, as collected from her own authors. Dens affirms, "That the Church, in matters of faith and manners, can by no means err, is an article of belief. Moreover, infallibility in the Church may be considered in a twofold point of view: the one active and authoritative, which is called infallibility in teaching and defining; the other passive or submissive (*obedientialis*), which is called infallibility in learning and believing. Infallibility, considered in the first sense, refers to the Church with respect to the head or chief pontiff, and the prelates of the Church; although this infallibility would not regard the laity or inferior pastors; for, as a man is said to see, although his vision does not apply to all his members, but to his eyes only, so the Church, in like manner, is said to be infallible, although this infallibility refers only to the prelates. But if the Church is not considered with regard to its head, but as it embraces all the faithful, or laics, under the obedience of the pope, it is not proper to say it is infallible in teaching and defining, because its gift in this respect is not to teach, but to learn and believe; wherefore the Church, in this view, is said to be 'passibly infallible,' or infallible in learning, believing, practising, etc. Therefore it is impossible that the whole Church, obedient to the pope, should believe any thing as revealed, or practice any thing as good which is not such; hence it can be said that the sense of the universal Church is always true, and its practice or usage always good" (Dens, *Theol.*, tom. ii, *De Ecclesia*, No. 80, *De Infallibilitate Ecclesiæ*). The same author affirms also that "the Church is an infallible judge of controversies of faith; that this authority is vested in the bishops only, especially in the pope, and that lay persons, priests, doctors, or others, have no part in making infallible decisions in the Church." He says the government of the Church is a monarchy with regard to its head, but, at the same time, tempered with an aristocracy. A unanimous consent is not necessary to make a decision infallible; a majority is sufficient for this purpose. He also says that a tacit consent is sufficient to make a decision infallible; for to be silent is to consent. Hence he concludes that "when the pope defines anything, and the majority of bishops do not object, it is impossible that this definition should embrace error" (Dens, *Theol.* tom. ii, No. 82, *Qualis esse debeat Consensus Episcoporum*). "From the above we collect four principal systems which concern the seat of infallibility, and these contain a considerable number of subdivisions, the chief of which are expressed in the following analysis. *First System:* This embraces the infallibility of the whole Church, and includes two cases: (1.) *The Church diffusive*, that is, all her clergy as a body, inasmuch as the people, whenever infallibility is concerned, compose no part of the Church. (2.) The bishops, as the *representatives* of the Church, though not assembled in council. *Second System:* A council composed of all the bishops; and this also is divided into two cases: (1.) The decision of a council when approved by the whole Church. (2.) The decision of a council when *not* approved by the whole Church. *Third System:* A council and pope united. There are four cases of this: (1.) A council convened by the pope. (2.) A council confirmed by the pope. (3.) A council convened by the pope, and whose decisions are received by the whole Church, or the body of her pastors. (4.) A council confirmed by the pope, and received subsequently by the Church. *Fourth System:* Respects the infallibility of the pope himself. This has the four following cases: (1.) The pope himself deciding officially. (2.) The pope and a few bishops. (3.) The pope, when his decisions are received by the whole Church. (4.) The pope and a few bishops, whose decisions are received by the whole Church. Any person who will examine the quotations given from Roman Catholic authors will perceive these four distinct systems, together with the several cases under each. If we also consider their differences in regard to the *extent* of infallibility (some confining it to articles of faith and precepts of morality, and others making distinctions between matters of *right and facts*, and then of facts connected with faith, and also that their Church has not precisely defined where this infallibility is to be found), then we may safely say that the bare recital of their endless divisions respecting the *seat* of infallibility will prove that the thing is not in existence" (Elliott, *On Romanism*, p. 66).

This infallibility of the Church Romanists attempt to prove (1.) from a supposed unanimity of the bishops, which, they argue, would, if considered as mere human testimony, carry with it an amount of moral certainty admitting of no doubt, and therefore equivalent to infallibility; (2.) from the divinely appointed mission of a clergy regularly descended from the apostles, who themselves had the most positive promises of Christ (John xx, 21; xv, 15; Matt. xxviii, 19, 20; John xiv, 16, 17;

Luke x, 16). They also quote 2 Tim. i, 14; ii, 2; and Acts xx, 28, to show that the apostles claimed this privilege for themselves, as well as the power of transmitting it to those they appointed over the churches.

The same privilege has also been ascribed to the pope as successor of St. Peter, and God's only vicegerent. The ultramontanes, such as Bellarmine, Baronius, etc., maintain that whatever dogmatic judgment or decision on a doctrinal point the pope addressed to the whole church, is necessarily correct. But as it has repeatedly occurred that the Church, as represented in councils, has disagreed with the pope on points of doctrine, it follows that, if both are equally infallible, the people are bound to believe equally two opposite doctrines. The French Church settled the difficulty by proclaiming general councils superior to the pope (or "more infallible"); the assembly of the clergy, in 1682, asserted that "in controversies of faith the office of the pope is the chief, and that his decrees pertain to all churches; nevertheless, that his judgment is not *irreformibile* unless it is confirmed by the consent of the Church." Bossuet sustained this principle with great talent and eloquence in his *Defensio Declarat. Cleri Gallic.* ii, pt. i, 12 sq. He proves by the decrees of councils, by the testimony of fathers, doctors, and schoolmen, by the declarations of popes themselves, and especially of Adrian VI, that the infallibility of the pope was a new doctrine, altogether unknown in the early ages of the Church. "He disproves the infallibility of the pope not merely by negative, but by a long and strong chain of positive evidence; by adducing a number of instances, as well as direct assertions of his infallibility from generation after generation; by showing, from a large induction of facts, that during a series of centuries he was regarded and treated as fallible, and never as otherwise than fallible; and that, when another opinion began to gain ground, it arose mainly from the exercise of that authority which belongs to a supreme power" (Hare, *Contest with Rome*, p. 213). Bossuet's views were held by Fleury, Dupin, cardinal Bausset, etc. They were attacked by De Maistre in his work *Du Pape*. A work of great interest on this subject is the recently discovered *Refutation of all Heresies* of Hippolytus, which gives us a clear idea of the manner in which the Roman bishops were considered in his times. "In Germany, where truth is held the most precious of all possessions, even by members of the Catholic Church, the conviction of the mischiefs produced by the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope is so strongly felt by many, that one of the greatest philosophers of the last generation, Baader, who was a zealous champion of the Christian truth, and himself an earnest Roman Catholic, used perpetually to repeat the pregnant words of St. Martin, 'Le Papisme est la faiblesse du Catholicisme; et le Catholicisme est la force du Papisme'" (Hare, *Contest with Rome*, p. 218).

As regards the infallibility of the Church, Dr. Newman himself, in his *Lectures on Romanism*, p. 61, said: "In the creed of pope Pius not a word is said expressly about the Church's infallibility: it forms no article of faith there. Her interpretation indeed of Scripture is recognised as authoritative; but so also is 'the unanimous consent of the fathers, whether as primitive or concordant; they believe the existing Church to be infallible; and, if ancient belief is at variance with it, which of course they do not allow, but if it is, then antiquity must be mistaken—that is all.'"

"That general councils are infallible is generally believed by Romanists. Some, however, maintain that the confirmation of the pope is necessary to constitute infallibility; and others, that the decisions of councils are infallible, whether confirmed by the pope or not. We quote the sentiments of some who contend that the decrees of a general council, with the confirmation of the pope, are infallible. Ferraris says, "The definitions of a general council legitimately assembled, issued in the absence of the pope, are not infallible without his confirmation" (Ferraris, *Biblioth. Prompt. in Concilium*, art. i, sect. 66). Cardinal Cusanus, as quoted by the former writer, declares that "the pope gives authority to the council" (Cusanus, lib. iii, cap. xv, *De Concord Cathol.*). Dens teaches that "general councils, without the approbation of the pope, are fallible, and often err; that the confirmation of the pope to any particular decrees of a council impart to these decrees plenary authority; it is an article of faith that general councils approved by the pope cannot err in defining matters of faith and morals: hence they are to be considered as manifest heretics who presume to call in question what is decreed by such councils." He also believes that the decisions of particular councils, confirmed by the pope, are likewise infallible, and that this is founded on the infallibility of the pope. But Benedict XIV., to whom Dens refers, thinks that the decisions of such councils are binding only in their own provinces or dioceses. Many Romanist writers, however, maintain strongly that the decisions of general councils are infallible without the pope's confirmation. It would be an endless task to quote the authorities on both sides. They are, for the most part, however, agreed that what they call general councils are infallible: some believe them infallible because they are general councils, while others, believing the same, consider the confirmation of the pope as necessary to the authoritative character of the assembly.

"The discordant sentiments of Romanists respecting those characteristics which are necessary to constitute infallibility, form a strong argument against the inerrancy of councils. The four following opinions have been strongly held by the Church of Rome: (1.) Some have asserted that the diffusive, and not the representative body of the Church possessed infallibility. Occam, Petrus de Aliaco, Cusanus, Antoninus of Florence, Panormitan, Nicholas de Clemangis, Franciscus Mirandula, and others, were of this opinion. (2.) Some say that councils are no farther infallible than as they adhere to Scripture and universal tradition. (3.) Others, that councils are of themselves infallible, whether the pope confirm them or not. This was the common opinion before the Council of Lateran, under Leo X, as appears from the Councils of Basil and Constance. (4.) Many make the confirmation of the pope necessary to the infallibility of a general council. There is an irreconcilable difference between the last two opinions; for those who suppose councils to be infallible without the confirmation of the pope believe them to be above him, and that he is fallible; while those who are of opinion that the confirmation of his holiness is absolutely necessary to the infallibility of the council believe him to be infallible, and superior to a council."

See Elliott, *On Romanism*, book iii, chap. iii; and book i, chap. iv; Bull, *Reply to the Bishop of Meaux* (Works, vol. ii; Faber, *Difficulties of Romanism;* Ouseley, *On Papal Novelties;* Hook, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Cramp, *Textbook of Popery*, p. 66; Hare, *Contest with Rome*, p. 16, 210, 223; Kitto, *Journal of Sacred Literature*, Oct. 1854.

II. Infallibility of the Pope.—For many centuries the popes have demanded, and, so far as lay in them, enforced an absolute submission to all their doctrinal decisions. They forbade appeal from their tribunal to the General Council, and even disallowed the plea of the Jansenists, Hermesians, and other schools whose views were censured, that the popes censuring them had erred, not in what they stated to be the Catholic doctrine, but in understanding the right sense of the censured books. Thus the popes for many centuries have acted as though they were infallible; and yet it was distinctly taught within the Church that the infallibility of the pope was not a recognised doctrine, and even many catechisms and manuals of doctrine explicitly stated, with the consent of many bishops, that the infallibility of the pope was not a doctrine of the Church. One of the chief objects for which the Vatican Council was called in 1869 was to make an end of this uncertainty and enrol the doctrine of papal infallibility among the formal Church doctrines. As soon as

it became generally known that it was intended to bring this subject before the council, a number of works appeared, discussing the proposed innovation in every aspect. By far the most important of these is the one published in Germany under the title *Der Papst und das Concil* (Mentz, 1869; Engl. transl. *The Pope and the Council*), which gives an exhaustive history of the views of the Church concerning infallibility. The author of the work, who on the title-page calls himself Janus, was subsequently found to be professor Huber, of the University of Munich. The book is a storehouse of immense learning, for the author quotes thousands of individual cases to show that no one can for a moment believe in this doctrine without falsifying the whole history of the Church. "For thirteen centuries," says our author, "an incomprehensible silence on this fundamental article reigned throughout the whole Church and her literature. None of the ancient confessions of faith, no catechism, none of the patristic writings composed for the instruction of the people, contain a syllable about the pope, still less any hint that all certainty of faith and doctrine depends on him." Not a single question of doctrine for the first thousand years was finally decided by the popes; in none of the early controversies did they take any part at all; and their interposition, when they began to interpose, was often far from felicitous. Pope Zosimus commended the Pelagian teaching of Celestius, pope Julian affirmed the orthodoxy of the Sabellian Marcellus of Ancyra, pope Liberius subscribed an Arian creed, pope Vigilius contradicted himself three times running on a question of faith, pope Honorius lent the whole weight of his authority to the support of the newly-introduced Monothelite heresy, and was solemnly anathematized by three œcumenical councils for doing so. Nor do these "errors and contradictions of the popes" grow by any means fewer or less important as time goes on. The blundering of successive popes about the conditions of valid ordination—on which, according to Catholic theology, the whole sacramental system, and therefore the means of salvation, depend—are alone sufficient to dispose forever of their claim to infallibility. Neither, again, did the Roman pontiffs possess, in the ancient constitution of the Church, any of those powers which are now held to be inherent in their sovereign office, and which must undoubtedly be reckoned among the essential attributes of absolute sovereignty. They convoked none of the general councils, and only presided, by their legates, at three of them; nor were the canons enacted there held to require their confirmation. They had neither legislative, administrative, nor judicial power in the Church, nor was any further efficacy attributed to their excommunication than to that of any other bishop. No special prerogatives were held to have been bequeathed to them by St. Peter, and the only duty considered to devolve on them in virtue of their primacy was that of watching over the observance of the canons. The limited right of hearing appeals, granted to them by the Council of Sardica in 347, was avowedly an innovation, of purely ecclesiastical origin, and, moreover, was never admitted or exercised in Africa or the East. Many national churches, like the Armenian, the Syro-Persian, the Irish, and the ancient British, were independent of any influence of Rome. When first something like the papal system was put into words by an Eastern patriarch, St. Gregory, the greatest and best of all the early popes, repudiated the idea as a wicked blasphemy. Not one of the fathers explains the passages of the New Testament about St. Peter in the ultramontane sense; and the Tridentine profession of faith binds all the clergy to interpret Scripture in accordance with their unanimous consent. "To prove the doctrine of papal infallibility, nothing less is required than a complete falsification of Church history."

The following are interesting specimens of cases in which the popes expressly contradicted other popes, or the doctrine of the Church as it is now recognised:

"Innocent I and Gelasius I, the former writing to the Council of Milevis, the latter in his epistle to the bishops of Picenum, declared it to be so indispensable for infants to receive communion, that those who die without it go straight to hell (St. August. *Opp.* ii, 640; *Concil. Coll.* [ed. Labbé], iv, 1178). A thousand years later the Council of Trent anathematized this doctrine.

"It is the constant teaching of the Church that ordination received from a bishop, quite irrespectively of his personal worthiness or unworthiness, is valid and indelible. Putting aside baptism, the whole security of the sacraments rests on this principle of faith, and re-ordination has always been opposed in the Church as a crime and a profanation of the sacrament. Only in Rome, during the devastation which the endless wars of Goths and Lombards inflicted on Central Italy, there was a collapse of all learning and theology, which disturbed and distorted the dogmatic tradition. Since the 8th century, the ordinations of certain popes began to be annulled, and the bishops and priests ordained by them were compelled to be reordained. This occurred first in 769, when Constantine II, who had got possession of the papal chair by force of arms, and kept it for thirteen months, was blinded, and deposed at a synod, and all his ordinations pronounced invalid.

"But the strongest case occurred at the end of the 9th century, after the death of pope Formosus, when the repeated rejections of his ordinations threw the whole Italian Church into the greatest confusion, and produced a general uncertainty as to whether there were any valid sacraments in Italy. Auxilius, who was a contemporary, said that through this universal rejection and repetition of orders ('ordinatio, exordinatio, et superordinatio'), matters had come to such a pass in Rome that for twenty years the Christian religion had been interrupted and extinguished in Italy. Popes and synods decided in glaring contradiction to one another, now for, now against the validity of the ordinations, and it was self-evident that in Rome all sure knowledge on the doctrine of ordination was lost. At the end of his second work, Auxilius, speaking in the name of those numerous priests and bishops whose ecclesiastical status was called in question by the decisions of Stephen VII and Sergius III, demanded the strict investigation of a General Council, as the only authority capable of solving the complication introduced by the popes (Mabillon, *Analecta* [Paris, 1723], p. 39).

"But the council never met, and the dogmatic uncertainty and confusion in Rome continued. In the middle of the 11th century the great contest against simony, which was then thought equivalent to heresy, broke out, and the ordinations of a simoniacal bishop were pronounced invalid. Leo IX reordained a number of persons on this ground, as Peter Damiani relates (Petri Damaini *Opusc.* p. 419). Gregory VII, at his fifth Roman synod, made the invalidity of all simoniacal ordinations a rule, and the principle, confirmed by Urban II, that a simoniacal bishop can give nothing in ordination, because he has nothing, passed into the *Decretum* of Gratian (Caus. i, qu. 7, c. 24).

"In these cases it is obvious that doctrine and practice were most intimately connected. It was only from their holding a false, and, in its consequences, most injurious notion of the force and nature of this sacrament, that the popes acted as they did, and if they had then been generally considered infallible, a hopeless confusion must have been introduced, not only into Italy, but the whole Church.

"In contrast to pope Pelagius, who had declared, with the whole Eastern and Western Church, the indispensable necessity of the invocation of the Trinity in baptism, Nicolas I assured the Bulgarians that baptism in the name of Christ alone was quite sufficient, and thus exposed the Christians there to the danger of an invalid baptism. The same pope declared confirmation administered by priests, according to the Greek usage from remote antiquity, invalid, and ordered those so confirmed to be confirmed anew by a bishop, thereby denying

to the whole Eastern Church the possession of a sacrament, and laying the foundation of the bitter estrangement which led to a permanent division (*Concil. Coll.* [ed. Labbé], vi, 548).

"Stephen II (III) allowed marriage with a slave girl to be dissolved, and a new one contracted, whereas all previous popes had pronounced such marriages indissoluble (*ib.* vi, 1650). He also declared baptism, in cases of necessity, valid when administered with wine (*ib.* vi, 1652).

"Celestine III tried to loosen the marriage tie by declaring it dissolved if either party became heretical. Innocent III annulled this decision, and Hadrian VI called Celestine a heretic for giving it. This decision was afterwards expunged from the MS. collections of papal decrees, but the Spanish theologian Alphonsus de Castro had seen it there (*Adv. Hor.* [ed. Paris], 1565; comp. Melch. Canus, p. 240).

"The Capernaite doctrine, that Christ's body is sensibly (*sensualiter*) touched by the hands and broken by the teeth in the Eucharist—an error rejected by the whole Church, and contradicting the impassibility of his body—was affirmed by Nicolas II at the Synod of Rome in 1059, and Berengar was compelled to acknowledge it. Lanfranc reproaches Berengar with afterwards wishing to make cardinal Humbert, instead of the pope, responsible for this doctrine (Lanfranc, *De Euch.* c. 3 [ed. Migne], p. 412).

"Innocent III, in order to exhibit the papal power in the fullest splendor of its divine omnipotence, invented the new doctrine that the spiritual bond which unites a bishop to his diocese is firmer and more indissoluble than the 'carnal' bond, as he called it, between man and wife, and that God alone can loose it, viz. translate a bishop from one see to another. But as the pope is the representative of the true God on earth, he, and he alone, can dissolve this holy and indissoluble bond, not by human, but divine authority, and it is God, not man, who looses it. (Decretal '*De Transl. Episc.*' c. 2, 3, 4. This was to introduce a new article of faith. The Church had not known for centuries that resignations, depositions, and translations of bishops belonged by divine right to the pope.) The obvious and direct corollary, that the pope can also dissolve the less firm and holy bond of marriage, Innocent, as we have seen, overlooked, for he solemnly condemned Celestine III's decision on that point, and thus he unwittingly involved himself in a contradiction. Many canonists have accepted this as the legitimate consequence of his teaching.

"Innocent betrayed his utter ignorance of theology when he declared that the Fifth Book of Moses, being called Deuteronomy, or the Second Book of the Law, must bind the Christian Church, which is the second Church (Decretal '*Qui filii sint legitimi*,' c. 13). This great pope seems never to have read Deuteronomy, or he could hardly have fallen into the blunder of supposing, e. g., that the Old-Testament prohibitions of particular kinds of food, the burnt-offerings, the harsh penal code and bloody laws of war, the prohibitions of woollen and linen garments, etc., were to be again made obligatory on Christians. As the Jews were allowed in Deuteronomy to put away a wife who displeased them and take another, Innocent ran the risk of falling himself into a greater error about marriage than Celestine III.

Notable contradictions as to temporal privileges occur in the history of the alternate approbations and persecutions of the Franciscan order by the popes.

"One of the most comprehensive, dogmatic documents ever issued by a pope is the decree of Eugenius IV 'to the Armenians,' dated November 22, 1439, three months after the Council of Florence was brought to an end by the departure of the Greeks. It is a confession of faith of the Roman Church, intended to serve as a rule of doctrine and practice for the Armenians on those points they had previously differed about. The dogmas of the Unity of the Divine Nature, the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Seven Sacraments, are expounded, and the pope, moreover, asserts that the decree thus solemnly issued has received the sanction of the council, that is, of the Italian bishops whom he had detained in Florence.

"If this decree of the pope were really a rule of faith, the Eastern Church would have only four sacraments instead of seven; the Western Church would for at least eight centuries have been deprived of three sacraments, and of one, the want of which would make all the rest, with one exception, invalid. Eugenius IV determines in this decree the form and matter, the substance of the sacraments, or of those things on the presence or absence of which the existence of the sacrament itself depends, according to the universal doctrine of the Church. He gives a form of confirmation which never existed in one half of the Church, and first came into use in the other after the 10th century. So, again, with penance. What is given as the essential form of the sacrament was unknown in the Western Church for eleven hundred years, and never known in the Greek. And when the touching of the sacred vessels, and the words accompanying the rite, are given as the form and matter of ordination, it follows that the Latin Church for a thousand years had neither priests nor bishops—nay, like the Greek Church, which never adopted this usage, possesses to this hour neither priests nor bishops, and consequently no sacraments except baptism, and perhaps marriage. (Comp. Denzinger, *Enchirid. Symbol. et Definit.*, Wirceb. 1854, p. 200 sq. But Denzinger, in order to conceal the purely dogmatic character of this famous decree, *has omitted the first part, on the Trinity and Incarnation*, which is given in Raynaldus's *Annals*, 1439. [The same conspicuously untenable explanation was adopted in the *Dublin Review* for January, 1866.—Tr.])

"It is noteworthy that this decree—with which papal infallibility or the whole hierarchy and the sacraments of the Church stand or fall—is cited, refuted, and appealed to by all dogmatic writers, but that the adherents of papal infallibility have never meddled with it. Neither Bellarmine, nor Charlas, nor Aguirre, nor Orsi, nor the other apologists of the Roman court, troubled themselves with it."

Into dogmatic theology the doctrine of papal infallibility was introduced by Thomas Aquinas. On the basis of fabrications invented by a Dominican monk, including a canon of the Council of Chalcedon, giving all bishops an unlimited right of appeal to the pope, and on the forgeries found in Gratian, Thomas built up his papal system, with its two leading principles, that the pope is the first infallible teacher of the world, and the absolute ruler of the Church. The popes were so well pleased with the teachings of Thomas that John XXII affirmed Thomas had not written without a special inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and Innocent VI said that whoever assailed his teaching incurred suspicion of heresy. The powerful mendicant orders of Dominicans and Franciscans found the papal system, with its theory of infallibility, indispensable for the success of their own claims against the bishops and universities, and they became the violent champions of the new doctrine. The boldest champions of papal absolutism admitted, however, that the popes could err, and that their decisions were no certain criterion. But they also held that in such cases a heretical pope *ipso facto* ceased to be pope, without or before any judicial sentence, so that councils, which are the Church's judicature, only attested the vacancy of the papal throne as an accomplished fact. The contest between the Council of Basel and pope Eugenius IV evoked the work of cardinal Torquemada, whose argument, which was held, up to the time of Bellarmine, to be the most conclusive apology of the papal system, rests entirely on fabrications later than the pseudo-Isidore, and chiefly on the spurious passages of St. Cyril. Torquemada also holds that a pope can lapse into heresy and propound false doctrine, but then he is *ipso facto* deposed by God himself before any sentence of the Church has been passed, so that the Church or

council cannot judge him, but can only announce the judgment of God, and thus one cannot properly say that a pope can become heretical, since he ceases to be pope at the moment of passing from orthodoxy to heterodoxy. The doctrine entered on a fresh phase of development from the time of Leo X. Its foremost defender at that time was Thomas of Vic or Cajetan, yet the doctrine was so far from becoming dominant at Rome that the successor of Leo X, Adrian VI, who, as professor of Louvain, had maintained in his principal work that several popes had been heretical, and that it was certainly possible for a pope to establish a heresy by his decision or decretals, caused, as pope, his work denying infallibility to be reprinted in Rome.

Another patron of the infallibility theory, who labored hard to naturalize it in Belgium, the Louvain theologian, Ruard Tapper, returned in 1552 from Trent cruelly disillusionized, and thought the deep-seated corruption of the Church a matter not to be disputed, but to be deplored. The third of the theological fathers of papal infallibility in the 16th century was Tapper's contemporary, the Spaniard Melchior Canus, whose work on theological principles and evidences was, up to Bellarmine's time, the great authority used by all infallibilists. Like Tapper, he became in later years disgusted with the effect of the papal system on the popes and the *Curia*, and in a report to the king of Spain expressed the opinion that the whole administration of the Church at Rome was "converted into a great trading business, a traffic forbidden by all laws, human, natural, and divine." Out of Italy the hypothesis of infallibility had but few adherents, even in the 16th century, till the Jesuits began to exercise a powerful influence.

The bishops and prominent scholars of France, Spain, Germany, and other countries were almost unanimous in advocating the superiority of œcumenical councils over the pope. The turning of the tide was chiefly due to the influence of the Jesuits, who were naturally inclined to favor the extremest absolutism in the Church. As their representative, cardinal Bellamrine further developed the ideas of Cajetan, in which he generally concurs; but he rejects decisively Cajetan's hypothesis of a heretical pope being deposed *ipso facto* by the judgment of God. A heretical pope is legitimate so long as the Church has not deposed him. If Cajetan said the Church was the handmaid of the pope, Bellarmine adds that whatever doctrine it pleases the pope to prescribe the Church must receive; there can be no question raised about proving it; she must blindly renounce all judgment of her own, and firmly believe that all the pope teaches is absolutely true, all he commands absolutely good, and all he forbids simply evil and noxious. For the pope can as little err in moral as in dogmatic questions. Nay, he goes so far as to maintain that if the pope were to err by prescribing sins and forbidding virtues, the Church would be bound to consider sins good and virtues evil, unless she chose to sin against conscience; so that if the pope absolve the subjects of a prince from their oath of allegiance, which, according to Bellarmine, he has a full right to do, the Church must believe that what he has done is good, and every Christian must hold it a sin to remain any longer loyal and obedient to his sovereign. Through the influence of Bellarmine and other writers of his order, the infallibility hypothesis now made immense strides. One great stumbling-block had, however, to be removed. Every theologian, on closer inspection, found papal decisions which contradicted other doctrines, laid down by popes or generally received in the Church, or which appeared to him doubtful, and it seemed impossible to declare all these products of an infallible authority. It became necessary, therefore, to specify some distinctive marks by which a really infallible decision of a pope might be recognised, or to fix certain conditions, in the absence of which the pronouncement is not to be regarded as infallible. And thus, since the 16th century, there grew up the famous distinction of papal decisions promulgated *ex cathedra*, and therefore dogmatically, and without any possibility of error. By means of this ingenious distinction, some of the most inconvenient decisions of popes, which it was desirable to except from the privilege of infallibility generally asserted in other cases, could be explained away. Thus pope Honorius, in the dogmatic letter which was condemned as heretical by the sixth œcumenical council, and the decision addressed by Nicolas I to the Bulgarian Church that baptism administered simply in the name of Jesus is valid, were declared to be judgments given by the popes as private persons. A number of other limitations were proposed by the theologians advocating infallibility, but only two were commonly received, viz. Bellarmine's, that the papal decree must be addressed to the whole Church; and Cellot's, that he must anathematize all who dissent from his teaching. According to this doctrine, which is taught by the most prominent dogmatic writer of the order in the present century, Perrone (*Prælect. Theolog.* viii, 497, Louvain, 1843), and received by pretty nearly the whole order, the pope is liable to err when he addresses an instruction to the French or German Church only; and, moreover, his infallibility becomes very questionable whenever he omits to denounce an anathema on all dissentients. Since the time of Bellarmine, the infallibility hypothesis has been one of the chief distinctions of the Jesuits and the most radical portion of the Ultramontane party on the one hand, and all other schools within the Catholic Church on the other. A number of synods, bishops, and prominent theologians, and in some instances the whole Catholic Church of several countries, put themselves on record against the doctrine, for which, on the other hand, the Jesuits and other Ultramontane writers incessantly strove to gain friends among bishops, clergy, and laity, and, in particular, among the sovereigns.

When pope Pius IX intimated his intention to convoke a council for the definition of the doctrine, a number of bishops, especially in France and Germany, declared themselves to be decidedly opposed to the doctrine, and at least one of them, the French bishop Maret (bishop of Sura *in partibus infid.*, and dean of the theological faculty of Paris), published an elaborate work (*On the General Council and the public Peace*) to refute it, and to prove that it would subvert the very foundation of the Church. The substance of his argument against papal infallibility is as follows: According to the holy Scriptures the Church is a limited monarchy, which stands under the common rule of the pope and the bishops. The history of the councils is at least as much in favor of the divine right of the bishops as of the supremacy of the holy chair. Freedom of discussion, vote by majority, a juridical examination of the apostolic decrees, and in certain cases a right to condemn the doctrines and the person of the pope—these are rights which prove beyond all doubt the participation of the bishops in the sovereign powers of the holy father. But these rights do not extend far enough to give the episcopal body a supremacy over the pope, and the latter therefore exercises, in general, all the privileges of supremacy. He summons the council, presides over it, dissolves it, and sanctions its decrees. In a word, he always remains the head of the Church. If, however, the changes desired by a certain school are made, the Church will cease to be a limited, and become an absolute monarchy. This would be a complete revolution; but what is truly divine is unchangeable, and, consequently, if the constitution of the Church is changed, it ceases to be divine. Pius IX, in his bull *Ineffabilis Deus*, has himself said of doctrine, *Crescat in eodem sensu, in eadem sententia;* but the new dogma would lead to a development of doctrine *in alio sensu, in alia sententia*. It would therefore amount to a denial of the divinity of the Church. "If it were realized," exclaims the bishop, "what a triumph would it be to the enemies of the Church! They would call the assev-

erations of centuries, and history itself, as witnesses against Catholicism: she would be crushed by the weight of opposing testimony; the holy Scriptures, the fathers, and the councils would rise in judgment against her. They would bury us in our shame, and from the desert atheism would rise more powerful and threatening than ever" (ii, 378).

When the council met (Dec. 8, 1869) it was soon found that there were, with regard to this question, three parties among the bishops: one, which regarded the promulgation of this new doctrine as the best and most urgent work the council should attend to; the second, which petitioned the pope against this doctrine, which they believed would be at least a great stumbling-block for all non-Catholics, and even for a great many members of the Catholic Church; the third, which was in favor of a compromise, would have some regard for the arguments adduced by the second class, and therefore, instead of promulgating in unmistakable and bold clearness the doctrine of papal infallibility, would attain the same end in a less offensive way, by inculcating the duty of an absolute submission to every decision of the pope in matters of faith. The majority of the bishops signed a petition for the promulgation of infallibility, which had been drawn up by the German bishop of Paderborn, and received 410 signatures. The counter address (or, rather, counter addresses) against the infallibility was signed by 162 bishops, among whom were 20 Americans, 46 Frenchmen, 37 Germans and Austrians, 19 Orientals, 2 Portuguese, 14 Hungarians, 3 Englishmen, and 15 Italians. The address of the middle party, which desired to effect a compromise, was drawn up by the archbishop of Baltimore. The address against the proclamation of the doctrine of infallibility, drawn up by the cardinal archbishop Rauscher, of Vienna, is couched in the most submissive expressions, assures the holy father of the devotedness of all the bishops to the apostolical see, and continues: "It would not be right to ignore that many difficulties, arising from expressions or actions of the Church fathers from the documents of history, and even from the Catholic doctrine, remain, which must be thoroughly explained before it would be admissible to lay this doctrine before the Christian people as one revealed by God. But our minds revolt against a controversial discussion of this question, and confidently implore thy kindness not to lay upon us the duty of such a transaction. As we, moreover, exercise the episcopal functions among great Catholic nations, we know their condition from daily intercourse; hence we are satisfied that the asked-for doctrinal decision will offer weapons to the enemies of religion, in order to excite aversion to the Catholic religion, even of men of good character, and we are certain that this decision would offer, at least in Europe, an opportunity or a pretext to the governments of our countries to make encroachments upon the rights which have remained to the Church. We have concluded to lay this before thy holiness, with the sincerity which we owe to the father of the faithful, and we ask thee that the doctrinal opinion, the sanction of which is demanded by the address, be not submitted to the council for consideration." Among the signers are, besides the cardinal archbishop of Vienna, nearly all the archbishops of Germany aud Austria; in particular, the cardinal archbishop of Prague, the archbishops of Cologne, Munich, Bamberg, and others. The bishops who signed this remonstrance against the promulgation of papal infallibility as a doctrine confined themselves to urging the inopportuneness. Only a few plainly expressed themselves against the dogma itself. But what the bishops failed to do, the catholic scholars, especially those of Germany, did so emphatically that their protests against the ultra papal theories, and against the whole spirit prevailing in Rome, made a profound sensation throughout the Christian world.

One of the most learned Church historians of the Roman Catholic Church, professor Döllinger, of the University of Munich, in a letter addressed to the *Augsburger Zeitung*, and since published as a pamphlet in an enlarged form (*Erwägungen für die Bischöfe des Concils*, Ratisbon, 1869), subjected the address of the bishops who asked for the promulgation of infallibility to the most crushing criticism. Dr. Döllinger says of this petition of the champions of papal infallibility that henceforth "one hundred and eighty millions of human beings are to be forced, on pain of excommunication, refusal of the sacraments, and everlasting damnation, to believe and to profess that which hitherto the Church has *not* believed, *not* taught." The proclamation of this dogma, he says, would be an "alteration in the faith and doctrine of the Church such as *has never been heard of since Christianity was first founded*." The whole foundation of the Church would thereby be affected. Dr. Döllinger shows conclusively that until the 16th century the doctrine of papal infallibility was entirely unknown, and that, when it was taken up by cardinal Bellarmine, it could only be supported by the testimony of Isidorian decretals, which are *forged*, and those of Cyril, which are a *fiction*.

The views of Döllinger and Gratry received the emphatic assent of the large majority of the Catholic scholars of Germany and France. The governments of France, Austria, Portugal, Spain, Bavaria, and other Catholic countries instructed their ministers in Rome to enter an earnest protest against a doctrine which would compel all members of the Roman Catholic Church to believe in the right of the pope to choose kings and release their subjects from the oath of allegiance. Even some of the members of the council, in particular the cardinal archbishop Rauscher of Vienna, and bishop Hefele of Rottenburg, who was regarded as the most learned bishop of the council, published pamphlets against the dogmatization of infallibility while it was discussed by the council. But all this opposition failed to make the least impression upon the majority of the bishops. From the opening of the council, the infallibilists showed themselves so uncompromising that they refused to give to the minority even one single representative in the important commission on dogmatical questions, which, on the other hand, embraced the name of every bishop who, by writings, influence, or otherwise, had gained a prominent position as a defender of infallibility: in particular, archbishop Manning, of Westminster; archbishop Dechamps, of Malines; archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore; bishop Martin, of Paderborn; bishop Pie, of Poitiers; the Armenian patriarch Hassun, of Constantinople. The discussion of the question commenced on the 13th of May. The *schema* was comprised in a preamble and four chapters, and was known to form the first part of the dogmatic constitution *De Ecclesia Christi*. The debate is known to have been long and animated, many bishops entering a very earnest protest against the promulgation of such an innovation. Bishop Strossmayer, of Bosnia and Sirmium, in Croatia; bishop Dupanloup, of Orleans, in France; archbishop Darboy, of Paris; bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg, in Würtemberg; cardinal archbishop Rauscher, of Vienna; cardinal archbishop prince Schwarzenberg, of Prague, are mentioned as those bishops who spoke with the greatest effect against the proposed doctrine. The regulations of the council made it lawful for ten prelates to petition for the closing of a discussion; the proposal being then put to the vote of all the fathers, and the majority deciding. When fifty-five speeches had been made on the schema in general, one hundred and fifty bishops sent a petition for closing the general discussion, which was accordingly done, to the great dissatisfaction of the opponents of infallibility, a number of whom addressed to the pope a protest against the closing of the general discussion, as it had deprived the council of the opportunity to hear all the arguments against the new doctrine. The discussion of the schema as regards the whole and the several parts having been completed, a vote was taken according to the regulations in a general

congregation on the 13th of July, on the whole *schema* by name, with *placet*, or *placet juxta modum*, or *non-placet*. The result was as follows: 451 *placets*, 62 *placets juxta modum*, and 88 *non-placets*. Some of the placets juxta modum recommended the insertion of words that would make the decree clearer and stronger. The schema was accordingly altered, and the amendments were retained in the general congregation, held Saturday, July 16. The final step was then taken, in the fourth public session of the council, on the 18th of July. The roll of the members was again called, when 534 answered *placet*, 2 replied *non-placet*, and 106 were absent, some because sick, the far greater number not willing to vote favorably. As soon as the result was made known officially to Pius IX, he announced the fact of all with the exception of two having given a favorable vote, "Wherefore," he continued, "by virtue of our apostolic authority, with the approval of the sacred council, we define, confirm, and approve the decree and canons just read." The following is a faithful translation of chapter iv of the schema, which treats of papal infallibility:

Of the infallible Authority of the Roman Pontiff in Teaching.—This holy see hath ever held—the unbroken custom of the Church doth prove—and the œcumenical councils, those especially in which the East joined with the West in union of faith and of charity, have declared, that in this apostolic primacy, which the Roman pontiff holds over the universal Church as successor of Peter, the prince of the apostles, there is also contained the supreme power of authoritative teaching. Thus the fathers of the fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, put forth this solemn profession:

"The first law of salvation is to keep the rule of true faith. And whereas the words of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church (Matt. xvi, 18), these words, which he spake, are proved true by facts; for in the apostolic see the Catholic religion has ever been preserved unspotted, and the holy doctrine has been announced. Therefore, wishing never to be separated from the faith and teaching of this see, we hope to be worthy to abide in that one communion which the apostolic see preaches, in which is the full and true firmness of the Christian religion." [Formula of St. Hormisdas, pope, as proposed by Hadrian II to the fathers of the eighth General Council (Constantinople, IV), and subscribed by them.]

So, too, the Greeks, with the approval of the second Council of Lyons, professed that the holy Roman Church holds over the universal Catholic Church a supreme and full primacy and headship, which she truthfully and humbly acknowledges that she received, with fulness of power, from the Lord himself in blessed Peter, the prince or head of the apostles, of whom the Roman pontiff is the successor; and as she, beyond the others, is bound to defend the truth of the faith, so, if any questions arise concerning faith, they should be decided by her judgment. And, finally, the Council of Florence defined that the Roman pontiff is the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians, and that to him, in the blessed Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ full power of feeding, and ruling, and governing the universal Church (John xxi, 15–17).

In order to fulfil this pastoral charge, our predecessors have ever labored unweariedly to spread the saving doctrine of Christ among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care have watched to preserve it pure and unchanged where it had been received. Wherefore the bishops of the whole world, sometimes singly, sometimes assembled in synods, following the long-established custom of the churches (St. Cyril, Alexand., and St. Cœlest. Pap.), and the form of ancient rule (St. Innocent I to Councils of Carthage and Milevi), referred to this apostolic see those dangers especially which arose in matters of faith, in order that injuries to faith might best be healed there where the faith could never fail (St. Bernard, *epistle* 190). And the Roman pontiffs, weighing the condition of times and circumstances, sometimes calling together general councils, or asking the judgment of the Church scattered through the world, sometimes consulting particular synods, sometimes using such other aids as divine Providence supplied, defined that those doctrines should be held which, by the aid of God, they knew to be conformable to the holy Scriptures and the apostolic traditions. For the Holy Ghost is not promised to the successors of Peter, that they may make known new doctrine revealed by him, but that, through his assistance, they may sacredly guard and faithfully set forth the revelation delivered by the apostles, that is, the deposit of faith. And this their apostolic teaching all the venerable fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox doctors have revered and followed, knowing most certainly that this see of St. Peter ever remains free from all error, according to the divine promise of our Lord and Saviour made to the prince of the apostles: I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren. (Conf. St. Agatho, *Ep. ad Imp. a Conc. Œcum. VI approb.*)

Therefore this gift of truth, and of faith which fails not, was divinely bestowed on Peter and his successors in this chair, that they should exercise their high office for the salvation of all, that through them the universal flock of Christ should be turned away from the poisonous food of error and should be nourished with the food of heavenly doctrine, and that, the occasion of schism being removed, the entire Church should be preserved one, and, planted on her foundation, should stand firm against the gates of hell.

Nevertheless, since in this present age, when the saving efficacy of the apostolic office is exceedingly needed, there are not a few who carp at its authority, we judge it altogether necessary to solemnly declare the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God has designed to unite to the supreme pastoral office.

Wherefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition handed down from the commencement of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian peoples, with the approbation of the sacred council, we teach and define it to be a doctrine divinely revealed, that, when the Roman pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in the exercise of his office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, and in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines that a doctrine of faith or morals is to be held by the universal Church, he possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed, in defining a doctrine of faith and morals; and therefore that such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not by force of the consent of the Church thereto.

And if any one shall presume, which God forbid, to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema.

Given in Rome, in the public session, solemnly celebrated in the Vatican Basilica, in the year of the incarnation of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our pontificate. Ita est.

JOSEPH, BISHOP OF ST. POLTEN,
Secretary of the Council of the Vatican.

The expectation that some of the bishops who opposed infallibility at the council would persist in their opposition, and decline to promulgate the new doctrine in their dioceses, was not fulfilled. The bishops not only submitted themselves, but forced also their dioceses to submit. In Germany a number of the most prominent theological scholars were removed from their chairs, and suspended from their priestly functions, for refusing to comply with the demands of Rome. Thus the creed of the Roman Catholic Church received a new doctrine which, in the opinion of many theologians who up to that time had been regarded throughout the Church as her ablest scholars, radically changes the character of the Church.

According to the opinion of Dr. Döllinger, more has been written on this subject during the last one hundred and thirty years than on any other point of Church history during fifteen hundred years. The most important work on the subject, thatof Janus (*The Pope and the Council*), as well as the works of Maret, Döllinger, Maistre, and several works of former centuries, have already been noticed. Other important works treating on the subject are Ballerini, *De Vi ac Ratione Primatus;* Schrader (Jesuit), *De Unitate Romana* (vol. i, Freiburg, 1862; vol. ii, Vienna, 1866); Philipp, *Kirchenrecht* (vol. v); Rudis, *Petra Romana* (Mentz, 1869); Deschamps (archbishop of Malines), *L'Infallibilité du Pape* (Malines, 1869); Gratry, *Lettres sur l'Infallibilité du Pape* (Paris, 1869, 1870); Weninger (Jesuit), *The Infallibility of the Pope* (Cincinnati, 1869); Hergenröther, *Anti-Janus* (Wurzburg, 1870); Frohshammer, *Zur Würdigung der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes und d. Kirche* (Munich, 1869); Bickell, *Gründe für die Unfehlbarkeit des Kirchenoberhauptes* (Münster, 1870); Rauscher (cardinal archbishop of Vienna), *Observationes quædam de infallibilitatis ecclesiæ subjecto* (Naples, 1870, against the dogmatization of infallibility); Kleutgen (Jesuit), *De Romani Pontificis Suprema potestate docendi* (Naples, 1870); Schmitz, *Ist der Papst persönlich unfehlbar?* (Munich, 1870). The fullest account of the proceedings of the council relative to the dogmatization of infallibility is given in Quirinus, *Römische Briefe vom Concil* (Munich, 1870). (A. J. S.)

Infant Baptism. See BAPTISM; PÆDOBAPTISM.

Infant Communion. Notwithstanding the apostle's direction, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup" (1 Cor. xi, 28), which so clearly points to a mature age when man is capable of self-examination as a requisite in those who approach the Lord's table, we find infants admitted to holy communion as early as in the 3d century. The first instances of it occurred in the North-African Church. Cyprian, in his *Tractatus de lapsis* (p. 139, ed. Gersdorf), speaks of children who at their entrance into the world partook of the body and blood of the Lord (*cibum et poculum dominicum*); he further gives the example of a girl (*puella*) whom a deacon had obliged to partake of the cup, but who could not retain what she had taken because she had previously, by her nurse's fault, partaken of bread dipped into wine, and had made an offering to idols. This practice of infant communion was undoubtedly connected with infant baptism, and, as a reason for it, Augustine lays down the principle that, unless we partake of the Supper of the Lord, to which no one can be regularly admitted who is not baptized, we can have no life in us (John vi, 53); and this, he maintains, applies as well to children as to men (*Epist.* 23, *ad Bonif.; Ep.* 106, *contra duas epistolas Pelag.* i, 22; *Sermo viii, de verbis apostol. de peccat. merit.* i, 20). The same reasons are given by his contemporary, Innocent I, bishop of Rome (416), in his letter to Augustine and to the Council of Milevi: *Aug. ep.* 93, "Parvulos æternæ vitæ præmiis etiam sine baptismatis gratia donari posse perfatum est; nisi enim manducaverint carnem Christi et biberint sanguinem ejus, non habebunt vitam in se ipsis." From a similar point of view, Gelasius I, pope of Rome, writes about A.D. 495, "No one should venture to *exclude* any child from this sacrament, without which no one can attain to eternal life." But as early as the 9th century, Fulgentius, the Augustine of that century, advocated the rite of baptism, only suggesting that by it "children were incorporated into Christ, and so partook of his flesh and blood." The custom continued, however, in the Western Church, to the time of Charlemagne. In the *Sacramentarium* of Gregory I, and in the old *Ordo Romanus*, we find passages in which it is expressly stated. Thus the latter recommends that after baptism children should not be permitted to taste food before partaking of the Eucharist, and should not even be nursed except in case of absolute necessity. We find the same in Alcuin's *De Afflic.*, where it is expressly directed that, whenever a bishop is present, baptism should be immediately followed by confirmation, and then by communion. In the synodal decrees of Walter of Orleans, in the same century, we find that priests are always to have the Eucharist ready, so that if a child should be taken ill it should not be in danger of dying without the *viaticum*. In the 9th century this question of infant communion gave rise to controversies. Thus Paschasius Ratbertus maintained that children dying before communion were not therefore in danger, since by baptism they had already entered into communion with Christ. Still, in the 12th century, we find Radulphus Ardens saying (*Hom. in die Paschœ de Euchar. necess.*) that it is prescribed (*statutum*) that children should receive communion, at least with the cup, soon after being baptized, so that "they might not be in danger of dying without that necessary sacrament." Hugo of St. Victor also recommends infant communion, where it can take place without danger, but remarks that this custom had already fallen into disuse in his time, the practice only remaining for the priest to give the newly-baptized child a little ordinary wine, instead of the blood of Christ, which practice he condemns. Soon after this, Odo, bishop of Paris, forbade giving children unconsecrated wafers, and thus the custom was lost in the Gallican Church. In Germany traces are to be found of it at a still later period; the thing ended in a mere senseless superstition. The Council of Trent condemns the principle of the necessity of infant communion, saying that the practice arose in the circumstances of the early ages, and that the fathers had sufficient grounds for introducing it in their days, without its being made a necessity of salvation; wherefore the usage could lawfully be altered and dropped (Sess. xxi).

In the Greek Church we find passages of some theologians, which in their exposition of the doctrine of baptism would seem to imply that they rejected this necessity of infant communion based on John vi, 53; for they designate the former sacrament as a purification through the blood of Christ, a partaking of the Lamb of God, etc. Yet infant communion was one of the early practices in that church, as is evident from the fact that in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii, 12) mothers are recommended to bring their children with them to communion, and children are counted among those who partake of the Lord's Supper (viii, 13). (Comp. Stanley, *Hist. of the Eastern Church*, p. 118, 119.) This custom is also defended by Pseudo-Dionysius (*Hier. Eccl.* vii, 11) against the profane, who considered it ridiculous. The Greek Church still upholds infant communion. According to Metophanes Kritopulos (*Conf. Eccl. Gr.* c. 9), children (βρέφη), after they are baptized, should commune whenever their parents do.

The Roman Church and all Protestant churches now agree in rejecting infant communion. Nevertheless, there have been a few advocates of the practice even among Protestants in modern times. Among the most prominent of them is Pierce (*Essay on the Eucharist*, London, 1804), who argues for the practice (1) on the ground of primitive usage; (2) from Scripture. The latter argument is "that Christians succeeding to the Jews as God's people, and being grafted upon that stock, their infants have a right to all the privileges of which they are capable, till forfeited by some immoralities; and, consequently, have a right to partake of this ordinance, as the Jewish children had to eat of the passover and other sacrifices; besides this, he pleads those texts which speak of the Lord's Supper as received by all Christians. The most obvious answer to all this is that which is taken from the incapacity of infants to examine themselves, and discern the Lord's body; but he answers that this precept is only given to persons capable of understanding and complying with it, as those which require faith in order to baptism are interpreted by the Pædobaptists. As for his argument from the Jewish children eating the sacrifice, it is to be considered that this was not required as circumcision was; the males were not necessarily brought to the Temple till they were twelve years old (Luke ii, 42); and the sacrifices they ate of were chiefly *peace-offerings*, which became the common food to all that were clean in the family, and were not looked upon as acts of devotion to such a degree as our Eucharist is; though, indeed, they were a token of their acknowledging the divinity of that God to whom they had been offered (1 Cor. x, 18); and even the Passover was a commemoration of a temporal deliverance; nor is there any reason to believe that its reference to the Messiah was generally understood by the Jews. On the whole, it is certain there would be more danger of a contempt arising to the Lord's Supper from the admission of infants, and of confusion and trouble to other communicants; so that, not being *required* in Scripture, it is much the best to omit it. When children are grown up to a capacity of behaving decently, they may soon be instructed in the nature and design of the ordinance; and if they appear to understand it, and give proof of love to Christ, it would be advisable to admit them to communion, though very young; which, by the way, might be a good security against many of the snares to which youth are exposed." See Augusti, *Handbuch d. christl. Archäol.* ii, 639 sq.; Böhmer, *Die christlich-kirchliche Alterthumswissenschaft*, ii, 365 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 549 sq.; Zorn, *Historia Eucharistiæ Infantium* (Berlin, 1736, 8vo); Knapp, *Theology*, § 144; Doddridge, *Lectures on Divinity*, lect. ccvii; Neander, *Church History*, i, 311,

315; ii, 319; iii, 496; Smith, *Account of the Gr. Church*, p. 161; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xv, ch. iii, § 7; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. xxi, § 8; Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, p. 242; Gieseler, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 542.

Infanticide is the term for the act or practice of murdering infants, which was very general among the ancients, and which still prevails among rude nations. The Greeks and Romans, with all their high notions of civilization, were guilty of favoring this horrible practice by legislative enactments, and Plato and Aristotle are found among its supporters. Thus, at Sparta, the law required that a child, immediately after birth, was to be exhibited to the authorities for inspection, and if its look was not wholesome, or its limbs crippled, "it was thrown into a deep cavern at the foot of the mountain Taygetus; and it was said that this law had a wholesome effect, for it made women with child very careful as to their eating, drinking, and exercise, and hence they proved excellent nurses. In the other Grecian republics a similar disregard of the life of sickly infants was shown." Among the Romans it seems to have been the duty of the father to decide the fate of his new-born babe. Among the Norse a somewhat similar rule determined the life of the infant. If weak, or of the weaker sex, the father not unfrequently "disapproved of its living, and it was exposed to die by wild beasts or the weather." Among the barbaric tribes, child-murder prevails most extensively. Thus it is general throughout the whole of the South-Sea Islands, and is even a regular system among the Fijians (q. v.). In Vanu Levu, we are informed by a recent authority, "the extent of infanticide reaches nearer two thirds than one half of all the children born." Among the people of India, especially the Hindus, as well as the Brahmans, this evil prevailed to a very great extent, due no doubt, in a great measure, to the national prejudice of remarriage of a widow (compare Max Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, ii, 312). But, since the rule of the English, laws have been enacted likely to modify the practice, if not to check it altogether. "The Rajputs, it is said, destroy all the female children but the first-born—a peculiar custom, due to its being a point of honor with a Rajput to nearly ruin himself in the marriage feast and portion of his daughter, so that he could not afford to have more than one. The Mohammedans were inclined to the same practice, but effected their object by means of abortion. In New Holland the native women think nothing of destroying by compression the infant in the womb, to avoid the trouble of rearing it alive. In China infanticide is supposed to be common, the chief cause being said to be the right of periodically repudiating their wives which is possessed by Chinamen. Some statistics, recently published in the *Esperance* of Nancy, indicate the fearful extent to which life is lost through this practice prevailing in so vast a population as that of China." Newcomb (*Cyclop. of Missions*, p. 487) says, "It is computed from authentic data that not less than 9000 children are exposed in the streets of Peking every year, and as many more in the provinces, and that it is a part of the duty of the police to carry away in carts, every morning, those that have been exposed at night, *some of whom are yet alive; but they are all carried to a pit without the walls, and buried promiscuously*." In Japan, poverty of the parent is deemed an admissible excuse for the destruction of an infant's life, and in Greenland the infant is buried with the mother, if she dies in or shortly after childbirth. The South American women commit the same atrocity as the poor parents of Japan. In Africa the Bushmen follow the practices that we detailed as prevalent among the ancient Greeks and Romans; and so frequent has been the practice of feeding lions with infants' flesh, that "it has greatly increased the desire of the lion for human flesh." "In Madagascar the fate of the infant depends upon the calculation of lucky and unlucky days." Among the North American Indians infanticide has also prevailed, and does still prevail very extensively. The lower castes of the Natchez Indians on the lower Mississippi, Brinton (*Myths of the New World* [N. Y. 1868, 8vo], p. 239) says, deliberately murder their own children on the funeral pyre of a son or chief to gain admittance to a higher caste. But as a principal reason of the great extent of infanticide, especially of female children, among savage tribes, Lubbock (*Origin of Civilization, and Primitive Condition of Man* [London, 1870, 8vo], p. 93) assigns the scarcity of game, and the fact that female children are only consumers, and not providers. "Under these circumstances, female children became a source of weakness in several ways. They ate, and did not hunt; they weakened their mothers when young, and when growing up were a temptation to surrounding tribes." But while these reasons, which seem quite plausible at the outset, may have helped to aggravate and spread the horrid crime of infanticide, it is no doubt true, after all, that the practice of child-murder is due to a false comprehension of the duties and relations of man towards his Maker. Perverted religious teachings have done much to foster this great crime among these ignorant human beings, whom Christianity is slowly but surely convincing of the error of their ways. The benign effect of Christianity, which was so marked on the legislation of the Græco-Roman empire in the treatment of woman, and, as a natural consequence, in the treatment likewise of her offspring, is already apparent also among these uncivilized tribes. One of the maxims of modern civilization, or, rather, of Christianity, is found among the enactments of the first Christian emperor, namely, Constantine's declaration that "the killing of a child by its father, which the Pompeian law left unpunished, is one of the greatest crimes" (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 114). "Instead of encouraging the destruction of life, modern civilization abounds in every kind of machinery for preserving it, however unsuccessful the attempt. The chief cause which, among Christian nations, leads to infanticide, is that of shame, which, however, operates only in the case of the child being illegitimate. The parents often incur the risk of committing the crime of murder to avoid social disgrace. In order, therefore, to appreciate the force of the checks put by the law on the tendency to infanticide, the law of bastardy, the practice of instituting foundling hospitals (q. v.), and the kind and degree of the punishments attending any attempt more or less direct to destroy the child, either before or after birth, require to be taken into account. The criminal law deals with the cognate offences which make up infanticide in the following manner, whether the child is legitimate or illegitimate. As regards the procuring of abortion, every woman who takes poison or other noxious thing, or uses instruments or other means to procure her miscarriage, is guilty of felony, and liable to penal servitude for life, or not less than three years; and so is any person who administers poison, or uses instruments upon the woman with such intent. Whoever supplies drugs, poison, or instruments for the same purpose is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to penal servitude for three years. The concealment of birth is also a criminal offence. Whoever, after a child is born, by any secret disposition of the body, endeavors to conceal its birth, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to imprisonment for two years. This is the offence which, perhaps, is most frequently committed, or at least made the subject of prosecution in such cases, as the attempt to establish the larger crime of murder to the satisfaction of a jury is frequently foiled by the secret sympathy shown towards the mother, who is presumed to have been the victim of seduction, or otherwise wronged" (Chambers). But one of the greatest difficulties we are beginning to encounter in our own day, in several *Christian* lands, among which our own is perhaps the most prominent, is the practice of abortion, only another form of infanticide, so general among the so-called higher classes of society. It is really alarming to the Christian man to see how extensive this great sin has

become in this country, as well as in England. We do not deign to speak of France, for that country, in this respect at least, can scarcely make the profession of being a Christian land. Houses for abortion are among us in the best parts of the largest cities. They are kept with the approval of our citizens, and are suffered to further a crime which must sooner or later prove the greatest curse that has yet befallen us. Mr. Greenwood, in his *Seven Curses of London*, speaks of "baby farming" as "a mischief of gigantic extent." Recent statistics, and, indeed, the unblushing advertisements of abortionists, male and female, in the daily prints, proclaim the equally fearful extent of the crime of infanticide in our own land. It is high time that the clergy raise their voice against this varied form of *feticide*, which threatens to decimate the population in the higher classes, and is poisoning the moral sense of outwardly respectable families. (J. H. W.)

Infant Jesus, Daughters of THE CONGREGATION OF THE, is an order in the Romish Church which has its seat at Rome. It owes its origin to Anna Moroni, a native of Lucca, who, having come to Rome entirely destitute, succeeded by her industry and economy in securing a competency. In more advanced years, her charitable feelings prompted her to establish an institution where poor girls should be instructed in such female work as would enable them to earn a livelihood. A priest, Cosmus Berlintani, and other members of the clergy, approved of her plan, and afforded her much assistance. By their joint efforts it was finally established as a regular institution, and in 1673 pope Clement X acknowledged the existence of the society, gave it bylaws, and endowed it with sundry particular privileges, under the appellation of "Daughters of the Infant Jesus." The number of the "Daughters" allotted to each convent was fixed at 33, in commemoration of the number of years Jesus lived upon earth. The novitiate lasts three years; the sisters make vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Such as may wish to leave the convent are allowed to do so before taking the vows, but, in that case, they are to leave to the convent all they brought to it at their admission. Prayers and fasts are strictly enforced. The regular habit of the order consists of a wide, dark brown dress, and a white hood. There also existed in former times an organization whose members bore the name of "Sisters of the good Jesus;" these, in the earlier part of the 15th century, were transformed from a lay association into a regular order, and supported themselves by suitable avocations.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 615.

Habit of the Daughters of the Society of the Infant Jesus.

Infant Membership. See MEMBERSHIP IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Infant Regeneration. See REGENERATION.

Infant Salvation. On this question most Christians will agree with the following statements: "The great consideration which leads to a solution of the case of persons dying in infancy is found in Rom. v, 18, 'Therefore, as by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.' In these words, the sin of Adam and the merits of Christ are pronounced to be co-extensive; the words applied to both are precisely the same, '*judgment* came upon *all men*,' 'the *free gift* came upon *all men*.' If the whole human race be meant in the former clause, the whole human race is meant in the latter also; and it follows that as all are injured by the offence of Adam, so all are benefited by the obedience of Christ. Whatever, therefore, that benefit may be, all children dying in infancy must partake of it, or there would be a large portion of the human race upon whom the 'free gift,' the effects of 'the righteousness of one,' did not 'come,' which is contrary to the apostle's words" (Watson, *Institutes*, ii, 57).

"Theologians have pursued two different methods in treating of this subject. (*a*.) Some are content with saying that God will pardon and save infants on account of the merits of Christ, which extend to all, although they may not have believed in Christ during their lifetime; and that their being born with natural depravity will not harm them, because they themselves are not to blame for it. These writers refer to Rom. v, 15-17 for an analogous proceeding. This is the most simple and safest view. (*b*.) Others, misunderstanding the passage Mark xvi, 16, suppose that faith in Christ is an indispensable requisite for salvation in all men, and have therefore (together with some schoolmen) embraced the doctrine of a *faith of infants*, which they have variously explained and described as *fides præsumpta, implicita, per baptismum sine verbo* (some say *sine cognitione*) *infusa; talis affectio in infante qualis Deo placeat*. The schoolmen describe it as *dispositio ad justitiam*. But none of them succeed in conveying any intelligible idea. Nothing is said in the N. T. about such a faith. Faith always presupposes *knowledge* and power to exercise the understanding. Now, since children have neither of these requisites, faith cannot be ascribed to them; nor, indeed, *disbelief*, unless the word is used very improperly. The mere want of *faith* is not *damnable*, but unbelief only, or the guilty destitution of faith. Those who have adopted this view have thus been compelled (as appears from the preceding remarks) to vary the idea which is uniformly attached to the word *faith* where adults are referred to, as soon as they speak of children, and call something in them by this name which is nowhere else so denominated. The passage Matt. xviii, 6, does not bear upon this point, since the disciples of Christ are there meant. See BAPTISM. From the words of Christ, however, Matt. xix, 14, 'Of such is the kingdom of God,' it is clear that he considers *children* as belonging to his kingdom. And this is enough" (Knapp, *Theology*, p. 423).

Calvin, who laid particular stress on infant baptism in harmony with the other leading reformers, held that "it is no small injustice to the covenant of God if we do not rely upon it as sufficient of itself, since the fulfilment depends not on baptism or anything adventitious. It is alleged there is danger lest a child who is sick, and dies without baptism, should be deprived of the grace of regeneration. This I can by no means admit. God pronounces that he adopts our infants as his children before they are born, when he promises that he will be a God to us, and to our seed after us. This promise includes their salvation. Nor will any dare to offer such an insult to God as to deny the sufficiency of his promise to insure its own accomplishment. The reception of an opinion, that all who happen to die without baptism are lost, makes our condition worse than that of the ancient Israelites, as though the grace of God were more restricted now than it was under law; it leads to the conclusion that Christ came, not to fulfil the promises, but to abolish them; since the promise, which at that time was of itself sufficiently efficacious to insure salvation before the eighth day, would have no validity now without the assistance of the sign." What Calvin here says is so clear, positive, and decided, and so entirely free from the least ambiguity, that he cannot be misunderstood.

Of late years a controversy has arisen in the "Reformed Church" as to the doctrines which she really promulgates on this point, and, as a result, we think we

may justly send forth the following: "We still hold on to the old faith of the Church, that the sacraments are *sealing* ordinances, and feel as confident as ever that God will remain true to his promise, and save the children of the covenant, though they should die without its seal." Indeed, it seems almost impossible for the "Reformed Church" to take any other ground, since one of her founders and great theological teachers, Ursinus, held not only in the case of infants, but also in the case of all God's reasoning creatures, that "not all those who are not baptized are excluded from the grace of Christ; for not the want, but the *contempt* of baptism, excludes men from the covenant of God, made with the faithful and their children." (Compare articles in the *Ref. Ch. Messenger*, March 4, 1868; March 11, 1868).

One of the greatest arguments against the salvation of children not baptized, which has been advanced, is, that the rite of *baptism* is essential to covenantship, provided the parents had not by peculiar circumstances been prevented from attending to this duty. But this point does not seem to be well taken, for among the Israelites circumcision did *not* admit their children into covenant with God, as they were in that covenant by *birth*. Circumcision was merely the sign or seal of the covenant, without which they could not be recognised as being of the people of God. So Christian children are included in the covenant with Christ; but the rite of baptism is their natural sign and seal of that covenant, and without it they cannot be considered as belonging to the visible followers of Christ. See, besides the authorities already referred to, Wesley, *Works*, v, 377; *Mercersb. Rev.* 1860, p. 387 sq.; *Meth. Quar. Rev.* 1859, p. 632; 1864, p. 517 sq., 552 sq.; 1865, p. 81; 1870, p. 290; Fairchild, *Are Infants elected* (Tract of the Presb. Ch. No. 229); McConoughy, *Are Infants saved* (Presb. Ch. Tract No. 132); *Children in Heaven* (Phila. 1865, Presb. Board of Publ.), p. 352; *Christian Examiner*, iv, 431; v, 229, 310; Russell, *On Infant Salvation* (London, 1822, 12mo); Harris, *Hope for Salvation of all dying in Infancy* (Lond. 1822, 8vo); Doddridge, *Lectures on Divinity*, Lect. 168.

Infel. See INFULA.

Inferential Theology. Many pious minds of the Christian Church have earnestly opposed the opinion of the more liberally inclined orthodox theologians, that the Christian theology is in some respects "inferential." Liddon adroitly puts this question in his Bampton Lecture of 1866 (*Our Lord's Divinity*, p. 441, 442): "No one would deny that in all ages of the Church the field of theology has been the scene of hasty, unwarrantable, and misleading inferences. False conclusions have been drawn from true premises, and very doubtful or false premises have been occasionally assumed, if not asserted to be true. . . . But if this should be admitted it would not follow that theology is in no sense 'inferential.' Within certain limits, and under due guidance, 'inference' is the movement, it is the life of theology. The primal records of revelation itself, as we find them in Scripture, are continually inferential, and it is at least the business of theology to observe and marshal these revealed inferences, to draw them out, and to make the most of them. The illuminated reason of the collective Church has for ages been engaged in studying the original materials of the Christian revelation. It has thus shaped, rather than created, the science of theology. What is theology but a continuous series of observed and systematized inferences respecting God in his nature and his dealings with mankind, drawn from premises which rest upon God's authority? . . . If we reject conclusions drawn professedly from the substance of revelation, but really enlarging instead of explaining it, it does not follow that we should reject inferences which are simply explanatory, or which exhibit the bearing of one revealed truth upon another. This, indeed, is the most fruitful and legitimate province of inference in theological inquiry. Such 'inference' brings out the meaning of the details of revelation. It raises this feature to prominence, it throws that into the shade. It places language to which a too servile literalism might have attributed the highest force in the lower rank of metaphor and symbol; it elicits pregnant and momentous truths from incidents which, in the absence of sufficient guidance or reflection, may have been thought to possess only a secondary degree of significance."

Inferior Clergy, "the several classes of assistants to the priesthood in the ancient churches. They were distinguished by the title ἀχειροτόνητος ὑπηρεσία, because they were appointed to their respective offices without the imposition of hands. Not being ordained at the altar, nor in ecclesiastical form, they were, of course, ineligible for the exercise of any of its sacerdotal functions; indeed, so distinctly drawn was the line between them and the superior orders, called ἱερώμενοι, *holy*, that they were strictly forbidden to touch the sacred vessels, or so much as to enter the 'diaconicum'—sanctuary. The inferior clergy of the Church of England includes all those in holy orders not distinguished by their position and title as *dignitaries of the Church*. The offices of churchwarden, verger, sexton, and pew-opener in the Church of England correspond in general to the offices of the inferior clergy of ancient times" (Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclopædia*, s. v.). See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* book i, ch. i. See CLERGY.

Infeudation is a term in law for the placing in possession of a fee or freehold estate. It was used in ecclesiastical law to designate the granting of tithes to laymen, and the temporary possession by ecclesiastical associations of lay property. Pope Urban VIII, in the year 1625, declared himself against all infeudation, and made it null and void if thereafter contracted. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iii, 450.

Infidel (ἄπιστος, 2 Cor. vi, 15; 1 Tim. v, 18), an *unbeliever*, as elsewhere rendered.

Infidelity etymologically means simply *want of belief*. By common usage it has come to mean (1), in a restricted sense, a rejection of the Christian faith; and (2), in a wider sense, the rejection of religion generally. Thus Atheists, who disbelieve in God, and Deists, who believe in God, but reject Christianity, are alike called infidels.

I. *Various Forms of Infidelity.*—Pearson, in his excellent prize essay on *Infidelity, its Aspects, Causes, and Agencies* (Lond. 1860, 8vo), classifies the forms of modern infidelity as follows: 1. Atheism, or the denial of the divine existence; 2. Pantheism, or the denial of the divine personality; 3. Naturalism, or the denial of the divine government; 4. Spiritualism, or the denial of the divine redemption. To these may be added, what belong more properly to practical than to theoretical infidelity, 5. Indifferentism, or the denial of man's responsibility; and, 6. Formalism, or the denial of the power of godliness. Each of these will be found noticed in this Cyclopædia under their proper heads. Riddle (*Bampton Lecture* for 1852) gives the following survey of the various phases of infidelity.

(1.) *Rationalism.*—"Infidelity, scarcely fashioned, and perhaps hardly conscious of its own true character, but yet really existing and putting forth some degree of energy, appears in the form of a *rationalistic rejection of Christian doctrine*. In this form, having reference rather to the substance of the Gospel than to its proofs and evidences, infidelity is susceptible of such diversified modifications, and assumes so many disguises, that it may sometimes escape detection, and is often in a disposition to repel, with logical correctness, the charges which may be justly brought against it by those who perceive its real tendency and nature. The faintest, but still dangerous phase of this rationalistic spirit consists in the habit of making an arbitrary *choice and selection* of dogmas to be believed by those who professedly, and with more or less sincerity, accept the Christian revelation as a whole. From this unhealthy state

or mind the transition is too easy to a systematic *elevation of reason above all the notices of revelation;* that is, to *rationalism* applied to the whole substance of the Gospel. This takes place when men systematically require that revealed truth shall be, not only not contradictory to sound reason, which is justly to be expected, but that it shall be in accordance with the independent notions of reason or deductions of the understanding." With the class of thinkers who have this tendency most prominently affiliates Mr. Leckey, who has lately published a *History of Rationalism* (London, 2 vols. 8vo). His aim, and that of his school, evidently is to reduce Christianity to a system of ethics, and deprive it of its supernatural character, holding that the contest between the champions and the adversaries of religion is no longer to be fought, as it was in the 16th and 17th centuries, upon points of dogmatic theology, and that the dogmatic forms of the Protestant churches are no longer the efficient antagonists of the Church of Rome. Nor are the free-thinkers of the present day to be confounded with those of the old Voltairean school in France, or with the English Deists of the last century. Their system is no longer exclusively negative and destructive, but, on the contrary, intensely positive, and, in its moral aspect, intensely Christian. It embraces a series of essentially Christian conceptions—equality, fraternity, the suppression of war, the education of the poor, the abolition of slavery, the diffusion of liberty. It revolves around the ideal of Christianity, and represents its spirit without its dogmatic system and its supernatural narratives. From both of these it unhesitatingly recoils, while deriving all its strength and nourishment from Christian ethics. Hardly conscious of its own character, as Mr. Riddle tells us, modern Rationalists go forth under such leaders as Leckey, and declare that "the idolatry of dogmas will pass away," and that "Christianity, being rescued from sectarianism and intolerance that have defaced it, will shine by its own moral splendor, and, sublimated above all the sphere of controversy, will assume its rightful position as an ideal, and not a system; as a person, and not a creed." We see this great result, which Mr. Leckey succeeds in *picturing*, in a somewhat *modified* form, in the efforts of the free-thinkers of our land, especially since the last meeting of the "Free Religious Association," more particularly in the abolition of the Sunday laws for *certain purposes* in the city of Boston, inaugurated first by the followers of Theodore Parker. See RATIONALISM.

(2.) *Spiritualism.*—"But while Rationalism appears to have lost much of its former reputation, there is another method of arriving at the same end which finds acceptance in the minds of many persons at the present day. These men are not Rationalists; they are so-called *Spiritualists.* They do not deny the great truths which lie on the very surface of the sacred record; nor do they disavow the fact of a divine revelation, and so leave man entirely to the dictates of his reason, and the conclusions of his understanding, with the additional aid to be derived from his fellow-creatures, all uninspired like himself. But their theory is this. There is, say they, a revelation made from God to man, but it is only subjective, inward, to the already existing spiritual life, or religious consciousness of humanity; the inspiration by which this life or consciousness is awakened is common to every man who will wait and seek for it; and as to religious truth, it is simply that which individuals, or the mass of humanity, so far as their powers have been heightened by the divine afflatus, are able to apprehend. According to this system, we are not to suppose that the Gospel announces positive spiritual facts, such, for example, as that which is usually understood by the atonement; but it propounds ideas which may be differently received by different men, and will possess a power and value according to the spiritual mould into which they may be cast. Now, in this Spiritualism, let it be observed, there is nothing original or new. This system is, in substance, only one of those phases of unbelief which have appeared and disappeared at intervals from the earliest ages of Christianity, but which, thanks be to God, have never yet succeeded in making the Gospel obsolete, and in robbing mankind of the knowledge of salvation. It is, however, fraught with danger, and its power of mischief arises, in no small degree, from its capability of disguise. It can put on the semblance of Christian truth; it can comply with any form of words, even the soundest form, in creeds and confessions drawn up with the greatest fidelity and care." (Comp. Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters,* i, 5 sq.) See SPIRITUALISM.

(3.) *Naturalism.*—"The mind that revolts at mystery, or religious truth which we cannot know independently of a direct and outward revelation, is also shocked and repelled by miracle. Accordingly we find that infidelity sometimes assumes the form of *naturalism,* or an assault upon the Bible chiefly with reference to its supernatural historic elements. According to some, the miracles of Scripture were really wrought, and presented all the appearances described in the sacred record; but they were miraculous only to the apprehension of ignorant persons, who did not understand how they were performed. Far more elaborate, and perhaps more plausible, has been an attempt of recent date to exhibit all the miraculous and supernatural features of the Gospel history under the character of an aggregate of myths or legends. Such is the hypothesis of Strauss. See NATURALISM.

(4.) *Deism.*—"This is a class of anti-Christian principles well known as having prevailed in England chiefly in the last century." Infidelity in this form no longer appears as mere philosophy, or speaks in the accents of calm or lofty speculation. It includes, indeed, some attempts at historical and verbal criticism, and makes some show of wisdom suited to the age in which it flourished; but, for the most part, it opens its mouth in blasphemy, and proclaims aloud the sentiments of an evil and ungodly heart. For, whether we consider the ignorant misrepresentations of Paine, the sneers of Gibbon, or the scoffings of Voltaire, it is impossible not to perceive that their opposition to the Gospel is founded upon moral repugnance and distaste. Their writings are a clear echo of that rebellious sentiment, 'We will not have this man to reign over us' (Luke xix, 14). And, so far as the school of infidelity continues to subsist, we find its adherents, for the most part, among men of depraved moral habits, of low taste and uncultivated intellect, revelling very often in the haunts of profligacy and vice, or filled with political rancor, and struggling against the restraints of all laws, human and divine." (Comp. Waterland, *Works,* v, 4 sq.; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters,* i, 38 sq.) See DEISM.

(5.) *Pantheism.*—"Some men there are who, while they reject Christianity, and know not the true God, yet retain the impression of a presiding or universal Intellect; but, at the same time, that which they thus recognise as mental energy, or the divine essence, or even a divine being, they regard as more or less identical with nature, conceiving that, in some way or other, either God is the universe, or the universe is God. This is *Pantheism* in its twofold aspect." See PANTHEISM.

(6.) *Atheism.*—"There appears to be only one step lower to which even the boldest infidelity can descend, and that is *Atheism,* properly so called. The Atheist is sometimes satisfied with taking a merely negative position. Without attempting to prove that there is no God, he simply affirms that, to his apprehension, there is no sufficient proof of his existence, or that the evidences of his being and his operation, to which many men appeal, are to his mind no evidence whatever, and therefore he holds himself excused from believing that there is a God, and from accepting the consequences which must follow from such admission, respecting the creation of the world, the responsibility of man, and the prospect of immortality hereafter. But this position, dreary as it is, by no means forms a resting-place of this infidel phi-

losophy. Atheism, even in the present day, is positive and dogmatic in its teachings. It professes to account for the absence of a Deity, and to prove that there is no God, or, at least, that there is none engaged in present operation on the universe around us." See ATHEISM.

II. *Causes of Infidelity.*—The chief source of infidelity is undoubtedly a moral one. "It is evident," remarks Pearson (*Modern Infidelity*, pt. ii, ch. i), "that unbelief, generally speaking, can originate in only one of two sources; either in a deficiency of evidence, or in a state of mind and heart on which the clearest and strongest evidence has no power. The causes of infidelity, we are persuaded, are more ethical than intellectual. This persuasion is greatly strengthened by the perusal of some of the productions of our modern infidel writers." "Nothing can be more contemptible," says professor Garbett (*Mod. Philosoph. Infidelity*, p. 5), "than the *argumentative* resources of modern infidelity. *It does not reason, it only postulates;* it dreams and it dogmatizes. Nor can it claim *invention.*" This testimony is true. Indeed, we venture to assert, that the general strain of argument brought to bear against Christianity by its modern assailants would not be tolerated for a moment within the province of purely literary criticism. The strong determination to withstand everything in the shape of reasonable evidence contrasts very much with the feeble argumentation by which many of the truths of religion are set aside. Be it atheism or pantheism, naturalism or spiritualism, indifferentism or formalism, the will has much to do with it. Moral evidence is the appropriate proof of moral truth. All moral evidence is cumulative; but, however strong it may be, it is never irresistible. An indocile mind can ward it off. The existence of God [see GOD] does not admit of demonstration, but moral certainty. See EVIDENCE. So the personality of God, though much more rational than pantheism, does not admit of mathematical demonstration. Christianity is based upon evidence. The reason why evidence is necessary is to be found in our moral constitution as rational, discriminating, accountable agents; and in the fact that, from the existence of evil in the world, we were otherwise liable to deception in reference to our highest interests. It could never be a man's duty to believe in a revelation claiming to itself the authority of heaven, unless that revelation bore, legibly on its front, heaven's signature, or was in some way attended with heaven's evidencing power. The evidence that attests the truth of Christianity, vast, varied, and of great cumulative power though it be, is not, however, irresistible. No man is warranted to expect it to be so. Faith is a moral act, and, while resting on a strong groundwork of proof, it must have some difficulties over which to triumph. Origen, speaking of the difficulties in the Bible revelation, and of those in the revelation of nature, says: "In both we see a self-concealing, self-revealing God, who makes himself known only to those who earnestly seek him; in both are found stimulants to faith, and occasions for unbelief." "There is light enough," says Pascal, "for those who sincerely wish to see, and darkness enough for those of an opposite description." Mr. Newman tells us it "supersedes the authoritative force of outward miracles entirely" to say that "a really overpowering miraculous proof would have destroyed the moral character of faith." This, however, is not argument, but a foolish dogmatic assertion. The Christian miracles are of "a convincing and stupendous character," and yet not so overpowering as the axiom that a whole is greater than its part; and we lack sagacity to perceive where lies the contradiction between these statements. Evidence is obligatory on man, not because it is overpowering or irresistible, but because it preponderates.

Besides the *moral* ground, there are certain subordinate causes constantly operating, e. g. Speculative Philosophy (q. v.); corruptions of Christianity [see CHRISTIANITY; ROMANISM]; religious intolerance [see TOLERATION]; and, more especially, the connection of Church and State. In our own country, on the other hand, the fact that religion is a matter of private opinion has brought upon us the charge, from the other side of the Atlantic, that in our corporate capacity we, by our peculiar position on this point, permit the inference that we "distinctly affirm that no religion is true, but that all theological systems are human speculations upon a doubtful matter, more or less plausible in themselves, and containing a greater or less amount of truth, but no one of which is so probable that we will act in a matter so important and legislate upon the theory of its truth." It is held by sceptics that it is not possible to prove any other theoretical justification of toleration, or religious equality, or whatever else the system which treats religion as a matter of private opinion is called, than one which is founded on the principle that religion is matter of opinion; in other words, that the best of all religions is doubtful. The mere non-acceptance of the Koran or of the Roman Catholic Creed, after notice of their contents, appears to them to amount to a denial of the truth of the claims of Mohammed and the pope respectively. They argue thus from the position that a nation cannot remain on *neutral* grounds in a matter in which it is theoretically, and practically too, impossible to be neutral, and that the 18th century theories of government, which led the founders of our Constitution to think otherwise, are fundamentally wrong (*The Nation*, 1868, p. 345). See CHURCH.

For further information, see the different articles referred to above, and also the articles EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY; PARKER; POSITIVISM; UNBELIEF. See also Garbett, *Modern Philosophical Infidelity;* Rogers, *Reason and Faith;* Rogers, *Eclipse of Faith;* Riddle, *Natural History of Infidelity* (Bampton Lect. for 1852, 8vo); Thomson, *Aids to Faith* (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Morgan, *Christianity and Modern Infidelity* (London, 1854, 12mo); Pearson, *Prize Essay on Infidelity* (Lond. 1860, 21st edition); *London Review*, No. 5, art. i; *Ch. of England Review*, Oct. 1854, art. iii; Wharton, *Theism and the Modern Sceptical Theories* (Phila. 1859, 12mo); Saintes, *History of Rationalism* (Lond. 1849, 8vo); *Christian Review*, iii, 134; *North British Review*, xv, 18; *Princeton Review*, xii, 31; Nelson, *Cause and Cure of Infidelity* (N. Y. 12mo); Godwin, *Philosophy of Atheism* (Lond. 1853); Van Mildert, *Boyle Lectures on the Rise and Progress of Infidelity* (Lond. 1820, 2 vols. 8vo); Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism* (2d ed. N. Y. 1866, 8vo); Hagenbach, *German Rationalism* (N. York, 1865); Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought* (N. Y. 1863, 8vo); *Evangel. Quart. Rev.* 1865, p. 162 sq.; *Mercersb. Rev.* July, 1869; *Meth. Quart. Review*, 1863, p. 687 sq.; 1864, p. 682 sq.

Infinite. See ATTRIBUTES; GOD.

Infinity, without end or limit, the negation of finite: ἄπειρον, "un-endlich."

I. *The Indefinite.*—Besides the definite consciousness of which logic formulates the laws, there is also an indefinite consciousness which cannot be formulated. Besides complete thoughts, and besides the thoughts which, though incomplete, admit of completion, there are thoughts which it is impossible to complete, and yet which are real, in the sense that they are normal affections of the intellect. Positive knowledge, however extensive it may become, does not and never can fill the whole region of possible thought. At the uttermost reach of discovery there arises, and must ever arise, the question, What lies beyond? Regarding science as a gradually increasing sphere, we may say that every addition to its surface does but bring it into wider contact with surrounding nescience. There is always something which forms alike the raw material of definite thought, and remains after the definiteness which thinking gave to it has been destroyed (H. Spencer, *First Principles*, p. 21 sq., 88, 90 sq.). This vague element in thought, which is ineradicable, Spencer considers to be the groundwork of the feeling of awe, and of natural religion. It is the infinite in this sense, the attempt to conceive which involves a contradiction in

terms; which can only be believed to exist, but can never become an object to consciousness. "If all thought is limitation; if whatever we conceive is, by the very act of conception, regarded as finite, the infinite, from a human point of view, is merely a name for the absence of those conditions under which thought is possible" (Mansell's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 48; comp. p. 30, 63, 80, 118; see esp. notes on p. 48 and 51, 4th ed.).

II. *The Infinite as an Interminable Series.*—Aristotle mentions five ways (*Phys. Ausc.* 203, b. 15) in which the notion of the *ἄπειρον* is attained: (*a*) From the unlimited duration of time; (*b*) from the possibility of perpetually subdividing magnitudes; (*c*) from the continuance of growth and decay in nature; (*d*) from the fact that limitation is always relative, and never absolute; and (*e*), "the strongest proof of all," from the inability to conceive a limit to number, magnitude, and space. Any given moment of time is both preceded and succeeded by another, and that by another without end. Any magnitude admits of multiplication or division, and the multiples or parts are again capable of multiplication or division, respectively, without limit. Any effect in nature is the result of a cause which, again, is the effect of another cause in an endless regress; and, conversely, every effect is itself the cause of some other effect, and this, in its turn, is the cause of another effect, and so on in an interminable progress. Time, space, and causation thus exhibit infinity in the form of a straight line or series of terms without beginning or end. The characteristics of this mode of the infinite are: (1) that it is purely negative, i. e. is the mere process of passing beyond limitations; (2) that it postulates the perpetual recurrence of limitations as its condition; and (3) that, as an endless series, it is incapable of being thought out, it is always possible and never actual, it cannot be said to exist, but always to be in the act of coming into existence.

It follows from this that, if infinity is an idea realizable by the mind, it must be conceived in some other way than as a linear series; it must be capable of an expression which is at once definite, and yet preserves the true character of infinity. Mathematical science does this by the summation of an infinite series in a finite expression, and manipulates both the infinite and the infinitesimal as terms having a definite meaning in calculation. The possibility of conceiving the infinite as complete may be seen more easily from the consideration that any object which we can see, handle, imagine, conceive, without any difficulty, e. g. a fruit, or a stone, is really the sum of an infinite number of parts into which it may be divided, an infinite, therefore, which is not merely coming into existence, but actually exists here and now. Regarded, too, under the aspect of a term in the line of causation, any object in nature sums up an infinite series in itself. For, as an effect, it is the result of all previous causes, and, as a cause, the germ of all succeeding effects.

These summations of the serial infinite, whether achieved by the formulæ of mathematics or presented as complete, in every portion of space, in every period of time, and in every object in nature, are anticipations of a higher form of infinity which is revealed by the mind of man.

III. *The Spiritual Infinite* (infinitum rationis, infinitum actu, *ὅλον τέλειον*) differs from the former, not so much in excluding as including the limit or boundary of which it is the negation, i. e. as not limited from without and perpetually passing beyond the limit, but as limiting itself. As the natural or mathematical infinite is represented by the line, so the rational or spiritual infinite finds its appropriate symbol in the circle, i. e. the line which is without beginning or end, and at the same time is limited at every point by itself. It is thus at once absolutely unlimited, and yet absolutely definite. The transition from II to III may be illustrated by the mathematical definition of a straight line as the chord of an infinite circle. Such is the infinite as exhibited in (*a*) the thought and (*b*) the volition of man.

(*a*) Consciousness, and thought as a mode of consciousness, involve the opposition of the subject which thinks and the object about which it thinks. As a condition of thinking at all, the mind must set its thought over against itself as not itself, and conversely, as the condition of an object being thought of at all, it must be presented as distinct from the mind which thinks of it. Here, then, is a limitation or barrier which constitutes what is called "the finiteness" of the human understanding. The thinker is limited and conditioned by his thought, the thought is limited and conditioned by the thinker. But, as it is possible to present any object to thought, it is competent for the thinker to present *himself* as the object about which he thinks, i. e. to be at once the subject which thinks and the object which is thought about. This capability of self-consciousness, of which, so far as can be ascertained, the lower animals are destitute, constitutes at once the pride and the degradation of man, is a source at once of his best and his worst actions. Here we have the analogue of the line returning, as the circumference of a circle, into itself. The limitation of the thinker by the object thought of is as real as before, only it is a limitation of himself by himself: he is conditioned, as before, but self-conditioned, i. e. infinite. See Personalty.

(*b*) The same infinity appears in free will. As free, a man does an action which originates absolutely with himself. But this action has a permanent effect on his character, and thus determines the quality of the next action. This new action is also originated absolutely by the free agent, but the agent himself is modified, conditioned, limited, by the previons action. The agent has thus his freedom limited and defined, and increasingly so with every fresh action, but he is limited by that of which he is himself the absolute originator. He is finite (limited, conditioned) and at the same time infinite (unlimited, unconditioned), because he is self-conditioned. See Liberty.

It is in this sense, rather than in that of infinite magnitude, that infinity is an attribute of God. See Theism.

IV. *Relation to the Finite.*—It follows from what has been said above (*a*) that, although the essence of infinity is the transcendence of every limitation, yet that the finite and limited, even when excluded (I and II), is postulated as a condition of infinity, and that in the higher forms of infinity the limit is included, or, rather, imposed from within. Even in the sense of the indefinite residuum of thought, definite thinking is presupposed as the condition of our becoming conscious of the vague element beyond. The serial infinite, again, as the mere process of transcending every given term, postulates the perpetual recurrence of terms to transcend: *ἄπειρον*, says Aristotle, *μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν οὐ κατὰ ποσὸν λαμβάνουσιν, αἰεί τι λαβεῖν ἔστιν ἔξω* (*Phys. Ausc.* 207, a. 7)—"The quantitative infinite is that which always has something outside it, i. e. a term 'not yet reached.'" The spiritual infinite, lastly, as the self-determination of thought and volition, is, *ex vi termini*, a process of generating at every step the finite and limited. (*b*) On the other hand, it would be a reversal of the true order to conceive the infinite to be, as its etymology suggests, the mere negation of the finite, and, as such, a secondary and derived idea. On such a supposition it becomes impossible to explain how we become conscious of limitation at all. How, it may be asked, do we know that thought is finite if we know nothing first of the infinite? How is the consciousness of limitation possible except as the negation of what is unlimited? The infinite is thus, as the condition of the finite, prior and positive; the finite, as the limit excluded, included, self-imposed by the infinite, posterior and negative.

The relation of God, as the Infinite, to the world and the soul, as finite, is considered elsewhere. But, unless

(*a*) be borne in mind, the logical result is deism, and if (*b*) be neglected, pantheism.

V. *Infinity as symbolized in the Imagination.*—We find the attempt to picture the infinite to the imagination among non-European nations in the form of a state of vacancy immediately preceding creation. The constituents of the image are generally air and water. The image of mere air or mere water would be no realizable image at all, because involving no distinction. But in the contrast of the two we get that minimum of definiteness which renders the image possible. A beautifully pure representation of the imagined infinite is found in the sacred books of the aborigines of Guatemala (Max Müller's *Chips*, i, 333). It is as follows: "There was a time when all that exists in heaven and earth was made. All was then in suspense; all was calm and silent. All was immovable, all peaceful, and the vast space of the heavens was empty. There was no man, no animal, no shore, no trees; heaven alone existed. The face of the earth was not to be seen; there was only the still expanse of the sea and the heaven above. Divine beings were on the waters like a growing light. Their voice was heard as they meditated and consulted, and when the dawn arose man appeared." Here we have as the constituents of the image "empty heaven," or space, and—which is introduced as if not at all contradictory to the statement that "heaven alone existed"—the "still expanse of the sea." [Compare this with the account in holy Scripture, where the constituents of the image are (1) "darkness upon the face of the abyss," and (2) the surface of the waters, with the Divine Spirit hovering between the two, and calling light into being.] In the Hindu account the creative spirit is represented as rowing about in a boat upon the ocean.

We have substantially the same image of the infinite lying at the back of the Greek mind. But there are two differences. (1) The double image is dismembered. The symbol of Thales is water alone; of Anaximander, the void in suspense; of Anaximenes, the atmosphere; of Xenophanes, the globe of the sky. (2) The infinite is not pictured as preceding the emergence of finite things, but as underlying the process of nature, as it is ordinarily known.

The Egyptian symbol of the serpent with his tail in his mouth approaches the mathematical representation of infinite length. — Blunt, *Theol. Dict.* i, 346 sq. See *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, July, 1870.

Infirmerer is the name of the person who "had the care of the sick-house, in which Lent and fasts were not observed, had charge of the burial of the dead, provided physicians and attendance, and flesh-meat."—Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 329.

Infralapsarians. See SUBLAPSARIANS.

Infula (otherwise called *mitra*, *στέφανος*, *corona*, *κίδαρις*, *diadema*, and *τίαρα*, *tiara*) is a cap worn, since the 16th century, by the bishops of the Roman Catholic and Greek churches, as one of the insignia of their episcopal office. See MITRE.

Ingathering, FEAST OF. See FESTIVALS; TABERNACLES, FEAST OF.

Ingelheim is the name of a place at which a church council (*Concilium Ingelenheimense*) was held June 27, 948, under the presidency of the Roman legate Marinus, and in the presence of the German emperor Otho I and king Louis Outremer. The principal business of the council was the punishment of Hugo, count of Paris, whom it excommunicated. It also decided that no layman should present a clerk to a church, or dispossess him, without the consent of the bishop; that the whole of Easter week be kept as a festival, and the three days following Whitsunday; that St. Mark's day be kept with fasting on account of the great litany, as was done on the rogation days preceding the feast of the Ascension; and that all differences as to tithe be settled in an ecclesiastical synod, instead of granting this power to the civil courts.—Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 267.

Ingen is the name of a deified Japanese, who is said to have arrived about 1653 in Japan, whither his zeal for the religion of Siaka had led him. He was at first regarded by the Japanese only as a saint, but at a season of an excessive drought they came to him and besought his prayers (kitû) to avert the judgment of heaven; and the rain descending in mighty torrents shortly after the offering up of Ingen's prayer, the people thought him no longer earthly, and deified him.—Kaempfer, *Hist. Japan*, Append.; Broughton, *Bibliotheca Hist. Sac.* i, 533.

Ingham, BENJAMIN, was born at Ossett, Yorkshire, June 11, 1712. He received a liberal education, first at Batley school, and afterwards at Queen's College, Oxford, where, in 1733, he joined himself with Charles and John Wesley, the founders of Methodism. In 1735 he received episcopal ordination, and in the same year embarked with Mr. Wesley for Georgia. He remained in Georgia about two years, visited Carolina and Pennsylvania, and then returned to England, where, soon after his arrival, he accompanied Wesley to Herrnhut, the seat of the Moravians, and so strong became his sympathies with this excellent people that he could not sacrifice his attachment to them when the Methodists revolted from the disorders of the Fetter-lane society. He went into Yorkshire, and with incredible itinerant labors, assisted by Moravian companions, he founded there what may be called a Moravian form of Methodism. Preaching stations were established throughout the county and in neighboring shires. At Birstal he took Nelson publicly by the hand, and gave him liberty to speak in all his chapels. The Wesleys, Whitefield, Madan, and Romaine often preached for his societies, and they seem to have been generally recognised by the Methodistic leaders as a legitimate branch of the great revival, notwithstanding Wesley's people in Yorkshire experienced many vexations from the eccentricities of individual preachers, who retained some of the London Moravian follies. Within a few years, the number of "Inghamite" societies reached eighty-four. In 1741, Mr. Ingham married Lady Margaret Hastings, sister to the earl of Huntingdon, on which he removed his residence from Ossett to Abberford, where he continued to reside till his death. After forming this connection, he was so far from relaxing in his exertions to preach the Gospel that he greatly extended the sphere of his operations, and, in process of time, may be said to have evangelized all the surrounding country. Ingham was admitted to Wesley's Conference in Leeds, but the precise relation of his societies to the Wesleyan body was never defined. He had his own Conferences also, and at one of them was elected a *general overseer*, or bishop. Lady Huntingdon, who could not approve all the disciplinary features of his societies, attempted to promote a union of them with Wesley, and she sent Whitefield to Newcastle-upon-Tyne to meet the Wesleys for consultation on the subject. Charles assented, but John declined the overture, very wisely, as events demonstrated. In 1759, Ingham read "Sandeman's Letters on Theron and Aspasio," and "Glas's Testimony of the King of Martyrs." These works produced such an impression on his mind that he deputed two of his preachers to Scotland to learn more fully the views of their authors. At Edinburgh they met Sandeman, and Glas at Dundee. They returned converts to the Sandemanian principles, and immediately spread discontent and disputes among the societies. Ingham's authority could not control the partisan violence which soon broke out. He called in the assistance of his friends. The countess of Huntingdon wrote them letters. Whitefield used his influence to save them. Romaine hastened into Yorkshire, but could not restrain them. Ingham attempted to excommunicate the disturbers, but it was an endless task. The whole order was wrecked and sunk. Thirteen societies

only remained from more than eighty which had flourished with all the evidences of permanent prosperity. Ingham seems to have remained a Sandemanian (q. v.), and developed his views in a *Treatise on the Faith and Hope of the Gospel* (1762). He died in 1772. Some of his societies came to the Wesleyan Church; others united with the Daleites (q. v.), a class of Scotch Independents. See Stevens, *History of Methodism*, i, 390 sq.; Tyerman, *Oxford Methodists*, p. 57-154.

Inghamites. See INGHAM.

Inglis, Charles, D.D., was born in Ireland about the year 1733. Emigrating to America, he took charge of the Free School at Lancaster, Pa., previous to 1759, and, having decided to enter the ministry, he went to England for ordination. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel appointed him their missionary at Dover, Del., his field embracing the whole county of Kent, including three churches. In 1765 he became assistant minister of Trinity, N. Y., and catechist to the negroes. He received the honorary degree of A.B. from King's College, N.Y., in 1767, and those of A.M. and D.D. from Oxford some years later. In the progress of the Revolution he took part with the Tories, and in 1775 replied to Paine's *Common Sense* by a pamphlet which was so offensive to the "Sons of Liberty" that they committed it to the flames. When preaching before Washington, in the same year, he refused to omit the prayer for the king and the royal family. After the Declaration of Independence he caused his church to be closed, and took refuge in Flushing, then in possession of the Royalists. He was chosen rector of Trinity, N. Y., in 1777. In consequence of many losses during the Revolution and political differences, he found it necessary finally to leave the country. In 1783 he sailed for Nova Scotia, of which province he was appointed bishop in 1787, as the first colonial bishop of the Church of England. He resided at Halifax till his death, Feb., 1816. He published *Two Sermons;* and a *Letter* in "Hawkins's Historical Notices." — Sprague, *Annals*, v, 186; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 932.

Inglis, John, D.D., a Scotch divine, was born about 1763. He was at one time minister at the Grayfriars' Church, Edinburgh. He died in 1834. Inglis is known as the author of a *Defence of Ecclesiastical Establishments, and a Vindication of the Christian Faith* (Edinb. 1830, 8vo.).—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 932; *Blackwood's Magazine*, xxv, 109.

Ingraham, IRA, a Congregational minister, was born at Cornwall, Vt., Dec. 1, 1791, and educated at Middlebury College, where he graduated in 1815. After teaching for a time in the Southern States, pursuing also his theological studies, he was licensed to preach by the Addison Association, Addison, Vt., June 3, 1819. May, 1820, the Congregational church in Orvill was offered him, and he was there ordained June 20, 1820. He left this charge in 1822, and after supplying several pulpits, and acting for a brief period as agent of the "Presbyterian Education Society," he was installed over the Congregational church at West Bradford, Mass., Dec. 1, 1824. In 1830 he removed to Brandon, Vt., and in 1834 left that place to assume the duties of secretary of the Vermont Domestic Missionary Society. In 1839 he accepted a call to the Presbyterian Church at Lyons, N. Y. In 1848 he returned to the church at Brandon, but declined to be reinstalled, and finally accepted the position as agent of the "Society for the promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West," making Western New York his field of labor. He retired from this and all other active work five years after, and only preached at intervals. He died April 9, 1864. Ingraham published five sermons (1826, 1843, 1844, 1847, and 1848).—*Congregational Quarterly*, 1864, p. 300.

Ingram, ROBERT, an English divine, was born at Beverley, in Yorkshire, March 9, 1726-7. He was educated at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, where he obtained a fellowship, and took his degrees in arts. His first preferment was to the perpetual curacy of Bridhurst, in Kent, next the living of Orston, in Nottinghamshire, and afterwards the vicarages of Wormington and Boxted, in Essex. He died in 1804. Mr. Ingram wrote *A View of the Great Events of the Seventh Plague, or Period when the Mystery of God shall be finished:—Accounts of the Ten Tribes of Israel being in America;* originally published by Manasseh ben-Israel:—*A Complete and Uniform Explanation of the Prophecy of the Seven Vials of Wrath.* See Hook, *Eccles. Biography;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 871. (J. N. P.)

Ingulphus, the celebrated abbot of Croyland, long considered the author of the *Historia Monasterii Croylandensis*, is supposed to have been born at London about A.D. 1030. According to the account of his life in his history, he was educated at the University of Oxford. He was a great favorite of Edgitha, the wife of Edward the Confessor, and visited duke William of Normandy at his own court in 1051. About 1064 he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. On his return he entered the monastery of Fontanelle, in Normandy, and there remained till 1076, when he was invited to England by the Conqueror, and made abbot of Croyland. He died Dec. 17, 1109. The *Historia Monasterii Croylandensis* was printed by Savile (in the collection *Script.*) at London in 1596, and in a more complete edition by Gale (*Rer. Angl. Script. Vet.*), at Oxford, in 1684. An English translation of it was furnished by Riley in Bohn's Antiquarian Library. "Some writers, even, of the last century questioned the entire genuineness of the book, though scepticism did not often proceed further than the hypothesis of interpolations by a later writer; but in 1826, the late Sir Francis Palgrave, in an article in the *Quarterly Review*, endeavored to prove that the whole so-called history was little better than a novel, and was probably the composition of a monk in the 13th or 14th century. His conclusions have been, on the whole, almost universally adopted." See Chambers's *Encyclopædia*, v, 579; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, v, 625 sq.

Inheritance (frequently חֵלֶק, *che'lek*, a "*portion*" or providential bestowment; but properly and usually some form of the verbs יָרַשׁ, *yarash*, to *possess*; נָחַל, *nachal*, to *possess*; κληρονομέω, to *get by lot*). God, as the creator of the earth, gave it to man to be held, cultivated, and enjoyed (Gen. i, 28 sq.; Psa. cxv, 16; Eccles. v, 9); not to any favored portion of our race, but to the race itself—to man as represented by our great primogenitor, to whom the use of the divine gift was first graciously vouchsafed. The impression which the original gift of the earth was calculated to make on men, the Great Donor was pleased, in the case of Palestine, to render, for his own wise purposes, more decided and emphatic by an express re-donation to the patriarch Abraham (Gen. xiii, 14 sq.). Many years, however, elapsed before the promise was fulfilled. Meanwhile the notices which we have regarding the state of property in the patriarchal ages are few and not very definite. The products of the earth, however, were at an early period accumulated and held as property. Violence invaded the possession: opposing violence recovered the goods. War soon sprang out of the passions of the human heart. The necessity of civil government was felt. Consuetudinary laws accordingly developed themselves. The head of the family was supreme. His will was law. The physical superiority which he possessed gave him this dominion. The same influence would secure its transmission in the male rather than the female line. Hence, too, the rise of the rights of primogeniture. In the early condition of society which is called patriarchal, landed property had its origin, indeed, but could not be held of first importance by those who led a wandering life, shifting continually, as convenience suggested, from one spot to another. Cattle were then the chief property (Gen. xxiv, 35). But land, if held, was held on a freehold tenure; nor could any other tenure

have come into existence till more complex and artificial relations arose, resulting, in all probability, from the increase of population and the relative insufficiency of food. When Joseph went down into Egypt, he appears to have found the freehold tenure prevailing, which, however, he converted into a tenancy at will, or, at any rate, into a conditional tenancy. Other intimations are found in Genesis which confirm the general statements which have just been made. Daughters do not appear to have had any inheritance. If there are any exceptions to this rule, they only serve to prove it by the special manner in which they are mentioned. Thus Job is recorded (xlii, 15) to have given his daughters an inheritance conjointly with their brothers. How highly the privileges conferred by primogeniture were valued may be learned from the history of Jacob and Esau. In the patriarchal age doubtless these rights were very great. See BIRTHRIGHT. The eldest son, as being by nature the first fitted for command, assumed influence and control, under his father, over the family and its dependents; and when the father was removed by death, he readily, and as if by an act of Providence, took his father's place. Thus he succeeded to the property in succeeding to the headship of the family, the clan, or the tribe. At first the eldest son most probably took exclusive possession of his father's property and power; and when, subsequently, a division became customary, he would still retain the largest share—a double portion, if not more (Gen. xxvii, 25, 29, 40). That in the days of Abraham other sons partook with the eldest, and that, too, though they were sons of concubines, is clear from the story of Hagar's expulsion: "Cast out (said Sarah) this bondwoman and her son; for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac" (Gen. xxi, 10). The few notices left us in Genesis of the transfer of property from hand to hand are interesting, and bear a remarkable similarity to what takes place in Eastern countries even at this day (Gen. xxi, 22 sq.; xxiii, 9 sq.). The purchase of the Cave of Machpelah as a family burying-place for Abraham, detailed in the last passage, serves to show the safety of property at that early period, and the facility with which an inheritance was transmitted even to sons' sons (comp. Gen. xlix, 29). That it was customary, during the father's lifetime, to make a disposition of property, is evident from Gen. xxiv, 35, where it is said that Abraham had given all he had to Isaac. This statement is further confirmed by ch. xxv, 5, 6, where it is added that Abraham gave to the sons of his concubines "gifts, sending them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward unto the east country." Sometimes, however, so far were the children of unmarried females from being dismissed with a gift, that they shared, with what we should term the legitimate children, in the father's property and rights. See CONCUBINE. Thus Dan and Naphtali were sons of Bilhah, Rachel's maid, whom she gave to her husband, failing to bear children herself. So Gad and Asher were, under similar circumstances, sons of Zilpah, Leah's maid (Gen. xxx, 2–14). In the event of the eldest son's dying in the father's lifetime, the next son took his place; and if the eldest son left a widow, the next son made her his wife (Gen. xxxviii, 7 sq.), the offspring of which union was reckoned to the first-born and deceased son. Should the second likewise die, the third son took his place (Gen. xxxviii, 11). While the rights of the first-born were generally established and recognised, yet were they sometimes set aside in favor of a younger child. The blessing of the father or the grandsire seems to have been an act essential in the devolution of power and property—in its effects not unlike wills and testaments with us; and instances are not wanting in which this (so to term it) testamentary bequest set aside consuetudinary laws, and gave precedence to a younger son (Gen. xlviii, 15 sq.). Special claims on the parental regards were acknowledged and rewarded by special gifts, as in the case of Jacob's donation to Joseph (Gen. xlviii, 22). In a similar manner, bad conduct on the part of the eldest son (as well as of others) subjected him, if not to the loss of his rights of property, yet to the evil influence of his father's dying malediction (Gen. xlix, 3); while the good and favored, though younger son, was led by the paternal blessing to anticipate, and probably also to reap, the richest inheritance of individual and social happiness (Gen. xlix, 8–22). See HEIR; ADOPTION.

The original promise made to Abraham of the land of Palestine was solemnly repeated to Isaac (Gen. xxvi, 3), the reason assigned being because "Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws," while it is expressly declared that the earlier inhabitants of the country were dispossessed and destined to extermination for the greatness of their iniquity. The possession of the promised land was embraced by Isaac in his dying benediction to Jacob (Gen. xxviii, 3, 4), to whom God vouchsafed (Gen. xxviii, 15; see also xxxv, 10, 11) to give a renewed assurance of the destined inheritance. That this donation, however, was held to be dependent for the time and manner of its fulfilment on the divine will, appears from Gen. xxxiii, 18, where Jacob, on coming into the land of Canaan, bought for a hundred pieces of money "a parcel of a field, at the hand of the children of Hamor." Delayed though the execution of the promise was, confidence never deserted the family of Abraham, so that Joseph, dying in the land of Egypt, assured his brothers that they would be visited by God and placed in possession of Canaan, enjoining on them, in this conviction, that, when conducted to their possession, they should carry his bones with them out of Egypt (Gen. l, 25). A promise thus given, thus repeated, and thus believed, easily, and indeed unavoidably, became the fundamental principle of that settlement of property which Moses made when at length he had effected the divine will in the redemption of the children of Israel. The observances, and practices too, which we have noticed as prevailing among the patriarchs, would, no doubt, have great influence on the laws which the Jewish legislator originated or sanctioned. The land of Canaan was divided among the twelve tribes descended through Isaac and Jacob from Abraham. The division was made by lot for an inheritance among the families of the sons of Israel, according to the tribes, and to the number and size of families in each tribe. The tribe of Levi, however, had no inheritance; but forty-eight cities with their suburbs were assigned to the Levites, each tribe giving according to the number of cities that fell to its share (Numb. xxxiii, 50; xxxiv, 1; xxxv, 1). The inheritance thus acquired was never to leave the tribe to which it belonged; every tribe was to keep strictly to its own inheritance. An heiress, in consequence, was not allowed to marry out of her own tribe, lest property should pass by her marriage into another tribe (Numb. xxxvi, 6–9). This restriction led to the marriage of heiresses with their near relations: thus the daughters of Zelophehad "were married unto their father's brother's sons," "and their inheritance remained in the tribe of the family of their father" (ver. 11, 12; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* iv, 7, 5). In general cases the inheritance went to sons, the first-born receiving a double portion, "for he is the beginning of his father's strength." If a man had two wives, one beloved, the other hated, and if the first-born were the son of her who was hated, he nevertheless was to enjoy "the right of the first-born" (Deut. xxi, 15). If a man left no sons, the inheritance passed to his daughters; if there was no daughter, it went to his brothers; in case there were no brothers, it was given to his father's brothers; if his father had no brothers, it came into possession of the nearest kinsman (Numb. xxvii, 8). The land was Jehovah's, and could not, therefore, be permanently alienated. See HUSBANDRY. Every fiftieth year, whatever land had been sold returned to its former owner. The value and price of land naturally rose or fell in proportion to the number of years there were to elapse prior to the ensuing fiftieth or jubi-

lee year. If he who sold the land, or a kinsman, could redeem the land before the year of jubilee, it was to be restored to him on his paying to the purchaser the value of the produce of the years remaining till the jubilee. Houses in villages or unwalled towns might not be sold forever; they were restored at the jubilee, and might at any time be redeemed. If a man sold a dwelling-house situated in a walled city, he had the option of redeeming it within the space of a full year after it had been sold; but if it remained unredeemed, it belonged to the purchaser, and did not return to him who sold it even at the jubilee (Lev. xxv, 8, 23). The Levites were not allowed to sell the land in the suburbs of their cities, though they might dispose of the cities themselves, which, however, were redeemable at any time, and must return at the jubilee to their original possessors (Lev. xxvii, 16). See LAND.

The regulations which the laws of Moses established rendered wills, or a testamentary disposition of (at least) landed property, almost, if not quite unnecessary; we accordingly find no provision for anything of the kind. Some difficulty may have been now and then occasioned when near relations failed; but this was met by the traditional law, which furnished minute directions on the point (Mishna, *Baba Bathra*, iv, 3, c. 8, 9). Personal property would naturally follow the land, or might be bequeathed by word of mouth. At a later period of the Jewish polity the mention of wills is found, but the idea seems to have been taken from foreign nations. In princely families they appear to have been used, as we learn from Josephus (*Ant.* xiii, 16, 1; xvii, 3, 2; *War*, ii, 2, 3); but such a practice can hardly suffice to establish the general use of wills among the people. In the New Testament, however, wills are expressly mentioned (Gal. iii, 15; Heb. ix, 17). Michaelis (*Commentaries*, i, 431) asserts that the phrase (2 Sam. xvii, 23; 2 Kings xx, 1) "set thine house in order" has reference to a will or testament. But his grounds are by no means sufficient, the literal rendering of the words being, "give commands to thy house." The utmost which such an expression could inferentially be held to comprise in regard to property is a dying and final distribution of personal property; and we know that it was not unusual for fathers to make, while yet alive, a division of their goods among their children (Luke xv, 12; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* v, 197). See HERITAGE.

Inhibition (Lat. *inhibitio*, from *inhibeo*, I restrain) is in some churches "a writ by which an inferior is commanded by a superior ecclesiastical authority to stay the proceedings in which it is engaged. Thus, if a member of a college appeals to the visitor, the visitor inhibits all proceedings against the appellant until the appeal is determined. When the archbishop visits, he inhibits the bishop of the diocese; when the bishop visits, he inhibits the archdeacon; which inhibitions continue in force until the last parish is visited. If a lapse happens while the inhibition is in force against the bishop, the archbishop must institute; institution by the bishop would be void, as his power is suspended."

Iniquity (prop. עָוֹן, ἀδικία; but represented in the A. Vers. by several other words) means in Scripture not only sin, but, by metonymy, also the *punishment* of sin, and the expiation of it: "Aaron will bear the iniquities of the people;" he will atone for them (Exod. xxviii, 38). The Lord "visits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children" (Exod. xx, 5); he sometimes causes visible effects of his wrath to fall on the children of criminal parents. "To bear inquity" is to endure the punishment of it, to be obliged to expiate it. The priests bear the iniquity of the people; that is, they are charged with the expiation of it (Exod. xxviii, 38; Lev. x, 17). See SIN.

Initiation, a common term in the early Church for baptism, having reference to the full instruction in the mysteries of Christianity which was given to the baptized, but withheld from the unbaptized. The baptized were thus called *initiati*, οἱ μεμυημένοι, μυσταί, or μυσταγώγητοι; and it is very common to find the fathers using the expression "the initiated will understand" in their preaching to mixed congregations, especially when they were speaking of anything which belonged to the doctrine of the holy Eucharist. This expression is said by Casaubon to occur fifty times in the sermons of St. Chrysostom alone.—Blunt, *Theolog. Dict.* i, 348. Several other names were given to these persons, such as πιστοί, *fideles*, φωτιζόμενοι, etc. The word has sometimes been employed with reference to the supposed duty of *reserve* in communicating divine knowledge, as though the holy Scriptures justified the withholding instruction in Christianity from persons in an early stage of their Christian course.—Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. i, ch. iv, § 2. See DISCIPLINA ARCANI.

Injury, a violation of the rights of another. "Some," says Grove, "distinguish between *injustitia* and *injuria.* Injustice is opposed to justice in general, whether negative or positive; an injury, to negative justice *alone.* See JUSTICE. An injury is wilfully doing to another what ought not to be done. This is injustice too, but not the whole idea of it; for it is injustice also to refuse or neglect doing what ought to be done. An injury must be wilfully committed; whereas it is enough to make a thing unjust that it happens through a culpable negligence. 1. *We may injure a person in his soul* by misleading his judgment, by corrupting the imagination, perverting the will, and wounding the soul with grief. Persecutors who succeed in their compulsive measures, though they cannot alter the real sentiments by external violence, yet sometimes injure the soul by making the man a hypocrite. 2. *We may injure another in his body* by homicide, murder, preventing life, dismembering the body by wounds, blows, slavery, and imprisonment, or any unjust restraint upon its liberty; by robbing it of its chastity, or prejudicing its health. 3. *We may injure another in his name and character* by our own false and rash judgments of him; by false witness; by charging a man to his face with a crime which either we ourselves have forged, or which we know to have been forged by some other person; by detraction or backbiting; by reproach, or exposing another for some natural imbecility either in body or mind; or for some calamity into which he is fallen, or some miscarriage of which he has been guilty; by innuendoes, or indirect accusations that are not true. Now if we consider the *value* of character, the *resentment* which the injurious person has of such treatment when it comes to his own turn to suffer it, the *consequence* of a man's losing his good name, and, finally, the *difficulty* of making reparation, we must at once see the injustice of lessening another's good character. There are these two considerations which should sometimes restrain us from speaking the whole truth of our neighbor, when it is to his disadvantage. (1.) That he may possibly live to see his folly, and repent and grow better. (2.) Admitting that we speak the truth, yet it is a thousand to one but when it is bandied about for some time it will contract a deal of falsehood. 4. *We may injure a person in his relations and dependencies.* In his servants, by corrupting them; in his children, by drawing them into evil courses; in his wife, by sowing strife, attempting to alienate her affections. 5. *We may be guilty of injuring another in his worldly goods or possessions:* (1.) By doing him a mischief without any advantage to ourselves, through envy and malice. (2.) By taking what is another's, which is theft." See Grove, *Mor. Phil.* ch. viii, p. 2; Watts, *Sermons*, vol. ii, ser. 33; Tillotson, *Sermons*, ser. 42.

Ink (דְּיוֹ, *deyo'*, so called from its *blackness*, Jer. xxxvi, 18; Gr. μέλαν, *black*, 2 Cor. iii, 3; 2 John 12; 3 John 13). The most simple, and hence probably the most ancient mode of preparing ink was a mixture of water with charcoal powdered, or with soot, to which

gum was added. The Hebrews made use of different colors for writing, as did also the ancient Egyptians, and some of the books of the former are stated by Josephus to have been written in gold. The mode of writing mentioned in Numb. v, 23, where it is said that "the priest shall write the curses in a book and blot them out with the bitter water," was with a kind of ink prepared for the purpose, without any calx of iron or other material that could make a permanent dye; these maledictions were then washed off the parchment into the water, which the woman was obliged to drink: so that she drank the very words of the execration. The ink still used in the East is almost all of this kind; a wet sponge will completely obliterate the finest of their writings. The ancients used several kinds of tinctures as ink; among them that extracted from the cuttle-fish, called in Hebrew תְּכֵלֶת, *tekeleth.* Their ink was not so fluid as ours. Demosthenes reproaches Æschines with laboring in the grinding of ink, as painters do in the grinding of their colors. The substance found in an inkstand at Herculaneum looks like a thick oil or paint, with which the manuscripts had been written in a sort of relievo, visible in the letters when a leaf is held to the light in a horizontal direction. Such vitriolic ink as has been used on the old parchment manuscripts would have corroded the delicate leaves of the papyrus, as it has done the skins of the most ancient manuscripts of Virgil and Terence in the library of the Vatican; the letters are sunk into the parchment, and some have eaten quite through it, in consequence of the corrosive acid of the vitriolic ink with which they were written. See WRITING.

Ink-horn (קֶסֶת, *ke'seth*, a round *vessel*), an inkstand worn in the girdle (Ezek. ix, 2, 3, 11). This implement is one of considerable antiquity; it is common throughout the Levant, and is often seen in the houses of the Greeks. To one end of a long brass tube for holding pens is attached the little case containing the moistened sepia used for ink, which is closed with a lid and snap, and the whole stuck with much importance in the girdle. This is, without doubt, substantially the instrument borne by the individual whom Ezekiel mentions as "one man clothed in linen, with a writer's ink-horn by his side." We find the Egyptian scribes had likewise a cylindrical box for ink, which was probably carried in a similar manner. Besides these, the modern Egyptians have a regular inkstand for more extensive writing. The ancient Egyptians had writing-tablets, which are square pallets of wood, with longitudinal grooves to hold the kash or small reeds used for writing; the well, for color, in some is in the usual form of an oval or signet; towards the upper end of the pallet on others is inscribed the name of the owner. In bronze, there are cylindrical boxes for ink, with a chain for the pen-case, the whole similar to the hieroglyphical symbol for scribe or writing. The monuments likewise represent scribes with inkstands in their left hands, containing two bottles for different colored inks (Wilkinson, ii, 176). See WRITING.

Modern Oriental Writing Implements.

Ancient Egyptian Writing-tablet. (From Abbott's Egyptian Museum.)

Inn (מָלוֹן, *malôn*, Gen. xlii, 27; xliii, 21; Exod. iv, 24, a *lodging*-place, as elsewhere rendered; κατάλυμα, Luke ii, 7, a place for *loosing* the beasts of their burden, rendered "guest-chamber," Mark xiv, 14; Luke xxiii, 11; πανδοχεῖον, Luke x, 34, a place for *receiving all* comers). Inns, in our sense of the term, were, as they still are, unknown in the East where hospitality is religiously practised. The khans, or caravanserais, are the representatives of European inns, and these were established but gradually. It is doubtful whether there is any allusion to them in the Old Testament. The halting-place of a caravan was selected originally on account of its proximity to water or pasture, by which the travellers pitched their tents and passed the night. Such was undoubtedly the "inn" at which occurred the incident in the life of Moses narrated in Exod. iv, 24. It was probably one of the halting-places of the Ishmaelitish merchants who traded to Egypt with their camel-loads of spices. Moses was on his journey from the land of Midian, and the merchants in Gen. xxxvii are called indiscriminately Ishmaelites and Midianites. At one of these stations, too, the first which they reached after leaving the city, and no doubt within a short distance from it, Joseph's brethren discovered that their money had been replaced in their wallets (Gen. xlii, 27).

Increased commercial intercourse, and, in later times, religious enthusiasm for pilgrimages, gave rise to the establishment of more permanent accommodation for travellers. On the more frequented routes, remote from towns (Jer. ix, 2), caravanserais were in course of time erected, often at the expense of the wealthy. The following description of one of those on the road from Bagdad to Babylon will suffice for all: "It is a large and substantial square building, in the distance resembling a fortress, being surrounded with a lofty wall, and flanked by round towers to defend the inmates in case of attack. Passing through a strong gateway, the guest enters a large court, the sides of which are divided into numerous arched compartments, open in front, for the accommodation of separate parties and for the reception of goods. In the centre is a spacious raised platform, used for sleeping upon at night, or for the devotions of the faithful during the day. Between the outer wall and the compartments are wide vaulted arcades, extending round the entire building, where the beasts of burden are placed. Upon the roof of the arcades is an excellent terrace, and over the gateway an elevated tower containing two rooms, one of which is open at the sides, permitting the occupants to enjoy every breath of air that passes across the heated plain. The terrace is tolerably clean, but the court and stabling below are ankle-deep in chopped straw and filth" (Loftus, *Chaldea*, p. 13). The great khans established by the Persian kings and great men, at intervals of about six miles on the roads from Bagdad to the sacred places, are provided with stables for the horses of the pilgrims. "Within these stables, on both sides, are other cells for travellers" (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 478, note). The "stall" or "manger," mentioned in Luke ii, 7, was probably in a stable of this kind. Such khans are sometimes situated near running streams, or have a supply of water of some kind, but the traveller must carry all his provisions with him (Ouseley, *Trav. in Persia*, i, 261, note). At Damas-

cus the khans are, many of them, substantial buildings; the small rooms which surround the court, as well as those above them which are entered from a gallery, are used by the merchants of the city for depositing their goods (Porter's *Damascus*, i, 33). The *wekálehs* of modern Egypt are of a similar description (Lane, *Mod. Eg.* ii, 10). In some parts of modern Syria a nearer approach has been made to the European system. The people of es-Salt, according to Burckhardt, support four taverns (*Menzel* or *Medhafe*) at the public expense. At these the traveller is furnished with everything he may require, so long as he chooses to remain, provided his stay is not unreasonably protracted. The expenses are paid by a tax on the heads of families, and a kind of landlord superintends the establishment (*Trav. in Syria*, p. 36). Usually, however, in Syrian towns, where there is no regular khan, the *menzoul* or public house is part of the sheik's establishment, with a keeper who makes a moderate charge for catering to his guests in addition to the cost of provisions. See CARAVANSERAI.

Plan of the Khan at Adalia, in Asia Minor.

"The house of paths" (Prov. viii, 2, ἐν οἴκῳ διόδων, *Ven. Vers.*), where Wisdom took her stand, is understood by some to refer appropriately to a khan built where many ways met and frequented by many travellers. A similar meaning has been attached to גֵּרוּת כִּמְהָם, *gêrûth Kimhâm*, "the hostel of Chimham" (Jer. xli, 17) beside Bethlehem, built by the liberality of the son of Barzillai for the benefit of those who were going down to Egypt (Stanley, *Sin. and Palest.* p. 163; App. § 90). The Targum says, "which David gave to Chimham, son of Barzillai the Gileadite" (comp. 2 Sam. xix, 37, 38). With regard to this passage, the ancient versions are strangely at variance. The Sept. had evidently another reading with ב and ג transposed, which they left untranslated γαβηραχαμάα, Alexand. γηβηρωθχαμάαμ. The Vulgate, if intended to be literal, must have read גֵּרִים בִּכְנַ״מ, *peregrinantes in Chanaam.* The Arabic, following the Alexandrian MS., read it ἐν γῇ Βηρωθχαμάαμ, "in the land of Berothchamaam." The Syriac has *b'edrê*, "in the threshing-floors," as if בְּגָרְנוֹת, *begornôth*. Josephus had a reading different from all, בְּגִדְרוֹת, *begidrôth*, "in the folds of" Chimham; for he says the fugitives went "to a certain place called Mandra" (Μάνδρα λεγόμενον, *Ant.* x, 9, 5), and in this he was followed by Aquila and the Hexaplar Syriac.

The πανδοκεῖον (Luke x, 34) probably differed from the κατάλυμα (Luke ii, 7) in having a "host" or "innkeeper" (πανδοκεύς, Luke x, 35), who supplied some few of the necessary provisions, and attended to the wants of travellers left to his charge. The word has been adopted in the later Hebrew, and appears in the Mishna (*Yebamoth*, xvi, 7) under the form פונדק, *pûndak*, and the host is פונדקי, *pûndâki*. The Jews were forbidden to put up their beasts at establishments of this kind kept by idolaters (*Aboda Zara*, ii, 1). It appears that houses of entertainment were sometimes, as in Egypt (Herod. ii, 35), kept by women, whose character was such that their evidence was regarded with suspicion. In the Mishna (*Yebamoth*, xvi, 7) a tale is told of a company of Levites who were travelling to Zoar, the city of Palms, when one of them fell ill on the road and was left by his comrades at an inn, under the charge of the hostess (פונדקית, *pûndekith* = πανδοκευτρία). On their return to inquire for their friend, the hostess told them he was dead and buried, but they refused to believe her till she produced his staff, wallet, and roll of the law. In Josh. ii, 1, זוֹנָה, *zônâh*, the term applied to Rahab, is rendered in the Targum of Jonathan פּוּנדקיתא, *pûndekîthâ*, "a woman who keeps an inn." So in Judg. xi, 1, of the mother of Jephthah; of Delilah (Judg. xvi, 1) and the two women who appealed to Solomon (1 Kings iii, 16). The words, in the opinion of Kimchi on Josh. ii, i, appear to have been synonymous. See KHAN.

Inner (i. e. DOMESTIC, or "*Home*") **Missions** is the name given, in the Protestant churches of Germany, to any association of evangelical Christians for the purpose of relieving the spiritual and temporal wants of the community by disseminating the Gospel truth, and affording help in temporal concerns.

I. *Origin and Organization.*—Christianity commands that faith should manifest itself in deeds of love; hence, as early as the apostolical times, we see deacons and deaconesses appointed to attend to the poor and the sick, distribute alms, etc. This was continued in later days by Origen, St. Anthony, etc. When, in the 4th century, Christianity became the religion of the state, the clergy assumed this office, which, from the abundance of means in the Church, had become a very important one. In subsequent times we find Francis of Assisi, Elizabeth of Thuringia, Francis of Sales, and a number of religious orders, hospitallers, sisters of charity, etc., devoting themselves to the care of the poor, the aged, and the sick. Hospitals, houses of refuge, orphan asylums, etc., were established for these purposes. The Protestant Church, in consequence of its subjection to the state, could exert itself but little in that direction, being oftentimes even prevented by law from the care of the poor. Still efforts were made by private individuals, such as August Hermann Francke, whose orphan asylum at Halle became a model which was imitated in other places; Biblical, missionary, and tract societies were established in Germany, and a number of houses of refuge and infant schools established. In modern times a fresh impulse was given to this evangelical movement by England. The attempts of Howard, Wilberforce, and Buxton were continued on an enlarged scale by lord Ashley, the duke of Argyle, Elizabeth Fry, etc. City missions, Magdalen and night asylums, Sabbath and ragged schools, were established. Chalmers, first in the Presbyterian and then in the Free Church of Scotland, restored the diacony and care of the poor on an ecclesiastical basis. Similar efforts were made in France, among the Romanists, by the Sisters of St. Mary and St. Joseph, and St. Regis.

II. *Sphere.*—The German inner missions endeavor to promote infant, secular, and Sunday school associations, institutions of refuge, intercourse with the families, etc. They at the same time take part in the social questions of the day, and labor to systematize the aid given to the poor, to promote personal intercourse between the giver and the receiver, the purification of morals; and for these purposes they have established female benevolent associations, diaconies, nurseries, labor societies, etc. The influx of communistic ideas they seek to counterbalance by establishing schools for apprentices and adults, societies for the education of servants, both male and female, and for the propagation of good books. They oppose unchristian and unecclesiastical tendencies by promoting the study of the Scriptures, establishing family worship, awakening religious feelings in the families, organizing book and tract societies, sending out colporteurs and street preachers, and opposing prostitution, drunkenness, and all other immorality. They discoun-

tenance revolution as subversive of political organization, and as the enemy of religion and of morality: in this department they act through political speeches and the press, in raising the standard of popular literature, and especially by their influence over the rising generation. They also attend to the prisons, trying to promote Christian love in the hearts of the officers intrusted with their charge, and forming persons for that office in their institutions. Aside from the protective associations for culprits who have finished their time of imprisonment, they endeavor also to establish asylums for them.

III. *Extent.*—In Germany the inner missions embrace some eleven to twelve million Protestants, not regularly connected with any Church, the floating population, the workmen's associations, which are often a prey to atheism and communism, travellers and strangers, etc. In this manner they become a friendly ally of the government, of which all they require is the protection of their associations and freedom of worship. With regard to the Church, they labor for the evangelizing of the masses according to a truly Christian spirit, but without entering into any of the disputes of the different confessions, and without seeking to gain proselytes. Their agents are women as well as men; for instance, Elizabeth Fry, Sarah Martin, Amelia Sieveking, etc. The absolute necessity of such an association was shown by statistical statements of the wants of the population, which were especially collected by Wichern. From this starting-point the institution in question developed its labors. Aside from the organization of societies, which were soon propagated throughout the country, it directed its attention to the establishing of houses of refuge, to which that established by Wichern at Horn, near Hamburg, served as model, and of which, in 1858, there were some 140 in existence in Germany. For the care of the poor it was difficult to do much, as the inner missions could not well associate themselves with the municipal organizations for that purpose, yet in some places, as at Erlangen and at Ansbach, the voluntary system of relief has produced good results. The inner missions also labor to promote the observance of the Sabbath, and to distribute Bibles. Their most important results, so far, in Germany, are the establishing of Bible dépôts, of associations to meet the wants of the ignorant, the improvement of the prison systems, which has been adopted in a number of countries, etc.

The interest of Germany in the cause of inner missions has of late greatly increased. The *Congress for Inner Missions*, which in 1848 was organized in connection with the *Church Diet* (*Kirchentag*), has ever since held annual or biennial general meetings in connection with the sittings of the Church Diet. At these meetings reports are made on the condition of religious life in Germany, and the proper remedies for the existing evils are discussed. The establishment of houses of refuge and of Christian lodging-houses, the care of the poor and of discharged prisoners, the solution of the social question, the extension of Young Men's Christian Associations, and of Bible and other religious societies, are the chief subjects which engage the attention of every congress. In addition to the General Congress for Inner Missions, a number of provincial associations for the same purpose have been organized. Thus a *South-western Conference for Inner Missions* was established in 1865; a central association for the inner mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the kingdom of Saxony in 1868. The *Central Committee for Inner Missions*, which is elected at every meeting of the Congress for Inner Missions, and is composed of some of the most prominent clergymen and laymen of Germany, endeavors to carry out the resolutions of the congresses, and to invoke the proper legislation of the state government for the suppression of vice and immorality, especially of prostitution. Germany has a number of papers advocating the cause of inner missions, the most important of which, the *Fliegende Blätter für innere Mission*, is published by Wichern (established in 1850). See also Merz, *Armuth u. Christenthum* (1841); Wichern, *Denkschrift* (1849); Braune, *Fünf Vorlesungen* (1850); Buss (Roman Catholic), *Die Volksmissionen* (1851); Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, viii, 919. For a fuller account of the subject, especially with regard to America, England, and other countries, see MISSIONS, HOME.

Innocent (prop. נָקִי, ἀθῶος). The Hebrews considered innocence as consisting chiefly in an exemption from external faults committed contrary to the law; hence they often join innocent with hands (Gen. xxxvii, 22; Psa. xxiv, 4). "I will wash my hands in innocency" (Psa. xxvi, 6); "Then have I cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocency" (Psa. lxxiii, 13). Josephus admits of no other sins than those actions which are put in execution (*Ant.* xii, 7, 1). Sins in thought, in his account, are not punished by God. This is a very different standard of morality from that of the Gospel (Matt. v, 28; John iii, 15), or even of the O. T. (Psa. li, 6). To be innocent is used sometimes for being exempt from punishment. "I will not treat you as one innocent" (Jer. xlvi, 28); literally, I will not make thee innocent; I will chastise thee, but like a kind father. Jeremiah (xlix, 12), speaking to the Edomites, says, "They who have not (so much) deserved to drink of the cup of my wrath, have tasted of it." Nahum (i, 3) declares that "God is ready to exercise vengeance; he will make no one innocent; he will spare no one;" (Exod. xxxiv, 7, Heb.), "Thou shalt make no one innocent;" no sin shall remain unpunished. "With the pure thou wilt show thyself pure" (Psa. xviii, 26); thou treatest the just as just, the good as good: thou never dost confound the guilty with the innocent.

Innocent I, St., a native of Albano, near Rome, became pope April 27, 402, as successor of Anastasius I. St. Chrysostom had just been driven from Constantinople and exiled to Bithynia in consequence of his zeal against the Arians, and of his attacks against the empress Eudoxia. Innocent I at once actively took his part, and sought to have the affair referred to a council of the joint bishops of the Eastern and Western churches. Failing in this, he next attempted an arrangement with the emperor, but his envoys were ill treated, and accomplished nothing. St. Chrysostom died in the mean time, but Innocent resolved to cease all intercourse with Constantinople until justice was done to his memory. The Western Church was itself in a state of great disturbance; in Africa the Donatists (q. v.) were giving much trouble, and Innocent finally caused them to be condemned by the Council of Carthage (405); in Rome Vigilantius opposed the abuses introduced into the Church, such as the celibacy of the priests, the worship of images, and monastic life. At the same time Alaric was marching with the Goths against Rome: the Christians fled to their churches, and Innocent permitted the heathen to offer up sacrifices to their gods; but prayers and sacrifices proved in vain, and the pope was obliged to pay to Alaric the ransom of the city, which was nevertheless taken by the barbarians Aug. 24, 410, and sacked. It was retaken, but plundered the following year by Astolf, Alaric's brother-in-law. After the Goths had left the neighborhood of Rome, Innocent I, who had sought refuge with the emperor at Ravenna, returned to the city, and by his efforts to restore its prosperity gained a great many heathens to the Church. He commanded that Sundays should be considered fast-days as well as Fridays, enjoined celibacy on the priests, and took repressive measures against the Macedonians. His course against the Pelagians seems to have been variable. Schaff says that he commended the Africans, who had condemned Pelagianism in two synods (Carthage and Mileve, now Melas), for having addressed themselves to the Church of St. Peter to obtain an approval for their acts, but that he refrained from giving judgment. He died March 12, 417, was canonized, and ranks among the highest saints of the Roman Catholic Church. He is commemorated on July 28. His decre-

tals are to be found in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus, and the most complete collection of his letters in Schönemann's *Pontificum Rom. epistolæ genuinæ*. Labbe, *Concil.* ii, 1245-1308, gives thirty of his letters. Gennadio, in *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, ch. iii, ascribes to him the *Decretum occidentalium et orientalium ecclesiis adversus Pelagianos datum*, published during the reign of his successor, Zozimus I. See Bruys, *Hist. des Papes* (1735, 5 vols. 4to), i, 160; Labbe and Cossart, *Sacrosancta Concilia* (1671, 15 vols. fol.), ii, 1241-1553; Baronius, *Annales*, vi, 401-632; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclesiastique*, v, ch. xxi; Vossius, *Histor. Pelag.*; H. de Noris (Norisius), *Histoire du Pélagianisme*; Alletz, *Hist. des Papes*, i, 95; Anastasius, *Vitæ Roman. Pontificum*, i, 275; Ciaconius, *Vitæ et res gestæ Pontificum Romanorum*, i, 63; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 662; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. v, pt. ii, ch. ii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 886; Neander, *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, ii, 170, 299, 585, 587; Schaff, *Church History*, iii, 797 sq.

Innocent II, Pope (*Gregorio Papareschi*), was born at Rome as one of the family of the Guidoni. He became successively abbot of the Benedictine convent of St. Nicholas at Rome, cardinal-deacon in 1118, and was finally elected pope by one party of the cardinals in 1130, as successor of Honorius II. The other party elected Peter Leonis, under the name of Anacletus II. Innocent fled to France, where Bernard de Clairvaux caused him to be acknowledged as pope by Louis VI and by the Council of Etampes; he was soon after recognised also by Henry II of England, by Lotharius, king of Germany, and even by the Synod of Pisa in 1134. In 1136 he returned to Rome with the emperor, and, after the death of Anacletus in 1138, was universally acknowledged as pope. He drove Arnold of Brescia out of Italy, and put king Roger under the ban, but, having taken the field against the latter, he was made prisoner at Galleccio in 1139. He was afterwards released by abandoning Sicily, Apulia, and Capua to Roger. He had also some severe conflicts with the king of France, and the Romans, having revolted against his government, re-established the senate, and declared themselves independent. In the midst of these troubles Innocent died, Sept. 23, 1143. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Lat. med. et inf. æt.* iv, 33; Lannes, *Pontificat du Pape Innocent II* (Paris, 1741, 8vo); Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xii, pt. ii, ch. ii; Neander, *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, iv, 75, 144, 255.

Innocent III (*a*) (*Lothario Conti*), by far the greatest pope of this name, was born of a noble family of Rome at Anagni in 1161. After a course of much distinction at Paris, Bologna, and Rome, he was made cardinal; and eventually, in 1198, was elected, at the unprecedentedly early age of thirty-seven, a successor of pope Celestine III. While at the high schools of Rome, Paris, and Bologna, he had greatly distinguished himself in the studies of philosophy, theology, and the canon law, and also by several written compositions, especially by his treatise *De Miseria Conditionis Humanæ*. "The gloomy ascetic views which he took in this work of the world and of human nature show a mind filled with contempt for all worldly motives of action, and not likely to be restrained in forwarding what he considered to be his paramount duty by any of the common feelings of leniency, conciliation, or concession, which to a man in his situation must have appeared sinful weaknesses. His ambition and haughtiness were apparently not personal. His interest seems to have been totally merged in what he considered the sacred right of his see, 'universal supremacy,' and the sincerity of his conviction is shown by the steady, uncompromising tenor of his conduct, and by a like uniformity of sentiments and tone throughout his writings, and especially his numerous letters." The external circumstances of his time also furthered Innocent's views, and enabled him to make his pontificate the most marked in the annals of Rome; the culminating point of the temporal as well as the spiritual supremacy of the Roman see. "The emperor Henry VI, king of Italy, and also of Sicily, had lately died, and rival candidates were disputing for the crown of Germany, while Constance of Sicily, Henry's widow, was left regent of Sicily and Apulia in the name of her infant son Frederick II. Innocent, asserting his claim of suzerainty over the kingdom of Sicily, confirmed the regency to Constance, but at the same time obtained from her a surrender of all disputed points concerning the pontifical pretensions over those fine territories. Constance dying shortly after, Innocent himself assumed the regency during Frederick's minority. At Rome, availing himself of the vacancy of the imperial throne, he bestowed the investiture on the prefect of Rome, whom he made to swear allegiance to himself, thus putting an end to the former, though often eluded claim of the imperial authority over that city. In like manner, being favored by the people, ever jealous of the dominion of foreigners, he drove away the imperial feudatories, such as Conrad, duke of Spoleti and count of Assisi, and Marcualdus, marquis of Ancona, and took possession of those provinces in the name of the Roman see. He likewise claimed the exarchate of Ravenna; but the archbishop of that city asserted his own prior rights, and Innocent, says the anonymous biographer, 'prudently deferred the enforcement of his claims to a more fitting opportunity.' The towns of Tuscany, with the exception of Pisa, threw off their allegiance to the empire, and formed a league with Innocent for their mutual support. It was on this occasion that Innocent wrote that famous letter in which he asserts that, 'as God created two luminaries, one superior for the day, and the other inferior for the night, which last owes its splendor entirely to the first, so he has disposed that the regal dignity should be but a reflection of the splendor of the papal authority, and entirely subordinate to it.'" It was in the affairs of Germany, however, that Innocent's position most clearly manifested the greatness of the papal power over the destinies of the world. Setting himself up as supreme arbitrator between the two claimants who were contending for the imperial crown, he decided (in 1201) in favor of Otho, because he descended from "a race (welf) devoted to the Church," with the condition that the disputed concession of the countess Mathilda be wholly resigned to the decisions of the holy see; and, as a natural consequence, he proceeded at the same time to excommunicate Otho's rival, Philip. In spite of a determined resistance of Philip and his friends, which for a time seemed almost to prove successful, but which finally ended in the assassination of Philip, Innocent's triumph in Germany was complete, and his vassal emperor Otho was made temporal lord of the West. But a further triumph crowned the efforts of Innocent in Germany only a short time after. Otho, incurring the displeasure of the pope by his estrangement from the papal see, was excommunicated and deposed in 1210, and Innocent's own ward, Frederick of Sicily, was brought forward as a candidate for the vacated throne, and finally crowned emperor at Aix-la-Chapelle, with the approval of the fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215). "For the second time Innocent was triumphant in Germany. Twice he had decided an imperial election. Against one of the emperors whom he supported he had made his sentence of excommunication and deposition valid; the other he had put forward, intending him to be a mere puppet and instrument in his own hands" (Reichel). But, if Innocent proved himself a great statesman, it must be conceded also that he was very much unlike many of his predecessors, very strict and uncompromising in his notions of discipline and morality. Irregularity and venality were repressed everywhere as soon as discovered. Thus he excommunicated Philip Augustus of France because he had repudiated his wife Ingerburga of Denmark, and had married Agnès de Meranie. "The interdict was laid on France: the dead lay unburied; the

living were deprived of the services of religion. Against an antagonist armed with such weapons, even Philip Augustus, brave and firm though he was, was not a match. The idea of the papal power had too firmly taken hold of men's minds; the French would gladly have remained true to their king; they dared not disobey the vicar of Christ. Besides, as in the case of Nicholas I's intervention with Lothair, Innocent's power was exercised on behalf of morality. Philip was obliged to take back his divorced wife, not yielding, as one of his predecessors, Robert I of France (996-1031), had done, to a feeble superstition; not subdued, like Henry IV, by internal dissensions, but vanquished in open fight with an opponent stronger than himself." As we have already said, the external circumstances of that day seem to have favored Innocent, and enabled him "to assert without concealment the idea of papal theocracy;" that the pope was "the vicegerent of God upon earth;" that to him "was intrusted by St. Peter the government not only of the whole Church, but of the whole world." "Next to God, he was to be so honored by princes that their claim to rule was lost if they failed to serve him; princes might have power on earth, but priests had power in heaven; the claim of princes to rule rested 'on human might, that of priests on divine ordinance.' In short, all the prerogatives which had once attached to the emperors were wrested from them, and transferred, with additions, to the popes" (Reichel). The same fate that had befallen Philip Augustus threatened king Leon of Spain for a marriage of his own cousin, the daughter of the king of Portugal. Not willing to submit to the pope's decision against such a marriage, and supported in his resolution by his father-in-law, excommunication was first resorted to, followed by an interdict on both kingdoms. Not more successful, though engaged in a much better cause, was John, king of England. John having appointed John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, to the vacant see of Canterbury, Innocent would not approve the selection, and bestowed the canonical investiture upon Stephen Langton; and the monks of Canterbury, of course, could and would receive no other archbishop. In a fit of rage, John drove away the monks and seized their property, for which the whole kingdom was laid under an interdict; and, as John continued refractory, the pope pronounced his deposition, released his vassals from their oath of allegiance, and called upon all Christian princes and barons to invade England and dethrone the impious tyrant, promising them the remission of their sins. By the consequent preparation of Philip Augustus of France to carry out the pope's invitation, John was not only forced to yield the point in dispute, agreeing to submit to the pope's will and pay damages to the banished clergy, but he even took an oath of fealty to the Roman see, and at the same time delivered to the papal envoy a charter testifying that he surrendered to pope Innocent and his successors forever the kingdom of England and lordship of Ireland, to be held as fiefs of the holy see by John and his successors, on condition of their paying an annual tribute of 700 marks of silver for England and 300 for Ireland. Nor were England and Sicily the only countries over which Innocent acquired the rights of a feudal suzerain. "In order to make his crown independent of his powerful vassals, and to baffle the claim to supremacy of the king of Castile, Peter II of Aragon voluntarily made himself tributary to the pope, binding himself and his successors to the annual payment of 200 pieces of gold. In return, he was crowned by Innocent at Rome, and took an oath to the pope as his feudal suzerain. From Innocent, too, as his liege lord, John, duke of Bavaria, accepted the kingly crown. Denmark looked to him, and obtained from him justice and redress for the injury inflicted on her royal daughter; and his legate was dispatched to Iceland, to warn the inhabitants not to submit to the excommunicated and apostate priest Severo. Perhaps it was well that in those ages there should be some recognised tribunal and fountain for royal honor; and in times of turbulence princes probably gained more than they lost by becoming the vassals of the pontiffs. Still, such power vested in the hands of an ecclesiastic was a new thing in the Church, and placed beyond dispute the greatness which the papal power had reached" (Reichel).

If, as we have seen, Innocent III would admit of no compromises with immorality and irregularity, he was certainly stern and even more unflinching in his dealings with all those who separated themselves from the body of the Romish Church. "To him, every offence against religion was a crime against society, and, in his ideal Christian republic, every heresy was a rebellion which it was the duty of the rulers to resist and repress." To extirpate this, "the deadliest of sins," he sent two legates, with the title of inquisitors, to France. One of them, Castelnau, having become odious by his severities, was murdered near Toulouse, upon which Innocent ordered a crusade against the Albigenses (q. v.), excommunicated Raymond, count of Toulouse, for abetting them, and bestowed his domains on Simon, count of Montfort. He addressed himself to all the faithful, exhorting them "to fight strenuously against the ministers of the old serpent," and promising them the kingdom of heaven in reward. He sent two legates to attend the crusade, and their letters or reports to him are contained in the collection of his "Epistles" (especially *Epistola* 108 of B. xii, in which the legate Arnaldus relates the taking of Beziers, and the massacre of 30,000 individuals of every age, sex, and condition). Innocent, however, who did not live to see the end of the conflagration he had kindled, can hardly be held responsible for the fearful excesses into which it ran. In 1215 he convened a general council at the Lateran, in which he inculcated the necessity of a new crusade, which he regarded not merely as lawful, but even a most glorious undertaking in behalf of religion and piety. He also launched fresh anathemas against heretics, determined several points of doctrine and discipline, especially concerning auricular confession, and sanctioned the establishment of the two great mendicant monastic orders, the Dominicans and Franciscans, the former to extirpate heresy, and the latter to preach sound doctrines, and to assist the parochial clergy in the execution of their duties. For if ever watchfulness was required by the clergy, it was at this time. "It was in this very century that the darkness of the Middle Ages began to disappear. It was during this very reign of Innocent III that the gray dawn of twilight gave the first promise of modern intelligence and modern independence. . . . Nothing could be more evident than that this spirit of independence, that was everywhere raising its menacing front, if not either subjugated or controlled, would revolutionize the whole structure of society, both feudal and ecclesiastical. To control or subjugate the new spirit was therefore the great problem presented to the Church of the 13th century" (Prof. C. K. Adams, in the *New-Englander*, July, 1870, p. 376). But if, by establishing these mendicant orders, Innocent III had provided himself with willing minions to spread over Europe, and to purify the Church from "modern intelligence" and "modern independence," he had certainly, at the same time, created for himself an opposition which afterwards became a still greater danger to the hierarchy itself, by the opposition which these mendicant orders created among the laity against the parochial clergy (compare Reichel, p. 576 sq.). It remains for us only to add one of the greatest achievements of Innocent's day, undertaken by him, no doubt, that nothing might be wanting to the completeness of his authority throughout the then known world, viz. the establishment of the Latin kingdom at Jerusalem, and the Latin conquest of Constantinople, which Ffoulkes (*Christendom's Divisions*, ii, 226), while yet a communicant of the Roman Catholic Church, does not hesitate to pronounce "one of the foulest acts ever perpetrated under the garb of religion in Christian times; a sorry

connection, unquestionably, for one of his high position and commanding abilities." At the very commencement of his pontificate, Innocent began writing epistles (209 of B. xi) to the patriarch of Constantinople, and other letters to the emperor Alexius, with the view of inducing the former to acknowledge the supremacy of the see of Rome; and although he failed in this, he had, soon after, by an unexpected turn of events, the satisfaction of consecrating a prelate of the Western Church as patriarch of Constantinople; but this by no means resulted, as Innocent most probably desired, in a reunion of churches or Christians; it was only followed by an increase of Church revenues. The Crusaders, whom Innocent had sent forth, as he thought, for the reconquest of the Holy Land, after taking Zara from the king of Hungary, for which they were severely censured by the pope, proceeded to attack Constantinople, and overthrew the Greek empire. All this was done without Innocent's sanction; but when Baldwin wrote to him, acquainting him with the full success of the expedition, Innocent, in his answer to the marquis of Montferrat, forgave the Crusaders in consideration of the triumph which they had secured to the holy Church over the Eastern empire. Innocent sent also legates to Calo Johannes, prince of the Bulgarians, who acknowledged his allegiance to the Roman see (Innocentii III *Epistolæ*). One year after the Lateran Council, "one of the latest acts, and by far the most momentous in the pontificate of Innocent," he was seized with a fatal illness, and died July 16, 1216, in the very prime of life, broken down by overwork, for "the work of the whole world was upon him, as may be seen from his letters, not one of which exhibits the impress of any other mind than his own." In Innocent III the Romish Church lost one of the most extraordinary characters, and in several respects the most illustrious, as he was certainly one of the most ambitious she has ever honored with the pontifical dignity. His pontificate may be fairly considered to have been the period of the highest power of the Roman see. At his death, "England and France, Germany and Italy, Norway and Hungary, all felt the power of Innocent; Navarre, Castile, and Portugal acknowledged his sway; even Constantinople owned his supremacy, and owned it to her cost" (Reichel, p. 247; compare Hallam, *Middle Ages*, vol. ii, pt. i, ch. vii, p. 199). His works, consisting principally of letters and sermons, and the remarkable treatise *On the Misery of the Condition of Man*, above alluded to, were published in two vols. folio (Par. 1682). See Baronius, *Annales;* Pagi, *Breviarium Histor.-criticum;* Lannes, *Histoire du Pontificat du Pape Innoc. III* (Paris, 1741, 12mo); Fabricius, *Bibl. Lat. med. et inf. alt.* iv, 93 sq.; *History of the Christ. Church*, in *Encyclop. Metrop.* vol. iii, ch. i; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xii, pt. ii, chap. ii; Neander, *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, iv, 43, 75, 173, 199, 207, 268, 269, 270, 272, 306, etc.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxv, 890; Böhringer, *Kirche Christi in Biographien*, ii, 2, 321; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages* (Lond. 1870, 8vo), p. 242 sq.; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* (see Index); Bower, *History of the Popes*, vi, 183 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 631 sq.; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Hurter, *Geschichte Inn. III u. seiner Zeitgenossen* (Hamburg, 1834-42, 4 vols.; 3d ed. 1845 sq.).

Innocent III (*b*). Under this name we also find an anti-pope in the Roman Church. He was a descendant of the Frangipani family, and is distinguished from the eminent pope of that name by the surname *Landus*. After the death of Hadrian he contested the succession of Alexander II, who succeeded in securing his person, and Innocent was imprisoned in the monastery Cava. Thus ended a schism which had lasted twenty years, under four successive rivals for the papal throne. (J. H. W.)

Innocent IV (*Sinibaldo de' Fieschi*, of Genoa) was elected as the successor of Celestine IV in the year 1243. In the preceding bitter quarrels between Gregory IX and the emperor Frederick II, cardinal Sinibaldo had shown himself rather friendly towards the emperor; and the imperial courtiers, on receiving the news of his exaltation, were rejoicing at it; but the experienced Frederick checked them by remarking, "I have now lost a friendly cardinal, to find another hostile pope: no pope can be a Ghibelline." Anxious, however, to be relieved from excommunication, Frederick made advances to the new pope, and offered conditions advantageous to the Roman see; but Innocent remained inflexible, and, suddenly leaving Rome, went to Lyons, and there summoned a council in 1245, to which he invited the emperor. Thaddeus of Sessa appeared before the council to answer to the charges brought by the pope against Frederick; and, after much wrangling, Innocent excommunicated and dethroned the emperor, on the ground of perjury, sacrilege, heresy, and defiance of the Church, commanded the German princes to elect a new emperor, and reserved the disposal of the kingdom of Sicily to himself. In Italy the only consequence was that the war which already raged between the Guelphs and Ghibellines continued fiercer than before; in Germany a contemptible rival to Frederick was set up in the person of Henry, landgrave of Thuringia, who was defeated by Conrad, Frederick's son. Frederick's sudden death in Apulia, A.D. 1250, led Innocent to return to Italy, and to offer the crown of Sicily to several princes, one of whom, Richard of Cornwall, observed that the pope's offer "was much like making him a present of the moon." Conrad, the son of Frederick, who had so valiantly and so successfully defended his cause, was excommunicated; but he gave little heed to this act of Innocent's, and even went into Italy in 1252, and took possession of Apulia and Sicily. Two years after he died, and his brother Manfred, who became regent, in a like manner baffled both the intrigues and the open attacks of the court of Rome. Innocent himself died soon after, at the end of 1254, at Rome, leaving Italy and Germany in the greatest confusion in consequence of his outrageous tyranny, and his unbending hostility to the whole house of Swabia. He was succeeded by Alexander IV. He wrote *Apparatus super decretales* (fol., often reprinted): —*De Potestate Ecclesiasticum et Jurisdictione Imperii:*—*Officium in octavis festi Nativitatis B. Mariæ:*—*Interpretationes in Vetus Testamentum.* Nineteen letters of his are given by Labbe, *Concil.* xi, 598-632; forty-eight by Ughelli, *Italia Sacra;* and five by Duchesne, *Historiæ Francorum Scriptores*, v, 412, 861. See Labbe and Cossart. *Sacrosancta Concilia*, xi, 597-716; Bruys, *Hist. des Papes*, iii, 199; Fleury, *Histor. Ecclésiastique;* Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, iii, 589-592; Ph. de Mornay, *Hist. de la Papauté*, p. 376-404; Ciaconius, *Vitæ et res gestæ Pontificum Romanorum*, ii, 99; Paolo Panza, *Vita del gran Pontéfice Innocenzio Quarto* (Naples, 1601, 4to); Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages* (London, 1870, 8vo), p. 264 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 906; *Engl. Cyclop.;* Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xiii, pt. ii, chap. ii; Neander, *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, iv, 76, 183; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 668.

Innocent V (*Peter of Tarantasia*, also called *Peter of Champagni* or *of Champagniaco*) was born at Moustier, in Savoy, in 1225. He was elected pope January 20, 1276, as successor of Gregory X. He was a member of the order of Preaching Friars, into which he had entered quite young, and where he had acquired a great reputation. He succeeded Thomas Aquinas as professor of theology in the University of Paris; was made archbishop of Lyons in 1272, and afterwards bishop of Ostia and grand penitentiary. As soon as he became pope he applied himself to the task of restoring peace to Italy, which was then divided into two contending factions, under the leadership of the Guelphs and the Ghibellines (q. v.), and in this he measurably succeeded. He was also on the eve of inducing the Greek emperor, Michel Palæologus, to confirm the act of union between the Greek and Roman churches, drawn up in the Council of Lyons, when he died June 22, 1276, having occupied the papal throne only five months. He wrote com-

mentaries *Super iv libros Sententiarum* (Toulouse, 1652, 3 vols. fol.):—*Super Pentateuchum; super Lucam; super Epistolas Pauli* (Cologne, 1478; Antw. 1617, fol.); and various treatises: *De Unitate Formæ; De Materia Cœli; De Æternitate Formæ; De Intellectu et Voluntate;* and some other MS. works, the titles of which are given by Quetif, *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum* (Paris, 1719, 2 vols. fol.). See Labbe, *Concilia*, xi, 1007; Ciaconius, *Vitæ et res gestæ Pontificum Romanorum*, ii, 203; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclésiastique*, l. xviii, chap lxxxvi; Duchesne, *Hist. des Papes*, ii, 208; Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, iii, 605; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vi, 301, 302; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 669; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxv, 908; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* cent. xiii, pt. ii, ch. ii.

Innocent VI (*Etienne d'Albert* or *Aubert*), a Frenchman, succeeded Clement VI in 1352. He resided at Avignon, like his immediate predecessors; but, unlike them, he put a check to the disorders and scandals of that court, which have been so strongly depicted by Petrarch, Villani, and other contemporary writers. He reformed the abuses of the reservations of benefices, and enforced the residence of bishops on their sees. His immediate predecessors having lost their influence in the States of the Church, Innocent VI determined on reconquering these territories, and successfully reoccupied, with the assistance of the warlike cardinal Ægidius Albornoz, the various provinces of the papal state which had been seized by petty tyrants. He then sent back to Rome the former demagogue Cola di Rienzo, who, being still dear to the people, repressed the insolence of the lawless barons, but who, becoming himself intoxicated with his power, committed acts of wanton cruelty, upon which the people rose and murdered him in 1354. In 1358 the emperor Charles IV was crowned at Rome by a legate deputed by pope Innocent for the purpose. Innocent died at Avignon, at an advanced age, in 1362. It was during his pontificate that the mendicant orders were persecuted in England, and declared to be an unchristian order by Richard, archbishop of Armagh and primate of Ireland, in a book which he published in defence of the curates or parish priests, entitled *Defensorium Curatorum.* Of course Innocent rallied to the defense of the mendicants. He reprimanded the archbishop, and confirmed anew all the privileges which had been granted by his predecessors to men of that order. A letter of his is given by Labbe, *Concilia*, xi, 1930; four by Ughelli, *Italia Sacra;* and two hundred and fifty by Martene, *Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum*, ii, 843-1072. See Duchesne, *Hist. des Papes*, ii, 261; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclésiastique*, l. xx, chap. lxxxvi; Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, x, 397-596; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 670; *Engl. Cyclop.:* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxv, 910; Neander, *Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church*, v, 44; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xiv, pt. ii, ch. ii; Schlosser, *Weltgesch.* bk. iv, ch. i, 408, 618; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vi, 482 sq.

Innocent VII (cardinal *Cosmo de' Migliorati*, of Sulmona), who had been appointed archbishop of Ravenna and bishop of Bologna by Urban VI, was elected by the *Italian* prelates as the successor of Boniface IX in 1404. At this time "the great Western schism" agitated the Romish Church, the French cardinals supporting a rival pope, Benedict XIII (q. v.), who held his court at Avignon, acknowledged by a part of Europe. After the election of Innocent, a tumult broke out in Rome, excited by the Colonna and by Ladislaus, king of Naples, which obliged the pope to escape to Viterbo. Ladislaus, however, failed in his attempt upon Rome; and Innocent, having returned to his capital, excommunicated him. Innocent died Nov. 6, 1406, after having made his peace with Ladislaus. Some think that he was poisoned. He is spoken of as a man who possessed great learning and virtue, and as governed by the purest motives in all his acts; hostile to all luxury, avariciousness, and simony—evils which were one and all possessed by his rival Benedict, and by his own predecessor Boniface (comp. Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 446 sq.). The charge which some lay to him that he did not keep the promise which he gave on his accession to the papal see that he would, if his rival should be declared the proper incumbent, vacate the papal throne, seems not well founded. It is true Benedict proposed a conference for the alleged purpose of restoring peace and union to the Church of Rome, which Innocent did not agree to, but this was done because Innocent knew that Benedict did not earnestly desire it. He wrote *Oratio de Ecclesiastica Unione; Approbatio regulæ patrum et sororum de penitentia ordinis S. Dominici;* and a letter of his is published by Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, i, 1381. See Labbe, *Concilia*, xi, 2082; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclésiastique*, l. xx, ch. xcix; Duchesne, *Hist. des Papes*, ii, 299; Sismondi, *Histoire des Français*, xii, 211; Maimbourg, *Hist. du grand Schisme d'Occident;* Bruni d'Arezzo, *De Rebus Italicis*, and *Epistolæ Familiares;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 671; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xv, pt. ii, ch. ii; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vi, 748 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxv, 911; Neander, *Hist. of the Christ. Religion and Church*, v, 70, 247; Bower, *History of the Popes*, vii, 91 sq. (J. H. W.)

Innocent VIII (cardinal *Giovanni Battista Cibo*), a Genoese of Greek descent, was during his youth in the service of Alfonso of Aragon, king of Naples, but subsequently entered the Church, Paul II giving him the bishopric of Savone. His conduct was disgracefully irregular: he had seven illegitimate children by different women, and was, besides, married when he took orders. At the death of Sixtus IV serious troubles broke out in Rome. The election was warmly contested, and among the chief agitators was chancellor Borgia, who afterwards attained an unenviable celebrity as Alexander VI; but the manœuvres in favor of Cibo proved at last successful. Innocent had bought the tiara by means of benefices, legations, palaces, and large sums of money, and was elected Aug. 24, 1484. His first undertaking was to conciliate the Italian princes, and to reconcile to the papal see all those whom his predecessor had alienated. Frightened at the advance of Bajazet with his Turks, Innocent wrote to the Christian princes for help in men or money to resist the invasion. Immense sums were at once forwarded to Rome from divers countries; but the pope, pretending that he could not act without the assistance of the German princes (who were then divided by the quarrels between Mathias, king of Hungary, and emperor Frederick, Albert of Brandenburg and Otho of Bavaria, etc.), used the funds thus obtained to war against Ferdinand I, king of Naples, who refused to pay him the usual tribute. The pope favored the revolted Neapolitan barons against Ferdinand I of Naples, in consequence of which the troops of Ferdinand ravaged the territory of Rome; but through the mediation of Lorenzo de Medici and of the duke Sforza of Milan, peace was re-established between the two parties. The Turks were still threatening war. Jem, in order to shun the enmity of his brother Bajazet, had fled to Rhodes, where he was seized by the grand master of the order of St. John, D'Aubusson, and delivered up to the pope in exchange for the cardinal's hat. The pope received Jem with great honor, but took care to secure his person, as he would be an important hostage. In this he was not mistaken, for Bajazet feared the power of his brother, and, to secure his throne, he sent an ambassador to Rome to offer Innocent a large sum if he would keep Jem in prison. The pope accepted the dishonorable bargain, although the sultan of Egypt, who desired Jem, as commander in chief of his forces, to march against Bajazet, offered, on condition of his release, to restore Jerusalem to the Christians, and was even ready to pledge himself to surrender to the pope all the territory that should be taken from the Turks. Under Innocent's successor, the depraved Alexander VI, Jem was poisoned *by order of the pope* (comp. Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 530). Bajazet, of

course, showed himself very generous towards his accomplice, Innocent VIII. On May 29, 1492, he sent him the iron of the spear with which, he asserted, Christ was pierced on the cross, and which was among the booty taken by Mohammed II after the downfall of Constantinople. The relic (although received with great ceremony) was, unfortunately, the third of the kind in Europe, for the emperor of Germany claimed to have the holy lance at Nuremberg, and the king of France in the Holy Chapel at Paris. Innocent VIII died July 25, 1492. Among the principal acts of his administration are the confirmation, in 1485, of the order of the Conception, founded at Toledo by Beatrix of Sylva; the canonization of Leopold of Austria in 1485; the condemnation of the propositions of Mirandola in 1487; the union under the crown of Spain of the three military orders of Calatrava, St. James, and Alcantara, in 1488; and the confirmation of the Brotherhood of Mercy, instituted at Rome for the benefit of condemned criminals. Two letters of Innocent are published by Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, i, 710; v, 948. Roman Catholic writers endeavor to free Innocent VIII from the charge of gross immorality by asserting that he had *only* two illegitimate children, and that they were born before he was made pope; but "the success of Innocent VIII in increasing the population of Rome was a favorite topic with the wits of the day" (Innocuo priscos æquum est debere Quirites. Progenie exhaustam restituit patriam.—Sannazarii *Epigram.* lib. i), and he was graced with "the epitaph which declared that filth, gluttony, avarice, and sloth lay buried in his tomb" (Marultus, *Epigram.* lib. iv). But the conduct of Innocent VIII can hardly compare with the career of his successor, Alexander VI, "the most depraved of all the popes, uniting in himself all the vices of Innocent VIII and the unscrupulous family ambition of Sixtus IV." Indeed, all the latter half of the 16th century scarcely saw a supreme pontiff without the visible evidences of human frailty around him, the unblushing acknowledgment of which is the fittest commentary on the tone of clerical morality (Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 358, 359). See Labbe, *Concilia*, xiii, 1465; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclésiastique*, lib. xxiii, ch. xv; Duchesne, *Historiæ Francorum Scriptores*, ii, 350; Sismondi, *Hist. des Français;* Ciaconius, *Vitæ et res gestæ Pontificum Romanorum*, iii, 90; F. Serdonati, *Vita e Fatti d'Innocenzo VIII* (Milan, 1829, 8vo); Comines, *Mémoires*, lib. vii, ch. i; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 672; *Engl. Cyclop.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 912; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy in the 16th and 17th Centuries*, i, 43, 296; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* p. 436; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vii, 317 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 641 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iii, 460 sq.

Innocent IX (*Giovanni Antonio Facchinetti*), born at Bologna in 1519, had distinguished himself as papal legate at Trent, afterwards as the papal nuncio at Venice, and as president of the Inquisition. He was elected pope after the death of Gregory XIV, in Oct. 1591. He bore a good reputation for learning and piety, but he was too old and feeble for the papal chair, and constantly confined to his bed by illness, and was even obliged to give his audiences there. Notwithstanding these difficulties, however, he took an active part in the affairs of France, favoring the party of the League and of Spain, as his predecessor Gregory had done. A letter of his is still extant (in Cayet, *Chronologie novenaire*), in which he urges Alexander Farnese to hasten the equipment of his troops, to invade France, and to relieve Rouen, all which that general forthwith executed with so much success and skill. He died Dec. 30, 1591, after a short reign of only two months, and was succeeded by Clement VIII. See Labbe, *Concilia*, xv, 1430; Duchesne, *Historiæ Francorum Scriptores*, ii, 457; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclés.* l. xxvi, chap. clxxix; Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, xxi, 124; B. Justiniani, *Oratio habita in funere Innocentii IX* (Rome, 1592, 4to); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 673; *English Cyclop.;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 914; Ranke, *History of the Popes of the 16th and 17th Cent.* ii, 231, 232; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* cent. xvi, sec. iii, pt. i, ch. i.

Innocent X (cardinal *Giovanni Battista Panfili*), born at Rome in 1572, was elected in Sept. 1644, after the death of Urban VIII. He was then seventy-three years of age, and wholly under the control of his sister-in-law, Donna Olimpia Maidalchini Panfili, who appears to have been an unprincipled woman, very fond of money, and anxious to aggrandize her relatives. Innocent, however, displayed in several instances much firmness, justice, and prudence, and a wish to protect the humble and poor against the oppressions of the great. He diminished the taxes, which had been very heavy under his predecessor, Urban VIII, and at the same time embellished Rome. The people of Fermo, on the Adriatic, revolted against their governor, being excited by the local nobility and landholders, who were irritated against him for having by an edict of annona kept the price of corn low; the governor and other official persons were murdered. Innocent sent a commissioner with troops, and the guilty, without distinction of rank, were punished, some being executed, and others sent to the galleys. The district of Castro and Ronciglione, near Rome, was still in possession of the Farnese dukes of Parma, notwithstanding the efforts of Urban VIII to wrest it from them. Disputes about jurisdiction were continually taking place between the officers of the duke and those of the pope. Innocent having consecrated a new bishop of Castro who was not acceptable to the duke, the latter forbade his entering his territories, and as the bishop elect persisted, he was murdered on the road. The pope immediately sent troops to attack Castro, which being taken, he ordered the town to be razed to the foundations, and a pillar erected on the site, with the inscription "Qui fù Castro." He showed the same resolution against the Barberini, who had opposed his election, and was a steadfast enemy of cardinal Mazarin, the supporter of the Barberini. The French prelate, however, outwitted the pope, and obliged him to yield by threatening to take Avignon. Innocent also took an active part in the quarrel between the Jesuits and the Jansenists. As early as 1650, Hubert, bishop of Vabres, had denounced to the pope five propositions ascribed to Jansenius (q. v.), which, in the preceding year, had been referred to the theological faculty. Innocent established a special congregation to examine them, April 20, 1651. De Saint Amour and some other theologians sent by the Jansenists were heard May 19, 1653, but P. Annat, a Jesuit, informs us that the affair had already been judged and decided in advance. Finally a bull was issued, *Cum occasione*, May 30, 1653, condemning the five propositions. It was received in France, and published by order of Louis XIV. Innocent died soon after, Jan. 6, 1654. His anxiety to further the interests of Rome throughout the world is manifest by the pecuniary assistance which he afforded the Venetians and Poles in their wars against the Turks, by his opposition to the peace of Westphalia, fearing that it endangered the Romish tenets, and even the pontifical chair, and especially by the assistance which he gave to the Irish to combat the English, and, if possible, to regain the English territory for his Church. In Germany, also, he secured, by his undaunted efforts, the conversion of several princes and noblemen of influence. He built two beautiful churches in Rome, and left a well-filled treasury, which proved very useful to his successor, Alexander VII. See Bruys, *Hist. des Papes*, v, 253; Duchesne, *Historiæ Francorum Scriptores*, ii, 532; Ciaconius, *Vitæ et res gestæ Pontificum Romanorum*, iv, 642; Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, xxiv, 78; *Relation des délibérations du clergé de France sur la Constitution et sur le Bref de N. S. P. le pape Innocent X* (Paris, 1656, fol.); De Lalane, *Defense de la Constitution du pape Innocent X*, etc. (1655, 4to); *Vie de Madame Olympe Maldachini, qui a gouverné l'Église pendant le pontificat d'Innocent X* (Amst. 1666, 18mo); *Mémoires du Cardinal de Retz*, l. iii;

L. de Saint Amour, *Journal de ce qui s'est fait à Rome dans l'affaire des cinq propositions* (Paris, 1662, fol.); J. C. Rosstenscher, *Historia Innocentii X* (1676, 4to); Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* vi, 673; *Engl. Cyclop.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 915; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 182, 242; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. i, ch. i; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 462 sq.

Innocent XI (cardinal *Benedetto Odescalchi*), born at Como in 1611, succeeded Clement X in 1676. It is said by some that he was a soldier in his younger days, though this has been denied by others (Count Torre Rezzonico, *De Suppositis Militaribus Stipendiis Benedetto Odescalchi*). He was a man of great firmness and courage, austere in his morals, and inflexible in his resolutions, and withal one of the most distinguished popes of the 17th century. He inaugurated many reforms, reduced very materially the pomp and luxury of the papal court, and suppressed various abuses. His administration was entirely free from the weakness of nepotism which had so greatly sullied the fame of many of the pontiffs who had preceded him. His own nephew he obliged to live at Rome, under his pontificate, in a private character; and in this respect, certainly, he has had few equals in the pontifical chair. Indeed, his austerity was so great that it made him many enemies, and oftentimes estranged even some who would gladly have offered him their friendship. His greatest enemies, no doubt, were the Jesuitical order, which he was determined to crush out. The principal event of his pontificate, however, was his quarrel with the imperious Louis XIV of France, particularly provoked by the question of the immunities enjoyed by the foreign ambassadors at Rome, an event which exhibits more clearly than any other act of his both his own character and that of the times, and deserves a few words of explanation. By an old usage or prescription, the foreign ambassadors at Rome had the right of asylum, not only in their vast palaces, but also in a certain district or boundary around them, including sometimes a whole street or square, which the officers of justice or police could not enter, and where, consequently, malefactors and dissolute persons found a ready shelter. These "quartieri," or free districts, were likewise places for the sale of contraband articles and for defrauding the revenue. The abuse had become contagious: several of the Roman princes and cardinals claimed and enforced the same rights and immunities, so that only a small part of the city was left under the sway of the magistrates. The classical advocates for this absurd custom quoted the example of Romulus, who made his new town a refuge for all the lawless persons of the neighborhood. Innocent determined to put a stop to the abuse, and to be master in his own capital; he, however, proceeded at first calmly and with sufficient caution. He would not disturb the present possessors of those immunities, but he declared and made it officially known that in future he would not give audience to any new ambassador who did not renounce for himself and his successors these abusive claims. All the great powers of Europe took umbrage at this very reasonable determination; but the question was not brought to a crisis until the death of the maréchal d'Estrées, the French ambassador at Rome. Just before Louis XIV had appointed the new ambassador, the pope repeated in a bull, dated May, 1687, his previous resolve. In view of this action of the pope, which Louis was determined not to observe, he instructed his minister "to maintain at Rome the rights and the dignity of France;" and in order to support this resolve, he gave him a numerous retinue of military and naval officers, who were to frighten the pope in his own capital. Lavardin's entrance into Rome under such an escort resembled that of a hostile commander. He had also been preceded by several hundred French under-officers, who had entered Rome as private travellers, but who took their quarters near the ambassador's palace, ready for any mischief. Innocent, however, remained firm, he refused to receive the new ambassador, and all the anger of Louis, who seized upon Avignon, and threatened to send a fleet with troops on the Roman coast, had no effect upon him. Lavardin, having remained eighteen months at Rome, unable to see the pope, was obliged to return to France with his credentials unopened. The quarrel was not adjusted till the following pontificate; but the distinct immunities of the foreign ambassadors at Rome continued, after various modifications, until the beginning of the 19th century. This quarrel was, however, not the initiative to a misunderstanding between the two sovereigns. It had been previously opened by the right which Louis XIV claimed to possess, in virtue of the *Droit de Regne*, to appoint to vacant benefices in his kingdom, and to collect the revenues. This right of the French king Innocent XI disputed. Louis XIV issued edict after edict, the pope bull after bull against them; finally, the French clergy demanded that a council should be assembled. This was done, and on Feb. 3, 1682, the council declared that the French clergy indorsed the action of the king, and that the pope should be notified of their decision. While awaiting his answer, the assembly continued its sittings, intending to put an end to all further papal encroachments by establishing firmly the doctrines of the Gallican Church concerning the temporal power of the popes, their infallibility, and the independence of the king. The result of their deliberation was the famous four propositions promulgated March 16, 1682. See GALLICAN CHURCH. Innocent XI, in a solemn consistory, condemned the propositions and the bishops who had voted them, and April 11, 1682, issued a brief annulling the proceedings of the French council. In 1686 he also condemned the doctrines of Molinos (q. v.), who was obliged to make a public recantation, September 3, 1687, besides suffering for the remainder of his life close confinement in the prisons of the Inquisition. At the close of 1676 Innocent took a threatening attitude towards the Jesuits, forbidding them, among other things, to receive any novices into their order. They retorted by calling the pope a Jansenist, offered prayers for his conversion, and entered into an alliance with the French king. Innocent XI, however, died only a few years after, August 21, 1689. It was during his pontificate that James II of England became a Romanist, and endeavored, by a succession of bold attempts, not only to give Romanism toleration, but even make it a Church establishment of his country. (Compare Fox, *James II*, p. 332; Hallam, *Constit. Hist.* ii, 212; Mackintosh, *Hist. of Revolution*, ch. v; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of England* [Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo], vol. ii, chap. viii.) Stoughton claims that these efforts accorded, however, only "with the daring policy of the Jesuits, who were masters at court, but not with the more cautious measures of the papacy." No doubt this is true in a measure. Innocent XI was evidently unwilling to become master of the English ecclesiastical establishment if to be secured by the aid of an order which he abhorred, and which he was determined upon extinguishing; and this our supposition is strengthened by the demand which James II made upon Rome for a red hat for a Jesuit named Petre. See JAMES II. Two letters of this pope are published by Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, iv, 513; x, 53. He wrote also *Breve ad Franciscum episcopum Apamiensem* (Paris, 4to):—*Decretum de sacræ communionis usu datum* (Paris, 1679, 4to). See Palatius, *Vit. Innocentius XI*, in the 5th vol. of the *Gest. Pontif. Rom. vita d'Innocenzo XI* (Venet. 1690); Bruys, *Hist. des Papes*, v, 360; Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, xxv, 311; J. A. Costa (R. Simon), *Hist. de l'Origine des Revenus ecclésiastiques* (Francfort, 1684, 12mo); De Larroque, *Nouveau Traité de la Régale* (1685, 12mo); Bayle, *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* (1686); Heidegger, *Historia Papatus* (Amst. 1698, 4to), pt. ii; De La Luzerne, *Sur la Déclaration de l'assemblée du clergé de France en* 1682 (Par. 1821, 8vo); F. Buonamici, *De Vita et Rebus gestis Innocentii XI* (Rome, 1776, 8vo); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 675; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*,

xxv, 919; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 273, 279; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. i, ch. i; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 464 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vii, 486 sq.; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Innocent XII (cardinal *Antonio Pignatelli*) was born at Naples March 13, 1615, and succeeded Alexander VIII in July, 1691. He had a serious dispute with the emperor Leopold I, who, attempting to revive in Italy the rights of the empire over the former imperial fiefs, which had, during the wars and vicissitudes of ages, become emancipated, published an edict at Rome in June, 1697, enjoining all the possessors of such territories to apply to the emperor for his investiture within a fixed time, or they would be considered as usurpers and rebels. This measure, if enforced, would have affected the greater part of the landed property of Italy, and also the sovereignty of its governments, and of the Roman see among the rest. The pope protested against the edict, and advised the other Italian powers to resist such obsolete pretensions, and, with the support of France, succeeded in persuading Leopold to desist from them. He also succeeded in putting an end to the difficulties existing between France and the see of Rome on the question of investiture [see INNOCENT XI], and obtained from the French clergy an address which amounted almost to a recantation of the four articles of the Gallican Church. The question of Quietism then reappeared. Bossuet accused Fénelon of favoring that tendency in his *Explication sur la vie intérieure*. The book was *moderately* condemned by the pope, in accordance with the report of the Congregation of the Index (q. v.), and Fénelon (q. v.), as is well known, submitted (see vol. iii, p. 529–530). Innocent built the harbor of Ponto d'Anzo on the ruins of the ancient Antium; he constructed the aqueduct of Civita Vecchia; the palace of the Monte Citorio at Rome, for the courts of justice; and the fine line of buildings at Ripagrande, on the north bank of the Tiber, below the town, where vessels which ascend the river load and unload. He also built the asylum, school, and penitentiary of San Michele, and other useful works. Innocent was of regular habits, attentive to business, a lover of justice, and averse to nepotism. He died Sept. 27, 1700, and was succeeded by Clement XI. See Bruys, *Hist. des Papes*, v, 454; Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, xxvi, 69; De Prades, *Abrégé de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, ii, 338; N. P. Giannetasio, *Panegyricus in funere Innocentii XII* (Naples, 1700, 8vo); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 676; *English Cyclop.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 923; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, i, 281–313; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt. i, chap. i; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 466 sq.

Innocent XIII (cardinal *Michel Angelo Conti*), born at Rome May 15, 1655, succeeded Clement XI May 8, 1721. He had previously been papal nuncio for a number of years at different courts, and was made cardinal in 1707, legate at Ferrara in 1709, and bishop of Viterbo in 1712. When he ascended the papal throne, the discussion concerning the constitution *Unigenitus* was in progress with great eagerness on all sides. On June 9, 1721, seven French bishops wrote to Innocent to obtain its withdrawal. Cardinal Althan complained also, in the emperor's name, of the trouble it was creating in Germany. The pope, however, referred the matter to the inquisitors, who condemned the letter of the bishops as injurious to the memory of Clement XI, and disrespectful towards the holy see. Innocent XIII was a man of prudence and experience of the world, and less wilful and headstrong than his predecessor. The most discreditable event of his reign was his giving the cardinal's hat to Dubois (q. v.). He was on the eve of suppressing the order of Jesuits when he died, March 7, 1724. Some think he was poisoned. See Bruys, *Hist. des Papes*, v, 489; Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, xxvii, 442; De Piosseus, *Mémoires de la Régence du duc d'Orleans* (1742, 3 vols. 12mo); A. Tricaud, *Relation de la Mort d'Innocent XIII* (Nancy, 1724, 12mo); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 677; *English Cyclop.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 925; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. iii, p. 485; Guamacci, *Vit. Pontif.* ii, 137 sq., 381 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 467.

Innocent, a Russian prelate, born in 1800 at Sievsk. At school he distinguished himself by his superior ability over his fellow-students, especially displaying great oratorical talent. When twenty-four years old, in accordance with the Russian custom of the better class of society destined for the service of the Church, he entered the monastic order. Two years after, he was called as an officer to the theological academy of St. Petersburg, and in 1830 was made rector of the high school at Kief. After filling various positions of great eminence in his Church, he was made a member of the "Holy Synod" in 1856. He died at Odessa May 6, 1857. His works are, *The last Days of Christ's terrestrial Life* (1828):—*The Life of the Apostle Paul* (eod.):—*Discourses and Sermons* (1843, 3 vols.):—*Of Sin and its Consequences* (1844); etc.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gén.* xxv, 927.

Innocent, GIZEL, a Russian prelate, was born in Prussian Poland, of Lutheran parents, at the commencement of the 17th century. He joined the Greek Church while yet young, and became a monk. Distinguished for great ability and learning, he was selected for a professor's chair at Kief. He died at that place Feb. 24, 1684. He published *On the Peace between God and Man* (Kief, 1669), which, by a ukase of the Synod of 1766, was put in the Index:—*Instructions on the Sacrament of Penitence* (Kief, 1671); and left in MS. a work on *The true Faith* (written in Polish), which aims to refute a work on the Supremacy of St. Peter, and the Procession of the Holy Spirit. He also published a synopsis of Russian history, which has been extensively circulated.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 926.

Innocentiæ Portus (*gate of innocence*) is one of the names given to the rite of baptism, aiming more directly at a description of its end or efficacy. See BAPTISM.

Innocentium Festum. See INNOCENTS' DAY.

Innocents, MASSACRE OF, BY HEROD (Matt. ii, 16). It has been thought strange that Josephus should not mention this atrocity (see Volborth, *Veram esse Infanticidii Bethlehem. hist.* Göttingen, 1788); but it was one only, and that a local one, of his many acts of tyranny and cruelty. See HEROD THE GREAT.

Innocents' Day (*Festum Innocentium*, ἡμέρα, τῶν ἁγίων ιδ' χιλιάδων νηπίων), set apart by the Greek, Roman, and English churches to commemorate the slaughter of the children by Herod shortly after our Saviour's birth, is celebrated in the Western Church on Dec. 28, and in the Eastern Church Dec. 29. Ancient ecclesiastical writers speak of these children as Christian martyrs. Cyprian says, "The nativity of Christ began" (*a martyriis infantium*) "with the martyrdom of those infants that from two years old and under were slain for his name" (*Epist.* 56, *ad Thibar.* p. 123). Augustine says, "These infants died for Christ, not knowing it; their parents bewailed them as dying martyrs; they could not yet speak, but, nevertheless, they confessed Christ: Christ granted them the honor to die for his name" (*De Symbol.* iii, 4, p. 303; *De Lib. Arbit.* iii, 23). So Prudentius (*Cath. Hymn. de Epiph.*),

> "Salvete, flores martyrum,
> Quos lucis ipso in limine
> Christi insecutor sustulit,
> Ceu turbo nascentes rosas!
> Vos prima Christi victima,
> Grex immolatorum tener,
> Aram sub ipsam simplices
> Palma et corona luditis."

"Hail, ye flower of martyrs, whom the enemy of Christ cut off in your very entrance upon the light, as the tempest does roses in the bud! First victims for Christ, tender flock of sacrifices, ye play innocently with your crowns and garlands before the very altar." It was a popular superstition in the old Church that Innocents'

Day (or Childermass, as it was also called) is very unlucky to begin any work upon; and what day soever that falls on, whether on a Monday, Tuesday, or any other, nothing must be begun on that day throughout the year. Though Childermass Day was reckoned unfortunate, nevertheless revels were held on it. The Society of Lincoln's Inn used to choose an officer at that season called the *King of the Cockneys*, who presided on the day of his appointment. But in the modern Church this feast is observed as a special holiday by the young, and many curious customs connected with it prevail in Catholic countries. Thus, in private families, the children are on this day privileged to wear the clothes of the elders, and in some sort to exercise authority over the household in their stead. So, also, in communities of nuns, the youngest sister becomes for this day superioress of the house, and exercises a sort of sportive authority even over the real superior. In Church, the priest celebrating mass on this day wears a *blue* gown. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. xx, cap. vii, § 12; Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten a. der christl. Archäol.* (Lips. 1817), i, 304 sq.

Innovatio Beneficii is the technical term for any *change* to be effected *in a benefice;* it may have regard either to the position itself, or only to the revenues accruing therefrom.

In partibus infidelium (i. q. *in heathen countries*), Episcopus, *episcopus titularis, episcopus suffraganeus.* All these expressions, sometimes used promiscuously, have, when closely examined, different significations. As bishops, on account of the great variety and number of duties devolving on them, are unable to perform them all in person, they are allowed the use of assistants, such as archdeacons, coadjutors, etc. For such functions, however, as can only be performed by a bishop, since there can be but one in a diocese (c. viii, *Conc. Nicæn.* a. 325), the bishop unable to perform them was formerly obliged to call in the aid of a neighboring bishop. In after times, the bishops driven out of their dioceses were especially intrusted with these functions, being considered as still belonging *de jure* to their diocese. The Roman Church was thus led never to give up, in principle, any place where it had once obtained a footing, even when it did lose it in fact; and thus, when its bishops were driven from a place, their connection with their *cathedra* did not therefore cease. In the 9th century a number of bishops were driven out of Spain by the Arabs, and sought refuge at Oviedo (Africa), waiting to resume their sees; and when one of them died, another was at once elected in his stead. While thus waiting they acted as assistants to the bishops of Oviedo, according to the express definition: "Ut episcopi, qui ditione carerent, Ovetensi præsuli vicariam operam exhiberent, cura in multos partita, ejusque reditibus alerentur" (see Thomassin, *Vetus ac nova ecclesiæ disciplina de beneficiis*, pt. i, lib. i, cap. xxvii, no. viii; Vinterim, *Die vorzüglichsten Denkwürdigkeiten d. christkath. Kirche*, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 379, 380). We next find instances of such *vice-episcopi, vices gerentes in pontificalibus, vicarii in pontificalibus*, in Germany, and they grew more numerous after the 12th century in consequence of the schism of the Eastern Church. It then became the practice to appoint for such dioceses as had formerly been Christian, but had now fallen into the hands of infidels (*in partibus infidelium*), bishops called *episcopi titulares*, who were used as assistants to other bishops in their strictly episcopal functions. The practice soon led to abuses, monks especially using every exertion to obtain such appointments. Clement V therefore decreed at Vienna in 1311 that no such bishops should thenceforth be appointed without the special authorization of the pope, and that no monks could be raised to that office without the consent of their superiors (cap. v, Clement. *De electione*). Other restrictions were also enacted at Ravenna in 1311, 1314, etc., but the practice was not abolished. Thus, at the Synod of Cologne in 1322, we find the bishop of Liege represented by a titular bishop (*episcopus ecclesiæ Hennensis*) (Hartzheim, *Concilia Germaniæ*, iv, 284). We find also mention made in the synod of Salzburg, in 1420, of *episcopi titulares* (Hartzheim, v, 179), and in that of Passau, in 1470 (can. 7, 8), of *suffraganei*, whose functions were to consecrate priests and churches. They received the name of *suffraganei* because they were to support the bishops by deed and word (*suffragio*). Leo X, in the fifth Lateran Council, 1514 (Sess. ix), granted also to the cardinals the privilege of having *vicarii seu suffraganei.* The Council of Trent (Sess. vi, cap. v, *De reform.;* Sess. xiv, cap. ii, viii, *De reform.*) sought to remedy the still existing abuses, for sometimes titular bishops endeavored to establish separate bishoprics for themselves in the dioceses of the bishops whom they were to assist. On this and subsequent decisions (see Benedict XIV, *De synodo diocesana*, lib. ii, cap. vii; lib. xiii, cap. xiv; Ferraris, *Bibl. Canonica*, s. v. Episcopus, art. vii. no. 21 sq.) is based the existing practice of creating bishops of the title of dioceses which have passed from the rule of the Romish Church. Hence, in the bull *De salute animarum* of 1821 to Prussia, it is enacted that the confirmation of existing suffraganeatus, as also the restoration of those of Treves and Cologne, shall be performed in the usual manner ("servatis consuetis formis de episcopatu titulari in partibus infidelium"). This consecration differs from that of the other bishops only in making the recipient simply an adjunct of the regularly located bishops, without separate jurisdiction. When they confer orders without the consent of their bishops, or otherwise overstep their duties, they are punished by being suspended for one year. The *episcopi in partibus*, as simple titular bishops, are revocable papal delegates. So also when they are missionary bishops. Suffragan bishops are in a more secure position, "cum assuetæ congruæ adsignatione provideatur," as says the bull *De salute.* See A. H. Andreucci, *De episcopo titulari seu in partibus infidelium* (Rom. 1732); Thomassin, *Vetus ac nova ecclesiæ disciplina de beneficiis*, pt. i, lib. i, cap. xxvii, xxviii; F. A. Dürr, *De suffraganeis seu vicariis in pontificalibus episcop. German.* (Mogunt. 1782); J. H. Heister, *Suffraganei Colonienses extraordinarii sive de sacræ Colon. ecclesiæ pro episcopis*, etc. (Mogunt. 1843).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* iv, 103.

Inquisition (Inquisitio hæreticæ, *Sanctum Officium*) is the name given to a tribunal of the Roman Catholic Church, whose function is to seek out and punish heretics and unbelievers. It is a degenerated and perverse form of the old Church discipline, originally in the hands of the rural bishops, on whom devolved the duty of checking false doctrines, and who, for the purpose of spying out rising heresies, made frequent visits to the churches of their diocese. Upon such heretics, when discovered, they inflicted several punishments, the severest of which, however, was only excommunication. Another punishment frequently resorted to was banishment; but capital punishment on account of one's faith was not inflicted by Christians until the 4th century. The first instance of legally enforcing the death-penalty against Christians occurred under the emperor Theodosius the Great (382), who opposed and aimed at uprooting all heresy, especially that of Manichæism (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 141 sq.). Under this emperor, and under Justinian, judges (*inquisitores*) were first appointed to examine heretics with a view to enforcing upon them punishments, if found guilty; and, in order to enable the ecclesiastical officers to execute their functions, the civil authorities surrendered for this purpose to the bishops the right of exercising the requisite jurisdiction in their several dioceses. Most frequently the ban only was pronounced by the ecclesiastics, leaving it to the civil officers to add other and more severe punishments. In the 8th century the rights of the ecclesiastics in exterminating heresy were put on a firmer basis by synodal courts, but it was not until the 12th century that it became a general institution in the Christian Church.

Establishment of the Inquisition in France.—At the

Synod of Verona, in 1184, certain directions were given to the bishops "concerning heretics," who at this time formed a very formidable enemy of the Romish Church, more especially in the south of France. The sects had become so numerous that some of them, such as the Cathari (q. v.), the Albigenses (q. v.), and the Waldensians (q. v.), threatened the very existence of the papal hierarchy, and this led Innocent III (q. v.) in 1198 to dispatch the Cistercians Raineri and Guido, and in 1206 Peter of Castelnau and Raoul, as papal legates to France, to *assist* the bishops and the civil authorities in punishing all heretics with the utmost rigor. But, to efface forever the last vestige of heresy, Innocent III determined to make a permanent institution of the Inquisition, "the most formidable of all the formidable engines devised by popery to subdue the souls and bodies, the reason and the consciences of men, to its sovereign will." Accordingly, the fourth Lateran Council (1215) made the persecution of heretics the chief business of synodal courts, in the form that every archbishop or bishop should visit, either personally, or through the archdeacon, or some other suitable person, the parish in which, according to rumor (*in qua fama fuerit*), there were heretics, and put under oath two or three of the inhabitants of irreproachable character, or, if necessary, all the inhabitants, to point out those who were known as heretics, or those who held secret meetings, or departed from the faithful in their walk and conduct. The refusal to take oath justified the suspicion of heresy, *hæreticæ pravitatis;* the careless bishop was deposed (comp. Biener, *Beiträge z. d. Gesch. des Inquisitionsprozesses* [Lpz. 1827], p. 60 sq.). In name, the bishops still conducted the matter, but the legates had supervision over them, and, in fact, conducted the persecution of heretics. In 1229 the Council of Toulouse confirmed this decision of the fourth Lateran Council, and published forty-five decrees to complete the institution of episcopal inquisition (see Mansi, xxiii, 192; Planck, *Gesch. d. Kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung*, iv, 2d half, 463 sq.). It was decided that each bishop should appoint in each district one priest and two or three laymen in good standing, who should devote themselves exclusively to ferreting out heretics, and then deliver them up to the archbishops, bishops, or other authorities for punishment. Every one guilty of concealing a heretic forfeited thereby his land possessions or offices; the house in which a heretic was found was to be torn down. In case of sickness, however severe, no heretic or unbeliever was to be allowed the aid of a physician; penitents were to leave their home, to wear a peculiar dress, and could hold no office except by a special dispensation from the pope. But, notwithstanding these rigid and definite regulations, and notwithstanding the great zeal of the legates in urging the execution of the laws by the bishops, the see of Rome did not even approach the desired end. To accomplish this more certainly, the affairs of the Inquisition were taken from the bishops, and made a papal tribunal, and the bishops themselves were subjected to it. Accordingly, Gregory IX appointed, in 1232, in Germany, Aragonia, and Austria, in 1233 in Lombardy and South France (see Beziers, anno 1233, in Mansi, xxiii, 269 sq.; Raynald, *Annal.* a. 1233, n. 59 sq.), the Dominicans (q. v.) permanent papal inquisitors (later also the Franciscans became such). "The solitude and retirement of which these monks made profession, but of which, as it appeared in the sequel, they soon began to tire, afforded them leisure to attend incessantly to this new calling. The meanness of their dress, the poverty of their monasteries, and, above all, the public mendicity and humility to which they bound themselves, could not fail to make the office of inquisitors one that flattered any relic of natural ambition which might yet lurk within their minds. The general renunciation which they made, even of the names of the families from which they sprang, must have gone a great way towards stifling those sentiments which the ties of kindred and civil connections generally inspire. Besides, the austerity of their rules, and the severity which they were continually practising upon themselves, were not likely to allow them to have much feeling for others. Lastly, they were zealous, as possessors of newly established religions commonly are; and they were learned, after the fashion of the times; that is to say, well versed in scholastic quibbles and in the new canon law. Moreover, they had a particular interest in the suppression of heretics, who were incessantly declaiming against them, and who spared no pains to discredit them in the minds of the people. On these monks, therefore, the pope conferred the office of inquisitors of the faith, and they acquitted themselves in such a manner as not to disappoint his expectations" (Shoberl, *Persecutions of Popery*, i, 103, 104). So much eagerness did they display in hunting up and prosecuting heretics, that a popular pun changed the name of Dominicans into *Domini canes* (the dogs of the Lord). To preserve the Church, however, from the charge of blood-guiltiness, the civil authorities were made the executioners of its judgments, and orders to that effect were caused to be issued in 1228 by Louis IX of France, in 1233 by Raymond of Toulouse, and in 1234 by Frederick II, the emperor of Germany. According to the regulations, the suspicion of heresy was sufficient cause for imprisonment; accomplices and culprits were deemed competent witnesses; the accused was never informed of his accusers, nor confronted with them; confession was extorted by torture, which, applied at first by the civil authorities, was afterwards, for the sake of secrecy, intrusted to the inquisitors themselves. To enlarge also the sphere, and last, but hardly least, to increase the pecuniary income of the Inquisition, a very wide meaning was given to the word *heresy*. It was not confined to views which departed from the dogmas of the Church, or to sectarian tendencies, but was made to include usury, fortune-telling by the hands, signs, lots, etc., insulting the cross, despising the clergy, pretended connection with the leprous, with Jews, dæmons, and the devil, dæmonolatry, and witchcraft. The punishments were of three kinds: Upon those who recanted, besides penance in the severest form which the court might enact, was frequently inflicted even the deprivation of all civil and ecclesiastical rights and privileges, and the sequestration of goods; upon those not absolutely convicted, imprisonment for life; upon the obstinate or the relapsed, the penalty of death—death at the stake, death by the secular arm. "The Inquisition, with specious hypocrisy, while it prepared and dressed up the victim for the burning, looked on with calm and approving satisfaction, as it had left the sin of lighting the fire to pollute other hands." As if these horrible treatments of fellow-beings were not bad enough, pope Innocent IV, in a bull (*De extirpanda*) in the year 1252, ordained that accused persons should be *tortured*, not merely to induce them to confess their own heresy, but also to compel them to accuse others. Such was the organization of the Inquisition in the 13th century—"a Christian code, of which the basis was a system of delation that the worst of the pagan emperors might have shuddered at as iniquitous; in which the sole act deserving of mercy might seem to be the Judas-like betrayal of the dearest and most familiar friend, of the kinsman, the parent, the child. . . . No falsehood was too false, no craft too crafty, no trick too base for this calm, systematic moral torture, which was to wring further confession against the heretic, denunciation against others. If the rack, the pulleys, the thumbscrew, and the boots were not yet invented or applied, it was not in mercy. . . . Nothing that the sternest or most passionate historian has revealed, nothing that the most impressive romance-writer could have imagined, can surpass the cold, systematic treachery and cruelty of these so-called judicial formularies" (Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vi, 32, 33). The excessive cruelties, however, of the inquisitors, their knavery even in accusing the innocent and robbing them of their possessions, exasperated the people, and they rose up against the inquisitors. At Tou-

louse and Narbonne the inquisitors were banished in 1235, and four of them killed in the former city in 1242, and the pope was finally obliged to suppress the tribunal at the former place altogether. When at last restored, the inquisitorial tribunal resumed its former cruelty, until Philip the Fair (A.D. 1291) ordered the civil officers to exercise great caution in acting on the accusations made by the inquisitors. But what insurrections and royal edicts in France could not accomplish, ecclesiastico-political events, such as the papal schism in the 14th, and the reformatory councils in the 15th century, were caused to bring about. The former crippled the power of the hierarchy with the latter, and limited thereby the power of the Inquisition, so that it now proceeded against secret or suspected heretics only on the accusation of sorcery and connection with the devil (compare the *Breve* of Nicholas V, in Raynald, a. 1451). In the 16th century, the time of the Reformation, the clergy, supported by the Guises, were able to rekindle violent persecutions against the Huguenots (q. v.), and endeavored to restore the Inquisition to its former power, but it had now lost its territory. Paul IV, it is true, published a bull (April 25, 1557) to re-establish it (Raynald, a. 1557, no. 29), and Henry II compelled Parliament to pass a corresponding edict; but Paul, who on his death-bed commended the Inquisition as the main support of the Romish Church (Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. seit d. Reformation*, iii, 248 sq.), died in 1559, and the new attempt to re-establish it failed; so that in France, where it took its rise first, it was also first discontinued, in spite of priestcraft and Jesuitism.

The Inquisition in Germany.—But from France the Inquisition soon cast its net over neighboring and distant countries, even beyond the ocean, by the aid of the Jesuits. Almost immediately after its firm establishment in France, the Inquisition spread to Germany. The first inquisitor was Conrad of Marburg, who organized the "holy office" with terrible severity during the years 1231-1233. The sentences of death which this new tribunal pronounced were not few in number, and of course they always obtained the approval of the emperor, Ferdinand II. But there was a higher power than that of the reigning prince, which had been lost sight of; and though the people's voice was in those dark days not quite so powerful as in our own, it certainly sufficed to thwart the iniquitous designs of these "holy officers." So energetically did the people and the nobles oppose the Inquisition, that it could carry out its sentences in a very few cases only. In 1233 the lower class of the people, always ready to execute judgment, took the law into their own hands, and Conrad of Marburg was slain in the streets of Strasburg. It was not really until the 14th century that the Inquisition can be said to have been properly established in Germany. It was at this time that the Beghards (q. v.) made their appearance. To suppress them, pope Urban V appointed in 1367 two Dominicans as inquisitors, who engaged in a regular crusade against the new sect, and sustained by three different edicts of the emperor Charles IV, rendered in 1369, failed not to repeat in Germany the cruel practices of the French brethren of their order. Encouraged by their successes against the Beghards, and by the, to them, so favorable attitude of the emperor, pope Gregory XI increased in 1372 the number of the inquisitors to five, and in 1399 Boniface IX appointed no less than six of these "holy men" for such "holy" work for the north of Germany alone. But in proportion as the reformatory tendencies gained ground in Germany, the Inquisition lost its foothold. A desperate effort was made by Jacob Sprenger and Heinrich Krämer, two inquisitors appointed by Innocent VIII, under the plea of a prosecution of sorcerers and witches only. They even influenced the pope to publish the bull (*Summis desiderantes affectibus*) in 1484 (Dec. 5) which reaffirmed the doctrines previously set forth concerning heresy in regard to sorcery and witchcraft, and the punishment by the Inquisition of those guilty of such crimes. To justify their harsh dealings as executors of the Romish dicta, and to hide their iniquitous work behind the screen of devotion to the cause of Christ, they published a code called "Hexenhammer" (*Malleus maleficorum*), in accordance with which the prosecution was to be carried on. In this way they proceeded to condemn and execute a large number of persons. The Reformation at last completely overthrew the power of the Inquisition in Germany, and the attempts to re-establish it, made mostly by the Jesuits, with an endeavor to check the progress of evangelical truth, as in Austria, Bohemia, and Bavaria (where a tribunal of the Inquisition was formally established in 1599), proved ineffectual, and of short duration.

In *Italy* the Inquisition was introduced under the direction of the Dominicans in 1224, but it was not until 1235 that it was firmly established as a tribunal by pope Gregory IX. Just here it may not be amiss to state that Lacordaire, in his Life of Dominic (*Works*, i, 95 sq.), seeks to relieve the memory of Dominic, and also the Dominican order, of the special odium which attaches to them from their agency in establishing and conducting the Inquisition (compare Hare, *Contest with Rome*, p. 284-292). The Dominicans certainly cannot be freed from this charge, which is too well founded, and the efforts of a Lacordaire even must prove to be in vain. But to return to the tribunal of Gregory IX. It was at this time intended especially against the Waldenses, who had fled from the south of France to Piedmont, and now threatened to infect all Italy with their doctrines. Later its power was directed against other heretics; but the papal schism and the political commotions which agitated the country greatly weakened its power. The free states of which Italy was then composed neither could nor would long bear the "arbitrary and vexatious proceedings" of the Inquisition; and "about the middle of the 14th century measures were generally adopted to restrain its exorbitant power, in spite of the opposition made by Clement VI, and the censures which he fulminated. The right of the bishops to take part with the inquisitors in the examination of heretics was recognised; they were restricted to the simple cognizance of the charge of heresy, and deprived of the power of imprisonment, confiscation, fine, and corporal punishment, which was declared to belong solely to the secular arm" (M'Crie, *Ref. in Italy*, p. 189; comp. Galluzzi, *Istor. del Granducato di Toscano*, i, 142, 143). But such a mode of procedure the Church of Rome found to be ineffectual for suppressing free inquiry, and maintaining hierarchical authority, after the new opinions began to spread in Italy; and as in Germany and the south of France, so also here. the bishops in many instances having become lukewarm, some even dared to manifest a humane feeling towards those who chose to differ from them in religious views; the accused often suffered only very slight punishment, or were permitted to escape before the necessary orders for their arrest were issued. On these accounts pope Paul III finally resolved, at the instigation of cardinal John Peter Caraffa, to strengthen the power of the inquisitors by the establishment of the "Congregation of the Holy Office" (1534), with cardinal Caraffa (afterwards Paul IV) at their head, which the more zealous of the Romanists considered the only means of preserving Italy from being overrun with heresy. A constitution for a supreme and universal Inquisition at Rome was promulgated July 21, 1542, and operations commenced under it in 1543. Six cardinals now received the title and rights of inquisitors general, and authority was given them on both sides of the Alps "to try all causes of heresy, with the power of apprehending and incarcerating suspected persons and their abettors, of whatsoever estate, rank, or order, of nominating officers under them, and appointing inferior tribunals in all places, with the same or with limited powers" (M'Crie, *Ref. in Italy*, p. 189 sq.; comp. Chandler's Limborch, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, i, 151; Llorente, *Histoire de l'Inquis.* ii, 78). But

while the inquisitors were to extirpate heresy and punish heretics, the vicar of Christ reserved for himself the graces of reconciliation and absolution. In the arrogance which Rome has ever manifested, the power which belonged to the judge was withdrawn, and the power of life and death over the subjects of the different governments of the world asserted to belong to the papal see. Of course the new cardinal inquisitors made full use of their powers, and soon became the terror not only of Rome and Italy, but of all the countries over which they could possibly exert any influence. The Inquisition was especially severe against the press. "Books were destroyed, and many more disfigured; printers were forbidden to carry on their business without licenses from the Holy Office." See INDEX. The terror-stricken people, however, soon gained their foothold again, and oppositions against the encroachments of Rome were everywhere manifest. The greatest resistance to it was offered in Venice. The republic refused to submit to an inquisitorial tribunal responsible solely to the pope, and, after long negotiations, permitted only the establishment of an inquisitorial tribunal on condition that, with the papal officers, a certain number of magistrates and lawyers should always be associated, and that the definitive sentence should not, at least in the case of laics, be pronounced before it was submitted to the senate (Busdragi *Epistola: Scrinium Antiquar.* i, 321, 326 sq.; Thuani, *Hist.* ad an. 1548). In Naples like difficulties between the government and the pope arose on the endeavor of the latter to establish the inquisitorial tribunal. Twice the Neapolitans had successfully resisted its establishment in their country at the beginning of the 16th century. In 1546, the emperor Charles V, with the view of extirpating the Lutheran heresy, renewed the attempt, and gave orders to set up that tribunal in Naples, after the same form in which it had long been established in Spain. The people rose in arms, and although Rome would have been only too glad to see this formidable tribunal established in Naples, yet, rather than to forego the introduction of an inquisitorial tribunal altogether, she took the part of the people against the government, and encouraged them in their opposition by telling them that they had reason for their fears, because the Spanish Inquisition (see below) was extremely severe. Here it may be well to quote M'Crie (*Ref. in Italy*, p. 253 sq.) on the truth of this assertion, which many Protestant as well as Roman Catholic writers have not failed to repeat and urge in favor of the tendency to mercy at Rome. Says M'Crie: "Both the statement of the fact and the reasons by which it is usually accounted for require to be qualified. One of these reasons is the policy with which the Italians, including the popes, have always consulted their pecuniary interests, *to which they postponed every other consideration.* (Compare the opposition of the papacy to the Inquisition as a state institution in Portugal, below.) The second reason is that the popes, being temporal princes in the States of the Church, had no occasion to employ the Inquisition to undermine the rights of the secular authorities in them, as in other countries. This is unquestionably true; and it accounts for the fact that the court of the Inquisition, long after its operations had been suspended in Italy, continued to be warmly supported by papal influence in Spain. But at the time of which I write, and during the remainder of the 16th century, it was in full and constant operation, and the popes found that it enabled them to accomplish what would have baffled their power as secular sovereigns. The chief difference between the Italian and Spanish Inquisitions at that period consisted in their respective lines of policy as to the mode of punishment. The latter sought to inspire terror by the solemn spectacle of a public act of justice, in which the scaffold was crowded with criminals. . . . The report of the autos da fé (q. v.) of Seville and Valladolid blazed at once over Europe; the executions of Rome made less noise in the city, because they were less splendid as well as more frequent, and the rumor of them died away before it could reach the ear of foreigners." But all that Rome could accomplish in Naples, in spite of her cunning, was the establishment of an independent Inquisition, such as Venice had permitted. In Sicily, on the other hand, Spain furnished a general inquisitor, and, though abolished for a time, the office was restored in 1782, and remained in force until Napoleon, as king of Italy, did away with it throughout the realm in 1808. The fall of Napoleon, of course, at once enabled the papal see to re-establish the Inquisition, but, though Pius VII improved the opportunity (in 1814), it did not spread far, and met with great opposition. In Sardinia, where Gregory XVI restored it in 1833, it was not discontinued until the Revolution of 1848 again did away with it. "In Tuscany it was arranged that three commissioners, elected by the congregation at Rome, along with the local inquisitor, should judge in all causes of religion, and intimate their sentence to the duke, who was bound to carry it into execution. In addition, it (the Holy Office) was continually soliciting the local authorities to send such as were accused, especially if they were either ecclesiastical persons or strangers, to be tried by the Inquisition at Rome." Everywhere within the territory persecution was let loose. Especially during the political reactions of 1849 the inquisitorial tribunal was perhaps nowhere so active and so severe in its dealings as in Tuscany (compare Ranke, *History of the Papacy*, ii, 156 sq.). It is only since the embodiment of that province with Italy (1859) that the country got rid of this great curse, from which all Italy suffered; and "popish historians" certainly "do more homage to truth than credit to their cause when they say that the erection of the Inquisition was the salvation of the Catholic Church in Italy." It certainly does not verify itself in our own days, though the tribunal of the Inquisition still exists at Rome, under the direction of a congregation, and though the last œcumenical council, which the landless pope, Pius IX, has just declared adjourned *sine die*, has but lately passed two canons (canon vi and canon xii, *De Ecclesia Christi*) in its favor. Its action, by the circumstances of the day, is mainly confined to the examination of books, and to the trial of ecclesiastical offences and questions of Church law, as in the late case of the Jewish boy Mortara; and its most remarkable prisoner in recent times was an Oriental impostor, who, by means of forged credentials, succeeded in obtaining his ordination as a bishop.

The Inquisition was introduced into *Poland* by pope John XXII in 1327, but it did not subsist there very long; and all attempts of Rome to introduce it into *England* were in vain.

Spanish Inquisition.—"The life of every devout Spaniard," says Milman (*Latin Christianity*, v, 239), "was a perpetual crusade. By temperament and by position he was in constant adventurous warfare against the enemies of the Cross: hatred of the Jew, of the Mohammedan, was the banner under which he served; it was the oath of his chivalry: that hatred, in all its intensity, was soon and easily extended to the heretic." No wonder, then, that pope Gregory IX, after the Inquisition had assumed general form in France and Germany, introduced it into Spain, and that it proved to be a plant on a most congenial soil; for it was in Spain that "it took root at once, and in times attained a magnitude which it never reached in any other country." It was first introduced into Aragon, where, in 1242, the Council of Tarragona gave the instructions which were to serve the "holy office" erected here as elsewhere by the Dominicans. "Accustomed, in the confessional, to penetrate into the secrets of conscience, they (the Dominicans) converted to the destruction of the bodies of men all those arts which a false zeal had taught them to employ for the saving of their souls. Inflamed with a passion for extirpating heresy, and persuading themselves that the end sanctified the means, they not only acted upon, but formally laid down, as a rule for their conduct,

maxims founded on the grossest deceit and artifice, according to which they sought in every way to ensnare their victims, and by means of false statements, delusory promises, and a tortuous course of examination, to betray them into confessions which proved fatal to their lives and fortunes. To this mental torture was soon after added the use of bodily tortures, together with the concealment of the names of witnesses" (M'Crie, *Ref. in Spain*, p. 85 sq.). The arm of persecution was directed with special severity, in the 13th and 14th centuries, against the Albigenses (q. v.), who, from the proximity and political relations of Aragon and Provence, had become numerous in the former kingdom. Indeed, the persecutions appear to have been chiefly confined to this unfortunate sect, "and there is no evidence that the 'holy office,' notwithstanding papal briefs to that effect, was fully organized in Castile before the reign of Isabella. This is, perhaps, imputable to the paucity of heretics in that kingdom. It cannot, at any rate, be charged to any lukewarmness in its sovereigns, since they, from the time of St. Ferdinand, who heaped the fagots on the blazing pile with his own hands, down to that of John the Second, Isabella's father, who hunted the unhappy heretics of Biscay, like so many wild beasts, among the mountains, had ever evinced a lively zeal for the orthodox faith." Upon the whole, the progress of the Inquisition during the 14th century was steady, and its vigor and energy constantly on the increase. Its jurisdiction the inquisitors succeeded in enlarging, and they severally multiplied its ramifications; autos da fé (q. v.) were celebrated in a number of places, and its victims were not a few. "By the middle of the 15th century the Albigensian heresy had become nearly extirpated by the Inquisition of Aragon, so that this infernal engine might have been suffered to sleep undisturbed from want of sufficient fuel to keep it in motion, when new and ample materials were discovered in the unfortunate race of Israel." "The 'new Christians,' or 'converts,' as those who had renounced the faith of their fathers were denominated, were occasionally preferred to high ecclesiastical dignities, which they illustrated by their integrity and learning. They were intrusted with municipal offices in the various cities of Castile; and as their wealth furnished an obvious resource for repairing, by way of marriage, the decayed fortunes of the nobility, there was scarcely a family of rank in the land whose blood had not been contaminated at some period or other by mixture with the *mala sangre*, as it came afterwards to be termed, of the house of Judah; an ignominious stain which no time has been deemed sufficient wholly to purge." Many of these noble men, of a race that can lay claim to the highest nobility that exists among men, felt that the irksome task of dissimulation which they had undertaken was too much below the dignity of a true Israelite, and rather than enjoy the favors of a nation as apostates from a religion which they still held to be the only true one (and who would expect that Romish treatment and Romish Christian example could instill confidence and produce impressions favorable to the cause of Christ?), preferred an open confession of the opinions which they cherished in their hearts, even at the expense of losing positions of prominence to which they were ably fitted, but from which, as is too often the case even in our own day, their religious convictions, if openly avowed, not only debarred them, but which even endangered their very life. But Romish priests could not, of course, be expected to tolerate *heresy* in any form, "especially the Dominicans, who seem to have inherited the quick scent for heresy which distinguished their frantic founder; they were not slow in sounding the alarm, and the superstitious populace, easily roused to acts of violence in the name of religion, began to exhibit the most tumultuous movements, and actually massacred the constable of Castile in an attempt to suppress them at Jaen, the year preceding the accession of Isabella" (Prescott, *Ferdinand and Isabella*, i, 235 sq.). After the union of Spain under one kingdom, governed by Ferdinand and Isabella, towards the close of the 15th century, the Inquisition became general. It was at this time that the inquisitorial tribunal underwent "what its friends have honored with the name of a *reform;* in consequence of which it became a more terrible engine of persecution than before. Under this new form it is usually called the Modern Inquisition, though it may with equal propriety bear the name of the Spanish, as it originated in Spain, and has been confined to that country, including Portugal, and the dominions subject to the two monarchies. . . . The principles of the ancient and modern Inquisition were radically the same, but they assumed a more malignant form under the latter than under the former. Under the ancient Inquisition the bishops always had a certain degree of control over its proceedings; the law of secrecy was not so rigidly enforced in practice; greater liberty was allowed to the accused on their defence; and in some countries, as in Aragon, in consequence of the civil rights acquired by the people, the inquisitors were restrained from sequestrating the property of those whom they convicted of heresy. But the leading difference between the two institutions consisted in the organization of the latter into one great independent tribunal, which, extending over the whole kingdom, was governed by one code of laws, and yielded implicit obedience to one head. The inquisitor general possessed an authority scarcely inferior to that of the king or the pope; by joining with either of them, he proved an overmatch for the other; and when supported by both, his power was irresistible. The ancient Inquisition was a powerful engine for harassing and rooting out a small body of dissidents; the modern Inquisition stretched its iron arms over a whole nation, upon which it lay like a monstrous incubus, paralyzing its exertions, crushing its energies, and extinguishing every other feeling but a sense of weakness and terror" (M'Crie, *Ref. in Spain*, p. 86, 103). Most prominent among those who were active in bringing about this new order of things were the archbishop of Seville, Petro Gonzalez de Mendoza, the Franciscan (afterwards cardinal) Ximenes, and the Dominican prior Torquemada. But to the credit of Isabella be it said, that it was only her zeal for the cause of her Church that led her, when misguided, to commit the unfortunate error; "an error so grave that, like a vein in some noble piece of statuary, it gives a sinister expression to her otherwise unblemished character" (Prescott). Indeed, it was only after repeated importunities of the clergy, particularly of those whom she believed to be sincere as herself in the zeal for the Romish religion, and only these when seconded by the arguments of Ferdinand, who, to his shame be it said, favored the project because he believed it likely to result in filling his coffers by means of confiscations, that she consented to solicit from the pope a bull for the establishment of the "holy office" in Castile. "Sixtus IV, who at that time filled the pontifical chair, easily discerning the sources of wealth and influence which this measure opened to the court of Rome, readily complied with the petition of the sovereigns, and expedited a bull bearing date Nov. 1, 1478, authorizing them to appoint two or three ecclesiastics inquisitors for the detection and suppression of heresy throughout their dominions" (Prescott, i, 248, 249). The appointment of these officers was made Sept. 17, 1480, the clergy in confidence with the queen professing to have failed in their attempts "to illuminate the benighted Israelites by means of friendly exhortation and a candid exposition of the true principles of Christianity," which Isabella had counselled before violent measures were resorted to. January 2, 1481, the new inquisitors commenced their proceedings in the Dominican convent of St. Paul, at Seville. But the tribunal did not really assume a permanent form until two years later, when the Dominican monk Thomas de Torquemada, the queen's confessor, subsequently raised to the rank of prior of Santa Cruz in Segovia, was placed at its head as inquisitor general,

first of Castile, and afterwards of Aragon. "This man, who concealed more pride under his monastic weeds than might have furnished forth a convent of his order, was one of that class with whom zeal passes for religion, and who testify their zeal by a fiery persecution of those whose creed differs from their own; who compensate for their abstinence from sensual indulgence by giving scope to those deadlier vices of the heart, pride, bigotry, and intolerance, which are no less opposed to virtue, and are far more extensively mischievous to society" (Prescott, i, 247). Torquemada at once set about his work, appointing his assessors, and erecting subordinate tribunals in different cities of the united kingdom. Over the whole was placed the *Council of the Supreme*, consisting of the inquisitor general as president, and three counsellors, two of whom were doctors of law. His next employment was the formation of a body of laws for the government of his new tribunal. This appeared in 1484; additions to it followed from time to time; and as a diversity of practice had crept into the subordinate courts, the inquisitor general Valdes in 1561 made a revisal of the whole code, which was published in eighty-one articles, and continues, with the exception of a few slight alterations, to be the law to this day. They are substantially as follows: the accused was invited three times *edictaliter* to appear. If he did not come before the tribunal, he was excommunicated *in contumaciam*, and condemned to pay a fine, under reservation of more severe punishment if the Inquisition saw fit to apply such. Seldom did any one escape, for familiars, the holy Hermandad, and the Congregation of the Cruciada tracked mercilessly all who were denounced to the Inquisition. If the accused appeared before the court he was at once seized, and from that moment all his relations and friends were to abandon him as an outlaw, and he was not even permitted to give proofs of his innocence. The prisoner and his house were now thoroughly searched, especially for papers or books, a list taken of all his possessions, and, in general, his goods sequestered at once, to provide beforehand for the expenses of his trial. His hair was cut to make his recognition more certain in case he should escape, and he was placed in a dark cell. If he confessed his real or imputed sin, he did indeed escape with his life, as his confession was considered a proof of repentance, but he and all his family were dishonored, and became incapable of holding any office. If he asserted his innocence, and there was not sufficient proof against him to condemn him, he was liberated, but carefully watched by the *familiares* as an object of suspicion, and generally was soon arrested a second time. Now commenced against him the real, slow trial of the Inquisition, conducted after the *Directorium Inquisitorium* of the grand inquisitor of Aragon, Nicolas Eymericus. When the prisoner refused to acknowledge his fault at the first interrogatory, he was remanded to prison; after many months he was again brought forth, and asked to swear before a crucifix that he would tell the truth. If now he did not confess, he was immediately considered guilty, otherwise he was plied with leading questions until thoroughly bewildered. The defensor was not allowed to take his client's part, but only to invite him to declare the truth. Witnesses were not named, and their testimony, the truth of which they were not required to prove, was only made known in disconnected fragments, and years after it had been given. Any sort of testimony was admitted. Two witnesses who would only testify of a hearsay were considered equivalent to an eye-witness. The accuser was examined as a witness. Friends and members of the family were also admitted to testify, but only against the prisoner, never in his favor. If the accused still persisted in asserting his innocence, he was now tortured by the whip, the water, and fire, under the direction of the inquisitors and the bishop of the diocese. If the prisoner then confessed, he was tortured a second time, to make him declare his motives, and afterwards a third time, to make him name his accomplices; and when the inquisitors had obtained from him all they wanted, they left him to his sufferings, without allowing a physician to assist him. After this confession the prisoner was considered penitent, yet recantation was still demanded of him *de levi;* if heresy or Judaism was his crime, *de vehementi;* and when he became reconciled to the Church, *in forma*, which latter included a free assent to all further punishments the Inquisition might yet see fit to inflict on the penitent. After that he was generally condemned to imprisonment for life, or sent to the galleys, his possessions sequestered, and his family dishonored. Those who confessed and recanted at once were punished only by having to wear for a certain time the *sanbenito* (q. v.), a frock without sleeves, with a red cross of St. Andrew before and behind, over a black underfrock (comp. *Encyclop. Britan.* xii, 390). The penitent (*sanbenitado*) who laid it aside before the appointed time was considered as unrepenting; when he had accomplished his penance, the sanbenito was hung up in the church with a card bearing his name, and a statement of his offence. A relapse was punished by death. When the three degrees of torture failed to elicit a confession, the accused was put into a worse prison; if this did not succeed, the inquisitors tried the opposite plan: they made the accused comfortable, allowed his family and friends to have access to him, and led him to think that a confession of his fault and profession of repentance would procure his pardon. When one suspected of heresy died, or when such suspicion arose after his death, the trial was carried on notwithstanding. If forty years had elapsed between the death of the party and his accusation, his descendants were permitted to remain in their possessions, but were dishonored, and incapable of holding office. If the remains of the accused could be found, they were burnt; if not, then he was burnt in effigy. When a number of trials were concluded, an auto da fé took place, i. e. the condemned were, with great pomp and parade, publicly burnt. See AUTO DA FÉ. A very able article in the *Galaxy* (May, 1870, p. 647 sq.), entitled *Ten Years in Rome*, the reader would do well to examine. It is written by one who has held high office under the present Roman pontiff, and who has enjoyed peculiar advantages for an extended examination of the authentic sources on the subject of the Inquisition. The position of subordinate member of the Inquisition (*familiare*), whose duties consisted in arresting the accused and taking them to prison, was much sought after, even by members of the highest families, on account of the privileges and indulgences attached to it. The tribunal of Madrid had branches in the provinces and colonies, each composed of three inquisitors, three secretaries, an alguazil, three receivers and assessors, familiars and jailers. Every one connected with the Inquisition had to submit to the *Casa limpia*, i. e. to prove his descent from honorable and orthodox parents, who had never been summoned before the Inquisition, and to take the oath of secrecy.

From the details of the proceedings of the inquisitorial tribunal which we have just enumerated, it clearly follows that "the Inquisition possessed powers which enabled it effectually to arrest the progress of knowledge, and to crush every attempt which might be made for the reformation of religion and the Church." The terrors which Torquemada's tribunal spread by imprisonment, tortures, etc., not only called forth complaints from the Cortes, but even provoked rebellions, followed by assassinations of the inquisitors (Llorente, i, 187 sq., 211 sq.); but it still prosecuted its bloody work. The suspicion of belonging to Judaism or Islamism, of protecting Jews or Moors, of practising soothsaying, magic, and blasphemy, caused an endless number of trials. Upon the inquisitor general's advice, all Jews who would not become Christians were compelled (1492) to emigrate; a similar fate befell the Moors (1501). The number of victims, as stated by Llorente, the popular historian of the Inquisition, is positively appalling. He affirms that during the sixteen years of Torquemada's

tenure of office (1483-1498) nearly 9000 were condemned to the flames, 6500 were burned in effigy, and more than 90,000 were subjected to various penalties, besides a still larger number who were *reconciled;* "a term which must not be misunderstood by the reader to signify anything like a pardon or amnesty, but only the commutation of a capital sentence for inferior penalties, as fines, civil incapacity, very generally total confiscation of property, and not unfrequently imprisonment for life" (Prescott, *Ferd. and Isab.* i, 253; comp. also p. 267). His successor, Diego Deza, in eight years (1499-1506), according to the same writer, put above 1600 to a similar death. Under the third general inquisitor, Francis Ximenes de Cisneros (1507-17), 2536 persons were killed, 1368 were burned in effigy, and 47,263 were punished in other ways (Llorente, iv, 252). Not much better are the records of the proceedings of the other successive inquisitors general. M'Crie (*Reform. in Spain*, p. 109) very rightly asserts that cardinal Ximenes, more than any other inquisitor general, contributed towards riveting the chains of political and spiritual despotism of Spain. "Possessed of talents that enabled him to foresee the dire effects which the Inquisition would inevitably produce, he was called to take part in public affairs at a time when these effects had decidedly appeared. It was in his power to abolish that execrable tribunal altogether as an insufferable nuisance, or at least to impose such checks upon its procedure as would have rendered it comparatively harmless. Yet he not only allowed himself to be placed at its head, but employed all his influence and address in defeating every attempt to reform its worst and most glaring abuses. . . . Ximenes had obtained the title of a great man from foreigners as well as natives of Spain. But in spite of the eulogiums passed upon him, I cannot help being of opinion, with a modern writer, that Ximenes bore a striking resemblance to Philip II, with this difference, that the cardinal was possessed of higher talents, and that his proceedings were characterized by a certain openness and impartiality, the result of the unlimited confidence which he placed in his own powers. His character was essentially that of a monk, in whom the severity of his order was combined with the impetuosity of blood which belongs to the natives of the South" (p. 110-112). Roman Catholics, of course, loudly protest against the credibility of these fearful allegations, assert that Llorente was a violent partisan, and allege that in his work on the Basque Provinces he had already proved himself a venal and unscrupulous fabricator; but they find it impossible to disprove his accuracy, and all that can possibly be done we see clearly in the efforts of one of the Catholic critics—Hefele, in his *Life of Cardinal Ximenes*—who produces many examples of Llorente's statements which he alleges are of a contradictory and exaggerated nature. Some Protestant historians, of course, fear that Llorente may have been too severe, as is apt to be the case with all apostates, and thus Prescott, in his *Ferdinand and Isabella* (iii, 467-470), has pointed out many instances similar to those which Hefele produces, and Ranke does not hesitate (*Fürsten und Völker des Südl. Europas*, i, 242) to impeach his honesty; Prescott even pronounces his "computations greatly exaggerated," and his "estimates most improbable" (iii, 468). Still, with all the deductions which it is possible to make, even Roman Catholics must acknowledge that the working of the Inquisition in Spain, and in its dependencies in the *New World* too, involves an amount of cruelty which it is impossible to contemplate without horror.

But, in spite of the terrors which it spread, voices were repeatedly heard in Spain to pronounce against it, especially when it developed all its power to crush out evangelical doctrines during the great Reformation of the 16th century. Hatred towards it had spread itself far through the country (M'Crie, *Reformation in Spain*, chap. v); and when Charles V ascended the throne, the Cortes of Castile, Aragon, and Catalonia endeavored to bring to pass a reformation of the tribunal (Llorente, i, 376 sq.). Negotiations to accomplish this end were entered into with the papal chair, and concessions were made, but they were not carried out. It directed its power now against those who openly or secretly adhered to evangelical doctrines. It published annually an edict of denunciation, and convened its chief tribunals at Seville and Valladolid. But it also directed its power against such members of its own Church as did not accept the doctrines of the Council of Trent concerning justification. As, however, they succeeded in entirely suppressing Protestantism in Spain before the beginning of the 17th century, executions became rarer, and in the latter half of the 17th century the Inquisition abated its rigor, and was active principally in suppressing books and persecuting those who possessed or circulated forbidden books. Autos da fé were hardly ever heard of, and, as a result, the tribunal was less feared; and, finally, even Charles III forbade first the execution of capital punishment without royal warrant, and afterwards also set further limits to the power of the Inquisition, preventing it from rendering any final decision without the assent of the king, and also from making any new regulations. In 1762 the grand inquisitor was exiled into a convent for condemning a book against the king's will. In 1770 his minister Aranda circumscribed its power still further by forbidding the imprisonment of any royal subject, unless his guilt was well substantiated; and in 1784 followed the provision that the papers of every suit against a grandee, minister, or any other officer in the employ of the king, should always be presented to the sovereign for inspection before judgment could be pronounced; and although it afterwards regained ground for a while, public opinion proved too averse to it. Even the pope began to restrict its powers, and it was finally abolished in Madrid, Dec. 4, 1808, by an edict of Joseph Napoleon. Llorente calculates that from the time of its introduction into Spain (1481) to that date (1808), the Inquisition had condemned in Spain alone 341,021 persons. Of these, 31,912 persons were burnt alive, 17,659 in effigy, and 291,456 others punished severely. When Ferdinand VII regained the throne of Spain in 1814, one of his first acts was the re-establishment of the Inquisition, but also one of the first acts of the Revolution of 1820 was the destruction of the palace of the Inquisition by the people, and the institution was suppressed by the Cortes. Yet, after the restoration, the apostolical party continued to demand its re-establishment; an inquisitorial junta was organized in 1825, and the old tribunal finally restored in 1826. The law of July 15, 1834, again suspended the Inquisition, after sequestering all its possessions, and the Constitution of 1855 expressly declares that no one shall be made to suffer for his faith. Yet in 1857 the Inquisition showed itself still very vigorous in persecuting all persons suspected of Protestantism, and all books containing their doctrines. Such as were found with heretical books in their possession, or had read them, were severely punished. The great political changes which the last few years have wrought on all the civilized world have not been without marked effects on Spain, and have removed not only in a measure, but, we hope, altogether, the deplorable effects of the Romish spirit of immitigated intolerance, which has ever been praised, preached, and imperatively enjoined as one of the highest of Christian virtues by the antichristian see of Rome. Indeed the Inquisition, not only in Rome, but in every land, the papacy considered its masterpiece, "the firmest and most solid support of its power, both spiritual and temporal. Hence it put all things under the feet of its tribunal in the countries subject to its authority. There the most extravagant maxims were held to be incontestable, and the most unfounded pretensions established beyond dispute. Thus the infallibility of the popes, their superiority to general councils, their dominion over the possessions of all the churches in the world, the power to dispose of them as

they pleased, their pretended authority over the temporal concerns of sovereigns, the right which they claim of deposing them, of absolving their subjects from the oath of allegiance, and giving away their dominions, are maxims which none dared to doubt in the countries of the Inquisition, much less to contest them, lest they should expose themselves to all the horrors of that detestable tribunal. No wonder that the popes, in return, so warmly supported all its pretensions, and earnestly and incessantly labored to procure for it so extensive an authority, that it at length became formidable to the very princes by whom it was adopted" (Shoberl, *Persecutions of Popery*, i, 113 sq.). These assertions, written (in 1844) long before the occurrence of the late so auspicious events, deserve especial consideration, as among the first changes which the downfall of the temporal power of the papacy must inevitably bring is religious *freedom* all over the world. (Comp. also Guettée, *The Papacy* [N. Y. 1867, 12mo], Introd. p. 4 sq.)

Portugal.—From Spain the Inquisition was introduced into the different countries over which it held its sway. Thus it was not really introduced into Portugal until its union with Spain in 1557, and only then after much opposition. It is true, under king Joan III of Portugal, an effort was made to establish the tribunal against the New-Christians of that country, imitating the Spaniards in this respect, and Henrique, the bishop of Ceuta, a former Franciscan monk and fanatic, even took the law in his own hands, and executed five New-Christians, to hasten the establishment of the Inquisition. Many reasons swayed in favor to tolerate the Jews in Portugal, and they, of course, were in that country the first against whom the tribunal was intended to direct the bloody work. In 1531 Clement VII was even persuaded to issue a breve (Dec. 17) to introduce the Inquisition, but already, in the year following (Oct. 17, 1532), he revoked this order (comp. Herculano, *Origem da Inquisição em Portugal*, i, 276 sq., et al.). But when the Inquisition, under Spanish influence, was at last introduced, as in Spain, it became also in Portugal a tribunal of the crown, and it is for this reason Roman Catholic writers argue that the see of Rome cannot be held responsible for the horrible deeds that it enacted in these two countries and in their dependencies. It is true, some of the popes protested against the establishment of the Inquisition *as a state tribunal*, but it must be remembered that the opposition was directed against it (as in Italy, above) not so much on account of its cruel measures, but because it chose to be independent of Rome. Indeed the popes, feeling their power insufficient to enforce obedience, found themselves compelled, from motives of prudence, to tolerate what they were powerless to suppress; i. e. unable to establish the Inquisition under their own immediate control, with the benefits accruing therefrom all flowing into their own treasury, they yielded to a state tribunal, that gave them at least a part in the proceedings, as well as a part of the spoils. The highest tribunal of the Portuguese Inquisition was, of course, at Lisbon, the capital of the country, and the appointment of the grand inquisitor at the pleasure of the king, nominally also subject to the approval of the pope. When, finally, Portugal became again independent under the duke of Braganza as John IV (1640), an effort was made by the Royalists to abolish the Inquisition, and to deprive it of the right of sequestration. But John IV found too strong an opposition in the priesthood, especially in the ever-plotting Jesuits, and he was prevented from executing his intentions successfully. After his death he was himself put under the ban, and his body was only a long time after officially absolved from this, one of the grossest sins a son of Rome could possibly have permitted, the attempt to cleanse his Church from the sin of unrighteousness. In the 18th century the Inquisition was further restricted in its activity and privileges by Pedro II (1706), and a still more decided step was taken by Pombal under his son and successor, Joseph I. The Jesuits were expelled from the country, and the inquisitorial tribunal was commanded by law to communicate to the arrested the accusations presented against him or them, the names of the accusers and witnesses, the right of an attorney to hold communication with the accused, and it was furthermore decreed that no sentence should be executed without the assent of the civil courts. At the same time, the auto da fé was also forbidden. After the fall of Pombal and the death of Joseph I the clergy regained their power for a season, but the spirit of enlightenment had made too great inroads not to conflict with the interference of the priests, and under king John VI (1818–26), when "this great engine for the coercion of the human mind, if worked with the unscrupulous, impassive resolution of Machiavellianism," could no longer be made to accomplish its purpose, it breathed its last, and the very records of its proceedings were condemned to the flames.

Netherlands.—From Spain the Inquisition was also introduced into the Netherlands as early as the 13th century, and from this time forward exerted in this country, next to Spain, her authority most unscrupulously. Especially active was its tribunal during the Reformation. After a severe edict by Charles V at Worms against the heretics (May 8, 1521), he appointed as inquisitors to the Netherlands his councillor, Franz von der Hulst, and the Carmelite Nicolas of Egmont. They at once set out to do their task, and to inflict the usual penalties on their victims—banishment, etc.—and found especial helpmeets in the regent of the Netherlands, Margaret of Austria, in connection with the bishop of Arras, Granvella. The printing, sale, and possession of heretical books were strictly forbidden, and the magistrates were required, under penalty of loss of office, to be active in discovering heretics, and send a quarterly report of their labors to the regent; the informers to receive a considerable reward for any proof (Raumer's *Briefe*, i, 164 sq.). Nevertheless, the Reformation spread, and the Inquisition was not even able to prevent the rise of fanatical sects, as the Anabaptists (q. v.), etc. But Charles, determined to uproot the Reformation, issued a new mandate for the organization of the Inquisition after the Spanish form (April 20, 1550) (see Sleidani *Commentarii*, ed. chr. car. Am Ende: Frcf. ad M. 1785, iii, 203; Gerdesii *Hist. Reformat.* iii, App. p. 122). But this attempt, like the former one, also failed. Maria, the widowed queen of Hungary, who in secret inclined to the Reformation, was now regent. Deputations of the citizens made her aware of the dangers which threatened her on that account; she went immediately to Germany to Charles, and was successful in effecting a change of the mandate in so far that in a new form of it (issued September 25, 1550) the words "Inquisition" and "inquisitors" were omitted. But it was still opposed, and could only be published in Antwerp on the condition of the municipal rights being preserved (Gerdesii, *ut sup.* iii, 216 sq.). That the Inquisition was very active up to this time in the Netherlands is certain; but the accounts that, under Charles V, 50,000, or even 100,000 persons lost their lives by it in that country (Sculteti *Annales*, p. 87; Grotii *Annales et Historiæ de rebus Belgicis*, Amst. 1658, p. 12), seems to be exaggerated. When the Netherlands were placed under the government of Philip II a more severe policy was initiated, determined, if possible, not to modify the existing heresies, but to extinguish them altogether. The Inquisition was at once set in full motion, and a zeal was manifested by its tribunal worthy of a better cause. But the cruelties which followed a people determined to worship their God in the manner which seemed to them a plain duty could excite no fear, but rather added new fuel to the flame already confined to too narrow limits, and it at last burst forth in all its maddened fury. At first the cities Louvain, Brussels, Antwerp, and Herzogenbusch united in demanding the abolition of the Inquisition. Their example was imitated, and in February, 1556, a league of the nobility,

called the Compromise, was formed, which energetically but humbly made the same request (Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* iii, 390 sq.). After some delay this was accomplished in 1567. Shortly after, however, the terrible Alba was dispatched to the Netherlands with unlimited power. Margaret was forced to resign the regency, and he now proceeded with unheard-of cruelty against those who had become suspected, or whose riches attracted him. Upon the 16th of February, 1568, by a sentence of the holy office, *all the inhabitants* of the Netherlands were condemned *to death* as heretics. "From this universal doom only a few persons especially named were excepted. A proclamation of the king, dated ten days later, confirmed this decree of the Inquisition, *and ordered it to be carried into instant execution. . . .* Three millions of people, men, women, and children, were sentenced to the scaffold in three lines" (Motley, *Rise of the Dutch Republic*, ii, 155). But even with these measures they failed in uprooting the Reformation as a dangerous heresy, and in 1573, when the provinces had almost become a waste, and depopulated by the emigration of hundreds of thousands and the execution of thousands of its most valuable citizens, Philip saw himself under the necessity of recalling the duke. The lesson that had been taught Spain was, however, insufficient to incline her to moderation. Philip now, as much as ever, was determined to uproot heresy by force, and these further attempts resulted finally in the independence of the northern provinces of the Netherlands, by a formidable union which they formed at Utrecht in 1579, and which the peace of Westphalia guaranteed to them. In the southern provinces the Jesuits continued to rule for a time, but soon there also the spirit of freedom abrogated their power, and the Inquisition, "all-seeing as Providence, inexorable as the grave; not inflicting punishment which the sufferer could remember, but remorselessly killing outright; not troubling itself to ascertain the merits of a case, and giving the accused the benefits of a doubt, but regarding suspicion and certainty as the same thing," was driven from the land.

Countries outside of Europe.—The Inquisition was introduced into the transatlantic countries also by Portugal, and especially by Spain, to which "the see of Rome, in virtue of the universal authority which it arrogated, had granted all the countries which she might discover beyond the Atlantic," and the Spaniards, reflecting that they had expelled the Jews, the hereditary and inveterate enemies of Christianity, from their coasts, and overturned the Mohammedan empire which had been established for ages in the Peninsula, began to consider themselves as the favorites of Heaven, destined to propagate and defend the true faith, and "thus the glory of the Spanish arms became associated with the extirpation of heresy." In the New World the Inquisition established its power, especially in Mexico. It was also terribly severe in Carthagena and Lima. By the Portuguese it was taken to East India, and had its chief seat at Goa. Under John VII of Portugal it was, after it had undergone several modifications, wholly abolished both in Brazil and East India.

Literature.—Nicol Eymericus, *Directorium inquisitorum* (Barcelona, 1503; Rome, 1578, etc.; with commentaries by Pegna, Venice, 1607); Ursini, *Hispan. inquisitionis et carnificinæ secretiora* (Antw. 1611); Limborch, *Historia Inquisitionis* (Amst. 1692); Plüm, *Ursprung u. Absichten d. I.;* Maurique, *Sammlung d. Instructionen d. Spanischen I.* (1630); Cramer, *Briefe ü. die I.* (Leipzig, 1784–85, 2 vols.); *Erzählungen v. d. Stiftung*, etc., *der I.* (Cologne, 1784); Llorente, *Hist. critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne* (Par. 1815–17, 4 vols.); Ant. Puigblauch, *Die entlarvte I.* (Weimar, 1817); Sarpi, *Discorso dell' Origine dell' Uffizio dell' Inquisitione* (1639), a very able, though short sketch; Rule, *Hist. of Inquisition* (ed. by Dr. Harris); Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, viii, chap. xii, xiii; ix, chap. vii, viii; x, 99 sq.; Leckey, *Hist. of Rationalism* (see Index); M'Crie, *Hist. of the Reformation in Italy; Hist. of the Reformation in Spain;* Milman, *Lat. Christ.* (see Index); Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy* (see Index); Schoberl, *Persecutions of Popery*, i, 102 sq.; Prescott, *Ferd. and Isabella* (see Index); *Philip II* (see Index); Motley, *Hist. of Dutch Republic* (see Index); Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 677 sq.; Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lexikon*, viii, 271 sq.; *Quart. Rev.* vi, 313 sq.; x, 204 sq.; *Blackwood's Mag.* xx, 70 sq.; *N. A. Rev.* lxxx, 504 sq.; Janus, *Pope and the Council*, p. 235 sq.; *English Rev.* xi, 438; *Contemp. Rev.* July, 1869, p. 455; *Method. Quart. Rev.* April, 1870, p. 309; *West. Rev.* 1856, p. 177; also *British Critic* of 1827, and *Museum of Foreign Lit. and Science* (Phila.) of the same year, in which appeared a critical survey of a number of works treating on the Inquisition; Rule, *The Brand of Dominic, or the Inquisition at Rome supreme and universal* (Lond. 1852, 12mo); (Roman Catholic), B. Vicuña Mackenna, *Francisco Moyen, or the Inquisition as it was in South America* (Lond. 1869, 8vo); Balmez, *Catholicism and Protestantism compared in Relation to Civilization;* Herculano, *Da origem e establecimento da inquisição em Portugal* (Lissabon, 1854–1856, 2 vols.); Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.* v, 266 et al. (J. H. W.)

Inquisitor. See INQUISITION.

I. N. R. J. are the initials for *Jesus Nazarenus Rex Judæorum* (Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews), frequently met with as inscriptions. See CROSS OF CHRIST.

Insabbatāti. See WALDENSIANS.

Insacrāti, the name usually given in the ancient canons to the inferior clergy. The superior clergy are commonly called the ἱερούμενοι, *holy* or sacred; the others *insacrati*, unconsecrated. Different ceremonies were observed at their ordination: the higher orders were set apart at the altar by the solemn imposition of hands; the others had no imposition of hands. The superior orders ministered as priests, celebrating the sacraments and preaching in the church; the inferior performed some lower or ordinary duties, and generally attended upon the others in their sacred services. See INFERIOR CLERGY.

Inscriptions carved on stone have in all ages been regarded by cultivated, and sometimes even by rude nations, as the most enduring monuments of remarkable events. Thus the early patriarch Job would have his dying profession of faith "graven with iron in the rock forever" (Job xix, 24). Moses inscribed the law upon stones, and set them up permanently in Mt. Ebal (Deut. xxvii, 2–8; Josh. viii, 30). See PILLAR.

The oldest inscriptions now known to us are the Chinese, which profess to ascend to B.C. 2278. Those of India date only back to B.C. 315, the age of Sandracottus; but it has been thought that the hieroglyphical inscriptions of Central America and of Mexico may prove to be of much older date than those of China even. The Egyptian inscriptions are generally acknowledged to be as old as B.C. 2000; next in order come the Assyrian and Babylonian, reaching nearly as high an antiquity, and then follow the Persian, and Median, and Phœnician, all of about B.C. 700, while the Greek date only to B.C. 500 and 600, and the Etruscan and Roman to no remoter date than the Indian, i. e. B.C. 400–300. The most remarkable of all the known inscriptions are the trilingual inscription of Rosetta, that of Shalmanezer on the obelisk of Nimrud, and the cylinder of Sennacherib; the trilingual inscription of Darius I on the rock at Behistun; the Greek inscription of the soldiers of Psammetichus at Ipsamboul, and of the bronze helmet dedicated by Hiero I to the Olympian Jupiter; the inscription on the coffin of the Cyprian king Asmumazer; the Etruscan inscription called the Eugubine Tables; that of Mummius, the conqueror of Corinth, at Rome, and the will of Augustus at Ancyra; the inscription of the Ethiopian monarch Silco; the old monument of Yu, and the inscription of Se-gan-fu, recording the arrival of Christianity in China (A.D. 631); the inscriptions of Chandra-gupta and Asoka in India.

I. *Egyptian Hieroglyphics.*—These are at once the most ancient, the most copious, and the most instruc-

tive of all relics of this description extant. The Egyptians used three modes of writing: (1) the *Enchorial* or *Demotic*, the common language of the country; (2) the *Hieratic*, peculiar to the priests; and (3) the *Hieroglyphic*. Hieroglyphics, again, are of three kinds: (i.) *Phonetic*, when the hieroglyphic stands for a letter; (ii.) *Emblematic* or Symbolic, when it is an emblem or symbol of the thing represented; (iii.) *Figurative*, when it is a representation of the object itself. The annexed engraving will give some idea of the four different kinds of Egyptian characters; by this it will be seen that in some cases the derivation of the demotic character is to be traced, through its various gradations, from the orig-

Letter.	Pure Hieroglyphic.	Linear Hieroglyphic.	Hieratic Character.	Demotic Character.
K				
M				
L				

inal pure hieroglyphic, while in others the resemblance is utterly lost. We illustrate this subject by a few examples, pointing out the various meanings attached to the Egyptian characters under different circumstances. The names of the gods were in general expressed by symbols and not by letters; "in the same manner, the Jews never wrote at full length the ineffable name of Jehovah, but always expressed it by a short mark, which they pronounced Adonai." These representations were of two kinds: *figurative*, in which the name of the deity is implied by the form in which he was represented in his statue, and *symbolic*, in which a part of the statue, or some object having a reference to the deity, was employed, as for instance:

FIGURATIVE NAMES OF GODS. SYMBOLIC NAMES OF GODS.

Phré. Cnouphis. Amon. Phré. Cnouphis. Amon.

Many words were also expressed by symbols, of which the following are examples:

Mother. Son or Child. Temple. God. Goddess.

Dr. Young and Mr. Tattam have satisfactorily shown that all that has come down to us of the language and literature of ancient Egypt is contained in the Coptic, Sahadic, or Upper Country, and the Basmurico-Coptic dialects, and in the enchorial, hieratic, and hieroglyphic inscriptions and MSS.; and it is a point that cannot be too much insisted upon, that a previous knowledge of the Coptic is absolutely necessary to a correct understanding of the hieroglyphics. See HIEROGLYPHICS.

These inscriptions are found abundantly on the various monuments still remaining in Egypt, especially in the tombs and palaces of the several kings. They are found either alone, as documentary records, e. g. on the obelisks and columns; or oftener in connection with pictorial representations of public or private scenes; very rarely, as in the famous Rosetta Stone, with interlinear translations in the corresponding Egyptian or a foreign language. See EGYPT.

II. *Assyrian Cuneatic.*—These characters, like the Egyptian hieroglyphics, are usually inscribed upon slabs containing likewise pictorial delineations of martial, hunting, or other scenes. See CUNEIFORM. The most noted places where they occur are at Behistun, Khorsobad, Kouyunjik, and Nimrud. See each in its order. All the great halls of the various palaces are surrounded in the interior with sculptured slabs set into the walls, and covered with representations of the great historical events of the reigns of the respective kings, such as battles, sieges of cities, the conquests of provinces, the building of towns, and of mounds for palaces and temples, processions of captives, caravans bearing tribute from subjected nations, or presents from vassal kings, or taxes from the various districts of the empire, etc. Several hundreds of these have been removed, taken down the Euphrates, and shipped to England and France, and set up in the British Museum, and that of the Louvre at Paris. These slabs vary in size from three to seven feet in breadth, and from five to eleven feet in height; and a part even reach thirteen and fifteen feet. Some of them have been brought to our own country, and presented to Amherst and other colleges. These slabs become, as it were, leaves in the Assyrian history. Each chamber, in fact, is a volume; for not only do we have the sculptures, but also inscriptions in a cuneiform or wedge-form letter, which furnishes a commentary on the events represented by the artist. Great progress has already been made in deciphering this language, as we have stated elsewhere, and we have most wonderful and interesting additions to our knowledge of ancient Nineveh (q. v.).

III. *Phœnician Records.*—These are very fragmentary and widely scattered. They are in characters closely resembling the old Hebrew. Most of them have been diligently collected and expounded by Gesenius in his *Monumenta Phœnicia* (Lpz. 1837). See PHŒNICIA. A very interesting inscription relating to the history of one of the early Moabitish kings has lately been discovered. See MESHA.

IV. *Sinaitic Inscriptions.*—Wady Mokatteb, the cliffs of which bear these inscriptions, is a valley entering wady Sheik, and bordering on the upper regions of the Sinai Mountains. It extends for about three hours' march, and in most places its rocks present abrupt cliffs twenty or thirty feet high. From these cliffs large masses have separated and lie at the bottom in the valley. The cliffs and rocks are thickly covered with inscriptions, which are continued, at intervals of a few hundred paces only, for at least the distance of two hours and a half. Burckhardt says that to copy all of them would occupy a skilful draughtsman six or eight days. The inscriptions are very rudely executed, sometimes with large letters, at others with small, and seldom with straight lines. The characters appear to be written from right to left; and, although not cut deep, an instrument of metal must have been required, as the rock is of considerable hardness. Some of them are on rocks at a height of twelve or fifteen feet, and must have required a ladder to ascend to them. The characters were not known. The superior of the Franciscans, who visited the place in 1722, observes: "Although we had among us men who understood the Arabian, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Coptic, Latin, Armenian, Turkish, English, Illyrian, German, and Bohemian languages, there was not one of us who had the slightest knowledge of the characters engraved in these hard rocks with great labor in a country where there is nothing to be had either to eat or drink. Hence it is probable that these characters contained some profound secrets, which, long before the birth of Jesus Christ, were sculptured in these rocks by the Chaldæans or some other persons." This account excited profound attention in Europe; and it was thought by many that the inscriptions might have been formed by the Israelites during their stay in this region, and probably contained irrefragable evidence for the truth of the Mosaic history. Hence copies of them have been anxiously sought and secured; but, with the exception of a few in Greek, the character and language were still unknown. "Before they can be all deciphered," says Laborde, "greater progress than has yet been attained must be made in the paleography and ancient

languages of the East. The most general opinion is that they were the work of pilgrims who visited Sinai about the 6th century." This seems to us very doubtful. The Greek inscriptions and the crosses, on which this conclusion chiefly rests, may indeed have been of that or a later age; but it does not follow that those in the unknown characters necessarily were so too.—Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note on Job xix, 24. Rev. Charles Forster contends that they are records of the Israelites on their way from Egypt to Palestine (*Sinai Photographed*, London, 1862, fol.). Better opportunities than had formerly been at the command of casual travellers were enjoyed by captain Palmer, a member of the expedition now employed in making a complete and exhaustive survey of the physical features and condition of the Sinaitic region. His collection of transcripts from wady Mokatteb and other localities exceeds 1500 in number, and he was much aided in the study of their meaning by finding several undoubted bilingual inscriptions where the Greek and Sinaitic characters occur together, and express the same meaning. The result of four months' steady devotion to this object has given a complete alphabet of the latter, so that captain Palmer can read and interpret any of the inscriptions with ease. Both the alphabet and language must have been employed by a late Shemitic people—"in all probability a commercial community who inhabited, or at least colonized, the Peninsula for the first few centuries of the Christian æra." That many of the writers were Christians is proved by the numerous Christian signs used by them; but it is equally clear, from internal evidence, that a large proportion of them were pagans. It is interesting to note that captain Palmer's researches were pursued without the knowledge of professor Beers's studies, though they mainly corroborate each other, and he bears testimony to the professor's acuteness and penetration. A writer in the *Princeton Review* (Oct. 1870), after giving the history of the discovery and decipherment of these inscriptions, thus concludes: "It seems to be ascertained that the writers were natives of Arabia Petræa, inclusive of the Sinaitic peninsula; and, whether they were subjects of the kingdom centring in Petra or not, they made use of the language and the mode of writing current there. They were neither Jews nor Christians, but worshippers of heathen deities, and particularly of the heavenly bodies. They were mostly pilgrims on their way to certain celebrated sanctuaries, which were for centuries resorted to at special seasons by the pagans resident in this region. The inscriptions in the old native character belong to the period immediately preceding and following the Christian era; and they come down to the time when the Gospel and the Christian Church penetrated these localities, supplanted heathenism, and suppressed its sanctuaries. They then yield to legends in Greek and Latin, and even more recent tongues, the work of Christians, who, in imitation of their heathen predecessors, have left the record of their pilgrimage to hallowed spots graven on the same imperishable works." Hence we find crosses and other marks of Christianity mingled in the pagan names and symbols. Similar inscriptions have been found scattered, but not so profusely, nor in such confusion, in various other portions of the Sinaitic peninsula, and even in the outskirts of Palestine. (See the literature in the *Princeton Review*, ut sup.) See SINAI.

INSCRIPTIONS, CHRISTIAN. There are but few Christian inscriptions that remain extant from an early date, but these few yet suffice to convey to us a pretty accurate idea of the history of the early Christian Church, and of the customs and belief of the first followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. "They express," says Maitland, in his justly celebrated and now quite rare work on *The Church in the Catacombs* (Lond. 1846, 8vo, p. 13), "the feelings of a body of Christians whose leaders alone are known to us in history. The fathers of the Church live in their voluminous works; the lower orders are only represented by these simple records, from which, with scarcely an exception, sorrow and complaint are banished; the boast of suffering, or an appeal to the revengeful passions, is nowhere to be found. One expresses faith, another hope, a third charity. The genius of primitive Christianity, 'to believe, to love, and to suffer,' has never been better illustrated. These 'sermons in stones' are addressed to the heart, and not to the head, to the feelings rather than to the taste; and possess additional value from being the work of the

Engraved Rocks in Wady Mokatteb.

purest and most influential portion of the 'catholic and apostolic Church' then in existence." In the early years of the Christian Church the inscriptions were, with few exceptions, confined to the memory of deceased persons and to sacred objects.

1. The custom of *tomb-stone* inscriptions was borrowed by the early Christians from the Romans and Grecians; they simplified them, however, very much, and indicated the Christian knowledge, life, and rank of the deceased partly by significant symbols, partly by written signs, words, and expressions. These symbols, as they are found in Italy, France, and the countries on the Rhine, pertain partly to the designation of the Redeemer by means of pictorial representations, partly to the life after death, hope for the same through Christ and the cross. The name of Christ, their Lord and Master, is, as would be expected of his followers, everywhere the most prominent, and is "repeated in an endless variety of forms, and the actions of his life are figured in every degree of rudeness of execution." But remarkable it certainly is, that in the inscriptions contained in the Lapidarian Gallery, selected and arranged under papal superintendence, containing one of the largest, if not *the* largest collection of Christian inscriptions, there are no prayers for the dead (unless the forms "May you live," "May God refresh you," be so construed); no addresses to the Virgin Mary, nor to the apostles or earlier saints; and, with the exception of "eternal sleep," "eternal home," etc., no expressions contrary to the plain sense of Scripture. Neither is the second person of the Trinity viewed in the Jewish light of a temporal Messiah, nor is he degraded to the Socinian estimate of a mere example, but he is ever represented as invested with all the honors of a Redeemer. On this subject there is no reserve, no heathenish suppression of the distinguishing feature of the Christian religion as professed by the evangelical sects. On stones innumerable appears the good Shepherd, bearing on his shoulders the recovered sheep, by which many an illiterate believer expressed his sense of personal salvation. One, according to his epitaph, "sleeps in Christ;" another is buried with a prayer that "she may live in the Lord Jesus." But most of all, the cross in its simplest form is employed to testify the faith of the deceased; and whatever ignorance may have prevailed regarding the letter of Holy Writ, or the more mysterious doctrines contained in it, there seems to have been no want of apprehension of that sacrifice "whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven" (Maitland, *Church in the Catacombs*, p. 14, 15). One of the principal signs used in referring to Christ is a monogram of the initial letters of the Greek name Χριστός. Most generally it is found to be composed of Χ and ρ, the latter placed in the heart of the former. Strange to say, we preserve in our own language a vestige of this figure in writing *Xmas* and *Xtian*, which can only be explained by supposing the first letter to stand for the Greek X. This fac-simile of a monogram of Christ's name is copied from Maitland, p. 166, and was originally taken from the Lapidarian Gallery. The α and ω reversed in this epitaph refer to the well-known passages in the Apocalypse: their continued use proves the general reception of that book as a part of the inspired canon. The α and ω [see article on ALPHA] are mentioned by Prudentius as well as by Tertullian, who regarded them as mysteriously containing the signification that in Christ rest the beginning and end of all spiritual life (*De monogram.* c. 8.). From the ignorance of the sculptor, the entire symbol was sometimes inverted, as in the opposite figure (also from

Read: "Tasaris [a man's name] — in Christ, the first and the last."

Maitland, p. 167). A change was afterwards made by the decussation (as it is technically termed) of the X, by which the figure of a cross was produced. Having once arrived at this happy coincidence, the monogram remained stationary. Its simple outline, thus chiselled on a grave-stone (from the Lapidarian Gallery), or accompanied by the misplaced letters,

or even converted into "Psr," as if for Psristos,

D·M·N

ELI ASA

SORICIO.

Read: "To our great God—Eliasa to Soricius, in Christ."

was in course of time ornamented with jewels; and the *monogramma gemmatum* took its place as a work of art among Christian bas-reliefs of the 4th century. The best specimen in the Lapidarian Gallery Maitland asserts that he accurately copied, and it is here reproduced: the jewels are only in marble, but they represent the real gems often lavished upon the ancient cross.

It is asserted by some antiquarians that the monogram was not used until the time of the emperor Constantine, and that, as is generally believed, it was first seen by him in the so greatly celebrated miraculous vision, which resulted in his conversion to the Christian religion. An epitaph, such as the subjoined, discovered by Bosio, may be well assigned to that time, when the motto "In hoc vinces" might have become common:

IN HOC VINCES

SINFONIA ET FILIIS

V·AN·XLVIII M·V·D IIII

"In this thou shalt conquer—In Christ. Sinfonia, also for her sons. She lived forty-eight years, five months, and four days."

The next is contained in Oderici:

IN ☧ VICTRIX

which probably signified,

"Victrix [a woman's name], victorious in Christ."

But the epitaphs of Alexander and Marius, martyrs under Adrian and Antonine, also exhibit the monogram; "and though," says Maitland, "they do not appear to have been executed at the time, they contain strong marks of belonging to a period of violent persecution." Gaetano Marini, however, asserts that the earliest monogram belongs to the year 331, i. e. six years after the Council of Nice.

A cut from a stamp of Boldetti. The P (*r*) of the monogram also serves as a *p* in the words *spes Dei*. It is to be read, "My hope is in God Christ."

The only resemblance to the monogram used by the

heathen was the ceraunium ⚹, or symbol of lightning. The Egyptian cross appears to be an abbreviation of the Nilometer.

SIGNV ☧

CELIX · ET CEREALIS · PATRI · BENEM ·
QVI · VIXIT · ANNIS · LXXXV · M · VIII · D · V
DORMIT IN PACEM.

Translate—"The mark of Christ. Celix and Cerealis to their deserving father," etc.

For the assertion that the monogram was a symbol of martyrdom, and signified "for Christ," there seems to be not the least authority. In many inscriptions we read, however, in ☧; as in

IN ☧ ASELVS D.

"Aselus sleeps [or is buried] in Christ."

Prudentius informs us that the name of Christ, "written in jewelled gold, marked the purple labarum, and sparkled from the helmets" of the army of Constantine; but this is, in all probability, only a poetical fiction (Liber i, *contra Symmachum*). Only in the later inscriptions, as far down as the Middle Ages, as in a Cologne inscription (Centralm. 100), are found the words *initium et finis*. The monogram with the two letters is there sometimes surrounded by a circle or a wreath. The symbols, however, were used more frequently than any other, and of these the fish (ἰχθύς), which is often found in different forms upon the same stone, was no doubt suggested by the initials which it contains of the formula Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Θεοῦ Υἱός, Σωτήρ (Jesus Christ, Son of God, the Saviour), a sentence which had been adopted from the Sibylline verses. "Moreover, the phonetic sign of this word, the actual fish, was an emblem whose meaning was entirely concealed from the uninitiated—an important point with those who were surrounded by foes ready to ridicule and blaspheme whatever of Christianity they could detect. Nor did the appropriateness of the symbol stop here. 'The first,' observed Tertullian, 'seems a fit emblem of him whose spiritual children are, like the offspring of fishes, born in the water of baptism.'" Sometimes the word ἰχθύς was expressed at length, as in the two following (Lapidarian Gallery):

IKΘYC
BONO ET INOCENTI FILIO
PASTORI · QV · X · A · N · IIII

NNIS · X
IXΘYC

The first contains the mistake of κ for χ. At other times the fish itself was figured, as recommended by Clement of Alexandria (*Pædagog.* iii, 106), who, besides the fish, proposed as Christian emblems for signets fishermen, anchors, ships, doves, and lyres.

This specimen Maitland also copied from the Lapidarian Gallery.

In a metrical Grecian inscription at Antrim, Christ himself, at the supper, is called ἰχθύς. Usually, however, it is the fisherman, who is Christ himself; he who also called the apostles to become the fishers of men (Matt. iv, 19; Mark i, 17). Clement observes that it refers to the apostle Peter, and the boys who were drawn out of the water (of baptism). To these the anchor is added, which, as early as the letter to the Hebrews (vi, 19), is made the symbol of hope resting in the centre of holiness (comp. Mai, *Inscrip. Chr.* p. 375, 4; 415, 9; 424, 7; 430, 10; 449, 4; 460, 6). Less frequently we find the sailing ship, e. g. upon an inscription of Firmia Victoria, in the porch of Maria in Trastevere, in Rome, and (Mai, *Inscrip. Chr.* p. 430, 6) upon the tomb-stone of a certain virgin named Serenila. The same is also found in the Vatican. Clement calls it ναῦς οὐρανοδρομοῦσα, "the ship hastening heavenwards." The *lyre*, as far as we know, does not occur on tomb-stones. The lyre is perhaps an ideal picture of the harmony which reigns in the Christian soul, or is used instead of Orpheus, by whom also Christ was represented. The *dove*, also specified by Clement, and the *olive-branch*, are more numerous, as the signs of love and peace. The word *peace* is added to this fac-simile from the Lapidarian Gallery.

PAX

The olive-branch which it bears is borrowed from the history of Noah: it was sometimes carried in the claws of the bird, as in the copy below given, which is taken from the Vatican library.

IENVARIE BIRGINI
BENEMERENTI IN
PACE BOTIS DEPOSITA

"To Jenuaria, a virgin, well-deserving. Buried in peace, with vows."

The substitution of *botis* and *birgini* for *votis* and *virgini:* the *b* and *v* are sometimes as absurdly reversed.

BIB · BEOVENE
MERENTI ☧ "To Bibbeus, the well-deserving."

DECEMBER S EVIVO FECIT SIBI
BISOMVM.

"In Christ. December, while living, made himself a Bisomum."

Clement, among other things, forbids Christians to carry pitchers and swords upon their rings. The *pitcher*, with or without handle, does occur, however, frequently in Rome, Trier, and elsewhere, on Christian graves, usually between two doves. Whether this symbol refers to the doves drinking from a bowl, or whether it points to the water of life which is to refresh the thirsty soul, is not known. Instead of the sword, the *axe* occurs a few times on Christian tomb-stones: thus in Rome, at the church Nereo ed Achille, in the Palazzo Guilelmi, several times at Aringhi, etc. They are most probably a concealed representation of the cross, whose form they somewhat resemble. The Christians could use this symbol more readily, because it was also used by the heathens as *dedicatio sub ascia*. In addition to these, we find the *seven-armed candlestick*, which occurs in the cloister of St. Paola at Rome and elsewhere upon Jewish tomb-stones, but also upon Christian basilisks of Rome; not so frequently on graves, e. g. Mai, *Inscript. Chr.* p. 408, 4. The *lamb* occurs seldom, e. g. Mai, *Inscript. Chr.* p. 401, 3; the same, between two doves, p.

363, 5. The *balance* occurs twice at Aringhi; and upon private sarcophagi, representations of the good shepherd, Old and New Testament histories, etc. Besides these, there are also occasionally met with the anchor, "understood to signify the close of a well-spent life: the conclusion of a successful voyage, when the anchor is cast. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that the Church was often represented by a ship sailing heavenward: ἡ ναῦς ' οὐρανοδρομοῦσα of Clement: in later times steered by Sts. Peter and Paul." This symbol may help to explain the expression used by Peter, "So shall an entrance be ministered unto you abundantly," generally referred to the prosperous entrance of a vessel into port. "The ignorance displayed by the sculptor is scarcely to be accounted for, excepting by the circumstance that the traffic on the Tiber was confined to barges, unprovided with masts and sails, and towed by horses. The peacock is said to have been used as an emblem of immortality. This idea was borrowed from the pagans, who employed it to signify the apotheosis of an empress: for this purpose it was let fly from the funeral pile on which her body was consumed. The phœnix was also adopted by the Christians with the same intention; so, also, the crowned horse, as a sign of victory." The supposed emblems of martyrdom, such as a figure praying, a crown, or a palm branch, which generally belong to this class, are borrowed from paganism, with additional significance in Christian cases, especially on account of the mention of it in the book of Revelation. "On the strength of some expressions there used, antiquarians of later times have taken it for granted that the early Church employed both crown and palm, or either separately, as emblems of martyrdom." This supposition, though apparently reasonable, has been abandoned from want of proof; and such a fragment as the following, found in the cemetery of St. Priscilla (Lapidarian Gallery), is now only supposed to belong to the epitaph of an ordinary Christian:

. NA VIBAS
DOMINO
. ESV

Translate, ". . . . na, may you live in the Lord Jesus."

The crown and palm conjoined are also met with: in the present example, from the Vatican library, they encircle the monogram, as represented below:

· FL · IOVINA · QVAE . VIX
ANNIS · TRIBVS · D · XXX
NEOFITA · IN PACE · XI · K

"Flavia Jovina—who lived three years and thirty days—a neophyte—in peace.—(She died) the eleventh Kalends . . . . "

The extreme youth of the neophyte, while it proves the custom of infant baptism, makes the martyrdom of Jovina improbable. "The notice of death is various in the heathen inscriptions. Occasionally occurs D.M. (*dis manibus*); instead of that, also B. M., i. e. *bonæ memoriæ*. The beginning formula usually is *hic quiescit*, or *requiescit in pace;* in the Greek, ἐνθάδε κεῖται or κατακεῖται ἐν εἰρήνῃ; the latter also occurs on the Jewish inscriptions of St. Paola. Instead of this stands also *hic pausat in pace*, ἀνέπαυσεν ἐν εἰρήνῃ, *hic posita est*, *hic sepultus jacet*, *requiescit in somno pacis*, *dormit in pace*, *locus*, κατάθεσις ΕΝ ΠΑΖΕ (? *in pace* Græcized), ἐν εἰρήνῃ κοίμησις, τόπος ἀναπαύσεως, etc.; or simply the name of the deceased in the nominative or dative, with and without *in pace*, ἐν εἰρήνῃ."

Quite remarkable, however, is the distinguishing feature of Christian inscriptions of the early centuries, and perhaps one in which more than in any other it differs from pagan inscriptions, viz. in its use of names. "While the heathen name consisted of several essential parts, all of which were necessary to distinguish its owner, the Christians in general confined themselves to that which they had received in baptism." But as some of the converts came from Roman families, it was quite natural for them to retain their Gentile and other names, yea, genuine heathen names, and thus even the names of heathen gods occur, e. g. Azizos, the name of a Syriac goddess, we find in Trier (Centralmus, iii, 53) given as the name of a Syriac Christian. Also Artemia, Martinus, Mercurilis, Jovinus, Venerosa, Venerigina, Saturninus, names united with Sabbatia, Sabbatius, Nundinas, and Dominica, taken in a great measure from the names of the days of the week. But the desire to simplify names, and to give them an ethical signification, is none the less noticeable even among the Roman converts; for while it was at that time nothing unusual in the heathen world for a person to have six, eight, or ten names, in Christian inscriptions (the name given at the time of baptism being always preferred) but one or two names generally occur. The name was, as a rule, taken in view of facts universally believed to be good or desirable, e. g. with regard to *life:* Vitalis, Vitalio, Vitalinus, Vitalissimus, Viventius, Zoe, etc.; in view of *fortune:* Felicio, Fortunio, Fortunula, Felicissima, Faustina, Prosper, Successus, Eutyches, etc.; of *joy:* Gaudentius, Gaudiosus, Hilario, Hilarianus, Jucunda, Edone; of *victory:* Victor, Vincentius, Nike, Pancratir; of *strength:* Virissimus, Fortissima, Alcimus, Dynamiola; of *faith:* Theophistus, Fidelis; of *hope:* Spes, Helpis, Elpidia; of *love:* Philetus, Philumena, Agape, Agapetus, Caritosa; of *spiritual blessing:* Dorotheus, Theodorus, Theodota, Theodulus, Timothea, Theophila, and various others. The kingdom of nature has also its part in Christian names, e. g. months: Januarius, Februarius, Aprilis, Decembrina; animals, plants, employments of rural life, etc. Of Old-Testament names few are found, e. g. Susanna, Daninil, and Daniel; of New-Testament names, Maria, Petrus, Paulus. The consideration of national names is foreign to our purpose. After the name of the deceased there is frequently appended a short statement of his Christian position, views, or habits which distinguished him in civil life. He is called a neophyte (once *in albis*), a believer (*fidelis*), i. e. one who is really accepted: martyr, diacon, exorcista, subdiacon, etc.; child, virgin, man, wife; anima dulcis, miræ innocentiæ anima or exemplum, dulcis aptissimus infans et visugrata et verbis dulcissima cunctis, filius innocentissimus, dulcissimus, bonus, sapiens, omnibus honorificentissimus et idoneus, deo fidelis et dulcis marito, nutrix familiæ, cunctis humilis, placata puro corde, amatrix pauperum, abstinens se ab omni maligna re, etc.; the most common form is bene merens. Then follows the age, with a qui vixit or in sæculo, ἔζησεν, ζήσας, either with an accurate account of the years, months, and days, or merely about the time, with the additional statement plus minus, πλέον ἐλάττον. Then the day of burial, with a depositus or deposito, not seldom the *fasti* for the year; sometimes, also, the announcement of the person who erected the stone (titulum posuit or posuerunt), and of his suffering (dolens, contra votum, etc.). Of course this arrangement is not always followed. Sometimes we find following the name a motto, such as ζήσῃς, vivas in Christo, in deo vivas, vivas in domino, spes pax tibi, accepta

sis in Christo. The language is largely corrupted, the Latin degenerating into the Roman, but for this reason is very important in grammar. Occasionally we find Latin words written in Greek letters, or mixed inscriptions in both languages. When written in poetry, the hexameter or distich measure is commonly used, and yet they are rhythmical rather than metrical. In such rhythmical inscriptions we find extension of thought not in the foregoing. The material upon which the inscriptions were made consists of small, plain marble slabs, either laid upon the grave or put into the coffin. Sometimes, to designate the death of martyrs, there occur vessels of blood and the instruments of death; also glasses, etc.

2. Besides the inscriptions on graves, which Rettberg first made useful to Church history, there are also sacred inscriptions, which we find partly upon glass, partly upon coins, gems, lamps, amulets, crosses, dishes, and other works of art. The more ancient Christian inscriptions have not yet been sufficiently sought for. In the collections of Fabretti, Reinesius, Gruter, Muratori, Donati, Castelli, Spon, Osann, Orelli, etc., they are badly injured. For descriptions of them, consult Franz, who speaks of the following: Bosio, *Roma sotterranea* (Rome, 1651); P. Aringhi, *Roma subterranea novissima* (Rome, 1657; Paris, 1659), vols. i and ii; Boldetti, *Osservazioni sopra i cimiteri de' santi martiri ed antichi christiani* (Rome, 1720); Banduri, *Numismata impp. Rom. a Traiano Decio ad palæologos Augustos* (Paris, 1718), vols. i, ii; Eckhel, *Doctr. Numm.* vol. viii; Bellori, *Lucernæ veteres* (Col. 1702); Ficoroni, *Gemmæ ant. litt. Rome;* Buonaruoti, *Osservazioni sopra alcuni vasi antichi di vetro* (Firenz. 1716); Seroux d'Agincourt, *Histoire de l'art par les monuments*, etc. (Paris, 1823), vols. i–iv; Krebs, *Lipsanotheca Weilburgensis* (1820); *Mémoires de l'Institut Royal de France* (1837, 1838), vol. iii. The following are not mentioned by Franz; the treatise of Pellicia, *De re lapidaria et siglis vet. Christian.*, in his *Christianæ ecclesiæ politia* (ed. Braun, Coloniæ, 1838), iii, 111–297; Kopp, *Palæogr. Critic* (Mannhemii, 1829), vols. iii and iv; Mai, or rather Marini, *Inscriptiones Christianæ*, in Mai, *Script. veterum nova collectio* (Rome, 1831), vol. v, a work that leaves untreated much to be wished for. Earlier undertakings are spoken of by Mai in his introduction, p. viii to xv. For the inscriptions at Naples, consult the works concerning the Catacombs there found; for those at Milan, Givo, *Labus intorno alcuni monumenti epigrafici christiani scoperti in Milano l'anno MDCCCXIII nell' insigne basilica di sant' Ambrogio* (Milan, 1824, fol.); and the same, *Intorno alcuni monumenti epigrafici gentileschi e christiani scoperti nell' insigne basilica di S. Simpliciano* (in the *Giornale dell' J. R. Instituto Lombardo di Science, Lettere ed Arti*, vol. iii, Milan, 1842); for those at Verona, Maffei's *Museum Veronense* (Veronæ, 1749), p. 178-184. For those at Autun, comp. Franz, *Das christliche Denkmal* (Berl. 1841, 8vo), in German and French. For Treves, see the works of Lersch, especially his *Central Museum Rheinländischer Inschriften* (Bonn, 1842), iii, 29-48; Steiner, *Cod. inscrip.-Rhen*, No. 829-849; Wyttenbach, *Neue Beiträge z. antiken, heidnisch. u. christl. Epigraphik* (Treves, 1833); and others. For later epigraphs of the Middle Ages, see Otte, *Abriss e. kirchl. Kunst-Archaeol. d. Mittelalters* (Nordhausen, 1845), p. 71–92; Mentié, in Didron, *Annales Archéologiques*, i, 106. For inscriptions still later, see Galletti, *Inscriptiones Romanæ infimi ævi* (Rome, 1760), vols. i–iii; Morcelli, *Op. Epigraph.* (Patavii, 1823), vols. iv and v; Hüpsch, *Epigrammatographie* (Cologne, 1801), vol. ii. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 484 sq.; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquités*, p. 315 sq.; and especially Maitland, *Church in the Catacombs* (London, 1846, 8vo), from which we have freely quoted.

Insect. The following is a complete list of all the specimens of entomology mentioned in the canonical Scriptures (including their products), together with their names in the original and in the A. V. See ZOOLOGY.

Akkabîsh',	"spider,"	spider.
Akrâb',	"scorpion,"	scorpion.
Akris,	"locust,"	locust.
Arbeh',	"locust,"	locust.
Arôb',	"swarms,"	gad-fly.
Ash,	"moth,"	moth.
Chagâb,'	"grasshopper,"	locust.
Chanamâl',	"frost,"	ant? (destructive).
Chargôl',	"beetle,"	locust (edible).
Chasîl',	"locust,"	locust.
Deborâh',	"bee,"	bee.
Gazâm',	"palmer-worm,"	locust (grub).
Gêb,	"locust,"	locust.
Gôb,	"grasshopper,"	locust.
Kên,	"lice,"	gnat.
Kŏkkŏs,	"scarlet,"	kermes (worm).
Kōnōps,	"gnat,"	fly (in wine).
Me'shî,	"silk,"	fine thread.
Nemâlâh',	"ant,"	ant.
Parôsh',	"flea,"	flea.
Sâs,	"moth,"	moth.
Sērikŏn,	"silk,"	silk.
Sēs,	"moth,"	moth.
Skŏrpiŏs,	"scorpion,"	scorpion.
Solâm',	"bald locust,"	locust (edible).
Tsaltsâl',	"locust,"	cricket.
Tsirâh',	"hornet,"	hornet.
Ye'lek,	"canker-worm," "caterpillar,"	locust (hairy).
Zebûb',	"fly,"	fly.

Insermentés or **Réfractaires**, a title of those of the French Roman Catholic clergy who were disloyal to the Revolution. August 10, 1789, the National Assembly proposed to appropriate the property of the Church, which then covered about one fifth of the surface of France, yielding an annual revenue of three hundred million francs, and by an act of Feb. 13, 1790, this became a law. Thus the great body of the clergy, who, patriotic in their aspirations, and suffering from the abuses of power, had hailed the advent of the Revolution with joy, now finding their dearest interests and privileges assailed, were forced into the position of reactionaries, and soon became the objects of suspicion and of persecution. To determine those who opposed the Revolution, the progressives devised a test-oath obligatory on all ecclesiastics, and lists were kept to distinguish between loyalists and disloyalists. "Harmless as the oath was in appearance when it was tendered in Dec. 1790, five sixths of the clergy throughout the kingdom refused it. Those who yielded to the pressure were termed assermentés, the recusants *insermentés* or *réfractaires*, and the latter, of course, at once became the determined opponents of the new régime, the more dangerous because they were the only influential partisans of reaction belonging to the people. To their efforts were attributed the insurrections which in La Vendée and elsewhere threatened the most fearful dangers. They were accordingly exposed to severe legislation. A decree of Nov. 29, 1791, deprived them of their stipends and suspended their functions; another of May 27, 1792, authorized the local authorities to exile them on the simple denunciation of twenty citizens. Under the Reign of Terror their persons were exposed to flagrant cruelties, and a prêtre réfractaire was generally regarded, *ipso facto*, as an enemy of the Republic."—Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotalism*, p. 547 sq.; Pressensé, *Reign of Terror* (transl. by Prof. Lacroix), p. 60 sq.

Insignia of Clergy. See VESTMENTS.

Inspiration (Lat. *a breathing into*), a term employed to designate the divine origin of Holy Scripture (q. v.).

I. *Definition.*—1. The word "inspiration" "is sometimes used to denote the excitement and action of a fervent imagination in the poet or orator. But even in this case there is generally a reference to some supposed divine influence, to which the excited action is owing. It is once used in Scripture to denote that divine agency by which man is endued with the faculties of an intelligent being, when it is said 'the inspiration (נְשָׁמָה, *breath*, as in Gen. ii, 7) of the Almighty giveth him understanding (Job xxxii, 8). But the inspiration now to be considered is that which belonged to those who wrote the Scriptures, and which is particularly spoken of in 2

Tim. iii, 16, and in 2 Pet. i, 21: 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God;' 'Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' These passages relate specially to the Old Testament, but there is at least equal reason to predicate divine inspiration of the New Testament."

2. The Greek expression θεόπνευστος (2 Tim. iii, 16) signifies a divine action on the perceptions ("Nemo vir magnus sine aliquo afflatu divino unquam fuit," Cicero, *pro Archia*, c. 8). The breath of God is used as a material expression for his power (as in *δύναμις ὑψίστου* for *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, Luke i, 35; xxiv, 49). In this sense, also, the classics speak of a *θεόπνευστος σοφίη* (Phocylides, 121), *θεόπνευστοι ὄνειροι* (Plutarch, *De plac. philos.* v, 2; comp. *ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἅγιοι θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι*, 2 Pet. i, 21). The neutral form, in the sense of "God-inspired," is used by Nonnus (*Paraphr. ev. Jo.* i, 27), and applied to Scripture by Origen (*Hom.* 21, *in Jerem.* vol. ii, de la Rue: "Sacra volumina spiritus plenitudinem spirant").

3. A psychological definition of the relation of this divine, consequently passively received perception to human spontaneity, is given by Plato in his doctrine of the divine *μανία*, the *ἔνθεος εἶναι*. This position is the root of the divinely implanted tendency to knowledge which has not yet attained a clear consciousness (Zeller, *Griech. Phil.* ii, 166, 275; Brandis, ii, 428). Of this, in so far as it includes the idea in the form of beauty, artists and authors say: *οὐ τέχνῃ ταῦτα τὰ καλὰ λέγουσι ποιήματα, ἀλλ' ἔνθεοι ὄντες καὶ κατεχόμενοι* (*Ion.* 533). *Οὐ γὰρ τέχνῃ ταῦτα λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ θείᾳ δυνάμει* (*ib.* p. 534). This gives rise to the *μαντική*, which requires the *προφήτης* for its interpreter (*Timæus*, 72). This doctrine of Plato concerning inspiration has had great influence on the Jewish and Christian doctrine. Philo admits it, and derives from it the incompatibility of divine and human knowledge (*Quis rerum d. h.* i, 511, Mang.); *ὅτε μὲν φῶς ἐπιλάμψει τὸ θεῖον, δύεται τὸ ανθρώπινον· ὅτε δ' ἐκεῖνο δύει, τοῦτ' ἀνίσχει καὶ ἀνατέλλει.* Yet he does not limit the divine influence to the inspiration of the sacred books, and does not hesitate to ascribe to himself an occasional *θεοληπτεῖσθαι* (*De Cherubim*, i, 143). Some of the Greek fathers also describe the state of inspiration as purely passive (Justin, *Cohort.* c. 8: *Οὔτε γὰρ φύσει οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἐννοίᾳ οὕτω μεγάλα καὶ θεῖα γινώσκειν ἀνθρώποις δυνατόν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἄνωθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ἄνδρας τηνικαῦτα κατελθούσῃ δωρεᾷ, οἷς οὐ λόγιον ἐδέησε τέχνης, ἀλλὰ καθαροὺς ἑαυτοὺς τῇ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος παρασχεῖν ἐνεργείᾳ, ἵν' αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατιὸν πλῆκτρον, ὥσπερ ὀργάνῳ, κιθάρας τινὸς ἢ λύρας τοῖς δικαίοις ἀνδράσι χρώμενον, τὴν τῶν θείων ἡμῖν ἀποκαλύφῃ γνῶσις.* Athenag. *Legat.* c. 9: *Νομίζω ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀνοήτους γεγονέναι οὔτε τοῦ Μωϋσέως οὔτε τοῦ Ἡσαΐου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν προφητῶν, οἳ κατ' ἔκστασιν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς λογισμῶν κινήσαντος αὐτοὺς τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, ἃ ἐνηχοῦντο ἐξεφώνησαν, συγχρησαμένου τοῦ πνεῦματος, ὡσεὶ καὶ αὐλητὴς αὐλὸν ἐμπνεῦσαι*). We therefore find at an early time the notion of a *literal* inspiration (Iren. iii, 16, 2: "Potuerat dicere Matthæus: Jesu generatio sic erat. Sed prævidens Spiritus S. depravatores et præmuniens contra fraudulentiam eorum, per Matthæum ait: Christi generatio sic erat." Clemens, *Cohort.* i, 71, ed. Pott.: *Ἐξ ὧν γραμμάτων* [he means the *ἱερὰ γράμματα*, 2 Tim. iii, 14] *καὶ συλλαβῶν τῶν ἱερῶν τὰς συγκειμένας γραφὰς ὁ αὐτὸς ἀκολούθως Ἀπόστολος θεοπνεύστους καλεῖ.* Origen, *Hom. xxi in Jer.*: "Secundum istiusmodi expositiones decet sacras litteras credere nec unum quidem apicem habere vacuum sapientia Dei"). Yet all these expressions represent rather the general religious impression than the settled dogma; hence we find the ante-Nicene fathers recognising some of the heathen books as inspired, e. g. the Sibyllian books (Theoph. *ad Autol.* 2, 9), whilst at the same time they expressed views excluding the idea of all parts of Scripture being *equally* inspired.

4. The definition which Dr. Knapp gives of inspiration is one which most will readily adopt. He says: "It may be best defined, according to the representations of the Scriptures themselves, as *an extraordinary divine agency upon teachers while giving instruction, whether oral or written, by which they were taught what and how they should write or speak.*" The nature, permanence, and completeness of this inspiration are matters upon which orthodox believers have differed. (See below.)

II. *The Fact of the Inspiration of the Bible.*—(On this point we condense the arguments of Dr. Leonard Woods in Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v., confining ourselves chiefly to the question of the inspiration of the *written* word.) To prove that the Scriptures are divinely inspired, we might with propriety refer to the excellence of the doctrines, precepts, and promises, and other instructions which they contain; to the simplicity and majesty of their style; to the agreement of the different parts, and the scope of the whole; especially to the full discovery they make of man's fallen and ruined state, and the way of salvation through a Redeemer; together with their power to enlighten and sanctify the heart, and the accompanying witness of the Spirit in believers. But the more direct and conclusive evidence that the Scriptures were divinely inspired is found in *the testimony of the writers themselves.* As the writers did, by working miracles and in other ways, sufficiently authenticate their divine commission, and establish their authority and infallibility as teachers of divine truth, their testimony, in regard to their own inspiration, is entitled to our full confidence. For who can doubt that they were as competent to judge and as much disposed to speak the truth on this subject as on any other? If, then, we admit their divine commission and authority, why should we not rely upon the plain testimony which they give concerning the divine assistance afforded them in their work? To reject their testimony in this case would be to impeach their veracity, and thus to take away the foundation of the Christian religion.

1. The prophets generally professed to speak *the word of God.* What they taught was introduced and confirmed by a "Thus saith the Lord;" or "The Lord spake to me, saying." In one way or another they gave clear proof that they were divinely commissioned, and spoke in the name of God, or, as it is expressed in the New Testament, *that God spake by them.*

2. The Lord Jesus Christ possessed the spirit of wisdom without measure, and came to bear witness to the truth. His works proved that he was what he declared himself to be—the Messiah, the great Prophet, the infallible Teacher. The faith which rests on him rests on a rock. As soon, then, as we learn how *he* regarded the Scriptures, we have reached the end of our inquiries. His word is truth. Now every one who carefully attends to the four Gospels will find that Christ everywhere spoke of that collection of writings called the Scripture as the word of God; that he regarded the whole in this light; that he treated the Scripture, and every part of it, as infallibly true, and as clothed with divine authority—thus distinguishing it from every mere human production. Nothing written by man can be entitled to the respect which Christ showed to the Scriptures. This, to all Christians, is direct and incontrovertible evidence of the divine origin of the Scriptures, and is by itself perfectly conclusive.

3. But there is clear concurrent evidence, and evidence still more specific, in the writings of the apostles. Particularly in one passage (2 Tim. iii, 16), Paul lays it down as the characteristic of "*all Scripture*" that it "*is given by inspiration of God*" (*θεόπνευστος*, "divinely inspired"); and from this results its profitableness. Some writers think that the passage should be rendered thus: *All divinely inspired Scripture*, or, *all Scripture, being divinely inspired, is profitable.* According to the common rendering, inspiration is predicated of all Scripture. According to the other, it is presupposed as the

attribute of the subject. But this rendering is liable to insuperable objections. For θεόπνευστος and ὠφέλιμος are connected by the conjunction καί, and must both be predicates, if either of them is; and unless one of them is a predicate there is no complete sentence. Henderson remarks that the mode of construction referred to "is at variance with a common rule of Greek syntax, which requires that when two adjectives are closely joined, as θεόπνευστος and ὠφέλιμος here are, if there be an ellipsis of the substantive verb ἐστί, this verb must be supplied after the former of the two, and regarded as repeated after the latter. Now there exists precisely such an ellipsis in the case before us; and as there is nothing in the context which would lead to any exception to the rule, we are bound to yield to its force." He adds that "the evidence in favor of the common rendering, derived from the fathers, and almost all the versions, is most decided." It cannot for a moment be admitted that the apostle meant to signify that divine inspiration belongs to a part of Scripture, but not to the whole; or that he meant, as Semler supposes, to furnish a criterion by which to judge whether any work is inspired or not, namely, its *utility*. "That author proceeds fearlessly to apply this criterion to the books of the Old Testament, and to lop off eight of them as not possessing the requisite marks of legitimacy. Many of the German divines adopt Semler's hypothesis." But it is very manifest that such a sense is not by any means suggested by the passage itself, and that it is utterly precluded by other parts of the New Testament. For neither Christ nor any one of his apostles ever intimates a distinction between some parts of Scripture which are inspired and other parts which are not inspired. The doctrine which is plainly asserted in the text under consideration, and which is fully sustained by the current language of the New Testament, is, that *all the writings denominated the Scriptures are divinely inspired.* What particular books have a right to be included under this sacred designation in the general opinion of the Church is a question considered under the article CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

III. *The Manner of Inspiration.*—The *interior process* of the Spirit's action upon the minds of the speakers or writers was of course inscrutable (John iii, 8) even to themselves. That they were *conscious*, however, of such an influence is manifest from the *authority* with which they put forth their words; yet, when they sat down to write, the divine and the human elements in their mental action were perfectly harmonious and inseparable (Luke i, 3).

As to the outward method, "God operated on the minds of inspired men in a variety of ways, sometimes by audible words, sometimes by direct inward suggestions, sometimes by outward visible signs, sometimes by the Urim and Thummim, and sometimes by dreams and visions. This variety in the mode of divine influence detracted nothing from its certainty. God made known his will equally in different ways; and, whatever the mode of his operation, he made it manifest to his servants that the things revealed were from him." All this, however, relates rather to *revelation* than simple inspiration, a distinction that is ably made by Prof. Lee in his work on the subject.

"But inspiration was concerned not only in making known the will of God to prophets and apostles, but also *in giving them direction in writing the sacred books.* In this, also, there was a diversity in the mode of divine influence. Sometimes the Spirit of God moved and guided his servants to write things which they could not know by natural means, such as new doctrines or precepts, or predictions of future events. Sometimes he moved and guided them to write the history of events which were wholly or partly known to them by tradition, or by the testimony of their contemporaries, or by their own observation or experience. In all these cases the divine Spirit effectually preserved them from all error, and influenced them to write just so much and in such a manner as God saw to be best. Sometimes he moved and guided them to write a summary record of larger histories, containing what his infinite wisdom saw to be adapted to the end in view, that is, the benefit of his people in all ages. Sometimes he influenced them to make a record of important maxims in common use, or to write new ones, derived either from their own reason or experience, or from special divine teaching. Sometimes he influenced them to write parables or allegories, particularly suited to make a salutary impression of divine things on the minds of men; and sometimes to record supernatural visions. In these and all other kinds of writing the sacred penmen manifestly needed special divine guidance, as no man could of himself attain to infallibility, and no wisdom, except that of God, was sufficient to determine what things ought to be written for permanent use in the Church, and what manner of writing would be best fitted to promote the great ends of revelation."

"Some writers speak of different modes and different kinds, and even different degrees of inspiration. If their meaning is that God influenced the minds of inspired men in different ways; that he adopted a variety of modes in revealing divine things to their minds; that he guided them to give instruction in prose and in poetry, and in all the different forms of composition; that he moved and guided them to write history, prophecy, doctrines, commands, promises, reproofs, and exhortations, and that he adapted his mode of operation to each of these cases—against this no objection can be made. The Scriptures do exhibit these different kinds of writing and modes of divine instruction. Still every part of what was written was divinely inspired, and equally so. It is all the word of God, and clothed with divine authority, as much as if it had all been made known and written in one way." While this is true of the word as written or as originally uttered, it is not true that all the subject matter is equally revealed; for some of the facts, doctrines, and views were known to the writers in their ordinary intelligence, while others were specially communicated by immediate divine afflatus. In other words, all is *inspired*, but not all *revealed*.

IV. *Theories of Inspiration.*—These may be concisely stated thus: (1.) The *orthodox*, or generally accepted view, which contents itself with considering Scripture to be inspired in such a sense as to make it infallibly *certain* when apprehended in its legitimate sense, and of absolute *authority* in all matters of faith and conscience. This theory has lately been, with great propriety, designated as the *dynamical*, purporting that the *power* or influence is from God, while the action is human. (2.) The *mystical*, or extremely strict view, thought to have been held by Philo, Josephus, and some of the primitive Christian fathers (but condemned by the early councils as savoring of heathenish μαντεία), which regarded the sacred writers as wholly possessed by the Spirit, and uttering its dicta in a species of frenzy. This, in opposition to the former, has justly been characterized as the *mechanical* view, denoting the passivity of the inspired subject. (3.) The *latitudinarian* view, entertained by Rationalists of all orders, which deems inspiration but a high style of poetic or religious fervor, and not inconsistent with errors in fact and sentiment.

This last view is not to be confounded, however, with that of those who limit inspiration to such matters in holy Scripture as directly pertain to the proper material of revelation, i. e. to strictly *religious* truth, whether of doctrine or practice. Among English divines, those who have asserted this form of theory are Howe (*Divine Authority of Scripture*, lect. viii and ix), Bp. Williams (*Boyle Lect.* serm. iv, p. 133), Burnet (*Article* vi, p. 157, Oxf. ed. 1814), Lowth (*Vind. of Div. Auth. and Inspir. of Old and New Testament*, p. 45 sq.), Hey (*Theol. Lect.* i, 90), Bp. Watson (*Tracts*, iv, 446), Bp. Law (*Theory of Religion*), Tomline (*Theology*, i, 21), Dr. J. Barrow (*Dissertations*, 1819, 4th diss.), Dean Conybeare (*Theological*

Lectures, p. 186), Bp. Hinds (*Inspiration of Scripture*, p. 151), Bp. D. Wilson (lecture xiii on *Evidences*, i, 509), Parry (*Inquiry into the Nature of the Inspiration of the Apostles*, p. 26, 27), and Bp. Blomfield (*Lectures on Acts*, v, 88-90). Others have even gone so far as to avow that the value of the religious element in the revelation would not be lessened if *errors* were acknowledged in the scientific and miscellaneous matter which accompanies it. Among those who have held this form of the theory are Baxter (*Method. Theol. Chr.* pt. iii, ch. xii, 9, 4), Tillotson (*Works*, fol. iii, 449, sermon 168), Doddridge (*On Inspir.*), Warburton (*Doctr. of Grace*, bk. i, ch. vii), Bp. Horsley (serm. 39 on Eccles. xii, 7, *Works*, iii, 175), Bp. Randolph (*Rem. on Michaelis' Introd.* p. 15, 16), Paley (*Evid. of Christianity*, pt. iii, ch. ii), Whately (*Ess. on Diff. in St. Paul*, ess. i and ix; *Sermons on Festivals*, p. 90; *Pecul. of Christianity*, p. 233), Hampden (*Bampton Lect.* p. 301), Thirlwall (Schleiermacher's *Luke*, Introd. p. 15), Bp. Heber (*Bampt. Lect.* viii, 577), Thomas Scott (*Essay on Inspir.* p. 3), Dr. Pye Smith (*Script. and Geol.* p. 276, 237, 3d ed.), and Dean Alford (*Proleg. to Gosp.* ed. 1859, vol. i, ch. i, § 22). (For other writers who have held the same views, see Dr. Davidson's *Facts, Statements*, etc., in defence of his vol. ii of Horne's *Introd.* 1857.) The inadmissibility, however, of either of these limitations to inspiration is evident from two considerations: 1st, That the sacred writers themselves make no such discrimination in their professions of divine sanction; and it would, in fact, be subversive of the above distinction between inspiration and revelation; and, 2dly, The line of demarcation between what is important to religion and what is not is too fine to be traced by any expositor, so that we would thus unsettle our whole confidence in the truthfulness of the Scriptures. We therefore are compelled by the necessity of the case, no less than the positive declarations of the Bible itself, to maintain that "all Scripture is divinely inspired," and not some of its parts or statements alone. At the same time we may, without inconsistency—nay, we must, in the light of just criticism—admit that the *phraseology* in which these statements is couched is oftentimes neither elegant nor exact. Yet this does not impair their essential *truth*, as the testimony of an illiterate witness may be scrupulously truthful, although confused in order and unscientific in form. Provided the *facts* are substantially given, the want of logical, rhetorical, and grammatical precision is comparatively unimportant, and forms no ground of impeachment. The mental habits of the sacred writers must be taken into account in order to arrive at their *meaning*, and this last, indeed, in the case of any writer, is what the reader is in search of, and of which language, whether clear or obscure, is legitimately but the vehicle. The errors imputed to the Scriptures by certain scientific men have accordingly all been explained, sooner or later, as being merely apparent, and due to the popular style of the sacred writers. Even the most difficult instances of these, such as the omissions and general enumerations in the genealogies [see GENEALOGY OF CHRIST], are susceptible of the same explanation, since these were evidently *copied faithfully* from public registers, which, however incorrect they may seem to us, were of unquestioned currency at the time. A nicety in stopping to rectify these (for, be it observed, no one was led into error by the transcription, since the writers, and, indeed, the whole public, were perfectly aware of the discrepancy) would have been a far greater piece of pedantry than for a modern divine to pause in the midst of a quotation of Scripture to correct an unimportant mistranslation in the Authorized Version. Just so when our Lord and the apostle Paul freely cite passages according to the inexact rendering of the Septuagint, and sometimes even make them the point of an argument; it is no disparagement either to their intelligence or inspiration, but rather an evidence of their appreciation of the literary aptitudes of those whom they addressed. See ACCOMMODATION.

On the other hand, within the bounds of the orthodox view of inspiration, as above stated, there are two epithets currently employed which seem to border too closely upon the extravagant, and are equally unnecessary and incorrect.

1. "*Plenary Inspiration*" is a phrase nowhere warranted by the Scriptures as predicated of themselves. Christ alone was plenarily inspired (John iii, 34) of all human beings. The term plenary *authority* would be far more scriptural and definite.

2. "*Verbal Inspiration*" is an expression still more objectionable as applied to the Scriptures. For,

(I.) *Words*, as such, are incapable of inspiration. They are either oral, consisting of certain sounds, or written, consisting of certain marks on paper; both material signs of which a spiritual element cannot properly be predicated. Thought, ideas, sentiments only can be inspired; and this is really what the theorists mean. It is better to say so plainly.

(II.) The assumption by these theorists that we think only in words is plentifully contradicted by every man's consciousness. As children, we have conceptions long before we have words. The dog that lies dreaming of the chase has rapid trains of thought, but not a syllable of a word. We are constantly exercising perceptions of shades of color, and shapes of matter, for which there is no name. He must have a feeble power of consciousness, or a mighty power over words, who is not often possessed of a thought for which he pauses for the word. We hold the conception fast, waiting for its correlative term to come. Who does not often think of a friend's face without being able to recall his name? Words, it is true, enable us to express our ideas, and generally that expression renders the conception itself more distinct. But surely God is shut up to no such necessity in communicating his mind to men. His Spirit even gives us thoughts beyond the compass of language (ἀλάλητα, Rom. viii, 26; ἄῤῥητα, 2 Cor. xii, 4).

(III.) The suggestion of the *ipsissima verba* to the minds of the sacred writers is incompatible with their free action, as evinced in the varieties and even blemishes of style. These are clearly the *human* element, partaking of the imperfection and diversity inseparable from man's productions. To say that God makes use of them is only evading the point. He does not directly supply them nor authorize them; he only suffers them. The inconsistency of statement by Gaussen and other verbalists on this head is palpable, and shows the untenableness of their position in the face of infidel objections and rationalistic criticism. Equally inconclusive and self-contradictory is their method of disposing of the objection that if the actual Greek and Hebrew words are inspired, no translations can in any correlative sense be called "the word of God."

(IV.) Nothing is gained by asserting the verbal theory that is not equally secured in point of divine sanction and infallible truth by simply claiming for the Holy Scriptures that their statements and sentiments substantially and in their essential import represent the mind and will of God; that they contain divine thoughts clothed in merely human language. Such is the obvious fact, recognised by every devout and judicious interpreter. Such a view, indeed, gives far more dignity to the sacred volume than the mechanical theory of a mere amanuensis. It is the power of God in earthen vessels (2 Cor. iv, 7).

(V.) The theory of verbal inspiration is comparatively recent in the history of theology.

[1.] There is no such theory stated in the Scriptures. Scriptural authority would preclude all citation of names, great or small, among the theologians. The passages adduced in its favor have no pertinence.

[2.] The fathers had no definite theory of inspiration at all. Sometimes, in dwelling upon the perfection of Scripture, they used striking figures and strong expressions, from which we might infer a belief in verbal inspiration. But, on the other hand, their ordinary mode

of commenting on Scripture, of quoting it, and of defending it, is inconsistent with such a belief.

(*a.*) John, the presbyter, who is believed to have been *one of our Lord's disciples*, speaking of Mark's Gospel, says that Mark "wrote it with great accuracy, as Peter's interpreter. . . . He committed no mistake when he wrote down things as he remembered them. He was very careful to omit nothing of what he had heard, and to say nothing false in what he related" (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 39).

(*b.*) Justin Martyr, after using the figure of the "lyre," which is so much relied upon by the advocates of verbal inspiration, goes on to limit his remark to "those things in Scripture which are necessary for us to know" (Just. *Ad Græc.* § 8).

(*c.*) Irenæus, in a fragment on "the style of St. Paul," alludes to the fact that his sentences were sometimes "unsyntactic," and accounts for it by the "rapidity of his utterances (*velocitas sermonum*), and the impulsiveness of spirit which distinguished him."

(*d.*) Clemens Alexandrinus states that "Peter having preached the Gospel at Rome . . . many present exhorted Mark to write the things which had been spoken, since he had long accompanied Peter, and remembered what he had said; and when he had composed the Gospel, he delivered it to them who had asked it of him" (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vi, 14).

(*e.*) Origen, speaking of the Epistle to the Hebrews, remarks that the "thoughts are Paul's, but the language belongs to some one who committed to writing what the apostle said, and, as it were, reduced to commentaries the things spoken by his master. But the ideas are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged writings of the apostle." Again, speaking of an apparent discrepancy between John and Matthew, Origen says, "I believe it to be impossible for those who upon this subject direct attention merely to the external history, to prove that this apparent contradiction can be reconciled" (Origen, *in Johann.* i, 183).

(*f.*) Chrysostom remarks on Acts xxvi, 6: "Here Paul speaks humanly, and does not throughout enjoy grace, but is permitted to intermix even his own materials."

(*g.*) Augustine declares that the evangelists wrote more or less fully, "according as each remembered, and as each had it in his heart (ut quisque meminerat, et ut cuique cordi erat);" and asserts that the "truth is not bound to the words," and that the "language of the evangelists might be ever so different, provided their *thoughts* were the same" (August. *De Consensu Evangelist.* ii, 12, 28).

[3.] The period between the fathers and the schoolmen is of so little value in the history of theology that it is hardly worth while to refer to it. One or two writers of some note in this period adopted verbal inspiration, but there was no received theory of the kind. Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, in answer to Fredegis (who is cited by Prof. Harris), asks, "What absurdity follows if the notion be adopted that the Holy Spirit not only inspired the prophets and apostles with the *sense* of their teachings, but also fashioned on their lips the very words themselves, bodily and outwardly (corporea verba extrinsecus in ora illorum)" (Agobard, *Contra Fredegisum*, c. 12).

[4.] By the schoolmen, and subsequently by the doctors of the Church in general, a distinction was made in inspiration between *revelatio* and *assistentia*.

[5.] Of the great reformers, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and Zwinglius, not one maintained any such doctrine as that of verbal inspiration, while they all speak in the strongest possible language of the divinity, credibility, and infallibility of the sacred writings.

[6.] It was in the 17th century that the notion of verbal inspiration, which had before only floated about from one individual mind to another, took the shape of a definite theory, and received a proper ecclesiastical sanction. The subject was treated at length by Calovius (the bitter opponent of Grotius and Calixtus), who set forth the verbal theory very fully; and later writers, both Lutheran and Reformed, carried it so far as to extend inspiration to the vowel-points and the punctuation. The *Formula Consensus Helvetici* declares that the Old Testament "is θεόπνευστος, equally as regards the consonants, the vowels, and the vowel-points, or at least their force."

V. *Literature.*—Early treatises on the subject, of a general character, are those of Quenstedt, Carpzov, Wegner, Lange, Le Clerc, Lowth, Lamothe, Clarke, Doddridge, etc., which rather belong to the province of "Introduction" (q. v.); more explict are the works of Bayly, *Essay on Inspiration* (London, 1707, 1708); Jaquelot, *La Vérité et l'Inspiration des livres du V. et N. T.* (Rotterd. 1715); Calamy, *Inspiration of O. and N. Test.* (London, 1710); Martense, *Christianæ doctrinæ de divina Sacrarum Litterarum inspir. vindiciæ* (Jena, 1724); Klemm, *Theopneust. Sacrorum Litt. asserta* (Tüb. 1743); Stosch, *De duplici Apostoll. theopneustia, tum generali tum speciali* (Guelpherb. 1754); Bullstedt, *De vera S. S. inspirationis indole* (Coburg, 1757 sq.); Teller, *De inspir. divina Vatum Sacrorum* (Helmst. 1762); also *Diss. de Inspir. Script. Sac. judicio formando* (Helmst. 1764); Töllner, *Die Göttliche Eingebung der heiligen Schrift untersucht* (Mittau and Leipzig, 1772); Jablonsky, *De θεοπνευστίᾳ Scriptorum Sacrorum N. T.* [in his *Opusc.* ed. te Water, iv, 425-54); Wakefield, *Essay on Inspiration* (Lond. 1781); Meyer, *De Inspiratione S. S.* (Tr. ad Rh. 1784); Hegelmaier, *De Theopneustia ejusque statu in viris sanctis Libb. Sacc. auctoribus* (Tüb. 1784); Miller, *Cum theopneustia Apostolorum nec omniscientiam quasi aliquam, nec anamartesiam fuisse* (Gött. 1789); Henckel, *Inspirationem Evv. et Act. sine ullo religionis damno negari posse dubitatum* (Frcft. ad V. 1793): the definite questions of the extent and character of inspiration, however, are specially discussed in the works of Moore, *Plenary Inspiration of the N. T.* (Lond. 1793); Jesse, *On the Learning and Inspiration of the Apostles* (London, 1798); Findlay, *The Divine Inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures*, etc. (Lond. 1803); Dick, *Essay on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures* (Glasgow, 1800; 4th edit. 1840); Sontag, *Doctr. inspirationis ejusque ratio, hist. et usus popularis* (Heidelberg, 1810); Dullo, *Ueber d. göttl. Eingebung des N. T.* (Jena, 1816); H. Planck, *Ueber Offenbarung u. Inspiration* [opposed to Schleiermacher's views] (Gött. 1817); Rennel, *Proofs of Inspiration* [N. T. compared with Apocrypha] (Lond. 1822); Parry, *Inquiry into the Nature and Extent of the Inspiration of the Writers of the N. T.* (2d edit. London, 1822); Macleod, *View of Inspiration* [general statement of fact] (Glasg. 1827); Carson, *Theories of Inspiration* [review of Wilson, Pye Smith, and Dick] (Edinb. 1830); Haldane, *The Books of the O. and N. T. proved to be canonical, and their Verbal Inspiration maintained and established*, etc. [a brief partisan treatise] (5th ed. Edinb. 1853); Hinds, Bp., *Proofs, Nature, and Extent of Inspiration* (Oxford, 1831); Fraser, *Essay on the Plenary and Verbal Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures* [a popular view] (in New Family Library, vol. ii, Edinb. 1834); Henderson, *Divine Inspiration* [a calm and judicious treatise, endeavoring to reconcile the extreme theories, and therefore somewhat inconsistent with itself] (London, 1836; 4th edit. 1852); Carson, *Divine Inspiration* [strictures on Henderson] (London, 1837); Gaussen, *Theopneustie* [a rhetorical rather than logical plea for the extreme view] (2d ed. 1842; translated into English, Edinburgh, 1850; Boston, 1850); Jahn, *Ad quosdam pertinent. promiss. Sp. S. sec. N. Test.* (Basle, 1841); Leblois, *Sur l'Inspiration des premièrs Chrétiens* (Strasburg, 1850); Carson, *Inspiration* [violent] (Dublin, 1854); Lee, *Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures* [an excellent work, making many good distinctions, and giving the history, but defective in arrangement and exactness] (Dublin, 1857, 2d edit.); Wordsworth, *Inspiration of Canon* [apologetic] (London, 1848, 1851; Philadelphia, 1854); Lord, *Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures* [an extremist] (New York, 1858); Macnaught, *Inspir. Infall. and Author. of Scrip-*

tures [apologetic] (London, 1856); Bannermann, *Truth and Authority of Scripture* [aims at orthodoxy, but fails to meet the controversy fully] (Edinb. 1864); Hannah, *Divine and Human Elements in Holy Scripture* (Bampton Lect. for 1853; presents many points clearly); Rowe, *Nature and Extent of Inspiration* [limited in plan] (London, 1864); Warrington, *Inspiration, its Limits and Effects* [chiefly apologetic] (London, 1867); Curtis, *Human Element in Inspiration* [Rationalistic] (N. Y. 1867). See also Horne, *Introduction*, i; Witsius, *Miscell. Sac.* i, p. 262 sq.; Twesten, *Dogmatik*, i, sec. 23–28; Hill, *Lectures on Divinity*, bk. ii, ch. i; Tholuck, in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* July, 1854, p. 331 sq. [takes rather a low position for orthodoxy] (from the *Deutsche Zeitschr.* 1850); Steudel, in the *Tübing. Zeitschr.* 1840 [takes more advanced ground] (transl. in the *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Oct. 1862); Rudelbach, in the *Zeitschr. f. Luth. Theol.* 1860 [mostly historical] (transl. in part in the *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* April, 1863); Westcott, *Introd. to the Gospels*, p. 5, 383; Donaldson, *Hist. Christ. Lit. and Doctr.* (see *Theol. Index*, vol. iii); Werner, *Gesch. d. apolog. u. polem. Litter. d. christl. Theol.* v, 346 sq.; Denziger, *Die theol. Lehre v. d. Inspiration mit Beziehung auf mannigfaltige ältere und neuere Abirrungen v. richtigen und correcten Begriffen* (in the *Rel. Erklär.* ii, 156–242); Fr. de Rougemont, *Christ et ses témoins* (Paris, 1856, 2 vols.) [opposes Gaussen and the false spiritualism of the Strasburg school of Scherer and others]; Lange, *Philosoph. Dogm.* p. 540 sq.; Pye Smith, *First Lines of Christian Theol.* (see Index: "Scripture"); Auberlen, *Div. Revelation*, p. 204, 233 sq., 245; Martensen, *Christian Dogmat.* p. 18, 338 sq., 402 sq.; Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought* (see Index); Donaldson, *Christian Orthodoxy*, ch. iii and Appendix v; Baur, *Dogmengesch.* (see Index to each vol. i–iii); Bull, *Theol.* ii, 152; Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.* p. 433; Liddon, *Bampt. Lect.* 1866, p. 45, 219; Augusti, *Dogmengesch.* i, ii (see Index); Münscher, *Dogmengesch.* ii, 219; Kahnis, *The Church*, p. 116; Bickersteth, *Christ. Stud.* p. 469; *Aids to Faith*, p. 287 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Dogm.* ii, 433, 442, 607; Hurst, *Rationalism*, p. 200 sq., 546 sq.; Carmichael, *Theol. and Metaph. of Scripture*, i, 1 sq.; Maurice, *Theolog. Essays*, p. 314; *Engl. Rev.* xii, 247; *Lond. Quart. Rev.* 1856, p. 559; 1860, p. 527; 1865, p. 260; *North. Brit. Rev.* xxv, 74; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1869, p. 468; *Bib. Sacra*, 1865, p. 350, 519; Oct. 1867, p. 67, 193; 1868, p. 192 sq., 316, 381; 1869, p. 588; 1870, p. 33; *Christian Remembrancer*, 1856, art. i; Jan. 1862, p. 506; 1868, p. 287; *Christian Examiner*, 1865, p. 255; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 1850, p. 500; 1855, p. 395; 1867 and 1868, Dr. Haven on Inspiration; 1870, p. 110; *New Englander*, 1861, p. 809; 1863, p. 95; Oct. 1867; *Westm. Rev.* 1864, p. 255, 257; *Am. Presb. Rev.* 1854, p. 141; 1860, p. 182; 1865, p. 328, 519; Oct. 1866; *Princeton Rep.* 1857, p. 660; *Bapt. Quart. Rev.* Jan. 1868.

Inspired, the name of a sect which existed for some 150 years in Germany, and remnants of which are still to be found in the United States. They owe their origin partly to the French Prophets [see CAMISARDS], partly to the German Separatists (q. v.). Their name they derived from the fact that, aside from the inspiration of the Scriptures, they also believe in an immediate divine inspiration, affecting the person in such a manner that he becomes the instrument by which the Holy Spirit manifests itself, and he is therefore to be obeyed by the faithful. After the unfortunate conclusion of the religious war in the Cevennes, a large number of these French Prophets, for the most part honest, but in whom bodily sufferings had exalted the mind until they believed themselves directly inspired by God, went to England and Scotland. Most important among them at that time were Elie Marion, Durande Fage, Jean Cavalier, and Jean Allnut. These prophets preached against France, and especially against the papacy, which latter they considered as the Anti-Christ. They soon, however, became objects of suspicion on account of their attempts at raising the dead, and were expelled from the established Episcopal Church. Obliged, therefore, to form a separate sect, Allnut and Marion, with their adherents, connected themselves for a while with the French Reformed churches of the Netherlands, but they failed also here to acquire any influence. On the other hand, they obtained great consideration among the Pietists and Separatists of Northern and Western Germany, and established separate congregations at Halle (1713) and Berlin (1714). From Halle the principles of the Inspired were disseminated into the neighboring regions, and communities, composed chiefly of Separatist emigrants from France and Suabia, soon formed in many places. Their chiefs were E. L. Gruber, at Himbach, near Hanau (born 1665, † 1728); A. Gross, in Frankfort; the saddler, J. F. Rock, at Himbach; and the hermit, E. C. Hochmann, at Schwarzenau, near Berleburg (born 1670, † 1721). In 1716 they took the name of *Truly Inspired* (see J. J. Winkel, *Casimir*, Bielef. 1850). Their organization was based on the so-called twenty-four rules of true sanctification and of holy conduct, taken mainly from an address of Johann A. Gruber in 1716. Up to 1719 they counted nine of their members endowed with the gift of inspiration. In order to make proselytes, these travelled through all the neighboring districts, Switzerland and Western Germany, especially the Palatinate and Alsace, and even visited Saxony and Bohemia. They established communities at Schwarzenau, Homringhausen, near Berleburg, Himbach and Bergheim, Nonneburg, Düdelsheim, Büdingen, Birstein in Wetteraw, Anwetler in the Palatinate, Göppingen, Calw, Stuttgart, Heilbronn, Ulm, Memmingen in Würtemberg, Schaffhausen, Zürich, Berne, Diesbach, Amsoldingen in Switzerland. In the mean time the number of inspired members did not increase, and the eight died out one by one, until, in 1719, Rock alone remained, and he continued to be the head of the sect until his death in 1749. From that time the sect gradually lost its influence. A number of former members, under the leadership of Gruber, Gleim, Mackinet, and other Separatists, emigrated to America, and settled at Germantown, Pa. In 1730, when the Herrnhut movement begun, Rock had some difficulties with his former friend Zinzendorf, which proved fatal to the interest of the Inspired. He also had a long controversy with the Mystic Separatist Johann Kaiser, who had founded a Philadelphian community at Stuttgart in 1710, and founded an Inspired one in 1717. In 1745–50 communities at Wetteraw and Herrnhaag became converts to the enthusiasts, who even at that time succeeded in making proselytes. They were joined by the court preacher Kämpf, of Bauhl, in Alsace, who remained attached to the cause until his death in 1753, and the celebrated theologians Ottinger and Tersteegen themselves were for a time favorable to the movement. After 1816 the sect received a new impulse, and reorganized themselves under the leadership of Michael Krausert, a tailor of Strasburg, and later under Christian Metz (born at Neuwied in 1792), but, being subjected to severe oppression by the civil authority, they emigrated, numbering about 800, in 1841, to this country, and settled at Ebenezer, near Buffalo, in the state of New York. They established a community which still exists at that place. They support themselves by agriculture and the manufacturing of cloth, practising communism to a certain extent; their numbers are about 2000. They have also established colonies in Canada and (since 1854) in Iowa. The Inspired occupy a place midway between the Separatists and the Herrnhutters. In their doctrines they are evangelical, but they reject the sacraments, and disclaim any relation to the Evangelical Church. They consider themselves soldiers of Christ, and, as such, obliged to lead a life of renouncement and abnegation; in their practice they follow the principles of the Mystic Schwenkfeld, J. Böhm, Weigel, etc. Inspiration, they believe, is always preceded by some material sign or physical sensation, such as a burning in the chest, cessation of breathing, convulsive motions of the arms, etc., after which, in a

sort of somnambulic state, the inspired person receives and manifests the divine inspiration: this manifestation consists sometimes only in convulsive motions, or in broken sentences, which latter are generally invitations to repentance and amendment, or denunciations of some adversary. The congregations are governed by a chief and two elders, and they hold occasional conferences together. They have no regular ministry, but all members, of both sexes, are required to contribute to the common edification by praying aloud in the assemblies; besides this, if an Inspired teacher is present, and feels inspired, he preaches; if not, he reads some passages of Scripture, or the recorded utterances of some Inspired members. They have also a particular collection of hymns. Their principal festivals are love-feasts, at which preaching is generally part of the order of exercises of the day. These festivals are announced long beforehand, but none take part in them except those who are personally invited to do so by the Inspired leaders. The week before a love-feast is always a season of especial fasting, penitence, and prayer, and the day preceding it is still more strictly observed. Prayer, singing, prophesying, and feet-washing always precede the love-feast, at which the persons invited partake of cake and wine. See M. Göbel, *Gesch. d. wahren Inspirationsgemeinden von* 1688-1854 (in the *Zeitschrift für hist. Theologie*, 1854); Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte s. d. Reformation*, viii, 401 sq.; Schlegel, *Kirchengeschichte d. 18ten Jahrhunderts*, ii, div. ii, 1047 sq.; Baumgarten, *Geschichte d. Relig. Partheien*, p. 1048 sq.

Installārĕ. See INSTALLATION.

Installation (Low Lat. *in* and *stallum*, a seat) is a name in some churches for the ceremonial act or process by which an ordained minister is formally put into possession of his office, and by which he is fully empowered not alone to exercise its functions, but to enjoy its honors and emoluments. The ceremonial form, as well as the name, differs according to the office which is conferred, as *enthronization* for a bishop, *induction* for a minister, etc. *Installation* in the English Church, however, properly regards only the office of a canon or prebendary. The word is also used generally for a formal introduction to any office. "Though technically distinguished in modern times from the act of *ordination*, it is virtually included in the 'ordination' services whenever the minister is inducted into the pastoral office for the first time. But when, having been previously ordained, he forms another pastoral connection, the public and official induction is termed simply an 'installation.'" See Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* p. 329 (for the use of the term as used in the English Church); *Congregat. Quarterly*, 1868, p. 340.

Instinct, that power which acts on and impels any creature to a particular manner of conduct, not by a view of the beneficial consequences, but merely from a strong impulse, supposed to be necessary in its effects, and to be given in order to supply the place of reason.

Institutio is one of the names by which the addresses on the Catechism or the catechetical instruction was designated in the Christian Church after the time of Charlemagne. See CATECHISM.

Institution, an established custom or law; a precept, maxim, or principle. Institutions may be considered as positive, moral, and human. 1. Those are called *positive* institutions or precepts which are not founded upon any reasons known to those to whom they are given, or discoverable by them, but which are observed merely because some superior has commanded them. 2. *Moral* are those, the reasons of which we see, and the duties of which arise out of the nature of the case itself, prior to external command. 3. *Human* are generally applied to those inventions of men, or means of honoring God, which are not appointed by him, and which are numerous in the Church of Rome, and too many of them in Protestant churches. See Butler's *Analogy*, p. 214; Doddridge's *Lect.* lect. 158; Robinson's *Claude*, i, 217; ii, 258; Burroughs, *Disc. on Positive Institutions*; Bp. Hoadley's *Plain Account*, p. 3.

INSTITUTION, in Church law, means the final and authoritative appointment to a church benefice—more especially a bishopric—by the person with whom such right of appointment ultimately rests. Thus, in the Roman Catholic Church—even after the *election* of a bishop by the chapter, or his *nomination* by the crown, when that right belongs to the crown—it is only the pope who confers *institution*. In English usage, institution is a conveyance of the cure of souls by the bishop, who, or whose deputy, reads the words of the institution, while the clerk kneels. The institution vests the benefice in the clerk, for the purpose of spiritual duty, who thereupon becomes entitled to the profits thereof. But the title is not complete till induction (q. v.).

Institution of a Christian Man, also called *The Bishop's Book*, is the name of a book containing an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Ave Maria, Justification, and Purgatory, which was drawn up by a committee of prelates and divines of the English Church in 1537, "for a direction for the bishops and clergy," and to be "an authoritative explanation of the doctrine of faith and manners," and a sort of standard for the desk and the pulpit, or, as it itself expresses it, for the clergy "to govern themselves in the instruction of their flocks by this rule." Some say that Stephen Poynet, bishop of Winchester, wrote the book himself, and that a committee of prelates and divines gave it their sanction. It was called forth at the time of the early reformatory ecclesiastical movements in England during the reign of Henry VIII. At the time of the publication of the "Institution of a Christian Man" (printed in *Formularies of Faith put forth by authority during the Reign of Henry VIII*, Oxf. 1825), the English Church had become alienated from the Church of Rome; at least king Henry had laid claim to his sovereignty over the Church in his dominions, which an act of Parliament in 1533 had secured him, and, with few dissentient voices, the clergy of the land had seconded the opinion of Parliament. In 1536 a convocation, called "the Southern Convocation," published a manifesto, entitled "Articles to *stablyshe Christen quietness, and unitée amonge us, and to avoyde contentious opinions*," which are generally regarded as the starting-point of the English Reformation. "But, upon the whole, these articles breathed rather the animus of the Middle Ages. Thus they took, on the doctrine of justification, a course midway between the Romanists and the Lutherans. They had also paid reverence to some of the Romish superstitions, as the use of images, invocation of saints, and still held to the doctrine of purgatory, which was at this time beginning to encounter a determined opposition from the more radical reformers. To represent more truly the real desires and opinions of the English Church, the Bishops' Book was launched. It discussed at length the Romish superstitions which the Southern Convocation had sanctioned, and declared against a further adherence to them by the English people. They also held that the fabric of the papal monarchy was altogether human; that its growth was traceable partly to the favor and indulgence of the Roman emperors, and partly to ambitious artifices of the popes themselves; that just as men originally made and sanctioned it, so might they, if occasion should arise, withdraw from it their confidence, and thus reoccupy the ground on which all Christians must have stood anterior to the Middle Ages." See Hardwick, *Reformation*, p. 202; Collier, *Eccles. Hist. of England*, anno 1537.

Instruction. See EDUCATION.

Instrument (כְּלִי, *keli'*, ὅπλον, general names for any *implement*, *vessel*, etc.). See MUSIC; ARMOR.

Instrumental Music. See MUSIC.

Instrumentum pacis. At the *pax tecum* (q. v.) in sacred mass, the celebrant of the mass gives to the deacon the kiss of peace, which the latter gives to the subdeacon, and then it is transmitted successively to the other inferior clergy present. Since Innocent III's time it is customary to use for this purpose an image of the crucified Christ, which is handed to the different clergy for the purpose of bestowing upon it the kiss in token of brotherly love (such are also used at the coronation of Roman Catholic princes), and the image is therefore called *instrumentum pacis*, "the instrument of peace." See *Theol. Univ. Lex.* ii, 410.

Insufflation. See EXORCIST.

Insulāni (*islanders*) is an old name by which the monks who belonged to the famous monastery in the island of Lewis were known.

Insult, or such a treatment of another, in word or deed, as to express contempt, is not definitely taken cognizance of in the Mosaic law; only the reviling of superiors is forbidden (Exod. xxii, 28), yet without any special penalty attached. The severity, however, with which disrespect towards sacred persons was punished appears from 2 Kings ii, 22 sq. There also occurs mention (Psa. xxii, 8; xxxviii, 21; Lam. ii, 15; Matt. xxvii, 39) of gestures of malicious mockery (wagging the head, הֵנִיעַ רֹאשׁ). Insult by abusive words (Matt. v, 22, ῥακά; see RACA) or stroke (smiting on the cheek, Job xvi, 10; Matt. v, 39; John xviii, 22; xix, 3; pulling the ears, spitting upon, Matt. xxvii, 30, etc.) was, in later law, punished by fine (Mishna, *Baba Kammer*, viii, 6; comp. Matt. v, 22), as also in Roman law. For a marked public affront which Herod Agrippa I received at Alexandria, see Philo, ii, 522. See COURTESY.

Intention, "a deliberate notion of the will by which it is supposed to accomplish a certain act: first, taking in merely the act; secondly, taking in also the consequences of the act. An action may be done with a good intention, and may produce bad results; or it may be done with a good intention, and produce good results. It may also be done with an evil intention, and yet good results may follow; or with an evil intention, producing evil results. As a question of morals, therefore, the intention with which anything is done really determines the quality of the action as regards the person who does it. It is not possible that it should always determine the course of social policy in the matter of rewards or punishments; but it may mostly determine the verdict of conscience respecting the good or evil of an act, and has doubtless a large place in the divine judgment of them. No intention can be good, however, which purposes the doing of an evil action, although with the object of securing good results; nor any which does a good action with the object of producing evil results." See ETHICS; MORAL SENSE.

In the Roman Catholic Church the *intention of the priest* is held to be essential to the valid celebration of the sacraments. This the Council of Trent decreed in its 11th canon (Sess. vii): "If any one shall say that in ministers, while they effect and confer the sacraments, there is not required the *intention* at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema." The same principle, in the main, was advocated and set forth by popes Martin V and Eugenius IV in the early part of the last century. So abused has this principle generally become in the Roman Catholic Church, that by its consequences it must be declared to be greatly detrimental to the cause of the Christian religion. For inasmuch as the insincerity of the actor reduces the act to a mockery and a sinful trifling with sacred things, the Church of Rome, by this decision, "exposes the laity to doubt, hesitation, and insecurity whenever they receive a sacrament at the hand of a priest in whose piety and sincerity they have not full confidence. If a wicked priest, for instance, should baptize a child without an inward *intention* to baptize him, it would follow that the baptism was null and void for want of the intention." The Church of England, to repudiate this perverse doctrine, in its 26th Article of Religion, declares, therefore, that the unworthiness of ministers does not hinder the effect of sacraments, "forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission, [and therefore] we may use their ministry both in hearing the word of God and in receiving the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith, and rightly, do receive the sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men." See Staunton, *Eccles. Dict.* p. 398; Blunt, *Theol. Dict.* i, 351; and, for a moderate Roman account of *Intention*, Liebermann, *Instit. Theol.* (ed. 1861), ii, 386 sq.

Intercalary Fruits is a term in the Roman Catholic Church for the revenues of an ecclesiastical benefice accruing during a vacancy. In the xxivth Sess. of the Council of Trent (c. 18, *De Reform.;* c. 1 and 3, X. *De præbend. et dignitt.*) it was decreed that whatever the deceased ecclesiastic had really earned was a part of the property of the deceased, but that the remainder should go either to his successor in office or to the *fabrica ecclesiæ*, or to him who is to appoint the successor, and to provide in the interim. It is frequently the case that these funds are transferred to societies of widows and orphans, or are used for some benevolent objects in the Church. See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 673; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 498; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* ii, 410.

Intercalary Month. See CALENDAR.

Intercession (פֶּגַע, ἔντευξις) is the act of interposition in behalf of another, to plead for him (Isa. liii, 12; lix, 16; 1 Tim. ii, 1). See ADVOCATE.

INTERCESSION OF CHRIST. This refers, in a general sense, to *any aid* which he, as perpetual High-priest, extends to those who approach God confiding in him (Heb. iv, 16; vii, 25-27). He is also represented as offering up the prayers and praises of his people, which become acceptable to God through him (Heb. xiii, 15; 1 Peter ii, 5; Rev. viii, 3). Of the intercession of Christ we may observe that it is righteous, for it is founded upon justice and truth (Heb. vii, 26; 1 John iii, 5), compassionate (Heb. ii, 17; v, 8), perpetual (Heb. vii, 25), and efficacious (1 John ii, 1). See MEDIATOR.

Intercession, in the sense of supplication, was not appropriate to the office of the Hebrew high-priest; he was the presenter of sacrifices on account of sins, and made intercession or atonement by sprinkling the blood of victims before Jehovah: this gave, as it were, a voice to the blood. Hence, if we attach a special idea to the term "intercession," as applied to the work of our glorious High-priest, may we not say that it is equivalent to propitiation or atonement? In the holiest of all, "the blood of Jesus speaketh" (Heb. xii, 24). The dignity and merit, power and authority of the Messiah, in his exalted state, imply a continued *presentation* of his obedience and sacrifice as ever valid and efficacious for the pardon and acceptance, the perfect holiness and eternal happiness, of all who are truly penitent, believing, and obedient. Hence his intercession, or his acting as high-priest in the heavenly world, was represented by the Hebrew high-priest's entering into the most holy place, on the annual day of atonement, with the fragrant incense burning, and with the sacrificial blood which he was to sprinkle upon the mercy-seat, over the ark of the covenant, and before the awful symbols of Jehovah's presence. See HIGH-PRIEST.

"The need of an intercessor arose from the loss of the right of communion with God, of which Adam was deprived when he sinned. Before the fall, Adam was the high-priest of all creation, and, as such, privileged to hold free intercourse with God; and this privilege, lost by Adam, was restored in Christ. Until the fulness of

time came a temporary provision was made for man's acceptance with God in the sacrifices of the patriarchal age, and the ceremonies of the Mosaic ritual; but all these were shadows of the priestly function of the Son of God, which commenced from the time when he offered up himself as a sacrifice on the cross. The intercession of Christ is the exercise of his priestly office, which is carried on continually in heaven (Rom. viii, 34). He was fitted to become our high-priest by the union of his divine and human natures (Heb. vii, 25; Isa. liii, 12). His manhood enables him to plead on our behalf as the representative of human nature, and so to sympathize with those needs and those sorrows which require his intercessions, that he offers them up as one most deeply interested in our welfare (Heb. iv, 15). His priesthood, moreover, requires an offering, and it is still his human nature which furnishes both the victim and the priest. His Godhead renders that sacrifice an invaluable offering, and his intercession all-effectual (Heb. ix, 14)."

INTERCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST. Man intercedes with man, sometimes to procure an advantage to himself, sometimes as a mediator to benefit another; he may be said to intercede for another when he puts words into the suppliant's mouth, and directs and prompts him to say what otherwise he would be unable to say, or to say in a more persuasive manner what he might intend to say. The intercession of the Holy Spirit (Rom. viii, 26) is easily illustrated by this adaptation of the term. See PARACLETE; INVOCATION.

INTERCESSION OF SAINTS. In addition to the intercessions of Christ, and, indeed, that of angels likewise, Roman Catholics believe in the efficacy of the intercession of the Virgin and the saints, who, however, as they state, do not directly intercede for men with God, but with the Saviour, the sinless One, who alone has the ear of the King of the universe. See INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

Intercessōrēs or **Interventōrēs** was the name of officers peculiar to the African Church, who acted as temporary incumbents of a vacant bishopric, and for the time being performed the episcopal functions. It was their duty to take measures for the immediate appointment of a bishop. To prevent abuses, which had become prevalent by either choosing incompetent successors or by protracting the election of a new prelate, a Council of Carthage in 401 forbade the tenure to continue longer than one year, and also any succession to the temporary occupant. See Farrar, *Theol. Dict.* s. v.; Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, s. v.; Riddle, *Christ. Antiq.* p. 223.

Interdict (*interdictum*, sc. *celebrationis divini officii*, a *prohibition* of religious offices) is an ecclesiastical censure or penalty in the Roman Catholic Church, consisting in the withdrawal of the administration of certain sacraments, of the celebration of public worship, and of the solemn burial service. There are three kinds of interdicts: *local*, which affect a particular place, and thus comprehend all, without distinction, who reside therein; *personal*, which only affect a person or persons, and which reach this person or persons, and these alone, no matter where found; and *mixed*, which affect both a place and its inhabitants, so that the latter would be bound by the interdict even outside of its purely local limits. But, as the interdict is oftentimes inflicted on the clergy alone, it is always strictly interpreted, so that one imposed on a parish, etc., does not take effect also on the clergy, and vice versa (compare Ferraris, art. ii, v). The interdict, like the ban (q. v.), may be inflicted by legal order (*interdictum a jure*), or procured by ecclesiastical judges (*ab homine*). The reasons for inflicting this ecclesiastical penalty are various; most generally they are the abolition of Church immunities, disrespect towards ecclesiastical authority or commands, and the effects are generally the prohibition of administering the sacraments, of holding public worship, and the denial of Christian burial; yet various modifications have been frequent. Thus Alexander III permitted in 1173 the administration of the sacrament of baptism to children, and that of penitence to the dying (c. 11, X. *De sponsalibus*, iv, 1; comp. c. 11, X. *De pœnit. et remiss.* v, 38; c. 24, *De sententia excomm.* vi; v, 11). Innocent III allowed confirmation and preaching (c. 43, X. *De sent. excomm.* v, 39, a. 1208), as also penitence, with some restrictions (c. 11, X. *De pœnit.* v, 38, a. 1214; comp. c. 24, *De sent. excomm.* in vi), the silent burial of the clergy (c. 11, X. cit. v, 38), and to convents the observance of the canonical hours, without singing, and the reading of a low mass, which was in the following year extended also to the bishops (c. 25, X. *De privilegiis*, v, 33, a. 1215). But to this was appended the condition that the parties under excommunication or interdict should not be present, that the doors of the churches should remain locked, and no bells be allowed to ring. Boniface VIII went further, and allowed the celebration of public worship with open doors, ringing of bells, and in the presence of the excommunicated parties on the occasions of the Nativity, Easter, Pentecost, and the Ascension of the Virgin. Yet such of the interdicted and excommunicated as did not come to the altar were to be excluded (c. 24, *De sent. excomm.* in vi [v, 11]). Martin V and Eugene IV extended this to the whole octave of the Corpus Christi (*Const. Ineffabile*, an. 1429, and *Const. Excellentissimum*, an. 1433, in *Bullar. Magnum*, i, 308, 323); and Leo X to the octave of the festival of the Holy Conception. There were, moreover, other special regulations made for the benefit of the Franciscans and other orders of monks (Ferraris, art. vi, no. 15). In the xxvth Session of the Council of Trent (cap. 12, *De regularibus*) it was decided that the regulars generally were to observe the interdict, as had already been commanded by Clement V (c. 1, Clem. *De sent. excomm.* v, 10, Concil. Vienn. 1311).

The right of pronouncing the interdict is vested in the pope, the provincial synod, the bishop, with the assent of the chapter, and even without it (c. 2, X. *De his quæ fiunt a majori parte capituli*, iii, 11, Cœlestin III, an. 1190; Clem. 1, *De sent. exc.* cit. Conc. Trid. cit. See Gonzalez Tellez, c. 5, X. *De consuet.* no. 4). The interdict can be withdrawn by any confessor when it is particular and personal, not reserved, but applying to minor points (c. 29, X. *De sent. exc.* v, 39, Innocent III, anno 1199); other interdicts are to be withdrawn by those who pronounced them, their successors, delegates, or superiors (see Ferraris, article viii). The fundamental principles of the interdict are yet in vigor in the Roman Church (see Benedict XIV, *De synod. dioec.* lib. x, cap. 1, § 3 sq.), but it has not been exercised to its full extent since the 17th century. As late as 1606 Paul V pronounced it against the Republic of Venice (see Riegger, *Diss. de pœnitentiis et pœnis eccl.* Vienn. 1772, § 76; and Schmidt, *Thesaurus juris eccl.* vii, 172), and particular interdicts are still in frequent use, as, for instance, the *interdictio ingressus in ecclesiam*, the defense for laymen to enter the Church (c. 48, X. *De sent. excomm.* v, 39, Innocent III, an. 1215; c. 20, *eod.* in vi; v, 11, Boniface VIII, etc.). The Council of Trent (Sess. vi, cap. 1, *in fin. de ref.*) pronounced this punishment against the bishops and archbishops who neglected the command to reside in their diocese. To it belongs also the *cessatio a divinis*, touching the use of the bells and organ (c. 55, X. *De appellat.* ii, 28, Innocent III, an. 1213; c. 13, § 1, X. *De officio judicis ord.* i, 31, Innocent III, an. 1215; c. 2, *eod.* in vi, and i, 16, Gregor. X, an. 1274; c. 8, *eod.* Bonifac. VIII), as a public mourning of the Church (c. 18, *De sent. excomm.* in vi, 1, ib. Bonifac. VIII).

History.—The time when the interdict was first introduced into the Church is not generally known; but it is usually traced to the early discipline of public penance, "by which penitents were for a time debarred from the privilege of presence at the celebration of the Eucharist." Instances of it are met with in very early times (see c. 8, Can. v, qu. vi [*Conc. Agath.* anno 506],

and 10, 11, Can. xvii, qu. iv [*Pœnit. Rom.*], etc. Comp. also Gonzalez Tellez, cap. 5, X. *De consuet.* i, 4, no. 19). But it was not until the Middle Ages, the days of superstition, when the mind was in a condition difficult for us of modern ideas fully to realize or to understand, that this ecclesiastical punishment came into general use as a weapon of the Church against all ecclesiastical and civil inroads. In 1125 Ivo of Chartres calls it yet (*Epist.* 94) "remedium insolitum, ob suam nimirum novitatem;" and at the Synod of Limoges in 1301, the following resolution was passed at the second session: "Nisi de pace acquieverint, ligate omnem terram Lemovicensem publica excommunicatione: eo videlicet modo, ut nemo, nisi clericus, aut pauper mendicans, aut peregrinus adveniens, aut infans a bimatu et infra in toto Lemovicino sepeliatur, nec in alium episcopatum ad sepeliendum portetur. Divinum officium per omnes ecclesias latenter agatur, et baptismus petentibus tribuatur. Circa horam tertiam signa sonent in ecclesiis omnibus, et omnes proni in faciem preces pro tribulatione et pace fundant. Pœnitentia et viaticum in exitu mortis tribuatur. Altaria per omnes ecclesias, sicut in Parasceve, nudentur; et cruces et ornamenta abscondantur, quia signum luctus et tristitiæ omnibus est. Ad missas tantum, quas unusquisque sacerdotum januis ecclesiarum obseratis fecerit, altaria induantur, et iterum post missas nudentur. Nemo in ipsa excommunicatione uxorem ducat. Nemo alteri osculum det, nemo clericorum aut laicorum, vel habitantium vel transeuntium, in toto Lemovicino carnem comedat, neque alios cibos, quam illos, quibus in Quadragesima vesci licitum est. Nemo clericorum aut laicorum tondeatur, neque radatur, quousque districti principes, capita populorum, per omnia sancto obediant concilio" (Mansi, *Coll. Conciliorum*, xix, 541; Du Fresne, s. v. Interdictum).

The most remarkable of the interdicts since the 11th century were those laid upon Scotland in 1180 by Alexander III; on Poland by Gregory VII, on occasion of the murder of Stanislaus at the altar in 1073; by Innocent III on France, under Philippe Augustus, in 1200; and on England under John in 1209. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 454; Milman, *Latin Christianity* (see Index); Riddle, *History of the Papacy*, ii, 83 sq., et al.; Janus, *Pope and Council*, p. 289; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 705 sq.

Interest. See USURY.

Interim, the name of certain formularies or confessions of faith obtruded upon the Reformers by the emperor Charles V. They were so called because they were only to take place *in the interim*, till a general council should decide all the points in question between the Protestants and Catholics. There were three of such formularies.

I. THE INTERIM OF RATISBON (*Regensburg*). Numerous conferences had been held by both parties, i. e. the Romanists and the Protestants, after the formation of the "League of Smalkald" (1531), to bring about a reconciliation. As a liberal Roman Catholic writer of our own days (Janus, *Pope and Council*, p. 369) says, "It was long before men (in Germany and generally on this side of the Alps) grasped the idea of the breach of Church communion becoming permanent. The general feeling was still so far Church-like that a really free council, *independent* of papal control, was confidently looked to for at once purifying and uniting the Church, though, of course, views differed as to the conditions of reunion, according to personal position and national sentiment." A conference was finally appointed and held at Worms, under the leadership of Melancthon and Eckius, according to appointment, by Charles V, and afterwards removed to Ratisbon, where the diet met (1541). Here Pflug and Gropper figured prominently by the side of Eckius on the Roman Catholic side, and Bucer and Pistorius by the side of Melancthon. The Roman Catholics now conceded that the communion of both kinds could be administered to all; that the question of sacerdotal celibacy was of no vital importance, etc.; but the Protestants were nevertheless afraid of some hidden plan, and only an *apparent* reconciliation was effected: it really settled no question at all, satisfied neither party, and finally, as Luther had predicted before the convocation, led only afterwards to much misunderstanding and mutual recrimination. "'Let them go on,' said Luther, referring to the schemes of those who thought that the differences between Roman Catholics and Protestants might be made up by such conferences, 'we shall not envy the success of their labors; they will be the first who could ever convert the devil and reconcile him to Christ. . . . The sceptre of the Lord admits of no bending and joining, but must remain straight and unchanged, the rule of faith and practice.'" Charles V, determined to secure the ratification of the points of agreement entered into at Ratisbon by a national council, forbade the Protestants to argue, in the mean time, on the controverted points, or to dispose in any way of the property of the churches. They protested, however, and went on, regardless of the interim.

II. THE AUGSBURG INTERIM. After the duke of Alva, through the treachery of Maurice of Saxony, had broken the power of the Protestants at the battle of Mühlberg, and, by the overthrow of the Smalkald league, the emperor had brought them helpless at his feet, Charles V, seeing that the pope had not acted in accordance with his wishes at the Council of Trent, decided to attempt by still other conferences to reunite the two contending parties, or at least "to keep matters quiet until the final verdict of that œcumenical council which constantly vanished in the distance." For that purpose he called the three divines, viz. Julius Pflug, bishop of Naumburg; Michael Helding, titular bishop of Sidon; and the Protestant John Agricola, preacher to the elector of Brandenburg, to agree upon a series of articles concerning the points of religion in dispute between the Catholics and Protestants. The controverted points were, the state of Adam before and after his fall; the redemption of mankind by Jesus Christ; the justification of sinners; charity and good works, the confidence we ought to have in God; that our sins are remitted; the Church and its true marks, its power, its authority, and ministers; the pope and bishops; the sacraments; the mass; the commemoration of saints; their intercession, and prayers for the dead. The result of their discussions was the agreement drawn up in twenty-six articles. These the emperor submitted to the pope for his approbation, and sent copies of them also to the electors of Saxony and of Brandenburg, and to other evangelical princes. But both the pope and the German theologians refused to adhere to them. The emperor next had them revised by two Dominican monks, who made several alterations, and they were then promulgated as an imperial constitution, called the "Interim," wherein he declared that "it was his will that all his Catholic dominions should, for the future, inviolably observe the customs, statutes, and ordinances of the universal Church; and that those who had separated themselves from it should either reunite themselves to it, or at least conform to this constitution; and that all should quietly expect the decisions of the general council;" and it was published in the diet of Augsburg, May 15, 1548. To the Protestant clergy it granted, for the time being, the right of the matrimonial state, and to the Reformed laity communion of both kinds. It was truly a standard of faith put forth by the emperor independent of Rome, as the pope refused to sanction it; and in the face of the bitter complaints that came to him that the power and property of the Church should be left in the hands of its present possessors, he showed the pope that he too, like Henry VIII, could regulate the consciences of his subjects, and prescribe their religious faith. The elector of Mentz, quite contrary to the wishes of the other members of the Diet, and of the people there represented, announced the acceptance of the interim by the states, and it was consequently declared law, and printed in Latin and in Ger-

man. Both Protestants and Catholics began, however, violently to attack it; the Romanists complained of the concessions made to the Protestants, while the Protestant princes (John Frederick of Saxony, the landgrave of Hesse, the margrave John v. Küstrin, the elector Wolfgang v. Zweibrücken) declined introducing it in their states; the only princes who submitted to it were the elector of Brandenburg, the elector of the Palatinate, the count of Würtemberg, and the cities of Augsburg, Halle, etc. (the latter by compulsion).

III. The Leipzig Interim.—The Lutheran theologians openly declared they would not receive the Augsburg interim, alleging that it re-established popery: some chose rather to quit their chairs and livings than to subscribe it. Calvin and several others wrote against it. On the other side, the emperor was so severe against those who refused to accept it, that he disfranchised the cities of Magdeburg and Constance for their opposition. Most important, however, for the Protestant cause, and impossible for Charles to pass unheeded, was the opposition against the Augsburg interim by Maurice of Saxony, who denied the right of the elector of Mentz to give himself the approval to an act that demanded the concurrence of the states directly and not indirectly. To fortify himself more strongly in his position, Maurice entered into correspondence with Melancthon, and called a council of state and of prominent theologians at Leipzig and other cities. In the conference at Leipzig it was decided, Sept. 22, 1548, that the Augsburg interim could not be accepted. Yet, for fear of incurring the displeasure of the emperor, a compromise was effected. In a series of resolutions which were adopted, they admitted a great part of the Roman Catholic ceremonials, and tacitly acknowledged also the power of the popes and bishops, but yet well guarded (!) the creed of the Reformers. These resolves of the conference were published as the *Leipzig Interim*, Dec. 22, 1548. Subsequently it was divided into a lesser and greater interim. The first was based on resolutions passed at the conference of Celle, and was published by an edict of the elector, and this ultimately became the basis of the *greater Leipzig Interim*. It was prepared by Melancthon, Eber, Bugenhagen, Major, and prince George of Anhalt. It restored some Roman Catholic practices; directed that mass should be celebrated with ringing of bells, lighted tapers, and a decorated altar, accompanied by singing, and be performed in Latin by priests in canonicals; that the *Horæ canonicæ* and psalms should be sung according to the custom of each place; the old festivals of Mary, etc., were re-established, and meat forbidden on Fridays and fast-days, etc. These decisions, which were promulgated in March, 1549, met with much opposition in Saxony, yet they were strictly enforced, and such ministers as refused to submit to the interim were deposed, as, for instance, Flacius of Wittenberg. The latter then put himself at the head of the opposing party, called by the partisans of the interim Adiaphorists. See Adiaphoric Controversy. Another treacherous action of Maurice, which secured his services anew to the Reformers, undid all the work already accomplished by Charles V; "and while Henry II was winning, at the expense of the empire, the delusive title of conqueror, Charles found himself reduced to the hard necessity of restoring all that his crooked policy had for so many years been devoted to extorting." In 1552 the *interim* was necessarily revoked, and, by the transaction of Passau, August 2, 1552, full liberty of conscience secured to all the Lutheran states; and Sept. 21, 1555, at the Diet of Augsburg, was finally confirmed the right of the states and cities of the Augsburg Confession (q. v.) "to enjoy the practices of their religion in peace." Compare Menzel, *Neue Geschichte*, vol. iii; Robertson, *Charles V* (Harper's edit.), bk. ix, especially p. 377 sq.; and see Bieck, *Ueber d. Interim* (Leipz. 1727, 8vo); Hirch, *Ueb. d. Interim* (Lpz. 1753); Baumgarten, *Gesch. d. Rel. Partheien*, p. 1163 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* i, 592, 674 sq., 683, 686 sq.; *Zeitschrift f. hist. theol.* 1868, p. 3 sq.; *Brit. and For. Evang. Review*, 1868, p. 631; Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 432 sq.; Hardwick, *Reformation* (see Ind.); Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

Intermediate State, a phrase employed to denote the state or situation of disembodied souls during the interval between death and the resurrection. There have been several theories upon the subject. See Hades.

The condition of the soul after death cannot but be a subject of intense concern to every thoughtful mind. Pagan philosophers have groped in the dark for some clew to guide their aspirations after immortality, but have at best attained only surmises and conjectures. Of all the millions that have crossed the dread gulf which separates time from eternity, none have ever returned to bring tidings of what befell them the moment after they launched from the shores of mortality. Revelation alone has cast a ray across the mighty void, and its light has gradually grown clearer and more penetrating, until in the New Testament we are no longer left in any measure to doubt whether, "if a man die, he shall live again." We rest assured that not only shall the soul survive the shock of dissolution, but the body also shall eventually join it in an endless reunion.

Still the question recurs, What will be the internal state and what the external circumstances of the spirit during the period between death and the resurrection? Respecting this little is definitely said in the Scriptures, and it is therefore left for speculation to fill up the lack of information on this interesting theme, guided by such hints as are casually thrown out by the sacred writers, and such considerations as the ascertained nature and destiny of man afford.

I. The popular sentiment or belief of Christians—expressed rather in the form of hope than as a theory—appears to be that the righteous enter heaven *immediately* after they pass away from this world. Such passages as the Saviour's declaration to the dying thief, "*This day* thou shalt be with me in Paradise," and the parable of Dives and Lazarus, are thought especially to support this view; and hence believers have fearlessly cast themselves into the arms of death, expecting to awake the next moment in the full realities of everlasting glory.

Now we would not for all the world deprive dying saints of a particle of the consolation which the Gospel is designed to yield, nor is it any part of our present purpose to weaken anticipations of the future rest in the bosom of any, however sanguine and impatient. But the known truth that a long—probably immense—interval of time will elapse between the decease of Christians of the present age—and certainly of past centuries—and the revival of their bodies at the general judgment, is sufficient to prove that they do not instantly pass from the Church militant to the New Jerusalem above. Let us calmly and logically consider what may be ascertained as to the experience and surroundings of the soul during this intermediate period. See Immortality.

The topic calls for a volume rather than an essay, and, as we must be brief, we make but two other preliminary remarks. The first is that we have not space here to discuss the above and kindred passages of the New Testament; but we direct the reader to professed commentaries for their exposition, and the solution of their bearing upon the point in question, contenting ourselves here with simply observing that they are figurative in their phraseology, and that, whatever they may mean, they cannot be intended to contradict the *fact* of a real space between death and the resurrection. Our other prefatory remark is, that as this is legitimately debatable ground, no essential item of creed or orthodoxy being involved in it, we ought not to incur any *odium theologicum* of unsoundness in the faith should our discussion lead to new and surprising conclusions. This last remark is especially pertinent in view of the fact that even orthodox Christians in all ages have en-

tertained very different views on this subject, as will appear from the following enumeration of opinions.

II. The theory of a state of *sleep*, insensibility, or unconsciousness. It was taught as early as A.D. 248 by the Arabian Thnetopsychites, whom Origen combated. It was thought to be held by pope John XXII, and was disapproved by the University of Paris and pope Benedict XII. It was revived by the Swiss Anabaptists under the name of *Psychopannychia*, and was opposed by Calvin. And in later times it has been started anew, in a form more or less distinct, by John Heyn, Wetstein, Sulzer, Reinhard, and Whately, and by a new sect in Iowa. The defenders of a state of unconsciousness produce such texts as Psa. xvii, 15; 1 Thess. iv, 14. In opposition are cited 2 Cor. v, 8; Phil. i, 23; Matt. xvii, 3; Luke xvi, 23; xxiii, 43; Rev. vi, 9.

III. The theory of *Purgatory*. That Christ preached to the souls detained in Hades, as the patriarchs or others, was held in the 2d and 3d centuries by Justin, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clem. Alexandrinus. It was supposed to be warranted by 1 Pet. iii, 19; Acts ii, 27; Rom. x, 7; Eph. iv, 9; Matt. xii, 31. The idea of a purgatorial fire is more or less obscurely hinted in the writings of Clem. Alexandrinus, Origen, and Augustine. But the complete scheme owes its paternity to Gregory the Great, who propounded it as an article of faith, along with intercessory masses for the dead; finding a supposed warrant in 2 Macc. xii, 46. In opposition to the notion of a Purgatory, it may be said that it is a fiction borrowed from paganism; that it is repugnant to reason and common sense; that it is contradictory to express assertions of Scripture (Heb. xii, 23; Rev. xiv, 13; xxii, 11); that it is subversive of the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel, the atonement and justification by faith in Christ; that it robs the Christian of evangelical peace and consolation; and that it was unknown to the primitive Church. Even Augustine, when he prayed for the increase of his deceased mother's happiness, denied the existence of any middle place. (So also Clem. Rom. *Ep.* 2 *ad Cor.*) The article, "he descended into hell," was not admitted into the Apostles' Creed, nor those of the East, until the 5th century. It appeared first in the Creed of Ariminum, A.D. 358, and in that of Aquileia, A.D. 381 (Rufinus, *De Symbol.*). See Wilson, *Illustrations from Apost. Fathers*, p. 108. Comp. PURGATORY.

IV. The scheme of a middle or intermediate place, or place of rest. This is a different idea from that of an intermediate state, meaning by the latter only an inferior degree of happiness apart from the yet unraised body. It is affirmed that judgment is not pronounced till the last day; but this is denied, a particular judgment passing on each individual, and his place being assigned him, upon his death (Acts i, 25; Luke xvi, 23; xxiii, 43; 2 Cor. xii, 2, 4). It is said that no one is perfectly holy when he dies, but only such can enter heaven. In reply, it is contended, as in the Westminster Catechism, that there is a distinction made between being perfectly holy and perfectly blessed, the first taking place at death, the latter only at the resurrection (Heb. xii, 23). It is alleged that the Scriptures favor the notion (John iii, 13; xx, 17; Acts ii, 34; Heb. xi, 39); to which it is replied that these texts are dubious, and neutralized by others positive and unequivocal (Job xiv, 12; 2 Kings ii, 11; Acts vii, 59; Rev. xiv, 2-5; vii, 14). We proceed to render this theory more definite by proposing our own view of the subject.

1. In the first place, we lay it down as an axiom that a disembodied or *pure spirit is necessarily freed from all the relations of space* of which we are terrestrially cognizant. The external senses are locked up, because their physical organs are absent. Such a spirit may, for aught we know—and perhaps this position is the more probable—be open to intercourse with other pure spirits; doubtless it is at least accessible to the divine Spirit, from whose influence nothing material or immaterial can be veiled; but we are unable to conceive of any intercourse or connection between it and the present relations of things. There is absolutely no medium of communication, as far as we are aware. Death severs the link between the soul and the body, and therefore between the soul and all bodies. What new capacities may by that act be developed *within* the soul, what new relations created with other immaterial beings, or what realization of new conceptions, we of course know not; and, indeed, we have no reason to suppose any such; but if we would not utterly confound mind and matter, or unconsciously clothe the departed spirits with some ethereal form of body, we are bound to conclude, from the total diversity and even contrariety of their properties and attributes, that a dead man is really dead to everything pertaining to time and sense.

This cuts up, root and branch, all those impressions—some have even gone so far as to claim them as scientific experience—of intercommunication between living persons and the spirits of their deceased friends. The common sense of enlightened Christianity has long since stamped all such stories with the just suspicion of superstitious imagination. Severe reasoning compels us to set them down as hallucination or imposture. Those who have indulged themselves in these fancies have always diverged towards insanity or materialism.

A disembodied spirit, therefore, prior to the restoration of its physical organism, is incapable of any of the material joys which imagination is wont to associate with the full idea of the heavenly state. We must carefully exclude from its experience during that interval everything that grows out of our mundane notions and present externalities. That these, and more than these, will be restored on the consummation of its bliss in the new heavens and the new earth of its final abode, we are abundantly assured by the symbols and teachings of the New Testament; but the soul must wait for these enjoyments until its bodily counterpart shall have been raised, spiritualized, perfected, and immortalized.

We may go further than this, and declare that none of the now known and verbally defined relations in point of location are predicable of the departed soul; in other words, it is not in any particular assignable *place* while in that state. The instant it quits the body it possesses no local habitation. Its position cannot be determined as to space, for it has no metes or boundaries, no point of contact with visible objects. It can neither be said to be somewhere nor nowhere, nor yet everywhere. It simply exists—like God, but not infinite. In short, if heaven be a locality (and the existence in some part of the universe of the Redeemer's actual body, as well as those of Enoch and Elijah, besides the concurrent figures of the whole Bible, lead us to conclude that it is such as well as a state), then certainly the disembodied spirit cannot with propriety be spoken of as being *there* any more than elsewhere. This, we admit, is an abstraction; but we are speaking of a mere abstraction; for what can be more abstract—more really inconceivable according to our earthly notions—than a soul without a body.

But let it not be imagined that the soul has thus lost any of its essence or inherent powers. It remains in all these absolute and intact, a veritable entity, as truly such as any spiritual being, or as when united to the body, or indeed as the body itself; but it is shut within itself, and circumscribed by the limits of its own nature. All that we are now demanding is that it shall no longer be viewed, and treated, and spoken of under the conditions, and associations, and terms of an absent corporeity. These have no meaning when applied to it, except as belonging to the past.

2. In the second place, it follows that *the soul can have no cognizance of the passage of time* while thus disembodied. Time consists of the sequence of events, and all means of knowing the transpiration of these are excluded by the very supposition of the present case. Time, moreover, is measured by the alternations of natural objects, and these are also abnegated here. It is evidently impossible for the isolated spirit to be at all

aware of the flight of hours, seasons, or ages. To it "a thousand years are as one day"—both alike unappreciable. The only change it could experience would be the succession of its own ideas, and these—if comparable for such a purpose with our present associations of thought, which are like chords played upon by every passing breeze of circumstance and touch of physical condition—furnish no fixed standard or definite mark to our own consciousness. How seldom do we think of the lapse of time during our dreams, which afford the nearest parallel to the state we are considering; and how wide of a true estimate are we when we chance to compute the moments or imaginary hours in our somnolency. Some notable instances are on record of the egregious miscalculation of time by dreaming persons, showing that in sleep they have no accurate means of determining it, but that they protract or abbreviate it to suit the humor of the dream. Much more would this be true with the disembodied soul, which has even less opportunity or occasion to review its course of thoughts for such a purpose, or, indeed, to take any note of their rapidity or tediousness of succession. We conclude, therefore, that *the intermediate state will pass to all its subjects as an instant*, and that none will be aware of the length of the interval.

This is in accordance with a remarkable passage of Scripture—about the only one where the subject is directly and literally touched upon—and this but incidentally, in answer apparently to a query that had been addressed to an apostle on account of certain curious or captious persons; for the Scriptures are very chary of information on such abstruse points. Paul tells us expressly (1 Thess. iv, 15, 17), "We [or those] which are alive and remain unto the [final] coming of the Lord *shall not precede* ["prevent"] them which are asleep. . . . We [or those] which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds." He is speaking, it is true, of the resurrection of the body, and it is with reference to this that he says one class of saints shall not anticipate another in that reward; but his language implies that none shall have any advantage in point of time over the rest, and this would not be true if some must pass long centuries of waiting, while others are translated suddenly from earth to heaven. No; it will all be equalized: Noah, who died thousands of years ago, shall not seem to himself to pass any longer period of expectation in the grave, or, rather, in the spirit world, than the last saint that is interred just as Gabriel's trump shall reawaken his undecayed corpse, or than those who then shall be living on the globe. This theory meets and harmonizes all their cases, and vindicates the divine impartiality.

Some confirmation of this view may likewise be derived from the simultaneousness of the general judgment. We surely are not to suppose that any will remain cycles of ages in the other world, whether happy or miserable, without having their destiny as yet fixed, and their final doom awarded. To each individual's consciousness, doubtless, will be definitely assigned, at the instant he is ushered into the presence of his Maker, the awards of his irrevocable fate, and this knowledge will form the basis of his joy or despair. The only object after this of a general gathering would be to make known to the universe a sentence that has already been anticipated to the parties chiefly interested. The Scriptural representations of the "last grand assize" are evidently *scenic* in their character, that is, pictures of what to those concerned shall seem to transpire substantially, but not necessarily literally thus. See JUDGMENT, GENERAL. Be that as it may, on our theory alone a universal assemblage would be more possible and significant: to each human being the hour of death is practically, although not actually, the day of judgment, for the two events are separated only by an inappreciable interval; and as the same is true of all his fellows, and as their several days of doom are also separated by an inappreciable interval, they are all reduced—*to every man's own apprehension*—to the same plane of time, and consequently may justly—even with reference to individuals—be depicted as judged together. The hour of Christ's three predicted comings—in vengeance on the Jews—in the article of death—in the final scene—thus, although really distinct events, become identical by more than a figure of speech, and he is justified in alluding to them all in the same breath.

3. In the third and last place, however, as above intimated, *the intermediate state will not be a period of unconsciousness.* This might be hastily inferred from the insulation of the spirit from all sources of external knowledge and impression. But it has still left to it the whole inner world of thought and feeling: memory is busy with the past, and hope is active with anticipations of the future; the direct comforts of the Holy Spirit also are by no means denied during this expectant period, and none can tell how greatly these and all the foregoing emotions may be intensified by the rapt state of the disembodied soul. Examples like those of Paul "caught up into the third heavens," of Tennent in a prolonged fit of catalepsy, and of others in similar extraordinary states of spiritual elevation, might be cited to show how far such an abreption of bodily functions is calculated to enhance the perceptions of celestial verities; but these, it must be borne in mind, were really experiences in the flesh—although Paul seems doubtful whether he was not actually "out of the body," and at least intimates that such mental exaltation would be possible if he were released from earth; they are, therefore, not strictly in point as proof. On the other hand, general observation and experiment show that all temporary collapse or extinction of the bodily functions—as by accident or disease affecting the brain or nervous centres—is attended by suppression in the same degree of the mental faculties; but these, again, are symptoms occurring under the joint relations of soul and body, and therefore no sure indications of what might take place in a disembodied state. Accordingly, we fall back upon the position most agreeable to our native aspirations, and most conformable, as we think, to the teachings of revelation, that the soul, immediately after passing out of the body, enters upon a condition of conscious happiness or misery, according to its previous fitness and habits. In a word, we see no reason why, when set free from connection with the body, the spirit should do otherwise than continue to exercise the emotions and intellections which had already become customary with it. Until its reunion with the body, however—a space, as we have seen, of practically no account to itself, at least in point of duration—it can receive no new experience, and be subject to no external influences, unless they be purely spiritual. See HEAVEN.

See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines;* Bp. Law, *Theory of Religion;* Rees, *Cyclopædia*, art. Sleep of Soul; Taylor, *Physical Theory of another Life;* Tucker, *Light of Nature;* Brougham, *Natural Theology;* Stuart, *Essays;* Abp. Whately, *On Future State; Les Horizons Célestes;* Barrow, Pearson, Bull, *On Apostles' Creed;* Bp. White, *Lectures on the Catechism;* Archibald Campbell, *View of the Middle State;* Watts, *World to Come;* Watson, *Theolog. Institutes;* Hall, *Purgatory Examined;* M'Cullough, *On the Intermediate State; Meth. Quart. Review*, 1852, p. 240; Baylie, *The Intermediate State of the Blessed* (Lond. 1864); Shimeall, *The Unseen World* (N. York, 1868); *Freewill Baptist Quarterly*, April, 1861; *Presb. Quart. Rev.* October, 1861; *Christian Rev.* April, 1862; *Boston Rev.* Jan. 1864.

Interment. See BURIAL.

Internal Dignitaries was the name by which, in the English Church, under the "old foundation," the dean, precentor, chancellor, and treasurer of cathedrals were known. See Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 331.

Internuntius or **Internuncio**, an envoy of the pope, sent only to small states and republics, while the real nuncio is the representative of the papal see at the courts of emperors and kings.

Interpretation, Biblical, or the science of sacred *Hermeneutics*, as it is more technically called. In a narrower sense it is frequently termed *exegesis*, especially in relation to particular passages. For practical rules of interpretation, see Hermeneutics.

I. *Definition and Distinctions.*—1. There is a very ancient and wide-spread belief that the knowledge of divine things in general, and of the divine will in particular, is by no means a common property of the whole human race, but only a prerogative of a few specially-gifted and privileged individuals. It has been considered that this higher degree of knowledge has its source in light and instruction proceeding directly from God, and that it can be imparted to others by communicating to them a key to the signs of the divine will. Since, however, persons who in this manner have been indirectly taught, are initiated into divine secrets, and consequently appear as the confidants of Deity, they also enjoy, although instructed only through the medium of others, a more intimate communion with God, a more distinct perception of his thoughts, and consequently a mediate consciousness of Deity itself. It therefore follows that persons thus either immediately or mediately instructed are supposed to be capable, by means of their divine illumination and their knowledge of the signs of the divine will, to impart to mankind the ardently-desired knowledge of divine things and of the will of Deity. They are considered to be interpreters or explainers of the signs of the divine will, and, consequently, to be mediators between God and man. Divine illumination, and a communicable knowledge of the signs and expressions of the divine will, are thus supposed to be combined in one and the same person. See Revelation.

2. The above general idea is the basis of the Hebrew נָבִיא, *prophet*. The prophet is a divinely-inspired seer, and, as such, he is an interpreter and preacher of the divine will. He may either be directly called by God, or have been prepared for his office in the schools of the prophets (comp. Knobel, *Der Prophetismus der Hebräer vollständig dargestellt*. Bresl. 1837, i, 102 sq.; ii, 45 sq.). See Seer.

However, the being filled with the Holy Ghost was the most prominent feature in the Hebrew idea of a prophet. This is even implied in the usual appellation נביא, which means a person in the state of divine inspiration (not a predicter of future events). Prophetism ceased altogether as soon as Jehovah, according to the popular opinion, ceased to communicate his Spirit. See Prophet.

3. The Hebrew notion of a נָבִיא appears among the Greeks to have been split into its two constituent parts of *μάντις*, from *μαίνεσθαι*, *to rave* (Plato, *Phædrus*, § 48, ed. Steph. p. 244, a. b.), and of *ἐξηγητής*, from *ἐξηγεῖσθαι*, *to expound*. However, the ideas of *μάντις* and of *ἐξηγητής* could be combined in the same person. Compare Boissonnade, *Anecdota Græca*, i, 96, *Λάμπων ἐζηγητής, μάντις γὰρ ἦν καὶ χρησμοὺς ἐξηγεῖτο* (compare Scholia in Aristophanes, *Nubes*, 336), and Arrian, *Epictetus*, ii, 7. *Τὸν μάντιν τὸν ἐξηγούμενον τὰ σημεῖα*; Plato, *De Legibus*, ix, p. 871, c., *Μετ' ἐξηγητῶν καὶ μάντεων*; Euripides, *Phœnissæ*, v. 1018, *Ὁ μάντις ἐξηγήσατο*, and *Iphigènia in Aulide*, l. 529. Plutarch (*Vita Numæ*, cap. xi) places *ἐξηγητής* and *προφήτης* together; so also does Dionysius Halicarnassensis, ii, 73. The first two of these examples prove that *ἐξηγηταί* were, according to the Greeks, persons who possessed the gift of discovering the will of the Deity from certain appearances and of interpreting signs. Jul. Pollux (viii, 124) says, *Ἐξηγηταὶ δὲ ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ τὰ περὶ τῶν διοσεμείων καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἱερῶν διδάσκοντες*. Harpocration says, and Suidas repeats after him, *Ἐξηγητής, ὁ ἐξηγούμενος τὰ ἱερά*. Comp. Becker, *Anecdota Græca*, i, 185, *Ἐξηγοῦνται οἱ ἔμπειροι*. Creuzer defines the *ἐξηγηταί*, in his *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker*, i, 15, as "persons whose high vocation it was to bring laymen into harmony with divine things. These *ἐξηγηταί* moved in a religious sphere (compare Herod. i, 78, and Xenophon, *Cyropædia*, viii, 3, 11). Even the Delphic Apollo, replying to those who sought his oracles, is called by Plato *ἐξηγητής* (*Polit.* iv, 448, b.). Plutarch mentions, in *Vita Thesei*, *ὁσίων καὶ ἱερῶν ἐξηγηταί*; compare also the above-quoted passage of Dionysius Halicarnassensis, and especially Ruhnken (*ad Timæum Lexicon*, ed. Lugd. Bat. 1789, p. 189 sq.). The Scholiast on Sophocles (*Ajax*, 320) has *ἐξήγησις ἐπὶ τῶν θείων*, and the Scholiast on Electra (426) has the definition *ἐξήγησις διασάφησις θείων*. It is in connection with this original signification of the word *ἐξηγητής* that the expounders of the law are styled *ἐξηγηταί*; because the ancient law was derived from the gods, and the law-language had become unintelligible to the multitude. (Compare Lysias, vi, 10; Diodorus Siculus, xiii, 35; Ruhnken, as quoted above; the annotators on Pollux and Harpocration; and K. Fr. Hermann, *Lehrbuch der Griechischen Staats-Alterthümer*, Marburg, 1836, § 104, note 4). In Athenæus and Plutarch there are mentioned books under the title *ἐξηγητικά*, which contained introductions to the right understanding of sacred signs. (Compare Valesius, *ad Harpocrationem Lexicon*, Lipsiæ, 1824, ii, 462.)

4. Like the Greeks, the Romans also distinguished between *vates* and *interpres* (Cicero, *Fragm.*; Hortens.): "Sive vates sive in sacris initiisque tradendis divinæ mentis interpretes." Servius (*ad Virgilii Æn.* ii, 359) quotes a passage from Cicero to this effect: "The science of divination is twofold; it is either a sacred raving, as in prophets, or an art, as in soothsayers, who regard the intestines of sacrifices, or lightnings, or the flight of birds." The *aruspices*, *fulguriti*, *fulguratores*, and *augures* belong to the idea of the *interpres deorum*. Comp. Cicero, *Pro domo sua*, c. 41: "I have been taught thus, that in undertaking new religious performances the chief thing seems to be the interpretation of the will of the immortal gods." Cicero (*De Divinatione*, i, 41) says: "The Hetrusci explain the meaning of all remarkable foreboding signs and portents." Hence, in Cicero (*De Legibus*, ii, 27), the expression "interpretes religionum."

An example of this distinction, usual likewise among the Greeks, is found in 1 Cor. xii, 4, 30. The Corinthians filled with the Holy Ghost were *γλώσσαις λαλοῦντες*, *speaking in tongues*, consequently they were in the state of a *μάντις*; but frequently they did not comprehend the full import of their own inspiration, and did not understand how to interpret it because they had not the *ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν*, *interpretation of tongues*: consequently they were not *ἐξηγηταί*.

The Romans obtained the *interpretatio* from the Etruscans (Cicero, *De Divinatione*, i, 2, and Ottfried Müller, *Die Etrusker*, ii, 8 sq.); but the above distinction was the cause that the *interpretatio* degenerated into a common art, which was exercised without inspiration, like a contemptible soothsaying, the rules of which were contained in writings. Cicero (*De Divinatione*, i, 2) says: "Supposing that divination by raving was especially contained in the Sibylline verses, they appointed ten public interpreters of the same."

The ideas of *interpres* and of *interpretatio* were not confined among the Romans to sacred subjects, which, as we have seen, was the case among the Greeks with the corresponding Greek terms. The words *interpres* and *interpretatio* were not only, as among the Greeks, applied to the explanation of the laws, but also, in general, to the explanation of whatever was obscure, and even to a mere intervention in the settlement of affairs; for instance, we find in Livy (xxi, 12) *pacis interpres*, denoting Alorcas, by whose instrumentality peace was offered. At an earlier period *interpretes* meant only those persons by means of whom affairs between God and man were settled (comp. Virgil, *Æneid*, x, 175, and Servius on this passage). The words *interpretes* and *conjectores* became convertible terms; "for which rea-

son the interpreters of dreams and omens are called also *conjecturers*" (Quintil. *Instit.* iii, 6).

From what we have stated, it follows that ἐξήγησις and *interpretatio* were originally terms confined to the unfolding of supernatural subjects, although in Latin, at an early period, these terms were also applied to profane matters.

5. The Christians also early felt the want of an interpretation of their sacred writings, which they deemed to be of divine origin; consequently they wanted interpreters and instruction by the aid of which the true sense of the sacred Scriptures might be discovered. The right understanding of the nature and will of God seemed, among the Christians, as well as at an early period among the heathen, to depend upon a right understanding of certain external signs; however, there was a progress from the unintelligible signs of nature to more intelligible written signs, which was certainly an important progress.

The Christians retained about the interpretation of their sacred writings the same expressions which had been current in reference to the interpretation of sacred subjects among the heathen. Hence arose the fact that the Greek Christians employed with predilection the words ἐξήγησις and ἐξηγητής in reference to the interpretation of the holy Scriptures. But the circumstance that St. Paul employs the term ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν for the interpretation of the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν (1 Cor. xii, 10; xiv, 26), greatly contributed to the use likewise of words belonging to the root ἑρμηνεύειν. According to Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, iii, 9), Paulus, bishop of Hierapolis, wrote, as early as about A.D. 100, a work under the title of λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις, which means an interpretation of the discourses of Jesus. Papias explained the religious contents of these discourses, which he had collected from oral and written traditions. He distinguished between the meaning of ἐξηγεῖσθαι and ἑρμηνεύειν, as appears from his observation (preserved by Eusebius in the place quoted above), in which he says concerning the λόγια of Matthew, written in Hebrew, Ἑρμήνευσε δὲ αὐτὰ ὡς ἐδύνατο ἕκαστος, "But every one interpreted them according to his ability." In the Greek Church, ὁ ἐξηγητής and ἐξηγηταὶ τοῦ λόγου were the usual terms for teachers of Christianity. (See Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, vii, 30, and Heinichen on this passage, note 21; Photius, *Biblioth. Cod.* p. 105; Cave, *Hist. Liter.* i, 146). Origen called his commentary on the holy Scriptures ἐξηγητικά; and Procopius of Gaza wrote a work on several books of the Bible, entitled σχολαὶ ἐξηγητικαί. However, we find the word ἑρμηνεία employed as a synonyme of ἐξήγησις, especially among the inhabitants of Antioch. For instance, Gregorius Nyssenus says concerning Ephraem Syrus, Γραφὴν ὅλην ἀκριβῶς πρὸς λέξιν ἡρμήνευσεν (see Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita Ephraimi Syri*, in *Opera*, Paris, ii, 1033). Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and others, wrote commentaries on the sacred Scriptures under the title of ἑρμηνεία (comp. A. H. Niemeyer, *De Isidori Pelusiotæ Vita, Scriptis, et Doctrina*, Halæ, 1825, p. 207).

Among the Latin Christians the word *interpres* had a wider range than the corresponding Greek term, and the Latins had no precise term for the exposition of the Bible which exactly corresponded with the Greek. The *interpretatio* was applied only in the sense of OCCUPATION or ACT *of an expositor of the Bible*, but not in the sense of CONTENTS *elicited from Biblical passages.* The words *tractare*, *tractator*, and *tractatus* were in preference employed with respect to Biblical exposition, and the sense which it elicited. Together with these words there occur *commentarius* and *expositio.* In reference to the exegetical work of St. Hilary on Matthew, the codices fluctuate between *commentarius* and *tractatus.* St. Augustine's *tractatus* are well known; and this father frequently mentions the *divinarum scripturarum tractatores.* For instance, *Retractationes*, l. 23, "Divinorum tractatores eloquiorum;" Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.* i, 6, "Origines . . . qui tractator sacrorum peritissimus habebatur." Vincentius Lirinensis observes in his *Commonitorium* on 1 Cor. xii, 28: "In the third place, teachers who are now called *tractatores;* whom the same apostle sometimes styles prophets, because by them the mysteries of the prophets are opened to the people" (comp. Dufresne, *Glossarium mediæ et infimæ Latinitatis*, s. vv. Tractator, Tractatus; and Baluze, *ad Servat. Lupum*, p. 479).

However, the occupation of *interpres*, in the nobler sense of this word, was not unknown to St. Jerome, as may be seen from his *Præfatio in libros Samuelis* (*Opera*, ed. Vallarsi, ix, 459): "For whatever, by frequently translating and carefully correcting, we have learned and retain, is our own. And if you have understood what you formerly did not know, consider me to be an expositor if you are grateful, or a paraphrast if you are ungrateful."

6. In modern classification, Hermeneutics "forms a branch of the same general study with Exegesis (q. v.), and, indeed, is often confounded with that science; but the distinction between the two branches is very marked, and is, perhaps, sufficiently indicated by the etymology of the names themselves. To hermeneutics properly belongs the 'interpretation' of the text—that is, the *discovery* of its true meaning; the province of exegesis is the 'exposition' of the meaning so discovered, and the practical office of making it intelligible to others in its various bearings, scientific, literal, doctrinal, and moral. Hence, although the laws of interpretation have many things in common with those of exposition, it may be laid down that to the especial province of hermeneutics belongs all that regards the text and interpretation of the Holy Scripture; the signification of words, the force and significance of idioms, the modification of the sense by the context, and the other details of philological and grammatical inquiry; the consideration of the character of the writer or the persons whom he addressed; of the circumstances in which he wrote, and the object to which his work was directed; the comparison of parallel passages; and other similar considerations. All these inquiries, although seemingly purely literary, are modified by the views entertained as to the text of Holy Scripture, and especially on the question of its inspiration, and the nature and degree of such inspiration" (Chambers, *Cyclopædia*).

II. *History, Methods, and Literature.*—1. From ancient times the Church, or rather ecclesiastical bodies and religious denominations, have taken the same supernatural view with reference to the Bible, as, before the Church, the Jews did with respect to the Old Testament. The Church and denominations have supposed that in the authors of Biblical books there did not exist a literary activity of the same kind as induces men to write down what they have thought, but have always required from their followers the belief that the Biblical authors wrote in a state of inspiration, that is to say, under a peculiar and direct influence of the divine Spirit. Sometimes the Biblical authors were described to be merely external and mechanical instruments of God's revelation. But, however wide or however narrow the boundaries were within which the operation of God upon the writers was confined by ecclesiastical supposition, the origin of the Biblical books was always supposed to be essentially different from the origin of human compositions; and this difference demanded the application of peculiar rules in order to understand the Bible. There were required peculiar arts and kinds of information in order to discover the sense and contents of books which, on account of their extraordinary origin, were inaccessible by the ordinary way of logical rules, and whose written words were only outward signs, behind which a higher and divine meaning was concealed. Consequently, the Church and denominations required ἐξηγηταί, or interpreters, of the signs by means of which God had revealed his will. Thus necessarily arose again in the Christian Church the art of opening

or interpreting the supernatural, which art had an existence in earlier religions, but with this essential difference, that the signs, by the opening of which supernatural truth was obtained, were now more simple, and of a more intelligible kind than in earlier religions. They were now written signs, which belonged to the sphere of speech and language, through which alone all modes of thinking obtain clearness, and can be readily communicated to others. But the holy Scriptures, in which divine revelation was preserved, differ, by conveying divine thoughts, from common language and writing, which convey only human thoughts. Hence it followed that its sense was much deeper, and far exceeded the usual sphere of human thoughts, so that the usual requisites for the right understanding of written documents appeared to be insufficient. According to this opinion, a *lower* and a *higher* sense of the Bible were distinguished. The lower sense was that which could be elicited according to the rules of grammar; the higher sense was considered to consist of deeper thoughts concealed under the grammatical meaning of the words. These deeper thoughts they endeavored to obtain in various ways, but not by grammatical research.

The Jews, in the days of Jesus, employed for this purpose especially the typico-allegorical interpretation. The Jews of Palestine endeavored by means of this mode of interpretation especially to elicit the secrets of futurity, which were said to be fully contained in the Old Testament. (See Wähner, *Antiquitates Hebræorum*, Gottingæ, 1743, i, 341 sq.; Döpke, *Hermeneutik der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller*, Leipzig, 1829, p. 88 sq., 164 sq.; Hirschfeld, *Der Geist der Talmudischen Auslegung der Bibel*, Berlin, 1840; compare Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv, 103; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i, p. 52, 61; Bretschneider, *Historisch-dogmatische Auslegung d. Neuen Testamentes*, Leipzig, 1806, p. 35 sq.)

The Alexandrine Jews, on the contrary, endeavored to raise themselves from the simple sense of the words τὸ ψυχικόν, to a higher, more general, and spiritual sense, τὸ πνευματικόν (see Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der Jüdisch-Alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie*, Halle, 1834, i, p. 52 sq.; ii, 17, 195 sq., 209, 228, 241). Similar principles were adopted by the authors of the New Testament (see De Wette, *Ueber die Symbolisch-Typische Lehrart in Briefe an die Hebräer*, in the *Theologische Zeitschrift*, by Schleiermacher and De Wette, pt. iii; Tholuck, *Beilage zum Commentar über den Brief an die Hebräer*, 1840).

These two modes of interpretation, the *allegorico-typical* and the *allegorico-mystical*, are found in the Christian writers as early as the first and second centuries; the latter as γνῶσις, the former as a demonstration that all and everything, both what had happened and what would come to pass, was somehow contained in the sacred Scriptures (see Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i, p. 52, 61, and Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, iv, 2, "The preaching of the disciples might appear to be questionable, if it was not supported by other authority").

To these allegorical modes of interpretation was added a third mode, which necessarily sprung up after the rise of the Catholico-apostolical Church, namely, the *dogmatical* or *theologico-ecclesiastical*. The followers of the Catholico-apostolical Church agreed that all apostles and all apostolical writings had an equal authority, because they were all under an equal guidance of the Holy Ghost. Hence it followed that they could not set forth either contradictory or different doctrines. A twofold expedient was adopted in order to effect harmony of interpretation. The one was of the apparent and relative kind, because it referred to subjects which appear incomprehensible only to the confined human understanding, but which are in perfect harmony in the divine thoughts. Justin (*Dialogus cum Tryphone*, c. 65) says: "Being quite certain that no Scripture contradicts the other, I will rather confess that I do not understand what is said therein." St. Chrysostom restricted this as follows (*Homil.* iii, c. 4, *in Ep.* 2 *ad Thessalonicenses*): "In the divine writings everything is intelligible and plain, whatever is necessary is open" (compare *Homil.* iii, *De Lazaro*, and Athanasii *Oratio contra gentes*, in *Opera*, i, 12).

The second expedient adopted by the Church was to consider certain articles of faith to be *leading doctrines*, and to regulate and define accordingly the sense of the Bible wherever it appeared doubtful and uncertain. This led to the *theologico-ecclesiastical* or *dogmatical* mode of interpretation, which, when the Christians were divided into several sects, proved to be indispensable to the Church, but which adopted various forms in the various sects by which it was employed. Not only the heretics of ancient times, but also the followers of the Roman Catholic, the Greek Catholic, the Syrian, the Anglican, the Protestant Church, etc., have endeavored to interpret the Bible in harmony with their dogmas.

Besides the three modes of interpretation which have been mentioned above, theological writers have spoken of *typical*, *prophetical*, *emphatical*, *philosophical*, *traditional*, *moral*, or *practical* interpretation. But all these are only one-sided developments of some single feature contained in the above three, arbitrarily chosen; and, therefore, they cannot be considered to be separate modes, but are only modifications of one or other of those three. The interpretation in which all these modes are brought into harmony has lately been called the *panharmonical*, which word is not very happily chosen (F. H. Germar, *Die Panharmonische Interpretation der Heiligen Schrift*, Lpz. 1821; and by the same author, *Beitrag zur Allgemeinen Hermeneutik*, Altona, 1828).

The interpretation which, in spite of all ecclesiastical opposition, ought to be adopted as being the only true one, strictly adheres to the demands of general hermeneutics, to which it adds those particular hermeneutical rules which meet the requisites of particular cases. This has, in modern times, been styled the *historico-grammatical* mode of interpretation. This appellation has been chosen because the epithet grammatical seems to be too narrow and too much restricted to the mere verbal sense. It might be more correct to style it simply the *historical* interpretation, since the word "historical" comprehends everything that is requisite to be known about the language, the turn of mind, the individuality, etc., of an author in order to rightly understand his book. This method, the origin of which has been traced to Semler (*Vorbereitung z. d. theol. Hermeneut.* 1762), is liable, however, to degenerate into Rationalism (Farrar, *History of Free Thought*, p. 22), unless guarded by the spirit of evangelical piety.

The different modes of interpreting the Bible which have generally obtained are, according to what we have stated, essentially the following three: the GRAMMATICAL, the ALLEGORICAL, the DOGMATICAL. The grammatical mode of interpretation simply investigates the sense contained in the words of the Bible. The allegorical, according to Quintilian's sentence, "Aliud verbis, aliud sensu ostendo," maintains that the words of the Bible have, besides their simple sense, another which is concealed as behind a picture, and endeavors to find out this supposed figurative sense, which, it is said, was not intended by the authors (see Olshausen, *Ein Wort über tieferen Schriftsinn*, Königsberg, 1824). The dogmatical mode of interpretation endeavors to explain the Bible in harmony with the dogmas of the Church, following the principle of *analogia fidei*. Compare *Concilii Tridentini*, Session iv, decret. ii: "Let no one venture to interpret the holy Scriptures in a sense contrary to that which the holy mother Church has held, and does hold, and which has the power of deciding what is the true sense and the right interpretation of the holy Scriptures." So also Rambach, *Institutiones Hermeneuticæ Sacræ* (Jenæ, 1723): "The authority which this analogy of faith exercises upon interpretation consists in this, that it is the foundation and general principle according to the rule of which all scrip-

tural interpretations are to be tried as by a touchstone." Art. xx of the Anglican Church: "It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it expound one place of Scripture so as to be repugnant to another." Scotch Confession, art. xviii: "We dare not admit any interpretation which contradicts any leading article of faith, or any plain text of Scripture, or the rule of charity," etc.

2. The allegorical, as well as the dogmatical mode of interpretation, presupposes the grammatical, which consequently forms the basis of the other two, so that neither the one nor the other can exist entirely without it. Hence the grammatical mode of interpretation must have a historical precedence before the others. But history also proves that the Church has constantly endeavored to curtail the province of grammatical interpretation, to renounce it as much as possible, and to rise above it. If we follow, with the examining eye of a historical inquirer, the course in which these three modes of interpretation, in their mutual dependence upon each other, have generally been applied, it becomes evident that in opposition to the grammatical mode, the allegorical was first set up. Subsequently, the allegorical was almost entirely supplanted by the dogmatical; but it started up with renewed vigor when the dogmatical mode rigorously confined the spiritual movement of the human intellect, as well as all religious sentiment, within the too narrow bounds of dogmatical despotism. The dogmatical mode of interpretation could only spring up after the Church, renouncing the original multiplicity of opinions, had agreed upon certain leading doctrines; after which time it grew, together with the Church, into a mighty tree, towering high above every surrounding object, and casting its shade over everything. The longing desire for light and warmth, of those who were spellbound under its shade, induced them to cultivate again the allegorical and the grammatical interpretation: but they were unable to bring the fruits of these modes to full maturity. Every new intellectual revolution, and every spiritual development of nations, gave a new impulse to grammatical interpretation. This impulse lasted until interpretation was again taken captive by the overwhelming ecclesiastical power, whose old formalities had regained strength, or which had been renovated under new forms. Grammatical interpretation, consequently, goes hand in hand with the principle of spiritual progress, and the dogmatical with the conservative principle. Finally, the allegorical interpretation is as an artificial aid subservient to the conservative principle, when, by its vigorous stability, the latter exercises a too unnatural pressure. This is confirmed by the history of all times and countries, so that we may confine ourselves to the following few illustrative observations.

The various tendencies of the first Christian period were combined in the second century, so that the principle of one general (Catholic) Church was gradually adopted by most parties. But now it became rather difficult to select, from the variety of doctrines prevalent in various sects, those by the application of which to Biblical interpretation a perfect harmony and systematical unity could be effected. Nevertheless, the wants of science powerfully demanded a systematic arrangement of Biblical doctrines, even before a general agreement upon dogmatical principles had been effected. The wants of science were especially felt among the Alexandrine Christians; and in Alexandria, where the allegorical interpretation had from ancient times been practiced, it offered the desired expedient which met the exigency of the Church. Hence it may naturally be explained why the Alexandrine theologians of the second and third century, particularly Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, interpreted allegorically, and why the allegorical interpretation was perfected, and in vogue, even before the dogmatical came into existence. Origen, especially in his fourth book, *De Principiis*, treats on scriptural interpretation, using the following arguments: The holy Scriptures, inspired by God, form a harmonious whole, perfect in itself, without any defects and contradictions, and containing nothing that is insignificant and superfluous. The grammatical interpretation leads to obstacles and objections which, according to the quality just stated of the holy Scriptures, are inadmissible and impossible. Now, since the merely grammatical interpretation can neither remove nor overcome these objections, we must seek for an expedient beyond the boundaries of grammatical interpretation. The allegorical interpretation offers this expedient, and consequently is above the grammatical. Origen observes that man consists of body, soul, and spirit; and he distinguishes a triple sense of the holy Scriptures analogous to this division (*De Princip.* iv, 108; comp. Klausen, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testamentes*, Leipzig, 1841, p. 104 sq.).

Since, however, allegorical interpretation cannot be reduced to settled rules, but always depends upon the greater or less influence of imagination; and since the system of Christian doctrines, which the Alexandrine theologians produced by means of allegorical interpretation, was in many respects objected to; and since, in opposition to these Alexandrine theologians, there was gradually established, and more and more firmly defined, a system of Christian doctrines which formed a firm basis for uniformity of interpretation, in accordance with the mind of the majority, there gradually sprung up a dogmatical mode of interpretation founded upon the interpretation of ecclesiastical teachers, which had been recognised as orthodox in the Catholic Church. This dogmatical interpretation has been in perfect existence since the beginning of the fourth century, and then more and more supplanted the allegorical, which henceforward was left to the wit and ingenuity of a few individuals. Thus St. Jerome, about A.D. 400, could say (*Comment. in Malach.* i, 16): "The rule of Scripture is, where there is a manifest prediction of future events, not to enfeeble that which is written by the uncertainty of allegory." During the whole of the fourth century, the ecclesiastico-dogmatical mode of interpretation was developed with constant reference to the grammatical. Even Hilary, in his book *De Trinitate*, i, properly asserts: "He is the best reader who rather expects to obtain sense from the words than imposes it upon them, and who carries more away than he has brought, nor forces that upon the words which he had resolved to understand before he began to read."

After the commencement of the fifth century, grammatical interpretation fell entirely into decay; which ruin was effected partly by the full development of the ecclesiastical system of doctrines defined in all their parts, and by a fear of deviating from this system, partly also by the continually increasing ignorance of the languages in which the Bible was written. The primary condition of ecclesiastical or dogmatical interpretation was then most clearly expressed by Vincentius Lirinensis (*Commonit.* i): "Since the holy Scriptures, on account of their depth, are not understood by all in the same manner, but their sentences are understood differently by different persons, so that they might seem to admit as many meanings as there are men, we must well take care that within the pale of the Catholic Church we hold fast what has been believed everywhere, always, and by all" (Compare *Commonit.* ii, ed. Bremensis, 1688, p. 321 sq.). Henceforward interpretation was confined to the mere collection of explanations, which had first been given by men whose ecclesiastical orthodoxy was unquestionable. "It is better not to be imbued with the pretended novelty, but to be filled from the fountain of the ancients" (Cassidori *Institutiones Divinæ*, Præf. Compare Alcuini *Epistola ad Gislam*, in *Opera*, ed. Frobenius, i, 464; *Comment. in Joh.*, *Præf.*, ib. p. 460; Claudius Turon. *Prolegomena in Comment. in libros Regum;* Haymo, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ix, 3, etc.). Doubtful cases were decided according to the precedents of ecclesiastical definitions. "In passages which may be

either doubtful or obscure, we might know that we should follow that which is found to be neither contrary to evangelical precepts, nor opposed to the decrees of holy men" (Benedicti *Capitulara*, iii, 58, in Pertz, *Monumenta Veteris German. Histor.* iv, 2, p. 107).

During the whole period of the Middle Ages the allegorical interpretation again prevailed. The Middle Ages were more distinguished by sentiment than by clearness, and the allegorical interpretation gave satisfaction to sentiment and occupation to free mental speculation. The typical system of miracle-plays (q. v.) and the Biblia Pauperum exactly illustrate the spirit of allegorical interpretation in the Middle Ages. But men like bishop Agobardus (A.D. 840, in Gallandii *Bibl.* xiii, p. 446), Johannes Scotus, Erigena, Druthmar, Nicolaus Lyranus, Roger Bacon, and others, acknowledged the necessity of grammatical interpretation, and were only wanting in the requisite means, and in knowledge, for putting it successfully into practice.

When, in the fifteenth century, classical studies had revived, they exercised also a favorable influence upon Biblical interpretation, and restored grammatical interpretation to honor. It was especially by grammatical interpretation that the domineering Catholic Church was combated at the Reformation; but as soon as the newly-arisen Protestant Church had been dogmatically established, it began to consider grammatical interpretation a dangerous adversary of its own dogmas, and opposed it as much as did the Roman Catholics themselves. From the middle of the 16th to the middle of the 18th century this important ally of Protestantism was subjected to the artificial law of a new dogmatical interpretation, while the Roman Catholic Church changed the principle of interpretation formerly advanced by Vincentius into an ecclesiastical dogma. In consequence of this new oppression, the religious sentiment, which had frequently been wounded both among Roman Catholics and Protestants, took refuge in allegorical interpretation, which then reappeared under the forms of typical and mystical theology.

After the beginning of the 18th century grammatical interpretation recovered its authority. It was then first reintroduced by the Arminians, and, in spite of constant attacks, towards the conclusion of that century, it decidedly prevailed among the German Protestants. It exercised a very beneficial influence, although it cannot be denied that manifold errors occurred in its application. During the last half century both Protestants and Roman Catholics have again curtailed the rights and invaded the province of grammatical interpretation by promoting (according to the general reaction of our times) the opposing claims of dogmatical and mystical interpretation. Comp. J. Rosenmüller, *Historia Interpretationis Librorum sacrorum in Ecclesia Christiana*, Lipsiæ, 1795-1814, 5 vols.; Van Mildert, *An Inquiry into the General Principles of Scripture Interpretation, in Eight Sermons*, etc. (Oxford, 1815); Meyer, *Geschichte der Schrifterklärung seit der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften* (Göttingen, 1802-9, 5 vols.); Simon, *Histoire Critique des principaux Commentateurs du Nouv. Test.* (Rotterdam, 1693); E. F. K. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der Biblischen Kritik und Exegese* (Gött. 1797-1800, 4 vols.).

3. In accordance with the various notions concerning Biblical interpretation which we have stated, there have been produced Biblical hermeneutics of very different kinds; for instance, in the earlier period we might mention that of the Donatist Ticonius, who wrote about the fourth century his *Regulæ ad investigandam et inveniendam intelligentiam Scripturarum septem;* Augustinus, *De Doctrina Christiana*, lib. i, 3; Isidorus Hispalensis, *Sentent.* 419 sq.; Santis Pagnini (who died in 1541), *Isagoga ad mysticos Sacræ Scripturæ sensus, libri octodecim* (Colon. 1540); Sixti Senensis (who died 1599), *Bibliotheca Sancta* (Venetiis, 1566. Of this work, which has frequently been reprinted, there belongs to our present subject only *Liber tertius, Artem exponendi Sancta Scripta Catholicis Expositoribus aptissimis Regulis et Exemplis ostendens.*) At a later period the Roman Catholics added to these the works of Goldhagen (Mainz, 1765), Bellarmine, Martianay, Calmet, and, more recently, Seemüller's *Hermeneutica Sacra* (1799); Mayr's *Institutio Interp. Sacri* (1789); Jahn's *Enchiridion Hermen.* (Vienna, 1812); Arigler's *Hermeneutica Generalis* (Vienna, 1813); Unterkircher's *Hermeneutica Biblica* (1831); Ranolder, *Herm. Bibl. Principia Rationalia* (Fünf Kirchen, 1838); Schnittler, *Grundlinien der Hermeneutik* (Ratisbon, 1844); Glaire's *Hermeneutica Sacra* (1840).

On the part of the Lutherans were added by Flacius, *Clavis Scripturæ Sacræ* (Basileæ, 1537, and often reprinted in two volumes); by Johann Gerhard, *Tractatus de Legitima Script. Sacræ Interpretatione* (Jenæ, 1610); by Solomon Glassius, *Philologiæ Sacræ libri quinque* (Jenæ, 1623, and often reprinted); by Jacob Rambach, *Institutiones Hermeneuticæ Sacræ* (Jenæ, 1723).

On the part of the Calvinists there were furnished by Turretin, *De Scripturæ Sacræ Interpretatione Tractatus Bipartitus* (Dordrecht, 1723, and often reprinted). In the English Church were produced by Herbert Marsh *Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible* (Cambridge, 1828).

Since the middle of the last century it has been usual to treat on the Old-Testament hermeneutics and on those of the New Testament in separate works: for instance, Meyer, *Versuch einer Hermeneutik des Alten Testamentes* (Lübeck, 1799); Pareau, *Institutio Interpretis Veteris Testamenti* (Trajecti, 1822); Ernesti, *Institutio Interpretis Novi Testamenti* (Lipsiæ, 1761, ed. 5ta., curante Ammon, 1809; translated into English by Terrot, Edinburgh, 1833); Morus, *Super Hermeneutica Novi Testamenti acroases academicæ* (ed. Eichstädt, Lipsiæ, 1797-1802, in two volumes, but not completed); Keil, *Lehrbuch der Hermeneutik des Neuen Testamentes, nach Grundsätzen der grammatisch-historischen Interpretation* (Leipzig, 1810; the same work in Latin, Lipsiæ, 1811); Conybeare, *The Bampton Lectures for the year* 1824, *being an attempt to trace the History and to ascertain the limits of the secondary and spiritual Interpretation of Scripture* (Oxford, 1824); Schleiermacher, *Hermeneutik und Kritik mit besonderer Beziehung auf das Neue Testament* (edited by Lücke, Berlin, 1838). The most complete is Klausen, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testamentes* (from the Danish, Leipzig, 1841); Wilke, *Die Hermeneutik des Neuen Testamentes systematisch dargestellt* (Leipzig, 1843); S. Davidson's *Sacred Hermeneutics developed and applied; including a History of Biblical Interpretation from the earliest of the Fathers to the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1843).

For lists of other works on the subject, see Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, iv, 206 sq.; Danz, *Universal Wörterbuch*, p. 384 sq.; Append. p. 46; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, ii, 31 sq.; Malcolm, *Theological Index*, p. 218.

Interregnum. The interregnum from the time of the execution of Charles I to the accession of Charles II to the throne of England is one of the most important periods in the ecclesiastical history of that country. It was during this period that the Episcopal Church, "which had been reared by the wealth and power of the state, and cemented with the tears and blood of dissentients," was hurled to the ground, and Presbyterianism, and for a time even Congregationalism, gained the ascendency. But, to the justice of the latter, it must be said that the Congregationalists, or, rather, the Independents, never actually sought to establish their religion as the religion of the state, while Presbyterianism struggled hard to enforce uniformity to her creed. Stoughton says (in his *Eccles. Hist. of England since the Restoration*, i, 49), "It was with Presbyterianism thus situated, rather than with Independency, or any other ecclesiastical systems, that Episcopacy came first into competition and conflict after the king's (Charles II) return." Some writers deny the possibility of an inter-

regnum in the English government as it then existed, because, say they, "there can be legally no interregnum in a hereditary monarchy like that of England," and hold that the reign of Charles II is "always computed in legal language as commencing at the execution of Charles I." See Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters* (2d ed. Lond. 1839, i, 68 sq. See also ENGLAND, CHURCH OF; INDEPENDENTS; PRESBYTERIANS. (J. H. W.)

Interrogatiōnēs Mariæ, an apocryphal work. See PSEUDOGRAPH.

Interstitia Tempŏrum. The Council of Sardica established the principle "Potest per has promotiones (i. e. to consecrate), *quæ habebant utique prolixum tempus*, probari, qua fide sit, qua modestia, qua gravitate et verecundia, et si dignus fuerit probatus, divino sacerdotio illustretur, quia conveniens non est, nec ratio vel disciplina patitur, ut temere et leviter ordinetur episcopus aut presbyter aut diaconus . . . sed hi, *quorum per longum tempus examinata sit vita et merita fuerint comprobata*." Consequently every member of the clergy was obliged to spend a preparatory *interval* (interstitium) before he could be promoted from a lower to a higher order (*ordo*) (*Dist.* 59, c. 2). This principle was also observed concerning the consecration for the lower orders of the priesthood while special ecclesiastical functions were attached to them, but, as their earlier character changed, the discipline also became more lax as regards the time of probation (see *Dist.* 77, c. 2, 3, 9). After the consecration to these lower offices had come to be considered a mere formality for the transition to higher *ordines*, the observation of these probations was also neglected. The Council of Trent attempted to restore the old customs concerning the lower degrees of the priesthood (c. 17, Sess. 23, *De Reform.*), and stated expressly that "per temporum interstitia, nisi aliud episcopo expedire magis videretur, conferantur, ut . . . in unoquoque munere juxta præscriptum episcopi se exerceant" (c. 11, etc.); yet this had but little or no effect, and it is even usual in some Roman Catholic countries to confer at once the tonsure and all the lower orders. The Council of Trent decided also that between the lower consecration and the higher, and between each of these, there should be an interval of one year, "nisi necessitas aut ecclesiæ utilitas aliud exposcat" (c. 11, 13, 14, etc.), but that "duo sacri ordines non eodem die, etiam regularibus, conferantur, privilegiis ac indultis quibusvis concessis non obstantibus quibuscunque" (c. 13, etc.; compare also c. 13, 15, X. *De temp. ord.* i, 11; c. 2, X. *De eo qui furtiv.* v, 30). These years of interval are computed, not according to the calendar, but according to the Church year. With regard to the right of dispensation conceded to the bishops by the Council of Trent (c. 11, cit.), the *Congregatio Concilii* decided that the simultaneous administration of the *ordines minores* and the subdeaconship is a punishable offence (No. 1, ad c. 11, cit. in the edition of Schulte and Richter). See Thomassen, *Vet. et nov. eccl. discipl.* i, 2, c. 35, 36; Van Espen, *Jus eccl. univers.* i, 1, c. 2; ii, 9, c. 5; Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, i, 648 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 707.

Intervals. See INTERSTITIA.

Interventōres. See INTERCESSORES.

Inthronization is the ceremony of installing a bishop on the episcopal seat immediately after his consecration. It is said that in the early times of the Church it was customary for the bishop, after taking possession of his seat, to address the congregation, and this address was called the *Inthronization sermon.* To the provincials under his control he addressed instead letters containing his confession of faith, intended to establish communications with them: these were called *Inthronization letters* (Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* l. ii, c. xi, § 10). Inthronization money is the sum of money paid by some prelates for the purpose of securing their ordination.—Bergier, *Dict. de Theol.* iii, 438.

Intinction is a name for one of the three modes in which the sacrament is administered to the laity of the Eastern Church (comp. Neale, *Introd. East. Church*, p. 525), viz., by breaking the consecrated bread into the consecrated wine, and giving to each communicant the two elements together in a spoon, to prevent the possibility of a loss of either element. Some Greek liturgical writers assert that the practice of intinction was introduced by Chrysostom himself (which Neale approves), but the traditional evidence adduced does not well support this assertion; and the fact, which seems to be pretty well established, that the two elements were of old administered by two persons, and not by one only, as is done at present, makes it doubtful whether their admixture for communion was ever the *ordinary* practice. Bona (*Rerum Liturg.* II, xviii, 3), however, says that it was forbidden by Julius I (A.D. 337–352), whose decree, as given by Gratian (*Distinct.* ii, c. 7), speaks of it as a practice not warranted by the Gospel, in which Christ is represented as giving first his body and then his blood to the apostles; and, if this decree is authentic, it goes to prove that the practice was known during Chrysostom's time. The third Council of Braga (A.D. 675) decreed against it in their first canon in the identical words used by Julius I: "Illud, quod pro complemento communionis intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc probatum ex evangelio testimonium recipit, ubi apostolis corpus suum et sanguinem commendavit; seorsum enim panis et seorsum calicis commendatio memoratur. Nam intinctum panem aliis Christum non præbuisse legimus excepto illo tantum discipulo, quem proditorem ostenderet." Micrologus (c. xix) asserts that the practice contradicted the primitive canon of the Roman liturgy, but this certainly cannot go to prove the time of its introduction into the Eastern Church. In the 11th century it was forbidden by pope Urban II (A.D. 1088–1099), except in cases of necessity; and his successor, Pascal II, forbade it altogether, and ordered in cases where difficulty of swallowing the solid element occurred, to administer the fluid element alone. Bona, however, quotes from Ivo of Chartres about this time a canon of a Council of Tours, in which priests are ordered to keep the reserved oblation "intincta in sanguine Christi, ut veraciter Presbyter possit dicere infirmo, Corpus, et Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi proficiat tibi in remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam." The Convocation of Canterbury (A.D. 1175) expressed itself opposed to the practice of intinction in the following plain language: "Inhibemus ne quis quasi pro complemento communionis intinctam alicui Eucharistiam tradat." But from the word *complementum* the practice forbidden seems to have been as much the consumption of the superabundant elements by the laity (directed in one of the modern rubrics of the Church of England) as that of intinction. There can be no doubt, however, that the Western Church always stood committed against the practice, though some think that traces of it can be found, e. g. in the ancient Irish Visitation Office, written about the 8th century, and which was published by Sir William Bentham (comp. Hart, *Eccles. Records*, Introd. xiv). See CONCOMITANT.

Intolerance is a word chiefly used in reference to those persons, churches, or societies who do not allow men to think for themselves, but impose on them articles, creeds, ceremonies, etc., of their own devising. See TOLERATION.

Nothing is more abhorrent from the genius of the Christian religion than an intolerant spirit or an intolerant church. "It has inspired its votaries with a savage ferocity; has plunged the fatal dagger into innocent blood; depopulated towns and kingdoms; overthrown states and empires, and brought down the righteous vengeance of heaven upon a guilty world. The pretence of superior knowledge, sanctity, and authority for its support is the disgrace of reason, the grief of wisdom, and the paroxysm of folly. To fetter the conscience is injustice; to insnare it is an act of sacrilege; but to torture it by an attempt to force its feelings is

horrible intolerance: it is the most abandoned violation of all the maxims of religion and morality. Jesus Christ formed a kingdom purely spiritual: the apostles exercised only a spiritual authority under the direction of Jesus Christ, particular churches were united only by faith and love; in all civil affairs they submitted to civil magistracy; and in religious concerns they were governed by the reasoning, advice, and exhortations of their own officers: their censures were only honest reproofs; and their excommunications were only declarations that such offenders, being incorrigible, were no longer accounted members of their communities."

Let it ever be remembered, therefore, that no man or men have any authority whatever from Christ over the consciences of others, or to persecute the persons of any whose religious principles agree not with their own. See Lowell's *Sermons;* Robinson's *Claude*, ii, 227, 229; Saurin's *Sermons*, vol. iii, Preface; Locke, *Government and Toleration; Memoir of Roger Williams.* See JUDGMENT, PRIVATE.

Intorcetta, PROSPER, a Roman Catholic Sicilian who went to China as a Jesuit missionary, was born at Piazza in 1625. He had first studied law, but, believing it to be his duty to serve the Church, he joined the order of the Jesuits, and prepared for the missionary field in China. Here he encountered many obstacles, but, notwithstanding, succeeded in making many converts. Persecuted by the Chinese, he courageously pushed his work forward, and became one of the greatest of the Jesuitical missionaries to that country. He died Oct. 3, 1696. His works evince a careful and continued study of the language of the country in which he aimed to establish his peculiar religious creed; and it might be well for Protestant missionaries sent to Asiatic and other heathen fields of missionary work to imitate the great zeal which has animated so many of the missionaries of the Romish Church, and which has secured them oftentimes greater prominence than the Protestant laborers. He wrote *Taïhio* (or "the great study of Confucius and of his disciple Tseu-sse"), edited, with a Latin translation, by Father Ignace de Costa (1662):—*Tchoung-young* (or "Invariability in the intermediate course"); one of the four books of Confucianism, preceded by a life of Confucius: *Confucii Vita* (Goa, 1669, small fol.):—*Lunyu* ("the book of Confucius's philosophical discussions") (without place or date, 1 vol. small fol.):—*Testimonium de Cultu Sinensi* (Lyon, 1700, 8vo):—*Compendiosa Narrat. dello Stato della Missione Cinese, cominciando dall' anno* 1581, *sino al* 1669 (Rome, 1671 or 1672, 8vo). There also remains still in MS. a complete paraphrase of the four books of Confucius. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 931.

Intrepidity is a term used to designate a disposition of mind unaffected with fear at the approach of danger. Resolution either banishes fear or surmounts it, and is firm on all occasions. Courage is impatient to attack, undertakes boldly, and is not lessened by difficulty. Valor acts with vigor, gives no way to resistance, but pursues an enterprise in spite of opposition. Bravery knows no fear; it runs nobly into danger, and prefers honor to life itself. Intrepidity encounters the greatest perils with the utmost coolness, and dares even present death. This is especially the case with the martyrs of Christianity. No persecution, however great, did they fear to encounter for the sake of their religious belief, and death was welcomed as the crowning victory over error and superstitition.

Introduction, BIBLICAL, is now the technical designation for works which aim to furnish a general view of such subjects and questions as are preliminary to a proper exposition of the sacred books, the corresponding branch of Biblical science being often styled "ISAGOGICS," in a strict sense. The word "introduction" being of rather vague signification, there was also formerly no definite idea attached to the expression "*Biblical Introduction.*" In works on this subject (as in Horne's *Introduction*) might be found contents belonging to geography, antiquities, interpretation, natural history, and other branches of knowledge. Even the usual contents of Biblical introductions were so unconnected that Schleiermacher, in his *Kurze Darstellung des Theologischen Studiums*, justly calls it *ein Mancherlei;* that is, a farrago or omnium-gatherum. Biblical introduction was usually described as consisting of the various branches of preparatory knowledge requisite for viewing and treating the Bible correctly. It was distinguished from Biblical history and archæology by being less intimately connected with what is usually called history. It comprised treatises on the origin of the Bible, on the original languages, on the translations, and on the history of the sacred text, and was divided into general and special introduction. An endeavor to remove this vagueness by furnishing a firm definition of Biblical introduction was made by Dr. Credner (in his *Einleitung*, noticed below). He defined Biblical introduction to be the history of the Bible, and divided it into the following parts: 1. The history of the separate Biblical books; 2, the history of the collection of these books, or of the canon; 3, the history of the spread of these books, or of the translations of it; 4, the history of the preservation of the text; 5, the history of the interpretation of it. The same *historical* idea has been advocated by Hävernick (in his *Einleit.*), and more particularly by Hupfeld (*Begriff u. Methode der bibl. Einl.* 1844). This view, however, has not generally been acquiesced in by Biblical scholars, being regarded as too limited and special a treatment, inasmuch as the end in view is to furnish a solution of such questions as arise upon the Bible as a book, yet excluding such preparatory sciences in general as philology, archæology, and exegesis, the first two of which rather relate to all ancient writings, and the last to passages in detail. By common consent, treatises on Biblical introduction have now usually come to embrace the field covered by the articles on the several books as given in this *Cyclopædia*, and the topics legitimately included in this department of Biblical science may briefly be summed up under the following heads, which may, however, sometimes require to be differently arranged, or even combined: 1, Authorship; 2, date; 3, place; 4, inspiration; 5, contents; 6, style; 7, peculiar difficulties—of the several books, with the literature and commentaries appended. In this way the old division of *general* and *special* introduction is preserved only so far that some treatises are on all the books of the Old or New Testament in order, while others take up a single book only —the latter usually as prolegomena to a separate commentary; and the wider topics formerly discussed are relegated to their appropriate and separate spheres, e. g. in addition to Archæology (including Geography, Chronology, History, and Antiquities proper), Lexicology (including radical and comparative philology, and synonymes), and Grammar (including all the peculiarities of Hebraistic and Hellenistic phraseology, poetical modes of expression, rhetorical traits, etc.)—the following more especially: the Canon, Criticism, Inspiration, and Interpretation (q. v. severally). With these prefatory distinctions, we proceed to give a sketch of the historical development of this department of Biblical Science, with some criticisms upon the several works in which it has been evolved. In these remarks we especially include formal treatises upon the subject at large, besides those found in commentaries; see also Bleek's *Introd. to the O. T.* (Lond. 1869), i, 5 sq.

The Greek word εἰσαγωγή, in the sense of an *introduction* to a science, occurs only in later Greek, and was first used, to denote an introduction to the right understanding of the Bible, by Adrian, a Greek who probably lived in the 5th century after Christ. Ἀδριάνου εἰσαγωγὴ τῆς γραφῆς is a small book, the object of which is to assist readers who are unacquainted with Biblical phraseology in rightly understanding peculiar words

and expressions. It was first edited by David Höschel, under the title of Adriani *Isagoge in Sacram Scripturam Græce cum Scholiis* (Augustæ Vindobonæ, 1602, 4to), and was reprinted in the *Critici Sacri* (London ed. vol. viii; Frankfort edit. vol. vi). Before Adrian, the want of similar works had already been felt, and books of a corresponding tendency were in circulation, but they did not bear the title of εἰσαγωγή. Melito of Sardis, who lived in the latter half of the 2d century, wrote a book under the title ἡ κλεῖς, being a *key* both to the Old and to the New Testament. The so-called Λέξεις, which were written at a later period, are books of a similar description. Some of these Λέξεις have been printed in Matthæi's *Novum Testamentum Græce*, and in Boissonade's *Anecdota Græca* (vol. iii, Parisiis, 1831). These are merely linguistic introductions; but there was soon felt the want of works which might solve other questions, such as, for instance, what are the principles which should guide us in Biblical interpretation? The Donatist Ticonius wrote, about the year 380, *Regulæ ad investigandam et inveniendam Intelligentiam Scripturarum Septem.* St. Augustine, in his work *De Doctrinâ Christianâ* (iii, 302), says concerning these seven rules that the author's intention was by means of them to open the secret sense of Holy Writ, "as if by a key." There arose also a question concerning the extent of Holy Writ—that is to say, what belonged, and what did not belong to Holy Writ; and also respecting the contents of the separate Biblical books, and the order in which they should follow each other, etc. About A.D. 550, Cassiodorus wrote his *Institutiones Divinæ.* He mentions in this work, under the name of *Introductores Divinæ Scripturæ*, five authors who had been engaged in Biblical investigations, and in his tenth chapter speaks of them thus: "Let us eagerly return to the guides to Holy Writ; that is to say, to the Donatist Ticonius, to St. Augustine on Christian doctrine, to Adrian, Eucherius, and Junillus, whom I have sedulously collected, in order that works of a similar purport might be combined in one volume." Henceforward the title *Introductio in Scripturam Sacram* was established, and remained current for all works in which were solved questions introductory to the study of the Bible. In the Western or Latin Church, during a thousand years, scarcely any addition was made to the collection of Cassiodorus, while in the Eastern or Greek Church only two works written during this long period deserve to be mentioned, both bearing the title Σύνοψις τῆς θείας γραφῆς. One of these works is falsely ascribed to Athanasius, and the other as falsely to Chrysostom.

The Dominican friar Santes Pagninus, with the intention of reviewing the Biblical knowledge of Jerome and St. Augustine, published his *Isagoge ad Sacras Literas, liber unicus* (Coloniæ, 1540, fol.), a work which, considering the time of its appearance, was a great step in advance.

The work of the Dominican friar Sixtus of Sienna, *Bibliotheca Sancta ex præcipuis Catholicæ Ecclesiæ auctoribus collecta, et in octo libros digesta* (Venetiis, 1566; frequently reprinted), is of greater importance, although it is manifestly written under the influence of the Inquisition, which had just been restored, and is perceptibly shackled by the decrees of the Council of Trent; but Sixtus furnished also a list of books to be used by a true Catholic Christian for the right understanding of Holy Writ, as well as the principles which should guide a Roman Catholic in criticism and interpretation. The decrees of the Council of Trent prevented the Roman Catholics from moving freely in the field of Biblical investigation, while the Protestants zealously carried out their researches in various directions. The Illyrian, Matthias Flacius, in his *Clavis Scripturæ Sacræ, seu de Sermone Sacrarum Literarum* (Basle, 1567, in folio), furnished an excellent work on Biblical Hermeneutics; but it was surpassed by the Prolegomena of Brian Walton, which belong to his celebrated *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (Lond. 1657, six vols. fol.). These Prolegomena contain much that will always be accounted valuable and necessary for the true criticism of the sacred text. They have been published separately, with notes, by archdeacon Wrangham (1528, 2 vols. 8vo). Thus we have seen that excellent works were produced on isolated portions of Biblical introduction, but they were not equalled in merit by the works in which it was attempted to furnish a whole system of Biblical introduction. The following Biblical introductions are among the best of those which were published about that period: Rivetus (1627); Michaelis Waltheri *Officina Biblica noviter adaperta*, etc. (Lipsiæ, first published in 1636); Abrahami Calovii *Criticus Sacer Biblicus*, etc. (Vitembergæ, 1643); Hottinger, *Thesaur. Philologicus, seu Clavis Script. Sac.* (Tiguri, 1649); Heidegger, *Enchiridion Biblicum ἱερομνημονικόν* (Tiguri, 1681); Leusden, a Dutchman, published a work entitled *Philologus Hebræus*, etc. (Utrecht, 1656); and *Philologus Hebr.-Græcus Generalis* (Utrecht, 1670); Pfeiffer (Ultraj. 1704); Van Til (1720–22); Du Pin (1701); Calmet (1720); Moldenhauer (1744); Börner (1753); Goldhagen (1765-8); Wagner (1795). Most of these works have frequently been reprinted.

The dogmatical zeal of the Protestants was greatly excited by the work of Louis Capelle, a reformed divine and learned professor at Saumur, which appeared under the title of Ludovici Cappelli *Critica Sacra; sive de variis quæ in veteris Testamenti libris occurrunt lectionibus libri sex* (Parisiis, 1650). A learned Roman Catholic and priest of the Oratory, Richard Simon, rightly perceived, from the dogmatical bile stirred up by Capelle, that Biblical criticism was the most effective weapon to be employed against the Protestantism which had grown cold and stiff in dogmatics. He therefore devoted his critical knowledge of the Bible to the service of the Roman Catholic Church, and endeavored to inflict a death-blow upon Protestantism. The result, however, was the production of Simon's excellent work on Biblical criticism, which became the basis on which the science of Biblical introduction was raised. Simon was the first who correctly separated the criticism of the Old Testament from that of the New. His works on Biblical introduction appeared under the following titles: *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* (Paris, 1678). This work was inaccurately reprinted at Amsterdam by Elzevir in 1679, and subsequently in many other bad piratical editions. Among these the most complete was that printed, together with several polemical treatises occasioned by this work, at Rotterdam, in 1685, 4to:—*Histoire Critique du Texte du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam, 1689):—*Histoire Critique des Versions du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam, 1690):—*Histoire Critique des principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterd. 1693). By these excellent critical works Simon established a claim upon the gratitude of all real friends of truth; but he was thanked by none of the prevailing parties in the Christian Church. The Protestants saw in Simon only an enemy of their Church, not the thorough investigator and friend of truth. To the Roman Catholics, on the other hand, Simon's works appeared to be destructive, because they demonstrated their ecclesiastical decrees to be arbitrary and unhistorical. The *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* was suppressed by the Roman Catholics in Paris immediately after its publication, and in Protestant countries, also, it was forbidden to be reprinted. Nevertheless, the linguistic and truly scientific researches of Pocock; the Oriental school in the Netherlands; the unsurpassed work of Humphry Hody, *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus Versionibus*, etc. (Oxoniæ, 1705, folio); the excellent criticism of Mill, in his *Novum Testamentum Græcum cum Lectionibus Variantibus* (Oxoniæ, 1707, folio), which was soon followed by Wetstein's *Novum Testamentum Græcum editionis receptæ, cum Lectionibus Variantibus* (Amstelodami, 1751–52, folio), and by which even Bengel was convinced, in spite of his ecclesiastical orthodoxy (comp. Bengelii *Apparatus Criticus Novi Testamenti*, p. 634 sq.); the Biblical works by H. Michaelis, especially his *Biblia Hebra-*

ica ex Manuscriptis et impressis Codicibus (Halæ, 1720), and Kennicott's *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis Lectionibus* (Oxon. 1776), and the revival of classical philology—all this gradually led to results which coincided with Simon's criticism, and showed the enormous difference between historical truth and the arbitrary ecclesiastical opinions which were still prevalent in the works on Biblical introduction by Pritius, Blackwall, Carpzov, Van Til, Moldenhauer, and others. J. D. Michaelis mildly endeavored to reconcile the Church with historical truth, but has been rewarded by the anathemas of the ecclesiastical party, who have pronounced him a heretic. By their ecclesiastical persecutors, Richard Simon was falsely described to be a disciple of the pantheistical Spinoza, and Michaelis as a follower of both Simon and Spinoza. However, the mediating endeavors of Michaelis gradually prevailed. His *Einleitung in die Göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes* (Göttingen, 1750, 8vo) was greatly improved in later editions, and the fourth (1788, 2 vols. 4to) was translated and essentially augmented by Herbert Marsh, afterwards bishop of Peterborough, under the title *Introduction to the New Testament*, etc. (Cambridge, 1791–1801, 4 vols. 8vo). Michaelis commenced also an introduction to the Old Testament, under the title *Einleitung in die Göttlichen Schriften des Alten Bundes* (Hamburg, 1787). Ed. Harwood's *New Introduction to the Study and Knowledge of the New Testament* (London, 1767–71; translated into German by Schulz, Halle, 1770–73, 3 vols.) contains so many heterogeneous materials that it scarcely belongs to the science of introduction.

The study of New-Testament introduction was in Germany especially promoted also by J. S. Semler, who died at Halle in 1791. It was by Semler's influence that the critical works of Richard Simon were translated into German, and the works of Wetstein re-edited and circulated. The original works of Semler on Biblical introduction are his *Apparatus ad liberalem Novi Testamenti Interpretationem* (Halæ, 1767), and his *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canons* (Halle, 1771–5, 4 vols.). Semler's school produced J. J. Griesbach, who died at Jena in 1812. Griesbach's labors in correcting the text of the New Testament are of great value. K. A. Hänlein published a work called *Handbuch der Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testamentes* (Erlangen, 1794–1802, 2 vols.), in which he followed the university lectures of Griesbach. A second edition of this work appeared in 1801–9, 3 vols. This introduction contains excellent materials, but is wanting in decisive historical criticism.

J. G. Eichhorn, who died at Göttingen in 1827, was formed in the school of Michaelis at Göttingen, and was inspired by Herder's poetical views of the East in general, and of the literature of the ancient Hebrews in particular. Eichhorn commenced his Introduction when the times were inclined to give up the Bible altogether as a production of priestcraft inapplicable to the present period. He endeavored to bring the contents of the Bible into harmony with modern modes of thinking, to explain, and to recommend them. He sought, by means of hypotheses, to furnish a clew to their origin, without sufficiently regarding strict historical criticism. Eichhorn's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* was first published at Leipsic in 1780–83, in three volumes. The fifth edition was published at Göttingen, 1820–24, in five volumes. His *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* was first published at Leipzig (1804–27, 5 vols.). The earlier volumes have been republished. The external treatment of the materials, the style, aim, and many separate portions of both works, are masterly and excellent; but, with regard to linguistic and historical research, they are feeble, and overwhelmed with hypotheses.

Leonhardt Bertholdt was a very diligent but uncritical compiler. He made a considerable step backwards in the science of introduction, not only by reuniting the Old and New Testament into one whole, but by even intermixing the separate writings with each other, in his work entitled *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in sämmtliche kanonische und apocryphische Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testamentes* (Erlang. 1812–19, 6 vols.).

Augusti's *Grundriss einer hist.-krit. Einleit. ins A. T.* (Lpz. 1806, 1827) contains little new or original.

The *Isagoge Historico-critica in Libros Novi Fœderis Sacros* (Jenæ, 1830) of H. A. Schott is more distinguished by diligence than by penetration.

The *Lehrbuch der Historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel A. und N. T.* Berlin (pt. i, O. T. 1817, and often since; pt. ii, 1826, and later), by W. M. L. de Wette, is distinguished by brevity, precision, critical penetration, and in some parts by completeness. This book contains an excellent survey of the various opinions prevalent in the sphere of Biblical introduction, interspersed with original discussions. Almost every author on Biblical criticism will find that De Wette has made use of his labors; but in the purely historical portion the book is feeble, and indicates that the author did not go to the first sources, but adopted the opinions of others; consequently the work has no internal harmony. An English translation of this work, with additions by the translator, Theodore Parker, has been published in this country (Boston, 1850). A new (the 8th), thoroughly revised edition of the German, not only embodying all the later results of exegetical researches, but also modifying many of the views of De Wette, has recently been published by Prof. E. Schräder (Berl. vol. i [O. T.], 1869).

K. A. Credner embodied the results of his method (see above) of the critical examination of the books of the New Testament in his work *Das Neue Testament nach seinem Zweck, Ursprunge und Inhalt* (Giessen, 1841–3, 2 vols.). His views are the basis of Reus's *Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften des Neuen Testamentes* (Halle, 1842; 3d ed. 1860).

The critical investigation which prevailed in Germany after the days of Michaelis has of late been opposed by a mode of treating Biblical introduction not so much in the spirit of a free search after truth as in an apologetical and polemical style. This course, however, has not enriched Biblical science. To this class of books belong a number of monographs, or treatises on separate subjects; also the *Handb. der Historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Alte Testament* of H. A. C. Hävernick (Erlangen, 1837–49, 2 pts. in 3 vols.; 2d ed. 1854–6, by Keil, who also edited pt. i of the first ed.), of which the *General Introduction* and the *Introduction to the Pentateuch* have been translated into English (Edinb. 1850, 1852); also H. E. E. Guericke's *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Halle, 1828), in which too frequently an anathema against heretics serves as a substitute for demonstration. The apologetical tendency prevails in the work of G. Hamilton, entitled *A General Introduction to the Study of the Hebrew Scriptures*, etc. (Dublin, 1814); in Thomas Hartwell Horne's *Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*, etc. (Lond. 1818, 4 vols.; the 10th ed. of this work was an entirely new production, and the best hitherto produced in English, in 4 vols. 8vo, 1856, vol. ii on the O. T. by Dr. S. Davidson [since displaced by one by Mr. Ayre], and vol. iv on the N. T. by Dr. S. P. Tregelles); and in J. Cook's *Inquiry into the Books of the New Testament* (Edinburgh, 1824).

The Roman Catholics also have, in modern times, written on Biblical introduction, although the unchangeable decrees of the Council of Trent hinder all free, critical, and scientific treatment of the subject. The Roman Catholics can treat Biblical introduction only in a polemical and apologetical manner, and are obliged to keep up the attention of their readers by introducing learned archæological researches, which conceal the want of free movement. This latter mode was adopted by J. Jahn (who died at Vienna in 1816) in his *Einleitung in die göttlichen Bücher des alten Bundes* (Vienna, 1793, 2 vols., and 1802, 3 vols.), and in his *Introductio in Libros Sacros Veteris Testamenti in epitome*

redacta (Viennæ, 1805). This work has been republished by F. Ackermann, in what are asserted to be the third and fourth editions, under the title of *Introductio in Libros Sacros Veteris Testamenti, usibus academicis accommodata* (Viennæ, 1825 and 1839). But these so-called new editions are full of alterations and mutilations, which remove every free expression of Jahn, who belonged to the liberal period of the emperor Joseph. J. L. Hug's *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Stuttgart and Tübing. 1800, 2 vols.; 4th ed. 1847) surpasses Jahn's work in ability, and has obtained much credit among Protestants by its learned explanations, although these frequently swerve from the point in question. Hug's work has been translated into English by the Rev. D. G. Wait, LL.D.; but this translation is much surpassed by that of Fosdick, published in the United States, and enriched by the addenda of Moses Stuart. The polemical and apologetical style prevails in the work of J. G. Herbst, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Schriften des Alten Testamentes* (completed and edited after the death of the author by Welte, Carlsruhe, 1840); and in *L'Introduction Historique et Critique aux Livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament*, by J. B. Glaire (Paris, 1839, 4 vols.). The work of the excellent Feilmoser, who died in 1831, *Einleitung in die Bücher des Neuen Bundes* (2d ed. Tubingen, 1830), forsakes the position of a true Roman Catholic, inasmuch as it is distinguished by a noble ingenuousness and candor. The same remark in a great measure applies to the still later work of Scholz, *Einl. in d. heil. Schriften d. A. und N. T.* (vol. i general introd. Cologne, 1845). Among the best Roman Catholic contributions to this branch of Biblical literature are the works of Reusch, *Lehrb. der Einleitung in das A. T.* (Freib. 3d ed. 1868), and Langen, *Grundriss der Einleitung in das N. T.* (Freib. 1868).

In Great Britain, besides the above works of Horne and Hamilton, we may especially name the following as introductory in their character. Collier's *Sacred Interpreter* (1746, 2 vols. 8vo) was one of the earliest publications of this kind. It went through several editions, and was translated into German in 1750. It relates both to the Old and New Testament, and is described by bishop Marsh as "a good popular preparation for the study of the holy Scriptures." Lardner's *History of the Apostles and Evangelists* (1756-57, 3 vols. 8vo) is described by the same critic as an admirable introduction to the New Testament. "It is a storehouse of literary information, collected with equal industry and fidelity." From this work, from the English translation of Michaelis's *Introduction* (1761), and from Dr. Owen's *Observations on the Gospels* (1764), Dr. Percy, bishop of Dromore, compiled a useful manual, called *A Key to the New Testament*, which has gone through many editions, and is much in request among the candidates for ordination in the Established Church. The *Key to the Old Testament* (1790), by Dr. Gray, afterwards bishop of Bristol, was written in imitation of Percy's compilation; but it is a much more elaborate performance than the *Key to the New Testament*. It is a compilation from a great variety of works, references to which are given at the foot of each page. Bishop Marsh speaks of it as "a very useful publication for students of divinity, who will find at one view what must otherwise be collected from many writers." It is now, however, almost entirely behind the times. Dr. Harwood's *Introduction to the Study and Knowledge of the New Testament* (1767, 1771, 2 vols. 8vo), although noteworthy in this connection, is not properly an introduction to the New Testament, in the usual and proper sense of the term. It does not describe the books of the New Testament, but is a collection of dissertations relative partly to the character of the sacred writers, Jewish history and customs, and to such parts of heathen antiquities as have reference to the New Testament. The first volume of bishop Tomline's *Elements of Christian Theology* contains an introduction both to the Old and to the New Testament, and has been published in a separate form. It is suited to its purpose as a manual for students in divinity; but the standard of present attainment cannot be very high if, as Marsh states, "it may be read with advantage by the most experienced divine."

The latest and most important works in this department are the following: Hengstenberg, *Beiträge zur Einleitung ins A. B.* (Berlin, 1831); Hertwig, *Tabellen z. Einleitung ins N. T.* [a useful compilation] (Berl. 1849; 3d ed. 1865); Maier (Roman Catholic), *Einleitung in d. Schriften des N. T.* (Freib. 1852); Keil, *Lehrbuch der Historisch Kritischen Einleitung ins Alte Test.* (Frankf. and Erlang. 1853 [a highly judicious work in most respects]; translated in Clarke's *Library*, Edinb. 1870, 2 vols.); Davidson, *Introd. to the O. Test.* [a different work from that contained in Horne above, and strongly Rationalistic] (London, 1862-3, 3 vols. 8vo); Davidson, *Introd. to the N. T.* [an excellent, though rather non-committal work] (Lond. 1848-50, 3 vols. 8vo; last edit. 1868 [more strongly inclining to Rationalism]); Scholten (decidedly Rationalistic), *Hist. Krit. Einl. ins N. T.* (Lpz. 1853, 1856); Bleek, *Einleitung in d. A. T.* (Berlin, 1860 [moderately Rationalistic]; translated into English, Lond. 1869, 2 vols. 8vo); Bleek, *Einleit. in d. N. T.* (Berl. 1862, 1865; translated into English, Edinburgh, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); Weber, *Kurzgef. Einl. in d. Schrift. A. und N. T.* (Nordl. 1867, 8vo). Less generally known are the following: Haneberg, *Versuch e. Gesch. d. bibl. offenbarung, als Einleitung ins A. und N. T.* (Regensb. 1850); Prins, *Handbook to de Kennis v. d. heil. Schriften d. O. e. U. Verbonds* (Rotterd. 1851-52, 2 vols.); Bauer (G. L.), *Entw. e. krit. Einl. in d. Schrift. d. A. T.* (Nürnb. 1794, 1801, 1806); Ackermann, *Introduct. in Libros Vet. Fæd.* (Vien. 1825); Schmidt, *Hist.-krit. Einleitung ins N. T.* (Giessen, 1804, 2 vols.); Schneckenburger, *Beitr. z. Einl. ins N. T.* (Stuttg. 1832); Neudecker, *Lehrbuch d. hist.-krit. Einleit. ins N. T.* (Lpz. 1840); Roman Catholic: Reithmayr, *Einl. i. d. kanonisch. Büch.* (Regensb. 1852). For other works, see Walch, *Bibliotheca Theolog.* iii, 31 sq.; iv, 196 sq.; Danz, *Universal Wörterb.* s. v. Bibel; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliographica*, i, 11 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v. Einleitung; Lange's *Commentary* (American ed.), i, 62; compare *British and For. Evang. Review*, October, 1861; *Deutsche Zeitsch. f. christl. Wissensch.* April, 1861; *Revue Chrét.* 1869, p. 745; Hauck, *Theol. Jahresber.* 1868, iv, 759. See SCRIPTURES, HOLY.

Introïbo (*I will go in*), the word taken from the 5th verse of the 42d Psalm (in the Vulgate), with which the Roman Catholic priest, at the foot of the altar, after having made the sign of the cross, begins the mass, and to which the servitor replies with the rest of the verse. The whole psalm is then recited alternately by the priest and the servitor. In masses for the dead, and during Passion-week, the psalm is not pronounced.

Introit (*a.*) (*Officium Sarum*, εἴσοδος, Eastern; *Ingressa*, Ambrosian) is the name (from the Latin *introire*, to enter) of a psalm or hymn, but now properly the former, sung in some churches as the priest goes up to the altar to celebrate the Eucharist. "Introitum autem vocamus antiphonam illam quam chorus cantat et sacerdos ut ascendit ad altare legit cum versu et gloria" (Martene, *De Antiq. Monach. Rit.* II, iv, 9). According to Symeon of Thessalonica, the introit typifies the union of men and angels. According to Freeman (*Princ. of Divine Service*, ii, 316), the true introit consists of the "Hymn of the only-begotten Son" in the East, and the *Gloria in Excelsis* in the further East and the whole Western Church. Neale too remarks (*Introd. to the East. Ch.* p. 363) that the "introits of the liturgies of St. Mark, and St. James, and the Armenian consist of the hymn 'Only-begotten Son.'" But, besides the introit *proper*, there are general in the Western Church a psalm or hymn, with antiphon, varying according to the season; and in the liturgy of Chrysostom we find no less than three of these. Walcott (*Sac. Archæol.* p. 331) says the introit is of two kinds: (1.) regular, that sung daily; (2.) the irregular, which is chanted on festivals. The latter he

describes as having been of old of a grand and solemn character. "In a great church there was a procession round the nave to the sound of bells, and with incense, passing out by the small gate of the sanctuary and re-entering by the great doors. The deacon then went up with the Gospel elevated in both his hands, and set it on the midst of the altar, so as to be seen by the people. Then followed the introit, composed of several anthems, succeeded by prayers and the Trisagion. The priest and deacon intoned it, the choir and people took it up, and a candlestick with three lights, as a symbol of the Holy Trinity, was lighted." The introit is believed to have originated with pope Celestine (A.D. 422-432), c. 430 (comp. Bona, iii, 48). Before that time the mass had immediately succeeded the Epistles of Paul and the Gospel. "Its structure is that of an antiphon, followed generally by a whole psalm or a portion of a psalm (compare, however, Neale, *Essays on Liturgy*, p. 138 sq.), and the Gloria Patri, and then by a repetition of the whole or part of the commencing antiphon. In the old Gregorian introit the antiphon was repeated three times, a custom found also in the Sarum rite; this triple recitation being connected mystically with the three laws, viz., the Natural, the Mosaic, and the Evangelic." In the English Church the introit was introduced by Edward VI, in his Prayer-book, before every collect, epistle, and gospel. It is a psalm containing something proper for the particular Sunday or holiday to which they were applied; but they were afterwards struck out, and the choice of the psalm was left to the clergyman. The introits of each Sunday and holiday are given by Wheatley in his *Common Prayer*, p. 205. See Blunt, *Theol. Cyclop.* i, 355 sq.; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Augusti, *Handbuch d. Christl. Archäol.* ii, 773; Siegel, *Archäol.* iii, 378. See also MASS.

(*b.*) This word also designates the verses sung at the entering of the congregation into the church, a custom as old as the 4th century, called *ingressa* in the Ambrosian Ritual. See Palmer, *Origines Lit.* ii, 19.

Intrusion (Lat. *intrudo*, I thrust upon), the unlawful appropriation or usurpation of a church benefice, i. e., if done without the co-operation of the person who, according to the canon, is entitled to the benefice. In the Church of Scotland, the General Assembly, in 1736, passed "an act against intrusion of ministers into vacant congregations;" and the reason assigned is the principle of the Church of Scotland, "that no minister shall be intruded into any church contrary to the will of the congregation . . . so as none be *intruded* into such parishes, as they (the General Assembly) regard the glory of God and edification of the body of Christ." See Hetherington, *Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland*, ii, 218, 302.

Intuition. See ILLUMINATION; INSTINCT; SPIRITUALISM.

Intuition OF GOD. See GOD.

Invention of the Cross is the name of a festival in the Latin and Greek churches, celebrated May 3, in memory of the invention of the cross said to have been miraculously discovered at Jerusalem by Helena, the mother of the emperor Constantine the Great, in 326. The legend of it runs as follows: Helena, being admonished in a dream to search for the cross of Christ at Jerusalem, took a journey thither with that intent; and having employed laborers to dig at Golgotha, after opening the ground very deep (for vast heaps of rubbish had purposely been thrown there by the spiteful Jews or heathens), she found three crosses, which she presently concluded were the crosses of our Saviour and the two thieves who were crucified with him. But, being at a loss to know which was the cross of Christ, she ordered them all three to be applied to a dead person. Two of them, the story says, had no effect; but the third raised the carcass to life, which was an evident sign to Helena that that was the cross she looked for. As soon as this was known, every one was for getting a piece of the cross, insomuch that in Paulinus's time (who, being a scholar of St. Ambrose, and bishop of Nola, flourished about the year 420) there was much more of the relics of the cross than there was of the original wood. Whereupon that father says "it was miraculously increased; it very kindly afforded wood to men's importunate desires without any loss of its substance." Dr. Schaff comments on it thus: "The legend is at best faintly *implied* in Eusebius, in a letter of Constantine to the bishop Macarius of Jerusalem (*Vita Const.* iii, 30—a passage which Gieseler overlooked—though in iii, 25, where it should be expected, it is entirely unnoticed, as Gieseler correctly observes), and does not appear till several decennia later, first in Cyril of Jerusalem (whose *Epist. ad Constantium* of 351, however, is considered by Gieseler and others, on critical and theological grounds, a much later production), then, with good agreement as to the main fact, in Ambrose, Chrysostom, Paulinus of Nola, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and other fathers. With all these witnesses the fact is still hardly credible, and has against it particularly the following considerations: (1.) The place of the crucifixion was desecrated under the emperor Hadrian by heathen temples and statues, besides being filled up and defaced beyond recognition. (2.) There is no clear testimony of a *contemporary*. (3.) The pilgrim from Bordeaux, who visited Jerusalem in 333, and in a still extant *itinerarium* (*Vetera Rom. itineraria*, ed. P. Wesseling, p. 593) enumerates all the sacred things of the holy city, knows nothing of the holy cross or its invention (comp. Gieseler, i, 2, 279, note 37; Edinb. ed. ii, 36). This miracle contributed very much to the increase of the superstitious use of crosses and crucifixes. Cyril of Jerusalem remarks that about 380 the splinters of the holy cross filled the whole world, and yet, according to the account of the devout but credulous Paulinus of Nola (*Epist.* 31, al. 11) (whom we mentioned above), the original remained in Jerusalem undiminished—a continual miracle!" (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 450; compare particularly the minute investigation of this legend by Isaac Taylor, *The Invention of the Cross and the Miracles therewith connected*, in *Ancient Christianity*, ii, 277-315; Wheatley, *Common Prayer*, p. 61 sq.; Walcott, *Sacred Archæol.* p. 351). See CROSS. (J. H. W.)

Investiture (Latin *investire*, to put on a vest or covering), in general, is defined by mediæval writers as "the conferring or the giving of possession of a fief or a property by a suzerain lord to his vassal," and was usually accompanied by a certain ceremonial, such as the delivery of a branch, a banner, or an instrument of office, more or less designed to signify the power or authority which it is supposed to convey (compare Gottfried, abbot of Vendôme [Vindocinensis], *Tractatus de ordinatione Episcoporum et Investitura Laicorum*, in Melch. Goldasti *Apologiæ pro Henrico IV—adv. Gregorii VII, P. criminationes* [Hamb. 1611, p. 262]).

The contest about ecclesiastical investitures is so interwoven with the whole course of mediæval history that a brief account of its origin and nature is indispensable to a right understanding of many of the most important events of that period.

1. By the liberality of the northern nations, the Church of Rome had gradually attained considerable wealth, both personal and real. "The Carlovingian and Saxon emperors, the kings of England and Leon, had vied with their predecessors in bestowing on her lavish benefactions, and the clergy were, in consequence, no strangers to wealth. Many churches possessed seven or eight thousand manses; one with two thousand passed for indifferently rich (comp. Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ii, pt. i, ch. vii, p. 142, small English edition). Of the lands possessed by the clergy, the greater part might be of little value at the time they had been given, perhaps consisting of wild and deserted tracts of country; but they were capable of cultivation and improvement, and as civilization and population increased they became a source of gain and profit." Nay, this accumulation of lands in the hands of the clergy progressed so rapidly that it naturally excited the jealousy of the sov-

ereigns. These provocations were still further sharpened by another great source of clerical enrichment, viz. the payment of tithes, which seems to have received a legal sanction in the 9th century, but which in the 12th century had become universal. Still other revenues were derived from the free donations and offerings of the laity. "Some made oblations to the Church before entering on military expeditions; bequests were made by others in the terrors of dissolution." Indeed, it became at last a pious custom to assign a portion of the property of a deceased person to the clergy for their distribution among the poor and the needy. But by degrees crafty Romanists learned to rank their churches among the poor, "and as it was believed that the deceased would regard them with special favor, they absorbed the lion's share of the alms, until the *other poor* were forgotten altogether." Thus what began as a pious custom the Church gradually so distorted until it all flowed into her coffers, and was finally made a compulsory tribute. But, as if all these sources of income were not yet sufficient to meet the wants of an indolent clergy, dependent wholly for their support upon a superstitious and ignorant class, in the Middle Ages as well as in our own day, the penances were added, and, by being made canonical, were imposed upon repentant offenders; and acts of lawlessness, which it ought to have taken more than an ordinary lifetime to discharge, were allowed to be committed for money payments. "One day's fasting might be redeemed with a penny; a year's fasting with thirty shillings, or with freeing a slave that was worth that money (one of the few good things that the Church of the Middle Ages is guilty of). Many, in a glow of zeal, vowed to go on a crusade, but, when the first ardor had cooled down, were glad to purchase exemption. Many, to atone for their sins, set out on pilgrimages to well-known shrines; and, as the clergy had not failed to inculcate that no atonement could be so acceptable to Heaven as liberal presents, large offerings were presented to such churches by the remorse of repentance. At Rome, in the year of jubilee, two priests stood with rakes in their hands sweeping the uncounted gold and silver from the altars." No wonder, then, that the Church and her officers the bishops, as well as all the clergy, with possessions so vast, and resources so unbounded and fertile, became the objects of suspicion to temporal princes, and objects of envy to the nobles.

2. But, while the enjoyment of these large possessions was undoubtedly the primary cause that provoked the distrust and displeasure of sovereigns, the struggle, which at the close of the 11th and at the beginning of the 12th century was especially fierce between Germany and England on the one side and Rome on the other, was directly brought about by the symbols incidental to feudal tenures. Investiture by the lord and an oath of fealty by the tenant, which were necessary in the case of all lay barons, had already, even in the old Frankish Church, been required of ecclesiastics before they were admitted to the temporalities of a see (Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ii, part i, ch. vii, p. 181; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 356), and were claimed to be the special prerogatives of the king. But, instead of fealty and homage, to which the lay barons were subjected, the king used symbols in the investiture of ecclesiastics. It had been at first the custom for the king to deliver or send to the bishops on their installation a ring or a staff, the one as a symbol of the close union which was to exist between the bishop and his congregation, the other as an emblem of his office as guide and shepherd. The delivery of the symbols was in accordance with the fundamental legal principle which the sovereigns were anxious to impress on the ecclesiastics, viz. that all the possessions of the Church were only held by consent of the king and as loans (beneficia), for which reason it became also the bishop's duty to accompany the army when required (see Eichhorn, *Deutsche Staats- u. Rechtsgesch.* Gött. 1834, pt. i, p. 202, 505, 516; Sugenheim, *Staatsleben d. Klerus i. Mittelalter*, Berlin, 1839, part i, p. 315). The bestowing of the symbols implied the installation into office, and was therefore called investiture. The investiture with both ring and staff was not habitual at first. King Clovis I (508) employed only the ring (Bouquet, *Rerum Gallic. scriptor.* iv, 616: "Quicquid est fisci nostri—per annulum tradimus"); Clovis II (623), Louis of Germany, Arnulf, and also Otto I, conferred only the staff, while the emperors Henry II and Conrad II gave the ring to the bishops merely as a pledge that they would afterwards be invested with the staff. It was not till after these emperors that the investiture with both ring and staff became general, and the sceptre was added to them still later. (See Mosheim, *Institutiones hist. eccles.* p. 408, note *r.*; Hüllmann, *Gesch. des Ursprungs d. Stände i. Deutschland*, Berlin, 1830, p. 153; Planck, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung*, iii, 462.) In the ninth century the symbols were first interpreted as referring not only to the investiture of the clergy into their office, but also as an obligation answering to the oath of fealty as given by the lay barons.

For nearly two centuries the practice had continued without exciting scandal or resistance, when the Church began to raise angry and frequent complaints against the assumption of this right by the lay suzerains. "On the part of the suzerains it was replied that they did not claim to grant by this rite the spiritual powers of the office, their function being solely to grant possession of its temporalities, and of the temporal rank thereto annexed. But the Church party urged that the ceremonial in itself involved the granting of spiritual powers, insomuch that, in order to prevent the clergy from electing to a see when vacant, it was the practice of the emperors to take possession of the crosier and ring until it should be their own pleasure to grant investiture to their favorites." The disfavor in which the practice had long been held by the Church was first expressed by Clement II (see Stenzel, *Gesch. Deutschl. u. d. fränkischen Kaiser*, pt. i, 117; ii, 130), but its most energetic opponent it really first found in the person of Gregory VII, who, having in the year 1074 enacted most stringent measures for the repression of simony, proceeded, in the beginning of the year 1075, to condemn, under excommunication, the practice of investiture, as almost necessarily connected with simony, or leading to it. "The prohibition was couched in the most imperious and comprehensive terms. It absolutely deposed every bishop, abbot, or inferior ecclesiastic who should receive investiture from any lay person. It interdicted him—whosoever should be guilty of this act of ambition and rebellion (which was the sin of idolatry), until he should have abandoned the benefice so obtained—from all communion in the favor of St. Peter, and from admission into the Church. And if any emperor, duke, marquis, count, or secular potentate or person should presume to grant such investiture of bishopric or inferior dignity, he was condemned to the same sentence. This statute made a revolution in the whole feudal system throughout Europe as regarded the relation of the Church now dominant to the state. In the empire (then under Henry IV) it annulled the precarious power of the sovereign over almost half his subjects. All the great prelates and abbots, who were at the same time the princes, the nobles, the counsellors, the leaders in the diets and national assemblies, became to a great degree independent of the crown; the emperor had no concern, unless indirectly, in their promotion, no power over their degradation. Their lands and estates were as inviolable as their persons. Where there was no fealty there could be no treason. Every benefice, on the other hand, thus dissevered from the crown was held, if not directly, yet at the pleasure of the pope. For as with him was the sole judgment (the laity being excluded) as to the validity of the election, with him was the decision by what offences the dignity might be forfeited; and as the estates and endowments were now inalienable, and were withdrawn from the national property, and became that of the Church and of God, the

pope might be, in fact, the liege lord, temporal and spiritual, of half the world" (Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, iii, 416-417). These proceedings of the pope the kings could not, of course, possibly permit without a practical abdication of all their powers, and hence arose the conflicts of investiture which resulted so triumphantly for the papacy, not only in rising to a supremacy over the princes of the earth, but drawing into their own hands all civil government, and which enabled some of the incumbents of the papal see, e. g. Innocent III, to aspire to be the supreme disposers of the Christian world, with all its belongings (see Reichel, p. 348). Some of the sovereigns, such as Philip of France and William of England, paid no attention whatever to the pope's mandate, and the latter, satisfied that they would not actively oppose him, was quite willing to let them alone; but far otherwise was his conduct towards the emperor Henry IV, whom he sought by every possible exertion to compel to submit to these decisions. For this the licentious and ambitious character of Henry had given him good cause. But for a time he failed to make any impression on the emperor, who paid no regard to the threats of Gregory VII, but continued to nominate not only to German, but also Italian bishoprics. Other causes widened the breach between the emperor and the pope. See the article GREGORY VII, vol. iii, especially p. 1003, col. 1. After Hildebrand's (Gregory VII) death, the rivalry for the papal throne assuaged for a time the controversy on investiture; each papal party, anxious to secure the greatest number of, and most powerful adherents, willingly made all possible concessions. But when Urban II, elected and supported by the Hildebrandian party, ascended the papal throne, the controversy was renewed by his declaration "Nullum jus laicis in clericos esse volumus et censemus," and the subject was even brought before the Council of Clermont (1095). By canon 15 of this council clergymen were forbidden to accept any ecclesiastical office from a layman; the 16th canon applies this especially to kings and other civil authorities; canon 17 forbade bishops and priests binding themselves by feudal oaths to either kings or other laymen; and canon 18 threatened every one who, after two warnings, continued in these forbidden relations, with deprivation of all office and power. Yet Urban found more difficulty than he had expected in bringing the princes to second him in his views, and he did not succeed in enforcing these decisions even in Italy, where Roger of Sicily stoutly defended the rights of the civil authorities. Urban, however, evaded the difficulty by naming Roger, to whom he was under many obligations, his legate in Sicily. The death of this pope, in 1099, by no means extinguished the opposition, but, instead, the contest became more earnest, and continued during the most of the 11th century. In the beginning of the 12th century it assumed a new form under Pascal II, whose name, of all popes, is most prominently connected with the question of investitures both in England and Germany. Pascal II had ascended the papal throne with the intention of following in the footsteps of his predecessors, but he lacked the strength of character necessary for determined action. "In England, William the Conqueror had maintained his supremacy over the Church with an iron arm. Thus no one was allowed to acknowledge the pope, when chosen, except by the king's permission; no one might receive letters from Rome unless they had been previously shown to him for approval. The archbishop was not permitted to frame any canon, although with the assistance of the bishop of the realm, unless it had been previously sanctioned by the sovereign. Nor was any bishop allowed to excommunicate a baron or minister of the crown on any charge, without having first obtained the king's consent. The same policy was pursued by his son William Rufus, without any difficulties being raised on the part of the popes. They had too many reasons for conciliating the friendship of the Normans in Italy to venture to oppose their wishes in England." Nor was it otherwise now when archbishop Anselm came forward, determined to execute the papal decisions concerning the investitures, and King Henry I felt his prerogatives invaded, and Anselm alone had to bear the whole brunt of Henry's indignation. See ANSELM. In 1107, an agreement which had been entered into between the king and the archbishop was finally proclaimed with great solemnity at a synod convened for this purpose. "By it Henry, whilst surrendering an unnecessary ceremony, retained a substantial power; and Anselm's scruples were set at rest by a letter from Paschal, in which he freed those who had received lay investitures from the penalties pronounced by his predecessor. . . . . Still more fortunate than the English kings were the kings of Castile, who, by directly yielding when Urban's decree was first published, obtained from him an absolute privilege of nomination to all bishoprics in their dominions—a privilege which they have since retained by virtue of a particular indulgence renewed by the pope for the life of each prince" (Reichel, p. 363; see Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ii, pt. i, ch. vii, 190).

But it was in Germany that the struggle about investitures was waged most fiercely, and that it also continued longest. Taking advantage of the political troubles which were agitating the country, Paschal used every exertion to detach the Church entirely from the control of the state. "Not only had Paschal II begun his course by denouncing lay investiture as strongly as his predecessor Urban II, but he had also followed the tactics of Urban." He not only put Henry IV a second time under the ban, but even committed one of the darkest crimes in the annals of history. He estranged from Henry the affection of those to whose love and consideration he was entitled by the most sacred of laws. Two of the sons of Henry IV were incited to rebellion against their own natural father (1101, 1104), which brought the emperor to an untimely grave of broken heart (1106). Paschal now thought, of course, that he had secured for himself the obedience of Germany, and with pride he announced that henceforth the Church would begin to enjoy anew her liberty indeed, for death had removed, and was fast removing, those who opposed her success (Mansi, *l. c.* p. 1209; Muratori, *Scriptores rerum Italic.* III, i, 363); he even caused the laws on investiture to be reasserted by the councils of Troyes, Benevento (1108), and Lateran (1100). But for once Paschal II had made his reckoning without his host. His boast, alas, how empty! "He had not to wait long before he discovered its vainness; for Henry V was no sooner in undisputed possession of the throne than he maintained as stoutly as his father had done his own right to invest bishops." Strengthened in his opposition by the example of England, and of France also, he interpreted the actions of the councils as threats at his power, and after a vain endeavor to bring the pope to acknowledge his right in a conference at Chalons, he resorted to arms. At the head of a vast army he marched to Italy, and so terrified the pope that he obtained a very favorable compact without the least difficulty (Feb. 9, 1111). But the bishops refused to comply with it, and Henry hesitated not to force a favorable conclusion by imprisoning the pope and his cardinals. By a second treaty, which was now compacted (April 8, 1111), Pascal II actually agreed to surrender all the possessions and royalties with which the Church had been endowed, and which alone had formed the subject of claim on the part of the emperor. To seal the compact more firmly, the pope divided the host with the emperor, and, after coronation, Henry returned to Germany, satisfied that Rome had for once been brought low (see Stenzel, pt. i, p. 632 sq.). This treaty, however, never had any practical effect, for the Hildebrandian party disapproved of the pope's concessions, and "nothing remained for Paschal, weak and vacillating Paschal, but to annul the grant, and to assemble a council in the Lateran, and to plead before it that the agreement had been concluded under the pressure of circumstances, in order to save the cardinals and the city of Rome; that it was beyond his power to

surrender any of the liberties and rights of the Church; that it was for the assembly to examine the agreement, and pronounce thereupon; but that for himself he would adhere to his oath, and undertake nothing personally against Henry," i. e. poor wretched Paschal had sworn to a compact which he felt he could not break himself, but for which, none the less determined to abrogate, he sought a pretext to surrender his authority into the hands of his inferiors, that they might execute the wishes of his heart, which he dared not openly espouse as a pope. The action of the pope, however, in accordance with his own wishes, was repudiated in a Lateran council in 1112 (Mansi, t. xxi, p. 49 sq.), which even put the emperor again under the ban. Unfortunately, Henry had in the mean time made himself many enemies at home by his course concerning the investitures, and the excommunication still further increased his difficulties; yet he succeeded in overcoming them all at the time when the papal see least expected it, and his whole power was then directed against the latter. Henry re-entered Italy, seized Rome, and the pope, compelled to flee, died at last in banishment, as by his policy he had well deserved (1118). Gelasius II was the next successor to the papal throne; but as he lived only a short time (1119), the glory of concluding the long-protracted struggle was reserved for Calixtus II, but not before one preliminary contract had been concluded and as soon violated, nor before the utterance of a sentence of excommunication and dethronement on Henry V, at the great synod at Rheims (Labbe, xii). It was now agreed that every investiture should be retained, and each bishopric restored to its former incumbent, but that those belonging to the Church should be governed according to the canons, and the secular ones by the civil laws (Mansi, t. xxi, p. 244; Stenzel, p. 690). Upon a second consideration, however, they relented, and the question of the oath soon created new pretexts for the struggle between them, and, in a synod of Rheims (1119), Calixtus put the emperor under the ban, and deposed him (Mansi, *l. c.*, p. 250). In the mean time, archbishop Adalbert, of Mentz, created troubles in Germany. Calixtus strengthened his position in Rome, and even succeeded in taking the anti-pope, Gregory VIII, whom the emperor had opposed to him, prisoner; yet the public sentiment of Germany was strong enough to compel the papal party finally to adopt the course which Ivo of Chartres and the monk Hugo of Fleury had commanded. "It was an intermediate course between the extreme views of the Gregorian party on the one hand, and the secularizing tendencies of their opponents on the other. It combated the Gregorian position that it was a degradation for the priesthood to own itself subject to any lay authority, and held fast to the principle that to God must be rendered that which is God's, and to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's. It therefore maintained that the king ought not to invest the candidate bishop with staff and ring, these being the symbols of spiritual jurisdiction, and, as such, belonging to the archbishop; but it allowed homage to be done to the emperor, and the use of some other symbol for bestowing the temporalities." The celebrated concordat of Worms, Sept. 1122 (Mansi, *l. c.* p. 273 sq.), finally settled the question to the satisfaction of all parties, and the Lateran Council of 1123 gave its full approval (comp. Mansi, *l. c.* p. 277). The emperor agreed to give up the form of investiture *with the ring and pastoral staff*, to grant to the clergy the right of free elections, and to restore all the possessions of the Church of Rome which had been seized either by himself or by his father; while the pope, on his part, consented that the elections should be held in the presence of the emperor or his official, but with a right of appeal to the provincial synod; that investiture might be given by the emperor, but only *by the touch of the sceptre;* and that the bishops and other church dignitaries should faithfully discharge all the feudal duties which belonged to their principality (see Montag. p. 436 sq.; Stenzel, p. 704). Lothair III, Henry's successor, rendered these conditions still more advantageous to the Roman see by substituting a more general profession for the feudal oath (see J. D. Olenschlager, *Erläuterung d. güldenen Bulle*, Frankfort, 1766; *Urkundenbuch*, p. 19). This measure, to some extent, at least, allayed the ill will which the hierarchical party bore to the Concordat of Worms. The pope had in reality secured but few actual advantages by the concordat, yet the freedom of election obtained by it in the place of the influence exercised over them by the emperor was sure in due time to be of great advantage to the papacy. It certainly had considerable effect in restraining one of the greatest abuses of the Middle Ages, if not in eradicating altogether the real evil of simony and corrupt promotion of unworthy candidates for ecclesiastical offices; and although, even as late as the 12th century, we find instances of the emperor's interference in the election of German bishops, and even of his direct appointments to such offices (see Sugenheim, *Staatsleben d. Klerus im Mittelalter*, Berlin, 1839, pt. i, p. 153), these instances are, after all, only few in number, and disappear altogether after the times of Otto IV and Frederick II. Civil interference in ecclesiastical appointments ceased also in France, England, and Spain; but in Naples, Hungary, Denmark, and Sweden, the kings continued to appoint bishops until the 13th century (Sugenheim, p. 197).

For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index*, p. 165. On the general subject, see Staudenmaier, *Geschichte d. Bischofswahlen* (Tübing. 1830, p. 249); Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, pt. ii, chap. xii; Gosselin, *Power of the Pope*, ii, 345; Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity*, iii, 415; iv, 146 sq.; Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, p. 572 sq.; Butler, *Eccles. Hist. to 13th Cent.* p. 474 sq., 492 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* p. 327, et al.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, s. v.; (J. H. W.)

Invisible Church. See CHURCH.

Invisibles is the name given to the school of theologians who held that the Church of Christ was not always visible. See Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, i, 354; ii, § 256.

Invitatōrēs. See INVITATORY.

Invitatory is a short antiphon, suitable to the occasion, sung or recited before the *Venite Exultemus Domino*, or interpolated between the verses of this psalm and the *Gloria Patri* also. The 95th Psalm, as an "invitation to praise," is supposed to have been used by the early Christians, adopted, no doubt, from the Temple service. In the Greek as well as the Latin churches it is still in use, though the two churches differ somewhat in form. In the East the following three clauses only are used:

"O come, let us worship God our King;
O come, let us worship and fall down before Christ our King and God;
O come, let us worship before Christ himself, our King and God;"

but in the Western churches the whole psalm has always been used, accompanied generally by the *invitatory*, the latter varying, of course, according to the subject of the office to which they invite thought. It always consists of two clauses: "both are said before the psalm, and at the end of the second, seventh, and last verses; the second clause only at the end of the fourth and ninth verses. The *Gloria Patri* is followed first by the second and then by both clauses. The Breviary of cardinal Quignones restricted the invitatory to the beginning and end of the psalms." The ninefold repetition of the whole or a part of the invitatory is of great antiquity. Durandus thus refers to its mystical bearing: "The invitatory is repeated six times at full length, because six is the first perfect number; and the sixfold repetition, therefore, sets forth the perfection with which we should endeavor to perform the service of God. Three is an imperfect number, and therefore the imperfect repetition takes place three times." On the *double feasts* of the Western Church the invitatory is doubled at matins, lauds, and vespers. In the Eng-

lish Church, where the order of daily prayer is chiefly taken from the corresponding offices of the Sarum Breviary (of which the rubric runs thus [after the Gloria and Allelulia]: "*Sequatur invitatorium hoc modo.* Ecce venit rex. Occuramus obviam Salvatori nostro. *Ps.* Venite; *post* i, iii *et* v, *vers. psalmi repetatur totum invitatorium.* Post. ii, vers. iv et vi, *vers. psalmi repetatur solum hæc pars,* Occuramus. *Et deinde reincipiatur totum invitatorium*"), the opening sentences of matins and evensong are generally considered to be of a similar character (compare Procter, *Common Prayer,* p. 182; Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service,* i, 152 sq.). Blunt (*Theol. Cyclop.* i, 356), however, says that the true invitatory of the English Church "is in the fixed versicle 'Praise ye the Lord,' with its response, 'The Lord's name be praised.' The singing of Allelulia after the *Gloria Patri,* at the commencement of matins, was ordered in the Prayer-book of 1549. The response was inserted in 1661. The 95th Psalm, with this versicle and response, is to be considered as an unvarying invitatory in the modern English rite, except on Easter day, for which special provision is made." See also Neale, *Liturgical Essays,* p. 7 sq., et al.; *Comment. on the Psalms,* i, 43 sq.; Walcott, *Sacred Archæology,* p. 332.

Invocation of Angels, or the act of addressing prayers to angels, especially to the angel-guardian, prevails in the Roman and the Greek churches, as well as in all the different Eastern churches. They hold that angels are sharers of the divine nature, though in a somewhat subordinate measure. In the same manner they also permit the invocation of saints (q. v.) even, and designate this worship under the technical term of δουλεία, in distinction from the worship of God himself, which they term λατρεία. See Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines,* i, 141, 142, 338 sq. Compare ANGELS; VENERATION.

Invocation of the Holy Ghost. In the prayer of the mediæval canon, retained also in the Scottish office on the consecration of the elements for the Lord's Supper, the Holy Ghost is thus invoked: "Vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with thy word and *Holy Spirit* these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son."

Invocation of Saints, a form of idolatry prevailing in the Roman, the Greek, and the different Eastern churches. They ignore the doctrine to which the Protestants tenaciously cling, that the rendering of divine worship to one Infinite Being must of necessity exclude the idea of rendering divine worship, no matter how modified and excused, to any other being, dependent upon and created by the Supreme Being. They also deny that the invocation of the created, instead of the Creator, does in any wise trench upon the honor due only to God, and that it is, as we assert, irreconcilable with Scripture, "which holds him forth as the sole object of worship, and the *only* fountain of mercy." They cannot, of course, disprove these truths from Scripture, neither can they furnish any authority from the holy book for a practice unknown to the early Church, and expressly condemned by the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 481) and by the early fathers. The few passages which they frequently cite they themselves claim only to *imply* an intercommunion of the two worlds (as Matt. xiii, 3; Luke xiv, 17; Exod. xxiii, 13), and they are therefore obliged to have recourse to tradition. To this end they cite some of the Church fathers, such as Origen (*Opp.* ii, 273), Cyprian (*Ep.* 60, Dodwell's edition), Basil (*Opp.* ii, 155), Gregory Nazianzen (*Opp.* i, 288), Gregory of Nyssa (ii, 1017), Ambrose (ii, 200), Chrysostom (iv, 449), and especially the liturgies of the different ancient churches of Roman, Greek, Syrian, and even Egyptian rite. But, while these testimonies are generally credited, it must be remembered that they are only unscriptural additions, and that they originated after the infusion into the Church system of Alexandrian Neoplatonism and Oriental Magianism, which left its traces even in the most orthodox form of Christian worship, and creed also, up to the 4th and 5th centuries, a period in the history of the Christian Church when heresies were, to use a common phrase, almost the order of the day. Nay, even the Roman Catholic Church admits that the worship of saints was carried to an excess not only in this age, but especially in the mediæval period. The worship of saints and of the Virgin Mary then took the place of the worship of Christ, the only legal intercessor between God and man, and thus virtually ignored the mediatorship of Christ. It is true some of the more enlightened and less bigoted of the Romanists claim that the saints are only invoked, "not for the purpose of obtaining mercy or grace from themselves directly, but in order to ask their prayers or intercession with God on our behalf" (see Bellarmine, *Controversiæ de Sanctorum Beatitudine,* lib. i, cap. xvii). But as we have already stated in our article on the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, we repeat also here, that it is not for us to examine only the intent of the Romish liturgy, but also what her communicants understand it to mean. Here lies the greatest difficulty, to say the least, against the introduction of a mode of worship wholly unauthorized by the word inspired by God to serve as a guide in all things. It brings home again not only the question of the immaculate conception of Mary, but even the infallibility theory of the vicar of Rome. Protestants are unwilling to take any authority except the word of God; they refuse to acknowledge as infallible any one except the Infinite Being himself. It was this view that inaugurated the Reformation, however much it may have been hastened by the sale of indulgences (see Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines,* ii, § 257). "The Church of Rome is justly and scripturally charged with idolatry in the worship, adoration, and invocation which she addresses to saints and angels. Idolatry, in the scriptural application of the term, is of two sorts, and consists (1) either in giving the honor due to the one true God, as maker and governor of the world, to any subordinate being, (2) or in giving the honor due to Christ, as the sole mediator between God and man, to any subordinate mediator. The former is the idolatry forbidden by the Jewish law, and by that of nature. The latter is Christian idolatry, properly so called, and is the abomination condemned in severe terms by the Gospel. This species of idolatry is, without doubt, chargeable on any Christian Church that shall adopt, in its religious addresses, another mediator besides Jesus Christ. But the Church of Rome, not merely in the private writings of her divines, but in the solemn forms of her ritual, publicly professes, and by her canons and councils authoritatively enjoins, the worship of saints and angels, under the idea of mediators or intercessors; not, indeed, in exclusion of Christ as the one or chief mediator, but in manifest defiance of his *sole* mediatorship. This charge is truly and justly brought against her, as she now stands, and hath stood for many ages, and cannot by any subterfuge be evaded. Therefore she must be content to have the imputation of dæmon-worship, or anti-Christian idolatry, still adhering to her" (Elliott).

As a regular doctrine, the invocation of saints is taught in a canon *Touching the Invocation, Veneration, and on Relics of Saints and sacred Images,* issued by the Council of Trent in its 25th session. It reads as follows: "The holy synod enjoins on all bishops, and others sustaining the office and charge of teaching, that, according to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times (!) of the Christian religion, and according to the consent of the holy fathers, and to the decrees of sacred councils, they especially instruct the faithful diligently touching the intercession and invocation of saints, the honor paid to relics, and the lawful use of images: teaching them that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful

suppliantly to invoke them, and to resort to their prayers, aid, and help for obtaining benefits from God, through his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour; but that they think impiously who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that the invocation of them to pray for each of us even in particular is idolatry; or that it is repugnant to the Word of God, and is opposed to the honor of the *one mediator between God and men, Jesus Christ;* or that it is foolish to supplicate, orally or inwardly, those who reign in heaven. Also, that the holy bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ, which were the living members of Christ, and *the temple of the Holy Ghost*, and which are by him to be raised unto eternal life, and to be glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful; through which [bodies] many benefits are bestowed by God on men; so that they who affirm that veneration and honor are not due to the relics of saints; or that these, and other sacred monuments, are uselessly honored by the faithful; and that the places dedicated to the memories of the saints are vainly visited for the purpose of obtaining their aid, are wholly to be condemned, as the Church has already long since condemned, and doth now also condemn them. Moreover, that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints, are to be had and retained particularly in temples, and that due honor and veneration are to be awarded them; not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped; or that anything is to be asked of them; or that confidence is to be reposed in images, as was of old done by the Gentiles, who placed their hope in idols; but because the honor which is shown unto them is referred to the prototypes which they represent; in such wise that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose similitude they bear. And this, by the decrees of councils, and especially of the second synod of Nicæa, has been ordained against the opponents of images. And the bishops shall carefully teach this: that, by means of the histories of the mysteries of our redemption, depicted by paintings or other representations, the people are instructed, and strengthened in remembering and continually reflecting on the articles of faith; as also that great profit is derived from all sacred images, not only because the people are thereby admonished of the benefits and gifts which have been bestowed upon them by Christ, but also because the miracles of God through the means of the saints, and their salutary example, are set before the eyes of the faithful; that so for these things they may give God thanks; may order their own life and manners in imitation of the saints; and may be excited to adore and love God, and to cultivate piety. But if any one shall teach or think contrary to these decrees, let him be anathema."

Most ridiculous is the defence which Ffoulkes (*Christendom's Divisions*, i, § 86) advances in behalf of this species of idolatry, while yet in communion with the Romish Church; and his friends of the High-Church party of England and our own country may do well to read it before they carry much farther the laughable affectations which they term "devotions." While defending the gross forgeries of Pius V in the missal and breviary of the Church, sometimes designated by Romanists as "revisions," on the invocation of saints and of Mary, he says, "They were but the expressions of what had been the devotional feelings of the whole Church. . . . His Holy Spirit communing with their spirits, and no other agent or instrument, had taught them that the saints reigning with Christ, and his blessed Mother especially, could and would intercede for them did they ask their prayers; and so one asked, and had his petitions granted, and asked again. Then he breathed the secret (!) of his success to his brother or friend, till he in turn was encouraged to ask. Then another, and another, as the secret was passed about from house to hamlet, and from hamlet to town, and from one country to another, till at length it had spread over Christendom." If this was the way in which the invocation of saints was practised, to authorize its admission in the litany by Pius V in the 16th century, and its affirmation as a doctrine by the Council of Trent, then why adduce the Church fathers of the early age, and the practices of some Christian churches of an age when the Church of Christ was so greatly corrupted and overrun by innovation? The Protestants also believe in saints. They believe in imitating the noble character exemplified in their life while on earth, which is a very different thing from invoking them to intercede in Christ's stead before the throne of God the Father. See Marheineke, *Symbolik*, iii, 439; Freeman, Claggett, and Whitby, in Gibson's *Preservative*, vii; *Dublin Rev.* April, 1853; Pusey, *Rule of Faith*, p. 55 sq.; Huss (John), *De Mysterio Antichristi*, c. 23; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxxiv, 614 sq.; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, p. 753 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s. v. See also IMAGES; SAINTS. (J. H. W.)

Invocations. About the 8th century, says Procter (*On the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 249), the *invocations of saints* (q. v.) were introduced into the churches of the West, and called the *Litany*, a name given to various other services. See LITANY. (Comp. Renaudot, *Liturg. Orient.* i, 356; Bingham, *Antiq.* xv, i, § 2; Mabillon, *Analect.* iii, 669 sq.)

Invocăvit, a name sometimes given to the first Sunday in Lent on account of the *Introit* (q. v.), which opens, "Invocavit me et exaudiam eum," etc. (Psa. xci, 15).—Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 668.

Iona (formerly *Ioua*), one of the most famous of the Hebrides. It is about three miles long, and varies in breadth from a mile to a mile and a half. In 1861 it had a population of 264. Its remarkable fertility was regarded as miraculous in the Dark Ages, and no doubt led to its early occupation. Dunii, the highest point on the island, is 330 feet above the sea-level. Its history begins in the year 563, when St. Columba (q. v.), leaving the shores of Ireland, landed upon Iona with twelve disciples. Having obtained a grant of the island, as well from his kinsman Conall, the son of Comghall, king of the Scots, as from Bruidi, the son of Melchon, king of the Picts, he built upon it a monastery, which was long regarded as the mother-church of the Picts, and was venerated not only among the Scots of Britain and Ireland, but among the Angles of the north of England, who owed their conversion to the self-denying missionaries of Iona. From the 6th to the 17th century, the island was most generally called *I, Ii, Ia, Io, Eo, Hy, Hi, Hii, Hie, Hu, Y*, or *Yi*—that is, simply, "the Island;" or (on Columba's account) *Icolmkill, I-Columb-Kille*, or *Hii-Colum-Kille*—that is, "the Island of Columba of the Church." From the end of the 6th to the end of the 8th century Iona was scarcely second to any monastery in the British Isles; but the fierce and heathen Norsemen burned it in 795, and again in 802. Its "family" (as the monks were called) of sixty-eight persons were martyred in 806. A second martyrdom, in 825, is the subject of a contemporary Latin poem by Walafridus Strabus, abbot of the German monastery of Reichenau, in the Lake of Constance. On the Christmas evening of 986 the island was again wasted by the Norsemen, who slew the abbot and fifteen of his monks. Towards the end of the next century the monastery was repaired by St. Margaret, the queen of king Malcolm Canmore. It was visited in 1097 by king Magnus the Barefooted, of Norway, being at that time a part of that kingdom, and so fell under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishop of Man and the archbishop of Drontheim. In 1203 the bishops of the north of Ireland disputed the authority of the Manx bishop, pulled down a monastery which he had begun to build in the island, and placed

the abbey under the rule of an Irish abbot of Derry. The Scottish Church had long claimed jurisdiction in Iona, and before the end of the 13th century the island fell under the rule of the Scottish king. Its abbey was now peopled by Clugniac monks; and a nunnery of Austin canonesses was planted on its shores. Towards the end of the 15th century it became the seat of the Scottish bishop of the Isles, the abbey church being his cathedral, and the monks his chapter. No building now remains on the island which can claim to have sheltered St. Columba or his disciples. The most ancient ruins are the Laithrichean, or Foundations, in a little bay to the west of Port-a-Churraich; the Cobhan Cuildich, or Culdees' Cell, in a hollow between Dunii and Dunbhuirg; the rath or hill-fort of Dunbhuirg; and the Gleann-an-Teampull, or Glen of the Church, in the middle of the island, believed to be the site of the monastery which the Irish bishops destroyed in 1203. St. Oran's Chapel, now the oldest church in the island, may probably be of the latter part of the 11th century. St. Mary's Nunnery is perhaps a century later. The Cathedral, or St. Mary's Church, seems to have been built chiefly in the early part of the 13th century. It has a choir, with a sacristy on the north side, and chapels on the south side; north and south transepts; a central tower about seventy-five feet high, and a nave. An inscription on one of the columns of the choir appears to denote that it was the work of an Irish ecclesiastic who died in 1202. On the north of the cathedral are the chapter-house and other remains of the conventual or monastic buildings. In the "Reilig Oran"—so called, it is supposed, from St. Oran, a kinsman of St. Columba, the first who found a grave in it—were buried Ecgfrid, king of Northumbria, in 684; Godred, king of the Isles, in 1188; and Haco Ospac, king of the Isles, in 1228. No monuments of these princes now remain. The oldest of the many tomb-stones on the island are two with Irish inscriptions, one of them, it is believed, being the monument of a bishop of Connor who died at Iona in 1174.—Chambers, *Cyclop.* v, 619; Duke of Argyll, in *Good Words*, Sept. 1, 1869, p. 614 sq.; *Princeton Rep.* 1867, p. 1-22. See also COLUMBA.

Ionia. It has been suggested that in 1 Macc. viii, 8, for the existing reading *χώραν τὴν Ἰνδικὴν καὶ Μήδειαν*, "*India* and Media," should be read *χ. τ. Ἰωνίαν καὶ Μυσίαν*, "*Ionia* and Mysia," on the ground that to include India and Media within the domain of Antiochus III is to contradict directly the voice of history, which confines that monarch's possessions to this side the Taurus range (Livy, *Hist.* xxxvii, 56; xxxviii, 38). See INDIA. This alteration is purely conjectural, as there is no MS. authority for it; and it is not easy to see, supposing it to be the correct reading, how the error in the text could have arisen. Michaelis supposes that, by a mistake on the part of the translator, מדו was read for מסי, and הדו or הנדו for הנטי, and that the nations intended are the Mysians and the Ἐνετοί (Homer, *Il.* ii, 580) of Paphlagonia; but this is still more improbable than the former conjecture; and, besides, not only was Paphlagonia not within the domain of Antiochus, but the Enetians did not at the time exist (Strabo, xii, 8). Perhaps the conjectural emendation above mentioned may be adopted on the ground of its internal probability, as the only alternative seems to be to suppose gross geographical and historical ignorance on the part of the author. It is followed by Luther (who puts "*Ionien*" in the text), Drusius, Grotius, Houbigant, etc. Adopting the reading Ionia, the district referred to is that bordering on the Ægean Sea from Phocæa to Miletus. Its original inhabitants were Greeks, but in later times a large Jewish element was found in the population (Josephus, *Ant.* xvi, 2, 3). Ionia, with its islands, was celebrated for its twelve, afterwards thirteen cities; five of which — Ephesus, Smyrna, Miletus, Chios, and Samos—are conspicuous in the N. T. See ASIA MINOR. Under the Roman dominion the name Ionia remained, but its towns were distributed politically under other provinces. Ptolemy ranks them in Asia Proper, while Strabo (xiv, 631), Pliny (*H. N.* v, 31), and Mela (i, 17) speak of Ionia as a distinct territory. In the account which Josephus gives (*Ant.* xvi, 2, 3) of the appeal of the Jews in Ionia to Agrippa for exemption from certain oppressions to which they were exposed, the ancient name of the country is retained. He speaks of *πολὺ πλῆθος Ἰουδαίων* as inhabiting its cities. See also JAVAN.

Ionic Order. See ARCHITECTURE.

Ionic Philosophy. See PHILOSOPHY (GREEK).

Iōta. See JOT.

Iperen, JOSUA VAN, a noted Dutch theologian, was born at Middelburg, Feb. 23, 1726. He was descended from an old and respectable Flemish family. His studies, in which he evinced very superior mental endowments, were pursued first at Groningen, and afterwards at Leyden, where he was permitted to enjoy the instructions and friendship of the celebrated professors A. Schultens and T. Hemsterhuys. In 1749 he was called to the pastoral charge of Lillo. Here he labored with zeal and fidelity for sixteen years. In 1752 he was made doctor of philosophy, and in 1766 was called to Veere, where he remained ten years. Several of the most noted literary, scientific, and poetic societies successively elected him to membership. Zealand also appointed him a member of the commission to which was intrusted the work of preparing a new poetic version of the Book of Psalms. He took an important part in the performance of this duty. The work was approved in 1773, and still continues in use in the Reformed Church of Holland. It possesses a high degree of poetic merit. His income, both at Lillo and Veere, was small, which, with a numerous family to support, was the source of many trials and perplexities. Accepting an appointment as preacher in Batavia, in the Dutch East India possessions, he went thither in 1778, accompanied by his wife and five children. He was cordially received, and an agreeable field of labor was opened to him. He labored here with redoubled zeal and fidelity, but the climate was adverse to his health, and in 1780, after the short space of two years, he rested from his labors on earth. A philological essay, dedicated to the Holland Society of Sciences, and published in 1755, was regarded as highly creditable to him in a linguistic point of view, and also as evincing a philosophical spirit. His *History of Church Psalmody*, published in 1777, is said to exhibit extensive historical knowledge, combined with good taste. He seems to have excelled in various departments of knowledge. See B. Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, ii, 190; H. Bouman, *Geschiedenis der Geldersche Hoogeschool*, ii, 190. (J. P. W.)

Iphedei'ah (Heb. *Yiphdeyah'*, יִפְדְּיָה, *set free* by *Jehovah*; Sept. Ἰεφαδία), one of the "sons" of Shashak, and a chief of the tribe of Benjamin resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 25). B.C. post 1612 and ante 588.

Ir (Heb. *id.* עִיר, a *city*; Sept. Ὢρ v. r. Ὠρά, Vulg. *Hir*), the father of Shuppim (Shupham) and Huppim (Hupham), of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii, 12); probably identical with one of the sons of Benjamin (Gen. xlvi, 21), and therefore not (as often supposed) the same with Iri (1 Chron. vii, 7). See BENJAMIN; also comp. IR-NAHASH, IR-SHEMESH, etc.

I'ra (Heb. *Ira'*, עִירָא, *citizen*, otherwise *watchful*; Sept Ἰράς, Ἰρά, Ὠραί, Εἰρά), the name of three of David's favorite officers.

1. Son of Ikkesh, a Tekoite, and one of David's thirty famous warriors (2 Sam. xxiii, 26; 1 Chron. xi, 28). He was afterwards placed in command of the sixth regiment of his troops (1 Chron. xxvii, 9). B.C. 1046-1014.

2. A Jethrite, another of David's thirty chief heroes (2 Sam. xxiii, 38; 1 Chron. xi, 40). B.C. 1046.

3. A Jairite and priest (כֹּהֵן, A. V. "chief ruler"), i.

e. royal chaplain (2 Sam. xx, 26). B.C. cir. 1022. As he was not of the sacerdotal family, the Rabbins hold that he was only one of David's cabinet. See JAIR.

I'rad (Heb. *Irad'*, עִירָד, perh. *runner;* Sept. Γαϊδάδ, apparently by erroneously reading עִידָד; Joseph. Ἰαρέδης, *Ant.* i, 3, 4; Vulg. *Irad*), one of the antediluvian patriarchs, of the Cainite line, son of Enoch and father of Mehujael (Gen. iv, 18). B.C. considerably post 4045.

I'ram (Heb. *Iram'*, עִירָם, *citizen*, otherwise *watchful;* Sept. 'Ηρά[illegible], but Ζαφωίν in Gen. xxxvi, 43; Vulg. *Hiram*), the last-named of the Edomite phylarchs in Mount Seir, apparently contemporary with the Horite kings (Gen. xxxvi, 43; 1 Chron. i, 54). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618. See IDUMÆA.

Ireland, the more western of the two principal islands of which the kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is composed, between lat. 51° 25′ and 55° 23′ N., and long. 6° 20′ and 10° 20′ W. Area, 32,513 sq. miles.

At the time when the island became known to the Greeks and the Romans its inhabitants were Celts. Of Celtic origin is the original name of Erin, which means "West Side," and was changed by the Greeks into Ierne, and by the Romans, who made no endeavors to subjugate the island, into Hibernia. During the whole period of the rule of the Romans over Brittany the history of Ireland is enveloped in profound obscurity. According to later chronicles, Ireland is said to have had in the 3d century five states, Momonia, Connacia, Lagenia, Ultonia, and Modia (Meath). As the people were akin to the Celts of Scotland, Ireland was, until the 4th century, often called Great Scotland (*Scotia major*). Christianity appears to have been brought to Ireland at an early time, perhaps as early as the 2d century. A reference to Ireland is, in particular, found in the words of Tertullian, who says that parts of the British Islands which had never been visited by the Romans were subject to Christ. In the 4th century a number of churches and schools are mentioned, and even before the 4th century missionaries went out from Ireland. Cœlestius, the friend and colaborer of Pelagius, was, according to Jerome, an Irishman, and the son of Christian parents. That the Irish had received their Christianity not from Rome, but from the East, is shown by their aversion against the institutions of the Church of Rome. The first Roman missionary, who about 430 was sent to Ireland by pope Cœlestius, was not well received, and had soon to return to Scotland. Two years later (432), the Scotch monk St. Patrick (q. v.) arrived in Ireland. He had spent his youth in Ireland as a slave, and had subsequently lived for some time in Gaul. With great zeal he preached Christianity throughout Ireland, converted several, and was, in particular, active for the establishment of convents, so that Ireland was called the island of the Saints. He settled finally as bishop of Armagh, which see thus received metropolitan power over all Ireland. According to some writers (Wiltsch, *Kirchl. Statistik*, ii, 48), Ireland was, however, without its own archbishop, being, until the 12th century, subject to the archbishop of Canterbury; according to others, pope Eugene, as early as 625, appointed four metropolitan sees at Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam. Certain it is that the permanent division of Ireland into the four ecclesiastical provinces of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam took place about 1150 (according to Moroni in 1152, at the Council of Mellefont; according to Wiltsch in 1155). From this time the primacy of Armagh over all the sees of Ireland was generally recognised. The first bishops for a long time maintained their independence with regard to Rome. In the 7th century Rome endeavored to induce the Irish churches to conform themselves with regard to the celebration of Easter to the practice of the Roman Church, instead of following, as heretofore, the rite of the Eastern churches. The Irish made a long resistance, until, in 717, the monks in Iona (q. v.) were on this account either expelled or coerced into submission. Most of the Irish churches then submitted; yet, as late as the 12th century, some monks were found who adhered to the Eastern practice of celebrating Easter. In the 9th century the Irish Church was considerably disturbed by the invasions of the Northmen, who destroyed many churches, and burned manuscripts and convents. These invasions were followed by a period of anarchy, during which the moral condition of the Irish clergy greatly degenerated. The complaints of Rome at this time referred chiefly to the peculiar ecclesiastical practices of the Irish—the marriage of the clergy, the administration of baptism without chrisma, and the use of their own liturgy. The legates of the popes finally succeeded in obtaining the entire submission of the Irish Church to the Church of Rome about the middle of the 12th century, which until then is believed to have been without auricular confession, sacrifice of the mass, and indulgences, and to have celebrated the Lord's Supper in both kinds. In 1155 a bull of pope Hadrian IV allowed king Henry II of England to subject Ireland, the king, in his turn, promising the pope to protect the papal privileges. In 1172, a synod at Cashel regulated the ecclesiastical affairs in accordance with the wishes of Rome. During the time of the following kings of the house of Plantagenet the clergy were in a deplorable condition: the bishops carried the sword, and lived with their clergy in open and secret sins. The monks, who were very different from what they had been in former times, traversed the country as troublesome beggars, molesting the priests as well as the laity.

When Henry VIII undertook to make himself the head of the Church in his dominions he met in Ireland with a violent opposition. The opposition was the more popular as it was intimated that henceforth only such priests as understood the English language would be appointed. The Englishman, George Brown, who was appointed bishop of Dublin, met, therefore, in spite of his earnest and incessant labors in behalf of the Reformation, with but little success. The English liturgy was introduced in 1551, under Edward VI, but the order to hold divine service in the English language seems not to have been executed. The germs of Protestantism were wholly destroyed under the government of Mary. The people were not prepared for the Reformation, and the clergy were not as corrupt as in many other countries. Moreover, there were among the ministers who had been sent to Ireland as Protestant missionaries many adventurers, who, by disreputable conduct, strengthened the aversion of the people to Protestantism. Under the government of Elizabeth, an order was issued in 1560 to introduce the general use of the English liturgy and of the English language at divine service. Some years later, however, concessions appear to have been made in favor of the old Irish language. In 1602 the first translation of the New Testament into the Irish language by William Daniel appeared, but the translation of the whole Bible was not finished until 1665. The persistent endeavors of the English government to extirpate the native language established a close union between the Irish nationality and the Church of Rome. The excitement against England greatly increased when Elizabeth showed a design to confiscate the whole property of the Roman Catholic Church in behalf of the Protestant clergy. A number of revolts consequently occurred, which found a vigorous support on the part of the pope and the Spanish court. A plan submitted by the English lord lieutenant, Sir John Perrot, for thoroughly Anglicizing Ireland, was rejected as being too expensive, and thus England was compelled to maintain at a heavy expense a large military force in Ireland. In 1595 the chieftain Hugh O'Niele, whom Elizabeth had made earl of Tyrone, placed himself at the head of a powerful insurrection, which was mainly supported by Irish soldiers who had returned from military service in foreign countries. The earl of Essex, with an army of 22,000 men, was unable

to quell the insurrection; but his successor, lord Mountjoy, was more successful, and pacified the whole island. In 1601 the Irish again rose, aided by Spanish troops under Aquila and Ocampo; but the combined forces of Ocampo and O'Niele were, on Dec. 24, 1601, totally defeated by Mountjoy near Kinsale. The Spaniards left Ireland in January, 1602, and O'Niele made peace with the English. At the death of Elizabeth the whole of Ireland was under English rule. As a large number of Irish had perished in this conflict, 600,000 acres of land were confiscated in favor of English colonists. In view of the close alliance between the Church of Rome and the native Irish, the government of Elizabeth proceeded with equal severity against both: the public exercise of the Catholic religion was totally forbidden, and every inhabitant, under penalty of twelve pence, was commanded to be present at divine service celebrated in the Anglican churches. Decrees like this provoked a general dissatisfaction, which was carefully fomented by the Jesuits of the University of Douay, in the Netherlands (now belonging to France). On the accession of James I to the English throne the papal party was very powerful: it expelled the Protestant ministers from many places, and re-established the service of the Catholic Church. These attempts were forcibly suppressed, and new insurrections consequently were caused, all of which proved of short duration. In order to break the power of the Catholic chieftains, the government of James, following the example of queen Elizabeth, was especially intent upon wresting from them their landed property. Whoever was unable to prove, by means of a bill of feoffment, his title to his property, lost it. Thus, in the northern part of Ireland alone, about 800,000 acres were confiscated by the crown, which sold them to English speculators and to Scottish colonists, who founded the town of Londonderry. From this time dates the predominance of Protestantism in Ulster, the northern province of Ireland. At the same time, however, many most beneficent measures were taken for improving the social condition of the people. The English law supplanted the previous lawlessness; all inhabitants were declared to be free citizens, and the country was divided into parishes. In 1615 an Irish National Parliament was called to sanction these measures. In consequence of the interference of the government, there were among the 226 members of the lower house only 101 Catholics, while the upper house, consisting of 50 members, consisted almost entirely of Protestants. The Catholics were, moreover, excluded from the public offices. because most of them refused (hence their name "Recusants") to take the oath of supremacy, which designated the king of England as head of the Church. At the beginning of the reign of Charles I the Anglican Church was nevertheless in a deplorable condition. Many churches were destroyed, the bishoprics impoverished, the clergy ignorant, indolent, and impoverished. A convocation called in 1634 adopted the 39 articles of the Church of England, and retained the 104 articles of the Irish Church which had been adopted by the Parliament of 1615. The constitution of the Church of Ireland was defined in 100 canons, which were of a somewhat more liberal character than the 141 canons of the Church of England. The Roman Catholics were generally allowed to celebrate divine service in private houses, and many priests who had fled returned. At the same time the Irish nationality continued to be persecuted, and a number of new confiscations were added to the old ones. On Oct. 23, 1644, a bloody insurrection broke out under the leadership of Roger More, O'Neale, and lord Maguire, the descendants of former chieftains. Within a few days from 40,000 to 50,000 Protestant Englishmen were murdered (according to other accounts the number of killed amounted to only 6000), and an equally large number is said to have perished while trying to flee. The enraged Parliament ordered the confiscation of two and a half million acres of land, but, in consequence of its conflict with the king, was unable to achieve anything. The king's lieutenant, the marquis of Ormond, concluded peace with the Catholic Irish, who received the promise of religious toleration, and, in return, furnished to the king an army against the Parliament. When, after the execution of the king, Ormond tried to gain the support of the Catholic Irish for the prince of Wales as king Charles II, the English Parliament sent an army of 10,000 men under Cromwell to Ireland, which conquered the whole island. The Catholics were punished with the utmost severity: all their landed property, about 5,000,000 acres, confiscated; about 20,000 Irish sold as slaves to the West Indies, and 40,000 others compelled to flee to Spain and France. The celebration of Catholic service was forbidden, and all Catholic priests ordered to quit Ireland within twenty days. The restoration of royalty caused no important changes in the condition of the people. Religious persecution ceased by order of Charles II, but the Protestants remained in possession of the confiscated property. The accession of the Catholic James II filled the Irish Catholics with the greatest hopes, and when, after his expulsion, he landed, at the beginning of 1689, with a French army of 5000 men, he was received by the Catholics with enthusiasm. His army in a short time numbered more than 38,000 men, and he succeeded in capturing all the fortified places except Enniskillen and Londonderry. Large numbers of Protestants had to leave the country because their lives and property were no longer secure. Soon, however, the victories of William III over the Catholic party on the Boyne River, near Drogheda (July 1, 1690), and near Aughrim (July 13, 1691), completed the subjugation of Ireland. The peace concluded with the British general Ginkel at the surrender of Limerick promised to the Irish the free exercise of their religion as they had possessed it under Charles II. While James II had deprived 2400 Protestant landowners of their estates, now more than 12,000 Irishmen who had fought for James voluntarily went into exile. A resolution of the English Parliament ordered a new confiscation of 1,060,000 acres, which were distributed among the Protestants, who began to organize themselves into Orange societies. A number of rigorous and cruel penal laws were passed in order to extirpate the national spirit and the Roman Catholic Church. Bishops and other high dignitaries were exiled; the priests were confined to their own counties; all instruction in the Catholic religion and its public exercise were forbidden; the Catholic Irishmen were not allowed to own horses of higher value than £5, or to marry Protestants, and were excluded from all public offices. The irritation produced by these laws was still increased when the English Parliament, by imposing high duties on the exports from Ireland, dealt a heavy blow to the commerce and prosperity of the island, and when, in 1727, it deprived the Catholic Irish of the franchise. These harsh measures soon led to the establishment of several secret societies, as the "Defenders," the "Whiteboys" (about 1760), so called from the white shirts which they threw over their other clothes when at night they attacked unpopular landlords and their officers; and the "Hearts of Oak" (about 1763). During the American War of Independence, the Irish, under the pretext that the French might avail themselves of the withdrawal of most of the British troops to invade their island, formed a volunteer army, which, in the course of two years, increased to 50,000 men. Monster petitions, numerously signed by Irish Protestants also, demanded the abolition of the penal laws, the restoration of the Irish Parliament, reform of the rotten electoral law, and relief of Irish commerce. Fear of a general insurrection induced the Parliament to mitigate the penal laws, and to allow the Catholics to establish schools, to own landed property, and to exercise their religious worship. The onerous tithes which the Catholics had to pay to the Protestant clergy soon led to the establishment of another secret society, the "Right Boys," who, by means of oaths and threatened vengeance, endeavored to in-

timidate the Catholics from paying tithes. A still more dangerous movement was called forth by the outbreak of the French Revolution. The league of "United Irishmen," which, in November, 1791, was formed at Dublin by former members of the volunteer army, endeavored, in union with the French convent, to make Ireland an independent republic. When the Catholics, at a meeting in Dublin in 1792, demanded equal rights with Protestants, the British Parliament abolished several penal laws, and gave to the Catholics the right of becoming attorneys-at-law and of marrying Protestants. In 1793 the law was abolished which fined the Catholics for neglecting to attend the Protestant Church on Sunday; at the same time they were admitted to several lower public offices, and received the right to vote. The United Irishmen, nevertheless, assumed a threatening attitude, and a French corps of 25,000 men, under general Hoche, landed in Ireland. The latter had, however, to leave again in December, 1796, and a new insurrection, which broke out in May, 1798, was unsuccessful. In 1800 the Irish Parliament, bribed by the English Parliament, consented to the legislative union of Ireland with Great Britain, and in the next year the first united Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland assembled. The union of the two parliaments involved the union of the Anglican churches in the two countries, which now received the name of the United Church of England and Ireland. Several further concessions were, however, about this time made to the Catholics. In 1795 a Catholic theological seminary had been established at Maynooth, as the British government hoped that if the Catholic priests were educated upon British territory they would be less hostile to British rule. The rules against convents were also moderated, and at the close of the 18th century the Dominican order alone had in Ireland about forty-three convents. In 1805 the "Catholic Association" was formed to secure the complete political emancipation of the Catholics. It soon became the centre of all political movements in Ireland, and, as the Orange lodges began likewise to be revived, frequent disturbances between Catholics and Protestants took place. In 1825 both associations were dissolved by the British government; but the Catholic association was at once reorganized by O'Connell, and gained considerable influence upon the elections. The unceasing agitation of O'Connell, aided by the moral support of the Liberal party in England, finally succeeded in inducing the British ministry to lay before Parliament a bill of emancipation, which passed after violent debates, and was signed by George IV on April 13, 1829. The oath which the members of Parliament had to take was so changed that Catholics also could take it. At the same time they obtained access to all public offices, with the only exception of that of lord chancellor. This victory encouraged the Catholics to demand further concessions; in particular, the abolition of the tithes paid to the Protestant clergy, and the repeal of the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland. To that end O'Connell organized the "Repeal Association," to which the ministry of earl Grey opposed in 1833 the Irish Coercion Bill, which authorized the lord lieutenant of Ireland to forbid mass meetings and to proclaim martial law. When the liberal ministry of Melbourne rescinded the Coercion Bill and began to pursue a conciliatory policy towards Ireland, O'Connell dissolved the Repeal Association. Earl Mulgrave, since 1835 lord lieutenant of Ireland, filled the most important offices with Catholics, and in 1836 suppressed all the Orange lodges. In 1838 the British Parliament adopted the Tithe Bill. When, in August, 1841, the government fell again into the hands of the Tories, O'Connell renewed the repeal agitation so violently that in 1843 he was arrested and sentenced to one year's imprisonment, a sentence which was, however, annulled by the Court of Peers. The repeal agitation ended suddenly by the death of O'Connell in 1847, because no competent successor in the leadership of the party could be found. It was followed by the ascendency of the more radical Young Ireland party, which did not, like O'Connell, court an alliance with the Catholic Church, but preferred to it an outspoken sympathy with the radical Republicans of France, and is on that account not so much interwoven with the ecclesiastical history of Ireland as the movements of O'Connell.

The ultramontane doctrines taught in the seminary of Maynooth called forth an agitation in Protestant England for a repeal of the annual subsidy which that seminary received from the British government. New offence was given to the bishops and the ultramontane party by the establishment of three undenominational "Queen's Colleges." The bishops unanimously denounced the colleges as "godless," and warned all Catholic parents against them; they could, however, not prevent that ever from the beginning the majority of the students in these colleges were children of Catholic parents. The disregard of the episcopal orders showed a decline of priestly influence upon a considerable portion of the Catholic Irishmen. This decline of priestly influence became still more apparent when, during the civil war in the United States, the Fenian organization was formed for the express purpose of making Ireland an independent republic. As it was chiefly directed against English rule in Ireland, the new organization, like all its predecessors, had to direct its attacks prominently against the Established Church of Ireland, and thus appeared to have to some extent an anti-Protestant character; but, being a secret society, it was excommunicated by the pope, and denounced by all the Irish bishops. The general sympathy with which it nevertheless met among the Catholic Irishmen both of Ireland and the United States is therefore a clear proof that the Catholics of Ireland no longer obey the orders of their bishops as blindly as formerly.

The Established Church of Ireland, regarding itself as the legitimate successor of the medieval Catholic Church, and taking possession of all her dioceses, parishes, and Church property, retained for a long time the same diocesan and parochial divisions as the Roman Catholic Church. As late as 1833, the Church, notwithstanding its small membership, had 4 archbishoprics and 18 bishoprics: namely, Armagh, with 5 bishoprics; Dublin, with 4 bishoprics; Tuam, with 4 bishoprics; and Cashel, with 5 bishoprics. The income of these 22 archbishops and bishops was estimated at from £130,000 to £185,000. In 1833 the first decisive step was taken towards reducing the odious prerogatives of the Established Church. The number of archbishoprics was reduced to two, Armagh and Dublin, and the number of bishoprics to ten, five for each archbishopric. As the income was very unequally distributed, all the benefices yielding more than £200 had a tax of from ten to fifteen per cent. imposed upon them, the proceeds of which were employed for church building, raising the income of poor clergymen, and other ecclesiastical purposes. In 1868, the English House of Commons, on motion of Mr. Gladstone, resolved to disestablish the Church of Ireland. The proposition was rejected by the House of Lords. Public opinion expressed itself, however, so strongly against the continuance of the privileges of the Irish Church, that the report of the royal commissioners on the revenues and condition of the Church of Ireland (dated July 27, 1868) recommended important reductions as to the benefices of the Irish Church. This report, a volume of more than 600 pages, is replete with interesting information, and is one of the best sources of information concerning the condition of the Church at this time. It states that the total revenue of the Church from all sources was at this time £613,984; 1319 benefices had a Church population of over forty persons, and extending to 5000 and upwards. Four bishoprics were suggested for abolition, namely, Meath, Killaloe, Cashel, and Kilmore. The commissioners were in favor of leaving one archbishopric only, that of Armagh. All bishops were to receive £3000 a year in-

come, and an additional £500 when attending Parliament. The primate was to get £6000, and the archbishop of Dublin, if continued, £5000. The abolition of all cathedrals and deaneries except eight was recommended. With a view to rearrangement of benefices, it was proposed that ecclesiastical commissioners should have extended powers to suppress or unite benefices. All benefices not having a Protestant population of forty were to be suppressed. The estates of all capitular bodies and of the bishoprics abolished were to be vested in ecclesiastical commissioners, and the surplus of all property vested in them to be applicable at their discretion to augmentation of benefices. The ecclesiastical commission was to be modified by the introduction of three unpaid laymen and two paid commissioners, one appointed by the crown, the other by the primate. The management of all lands was to be taken out of the hands of ecclesiastical persons and placed in those of the ecclesiastical commissioners. Mr. Gladstone having become, towards the close of the year 1868, prime minister, introduced in March, 1869, a new bill for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. It passed a second reading in the House of Commons, after a long and excited debate, by a vote of 368 to 250, showing a majority in favor of the passage of 118; and in the House of Lords by a majority of 33 in a house of 300 members. The amendments adopted by the House of Lords were nearly all rejected by the Commons, and on July 26 it received the royal assent. The bill, which contains sixty clauses, is entitled "A bill to put an end to the establishment of the Church of Ireland, and to make provision in respect to the temporalities thereof, and in respect to the royal College of Maynooth." The disestablishment was to be total, but was not to take place until Jan. 1, 1870, when the ecclesiastical courts were to be abolished, the ecclesiastical laws to cease to have any authority, the bishops to be no longer peers of Parliament, and all ecclesiastical corporations in the country to be dissolved. The disendowment was technically and legally to be total and immediate. Provision was made for winding up the ecclesiastical commission, and the constitution of a new commission, composed of ten members, in which the whole property of the Irish Church was to be vested from the day the measure received the royal assent. A distinction was made between public endowments (valued at £15,500,000), including everything in the nature of a state grant or revenue, which were to be resumed by the state, and private endowments (valued at £500,000), which were defined as money contributed from private sources since 1660, which were to be restored to the disestablished Church. Provision was made for compensation to vested interests, including those connected with Maynooth College and the Presbyterians who were in receipt of the *regium donum*. Among these interests, the largest in the aggregate were those of incumbents, to each of whom was secured during his life, provided he continued to discharge the duties of his benefice, the amount to which he was entitled, deducting the amount he might have paid for curates, or the interest might, under certain circumstances, be commuted, upon his application for a life annuity. Other personal interests provided for were those of curates, permanent and temporary, and lay compensations, including claims of parish clerks and sextons. The amount of the Maynooth grant and the *regium donum* was to be valued at fourteen years' purchase, and a capital sum equal to it handed over to the respective representatives of the Presbyterians and of the Roman Catholics. The aggregate of the payments would amount to about £8,000,000, leaving about £7,500,000, placing an annual income of about £30,000,000 at the disposal of Parliament. This was to be appropriated "mainly to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, but in such a way as not to interfere with the obligation imposed upon property by the poor laws." A constitution for the disestablished Church was adopted by a General Convention, held in Dublin in 1870. The Church will be governed by a General Synod, consisting of a House of Bishops and a House of Clerical and Lay Delegates. The House of Bishops has the right of veto, and their veto prevails also at the next synod; but seven bishops must agree upon a veto to make it valid. The bishops will be elected by the Diocesan Convention, but the House of Bishops will in all cases be the court of selection when the Diocesan Synod does not elect by a majority of two thirds of each order a clergyman to fill the vacant see. The primate (archbishop of Armagh) shall be elected by the Bench of Bishops out of their own number. The property of the Church is to be vested in a "Representative Church Body," which is to be permanent. It is to be composed of three classes: the *ex-officio*, or archbishops and bishops; the elected members, who are to consist of one clerical and two lay representatives for each diocese; and the coöpted members, who are to consist of persons equal in number to such dioceses, and to be elected by the *ex-officio* and representative members. The elected members are to retire in the proportion of one third by rotation. The Convention also adopted a resolution against the introduction of the ritualistic practices which have crept into the Established Church of England.

The following table shows the population connected with the Anglican Church, according to the official census of 1881, in each of the counties, together with the number of Roman Catholics, and the population of other religious denominations in each:

Counties.	Total.	Roman Catholics.	Protestant Episcopalians	Presbyterians.	Methodists.	All other Denominations.
Leinster............	1,279,190	1,095,459	157,622	12,633	6,712	6,764
Munster............	1,513,558	1,244,876	68,352	3,794	4,421	2,467
Ulster..............	1,739,542	831,784	377,936	466,107	34,494	29,221
Connaught.........	817,197	779,769	31,760	2,969	2,042	657
Grand Total....	5,159,839	3,951,888	635,670	485,503	47,669	39,109

The Roman Catholic Church in Ireland is governed by four archbishops, whose sees are in Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, and twenty-four bishops; they are all nominated by the pope, generally out of a list of three names submitted to him by the parish priests and chapter of the vacant diocese, and reported on by the archbishops and bishops of the province. In case of expected incapacity from age or infirmity, the bishop names a coadjutor, who is usually confirmed by the pope, with the right of succession. In many of the dioceses

a chapter and cathedral corps have been revived, the dean being appointed by the cardinal protector at Rome. The diocesan dignitaries are the vicars-general, of whom there are one, two, or three, according to the extent of the diocese, who have special disciplinary and other powers; vicars-forane, whose functions are more restricted; the archdeacon, and the parish priests or incumbents. All of these, as well as the curates, are appointed by the bishop. The whole of the clergy are supported solely by the voluntary contributions of their flocks. The episcopal emoluments arise from the mensal parish or two, the incumbency of which is retained by the bishop, from marriage licenses, and from the *cathedraticum*, an annual sum, varying from £2 to £10, paid by each incumbent in the diocese. The 2425 civil parishes in Ireland are amalgamated into 1073 ecclesiastical parishes or unions, being 445 livings less than in the Anglican Church. The incomes of the parish priests arise from fees on marriages, baptisms, and deaths, on Easter and Christmas dues, and from incidental voluntary contributions either in money or labor. The number of priests in Ireland in 1853 was 2291 (of whom 1222 were educated at Maynooth College); in 1889 it was 3353. The curates of the parish priests form more than a half of the whole clerical strength; and scattered through the cities and towns are 70 or 80 communities of priests of various religious orders or rules, hence called *Regulars*, who minister in their own churches, and, though without parochial jurisdiction, greatly aid the secular clergy. All the places of public worship are built by subscriptions, legacies, and collections. There are numerous monasteries and convents; the latter are supported partly by sums, usually from £300 to £500, paid by those who take the vows in them, and partly by the fees for the education of the daughters of respectable Roman Catholics. Various communities of monks and nuns also devote themselves to the gratuitous education of the children of the poor. Candidates for the priesthood, formerly under the necessity of obtaining their education in continental colleges, are now educated at home. The principal clerical college is that of Maynooth, which was founded in 1795 as Royal College of St. Patrick at Maynooth. The Irish Parliament made to it an annual grant of £14,000; the English Parliament sanctioned the grant, but reduced it to £8927, out of which the professors and 480 students were supported. The Irish lord Dunboyne founded 20 more scholarships. In 1845, the government, under the administration of Sir Robert Peel, raised the annual grant to £26,000; more recently this sum was again raised to £38,000. In 1869, when the Anglican Church was disestablished, a capital sum equal to the amount of the Maynooth grant, valued at fourteen years' purchase, was handed over to the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic University at Dublin was established at a synodal meeting of the Catholic bishops held on May 18, 1854. At a conference held in 1863 the bishops resolved to enlarge the university, and to erect a new building at the cost of £100,000. There are, besides, the Catholic colleges of St. Patrick, Carlow; St. Jarlath, Tuam; St. John's, Waterford; St. Peter's, Wexford; St. Colman's, Fermoy; St. Patrick's, Armagh; St. Patrick's, Thurles; St. Kyran's, Kilkenny; St. Mel, Longford; All Hallows (devoted exclusively to prepare priests for foreign missions), and Clonliffe, Dublin, all supported by voluntary contributions.

There are also for the education of Irish priests two colleges in Rome, the Irish College and the College of St. Isidor, and one in Paris. The number of religious communities of men has decreased during the last hundred years. The Dominicans, at the time of Benedict XIV, had 29 houses, in 1890 only 13 houses, with about 50 monks; the Augustines had formerly 28, now 11 convents; the Carmelites have 19 houses, formerly 167; the Jesuits 5 colleges, 1 home, and 70 members; the Lazarists, Passionists, and Redemptorists 2 houses each; the brothers of the Christian Schools have a large number of institutions.

The following is a statistical summary of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland in 1889:

Dioceses.	Archbishops and Bishops.	Parishes.	Parish Priests.	Administrators, Curates, and others.	Regular Clergy.	Total Priests.	Churches and Chapels.	Houses of Religious Orders, or Communities of		
								Priests.	Men.	Women.
Armagh	1	55	50	90	36	176	155	7	3	8
Meath	1	67	65	91	15	171	144	3	4	12
Derry	1	37	32	65	..	97	74	..	3	5
Clogher	1	40	37	73	..	110	87	..	2	4
Raphoe	1	28	22	35	..	59	44	..	..	2
Down and Connor	1	52	52	82	4	138	103	1	2	8
Kilmore	1	41	40	67	..	108	90	..	1	5
Ardagh	1	41	38	58	3	99	72	1	..	10
Dromore	1	18	17	27	4	48	41	1	1	4
Armagh Province	9	379	353	588	62	1006	800	13	16	58
Dublin	2	58	52	143	36	231	155	21	18	55
Kildare and Leighlin	2	48	46	82	18	146	126	3	5	14
Ossory	1	41	37	82	11	130	96	4	2	12
Ferns	1	41	41	79	18	138	92	4	4	14
Dublin Province	6	118	176	386	83	645	469	32	29	95
Cashel and Emly	1	46	43	59	10	149	84	3	4	11
Cork	1	34	32	82	32	131	70	7	2	16
Killaloe	2	56	54	76	13	143	142	2	3	5
Kerry	1	49	49	57	11	117	98	2	5	22
Limerick	1	49	47	70	34	151	94	5	6	13
Waterf'd and Lismore	2	40	37	83	38	158	76	6	7	18
Cloyne	1	47	45	92	.	137	108	5	7	15
Ross	1	11	9	16	..	25	22	..	..	2
Cashel Province	10	332	316	535	138	981	689	30	34	102
Tuam	1	53	49	51	1	101	115	1	14	8
Clonfert	1	24	20	21	14	55	50	3	..	4
Achonry	1	22	26	38	..	66	38	..	..	3
Elphin	1	33	34	64	4	102	64	1	2	7
Galway, Kilmacduagh, and Kilfenora	1	29	26	21	16	63	53	4	3	10
Killala	1	22	18	18	..	36	39	..	..	1
Tuam Province	6	190	167	213	35	423	379	9	19	33
Ireland	31	1089	1012	1716	318	3353	2336	84	98	288

The first *Presbytery* in Ireland was formed at Carrickfergus in 1642, and gave rise to the *Synod of Ulster*. The *Presbyterian Synod of Munster* was formed about 1660. The *Presbytery of Antrim* separated from the Synod of Ulster in 1727, and the *Remonstrant Synod* in 1829. A number of seceders formed themselves into the *Secession Synod of Ireland* about 1780. In 1840, the General and Secession Synods, having united, assumed the name of the *General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, comprising, in 1888, 600 congregations, arranged under 37 presbyteries. The ministers were supported by voluntary contributions, the rents of seats and pews, and the interest of the *regium donum*, or royal gift. This was first granted in 1672 by Charles II, and in 1869 26 (first class) ministers received from the state £92 6*s.* 2*d.* each, and 551 (second class) £69 4*s.* 8*d.* each per annum. As the ministers in the first class died, their successors only received the latter amount. The *regium donum*, as annual grant, was abolished by the Irish Church Bill, but a capital sum equal to the amount of the *donum*, valued at fourteen years' purchase, was handed over to the representatives of the Presbyterian body. The total sum for *regium donum* voted by Parliament for the year ending March 31, 1869, was £40,547. The minutes of the General Assembly for 1869 state that in the year ending March 31 there were 628 ministers (besides 51 licentiates and ordained ministers without charge), 560 congregations, and 262 manses. The seat rents produced £38,011; the stipends paid to ministers, £37,853; raised for building or repairing churches, manses, and schools, £17,830; Sabbath collections, £13,575; mission collections, £12,124; other charitable collections, £6,835. The Congregational Debt was £37,167.

The Presbyterians have the General Assembly's College at Belfast, and Magee College at Londonderry. The latter was opened Oct. 10, 1865. In the year 1846, Mrs. Magee, widow of the late Rev. William Magee, Presbyterian minister of Lurgan, left £20,000 in trust for the erection and endowment of a Presbyterian college. This sum was allowed to accumulate for some

years, until eventually the trustees were authorized, by a decree of the lord chancellor, to select a convenient site at or near the city of Londonderry. The citizens of Derry subscribed upwards of £5000 towards the erection of the building, which cost about £10,000. The Irish Society have granted an annual endowment of £250 to the chair of natural philosophy and mathematics, and £250 for five years towards the general expenses of the college.

Remonstrant Synod of Ulster.—This synod was formed in May, 1830, in consequence of the separation of seventeen ministers, with their congregations, from the General Synod of Ulster, on the ground that, contrary to its usages and code of discipline, it required from its members in 1827 and 1828 submission to certain doctrinal tests and overtures of human invention. There are 4 presbyteries and 27 congregations in this synod.

The Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, consisting of 4 presbyteries and 25 congregations, is unconnected with the *General Assembly*. It did not participate in the *regium donum*.

United Presbytery or Synod of Munster.—This body was formed in 1809 by the junction of the Southern Presbytery of Dublin with the Presbytery of Munster, and is one of the three non-subscribing Presbyterian bodies of Ireland, the other two being the *Presbytery of Antrim* (now consisting of 11 congregations) and the *Remonstrant Synod of Ulster.* A few years ago these three bodies united to form the "General Non-subscribing Presbyterian Association of Ireland," for the promotion of their common principles, the right of private judgment, and non-subscription to creeds and confessions of faith. The General Association meets triennially for these objects, while the three bodies of which it is composed retain their respective names and independent existence, being governed by their own rules and regulations.

The *Irish Conference* of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of Great Britain numbered in 1869 19,659 *members*, 627 members on trial, and 174 ministers. The president of the British Conference is also president of the Irish Conference. The Primitive Methodist Society (also called Church Methodists) numbered in 1869 8763 members in Ireland. They regard themselves as belonging to the Anglican Church. According to the census of 1881, the total Methodist *population* of Ireland amounted to 47,669. There were also, according to the same census, 4532 Independents, 4327 Baptists, 3695 Friends, 18,798 belonging to other sects, and 453 Jews.

The commissioners of public instruction and the census commissioners return the numbers in the principal religious denominations, and their percentage of the general population have been as follows:

Profession.	1861.		1881.		Decrease between 1861 and 1881.	Increase between 1861 and 1881.
	Number.	Per Ct.	Number.	Per Ct.	Number.	Number.
Irish Church..	693,357	11.9	635,670	12.3	57.687	....
Roman Catholics ..	4,505,265	77.7	3,951,888	76.6	553.379	....
Presbyterians .	523,291	9.0	485,503	9.4	37.788	....
Methodists....	45,399	0.8	47,669	0.9	....	2270
Other Denominations	31,655	0.6	38,656	0.8	....	7001
Jews..........	393	..	453	..	....	60
Total......	5,798,967	100.0	5,159,839	100.0	648.852	9331

The census commissioners of 1861, in their report on religion and education (p. 5), remark that "the Wesleyan Methodists, by a peculiarity of their constitution, although frequenting places of worship distinct from those of the Established Church, very generally declined to be reckoned as dissenters, and were therefore included (by the commissioners of public instruction of 1834) among the members of the Established Church."

Between the years 1834 and 1861 the Roman Catholic population showed a decline of 1,930,975 persons—the difference between 6,436,060 in 1834 and 4,505,265 in 1861—or nearly a third of what was their entire number in 1834; and, distributing this loss over the original dioceses (as given in the list of Anglican dioceses), as in the case of the Established Church, we find that it has to be divided among thirty out of the thirty-two, the only exceptions being the dioceses of Dublin and Connor, in both of which the number of Roman Catholics is something in excess of what it was in 1834. The total Roman Catholic population of the thirty dioceses in which it is found to have declined was 5,949,509 in 1834, and 4,005,104 in 1861, showing a loss of 1,944,405, or nearly a third of the former population. In 1834 the number of Presbyterians in Ireland was returned as 643,058, and in 1861 it had fallen to 523,291, exhibiting a reduction of 119,767, or rather less than a fifth of their number in 1834. This reduction distributes itself over ten of the thirty-two (original Anglican) dioceses—those, namely, of Achonry, Armagh, Clogher, Connor, Derry, Down, Dromore, Kilfenora, Kilmore, and Raphoe, the total Presbyterian population of which amounted in 1834 to 637,784, and in 1861 to 505,196, showing a reduction of 132,588, or 20.8 per cent. of the original numbers. In twenty-two dioceses the Presbyterians have very considerably increased, their gross population having been only 5274 in 1834, and 18,095 in 1861, showing an increase of 243.1 per cent. The proportion per cent. of the members of the Established Church to the general population had risen since 1834 in twenty-one out of the thirty-two dioceses, had remained stationary in two, and fallen in nine.

In 1831 the grants of public money for the education of the poor were intrusted to the charge of the lord lieutenant, to be expended on the instruction of the children of every religious denomination, under the superintendence of commissioners appointed by the crown, and named "The Commissioners of National Education." The principles on which the commissioners act are, that the schools shall be open alike to Christians of every denomination; that no pupil shall be required to attend at any religious exercise, or to receive any religious instruction which his parents or guardians do not approve, and that sufficient opportunity shall be afforded to the pupils of each religious persuasion to receive separately, at appointed times, such religious instruction as their parents or guardians think proper. In 1845 the commissioners were incorporated under the name of "The Commissioners of National Education in Ireland," with power to hold lands to the yearly value of £40,000, to purchase goods and chattels, to receive gifts and bequests to that amount, to erect and maintain schools where and as many as they shall think proper, to grant leases for three lives or thirty-one years, to sue and to be sued by their corporate name in all courts, and to have a common seal, a power being vested in the lord lieutenant to fill up vacancies, to appoint additional members, provided the total number does not exceed twenty, and to remove members at his pleasure.

The following return gives the number of schools and pupils at different periods, and the amount of parliamentary grants annually voted for their maintenance:

Year.	Schools.	Pupils.	Parliam. Grants.	Year.	Schools.	Pupils.	Parliam. Grants.
1840	1978	232,560	£50,000	1860	5632	804,000	£270,722
1845	3426	432,844	75,000	1865	6372	922,084	325,583
1850	4321	480,623	120,000	1868	6586	967,563	360,195
1855	5124	535,905	215,200	1880	7590	1,083,020	727,366

The religious denomination of the children who, on Dec. 31, 1888, were on the rolls of the national schools, was as follows:

	Irish Church.	Roman Catholic.	Presbyterians.	Other Denom.	Total.
Ulster	76,684	185,462	113,028	8,647	383,821
Munster	7,481	279,774	595	583	288,433
Leinster.......	12,576	204,786	1,397	553	219,312
Connaught....	5,477	185,035	609	333	191,454
Ireland	102,218	855,057	115,629	10,116	1,083,020
Per Cent...	9.4	79.0	10.7	0.9	....

See Herzog, *Allgem. Real-Encyklop.* vii, 63; Wiggers, *Kirchliche Geogr. u. Statistik*; Neher, *Kirchl. Geogr. u. Statistik*, ii, 1 sq.; Thom, *Irish Almanac*; Porter, *Comp. Annal. eccl. Hib.* (Rom. 1690); Waræus, *Hibernia Sacra.* (Dubl. 1717); Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. of Ireland* (Dubl. 1829).

Ireland, COUNCIL OF (*Concilium Hibernicum*), a title of four different councils. The first of these was held about 456. By this council were published thirty-four canons under St. Patrick's name, and two other bishops, Auxilius and Jeserinus (or Iserinus). From the 6th of these canons it is evident that the priests, deacons, and other clergy (to whom they are addressed) were married (comp. Wilkins, *Conc.* i, 2). Another council was held about the same time, or shortly after, also said to have been presided over by St. Patrick; but for this assertion no evidence exists, and there is not only no possibility of determining the presiding officer, but even the place and date where and when it convened are very doubtful, except that the mention of a *heathen* population in Canon 2 makes it certain that it cannot have been much later than the council above alluded to. By this council, which, for convenience sake, we may call the 2d, 32 canons were published, the 7th of which forbids "to rebaptize any who have received the outward form, by whomsoever administered, since the iniquity of the sower infects not the seed itself." A third council was held in 684, according to Mansi, who adds that the canons of this and other councils held about this time form together the code known as the "Irish Code" (part of it is given in the *Spicilegium* of D'Achery, i, 491). Another council was held about 1097, but its enactments are of but little importance. See Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 267 sq.; Labbe, x, 613; Wilkins, *Concil.* i, 4, 374. (J. H. W.)

Ireland, JOHN, D.D., an eminent English divine, was born at Ashburton, Devonshire, in 1761. He matriculated at Oxford as Bible clerk of Oriel College in 1780, and afterwards became successively vicar of Croydon, Surrey, in 1793, prebendary of Westminster in 1802, dean of Westminster and rector of Islip in 1816. He died in 1842. He was one of the earlier writers for the *Quarterly Review*, and founded four scholarships, an exhibition, and a professorship at Oxford. His principal works are, *Five Discourses*, with notes (Lond. 1796, 8vo):—*Vindiciæ regiæ*; or, a defence of the kingly office (Lond. 2d ed. 1797, 8vo):—*Nuptiæ sacræ*; or, an inquiry into the scriptural doctrine of marriage and divorce (Lond. 1821, 8vo):—*Paganism and Christianity compared* (Lond. 1809, 8vo):—*The Plague of Marseilles in the year* 1720 (Lond. 1834, 4to).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bib.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 933.

Irenæus (Εἰρηναῖος), one of the most distinguished of the early Church fathers, standing, with his disciple Hippolytus, "both of Greek education, but both belonging, in their ecclesiastical relations and labors, to the West," at the head of the old Catholic controversialists, and called by Theodoret "the Light of the Western Church," was bishop of Lyons, in France, during the latter half of the 2d century.

I. *Life*.—Of the personal history of Irenæus, especially in his youth, but little is known. The dates of his birth are very variably given by different critics. Thus Dodwell places it about A.D. 97, Grabe about 108, Tillemont about 120, Du Pin about 140. Most of the latest students of the Church fathers incline to put it between the years 120 and 140. The place of his birth, also, is not definitely known. It is probable, however, from his very early acquaintance with Polycarp, the illustrious bishop of Smyrna, of which he himself tells us (iii, 3, 4; comp. Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.* p. 191, Bohn's edition), that he was born somewhere in Asia Minor; and some have assigned the city of Smyrna as his native place. Harvey, one of the editors of his works, however, thinks that Irenæus was born in Syria, and that he came to Smyrna while yet very young; was there attracted by the teaching of bishop Polycarp, and became at once one of his most ardent disciples. "Through this link he still was connected with the Johannean age. The spirit of his preceptor passed over to him." Addressing a former friend of his own, Florinus, who had lapsed to Valentinianism, whom he earnestly endeavored to bring back to the Church, he bears witness to this connection in the following words: "These opinions, Florinus, that I may speak in mild terms, are not part of sound doctrine; these opinions are not consonant with the Church, and involve their votaries in the utmost impiety; these opinions even the heretics beyond the Church's pale have never ventured to broach; these opinions those presbyters who preceded us, and who were conversant with the apostles, did not hand down to thee. For, while I was yet a boy, I saw thee in Lower Asia with Polycarp, distinguishing thyself in the royal court, and endeavoring to gain his approbation. For I have a more vivid recollection of what occurred at that time than of recent events (inasmuch as the experiences of childhood, keeping pace with the growth of the soul, become incorporated with it), so that I can even describe the place where the blessed Polycarp used to sit and discourse—his going out and his coming in—his general mode of life and personal appearance, together with the discourses which he delivered to the people; also how he would speak of his familiar intercourse with John, and with the rest of those who had seen the Lord; and how he would call their words to remembrance. . . . What I heard from him, that wrote I not on paper, but in my heart, and, by the grace of God, I constantly bring it fresh to my mind." It is not known at what time Irenæus removed to Gaul, but it is supposed by some that he accompanied Photinus (whom he afterwards succeeded as bishop) on his mission to Gaul to establish churches at Lyons and Vienne. So much is certain, that he was a presbyter at Lyons under Marcus Aurelius, according to Eusebius (*ut sup.* p. 171; compare p. 157), and was sent by his people to Eleutherus, bishop of Rome (A.D. 176-192), as a mediator in the Montanistic disputes. While yet on this mission Photinus suffered martyrdom, and Irenæus was elected as his successor (about A.D. 177). He at once returned and zealously devoted himself, by tongue and pen, for the upbuilding of the Christian Church, so greatly suffering at this time in Further Gaul from the persecutions of the heathen government. He is supposed by some to have suffered martyrdom in the persecutions under Septimius Severus, A.D. 202; but the silence of Tertullian and Eusebius, and most of the early Church fathers, makes this point very doubtful. "Irenæus was the leading representative of the Asiatic Johannean school in the second half of the 2d century, the champion of catholic orthodoxy against Gnostic heresy, and the mediator between the Eastern and Western churches. He united a learned Greek education and philosophical penetration with practical wisdom and moderation, and a just sense of the simple essentials in Christianity. We plainly trace in him the influence of the spirit of John. 'The true way to God,' says he, in opposition to the false Gnosis, 'is love. It is better to be willing to know nothing but Jesus Christ the crucified, than to fall into ungodliness through our curious questions and paltry subtleties.' He was an enemy of all error and schism, and, on the whole, the most orthodox of the ante-Nicene fathers, except in eschatology. Here, with Papias and most of his contemporaries, he maintained the millenarian views which were subsequently abandoned by the Catholic Church" (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i, 488, 489). Irenæus's death is commemorated in the Roman Church, June 28.

II. *Writings of Irenæus*.—His writings, which are very extended, covering, in their translation into English, so far as now known, between six and seven hundred pages of the "Ante-Nicene Library" of the Messrs. Clark, of Edinburgh, are perhaps the most valuable relic of early Christian antiquity. But "their preciousness bears no proportion to their bulk." "Indeed," says a writer in the *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* (Jan. 1869, p. 2), "it would be possible to compress into a very few pages all the statements of fact that can be deemed really valuable to us at the present day." Yet the same writer adds (p. 4) that the work of Irenæus is to us "invaluable for the light it sheds on the views which pre-

vailed in the primitive Church respecting many most important points." Especially valuable, and the most important of all the writings of Irenæus, is his work Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, generally published under the Latin title *De Refutatione et Eversione Falsæ Scientiæ* ("A Refutation and Subversion of Knowledge falsely so called"), and more commonly even under the shorter title of *Adversus Hæreses* ("Against Heresies"). This work, which was mainly directed against the Gnostic error of that day, was composed during the pontificate of Eleutherus, and "is at once the polemic theological master-piece of the ante-Nicene age, and the richest mine of information respecting the Gnostics, particularly the Valentinian heresy, and the Church doctrine of that age" (Schaff). The work is divided into five books. The first of these contains a minute description of the tenets of the various heretical sects, with occasional brief remarks in illustration of their absurdity, and in confirmation of the truth to which they were opposed. In his second book, Irenæus proceeds to a more complete demolition of those heresies which he has already explained, and argues at great length against them, on grounds principally of reason. The three remaining books set forth more directly the true doctrines of revelation, as being in utter antagonism with the views held by the Gnostic teachers. "In the course of this argument many passages of Scripture are quoted and commented on; many interesting statements are made, bearing on the rule of faith; and much important light is shed on the doctrines held, as well as the practices observed by the Church of the 2d century." As an introduction to the study which he describes, and with which he manifestly had taken great pains to make himself familiar, and as an exposé and refutation of them, for which the great learning of the writer, acknowledged by nearly all his critics, fortunately coupled with a firm grasp of the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, especially fitted him, this work is truly invaluable. And though it must be admitted that on some points Irenæus has put forth very strange opinions, it cannot be denied that, upon the whole, his *Adversus Hæreses* "contains a vast amount of sound and valuable exposition of Scripture in opposition to the fanciful systems of interpretation which prevailed in his day." The *Adversus Hæreses* was written in Greek, but it is unfortunately now no longer extant in the original. The English translator of it for Clark's (Edinburgh) edition says that "it has come down to us only in an ancient Latin version, with the exception of the greater part of the first book, which has been preserved in the original Greek, through means of copious quotations made by Hippolytus and Epiphanius." The text, both of the Latin and of the Greek, as far as extant, is often most uncertain, and this has made it a difficult task for translation into English. In all only three MSS. of it are known to exist at present; but there is reason to believe that Erasmus, who printed the first edition of it (1526), had others at hand in his preparation of the work for the press. The Latin version, spoken of above as the only complete version of it, was, according to Dodwell (*Dissertt. Iren.* v, 9, 10), prepared in the 4th century; but it is known that Tertullian, in his day, used the same version, and it is highly probable, therefore, that it was made even as early as the beginning of the 3d century. It is certainly to be deplored that the other codices which Erasmus must have used have not come down to us, or that they are, at least, not known to us, for they might, perhaps, enable us to determine more definitely his meaning in many passages now quite obscure to us in their barbaric Latin. From 1526, when Erasmus printed his first edition, to 1571, several editions were produced. But all these had depended on the ancient barbarous Latin versions, and were moreover defective towards the end by five entire chapters. These latter were first supplied in print by Prof. Fuardentius, of Paris, in an edition of 1575, which was reprinted in six successive editions. Gallasius, a minister of Geneva, also had in 1570 supplied the Latin with the first portions of the Greek text from Epiphanius. In 1702, Grabe, a Prussian, resident in England, published an edition at Oxford, which contained considerable additions to the Greek text, besides some fragments. But the first really valuable edition was that by the Benedictine Massuet (Paris, 1712; Venice, 1724, 2 vols. fol.), since (1857) added to the Migne edition of the fathers, of which, very unfortunately, all the stereotype plates have lately been destroyed by fire. Another edition, containing the additions which have been made to the Greek text from the recently discovered *Philosophoumena* of Hippolytus, and thirty-two fragments of a Syriac version of the Greek text of Irenæus, culled from the Nitrian collection of Syriac MSS. in the British Museum, all of which in several instances rectify the readings of the barbarous Latin version, was prepared by Wigan Harvey, at Cambridge, in 1837, under the title *S. Irenæi Episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinque adversus Hæreses*, and may be considered the best now extant. It is also enriched with an introduction of great length, which supplies much valuable information on the sources and phenomena of Gnosticism, and the life and writings of Irenæus. It furthermore contains notes, which display great research and erudition, and are especially deserving of notice on account of the hypothesis which the writer seeks to establish, that Irenæus understood Syriac, and that the version of the Scriptures used by him was in the Syriac. An attempt has also been made by H. W. J. Thiersch (in the *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1845) to translate the Latin version of the first four chapters of the third book back into the original, in order to lead to a better understanding of Irenæus's meaning. Objections to the genuineness of this work of Irenæus were of course made by the so-called "liberal" German theologians, as it is one of the "historic links associating the Christianity of the present day with that of our Lord's apostles and disciples," and a work on which "we depend for satisfactory evidence respecting the canon of the New Testament" (see below, under "Doctrines of Irenæus," Froude's attack against Irenæus as a witness for the Gospels). They were made first by Semler, but were "so thoroughly refuted," says Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* i, 489, foot-note), "by Chr. G. F. Walch (*De Authentia librorum Irenæi*, 1774), that Möhler and Stieren might have spared themselves the trouble."

Besides *Adversus Hæreses*, Irenæus also wrote, according to Eusebius, "several letters against those who at Rome corrupted the doctrine of the Church: one to Blastus, concerning schism; another to Florinus (already alluded to), concerning the monarchy, or to prove that God is not the author of evil; and concerning the number eight;" but these are all lost to us with the exception of a few fragments. Eusebius also mentions "a discourse of Irenæus against the Gentiles, entitled περὶ ἐπιστήμης (*Concerning Knowledge*); another inscribed to a brother named Marcianus, being a demonstration of the apostolical preaching; and a little book of sundry disputations;" but these, also, are mainly lost to us. Pfaff, in 1715, discovered at Turin four more Greek fragments, which he attributed to Irenæus as their author. The genuineness of these has been called in question by some Roman divines, "though," says Dr. Schaff, "without sufficient reason." These four fragments treat (1) *of true knowledge* (Γνῶσις ἀληθινή), "which consists, not in the true solution of subtle questions, but in divine wisdom and the imitation of Christ;" (2) *on the Eucharist;* (3) on the *duty of toleration in subordinate points of difference* with reference to the Easter difficulties; (4) on the *object of the incarnation*, "which is stated to be the purging away of sin, and the final annihilation of all evil." An edition containing the Prolegomena to the earlier editions, and also the disputations of Maffei and Pfaff on the fragments of Irenæus just mentioned, was published by H. Stieren under the title *S. Irenæi Episcopi Lugdun. quæ supersunt omnia* (Lips. 1853, 2 vols.).

III. *Doctrines.*—We have already said that the writings of Irenæus are invaluable to us as an index of the views which the primitive Church of Christ held on many very important points that have become matters of controversy between the different branches of the Christian Church up to our own day. In this, of course, we shall be mainly dependent upon his extensive work against Heretics, or the Gnostics; and though some of his views, especially on the millennium, may not have our approval, we must none the less commend the whole work for the fervent piety which constantly impresses us in the perusal of it.

1. *God and Creation.*—The doctrine of the unity of God as the eternal, almighty, omnipresent, just, and holy creator and upholder of all things, which the Christian Church inherited from Judaism, was one which the early Christian writers were especially called upon to vindicate against the absurd polytheism of the pagans, and particularly against the dualism of the Gnostics. Accordingly we find most of the creeds of the first centuries, especially the Apostles' and the Nicene, begin with the confession of faith in God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of the visible and the invisible. In like manner, "with the defense of this fundamental doctrine laid down in the very first chapters of the Bible, Irenæus opens his refutation of the Gnostic heresies, saying, in the language of Justin Martyr, that he would not have believed the Lord himself if he had announced any other God than the Creator. He repudiates everything like an *à priori* construction of the idea of God, and bases his knowledge wholly on revelation and Christian experience." So also on the doctrine of creation, Irenæus, and with him Tertullian, "most firmly rejected the hylozoic and demiurgic views of paganism and Gnosticism, and taught, according to the book of Genesis (comp. Psa. xxxiii, 9; cxlviii, 5; John i, 3), that God made the world, including matter, not, of course, out of any material, but out of nothing, or, to express it positively, out of his free, almighty will by his word. This free will of God, a will of *love*, is the supreme, absolutely unconditioned, and all-conditioning cause and final reason of all existence, precluding every idea of physical force or of emanation. Every creature, since it proceeds from the good and holy God, is in itself, as to its essence, good (comp. Gen. i, 31). Evil, therefore, is not an original and substantial entity, but a corruption of nature, and hence can be destroyed by the power of redemption. Without a correct doctrine of creation there can be no true doctrine of redemption, as all the Gnostic systems show."

2. *Person of Christ.*—On the relation which Christ sustained to the Father also, the views of Irenæus are important, because he is, after Polycarp, "the most faithful representative of the Johannean school." He certainly "keeps more within the limits of the simple Biblical statements," and in the simpler way of the Western fathers, among whom he may be counted, notwithstanding his early Greek training. "He ventures no such bold speculations as the Alexandrians, but is more sound, and much nearer the Nicene standard. He likewise uses the terms λόγος and Son of God interchangeably, and concedes the distinction, made also by the Valentinians, between the inward and the uttered word, in reference to man, but contests the application of it to God, who is above all antitheses, absolutely simple and unchangeable, and in whom before and after, thinking and speaking, coincide. He repudiates also every speculative or *à priori* attempt to explain the derivation of the Son from the Father; this he holds to be an incomprehensible mystery. He is content to define the actual distinction between Father and Son by saying that the former is God revealing himself; the latter, God revealed; the one is the ground of revelation, the other is the actual, appearing revelation itself. Hence he calls the Father the invisible of the Son, and the Son the visible of the Father. He discriminates most rigidly the conceptions of generation and of creation. The Son, though begotten of the Father, is still, like him, distinguished from the created world, as increate, without beginning, and eternal—all plainly showing that Irenæus is much nearer the Nicene dogma of the substantial identity of the Son with the Father than Justin and the Alexandrians. If, as he does in several passages, he still subordinates the Son to the Father, he is certainly inconsistent, and that for want of an accurate distinction between the eternal Logos and the actual Christ. The λόγος ἄσαρκος and the λόγος ἔνσαρκος, expressions like 'My Father is greater than I,' which apply only to the Christ of history, he refers also, like Justin and Origen, to the eternal Word. On the other hand, he has been charged with leaning in the opposite direction towards the Sabellian and Patripassian views, but unjustly, as Duncker, in his monograph *Die Christologie des heilig. Irenäus* (p. 50 sq.), has unanswerably shown. Apart from his frequent want of precision, he steers in general, with sure Biblical and churchly tact, equally clear of both extremes, and asserts alike the essential unity and the eternal personal distinction of the Father and the Son. The incarnation of the Logos he ably discusses, viewing it both as a restoration and redemption from sin and death, and as the completion of the revelation of God and of the creation of man. In the latter view, as finisher, Christ is the perfect Son of man, in whom the likeness of man to God, the *similitudo Dei*, regarded as moral duty, in distinction from the *imago Dei*, as an essential property, becomes for the first time fully real. According to this, the incarnation would be grounded in the original plan of God for the education of mankind, and independent of the fall; it would have taken place even without the fall, though in some other form. Yet Irenæus does not expressly say this; speculation on abstract possibilities was foreign to his realistic cast of mind" (Dr. Schaff, i, § 77, 78).

We now pass to a consideration of Irenæus's views on the doctrine of Christ's *humanity*. Here, again, his first task is to refute Gnostic Docetists. "Christ," he contends against them, "must be a man, like us, if he would redeem us from corruption and make us perfect. As sin and death came into the world by a man, so they could be blotted out legitimately and to our advantage only by a man; though, of course, not by one who should be a mere descendant of Adam, and thus himself stand in need of redemption, but by a second Adam, supernaturally begotten, a new progenitor of our race, as divine as he is human. A new birth unto life must take the place of the old birth unto death. As the completer, also, Christ must enter into fellowship with us, to be our teacher and pattern. He made himself equal with man, that man, by his likeness to the Son, might become precious in the Father's sight." Irenæus (to quote Dr. Schaff still further) "conceived the humanity of Christ not as mere corporeality, though he often contends for this alone against the Gnostics, but as true humanity, embracing body, soul, and spirit. He places Christ in the same relation to the regenerate race which Adam bears to the natural, and regards him as the absolute universal man, the prototype and summing up of the whole race. Connected with this is his beautiful thought, found also in Hippolytus in the tenth book of the *Philosophoumena*, that Christ made the circuit of all the stages of human life, to redeem and sanctify all. To apply this to advanced age, he singularly extended the life of Jesus to fifty years, and endeavored to prove his view from the gospels against the Valentinians. The full communion of Christ with men involved his participation in all their evils and sufferings, his death, and his descent into the abode of the dead." Also on the doctrine of the mutual relation of the divine and the human in Christ, which was neither specially discussed nor brought to a final, definite settlement until the Christological controversies of the 5th century, Irenæus, in a number of passages, throws out hints which deserve consideration from their importance. "He teaches unequivocally a true and indissoluble union

of divinity and humanity in Christ, and repels the Gnostic idea of a mere external and transient connection of the divine Σωτήρ with the human Jesus. The foundation for that union he perceives in the creation of the world by the Logos, and in man's original likeness to God and destination for permanent fellowship with him. In the act of union, that is, in the supernatural generation and birth, the divine is the active principle, and the seat of personality; the human, the passive or receptive; as, in general, man is absolutely dependent on God, and is the vessel to receive the revelations of his wisdom and love. The medium and bond of the union is the Holy Ghost (see below), who took the place of the masculine agent in the generation, and overshadowed the virgin womb of Mary with the power of the Highest. In this connection he calls Mary the counterpart of Eve, the 'mother of all living' in a higher sense, who, by her believing obedience, became the cause of salvation both to herself and to the whole human race, as Eve, by her disobedience, induced the apostasy and death of mankind—a fruitful parallel, which was afterwards frequently pushed too far, and turned, no doubt, contrary to its original sense, to favor the idolatrous worship of the blessed Virgin. Irenæus seems, at least according to Dorner (*Christology*, i, 495), to conceive the incarnation as progressive, the two factors reaching absolute communion (but neither absorbing the other) in the ascension; though before this, at every stage of life, Christ was a perfect man, presenting the model of every age" (Schaff, i, § 79).

3. *The Holy Ghost.*—On the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, Irenæus, more nearly than the Greek Church fathers, especially the Alexandrians, represents the dogma of the perfect, substantial identity of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son; "though his repeated figurative (but for this reason not so definite) designation of the Son and Spirit as the 'hands' of the Father, by which he made all things, implies a certain subordination (see Irenæus's views given below under "Trinity"). He differs from most of the fathers in referring the Wisdom of the book of Proverbs not to the Logos, but to the Spirit, and hence he must have regarded him as eternal. Yet he was far from conceiving the Spirit as a mere power or attribute; he considered him an independent personality, like the Logos. 'With God,' says he (*Adv. Hæres.* iv, 20, § 1), 'are ever the Word and the Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, through whom and in whom he freely made all things, to whom he said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."' But he speaks more of the operations than of the nature of the Holy Ghost. The Spirit predicted in the prophets the coming of Christ; has been near to man in all divine ordinances; communicates the knowledge of the Father and the Son; gives believers the consciousness of sonship; is fellowship with Christ, the pledge of imperishable life, and the ladder on which we ascend to God" (Schaff, § 80).

4. *The Trinity.*—On the doctrine of the Trinity, the language of Irenæus is perhaps plainer and more incontrovertible than that of any other of the early Church fathers, and yet both Arians and Socinians have sometimes presumed to claim him as a supporter of their peculiar theories. But we have his own expressions making both Christ and the Holy Spirit parts of the supreme divinity. Nay, Christ is often expressly declared to be God. Thus, in a passage in which Irenæus is commenting on the prophecy respecting the birth of Emmanuel he says: "Carefully, then, has the Holy Ghost pointed out, by what has been said, his birth from a virgin, and his essence, *that he is God*, for the name Emmanuel indicates this" (iii, 21, 4); and again, in allusion to the Father: "*With him were always present the Word and Wisdom*, the Son and the Spirit, by whom and in whom, freely and spontaneously, he made all things; to whom, also, he spoke, saying, 'Let us make man after our image and likeness.'" Indeed, Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* i, 286) seems hardly justified in his statement that "of a supramundane trinity of essence Irenæus betrays but faint indications." He continually quotes from Genesis, with the object of showing that both Christ and the Holy Spirit existed with the Father anterior to all creation ("ante omnem constitutionem"). With a writer in the *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* (1869, p. 12), we are inclined to believe that the word "hands" is used by Irenæus to indicate that they are both *co-workers of the Father* rather than his subordinate workman (compare Ebrard, *Kirchen- und Dogmengesch.* i, 110 and 111, note 8). "In all things and through all things there is one God, the Father, and one Word, and one Son, and one Spirit, and one salvation to all that believe in him." Another very beautiful passage "reveals the doctrine of the Trinity as being, in fact, wrapped up in the official title by which the Saviour is designated." Says he: "In the name of *Christ* (iii, 18, 3) is implied he that anoints, he that is anointed, and the unction itself with which he is anointed. And it is the Father who anoints, but the Son who is anointed by the Spirit, who *is* the unction, as the word declares by Isaiah, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me,' thus pointing out the anointing Father, the anointed Son, and the Unction which is the Spirit"—certainly "a rich and pregnant thought, which will bear much consideration. It is very striking and satisfactory to find the doctrine of the three divine persons thus developed out of the very name which the Saviour bears. Nor does there seem anything fanciful in the reasoning; for, as we cannot think of an anointed one without necessarily thinking also of one who anoints, and of the unction with which he is anointed, we are thus led to conceive, by a simple remembrance of our Lord's official designation, of the Father, the anointer, the Son, the anointed, and the Spirit, the living unction who came down, in infinite fulness, from the Father on the Son—the three-one God, being by means of a single word thus brought before us as the God of our salvation" (*Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* 1869, p. 13). With all these direct testimonies staring us in the face, it is certainly ridiculous to see the efforts on the part of some Rationalistic theologians to assert that Irenæus was not strictly Trinitarian in his views on this subject. But more than this: it was this self-same Irenæus who *opposed* the Philonic doctrine of the λόγος, which other Church fathers, especially of the Alexandrian school, seemed so ready to accept, as Theophilus of Antiochia, and even Tertullian (comp. Ebrard, *Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch.* i, 116.

5. *Redemption.*—Of all the Church fathers, Irenæus was the first who gave a careful analysis of the work of redemption, "and his view," says Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* i, 297), "is by far the deepest and soundest we find in the first three centuries. Christ, he teaches, as the second Adam, repeated in himself the entire life of man, from birth to death and hades, from childhood to manhood, and, as it were, summed up that life and brought it under one head (this is the sense of his frequent expression, Ἀνακεφαλαιοῦν, ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, recapitulare, recapitulatio), with the double purpose of restoring humanity from its fall and carrying it to perfection. Redemption comprises the taking away of sin by the perfect obedience of Christ, the destruction of death by victory over the devil, and the communication of a new divine life to man. To accomplish this work, the Redeemer must unite in himself the divine and human natures; for only as God could he do what man could not, and only as man could he do, in a legitimate way, what man should. By the voluntary disobedience of Adam the devil gained a power over man, but in an unfair way, by fraud (*dissuasio*). By the voluntary obedience of Christ that power was wrested from him by lawful means (by *suadela*, persuasion, announcement of truth, not overreaching or deception). This took place first in the temptation, in which Christ renewed or recapitulated the struggle of Adam with Satan, but defeated the seducer, and thereby liberated man from his thraldom. But then the whole life of Christ was a con-

tinued victorious conflict with Satan, and a constant obedience to God. This obedience was completed in the suffering and death on the tree of the cross, and thus blotted out the disobedience which the first Adam had committed on the tree of knowledge. It is, however, only the negative side. To this is added the communication of a new divine principle of life, and the perfecting of the idea of humanity first effected by Christ." See REDEMPTION; ORIGEN.

6. *The Sacraments.*—On this subject, perhaps more than upon any other on which Irenæus has written, we meet with a vagueness of expression which hardly enables us definitely to determine what he actually believed. But even "Romanists tacitly admit that he says nothing of confirmation, ordination, marriage, or extreme unction favorable to the sacramental character which they assign to these rites. And this is a very strong negative testimony against the correctness of their opinions. If such an early writer as Irenæus, in the course of a lengthened theological work, which naturally led him to the ordinances as well as doctrines of the Church, has not a word to say in regard to the above so-called sacraments, the inference is pretty clear that they were not recognised as such in his day. . . . Massuet makes a very lame attempt to prove from the writings of Irenæus that the sacrament of *penance* was practised in the Church of his day. There can be no doubt that the passages to which he refers (i, 6, 3; 13, 5) prove that public confession of flagrant sins was common in the Church of the 2d century. This was called *exomologesis*, and seems to have been indispensable for the removal of the censures of the Church. But there is nothing to indicate its sacramental character, and not a shadow of support can be derived from it for the popish practice of auricular confession" (*Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* Jan. 1869, p. 18). See CONFESSION.

Of *Infant Baptism* the first clear trace is found in the writings of our author, who thus writes of the sacrament of baptism (ii, 22, 4): "Christ came to save all who are regenerated by him, infants and little children, and boys, and youths, and elders." He thus applies it to all ages, Christ having passed through all the stages of life for this purpose. Neander says of this passage (*Hist. Christian Dogmas*, i, 230): "If by the phrase *renasci in Deum* (in the Latin transl.) baptism is intended, it contains a proof of infant baptism. *Infantes* and *parvuli* are distinguished; the latter possess a developed consciousness, hence to them Christ is a pattern of piety, while to the *infantes* he merely gives an objective sanctification; we must therefore understand the latter to mean quite little children." But the statement of Irenæus leads us to infer that he believed in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which is strengthened by another passage (iii, 17, 1): "And again, giving to the disciples the power of regeneration unto God, he said to them, 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'" (Compare an article on this subject in the *American Presbyterian Review*, April, 1867, p. 239 sq.; Schaff, *Church History*, i, 402.)

On the *Lord's Supper*, also, the indefinite statements of Irenæus have given rise to much dispute. Romanists stoutly affirm that he declares in favor of their doctrine of transubstantiation, and the real presence; but this arises from a variable reading of one passage, of which Neander says (p. 238), "According to one reading it is said, *Verbum quod offertur Deo*, which must mean the Logos which is presented to God; therefore, the sacrifice would refer to the presentation of Christ himself. Yet we can hardly make up our minds to accept this as the opinion of Irenæus, who always says that Christians must consecrate all to God in Christ's name; for example, *Ecclesia offert per Jesum Christum.* We cannot doubt that the other reading is the correct one, *Verbum per quod effertur Deo.*" Dr. Schaff also declines to give the Romanists a hearing on this point, and argues further, that Irenæus "in another place (iv, 18 and *passim*) calls the bread and wine, after consecration, 'antitypes,' implying the continued distinction of their substance from the body and blood of Christ. This expression in itself, indeed, might be understood as merely contrasting here the Supper, as the substance, with the Old-Testament Passover, its type; as Peter calls baptism the antitype of the saving water of the flood (1 Pet. iii, 20, 21). But the connection, and the *usus loquendi* of the earlier Greek fathers, require us to take the term antitype in the sense of type, or, more precisely, as the antithesis of archetype. The bread and wine represent and exhibit the body and blood of Christ as the archetype, and correspond to them as a copy to the original. In exactly the same sense it is said in Heb. ix, 24 (comp. viii, 5), that the earthly sanctuary is the antitype, that is, the copy of the heavenly" (i, 387). We think Irenæus speaks more definitely of this ordinance in one of the Fragments (xxxviii, Massuet), from which it clearly follows that he by no means believed in the *opus operatum* of the Romanists. (Comp. *Brit. and For. Evang. Review*, Jan. 1869, p. 19, 20.)

7. *The Church.*—By the peculiar attitude in which Irenæus placed himself when combating the Gnostic heresies, he became unconsciously one of the most elaborate writers on the early Church that now remains to us, and the utterances of no other of the early Church fathers have so frequently been misinterpreted to prop up the claims of Romanism as those of Irenæus. It is beyond question that the Romanists, as well as High-Church prelatists, however hesitatingly, misconstrued the statements of Irenæus in defence of the Church of Christ against Valentinus, Basilides, Marcion, and other schismatics, who in his time threatened the very life of the early Christian Church, as statements favoring the doctrine of *apostolic succession* (q. v.). Irenæus, evidently in defence of his Church, and as an opponent of the heretics, presents a "*historical* chain of bishops." Says he (iii, 3, 1), "We are in a position to reckon up those who were by the apostles instituted bishops in the churches, and the successors of these bishops to our own times." But, in naming the bishops in their historical order, he "never dreams of ascribing to them any sort of spiritual influence or authority which was propagated from one to another. To show that he could link historically Eleutherius, who was then head of the Church of Rome, with the apostles, who were supposed to have founded that Church, was the sole and simple object contemplated by our author in reference to the succession." In his arguments with the Valentinians, Marcionites, and others, he endeavors to prove, by constant appeals to the Scriptures, that their doctrines were not in harmony with the inspired writings. "Had he found 'the truth' among them, he would have had no occasion to treat of the *succession* at all, but would at once have owned them as forming a part of the Catholic Church," which he defined, not as Romanists and High-Churchmen, to be only where the pope's supremacy is acknowledged, or the Episcopal Church doctrines are adhered to, but, he says, "Ubi ecclesia"—putting the Church first, in the genuine catholic spirit (iii, 24)—"ibi et Spiritus Dei; et ubi Spiritus Dei, illic ecclesia et omnis gratia," or, as Dr. Schaff says, Protestantism would put it conversely: "Where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church; and where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God and all grace."

8. *The Millennium.*—The peculiar millennial views of Irenæus, which stamp him, by his close adherence to Papias, as a Chiliast, we hardly care to touch; they are certainly the weak spot in our author, and deserve to be passed not only without comment, but even unnoticed. They are brought out specially near the end of his great work (v, 32-36), declaring a future reign of the saints on earth; arguing that such promises of Scripture as those in Gen. xiii, 14; Matt. xxvi, 27-29, etc., can have no other interpretation.

9. *The Easter Controversy.*—The personal character of Irenæus, of which we have as yet said but little, is

perhaps best illustrated by his conduct in the Easter controversy (q. v.). Determined to work for a union of all Christians (iv, 33, 7), he displayed an irenical disposition in all disputes about unessential outward things, and more especially in his mediation between Victor, then bishop of Rome, and the Asiatic churches.

10. *Testimony to the Scriptures.*—The influence which Irenæus exerted at this time, and in other controversies that preceded, adds additional interest to the writings of this Church father, and makes especially valuable any testimony that he may have left us on the authenticity of the sacred writings. A leading representative of the Asiatic Johannean school of the second half of the 2d century, born ere the apostle John had departed this life, and consequently called by Eusebius "a disciple of the apostles," and by Jerome "the disciple of John the apostle," he bears us such direct testimony in behalf of the Gospels, or, as Eusebius terms them, the "Homologoumena," that it becomes to us of the very highest importance among the external proofs of their genuineness, more especially at the present moment, in face of the denials of this truth by Rationalists, and by those "who take up themes which lie outside of their chosen studies, or with which they are not profoundly conversant," among them figuring no less a personage than the distinguished English historian Froude (*Short Essays on Great Subjects*). Now what does Irenæus say of the Gospels? "We have not received," he says, "the knowledge of the way of our salvation by any others than those by whom the Gospel has been brought to us; which Gospel they first preached, and afterwards by the will of God committed to writing, that it might be for time to come the foundation and pillar of the faith." Here follows a declaration that the first Gospel was written among the Jews by Matthew; the second by Mark, a companion of Peter; the third by Luke, a companion of Paul; and the fourth by John, of whom he says, "Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, he likewise published a gospel while he dwelt in Ephesus, in Asia." "Let us assume now that Irenæus—between whom and the apostles there is only one intervening link—was an honest man and an intelligent man; in short, that he is a competent witness. At the time when he knew Polycarp, were the four Gospels extant and acknowledged authorities in the Church? We will here confine the question to the Gospel of John (q. v.), which is now so much a topic of controversy. Was or was not this gospel received as the production of him whose name it bears by Polycarp and his contemporaries at the time to which Irenæus, in his graphic reminiscence, refers? If it was thus received—received in the neighborhood of Ephesus, in the very region where John had lived to so advanced an age, and where his followers and acquaintances survived—it will be very difficult to disprove its genuineness. But if it was not thus received, when, we ask, can it be supposed to have first seen the light? Who contrived a book of which Polycarp had known nothing, and palmed it off on him and on the whole circle of Johannean disciples and churches in Asia? How is it that Irenæus knows nothing of the late discovery or promulgation of so valuable a book? Why does he not mention the momentous fact—if, indeed, it be a fact—that after his interviews with Polycarp there was found somewhere, or put forth by somebody, this priceless treasure? It is obvious that Irenæus would have had something to say of the extraordinary concealment and final appearance of this Gospel history had he remembered a time or known of a time since John's death when this Gospel had not been a familiar and prized possession of the Church. This testimony of Irenæus is a tough piece of evidence. Here we have specific declarations as to what he had himself seen and heard. Yet the attempt is made to disparage the value of this testimony on the ground of the following passage, which stands in connection with his statements about the composition of the several gospels: 'Nor can there be more or fewer gospels than these. For as there are four regions of the world in which we live, and four catholic spirits, and the Church is spread all over the earth, and the Gospel is the pillar and foundation of the Church, and the spirit of life, in like manner was it fit it should have four pillars, breathing on all sides incorruption and refreshing mankind. Whence it is manifest that the Word, the former of all things, who sits upon the cherubim and upholds all things, having appeared to men, has given us a Gospel of a fourfold character, but joined in one spirit.' (Here follows a brief characterization of the several gospels in their relation to one another.) That this is a fanciful (if one will, a puerile) observation there is no reason to deny; but how it can in the least invalidate the credibility of the author's testimony on a matter of fact within his cognizance, it is impossible to see. If these analogies had exerted any influence in determining Irenæus's acceptance of the four gospels of the canon, the case would be different. But Froude admits that such was not the fact. He accepts the Gospels on account of the historical proof of their genuineness, as he repeatedly affirms, and independently of these supposed analogies. It is the established and exclusive authority of the four gospels that sends him after these fancied analogies and accounts for the suggestion of them. The suggestion of them, therefore, strengthens instead of weakens the evidence in behalf of the canonical evangelists, because it shows how firm and long-settled must have been the recognition of them in the Church. It is even a hasty inference from such a passage that the author was intellectually weak. If this inference is to be drawn from such an observation, the ablest of the fathers, as Augustine, must be equally condemned. Men who are not deficient in ability may say sometimes rather foolish things. . . . On the whole, Irenæus is distinguished for the soundness and clearness of his understanding. (See Schaff in the first part of our article.) He is rather averse to speculation, being of a pr ctical turn. There is hardly one of the early ecclesiastical writers who, in all the qualities that made up a trustworthy witness, is to be set before him. There is no reason to doubt that, in his statements concerning the origin and authority of the Gospels, he represents the Christians of his time. It is not the sentiment of an individual merely, but the state of things, the general judgment of the Church, which he brings before us. No good reason can be given for this general, exclusive recognition of the Gospels now included in our canon, no even plausible solution of the fact can be rendered, unless it be granted that they were really handed down from the days of the apostles, and were thus known to embody the testimony of eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses of the events which they record. Had Polycarp known nothing of John's Gospel—or, knowing of it, had he rejected it—it is impossible that Irenæus and his contemporaries should have been ignorant of the fact. It is proved by the most convincing array of circumstantial evidence that Polycarp, a personal acquaintance of John the Apostle, an honored bishop in the neighborhood where John had labored and died, considered the fourth gospel to be his composition" (Dr. G. P. Fisher, of Yale College, in the *Independent*, Feb. 4, 1869; comp. the reply to Dr. Davidson [*Introd. to the N. Test.* Lond. 1868, 2 vols. 8vo], in the *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Jan. 1869, p. 4-8). In a similar strain argues Mr. Westcott (*History of the New Test. Canon*): "In the same Church where Irenæus was a presbyter—'zealous for the covenant of Christ'—Photinus was bishop, already ninety years old. Like Polycarp, he was associated with the generation of St. John, and must have been born before the books of the N. T. were all written. And how, then, can it be supposed with reason that forgeries came into use in his time, which he must have been able to detect by his own knowledge? that they were received without suspicion or reserve in the church over which he presided? It is possible to weaken the connection of facts by arbitrary

hypotheses; but, interpreted according to their natural meaning, they tell of a Church united by its head with the times of St. John, to which the books of the N. T. furnished the unaffected language of hope, and resignation, and triumph. And the testimony of Irenæus is the testimony of the Church." But not only to the authenticity of the Gospels does Irenæus bear his testimony. He also furnishes conclusive evidence in support of other N.-T. books which have been questioned (see *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* 1869, p. 7 sq.).

11. *Canon of Scripture.*—Not a little surprising, but agreeably so, it must be to the Christian of the present day to find that in the days of Irenæus, even when the canon of Scripture could not be expected to have been so accurately defined as it afterwards was, we find, with the exception of the spurious additions to Daniel, found in the Septuagint, and the books of Baruch, quoted under the name of Jeremiah, no writings of the O. T., acknowledged as forming part of the O.-T. canon, which Protestants do not include in it at the present day. So likewise of the N. T., the only book not now accepted, but to which Irenæus credited canonical authority, is the "Shepherd of Hermas." Altogether, "with the most inconsiderable exceptions . . . . . the canon of both the O. and N. T., then accepted by the Church, was coincident and conterminous with our own." But more than this, by the language which Irenæus uses, we find the Church of his day harmonizing with and justifying the very highest claims that have ever been advanced in support of the inspired authority and infallible accuracy of the canonical writings. The utterance which Irenæus has made on this subject Romanists have sought to turn to account in their assertions of the authority of tradition as co-ordinate with that of Scripture. But though, as was natural in such an early writer, Irenæus often refers to the apostolic traditions preserved in the churches, he never ascribes to these an authority independent of Scripture.

12. *Literature.*—Beaven, *Life of Irenæus* (Lond. 1841); Schaff, *Irenæus*, in *Der Deutsche Kirchenfreund*, vol. v (Mercersb. 1852); Gervaise, *La Vie de S. Irénée* (Paris, 1723, 2 vols. 8vo); Stieren, art. "Irenæus," in Ersch u. Gruber, *Encyklop.* vol. ii, sec. xxiii; Massuet, *Dissertationes in Irenæi libros*, prefixed to his edition of the *Opera;* Deyling, *Irenæus, evangelicæ veritatis confessor ac testis* (Lips. 1721), against Massuet; Ceillier, *Hist. génér. des Auteurs sacrés et Ecclés.* i, 495 sq.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* vii, 75 sq.; Böhringer, *Kirchengesch. in Biographien*, vol. i; Möhler, *Patrologie*, vol. ii; Ritter, *Gesch. der Philos.* i, 345 sq.; Duncker, *Des heil. Iren. Christol. i. Zusammenhange m. d. theol. und anthropol. Grundlehren dargestellt* (1843, 8vo); Graul, *D. christlich Kirche a. d. Schwelle d. Iren. Zeitalters* (Lpz. 1860), a very valuable little work of 168 pages, in which "the position of Irenæus is sketched with a bold and firm hand;" Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, iii, 192 sq.; Schaff, *Church History*, vol. i (see Index); Neander, *Church History*, vol. i (see Index); Shedd, *History of Doctrines* (see Index); Harrison, *Whose are the Fathers?* (see Index); Augusti, *Dogmengesch.* vol. i and ii; Baumgarten-Crusius, *Dogmengesch.* (see Index); *Bullet. Théolog.* 1869, Oct. 25, p. 319; *Rev. de deux Mondes*, 1865, February 15, art. viii; *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1853, p. 226; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vii, 46 sq. (J. H. W.)

Irenæus, St., a Tuscan martyr, flourished in the second half of the 3d century. But very little is known of the history of his life. He suffered martyrdom during the persecutions under the emperor Aurelius (275), and is commemorated in the Roman Church July 3.—Tillemont, *Mémoires Ecclés.* vol. iv; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 948.

Irenæus, St., another martyr, was bishop of Sirmium (now Sirmish, a Hungarian village), his native country, at the beginning of the 4th century. Many inducements were offered him by the then governor of the country, Probus, who, no doubt, acted under instructions from the emperors Diocletian and Maximus, to renounce Christianity, but, all proving futile, he was at last beheaded, after having been subjected to various tortures. Though but little is known of this Irenæus's personal history, it is evident, from the efforts of the governor to secure his adhesion to the heathen practices, that he was a man of great influence. The date of his death is not accurately known. Some think it to be March 25, the day on which his death is commemorated by Romanists; others put it April 6, A.D. 304. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 948; Ceillier, *Hist. des aut. sacr.* iii, 27; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, iii, 651 sq.; *Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschland*, v, 715 sq.

Irenæus, bishop of Tyre, flourished in the first half of the 5th century. He was originally a count of the empire, and first took part in ecclesiastical affairs at the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, where he represented the emperor Theodosius as assistant to Candidius, to settle the controversy between Cyril and Nestorius, and their respective followers. Both he and Candidius favored Nestorius, and, failing to prevent his condemnation at the council, did their utmost, on their return to court, to counteract on the emperor's mind the influence and decision of the Cyrillians against Nestorius. For a time they succeeded well, as their representations "bore on their very face the impress of truth." But the Cyrillian party predominating, and John, the secretary of Cyril, appearing himself at court to counteract the efforts of Irenæus and Candidius, the feeble sovereign was soon turned in favor of the Cyrillian party, and Irenæus himself was banished from the court about A.D. 435. He at once betook himself to his friends, the Oriental bishops, and by them was raised to the bishopric of Tyre in 444. The emperor now issued an edict condemning the Nestorians, and, in addition, it was ordered that Irenæus should be deposed from the bishopric, and deprived of his clerical character. In 448 the sentence was finally executed. After his retirement Irenæus wrote a history of the Nestorian struggle, under the title of *Tragœdia seu Commentarii de rebus in Synodo Ephesina ac in Oriente gestis.* The original, which was written in Greek, is lost, and only parts of it remain to us in a Latin translation published by Christian Lupus, under the inaccurate title of *Variorum Patrum Epistolæ ad Concilium Ephesinum pertinentis* (Louv. 1682). See Mansi, *Sacr. Concil. Nov. Collect.* v, 417, 731; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xiv; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* sub. ann. 444; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxv, 949; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 468 sq.

Irenæus, a pseudonym for the celebrated Church historian Johann Karl Ludwig Gieseler (q. v.).

Irenæus, Christoph, one of the most zealous defendants of the doctrine of the Flacians, was born at Schweidnitz, near the middle of the 16th century. First a deacon at Aschersleben, he was afterwards called to Eisleben as regular pastor, and finally appointed court preacher at Weimar. Accused of favoring the views of Flacius, a consistent though much persecuted follower of Luther, he was, with other prominent preachers guilty of the same failing, dismissed from his position in 1572. He now removed to Austria, where he published in 1581 a pamphlet against the first article of the *Concordienformel*, under the title of *Christoph Irenæi Examen d. ersten Artikels u. d. Wirbel-Geistes i. d. neuen Concordienbuch von der Erbsünde.* The date of his death is not known to us. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* ii, 781. See Flacius.

Irenæus, Falkovski, a learned Russian priest, was born May 28, 1762. He acquired a good knowledge of Hebrew, Latin, French, and German, then went to Hungary to study philosophy, history, and mathematics. He was married, but his great merits caused him to be appointed bishop, although, according to the general rules of the Greek Church, marriage is a bar to a candidate for this office. He died April 29, 1823. Irenæus wrote *Chronologie ecclesiastique* (Moscow, 1797):—*Christianæ, orthodoxæ dogmatico-polemicæ Theologiæ*

Compendium (Moscow, 1802, 2 vols. 8vo), and commentaries on Paul's Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians (Kief, 1806, 2 vols. 8vo). See Gagarin, *De la Theol. dans l'Église Russe* (Par. 1857), p. 53. (J. N. P.)

Irenæus, Klementievski, a very able Russian theologian, was born at Klementief (Vladimir district) in 1753. Of his early history but little is known to us. He enjoyed the reputation of a great savant, and held the bishopric of Tvar, and, later, the archbishopric of Pskof, and died at St. Petersburg April 24, 1818. Of course he belonged to the monastic order of the Russo-Greek Church, for, as is well known, the higher ecclesiastical offices of Russia are accessible only to monastic orders (compare Eckardt, *Modern Russia*). Archbishop Irenæus wrote *Commentaries on the Twelve minor Prophets:—St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans and to the Hebrews:*—and also published some of his sermons, delivered before the royal household at St. Petersburg (1794). He likewise translated into Russian the writings of several of the Church fathers, and cardinal Bellarmine's *Commentary on the Psalms* (Moscow, 1807, 2 vols. 4to); and two other works on ascetism by Bellarmine. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 949.

Irénè (Εἰρήνη, *Peace*), empress of Constantinople, and one of the most extraordinary, though corrupt characters of the Byzantine empire, was born in Athens about A.D. 725. An orphan, 17 years of age, without any fortune except her beauty and talents, she excited the admiration of the then reigning emperor, Leo IV, and in A.D. 769 became his lawful wife. Her love for power, it is said, caused her to commit the crime of murder, for her husband, who died in 780, is generally believed to have been poisoned by her. During his reign she had acquired not only the love, but also the confidence of the emperor, and in his testament he declared her "empress guardian of the Roman world, and of their son Constantine VI," who was, at the decease of Leo IV, only ten years of age. Educated in the worship of images, she was herself an ardent opponent of the iconoclasts, who held sway during the reign of her husband, and who, even at one time, had caused her banishment from his court on account of her secret worship of images, and her conspiracies with image-worshippers against iconoclasm. "But, as soon as she reigned in her own name and that of her son, Irene most seriously undertook the ruin of the iconoclasts, and the first step of her future persecution was a general edict for liberty of conscience. In the restoration of the monks, a thousand images were exposed to public veneration; a thousand legends were invented of their sufferings and miracles. As opportunities occurred by death or removal, the episcopal seats were judicially filled; the most eager competitors for earthly or celestial favor anticipated and flattered the judgment of their sovereign; and the promotion of her secretary, Tarasius, gave Irene the patriarch of Constantinople, and the command of the Oriental Church." But the decrees of a general council could only be repeated effectually by a similar assembly, and to this end she convened a council of bishops at Constantinople, A.D. 786. By this time, however, the people and the army had learned to abhor the worship of images in place of the true God, and the council was opposed by a mob, assisted by the troops, and even driven from the capital. This by no means intimidated Irene in her marked course. She had determined on the reintroduction of image-worship and the extirpation of all iconoclasts, and well did her zeal for the restoration of this gross superstition deserve to be rewarded by the Church (Greek) with a saintship (which she still occupies in the Greek calendar). A second council was convened only a year after the first had been broken up, but this time at Nice. "No more than 18 days were allowed for the consummation of this important work; the iconoclasts appeared not as judges, but as criminals or penitents; the scene was decorated by the legates of pope Adrian and the Eastern patriarchs, the decrees were framed by the president Tarasius, and ratified by the acclamations and subscriptions of 350 bishops. They unanimously pronounced that the worship of images is agreeable to Scripture and reason, to the fathers and councils of the Church; but they hesitate whether that worship be relative or direct; whether the godhead and the figure of Christ be entitled to the same mode of adoration. Of this second Nicene Council the acts are still extant; a curious monument of superstition and ignorance, of falsehood and folly" (Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, v, 37 sq.). Meanwhile, however, the young emperor was attaining the maturity of manhood; "the maternal yoke became more grievous; and he listened to the favorites of his own age, who shared his pleasures, and were ambitious of sharing his power." But Irene was by no means ready to concede to her son the power which she preferred to hold in her own hand, and, ever vigilant, she soon penetrated the designs of her son. As a consequence, there arose at court two factions. The young and the vigorous gathered around the heir presumptive, and in 790 he actually succeeded in assuming himself the government of affairs. As Constantine VI he became the lawful emperor of the Romans, and Irene was dismissed to a life of solitude and repose. "But her haughty spirit condescended to the arts of dissimulation: she flattered the bishops and eunuchs, revived the filial tenderness of the prince, regained his confidence, and betrayed his credulity. The character of Constantine was not destitute of sense or spirit; but his education had been studiously neglected: and the ambitious mother now exposed to the public censure the vices which she herself had nourished, and the actions which she herself had secretly advised." Meanwhile a powerful conspiracy was also concocted against Constantine, and only reached his ears when he knew it to be impossible for him to successfully resist. In haste he fled from the capital. But his own guards even had been bought in the interests of Irene, and the emperor was seized by them on the Asiatic shore, and transported back to Constantinople to the porphyry apartment of the palace where he had first seen the light. "In the mind of Irene ambition had stifled every sentiment of humanity and nature;" and it was decreed, in a bloody council which she had assembled, that Constantine must by some means be forever rendered incapable of assuming the government himself. While asleep in his bed, the hirelings of Irene entered the room of the prince and stabbed their daggers with violence and precipitation into his eyes, depriving him not only of his eyesight, but rendering his life even critical. As if this crime were in itself not sufficiently great, the youth was even deprived of his liberty when it was found that he had survived the fatal stroke, and confined in a dungeon, where he was left to pine away. Thus the unnatural mother, guilty of a crime unparalleled in the history of crimes, secured for herself the reins of government. But still Irene was not free from anxieties. Though the punishment which her crime deserved did not immediately follow the bloody deed, it yet came surely. Her two favorites, Stauracius and Ætius, whom she had raised, enriched, and intrusted with the first dignities of the empire, were constantly embroiled with each other, and their jealousies only ceased with the death of the former, A.D. 800. In order to secure her possession of the throne, she sought a marriage with Charlemagne, but the Frank emperor had evidently no relish for a woman who had committed so many crimes, and the scheme proved abortive. Two years later, her treasurer, Nicephorus, rebelled against her, and, suddenly seizing her person, banished her to the isle of Lesbos, where she was forced to spin for a livelihood. Here she died of grief, A.D. 803. See ICONOCLASM. (J. H. W.)

Irenical Theology is a term (from εἰρήνη, *peace*) used to designate the art or science of conciliating any differences which arise in religion and in the Church from one-sided theories or misapprehension. Making peace implies a previous warfare, hence irenical theology

is closely allied to polemics (q. v.), which, in its true character, should be but a struggle for peace. For the σύνδεσμος τῆς εἰρήνης, or "bond of peace" (Eph. iv, 3), embraces all Christians, and the ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ, or "speaking the truth in love" (Eph. iv, 15), contains *two* commandments which cannot be separated. Hence we find in the Christian Church, from her earliest days up to our own times, attempts to secure peace and unity by conciliating all differences and by reuniting those who had separated from each other. Such was particularly the case when schism occurred first between the Latin and the Greek churches, then between the Romish and the Protestant, and, again, between the Lutheran and the Reformed. Irenical attempts accompanied each of these separations, as is evinced by the large number of works known as *Irenicum, Unio, Concordia*, etc. But the labor of dogmatical peace-makers, or, as some call them, the angels of peace upon earth, is so profoundly, so quietly, and unostentatiously done, that the general mass of professional theologians hardly become aware of it. As a regular science, however, or systematic theory, these efforts at peaceful agreement on the points of difference could only spring from a well defined and developed state of Christian doctrine, and Christian life and its theory. Hence irenical theology is comparatively modern, and its system but little developed as yet. No one can deny that in the N. T., in the works of the apologists, apostles, and fathers, and down through a long series of ecclesiastical writings, and particularly in those of the mystics and pious ascetics, there are many pacificatory elements which might serve as material for an irenical system. After the Reformation we find such fragments side by side with the most violent polemical works. We might mention in this connection Erasmus (*De amabili ecclesiæ concordia*), George Wicel, H. Cassander, Fr. Junius, besides Melancthon, Martin Bucer, etc. It was against one of these peace-makers, David Paræus († 1615) that Leonhard Hutter wrote his *Irenicum vere Christianum* (2d edit. Rostock, 1619), in which, however, he admits that the attainment of ultimate unity and peace is problematical. Among the most active in the cause of union we find, in the Reformed Church, Hugo Grotius († 1645), and, in the Lutheran, George Calixtus († 1656). The Jesuits, however, managed to interfere in all these attempts, and to render them abortive by proposing sophistical and impossible bases of union. On the other hand, untimely propositions on both sides, dictated either by fear or worldly motives, threw discredit on the cause itself. It was now decried as Babelianism, Samaritanism, neutralism, syncretism, etc. Still there continued to appear persons who believed in the possibility of union, and labored zealously for it. Among them were John Fabricius of Helmstadt († 1729), a disciple of Calixtus, and the Scotch divine, John Dury, or Duræus (1630–78), who, knowing the relation between the Protestant confessions, labored with a truly Christian spirit to secure this end. His principal work, *Irenicorum tractatuum Prodromus* (Amstelod. 1662, 8vo), is in itself a sort of irenical theory, as it treats of the manner of removing the obstacles to union, of the grounds sufficient for evangelical unity, of the causes and means of religious reconciliation, and of the true method of accomplishing that result. Similar works, like the *viæ ad pacem*, etc., appeared in the Reformed Church, and also, though not so numerously, in the Lutheran. Among the Romanists even, we find some earnest peace-makers, but their efforts met with little success. Among the most prominent was the Spaniard, Christopher Roja de Spinola, appointed bishop in Austria in 1668; he made great efforts towards reconciling the churches, and was countenanced by the emperor Leopold and pope Innocent XI, but was afterwards disowned by the latter, and Spener himself was obliged to caution all against holding secret intercourse with him. He gained to his views the Lutheran abbot Molanus, of Loccum, in Hanover, who, in turn, found a zealous and distinguished advocate of unity in Leibnitz. Correspondence was begun with Bossuet on this subject, and Leibnitz wrote a very ingenious *Systema Theologiæ*, which was only published in 1819, at Paris, and afterwards in German by the Roman Catholic Lorenz Döller (Mayence, 1820), with a preface, in which he asserts that Leibnitz was at heart a Romanist. This brought an answer of G. E. Schulze, *Ueber die Entdeckung das Leibnitz ein Katholik gewesen* (Götting. 1827). The negotiations in the mean time proved unsuccessful, and matters remained unchanged; but still the irenical tendency was clearly gaining ground. Soon after the impulse towards a living faith given by Spener and his school, there appeared a large number of works for and against the union of the Protestant churches, which finally led, in Prussia, to some practical results. These, however, we shall not dwell upon here, our present object being only to show the development of irenical theology. John Christopher Köcher († 1772) published a *Bibliotheca theologiæ irenicæ* (Jenæ, 1764), which, though short, is valuable. He defines irenical theology (§ 3) as being "that part of controversial theology which inquires into the import of such doctrines and religious ceremonies as either whole ecclesiastical bodies or personal members contend about, with a view to preserve the peace and unity of the Church of God, or to restore them to the position which they first held." The tendency to unity now gradually became transformed into a general toleration; nothing was done towards the actual settlement of the differences, though much preparation was made in that direction by the humanistic tendency, and the spirit of inquiry into all religious systems. (On the literature of the subject in that period, see Winer, *Handbuch der theol. Literaturg.* i, 356–60.) Among the works which advocated a union of the churches, but rather from a practical than a scientific point of view, are to be mentioned first those of Joseph Planck († 1833) and Marheineke († 1845); then those of J. A. Stark († 1816); Theoduls Gastmahl, the crypto-catholic Protestant court-preacher of Darmstadt (7th edit. 1828, 8vo); the *Christliche Henotikon* of Dr. C. F. Böhme (Halle, 1827); and *Ideen ü. d. innern Zusammenhang v. Glaubensreinigung u. Glaubenseinigung in d. Evangel. Kirche*, by Daniel of Cologne (Leipzig, 1823).

In Germany, Marheineke, who, in imitation of Planck, transformed symbolics into a comparison of the different Christian confessions, greatly advanced the real scientific character of irenical theology, partly as the general union of the churches, partly as that of the different confessions. The same spirit, though joined to much partiality, pervades also the Roman Catholic *Symbolik* of Adam Möhler, and in a more liberal tone Leopold Schmid's *Geist des Katholicismus oder Grundlegung der christlichen Irenik* (1848). On the contrary, such works as Dr. F. A. Staudenmaier's († 1856) *Zum religiösen Frieden d. Zukunft* (1846, 2 vols. 8vo) disfigure Protestantism to such an extent, and are written in so illiberal a tone, that, if such were more abundant, they would kindle again the fiercest strife. Yet the scientific basis of religious and denominational peace has made much progress since Schleiermacher gave a scientific development to polemics and apologetics. This is especially evident in J. Peter Lange's *Christliche Dogmatik*, the third part of which (Heidelberg, 1852) contains a clever sketch of practical dogmatics, or of polemics and irenical theology. According to him, it is the province of irenical theology to bring out of the different religious opinions those which coincide with the Christian dogma, to free them from all errors and excesses, and to bring them into the life and consciousness of the Church, or to submit them to the Christian dogmas (§ 5). It has therefore to search out the hidden efforts of truth in all religious manifestations. All distortions of truth are evidences of the existence of an original truth. Irenical theology is again divided into *elementary*, i. e. an exposition of the struggles of truth and of the means of assisting it; and *concrete*, i. e. an exposition of the organic

liberation and development of truth in humanity until the completion of the Church. Sin, however, will always remain an obstacle to absolute peace till it is finally abolished in the kingdom of God. For this we must prepare ourselves by adhering to Meldenius's maxim: "In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas." See Dr. F. J. Lücke, *Ueber d. Alter dieses kirchlichen Friedensspruches* (Gött. 1850).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vii, 60; Ersch u. Gruber's *Encyklopädie*, ii, 23.

Ir-ha-Hérès, in the A. Vers. "THE CITY OF DESTRUCTION" (עִיר הַהֶרֶס, *Ir-ha-he'res*, v. r. *Ir-ha-che'res*, עִיר הַחֶרֶס; Sept. Ἀχερές, Vulg. *Civitas Solis*), the name or appellation of a city in Egypt, mentioned only in Isa. xix, 18. The reading הֶרֶס, *Heres*, is that of most MSS., the Syr., Aq., and Theod.; the other reading, חֶרֶס, *Cheres*, is supported by the Sept., but only in form, by Symm., who has πόλις ἡλίου, and the Vulg. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 391, *a;* 522) prefers the latter reading. There are various explanations; we shall first take those that treat it as a proper name, then those that suppose it to be an appellation used by the prophet to denote the future of the city.

1. "*The city of the Sun*," a translation of the Egyptian sacred name of Heliopolis, generally called in the Bible On, the Hebrew form of its civil name AN [see ON], and once *Beth-shemesh*, "the house of the sun" (Jer. xliii, 13), a more literal translation than this supposed one of the sacred name. See BETH-SHEMESH. This explanation, however, is highly improbable, for we find elsewhere both the sacred and the civil names of Heliopolis, so that a third name, merely a variety of the Hebrew rendering of the sacred name, is very unlikely. The name *Beth-shemesh* is, moreover, a more literal translation in its first word of the Egyptian name than this supposed one. It may be remarked, however, as to the last part of the word, that one of the towns in Palestine called Beth-shemesh, a town of the Levites on the borders of Judah and Dan, was not far from a Mount Heres, הַר־חֶרֶס (Judg. i, 35), so that the two names, as applied to the sun as an object of worship, might probably be interchangeable. See HERES.

2. "*The city Heres*," a transcription in the last part of the word of the Egyptian sacred name of Heliopolis, HA-RA, "the abode (liter. "house") of the sun." This explanation, however, would necessitate the omission of the article.

3. Jerome supposes חרס to be equivalent to חרש, "a potsherd," and to be a name of the town called by the Greeks *Ostracinè*, Ὀστρακινή ("earthen"). Akin with this is the view of others (see Alexander ad loc.), who suppose that reference is made to *Tahpanes*, the brick-kilns of which are mentioned by Jeremiah (xliii, 9).

4. "*A city preserved*," meaning that one of the five cities mentioned should be preserved. Gesenius, who proposes this construction, if the last half of the word be not part of the name of the place, compares the Arabic *charasa*, "he guarded, kept, preserved," etc. It may be remarked that the word HERES or HRES, in ancient Egyptian, probably signifies "a guardian." This rendering of Gesenius is, however, merely conjectural, and has hardly been adopted by any other leading interpreter.

5. The ordinary rendering, "*a city destroyed*," lit. "a city of destruction;" in the A.V. "the city of destruction," meaning that one of the five cities mentioned should be destroyed, according to Isaiah's idiom. Some maintain that the prophet refers to five great and noted cities of Egypt when he says, "In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan;" but they cannot agree as to what these cities are. Others suppose that by *five* a round number is meant; while others think that some proportional number is referred to—five out of 20,000, or five out of 1000. Calvin interprets the passage as meaning five out of six—*five* professing the true religion, and *one* rejecting it; and that *one* is hence called "City of destruction," which is not its proper name, but a description indicative of its doom. Egypt and Ethiopia were then either under a joint rule or under an Ethiopian sovereign. We can, therefore, understand the connection of the three subjects comprised in this and the adjoining chapters. Chap. xviii is a prophecy against the Ethiopians, xix is the Burden of Egypt, and xx, delivered in the year of the capture of Ashdod by Tartan, the general of Sargon, predicts the leading captive of the Egyptians and Ethiopians, probably the garrison of that great stronghold, as a warning to the Israelites who trusted in them for aid. Chap. xviii ends with an indication of the time to which it refers, speaking of the Ethiopians—as we understand the passage—as sending "a present" "to the place of the name of the Lord of hosts, the Mount Zion" (ver. 7). If this be taken in a proper and not a tropical sense, it would refer to the conversion of Ethiopians by the preaching of the law while the Temple yet stood. That such had been the case before the Gospel was preached is evident from the instance of the eunuch of queen Candace, whom Philip met on his return homeward from worshipping at Jerusalem, and converted to Christianity (Acts viii, 26–39). The Burden of Egypt seems to point to the times of the Persian and Greek dominions over that country. The civil war agrees with the troubles of the Dodecarchy, then we read of a time of bitter oppression by "a cruel lord and [or "even"] a fierce king," probably pointing to the Persian conquests and rule, and specially to Cambyses, or Cambyses and Ochus, and then of the drying of the sea (the Red Sea; compare xi, 15), and the river, and canals, of the destruction of the water-plants, and of the misery of the fishers and workers in linen. The princes and counsellors are to lose their wisdom and the people to be filled with fear, all which calamities seem to have begun in the desolation of the Persian rule. It is not easy to understand what follows as to the dread of the land of Judah which the Egyptians should feel, immediately preceding the mention of the subject of the article: "In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to the Lord of hosts; one shall be called Ir-ha-heres. In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be for a sign and for a witness unto the Lord of hosts in the land of Egypt; for they shall cry unto the Lord because of the oppressors, and he shall send them a saviour, and a great one, and he shall deliver them" (xix, 18–20). The partial or entire conversion of Egypt is prophesied in the next two verses (21, 22). The time of the Greek dominion, following the Persian rule, may here be pointed to. There was then a great influx of Jewish settlers, and as we know of a Jewish town, Onion, and a great Jewish population at Alexandria, we may suppose that there were other large settlements. These would "speak the language of Canaan," at first literally, afterwards in their retaining the religion and customs of their fathers. The altar would well correspond to the temple built by Onias; the pillar, to the synagogue of Alexandria, the latter on the northern and western borders of Egypt. In this case Alexander would be the deliverer. We do not know, however, that at this period there was any recognition of the true God on the part of the Egyptians. If the prophecy is to be understood in a proper sense, we can, however, see no other time to which it applies, and must suppose that Ir-ha-heres was one of the cities partly or wholly inhabited by the Jews in Egypt: of these, Onion was the most important, and to it the rendering, "One shall be called a city of destruction," would apply, since it was destroyed by Titus, while Alexandria, and perhaps the other cities, yet stand. If the prophecy is to be taken tropically, the best reading and rendering are matters of verbal criticism. See ISAIAH.

Ir-ham-Mélach (עִיר הַמֶּלַח, *city of the salt*, so called prob. from the salt rocks still found in that vicinity; Sept. ἡ πόλις τῶν ἁλῶν, Vulg. *civitas salis*, Auth. Vers. "City of Salt"), a city in the Desert of Judah, mentioned between Nibshan and En-gedi (Josh. xv, 62); probably situated near the south-western part of the Dead Sea. Compare the "Valley of Salt" (2 Sam. viii, 13; Psa. lx, 2).

Ir-hat-Temarím (עִיר הַתְּמָרִים, *city of the palms*, so called prob. from a palm grove in its neighborhood; Sept. πόλις φοινίκων, or ἡ πόλις τῶν φοινίκων, Vulg. *civitas palmarum*, Auth. Vers. "city of palm-trees"), a place near or identical with JERICHO (Deut. xxxiv, 3; Judg. i, 16; iii, 13; 2 Chron. xxviii, 15), which now, however, is utterly destitute of palm-trees.

I'ri (Heb. *Iri'*, עִירִי, *citizen;* Sept. Οὐρί, Vulg. *Urai*), the last-named of the five sons of Bela, son of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii, 7). B.C. between 1856 and 1658. See IR.

I'RI also appears in the A. Vers. of the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. viii, 62) as tne nâme (Οὐρία v. r. Οὐρί, Vulg. *Jorus*) of the father of the priest Marmoth; evidently the URIAH (q. v.) of Ezra viii, 33.

Iri'jah (Heb. *Yiriyah'*, יִרְאִיָּיה, *seen by Jehovah;* Sept. Σαρουΐας, Vulg. *Jerias*), son of Shelemiah, and a captain of the ward at the gate of Benjamin, who arrested the prophet Jeremiah on the pretence that he was deserting to the Chaldæans (Jer. xxxvii, 13, 14). B.C. 589.

Irish Church. See IRELAND.

Irmensaul, a statue of unknown form and significance, which was erected at Eresberge, in Hessen or Westphalia, and worshipped by the ancient Saxons. In 772, Charlemagne, having conquered the country and brought the people under subjection, destroyed it, to discontinue the idolatrous worship. It is said that he found in the inside a great amount of gold and silver. In the cathedral of Hildesheim they show a column of green marble which is claimed to be the column of Irmensaul. See Grimm, *Irmenstrasse u. Irmensaüle* (Vienna, 1815); Von der Hagen, *Irmin, seine Säule u. s. Wege* (Bresl. 1817).—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* ix, 66. (J. N. P.)

Ir-na'hash [many *Ir'nahash*] (Heb. *Ir-Nachash'*, עִיר נָחָשׁ, *serpent city;* Sept. πόλις Ναάς, Vulg. *urbs Naas*, Auth. Vers. margin, "city of Nahash"), a place founded (rebuilt) by Tehinnah, the son of Eshton, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 12). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 116) thinks it the present *Dir-Nachas*, one mile east of Beth-Jibrin; prob. the same marked (perh. inaccurately) *Dar-Hakhas* on Zimmerman's map, a short distance north-east of Beit-Jibrin. Van de Velde likewise identifies it with "*Deir-Nakhaz*, a village with ancient remains east of Beit-Jibrin" (*Memoir*, p. 322). See NAHASH.

Iron (בַּרְזֶל, *barzel'*; Chald. פַּרְזֶל, *parzel'*; Gr. σίδηρος, Lat. *ferrum*). There is not much room to doubt the identity of the metal denoted by the above terms. Tubal-Cain is the *first-mentioned* smith, "a forger of every instrumcnt of iron" (Gen. iv, 22). As this metal is rarely found in its native state, but generally in combination with oxygen, the knowledge of the art of forging it, which is attributed to Tubal-Cain, argues an acquaintance with the difficulties that attend the smelting of this metal. Iron melts at a temperature of about 3000° Fahrenheit, and to produce this heat large furnaces supplied by a strong blast of air are necessary. But, however difficult it may be to imagine a knowledge of such appliances at so early a period, it is perfectly certain that the use of iron is of extreme antiquity, and that therefore some means of overcoming the obstacles in question must have been discovered. What the process may have been is left entirely to conjecture; a method is employed by the natives of India, extremely simple and of great antiquity, which, though rude, is very effective, and suggests the possibility of similar knowledge in an early stage of civilization (Ure, *Dict. Arts and Sciences*, s. v. Steel). The smelting furnaces of Æthalia, described by Diodorus (v, 13), remains of which still exist in that country, correspond roughly with the modern bloomeries (Napier, *Metallurgy of the Bible* p. 140). Malleable iron was in common use, but it is doubtful whether the ancients were acquainted with cast-iron. See METAL.

The mineral wealth of Canaan is indicated by describing it as "a land whose stones are iron" (Deut. viii, 9), a passage from which it would seem that in ancient times it was a plentiful production of that vicinity (compare Job xxviii, 2), as it is still in Syria, especially in the region of Lebanon (Volney's *Trav.* i, 233). There appear to have been furnaces for smelting at an early period in Egypt (Deut. iv, 20; comp. Hengstenberg, *Mos. u. Aeg.* p. 19). Winer, indeed (*Realw.* s. v. Eisen), understands that the basalt which predominates in the Hauran (Burckhardt, ii, 637) is the material of which Og's bedstead (Deut. iii, 11) was made, as it contains a large percentage of iron. But this is doubtful. Pliny (xxxvi, 11), who is quoted as an authority, says, indeed, that basalt is "ferrei coloris atque duritiæ," but does not hint that iron was ever extracted from it. The book of Job contains passages which indicate that iron was a metal well known. Of the manner of procuring it, we learn that "iron is taken from dust" (xxviii, 2). Iron was prepared in abundance by David for the building of the Temple (1 Chron. xxii, 3), to the amount of one hundred thousand talents (1 Chron. xxix, 7), or, rather, "without weight" (1 Chron. xxii, 14). Working in iron was considered a calling (2 Chron. ii, 7). See SMITH. In Ecclus. xxxviii, 28, we have a picture of the interior of an iron-smith's (Isa. xliv, 12) workshop: the smith, parched with the smoke and heat of the furnace, sitting beside his anvil, and contemplating the unwrought iron, his ears deafened with the din of the heavy hammer, his eyes fixed on his model, and never sleeping till he has accomplished his task. The superior hardness and strength of iron above all other substances is alluded to in Dan. ii, 40; its exceeding utility, in Sir. xxxix, 31. It was found among the Midianites (Numb. xxxi, 22), and was part of the wealth distributed among the tribes at their location in the land (Josh. xxii, 8).

The market of Tyre was supplied with bright or polished iron by the merchants of Dan and Javan (Ezek. xxvii, 19). Some, as the Sept. and Vulg., render this "wrought iron:" so De Wette "geschmiedetes Eisen." The Targum has "bars of iron," which would correspond with the *stricturæ* of Pliny (xxxiv, 41). But Kimchi (*Lex.* s. v.) expounds עֲשׁוֹת, *'âshôth*, as "pure and polished" (=Span. *acéro*, steel), in which he is supported by R. Sol. Parchon, and by Ben-Zeb, who gives "glänzend" as the equivalent (comp. the Homeric αἴθων σίδηρος, *Il.* vii, 473). If the Javan alluded to were Greece, and not, as Bochart (*Phaleg*, ii, 21) seems to think, some place in Arabia, there might be reference to the iron mines of Macedonia, spoken of in the decree of Æmilius Paulus (Livy, xlv, 29); but Bochart urges, as a very strong argument in support of his theory, that, at the time of Ezekiel's prophecy, the Tyrians did not depend upon Greece for a supply of cassia and cinnamon, which are associated with iron in the merchandise of Dan and Javan, but that rather the contrary was the case. Pliny (xxxiv, 41) awards the palm to the iron of Serica, that of Parthia being next in excellence. The Chalybes of the Pontus were celebrated as workers in iron in very ancient times (Æsch. *Prom.* 733). They were identified by Strabo with the Chaldæi of his day (xii, 549), and the mines which they worked were in the mountains skirting the sea-coast. The produce of their labor is supposed to be alluded to in Jer. xv, 12, as being of superior quality. Iron mines are still in existence on the same coast, and the ore is found "in small nodular masses in a dark yellow clay which overlies a limestone rock" (Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v. Chalybes).

From the earliest times we meet with manufactures in iron of the utmost variety (*some* articles of which seem to be anticipations of what are commonly supposed to be modern inventions). Thus iron was used for chisels (Deut. xxvii, 5), or something of the kind; for axes (Deut. xix, 5; 2 Kings vi, 5, 6; Isa. x, 34; comp. Homer, *Il.* iv, 485); for harrows and saws (2 Sam. xii, 31; 1 Chron. xx, 3); for nails (1 Chron. xxii, 3), and the fastenings of the Temple; for weapons of war (1 Sam. xvii, 7; Job xx, 24), and for war chariots (Josh. xvii, 16, 18; Judg. i, 19; iv, 3, 13). The latter were plated or studded with it, or perhaps armed with iron scythes at the axles, like the *currus falcati* of the ancient Romans. Its usage in defensive armor is implied in 2 Sam. xxiii, 7 (compare Rev. ix, 9), and as a safeguard in peace it appears in fetters (Psa. cv, 18), prison gates (Acts xii, 10), and bars of gates or doors (Psa. cvii, 16; Isa. xlv, 2), as well as for surgical purposes (1 Tim. iv, 2). Sheet-iron was used for cooking utensils (Ezek. iv, 3; compare Lev. vii, 9), and bars of hammered iron are mentioned in Job xl, 18 (though here the Sept. perversely renders σίδηρος χυτός, "cast-iron"). We have also mention of iron instruments (Numb. xxxv, 7); barbed irons, used in hunting (Job xli, 7); *an iron bedstead* (Deut. iii, 11); iron weights (shekels) (1 Sam. xvii, 7); iron tools (1 Kings vi, 7: 2 Kings vi, 5); horns (for symbolical use, 1 Kings xxii, 11); trees bound with iron (Dan. iv, 15); gods of iron (Dan. v, 4), etc. It was used by Solomon, according to Josephus, to clamp the large rocks with which he built up the Temple mount (*Ant.* xv, 11, 3), and by Hezekiah's workmen to hew out the conduits of Gihon (Ecclus. xlviii, 17). Images were fastened in their niches in later times by iron brackets or clamps (Wisd. xiii, 15). Agricultural implements were early made of the same material. In the treaty made by Porsena was inserted a condition like that imposed on the Hebrews by the Philistines, that no iron should be used except for agricultural purposes (Pliny, xxxiv, 39). It does not follow from Job xix, 24, that it was used for a writing implement, though such may have been the case (comp. Isa. xvii, 1), any more than that adamant was employed for the same purpose (Jer. xvii, 1), or that shoes were shod with iron and brass (Deut. xxxiii, 25). Indeed, iron so frequently occurs in poetic figures that it is difficult to discriminate between its literal and metaphorical sense. In such passages as the following, in which a "*yoke* of iron" (Deut. xxviii, 48) denotes hard service; "a *rod* of iron" (Psa. ii, 9), a stern government; "a *pillar* of iron" (Jer. i, 18), a strong support; "and *threshing instruments* of iron" (Amos i, 3), the means of cruel oppression; the hardness and heaviness (Ecclus. xxii, 15) of iron are so clearly the prominent ideas, that, though it may have been used for the instruments in question, such usage is not of necessity indicated. "The *furnace* of iron" (Deut. iv, 28; 1 Kings viii, 51) is a figure which vividly expresses hard bondage, as represented by the severe labor which attended the operation of smelting. Iron is alluded to in the following instances: Under the same figure, chastisement is denoted (Ezek. xxii, 18, 20, 22); reducing the earth to total barrenness by turning it into iron (Deut. xxviii, 23); strength, by a bar of it (Job xl, 18); affliction, by iron fetters (Psa. cvii, 10); prosperity, by giving silver for iron (Isa. lx, 17); political strength (Dan. ii, 33); obstinacy, by an iron sinew in the neck (Isa. xlviii, 4); giving supernatural fortitude to a prophet, making him an iron pillar (Jer. i, 18); destructive power of empires, by iron teeth (Dan. vii, 7); deterioration of character, by becoming iron (Jer. vi, 28; Ezek. xxii, 18), which resembles the idea of the iron age; a tiresome burden, by a mass of iron (Ecclus. xxii, 15); the greatest obstacles, by walls of iron (2 Macc. xi, 9); the certainty with which a real enemy will ever show his hatred, by the rust returning upon iron (Ecclus. xii, 10). Iron seems used, as by the Hebrew poets, metonymically for the sword (Isa. x, 34), and so the Sept. understands it, μάχαιρα. The following is selected as a *beautiful comparison* made to iron (Prov. xxvii, 17), "Iron (literally) uniteth iron; so a man uniteth the countenance of his friend," gives stability to his appearance by his presence.

It was for a long time supposed that the Egyptians were ignorant of the use of iron, and that the allusions in the Pentateuch were anachronisms, as no traces of it have been found in their monuments; but in the sepulchres at Thebes butchers are represented as sharpening their knives on a round bar of metal attached to their aprons, which, from its blue color, is presumed to be steel. The steel weapons on the tomb of Rameses III are also painted blue; those of bronze being red (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* iii, 247). One iron mine only has been discovered in Egypt, which was worked by the ancients. It is at Hammámi, between the Nile and the Red Sea; the iron found by Mr. Burton was in the form of specular and red ore (*ibid.* iii, 246). That no articles of iron should have been found is readily accounted for by the fact that it is easily destroyed by exposure to the air and moisture. According to Pliny (xxxiv, 43), it was preserved by a coating of white lead, gypsum, and liquid pitch. Bitumen was probably employed for the same purpose (xxxv, 52). The Egyptians obtained their iron almost exclusively from Assyria Proper in the form of bricks or pigs (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 415). Specimens of Assyrian iron-work overlaid with bronze were discovered by Mr. Layard, and are now in the British Museum (*Nin. and Bab.* p. 191). Iron weapons of various kinds were found at Nimrûd, but fell to pieces on exposure to the air. Some portions of shields and arrow-heads (*ib.* p. 194, 596) were rescued, and are now in England. A pick of the same metal (*ib.* p. 194) was also found, as well as part of a saw (p. 195), and the head of an axe (p. 357), and remains of scale-armor and helmets inlaid with copper (*Nineveh*, i, 340). It was used by the Etruscans for offensive weapons, as bronze for defensive armor. The Assyrians had daggers and arrow-heads of copper mixed with iron, and hardened with an alloy of tin (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 418). So in the days of Homer war-clubs were shod with iron (*Il.* vii, 141); arrows were tipped with it (*Il.* iv, 123); it was used for the axles of chariots (*Il.* v, 723), for fetters (*Od.* i, 204), for axes and bills (*Il.* iv, 485; *Od.* xxi, 3, 81). Adrastus (*Il.* vi, 48) and Ulysses (*Od.* xxi, 10) reckoned it among their treasures, the iron weapons being kept in a chest in the treasury with the gold and brass (*Od.* xxi, 61). In *Od.* i, 184, Mentes tells Telemachus that he is travelling from Taphos to Tamese to procure brass in exchange for iron, which Eustathius says was not obtained from the mines of the island, but was the produce of piratical excursions (Millin, *Minéral. Hom.* p. 115, 2d ed.). Pliny (xxxiv, 40) mentions iron as used symbolically for a statue of Hercules at Thebes (comp. Dan. ii, 33; v, 4), and goblets of iron as among the offerings in the temple of Mars the Avenger, at Rome. Alyattes the Lydian dedicated to the oracle at Delphi a small goblet of iron, the workmanship of Glaucus of Chios, to whom the discovery of the art of soldering this metal is attributed (Herod. i, 25). The goblet is described by Pausanias (x, 16). From the fact that such offerings were made to the temples, and that Achilles gave as a prize of contest a rudely-shaped mass of the same metal (Homer, *Il.* xxiii, 826), it has been argued that in early times iron was so little known as to be greatly esteemed for its rarity. That this was not the case in the time of Lycurgus is evident, and Homer attaches to it no epithet which would denote its preciousness (Millin, p. 106). There is reason to suppose that the discovery of brass preceded that of iron (Lucret. v, 1292), though little weight can be attached to the line of Hesiod often quoted as decisive on this point (*Op. et Dies*, 150). The Dactyli Idæi of Crete were supposed by the ancients to have the merit of being the first to discover the properties of iron (Pliny, vii, 57; Diod. Sic. v, 64), as the Cyclopes were said to have invented the iron-smith's forge (Pliny, vii, 57). According to the Arundelian marbles,

iron was known B.C. 1370, while Larcher (*Chronologie d'Herod.* p. 570) assigns a still earlier date, B.C. 1537. See STEEL.

I'ron (Heb. *Yiron'*, יִרְאוֹן, *place of alarm;* Sept. Ἰερών), one of the "fenced" cities of Naphtali, mentioned between En-hazor and Migdal-el (Josh. xix, 38). De Saulcy (*Narrat.* ii, 382) thinks it may be the *Yaroun* marked in Zimmerman's map north-west of Safed, the *Yaron* observed by Dr. Robinson (new ed. of *Researches*, iii, 61, 62, notes). Van de Velde likewise remarks that it is "now *Yarun*, a village of Belad Besharah. On the north-east side of the place are the foundations and other remains of the ancient city" (*Memoir*, p. 322).

Ironside, GILBERT, D.D., a bishop in the Church of England during the period of the Restoration. Of his early history but little is known to us. He was the rector of a small church in an obscure little village in Dorsetshire when he was promoted to the see of Bristol immediately after the Restoration. Wood (*Athen. Oxon.* iii, 940) says of him that he owed his promotion to a poor bishopric solely to his great wealth. He died in 1671. Bishop Ironside is the author of a work entitled *The Sabbath* (Oxford, 1637, 4to). See Stoughton, *Eccles. History of England* (*Church of the Restoration*), i, 494.

Iroquois. See INDIANS.

Ir'peël (Hebrew *Yirpeël'*, יִרְפְּאֵל, *restored by God;* Sept. Ἰερφαήλ), a city in the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned between Rekem and Taralah (Josh. xviii, 27). The associated names only afford a conjectural position somewhere in the district west of Jerusalem, possibly at *el-Kustul* (Lat. *castellum*), on a conical hill about half way between Kuloniyeh (Lat. *colonia*) and Soba (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 328).

Irregularity is a technical term for the want of the necessary canonical qualifications for the acquisition and exercise of an ecclesiastical office. These requisite qualifications are set forth in *canones* or *regulæ* enacted from time to time by the Church for that purpose. It was based first on the apostolic examples given in 1 Tim. iii, 1 sq.; v, 22; Tit. i, 6 sq.; and, after the notion of the Levitical priesthood gained ground among the clergy, on the regulations of the O. Test., which were explained in a mythical sense. The qualifications themselves can all be reduced to this, that the party ordained should not be in disrepute for crime, or in a state which would render him unfit for and incapable of ordination. Innocent III (in c. 14, X. *De purgatione canonica* [v, 33] an. 1207) distinguishes "*nota delicti*" and "*nota defectus*" as "impedienta ad sacros ordines promovendum;" and subsequent canonists have therefore divided the impediments in a like manner. In early times divers expressions were made use of to designate these impediments, but since Innocent III *irregularitas* has become the technical name of them in canon law (c. 33, X. *De testibus* [ii, 20] an. 1203). See INCAPACITY.

The *Greek Church* in general adhered more to the principles which had been established during the first six centuries (see *Canones Apostolorum, Conc. Neocæsar.* an. 314, can. 9 [c. 11, dist. xxxiv]; *Concil. Nicæn.* eod. an., *Trullianum*, an. 692, can. 21), whilst the Evangelical Church has so far adopted also later regulations, which were in accordance with its general spirit. The formulas of confession and ecclesiastical discipline still continue, however, to refer expressly to the above-named passages of Scripture.

I. *Irregularity on Account of a Crime.*—The apostle demands that he who is to assume an office over the congregation should be unimpeached. Church discipline has gradually defined the offenses which compose irregularity. Originally it consisted of all offenses that necessitated public penance; after the 9th century, of such as were publicly known (*delictum manifestum, notorium*), and all faults entailing dishonor, in which the "infamibus portæ non pateant dignitatum" of c. 87, *De regalis juris*, was practically adhered to (comp. c. 2, *Cod. Just.* "de dignitatibus," xii, 1, Constantin.). There are, besides, other offenses named by the law which, even though secret (*delicta occulta*), constitute irregularity, namely, heresy, apostasy, schism, simony, anabaptism, subreption of the ordination, promotion without passing through the regular hierarchical degrees, ministration without consecration, performance of worship whilst under excommunication or interdict, disregard of the rule of celibacy, etc. (see Thomassin, *Vetus et nova ecclesiæ disciplina*, pt. ii, lib. i, cap. lvi–lxv; Ferraris, *Bibliotheca canonica*, s. v. Irregularitas, art. i, No. 11; Ersch und Gruber, *Encyklopädie*, s. v. Ordination).

Whilst the Greek Church generally adhered to these regulations, the Evangelical Church naturally deviates from them in many particulars, in consequence of the absence of an ecclesiastical hierarchy, the abolition of the rule of celibacy, etc. That a person who has undergone punishment for crime is incapable of being ordained is self-evident. If a party is in bad repute, the congregation has a right to oppose his appointment, in case the imputations are well founded. This is a law among all Christian denominations.

The Romish Church suppresses the consequences of irregularity on account of crime by means of a dispensation which the bishops are empowered to give when the crime is not public, except in case of premeditated murder (*Concilium Trident.* Sess. xxiv, cap. 6, "De reform. verb.;" Sess. xiv, cap. 7, "De reform."). In this case the dispensation can come only from the pope himself. So also for public offences, except he delegates special powers to the bishop for that purpose. In the Greek Church, on the contrary, the strict regulations of old are maintained, whereby irregularity for heavy offences cannot be removed (Thomassin, *Vetus et nova eccles. disciplina*, cap. lx, § 12).

II. *Irregularity caused by Want of Qualification.*—Irregularity for offence constitutes also irregularity for want of sufficient qualification, as it entails the loss of good reputation (*defectus famæ*); to this are, however, added other causes which are considered as defects. Among these are:

1. *Defectus ætatis* (want of the canonical age).—The age appointed for ordination has undergone various changes. According to the present canon law, the primary consecration of the Romish Church can be imparted in the seventh year; it is the tonsure (c. 4, *De tempori. ord.* in vi [1, 9] Boniface VIII; *Conc. Trid.* Sess. xxiii, cap. 4, "De reform."). The age demanded for the other orders is: for subdeacons, the twenty-second; deacons, the twenty-third; presbyters, the twenty-fifth; bishops must be over thirty (*Conc. Trid.* Sess. xxiii, cap. 12, "De reform."). Yet the pope can grant dispensations. In the Greek Church, the old rule demanding that deacons should be twenty years old when ordained, and presbyters thirty, is still retained (*Nov. Justin.* cxxxvii, cap. 1; *Conc. Trullianum*, can. xii). The evangelical churches generally require full majority, or twenty-five years; in some countries ordination is given at twenty-one. Dispensations are also granted under certain circumstances. The Church of England requires candidates to deacons' orders to be twenty-three, presbyters twenty-four, and bishops thirty.

2. *Defectus natalium* (*legitimorum*).—Illegitimacy was no obstacle to ordination in the ancient Church (c. 8, dist. lvi, Hieronymus). It has been considered so since the 9th century; yet the rule was not very strictly enforced (*Concil. Meldense*, an. 845 [in cap. 17, can. i, qu. vii]; Regino, *De discipl. eccl.* lib. i, c. 416 sq.). Especial action was taken concerning the children of ordained priests (*Concil. Pictaviense*, an. 1078 [c. 1, X. "De filiis presbyterorum ordinandis vel non," i, 17]; *Claramontan.* an. 1095 [comp. c. 14, dist. lvi, Urban II), etc.; see especially dist. lvi, tit. x, 1, 17; lib. vi, 1, 11; *Conc. Trid.* Sess. xxv, cap. 15, "De reform."), and justified their laws by the passage of the O. T., Deut. xxiii, 2 (comp. c. 10, § 6, X. "De renunciat." i, 9, Innocent III, an. 1206). This

defect, however, can be remedied (*a*) by recognition (c. 6, X. "Qui filii sint legitimi," iv, 17, Alexander III); (*b*) by entrance into a convent or foundation of regular canons (c. 11, dist. lvi, Urban II; c. 1, X. "De filiis presbyterorum," etc.). This regulation, abolished by Sixtus V, was restored by Gregory XVI in 1591, but with this condition, that such persons should be disabled from prelatical honors. (*c*) By dispensation, which, for *ordines minores*, and for *majores* when the defect is not publicly known, can be granted by the bishop; otherwise, for *ordines majores*, and benefits connected with cure of souls, the dispensation can be granted only by the pope (c. 1, "De filiis presbyterorum," in vi [i, 11]; comp. c. 20, 25, X. "De electione" [i, 6]). The Greek Church does not recognise this defect (Thomassin, cap. lxxxi, § 4), neither does the evangelical Church, although many jurists consider the canonical principle on which it is based as common law (Wiese, *Kirchenrecht*, pt. iii, sec. 1, p. 160; Eichhorn, *Deutsches Privatrecht*, § 89; *Kirchenrecht*, i, p. 704).

3. *Defectus corporis.*—In imitation of the Mosaic law (Lev. xxi, 17-20 sq.), it was at an early time demanded that the candidates for orders should have no bodily blemishes such as might render them unfit for the duties of their office, or a subject of dislike to the people (*Constit. Apost.* lib. vii, cap. 2, 3; *Canones Apostolorum*, cap. 76, 77). The Church became subsequently very strict on this point, and declared all bodily defects sufficient ground for irregularity (cap. 2, dist. xxxiii; cap. 7, dist. xxxiv; c. 1, dist. xxxvi; c. 1, 3, dist. lv, etc.), but finally returned again to the former rules (tit. x, "De corpor. vitiatis ordinandis vel non," i, 20). Thus ordination is refused to the deaf, dumb, and blind (*Con. Apostol.* 77, c. 6, X. "De clerico ægrotante vel debilitato," iii, 6); also to those who have but one eye, especially if the one wanting is the left (*oculus canonis*), as in reading mass the Missal is placed on the left side (cap. 13, dist. lv), the lame (c. 10, dist. lv; c. 56, dist. i, "De consecr."), epileptics (c. 1, 2, can. vii, qu. ii; c. 21, X. "De electione," i, 6), lepers (c. 3, 4, X. "De clerico ægrot." iii, 6), those who had mutilated themselves (c. 21 sq.; *Apost.* c. 7 sq., dist. lv), hermaphrodites (Ferraris, *Bibliotheca canonica*, s. v.). In some of these cases there can be dispensations granted, as, for instance, for the loss of the left eye, when the right has gained more strength so as to compensate for the defect (Ferraris, s. v. Irregularitas, art. i, no. 12). The Greek Church has retained the original principle, and its application by the Evangelical Church appears fully justified.

4. *Defectus animæ* (want of spiritual capacity).—Thus madness, imbecility, etc., are grounds of irregularity (c. 2-5, dist. xxxiii).

5. *Defectus scientiæ* (the want of adequate educational preparation).—In accordance with various passages of the O. T. (Jer. i, 9; Hos. iv, 6; Mal. ii, 7, etc.), even the early Church demanded of its officers to have enjoyed special educational advantages, which alone could qualify them to act as teachers of the people (comp. dist. xxxvi-xxxviii, etc.), and the civil laws also insisted on this point (Novella, v. vi, cap. 4, etc., *Capitulares* of Charlemagne; Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, vol. ii, § 124). With regard to the different orders special regulations were gradually adopted. The Council of Trent prescribes: "Prima tonsura non initientur, qui sacramentum confirmationis non susceperint et fidei rudimenta edocti non fuerint, quique legere et scribere nesciant. Minores ordines iis qui saltem Latinam linguam intelligant . . . conferantur. Subdiaconi et diaconi ordinentur . . . in minoribus ordinibus jam probati, ac libris et iis quæ ad ordinem exercendum pertinent instructi. Qui . . . ad ordinem presbyteratus assumuntur . . . ad populum docenda ea, quæ scire omnibus necesse est ad salutem, ac ministranda sacramenta diligenti examine præcedente idonei comprobentur. Quicunque posthac ad ecclesias cathedrales erit assumendus . . . antea in universitate studiorum magister sive doctor aut licentiatus in sacra theologia vel jure canonico merito sit promotus, aut publico alicujus academiæ testimonio idoneus ad alios docendos tendatur" (*Concil. Trid.* Sess. xxiii, cap. 4, 11, 13, 14, "De reform.;" Sess. xxii, cap. 2, "De reform."). No dispensations can be granted for this case; still the pope may direct that a party be ordained without possessing the necessary instruction, but should not act in the office until he has remedied this defect. Otherwise the party thus ordained is to be deposed (c. 15, X. "De ætate" [i, 14]). The Evangelical Church has from the beginning attached much importance to the proper preparation and natural attainments of candidates. They are therefore generally subjected to examinations before ordination. See LICENTIATE; MINISTRY; THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION; and also the different articles on Christian denominations.

6. *Defectus fidei* (want of a well-grounded faith).—In consequence of the prescription of the apostle (1 Tim. iii, 6; v, 22) that no νεόφυτος should be ordained, the Church commanded that none should be ordained immediately after conversion (*Canon. Apost.* 79; *Concil. Nicæn.* 325, c. 2 [c. 1, dist. xlvii]; Gregorius, anno 599 [c. 2, eod.]), and especially none who had been baptized in sickness (*clinici*) (*Conc. Neocæsar.* an. 314, c. 12 [c. 1, dist. lvii]). Its original strictness against the children and relatives of heretics was subsequently relaxed, and even the decrees concerning new converts fell into disuse where such showed that they possessed a firm faith (c. 7, X. "In fine de rescriptis" [i, 3]); Gonzalez Tellez, *Comment.* No. 7; Lancelot, *Instit. jur. can.* lib. i, tit. vii, § 12). It was, however, always the rule that no new convert could be raised at once to high offices (c. 1 sq., dist. lxi), and this rule has been maintained in the Greek Church (Synod. i et ii, anno 861, c. 17). In the Evangelical Church it was also forbidden to raise any proselyte to office, but this is not generally adhered to in practice.

7. *Defectus perfectæ lenitatis* (want of meekness).—It applies to those who have departed from the principle *Ecclesia non sitit sanguinem.* Hence, to those who have shed blood in war (*Conc. Tolet.* i, anno 400, c. 8 [c. 4, dist. li]; Innocent I, anno 404 [c. 1, eod.]; c. 24, X. "De homicidio" [v, 12], Honorius III); also those who have sat as accuser, witness, lawyer, judge, or juryman in a criminal court, and taken part in a sentence of death (*Concil. Tolet.* iv, anno 633, c. 31; *Conc. Tolet.* xi, anno 675, c. 6 [c. 29, 30, can. xxiii, qu. viii]; c. 5, 9, X. "In clerici vel monachi negotiis secularibus se immisceant," iii, 50; comp. c. xxi, X. "De homicidio," v. 12, etc., especially the glosses to c. 1, dist. li, "Ad. v. sacerdotium"); also all who had practised surgery, in so far as cutting and cauterizing were concerned (*quæ ad ustionem vel incisionem inducit*) (c. 9, X. cit. iii, 50).

8. *Defectus sacramenti* (*matrimonii*) (want of adherence to the rule of monogamy).—The apostolic command about the bishops and deacons being the husbands of one wife (1 Tim. iii, 2, 12; Tit. i, 6) was by the Church considered as forbidding not only actual bigamy (*bigamia vera seu simultanea*), but also second marriage (*bigamia successiva*) (dist. xxvi; c. 1, 2, dist. xxxiii, tit. x, "De bigamis non ordinandis," i, 21, etc.). The idea of bigamy was subsequently extended to include marriage with a widow or a deflowered virgin (*bigamia interpretativa*) (c. 2, dist. xxxiii; c. 10, 13, dist. xxxiv; c. 8, dist. i; c. 10, § 6, X. "De renunciatione," i, 9; c. 33, X. "De testibus," ii, 20; c. 4, 5, 7, X. "De bigamis non ord." i, 21; *Novella Justiniani*, vi, cap. 1, § 3; cap. v, cxxiii; cap. xii); also the continuation of the marriage relation after a woman had committed adultery (c. 11, 12, dist. xxxiv). Finally, it was considered bigamy for those who, by a vow of chastity, had been joined in spiritual marriage to the Church, like monks, or who had attained high ecclesiastical positions, to marry even a virgin (*bigamia similitudinaria*) (c. 24, can. xxvii, qu. i [*Conc. Ancyr.* an. 314]). In this case the irregularity results *non propter sacramenti defectum, sed propter affectum intentionis cum opere subsecuto*, as Innocent III expressly

declares (c. 4 and 7. X. "De bigamis non ord."). This constitutes a real offense, for which, however, the bishop can give a dispensation (c. 4, X. "De clericis conjugatis," iv, 3; c. 1, X. "Qui clerici vel voventes matrim. contrahere possunt," iv, 6). In cases of real bigamy, the dispensation is granted by the pope himself for higher, and by the bishop for minor orders (see glosses on c. 17, dist. xxxiv, and on c. 2. X. "De bigamis non ord."). The Greek Church follows the same principles, whilst the Evangelical Church thinks there is nothing reprehensible in repeated marriages, even with widows (see Rom. vii, 2, 3; 1 Cor. vii, 39).

9. *Defectus famæ* (a bad reputation).—On the many cases of this kind which may produce irregularity, but are distinguished from those in which irregularity results from a misdeed, see Ferraris, *Bibliotheca canonica*, s. v. Irregularitas, art. i, no. 12, a; E. Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, vol. i, c. 53.

10. *Defectus libertatis* (want of liberty).—No one who is not perfectly free to dispose of himself can be ordained until consent has been given to it by the party on whom he depends. Thus slaves require the assent of their master (*Canones Apostolorum*, c. 82; c. 1, 2, 4 sq., 12, 21, dist. liv; c. 37, can. xvii, qu. iv, tit. x, "De servis non ordinandis," i, 18). But on being ordained with the consent of their master they become free; when they are ordained without his consent he can reclaim them within one year (*Novella Justiniani*, cxxiii, cap. xvii, "Auth. si servus" [c. 37, *Cod. de episcopis et clericis*, i, 3]). Yet we find among the clergy of the Middle Ages some who remained in the dependence of their former masters after their ordination, though with some restrictions (see Fürth, *Die Ministerialen*, Cologne, 1836, § 272, p. 462–465). Those who are liable to civil or military duties are to free themselves from such obligations before ordination (*Cod. Theodos.* tit. "De decurionibus," xii, 1; c. 12, 53, *Cod. Justin.* "De episcopis et clericis," i, 3; *Novella*, cxxiii, cap. i, pr. § 1; cap. xv, "Auth. sed neque curialem" [*Cod. de episcopis et clericis*, i, 3]; c. 1–3, dist. li; c. 3, can. xxiii, qu. vi, etc.). Those who have accounts to settle are to do so before being ordained (*Conc. Carthag.* anno 348, c. 8; and c. 3, dist. liv, cap. un. X. "De obligatis ad ratiocinia ordinandis vel non," i, 19; c. 1, dist. lv [Gelasius, 494]; c. 1, dist. liii [Gregor. i, 598]). Those who are married require the consent of their wife, who is then to take the vow of chastity or to enter a convent (c. 6, dist. xxviii [*Concil. Arelat.* ii, 461?]; c. 8, X. "De clericis conjugatio" [iii, 3], Innocent III, an. 1207; comp. c. 5, 8, X. "De conversione conjugatorum" [iii, 32], Alex. III; c. 4, "De tempore ordinat." in vi [i, 9], Boniface VIII). According to Greek canon law the presbyter may be married; and it is only in case he should be made bishop that his wife is obliged to enter a convent (*Conc. Trullian.* an. 692, c. 48). Children need the consent of their parents until they have reached the age of puberty (fixed at 14) (c. 1, can. xx, qu. ii; c. 5, dist. xxviii). See Thomassin, *Vetus et nova ecclesiæ disciplina*, part ii, lib. i, cap. xii–xcii; Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, vol. i, § 46–53.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vii, 67 sq. See INABILITY. (J. N. P.)

Irresistible Grace. As already stated in the article on GRACE, the word *grace* is the hinge of three great theological controversies. One of these, on the nature of depravity and regeneration, between the orthodox doctrine of the Church and Pelagianism, comprehends the question of irresistible grace. Some of the followers of Augustine, in their attempt to oppose Pelagianism, says the Rev. O. Adolphus (*Compendium Theologicum*, p. 144, 3d edit. Cambridge, England, 1865), of the Church of England, and himself a believer in predestination, carry their views of the *absolute predestination* of a limited number to the ultimate attainment of salvation, through the influence of the irresistible grace of God causing their *final perseverance*, to such an extreme in their logical deductions that there appeared persons who charged the Augustinian system with leading to the dangerous conclusions that human actions are immaterial, and human efforts for the conversion of the wicked unavailing, in the face of God's *free gift of grace* in accordance with his *secret decrees*, predetermined from everlasting. For the Arminian argument on the other hand, see ARMINIANISM; ELECTION; PREDESTINATION; WILL.

Irrigation. Gardens in the East anciently were, and still are, when possible, planted near streams, which afford the means of easy irrigation. (See the curious account of ancient garden irrigation in Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xix, 4.) This explains such passages as Gen. ii, 9 sq., and Isa. i, 30. But streams were few in Palestine, at least such as afforded water in summer, when alone water was wanted for irrigation: hence rain-water, or water from the streams which dried up in summer, was in winter stored up in reservoirs, spacious enough to contain all the water likely to be needed during the dry season. See POOL; WELL. In fact, many of our own large nurseries are watered in the same manner from reservoirs of rain-water. The water was distributed through the garden in numerous small rills, which trav-

Ancient Egyptians watering gardens by buckets carried on the shoulder, and by means of the well-sweep.

Modern Egyptian *Shadûf*.

ersed it in all directions, and which were supplied either by a continued stream from the reservoir, or had water poured into them by the gardeners, in the manner shown in the Egyptian monuments (see Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* abridgm. i, 33 sq.). See GARDEN. These rills, being turned and directed by the foot, gave rise to the phrase "watering by the foot," as indicative of garden irrigation (Deut. xi, 10). Thus Dr. Thomson says (*Land and Book*, ii, 279), "I have often watched the gardener at this fatiguing and unhealthy work. When one place is sufficiently saturated, he pushes aside the sandy soil between it and the next furrow with his foot, and thus continues to do until all are watered." The reference, however, may be to certain kinds of hydraulic machines turned by the feet, such as the small water-wheels used on the plain of Acre and elsewhere. At Hamath, Damascus, and other places in Syria, there are large water-wheels, turned by the stream, used to raise water into aqueducts. But the most common method of raising water along the Nile is the *Shadûf*, or well-sweep and bucket, represented on the monuments, though not much used in Palestine. (On the whole subject, see Kitto, *Nat. Hist. of Pal.* p. ccxciii sq.). See WATER.

Ir-she'mesh (Heb. *id.* עִיר שֶׁמֶשׁ, in pause עִיר שָׁמֶשׁ, *city of* the *sun;* Sept. πόλις Σάμες, Vulg. *Hirsemes, id est civitas solis*), a town on the border of Dan, mentioned between Eshtaol and Shaalabbin (Josh. xix, 41); probably the same as the BETH-SHEMESH (q. v.) of Josh. xv, 10.

I'ru (Hebrew *Iru'*, עִירוּ, *citizen;* Sept. Ἡρά, Vulg. *Hir*), the first-named of the sons of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (1 Chron. iv, 15). B.C. 1618.

Irvine, MATHEW, a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Cumberland Co., Pa., December 22, 1817. In early life he was a school-teacher. On account of his piety and gifts he was made an elder in the Church. His call to the ministry then became more apparent to himself and to others, and he began the study of theology privately with his pastor, and in 1843 was licensed and ordained. He took charge of feeble and scattered German Reformed congregations in Bedford Co., Pa., where he did the work of a pioneer in a truly apostolic spirit. A number of separate charges were formed from time to time out of parts of his field. His ministry was greatly blessed, and the wilderness and solitary places all around became glad. He accomplished the work of a long life in a comparatively few years, and died in peace April 21, 1857.

Irving, EDWARD, "the great London preacher, and promoter of a strange fanaticism, whose name thirty years ago was in everybody's mouth, and whose career, so strange, grotesque, solemn, and finally so sad, was the theme of the sneers of the thoughtless and of the wonder of the thoughtful," was born Aug. 15, 1792, at Annan, county of Dumfries, Scotland, where his father was a tanner. He was piously brought up, having been early destined by his ambitious parents for the ministry. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and shortly after graduation (1805) was appointed to superintend the mathematical school at Haddington, whence he removed in 1812 to Kirkcaldy to assume the duties of a similar but more eligible position. About this time he also began his theological studies, and, in accordance with the usage of his *alma mater*, he entered as one of her students of theology. After a stay of about seven years, having completed the probation required by the Church of Scotland, he attained, by action of the Presbytery of Annan, to "the ambiguous position of a licensed preacher and candidate—a layman in fact, though often recognised as a clergyman by courtesy; and he only waited an opportunity to escape from his present occupation to that for which he had been formally designated." But not finding an opening immediately, and tired of the occupation of teaching, he recommenced study at Edinburgh, devoting most of his time to the writings of Bacon, Hooker, and Jeremy Taylor. At last there came an invitation to preach in the hearing of the celebrated Dr. Chalmers, who was desirous of procuring for himself an assistant in the great parish of St. John's, Glasgow; and shortly after Irving was chosen for this position, and so enabled to begin "in earnest the great life-work for which he had been preparing, and which he had anticipated with most painful longings. A parish of 10,000 souls, mostly the families of poor artisans and laborers, composed the pastorate of St. John's, Glasgow, and Irving at once entered on its varied duties with all his energies." But as his association in this parish with Dr. Chalmers only afforded him an inferior place, he soon grew dissatisfied with the position; and, his preaching having secured him quite a favorable reputation, he was invited to the great English metropolis as minister of the Caledonian Church, a kirk of Scotland in Cross Street, Hatton Garden. Early in July, 1822, he began his labors in this little out-of-the-way church, composed of only fifty members, occasionally enlarged by some stray Scotchmen visiting the great city. In a very few weeks he began to attract large congregations; in three months the applications for seats had risen to 1500; at length it became necessary to exclude the general public, and to admit only those who were provided with tickets. Statesmen, orators, the noble, the wealthy, the fashionable, occupied the seats of the church, and their carriages thronged the adjoining streets. His ability and success as a preacher are thus stated by a writer on "Henry Drummond" in the *London Quart. Review*, October, 1860, p. 275: "The preacher's great stature, his bushy black hair hanging down in ringlets, his deep voice, his solemn manner, the impressiveness of his action, his broad Scotch dialect, his antiquated yet forcible style, all combined to rivet attention, and made you feel that you were in the presence of a power. Nor did his matter belie the impression which was thus created. He was bent upon accomplishing the end of the Gospel ministry in saving souls from death; and at the beginning of his course, before the disturbing influences of his position had done their full work upon him, he preached with great force and effect." The influence which Irving exerted among all classes of society of London was really surprising. Such an amount of applause as was awarded to his pulpit discourses has never fallen to the lot of man since his day, excepting perhaps in the case of Spurgeon. In 1824, a volume containing some of his discourses was sent forth, not as sermons, but under the title of *Orations: For the Oracles of God, four Orations; For Judgments to come, an Argument in nine Parts.* The author shared the same popular favor as the preacher, and three editions of the book were sold in less than half a year. "Aimless, and without a wide or lasting interest, curiously quaint in style and manner, while the matter generally bears upon the topics of the passing hour, it contains many passages of extraordinary beauty and depth, many an outpouring of lofty devotion, and frequent bursts of the most passionate eloquence" (*Encyclop. Britan.* xii, 625). But, as the production of the preacher of the little Hatton Garden chapel, everybody who wished to be up with the times had to read it, and so it soon "became the talk of the town, and was criticised by each according to his position and temper." The book had many vulnerable points, one of which, not the least perhaps, was the thrust in his introduction against the evident lack of success of the ordinary instructions of the pulpit, charging it all as the result of the defective manner of preaching generally prevalent in England at that time. But if this arrayed a number of critics against him, an estrangement of the great body of contemporary evangelical Christians only followed his course of action in 1824. In this year he was called upon, as one of the pulpit celebrities of the great metropolis, to preach before the London Missionary Society. He had long dreamed of a revival of apostolical missions, and to advance "these

sublime fancies" this opportunity afforded him scope. "For three mortal hours the vast assembly was held entranced by his gorgeous oratory while he depicted, not the work of that or any other body, but a grand ideal of a mission scheme after the model of apostolic times. During all this time the managers sat in painful solicitude, first for their usual collections, and ultimately for the damage that such a discourse must entail upon the cause in which they were engaged. But nobody could suspect the preacher of a design to harm the cause he was called to advocate. To his mind the missionary work was not the same thing with that contemplated by the society, and, as he spoke from his own inflamed fancy and full heart, his utterances were foreign to the subject as they viewed it. But the discourse was more than a blunder; it was a burning protest, though undesigned, against the spirit of cowardly prudence in which the work of missions was, and, alas! that it must be said, still is prosecuted. It unluckily struck precisely upon those points which annual reports and platform orators are usually careful to leave untouched, and by holding up the bright ideal it condemned the actual" (Dr. Curry).

However candid may have been his manner and true the zeal for the Christian cause which unquestionably impelled Irving at this time, the effect was to estrange from him many of his Christian friends. But the birth of a son for a time turned his attention from the controversy which his acts had provoked and to him, so fond of home life, atoned in a measure for the loss of friends. The child, however, soon died, and this additional loss incited him to the study of prophecy. His attention had already been called in this direction by Hatley Frere, "an earnest but one-sided student of the prophecies," who was propounding about this time a new theory of interpretation, the especial object of which was to establish the idea of a personal reign of Christ on earth. The study and translation of a Spanish work on this subject, generally attributed to Ben-Ezra, but really the production of the Jesuit Lacunza (q. v.) (published by Irving under the title of *The Coming of Messiah in Glory and Majesty*), aided in "turning the balance of Irving's mind the wrong way just at the crisis of his intellectual fate. These prophetical studies met an original bias in his mind, and made him a fatal prey to religious delusion." An opportunity soon occurred to lay before the public his favorite theory of the millennium by an invitation from the Continental Society to preach the annual sermon (1825). Like the missionary sermon of the previous year, it gave rise to considerable commotion, more especially among the friends of "Catholic Emancipation." England at this time was decidedly in favor of bestowing upon Roman Catholics unlimited political power, which Irving vehemently opposed. A good part of his audience left their seats before the speaker had finished his discourse, which, like the missionary sermon, occupied some "three or more hours in the delivery." To make a bad matter still worse, Irving determined to publish his discourse, enlarged and rearranged, in book form, and during the next year sent it forth under the title *Babylon and Infidelity Foredoomed*, dedicating it "to my beloved friend and brother in Christ, Hatley Frere, Esq." "Irving now threw himself unreservedly," says Dr. Curry, "into the current that swept him away from his moorings. By the strange fascination which often attends the study of prophecy and the expectation of a terrestrial millennium, he now came to expect the *speedy* coming of Christ to set up his kingdom on earth, and this wrought in him the usual results of excitement and specialty of religious thought and conversation. He had reached that stage of mental excitement in which almost every event becomes a proof of the cherished expectation, and the mind's own action steadily intensifies the dominant fascination. In this, too, he craved the sympathy of other minds inspired with the same sentiments, and these he readily obtained; a kind of mystic circle, among whom were Hatley Frere, now relieved of his isolation, the celebrated Rabbin, Dr. Wolff, Irving himself, and Henry Drummond, with others less distinguished, after numerous informal conversations, at length came together in a conference at Albury, the hospitable residence of Mr. Drummond, brought together, as Irving declared, by 'a desire to compare their views with respect to the prospects of the Church at this present crisis'" (comp. art. ix, "On Drummond," in the *London Quart. Review*, Oct. 1860). "Irving sat down with his motley associates, a giant among pigmies, the most docile of the company, and quite ready to yield his own views to the superficial fancies of the least distinguished of the body, and to surrender his clearest intellectual convictions to what was styled the answer to prayer. From such sessions the only probable results followed: the fanaticism in which they began was heightened and confirmed, especially in the single mind capable of being damaged by it."

The popularity of the great preacher, however, continued unabated in the midst of all these difficulties; nay, his late meditations and yearnings rather increased his reputation, and soon a new and more commodious church had to be provided for the throngs of hearers that weekly came to listen to him. The money for the building of a new edifice was easily procured, and early in 1827 he was installed pastor of the newly-built church in Regent Square, Chalmers preaching on the occasion. "The transition from the little Caledonian chapel, so long thronged by a promiscuous crowd of London fashionable life, to the commodious National Scotch Church in Regent Square, with its well-ordered and well-defined congregation, marks the culmination and the beginning of the descent of Irving's popularity." Shortly after his removal to the new church, he again ventured before the public as an author by the publication of three volumes (1828) selected from his discourses preached since the commencement of his ministry at London. Up to this time many of the extravagances of Irving had more or less displeased his brother laborers in the ministry, but no one had ventured to attack him publicly until "an idle clergyman called Cole," of whom Mr. Irving's biographer, Mrs. Oliphant, can barely speak with civility, accused Irving of inculcating heterodox doctrines on the *Incarnation* in the first volume of his sermons, which treats chiefly of the Trinity; first of the divine character, and especially of the person and work of Christ. "The perfect humanity of Christ was Irving's favorite theme. With the utmost intensity he clung to the idea of the brotherhood of his Master—an idea he held with perfect reverence. The first shock of the charge of heresy, and of heresy, too, in relation to his adorable Lord, utterly unmanned him. The last thought of his heart would have been to derogate from the dignity of his Master, his impassioned reverence for whom had probably stimulated the teaching which now bore the brand of heresy" (*Lond. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1862, p. 193). It would hardly be worth while to follow up the controversy incited by the impertinent, if not treacherous conduct of Mr. Cole in exaggerating "an error which should have been the groundwork of a brotherly expostulation," were it not for the fact that for these very views on the incarnation Irving was, some years later, deposed from the ministry. As we have already said, he was the last of all persons who could be led to believe that the views which he set forth on this subject had anything novel or unusual in them. All that he was possibly guilty of, says Dr. Curry, is that "*he took in a larger view which contemplated the whole work of the incarnation of the Word as redemptive, in that by it the Godhead came into vital union with humanity, fallen and under the law.* This last thought carried to his realistic mode of thinking the notion of Christ's participation in the fallen character of humanity, which he designated by terms that implied a real sinfulness in Christ. His attempt to get rid of the odiousness of that idea by saying that this was overborne and at length

wholly expelled by the indwelling Godhead helped the matter but little, and still left him open to grave censures for at least an unhappy method of statement. But under all this there is unquestionably a most precious Gospel truth, and if Irving was justly condemned for an unwarrantable misstatement of certain doctrines of Christianity, the orthodoxy of the age may be justly called to account for its partial exhibition of those doctrines. For centuries the Church has been actively occupied in setting forth and defending the doctrine of Christ's divinity, until that of his humanity has largely fallen out of its thinkings. It is quite time to cease from this one-sidedness and to take in a whole Gospel. Fallen humanity demands a sympathizing no less than an almighty Saviour; and if indeed Jesus is to be that Saviour, he must be apprehended by our faith, as 'man with man,' and as really and fully 'touched with a *sense* of our infirmities.' The Church of Rome answers to the heart's yearning for human sympathy in the Mediator by giving that office to Mary; while our misformed practical creeds remove Jesus beyond our sympathies, and give us no other Mediator. The Church awaits the coming of a John, uprising from the Saviour's bosom, to set forth in all fulness the blessedness of the grace of Jesus, the *incarnate* God, who hath 'borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.'" With this charge of heresy advanced against him, Irving set out on a visit to his native land "to warn, first his father's house and kindred, and the country side which had still so great a hold upon his heart, and then universal Scotland, of that advent which he looked for with undoubting and fervent expectations;" and brilliant was the success with which he saw his labors crowned wherever he went. For once he was a prophet who received honors in his own country. Wherever he preached, not only whole congregations from neighboring towns came to swell his already large numbers of hearers, but oftentimes even the ministers would adjourn their services and go with their flocks *en masse* to hear Scotland's noble descendant. While preaching at Edinburgh on the *Apocalypse*, the special theme of study in these later years, the services began at six o'clock A.M. Of these Chalmers writes: "He is drawing prodigious crowds. We attempted this morning to force our way into St. Andrew's Church, but it was all in vain. He changes to the West Church, with its three hideous galleries, for the accommodation of the public," and even then there was not room. As in Edinburgh, so was his success at Glasgow and other places that he visited, and we need not wonder that Chalmers himself exclaims "that there must have been a marvellous power of attraction that could turn a whole population out of their beds as early as five in the morning."

As if to augment the difficulties already in his way, in his candid and straightforward manner, he further estranged his friends of the Scottish Church by extending his sympathy to a minister of his native Church, a Mr. Campbell, of Row, who was just then under the odium of teaching false notions on the Procrustian high-Calvinistic doctrine of the Atonement as set forth in the Westminster Confession.

But the grand and final divergence from his mother Church further resulted, not from the communication of any doctrinal excitement from the banks of Guirloch, but from a very strange phenomenon which about this time took its rise along the quiet banks of this river. For some time Irving had been pondering on the heritage of the *gift of tongues* (q. v.; see also GIFTS), and was inclined to believe this spiritual gift to have been not only possessed by the apostolic Church, but an actual heritage of the Church of all times; indeed, a necessary condition for the healthy state of any Church of Christ. These thoughts of his became convictions when seconded at this juncture by some remarkable instances. In the locality of Row, celebrated for the piety of its inhabitants, there had lived and died a young woman, Isabella Campbell by name, of rare and saintly character. A memoir which her minister had written of her attracted the attention of people far and near, and many of them came as pilgrims to visit the spot where she had lived and prayed. These visits to the earthly dwelling-place, as well as the noble reputation, if not example of a departed sister, had a wonderful influence on the surviving sister Mary—"gifted with the same spiritual temperament, with powers of mind of no ordinary character, and, moreover, with the personal fascination of beauty." For a long time she had been afflicted with the same disease which had made a prey of her sister, and while lying, as all believed, at the point of death, she professed to have received "the gift of tongues," and, "as she lay in her weakness," the Holy Ghost, they said, had come upon her with mighty power, and "constrained her to speak at great length, and with superhuman strength, in an unknown tongue." Similar cases occurred in other neighboring places, and the news of the wondrous phenomena soon reached the ears of Irving. To him, of course, these indicated "an approaching realization of his prophetic dreams." Not for an instant was he to hesitate to acknowledge them as the natural answer of his aspirations and prayer; and many of his own flock, prepared by his previous teachings, seconded his leanings in favor of these long-lost spiritual gifts. Manifestations of a similar character soon appeared in his own Church, at first privately, then at the week-day matins, and finally even in the public service on the Sabbath. "The die" had truly been "cast, and from that time the Regent Square church became a Babel." His oldest and most discreet friends one by one deserted him, finding that their counsel was of no avail. Even a visit of Chalmers and Coleridge, both his friends, could not in the least stay the current that was fast hurrying him to a most frightful abyss. A collision between the pastor and his flock was inevitable, though some of his people shared his views. Against the continuation of the "new prophets" even his own brother-in-law voted, and the inevitable result was of course the ejectment of the minister and his believers in the "gift of tongues" from Regent Square Church. But it must not be supposed that a man of Irving's great abilities, though his course was now downward, was surrounded only by a few weak followers. Among those who faithfully followed their pastor were some of London's most distinguished characters, and when on the following Sunday he met his adherents in the hall of the great infidel Owen, no less than 800 were there to partake of the Lord's Supper. Indeed, the place they had temporarily secured was far too small to contain all that still flocked to hear Irving, and they removed to a large gallery in Newman Street, generally designated as West's Gallery, because it had formerly belonged to West the painter. The denouement of the play had now fairly begun, and it rapidly hastened to its close. The "gifted ones" at Newman Street had things in their own hands, and everything proceeded by "vision," and "prophecy," and in the "Spirit;" to all which Irving gave the most reverent and obedient attention. The Presbytery of Annan, by which body Irving had been first licensed to preach, but not ordained, "by a remarkable stretch of power" condemned him as guilty of heresy, and excommunicated him from the Church of Scotland. But as if his cup of sorrows was not yet sufficiently bitter, to add to the condemnation which he had just received at the hand of his mother Church, which he so dearly loved, he was, on his return from Annan to London, deprived even by his own adherents of the authority which by reason of his superiority had universally been granted to him, and, in accordance with a "revelation," was interdicted "from exercising any priestly function, or administering the sacraments, or even preaching, excepting to those less sacred assemblies to which unbelievers were admitted. Astounded, he yet uttered no murmur, but sat in the lowest places of the Church which he himself had created, in silent and resigned humility." Mr. Andrews, in

an article on Irving in the *New Englander* (1863, p. 816 sq.), seeks to refute this statement, so generally accepted as made by Mrs. Oliphant in her biography of Mr. Irving. But even Mr. Andrews acknowledges that when Mr. Irving was finally reordained by these "superior" officers, who claimed to have been called by God to higher distinctions, his position "was in some respects less independent than before," and that it could not have been otherwise than "that Mr. Irving should have met with trials and difficulties in the progress of the work under his new phase," especially "a man of his great strength of character, and gifts for leadership, accustomed hitherto to be foremost in whatever he engaged in" (p. 821). But for once fortune favored Irving. The great degradation which he was called upon to suffer was to be his last, and a short one at that. In the autumn of 1834, the severe task which he had been imposing on his mind and body began to tell upon him, and while on a journey to Scotland for the recovery of his failing health, he was taken dangerously ill, and died at Glasgow Dec. 8, 1834.

Of Irving it may truly be conceded that a more devout or earnest spirit has not appeared on the stage of time in the 19th century. Destined to be a Christian minister, "he strove" (said of him a friend who knew him well), "with all the force that was in him, to *be* it. He might have been so many things; not a speaker only, but a doer—the leader of hosts of men. For his head, when the fog of Babylon had not yet obscured it, was of strong, far-reaching insight. His very enthusiasm was sanguine, not *atrabiliar;* he was so loving, full of hope, so simple-hearted, and made all that approached him his. A giant form of activity was in the man; speculation was accident, not nature. There was in him a courage dauntless, not pugnacious; hardly fierce, by no possibility ferocious; as of the generous war-horse, gentle in its strength, yet that laughs at the shaking of the spear. But, above all, be he what he might, to be a reality was indispensable for him." In another place the same friend exclaims: "But for Irving I had never known what the communion of man with man means. His was the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came in contact with. I call him, on the whole, the best man I have ever, after trial enough, found in this world, or now hope to find." Similar was the judgment of all Irving's friends, and even of most of his opponents. "All admired the man, his many virtues, his matchless eloquence; all deplored his fall, and the gulf of separation which it created between him and his mother Church." His works have been collected by his nephew, the Rev. P. Carlyle, who has published them under the title of *Collected Writings of Edward Irving* (Lond. 1864-5, 5 vols. 8vo). See Mrs. Oliphant, *Life of Edward Irving* (Lond. 1862; N. Y. [Harpers'] 1862, 8vo); Carlyle, *Miscellaneous Essays; Meth. Qu. Rev.* Jan. 1849; 1863; *Lond. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1862, art. vi; *Edinb. Rev.* Oct. 1862, art. vii; *Encyclop. Britann.* xii, s. v.; Baring Gould, *Post Mediæval Preachers* (of England only); Littell's *Living Age* (on Irving's works), Feb. 23, 1867, art. i; and M. W. Andrews (of the Catholic Apostolic Church, the name now assumed by the Irvingites), in the *New Englander*, July, 1863, art. i; Oct., art. viii. (J. H. W.)

I'saäc (Heb. *Yitschak'*, יִצְחָק, *laughter*, in the poet. books sometimes יִשְׂחָק, *Yischak'*, Psa. cv, 9; Jer. xxxiii, 26; Amos vii, 9, 16, in the last two passages spoken of the Israelitish nation; Sept. and N. T. Ἰσαάκ, Joseph. Ἴσακος, *Ant.* i, 10, 5), the only son of Abraham by Sarah, and the middle one of the three patriarchs who are so often named together as the progenitors of the Jewish race.

I. *Personal History.*—The following are the facts which the Bible supplies of the longest-lived of the three patriarchs, the least migratory, the least prolific, and the least favored with extraordinary divine revelations. A few events in this quiet life have occasioned discussion.

1. The promise of a son had been made to his parents when Abraham was visited by the Lord in the plains of Mamre, and appeared so unlikely to be fulfilled, seeing that both Abraham and Sarah were "well stricken in years," that its utterance caused the latter to laugh incredulously (Gen. xviii, 1 sq.). B.C. 2064. Being reproved for her unbelief, she denied that she had laughed. The reason assigned for the special visitation thus promised was, in effect, that Abraham was pious, and would train his offspring in piety, so that he would become the founder of a great nation, and all the nations of the earth should be blessed in him. See ABRAHAM. In due time Sarah gave birth to a son, who received the name of Isaac (Gen. xxi, 1-3). B.C. 2063. This event occurred at Gerar. Isaac was thus emphatically the child of promise. Born, as he was, out of due time, when his father was a hundred years old and his mother ninety, the parents themselves laughed with a kind of incredulous joy at the thought of such a prodigy (Gen. xvii, 17; xviii, 12), and referring to the marvellousness of the event when it had actually taken place, Sarah said that not only she, but all who heard of it, would be disposed to laugh (Gen. xxi, 6). The name Isaac, therefore, was fitly chosen by God for the child, in commemoration of the extraordinary, supernatural nature of the birth, and of the laughing joy which it occasioned to those more immediately interested in it. This signification of Isaac's name is thrice alluded to (Gen. xvii, 17; xviii, 12; xxi, 6). Josephus (*Ant.* i, 12, 2) refers to the second of those passages for the origin of the name; Jerome (*Quæst. Hebr. in Gen.*) vehemently confines it to the first; Ewald (*Gesch.* i, 425), without assigning reasons, gives it as his opinion that all three passages have been added by different writers to the original record. There need be no dispute as to which of these passages the import of the name refers; it includes a reference to them all, besides according with and expressing the happy, cheerful disposition of the bearer, and suggesting the relation in which he stood, as the seed of Abraham, the channel of the promised blessing, and the type of him who is pre-eminently *the Seed*, whose birth has put laughter into the hearts of myriads of our race. The preternatural birth of Isaac was a sign from heaven at the outset, indicating what kind of seed God expected as the fruit of the covenant, and what powers would be required for its production—that it should be a seed at once coming in the course of nature, and yet in some sense above nature—the special gift and offspring of God. When Isaac was eight days old he received circumcision, and was thus received into the covenant made with his father; while his mother's sceptical laughter was turned into triumphant exultation and joy in God (Gen. xxi, 4-7). (See De Wette, *Krit.* p. 133 sq.; Ewald, *Gesch.* i, 388; Hartmann, *Ueber d. Pentat.* p. 269; Lengerke, *Ken.* p. 290; Niemeyer, *Charact.* ii, 160.) See NAME.

2. The first noticeable circumstance in the life of Isaac took place in connection with his weaning. His precise age at the time is not given, but we may suppose him to have been (according to Eastern custom) fully two years old. In honor of the occasion Abraham made a great feast, as an expression, no doubt, of his joy that the child had reached this fresh stage in his career—was no longer a suckling, but capable of self-sustenance, and a certain measure of independent action. For the parents, and those who sympathized with them, it would naturally be a feast of laughter—the laughter of mirth and joy; but there was one in the family—Ishmael—to whom it was no occasion of gladness, who saw himself supplanted in the more peculiar honors of the house by this younger brother, and who mocked while others laughed—himself, indeed, laughed (for it is the same word still, מְצַחֵק, Gen. xxi, 9), but with the envious and scornful air which betrayed the alien and hostile spirit that lurked in his bosom. He must have been a well-grown boy at the time; and Sarah, descrying in the manifestations then given the sure

presage of future rivalry and strife, urged Abraham to cast forth the bondmaid and her son, since the one could not be a co-heir with the other. Abraham, it would seem, hesitated for a time about the matter, feeling pained at the thought of having Ishmael separated from the household, and only complied when he received an explicit warrant and direction from above. At the same time, he got the promise, as the ground of the divine procedure, "For in Isaac shall thy seed be called," that is, in Isaac (as contradistinguished from Ishmael, or any other son) shall the seed of blessing that is to hold of thee as a father have its commencement. It is probable that Abraham needed to have this truth brought sharply out to him, for correction on the one side, as well as for consolation and hope on the other, as his paternal feelings may have kept him from apprehending the full scope of former revelations concerning the son of Hagar. The high purposes of God were involved in the matter, and the yearnings of natural affection must give way, that these might be established. In the transactions themselves the apostle Paul perceived a revelation of the truth for all times—especially in regard to the natural enmity of the heart to the things of God, and the certainty with which, even when wearing the badge of a religious profession, it may be expected to vent its malice and opposition towards the true children of God (Rom. ix, 7, 10; Gal. iv, 28; Heb. xi, 18). The seed of blessing, those who are supernaturally born of God, like Isaac, and have a special interest in the riches of his goodness, are sure to be eyed with jealousy, and, in one form or another, persecuted by those who, with a name to live, still walk after the flesh (Gal. iv, 21-31). See ISHMAEL.

It has been asked, what were the persecutions sustained by Isaac from Ishmael to which Paul refers (Gal. iv, 29)? If, as is generally supposed, he refers to Gen. xxi, 9, then the word מְצַחֵק, παίζοντα, may be translated *mocking*, as in the A. V., or *insulting*, as in xxxix, 14, and in that case the trial of Isaac was by means of "*cruel* mockings" (ἐμπαιγμῶν), in the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi, 36). Or the word may include the signification *paying idolatrous worship*, as in Exod. xxxii, 6, or *fighting*, as in 2 Sam. ii, 14. These three significations are given by Jarchi, who relates a Jewish tradition (quoted more briefly by Wetstein on Gal. iv, 29) of Isaac suffering personal violence from Ishmael, a tradition which, as Mr. Ellicott thinks, was adopted by Paul. The English reader who is content with our own version, or the scholar who may prefer either of the other renderings of Jarchi, will be at no loss to connect Gal. ix, 29 with Gen. xxi, 9. But Origen (*in Gen. Hom.* vii, § 3), and Augustine (*Sermo* iii), and apparently Prof. Jowett (on Gal. iv, 29), not observing that the gloss of the Sept. and the Latin versions "playing *with her son Isaac*" forms no part of the simple statement in Genesis, and that the words מְצַחֵק, παίζοντα, are not to be confined to the meaning "playing," seem to doubt (as Mr. Ellicott does on other grounds) whether the passage in Genesis bears the construction apparently put upon it by St. Paul. On the other hand, Rosenmüller (*Schol. in Gen.* xxi, 9) even goes so far as to characterize ἐδίωκε—"persecuted"—as a very excellent interpretation of מְצַחֵק. (See Drusius on Gen. xxi, 9, in *Crit. Sacr.*, and Estius on Gal. iv, 29.)

What effect the companionship of the wild and wayward Ishmael might have had on Isaac it is not easy to say; but his expulsion was, no doubt, ordered by God for the good of the child of promise, and most probably saved him from many an annoyance and sorrow. Freed from such evil influence, the child grew up under the nurturing care of his fond parents, mild and gentle, loving and beloved.

3. The next recorded event in the life of Isaac is the memorable one connected with the command of God to offer him up as a sacrifice on a mountain in the land of Moriah (Gen. xxii). B.C. cir. 2047. Nothing is said of his age at the time except that he is called "a lad" (נַעַר), perhaps sixteen years of age. According to Josephus (*Ant.* i, 13, 2), he was twenty-five years old. That Isaac knew nothing of the relation in which he personally stood to the divine command, came affectingly out in the question he put to his father while they journeyed together, "Behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering?" Even then the secret was not disclosed to him; and only, it would appear, when the act itself was in process of being consummated, did the fearful truth burst upon his soul that he was himself to be the victim on the altar. Yet the sacred narrative tells of no remonstrant struggle on the part of this child of promise, no strivings for escape, no cries of agony or pleadings for deliverance: he seems to have surrendered himself as a willing sacrifice to the call of Heaven, and to have therein showed how thoroughly in him, as in his believing parent, the mind of the flesh had become subordinate to the mind of the spirit. To act thus was to prove himself the fitting type of him who had the law of God in his heart, and came to do, not his own will, but the will of him that sent him. But the death itself, which was to prove the life of the world, it belonged to the antitype, not to the type, to accomplish. The ram provided by God in the thicket must meanwhile take the place of the seed of blessing. In the surrender by the father of his "only son," the concurrence of the son's will with the father's, the sacrificial death which virtually took place, and the resurrection from the dead, whence Abraham received his son "in figure" (Heb. xi, 19), are all points of analogy which cannot be overlooked.

The offering up of Isaac by Abraham has been viewed in various lights. It is the subject of five dissertations by Frischmuth in the *Thes. Theol. Philol.* p. 197 (attached to *Crit. Sacri;* originally Jena, 1662-5, 4to). By bishop Warburton (*Div. Leg.* b. vi, § 5) the whole transaction was regarded as "merely an information by action (comp. Jer. xxvii, 2; Ezek. xii, 3; Hos. i, 2), instead of words, of the great sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of mankind, given at the earnest request of Abraham, who longed impatiently to see Christ's day." This view is adopted by dean Graves (*On the Pentateuch*, pt. iii, § 4), and has become popular. But it is pronounced to be unsatisfactory by Davidson (*Primitive Sacrifice*, pt. iv, § 2), who, pleading for the progressive communication of the knowledge of the Christian atonement, protests against the assumption of a contemporary disclosure of the import of the sacrifice to Abraham, and points out that no expiation or atonement was joined with this emblematic oblation, which consequently symbolized only the act, not the power or virtue of the Christian sacrifice. Mr. Maurice (*Patriarchs and Lawgivers*, iv) draws attention to the offering of Isaac as the last and culminating point (compare Ewald, *Geschichte*, i, 430-4) in the divine education of Abraham, that which taught him the meaning and ground of self-sacrifice. The same line of thought is followed up in a very instructive and striking sermon on the sacrifice of Abraham in *Doctrine of Sacrifice*, iii, 33-48. Some German writers have spoken of the whole transaction as a dream (Eichhorn, *Biblioth. f. bibl. Liter.* i, 45 sq.), or a myth (De Wette), or as the explanation of a hieroglyph (Otman, in Henke's *Magazin*, ii, 517), and treat other events in Isaac's life as slips of the pen of a Jewish transcriber. Even the merit of novelty cannot be claimed for such views, which appear to have been in some measure forestalled in the time of Augustine (Sermo ii, *De tentatione Abrahæ*). They are, of course, irreconcilable with the declaration of St. James, that it was *a work* by which Abraham was justified. Eusebius (*Præp. Evang.* iv, 16, and i, 10) has preserved a singular and inaccurate version of the offering of Isaac in an extract from the ancient Phœnician historian Sanchoniathon; but it is absurd to suppose that the widely-spread (see Ewald, *Alterthümer*, p. 79, and Thomson's *Bampton Lectures*, 1853, p. 38) heathen practice of sacrificing human

beings (so Bruns, in Paulus's *Memorab.* vi, 1 sq.) received any encouragement from a sacrifice which Abraham was forbidden to accomplish (see Waterland, *Works*, iv, 203). Some writers have found for this transaction a kind of parallel—it amounts to no more—in the classical legends of Iphigenia and Phrixus (so Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* i, 95), etc. (see J. G. Michaelis, *De Abr. et Is. a Græcis in Hyrilum et Orionem conversis*, Frcft. a. O. 1721; Zeibich, *Isaaci ortus in fabula Orionis vestigia*, Ger. 1776). The story of Iphigenia, which inspired the devout Athenian dramatist with sublime notions of the import of sacrifice and suffering (Æsch. *Agam.* 147, et seq.), supplied the Roman infidel only with a keen taunt against religion (Lucret. i, 102), just as the great trial which perfected the faith of Abraham and moulded the character of Isaac draws from the Romanized Jew of the first century a rhetorical exhibition of his own unacquaintance with the meaning of sacrifice (see Joseph. *Ant.* i, 13, 3). The general aim of certain writers has been, as they consider it, to relieve the Bible from the odium which the narrated circumstances are in their opinion fitted to occasion. That the passage is free from every possible objection it may be too much to assert: it is, however, equally clear that many of the objections taken to it arise from viewing the facts from a wrong position, or under the discoloring medium of a foregone and adverse conclusion. The only proper way is to consider it as it is represented in the sacred page. The command, then, was expressly designated to try Abraham's faith. Destined as the patriarch was to be the father of the faithful, was he worthy of his high and dignified position? If his own obedience was weak, he could not train others in faith, trust, and love: hence a trial was necessary. That he was not without holy dispositions was already known, and indeed recognised in the divine favors of which he had been the object; but was he prepared to do and to suffer all God's will? Religious perfection and his position alike demanded a perfect heart: hence the kind of trial. If he were willing to surrender even his only child, and act himself both as offerer and priest in the sacrifice of the required victim, if he could so far conquer his natural affections, so subdue the father in his heart, then there could be no doubt that his will was wholly reconciled to God's, and that he was worthy of every trust, confidence, and honor (comp. James ii, 21). The trial was made, the fact was ascertained, but the victim was not slain. What is there in this to which either religion or morality can take exception? This view is both confirmed and justified by the words of God (Gen. xxii, 16 sq.), "*Because* thou hast not withheld thy only son, in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." We remark, also, that not a part, out the whole of the transaction must be taken under consideration, and especially the final result. If we dwell exclusively on the commencement of it, there appears to be some sanction given to human sacrifices; but the end, and the concluding and ever-enduring fact, has the directly opposite bearing. Viewed as a whole, the transaction is, in truth, an express prohibition of human sacrifices. Nothing but a clear command from God could have suggested such a service. "A craving to please, or propitiate, or communicate with the powers above" by surrendering "an object near and dear" to one, which canon Stanley erroneously says is the "source of all sacrifice," and to which he attributes Abraham's conduct in the present case (*History of the Jewish Church*, i, 47), could never have led to such an act. The idea is wholly improbable and irrational. Kurtz maintains that the basis for this trial of Abraham was laid in the state of mind produced in him by beholding the Canaanitish human sacrifices around him. His words are: "These Canaanitish sacrifices of children, and the readiness with which the heathen around him offered them, must have excited in Abraham a contest of thoughts . . . . and induced him to examine himself whether he also were capable of sufficient renunciation and self-denial to do, if his God demanded it, what the heathen around him were doing. *But if this question was raised in the heart of Abraham, it must also have been brought to a definite settlement through some outward fact.* Such was the *basis* for the demand of God so far as Abraham was concerned, and such the *educational motive* for his trial. The obedience of Abraham's faith must, in energy and entireness, not lag behind that which the religion of nature demanded and obtained from its professors. Abraham must be ready to do for *his* God what the nations around him were capable of doing for their false gods. In every respect Abraham, as the hero of faith, is to out-distance all others in self-denial" (*Hist. of the O. Coven.* i, 269). *Objectively*, the transaction was intended to *recognise* the element of *truth* in human sacrifices, while condemning the sacrifices themselves (p. 269, 270). See SACRIFICE.

4. Isaac passed his early days under the eye of his father, engaged in the care of flocks and herds up and down the plains of Canaan. At length his father wished to see him married. Abraham therefore gave a commission to his oldest and most trustworthy servant to the effect that, in order to prevent Isaac from taking a wife from among the daughters of the Canaanites, he should proceed into Mesopotamia, and, under the divine direction, choose a partner among his own relatives for his beloved son. Rebekah, in consequence, becomes Isaac's wife, when he was forty years of age (Gen. xxiv). B.C. 2023. In connection with this marriage an event is recorded which displays the peculiar character of Isaac, while it is in keeping with the general tenor of the sacred record regarding him. Probably in expectation of the early return of his father's messenger, and somewhat solicitous as to the result of the embassy, he went out to meditate in the field at the eventide. While there engaged in tranquil thought, he chanced to raise his eyes, when lo! he beheld the retinue near at hand, and soon conducted his bride into his mother's tent. In unison with all this is the simple declaration of the history, that Isaac "loved her." Isaac was evidently a man of kind and gentle disposition, of a calm and reflective turn of mind, simple in his habits, having few wants, good rather than great, fitted to receive impressions and follow a guide, not to originate important influences, or perform deeds of renown. If his character did not take a bent from the events connected with his father's readiness to offer him on Mount Moriah, certainly its passiveness is in entire agreement with the whole tenor of his conduct, as set forth in that narrative. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.)

Isaac having, in conjunction with his half-brother Ishmael, buried Abraham his father, "in a good old age, in the cave of Machpelah," took up a somewhat permanent residence "by the well Lahai-roi," where, being blessed of God, he lived in prosperity and at ease (Gen. xxv, 7–11). B.C. 1988. One source of regret, however, he deeply felt. Rebekah was barren. In time, however, two sons, Jacob and Esau, were granted to his prayers (Gen. xxv, 21–26). B.C. 2003. As the boys grew, Isaac gave a preference to Esau, who seems to have possessed those robust qualities of character in which his father was defective, and therefore gratified him by such dainties as the pursuits of the chase enabled the youth to offer; while Jacob, "a plain man, dwelling in tents," was an object of special regard to Rebekah—a division of feeling and a kind of partiality which became the source of much domestic unhappiness, as well as of jealousy and hatred between the two sons (Gen. xxv, 27, 28). See ESAU.

5. The life of Isaac, moveover, was not passed wholly without trials coming in from without. A famine compels him to seek food in some foreign land (Gen. xxvi, 1 sq.). B.C. cir. 1985. At the occurrence of this famine Isaac was expressly admonished by God not to go down into Egypt, but to abide within the boundaries of the Promised Land; and occasion was taken to renew

the promise to him and his seed, and to confirm in his behalf the oath which had been made to his father. The Lord pledged his word to be with him and to bless him in the land—which he certainly did, though Isaac did not feel so secure of the promised guardianship and support as to be able to avoid falling into the snare which had also caught his father Abraham. When sojourning in the neighborhood of Gerar, during the prevalence of the famine, and no doubt observing the wickedness of the place, he had the weakness to call Rebekah his sister, in fear that the people might kill him on her account, if they knew her to be his wife. It does not appear that any violence was offered to Rebekah; and the Philistine king, on discovering, as he did, from the familiar bearing of Isaac towards Rebekah, that she must be his wife, simply rebuked him for having, by his prevarication, given occasion to a misapprehension which might have led to serious consequences (Gen. xxvi, 10).

No passage of his life has produced more reproach to Isaac's character than this. Abraham's conduct while in Egypt (ch. xii) and in Gerar (ch. xx), where he concealed the closer connection between himself and his wife, was imitated by Isaac in Gerar. On the one hand, this has been regarded by avowed adversaries of Christianity as involving the guilt of "lying and endeavoring to betray the wife's chastity," and even by Christians, undoubtedly zealous for truth and right, as the conduct of "a very poor, paltry earthworm, displaying cowardice, selfishness, readiness to put his wife in a terrible hazard for his own sake." But, on the other hand, with more reverence, more kindness, and quite as much probability, Waterland, who is no indiscriminate apologist for the errors of good men, after a minute examination of the circumstances, concludes that the patriarch did "right to evade the difficulty so long as it could lawfully be evaded, and to await and see whether divine Providence might not, some way or other, interpose before the last extremity. The event answered. God did interpose" (*Scripture Vindicated*, in *Works*, iv, 188, 190).

There is no improbability, as has been asserted, that the same sort of event should happen in rude times at different intervals, and, therefore, no reason for maintaining that these events have the same historical basis, and are, in fact, the same event differently represented. Neither is it an unfair assumption that Abimelech was the common title of the kings of Gerar, as Pharaoh was of the kings of Egypt, or that it may have been the proper name of several kings in succession, as George has been of several English kings.

In all respects except this incident, Isaac's connection with the Philistine territory was every way creditable to himself, and marked with tokens of the divine favor. He cultivated a portion of ground, and in the same year reaped a hundred fold—a remarkable increase, to encourage him to abide under God's protection in Canaan. His flocks and herds multiplied exceedingly, so that he rose to the possession of very great wealth; he even became, on account of it, an object of envy to the Philistines, who could not rest till they drove him from their territory. He reopened the wells which his father had digged, and which the Philistines had meanwhile filled up, and himself dug several new ones, but they disputed with him the right of possession, and obliged him to withdraw from them one after another. Finally, at a greater distance, he dug a well, which he was allowed to keep unmolested; and in token of his satisfaction at the peace he enjoyed, he called it Rehoboth (*room*) (Gen. xxv, 22). Thence he returned to Beersheba, where the Lord again appeared to him, and gave him a fresh assurance of the covenant-blessing; and Abimelech, partly ashamed of the unkind treatment Isaac had received, and partly desirous of standing well with one who was so evidently prospering in his course, sent some of his leading men to enter formally into a covenant of peace with him. Isaac showed his meek and kindly disposition in giving courteous entertainment to the messengers, and cordially agreed to their proposal.

It was probably a period considerably later still than even the latest of these transactions to which the next notice in the life of Isaac must be referred. This is the marriage of Esau to two of the daughters of Canaan (Judith and Bashemath), which is assigned to the fortieth year of Esau's life, coeval with Isaac's hundredth. These alliances were far from giving satisfaction to the aged patriarch; on the contrary, they were a grief of mind to him and his wife Rebekah (Gen. xxvi, 36).

6. The last prominent event in the life of Isaac is the blessing of his sons (Gen. xxvii, 1 sq.). B.C. 1927. It has been plausibly suggested (Browne, *Ordo Saeclorum*, p. 310) that the forebodings of a speedy demise (ver. 2) on the part of Isaac, whose health always appears to have been delicate (Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.), may have arisen from the fact that his brother Ishmael died at the age he had just now reached (Gen. xxv, 17), although he himself survived this point for many years (Gen. xxxv, 28). When old and dim of sight (which fails much sooner in Eastern countries than with us), supposing that the time of his departure was at hand, he called for his beloved son Esau, and sent him to "take some venison" for him, and to make his favorite "savory meat," that he might eat and "bless" him before his death. Esau prepared to obey his father's will, and set forth to the field; but through the deceptious stratagem of Rebekah the "savory meat" was provided before Esau's return; and Jacob, disguised so as to resemble his hairy brother, imposed on his father, and obtained the blessing. Yet, on the discovery of the cheat, when Esau brought in to his father the dish he had prepared, Isaac, remembering no doubt the prediction that "the elder should serve the younger," and convinced that God intended the blessing for Jacob, would not, perhaps rather could not, reverse the solemn words he had uttered, but bestowed an inferior blessing on Esau (comp. Heb. xii, 17). See EDOM. This paternal blessing, if full, conveyed, as was usual, the right of headship in the family, together with the chief possessions. In the blessing which the aged patriarch pronounced on Jacob, it deserves notice how entirely the wished-for good is of an earthly and temporal nature, while the imagery which is employed serves to show the extent to which the poetical element prevailed as a constituent part of the Hebrew character (Gen. xxvii, 27 sq.). Most natural, too, is the extreme agitation of the poor blind old man on discovering the cheat which had been put upon him. All the parties to this nefarious transaction were signally punished by divine Providence (comp. Jarvis, *Church of the Redeemed*, p. 47). The entire passage is of itself enough to vindicate the historical character and entire credibility of those sketches of the lives of the patriarchs which Genesis presents.

Yet Isaac's tacit acquiescence in the conduct of his sons has been brought into discussion. Fairbairn (*Typology*, i, 334) seems scarcely justified by facts in his conclusion that the later days of Isaac did not fulfil the promise of his earlier; that, instead of reaching to high attainments in faith, he fell into general feebleness and decay moral and bodily, and made account only of the natural element in judging of his sons. The inexact translation (to modern ears) of צַיִד, prey taken in hunting, by "venison" (Gen. xxv, 28), may have contributed to form, in the minds of English readers, a low opinion of Isaac. Nor can that opinion be supported by a reference to xxvii, 4; for Isaac's desire at such a time for savory meat may have sprung either from a dangerous sickness under which he was laboring (Blunt, *Undesigned Coincidences*, pt. i, ch. vi), or from the same kind of impulse preceding inspiration as prompted Elisha (2 Kings iii, 15) to demand the soothing influence of music before he spoke the word of the Lord. For sadness and grief are enumerated in the Gemara among the impediments to the exercise of the gift of prophecy

(Smith's *Select Discourses*, vi, 245). The reader who bears in mind the peculiarities of Isaac's character will scarcely infer from those passages any fresh accession of mental or moral feebleness. Such a longing in an old man was innocent enough, and indicated nothing of a spirit of self-indulgence. It was an extraordinary case, too, and Kalisch sets it in its true light: "The venison is evidently like a sacrifice offered by the recipient of the blessing, and ratifying the proceedings; and hence Jacob killed and prepared two kids of the goats (verse 9), whereas, for an ordinary meal, one would have been more than sufficient; it imparted to the ceremony, in certain respects, the character of a covenant (comp. xxi, 27-30; xxvi, 30; Exod. xii, 2; xxiv, 5-11, etc.); the one party showed ready obedience and sincere affection, while the other accepted the gift, and granted in return the whole store of happiness he was able to bequeath. Thus the meal which Isaac required has a double meaning, both connected with the internal organism of the book" (*Comm. on Gen.* xxvii, 1-4).

7. The stealing, on the part of Jacob, of his father's blessing having angered Esau, who seems to have looked forward to Isaac's death as affording an opportunity for taking vengeance on his unjust brother, the aged patriarch is induced, at his wife's entreaty, to send Jacob into Mesopotamia, that, after his own example, his son might take a wife from among his kindred and people, "of the daughters of Laban, thy mother's brother" (Gen. xxvii, 41-46). B.C. 1927. See JACOB.

This is the last important act recorded of Isaac. Jacob having, agreeably to his father's command, married into Laban's family, returned after some time, and found the old man at Mamre, in the city of Arbah, which is Hebron, where Abraham and Isaac sojourned (Gen. xxxv, 27). B.C. cir. 1898. Here, "being old and full of days" (180), Isaac gave up the ghost, and died, and was gathered unto his people, and his sons Esau and Jacob buried him" (Gen. xxxv, 28). B.C. 1883.

In the N. T. reference is made to the offering of Isaac (Heb. xi, 17, and James ii, 21) and to his blessing his sons (Heb. xi, 20). As the child of the promise, and as the progenitor of the children of the promise, he is contrasted with Ishmael (Rom. ix, 7, 10; Gal. iv, 28; Heb. xi, 18). In our Lord's remarkable argument with the Sadducees, his history is carried beyond the point at which it is left in the O. T., into and beyond the grave. Isaac, of whom it was said (Gen. xxxv, 29) that he was gathered to his people, is represented as still living to God (Luke xx, 38, etc.); and by the same divine authority he is proclaimed as an acknowledged heir of future glory (Matt. viii, 11, etc.).

II. *His Character.*—Isaac, the gentle and dutiful son, the faithful and constant husband (see Becker, *De Isaaco*, etc., Greifsw. 1750), became the father of a house in which order did not reign. If there were any very prominent points in his character, they were not brought out by the circumstances in which he was placed. He appears less as a man of action than as a man of suffering, from which he is generally delivered without any direct effort of his own. Thus he suffers as the object of Ishmael's mocking, of the intended sacrifice on Moriah, of the rapacity of the Philistines, and of Jacob's stratagem. But the thought of his sufferings is effaced by the ever-present tokens of God's favor; and he suffers with the calmness and dignity of a conscious heir of heavenly promises, without uttering any complaint, and generally without committing any action by which he would forfeit respect. Free from violent passions, he was a man of constant, deep, and tender affections. Thus he mourned for his mother till her place was filled by his wife. His sons were nurtured at home till a late period of their lives; and neither his grief for Esau's marriage, nor the anxiety in which he was involved in consequence of Jacob's deceit, estranged either of them from his affectionate care. His life of solitary blamelessness must have been sustained by strong habitual piety, such as showed itself at the time of Rebekah's barrenness (Gen. xxv, 21), in his special intercourse with God at Gerar and Beersheba (xxvi, 2, 23), in the solemnity with which he bestows his blessing and refuses to change it. His life, judged by a worldly standard, might seem inactive, ignoble, and unfruitful; but the "guileless years, prayers, gracious acts, and daily thank-offerings of pastoral life" are not to be so esteemed, although they make no show in history. Isaac's character may not have exercised any commanding influence upon either his own or succeeding generations, but it was sufficiently marked and consistent to win respect and envy from his contemporaries. By his posterity his name is always joined in equal honor with those of Abraham and Jacob, and so it was even used as part of the formula which Egyptian magicians in the time of Origen (*Contra Celsum*, i, 22) employed as efficacious to bind the dæmons whom they adjured (comp. Gen. xxxi, 42, 53).

If Abraham's enterprising, unsettled life foreshadowed the early history of his descendants; if Jacob was a type of the careful, commercial, unwarlike character of their later days, Isaac may represent the middle period, in which they lived apart from nations, and enjoyed possession of the fertile land of promise. (See Kalisch, *Gen.* ad loc.)

III. The *typical view* of Isaac is barely referred to in the N. T., but it is drawn out with minute particularity by Philo and those interpreters of Scripture who were influenced by Alexandrian philosophy. Thus in Philo, Isaac (laughter = the most exquisite enjoyment = the soother and cheerer of peace-loving souls) is foreshadowed in the facts that his father had attained 100 years (the perfect number) when he was born, and that he is specially designated as given to his parents by God. His birth from the mistress of Abraham's household symbolizes happiness proceeding from predominant wisdom. His attachment to one wife (Rebekah = perseverance) is contrasted with Abraham's multiplied connections, and with Jacob's toil-won wives, as showing the superiority of Isaac's heaven-born, self-sufficing wisdom to the accumulated knowledge of Abraham and the painful experience of Jacob. In the intended sacrifice of Isaac, Philo sees only a sign (laughter = rejoicing is the prerogative of God, and is a fit offering to him) that God gives back to obedient man as much happiness as is good for him. Clement of Rome (ch. xxxi), with characteristic soberness, merely refers to Isaac as an example of faith in God. In Tertullian he is a pattern of monogamy, and a type of Christ bearing the cross. But Clement of Alexandria finds an allegorical meaning in the incidents which connect Abimelech with Isaac and Rebekah (Gen. xxvi, 8), as well as in the offering of Isaac. In this latter view he is followed by Origen, and by Augustine, and by Christian expositors generally. The most minute particulars of that transaction are invested with a spiritual meaning by such writers as Rabanus Maurus, *in Gen.* § iii. Abraham is made a type of the first person in the blessed Trinity, Isaac of the second; the two servants dismissed are the Jewish sects who did not attain to a perception of Christ in his humiliation; the ass bearing the wood is the Jewish nation, to whom were committed the oracles of God which they failed to understand; the three days are the Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian dispensations; the ram is Christ on the cross; the thicket they who placed him there. Modern English writers hold firmly the typical significance of the transaction, without extending it into such detail (see Pearson, *On the Creed*, i, 243, 251, edit. 1843; Fairbairn's *Typology*, i, 332). A recent writer (A. Jukes, *Types of Genesis*), who has shown much ingenuity in attaching a spiritual meaning to the characters and incidents in the book of Genesis, regards Isaac as representing the spirit of sonship, in a series in which Adam represents human nature, Cain the carnal mind, Abel the spiritual, Noah regeneration, Abraham the spirit of faith, Jacob the spirit of service, Joseph suffering or glory. With this series may be compared the

view of Ewald (*Gesch.* i, 387-400), in which the whole patriarchal family is a prefigurative group, comprising twelve members with seven distinct modes of relation: 1. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are three fathers, respectively personifying active power, quiet enjoyment, success after struggles, distinguished from the rest as Agamemnon, Achilles, and Ulysses among the heroes of the Iliad, or as the Trojan Anchises, Æneas, and Ascanius, and mutually related as Romulus, Remus, and Numa; 2. Sarah, with Hagar, as mother and mistress of the household, 3. Isaac as child; 4. Isaac with Rebekah as the type of wedlock (comp. his *Alterthümer*, p. 233); 5. Leah and Rachel the plurality of coequal wives; 6. Deborah as nurse (compare Anna and Caieta, *Æn.* iv, 654, and vii, 1); 7. Eliezer as steward, whose office is compared to that of the messenger of the Olympic deities.

IV. *Traditions.*—Jewish legends represent Isaac as an angel made before the world, and descending to earth in human form (Origen, *in Johann.* ii, § 25); as one of the three men in whom human sinfulness has no place, as one of the six over whom the angel of death has no power (Eisenmenger, *Entd. Jud.* i, 343, 864). He is said to have been instructed in divine knowledge by Shem (Jarchi, *on Gen.* xxv). The ordinance of evening prayer is ascribed to him (Gen. xxiv, 63), as that of morning prayer to Abraham (xix, 27), and night prayer to Jacob (xxviii, 11) (Eisenmenger, *Ent. Jud.* i, 483).

The Arabian traditions included in the Koran represent Isaac as a model of religion, a righteous person inspired with grace to do good works, observe prayer, and give alms (ch. xxi), endowed with the divine gifts of prophecy, children, and wealth (ch. xix). The promise of Isaac and the offering of Isaac are also mentioned (ch. xi, 38). Faith in a future resurrection is ascribed to Abraham: but it is connected, not, as in Heb. xi, 19, with the offering of Isaac, but with a fictitious miracle (chap. ii). Stanley mentions a curious tradition of the reputed jealousy of Isaac's character that prevails among the inhabitants of Hebron respecting the grave of Rebekah (*Jewish Church*, i, 496 sq.). (On the notices of Isaac in the Talmud, see Otho's *Lex. Talm.* p. 133; Hamburger, *Real-Encyklop. f. Bibel u. Talmud*, p. 612 sq.; for the notices in the Koran, see Hottinger's *Hist. Orient.* p. 25, 52). See Bouchier, *History of Isaac* (Lond. 1864). For older treatises, see Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliograph.* col. 190.

Isaac, bishop OF LANGRES, France, is supposed to have been present at the Council of Kiersy in 840, as deacon of Laon. After the death of Theutbalde, Wulfade seized the bishopric of Langres in spite of all opposing canons; but Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, declared against him, and Charles the Bald compelled him to flee. Hilduin, lay abbot of St. Denis, then proposed Isaac as bishop, and by his influence caused him to be appointed. Isaac was ordained bishop of Langres about 856. We afterwards find his name in the councils of Toul and Langres (859), of Tousy (860), of Pistes (862), of Verberie, and of Soissons (866)—an evidence that he had gained great consideration and influence. His mildness caused him to be surnamed *bonus*, and the martyrology of the Church of Dijon praises him highly. A lasting monument of his efforts to effect a reform among the monastic orders is his work on *Canons*, published by Sirmond, *Conciles*, vol. iii; Labbe, *Concil.* etc.; Baluze, *Capitulaires*, vol. ii. See *Gallia Christ.* vol. v, col. 533; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v, 528; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 4. (J. N. P.)

Isaac THE SYRIAN (*a*), with the surname of *Doctor* or *Magnus*, because of his ability as an ecclesiastical writer, who flourished in the first half of the 5th century, was, in all probability, a native of Syria. He was at first a monk in a convent not far from Gabala, in Phœnicia, and afterwards became a priest at Antioch. He died about 456. He wrote several theological pamphlets in Syriac (and perhaps also in Greek), directed chiefly against the Nestorians and Eutychians. A work on the *Contempt of the World* would be considered as his chief claim to reputation, but the authorship of this book is not at all well established. It is by some supposed to have been written by the other *Isaac the Syrian* (see next art.). There seem to be better grounds for considering him as the author of the treatise *De Cogitationibus*, the Greek text of which, together with a Latin translation, can be found in the *Ascetica* of Petrus Possinus. The library of the Vatican contains some other MS. works of Isaac. He is honored as a saint both by the Maronites and Jacobites of Syria. See Gennadius, *De Script. Eccles.*; Cave, *Hist. Litteraria*; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, xi, 214; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 3; Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1991.

Isaac THE SYRIAN (*b*), generally with the surname of *Ninivita*, an ecclesiastical writer of the 6th century, became bishop of Nineveh, but afterwards resigned his office to enter a convent, of which he was subsequently chosen abbot. He died towards the close of the 6th century. He is generally, and, as it seems, justly considered as the author of the treatise *De Contemptu Mundi, de Operatione corporali et sui Abjectione Liber*, which may be found in the *Orthodoxographi* (second edition, Basle, 1569), *Bibliotheca Patrum* (of Cologne, vol. vi), *Bibliotheca Patrum* (of Paris, vol. v), *Bibliotheca novissima* (of Lyons, vol. xi), and in Galland, *Bibliotheca Patrum* (vol. xii). All these collections contain a Greek text with a Latin translation, yet the former appears itself to be a translation from the Syriac. There are twenty-seven ascetic sermons of his in Greek (MSS. in the Vienna Library) and some homilies (MSS. in the Bodleian Library). See Cave, *Hist. Liter.*; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, xi, 215; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvi, 4; Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1991.

Isaac Aboab, a Spanish Jew of some distinction as a commentator and preacher, was born, according to Grätz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, viii, 225), in 1433, and succeeded the celebrated Isaac of Campanton as gaon of Castile. He died in 1493. Aboab wrote, besides super commentaries to the commentaries of Rashi and Nachmani, שִׁטּוֹת עַל הַתַּלְמוּד, or *Dissertations on a Part of the Talmudic Tract Jam-Tob* (Beza), edited by Jedidja Galante (Venice, 1608; Wilmersdorf, 1716):—נְהַר פִּישׁוֹן, or *Homilies, with free Use of the Hagadah*, edited by Gershom Soncini (Constantinople, 1538, 4to; Zolkiew, 1806, 4to). There are a number of other works that have frequently been attributed to the pen of this Isaac, which Dr. Zunz assigns, as Grätz believes very properly, to another Isaac Aboab, who flourished about 1300-1320. Among these, the most important, which Fürst (*Bibliotheca Judaica*, i, 4 sq.) assigns to the present Isaac, is מְנוֹרַת הַמָּאוֹר, a hagadic or ethical treatise on the Talmud and Midrashim, in seven sections (published at Venice, 1544, fol., and several times later; also with a Heb. commentary by Frankfurter, Amsterd. 1701, 8vo; and by others with Spanish, Hebrew, German, and High-German translations at different times and places). (J. H. W.)

Isaac Albalag, a Jewish philosopher of some note, flourished in Spain during the latter half of the 13th century. He was a contemporary of the celebrated Falaquera, and, like him, well versed in Arabian philosophy. Albalag possessed greater natural endowments than Falaquera, but, wanting that independence of mind which made the latter so justly celebrated, he failed to take as prominent a position. He died about 1294. About 1292 he edited and improved Alghazali's *Makasid Alphilsapha*, under the title of תִּקּוּן הַדֵּעוֹת. A part of it has been published by Schorr in *Chaluz*, iv (1859) and vi (1861). See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 252 sq. (J. H. W.)

Isaac Argyrus, a Greek monk who flourished in the latter half of the 14th century at Æneus, in Thracia, wrote about 1373, when he is said to have been at the age of sixty, *Computus Græcorum de solemnitate pascha-*

tis celebrandi, published in Greek and Latin by J. Christmann (Heidelberg, 1611, 4to), and inserted by Dionysius Petavius in his *De Doctrina temporum* (iii, 359). He is also supposed to be the author of a work still in MS. form on astronomy. Of Isaac's personal history but little is clearly known.—Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* ii, 1984; Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* bk. iii, cent. xiv, pt. ii, ch. ii. (J. H. W.)

Isaac ben-Abba-Mare, a Jewish exponent of the Talmud, was born at Bourg des St. Gilles, France, in 1139. His father was an officer under the government of the count of Toulouse, and afforded Isaac every opportunity for distinction, but he early devoted himself to the study of the Talmud under the celebrated Rabbi Tam of Rameru. When only seventeen years old he prepared a compendium of certain ritualistic laws of the Jews, in which he evinced thorough familiarity with the Talmud. He also wrote a commentary on one of the most difficult parts of the Talmud, and finally collected all his investigations on the Jewish traditions under the title of הָעִטּוּר (probably in 1179). It was incompletely published by Josef ben-Saruk (Ven. 1608; and since then, Warsowa, 1801). See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vi, 244; Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, ii, 137. (J. H. W.)

Isaac ben-Abraham, a distinguished Jewish Rabbi of the Karaitic sect, was born at Trock, near Wilna (Lithuania) about 1533. He is especially celebrated as the author of a work against Christianity, entitled חִזּוּק אֱמוּנָה, *Chizzûk Amunah* (*munimen fidei*), written in 1593. It is divided into two parts: the first, containing fifty chapters, consists of an apology for Judaism, and a general attack on the Christian faith; the second contains a critical examination of a hundred passages of the N. T., intended by the writer to refute the proofs adduced by Christians from the Old Test. It is considered, next to the productions of Duran (q. v.), the ablest work ever written by any Jew against the Christian religion. It was first published by Wagenseil, with a Latin translation, in the *Tela ignea Satanæ* (Altdorf, 1682, 4to), from a MS. obtained from an African Jew, which, as Grätz asserts, was imperfect. The Hebrew text was afterwards reprinted by the Jews (Amsterdam, 1705, 12mo), and by Gousset, with a Latin translation and a refutation (Amst. 1712, fol.). Wolf, in his *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, gives a supplement and variation, said to be derived from a more perfect MS. than the one at Wagenseil's command. But the best edition is held to be that of Rabbi Deutsch (Sohrau, 1865). It was also translated into German Hebrew (Amst. 1717, 8vo); into German by Gebling, and into Spanish by Is. Athia. Among the works written in answer to it, which deserve especial mention, besides those named above, are J. Müller, *Confutatio libri Chizuk Emuna* (Hamb. 1644, 4to); Gebhard, *Centum loca Novi Testamenti vindicata adversus Chizuk Emuna* (Greifswald, 1699, 4to); J. P. Storr, *Evangelische Glaubenslehre gegen d. Werk Chissuk Emuna* (Tüb. 1703, 8vo); K. Kidder, *Demonstrat. of the Messiah* (Lond. 1684–1700, 3 pts. 8vo). Isaac ben-Abraham died about 1594. See Rossi, *Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei*; Bartolocci, *Magna Biblio. Rabbin.*; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, ix, 490 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxvi, 10; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 139. (J. H. W.)

Isaac ben-Abraham Akrish, a Jewish writer of considerable note, was born about 1489, in Spain; the name of the place is not known to us. He was lame on both feet, but this maimed condition by no means prevented him from acquiring great learning; nay, he even travelled extensively, and enjoyed the reputation of a great scholar. When yet a boy, the persecutions of the Jews by the Spaniards obliged him to leave his native land (1492), and he removed to Naples. But also here he and his coreligionists were sorely tried by persecution, and again he fled; this time from country to country "whose languages he did not understand, and whose inhabitants spared neither the aged nor the young," until he finally found a home in the house of a banished coreligionist in far-off Egypt. After a stay of some ten years he removed to Palestine, and finally settled in Turkey, where he was honored with the instruction of one of the princes of the realm. He died after 1577. His works are קוֹל מְבַשֵּׂר, or *on Jewish Reign during the Exile*; containing (1) the correspondence of Chasdai ben-Isaac with Jusuf, the king of the Chassars; (2) מַעֲשֵׂה בֵּית דָּוִד בִּימֵי פָּרָס, or *History of the House of David during the reign of the Persians*; also the history of Bastanai, etc. (Constant. 15 . , 8vo; Basle, 1589, 8vo; and with a work of Farissolo, Offenb. 1720, 12mo). See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, ix, 10 sq., 420 sq. (J. H. W.)

Isaac ben-Calonymos. See NATHAN.

Isaac ben-Elia ben-Samuel, a Jewish commentator who flourished in the beginning of the 18th century, deserves our notice as the author of (1.) *A Commentary on the Psalms*, published at Dyrhenfurt, under the title of תהלים עם לקוטי מגדים, *the Psalms with a valuable catena* (1728), consisting of excerpts from the celebrated expositions of Rashi, D. Kimchi, etc., giving also an abridgment of Alsheich's commentary, entitled רוממות אל, and a German explanation of the difficult words. (2.) *A Commentary on Proverbs*, entitled משלי עם לקוטי מגדים, *Proverbs with a valuable catena* (Wandsbeck, 1730–31), composed of excerpts from the expositions of Rashi, D. Kimchi, Ibn Ezra, Levi b.-Gershon, Salomon b.-Melech, giving also a German explanation of the difficult expressions, and an abridgment of Alsheich's exposition called ריב פנינים; and (3.) *A Commentary on the Sabbatic Lessons from the Prophets*, entitled פני יצחק, *the face of Isaac* (Wandsbeck, 1730), which consists of excerpts from nine of the most distinguished commentators, viz. Rashi, Ibn Ezra, D. Kimchi, Levi b.-Gershon, Abrabanel, Alsheich, Samuel b.-Laniado, J. Arama, and Joseph Albo. The works of Isaac b.-Elia are very valuable, inasmuch as they enable the Biblical student to see on one page the expositions of the best and most famous Jewish commentators on every difficult passage, without being obliged to search for them in inaccessible and costly volumes.—Kitto, *Biblical Cyclopædia*, ii, 410.

Isaac ben-Gikatilla. See IBN-GIKATILLA.

Isaac ben-Jacob Alfasi or **Alcalai**, one of the most distinguished Talmudical scholars of the Middle Ages, was born at Cala-Hammad, near Fez, in Africa, about 1013. It had been the custom among Jewish Rabbis to follow in the interpretation of the Talmud the decisions of the Gaonim, and thus direct inquiry and independence of thought had well-nigh become not only obsolete, but even impossible. But when Alfasi had become sufficiently familiar with the Talmudic writings to make his voice heard among his Jewish brethren, he evinced such an independence of thought, and a mind of such penetration, that he was soon acknowledged not only on Africa's shore, but even on the other side of the sea, by Spain's Jewish savans, as one of the ablest interpreters of their tradition. A work which he published at this time, סֵפֶר הֲלָכוֹת, or *the Halacha's of the whole Talmud*, intended as a Talmudical compendium (published at Cracow, 1597, 8vo; Basle, 1602, 8vo), which has preserved its authority even to the present day, still further increased his renown. During a time of persecution (1088), being obliged to flee his native country, he sought refuge in Cordova, and there he was received with great honor. But his distinction as a Talmudist, and the kind offices of his Spanish brethren, seem to have annoyed some of the more distinguished Rabbis of Spain. A controversy, into which he was unwillingly drawn, with Ibn-Gia and Ibn-Albalda, became especially severe. After the death of Ibn-Gia, he removed to Lucena, and was there appointed the successor of his former opponent. But his controversy with Ibn-Albalda continued until the death of the latter (1094), when

Alfasi adopted a son of Ibn-Albalda, and made him one of his most faithful adherents. He died in 1103. A list of the different editions of his works may be found in Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, i, 34 sq. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vi, 76 sq., 92 sq.; Munk, *Notice sur Aboulwalid*, p. 4 sq.; Pinsker, *Likute Kadmonijot*, text No. 210, and note X. (J. H. W.)

Isaac ben-Jehudah. See IBN-GIATH.

Isaac ben-Joseph, called also ISAAC DE CORBEIL, was born in Corbeil, a city in France, towards the beginning of the 13th century, and died in 1280 according to Rossi (Jachia Ghedalia and Abraham Zakuth say, the one 1240, the other 1270). He is the author of the celebrated work entitled עַמּוּדֵי גוֹלָה, *Ammudey Golêh* (Constantinople, 1510, 4to; Cremona, 1557, 4to; and with glosses by Perez ben-Elia, and indications of the passages quoted from the Bible and the Talmud, Cracow, 1596, 4to). This work is taken from the סֵפֶר מִצְוֹת גָּדוֹל (*Sepher Mitsvoth Gadol*) of Moses of Coucy, and is known also by the name of *Semak* (from the initials of the three Hebrew words *Sepher Mitsvoth Katon*). It contains a synopsis of the precepts of the Jewish religion. It is divided into seven parts, each containing regulations for one day of the week. Isaac wrote it in 1277, at the request of the French Jews, who desired to have a clear and convenient manual to guide them in matters pertaining to their religion. It is also known under the Latin title of *Columnæ captivitatis*, and still more frequently as the *Liber Præceptorum parvus*. Several other copies of it were made by French as well as German Rabbis. Jekutiel Salmon ben-Mose, of Posen, made a compendium of the work (Cracow, 1579, 4to). See Bartolocci, *Magna Biblioth. Rabbin.*; Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebraica*; Rossi, *Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei*; Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, i, 186; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 131; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, iii, 33. (J. H. W.)

Isaac ben-Juda (Abrabanel). See ABRABANEL.

Isaac ben-Latif or **Allatif,** a Jewish philosopher of some note, was born about 1270, somewhere in the southern part of Spain. Of his early history scarcely anything is now known. But some of his works have been preserved, and from notices of distinguished contemporaries we learn that he was inclined to favor the Cabalists (q. v.). He is highly spoken of by the Rabbins of his day, but evidently, judging from his works, was rather two-sided on all cabalistic points, so that he may most appropriately be said to have stood "with one foot in philosophy, and with the other in the Cabala." He died some time in the first half of the 14th century. Of his works are printed פֵּרוּשׁ עַל קֹהֶלֶת, a *Commentary on Kohelet* (Constantinople, 1554, 8vo):—צוּרַת הָעוֹלָם and צְרוֹר הַמּוֹר, a Cosmology (Vien. 1862, edited by S. Stern):—שַׁעַר הַשָּׁמַיִם, a work on Dogmatics, Religious Philosophy, and the Physical Sciences, in 4 parts:—ס' תּוֹלְדוֹת אָדָם, a History of Man; etc. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 220 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, iii, 80; Sachs, *Kerem Chemed*, viii, 88 sq.; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 224. (J. H. W.)

Isaac ben-Mose. See PROFIAT DURAN.

Isaac ben-Moses, also called AVOJI, who flourished in the latter half of the 16th century, deserves our notice as the author of (1.) a *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, entitled תנחומות אל, or *Consolations of God* (Saloniki, 1578-9); and (2.) a *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, entitled מקהיל קהלת, or *the Gatherer of the Congregation* (ibid. 1597), which are both valuable contributions to the exegetical literature of the O.-T. Scriptures. See Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 410; Steinschneider, *Catol. Lib. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bod.* col. 1139.

Isaac ben-Schescheth (*Barfat*), one of the most distinguished Rabbis of the 14th century, was born about 1310, at or near Saragossa (Spain). He presided over the congregation at Saragossa for a number of years, and when, in 1391, the persecutions instituted against the Jews made it impossible for him to remain, he removed to Algiers, where he continued to hold a like position until his death, about 1444, and appointed as his successor the celebrated Simon ben-Simach Duran (q. v.). He was especially celebrated for his thorough acquaintance with Jewish tradition. Not only from all parts of Spain, but from the different parts of Europe, he was constantly invited to express his opinion on the meaning of obscure Talmudical passages. These were collected, and form a very important source for the study of the interpretation of the Talmud, and convey at the same time a pretty accurate idea of the state of the Jews in his day, not only in Spain and Algiers, but in France and even other countries as well. His works are שְׁאֵלוֹת וּתְשׁוּבוֹת, a collection of *Halachoth* (edited by Samuel Levi in 2 parts, Constantinople, 1547, fol. and often):—פֵּ' עַל הַתּוֹרָה, or *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, with notes from the Talmud:—חִדּוּשִׁים, also a work on the Talmud. The latter two, we think, still remain in MS. form. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, viii, 33 sq., 109 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, iii, 87; Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, ii, 145. (J. H. W.)

Isaac ben-Suleiman (*Salomo*) **Israëli,** a Jewish philosopher and philologian, was born in Egypt about 845. He was a physician by profession, and as such attained to very high distinction, serving from 904 to his death at Kairuan, as private physician to the reigning prince, and celebrated as the author of several medical works valuable even in our day. But also as philologian and philosopher he attained great notoriety, more particularly as the author of a philosophical commentary on the first chapters of Genesis, treating of the Creation, of which, however, only a part is now extant. It bore the title of *Sefer Jezirah*, whence the error that he wrote a commentary on the book *Jezirah*. He died about 940. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, v, 282 sq. (J. H. W.)

Isaac Blitz. See JEKUTHIEL BEN-ISAAC.

Isaac Campanton. See KAMPANTON.

Isaac, Daniel, a prominent Methodist minister, commonly designated as the Wesleyan "Polemic Divine," was born at Caythorpe, in the county of Lincoln, England, July 7, 1778. He was early devoted to books, and, on his conversion in his nineteenth year, he at once determined to devote his life to the work of the Christian ministry. In 1800 he joined the Conference on probation, supplying at this time a vacancy on Grimsby Circuit. He soon rose to great distinction among his brethren in the ministry, and was appointed to some of the most prominent charges at the command of his denomination. May 20, 1832, while in Manchester preaching in behalf of the Sunday-school work, he was seized with paralysis, from the effects of which he never recovered. At the session of the next Conference he was present, and believed himself sufficiently recovered to re-enter upon active work, and was appointed to York Circuit, an old and favorite circuit, to which he was now sent for the third time. But he began to fail fast, and died in the midst of his work, March 21, 1834. Speaking of the abilities of Daniel Isaac, the Rev. Samuel Dunn says: "He was an independent thinker, acute reasoner, formidable opponent, dexterous polemic, sound theologian, striking, instructive, extemporaneous preacher, perspicuous writer, generous benefactor, faithful friend, and amiable Christian. His intellect was original, subtle, analogical, penetrating, clear, strong. His manner was deliberate, grave, conversational, pointed, humorous, sarcastic, ironical. The sagacious Henry Moore remarked: 'Daniel Isaac, like Paul, reasoned with his hearers out of the Scriptures; and he kept in them, never went out of them, and never reasoned himself out of them.' If at any time he drew a smile from his hearers, he would maintain the utmost gravity He

displayed great power in grappling with the conscience, and in bringing to light the hidden things of darkness. Of the ludicrous he had a marvellous perception, and could present an object in such a light as to excite the indignation or the loathing of those who before admired it. He painted from life. Many hearers were disgusted with their own likeness as they saw it in the clear mirror he held before them. He was never declamatory or ornate. In debate he was remarkably cool, calm, collected, keen, argumentative, and close. There was no trembling hesitancy, quibbling, or artifice. He engaged in no sham fight; never brandished the sword at a distance, but came at once to close quarters, grappled with his opponent, pierced his vitals, and took from him his armor." But the great strength of Daniel Isaac lay in his pen, and he wielded it with especial ability in matters of controversy. His works are, *Universal Restoration* (N. Y. 1830, 12mo), in which he meets the objections of the Universalists to the eternity of punishment:—*Sermons on the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ* (Lond. 1815):—*Ecclesiastical Claims* (Lond. 1816), the views of which his Conference disapproved, but to which, in a reply, he steadfastly adhered. Dr. George Smith (*History of Wesleyan Methodism*, iii, 7) says of this work and the action of the Conference: "In many important respects the work does great credit to the author's industry and research. It contains the most convincing proofs, from Scripture and history, of the groundless character and the extravagant claims put forth on behalf of the ministerial order by Papists and High-Churchmen, and clearly shows the contradictions, impieties, and absurdities to which the admission of these claims must inevitably lead. But in doing this, Mr. Isaac went so far as to impugn the scriptural position of the Christian ministry as held by Wesley and the Methodist people. Nor is this the only serious defect in the work; some passages therein are grossly indelicate and irreverent, if not, indeed, profane (from this charge, however, it should be said, others seek to free Mr. Isaac); while, as stated in the resolution of the Conference, its 'general spirit and style' are decidedly improper. . . . The case is greatly to be regretted. Mr. Isaac's ability, energy, and sterling worth are fully admitted, and it is equally clear to our judgment, from a careful perusal of the work, that the Conference were not only justified in adopting the course they pursued, but were compelled to pursue it by the circumstances of the case." His next work was published whilst he was stationed at Leicester, and on terms the most friendly with Robert Hall, the celebrated Baptist minister. It was entitled *Baptism Discussed*. This volume Hall would never read; but, when urged to do it by his friends, he remarked, in good temper, "If he has exposed our views of baptism as he exposed the Episcopalians in his *Ecclesiastical Claims*, the Lord have mercy upon us." Isaac also wrote pamphlets against the use of instrumental music in the house of God, and on the Leeds organ discussions. He edited the *Life* of his father, *Memoirs of the Rev. John Strawe*, and published sketches of the *Lives of Robert Bolton, John Corbett, and other old Divines*. In 1826 he began, at the instigation of the Rev. Samuel Dunn, a work on the *Atonement*, which made its appearance a few years after. His works were edited after his death by the venerable John Burdsall, and published at London (1828, in 3 vols. 8vo). See Everett, *Polemic Divine, or Memoirs*, etc., *of Rev. Dan. Isaac* (Lond. 1839); Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, iii, 482 sq. (J. H. W.)

Isaac Ibn-Albalia, a Jewish writer of great distinction, was born at Cordova about 1035. He manifested at an early age superior talents and great thirst for learning. Besides the study of the Talmud, and of philosophy, he was eager for the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of astronomy and the mathematical sciences, and when thirty years old began a commentary on the most difficult parts of the Talmud, under the title *Kuput ha-Rochelim*, but it was so extensive a work that he did not live long enough to complete it. He also attempted an astronomical work on the principle of the Jewish mode of calculating the calendar, under the title *Ibbur* (about 1065). Becoming a favorite of the reigning prince of Spain, he was honored with the distinguished position of nasi and grand rabbi of the Jews of that domain. He died about 1094. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vi, 72. (J. H. W.)

Isaac Ibn-Giat. See Ibn-Giat.

Isaac Israëli ben-Josef, a very distinguished Jewish writer who flourished at Toledo in the first half of the 14th century (1300–1340), deserves our notice as the author of יְסוֹד עוֹלָם, or *The Foundation of the World*, a masterly production on Jewish chronology, including also the entire field of the science of astronomy, both theoretically and practically delineated (Berlin, 1777, 4to; and a better edition, ibid. 1848, 4to). This work, of which a part of the MS. has been preserved, was written about 1310 at the express wish of Israëli's teacher, Asher ben-Jechiël. He also compiled tables of Jewish chronology under the title of סֵדֶר הַקַּבָּלָה (Zolkiew, 1805, 8vo, et el.). See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 290; Carmoly, *Itinéraires*, p. 224; B. Goldberg, *Isaac Israëli* (in the *Lib. d. Or.* 1845), c. 433–435; Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, ii, 150. (J. H. W.)

Isaac Levita, or Johann Isaac Levi, as he called himself after his change from Judaism, one of the most celebrated Jewish savans of the 16th century, was born at Wetzlar in 1515. He was thoroughly prepared by his friends for the Rabbinical office, and filled it for years with great distinction; but, becoming impressed with the truthfulness of the Christian interpretation of the Messianic predictions, he and his son both, after a careful and extended study of the prophecies, forsook the faith of their forefathers, and joined the Roman Catholic Church. Some Jewish writers have attributed this course to a desire for promotion in literary circles, which as a Jew were closed to him. But there is no reason to believe it other than the result of association with Christians, and the study of the writings of Christian commentators on the prophecies, especially of Isaiah (more particularly chapter liii), which is said first to have led him to a study of the Messianic predictions. After his conversion (1546) he was appointed professor of Hebrew and Chaldee at the city of Löwen, and in 1551 was called to a like position in the University of Cologne. He became a vigorous defendant of the Hebrew text of the Bible, and replied to Lindanus, who had attacked it (in his *De optimo Scripturas interpretandi genere*, Cologne, 1538), in a work entitled *Defensio Veritatis Hebrææ sacrarum scripturarum* (Col. 1559). He published also the following works on Hebrew grammar, which rank among the best in that language: (1.) *An Introduction to the Hebrew Grammar, and to the Art of Writing a pure Hebrew style*, entitled מבוא אמרי שפר (Colon. 1553), in which he gave different specimens of Hebrew writing, dialogues, and epistles, both from the O. T. and other Hebrew writings, as well as the books of Obadiah and Jonah in Hebrew, with a Latin translation:—(2.) A grammatical treatise entitled *Meditationes Hebraicæ in Artem Gramm. per integrum librum Ruth explicatæ; adjecta sunt quædam contra D. I. Försteri lexicon* (Colon. 1558), which consists of a useful analysis and excellent translation of the entire book of Ruth:—(3.) *Notæ in Clenardi Tabulam*, etc. (Colon. 1555), being annotations on Clenard's Tables of Hebrew Grammar:—(4.) An excellent introduction to the edition of Elias Levita's Chaldee Lexicon, entitled מתורגמן (Colon. 1560). He likewise translated several scientific works written by Jews into Latin, and was an assistant to Pagnini on his great lexicological work. See Bartolocci, *Bibl. Rabb.*; Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* Addenda, ii, 2332 sq.; Rivet, *Isagoge ad Sacr. Script.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxvi, 10; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 410.

Isaac Pulgar. See PULGAR.

Isaac "the Blind," a Jewish writer of the 13th century (from 1190-1210), is noted as the reputed author of the modern cabalistic system. See CABALA. Some writers, as is well known, assert that the Cabala originated with him, but this is doubted by the best authorities, and he is considered only to have been the first to give a new impulse to the study of this peculiar philosophical system, to oppose the inroads of Maimonides's (q. v.) philosophical interpretation of the Scriptures. It is certain, at least, that he had much to do with one of the mystical books of the Cabala, the *Jezirah.* His theories were further developed after his death by his two disciples Ezra and Azariel of Zerona. Grätz (*Gesch. d. Juden,* vii, 74 sq., 444 sq.) seems inclined to favor the assertion of Joseph Ibn-Gikatilla, that the Cabala system was the production of Isaac the Blind, and that neither the sacred Scriptures nor Jewish tradition bear any reference to prove its earlier existence. (J. H. W.)

Isaacus. See ISAAC LEVITA.

Isabella OF CASTILE, queen of Spain, one of the most celebrated characters of the 15th century, deserves our notice on account of the part she acted in the religious history of Spain, and those dominions subject to her rule. Isabella, born April 22, 1451, was the daughter of John II, king of Castile and Leon. In 1469 she married Ferdinand V, surnamed "the Catholic," king of Aragon. She was not the heir-apparent to the throne on the death of her father in 1481, as she had an elder sister. But, assisted by the powerful armies of her husband, a man of some sterling qualities, but of very little conscience, she succeeded in ascending the throne. Mr. Prescott and most modern historians seek to relieve her of the stigma that she was responsible for the cruelties that were inflicted on those of her subjects who chose to differ with the Church of Rome in their worship of their divine Maker. It seems certain that she was deceived by the Jesuits, and consented to these outrages only because, in her fervor for the Roman Catholic cause, she believed the very existence of the Church of Rome threatened; and, though we pity her weakness in the hour when resoluteness on her part was most needed to defend and protect her subjects, she saw that, Spain once reformed, Romanism would have passed from the world in the 16th century, instead of still lingering in our midst at this late hour. But if we excuse the conduct of queen Isabella of Castile on the ground of her piety and misled devotion to the Church of Rome, quite otherwise must we treat the conduct of her husband. He it is upon whom must fall the guilt of the outrages committed in the name of God in Spain and other lands under her dominion by the "Holy League." It was the desire of money, the longing for power, and extension of his government to the American shore that made him the docile follower of the Jesuits, and brought ruin upon Spain. But he was well rewarded for his low and parsimonious conduct by the disturbances which followed the death of Isabella (Nov. 26, 1504) in Castile, and his expulsion from that country, over which, by the will of his departed wife, he had been appointed regent. See SPAIN. (J. H. W.)

Isagogics. See INTRODUCTION.

Isai'ah (prop. Heb. *Yeshayah',* יְשַׁעְיָה, *saved* by *Jehovah*; but this shorter form occurs, with reference to this person, only in the Rabbinic title of the book: the text always has the name in the paragogic form *Yeshaya'hu,* יְשַׁעְיָהוּ, Sept., Josephus, and N. T. Ἡσαΐας, Vulg. *Isaias;* Auth. Vers. N. T. "Esaias:" but the Heb. name, both in the simple and prolonged forms, occurs of other persons likewise, although differently Anglicized in the Eng. Vers.; see JESHAIAH; JESAIAH), one of the most important of "the Greater Prophets," who gave title to one of the books of Scripture.

I. *Personal History of the Prophet.*—Little is known respecting the circumstances of Isaiah's life. Kimchi (A.D. 1230) says in his commentary on Isa. i, 1, "We know not his race, nor of what tribe he was." His father's name was Amoz (i, 1), whom the fathers of the Church confound with the prophet Amos, because they were unacquainted with Hebrew, and in Greek the two names are spelled alike (so Clem. Alex.; Jerome, *Præf. in Am.;* August. *Civ. D.* xviii, 27). See AMOZ. The opinion of the Rabbins (Gemara, *Megilla,* x, 2) that Isaiah was the brother of king Amaziah rests also on a mere etymological combination (see Carpzov, *De regiis Jesaiæ natalibus,* Rost. 1735). Isaiah resided at Jerusalem, not far from the Temple (ch. vi). We learn from ch. vii and viii that he was married. Two of his sons are mentioned, Shear-jashub and Maher-shalal-hash-baz. These significant names, which he gave to his sons, prove how much Isaiah lived in his vocation. He did not consider his children as belonging merely to himself, but rendered them living admonitions to the people. In their names were contained the two chief points of his prophetic utterances: one recalled to mind the severe and inevitable judgment wherewith the Lord was about to visit the world, and especially his people; the other, which signifies "The remnant shall return," pointed out the mercy with which the Lord would receive the elect, and with which, in the midst of apparent destruction, he would take care to preserve his people and his kingdom. Isaiah calls his wife a *prophetess.* This indicates that his marriage-life was not only consistent with his vocation, but that it was intimately interwoven with it. This name cannot mean the wife of a prophet, but indicates that the prophetess of Isaiah had a prophetic gift, like Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah. The appellation here given denotes the suitableness as well as genuineness of their conjugal relation.

Even the dress of the prophet was subservient to his vocation. According to xx, 2, he wore a garment of hair-cloth or sackcloth. This seems also to have been the costume of Elijah, according to 2 Kings i, 8; and it was the dress of John the Baptist (Matt. iii, 4). Hairy sackcloth is in the Bible the symbol of repentance (compare Isa. xx, 11, 12, and 1 Kings xxi, 27). This costume of the prophets was a *sermo propheticus realis,* a prophetic preaching by fact. Before he has opened his lips his external appearance proclaims *μετανοεῖτε, repent.*

It is held traditionally that Isaiah suffered martyrdom under the wicked Manasseh, by being sawn in two under a memorable tree long said to have stood in the vicinity of Jerusalem (Gemara, *Jebam.* iv, 13; compare *Sanhedr.* f. 103 b, and the Targumites, in Assemani, *Catalog. Bibl. Vat.* i, 452; Trypho, p. 349; Jerome, in *Jes. lvii;* Origen, in *Psalm. xxxvii,* in *Matt. xxiii;* Tertullian, *Patient.* xiv; Augustine, *Civ. Dei,* xviii, 24; *Chronic. Pasch.* p. 155). The traditional spot of the martyrdom is a very old mulberry-tree which stands near the Pool of Siloam, on the slopes of Ophel, below the south-east wall of Jerusalem. A similar account of his death is contained in the *Ascension of the Prophet Isaiah,* an apocryphal work, the Greek original of which was known to the early Church (Epiphan. *Hær.* xl, 2; Jerome, in *Jes. xliv,* 4, p. 761, etc.), and of which only recently an Ethiopic version has been found and translated by Dr. Laurence, Oxford, 1819 (see Nitzsch, in the *Studien und Krit.* 1830, ii, 209; Engelhardt, *Kirchengesch. Abhandl.* 207 sq.). The same fate of Isaiah appears to be alluded to by Josephus (*Ant.* x, 3, 1).

II. *Time of Isaiah.*—The heading of this book places the prophet under the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah; and an examination of the prophecies themselves, independently of the heading, leads us to the same chronological results. Chapter vi, in which is related the definite call of Isaiah to his prophetic office, is thus headed: "In the year in which king Uzziah died I saw the Lord," etc. The collection of prophecies is, therefore, not chronologically arranged, and the utterances in the preceding chapters (i to vi) belong, for chronological and other reasons,

to the last year of the reign of Uzziah, although the utterances in chapters ii, iii, iv, and v have been erroneously assigned to the reign of Jotham. As, however, the position of affairs was not materially changed under the reign of Jotham, we may say that the first chapter was uttered during that reign. The continuation of prophetic authorship, or the writing down of uttered prophecies, depended upon the commencement of new historical developments, such as took place under the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah. Several prophecies (namely, vii–x, 4; i, 2–31; xvii) belong to the reign of Ahaz (xiv, 28–32, apparently to the occasion of his death); and most of the subsequent prophecies to the reign of Hezekiah. The prophetic ministry of Isaiah under Hezekiah is also described in a historical section contained in chapters xxxvi–xxxix. The data which are contained in this section come down to the fifteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah; consequently we are in the possession of historical documents proving that the prophetic ministry of Isaiah was in operation during about forty-five years, commencing in the year B.C. 756, and extending to the year B.C. 711. Of this period, at least one year belongs to the reign of Uzziah, sixteen to the reign of Jotham, fourteen to the reign of Ahaz, and fourteen and upwards to the reign of Hezekiah. It has been maintained, however, by Stäudlin, Jahn, Bertholdt, Gesenius, and others, that Isaiah lived to a much later period, and that his life extended to the reign of Manasseh, the successor of Hezekiah. For this opinion the following reasons are adduced:

(1.) According to 2 Chron. xxxii, 32, Isaiah wrote the life of king Hezekiah. It would hence appear that he survived that king; although it must be admitted that in 2 Chron. xxxii, 32, where Isaiah's biography of Hezekiah is mentioned, the important words "first and last" are omitted; while in xxvi, 22, we read, "Now the rest of the acts of Uzziah, *first and last*, did Isaiah, the son of Amoz, write."

(2.) We find (as above stated) a tradition current in the Talmud, in the fathers, and in Oriental literature, that Isaiah suffered martyrdom in the reign of Manasseh by being sawn asunder. It is thought that an allusion to this tradition is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi, 37), in the expression *they were sawn asunder* (ἐπρίσθησαν), which seems to harmonize with 2 Kings xxi, 16, "Moreover, Manasseh shed innocent blood very much."

(3.) The authenticity of the second portion of the prophecies of Isaiah being admitted (see below), the nature of this portion would seem to confirm the idea that its author had lived under Manasseh. The style of the second portion, it is asserted, is so different from that of the first that both could not well have been composed by the same author, except under the supposition that a considerable time intervened between the composition of the first and second portion. The contents of the latter—such as the complaints respecting gross idolatry, the sacrifice of children to idols, the wickedness of rulers, etc.—seem to be applicable neither to the times of the exile, into which the prophet might have transported himself in the spirit, nor to the period of the pious Hezekiah, but are quite applicable to the reign of Manasseh. This last argument, however, is too subjective in its character to be of much weight; the difference of style referred to may be more readily accounted for by the difference in the topics treated of, and it is a gratuitous supposition that the national sins rebuked in the later prophecies had ceased during the reign of Hezekiah. The other arguments may be admitted so far as to allow a survivorship on the part of the prophet beyond the sickness of Hezekiah, and sufficiently into the reign of Manasseh to have suffered martyrdom at the order of the latter, but it does not appear that he uttered any predictions during the fifteen added years of Hezekiah; at least none are found extant that seem to belong to that period (except ch. xl to end, which may be assigned to the year ensuing Hezekiah's recovery); his great age and the absence of any special occasion may well account for his silence, and he may naturally be supposed to have occupied the time in writing down his former predictions. Nor will this view, which seems to meet all the requirements in the case, require to be extended a life-time; for if Isaiah, like Jeremiah, was called to the prophetical office in his youth, perhaps at twenty years of age, he would have been but eighty years old at the accession of Manasseh (B.C. 696), an age no greater than that of Hosea, whose prophecies extend over the same period of sixty years (Hos. i, 1).

III. *Historical Works of Isaiah.*—Besides the collection of prophecies which has been preserved to us, Isaiah also wrote two historical works (comp. Isa. xxxvi, 3, 22). It was part of the vocation of the prophets to write the history of the kingdom of God, to exhibit in this history the workings of the law of retribution, and to exhort to the true worship of the Lord (see Augusti,

CHRONOLOGICAL VIEW OF ISAIAH'S PROPHECIES.

Passages.	*Principal Theme.*	*Probable Occasion.*	B.C. cir.
vi: v; ii, 6–22; iii; iv, 1; ii, 1–5; iv, 2–6.	Divine punishment and ultimate mercy on the nation.	The prophet's inauguration.	756
i, 2–31.	Rebuke of the prevalent apostasy.	Accession of Ahaz.	740
vii, 1–16; viii, 1–4, 21, 22; ix, 1–7; viii, 5–20; ix, 8–21; x, 1–4; vii, 17–25.	Rebuke of the popular want of faith and justice, and typification of Messiah.	Invasion of Jerusalem by Rezin and Pekah.	739
xvii.	Capture of Damascus by Assyria.	Invasion of Tiglath-pileser.	738
xiv, 28–32.	Against the Philistines.	Death of Ahaz.	726
i, 1; xxviii; xxiv; xxxiii; xxv; xxvi; xxvii; xi, 11–16; xxxv; xii; xxxii, 1–8; xxxiii, 13–24; xxviii, 5, 6, 16; xi, 1–10.	Generally on the fate of the land and the æra of Messiah.	A summary.	725
xv; xvi.	Against the Moabites.	In view of the Assyrian conquest.	723
xx; xix; xviii; xxx, 1–17; xxxi, 1–3; xxx, 18–33; xxxi, 4–9; xxxiv; xxi, 11–17; xxiii.	Further success of Assyria, but check at Jerusalem.	Progress of the Assyrian empire.	715
xxxvi, 1; xxix; xxii; x, 5–34; xxxvi, 2–22; xxxvii.	Defeat of Sennacherib.	Sennacherib's invasion of Jerusalem.	713
xiii; xiv, 22, 23; xxi, 1–10; xiv, 1–27.	Overthrow of Babylon and return of the Jews.	Culmination of Assyro-Babylonian power.	712
xxxviii, 1–6, 21, 22, 7–20; xxxix.	Cure and reproof of Hezekiah.	Hezekiah's sickness and vanity.	712
lvi, 9–12; lvii; xlviii, 22; lviii; lix; lxiii; lxiv; l; xl, 27–31; xlviii, 1–21; xlvii; xlii, 13–17; li; lii, 1–12; xl, 1, 2; xli, 8–20; xlix; xli, 1–7; xliv, 21–28; xlv, 1–13; xli, 21–29; xliii; xliv, 6–20; xlv, 14–25; xlvi; xl, 12–26; xlii, 1–12; xl, 3–11; lii, 13–15; liii; xlii, 18–25; xliv, 1–5; lx; lxi; lxii; liv; lv; lvi, 1–8; lxv; lxvi.	Future of the nation and person of Messiah.	Concluding summary.	712

Einleit. p. 290; Bertholdt, *Einleit.* iv, 1349). Most of the historical books in the Old Testament have been written by prophets. The collectors of the canon placed most of these books under the head *prophets;* hence it appears that, even when these historical works were remodelled by later editors, these editors were themselves prophets. The Chronicles are not placed among the prophetical books so called: we may therefore conclude that they were not written by a prophet. But their author constantly indicates that he composed his work from abstracts taken verbatim from historical monographies written by the prophets; consequently the books of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther are the only historical books of the Old Testament which did not originate from prophets.

The first historical work of Isaiah was a biography of king Uzziah (comp. 2 Chron. xxvi, 22), "Now the rest of the acts of Uzziah, first and last, did Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, write." The second historical work of Isaiah was a biography of king Hezekiah, which was subsequently inserted in the annals of Judah and Israel. These annals consisted of a series of prophetic monographies, which were received partly entire, partly in abstracts, and are the chief source from which the information contained in the Chronicles is derived. In this work of Isaiah, although its contents were chiefly historical, numerous prophecies were inserted. Hence it is called in 2 Chron. xxxii, 32, חֲזוֹן יְשַׁעְיָהוּ, *The Vision of Isaiah.* In a similar manner, the biography of Solomon by Ahijah is called in 2 Chron. ix, 29, "the prophecy of Ahijah." The two historical works of Isaiah were lost, together with the annals of Judah and Israel, into which they were embodied. Whatever these annals contained that was of importance for all ages, has been preserved to us by being received into the historical books of the Old Testament, and the predictions of the most distinguished prophets have been formed into separate collections. After this was effected, less care was taken to preserve the more diffuse annals, which also comprehended many statements, of value only for particular times and places.

The so-called "*Ascension of Isaiah*" is a pseudepigraphal work of later times, originally written, it would seem, in Greek (Ἀναβατικὸν Ἠσαΐου), of which only an old Latin translation (*Ascensio Isaiæ*) was known to scholars, until Bp. Laurence discovered and published the Ethiopic version (Oxford, 1819, 8vo). It has also been edited, with notes, etc., by Dillmann (Leips. 1877, 8vo). See Carpzov, *Introduct.* iii, p. 90; Gesenius, *Comment.* at Isa. i, 3 sq.; Knobel, *Prophet.* ii, 176 sq.; Stickel, in the *Hall. Encyklop.* II, xv, 371 sq.; Stuart's *Comment. on the Apocalypse,* Introd.; Whiston, *Authentic Records,* i, 470; Gieseler, *Visio Jesaiæ illustrata* (Gött. 1832); Gfrörer, *Prophetæ veteres* (Stuttg. 1840); Jolowicz, *Himmelfahrt u. Vision des Proph. Jes.* (Lpz. 1854); *De heemelvaart van den profeet Jesaja,* in the *Godgeleerde Bijdragen* for 1862, pt. vii, p. 529-601. See APOCRYPHA; REVELATIONS, SPURIOUS.

IV. *Integral Authenticity of the Prophecies of Isaiah.*—The Jewish synagogue, and the Christian Church during all ages, have considered it as an undoubted fact that the prophecies which bear the name of Isaiah really originated from that prophet. Even Spinoza did not expressly assert, in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* (viii, 8), that the book of Isaiah consisted of a collection originating from a variety of authors, although it is usually considered that he maintained this opinion. But in the last quarter of the 18th century this prevailing conviction appeared to some divines to be inconvenient. All those who attack the integral authenticity of Isaiah agree in considering the book to be an anthology, or gleanings of prophecies, collected after the Babylonian exile, although they differ in their opinions respecting the origin of this collection. Koppe gave gentle hints of this view, which was first explicitly supported by Eichhorn in his *Introduction.* Eichhorn advances the hypothesis that a collection of Isaian prophecies (which might have been augmented, even before the Babylonian exile, by several not genuine additions) formed the basis of the present anthology, and that the collectors, after the Babylonian exile, considering that the scroll on which they were written did not form a volume proportionate to the size of the three other prophetic scrolls, containing Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and the minor prophets, annexed to the Isaian collection all other oracles at hand whose authors were not known to the editors. In this supposition of the non-identity of date and authorship, many German scholars, and lately also Hitzig and Ewald, followed Eichhorn. Gesenius, on the contrary, maintained, in his introduction to Isaiah, that all the non-Isaian prophecies extant in that book originated from one author, and were of the same date. Umbreit and Köster on the main point follow Gesenius, considering chaps. xl to lxvi to be a continuous whole, written by a pseudo-Isaiah who lived about the termination of the Babylonian exile. In reference to other portions of the book of Isaiah, the authenticity of which has been questioned, Umbreit expresses himself doubtingly, and Köster assigns them to Isaiah. Gesenius declines to answer the question how it happened that these portions were ascribed to Isaiah, but Hitzig felt that an answer to it might be expected. He accordingly attempts to explain why such additions were made to Isaiah, and not to any of the other prophetical books, by the extraordinary veneration in which Isaiah was held. He says that the great authority of Isaiah occasioned important and distinguished prophecies to be placed in connection with his name. But he himself soon after destroys the force of this assertion by observing that the great authority of Isaiah was especially owing to those prophecies which were falsely ascribed to him. A considerable degree of suspicion must, however, attach to the boasted certainty of such critical investigations, if we notice how widely these learned men differ in defining what is of Isaian origin and what is not, although they are all linked together by the same fundamental tendency and interest. There are very few portions in the whole collection whose authenticity has not been called in question by some one or other of the various impugners. Almost every part has been attacked either by Döderlein, or by Eichhorn (who, especially in a later work entitled *Die Hebräischen Propheten,* Götting. 1816 to 1819, goes farther than all the others), or by Justi (who, among the earlier adversaries of the integral authenticity of Isaiah, uses, in his *Vermischte Schriften* [vols. i and ii], the most comprehensive and, apparently, the best-grounded arguments), or by Paulus, Rosenmüller, Bauer, Bertholdt, De Wette, Gesenius, Hitzig, Ewald, Umbreit, or others. The only portions left to Isaiah are chaps. i, 3-9; xvii, xx, xxviii, xxxi, and xxxiii. All the other chaps. are defended by some and rejected by others; they are also referred to widely different dates. In the most modern criticism, however, we observe an inclination again to extend the sphere of Isaian authenticity as much as the dogmatic principle and system of the critics will allow. Recent critics are therefore disposed to admit the genuineness of chaps. i to xxiii, with the only exception of the two prophecies against Babylon in chaps. xiii and xiv, and in chap. xxi, 1-10. Chapters xxviii-xxxiii are allowed to be Isaian by Ewald, Umbreit, and others.

Divines who were not linked to these critics by the same dogmatical interest undertook to defend the integrity of Isaiah, as Hensler (*Jesaius neu übersetzt* 1788), Piper (*Integritas Jesaiæ,* 1793), Beckhaus (*Ueber die Integrität der Prophetischen Schriften,* 1796), Jahn, in his *Einleitung,* who was the most able among the earlier advocates, Dereser, in his *Bearbeitung des Jesaias,* iv, 1, and Greve (*Vaticinia Jesaiæ,* Amsterdam, 1810). All these works have at present only a historical value, because they have been surpassed by two recent monographs. The first is by Jo. Ulrich Möller (*De Authentia Oraculorum Jesaiæ,* chap. xl-xlvi, Copenhagen, 1825). Although this work professedly defends only

the latter portion of the book of Isaiah, there occur in it many arguments applicable also to the first portion. The standard work on this subject is that of Kleinert (*Die Aechtheit des Jesaias*, vol. i, Berlin, 1829). It is, however, very diffuse, and contains too many hypotheses. The comprehensive work of Schleier (*Würdigung der Einwürfe gegen die Altestamentlichen Weissagungen in Jesaias*, chap. xiii and xiv) of course refers more especially to these chapters, but indirectly refers also to all the other portions whose authenticity has been attacked. Since the objections against the various parts of Isaiah are all of the same character, it is very inconsistent in Köster, in his work *Die Propheten des alten Testamentes*, to defend, in page 102, the genuineness of chaps. xiii, xiv, and xxi, but nevertheless, in pages 117 and 297, to ascribe chaps. xl-lxvi to a pseudo Isaiah.

We have space here only to indicate the following reasons as establishing the integrity of the whole book, and as vindicating the authenticity of the second part:

1. *Externally.*—The *unanimous* testimony of Jewish and Christian tradition—Ecclus. xlviii, 24, 25, which manifestly (in the words *παρεκάλεσε τοὺς πενθοῦντας ἐν Σιών* and *ὑπέδειξε—τὰ ὑπόκρυφα πρὶν ἢ παραγενέσθαι αὐτά*) refers to this second part. The use apparently made of the second part by Jeremiah (x, 1-16; v, 25; xxv, 31; l, li), Ezekiel (xiii, 40, 41), and Zephaniah (ii, 15; iii, 10). The decree of Cyrus in Ezra i, 2-4, which plainly is founded upon Isa. xliv, 28; xlv, 1, 13, accrediting Josephus's statement (*Ant.* xi, 1, 2) that the Jews showed Cyrus Isaiah's predictions of him. The inspired testimony of the N. T., which often (Matt. iii, 3, and the parallel passages; Luke iv, 17; Acts viii, 28; Rom. x, 16, 20) quotes with specification of Isaiah's name prophecies found in the second part.

2. *Internally.*—The congruity of topic and sentiment in the last twenty-seven chapters with the preceding parts of the book. The oneness of diction which pervades the whole book. The peculiar elevation and grandeur of style which, as is universally acknowledged, distinguishes the whole contents of the second part as much as of the first, and which assigns their composition to the golden age of Hebrew literature. The absence of any other name than Isaiah's claiming the authorship. At the time to which the composition is assigned, a Zechariah or a Malachi could gain a separate name and book; how was it that an author of such transcendent gifts as "the great Unnamed" who wrote xl-lxvi could gain none? The claims which the writer makes to the *fore*knowledge of the deliverance by *Cyrus*, which claims, on the opposing view, must be regarded as a fraudulent personation of an earlier writer. Lastly, *the predictions which it contains of the character, sufferings, death, and glorification of Jesus Christ:* a believer in Christ cannot fail to regard those predictions as affixing to this second part the broad seal of divine inspiration, whereby the chief ground of objection against its having been written by Isaiah is at once annihilated.

For a full vindication of the authenticity of Isaiah, besides the above works, see professor Stuart *On the Old Testam. Canon*, p. 103 sq., and Dr. Davidson in the new edit. of Horne's *Introduction*, ii, 835 sq., in which latter, especially, copious references are made to the latest literature on the subject. Other writers who have taken the same side are especially Hengstenberg, in his *Christology*, vol. ii; Hävernick, *Einleitung*, vol. iii (1849); Stier, in his *Jesaias nicht Pseudo-Jesaias* (1850); and Keil, in his *Einleitung* (1853), in which last the reader will find a most satisfactory compendium of the controversy, and of the grounds for the generally received view.

V. *Origin, Contents, and Style of the Compilation.*—No definite account respecting the method pursued in collecting into books the utterances of the prophets has been handed down to us. Concerning Isaiah as well as the rest, these accounts are wanting. We do not even know whether he collected his prophecies himself. But we have no decisive argument against this opinion. Those critics who reject the authenticity of the book are compelled to invent other authors, and, of course, different theories with respect to compilers. None of these have proved satisfactory. (See the authorities above referred to.) According to the Talmudists, the book of Isaiah was collected by the men of Hezekiah. But this assertion rests merely upon Prov. xxv, 1, where the men of Hezekiah are said to have compiled the Proverbs. To us it seems impossible that Isaiah left it to others to collect his prophecies into a volume, because we know that he was the author of historical works, and it is not likely that a man accustomed to literary occupation would have left to others to do what he could do much better himself.

Chaps. i-v contain a series of rebukes, threatenings, and expostulations with the nation, especially Jerusalem its head, on account of the prevalent sins, and particularly idolatry. Chap. vi describes a theophany and the prophet's own call, in the last year of Uzziah (to which the preceding chapters may also be assigned, with the exception of chap. i, 2-31, which appears to belong to the first of Ahaz). What follows next, up to chap. x, 4, belongs to the reign of Ahaz, and consists of a sublime prediction of the future consolation of Israel, in the first instance by the deliverance from surrounding enemies (especially Damascus and Samaria), and eventually by the Messiah, who is prefigured by historical signs. The same subject is treated in a similar manner in the succeeding chapters (x-xii), the deliverance from Assyria being there the historical type; this is the first portion appertaining to the reign of Hezekiah. Then follows a series of prophecies against foreign nations, in which the chronological arrangement has been departed from, and, instead of it, an arrangement according to contents has been adopted. In the days of Hezekiah, the nations of Western Asia, dwelling on the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris, more and more resembled a threatening tempest. The prophetic gift of Isaiah was more fully unfolded in sight of the Assyrian invasion under the reign of Hezekiah. Isaiah, in a series of visions, describes what Assyria would do, as a chastising rod in the hand of the Lord, and what the successors of the Assyrians, the Chaldees, would perform, according to the decree of God, in order to realize divine justice on earth, as well among Israel as among the heathen. The prophet shows that mercy is hidden behind the clouds of wrath. This portion comprises chaps. xiii-xxxv, the several prophecies of which were uttered at various times prior to the Assyrian invasion, although isolated portions appear to belong to previous reigns (e. g. chap. xvii to the occasion of the alliance of Ahaz with Tiglath-pileser; chap. xiv, 28-32, to the death of Ahaz). With the termination of this war terminated also the public life of Isaiah, who added a historical section in chaps. xxxvi-xxxix, in order to facilitate the right understanding of the prophecies uttered by him during the most fertile period of his prophetic ministry. Then follows the conclusion of his work on earth (chaps. xl to the end), composed during the peaceful residue of Hezekiah's reign, and containing a closely connected series of the most spiritual disclosures touching the future history of the nation under the Messiah. This second part, which contains his prophetic legacy, is addressed to the small congregation of the faithful strictly so called; it is analogous to the last speeches of Moses in the fields of Moab, and to the last speeches of Christ in the circle of his disciples, related by John.

The proclamation of the Messiah is the inexhaustible source of consolation among the prophets. In Isaiah this consolation is so clear that some fathers of the Church were inclined to style him rather *evangelist* than *prophet*. The following are the outlines of Messianic prophecies in the book of Isaiah: A scion of David, springing from his family, after it has fallen into a very low estate, but being also of divine nature, shall, at first in lowliness, but as a prophet filled with the spirit of God, proclaim the divine doctrine, develop the law in

truth, and render it the animating principle of national life; he shall, as high-priest, by his vicarious suffering and his death, remove the guilt of his nation, and that of other nations, and finally rule as a mighty king, not only over the covenant-people, but over all nations of the earth who will subject themselves to his peaceful sceptre, not by violent compulsion, but induced by love and gratitude. He will make both the moral and the physical consequences of sin to cease; the whole earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, and all enmity, hatred, and destruction shall be removed even from the brute creation. This is the survey of the Messianic preaching by Isaiah, of which he constantly renders prominent those portions which were most calculated to impress the people under the then existing circumstances. The first part of Isaiah is directed to the whole people, consequently the glory of the Messiah is here dwelt upon. The fear lest the kingdom of God should be overwhelmed by the power of heathen nations is removed by pointing out the glorious king to come, who would elevate the now despised and apparently mean kingdom of God above all the kingdoms of this world. In the second part, which is more particularly addressed to the ἐκλογή, *the elect*, than to the whole nation, the prophet exhibits the Messiah more as a divine teacher and high-priest. The prophet here preaches righteousness through the blood of the servant of God, who will support the weakness of sinners, and take upon himself their sorrows.

Isaiah stands pre-eminent above all other prophets, as well in the contents and spirit of his predictions, as also in their form and style. Simplicity, clearness, sublimity, and freshness, are the never-failing characters of his prophecies. Even Eichhorn mentions, among the first merits of Isaiah, the concinnity of his expressions, the beautiful outline of his images, and the fine execution of his speeches. In reference to richness of imagery he stands between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Symbolic actions, which frequently occur in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, seldom occur in Isaiah. The same is the case with visions, strictly so called, of which there is only one, namely, that in chap. vi, and even it is distinguished by its simplicity and clearness above that of the later prophets. But one characteristic of Isaiah is, that he likes to give signs—that is, a fact then present, or near at hand—as a pledge for the more distant futurity, and that he thus supports the feebleness of man (comp. vii, 20; xxxvii, 30; xxxviii, 7 sq.). The instances in chaps. vii and xxxviii show how much he was convinced of his vocation, and in what intimacy he lived with the Lord, by whose assistance alone he could effect what he offers to do in the one passage, and what he grants in the other. The spiritual riches of the prophet are seen in the variety of his style, which always befits the subject. When he rebukes and threatens it is like a storm, and when he comforts his language is as tender and mild as (to use his own words) that of a mother comforting her son. With regard to style, Isaiah is comprehensive, and the other prophets divide his riches.

Isaiah enjoyed an authority proportionate to his gifts. We learn from history how great this authority was during his life, especially under the reign of Hezekiah. Several of his most definite prophecies were fulfilled while he was yet alive; for instance, the overthrow of the kingdoms of Syria and Israel; the invasion of the Assyrians, and the divine deliverance from it; the prolongation of life granted to Hezekiah; and several predictions against foreign nations. Isaiah is honorably mentioned in the historical books. The later prophets, especially Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, clearly prove that his book was diligently read, and that his prophecies were attentively studied. The authority of the prophet greatly increased after the fulfilment of his prophecies by the Babylonian exile, the victories of Cyrus, and the deliverance of the covenant-people. Even Cyrus (according to the account in Josephus, *Ant.* xl, 1, 1 and 2) was induced to set the Jews at liberty by the prophecies of Isaiah concerning himself. Jesus Sirach (xlviii, 22-25) bestows splendid praise upon Isaiah, and both Philo and Josephus speak of him with great veneration. He attained the highest degree of authority after the times of the New Testament had proved the most important part of his prophecies, namely, the Messianic, to be divine. Christ and the apostles quote no prophecies so frequently as those of Isaiah, in order to prove that he who had appeared was one and the same with him who had been promised. The fathers of the Church abound in praises of Isaiah.—Kitto; Smith. See MESSIAH.

VI. The following are express commentaries on the whole of the book of Isaiah, the most important being designated by an asterisk (*) prefixed: Origen, *Fragmenta* (in *Opp.* iii, 104); also *Homiliæ* (in Jerome, *Opp.* iv, 1097); Eusebius, *Commentarii* (in Montfaucon's *Collectio Nova*); Ephrem Syrus, *Enarratio* (from the Syr. in *Opp.* I, ii, 535); Basil, *Enarratio* (Gr. in his *Opp.* I, ii, 535; tr. in Lat., Basle, 1518, 4to); Jerome, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* iv, 1); also *Adbreviatio* (*ib.* iv, 1131); Chrysostom, *Interpretatio* [on i-viii] (Gr. in *Opp.* vi, 1); Cyril, *Commentarii* (Gr. in. *Opp.* ii, 1 sq.); Theodoret, *Interpretation* [in Greek] (in *Opp.* II, i); Procopius, *Epitome* (Gr. and Lat., Par. 1580, fol.); Rupertus, *In Esaiam* (in *Opp.* i, 429); Herveus, *Commentarii* (in Pez, *Thesaur.* III, i); S. Jarchi [i. e. "Rashi"], *Commentarius* (from the Heb. edit. Breithaupt, Goth. 1713, 1714, 3 vols. 4to); D. Kimchi, *Commentarius* (from the Heb. by Malamineus, Florence, 1774, 4to); Abrabanel, פֵּרוּשׁ (ed. L'Empereur, Lugd. B. 1631, 8vo); Aquinas, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1531, 8vo; also in *Opp.* ii); Luther, *Enarrationes* (in *Opp.* iii, 294); Melancthon, *Argumentum* (in *Opp.* iii, 398); Œcolampadius, *Hypomnematon* (Basil. 1525, 1567, 4to); Zuinglius, *Complanatio* (Tigur. 1529, fol.; also in *Opp.* iii, 163); Dieterich, *Auslegung* (Norimb. 1543, 4to); Calvin, *Commentarii* (Gen. 1551, 1559, 1570, 1583, 1587, 1617, fol.; in French, ib. 1552, 4to; 1572, fol.; in English by Colton, Lond. 1609, fol.; by Pringle, Edinb. 1850, 4 vols. 8vo); Day, *Exposition* (London, 1654, fol.); Musculus, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1557, 1570, 1600, 1623, fol.); Borrhasius, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1561, fol.); Draconis, *Commentarius* (Lipsiæ, 1563, fol.); Strigel, *Conciones* (Lipsiæ, 1563, 12mo); Forerius, *Commentaria* (Venice, 1563, fol.; Antwerp, 1565, 8vo; also in the *Critici Sacri*, iv); Sasbouth, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1563, 8vo); Marloratus, *Expositio* (Par. 1564; Gen. 1610, fol.); Pintus, *Commentaria* (Lugd. 1561, 1567; Antw. 1567, 1572, fol.); Gualtherus, *Homiliæ* (Tigur. 1567, folio); Bullinger, *Expositio* (Tigur. 1567, folio); Selnecker, *Erklär.* (Lpz. 1569, 4to); Castri, *Commentaria* (Salam. 1570, folio); De Palacios, *Dilucidationes* (Salam. 1572, 3 vols. fol.); Schnepf, *Scholæ* (Tüb. 1575, 1583, fol.); Osorius, *Paraphrasis* (Bonon. 1576, 4to; Col. Agr. 1579, 1584, 8vo); Ursinus, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* iii); Wigand, *Adnotationes* (Erford. 1581, 8vo); Guidell, *Commentarius* (Perus. 1598-1600, 2 vols. 4to); Montanus, *Commentarii* (Antw. 1599, 2 vols. 4to); D. Alvarez, *Commentarii* (Rome, 1599-1702, 2 vols. fol.; Lugd. 1716; fol.); Arcularius, *Commentarius* (ed. Mentzer, Frankfort, 1607; Lips. 1653, 8vo); Arama, אוּרִים וְתֻמִּים (Ven. 1608, 8vo; also in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible); Sancius, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1615; Antwerp and Mogunt. 1616, fol.); Heshusius, *Commentarius* (Hal. 1617, fol.); Forster, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1620, 1664, 1674, 1679, 4to); Oleastre, *Commentarii* (Par. 1622, 1656, fol.); à Lapide, *In Esaiam* (Antw. 1622, folio); G. Alvarez, *Expositio* (Lugd. 1623, fol.); De Arcones, *Elucidatio* (Lugd. 1642, 2 vols. folio); Di Marino, תִּקּוּן עוֹלָם (Verona, 1652, 4to); Laisne, *Commentaire* (Paris, 1654, fol.); Lañado, כְּלִי פָז (Ven. 1657, fol.); Varenus, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1673, 1708, 4to); Brentius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* iv, Tüb. 1675); Jackson, *Annotations* (London, 1682, 4to); S. Schmid, *Commentarius* (ed. Sandhagen, Hamb. 1693, 1695, 1702, 1723, 4to); Sibersma, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1700, 4to); Cocceius, *Commentarius* (in

Opp. ii, Amst. 1701); Dorsche, *Commentarius* (ed. Fecht, Hamb. 1703, 4to); Hellenbroek, *Erklaaring* (Rotterdam, 1704, 4 vols. 4to); Schmuck, *Prælectiones* (edit. Vlich, Dresd. 1708, 4to); White, *Commentary* (Lond. 1709, 4to); Kortum, *Untersuchung* (Lpz. 1709, 4to); *Vitringa, *Commentarius*, Louv. 1714–20, 1724, 2 vols. fol.; in German, Herb. 1715–22, 2 vols. fol.; the last abridged by Busching, Hal. 1749, 4to); Petersen, *Erklär.* (Frckft. 1719, 4to); Leigh, *Commentar* (Brunsw. 1725–34, 6 vols. 4to); Hoheisel, *Observationes* (Gedan. 1729, 8vo); Le Clerc, *Commentarius* (an abstract, Amsterdam, 1731, fol.); Woken, *Erklär.* (Lpz. 1732, 8vo); Duguet, *Explication* (in French, Paris, 1734, 5 vols. 12mo); Rambach, *Erklärung* (Zür. 1741, 4to); Reichel, *Erläut.* (Lpz. and Gorl. 1755–59, 16 pts. 8vo); Vogel, *Umschreibung* (Hal. 1771, 8vo); Struensee, *Uebers.* (Halb. 1773, 8vo); Crusius, *Hypomnemata* (Lips. 1773, 8vo); *Lowth, *Commentary* (Lond. 1774, 1778, 4to; and frequently since in many forms; finally in connection with the notes of Bp. Patrick and others, in 4 vols. 8vo, Lond. and Philadelphia); Walther, *Anmerk.* (Hal. 1774, 4to); *Döderlein, *Notæ* (Altd. 1775, 1780, 1783, 8vo); Holden, *Paraphrase* (Chelmsf. 1776, 2 vols. 8vo); Rambach, *Anmerk.* [to tr. of Matt. Henry's] (Lpz. 1777, 8vo); Sponsel, *Abhandlung* (Nurenb. 1779–80, 2 vols. 4to); Koppe, *Anmerk.* [to Lowth] (Lpz. 1779–81, 4 vols. 8vo); Moldenhauer, *Anmerk.* (Quedlinb. 1780, 4to); Weise, *Redan* (Halle, 1780, 8vo); *Seiler, *Erläut.* (Erl. 1783, 8vo); Cube, *Anmerk.* (Berlin, 1785–6, 2 vols. 8vo); Rieger, *Scholien* (Memming. 1788, 8vo); Henssler, *Anmerk.* (Hamb. and Kiel, 1788, 8vo); Berthier, *Notes* [French] (Paris, 1789, 5 vols. 12mo); Kocher, *Vindiciæ* (Tübing. 1790, 8vo); Dodson, *Notes* (Lond. 1790, 8vo); Krägelius, *Bearbeitung* (Brem. 1790, 8vo); Macculloch, *Lectures* (Lond. 1791–1805, 4 vols. 8vo); Paulus, *Clavis* (Jena, 1793, 8vo); Fraser, *Commentary* (Edinburgh, 1800, 8vo); Bp. Stock, *Translation* (Bath, 1805, 4to); Van der Palm, *Anmerk.* [Dutch] (Amst. 1805, 2 vols. 8vo); Ottensosser, באור (Fürth, 1807, 8vo); Dereser, *Erklärung* (Frckft. a. M. 1808, 8vo); *Gesenius, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1821–9, 3 vols. 8vo); Horsley, *Notes* (in *Biblical Criticism*, i, 229); Moller, *Anmerk.* [Danish] (Copenh. 1822, 8vo); De Liere, *Traduction* (Paris, 1823, 8vo); Knös, *Enodatio* (Upsal. 1824, 8vo); Jones, *Translation* (Oxford, 1830, 8vo; 1842, 12mo); Jenour, *Notes* (London, 1830, 2 vols. 8vo); Hendewerk, *Erklär.* (Königsberg, 1830–44, 2 vols. 8vo); Maller, *Erklär.* (Brem. 1831, 8vo, pt. i); Hitzig, *Auslegung* (Heidelb. 1833, 8vo); Maurer, *Commentarius* (Lpz. 1836, 8vo); Barnes, *Notes* (Bost. 1840, 3 vols. 8vo; abridged, N. Y. 1848, 2 vols. 12mo); *Henderson, *Commentary* (London, 1840, 1857, 8vo); Govett, *Notes* (Lond. 1841, 8vo); *Umbreit, *Commentar* (Hamb. 1841–42, 2 vols. 8vo); Heinemann, מִקְרָא מְפֹרָשׁ (Berl. 1842, 8vo); *Knobel, *Erklärung* (Lpz. 1843, 8vo); Dreschler, *Erklär.* (Stuttg. 1845–9, 3 vols. 8vo); *Alexander, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1846–7, 1865, 2 vols. 8vo; Glasgow, 1848, 8vo; abridged, N. York, 1851, 2 vols. 12mo); Stier, *Nicht Pseudo-Jesaias* (Barmen, 1850, 2 pts. 8vo); Smithson, *Translation* (Lond. 1860, 8vo); Keith, *Commentary* (London, 1850, 8vo); Meier, *Erklär.* (pt. i, Pforzh. 1850, 8vo); Whish, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1855, 8vo); Williams, *Commentary* (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Diedrich, *Erklär.* (Lpz. 1859, 8vo); Renner, *Auslegung* (Stuttg. 1865, 8vo); Luzatto, *Commenti* [in Heb.] (Padova, 1865–7, 2 vols. 8vo); Second, *Commentaire* (Genev. 1866, 8vo); *Delitzsch, *Commentar* (in Keil and Delitzsch's series, Lpz. 1866; tr. in Clarke's Library, Edinb. 1867, 2 vols. 8vo); Cheyne, *Notes* (Lond. 1868, 8vo); Ewald, *Commentary* (chaps. i–xxxiii, transl. from the Germ. by Glover, London, 1869, 12mo); Neteler, *Grundlage* (Munst. 1869, 8vo); Birks, *Commentary* (Lond. 1871, 8vo). See PROPHET.

Isauites. See OBADIAH (ABU-ISA).

Is'cah (Heb. *Yiskah'*, יִסְכָּה, *spy;* Sept. Ἰεσχά), the daughter of Haran, and sister of Milcah and Lot (Gen. xi, 29; comp. 31). Jewish tradition, as in Josephus (*Ant.* i, 6, 5), Jerome (*Quæst. in Genesim*), and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, identifies her with SARAH (q. v.).

Iscar'iot (Ἰσκαριώτης, probably from Heb. אִישׁ קְרִיּוֹת, *man of Kerioth*), a surname of Judas the traitor, to distinguish him from others of the same name (Matt. x, 4, and often). See KERIOTH; JUDAS.

Is'daël (Ἰσδαήλ, Vulg. *Gaddahel*), the name of one of the heads of families of "Solomon's servants" that returned from the captivity (1 Esd. v, 33); evidently the GIDDEL (q. v.) of the Heb. texts (Ezra ii, 56; Neh. vii, 58).

Iselin, Isaac, a German philosopher and philanthropist, was born at Basle March 27, 1728. He was educated at the university for the law profession, but much of his time was devoted to the study of philosophy, and he deserves our notice as the author of a *Geschichte d. Menschheit* (Frkf. and Lpz. 1764, 2 vols. 8vo, and often), and *Traüme eines Menschenfreundes* (Zürich, 1758, 8vo, and often). He was a very conspicuous helper of Basedow (q. v.) in the philosophic efforts of the latter, founded a "society for the public good" at Basle, aided in founding the Helvetic Society (1761), in which Hirzel, Sarasin, Pfeffel, and others took part, and was, in short, one of the most prominent leaders in the humanitarianism or philanthropism which flourished in the second half of last century in Germany, and more especially in Switzerland. Isaac Iselin died June 15, 1782. See Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Cent.* i, sect. xiv; professor Vischer, *Programm* (Basle, 1841, 4to). (J. H. W.)

Iselin, James Christopher, a Swiss Protestant theologian and philologist, was born at Basle June 12, 1681. After he had acquired a good knowledge of the classics, and especially of Greek, he applied himself to the study of Hebrew and theology. He was ordained in 1701, and in 1705 was appointed professor of history and rhetoric at Marburg. In 1707 he returned to Basle, and became successively professor of history, of antiquities, and finally (1711) of theology, in the university of that place. In 1716 he visited France (he had previously made a journey there in 1698), and was warmly received at Paris by chancellor D'Aguesseau. In 1717 he was elected member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Iselin died April 14, 1737. He had been in relation with some of the most eminent men of his day, such as cardinal Passioneï, the archbishop of Canterbury, Wake, the marquis Beretti Laudi, ambassador of Spain, etc. He wrote *In Sententiam Jac. Benj. Bossuet de Babylone bestiisque et meretrice Apocalypseos* (Basle, 1701, 4to):—*Specimen observationum atque conjecturarum ad orientalem philologiam et criticen pertinentium* (Basle, 1704, 4to):—*De Magorum in Persia Dominatione* (Marb. 1707, 4to):—*Dissertatio qua mundi æternitas argumentis historicis confutatur* (1709, 4to):—*De Canone Novi Testamenti* (in *Miscellanea Groningana*, vol. iii), against Dodwell: etc. He also contributed a number of articles to the *Mercure Suisse* (1734–5), etc. See Beck, *Vita Iselini* (*Tempe Helvetica*, vol. iii): *Éloge d'Iselin* (*Hist. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions*, vol. vi); Schelhorn, *Lebensbeschr. Iselin's* (*Acta Hist. Eccles.* vol. ii; iii, 1156; iv, 1160); Moréri, *Dict.;* Chauffepié, *Dict.;* J. R. Iselin, *Laudatio Iselini.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxvi, 50 (J. N. P.)

Isenbiehl, JOHANN LAURENZ, a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born on the Eichsfeld in 1744. Of his early history we know nothing, but in 1773 we find him appointed to the position of professor of the Oriental languages and exegetical literature at Mentz. As his first theme before the students over whom he had been chosen to preside, he selected the interpretation of Isa. vii, 14. He advanced the opinion that it was erroneous to attribute any connection to this passage with Matt. i, 23, and asserted that it did not at all refer to Immanuel the Christ, or to Mary, the mother of Christ; that Matthew only alluded to this passage because of its similarity with the circumstances of the birth of Christ. Of course he was at once deposed

from his position, and, as is customary among Roman Catholics, deprived of his personal liberty on account of propagating and cherishing heretical opinions. He was returned to the theological seminary for further *instruction*, and released two years after. In 1778, however, he appeared before the public, defending his original opinion under the title of *Neuer Versuch über d. Weissagungen v. Immanuel* (Coblenz). He had meanwhile been reappointed to the professional dignity, and his persistency in defending his peculiar interpretations again deprived him of his position, and he was once more imprisoned and put on trial. His book was forbidden to all good Roman Catholics by all archbishops and bishops, and in 1779 a bull was issued against it by the pope. In the interim he had made his escape from prison, but, finding the ecclesiastical authorities all opposed to him, he recalled his former opinion, and was honored with ecclesiastical dignity (1780). In 1803 his income was reduced to a small pension, and he lived in want until his death in 1818. Isenbiehl also wrote on the diacritical points under the title of *Corpus decisionum dogmaticarum.* See Walch, *Neueste Relig. Geschichte*, viii, 9 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* vii, 203 sq.; Henke, *Kirchengesch.* vii, 199 sq.; Fuhrmann, *Handw. d. Kirchengesch.* ii, 507. (J. H. W.)

Isham, Chester, a Congregational minister, was born in 1798, and, after a course of preparatory study at the Latin Grammar School in Hartford, Conn., entered Yale College, where he graduated in 1820. Shortly afterwards he went to Andover Seminary to prepare for the ministry, upon which he had decided soon after his conversion while at Yale College. In 1824, on the completion of his theological course of study, he accepted a call to a newly-formed church at Taunton, where he had been preaching during the latter part of the last year spent at Andover. But the great exertions which the work demanded of him were too severe upon his constitution, and the symptoms of consumption appearing shortly after, he went South in the hope of recovering his health. He continued failing, however, and returned to Boston April 19th, to die among his friends. Dr. Leonard Bacon, who was a classmate of Chester Isham at Yale, speaks very highly of his attainments and religious bearing, in Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*, ii, 704 sq.

Ishaneki (*elect band*), a Russian sect which arose in 1666, under the fear that the printed Church books were tainted with error, since they differed from the old MS. copies which had been so long in use. They stoutly adhere to the letter of Scripture, deny different orders among the clergy, and any gradation of rank among the people. but under Alexander I obtained toleration, though they had previously been exposed to constant persecution. See Eckardt, *Modern Russia*, s. v.

Ish'bah (Hebrew *Yishbach*,' יִשְׁבָּח, *praiser;* Sept. Ἰεσαβά), a descendant of Judah, and founder ("father") of Eshtemoa (q. v.); he probably was a son of Mered by his wife Hodiah (1 Chron. iv, 17). B.C. post 1612. See Mered. He is perhaps the same as Ishi (q. v.) in verse 20, and apparently identical with the Naham (q. v.) of ver. 19.

Ish'bak (Heb. *Yishbak'*, יִשְׁבָּק, *leaner;* Sept. Ἰεσβώκ, Ἰεσβόκ), one of the sons of Abraham by Keturah (Gen. xxv, 2; 1 Chron. i, 32). B.C. post 2024. We are told that Abraham "gave gifts" to the sons of Keturah, "and sent them away from Isaac his son eastward, unto the east country" (Gen. xxv, 1–6). They settled in the region east of the Arabah, in and near Mount Seir, and southward in the peninsula of Sinai (Gen. xxxvii, 28, 36; Exod. iii, 1; Numb. xxxi, 9, 10). See Keturah.

The settlements of this people are very obscure, and Poole (in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.) suggests as possible that they may be recovered in the name of the valley called *Sabák*, or, as it is also called, "*Sibák*, in the Dahnà" (*Marásid*, s. v.). The Heb. root precisely corresponds to the Arabic (*sabaq*) in etymology and signification. The Dahnà, in which is situate Sabák, is a fertile and extensive tract belonging to the Benî-Temîm, in Nejd, or the highland of Arabia, on the north-east of it, and the borders of the great desert, reaching from the rugged tract ("hazn") of Yensû'ah to the sands of Yebrîn. It contains much pasturage, with comparatively few wells, and is greatly frequented by the Arabs when the vegetation is plentiful (*Mushtarak* and *Marásid*, s. v.). There is, however, another Dahnà, nearer to the Euphrates (*ib.*), and some confusion may exist regarding the true position of Sabák; but either Dahnà is suitable for the settlements of Ishbak. The first-mentioned Dahnà lies in a favorable portion of the widely-stretching country known to have been peopled by the Keturahites. They extended from the borders of Palestine even to the Persian Gulf, and traces of their settlements must be looked for all along the edge of the Arabian peninsula, where the desert merges into the cultivable land, or (itself a rocky undulating plateau) rises to the wild, mountainous country of Nejd. Ishbak seems from his name to have preceded or gone before his brethren: the place suggested for his dwelling is far away towards the Persian Gulf, and penetrates also into the peninsula. See Arabia. There are many places, however, of an almost similar derivation (root *shabak*), as *Shebek*, *Shibák*, and *Esh-Shóbak;* the last of which has especially been supposed (as by Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 215; Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, I, ii, 53) to preserve a trace of Ishbak. It is a fortress in Arabia Petræa, and is near the well-known fortress of the Crusaders' times called *El-Karak.* This great castle of *Shobek* "stands on the top of the mountain range which bounds the valley of Arabah on the east, and about twelve miles north of Petra, on the crest of a peak commanding a wide view. It was built by Baldwin, king of Jerusalem, in A.D. 1115, on the site of a much more ancient fortress and city, and it was one of the chief strongholds of the Crusaders. The name they gave it was *Mons Regalis;* but by the Arabs, both before and since, it has been uniformly called Shobek. It was finally taken from the Franks by Saladin in A.D. 1188 (*Gesta Dei Per Francos*, p. 426, 611, 812; Bohadin, *Vita Saladini*, p. 38, 54, and *Index Geographicus*, s. v. Sjanbachum). The castle is still in tolerable preservation, and a few families of Arabs find within its walls a secure asylum for themselves and their flocks. It contains an old church, with a Latin inscription of the crusading age over its door (Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 416; *Hand-book for Syr. and Pal.* p. 58; see Forster, *Geogr. of Arabia*, i, 352; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 164)" See Idumæa.

Ish'bi-be'nob (Heb. *Yishbi'-Benob'*, יִשְׁבִּי בְּנֹב, *my seat* is *at Nob*, as in the margin, for which the text has יִשְׁבּוֹ בְּנֹב, *Yishbo'-Benob'*, *his seat* is *at Nob;* Sept. Ἰεσβὶ ἀπὸ Νώβ, Vulg. *Jeshi-benob*), one of the Rephaim, a gigantic warrior who bore a spear of 300 shekels' weight, and came near slaying David in a personal rencounter, but was slain by Abishai (2 Sam. xxi, 16). B.C. cir. 1018. See Giant.

Ish-bo'sheth [many *Ish'-bosheth*,] (Heb. *Ish-bo'-sheth*, אִישׁ־בֹּשֶׁת, *man of shame*, i. e. *bashful*, otherwise *disgraceful;* Sept. Ἰσβόσεθ v. r. Ἰεβοσθέ, Joseph. Ἰέβοσθος, Vulg. *Isboseth*), the youngest of Saul's four sons, and his legitimate successor, being the only one who survived him (2 Sam. ii–iv). His name appears (1 Chron. viii, 33; ix, 39) to have been originally Esh-baal, אֶשְׁבַּעַל, "the man of Baal." Whether this indicates that *Baal* was used as equivalent to *Jehovah*, or that the reverence for Baal still lingered in Israelitish families, is uncertain; but it can hardly be doubted that the name (Ish-bosheth, "the man of *shame*") by which he is commonly known must have been substituted for the original word, with a view of removing the scandalous sound of Baal from the name of an Israelitish king

(see Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* ii, 383), and superseding it by the contemptuous word (Bosheth—"shame") which was sometimes used as its equivalent in later times (Jer. iii, 24; xi, 13; Hos. ix, 10). A similar process appears in the alteration of Jerubbaal (Judg. viii, 35) into Jerubbesheth (2 Sam. xi, 21); Meri-baal (2 Sam. iv, 4) into Mephibosheth (1 Chron. viii, 34; ix, 40). The last three cases all occur in Saul's family. See SAUL. He is thought by some to be the same with ISHUI (יִשְׁוִי, 1 xiv, 49), these two names having considerable resemblance; but this is forbidden by 1 Sam. xxxi, 2, comp. with 1 Chron. viii, 33. See ABINADAB. He appears to have been forty years of age at the time of the battle of Gilboa (B.C. 1053), in which he was not himself present, but in which his father and three older brothers perished; and therefore, according to the law of Oriental, though not of European succession, he ascended the throne, as the oldest of the royal family, rather than Mephibosheth, son of his elder brother Jonathan, who was a child of five years old. Too feeble of himself to seize the sceptre which had just fallen from the hands of Saul, he was immediately taken under the care of Abner, his powerful kinsman, who brought him to the ancient sanctuary of Mahanaim, on the east of the Jordan, beyond the reach of the victorious Philistines, and he was there recognised as king by ten of the twelve tribes (2 Sam. ii, 8, 9). There was a momentary doubt even in those remote tribes whether they should not close with the offer of David to be their king (2 Sam. ii, 7; iii, 17). But this was overruled in favor of Ish-bosheth by Abner (2 Sam. iii, 17), who then for five years slowly but effectually restored the dominion of the house of Saul over the trans-Jordanic territory, the plain of Esdraelon, the central mountains of Ephraim, the frontier tribe of Benjamin, and eventually "over all Israel" (except the tribe of Judah, 2 Sam. iii, 9). In 2 Sam. ii, 10 Ish-bosheth is said to have reigned two years, which some understand as the whole amount of his reign. As David reigned seven and a half years over Judah before he became king of all Israel upon the death of Ish-bosheth, it is conceived by the Jewish chronologer (*Seder Olam Rabba*, p. 37), as well as by Kimchi and others, that there was a vacancy of five years in the throne of Israel. It is not, however, agreed by those who entertain this opinion whether this vacancy took place before or after the reign of Ish-bosheth. Some think it was before, it being then a matter of dispute whether he or Mephibosheth, the son of Jonathan, should be made king; but others hold that after his death five years elapsed before David was generally recognised as king of all Israel. If the reign of Ish-bosheth be limited to two years, the latter is doubtless the best way of accounting for the other five, since no ground of delay in the succession of Ish-bosheth is suggested in Scripture itself; for the claim of Mephibosheth, the son of Jonathan, which some have produced, being that of a lame boy five years old, whose father never reigned, against a king's son forty years of age, would have been deemed of little weight in Israel. Besides, our notions of Abner do not allow us to suppose that under him the question of the succession could have remained five years in abeyance. But it is the more usual, and perhaps the better course, to settle this question by supposing that the reigns of David over Judah, and of Ish-bosheth over Israel, were nearly contemporaneous, namely, about seven years each; and that the two years named are only the first of this period, being mentioned as those from which to date the commencement of the ensuing events—namely, the wars between the house of Saul and that of David. This appears to be the view taken by Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 1, 3; comp. 2, 1). Ish-bosheth thus reigned seven, or, as some will have it, two years—if a power so uncertain as his can be called a reign. Even the semblance of authority which he possessed he owed to the will and influence of Abner, who kept the real control of affairs in his own hands. The wars and negotiations with David were entirely carried on by Abner (2 Sam. ii, 11; iii, 6, 12). After various skirmishes between the forces of the rival kings, a pitched battle was fought, in which the army of David under Joab was completely victorious. After this the interest of David continually waxed stronger, while that of Ish-bosheth declined (2 Sam. iii, 1). At length Ish-bosheth accused Abner (whether rightly or wrongly does not appear) of an attempt on his father's concubine, Rizpah, which, according to Oriental usage, amounted to treason (2 Sam. iii, 7; comp. 1 Kings ii, 13; 2 Sam. xvi, 21; xx, 3). Although accustomed to tremble before Abner, even Ish-bosheth's temper was roused to resentment by the discovery that Abner had thus invaded the harem of his late father Saul, which was in a peculiar manner sacred under his care as a son and a king. By this act Abner exposed the king to public contempt, if it did not indeed leave himself open to the suspicion of intending to advance a claim to the crown on his own behalf. Abner resented this suspicion in a burst of passion, which vented itself in a solemn vow to transfer the kingdom from the house of Saul to the house of David, a purpose which from this time he appears steadily to have kept in view. Ish-bosheth was too much cowed to answer; and when, shortly afterwards, through Abner's negotiation, David demanded the restoration of his former wife, Michal, he at once tore his sister from her reluctant husband, and committed her to Abner's charge (2 Sam. iii, 14, 15). It is, perhaps, right to attribute this act to his weakness; although, as David allows that he was a righteous man (2 Sam. iv, 10), it may have been owing to his sense of justice. This trust seems to have given Abner a convenient opportunity to enter into negotiations with David; but in the midst of them he himself fell a victim to the resentment of Joab for the death of Abishai. The death of Abner deprived the house of Saul of their last remaining support. See ABNER. When Ish-bosheth heard of it, "his hands were feeble, and all the Israelites were troubled" (2 Sam. iv, 1). In this extremity of weakness he fell a victim, probably, to a revenge for a crime of his father. The guard of Ish-bosheth, as of Saul, was taken from their own royal tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. xii, 29). But among the sons of Benjamin were reckoned the descendants of the old Canaanitish inhabitants of Beeroth, one of the cities in league with Gibeon (2 Sam. iv, 2, 3). Two of those Beerothites, Baana and Rechab, in remembrance, it has been conjectured, of Saul's slaughter of their kinsmen the Gibeonites, determined to take advantage of the helplessness of the royal house to destroy the only representative that was left, excepting the child Mephibosheth (2 Sam. iv, 4). They were "chiefs of the marauding troops" which used from time to time to attack the territory of Judah (comp. 2 Sam. iv, 2; iii, 22, where the same word גְּדוּד is used; Vulg. *principes latronum*). They knew the habits of the king and court, and acted accordingly. In the stillness of an Eastern noon they entered the palace, as if to carry off the wheat which was piled up near the entrance. The female slave, who, as usual in Eastern houses, kept the door, and was herself sifting the wheat, had, in the heat of the day, fallen asleep at her task (2 Sam. iv, 5, 6, in Sept. and Vulg.). They stole in, and passed into the royal bedchamber, where Ish-bosheth was asleep on his couch during his midday siesta. They stabbed him in the stomach, cut off his head, made their escape, all that afternoon, all that night, down the valley of the Jordan (Arabah, A.V. "plain;" 2 Sam iv, 7), and presented the head to David as a welcome present. B.C. 1046. They met with a stern reception from the monarch, who—as both right feeling and good policy required—testified the utmost horror and concern. He rebuked them for the cold-blooded murder of an innocent man, and ordered them to be executed; their hands and feet were cut off, and their bodies suspended over the tank at Hebron. The head of Ish-bosheth was carefully buried in the sepulchre of his great kinsman

Abner, at the same place (2 Sam. iv, 9-12). See DAVID.

I'shi (Heb. *Yishi'*, יִשְׁעִי, *salutary;* Sept. Ἰεσεί, Ἔς, Ἰεσεί), the name of four men.

1. The son of Appaim, and father of Sheshan, the eighth in descent from Judah (1 Chron. ii, 31). B.C. prob. post 1612.

2. The father of Zoheth and Ben-zoheth, a descendant of Judah, but through what line does not appear (1 Chron. iv, 20). The name is possibly a corruption for the ISHBAH of ver. 17. B.C. perh. cir. 1017.

3. Father (progenitor) of several (four only are named) Simeonites who invaded Mt. Seir and dispossessed the Amalekites (1 Chron. iv, 42). B.C. ante 726.

4. One of the chiefs of Manasseh East, of famous valor (1 Chron. v, 24). B.C. cir. 720.

I'SHI (Heb. *Ishi'*, אִישִׁי, *my husband;* Sept. ὁ ἀνήρ μου, Vulg. *Vir meus*), a metaphorical name prescribed for himself by Jehovah, to be used by the Jewish Church, expressive of her future fidelity and privilege of intimacy, in contrast with the spirit of legalism indicated by the title *Baali*, "my master" (Hos. ii, 16).

Ishi'ah (Hebrew *Yishshiyah'*, יִשִּׁיָּה, once יִשִּׁיָּהוּ, 1 Chron. xii, 6; *lent* by *Jehovah*), the name of several men, differently Anglicized.

1. (Sept. Ἰεσία, Vulg. *Jesia*, Author. Vers. "Ishiah.") The fifth son of Uzzi (grandson of Issachar), a valiant chieftain of his tribe (1 Chron. vii, 3). B.C. cir. 1618; but in ver. 2 he is apparently made nearly contemporary with David. See UZZI.

2. (Sept. Ἰεσσιά v. r. Ἰσιά, Ἰσία; Vulg. *Jesia;* Auth. Vers. "Jesiah," "Isshiah.") The second son of Uzziel (grandson of Levi), and father of Zechariah (1 Chron. xxiii, 20; xxiv, 25). B.C. cir. 1618; although the context seems to place this one also in the time of David.

3. (Sept. Ἰεσίας, Vulg. *Jesias*, Auth. Vers. "Isshiah.") The first of the sons of Rehabiah, and great-grandson of Moses (1 Chron. xxiv, 21; compare xxiii, 17; xxvi, 25, where he is called JESHAIAH). B.C. post 1618. See REHABIAH.

4. (Sept. Ἰεσιά, Vulg. *Jesia*, Author. Vers. "Jesiah.") A Korhite, and one of the braves that joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 6). B.C. 1055.

5. (Sept. Ἰεσσία, Vulg. *Josue*, Auth. Vers. "Ishijah.") One of the "sons" of Harim, who renounced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Ezra x, 31). B.C. 459.

Ishi'jah (Ezra x, 31). See ISHIAH, 5.

Ish'ma (Heb. *Yishma'*, יִשְׁמָא, *desolation*, otherwise *high;* Sept. Ἰεσμά), a descendant of Judah, apparently named (with two brothers and a sister) as a son of the founder ("father") of Etam (1 Chron. iv, 3). B.C. prob. cir. 1612.

Ish'maël (Heb. *Yishmaël'*, יִשְׁמָעֵאל, *heard* by *God;* Sept. Ἰσμαήλ, Joseph. Ἰσμάηλος), the name of several men.

1. Abraham's eldest son, born to him by the concubine Hagar (Gen. xvi, 15; xvii, 23). See ABRAHAM; HAGAR. It may here be remarked that the age attributed to him in Gen. xxi, 14 is not inconsistent with Gen. xvii, 25 (see Tuch, *Comm.* p. 382). The story of his birth, as recorded in Gen. xvi, is in every respect characteristic of Eastern life and morals in the present age. The intense desire of both Abraham and Sarah for children; Sarah's gift of Hagar to Abraham as wife; the insolence of the slave when suddenly raised to a place of importance; the jealousy and consequent tyranny of her high-spirited mistress; Hagar's flight, return, and submission to Sarah—for all these incidents we could easily find parallels in the modern history of every tribe in the desert of Arabia. The origin of the name *Ishmael* is thus explained. When Hagar fled from Sarah, the angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness in the way of Shur . . . and he said, "Behold, thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name *Ishmael* ('God hears'), because the Lord *hath heard* thy affliction" (Gen. xvi, 11). Hagar had evidently intended, when she fled, to return to her native country. But when the angel told her of the dignity in store for her as a mother, and the power to which her child, as the son of the great patriarch, would attain, she resolved to obey his voice, and to submit herself to Sarah (xvi, 10-13).

1. Ishmael was born at Mamre, in the eighty-sixth year of Abraham's age, eleven years after his arrival in Canaan, and fourteen before the birth of Isaac (xvi, 3, 16; xxi, 5). B.C. 2078. No particulars of his early life are recorded, except his circumcision when thirteen years of age (xvii, 25). B.C. 2065. His father was evidently strongly attached to him; for when an heir was promised through Sarah, he said, "Oh that Ishmael might live before thee!" (xvii, 18). Then were renewed to Abraham in more definite terms the promises made to Hagar regarding Ishmael: "As for Ishmael, I have heard thee; behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly: twelve princes shall he beget: and I will make him a great nation" (ver. 20). Before this time Abraham seems to have regarded his first-born child as the heir of the promise, his belief in which was counted unto him for righteousness (xv, 6); and although that faith shone yet more brightly after his passing weakness when Isaac was first promised, his love for Ishmael is recorded in the narrative of Sarah's expulsion of the latter: "And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son" (xxi, 11).

Ishmael seems to have remained in a great measure under the charge of his mother, who, knowing his destiny, would doubtless have him trained in such exercises as would fit him for successfully acting the part of a desert prince. Indulged in every whim and wish by a fond father, encouraged to daring and adventure by the hardy nomads who fed and defended his father's flocks, and having a fitting field on that southern border-land for the play of his natural propensities, Ishmael grew up a true child of the desert—a wild and wayward boy. The perfect freedom of desert life, and his constant intercourse with those who looked up to him with mingled feelings of pride and affection as the son and heir-apparent of their great chief, tended to make him impatient of restraint, and overbearing in his temper. The excitement of the chase—speeding across the plains of Beersheba after the gazelles, and through the rugged mountains of Engedi after wild goats, and bears, and leopards, inured him to danger, and trained him for war. Ishmael must also have been accustomed from childhood to those feuds which raged almost incessantly between the "trained servants" of Abraham and their warlike neighbors of Philistia, as well as to the more serious incursions of roving bands of freebooters from the distant East. Such was the school in which the great desert chief was trained. Subsequent events served to fill up and fashion the remaining features of Ishmael's character. He had evidently been treated by Abraham's dependents as their master's heir, and Abraham himself had apparently encouraged the belief. The unexpected birth of Isaac, therefore, must have been to him a sad and bitter disappointment. And when he was afterwards driven forth, with his poor mother, a homeless wanderer in a pathless wilderness; when, in consequence of such unnatural harshness, he was brought to the very brink of the grave, and was only saved from a painful death by a miracle; when, after having been reared in luxury, and taught to look forward to the possession of wealth and power, he was suddenly left to win a scanty and uncertain subsistence by his sword and bow—we need scarcely wonder that his proud spirit, revolting against injustice and cruelty, should make him what the angel had predicted, "a wild-ass man; his hand against every man, and every man's hand against him" (xvi, 32).

2. The first recorded outbreak of Ishmael's rude and

wayward spirit occurred at the weaning of Isaac. B.C. 2061. On that occasion Abraham made a great feast after the custom of the country. In the excitement of the moment, heightened probably by the painful consciousness of his own blighted hopes, Ishmael could not restrain his temper, but gave way to some insulting expressions or gestures of mockery. Perhaps the very name of the child, Isaac ("*laughter*"), and the exuberant joy of his aged mother, may have furnished subjects for his untimely satire. See ISAAC. Be this as it may, Sarah's jealous eye and quick ear speedily detected him; and she said to Abraham, "Expel this slave and her son; for the son of this slave shall not be heir with my son, with Isaac" (xxi, 10). Now Abraham loved the boy who first, lisping the name "father," opened in his heart the gushing fountain of paternal affection. The bare mention of such an unnatural act made him angry even with Sarah, and it was only when influenced by a divine admonition that he yielded. The brief account of the departure of Hagar, and her journey through the desert, is one of the most beautiful and touching pictures of patriarchal life which has come down to us: "And Abraham rose early in the morning, and took bread, and a skin of water, and gave it to Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the lad (הַיֶּלֶד), and sent her away; and she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beersheba. And when the water was spent in the skin, she placed the lad under one of the shrubs. And she went and sat down opposite, at the distance of a bowshot; for she said, I will not see the death of the lad. And she sat opposite, and lifted up her voice and wept" (xxi, 14-16).

Isaac was born when Abraham was a hundred years old (xxi, 5), and as the weaning, according to Eastern usage, probably took place when the child was about three years old, Ishmael himself must have been then about sixteen years old. The age of the latter at the period of his circumcision, and at that of his expulsion, has given occasion for some literary speculation. A careful consideration of the passages referring to it fails, however, to show any discrepancy between them. In Gen. xvii, 25, it is stated that he was thirteen years old when he was circumcised; and in xxi, 14 (probably two or three years later) "Abraham . . . took bread, and a bottle of water, and gave [it] unto Hagar, putting [it] on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away." Here it is at least unnecessary to assume that the child was put on her shoulder, the construction of the Hebrew (mistranslated by the Sept., with whom seems to rest the origin of the question) not requiring it; and the sense of the passage renders it highly improbable: Hagar certainly carried the bottle on her shoulder, and perhaps the bread: she could hardly have also thus carried a child. Again, these passages are quite irreconcilable with ver. 20 of the last quoted chapter, where Ishmael is termed הַנַּעַר, A.V. "lad" (comp., for use of this word, Gen. xxxiv, 19; xxxvii, 2; xli, 12). It may seem strange to some that the hardy, active boy, inured to fatigue, should have been sooner overcome by thirst than his mother; but those advanced in life can bear abstinence longer than the young, and, besides, Ishmael had probably exhausted his strength in vain attempts to gain a supply of food by his bow. Again Hagar is saved by a miracle: "God heard the voice of the lad . . . and said unto her, What aileth thee, Hagar? Fear not . . . And God opened her eyes, and she saw a well of water" (ver. 17, 19). And again the cheering promise is renewed to her son, "I will make of him a great nation" (ver. 18).

3. The wilderness of Paran, lying along the western side of the Arabah, between Canaan and the mountains of Sinai, now became the home of Ishmael (see Baumgarten, *Comm.* I, i, 22): "And God was with him, and he became a great archer" (ver. 20). Some of the border tribes with which the shepherds of Abraham were wont to meet and strive at the wells of Gerar, Beersheba, and En-Mishpat probably received and welcomed the outcast to their tents. A youth of his warlike training and daring spirit would soon acquire a name and a high position among nomads. (See Prokesch, *Spec. Hist. Arab.* p. 46.) His relationship to Abraham also would add to his personal claims. It would seem to have been the original intention of his mother to return to Egypt, to which country she belonged; but this being prevented, she was content to obtain for her son wives from thence (Gen. xxi, 9-21; on which latter verse the *Targum* of Jonathan adds traditionally that he divorced his first wife Adisha, and then married an Egyptian Phatima). His mother, accordingly, as soon as she saw him settled, took for him an Egyptian wife—one of her own people, and thus completely separated him from his Shemitic connections. This wife of Ishmael is not elsewhere mentioned; she was, we must infer, an Egyptian; and this second infusion of Hamitic blood into the progenitors of the Arab nation, Ishmael's sons, is a fact that has generally been overlooked. No record is made of any other wife of Ishmael, and failing such record, the Egyptian was the mother of his twelve sons and daughter. This daughter, however, is called the "sister of Nebajoth" (Gen. xxviii, 9), and this limitation of the parentage of the brother and sister certainly seems to point to a different mother for Ishmael's other sons. The Arabs, probably borrowing from the above Rabbinical tradition, assert that he twice married; the first wife being an Amalekite, by whom he had no issue; and the second a Joktanite, of the tribe of Jurhûm (*Mir-át et-Zemán*, MS., quoting a tradition of Mohammed Ibn-Is-hák). Though Ishmael joined the native tribes of Arabia, his posterity did not amalgamate with them. The Joktanites have left traces of their names and settlements chiefly in the southern and south-eastern parts of the peninsula, while the Ishmaelites kept closer to the borders of Canaan (see Forster's *Geography of Arabia*, i, 77 sq.).

4. Although their lots were cast apart, it does not appear that any serious alienation existed between Ishmael and Isaac; for when Abraham died, we read that "his sons Isaac and Ishmael buried him in the cave of Machpelah." The rival brothers then met, in the vale of Mamre, at their father's tomb (Gen. xxv, 9). B.C. 1989. (The Talmud states [*Baba Bathra*, 16] that prior to Abraham's death Ishmael had forsaken the nomadic mode of life.) That must have been a strange and deeply interesting scene at the burial of the great patriarch. All his own old "trained servants," with Isaac, the peaceful shepherd chief, at their head, were assembled there; while Ishmael, surrounded by the whole body of his wild retainers and allies, as was and still is the custom of Bedawy sheiks, stood there too. As funerals in the East take place almost immediately after death, it is evident that Ishmael must have been called from the desert to the death-bed of his father, which implies that relations of kindness and respect had been kept up, although the brevity of the sacred narrative prevents any special notice of this circumstance. Ishmael had, probably, long before received an endowment from his father's property similar to that which had been bestowed upon the sons of Keturah (Gen. xxv, 6).

5. Of Ishmael's personal history after this event we know nothing. The sacred historian gives us a list of his twelve sons, tells us that Esau married his daughter Mahalath, the sister of Nebajoth (xxviii, 9), and sums up the brief simple sketch in these words: "These are the years of the life of Ishmael, a hundred and thirty-seven years; and he died, and was gathered to his people" (xxv, 17). B.C. 1941. Where he died, or where he was buried, we know not.

6. It has been shown, in the article ARABIA, that Ishmael had no claim to the honor, which is usually assigned to him, of being the founder of the Arabian nation. That nation existed before he was born. He merely joined it, and adopted its habits of life and character; and the tribes which sprung from him formed eventually an important section of the tribes of which

it was composed. (See also Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* p. 210.) At this period the Arabian desert appears to have been thinly peopled by descendants of Joktan, the son of Eber, "whose dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar, a mount of the east" (Gen. x, 25-30). The Joktanites, or *Bene-Kahtân*, are regarded by Arab historians as the first and most honorable progenitors of the Arab tribes (D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, s. v. Arabes). See JOKTAN.

Ishmael had twelve sons: Nebajoth, Kedar, Abdeel, Mibsam, Mishma, Dumah, Massa, Hadar, Tema, Jetur, Naphish, and Kedemah. To the list of them, the sacred historian appends (Gen. xxv, 16) an important piece of information: "These are the sons of Ishmael, and these are their names, *by their cities* (חצריהם, "fortified towns"), *and their camps* (טירתם); twelve *princes according to their nations*" (לאמתם). Every one of the twelve sons of Ishmael, therefore, like the children of Jacob, was the head of a tribe, and the founder of a distinct colony or camp. In this respect the statements in the Bible exactly accord with the ancient traditions and histories of the Arabs themselves. Native historians divide the Arabs into two races: 1. *Pure Arabs*, descendants of Joktan; and, 2. *Mixed Arabs*, descendants of Ishmael. Abulfeda gives a brief account of the several tribes and nations which descended from both these original stocks (*Historia Anteislamica*, ed. Fleischer, p. 180, 191 sq.). Some of the tribes founded by sons of Ishmael retained the names of their founders, and were well known in history. The *Nabathæans*, who took possession of Idumæa in the 4th century B.C., and constructed the wonderful monuments of Petra, were the posterity of *Nebajoth*, Ishmael's eldest son. See NABATHÆANS. The descendants of *Jetur* and *Naphish* disputed with the Israelites possession of the country east of the Jordan, and the former, described by Strabo as κακοῦργοι πάντες (xvi, 2), gave their name to a small province south of Damascus, which it bears to this day. See ITURÆA. The black tents of *Kedar* were pitched in the heart of the Arabian desert, and from their abundant flocks they supplied the marts of Tyre (Jer. ii, 10; Isa. lx, 7; Ezek. xxvii, 21). The district of *Tema* lay south of Edom, and is referred to by both Job and Isaiah (Job vi, 19; Isa. xxi, 14; Forster's *Geogr. of Arabia*, i, 292; Heeren's *Historical Researches*, ii, 107). *Dumah* has left his name to a small province of Arabia. Since the days of Abraham the tents of the Ishmaelites have been studded along the whole eastern confines of Palestine, and they have been scattered over Arabia from the borders of Egypt to the banks of the Euphrates. As friends and foes, as oppressors and oppressed—but ever as freemen—the seed of Ishmael have "dwelt in the presence of their brethren."

Of this last expression various explanations have been given, but the plainest is the most probable; which is, that Ishmael and the tribes springing from him should always be located near the kindred tribes descended from Abraham. This was a promise of benefit in that age of migration, when Abraham himself had come from beyond the Euphrates, and was a stranger and sojourner in the land of Canaan. There was thus, in fact, a relation of some importance between this promise and the promise of the heritage of Canaan to another branch of Abraham's offspring. It had seemingly some such force as this—The heritage of Canaan is indeed destined for another son of Abraham; but still the lot of Ishmael, and of those that spring from him, shall never be cast far apart from that of his brethren. This view is confirmed by the circumstance that the Israelites did, in fact, occupy the country bordering on that in which the various tribes descended from Abraham or Terah had settled—the Ishmaelites, Edomites, Midianites, Moabites, Ammonites, etc. Most interpreters find in this passage a promise that the descendants of Ishmael should never be subdued. But we are unable to discover this in the text; and, moreover, such has not been the fact, whether we regard the Ishmaelites apart from the other Arabians, or consider the promise made to Ishmael as applicable to the whole Arabian family. The Arabian tribes are in a state of subjection at this moment; and the great Wahaby confederacy among them, which not many years ago filled Western Asia with alarm, is now no longer heard of.

The prophecy which drew their character has been fulfilled with equal minuteness of detail. "He shall be *a wild ass of a man* (פֶּרֶא אָדָם); his hand against every man, and every man's hand against him." This means, in short, that he and his descendants should lead the life of the Bedouins of the Arabian deserts; and how graphically this description portrays their habits may be seen in notes on these verses in the *Pictorial Bible*, and in the works of Niebuhr, Burckhardt, Lane, etc.; and, more particularly, in the Arabian romance of *Antar*, which presents the most perfect picture of real Bedouin manners now in existence. A recent commentator on the passage has illustrated the prophecy with equal force and beauty. "The character of the Ishmaelites, or the Bedouins, could not be described more aptly or more powerfully. Against them alone time seems to have no sickle, and the conqueror's sword no edge. They have defied the softening influence of civilization, and mocked the attacks of the invader. Ungovernable and roaming, obeying no law but their spirit of adventure, regarding all mankind as their enemies, whom they must either attack with their spears or elude with their faithful steeds, and cherishing their deserts as heartily as they despise the constraint of towns and communities, the Bedouins are the outlaws among the nations. Plunder is legitimate gain, a daring robbery is praised as valor" (Kalisch, ad loc.). See ISHMAELITE.

7. The notions of the Arabs respecting Ishmael (*Ismail*) are partly derived from the Bible, partly from the Jewish Rabbins, and partly from native traditions. The origin of many of these traditions is obscure, but a great number may be ascribed to the fact of Mohammed's having, for political reasons, claimed Ishmael for his ancestor, and striven to make out an impossible pedigree; while both he and his followers have, as a consequence of accepting this assumed descent, sought to exalt that ancestor. Another reason may be safely found in Ishmael's acknowledged headship of the naturalized Arabs, and this cause existed from the very period of his settlement. See ARABIA. Yet the rivalry of the Joktanite kingdom of Southern Arabia, and its intercourse with classical and mediæval Europe, the wandering and unsettled habits of the Ishmaelites, their having no literature, and, as far as we know, only a meagre oral tradition, all contributed, till the importance it acquired with the promulgation of El-Islâm, to render our knowledge of the Ishmaelitic portion of the people of Arabia, before Mohammed, lamentably defective. That they maintained, and still maintain, a patriarchal and primitive form of life, is known to us. Their religion, at least in the period immediately preceding Mohammed, was in Central Arabia chiefly the grossest fetishism, probably learnt from aboriginal inhabitants of the land; southwards it diverged to the cosmic worship of the Joktanite Himyerites (though these were far from being exempt from fetishism), and northwards (so at least in ancient times) to an approach to that true faith which Ishmael carried with him, and his descendants thus gradually lost. This last point is curiously illustrated by the numbers who, in Arabia, became either Jews (Karaites) or Christians (though of a very corrupt form of Christianity), and by the movement in search of the faith of the patriarchs which had been put forward, not long before the birth of Mohammed, by men not satisfied with Judaism or the corrupt form of Christianity with which alone they were acquainted. This movement first aroused Mohammed, and was afterwards the main cause of his success.

The Arabs believe that Ishmael was the first-born of Abraham, and the majority of their doctors (but the

point is in dispute) assert that this son, and not Isaac, was offered by Abraham in sacrifice. The scene of this sacrifice is Mount 'Arafát, near Mecca, the last holy place visited by pilgrims, it being necessary to the completion of pilgrimage to be present at a sermon delivered there on the 9th of the Mohammedan month Zu-l-Hejjeh, in commemoration of the offering, and to sacrifice a victim on the following evening after sunset, in the valley of Minè. The sacrifice last mentioned is observed throughout the Muslim world, and the day on which it is made is called "The Great Festival" (Lane's *Mod. Egypt.* ch. iii). Ishmael, say the Arabs, dwelt with his mother at Mekkeh, and both are buried in the place called the "Hejr," on the north-west (termed by the Arabs the north) side of the Kaabeh, and inclosed by a curved wall called the "Hatîm." Ishmael was visited at Mekkeh by Abraham, and they together rebuilt the temple, which had been destroyed by a flood. At Mekkeh, Ishmael married a daughter of Mudád or El-Mudád, chief of the Joktanite tribe Jurhum, and had thirteen children (*Mir-át ez-Zemán*, MS.), thus agreeing with the Biblical number, including the daughter.

Mohammed's descent from Ishmael is totally lost, for an unknown number of generations, to 'Adnán, of the twenty-first generation before the prophet: from him downwards the latter's descent is, if we may believe the genealogists, fairly proved. But we have evidence far more trustworthy than that of the genealogists; for, while most of the natives of Arabia are unable to trace up their *pedigrees*, it is scarcely possible to find one who is ignorant of his *race*, seeing that his very life often depends upon it. The law of blood-revenge necessitates his knowing the names of his ancestors for four generations, but no more; and this law, extending from time immemorial, has made any confusion of race almost impossible. This law, it should be remembered, is not a law of Mohammed, but an old pagan law that he endeavored to suppress, but could not. In casting doubt on the prophet's pedigree, we must add that this cannot affect the proofs of the chief element of the Arab nation being Ishmaelitish (and so, too, the tribe of Kureysh, of whom was Mohammed). Although partly mixed with Joktanites, they are more mixed with Keturahites, etc.; the characteristics of the Joktanites, as before remarked, are widely different from those of the Ishmaelites; and, whatever theories may be adduced to the contrary, we believe that the Arabs, from physical characteristics, language, the concurrence of native traditions (*before* Mohammedanism made them untrustworthy), and the testimony of the Bible, are mainly and essentially Ishmaelitish.

2. The father (or ancestor) of Zebadiah, which latter was "ruler of the house of Judah" under Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xix, 11). B.C. cir. 900.

3. Son of Jehohanan, and captain of a "hundred" under the regency of Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiii, 1). B.C. 877.

4. One of the six sons of Azel, of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. viii, 38; ix, 44). B.C. ante 588.

5. The son of Nethaniah, whose treachery forms one of the chief episodes of the history of the period immediately succeeding the first fall of Jerusalem (Jer. xl, 7–xli, 15, with a short summary in 2 Kings xxv, 23-25). B.C. 587. His full description is "Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah, the son of Elishama, of the seed royal" of Judah (Jer. xli, 1; 2 Kings xxv, 25). Whether by this is intended that he was actually a son of Zedekiah, or of one of the later kings, or, more generally, that he had royal blood in his veins—perhaps a descendant of Elishama, the son of David (2 Sam. v, 16)—we cannot tell. Jerome (*Qu. Hebr.* on 2 Chron. xxviii, 7) interprets this expression as meaning "of the seed of Molech." He gives the same meaning to the words "the king's son" applied to Maaseiah in the above passage. The question is an interesting one, and has recently been revived by Geiger (*Urschrift*, etc., p. 307), who extends it to other passages and persons. See MOLECH. Jerome (as above) further says—perhaps on the strength of a tradition—that Ishmael was the son of an Egyptian slave, Gera: as a reason why the "seed royal" should bear the meaning he gives it. During the siege of the city he had, like many others of his countrymen (Jer. xl, 11), fled across the Jordan, where he found a refuge at the court of Baalis, then king of the Bene-Ammon (Josephus, *Ant.* x, 9, 2). Ammonitish women were sometimes found in the harems of the kings of Jerusalem (1 Kings xi, 1), and Ishmael may have been thus related to the Ammonitish court on his mother's side. At any rate, he was instigated by Baalis to the designs which he accomplished but too successfully (Jer. xl, 14; Josephus, *Ant.* x, 9, 3). Several bodies of Jews appear to have been lying under arms in the plains on the south-east of the Jordan, during the last days of Jerusalem, watching the progress of affairs in Western Palestine, commanded by "princes" (שָׂרִים), the chief of whom were Ishmael, and two brothers, Johanan and Jonathan, sons of Kareah. Immediately after the departure of the Chaldæan army these men moved across the Jordan to pay their respects to Gedaliah, whom the king of Babylon had left as superintendent (פָּקִיד) of the province. Gedaliah had taken up his residence at Mizpah, a few miles north of Jerusalem, on the main road, where Jeremiah the prophet resided with him (xl, 6). The house would appear to have been isolated from the rest of the town. We can discern a high inclosed court-yard and a deep well within its precincts. The well was certainly (Jer. xli, 9; comp. 1 Kings xv, 22), and the whole residence was probably, a relic of the military works of Asa, king of Judah. Ishmael made no secret of his intention to kill the superintendent and usurp his position. Of this Gedaliah was warned in express terms by Johanan and his companions; and Johanan, in a secret interview, foreseeing how irreparable a misfortune Gedaliah's death would be at this juncture (xl, 15), offered to remove the danger by killing Ishmael. This, however, Gedaliah, a man evidently of a high and unsuspecting nature, would not hear of (xl, 16; and see the amplification in Josephus, *Ant.* x, 9, 3). They all accordingly took leave. Thirty days after (Josephus, *Ant.* x, 9, 4), in the seventh month (Jer. xli, 1), on the third day of the month—so says the tradition—Ishmael again appeared at Mizpah, this time accompanied by ten men, who were, according to the Hebrew text, "princes of the king" (רַבֵּי הַמֶּלֶךְ), though this is omitted by the Sept. and by Josephus. Gedaliah entertained them at a feast (xli, 1). According to the statement of Josephus, this was a very lavish entertainment, and Gedaliah became much intoxicated. It must have been a private one, for before its close Ishmael and his followers had murdered Gedaliah and all his attendants with such secrecy that no alarm was given outside the room. The same night he killed all Gedaliah's establishment, including some Chaldæan soldiers who were there. Jeremiah appears fortunately to have been absent, and, incredible as it seems, so well had Ishmael taken his precautions, that for two days the massacre remained perfectly unknown to the people of the town. On the second day Ishmael perceived from his elevated position a large party coming southwards along the main road from Shechem and Samaria. He went out to meet them. They proved to be eighty devotees, who, with rent clothes, and with shaven beards, mutilated bodies, and other marks of heathen devotion, and weeping (Sept.) as they went, were bringing incense and offerings to the ruins of the Temple. At his invitation they turned aside to the residence of the superintendent. Here Ishmael put into practice the same stratagem which, on a larger scale, was employed by Mehemet Ali in the massacre of the Mamelukes at Cairo in 1806. As the unsuspecting pilgrims passed within the outer gates (Sept. *court-yard*) he closed the entrances behind them, and there he and his band butchered the whole number: ten only escaped by the offer of heavy

ransom for their lives. The seventy corpses were then thrown into the well, which (as in the Sepoy massacre at Cawnpore) was within the precincts of the house, and which was completely filled with the bodies. It was the same thing that had been done by Jehu—a man in some respects a prototype of Ishmael, with the bodies of the forty-two relatives of Ahaziah (2 Kings x, 14). This done, he descended to the town, surprised and carried off the daughters of king Zedekiah, who had been sent there by Nebuchadnezzar for safety, with their eunuchs and their Chaldæan guard (Jer. xli, 10, 16), and all the people of the town, and made off with his prisoners to the country of the Ammonites. Which road he took is not quite clear; the Hebrew text and Sept. say by Gibeon, that is north; but Josephus, by Hebron, round the southern end of the Dead Sea. The news of the massacre had by this time got abroad, and Ishmael was quickly pursued by Johanan and his companions. Whether north or south, they soon tracked him and his unwieldy booty, and found them reposing by some copious waters (מַיִם רַבִּים). He was attacked, two of his bravoes slain, the whole of the prey recovered, and Ishmael himself, with the remaining eight of his people, escaped to the Ammonites, and thenceforward passes into the obscurity from which it would have been well if he had never emerged. Johanan's foreboding was fulfilled. The result of this tragedy was an immediate panic. The small remnants of the Jewish commonwealth—the captains of the forces, the king's daughters, the two prophets Jeremiah and Baruch, and all the men, women, and children—at once took flight into Egypt (Jer. xli, 17; xliii, 5-7), and all hopes of a settlement were for the time at an end. The remembrance of the calamity was perpetuated by a fast—the fast of the seventh month (Zech. vii, 5; viii, 19), which is to this day strictly kept by the Jews on the third of Tisri. (See Reland, *Antiq.* iv, 10: Kimchi on Zech. vii, 5). The part taken by Baalis in this transaction apparently brought upon his nation the denunciations both of Jeremiah (xlix, 1-6) and the more distant Ezekiel (xxv, 1-7), but we have no record to show how these predictions were accomplished. See GEDALIAH.

6. One of the "sons" of Pashur, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Exile (Ezra x, 22). B.C. 459.

Ishmaël (as a later name). See ISMAEL.

Ish'maëlite (Heb. *Yishmeëli'*, יִשְׁמְעֵאלִי, 1 Chron. ii, 17; xxviii. 3, etc., plur. יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים, usually Anglicized "Ishmeelites," q. v.), a descendant of Ishmael, the son of Abraham by Hagar. Ishmaelites carried on a traffic with Egypt (Gen. xxxvii, 25, 27; xxxix; 1), and lived a wandering life as nomades at the eastward of the Hebrews and of Egypt as far as to the Persian Gulf and Assyria, i. e. Babylonia (Gen. xxv, 18), which same limits are elsewhere assigned to the Amalekites (1 Sam. xv, 7); so also the names "Ishmaelites" and "Midianites" appear to be sometimes applied to the same people (Gen. xxxvii, 25, 27, 28; Judg. viii, 22, 24). In Gen. xxv, 18, it is said, "And they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt, as thou goest towards Assyria: and he died in the presence of all his brethren." As Ishmael's death had already been mentioned, and as the Hebrew term נָפַל, *naphal*—rendered "*he died*," properly *he fell*—is seldom used in the Scriptures in reference to "dying," except in cases of sudden and violent death, as when one "falls" in battle, the probability is that *naphal* here signifies that his territory or possession *fell* to him in the presence of all his brethren, or immediately contiguous to the borders of the territories in which the various tribes descended from Abraham or Terah had settled—the Israelites, Edomites, Midianites, Moabites, Ammonites, etc. This interpretation is countenanced by the Sept. and Targums, which have *dwelt*, and by the promise in Gen. xvi, 12 (comp. the similar phraseology in Josh. xxiii, 4; Psa. xvi, 6). "The twelve sons of Ishmael, somewhat like the twelve sons of Jacob, became so many heads of tribes (Gen. xxv, 13-15), which implies that in the next generation they spread themselves pretty widely abroad. It appears (Gen. xxv, 18) that the head-quarters of the race lay in the northern parts of the Arabian peninsula; but in process of time they would naturally stretch more inland, eastward and southward. That they also extended their journeying northwards is evident from the fact that the brethren of Joseph espied "a company of Ishmaelites coming from Gilead, with their camels bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh, to carry it down to Egypt" (Gen. xxxvii, 25). The company has afterwards the name of Midianites applied to it (ver. 28), probably on account of its consisting of more than one class of people, Midianites also in part; but being first called Ishmaelites, we can have no reasonable doubt that these formed a considerable portion of the caravan party. The trade of inland carriers between the countries in the north of Africa on the one side, and those in southern and western Asia (India, Persia, Babylonia, etc.) on the other, is one in which sections of the Ishmaelitish race have been known from the remotest times to take a part. It suited their migratory and unsettled habits; and they became so noted for it, that others, who did not belong to the same race, were not unfrequently called Ishmaelites, merely because they followed the Ishmaelitic traffic and manners. It is impossible to say how far the descendants of Ishmael penetrated into Arabia, or acquired settlements in its southern and more productive regions. As it is certain the Ishmaelitish mode of life has been always less practised there, and a modified civilization is of old standing, the probability is that the population in those regions has little in it of Ishmaelitish blood. But, with all their regard to genealogies, the Arabic races have for thousands of years been so transfused into each other, that all distinct landmarks are wellnigh lost. The circumstance of Mohammed having, for prudential reasons, claimed to be a descendant of the son of Abraham, has led to an extension of the Ishmaelitish circle far beyond what the probable facts will bear out" See ISHMAEL, 1.

Ishmaï'ah (Heb. *Yishmayah'*, יִשְׁמַעְיָה, and in 1 Chron. xxvii, 19 in the paragogic form *Yishmaya'hu*, יִשְׁמַעְיָהוּ, *heard* by *Jehovah*), the name of two of David's officers. See DAVID.

1. (Sept. Σαμαΐας, Vulg. *Samajas*, Auth. Vers. "Ismaiah.") A Gibeonite, one of the chiefs of those warriors who relinquished the cause of Saul, the head of their tribe, and joined themselves to David when he was at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 4). B.C. 1046. He is described as "a hero (*gibbor*) among the thirty and over the thirty"—i. e. David's body-guard; but his name does not appear in the lists of the guard in 2 Sam. xxiii and 1 Chron. xi. Possibly he was killed in some encounter before David reached the throne.

2. (Sept. Σαμαΐας, Vulg. *Jesmajas*, Auth. Vers. "Ishmaiah.") Son of Obadiah, and viceroy of Zebulon under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 19). B.C. 1014.

Ish'meëlite occurs in the A. V. at Gen. xxxvii, 25, 27, 28; xxix, 1, as a general name of the Abrahamic peoples of the "east country" or BENE-KEDEM (q. v.); but elsewhere (1 Chron. ii, 17) in the strict sense of the proper ISHMAELITES (as Anglicized in Judg. viii, 24; Psa. lxxxiii, 6), with which the Heb. name corresponds.

Ish'merai (Heb. *Yishmeray'*, יִשְׁמְרַי for יִשְׁמְרְיָה, *preserved* by *Jehovah*; Septuag. Ἰεσαμαρί), one of the "sons" of Elpaal, a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 18). B.C. ante 588.

I'shod (Heb. *Ishhod'*, אִישְׁהוֹד, *man of splendor*, i. e. in countenance or in fame; Sept. simply Σουδ, Vulg. translates *vir decorus*), a son of Hammoleketh, the sister of Machir of Gilead (1 Chron. vii, 18). B.C. cir. 1658.

Ish'pan (Heb. *Yishpan'*, יִשְׁפָּן, prob. *hid*, but Gesenius *bald*, Fürst *strong*; Sept. Ἰεσφάν, Vulg. *Jesphan*),

one of the "sons" of Shashak, a Benjamite chief resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 22). B.C. ante 588.

Ish'-tob (Heb. *Ish-Tôb'*, אִישׁ־טוֹב, *man of Tob* [i.e. *good*]; Sept. Ἰστώβ; Josephus Ἴστωβος; Vulg. *Istob*), apparently one of the small kingdoms or states which formed part of the general country of Aram, named with Zobah, Rehob, and Maacah (2 Sam. x, 6, 8). In the parallel account of 1 Chron. xix Ishtob is omitted. By Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 6, 1) the name is given as that of a king. But though in the ancient versions the name is given as one word, it is probable that the real signification is "the men of Tob" (q. v.), a district mentioned also in connection with Ammon in the records of Jephthah (Judg. xi, 3, 5), and again, perhaps, under the shape of TOBIE or TUBIENI, in the history of the Maccabees (1 Macc. v, 13; 2 Macc. xii, 17).

Ish'uah (Heb. *Yishvah'*, יִשְׁוָה, *uniform;* Septuag. Ἰεσούα, but Ἰεσσουά in Gen.; Vulg. *Jesua*), the second named of the sons of Asher (Gen. xlvi, 17; 1 Chron. vii, 30, in which latter passage it is Anglicized "Isuah"). B.C. 1856. He appears to have left no issue (compare Numb. xxvi, 44).

Ish'uai (1 Chron. vii, 30). See ISHUI, 1.

Ish'uï (Heb. *Yishvi'*, יִשְׁוִי, *uniform*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. in Gen. xlvi, 17, Ἰεύλ; Vulg. *Jessui*, Auth. Vers. "Isui;" in Numb. xxvi, 44, Ἰεσού, *Jessui*, "Jesui;" in 1 Chron. vii, 30, Ἰησουΐ, *Jessui*, "Ishuai"). The third named of the sons of Asher, and founder of a family that bore his name ("Jesuites," Numb. xxvi, 44). B.C. 1856.

2. (Septuag. Ἰεσσουί, Josephus Ἰεσούς, *Ant.* vi, 6, 6; Vulg. *Jessui*, Auth. Vers. "Ishui"). The second named of the three oldest sons of king Saul (1 Sam. xiv, 49); probably the same with ABINADAB (1 Sam. xxxi, 2; comp. 1 Chron. viii, 33). See ISH-BOSHETH.

Isidore OF ALEXANDRIA, ST., was born in Egypt about the year 318, and led for a time the life of a hermit in the wilderness of the Thebaïd and in the desert of Nitria. St. Athanasius ordained him priest, and gave him the charge of a hospital, whence Isidore is also called *the Hospitaller.* After the death of Athanasius, Isidore courageously defended his works and his memory against the attacks of the Arians. Having got into difficulties with Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, Isidore was obliged to flee to Constantinople, where he died in 403. The Greek Church commemorates him on the 15th of January. See Palladius, *Hist. Lausiaca;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvi, 56. (J. N. P.)

Isidore, ST., bishop OF CORDOVA, and an eminent Spanish theologian and historian, who flourished in the 4th century, is supposed to have died about 380. The chronicle of Flav. Dexter mentions him as having continued St. Jerome's *Chronicon* to the year 380; Sigebert de Gembloux attributes to him also a *Commentarius in Orosii Libros Regum;* but Florez and Antonio show good grounds for discrediting this assertion. Antonio even gives very strong reasons for considering this Isidore an imaginary individual, as well as another Isidore, likewise supposed to have been bishop of Cordova in 400–430, whom Dexter considers to be the author of a *Liber Allegoriarum* and a *Commentarius in Lucam.* See Bivarius, *Notæ ad Dextrum;* Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana vetus*, i, 249; Fabricius, *Bibl. Med. et Infimæ Latinitatis;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 56. (J. N. P.)

Isidore MERCATOR (or *Peccator*), the supposed name of a compiler who, towards the middle of the 9th century, published the famous collection of canons known as the Pseudo-Isidorian. See CANONS; DECRETALS. It is pretty generally conceded that this writer lived in the dominions of Charles the Bald, but his real name is a matter of doubt. As for his collection, it is evidently based on that of Isidore of Seville, numerous copies of which were at the time circulating in France; but it contains besides a vast number of apocryphal additions. Some of these pieces had already been in circulation for years, and they were not all made up by the Pseudo-Isidore. The collection of capitularies of Benedict Levita, a deacon of Mayence (who has by some been considered as the author of the Pseudo-Isidorian collection), which was written about 840, contains already numerous extracts of the fictitious documents of the work of Mercator. They circulated at first only in Southern France. They remained unknown in Spain until the 16th century, and in Germany and Italy but few copies of them are to be found. They are compiled from the histories of Rufinus and Cassiodorus, the *Liber Pontificalis*, the works of the fathers, decisions of the councils, regular decretals, the Bible (which, according to Richter, he quotes from the Vulgate, revised by Rhabanus Maurus), and, finally, the Roman law, of which he possessed a compendium in the Visigoth language. These two latter circumstances go far to prove that the writer must have been either a native, or at least, at the time, a resident of France. Mayence has sometimes been considered as the place where the pseudo-decretals were written, and Riculf or Otgar, archbishops of that city, or even Benedict Levita, above alluded to, as their author; but this seems unlikely, the more since Rhabanus Maurus, who succeeded Otgar in 847, appears entirely unacquainted with their existence. It must have been written about the middle of the 9th century, for it contains the decrees of the council held at Paris in 829, shows a knowledge of Rhabanus Maurus's work against the chor-bishops written in 847–849, and was first made public at the Synod of Chiersy in 857. The history of this collection has never been fully traced out; much may perhaps be done for it by a careful comparison of the numerous MS. copies of it which are still extant. Among these copies, one of the most important is the *Codex Vaticanus*, No. 630, written in 858–867. It is thought that the *Capitula Angilramni*, another apocryphal document of canon law, must also be considered as the work of the so-called Isidore Mercator. See, besides the works already referred to under DECRETALS, Centuriatores, *Ecclesiastica historia*, vol. vi, cap. vii, and vol. iii, cap. vii; Blondel, *Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes;* Van Espen, *De Collectione Isidori, Opera*, vol. iii; Zaccaria, *Antifebronio*, vol. i, diss. iii; Spittler, *Gesch. des canonischen Rechts*, p. 243; Kunstmann, *Fragmente über Pseudo-Isidor* (Neue Sion, 1855); Gfrorer, *Untersuchung. über Alter, Ursprung und Zweck d. Dekretalen d. falschen Isidorus* (Friburg, 1848); Same, *Gesch. d. Carolinger*, i, 71; Rosshirt, *Zu den Kirchenrechtlichen Quellen u. z. den Pseudo-Isidorischen Decretalen* (Heidelberg, 1849); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xvi, 71; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, ii, 370 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* xii, 337; Hefele, in Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* viii, 859. (J. H. W.)

Isidore OF MOSCOW, a distinguished Russian bishop, was born at Thessalonica towards the close of the 14th century. He became successively archimandrite of the convent of St. Demitri at Constantinople, coadjutor of the archbishop of Illyria, and, finally (in 1437), metropolitan bishop of Russia. In this capacity he attended, at the head of a hundred Russian bishops and priests, the Council of Florence, at which the union of the Latin and Greek churches was effected. See FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF. Isidore and Bessarion played the most important part in that council. In June, 1439, having fulfilled his task, he returned to Moscow to proclaim the news. But the grand duke Vasili, who was displeased with the results of the council, had him thrown into prison, and condemned to be burned alive; but on the day appointed for the execution he made his escape, and fled to Rome, where Eugene IV welcomed him as a martyr. As the union effected by the Council of Florence in 1439 was of very short duration, Isidore was selected by the Roman pontiff, Nicholas V, as messenger to Constantinople, to attempt again a union of the churches, but in this mission he failed. Isidore died at Rome April 27, 1463. Having witnessed the estab-

lishment of Islamism at Constantinople, he gave an account of it in two letters, one of which was published in the *Lettres Turques* of Reisner, vol. iv; the second, which is dated Candia, July 7, 1453, was never printed, and is probably contained in the Riccardini Library at Florence. Some Russian annalists, especially Nikon, give extracts of some of his sermons and mandaments. See *Nanamnukre sckoba Opcoba; Drevnaia Rosjeiskaia Biblioteca*, vol. xi; Strahl, *Der Russische Metropolit Isidor u. sein Versuch d. russisch-griechische Kirche mit d. Römisch-Katolischen zu vereinen* (Tübingen, 1823); Claconii et Oldoini *Vitæ et Res gestæ Pontificum et Cardinalium* (Romæ, 1677), ii, 903; *Statuta Concilii Florentini* (Florence, 1518); Maimbourg, *Histoire du Schisme des Grecs;* Theiner, *Vicissitudes de l'Église en Pologne et en Russie*, i, 33; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 73; Neale's *History of the Council of Florence*, p. 59; Covel, *Account of the Greek Church*, p. 117.

Isidore OF PELUSIUM (or *Pelusiota*), ST., an ecclesiastical writer, was born at Alexandria about the year 370. He spent his life in the neighborhood of Pelusium, in a monastery of which he was abbot, and where he practised strict asceticism. He was a great admirer of St. Chrysostom, of whom, according to some, he was a pupil, and whom he defended against the attacks of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Theophilus and Cyril. In the controversy waged by Cyril against Nestorius, Isidorus Pelusiota favored the Cyrillian party, his counsels of moderation contrasting greatly with the passion and ambition of Cyril. He was a firm adherent to the doctrines of the Greek Church, and vigorously opposed all heretical inroads. Of his writings, which "discuss, with learning, piety, judgment, and moderation, nearly all the theological and practical questions of his age," there remain to us yet a collection of his letters, forming five volumes, though they are probably not all (there are more than 2000 of them) his own. These letters treat almost all on the interpretation of Scripture. The first three volumes were published, with a Latin translation and notes, by J. de Billy (Paris, 1585, fol.), and reprinted, together with the fourth volume, by Conrad Rittershausen (Heidelb. 1605, fol.), and the fifth by the Jesuit Schott (Antw. 1623, 8vo). A complete, though rather faulty edition was finally published at Paris in 1638, folio, and in Migne's edition of the fathers, vol. lviii (Paris, 1860). See Photius, *Bibliotheca* (cod. 228, 232); Schröckh, *Christliche Kirchengesch.* xvii, 520, 529; Heumann, *Dissertatio de Isidoro Pelusiota ejusque epistolis* (Göttingen, 1737, 4to); Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, x, 480, 494; H. A. Niemeyer, *De Isid. Pel. vita, scriptis et doctrina* (Halle, 1825); Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclésiastiques*, vol. xv.; Du Pin, *Nouv. Bibl. des aut. eccles.* iv, 5 sq.; Ceillier, *Hist. des aut. sac.* xiii, 600 sq.; Neander, *Kirchengesch.* ii, 2, 361 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 941; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 85; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxvi, 57.

Isidore OF SEVILLE, or ISIDORUS HISPALIENSIS, surnamed also "*the young*" to distinguish him from Isidore of Cordova, one of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of the 7th century, was born at Carthagena about the year 560 or 570. He was a son of Severianus and Theodora, and brother of St. Leander, his predecessor in the bishopric of Seville, and of St. Fulgentius, bishop of Carthage. He was brought up by his brother Leander, and it was therefore natural that he should have been favored in the selection of a successor for the bishopric of Seville, but it was not principally owing to his relationship to Leander that he was honored with this distinguished position. His abilities fully entitled him to this distinction. When he ascended to the bishopric the Goths had been masters of Spain for a century and a half. The north and west of Europe were shrouded in moral darkness. Germany, occupied by a number of adverse tribes, was yet given to idolatry; Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Scotland, were almost unknown; England and Ireland had just received the first faint glimpse of Christianity; France was torn by the dissensions of petty monarchs, and the East itself was on the eve of the inroads of Mohammedanism. To counteract these influences, and to build up the Christian faith among his countrymen, was his first care. To this end he established schools to properly train the young, entered into closer relations with the bishop of Rome (Gregory the Great), and made every effort to bring the doctrinal and moral system of Christianity into harmony with the habits and institutions of those various races and nationalities which at that time composed the Hispano-Gothic kingdom; and so successful was he in his efforts that he is considered one of the brightest ornaments of the Church of Spain. His abilities were further recognised by his contemporaries in permitting him to preside over the two Councils—half ecclesiastical, half civil—of Seville (619) and Toledo (Dec., 633). On both occasions he showed great zeal for the orthodox side, and strict opposition to all heretical manifestations; especially, however, was he opposed to Arianism. So able was the conduct of Isidore at these councils that the canons of them may be said to have served as a basis even for the constitutional law of the Spanish kingdom, both in Church and State, down to the time of the great constitutional changes of the 15th century. Isidore of Seville died at Seville April 4, 636, and was canonized by the Church soon after his death. We have but few particulars of his life from his writings, except that in a letter, about the authenticity of which there is much doubt, he invites some bishop to join him in a synod to depose the bishop of Cordova for luxuriousness and worldliness. The great reputation which Isidore enjoyed among his colleagues may be best inferred from the fathers of the 8th Council of Toledo, who call him *Doctor egregius, ecclesiæ catholicæ novissimum, decus, præcedentibus ætate postremus, doctrinæ comparatione non infimus, atque, et quod majus est, jam sæculorum finitorum doctissimus, cum reverentia nominandus, Isidorus.* According to the testimony of his disciple, St. Ildefonse, he was a man of wonderful eloquence. The same authority names him as the author of *De Genere Officiorum* (generally called *De Officiis ecclesiasticis*), *Liber Proœmiorum:—De Ortu et Obitu Patrum* (sanctorum):—*Liber Synonymorum* (sive lamentationis):—*De Natura rerum:—Liber Sententiarum:—Liber Etymologiarum* (*Origines*), probably the last work of Isidore. The first edition of his works, which display very extensive learning, and cover the various departments of literature—theological, ascetical, liturgical, scriptural, historical, philosophical, and even philological—and thus amply account for the admiration of his contemporaries, was published by Michael Somnius (Paris, 1580, folio); another, very complete, was taken principally from the MSS. of Alvar. Gomez, and augmented by notes by J. B. Perez and Grial (Madrid, 1599, 2 vols. fol.). The edition of James Dubreuil (Paris, 1601, folio) and that of Cologne (1667) are taken from that of Madrid. The latest, which is also considered the best, is due to Arevoli (Rome, 1797-1803, 7 vols. 4to). See St. Ildefonse, *De Viris Illustribus;* Sigebert de Gembloux, *De Script. Ecclesiast.* (c. 55); Tritheim, *De Script. Eccles.;* M'Crie, *Reformation in Spain*, p. 52; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxvi, 57 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 89 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biography*, ii, 627 sq. (J. H. W.)

Isidōrus HISPALIENSIS. See ISIDORE OF SEVILLE.

Isis (Ἶσις), an Egyptian deity, sister and wife of Osiris (q. v.), is called by the Egyptians *Hes*, and is by them said to have been born on the 4th day of the Epagomenæ, or five days added to the Egyptian year of 360 days. The history of the worship of Isis is very obscure, all the information we possess on the subject being derived from Greek writers. Tradition said that her brother Osiris having married her, they together undertook the task of civilizing men, and taught them agriculture; their marriage produced Horus. Their other brother, Typhon, being at enmity with them, succeed-

ed once in surprising Osiris, murdered him, and deposited the body in a box, which he threw into the sea (Nile). Isis, while wandering about in mourning, seeking Osiris, heard that Osiris, before his departure, had been enamored with her sister Nephthys, who had had a son, now abandoned by the mother for fear of Typhon. By the aid of some dogs Isis succeeded in discovering that son, Anubes by name; she at once adopted him, and brought him up, and he became her faithful follower. In the mean time, the box containing Osiris drifted in the sea towards Byblos, in Phœnicia, and was arrested by a bush, which soon grew into a tree, the box remaining inclosed in the wood. The king of Byblos caused a column to be made of this tree for his palace. Isis hastened thither to investigate the rumor, and, to avoid recognition, offered her services to the queen as nurse. At nightfall she put one of the children placed under her care in the fire, to divest it of all that was mortal, while she herself, in the form of a swallow, flew around the column which contained Osiris. The queen, seeing her child in the fire, cried out loudly, and thus deprived him of immortality. The goddess now revealed herself amidst thunder and lightning, and at one blow broke down the column, out of which the box containing Osiris fell. This she carried to her son Horus, who had been brought up in Butos, and he hid it. Typhon, however, discovered it, recognised the body, and tore it into 14 pieces (according to others, into 26 or 28 pieces). By means of magic, Isis succeeded in gathering all these pieces with the exception of the genitals, to replace which she made artificial ones. This is the reason why the Egyptians considered the Phallus as sacred. The body was now interred at Philæ, which became the principal burial-place of the Egyptians. Osiris, however, returned from Hades to educate his son, and Isis bore him again another son, Harpocrates. As, however, she allowed Typhon, who had been captured by Horus, and whom she was to have killed, to escape, Horus took the crown from her, and in its place Hermes placed bulls' horns on her head, since which Isis has generally been represented under the form of a woman with the horns of a cow. Isis was originally for the Egyptian a personification of the valley of the Nile, fecundated by Osiris, the god of the Nile. In after times, when, under the influence of foreign notions, Osiris came to be considered as the god of the sun, Isis was transformed into the goddess of the moon, and consequently as a friendly and life-imparting deity. She was also considered as the goddess of the lower world, of which she was said to hold the keys, and to be the ruler and judge. She subsequently came to be regarded as the ruler of the sea, the law-giver and protector of marriage, the support of the state, the foundress of religion and the mysteries; and she finally obtained such importance that she was considered by the philosophers as the fundamental principle of the world, the divine power which is the cause of all the phenomenon of nature, and the source of divine and human life.

In the monuments Isis is called the goddess-mother, the mistress of heaven, sister and wife of Osiris, and nurse of Horus, the mourner of her brother, the eye of the sun, and regent of the gods. In her terrestrial character she wears upon her head the throne which represented her name; in her celestial, the disc and horns, or tall plumes. She is often seen nursing Horus (q. v.); sometimes also with the head of a cow (indicating her identity with the cow Athor, the mother of the sun), having a ball between her horns, the lotus on the top of her head, and the sistrum in her hand. She mostly wore a cloak fastened on her bosom by a knot; other images represent her with a spear, or, again, with the head of a hawk and wings, a spear in her right hand and a snake in the left, or with a flowing mantle and spreading a sail. Isis was worshipped throughout Egypt, and especially at Memphis. There was an image of her at Saïs with the inscription, "I am the all, that has been, is, and shall be, and my cloak has no mortal lifted yet." An annual festival of ten days' duration commemorated the victory of Isis over Typhon by means of the sistrum: on this occasion a solemn fast was succeeded by processions, in which sheaves of wheat were carried about in honor of Isis, etc. After Alexander the Great, the worship of Isis was propagated throughout all the countries inhabited by the Greeks; in Greece temples were erected to her at Phlius, Megara, Tithorea, and Phocis. The worship of Isis was also introduced into Rome in the time of Sulla (B.C. 86), but her temples were often closed on account of the licentiousness of her priests. (Josephus tells a story about the demolition of her temple at Rome by order of the emperor on account of an intrigue by one Mundus to secure the gratification of his passion for a Roman matron, *Ant.* xviii, 3, 4). Yet, under the emperors, it found credit, and Domitian, Commodus, and Caracalla were themselves among her priests. Writers of those times say that it was in their day still the custom of the Greeks and Romans to carry a boat in solemn procession in honor of Isis on the opening of spring (March 5th). Hence, in the Roman calendar, the 5th of March is designated as *Isidis navigium.* As similar processions were also made by some of the German nations in honor of their deities, Tacitus claims that they also worshipped Isis; yet her name nowhere appears among them, neither is it exactly known what goddess he thus designated.

"The myth of Isis, as given by Plutarch (*De Iside*), appears to be a fusion of Egyptian and Phœnician traditions, and the esoterical explanations offered by that writer and others show the high antiquity and unintelligibility of her name. She was thought to mean the cause or seat of the earth, to be the same as the Egyptian Neith or Minerva, and Athor or Venus; to be the Greek Demeter or Ceres, Hecate, or even Io. Many monuments have been found of this goddess, and a temple at Pompeii, and a hymn in her honor at Antioch. The representations of her under the Roman empire are most numerous, Isis having, in the pantheistic spirit of the age, been compared with and figured as all the principal goddesses of the Pantheon" (Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.).

The fable was adopted and incorporated in the mysticism of the Gnostics. Accordingly, among other representations, we find a gem containing a beetle, with Isis on the opposite side, holding two children, the emblem of maternal fecundity. See MADONNA. On another gem the beetle is not cut on the stone, but the stone is formed into the shape of the insect, and on the convex back is represented Isis, or the Egyptian Ceres, reclining beside the Nile, with two vases of Egyptian corn, the emblem of vegetable prolificness, naturally expressed by the emblem of the sun's rays and the Nile: from the head issues the lotus, and in one hand is held a nilometer, or perhaps a spade. It is the exact form of the same agricultural instrument as used at this day in the East. An amulet of Isis was held in great sanctity. See EGYPT.

See Herod. ii, c. 59; Ovid, *Metam.* ix, 776; Bunsen, *Egypt's Place*, i, 413; Wilkinson, *Manners and Cust.* iii, 276; iv, 366; Birch, *Gall. Ant.* p. 31; Reichel, *De Isis apud Romanos cultu* (Berlin, 1849); Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, ix, 82; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Mythol.* s. v.

Gnostic Gem of Isis, on a Scarabæus.

Isites, the name of a Mohammedan sect, who derive their name from their founder, Isa-Alerdad. They

hold that the Koran was created, notwithstanding the opposition of Mohammed himself against such a statement, for he held that it was eternal, and in his day anathematized all who dared to dissent from his assertion. The Isites, however, really avow the same belief, though they clothe it in very different language. They say that the copy of the Koran delivered by the Almighty to his Prophet was only a transcription of the original, and that the reference of eternal could not therefore be to any copy possessed by man. But their real heresy consists in their declaration that the Koran does not contain that matchless eloquence which Mohammedans generally claim as evidence of the inspiration of the book. See Broughton, *Biblioth. Histor. Sac.* i, 547.

Islâm or **Eslam** (Arab.), the proper name of the religion known as Mohammedanism, designates complete and entire submission of body and soul to God, his will and his service, as well as to all those articles of faith, commands, and ordinances revealed to and ordained by Mohammed his prophet. Islam, the Mohammedans say, was once the religion of all men; but wickedness and idolatry came into the world either after the murder of Abel, or at the time which resulted in the flood, or only after Amru Ibn-Lohai, one of the first and greatest Arabian idolaters. Every child, they believe, is born in Islam, or the true faith, and would continue faithful to the end were it not influenced by the wickedness of its parents, "who misguide it early, and lead it astray to Magism [see PARSEES], Judaism, or Christianity." See MOHAMMEDANISM.

Island or **Isle** is the invariable rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the Heb. word אִי (Sept. νῆσος, Vulg. *insula*), which occurs in the following senses, chiefly in poetry: First, that of dry or habitable *land* in opposition to water: as. "I will make the rivers islands" (Isa. xlii, 15: comp. xliii, 19; lii, 2). Especially is it a maritime region or sea-*coast*, like the East-Indian *Dsib*, which means both shore and island. In Isa. xx, 6, the isle of Ashdod means the country, and is so rendered in the margin, particularly as this was a sea-shore. In Isa. xxiii, 2, 6, "the isle" means the country of Tyre, and in Ezek. xxvii, 6, 7, that of Chittim and Elisha, both being maritime regions. (In Job xxii, 30, אִי־נָקִי means the *non*-guiltless.) In this sense it is more particularly restricted to the shores of the Mediterranean, sometimes in the fuller expression "islands of the sea" (Isa. xi, 11), or "isles of the Gentiles" (Gen. x, 5; comp. Zeph. ii, 11), and sometimes simply as "isles" (Psa. lxxii, 10; Ezek. xxvi, 15, 18; xxvii, 3, 35; xxxix, 6; Dan. xi, 18): an exception to this, however, occurs in Ezek. xxvii, 15, where the shores of the Persian Gulf are intended. Secondly, it is used both in Hebrew and English, according to its geographical meaning, for an *island* proper, i. e. a country surrounded by water, as in Jer. xlvii, 4, "the isle (margin) of Caphtor," which is probably that of Cyprus. "The isles of the sea" (Esth. x, 1) are evidently put in opposition to "the land" or continent. Thirdly, the word is used by the Hebrews to designate all those countries divided from Palestine by water, as fully described in Jer. xxv, 22, "the isles which are beyond the sea," which were hence regarded as the most remote regions of the earth (Isa. xxiv, 15; xlii, 10; lix, 18; compare the expression in Isa. lxvi, 19, "the isles afar off"), and also as large and numerous (Isa. xl, 15; Psa. xcvii, 1). (See J. D. Michaelis, *Spicilegium*, i, 131–142.) In Isa. xi, 11, after an enumeration of countries lying on their own continent, the words "and the islands of the sea" are added in order to comprehend those situate beyond the ocean. It is observed by Sir I. Newton (*on Daniel*, p. 276), "By the earth the Jews understood the great continent of all Asia and Africa, to which they had access by land; and by the isles of the sea they understood the places to which they sailed by sea, particularly all Europe. (See Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 38.)—Kitto; Smith. Comp. WILD BEAST.

Islands of the Blessed were, according to a very old Greek myth, certain happy isles situated towards the edge of the Western Ocean, where the favorites of the gods, rescued from death, dwelt in joy, and possessed everything in abundance that could contribute to it.

Islebians is the name by which the followers of John Agricola (q. v.) are designated, in distinction from all other Antinomians (q. v.). The name is derived from their master, who was also known as the *magister Islebius*, because a native of Eisleben, also the birthplace of Luther, with whom he was a contemporary. Sometimes the Islebians are called *Nomomachi* (q. v.).

Islip, SIMON, an English prelate, flourished in the 14th century. But little is known of his early history. He became archbishop in 1349, having previously been canon of St. Paul's, dean of the Arches, and a member of the privy council of the king. He is especially celebrated as the founder of the college of Canterbury (now a part of Christ Church, Oxford). "He built it," says bishop Godwin, in his account of Islip, "and endowed it with good possessions, appropriating unto the same the parsonages of Pagham and Mayfield." Perhaps more noteworthy still is his conduct towards Wickliffe, related by Neander (*Ch. Hist.* v, 135–6, where the name is by mistake spelled Islep, and so even in the English translation by Torrey). Islip, says Neander, was a firm friend of the reformer, and in 1363 showed his predilections for Wickliffe by appointing him overseer over the Canterbury college, characterizing him "as a man in whose circumspection, fidelity, and activity he had the utmost confidence, and to whom he gave this post on account of his honorable deportment and his learning." Of course, after Islip's death in 1366 (Apr. 26), Wickliffe was deprived of his place (comp. Lewis, *Life of Wickliffe*, 1820, p. 9 sq.). See Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, vi, 265. (J. H. W.)

Ismachi'ah (Heb. *Yismakyah'*, but only in the prolonged form *Yismachya'hu*, יִסְמַכְיָהוּ, *supported* by *Jehovah;* Sept. Σαμαχία), one of the Levites charged by Hezekiah with the superintendence of the sacred offerings under the general direction of the high-priest and others (2 Chron. xxxi, 13). B.C. 726.

Is'maël, a Græcized form of the name ISHMAEL (q. v.), found in the A. V. of the Apocrypha.

1. (Ἰσμαήλ.) The son of Abraham (Judith ii, 23).

2. (Ἰσμαῆλος.) One of the priests who relinquished their Gentile wives after the Captivity (1 Esdr. ix, 22).

Ismaël, the elder son of Jaafer Saduk, the sixth imaum, in a direct line, from Ali Ben-Ali Taleb (who married Mohammed's daughter Fatima, and founded the Ali sect, also known as *Fatimites*, and more generally as the *Shiites*, q. v.), was to have been the seventh imaum of the Shiites, but, as he died during his father's lifetime, Jaafer appointed as his successor his younger son Kauzim. This many of the Shiites opposed, holding that, as the imaum is an incarnate emanation of the Deity, only a descendant of the direct line could assume the responsibilities of this high office, and claimed the distinction for the sons of Ismaël, who alone, of the descendants of Jaafer, were entitled to be imaums. This contention caused a schism among the Shiites about the 2d century of the Hegira (8th century of our æra), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITES, or ISMAËLIANS. The Abbassidæ (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the powerful Shiites, in order to assume the government themselves, sided with the Ismaëlites. But the Persians, among whom the Ismaëlites at first mainly prospered (generally known as Talimis, from *talimi*, "learning," because they afterwards held, contrary to the orthodox Mussulmans, that man can arrive at the truth of anything only by continued study), soon comprehended the designs of the Abbassidæ, and they warred alike against

the Abbasside caliphs and the other Mussulmans. Missionaries were sent through all the territories settled by the followers of Mohammed, at this time torn in pieces by scores of sects, to advocate the claims of the house of Ismaël. They flourished in the 9th and 10th centuries under the name of *Karmatians* (q. v.), and constituted a secret band, governed by laws very much like the freemasons, admitting, however, some very dangerous tenets, and advocating the extirpation of their enemies by the sword. They received additional strength in the 11th century of our æra, when a family of chiefs, through the means of superstition, established an influence over the minds of the Ismaëlians that enabled them for two centuries to control the affairs of Persia. The first of these chiefs was Hussun Subah (from whose name the Ismaëlites of this period are often called *Hussuni* or *Hossoni*—a title, however, having no connection [as has been erroneously supposed by some] with the English word assassin, which is really equivalent to "*hashish*-eaters;" see ASSASSINS), who, after many years of persecution, succeeded in obtaining a stronghold, and, there fortifying himself, founded upon the Ismaëlitic model a sect of his own. Besides maintaining the principles of the Ismaëlites so far as regarded their rights of succession to the office of imaum, he also "introduced many new tenets more conformable to the opinions of the Sûffis, or philosophical deists, than to those of orthodox Mohammedans. The Koran, he admitted, was a holy volume; but he insisted that its spirit, and not its literal meaning, was to be observed. He rejected the usual modes of worship, as true devotion, he said, was seated in the soul, and prescribed forms might disturb, though they could never aid, that secret and fervent adoration which it must always offer to its Creator (Malcolm, from a Persian MS.). But the principal tenet which Hussun Subah inculcated was a complete and absolute devotion to himself and to his descendants. His disciples were instructed to consider him more as their spiritual than their worldly leader. The means he took to instil this feeling into their minds must have been powerful, from the effect which was produced. "When an envoy from Malik Shah came to Allahamout, Hussun commanded one of his subjects to stab himself, and another to cast himself headlong from a precipice. Both mandates were instantly obeyed! 'Go,' said he to the astonished envoy, 'and explain to your master the character of my followers'" (Malcolm, *Hist. of Persia*, i, 399). One reason which may be assigned for this control of Hussun over his adherents is that he formed them into a secret order, and, besides, promised them advancement from one degree to another, in the highest of which a foretaste of the life that is to come was given them. This extraordinary mode of procuring the devotion of his disciples he is said to have produced by drugs. "A youth who was deemed worthy, by his strength and resolution, to be initiated into the Assassin service was invited to the table and conversation of the grand master, or grand prior; he was then intoxicated with *hashish* (the hemp-plant), and carried into the garden—a true Eastern Paradise—where the music of the harp was mingled with the songs of birds, and the melodious tones of the female singers harmonized with the murmurs of the brooks. Everything breathed pleasure, rapture, and sensuality, and this, on awakening, he believed to be Paradise; everything around him, the houris in particular, contributed to confirm his delusion. After he had experienced as much of the pleasures of Paradise, which the Prophet had promised to the blessed, as his strength would admit—after quaffing enervating delight from the eyes of the houris, and intoxicating wine from glittering goblets, he sank into the lethargy produced by narcotic draughts, on awakening from which, after a few hours, he again found himself by the side of his superior. The latter endeavored to convince him that corporeally he had not left his side, but that spiritually he had been rapt into Paradise, and had there enjoyed a foretaste of the bliss which awaits the faithful, who devote their lives to the service of the faith and the obedience of their chiefs. Thus did these infatuated youths blindly dedicate themselves as the tools of murder, and eagerly seek an opportunity to sacrifice their lives, in order to become partakers of a Paradise of sensual pleasure. What Mohammed had promised in the Koran to the Moslem, but which to many might appear a dream and mere empty promises, they had enjoyed in reality; and the joys of heaven animated them to deeds worthy of hell" (Madden, *Turkish Empire*, ii, 185, based on Hammer's *Gesch. der Assassinen*). Malcolm thinks this an improbable tale, invented by the orthodox Mohammedans, who hold the Assassins in great abhorrence, because "the use of wine was strictly forbidden them, and they were enjoined the most temperate and abstemious habits." But this seems to us only an additional reason why we should believe it to be true; for if Hussun used the *hashish* to intoxicate his followers when their nerves needed strengthening for some atrocious deed, we could not expect him to advocate the free use of intoxicating beverages. Nay, its truth is further confirmed by the revelations which the fourth successor of Hussun as grand master made of the imposture. The use also to this day at Constantinople and at Cairo of opium with henbane shows what an incredible charm they exert on the drowsy indolence of the Turk and the fiery imagination of the Arab.

Hussun, on account of several hill forts which he had seized, "was styled 'Sheik el-Jebel,' an Arabic title which signifies 'the chief of the mountains,' and which has been literally, but erroneously, translated 'the old man of the mountain'" (Malcolm, i, 401). The Ismaëlites in his time spread extensively. They flourished not only in Persia, but also in Syria and Arabia, until A.D. 1253, when their atrocities became unbearable, and a general massacre against them was inaugurated. A command was issued by the reigning prince, Mangu Khan, in the 651st year of the Hegira, "to exterminate all the Ismaëlites, and not to spare even the infant at its mother's breast. . . . Warriors went through the provinces, and executed the fatal sentence without mercy or appeal. Wherever they found a disciple of the doctrine of the Ismaëlites they compelled him to kneel down, and then cut off his head. The whole race of Kia Busurgomid, in whose descendants the grand mastership had been hereditary, were exterminated. . . . Twelve thousand of these wretched creatures were slaughtered without distinction of age. . . . The 'devoted to murder' were not now the victims of the order's vengeance, but that of outraged humanity. The sword was against the dagger [the weapon the Assassins most generally used to murder their opponents], the executioner destroyed the murderer. The seed sowed for two centuries was now ripe for the harvest, and the field ploughed by the Assassin's dagger was reaped by the sword of the mogul. The crime had been terrible, but no less terrible was the punishment" (Madden, ii, 187; comp. Milman's Gibbon [Harper's edition], *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vi, 215). But, with all these persecutions, they still struggled on for many years, and even in our own day "remains of the Ismaëlites still exist both in Persia and Syria, but merely as one of the many sects and heresies of Islamism [see MOHAMMEDANISM], without any claims to power, without the means of retaining their former importance, of which they seem, in fact, to have lost all remembrance. The policy of the secret state-subverting doctrine which animated the followers of Hussun, and the murderous tactics of the Assassins, are equally foreign to them. Their writings are a shapeless mixture of Ismaëlitic and Christian traditions, glossed over with the ravings of a mystical theology. Their places of abode are, both in Persia and Syria, those of their forefathers, in the mountains of Irak, and at the foot of the anti-Lebanon" (Madden, ii, 190, 191). At present many students of Eastern history incline to the opinion that

"the Druses" (q. v.), generally supposed to be the descendants of the Hivites, to whom they bear some characteristic resemblances (comp. Chasseaud [a native of Syria, and a very able scholar], *Druses of the Lebanon*, p. 361 sq.), "must be looked upon as the only true representatives in Syria of the Ismaëlian sect of the followers of Ali, from whom the Assassins are derived" (Madden, ii, 196). Some also hold to a connection of the *Ansarians* with the Assassins, especially Mr. Walpole (*Travels in the further East in* 1850-51 [London, 2 vols. 8vo]; compare also his *Travels in the East*, iii, 3 sq.). Even in India the Ismaëlites are believed to have followers, and as such "the *Borahs*, an industrious race of men, whose pursuits are commercial, and who are well known in the British settlements of India, who still maintain that part of the creed of Hussun Subah which enjoins a complete devotion to the mandate of the high-priest" (Malcolm, i, 407, 408), are mentioned. See, besides the works already cited, J. F. Rousseau, *Mémoire sur les Ismaelis et les Nosaïris*, with notes by De Sacy; the Rev. Samuel Lyde, *The Ansireeh and Ishmaleeh, a Visit to the secret Sects of Northern Syria* (Lond. 1858, 8vo); *Asiatic Researches*, xi, 43 sq. See also MOHAMMEDANS; SHIITES. (J. H. W.)

Ismaël HAJI, a Mussulman reformer, was born on the 28th of Shawal, 1196 of the Hegira (Sept. 11, 1781), in the village of Pholah, district of Delhi. His family had furnished quite a number of distinguished theologians, and Ismaël began early to preach and write against the superstitious practices which had been introduced into the Mohammedan worship in Hindustan. In 1819 he became connected with Ahmed Shah, a Mohammedan of a family of Syeds of Bareilly, in Upper India, who was at this time attracting a great deal of attention at Delhi by superior sanctity, and by his denunciations of the corrupt forms of worship then prevalent. In 1822, he and another Mussulman of some learning set out with Ahmed Shah on a visit to Arabia and Turkey. In all the great cities large congregations gathered about these new reformers, who sought to enforce attention to the precepts of the Koran independent of the opinions of the high dignitaries of the Moslem Church. After travelling about for more than four years they returned to Delhi, determined to establish a theocratic form of government in India, and to restore Islamism to its original simplicity. The reformers inaugurated a general war against the unbelieving, and laying particular stress on the doctrine of the unity of God, they soon succeeded in gaining considerable power by the great number of their adherents. The Sikhs (q. v.) became their chief opponents, and with them a protracted struggle ensued. Driven from Delhi by the civil authorities, they retired in 1827 to Punjtâr (situated in the Eusofzai hills, between Peshawur and the Indus), where they found an ally in Omar, khan Afghan of Punjtâr. At first these united forces were successful in their wars against the Sikhs, but the Afghans soon grew weary of these conquests for strange allies, and Ahmed and Ismaël being left alone, removed to the left bank of the Indus, and there, amid rugged mountains, continued for a time the desultory warfare. Early in May, 1831, however, they were surprised at a place called Balakot, in the mountains of Pahkli, and slain.

The followers of Ahmed and Ismaël are called *Tharicati Mohammediyat*, and bear some resemblance in their doctrines to the *Sunnites* (q. v.). Ismaël composed for the benefit of the sect, and at the instigation of Ahmed, the *Tukvia ul-Imân*, or "Basis of the Faith," in the Urdu, or vernacular language of Upper India, and it was printed at Calcutta. "It is divided into two portions, of which the first only is understood to be the work of Ismaël, the second part (the *Sirat Almostakim*, published in Persian at Calcutta, and translated in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*) being inferior, and the production of another person. In the preface Ismaël deprecates the opinion 'that the wise and learned alone can comprehend God's Word. God himself had said a prophet had been raised up among the rude and ignorant for their instruction, and that he, the Lord, had rendered obedience easy. There were two things essential: a belief in the unity of God, which was to know no other, and a knowledge of the Prophet, which was obedience to the law. Many held the sayings of the saints to be their guide, but the Word of God was alone to be attended to, although the writings of the pious which agreed with the Scriptures might be read for edification.' The first chapter treats of the unity of God, and in it the writer deprecates the supplication of saints, angels, etc., as impious. He declares the reasons given for such worship to be futile, and to show an utter ignorance of God's Word. 'The ancient idolaters had likewise said that they merely venerated powers and divinities, and did not regard them as the equal of the Almighty; but God himself had answered these heathens. Likewise the Christians had been admonished for giving to dead monks and friars the honor due to the Lord. God is alone, and companion he has none; prostration and adoration are due to him, and to no other.' Ismaël proceeds in a similar strain, but assumes some doubtful positions, as that Mohammed says God is one, and man learns from his parents that he was born; he believes his mother, and yet he distrusts the apostle; or that an evil-doer who has faith is a better man than the most pious idolater" (Cunningham, *History of the Sikhs*, p. 190, foot-note †). The work was translated in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain* (1852), xiii, 317-367. See Garcin de Tassy, *Hist. de la Litt. hindoustane*, i, 251; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxvi, 81. (J. H. W.)

Ismaël ben-Elisa, HA-COHEN, one of the most celebrated Jewish Rabbis and theologians, was born about A.D. 60 in Upper Galilee, and when yet a child was carried as a captive to Rome on the destruction of Jerusalem. While he was confined in prison in the Eternal City, the Rabbis Joshua, Azzariah, and Gamaliel II had come to Rome to implore mercy and pardon for the captive Jews of the then reigning emperor Dioclctian (about A.D. 83), and by accident passing the prison door of this young boy, Rabbi Joshua exclaimed at his door, "Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers?" (Isa. xlii, 24) to which Ismaël ben-Elisa gave this manly reply: "The Lord, against whom we have sinned, and would not walk in his ways, nor be obedient unto his law" (ibid.). This remarkable reply from the mouth of Ismaël so interested the celebrated Rabbis in his behalf that they vowed to secure his liberation before they should quit the city. Ismaël ben-Elisa, when liberated, placed himself under the instruction of Rabbi Joshua, and also studied under the celebrated Simon ben-Jochai. At a later period we find Ismaël ben-Elisa in Southern Judæa, not far from the Idumæan boundaries, at Kephar-Aziz (כפר־אזיז), occupied in the cultivation and sale of the grape. But while thus employed he was also engaged in the noble effort of maintaining young Jewish maidens, who, by the desolations of the war, had been impoverished, and were suffering terribly from destitution. Ismaël ben-Elisa is supposed to have suffered martyrdom during the persecutions so frequent at that period (about A.D. 121). His especial service to Judaism was the system of interpretation which he inaugurated in opposition to the system of Rabbi Akiba. The latter held that "every repetition, figure, parallelism, synonyme, word, letter, particle, pleonasm, nay, the very shape, and every ornament of a letter or title, had a recondite meaning in the Scripture, 'just as every fibre of a fly's wing or an ant's foot has its peculiar significance.' Hence he maintained that the particles את, גם, אך, and רק, as well as the construction of the finite verb with the infinitive, e. g. חשב תשיב, הצבט העביטנו, have a dogmatic significance, and he therefore deduced points of law from them. Philo was of the same opinion (comp. *σαφῶς εἰδώς, ὅτι περιττὸν ὄνομα οὐδὲν τίθησιν, ὑπὸ τῆς*

τοῦ πραγματολογεῖν ἀμυθήτου φορᾶς, *De profugis*, ed. Mangey, p. 458), and he even deduced from them ethical and philosophical maxims; and this was also the opinion of the Greek translator of Ecclesiastes in the Septuagint, as may be seen from his anxiety to indicate the Hebrew particle את by the Greek σύν, which has greatly perplexed the commentators who, being unacquainted with this fact, have been unable to account for this barbarism and violation of grammatical propriety" (comp. Ginsburg, *Comment. on Ecclesiastes*, p. 496). On the other hand, Rabbi Ismaël ben-Elisa held that the Scriptures (of course only the O. T.), being a composition intended for human eyes and comprehension, "used expressions in their common acceptation, and that many of the repetitions and parallelisms are simply designed to render the style more rhetorical and powerful, and cannot, therefore, without violation of the laws of language, be adduced in support of legal deductions." In accordance with this theory, he established thirteen exegetical rules, which are called שלש עשרה מדות דרבי ישמעאל, *The thirteen Rules of R. Ismaël*, by which alone, as he maintained, the Scriptures are to be interpreted (שהתורה נדרשת בהם). Comp. the very valuable work of Dr. E. M. Pinner, *Tulmud Babli* (*tractat Berachoth*) *mit deutscher Uebersetzung*, etc. (Berlin, 1842, fol.), i, 17–20, where Ismaël's rules are given with lengthy annotations. See also the article MIDRASH. Rabbi Ismaël is also the reputed author of a number of other works. The most important of these are, an allegorical commentary on Exod. xii–xxiii, 20, called מכלתא, treating of the ceremonies prescribed by the Torah. Numerous editions of it have been printed; the first at Constantinople, 1515, folio; the last, to our knowledge, at Wilna, 1844, folio. It has been augmented by notes from several other Jewish writers, and was translated into Latin by Ugolino (*Thesaurus Antiquitatum*, vol. xiv):—פִּרְקֵי הֵיכָלוֹת (or סֵ' חֲנוֹךְ), a work on mystic theology, of which extracts have been published in אַרְזֵי לְבָנוֹן (Venice, 1601, 4to; Cracow, 1648, 4to), and in other works. It was printed separately under the title דְּרוּשׁ פִּרְקֵי הֵיכָלוֹת (Venice, 1677, 8vo; Zolkiew, 1833, 8vo). It was also inserted in parts in the edition of the Zohar. Ismaël also wrote a cabalistic, allegorical treatise on the nature and attributes of God, under the title שִׁעוּר קוֹמָה; also called סֵ' הַקּוֹמָה. A part of it was published in the סֵ' רְזִיאֵל of Eleazar ben-Jehudah of Worms (Amsterd. 1701, 4to, and often). Another small cabalistic treatise on the shape and mystic value of letters, under the title of סֵ' הַתְּמוּנָה, was published with a long commentary (Konz, 1774, 4to), etc. See Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, ii, 75 sq.; Rossi, *Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei*; Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (Berlin, 1832), p. 47 sq.; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iv, 68 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodleiana*, col. 1160, etc.; *Ben-Chananja* (Szegedin, 1858), i, 122 sq.

Ismaëlites. See ISMAËL.

Ismaï'ah (1 Chron. xii, 4). See ISHMAIAH, 1.

Is'pah (Heb. *Yishpah'*, יִשְׁפָּה, prob. *bald*; Septuag. Ἐσφάχ v. r. Ἰεσφά), one of the "sons" of Beriah, a chief Benjamite (originally from the neighborhood of Aijalon) resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 16). B.C. ante 588.

Is'raël [not *Izrœl*] (Heb. *Yisraël'*, יִשְׂרָאֵל; Sept. and N. T. Ἰσραήλ), the name of the founder of the Jewish nation, and of the nation itself, specially of the kingdom comprising the ten northern tribes after the schism.

The name was originally conferred by the angel-Jehovah upon Jacob after the memorable prayer-struggle at Peniel (Gen. xxxii, 28); and the reason there assigned is that the patriarch "as a prince had power (שָׂרִיתָ) with God and man, and prevailed" (comp. Gen. xxxv, 10; Hos. xii, 4). The etymology is therefore clearly from the root שָׂרָה, with the frequent adjunct אֵל, *God*. The verb itself occurs nowhere else than in the above passages, where it evidently means to *strive* or contend as in battle; but derivatives are found, e. g. שָׂרָה, a *princess*, and hence applied to Abraham's wife in exchange for her former name Sarai. The signification thus appears to be that of a "successful *wrestler* with *God*," a sense with which all the lexicographers substantially coincide; e. g. Gesenius (*Heb. Lex.* s. v., and *Thesaur.* p. 1338), *pugnator*, i. e. *miles Dei*; Winer (*Heb. Lex.* p. 1026), *luctator*, i. e. *pugnator Dei*; Fürst (*Heb. Wörterb.* s. v.), *Gott-Beherrscher*.

1. JACOB, whose history will be found under that name. Although, as applied to Jacob personally, Israel is an honorable or poetical appellation, it is the common prose name of his descendants, while, on the contrary, the title Jacob is given to them only in poetry. In the latter division of Isaiah (after the 39th chapter), many instances occur of the two names used side by side, to subserve the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, as in ch. xl, 27; xli, 8, 14, 20, 21; xlii, 24; xliii, 1, 22, 28, etc.; so, indeed, in xiv, 1. The modern Jews, at least in the East, are fond of being named *Israêli* in preference to *Yahûdi*, as more honorable. See JACOB.

2. The ISRAELITES, i. e. the whole people of Israel, the twelve tribes; often called the *children of Israel* (Josh. iii, 17; vii, 25; Judg. viii, 27; Jer. iii, 21); and *the house of Israel* (Exod. xvi, 31; xl, 38); so also *in Israel* (1 Sam. ix, 9); and *land of Israel*, i. e. Palestine (1 Sam. xiii, 19; 2 Kings vi, 23). Sometimes the whole people is represented as one person: "Israel is my son" (Exod. iv, 22; Numb. xx. 14; Isa. xli, 8; xlii, 24; xliii, 1, 15; xliv, 1, 5). *Israel* is sometimes put emphatically for *the true* Israelites, the faithful, those distinguished for piety and virtue, and worthy of the name (Psa. lxxiii, 1; Isa. xlv, 17; xlix, 3; John i, 47; Rom. ix, 6; xi, 26). *Israelites* was the usual name of the twelve tribes, from their leaving Egypt until after the death of Saul. But in consequence of the dissensions between the ten tribes and Judah from the death of Saul onward, these ten tribes, among whom Ephraim took the lead, arrogated to themselves this honorable name of the whole nation (2 Sam. ii, 9, 10, 17, 28; iii, 10, 17; xix, 40–43; 1 Kings xii, 1); and on their separation, after the death of Solomon, into an independent kingdom, founded by Jeroboam, this name was adopted for the kingdom, so that thenceforth the kings of the ten tribes were called *kings of Israel*, and the descendants of David, who ruled over Judah and Benjamin, were called *kings of Judah*. So in the prophets of that period *Judah* and *Israel* are put in opposition (Hos. iv, 15; v, 3, 5; vi, 10; vii, 1; viii, 2, 3, 6, 8; ix, 1, 7; Amos i, 1; ii, 6; iii, 14; Mic. i, 5; Isa. v, 7). Yet the kingdom of Judah could still be reckoned as a part of *Israel*, as in Isa. viii, 14, the two kingdoms are called *the two houses of Israel;* and hence, after the destruction of the kingdom of Israel at Samaria, the name *Israel* began again to be applied to the whole surviving people. See HEBREW; ISRAELITE, etc.

3. It is used in a narrower sense, excluding Judah, in 1 Sam. xi, 8. It is so used in the famous cry of the rebels against David (2 Sam. xx, 1) and against his grandson (1 Kings xii, 16). Thenceforth it was assumed and accepted as the name of the northern kingdom, in which the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, Levi, Dan, and Simeon had no share. See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

4. After the Babylonian captivity, the returned exiles, although they were mainly of the kingdom of Judah, resumed the name Israel as the designation of their nation, but as individuals they are almost always described as Jews in the Apocrypha and N. T. Instances occur in the books of Chronicles of the application of the name Israel to Judah (e. g. 2 Chron. xi, 3; xii, 6), and in Esther of the name Jews to the whole people. The name Israel is also used to denote laymen as dis-

tinguished from priests, Levites, and other ministers (Ezra vi, 16: ix, 1; x, 25; Neh. xi, 3, etc.).—Smith. The twelve tribes of Israel ever formed the ideal representation of the whole stock (1 Kings xviii, 30, 31; Ezra vi, 17; Jer. xxxi, 1, etc.). Hence also in the New Test. "Israel" is applied (as in No. 2 above) to the true people of God, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin (Rom. ix, 6; Gal. vi, 16, etc.), being, in fact, comprehensive of the entire Church of the redeemed. See JEWS.

ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF. The name *Israel* (q. v.), which at first had been the national designation of the twelve tribes collectively (Exod. iii, 16, etc.), was, on the division of the monarchy, applied to the northern kingdom (a usage, however, not strictly observed, as in 2 Chron. xii, 6), in contradistinction to the other portion, which was termed the kingdom of Judah. This limitation of the name Israel to certain tribes, at the head of which was that of Ephraim, which, accordingly, in some of the prophetical writings, as e. g. Isa. xvii, 13; Hos. iv, 17, gives its own name to the northern kingdom, is discernible even at so early a period as the commencement of the reign of Saul, and affords evidence of the existence of some of the causes which eventually led to the schism of the nation. It indicated the existence of a rivalry, which needed only time and favorable circumstances to ripen into the revolt witnessed after the death of Solomon.

I. *Causes of the Division.*—The prophet Abijah, who had been commissioned to announce to Jeroboam, the Ephraimite, the transference to him of the greater part of the kingdom of Solomon, declared it to be the punishment of disobedience to the divine law, and particularly of the idolatry so largely promoted by Solomon (1 Kings xi, 31-35). But while this revolt from the house of David is to be thus viewed in its directly penal character, or as a divine retribution, this does not preclude an inquiry into those sacred causes, political and otherwise, to which this very important revolution in Israelitish history is clearly referable. Such an inquiry, indeed, will make it evident how human passions and jealousies were made subservient to the divine purpose.

Prophecy had early assigned a pre-eminent place to two of the sons of Jacob—Judah and Joseph—as the founders of tribes. In the blessing pronounced upon his sons by the dying patriarch, Joseph had the birthright conferred upon him, and was promised in his son Ephraim a numerous progeny; while to Judah promise was made, among other blessings, of rule or dominion over his brethren—"thy father's children shall bow down before thee" (Gen. xlviii, 19, 22; xlix, 8, 26; comp. 1 Chron. v, 1, 2). These blessings were repeated and enlarged in the blessing of Moses (Deut. xxxiii, 7, 17). The pre-eminence thus prophetically assigned to these two tribes received a partial verification in the fact that at the exodus their numbers were nearly equal, and far in excess of those of the other tribes; and further, as became their position, they were the first who obtained their territories, which were also assigned them in the very centre of the land. It is unnecessary to advert to the various other circumstances which contributed to the growth and aggrandizement of these two tribes, and which, from the position these were thus enabled to acquire above the rest, naturally led to their becoming heads of parties, and, as such, the objects of mutual rivalry and contention. The Ephraimites, indeed, from the very first, gave unmistakable tokens of an exceedingly haughty temper, and preferred most arrogant claims over the other tribes as regards questions of peace and war. This may be seen in their representation to Gideon of the tribe of Manasseh (Judg. viii, 1), and in their conduct towards Jephthah (Judg. xii, 1). Now if this overbearing people resented in the case of tribes so inconsiderable as that of Manasseh what they regarded as a slight, it is easy to conceive how they must have eyed the proceedings of the tribe of Judah, which was more especially their rival. Hence it was, that while on the first establishment of the monarchy in the person of Saul, of the tribe of Benjamin, the Ephraimites, with the other northern tribes with whom they were associated, silently acquiesced, they refused for seven years to submit to his successor of the tribe of Judah (2 Sam. ii, 9-11), and even after their submission they showed a disposition on any favorable opportunity to raise the cry of revolt: "To your tents, O Israel" (2 Sam. xx, 1). It was this early, long-continued, and deep-rooted feeling, strengthened and embittered by the schism, though not concurring with it, that gave point to the language in which Isaiah predicted the blessed times of Messiah: "The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off; Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim" (Isa. xi, 13). Indeed, for more than 400 years, from the time that Joshua was the leader of the Israelitish hosts, Ephraim, with the dependent tribes of Manasseh and Benjamin, may be said to have exercised undisputed pre-eminence till the accession of David. Accordingly it is not surprising that such a people would not readily submit to an arrangement which, though declared to be of divine appointment, should place them in a subordinate condition, as when God "refused the tabernacle of Joseph, and chose not the tribe of Ephraim, but chose the tribe of Judah, even the Mount Zion which he loved" (Psa. lxxviii, 67, 68). See EPHRAIM.

There were thus, indeed, two powerful elements tending to break up the national unity. In addition to the long-continued and growing jealousy on the part of the Ephraimites to the tribe of Judah, another cause of dissatisfaction to the dynasty of David in particular was the arrangement just referred to, which consisted in the removal of the civil, and more particularly the ecclesiastical government, to Jerusalem. The Mosaic ordinances were in themselves exceedingly onerous, and this must have been more especially felt by such as were resident at a distance from the sanctuary, as it entailed upon them long journeys, not only when attending the stated festivals, but also on numerous other occasions prescribed in the law. This must have been felt as a special grievance by the Ephraimites, owing to the fact that the national sanctuary had been for a very long period at Shiloh, within their own territory; and therefore its transference elsewhere, it is easy to discern, would not be readily acquiesced in by a people who had proved themselves in other respects so jealous of their rights, and not easily persuaded that this was not rather a political expedient on the part of the rival tribe, than as a matter of divine choice (1 Kings xiv, 21). Nor is it to be overlooked, in connection with this subject, that other provisions of the theocratic economy relative to the annual festivals would be taken advantage of by those in whom there existed already a spirit of dissatisfaction. Even within so limited a locality as Palestine, there must have been inequalities of climate, which must have considerably affected the seasons, more particularly the vintage and harvest, with which the feasts may in some measure have interfered, and in so far may have been productive of discontent between the northern and southern residents. That there were inconveniences in both the respects now mentioned would indeed appear from the appeal made by Jeroboam to his new subjects, when, for reasons of state policy, and in order to perpetuate the schism by making it religious as well as political, he would dissuade them from attendance on the feasts in Judah: "It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem" (1 Kings xii, 28); and from the fact that he postponed for a whole month the celebration of the feast of tabernacles (ver. 32), a change to which it is believed he was induced, or in the adoption of which he was at least greatly aided, by the circumstance of the harvest being considerably later in the northern than in the southern districts (*Pict. Bible*, note on 1 Kings xii, 32).

Again, the burdensome exactions in the form of service and tribute imposed on his subjects by Solomon

for his extensive buildings, and the maintenance of his splendid and luxurious court, must have still further deepened this disaffection, which originated in one or other of the causes already referred to. It may indeed be assumed that this grievance was of a character which appealed to the malcontents more directly than any other; and that these burdens, required especially for the beautifying of the capital, must have been exceedingly disagreeable to the inhabitants of the provinces, who did not in any way participate in the glories in support of which such onerous charges were required. The burdens thus imposed were indeed expressly stated to be the chief ground of complaint by the representatives of Israel headed by Jeroboam, who, on the occasion of the coronation at Shechem, waited on the son of Solomon with a view to obtain redress (1 Kings xii, 4). The long smouldering dissatisfaction could no longer be repressed, and a mitigation of their burdens was imperiously demanded by the people. For this end Jeroboam had been summoned, at the death of Solomon, from Egypt, whose presence must have had a marked influence on the issue, although it may be a question whether Jeroboam should not be regarded rather as an instrument called forth by the occasion than as himself the instigator of the revolt. With this agrees the intimation made to him from the Lord many years before by Ahijah the Shilonite. The very choice of Shechem, within the territories of Ephraim, as the coronation place of Rehoboam, may have had for its object the repression of the rebellious spirit in the northern tribes by means of so grand and imposing a ceremony.

However this may have been, or in whatever degree the causes specified may have severally operated in producing the revolt, the breach now made was never healed, God himself expressly forbidding all attempts on the part of Rehoboam and his counsellors to subjugate the revolted provinces with the intimation, "This thing is from me" (1 Kings xii, 24). The subsequent history of the two kingdoms was productive, with but slight exceptions, of further estrangement.

II. *Extent and Resources of the Kingdom of Israel.*—The area of Palestine, even at its utmost extent under Solomon, was very circumscribed. In its geographical relations it certainly bore no comparison whatever to the other great empires of antiquity, nor indeed was there any proportion between its size and the mighty influences which have emanated from its soil. Making allowance for the territories on the shore of the Mediterranean in the possession of the Phœnicians, the area of Palestine did not much exceed 13,000 square miles. This limited extent, it might be shown, however, did the present subject call for it, rendered that land more suitable for the purposes of the theocracy than if it were of a far larger area. What precise extent of territories was embraced in the kingdom of Israel cannot be very easily determined, but it may be safely estimated as more than double that of the southern kingdom, or, according to a more exact ratio, as 9 to 4. Nor is it easy to specify with exactness the several tribes which composed the respective kingdoms. In the announcement made by Ahijah to Jeroboam, he is assured of ten tribes, while only one is reserved for the house of David; but this must be taken only in a general sense, and is to be interpreted by 1 Kings xii, 23 (compare ver. 21); for it would appear that Simeon, part of Dan, and the greater part of Benjamin, owing doubtless to the fact that Jerusalem itself was situated within that tribe, formed portion of the kingdom of Judah (Ewald, *Geschichte*, iii, 409). It is to be noticed, however, that Judah was the only independent tribe, and therefore it might be spoken of as the *one* which constituted the kingdom of the house of David. The ten tribes nominally assigned to Israel were probably Joseph (=Ephraim and Manasseh), Issachar, Zebulun, Asher, Naphtali, Benjamin, Dan, Simeon, Gad, and Reuben, Levi being intentionally omitted; the ten actually embraced in it seem to have been Ephraim, Manasseh (East and West), Issachar, Zebulon, Asher, Naphtali, Gad, Reuben, and (in part) Dan. With respect to the conquests of David, Moab appears to have been attached to the kingdom of Israel (2 Kings iii, 4); as much of Syria as remained subject to Solomon (see 1 Kings xi, 24) would probably be claimed by his successor in the northern kingdom; and Ammon, though connected with Rehoboam as his mother's native land (2 Chron. xii, 13), and though afterwards tributary to Judah (2 Chron. xxvii, 5), was at one time allied (2 Chron. xx, 1), we know not how closely or how early, with Moab. The sea-coast between Accho and Japho remained in the possession of Israel.

With regard to population, again, the data are even more defective than with respect to territorial extent. According to the uncompleted census taken in the reign of David, about forty years previous to the schism of the kingdom, the fighting men in Israel numbered 800,000, and in Judah 500,000 (2 Sam. xxiv, 9); but in 1 Chron. xxi, 5, 6, the numbers are differently stated at 1,100,000 and 470,000 respectively, with the intimation that Levi and Benjamin were not included (comp. xxvii, 24). As bearing more directly on this point, Rehoboam raised an army of 180,000 men out of Judah and Benjamin to fight against Jeroboam (1 Kings xii, 21); and again, Abijah, the son of Rehoboam, with 400,000 men, made war on Jeroboam at the head of an army of 800,000 (2 Chron. xiii, 3). According to the general laws observable in such cases, these numbers may be said to represent an aggregate population of from *five and a half to six millions*, of which about *one third*, or two millions, may be fairly assigned to the kingdom of Judah at the time of the separation.

Shechem was the first capital of the new kingdom (1 Kings xii, 25), venerable for its traditions, and beautiful in its situation. Subsequently Tirzah, whose loveliness had fixed the wandering gaze of Solomon (Cant. vi, 4), became the royal residence, if not the capital of Jeroboam (1 Kings xiv, 17) and of his successors (xv, 33; xvi, 8, 17, 23). After the murder of Jeroboam's son, indeed, Baasha seems to have intended to fix his capital at Ramah, as a convenient place for annoying the king of Judah, whom he looked on as his only dangerous enemy; but he was forced to renounce this plan (1 Kings iv, 17, 21). Samaria, uniting in itself the qualities of beauty and fertility, and a commanding position, was chosen by Omri (1 Kings xvi, 24), and remained the capital of the kingdom until it had given the last proof of its strength by sustaining for three years the onset of the hosts of Assyria. Jezreel was probably only a royal residence of some of the Israelitish kings. It may have been in awe of the ancient holiness of Shiloh that Jeroboam forbore to pollute the secluded site of the tabernacle with the golden calves. He chose for the religious capitals of his kingdom Dan, the old home of northern schism, and Bethel, a Benjamite city not far from Shiloh, and marked out by history and situation as the rival of Jerusalem.

III. *Political and Religious Relations of the Kingdom of Israel.*—But whilst, in extent of territory and of population, and it might be shown also in various other respects, the resources of the northern kingdom were at the very least double those of its southern rival, the latter embraced elements of strength which were entirely lacking in the other. There was first the geographical position of the kingdom of Israel, which exposed its northern frontier to invasions on the part of Syria and the Assyrian hosts. But more than this, or any exposure to attack from without, were the dangers to be apprehended from the polity on which the kingdom was founded. Jeroboam's public sanction of idolatry, and his other interferences with fundamental principles of the Mosaic law, more especially in the matter of the priesthood, at once alienated from his government all who were well affected to that economy, and who were not ready to subordinate their religion to any political considerations. Of such there were not a few within the territories of the new kingdom. The Le-

vites in particular fled the kingdom, abandoning their property and possessions; and so did many others besides; "such as set their hearts to seek the Lord God of Israel came to Jerusalem, to sacrifice unto the Lord God of their fathers. So they strengthened the kingdom of Judah" (2 Chron. xi, 13-17). Not only was one great source of strength thus at once dried up, but the strongly conservating principles of the law were violently shocked, and the kingdom more than ever exposed to the encroachments of the heathenism which extended along its frontier.

One element of weakness in the kingdom of Israel was the number of tribes of which it was composed, more especially after they had renounced those principles of the Mosaic law which, while preserving the individuality of the tribes, served to bind them together as one people. Among other circumstances unfavorable to unity was the want of a capital in which all had a common interest, and with which they were connected by some common tie. This want was by no means compensated by the religious establishments at Bethel and Dan. But it is in respect to theocratic and religious relations that the weakness of the kingdom of Israel specially appears. Any sanction which the usurpation of Jeroboam may have derived at first from the announcement made to him by the prophet Ahijah, and afterwards from the charge given to Rehoboam and the men of Judah not to fight against Israel, because the thing was from the Lord (1 Kings xii, 23), must have been completely taken away by the denunciations of the prophet out of Judah against the altar at Bethel (1 Kings xiii, 1-10), and the subsequent announcements of Ahijah himself to Jeroboam, who failed to fulfil the conditions on which the kingdom was given him (1 Kings xiv, 7-16). The setting up of the worship of the calves, in which may be traced the influence of Jeroboam's residence in Egypt, and the consecrating of priests who could have no moral weight with their fellow-subjects, and were chosen only for their subservience to the royal will, were measures by no means calculated to consolidate a power from which the divine sanction had been expressly withdrawn. On the contrary, they led, and very speedily, to the alienation of many who might at the outset have silently acquiesced in the revolution, even if they had not fully approved of it. The large migration which ensued into Judah of all who were favorable to the former institutions must still further have aggravated the evil, as all vigorous opposition would thenceforth cease to the downward and destructive tendency of the anti-theocratic policy. The natural result of the course appears in the fact that the step taken by Jeroboam was never retraced by any of his successors, one after another following the example thus set to them, so that Jeroboam is emphatically and frequently characterized in Scripture as the man "who made Israel to sin," while his successors are described as following in "the sin of Jeroboam."

Further, as the calves of Jeroboam are referable to Egypt, so the worship of Baal, which was introduced by Ahab, the seventh of the Israelitish kings, had its origin in the Tyrian alliance formed by that monarch through his marriage with Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of Sidon. Hitherto the national religion was ostensibly the worship of Jehovah under the representation of the calves; but under this new reign every attempt was made to extirpate this worship entirely by the destruction of God's prophets and the subversion of his altars. It was to meet this new phase of things that the strenuous agency of Elijah, Elisha, and their associates was directed, and assumed a quite peculiar form of prophetic ministration, though still the success was but partial and temporary. See, however, under ELIJAH and ELISHA.

IV. *Decay and Dissolution of the Kingdom of Israel.*—The kingdom of Israel developed no new power. It was but a portion of David's kingdom deprived of many elements of strength. Its frontier was as open and as widely extended as before, but it wanted a capital for the seat of organized power. Its territory was as fertile and as tempting to the spoiler, but its people were less united and patriotic. A corrupt religion poisoned the source of national life. While less reverence attended on a new and unconsecrated king, and less respect was felt for an aristocracy reduced by the retirement of the Levites, the army which David found hard to control rose up unchecked in the exercise of its wilful strength; and thus eight houses, each ushered in by a revolution, occupied the throne in quick succession. Tyre ceased to be an ally when the alliance was no longer profitable to the merchant city. Moab and Ammon yielded tribute only while under compulsion. A powerful neighbor, Damascus, sat armed at the gate of Israel; and beyond Damascus might be discerned the rising strength of the first great monarchy of the world.

The history of the kingdom of Israel is therefore the history of its decay and dissolution. In no true sense did it manifest a principle of progress, save only in swerving more and more completely from the course marked out by Providence and revelation for the seed of Abraham; and yet the history is interesting as showing how, notwithstanding the ever-widening breach between the two great branches of the one community, the divine purposes concerning them were accomplished. That a polity constituted as was that of the northern kingdom contained in it potent elements of decay must be self-evident, even were the fact less clearly marked on every page of its history.

There is reason to believe that Jeroboam carried back with him into Israel the good-will, if not the substantial assistance of Shishak, and this will account for his escaping the storm from Egypt which swept over Rehoboam in his fifth year (2 Chron. xii, 2-9). During that first period Israel was far from quiet within. Although the ten tribes collectively had decided in favor of Jeroboam, great numbers of individuals remained attached to the family of David and to the worship at Jerusalem, and in the three first years of Rehoboam migrated into Judah (2 Chron. xi, 16, 17). Perhaps it was not until this process commenced that Jeroboam was worked up to the desperate measure of erecting rival sanctuaries with visible idols (1 Kings xii, 27); a measure which met the usual ill-success of profane state-craft, and aggravated the evil which he feared. Jeroboam had not sufficient force of character in himself to make a lasting impression on his people. A king, but not a founder of a dynasty, he aimed at nothing beyond securing his present elevation. Without any ambition to share in the commerce of Tyre, or to compete with the growing power of Damascus, or even to complete the humiliation of the helpless monarch whom he had deprived of half a kingdom, Jeroboam acted entirely on a defensive policy. He attempted to give his subjects a centre which they wanted for their political allegiance, in Shechem or in Tirzah. He sought to change merely so much of their ritual as was inconsistent with his authority over them. But, as soon as the golden calves were set up, the priests, and Levites, and many religious Israelites (2 Chron. xi, 16) left their country, and the disastrous emigration was not effectually checked even by the attempt of Baasha to build a fortress (2 Chron. xvi, 6) at Ramah. A new priesthood was introduced (1 Kings xii, 31) absolutely dependent on the king (Amos vii, 13); not forming, as under the Mosaic law, a landed aristocracy, not respected by the people, and unable either to withstand the oppression or to strengthen the weakness of a king. A priesthood created and a ritual devised for secular purposes had no hold whatever on the conscience of the people. To meet their spiritual cravings a succession of prophets was raised up, great in their poverty, their purity, their austerity, their self-dependence, their moral influence, but imperfectly organized—a rod to correct and check the civil government, not, as they might have been under happier circumstances, a staff to support it. The army soon learned its power to dictate to the isolated monarch and dis-

nited people. Although Jeroboam, the founder of the kingdom, himself reigned nearly twenty-two years, yet his son and successor Nadab was violently cut off after a brief reign of less than two years, and with him the whole house of Jeroboam.

Thus speedily closed the first dynasty, and it was but a type of those which followed. Eight houses, each ushered in by a revolution, occupied the throne in rapid succession, the army being frequently the prime movers in these transactions. Thus Baasha, in the midst of the army at Gibbethon, slew Nadab, the son of Jeroboam; and, again, Zimri, a captain of chariots, slew Elah, the son and successor of Baasha, and reigned only *seven days*, during which time, however, he smote all the posterity and kindred of his predecessor, and ended his own days by suicide (1 Kings xvi, 18). Omri, the captain of the host, was chosen to punish the usurper Zimri, and after a civil war of four years he prevailed over his other rival Tibni, the choice of half the people. Omri, the sixth in order of the Israelitish kings, founded a more lasting dynasty, for it endured for forty-five years, he having been succeeded by his son Ahab, of whom it is recorded that he "did more to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger than all the kings of Israel that were before him" (1 Kings xvi, 33); and he, again, by his son Ahaziah, who, after a reign of less than two years, died from the effects of a fall, and, leaving no son, was succeeded by his brother Jehoram, who reigned twelve years, until slain by Jehu, the captain of the army at Ramoth-Gilead, who also executed the total destruction of the family of Ahab, which perished like those of Jeroboam and of Baasha (2 Kings ix, 9).

Meanwhile the relations between the rival kingdoms were, as might be expected, of a very unfriendly character. "There was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all their days" (1 Kings xiv, 30); so also between Asa and Baasha (1 Kings xv, 14, 32). The first mention of peace was that made by Jehoshaphat with Ahab (1 Kings xxii, 44), and which was continued between their two successors. The princes of Omri's house cultivated an alliance with the contemporary kings of Judah, which was cemented by the marriage of Jehoram and Athaliah, and marked by the community of names among the royal children. Ahab's Tyrian alliance strengthened him with the counsels of the masculine mind of Jezebel, but brought him no further support.

The kingdom of Israel suffered also from foreign enemies. In the reign of Omri the Syrians had made themselves masters of a portion of the land of Israel (1 Kings xx, 33), and had proceeded so far as to erect streets for themselves in Samaria, which had just been made the capital. Further incursions were checked by Ahab, who concluded a peace with the Syrians which lasted three years (1 Kings xxii, 1), until that king, in league with Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, attempted to wrest Ramoth-Gilead out of their hands, an act which cost him his life. The death of Ahab was followed by the revolt of the Moabites (2 Kings i, 4), who were again, however, subjugated by Jehoram, in league with Jehoshaphat. Again the Syrians renewed their inroads on the kingdom of Israel, and even besieged Samaria, but fled through panic. In the reign of Jehu "the Lord began to cut Israel short: and Hazael smote them in all the coasts of Israel" (2 Kings x, 32). Their troubles from that quarter increased still further during the following reign, when the Syrians reduced them to the utmost extremities (2 Kings xiii, 7). To this more prosperous days succeeded, with a reverse to Judah, whose king presumptuously declared war against Israel.

Under Jeroboam II, who reigned forty-two years, the affairs of the northern kingdom revived. "He restored the coast of Israel, from the entering of Hamath unto the sea of the plain; . . . he recovered Damascus, and Hamath, which belonged to Judah, for Israel" (2 Kings xiv, 25, 28). Damascus was by this time probably weakened by the advance of the power of Assyria. This period of prosperity was followed by another of a totally different character. Jeroboam's son and successor Zachariah, the last of the dynasty of Jehu, was assassinated, after a reign of six months, by Shallum, who, after a reign of only one month, was slain by Menahem, whose own son and successor Pekahiah was in turn murdered by Pekah, one of his captains, who was himself smitten by Hoshea. In the days of Menahem, and afterwards of Pekah, the Assyrians are seen extending their power over Israel; first under Pul, to whom Menahem paid a tribute of threescore talents of silver, that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand (2 Kings xv, 19). Now the Assyrians are found pushing their conquests in every direction; at one time, in the reign of Pekah, leading away into captivity a part of the inhabitants of Israel (2 Kings xv, 29), and again coming to the assistance of Ahaz, king of Judah, then besieged in Jerusalem by the Israelites, in conjunction with the Syrians, who had somehow recovered their former ascendency. See SYRIA. This interposition led to the destruction of Damascus, and in the succeeding weak reign of Hoshea, who had formed some secret alliance with Egypt which was offensive to the Assyrian monarch, to the destruction of Samaria, after a three-years' siege, by Shalmaneser, and the removal of its inhabitants to Assyria; and thus terminated the kingdom of Israel, after an existence of 253 years. Some gleanings of the ten tribes yet remained in the land after so many years of religious decline, moral debasement, national degradation, anarchy, bloodshed, and deportation. Even these were gathered up by the conqueror and carried to Assyria, never again, as a distinct people, to occupy their portion of that goodly and pleasant land which their forefathers won under Joshua from the heathen. (See Ewald, *Einleitung in die Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, and *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, Götting. 1851; also Witsii, *Δεκάφυλον, de decem tribubus Israel*, in his *Ægyptiaca*, p. 303 sq.; J. G. Klaiber, *Hist. regni Ephraim.*, Stuttg. 1833.)

V. *Chronological Difficulties of the Reigns as compared with those of Judah.*—These will mostly appear by a simple inspection of the annexed table, where the numbers given in the columns headed "nominal" are those contained in the express words of Scripture. These and other less obvious discrepancies will be found explained under the titles of the respective kings in this *Cyclopædia*, but it may be well here to recapitulate the most prominent of them together.

1. The length of Jeroboam's reign is stated in 1 Kings xiv, 20 to have been twenty-two years, which appear to have been reckoned from the same point as Rehoboam's (i. e. in Nisan); whereas they were only current, since Rehoboam's accession took place somewhat prior to that of Jeroboam. This is confirmed by the fact that the reigns of Rehoboam (seventeen years, 1 Kings xiv, 21), and Abijah (three years, 1 Kings xv, 2) were but twenty years, and Nadab succeeded Jeroboam in Asa's second year (ver. 25). In like manner Nadab's two nominal years (ver. 25) are current, or, in reality, little over one year; for Baasha succeeded him in Asa's third year (verse 28, 33). So, again, Baasha's twenty-four years of reign (verse 33) must be reduced, for purposes of continuous reckoning, to twenty-three; for Elah succeeded him in Asa's twenty-sixth year (1 Kings xvi, 8). Once more, Elah's two years (ver. 8) must be computed as but one full year, for Zimri slew and succeeded him in Asa's twenty-seventh year (ver. 10, 15). The cause of this surplusage in these reigns appears to be that at some point during the reign of Jeroboam the beginning of the calendar for the regnal years of the Israelitish reign was changed (see 1 Kings xii, 32, 33) from the spring (the Hebrew sacred year) to the fall (their older and secular year), so that they overlap those of the kings of Judah by more than half a year. The reigns of the line of Judah must therefore be taken as the standard, and the parallel line of Israel adjusted by it. (The numbers thirty-five and thirty-six in 2

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE KINGS OF JUDAH AND ISRAEL.

Year of preceding King of Judah.		*Length of Reign.*		KINGS OF ISRAEL.	*Commencement of Reign.* B.C.				KINGS OF JUDAH.	*Age at Accession.*		*Length of Reign.*		*Year of preceding King of Israel.*		*Queen Mother in Judah.*
Nominal.	Real.	Nominal.	Real.		Usher.	Clinton.	Winer.	Correct.		Nominal.	Real.	Nominal.	Real.	Nominal.	Real.	
		22	21+	Jeroboam	975	976	975	973	Rehoboam	41	41+	17	17+	..	..	Naamah.
					958	959	957	956–5	Abijah	..	..	3	3	18th	18th	Maachah.
					955	956	955	953	Asa		..	41	41	20th	20th	Maachah.
2d	2d	2	1	Nadab	954	955	954	951								
3d	3d	24	23	Baasha	953	954	953	950								
26th	26th	2	1	Elah	930	930	930	927								
27th	27th	7 d.	7 d.	Zimri	929	930	928	926								
			4	Tibni	..	..	..	926								
31st	31st	12	7	Omri	929	930	928	922								
38th	38th	22	20	Ahab	918	919	918	915								
					914	915	914	912	Jehoshaphat	35	35	25	25	4th	4th	Azubah.
17th	17th	2	1	Ahaziah	898	896	897	895								
18th	18th	12	12—	Jehoram	896	895	896	894								
					892	891	889	887–6	Jehoram	32	37	8	3	5th	8–9th	
					885	884	885	884	Ahaziah	22	22+	1	1	12th	11th	Athaliah.
		28	28	Jehu	884	883	884	883–2	(Athaliah)	..	..	6	6			
					878	877	878	877–6	Jehoash	7	7	40	40—	7th	7th	Zibiah.
23d	23d	17	17—	Jehoahaz	856	855	856	855–4								
37th	39th	16	16—	Jehoash	841	839	840	838								
					839	837	838	837	Amaziah	25	25	29	29	2d	2d	Jehoaddan.
15th	15th	41	41	Jeroboam II	825	823	825	823–2								
					810	808	809	808	Uzziah	16	16	52	52	27th	15th	Jecholiah.
			[11]	[Interregnum]	..	..	..	782–1								
38th	38th	6 m.	6 m.	Zechariah	773	771	772	770								
39th	39th	1 m.	1 m.	Shallum	772	770	771	770								
39th	39th	10	10+	Menahem	772	770	771	770–69								
50th	50th	2	2	Pekahiah	761	759	760	759–8								
52d	52d	20	20	Pekah	759	757	758	757–6								
					758	756	758	756–5	Jotham	25	50	16	16+	2d	2d	Jerusha.
					742	741	741	740	Ahaz	20	36	16	16	17th	17th	
			[8]	[Interregnum]	..	..	..	737–6								
12th	12th	9	9—	Hoshea	730	730	729	729–8								
					726	726	725	726	Hezekiah	25	25	29	29	3d	3d	Abi.
6th	6th			Samaria taken	721	721	721	720								
					698	697	696	697–6	Manasseh	12	12	55	55	..	..	Hephzibah.
					643	642	641	642–1	Amon	22	22	2	2	..	..	Meshullemeth.
					641	640	639	640–39	Josiah	8	8	31	31	..	..	Jedidah.
					610	609	609	609	Jehoahaz	23	23	3 m.	3 m.	..	..	Hamutal.
					610	609	609	609–8	Jehoiakim	25	25	11	10+	..	..	Zebudah.
					599	598	598	598	Jehoiachin	18	18	3 m.	3 m.	..	..	Nehushta.
					599	598	598	598	Zedekiah	21	21	11	10+		..	Hamutal.
					588	587	586	588	Jerusalem destroyed.							

Chron. xv, 19; xvi, 1, are evidently a transcriber's error for twenty-five and twenty-six; see 1 Kings xvi, 8).

2. Omri's reign is stated in 1 Kings xvi, 23 to have lasted twelve years, beginning, not, as the text seems to indicate, in Asa's thirty-first year, but in his twenty-seventh (for Zimri reigned but seven days), since Ahab succeeded him in Asa's thirty-eighth (ver. 29), making these really but eleven full years, computed as above. The thirty-first of Asa is meant as the date of Omri's *sole* or undisputed reign on the death of his rival Tibni, after four years of contest. His six years of reign in Tirzah (same verse) are dated from this latter point, and are mentioned in opposition to his removal of his capital at the end of this last time to Samaria (ver. 24), where, accordingly, he reigned one full or two current years, still computed as above. This last-named fact is again the key to the discrepancy in the length of his successor Ahab's reign, which is set down in ver. 29 as twenty-two years "in Samaria;" for they date from the change of capital to that place (Ahab having probably been at that time appointed viceroy), being in reality only a small fraction more than twenty years. This appears from the combination of the residue of Asa's reign (41 — 38 = 3; comp. also 1 Kings xxii, 41) and the seventeenth of Jehoshaphat, when Ahaziah succeeded Ahab (1 Kings xxii, 51). Ahaziah's two years (same verse) are to be computed as current, or one full year, on the same principle as above.

The other difficulties relate to minute textual discrepancies, not important to the chronology; some of them involve the supposition of interregna. They will all be found fully discussed under the names of the respective kings to whose reigns they belong. For a complete vindication and adjustment of all the textual numbers (save two or three universally admitted to be corrupt) by means of actual tabular construction, see the *Meth. Quart. Review*, Oct. 1856. See also JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

The chronology of the kings has been minutely investigated by Usher, *Chronologia Sacra* (in his *Works*, xii, 95–144); by Lightfoot, *Order of the Texts of the O. T.* (in *Works*, i, 77–130); by Hales, *New Analysis of Chronology*, ii, 372–447; by Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, iii, Append. § 5; by H. Browne, *Ordo Sæclorum*, chap. iv; and by Wolff, in the *Studien u. Krit.* (1858, iv.) See CHRONOLOGY.

Israel ben-Samuel MAGHREBI, a Jewish writer of the Karaitic sect, flourished at the opening of the 14th century, at Kahira. He deserves our notice as the author of works on the Jewish laws and traditions, in which he advanced the peculiar theories of the Karaites. Thus, in his work הִלְכוֹת שְׁחִיטָה (written about 1306), he asserts that the animal, if killed according to law, and eaten according to prescription, develops itself in man to a higher state of being. The "shochet" (the person killing the animal) must, however, be a believer of the migration of the souls of animals into the souls of men, else it can not only not take effect, but makes the meat unfit for food. But it is also as the interpreter of the matrimonial laws that he ranks high among the Karaites. See Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vii. 322. (J. H. W.)

Is'raëlite (Heb. *Yisreëli'*, יִשְׂרְאֵלִי, 2 Sam. xvii. 25; once [Numb. xxv, 14] אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, *man of Israel*, i. e. male Israelite; fem. יִשְׂרְאֵלִית, "Israelitish woman," Lev. xxiv, 10; Sept. and New Test. Ἰσραηλίτης), a descendant of Jacob, and therefore a member of the chosen nation, for which, however, the simple name ISRAEL (q. v.) is oftener employed in a collective sense, but with various degrees of extension at different times: (1.) The twelve tribes descended from Jacob's sons,

called "Israel" already in Egypt (Exod. iii, 16), and so throughout the Pentateuch and in the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, often with the explicit addition "*all*" Israel. (2.) The larger portion, or ten northern tribes, after the death of Saul (2 Sam. ii, 9, 10, 17, 28), a distinction that prevailed even under David (2 Sam. xix, 40). (3.) More definitely the schismatical portion of the nation (consisting of all the tribes but Judah [including Simeon] and Benjamin), which established a separate monarchy at Samaria after the death of Solomon (1 Kings xii, 19). Seldom does the legitimate kingdom of Judah appear in the sacred narrative under this appellation (2 Chron. xii, 1; xv, 17). (4.) After the Exile, the two branches of the nation became again blended, both having been carried away to the same or neighboring regions, and are therefore designated by the ancient title without distinction in Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1 Maccabees. Gradually, however, the name "Jews" (q. v.) supplanted this appellation, especially among foreigners. (5.) In the New Test. the term "Israel" or "Israelite" is used of the true theocracy or spiritual people (2 Cor. xi, 22). See HEBREW.

Isra̅ĕl'tish (Lev. xxiv, 10 sq.). See ISRAELITE.

Is'sachar, the name of two men in the Bible, and of the descendants of one of them, and the region inhabited by them.

1. The ninth son of Jacob and the fifth of Leah; the first born to Leah after the interval which occurred in the births of her children (Gen. xxx, 17; comp. xxix, 35). He was born in Padan-Aram early in B.C. 1914. In Genesis he is not mentioned after his birth, and the few verses in Chronicles devoted to the tribe contain merely a brief list of its chief men and heroes in the reign of David (1 Chron. vii, 1-5). At the descent into Egypt four sons are ascribed to him, who founded the four chief families of the tribe (Gen. xlvi, 13; Numb. xxvi, 23, 25; 1 Chron. vii, 1).

Form and Signification of the Name.—Both are peculiar. The form is יששכר [i. e. *Yissaskar';* if pointed as would be regular, יִשְּׂשְׂכַר]: such is the invariable spelling of the name in the Hebrew, the Samaritan Codex and Version, the Targums of Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan, but the Masoretes have pointed it so as to supersede the second S, יִשָּׂשכָר, *Yissa[s]kar';* Sept. Ἰσσάχαρ, N. T. Ἰσασχάρ, Josephus Ἰσσάχαρις (*Ant.* v, 1, 22), referring to the tribal territory; Vulg. *Isachar.* (See Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1331.)

As is the case with each of the sons of Jacob, the name is recorded as bestowed on account of a circumstance connected with the birth. But, as may be also noticed in more than one of the others, two explanations seem to be combined in the narrative, which even then is not in exact accordance with the requirements of the name. "God hath given me my hire (שָׂכָר, *sâkâr*) . . . and she called his name Issachar," is the record; but in verse 18 that "hire" is for the surrender of her maid to her husband, while in verse 14-17 it is for the discovery and bestowal of the mandrakes. Besides, as indicated above, the name in its original form—Issaskar—rebels against this interpretation, an interpretation which, to be consistent, requires the form subsequently imposed on the word, Is-sachar. The verbal allusion is not again brought forward, as it is with Dan, Asher, etc., in the blessings of Jacob and Moses. In the former only it is perhaps allowable to discern a faint echo of the sound of "Issachar" in the word *shikmo*—"his shoulder" (Gen. xlix, 15). The words occur again almost identically in 2 Chron. xv, 7, and Jer. xxxi, 16: יֵשׁ שָׂכָר="there is a reward for;" A.V. "shall be rewarded." An expansion of the story of the mandrakes, with curious details, will be found in the *Testamentum Isachar* (Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudepigr.* p. 620-623). They were ultimately deposited "in the house of the Lord" (according to the same legend), whatever that may mean.

Tribe of Issachar.—Issachar's place during the journey to Canaan was on the east of the tabernacle, with his brothers Judah and Zebulun (Numb. ii, 5), the group moving foremost in the march (x, 15), and having a common standard, which, according to the Rabbinical tradition, was of the three colors of sardine, topaz, and carbuncle, inscribed with the names of the three tribes, and bearing the figure of a lion's whelp (see Targum Pseudo-Jon. on Numb. ii, 3). At this time the captain of the tribe was Nethaneel ben-Zuar (Numb. i, 8; ii, 5; vii, 18; x, 15). He was succeeded by Igal ben-Joseph, who went as representative of his tribe among the spies (xiii, 7), and he again by Paltiel ben-Azzan, who assisted Joshua in apportioning the land of Canaan (xxxiv, 26). Issachar was one of the six tribes who were to stand on Mount Gerizim during the ceremony of blessing and cursing (Deut. xxvii, 12). He was still in company with Judah, Zebulun being opposite on Ebal. The number of the fighting men of Issachar when taken in the census at Sinai was 54,400. During the journey they seem to have steadily increased, and after the mortality at Peor they amounted to 64,300, being inferior to none but Judah and Dan—to the latter by 100 souls only. The numbers given in 1 Chron. vii, 2, 4, 5, probably the census of Joab, amount in all to 145,600.

The Promised Land once reached, the connection between Issachar and Judah seems to have closed, to be renewed only on two brief occasions, which will be noticed in their turn. The intimate relation with Zebulun was, however, maintained. The two brother-tribes had their portions close together, and more than once they are mentioned in company. The allotment of Issachar lay above that of Manasseh. The specification of its boundaries and contents is contained in Josh. xix, 17-23. But to the towns there named must be added Daberath (a Levitical city, xxi, 28: Jarmuth here is probably the Remeth of xix, 21) and Ibleam (Josh. xvii, 11). The boundary, in the words of Josephus (*Ant.* v, 1, 22), "extended in length from Carmel to the Jordan, in breadth to Mount Tabor." In fact, it almost exactly consisted of the plain of Esdraelon or Jezreel. The southern boundary we can trace by En-gannim, the modern Jenin, on the heights which form the southern enclosure to the plain; and then further westward by Taanach and Megiddo, the authentic fragments of which still stand on the same heights as they trend away to the hump of Carmel. On the north the territory nearly ceased with the plain, which is there bounded by Tabor, the outpost of the hills of Zebulun. East of Tabor, the hill-country continued so as to screen the tribe from the Sea of Galilee, while a detour on the S.E. included a part of the plain within the territory of Manasseh, near Beth-shean and the upper part of the Jordan valley. In a central recess of the plain stood Jezreel, on a low swell, attended, just across the border, on the one hand by the eminence of Mount Gilboa, and on the other by that now called Ed-Duhy, or "Little Hermon," the latter having Shunem, Nain, and Endor on its slopes—names which recall some of the most interesting and important events in the history of Israel. See TRIBE.

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities in the tribe, with their approved or conjectural identifications:

Abez,	Town.	*Ukneifis*?
Anaharath,	do.	[*Meskarah*]??
Anem,	do.	See EN-GANNIM.
Aphek,	do.	[*El-Fuleh*]?
Beth-gan,	do.	See EN-GANNIM.
Beth-pazzez,	do.	[*Beit-Jenu*]??
Beth-shemesh,	do.	*Kaukab-el-Hawa*?
Chesulloth, or Chisloth Tabor,	do.	*Iksal.*
Dabareh, or Daberath,	do.	*Debureh.*
En-gannim,	do.	*Jenin.*
En-haddah,	do.	[*Ain Mahil*]?
Gur,	Ascent,	[*Mukeibileh*]?
Hapharaim,	Town,	[*El-Afuleh*]?
Ibleam	do.	[*Jelameh*]?
Ittah-kazin,	do.	[*Kefr Kenna*]?
Jarmuth,	do.	See RAMOTH.

Map of the Tribe of Issachar.

Jezreel,	Town.	*Zerin.*
	Plain,	*Merj Ibn-Amer.*
	Fountain,	*Ain Meyiteh.*
Jokmeam, or Jokneam,	Town.	*El-Kaimon.*
Kedesh,	do.	*Kashaneh?*
Kibzaim,	do.	See JOKNEAM.
Kishion,	do.	See KEDESH.
Maralah,	do.	[*Mujeidil*]?
Meroz,	do.	*Kefr Musr?*
Nain,	do.	*Nein.*
Nazareth,	do.	*En-Nasirah.*
Rabbith,	do.	[*Sunurieh*]?
Ramoth, or Remeth,	do.	[Tell between Sundela and Mukeibileh]?
Shahazimah,	do.	[*Shara*]?
Shihon,	do.	[*Esh-Shijrah*]?
Shunem,	do.	*Solam.*

This territory was, as it still is, among the richest land in Palestine. Westward was the famous plain which derived its name, the "seed-plot of God"—such is the signification of Jezreel—from its fertility, and the very weeds of which at this day testify to its enormous powers of production (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 348). See ESDRAELON; JEZREEL. On the north is Tabor, which, even under the burning sun of that climate, is said to retain the glades and dells of an English wood (*ibid.* p. 350). On the east, behind Jezreel, is the opening which conducts to the plain of the Jordan—to that Beth-Shean which was proverbially among the Rabbis the gate of Paradise for its fruitfulness. It is this aspect of the territory of Issachar which appears to be alluded to in the blessing of Jacob. The image of the "sturdy he-ass" (חֲמֹר גָּרֶם)—the large animal used for burdens and field-work, not the lighter and swifter she-ass for riding —"couching down between the two stalls," chewing the fodder of stolid ease and quiet—is very applicable, not only to the tendencies and habits, but to the very size and air of a rural agrarian people, while the sequel of the verse is no less suggestive of the certain result of such tendencies when unrelieved by any higher aspirations: "He saw that rest was good and the land pleasant, and he bowed his back to bear, and became a slave to tribute"—the tribute imposed on him by the various marauding tribes who were attracted to his territory by the richness of the crops. The blessing of Moses completes the picture. He is not only "in tents"—in nomad or semi-nomad life—but "rejoicing" in them; and it is perhaps not straining a point to observe that he has by this time begun to lose his individuality. He and Zebulun are mentioned together as having part possession in the holy mountain of Tabor, which was near the frontier line of each (Deut. xxxiii, 18, 19). We pass from this to the time of Deborah: the chief struggle in the great victory over Sisera took place on the territory of Issachar, "by Taanach at the waters of Megiddo" (Judg. v, 19); but the allusion to the tribe in the song of triumph is of the most cursory nature, not consistent with its having taken any prominent part in the action.

One among the judges of Israel was from Issachar—Tola (Judg. x, 1)—but beyond the length of his sway we have only the fact recorded that he resided out of the limits of his own tribe—at Shamir, in Mount Ephraim. By Josephus he is omitted entirely (see *Ant.* v, 7, 6). The census of the tribe taken in the reign of David has already been alluded to. It is contained in 1 Chron. vii, 1-5, and an expression occurs in it which testifies to the nomadic tendencies above noticed. Out of the whole number of the tribe no less than 36,000 were marauding mercenary troops—"bands" (גְּדוּדִים)—a term applied to no other tribe in this enumeration, though elsewhere to Gad, and uniformly to the irregular bodies of the Bedouin nations round Israel. This was probably at the close of David's reign. Thirty years before, when two hundred of the head men of the tribe had gone to Hebron to assist in making David king over the entire realm, different qualifications are noted in them—they "had understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do . . . and all their brethren were at their commandment." To what this "understanding of the times" was we have no clew (see Deyling, *Observ.* i, 160 sq.). By the later Jewish interpreters it is explained as skill in ascertaining the periods of the sun and moon, the intercalation of months, and dates of solemn feasts, and the interpretation of the signs of the heavens (Targum, ad loc.; Jerome, *Quæst. Heb.*). Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 2, 2) gives it as "knowing the things that were to happen;" and he adds that the armed men who came with these leaders were 20,000. One of the wise men of Issachar, according to an old

Jewish tradition preserved by Jerome (*Quæst. Heb.* on 2 Chron. xvii, 16), was Amasiah, son of Zichri, who, with 200,000 men, offered himself to Jehovah in the service of Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 16); but this is very questionable, as the movement appears to have been confined to Judah and Benjamin. The ruler of the tribe at this time was Omri, of the great family of Michael (1 Chron. xxvii, 18; compare vii, 3). May he not have been the forefather of the king of Israel of the same name—the founder of the "house of Omri" and of the "house of Ahab," the builder of Samaria, possibly on the same hill of Shamir on which the Issacharite judge, Tola, had formerly held his court? But, whether this was so or not, at any rate one dynasty of the Israelitish kings was Issacharite. Baasha, the son of Ahijah, of the house of Issachar, a member of the army with which Nadab and all Israel were besieging Gibbethon, apparently not of any standing in the tribe (compare 1 Kings xvi, 2), slew the king, and himself mounted the throne (1 Kings xv, 27, etc.). He was evidently a fierce and warlike man (xvi, 29; 1 Chron. xvi, 1), and an idolater like Jeroboam. The Issacharite dynasty lasted during the twenty-four years of his reign and the two of his son Elah. At the end of that time it was wrested from him by the same means that his father had acquired it, and Zimri, the new king, commenced his reign by a massacre of the whole kindred and connections of Baasha—he left him "not even so much as a boy" (xvi, 11).

Distant as Jezreel was from Jerusalem, the inhabitants took part in the Passover with which Hezekiah sanctified the opening of his reign. On that memorable occasion a multitude of the people from the northern tribes, and among them from Issachar, although so long estranged from the worship of Jehovah as to have forgotten how to make the necessary purifications, yet by the enlightened piety of Hezekiah were allowed to keep the feast; and they did keep it seven days with great gladness—with such tumultuous joy as had not been known since the time of Solomon, when the whole land was one. Nor did they separate till the occasion had been signalized by an immense destruction of idolatrous altars and symbols, "in Judah and Benjamin, in Ephraim and Manasseh," up to the very confines of Issachar's own land—and then "all the children of Israel returned every man to his possession into their own cities" (2 Chron. xxxi, 1). Within five years from this date Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, had invaded the north of Palestine, and after three years' siege had taken Samaria, and, with the rest of Israel, had carried Issachar away to his distant dominions. The only other scriptural allusion to the tribe is that, with the rest of their brethren of all the tribes of the children of Israel (Dan only excepted), the twelve thousand of the tribe of Issachar shall be sealed in their foreheads (Rev. vii, 7).

2. A Korhite Levite, one of the door-keepers (A. V. "porters") of the house of Jehovah, seventh son of Obed-Edom (1 Chron. xxvi, 5). B.C. 1014.

Issendorp, HENDRIK, belonged to the Evangelical Lutherans of Holland. He was called in 1723 to the charge of a Lutheran church at Purmerend. In 1737 bodily infirmities rendered a colleague necessary. In 1743 he resigned his charge. Though obliged to desist from his ministerial work, he rendered himself eminently useful to his denomination by presenting to the Dutch a translation of some three or four hundred German hymns. See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, ii, 196 sq.; also *Geschiedenis van het godsdienstig Gezang bij de Lutherschen in de Nederlanden door.* (J. P. W.)

Isserlein, ISRAEL BEN-PETACHYA, a Jewish Rabbi of great distinction among Jewish scholars in the 15th century, and one of the representatives of truly learned German synagogal teachers, flourished about 1427–1470. At first he was settled over a congregation at Marburg; later he removed to Neustadt, near Vienna. Isserlein was a very liberal-minded Jew, and did much by his influence to advance the standing of Jewish scholarship in his day. More particularly was his influence felt in the theological schools of his Hebrew brethren all over Germany. From the most distant parts of Europe students flocked to the schools at Erfurt, Nuremburg, Regensburg, and Prague, where the Talmud was expounded in a most masterly manner (comp. Zunz, *Zur Gesch. u. Lit.* p. 167 sq.). According to Jost (*Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten*, iii, 116), Isserlein died obscurely in 1452, but this seems improbable, as Fürst has evidence of Isserlein's activity in 1457. His works are שׁו״ת תְּרוּמַת הַדֶּשֶׁן, a collection of 354 opinions on the different fields of Rabbinism (Venice, 1519, 4to; Fürth, 1778, 4to):—פְּסָקִים וּכְתָבִים, on the Halachoth (Venice, 1519, 4to, and often; Fürth, 1778, 4to):—בֵּאוּרִים לְרַשׁ״י עַל הַתּוֹרָה, or Expositions on Rashi's Commentary to the Pentateuch (Venice, 1519, 4to, and often):—בֵּאוּרִים לְסֵ׳ שַׁעֲרֵי דוּרָא, or Commentary on the Book Sha'are Dura of Isaac Duran (Venice, 1548, 4to, and often); etc. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, viii, 220 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 154; Fränkel, *Israel Isserlein* (*Lib. d. Or.* 1847), c. 675–678. (J. H. W.)

Isserles, MOSE BEN-ISRAEL, a celebrated Polish Rabbi, was born at Cracow in 1520. The son of a very wealthy man, and a relative of the distinguished savan Meïr Katzenellenbogen of Padua, he was afforded peculiar advantages for thorough culture. Of these he readily availed himself, and, in consequence, filled very prominent positions at quite an early age. He was distinguished, however, rather for his early acquisitions and extended knowledge than any great natural abilities. He died in 1573. The writings of Isserles are very varied, covering the departments of theological, exegetical, ecclesiastical, and even historical and philosophical literature. In all of these he was perfectly at home. His most important works are סֵ׳ תּוֹרַת הָעוֹלָה, *on Sacrifices and other subjects of Jewish Antiquities* (Prague, 1569):—מְחִיר יַיִן, or *Commentary on the Book of Esther* (Cremona, 1559, 4to; Amsterd. 1769, 8vo). For a list of all his works, see Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 155 sq. See Fränkel, *Mos. b.-Isräel genannt Mose Isserles*, in the *Oriental. Literaturblatt* (1847), c. 827–30; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, ix, 472 sq. (J. H. W.)

Isshi'ah (*a*, 1 Chron. xxiv, 21; *b*, 1 Chron. xxiv, 25). See ISHIAH.

Issue, besides its ordinary sense of *going forth* (נְגַד, Chald. to *flow*, Dan. vii, 10; also תּוֹצָאוֹת, *exit*, i. e. source, Prov. iv, 23, frequently of the direction or terminus of a boundary; ἐκπορεύομαι, to *go out*, Rev. ix, 17, 18), and *progeny* (מוֹלֶדֶת, Gen. xlviii, 6, elsewhere "*kindred;*" צְפִיעוֹת, *shoots*, i. e. offspring, Isa. xxii, 24; σπέρμα, *seed*, Matt. xxii, 25), is the rendering employed by our translators for several terms expressive of a purulent or unhealthy discharge, especially from the sexual organs. The most emphatic of these is זוֹב, from זוּב, to *flow*, both the verb and noun being frequently applied to diseased or unusual secretions, e. g. the monthly courses or *catamenia* of women, and the seminal flux or *gonorrhœa benigna* of men (Lev. xv; Numb. v, 2). See DISEASE. A more intense and chronic form of this discharge was the "issue of blood," or uterine hæmorrhage of the woman in the Gospels (ῥύσις αἵματος, Mark v, 25; Luke viii, 43, 44; αἱμοῤῥέω, Matt. ix, 20), which, as it made her ceremonially unclean, she was so anxious to conceal when she came in contact with the multitude and with Christ. (See monographs in Volbeding, *Index*, p. 49; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 141.) The term זִרְמָה, Ezek. xxiii, 20, signifies a pouring, and is applied to the *emissio seminis* of a stallion, to which the idolatrous paramours of Judæa are compared in the strong language of the prophet. See ADULTERY. The only other term so rendered is מָקוֹר, a *fountain*, applied to the womb, or

pudenda muliebra, as the source of the menstrual discharge (Lev. xii, 7; xx, 18; comp. πηγή, Mark v, 29). See FLUX.

"The texts Lev. xv, 2, 3; xxii, 4; Numb. v, 2 (and 2 Sam. iii, 29, where the malady is invoked as a curse), are probably to be interpreted of gonorrhœa. In Lev. xv, 3 a distinction is introduced, which merely means that the cessation of the actual flux does not constitute ceremonial cleanness, but that the patient must bide the legal time, seven days (ver. 13), and perform the prescribed purifications and sacrifice (ver. 14). See, however, Surenhusius's preface to the treatise *Zabim* of the Mishna, where another interpretation is given. As regards the specific varieties of this malady, it is generally asserted that its most severe form (*gon. virulenta*) is modern, having first appeared in the 15th century. Chardin (*Voyages en Perse*, ii, 200) states that he observed that this disorder was prevalent in Persia, but that its effects were far less severe than in Western climates. If this be true, it would go some way to explain the alleged absence of the *gon. virul.* from ancient nosology, which found its field of observation in the East, Greece, etc., and to confirm the supposition that the milder form only was the subject of Mosaic legislation. But, beyond this, it is probable that diseases may appear, run their course, and disappear, and, for want of an accurate observation of their symptoms, leave no trace behind them. The 'bed,' 'seat,' etc. (Lev. xv, 5, 6, etc.), are not to be supposed to have been regarded by that law as contagious, but the defilement extended to them merely to give greater prominence to the ceremonial strictness with which the case was ruled. In the woman's 'issue,' (v. 19), the ordinary menstruation seems alone intended, supposed to be prolonged (v. 25) to a morbid extent. The scriptural handling of the subject not dealing, as in the case of leprosy, in symptoms, it seems gratuitous to detail them here: those who desire such knowledge will find them in any compendium of therapeutics. See Josephus, *War*, v, 5, 6; vi, 9, 3; Mishna, *Chelim*. i, 3, 8; Maimon. *ad Zabim*, ii, 2: whence we learn that persons thus affected might not ascend the Temple mount, nor share in any religious celebration, nor even enter Jerusalem. See also Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, iv, 282" (Smith). See UNCLEANNESS.

Issus, or, rather, Isus (Ἴσος), mentioned by Josephus (*Ant*. x, 8, 6) as high-priest between Joram and Axioramus; apparently corresponding to the Jehoshaphat of the *Seder Olam*. See HIGH-PRIEST.

Istalcu'rus. "In 1 Esdr. viii, 40, the 'son of Istalcurus' (ὁ τοῦ Ἰσταλκούρου) is substituted for 'and ZABBUD' of the corresponding list in Ezra (viii, 14). The *Keri* has *Zikkur* instead of Zabbud, and of this there is perhaps some trace in Istalcurus."

Is'uah (1 Chron. vii, 30). See ISHUAH.

Is'ui (Gen. xlvi, 17). See ISHUI, 1.

Ităla, a name attributed to the old Latin version which was the foundation of Jerome's Vulgate. See ITALIC VERSION.

Ital'ian (Ἰταλικός) occurs but once in Scripture, in the mention of the "Italian band," i. e. Roman cohort, to which Cornelius belonged (Acts x, 1). "This seems to have been a cohort of Italians separate from the legionary soldiers, and not a cohort of the '*Legio Italica*,' of which we read at a later period (Tacitus, *Hist*. i, 59, 64; ii, 100; iii, 14) as being raised by Nero (Dio Cass. lv, 24; Sueton. *Nero*, 19). (See Biscoe, *On the Acts*, p. 300 sq.) Wieseler (*Chronol*. p. 145) thinks they were Italian volunteers; and there is an inscription in Gruter in which the following words occur: 'Cohors militum Italicorum voluntaria, quæ est in Syria' (see Ackerman, *Numismatic Illustrations*, p. 34)" (Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, i, 113). There is a monograph on the subject: Schwarz, *De cohorte Italica et Augusta* (Altdorf, 1720). See COHORT.

Italian School OF PHILOSOPHY. By the Italian school is properly understood the blending of the Pythagorean and Eleatic systems of philosophy into one. It is sometimes, however, used of the Pythagorean system merely. The reason for designating it as the Italian school is because Pythagoras is said to have taught in Italy. See PYTHAGORAS.

Italian Versions OF THE SCRIPTURES. The earliest translation of the Bible into the modern Italian is said to have been made by Giacomo da Viraggio (Jacobus de Voragine), archbishop of Genoa, in the beginning of the 13th century. This rests exclusively on the authority of Sixtus Senensis (*Biblioth. Sanct*. lib. iv), and there is weighty reason for doubting the statement. That at an early period, however, versions of parts, if not of the whole of Scripture into Italian were made, is evinced by the fact that there exist in various libraries MSS. containing them. In the Royal Library at Paris is an Italian Bible in two vols. folio, as well as several codices containing parts of the Bible in that language; in the library at Upsala is a Codex containing a history compiled from the first seven books of the O. T. in Italian; in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, is an Italian translation of the N.T., with portions of the Old, and in other libraries like relics are preserved (see Le Long, *Bib. Sac*. cap. vi, § 1).

The earliest printed Italian Bible is that of Nicolo di Malermi (or Malherbi), a Venetian Benedictine monk of the order of Camaldoli: it appeared under the title of *Biblia Volgare Historiota*, etc. (Ven. 1471.) The translation is from the Vulgate, and is pronouneed by R. Simon to be executed in a harsh style and carelessly (*Hist. Crit. du N. T.* p. 487). It was, however, repeatedly reprinted; the best editions are that superintended by Marini (Ven. 1477, 2 vols. fol.), and that issued at Venice in 1567 (1 vol. fol.). In 1530 Antonio Bruccioli issued his translation of the N. T., and in 1532 the first edition of his translation of the entire Bible, containing a revised and corrected translation of the N. T., under the title of *La Biblia che contiene Sacri libri del vecchio Testamento tradotto nuovamente de la Hebraica verita in lingua Toscana, con divini libri del N. T. tradotti da Greco in lingua Tosc. con privilegio de lo inclito Senato Veneto e letera a Francesco I, Rege Christianissimo* (fol. Venice, ap. Luc. Ant. Juntæ). This translation is said by Simon to follow in the O. T. the Latin version of Pagnini rather than to be made from the original Hebrew, and to partake of the rudeness and barbarism of Pagnini's style. It was put in the index of the prohibited books among works of the first class. Many editions of it, however, appeared, of which the most important is that of Zanetti (Ven. 1540, 3 vols. fol). Bruccioli's version of the O.T. in a corrected form was printed at Geneva in 1562, along with a new version of the N. T. by Gallars and Beza; to this notes are added, and especially an exposition of the Apocalypse. The translation of Marmochini, though professedly original, is, in reality, only a revised edition of that of Bruccioli, the design of which was to bring it more fully into accordance with the Vulgate. Several translations of the Psalms (some from the Hebrew) and of other parts of Scripture appeared in Italy between the middle and end of the 16th century, and a new translation of the N. T., by a Florentine of the name of Zacharia, appeared in 8vo at Venice in 1542, and at Florence in 1566, copies of which are now extremely rare. The Jew David de Pomis issued a translation of Ecclesiastes with the original Hebrew (Ven. 1578).

In 1607 appeared at Geneva the first Protestant Italian version—that of Giovanni Diodati (*La Biblia: Cioe I Libri del Vecchio e del Nuovo Testamento* [sm. folio]). To this are appended brief marginal notes. This version was made directly from the original texts, and stands in high esteem for fidelity. It has been repeatedly reprinted. Being in the plain Lucchese dialect, it is especially adapted for circulation among the common people. It is that now adopted by the Bible Societies.

A version affecting greater elegance, but by no means so faithful, is that of Antonio Martini, archbishop of

Florence. The N. T. appeared at Turin in 1769, and the O. T. in 1779, both accompanied with the text of the Vulgate, and with copious notes, chiefly from the fathers. This work received the approbation of pope Pius VI. It is made avowedly from the Vulgate, and is in the pure Tuscan dialect. Repeated editions have appeared; one, printed at Livorno (Leghorn), and those issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society (Lond. 1813, 1821), want the notes, and have consequently been placed in the index of prohibited books. To read and circulate this book, though bearing the papal sanction, was, till lately, a grave offense, as the well-known case of the Madiai in Florence proves. See VERSIONS.

Italic Version (*Vetus Itala*), the usual name of the old Latin version of the Scriptures, used prior to the days of Augustine and Jerome, and probably made in Northern Africa in the 2d century. The Italic, however, is properly a revision of this old Latin version, which was in use in Northern Italy, or around Milan. Fragments of it have been preserved by Blanchini and Sabatier (Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.). Portions containing the books of Leviticus and Numbers have been published by Lord Ashburnham (London, 1870) from an ancient Codex in his library. See LATIN VERSIONS.

It'aly (Ἰταλία, of uncertain etymology), the name of the country of which Rome was the capital (Acts xviii, 2; xxvii, 1, 6; Heb. xiii, 24). This, like most geographical names, was differently applied at different periods. In the earliest times the name "*Italy*" included only the little peninsula of *Calabria* (Strabo, v, 1). The country now called Italy was then inhabited by a number of nations distinct in origin, language, and government, such as the Gauls, Ligurians, and Veneti on the north, and the Pelasgi, Sabines, Etrurians, etc., on the south. But, as the power of Rome advanced, these nations were successively annexed to the great state, and the name "*Italy*" extended also, till it came to be applied to the whole country south of the Alps, and Polybius seems to use it in this sense (i, 6; ii, 14). For the progress of the history of the world, see Smith's *Dictionary of Classical Geography*, s. v. From the time of the close of the republic it was employed as we employ it now, i. e. in its true geographical sense, as denoting the whole natural peninsula between the Alps and the Straits of Messina. In the New Testament it occurs three, or, indeed, more correctly speaking, four times. In Acts x, 1, the Italian cohort at Cæsarea (ἡ σπεῖρα ἡ καλουμένη Ἰταλική, A.V. "Italian band"), consisting, as it doubtless did, of men recruited in Italy, illustrates the military relations of the imperial peninsula with the provinces. See ARMY. In Acts xviii, 2, where we are told of the expulsion of Aquila and Priscilla with their compatriots "from Italy," we are reminded of the large Jewish population which many authorities show that it contained. Acts xxvii, 1, where the beginning of St. Paul's voyage "to Italy" is mentioned, and the whole subsequent narrative, illustrate the trade which subsisted between the peninsula and other parts of the Mediterranean. Lastly, the words in Heb. xiii, 24, "They of Italy (οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας) salute you," whatever they may prove for or against this being the region in which the letter was written (and the matter has been strongly argued both ways), are interesting as a specimen of the progress of Christianity in the West. A concise account of the divisions and history of ancient Italy may be found in Anthon's *Class. Dict.* s. v. Italia. See ROME.

Italy, MODERN, a kingdom in Southern Europe, with an area of 112,852 square miles, and a population in 1870 of 26,500,000 inhabitants. The name originally belonged to the southern point of the Apennine peninsula alone; at the time of Thucydides it embraced the whole southern coast from the river Laus, on the Tyrrhenian Sea, to Metapontium, on the Sicilian Straits; after the conquest of Tarentum by the Romans it was extended to all the country from the Sicilian Straits to the Arno or Rubicon; finally, at the time of Augustus, it came to be used of the whole of the peninsula. In a still wider sense it was, under Constantine, the name of one of the four chief divisions of the Roman Empire, being subdivided into three (according to others into four or two) dioceses—Illyria, Africa, and Italy Proper. But this wider significance died out with the dissolution of the Roman Empire, and the name has since been confined to the Apennine peninsula. It denoted a country, the people of which gradually coalesced into one nation, united by the same language, literature, and habits, but which never, for any length of time, constituted one political commonwealth. Not until 1859 did the national aspirations for unity succeed in erecting by far the larger portion of the peninsula into the kingdom of Italy; in 1866 Venetia was added, and in 1870 the incorporation of Rome completed the structure of national unity.

I. *Church History.*—(1.) The planting of Christianity in Italy can be traced to the first years of the Christian æra. The apostle Peter, according to old accounts, visited Rome as early as A.D. 42, but no satisfactory evidence can be adduced for the assertion of Roman theologians that Peter was at any time bishop of the Church of Rome, and still less that he held this office for twenty-five years. In 53 the Christians, together with the Jews, were expelled from Rome by order of the emperor Claudius. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (about 55) indicates that the Church in Rome was at that time fully organized. Under Nero, Peter and Paul were probably put to death, together with numerous other professors of Christianity. Among those who were put to death under Domitian (81-96) was Flavius Clemens, a man of consular dignity, and belonging to the imperial family. Many other churches in Italy, besides that of Rome, trace their foundation to assistants of the apostles; thus Barnabas is said to have established the Church of Milan, Mark the Church of Aquileja, Apollinaris the Church at Ravenna. The churches of Lucca, Fiesole, Bologna, Bari, Benevento, Capua, Naples, Palermo, Syracuse, Pavia, Urbino, Mantua, Verona, Pisa, Florence, and Sienna also claim to be of apostolic origin. That many of the churches were really organized during the first century is not doubted, but hardly any of them has a documentary history which ascends beyond the beginning of the 2d century. Even the history of the Church of Rome is so involved in obscurity that it is not known in which order the first four bishops succeeded each other. From the beginning of the 2d century bishoprics rapidly increased, and down to the year 311 there are enumerated many seats of bishops in all the provinces. The first epistle of the Roman bishop Soter (A.D. 175 sq.) was written to the bishops of Campania, and his second to the bishops of Italy. The Roman bishop Zephyrinus (203-221) addressed his first epistle to *all* the bishops of Sicily, and Eusebius his third to the bishops of Tuscia and Campania. A "Provincial Synod of Rome," consisting of twelve bishops, was presided over by Telesphorus (142-154); it was followed by a synod under Anicetus (167-175); another in 197, and many more in the 3d century. At the beginning of the 4th century Christianity was so firmly established throughout Italy that the pagans could make no notable resistance when Christianity under Constantine the Great became the religion of the state. The apostasy of Julian retarded but little the victory of Christianity, which became complete when, towards the close of the 4th century, Theodosius exterminated paganism by fire and sword. As the bishop of Rome was from the earliest period of the Church one of the three great bishops of the Christian Church (Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch), the churches of Italy became subordinate to his superintendence and jurisdiction; only the Church provinces of the metropolitans of Milan and Aquileia remained independent of the jurisdiction of Rome for many more centuries. The more the power of the bishops of Rome rose, the more the Church his-

Map of Ancient Italy.

tory of Italy is absorbed by the history of the papacy and the Roman Church. In no other country of Europe was the unity of faith better preserved and less interrupted than in Italy. The rule of the Arian Goths (493-563) lasted too short a time to establish Arianism on a firm foundation, and all the following changes in the secular government of the country recognised the predominant Church. The unity of the Italian Church during the Middle Ages was but little disturbed by heretical sects; the Catharists and Pasagii never became powerful, and soon disappeared; only the Waldenses, in the remote valleys of Piedmont, survived all persecution. See PAPACY.

(2.) *History of the Reformation.*—Italy, like other countries, had its forerunners of the Reformation, the most prominent of whom was the Dominican monk Savonarola (q. v.), who fearlessly advocated a radical reform of the Church. The revival of the classical studies on the one hand, and the corruption which prevailed at the papal court on the other, disposed at the beginning of the 16th century many minds towards abandoning the doctrines of Rome. In general, however, the tendency towards freethinking was stronger among the malcontents than the wish for a religious reform. One of the most important efforts in the latter direction was made in the time of Leo X by some twenty earnest men, who formed a society for the purpose of rekindling in the Church a spirit of piety in opposition to the prevailing corruption. Among them were Cajetan, subsequently founder of the order of the Theatines; Caraffa, subsequently pope Paul IV; and Contarini, subsequently cardinal. All of them desired to effect a reformation within the Church, though some of them strongly inclined towards the reformatory doctrine of justification by faith alone. To this class of reformers belonged also Bruccioli, who published an Italian translation of the Bible (1530-1532), which passed through several editions. Among the sympathizers with this movement were also Foscarari, bishop of Modena; San Felice, bishop of Cava; cardinal Morone, Grimani, patriarch of Aquileia, and Folengo, a pious Benedictine of Monte Casino. In consequence of the frequent intercourse of Upper Italy with Germany and Switzerland, the writings of Luther and other reformers began to circulate in Italy from the beginning of the Reformation. To evade the Inquisition, they were generally published either anonymously, or under the name of other authors.

Venice appears to have been the first city of Italy in which the Reformation took root. This was chiefly due to its constant intercourse with Germany, and to the independent position maintained by that republic towards the see of Rome. As early as 1520 Luther received news from Venice that a great need was felt there of evangelical preachers and books, and in 1528 he was informed that the cause was making good progress. The fact that Venice was a refuge for all who in other parts of Italy were persecuted for their faith was likewise favorable to the progress of Protestantism. The proceedings of the Diet of Augsburg (1530) excited the attention of the friends of the Reformation at Venice to a high degree, and Lucio Paolo wrote a pressing letter in their name to Melancthon, imploring him to resist to the last. Even priests were found in the evangelical party, as Valdo Lupetino, provincial of the Franciscans, who advised his relative, M. Flacius, of Illyria, afterwards one of the champions of Protestantism, to go to Germany, where he would learn a better theology than he would find in a convent (1537). Through such men, who were in personal communication with the reformers, Venice remained regularly connected with Wittenberg. In 1539 Melancthon addressed an epistle to Venice which affords most valuable information concerning the position of the evangelical party in that city at that time. The evangelical party increased not only in the city of Venice, but in the whole territory of the republic, particularly at Vicenza and Treviso, and it does not appear that the government ever interfered with its peaceful development. It is only after 1542 that, at the instigation of Rome, the Protestants of the Venetian republic began to experience serious difficulties. Although very numerous, they had not till then organized themselves into a society. They were obliged to observe the greatest caution and secrecy. They were without a leader, and, besides, there were differences of opinion dividing them. Balthasar Altieri, a native of Aquila, and secretary of the English ambassador, succeeded in uniting them. He also wrote to Luther, asking him to obtain for the Protestants, through the intercession of German Protestant princes, permission from the senate to act according to the dictates of their conscience, at least until the council should decide on the points of difference. He also invoked the mediation of Luther to allay the manifold divisions which weakened the Protestants of Venetia. As Italy had intercourse with Switzerland as well as with Germany, both the Reformed and the Lutheran reformations had found their adherents; and, in particular, disputes arose about the doctrine of the Eucharist. Bucer had in vain endeavored to heal these difficulties, and it was now expected that Luther would be more successful. The answer of Luther expressed, however, distrust towards the Swiss and their doctrines, and warned the people against the works of Bucer. Melancthon was deeply grieved at the tone of Luther's answer, as he knew the Italians to be only too prone to indulge in discussions and arguments on disputed points of doctrine. Probably about this time secret societies began to be formed for the discussion of theological doctrines, principally concerning the Trinity; and those anti-Trinitarian schemes which, in the following century, separated Italian Protestantism from that of other countries, originated in them. About 1542 the principles of Protestantism were introduced into Istria by Paolo Vergerio, bishop of Capo d' Istria, and for a while made rapid progress, which, however, was soon interrupted. After opposing Protestantism for a long while, particularly in Germany, where he was for a while papal legate, and took part as such in the Conference of Worms, Vergerio was, by the reading of Luther's works, which he had procured for the purpose of refuting them, brought to embrace their views. His first convert was his brother, the bishop of Pola. Both now labored zealously, and with great success, to evangelize their dioceses, until in 1545 the Inquisition finally interfered, and Vergerio was obliged to flee.

Next to Venice, Ferrara became one of the central points of Protestantism. It was introduced there by Renata, wife of Hercules II, duke of Ferrara, and the daughter of Louis XII, king of France. She had become acquainted with the doctrines of the Reformation through Margaret of Navarre, and when she came to Ferrara in 1527, she soon found herself surrounded by persons holding the same views. Some were scholars who held offices in the university or at court, while others were refugees who, persecuted in their own country for their Protestant opinions, found there a safe refuge. Calvin himself spent a few months there in 1536, and ever after remained in active correspondence with the duchess; also Hubert Languet, who distinguished himself in the history of the French Reformation. Among the Italians were Flaminio and Calcagnini, a friend of Contarini and Poole; Peter Martyr Vermigli, Aonio Paleario, and Celio Secundo Curione, who won over Peregrino Morata, the tutor of the duke's brother, to Protestantism. The learned daughter of Morata, Olympia, whose letters express a truly evangelical spirit, was one of the ornaments of the court, and the companion of the young daughter of Renata.

From Ferrara probably the movement spread over to Modena, which belonged also to the duke of Ferrara. Already in 1530 a papal rescript commanded the Inquisition to use every exertion to suppress the heretical tendency among the monks of the diocese of Ferrara. Yet the movement did not really break out until 1540, when the learned Sicilian Paolo Ricci came to Modena

and established a congregation there. Ladies of high rank protected the new doctrine, especially a certain countess Rangone. As a sign of the spirit of opposition against Rome, we may mention the satires which were published, as, for instance, a letter purporting to come from Jesus Christ, and worded in the manner of the papal mandaments, announcing that our Lord contemplated resuming the absolute and immediate government of the Church himself. Cardinal Morone, bishop of Modena, although evangelically inclined himself, complained much in his letters (1540–1544), written during his stay in Germany as papal legate, of the progress of Protestantism in his diocese, and said he was told that Modena had become Lutheran. But with the news of the progress of the Reformation came also the information that the differences concerning the Eucharist had arisen, and Bucer wrote to the Protestants of Modena and Bologna to heal the breach (1541). At Bologna, the Germans who came there to attend the university gained many supporters to evangelical views; the most important among them was Giovanni Mollio, a Minorite, who labored long as a preacher and professor. The presence of the Saxon ambassador, John of Planitz, who came to Bologna with Charles V, gave the Protestants an opportunity to present a request in which they asked for the convocation of a synod, and expressed their veneration for the German princes who had protected Protestantism in their states. They hoped by the council to get freed from the yoke of Rome, and to obtain religious liberty; in the mean time they wished only permission to use their Bibles without being on that account considered as heretics. The movement was propagated also through other parts of the Papal States, at Faenza and Imola; and in Rome itself there were many who privately approved the doctrines of Luther. In Naples, the principles of the Reformation were imported by the German soldiers in 1527, and they appear to have taken root, for an imperial edict was issued in 1536 to counteract the Protestant tendencies by threatening the severest punishments against the so-called heretics. Yet in the same year the emperor himself sent to Naples the man who was destined to play the most important part in the evangelization of Italy. Juan Valdez came to Naples as secretary of the viceroy. Position, education, intelligence, and character combined to make him influential. A small but eminent circle silently formed around him for reciprocal edification and the promotion of an inner, living Christianity. Among them were count Galeazzo Caraccioli, nephew of pope Paul IV; the martyr Pietro Carnesecchi, Roman protonotary; Giulia Gonzaga, duchess of Trajetto; Vittoria Colonna, the widow of Pescara; and the noble confessor Isabella Maurica. Valdez only continued his evangelizing labors for four years: he died in 1540. But his work was continued by two of his followers, Pietro Martyr Vermigli and Bernardino Occhino. The former, having been sent as prior to an Augustinian convent at Naples, read some of Bucer's and Zwingle's works, and, having become converted to their doctrines, he began working in the same direction as Valdez. He delivered lectures on the epistles of St. Paul, which were attended not only by his own monks, but also by the most distinguished members of the clergy and the laity. In the mean time the Capuchin Occhino, confessor of Paul III, general of his order, and one of the most eminent men of the Church at the time, was invited to preach the Lent sermons at Naples, first in 1536, and again in 1539. An attentive reading of the Bible had already caused him to regard faith as the only means of salvation; his intercourse with Valdez strengthened him still more in his views; he began preaching justification by faith, and gained many adherents by his fiery eloquence. Although none of these men thought as yet to separate from the Church of Rome, they were soon looked upon with suspicion. The Theatine Cajetan, friend of the zealot Caraffa, was the first to call attention to them. Vermigli was summoned to appear, and to justify himself, but was saved from any annoyance this time by the interference of several cardinals. Soon after, having been at Naples for about three years, he demanded his recall; and having been appointed prior at Lucca, he began to labor for the evangelization of this new field. New persecutions finally decided him to separate openly from the Church of Rome, and to flee the country for safety. Three of his most intimate disciples accompanied him: Paolo Lacisio, afterwards professor at Strasburg, Theodosio Trebellio, and Giulio Terenziano. Eighteen others followed him soon after; among them Celso Martinengho, who died as pastor of the Italian congregation at Geneva; Em. Tremellio, who, after various vicissitudes, became professor of Hebrew at the Academy of Sedan, and H. Zanchi, who occupied a distinguished place among the most eminent theologians of Germany. At Florence Vermigli met with Occhino, who, stimulated by his example, also sacrificed his position, and left Italy. Another champion of the Reformation, the learned Celio Secundo Curione, replaced for a while Martyr in the congregation at Lucca, and afterwards labored at various places, until he also was obliged to seek safety in flight, and went to Switzerland.

Thus the movement had become general throughout Italy. Many admitted that no reforms were to be expected from the Church or its hierarchy, and separated from it, some silently, others openly; the latter inclined more and more to a union with the Protestants of Germany and Switzerland. Still a large number retained the hope that the Church itself would make the necessary reforms, either by the long-wished-for council, or by other concessions. The evangelical tendencies finally acquired such influence, even among the clergy, that pope Paul III thought it best to make apparently some concessions; he appointed Contarini, Sadolet, Poole, and Fregoso (but at the same time also Caraffa), members of the college of cardinals. As a preliminary step towards the convocation of a council, he formed them, together with some other prelates, into a congregation, with the mission of drawing up a project of the reforms most needed. Soon, however, the uncompromising opponents of all reformatory measures gained the ascendency with the pope, and it was resolved to put down the reformatory movement at any price. A superior tribunal of the Inquisition was established at Rome, with full power of life and death in all cases concerning religion, and acting with the same severity against all, without distinction of rank or person. The bull establishing the new Congregation of the Holy Office was issued July 21, 1542. It was composed of six cardinals, with Caraffa at their head. They were authorized to appoint envoys, with full power to act for them in the different provinces. The pope alone had the power of pardoning those they had condemned. The new institution was soon adopted in Tuscany, Milan, and Naples; all the Italian states gave it the necessary support. Venice itself was unable to resist its introduction, though here lay judges were joined to the inquisitors. Books were also subjected to the judgment of the Inquisition; after 1543 no book was permitted to be published without its sanction, and soon there appeared lists of forbidden books. Next to the Inquisition, the Council of Trent proved a heavy blow to Italian Protestantism. Many who were wavering or lacked courage were induced to return to the old fold; many others left their native land for safety, and a great number became martyrs to their faith in dungeons or at the stake. Rome gave the signal of most of the persecutions which the Protestants suffered in Italy. Caraffa had spies everywhere. Among the first who were obliged to seek safety in flight were Occhino and Vermigli. The congregation which had been established by them and Valdez at Naples was subjected to severe attacks as soon as the latter was dead; many of its members gave way under the persecution, and the others were obliged to use the utmost secrecy. Giovanni Mollio, of Montalcino, a Franciscan, still officiated among them for some time, but he

also was obliged to leave Naples in 1543. An Augustinian from Sicily, Lorenzo Romano, subsequently shared the same fate, and finally became reconciled with Rome.

The congregation founded at Lucca by Peter Vermigli met with the same fate. Rome compelled the senate in 1545 to issue severe edicts against the Protestants, who here also submitted to outward conformity, and by so doing lost the spirit which had animated them, so that when the Inquisition was really established among them the greater number became reconciled to the Church. Many, however, resisted to the last, and a number of prominent citizens left for Geneva, Berne, Lyon, and other places. See INQUISITION.

The countess of Ferrara was no longer able to protect her fellow-Protestants. A papal decree commanded that all suspicious persons should be examined; imprisonment, banishment, death, or, at best, flight, was the usual fate of the accused. Fannio, of Faenza, fell a martyr to his faith. Renata herself was much persecuted by her husband, but remained steadfast, and after her husband's death retired to France, where she showed herself a courageous protector of the Protestants. All Italy was awed into obedience by the Inquisition. The prisons at Rome were filled with prisoners brought from all parts of Italy. Mollio, having returned from Naples to Bologna, was taken, brought to Rome, and executed. The Gospel had made great progress among the Franciscans, especially in Upper Italy; a large number of them were imprisoned, others escaped, and most of them were compelled to recant. The persecution became still more violent when Caraffa himself, aged seventy-nine years, ascended the papal throne in 1555 under the name of Paul IV. To purify and restore the Church was his chief aim, and, in order to attain this, he was most zealous in the persecution of all unbelievers and heretics. He spared none—not even the leaders of the moderate reform party. The most distinguished of these (Contarini being dead), cardinal Morone, remained a prisoner until the pope's death, in the castle of St. Angelo. Bishop Foscarari, of Modena, and San Felice, of Cava, were also arrested, while cardinal Poole was summoned to come from England to justify himself. Among the chief points of accusation against Morone were that he doubted the correctness of the decisions of the Council of Trent, especially in regard to justification; that he rejected the efficiency of good works, and advised his hearers to trust only in the redeeming sacrifice of Christ. The first martyr in the reign of Paul IV was Pomponio Algieri, who had labored faithfully for the propagation of evangelical views at Padua; he died courageously at the stake. Under Pius IV, the Inquisition did not relent in its work. He was himself present at an auto-da-fé at which Ludovico Pascali, a minister of the Waldenses of Calabria, was executed. When the Dominican Ghislieri, former president of the Inquisition, and a worthy disciple of Caraffa, ascended the papal throne in 1566, under the name of Pius V, the Inquisition entered a new era of prosperity. He accomplished the final suppression of Protestantism in Italy. Prisoners were sent to Rome from all parts of Italy. The duke of Florence himself sent there, as his peace-offering, the eminent apostolical protonotary, Pietro Carnesecchi, whom his learning, piety, and position had heretofore protected, and who now became a martyr. The same fate befel Antonio del Pagliarici (Aonio Paleario), who, as professor of rhetoric at Sienna, Lucca, and Milan, had acquired universal reputation, and who is generally considered as the author of the treatise *Del Beneficio di Christo*, a truly evangelical work, which, by its clear exposition of the doctrine of justification by faith, gained many adherents to Protestantism.

The numerous Protestants of Venetia also experienced the effects of the papal persecution, although the republic resisted the Inquisition, and sought to counteract it by a number of decrees. Already, in 1542, the papal nuncio Della Casa procured the arrest of a priest, Giulio Milanese, and, soon after, that of the provincial of the Minorites, Baldo Lupetino. The former, however, succeeded in making good his escape. In 1546 pope Paul III gave a fresh impulse to the persecutions, and many fled the country, some recanted, and others were imprisoned for life. The persecution was still more violent in the neighborhood of Venice than in the city itself. The bishop of Bergamo himself, Soranzo, was obliged to go to Rome to give an account of his faith, and was imprisoned. A few only succeeded in hiding themselves in the midst of the greatest dangers. Altieri, who had so often obtained protection for the Italian Protestants from the princes forming the League of Smalcald, was at last in danger himself, and, after many escapes, died poor in the neighborhood of Brescia in 1550. After 1557, foreigners who visited Venice for study or commerce received, however, some degree of protection. This encouraged the native Protestants, who called a minister, and again formed a congregation in private. They were soon betrayed, and most of them imprisoned. The senate now for the first time consented that their offence should be punished by death. They were not burnt, however, but thrown into the sea at night. Baldo Lupetino was among these. The destruction of the little church of the Waldenses, who, since the end of the 14th century, had settled at St. Pisto and Montalto, in Calabria, is one of the saddest episodes of the sad history of Italian Protestantism. The other evangelical communities of Locarno, etc., met with the same fate.

(3.) *Church History from the Suppression of the Reformation until the present Day.*—Throughout the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries Italy remained dismembered into a number of small states, which prevented the people from becoming one consolidated nation. Its ecclesiastical history during this period is as unimportant as the political. Only once an æra of ecclesiastical reforms appeared to dawn, when Leopold, grand-duke of Tuscany, brother of emperor Joseph II, attempted, by the agency of Scipio Ricci, bishop of Pistoia and Prato, to reform the polity of the Church. At a synod of his clergy which Ricci assembled at Pistoia (1786), and which was largely attended, the principles of the Gallican Church and of the most liberal Jansenism were adopted; the prerogatives claimed by the popes, and, in particular, the claim of infallibility, were severely denounced, many superstitious ceremonies were abolished, and it was determined that public worship should be conducted in the language of the people, and that the Scriptures should be circulated among them. But these enactments were opposed by most of the bishops of Tuscany, and when Leopold ascended the imperial throne of Austria, the hierarchy obtained a complete victory. The territorial changes which the French republic and the first Napoleon introduced in Italy were not of long duration, but the revolutionary ideas which during this period had been kindled in the minds of many Italians survived. A secret society, the *Carbonari*, which at first aimed at the introduction of a universal republic, but subsequently had the establishment of a national union and the introduction of liberal reforms, and, in particular, religious toleration, for its chief object, spread with great rapidity throughout the peninsula, and became the rallying-point for all the educated Italians who wished to break the omnipotent influence of the Church upon the political and social affairs of the people. The *Carbonari* succeeded in 1821 in compelling the government of the Two Sicilies to grant a liberal constitution, but an armed intervention of the Austrians soon restored the absolute power of the king and the despotic influence of the Church. It was, however, apparent that the educated classes of Italy only yielded to brutal force, and that the desire to emancipate the people from the influence of the priests, and, in particular, from the temporal rule of the popes, became stronger every year. In 1830 a new revolution broke out in the papal provinces, and within a fortnight four fifths of the States of the Church had made themselves free from

papal rule, and constituted themselves an independent state. Again it required the armed intervention of Austria to arrest the success of the liberal and anti-papal movement throughout Italy. The accession to the throne of Sardinia of Charles Albert in 1831 gave, however, to Italy one prince who openly adhered to the programme of the national liberal party, and therefore awakened great hopes for the future. In the same year Mazzini organized the secret society Young Italy, which repeatedly attempted insurrections for the purpose of establishing an Italian republic. All these attempts were unsuccessful, but they greatly increased the breach between the Italian people and the Church of Rome. The liberal priest V. Gioberti, in his work on the moral and political primacy of the Italians (1843), endeavored to prove that a reconciliation between the national liberal party and a reformed papacy was possible, and that the best way for securing a political regeneration of Italy was the establishment of a confederation of the several states, with a liberal pope at its head. When, in 1846, Gregory XVI died, and the new pope, Pius IX, seemed to adopt some of the views of Gioberti, the belief in the practicability of the scheme found many adherents among the liberal party, but the large body of the ultramontane party looked upon them with distrust, and even regarded many steps taken by the new pope as a mistaken policy.

The revolutionary movements of 1848 at first appeared to have a great influence upon the religious affairs of the country. In Rome a Constituent Assembly was called, which on Feb. 5, 1849, abolished the temporal power of the pope, and proclaimed the Roman republic. The greatest enemies of the papacy in Italy, Mazzini and Garibaldi, were at the head of the republic, which, however, only a few months later (June 4), was struck down by the French troops, which Louis Napoleon, the president of the French republic, had sent there for the restoration of the temporal power. But, although the revolutionary movements, which, if successful, would have abolished throughout Italy the prerogatives of the Church of Rome, were unsuccessful, one of the state governments, Sardinia, remained favorable to the cause of national union and of a liberal legislation in the province of Church affairs. The Legislature, in 1850, adopted liberal laws, introduced by the minister Siccardi (hence called the Siccardian laws), which provided, 1, that all civil suits must be decided in civil courts and according to the common law; 2, that all priests in criminal cases be subject to the jurisdiction of the state; 3, that criminals may be arrested in churches and other sacred places. When archbishop Franzoni, of Turin, resisted the new law of the state, he was promptly arrested; and when he refused the sacraments of the Church to the dying minister Santa Rosa, he was deposed from his office (Sept. 26, 1850) and exiled. The archbishop of Cagliari shared his fate. In the threatening allocutions of the pope (the first dated Nov. 1, 1850), the government replied by sequestrating the revenues of the archbishop. In consequence of the violent opposition made to the government by the monks, the ministry of Cavour (1852-1858), the greatest Italian statesman of modern times, issued the stringent laws of March 2, 1855, by which the convents of all monks who did not devote themselves to preaching, to instruction, or to the nursing of the sick were suppressed (331 out of 605). The papal anathema against the authors of these laws remained without the least effect. On the contrary, when the king of Sardinia, in consequence of the war against Austria and the successful revolutions in central and southern Italy, united all the provinces of Italy, with the only exception of a part of the papal territory and of Venetia, into the kingdom of Italy, the liberal Sardinian laws were not only retained, but made more stringent. Nobody seemed to care about the Church laws against those who spoliated the patrimony of St. Peter (the States of the Church), and on Jan. 1, 1866, the obligatory civil marriage was introduced. The government and the Parliament were fully agreed in the wish to complete, as soon as possible, the unity of Italy, by the annexation of Venetia and the remainder of the papal territory, inclusive of the city of Rome. In accordance with the plan of Cavour, the Parliament, as early as 1861, almost unanimously declared in favor of making Rome the capital of Italy, though they expressed a willingness to give to the pope full guarantees for the free and independent exercise of his ecclesiastical functions. The movements of Garibaldi showed that the inhabitants of the papal provinces alone, aided by volunteers from other parts of Italy, would have been fully able to depose the papal government, and unite the territory with the kingdom of Italy; and it required the presence of a large French army in Rome to maintain the detested papal rule. Venetia was obtained as a result of the war of 1866, but the expedition of Garibaldi against Rome in 1867 led to a new occupation of the papal territory by a French army.

The wretched financial condition of Italy, which had become more threatening than ever by the war of 1866, and the September convention of 1864, by which the government engaged to assume a part of the papal debt, compelled the ministry in 1867 to bring in a bill for the confiscation of the property of the Church. The subject had been under deliberation since 1865, when a personal correspondence took place between the pope and the king, which induced the latter to make to the Church a few concessions. But the sale of the Church property, though for a time delayed, was urgently demanded by the Parliament and public opinion as the only escape from a general bankruptcy, and the government therefore laid a bill before the Parliament which met on March 22, 1867; but the committee elected by the Parliament rejected the project of the government as too compromising and not sufficiently radical, and in the very first article of its own draft demanded the abolition of all monastic institutions, and the confiscation of the whole property of the Church. The government yielded to the views of the committee, and, after several modifications had been agreed upon by the government and the Parliament, both chambers adopted the bill for the sale of the Church property by an immense majority (the lower chamber, on July 27, by 296 votes against 41; the senate, on Aug. 12, by 84 against 29). The actual sale began at Florence on October 26, 1867, though even before this drafts on the revenue to be realized by the sale had been issued to the amount of 400 million francs. The new excommunications pronounced against all buyers of Church property failed to have any effect; the government and the overwhelming majority of both chambers unwaveringly persisted in carrying out the new laws concerning the Church and her property.

The Œcumenical Council which was opened by the pope at Rome on Dec. 8, 1869, was unable to improve the influence and the prospects of the papacy among the Italians. The government, the Parliament, and the people at large repudiated the claims of the council more generally than was done in any other purely Catholic country. The nation became more impatient than ever for the overthrow of the temporal sovereignty of the pope, and the incorporation of his states with the kingdom; and when, in 1870, the Franco-German war caused the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome, and ultimately led to the destruction of the French Empire, the Italian government could no longer resist the popular pressure for the annexation of the papal states. In September, 1870, count Ponza di San Martino was sent to Rome, and, in the name of the Italian government, proposed to the pope to renounce the temporal rule and to dissolve his army; he was, in this case, to retain the Leonine part of Rome, a civil list, and the right of diplomatic representation. The government also offered to guarantee the free exercise, by the pope, the bishops, and the priests, of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the immunity of all cardinals and ambassadors. When the pope rejected all these offers of com-

promise, on Sept. 11, the Italian troops, in compliance with numerous petitions from the subjects of the pope, entered the States of the Church, and on Sept. 20, by the occupation of the city of Rome, put an end to the temporal power of the pope. A note from cardinal Antonelli, the secretary of state, to the foreign government, protested against the act; and the bishops and the ultramontane party in all the countries re-echoed the protest, and many princes, both Catholic and Protestant, were called upon to interfere and to restore the pope to his throne. The pope issued a new brief of excommunication, in which he said, "We declare to you, venerable brethren, and through you to the whole Church, that all those (in whatever notable dignity they may shine) who have been guilty of the invasion, usurpation, occupation of any of our provinces, or of this holy city, or of anything connected therewith, and likewise all who have commissioned, favored, aided, counselled, adhered to them, and all others who promote or carry out the things aforesaid, under any pretext whatever, and in any manner whatever, have incurred the greater excommunication (*excommunicatio major*), and the other censures and penalties which have been provided in the holy canons of the apostolical constitutions and the decrees of the œcumenical councils, in particular that of Trent." None of all these measures produced the least effect. When the first Parliament of all Italy met, the king declared, "We entered Rome in virtue of the national right, in virtue of the compact which unites all Italians to one nation. We shall remain there, keeping the promises which we have solemnly given to ourselves; freedom of the Church, entire independence of the pope in the exercise of his religious functions, and in his relations to the Catholic Church." None of the foreign governments interrupted its amicable relations with the Italian government. In July, 1871, the government transferred its seat to Rome, where, in spite of all the papal excommunications, it received the enthusiastic applause of a large majority of the Italian people, and where it was at once followed by the representatives of all the foreign governments.

Although nearly all the bishops and the overwhelming majority of the priests showed themselves as partisans of the papacy in its struggle against the government and the public opinion of Italy, the idea of reforming the Church by rejecting all or much of the corruptions which had crept into it during the Middle Ages and in modern times, and by reconciling it with the civilization of the 19th century, found more adherents among the priests of Italy than among those of any other country. In a political point of view, the reformers desired the Church, in particular, to abandon the temporal rule of the pope, to recognise the national unity of Italy, and to aid in carrying through a separation between Church and State. In the province of religion they all wished to restrict the power of the popes, to enlarge that of the bishops, and one portion went so far as to enter into amicable relations with the High-Church party of the Church of England. They had an organ, the *Examinatore* of Florence; and as even one of the six hundred bishops (cardinal D'Andrea), and the Jesuit Passaglia, who had long been regarded by the ultramontane party as one of their ablest theologians, and other men of high prominence, declared their concurrence with a part or the whole of the reformatory projects, there seemed to be good reason for hoping lasting results from the movement. More recently, the reformatory movement in Germany, headed by Dr. Döllinger, has found the warmest sympathy among the Italian reformers.

After the suppression of the Reformation in the 16th century, cruel laws made it for more than two hundred years impossible for any Italian to declare himself a Protestant; only the Waldenses (q. v.), in their remote valleys, maintained with difficulty, and amidst great persecutions, their organization. At the close of the 18th century the victorious French republic recognised the human rights of the Waldenses, and proclaimed religious toleration; but the restored monarchies revived some of the most intolerant laws, and even the Waldenses were placed in so unbearable a position that it required the intervention of England and Prussia to secure for them the merest toleration. At length the liberal constitution of 1848 gave them full political rights in Sardinia; they were allowed to step forward out of their seclusion in the valley, and, with the most hearty sympathy of all friends of religious toleration, opened a chapel in the capital of the kingdom, Turin. In the remainder of Italy the persecution of the Protestants continued. The government of Tuscany, though by no means the most tyrannical of the Italian governments, startled the whole civilized world by its cruel measures against the Madiai couple, against count Guicciardini and Dominico Cecchetti, and only the most energetic remonstrances of the foreign powers prevailed upon the grand-duke to change the penalty of imprisonment into exile. Finally, in 1859, the establishment of the kingdom of Italy gave to the Waldenses the liberty of extending their evangelistic labors to all parts of the peninsula. They soon occupied a number of important places, transferred their theological seminary to Florence, and had an able representative in the Italian Parliament (the Turin banker Malan). Many Italians, however, who were eager to embrace Protestant views, did not share all the views of the Waldenses, especially those on the ministry and the Church, and, after the model of the Plymouth Brethren in England, organized free Christian organizations. Of their leaders, professor Mazarella and count Guicciardini are the best known. Moreover, a number of missionaries were sent out by the Protestant churches of the United States, Great Britain, and other countries, who laid the foundation of several other Church organizations. Nearly every town of importance has thus received the nucleus of a Protestant population. In some places the fanaticism of the priests caused riots against Protestants, none of which was so bloody as that in Barletta in 1866; but the government of Italy, and the immense majority of the Italian Parliaments, have secured the complete triumph of the cause of religious toleration.

II. *Statistics.*—Nearly the whole population of Italy is nominally connected with the Roman Catholic Church. The total population of the kingdom was estimated in 1881 at 28,459,457; of whom 96,000 were Protestants, 36,000 Jews, and 100,000 members of the Greek Church. Practically a large portion of the population is no longer in communion with the Church of Rome, as can easily be proved by the fact that the government and Parliament have been for years in open conflict with Rome, and utterly disregard and set aside the laws of the Church; that the claims of the pope have only a few advocates in the Parliament, and that, in particular, the radical party, with men like Mazzini and Garibaldi at their head, have openly and formally renounced the religious communion with Rome.

According to the Papal Almanac (*Annuario Pontifico*) for 1889, the country had, exclusive of Rome and of the six suburban sees (the sees of the cardinal bishops), Ostia, Porto, Palestrina, Frascati, Albano, and Sabina, 268 dioceses, which were distributed among the former Italian states as follows:

	Archbishoprics.	Bishoprics.		Archbishoprics.	Bishoprics.
Naples	25	89	Venetia	2	9
States of the Church	7	57	Lombardy	1	7
Sardinia	6	32	Modena	1	4
Tuscany	4	19	Parma	..	3
			Total	47	221

Of these dioceses, 11 archbishoprics and 63 bishoprics are immediately subject to the pope, and without connection with an ecclesiastical province, while 37 archbishops are heads of ecclesiastical provinces, containing, besides them, 155 suffragan bishops. The dioceses of

Italy, in point of territorial extent, are smaller than in any other country; and while the (nominally) Catholic population is no more than one eighth of the Roman Catholic population of the world, it has more than one fourth of all the dioceses. Thus the Italian bishops have an undue preponderance at every council; and as they generally hold the most ultramontane views, they have considerably contributed to the success of ultra papal theories within the Catholic Church. The government of Italy has expressed a wish to reduce the number of dioceses, and a considerable number has therefore been kept vacant since the establishment of the kingdom.

The secular clergy in 1866 had about 115,000 members, or about 1 to every 245 inhabitants, showing a relatively larger number of priests than in any other country of the world. Besides the secular clergy, Italy had in 1860 more than 60,000 monks in 2050 establishments, and about 30,000 nuns in 302 establishments. The most numerous among the monastic orders are the Franciscan monks, with 1227 houses; the Dominicans, with 140; the Augustinians, with 138; the Carmelites, with 125; the Jesuits, with 57; the Brothers of Charity, with 49; the Redemptorists, with 31; the Franciscan nuns, with 89; the Sisters of Charity, with 50. The convents were formerly very rich, but a large portion of their property was confiscated during the French invasion at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. More recently the government of Italy has suppressed a large portion of all the convents, and confiscated their property. In 1866, the total number of convents suppressed amounted to over 2000, with 38,000 inmates; of these, 1252, with 20,228 inmates, belonged to the mendicant orders, and 1162, with 18,168 inmates, were of other orders.

Popular instruction, which until recently was chiefly in the hands of monks and nuns, is, according to official accounts, in a very low condition. In 1862, of the entire male population, only 2,620,269 were able to read; of the female, only 1,258,186; 17,000,000 persons were unable to read and write. Of every 1000 persons, there were, unable to read—in Lombardy, 599; in Piedmont, 603; in Tuscany, 773; in Modena, 799; in the Romagna, 802; in Parma, 818; in the Marca, 851; in Umbria, 858; in Naples, 880; in Sicily, 902; in Sardinia, 911. Since the establishment of the kingdom of Italy public instruction has made great progress. From 1860 to 1863 the number of male teachers increased from 12,475 to 17,604; that of female teachers from 6631 to 13,817. The number of educational institutions amounted in 1881 to 42,510, which were attended by 1,928,706 children. In the same year Italy had 104 gymnasia, with 8268 pupils; 79 lycea, with 3773 pupils; and 135 seminaries, with 10,659 pupils. There were 21 universities, 16 of which were state and 5 free. Six have been declared by the government to be first-class universities: Turin, Pavia, Bologna, Florence, Naples, and Palermo. The number of students had in 1881 decreased to 11,728, from 15,668 in 1862.

The Church of the Waldenses is the only fully organized Protestant Church in Italy. It consists of 16 communities, with a membership of 22,000. Its governing body is called the Table. The Theological School in Florence had in 1869 3 professors (Revel, Geymonat, and De Sanctis) and 14 students, 4 of whom were formerly Catholic priests. According to the report made to the Waldensian Synod in 1866, evangelistic work was carried on by this Church at 23 principal stations, which were thus distributed: 7 in Piedmont, 3 in Lombardy, 1 in Emilia, 3 in Liguria, 4 in Tuscany, 1 in the district of Naples, 1 in Sicily, 1 in the Isle of Elba, and 2 in France for Italians. To work these stations it employed 19 pastors, 11 evangelists, and 29 teachers—in all, 59 agents. The number of attendants upon public worship was reckoned at from 2000 to 2500; that of communicants at 1095. According to the latest official returns the Waldensian Church had in 1886–87 43 churches and 38 mission churches throughout Italy. The ordained pastors numbered 37, evangelists 6, male and female teachers 56, the total number of salaried agents being 124. The Church had 4005 members, and the day-schools were attended by 2206 scholars, the Sunday-schools by 2482. The Methodist Episcopal Church entered this field in 1872. The work is now organized into an Annual Conference with two districts, with (1889) 17 preachers, 968 members, and property valued at $105,900. There is a theological school at Florence. The Nice Foreigners' Evangelization Committee employed in 1867 15 agents, who were stationed at Barletta, Como, Milan, Fara, Florence, Piverone, Sardinia, and Sondrio. The salaries of six of the evangelists are paid by the Evangelical Continental Society of London. The total receipts of the committee, including the money received from the Evangelical Continental Society, were £1323; the expenditures £1180. The American and Foreign Christian Union supports more han 40 agents in Italy. A Theological Training School has been established by the society at Milan, where in 1866 the Rev. Mr. Clark, assisted by 4 Italian professors, instructed 19 theological students, superintended churches in 8 different places, and sustained from 10 to 20 colporteurs in North Italy. In 1870 the training school was transferred to the care of a Committee of Evangelization appointed by the Free Christian Church of Italy. This body was formally organized at Milan in June, 1870, and consists of a considerable number of evangelical churches, two thirds of which (more than 20) represent the results of the previous expenditure and labor of this society. These churches and their pastors are still sustained by the board. Another missionary of the society superintended at Sarzana evangelistic operations in some 10 different places. The Wesleyan Missionary Society had in 1867 several agents in Italy under the superintendence of the Rev. H. J. Piggott at Padua. A Ragged School, supported by the society in this city, was regularly attended by 40 lads. Florence also had prosperous schools; there were increasing congregations at Cremona, Parma, Mezzano Inferiore (15 miles from Parma), and at Naples; and efforts, with some success, had been made in other places. The missionaries and other agents were sustained at a cost of about $20,000. The Scotch Free Church had several ministers settled in various parts of Italy, who were engaged, in addition to their regular labors among their countrymen, in superintending the work of Bible distribution. In addition to these Protestant agencies, free evangelical Italian churches were to be found in several parts, as in Genoa, Florence, etc., all of them being more or less allied with the Plymouth Brethren.

School-work is carried on in connection with most of the churches and stations. In Naples there were in 1868 4 schools, with 14 teachers and 373 children, under the direction of a special committee. There were 3 Waldensian schools in Florence and 2 in Leghorn. The Waldensian schools in the valleys numbered 80, with 3750 children in regular attendance. The "Italian Evangelical Publication Society" selects and translates religious books and tracts suitable for Italy, and prints them at the lowest possible rate. It prints the *Eco della Verita* (weekly) and the *Amico di Casa* (annual). It has published 232 new works, or new editions of works, amounting to 520,000 copies, and has sold since 1862 as many as 390,000 copies. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* viii, 99; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, v, 582 sq.; Wiggers, *Kirchl. Statistik*, ii, 3 sq.; Neher, *Kirchl. Geogr. u. Statistik*, i, 4 sq.; Nippold, *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengesch.* (2d ed. Elberf. 1868); *Christian Yearbook* (London, 1867 and 1868); Ughelli, *Italia Sacra* (Rome, 1644, 6 vols.); M'Crie, *Hist. of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy* (Edinb. 1827); Erdmann, *Die Reformation u. ihre Märtzrer in Italien* (Berl. 1855); Leopold, *Ueber die Ursachen der Reformation und deren Verfall in Italien* (in *Zeitschrift für hist. Theol.* 1843); Matthes, *Kirchl. Chronik.* (A. J. S.)

Itch (חֶרֶס, *che'res*, from חָרַס, to *scratch* and to *burn*), an inflammatory irritation of the skin, threatened to the Israelites as an infliction in case of idolatry (Deut. xxviii, 27); probably some cutaneous or eruptive disorder common in Egypt, but of what peculiar character is uncertain, if, indeed, any peculiar malady is intended. See DISEASE.

Ith, JOHANN, a German theologian and philosopher of some note, was born at Berne, Switzerland, in 1747. In 1781 he was appointed to the chair of philosophy at the university of his native place, where he had also pursued his studies, but in 1796 he entered the ministry, and settled at Siselen, where he lived until 1799, when he was elected dean and president of the committee of education and religion in the canton of Berne. He died in 1813. Besides a number of philosophical, philological, pædogogical, and even homiletical works, he wrote *Versuch einer Anthropologie oder Philosophie der Menschen* (Berne, 1794-5, 2 vols.; new edit. 1803 sq.), which is a very valuable work:—*Verhältnisse d. Staats z. Religion u. Kirche* (ibid. 1798, 8vo):—*Sittenlehre der Braminen* (ibid. 1794, 8vo), really a reproduction of his translation of *Ezour-Vidam*, an old Hindu work on morals and religion. See Krug, *Philos. Wörterbuch*, ii, 558. (J. H. W.)

Ithacius. See IDACIUS.

Ith'aï (1 Chron. xi, 31). See ITTAI.

Ith'amar (Heb. *Ithamar'*, אִיתָמָר, *palm-isle*; but according to Fürst, *not high*, i. e. *little*; Sept. Ἰθάμαρ; Josephus Ἰθάμαρος, *Ant.* viii, 1, 3), the fourth and youngest son of Aaron (1 Chron. vi, 3). B.C. 1658. He was consecrated to the priesthood along with his brothers (Exod. vi, 23; Numb. iii, 2, 3); and after the death of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x, 1 sq.), as they left no children, he and Eleazar alone remained to discharge the priestly functions (Lev. x, 6, 12; Numb. iii, 4; xxvi, 60 sq.; 1 Chron. xxiv, 2). Nothing is individually recorded of him, except that the property of the tabernacle was placed under his charge (Exod. xxxviii, 21), and that he superintended all matters connected with its removal by the Levitical sections of Gershon and Merari (Numb. iv, 28). The sacred utensils and their removal were intrusted to his elder brother Eleazar, whose family was larger than that of Ithamar (1 Chron. xxiv, 4). Ithamar, with his descendants, occupied the position of common priests till the high-priesthood passed into his family in the person of Eli, under circumstances of which we are ignorant. See ELI. Abiathar, whom Solomon deposed, was the last high-priest of that line, and the pontificate then reverted to the elder line of Eleazar in the person of Zadok (1 Kings ii, 27). See HIGH-PRIEST. The traditionary tomb of Ithamar is still shown near that of his brother Eleazar in the hill of Phinehas (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 151). A priest by the name of Daniel, of his posterity, returned from Babylon (Ezra viii, 2; 1 Esdr. viii, 29).

Ith'iël (Heb. *Ithiël'*, אִיתִיאֵל, for אִתִּי אֵל, *God with me*, or, according to Fürst, the *property of God*; Sept. Αἰθιήλ, Vulg. *Etheel*; but in Prov. xxxi, 1, both translate οἱ πιστεύοντες θεῷ, *cum quo est Deus* and *Deo secum morante*), the name of two men.

1. A person mentioned along with Ucal in Prov. xxx, 1, apparently as one to whom the "words of Agur's prophecy" had been addressed. B.C. perhaps cir. 990. See AGUR. Gesenius (*Thesaur. Heb.* p. 88) thinks that Ithiel and Ucal were the children or disciples of Agur, to whom he inscribed his aphorisms; others regard both words as appellatives, and render the whole clause as follows: "Thus spake the man: *I have toiled for God*, I have toiled for God, and have ceased" (see Stuart's *Comment.* ad loc.).

2. The son of Jesaiah and father of Maaseiah, a Benjamite, one of whose posterity returned with a party from Babylon (Neh. xi, 7). B.C. long ante 536.

Ith'mah (Heb. *Yithmah'*, יִתְמָה, *orphanage*; Sept. Ἰεθεμά), a Moabite, and one of David's supplementary body-guard (1 Chron. xi, 46). B.C. 1046. See DAVID.

Ith'nan (Heb. *Yithnan'*, יִתְנָן, *bestowed*, otherwise *distance*; Sept. Ἰθνάν [but the Vat. MS. joins it to the preceding word, Ἀσοριωνάν, and the Alex. to the following, Ἰθναζιφ], Vulg. *Jethnam*), one of the cities in the south of Judah, mentioned between Hazor and Ziph (Josh. xv, 23); perhaps lying along the southern edge of the highland district. It cannot well have been the *Jedna* of the *Onomasticon* (Ἰεδνά, the modern *Idhna*), for this is in the mountains west of Hebron (see Keil's *Comment.* ad loc.). The enumeration in ver. 32 requires us to join this with the following (there being no copula between), *Ithnan-Ziph*, i. e. Zephath (q. v.). See JUDAH.

Ith'ra (Heb. *Yithra'*, יִתְרָא, *excellence*; Sept. Ἰεθέρ, Vulg. *Jetra*), an Israelite (probably an error of transcription [see Thenius, *Comment.* ad loc.]; a *Jezreelite*, according to the Sept. and Vulg.; but [more correctly] an *Ishmaelite*, according to 1 Chron. ii, 17), and father of Amasa (David's general) by Abigail, David's sister (1 Kings ii, 5); elsewhere called JETHER (2 Sam. xvii, 25). B.C. ante 1023.

Ith'ran (Heb. *Yithran'*, יִתְרָן, *excellent*), the name of one or two men.

1. (Sept. Ἰθράν, Ἰεθράν; Vulg. *Jethram*, *Jethran.*) One of the sons of Dishon, and grandson of Seir the Horite (Gen. xxxvi, 26; 1 Chron. i, 41). B.C. cir. 1964.

2. (Sept. Ἰεθέρ, Vulg. *Jethran.*) Apparently one of the sons of Zophah, the great-grandson of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 37); probably the same as JETHER in v. 58. B.C. long post 1856.

Ith'reäm (Heb. *Yithreäm'*, יִתְרְעָם, *superabundance of* the *people*; Sept. Ἰεθεραάμ, Ἰεθράμ; Josephus Γεθραάμης [*Ant.* vii, i, 4]), David's sixth son, born of Eglah in Hebron (2 Sam. iii, 5; 1 Chron. iii, 3). B.C. 1045. In the ancient Jewish traditions (Jerome, *Quæst. Heb.* in 2 Sam. iii, 5; v, 23) Eglah is said to have been Michal, and to have died in giving birth to Ithream: but this is at varianee with the Bible.

Ith'rite, or, rather, JE'THERITE (Heb. *Yithri'*, יִתְרִי, Sept. Ἰεθραῖος and Ἰεθερί, but Αἰθαλείμ in 1 Chron. ii, 53; Vulg. *Jethrites* and *Jethræus* or *Jethreus*), the posterity of some JETHER mentioned as resident in Kirjath-jearim (A.V. "the Ithrites" [1 Chron. ii, 53]); probably the descendants of Hobab, the brother-in-law of Moses (who settled in this region, Judges i, 16), and so called as being thus the posterity of JETHRO, the father-in-law of Moses. See KENITE. Two of David's famous warriors, Ira and Gareb, belonged to this clan (2 Sam. xxiii, 38; 1 Chron. xi, 40). See DAVID. Ira has been supposed to be identical with "Ira the Jairite," David's priest (2 Sam. xx, 26). According to another supposition, Jether may be only another form for ITHRA (2 Sam. xvii, 25), the brother-in-law of David, and it is possible that the "Ithrites," as a family, sprang from him. According to still another supposition, the two Ithrite heroes of David's guard may have come from JATTIR, in the mountains of Judah, one of the places which were the "haunt" of David and his men in their freebooting wanderings, and where he had "friends" (1 Sam. xxx, 27; comp. 31).

Itinerancy, a word which Methodism has adopted in its ecclesiastical terminology as expressing one of the most characteristic features of that religious denomination. Wesley's plans for the revival of Christian life throughout the United Kingdom rendered it necessary that he should travel from town to town. He did so quite systematically through his long life. Very early a few talented laymen were commissioned by him to preach in the societies which he had organized during his own absence, for he usually staid but a day or two in any one place. These lay preachers, or "help-

ers," as he called them, soon multiplied to scores, at last to hundreds; but the societies demanding their labors in the intervals of the great preacher's visits multiplied still faster. As early as his third Conference (May, 1746), he saw the necessity of extending and methodizing the labors of his "helpers" on some plan of "itinerancy." He appointed them, therefore, to definitive "circuits" this year. The word "circuit" has ever since been an important technical term in Methodism. The "Minutes," or journal of this Conference, show that the whole country was mapped into seven of these "itinerant" districts. Wales and Cornwall each constituted one; Newcastle and its neighboring towns another. That of Yorkshire comprised seven counties. London, Bristol, and Evesham were the head-quarters of others. By 1749 there were twenty of these "rounds" in England, two in Wales, two in Scotland, and seven in Ireland; and at Wesley's death there were seventy-two in England, three in Wales, seven in Scotland, and twenty-eight in Ireland. The circuits were long, comprising at least thirty "appointments" for each month, or about one a day. The preachers were changed at first from one circuit to another, usually every year, and invariably every two years; sometimes from England to Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and back again.

The "circuit system" has been retained in England down to our day; even the churches of the large cities are combined under a "circuit" pastorate. In "America," the societies in cities, and also the large societies in the country, are generally "stations," each being supplied by its own pastor. The "circuit system," however, is maintained among the feebler churches, and quite generally in the Far West, and nearly everywhere along the frontier settlements of the country.

Two other characteristic features of Wesley's system rendered the "itinerancy" not only possibly, but notably effective. The "local" ministry—consisting of gifted laymen in secular business—supplied the pulpits in the absence of the "regular" or itinerant preachers, as the latter could appear in any given place on their long circuits but once a fortnight, in most cases but once a month, and in others but once in six weeks. Thus public ministrations were kept up every Sunday. The class-meeting, comprising twelve "members," under an experienced "leader," met weekly, and thus a sort of pastoral supervision of the whole membership was maintained in the absence of the authorized pastor or itinerant. See Lay Ministry.

In these facts, so co-ordinate and co-operative, we have the chief explanation of the remarkable success of Wesley's ministerial system. Some of the circuits, in our own country especially, were five or six hundred miles in extent, including scores or hundreds of societies or "appointments," each of which was regularly visited, at intervals of four or six weeks, by the "circuit preacher," and meanwhile the "local preachers" and "class-leaders" kept each fully supplied with Sabbath, and, indeed, almost daily religious services. In nothing, perhaps, does the legislative genius of Wesley, so highly estimated by Southey, Macaulay, and Buckle, more strikingly appear than in this combination of pastoral provisions.

If its adaptation to England was eminent, it was preeminent in America, where the customary local pastorate of other denominations seemed to afford no adequate provision for the prodigiously advancing population and settlement of the country. "Methodism, with its 'lay ministry' and its 'itinerancy,' could alone afford the ministrations of religion to this overflowing population; it was to lay the moral foundations of many of the great states of the West. The older churches of the colonies could never have supplied them with 'regular' or educated pastors in any proportion to their rapid settlement. Methodism met this necessity in a manner that should command the national gratitude. It was to become at last the dominant popular faith of the country, with its standard planted in every city, town, and almost every village of the land. Moving in the van of emigration, it was to supply with the means of religion the frontiers, from the Canadas to the Gulf of Mexico, from Puget's Sound to the Gulf of California. It was to do this indispensable work by means peculiar to itself; by districting the land into circuits which, from one hundred to five hundred miles in extent, could each be statedly supplied with religious instruction by one or two travelling evangelists, who, preaching daily, could thus have charge of parishes comprising hundreds of miles and tens of thousands of souls. It was to raise up, without delay for preparatory training, and thrust out upon these circuits, thousands of such itinerants, tens of thousands of 'local' or lay preachers and 'exhorters,' as auxiliary and unpaid laborers, with many thousands of class-leaders, who could maintain pastoral supervision over the infant societies in the absence of the itinerant preachers, the latter not having time to delay in any locality for much more than the public services of the pulpit. Over all these circuits it was to maintain the watchful jurisdiction of travelling presiding elders, and over the whole system the superintendence of travelling bishops, to whom the entire nation was to be a common diocese" (Stevens, *History of Methodism*). "Without any disparagement of other churches, we may easily see that they were not in a state to meet the pressing wants of the country. The Episcopal Church was much shattered and enfeebled, was destitute of the episcopal order, had to wait long, and urge her plea ardently upon the attention of the bishops of England before they could procure consecration for any of her ministers (and, as is well known, the non-existence of a bishop involves amongst the Episcopalians the non-existence of the Church), so that this community was not in a position to undertake to any great extent an aggressive service. The principles of the Independents, which subordinate the call of a minister to the voice of the Church, placed a bar in the way of their seeking the outlying population, inasmuch as there were no Churches to address this call; and, though the Presbyterian system is not necessarily so stringent in these matters as Independent churches acting on their theories, yet, as they cannot move without the action of their synodical bodies, there was little prospect of their doing much missionary work. Thus this work fell very much into the hands of the Methodist itinerancy. The men were admirably fitted for their task. Rich in religious enjoyment, full of faith and love, zealous and energetic, trained to labor and exertion, actuated by one single motive—that of glorifying God, they thought not of privation, but unhesitatingly followed the emigrants and 'squatters' in their peregrinations wherever they went. American society was thus imbued with Christian truth and principle, as well as accustomed to religious ordinances, in its normal state" (*London Quarterly Review*, October, 1854, p. 125).

Wesley started with no "theory" of ministerial itinerancy. The expediency of the plan alone led to its adoption; but he died believing in it as a theory, as, indeed, the apostolic plan of evangelization. In his estimation, it not only had a salutary effect on the evangelists, by keeping them energetic and chivalrous, but it had the capital advantage of enabling one preacher to minister the truth to many places, and it made small abilities available on a large scale. He says that he believes he should himself preach even his congregation "asleep" were he to stay in one place an entire year. Nor could he "believe that it was ever the Lord's will that any congregation should have one teacher only." "We have found," he writes, "by long and constant experience, that a frequent exchange of teachers is best. This preacher has one talent, that another. No one whom I ever yet knew has all the talents which are needful for beginning, continuing, and perfecting the work of grace in a whole congregation." (A. S.)

There can be no question that an itinerant ministry has the sanction of the highest scriptural examples. Christ was an itinerant. His ministry in the flesh was

not a settled pastorate; he went about doing good. The twelve disciples were itinerants, both before and after the crucifixion and resurrection. They went from city to city preaching the Gospel of the kingdom. And the prophets before them were itinerants. Samuel had his circle of appointments; Elijah, and, after him, Elisha, had no settled abode even, but moved about from place to place. These were all itinerants. If in the early Christian Church, even while the apostles were yet at work, there are evidences that a stationary ministry was occasionally introduced, it does not appear to have entered into the original plan of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. "Is there one word," says Beauchamp (*Letters on the Call and Qualifications of Ministers of the Gospel* [Charleston, S. C., 1849, 18mo], page 97), perhaps too strongly, "in the New Testament from which anything can be inferred in favor of a settled ministry? The whole of this sacred book breathes the spirit of itinerancy; and all the transactions recorded in it, in reference to the ministry, agree with this spirit." Nay, it is unquestionably true that in the early Christian Church, though many were in favor of a settled ministry, and numerous the efforts to bring it about, most of the Christian preachers were "itinerants." In the Latin Church, itinerant preachers have ever been employed: they form a special religious order—a class of preaching monks (comp. D'Aubigné, *Histoire de la Reformation*, v, 102). Thus Berenger, in France, employed itinerant ministers to spread his objections to the doctrine of transubstantiation; Wycliffe, in England, introduced the system of itinerant preaching, and the Swiss historian goes so far even as to assert that the reformatory movements among the Christians of England have all been marked by an effort to introduce the system of itinerant preaching. "This kind of preaching always reappears in England in the grand epochs of the Church" (*ibid.* p. 103). But if Wycliffe and the Reformers were first in their efforts to introduce itinerant preaching, it is to Wesley, nevertheless, that alone is due the credit of organizing "itinerancy" as a permanent and universal scheme of ministerial labor throughout a large denomination.

The itinerancy has always been a feature cherished with jealous care by the Methodist bodies, and with respect to bishops it is hedged about by one of the restrictive rules in the Meth. Epis. Church (see their *Discipline*, Powers of the General Conference). The length of time for which the travelling preachers may remain on the same "charge" (whether a circuit or station) has varied at different times in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and is now limited to three years. "Presiding elders" can remain only four years on the same "district."

As to the *advantages* and *disadvantages* of the itinerant system, no one has given a more unbiased account of the objections that have thus far been presented against the continuation of "itinerancy" than Dr. Crane (*Method. Quart. Rev.*, Jan. 1866, p. 73 sq.), and we follow him in the main, supplementing it only with what comes from other churches.

1. "The people are restricted in the choice of their pastors." If this be true, no other system so soon remedies the difficulty as the itinerancy, for it secures at the same time with the pastor a further change within a short period, without inflicting dishonor or injustice.

2. "At certain fixed intervals it removes the pastor with whom the people have become acquainted, and substitutes a stranger in his place." In return, it affords each church the benefit of the varied endowments of many ministers, and, moreover, keeps ministers and people in vigorous action.

3. "Societies and congregations have less cohesive force than their own good demands." This, of all objections, has been the one most frequently urged, and is, perhaps, the only one that it is hard to deny. It is with a view to obviate this evil that many have advocated an extension of the term of service to five or more years.

4. "The change sometimes comes inopportunely." If this happen in some instances, and they can, after all, be but few, much greater are the advantages which arise from this system, as it never leaves a church without a pastor, and at the same time also secures to the minister a pastorate, so long as he is able to work effectively in the Gospel field. The greatest problem for other denominations to solve is "unemployed ministers." Thus a writer in the *Intelligencer*, speaking of the trials resulting from a want of an itinerant ministry in the Reformed (Dutch) Church, says of Methodism: "No man who can work, and wants to work, need be idle, with fields appointed and the Church's benedictions upon those who strive to till them, and no man is laid upon the shelf till age, infirmity, or misconduct places him there; while, when age and infirmity come, that Church still supports and cherishes those who have worn life out in her and the Master's work. That a Church thus served with the whole life-long energies of her ministry should thrive and grow under the divine blessing, need surprise no one who properly weighs the bearings of cause and effect. The ruling out by our churches of half the aggregate effective force of the ministry, which a growing fastidiousness in the matter of choosing and settling preachers causes to be practically lost to the Church, has a gloomy look for her future prosperity. The prospect of such a life-voyage is not apt to be specially attractive to youth pondering whether or not to embark; for, once embarked, unless it be a Methodist vessel that bears them, they may find themselves stranded high and dry, and that from no fault of theirs, ere the voyage is half run."

5. "The brief pastorates are liable to create an unwise love of novelty and excitement." This, if somewhat true, is not a very formidable objection; while, on the other hand, the evil of indifference and dissatisfaction, so liable to be produced by a long pastoral term, is far greater. The brief pastorates afford the minister time and mental force for the preparation of a comparatively small number of sermons, and are therefore favorable to thorough preparation for the pulpit. Says Dr. Isaac Taylor (*Wesley and Methodism*, Lond. 1851), "Any one who, endowed with some natural faculty and fluency of utterance, has made the experiment, will have found it far from difficult to acquire the power of continuous and pertinent speaking upon familiar topics, especially upon religious topics, and so to hold out for thirty or forty minutes or more; and if this habit of speaking be well husbanded, and kept always within the safe enclosures of conventional phrases, and of authenticated modes of thinking, this preacher may be always ready to ascend the pulpit, in season and out of season. His sermon, or his set of discourses, is, in fact, the glib run of the mental associations upon worn tracks, this way or that, as the mind may chance to take its start from a given text. This sort of mindless facility of speaking proves a sore temptation to many a located minister, and its consequence is to leave many a congregation sitting from year to year deep in a quagmire. Better than this, undoubtedly, would be itinerancy—far better is a frequent shifting of monotonies than a fixedness of the same."

But also to the "itinerant" himself the system affords many advantages, though, it is true, it also subjects him to some disadvantages. The pros and cons of this part of the question are these:

1. "It restricts him in the choice of his field of labor." But if this be a disadvantage, it is fully atoned for by the fact that, however restricted, the field is certain.

2. "It tends in some cases to lessen the amount paid for the support of the pastor." If this be true, it can be so only measurably, for of late, at least, the Methodist pastor is remunerated as well as his brethren in the sister churches, while the itinerancy affords him a greater degree of independence, enabling him to "speak boldly, as he ought to speak."

3. "It deprives the minister and his family of a permanent place of residence." This the more prolonged

stay has measurably remedied, but it is a question whether a still longer term would not deprive the itinerant of one of the greatest blessings, health. It is held by competent judges, and the point is also made by Dr. Crane, that the itinerancy is conducive to health and long life, as the vital forces of a pastor settled over a congregation for many years in succession are necessarily subjected to a fearful strain, and thus what appears at first a family deprivation turns out really to be a great blessing to the entire household. See, besides the articles and books already referred to, Hodgson, *Eccles. Polity of Methodism defended*, especially p. 95-118; Porter, *Compendium of Methodism.*

It'tah-ka'zin (Heb. *Eth-katsin'*, עֵת קָצִין, *time* [according to Fürst, *people*] *of* the *judge*, only with ה local, עִתָּה קָצִין; Sept. ἐπὶ πόλιν κασὶμ v. r. κατασέμ; Vulg. *Thacasin*), a city near the eastern boundary of Zebulun (but within Issachar), between Gath-hepher and Remmon-methoar (Josh. xix, 13), therefore a very short distance (east) from Sepphoris (Seffurieh). It is, perhaps, identical with the *Kefr Kenna* usually regarded as the site of Cana (q. v.) of the N. T.

It'taï (Heb. *Ittay'*, אִתַּי, perh. *near* or *timely*, otherwise *possessor*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. 'Εσθαΐ.) Son of Ribai, a Benjamite of Gibeah, one of David's thirty heroes (2 Sam. xxiii, 29), called in the parallel passage (1 Chron. xi, 31) ITHAI (Heb. *Ithay'*, אִיתַי, a fuller form; Sept. 'Ηθούι). B.C. 1046.

2. (Sept. 'Εθί [and so Josephus] v. r. 'Εθθεί). "ITTAI THE GITTITE," i. e. the native of Gath, a Philistine in the army of king David. He appears only during the rebellion of Absalom, B.C. cir. 1023. We first discern him on the morning of David's flight, while the king was standing under the olive-tree, below the city, watching the army and the people defile past him. See DAVID. Last in the procession came the 600 heroes who had formed David's band during his wanderings in Judah, and who had been with him at Gath (2 Sam. xv, 18; comp. 1 Sam. xxiii, 13; xxvii, 2; xxx, 9, 10; and Josephus, *Ant.* vii, 9, 2). Among these, apparently commanding them, was Ittai the Gittite (v. 19). He caught the eye of the king, who at once addressed him, and besought him as "a stranger and an exile," and as one who had but very recently joined his service, not to attach himself to a doubtful cause, but to return "with his brethren" and abide with the king (v. 19, 20). But Ittai is firm; he is the king's slave (עֶבֶד, A.V. "servant"), and wherever his master goes he will go. Accordingly, he is allowed by David to proceed, and he passes over the Kedron with the king (xv, 22, Sept.), with all his men, and "all the little ones that were with him." These "little ones" (כָּל־הַטַּף, "all the children") must have been the families of the band—their "households" (1 Sam. xxvii, 3). They accompanied them during their wanderings in Judah, often at great risk (1 Sam. xxx, 6), and they were not likely to leave them behind in this fresh commencement of their wandering life.

When the army was numbered and organized by David at Mahanaim, Ittai again appears, now in command of a third part of the force, and (for the time at least) enjoying equal rank with Joab and Abishai (2 Sam. xviii, 2, 5, 12). But here, on the eve of the great battle, we take leave of this valiant and faithful stranger; his conduct in the fight and his subsequent fate are alike unknown to us. Nor is he mentioned in the lists of David's captains and of the heroes of his body-guard (see 2 Sam. xxiii; 1 Chron. xi), lists which are possibly of a date previous to Ittai's arrival in Jerusalem.

An interesting tradition is related by Jerome (*Quæst. Hebr.* on 1 Chron. xx, 2). "David took the crown off the head of the image of Milcom (A.V. 'their king'). But, by the law, it was forbidden to any Israelite to touch either gold or silver of an idol. Wherefore they say that Ittai the Gittite, who had come to David from the Philistines, was the man who snatched the crown from the head of Milcom; for it was lawful for a Hebrew to take it from the hand of a man, though not from the head of the idol." The main difficulty to the reception of this legend lies in the fact that if Ittai was engaged in the Ammonitish war, which happened several years before Absalom's revolt, the expression of David (2 Sam. xv, 20), "thou camest but yesterday," loses its force. However, these words may be merely a strong metaphor.

From the expression "thy brethren" (xv, 20) we may infer that there were other Philistines besides Ittai in the six hundred; but this is uncertain. Ittai was not exclusively a Philistine name, nor does "Gittite"—as in the case of Obed-edom, who was a Levite—necessarily imply Philistine parentage. Still David's words, "stranger and exile," seem to show that he was not an Israelite.—Smith. Others, however, have hazarded the supposition that this Ittai is the same as the preceding, having been called a Gittite as a native of *Gittaim*, in Benjamin (2 Sam. iv, 3), and a "stranger and an exile" as a Gibeonite, who, having fled from Beeroth, a Gibeonitish town (Josh. ix, 17), had, with his brethren, taken up his residence in Gittaim. All this is very improbable. See GITTITE.

Ittig, THOMAS, a German Lutheran divine, was born at Leipzig Oct. 31, 1643. He studied at the universities of Leipzig, Rostock, and Strasburg. After filling the pastorate, he became, in 1698, professor of philosophy in the university of his native city. In 1691 he was transferred to the chair of theology. He died April 7, 1710. Ittig was a very able man, but he lacked all tolerance towards those who chose to differ from him, and in some of his writings he is quite severe against other religious bodies than Lutherans. He is especially celebrated as a collector of the writings of the apostolical fathers (see below). His principal works are, *Animadversiones in censuram facultatis theologicæ Parisiensis*, etc. (Leipzig, 1685, 4to):—*De Heresiarchis ævi apostolici et apostolico proximi* (Leipz. 1690 and 1703, 4to):—*Prolegomena ad Flavii Josephi opera Græco-Latina* (Cologne, 1691, fol.):—*Bibliotheca Patrum apostolicorum Græco-Latina*, etc. Leipz. 1699, 8vo) (above alluded to):—*Operum Clementis Alexandrini Supplementum*, etc. (Leipzig, 1700, 8vo):—*Exercitationum Theologicarum varii argumenti*, etc. *Accedunt duæ orationes inaugurales*, etc. (Leipzig, 1702):—*Exercitatio theologica de novis fanaticorum quorundam nostræ ætatis purgatoriis* (Lpz. 1703, 4to):—*De Synodi Carentonensis a reformatis in Gallia ecclesiis anno* 1631 *celebratæ indulgentia erga Lutheranos*, etc., *Dissertatio theologica. Accedunt quatuor Programmata* (Lpz. 1705, 4to):—*Historia Synodorum nationalium a reformatis in Gallia habitarum*, etc. (Lpz. 1705):—*De Bibliothecis et Catenis Patrum*, etc. (Lpz. 1707, 8vo):—*Historiæ ecclesiasticæ primi a Christo nato sæculi selecta Capita de scriptoribus et scriptis ecclesiasticis*, etc. (Lpz. 1709, 4to):—*Schediasma de autoribus qui de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis egerunt* (Lpz. 1711, 8vo):—*Historia Concilii Nicæni* (Leipz. 1712, 4to):—*Opuscula varia*, edita cura Christiani Ludovici (Leipz. 1714, 8vo). See Kern, *De Vita, Obitu, Scriptisque Th. Ittigii epistolica Dissertatio* (Lpz. 1710); *Acta Eruditorum Lipsiensia*, p. 221; Niceron, *Mémoires*, xxix, 241-252; Sax, *Onomast. Literar.* v, 392; Appendix, vi, 585; Ersch. u. Gruber, *Allg. Encyk.*; J. Fabricius, *Hist. Bibliothecæ*, v, 140, 141, 302, 303, 310; vi, 456; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 106; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengeschichte*, ii, 515.

Ituræ'a ('Ιτουραία), a small district in the N.E. of Palestine, forming the tetrarchy of Philip, in connection with the adjacent territory of Trachonitis (Luke iii, 1). The name is supposed to have originated with יְטוּר, *Itur*, or JETUR, one of Ishmael's sons (1 Chron. i, 31). In 1 Chron. v, 19, this name is given as that of a tribe or nation with which Reuben (beyond the Jordan) warred; and, from its being joined with the names of other of Ishmael's sons, it is evident that a tribe descended from

his son Jetur is intimated. In the latter text the Sept. takes this view, and for "with the Hagarites, with Jetur, and Nephish, and Nodab," reads "with the Hagarites, and Ituræans, and Nephisæans, and Nadabæans." The old name seems to be still preserved in that of *Jedur*, which the same region, or a part of it, now bears. (This, however, has lately been disputed by Wetzstein [*Reisebericht*, p. 88 sq.] on the precarious ground of the present dependent situation of the district.) We may thus take the district to have been occupied by Ishmael's son, whose descendants were dispossessed or subdued by the Amorites, under whom it is supposed to have formed part of the kingdom of Bashan, and subsequently to have belonged to that half tribe of Manasseh which had its possessions east of the Jordan. From 1 Chron. v, 19, it appears that the sons of Jetur, whether under tribute to the Amorites (as some suppose), and forming part of the kingdom of Bashan or not, were in actual occupation of the country, and were dispossessed by the tribes beyond the Jordan, who now conquered and colonized the little province of Jetur, which lay between Bashan and Mount Hermon ("in Libano monte" according to Muratori, *Thes. Inscript.* ii, 670). During the Exile this and other border countries were taken possession of by various tribes, whom, although they are called after the original names, as occupants of the countries which had received those names, we are not bound to regard as purely descendants of the original possessors. These new Ituræans were eventually subdued by king Aristobulus (B.C. 106), who reconquered the province, then called by its Greek name Ituræa, and gave the inhabitants their choice of Judaism or banishment (Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 11, 3). While some submitted, many retired to their own rocky fastnesses, and to the defiles of Hermon adjoining. Nevertheless, the Ituræans were still recognisable as a distinct people in the time of Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* v, 23). They extended their incursions as far as Phœnicia, but submitted to the Romans under Pompey (Appian, *Mithrid.* 106), and appear to have been allowed to retain their native princes as vassals. Ituræa was first formally annexed to the province of Syria by Claudius (Tacitus, *Ann.* xii, 23, 1; Dio Cassius, lix, 12), having been previously included in Peræa as part of the dominions of Herod. (See F. Münter, *De rebus Ituræorum* [Hav. 1824]). As already intimated, Herod the Great, in dividing his dominions among his sons, bequeathed Ituræa to Philip as part of a tetrarchy composed, according to Luke, of Trachonitis and Ituræa; and as Josephus (*Ant.* xv, 10, 1; comp. xvii, 8, 1) mentions his territory as composed of Auranitis, Trachonitis, and Batanæa, some have thought (Reland, p. 106; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*) that the evangelist regarded Auranitis and Paneas as comprehended under Ituræa, a name loosely applied by ancient writers (see Pliny, v, 19; Epiphan. *Hæres.* 19; comp. Paulus, *Comment.* i, 311; Wetstein, i, 671). But it properly denoted a well-defined region distinct from Auranitis. Pliny rightly places it north of Bashan and near Damascus (v. 23), and J. de Vitry describes it as adjoining Trachonitis, and lying along the base of Libanus, between Tiberias and Damascus (*Gesta Dei*, p. 1074; comp. p. 771, 1003). The districts mentioned by Luke and Josephus were distinct, but neither of these historians give a full list of all the little provinces in the tetrarchy of Philip. Each probably gave the names of such as were of most importance in connection with the events he was about to relate. Both Batanæa and Auranitis appear to have been included in the "region of Trachonitis" (Τραχωνίτιδος χώρα); and as Josephus mentions a part of the "house of Zenodorus" which was given to Philip, it unquestionably embraced Ituræa (*Ant.* xv, 10, 3). According to Strabo (xvi, 755 sq.), the country known to classical writers was hilly (comp. Jac. de Vitriaco, p. 1074), with many ravines and hollows; the inhabitants were regarded as the worst of barbarians (Cicero, *Philip.* ii, 14), who, being deprived of the resources of agriculture (Apul. *Florid.* i, 6), lived by robbery (Strabo, xvi, 756), being skilful archers (Virgil, *Georg.* ii, 448; Lucan. vii, 230, 514). The present Jedur probably comprehends the whole or greater part of the proper Ituræa. This is described by Burckhardt (*Syria*, p. 286) as "lying south of Jebelkessoue, east of Jebel es-Sheik (Mount Hermon), and west of the Haj road." It is bounded on the east by Trachonitis, on the south by Gaulanitis, on the west by Hermon, and on the north by the plain of Damascus. It is table-land, with an undulating surface, and has little conical and cup-shaped hills at intervals. The southern section of it has a rich soil, well watered by numerous springs, and streams from Hermon. The greater part of the northern section is entirely different. The surface of the ground is covered with jagged rocks, in some places heaped up in huge piles, in others sunk into deep pits; at one place smooth and naked, at another seamed with yawning chasms, in whose rugged edges rank grass and weeds spring up. The rock is all basalt, and the formation similar to that of the Lejah. See ARGOB. The molten lava seems to have issued from the earth through innumerable pores, to have spread over the plain, and then to have been rent and shattered while cooling (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 465). Jedur contains thirty-eight towns and villages, ten of which are now entirely desolate, and all the rest contain only a few families of poor peasants, living in wretched hovels amid heaps of ruins (Porter, *Damascus*, ii, 272 sq.). See Robinson, *Bib. Res.* Appendix, p. 149; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* July, 1854, p. 311.

Itzchaki, also called *Ben-Jasus*, and by the long Arabic name of *Abu Ibrahim Isaac Ibn-Kastar* (or *Saktar*) *ben-Jasus*, a Jewish philosopher of great celebrity, and commentator, was born A.D. 982 at Toledo. Like many other Jewish savans, he followed the medical profession, and so distinguished himself that he was appointed physician to the princes of Denia and Mug'ahid, and to Ali Ikbal Addaula. He died in 1057. Itzchaki wrote (1) a Hebrew grammar, called ספר הצרופים, *The Book of Syntax;* and (2) on Biblical criticism, called ספר יצחקי, *The Work of Itzchaki.* Neither of these works is now known to us, but from Aben-Ezra, who quotes them, we learn that Itzchaki was one of the earliest assailants of the Mosaic authorship of some portions of the Pentateuch. Thus he is said to have maintained that the portion in the Pentateuch which describes the kings of Idumæa (Gen. xxxvi, 30, etc.) was written many centuries after Moses (comp. Aben-Ezra, *Commentaries on Gen. xxxvi*, 30, 31; *Numb. xxiv*, 17; *Hos. i*, 1). See Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vi, 53; *Zeitschrift der deutsch. morgenl. Gesellsch.* 1854, p. 551; 1855, p. 838.

Itzchaki, SOLOMON. See RASHI.

I'vah (Heb. *Ivvah'*, עִוָּה, for עַוָּה, *avvah'*, an *overturning* or ruin, as in Ezek. xxi, 32; Sept. Ἀουά, but in Isa. xxxvii, 13, unites with the preced. word into Ἀναεγγουγανά), a city of the Assyrians whence they brought colonists to repeople Samaria (2 Kings xviii, 34; xix, 13; Isa. xxxvii, 13, where it is mentioned in connection with Hena and Sepharvaim; also in the cognate form "Ava," 2 Kings xvii, 24, where it stands in connection with Babylon and Cuthah). Sir H. Rawlinson thinks that the site must be sought in Babylonia, and that it is probably identical with the modern *Hit*, which is the Ἴς of Herodotus (i, 179), a place famous for bituminous springs (see Rich, *First Memoir on Babylon*, p. 64, and Chesney, *Euphrates Expedition*, i, 55). This town lay on the Euphrates, between Sippara (Sepharvaim) and Anah (Hena), with which it seems to have been politically united shortly before the time of Sennacherib (2 Kings xix, 13). He also regards it as probably the Ahava (אַהֲוָא) of Ezra (viii, 15). He believes the name to have been originally derived from that of a Babylonian god, *Iva*, who represents the sky or Æther, and to whom the town is supposed to have been dedicated (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 1, 606, note). In the Talmud the name appears as *Ihih* (ידהיא), whence might

possibly be formed the Greek Ἶς, and the modern *Hit* (where the *t* is merely the feminine ending), if we might suppose any connection between the Greek and the Talmud. Isidore of Charax seems to intend the same place by his Ἀεί-πολις (*Mans. Parth.* p. 5). Some have thought that it occurs as *Ist* in the Egyptian inscriptions of the time of Thothmes III, about B.C. 1450 (Birch, in *Otia Ægyptiaca*, p. 80). But these conjectures are destitute of any great probability, as the form of the Heb. name does not well correspond. See AVA.

Ives, LEVI SILLIMAN, D.D., LL.D., a theologian of some note, more especially on account of his defection from the Protestant Episcopal Church to Romanism, was born in Meriden, Conn., Sept. 16, 1797. His parents removed to New York State while he was quite young, and he was prepared for college at Lewisville Academy. At the outbreak of the war in 1812, he served his country for one year, and in 1816 finally entered upon his collegiate course at Hamilton College, pursuing, at the same time, studies preparatory for the work of the ministry. He had been reared in the Presbyterian Church, but in 1819, when impaired health obliged him to quit the college, he joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and continued his theological education at N. Y. City under bishop Hobart, at whose hands he received deacon's orders in 1822, and whose son-in-law he became in 1825. His first parish was Batavia, N. Y.; but he remained there only a few months, as he received a call in 1823 from Trinity Church, Philadelphia, which he at once accepted, bishop White ordaining him to the priesthood. In 1827 he was called to Christ Church, Lancaster, Pa., and the year following became assistant rector of Christ Church, N. Y. City. This connection he severed six months later, to assume the rectorship of St. Luke's Church, N. Y. In 1831 he was honored with the bishopric of North Carolina, where he became very popular, and for a time wielded great influence; but in 1848 he began to advocate doctrines inadmissible by any Protestant believer of the Christian doctrines, and distrust and alienation on the part of his diocese led him to renounce publicly his mistaken course. But so inclined had he become to the Roman Catholic view of the apostolical succession, and the need of an "infallible" interpreter of the Scriptures, that he soon avowed his former opinions, and in 1852, while in Europe, publicly submitted to the authority of Rome. Of course, this caused his deposition from the bishopric of N. Carolina. In defense of his course, he published *The Trials of a Mind in its Progress to Catholicism* (Boston, 1854, 8vo), in which he sets forth the Roman Catholic view of the divine right of episcopacy. Finding that the Protestant Epis. Church does not possess a regular apostolical succession (p. 146-157), he felt obliged to accept the Church of Rome as the true Church. This course was very naturally pursued by bishop Ives, who, while yet in the Episcopal Church, had always inclined to High-Churchism. "Sitting upon the pinnacle of High-Churchism, the head easily turns, or becomes so dizzy as to fall down into the abyss of Popery." Ives fell, like Doane, and Wheaton, and Markoe, by carrying out the High-Church principles to their legitimate results. After his change he was employed as professor of rhetoric in St. Joseph's Theological Seminary, and as lecturer on rhetoric and English literature in the convents of the Sacred Heart and the Sisters of Charity. Ex-bishop Ives evidently was a man of good parts and noble intentions, for during the last years of his life we find him incessantly at work in the establishment of an institution at Manhattanville for the protection of destitute children: here nearly 2000 children are now provided for. He died Oct. 13, 1867. Ives published also a volume of sermons *On the Apostles' Doctrine and Fellowship*, and another *On Obedience of Faith* (1849, 18mo). See *New Englander*, Aug. 1855, art. iv; *Princeton Review*, xvii, 491 (on his sermons); Appleton, *American Cyclop.* annual of 1867, 411 sq.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 945. (J. H. W.)

Ivimey, JOSEPH, the historian of the English Baptists, was born in 1773, pursued his studies at the Bristol Academy, and for twenty-nine years was pastor of a Baptist church in London. His principal publications are, (1) an edition of *The Pilgrim's Progress, with Notes:*—(2) *The Life of John Bunyan:*—(3) *Treatise on Baptism and Communion:*—(4) *The Life, Times, and Opinions of John Milton:*—(5) *History of the English Baptists* (4 vols. 8vo). The last, his most important work, is highly commended by Robert Hall for the value of its historical substance and for the quality of the author's style. His Life of Bunyan continued to be the chief authority on the subject, until the growing public appreciation of the "ingenious dreamer" enlisted in the illustration of his life the classic pen of Southey and the minute diligence of Mr. Offor. Mr. Ivimey's death occurred in 1834. See G. Pritchard, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Joseph Ivimey* (London, 1835, 8vo).

Ivo, bishop of Chartres (*Carnotensis*). Little is known of the life of this prelate beyond what we can learn from his works. The exact date of his birth is not ascertained (it is supposed to have been about 1040), neither is his descent: some say that he was of low extraction ("ex genere minime nobili," *Gallia Christiana*, viii, 1126), while others give him a noble parentage ("in agro Bellovacensi natus nobili a sanguine nobilem animum traxit," *Vita D. Ivonis*, Paris ed. 1647). He studied philosophy and rhetoric at Paris, then theology under Lanfranc in the convent of Bec; and in 1078 became superior of the convent of St. Quentin, in which office he acquired great reputation as a theologian and canonist. In 1090, upon the deposition of the bishop of Chartres for simony, Ivo was appointed in his place, yet his predecessor had still such strong local interest that Ivo had to be nominated directly by the pope (Urban II), and was only installed in 1092, at Capua. He is one of the prelates who contributed most to the extension of papal authority, yet he did not hesitate to speak plainly against the abuse of the system of curacy; in the Paris edition of his life he is even praised as one of the defenders of the Gallican liberties. In the difficulty about the question of *investiture* (q. v.), raised by Hildebrand and his followers, the course of Ivo was marked by great moderation, arising, not from weakness, but from a desire of conciliating and meting justice to all parties. He also endeavored to check the persecuting spirit of the hierarchy when it began to accuse pope Paschal II of heresy for having yielded to emperor Henry V. His private character, as well as his learning, gave him great influence. When Philip I repudiated his legitimate wife to marry another, he alone had the courage to oppose him, and neither promises nor threats could induce him to sanction the misdeed; and by his noble and straightforward course he excited the admiration of the people and nobility, who all took his part. He died in 1115 (according to Richter and Mejer, in 1125), and was canonized in 1570 for May 20. As a writer, he is known as the author of a *Pannormia* and a *decretum* [see CANONS AND DECRETALS, COLLECTIONS OF); also of 287 Letters (Paris, 1584-85, 1610), which shed much light on the history of his time, and show in how high an estimation his opinions were held; 24 ecclesiastical discourses on synods, festivals, etc.; and, finally, a short chronicle of the French kings. The most complete collection of his works has been published at Paris in 1647, fol., but it does not contain the *Pannormia*. In Migne's edition of the fathers Ivo's works were reprinted in 1855 (Paris). See *Hist. Litt. de France*, x, 102; v, 150; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vii, 189 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* ii, 180 sq.; Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. Sac.* xxi, 423 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xvii, 13 sq.; xxvi, 12 sq.

Ivory (שֶׁנְהַבִּים, *shenhabbim'*, *elephant's tooth*; see A. Benary, in the *Berliner Lit. Jahrbücher*, 1831, No. 96; 1 Kings x, 22; 2 Chron. ix, 21; and so explained by the Targum, שֵׁן דְּפִיל, and Sept. ὀδόντες ἐλεφάντινοι,

also simply שֵׁן, a *tooth*, Psa. xlv, 8; Ezek. xxvii, 15; Amos vi, 4; N. T. ἐλεφάντινος, *of ivory*, Rev. xviii, 12). It is remarkable that no word in Biblical Hebrew denotes an elephant, unless the latter portion of the compound *shen-habbim* be supposed to have this meaning. Gesenius derives it from the Sanscrit *ibhas*, "an elephant;" Keil (on 1 Kings x, 22) from the Coptic *eboy;* while Sir Henry Rawlinson mentions a word *habba*, which he met with in the Assyrian inscriptions, and which he understands to mean "the large animal," the term being applied both to the elephant and the camel (*Journ. of As. Soc.* xii, 463). It is suggested in Gesenius's *Thesaurus* (s. v.) that the original reading may have been שֵׁן הָבְנִים, "ivory, ebony" (compare Ezek. xxvii, 15). By some of the ancient nations these tusks were imagined to be horns (Ezek. xxvii, 15; Pliny, viii, 4; xviii, 1), though Diodorus Siculus (i, 55) correctly calls them teeth. As they were first acquainted with elephants through their ivory, which was an important article of commerce, the shape of the tusks, in all probability, led them into this error. They are genuine teeth, combining in themselves, and occupying, in the upper jaw, the whole mass of secretions which in other animals form the upper incisor and laniary teeth. They are useful for defence and offence, and for holding down green branches, or rooting up water-plants; but still they are not absolutely necessary, since there is a variety of elephant in the Indian forests entirely destitute of tusks, and the females in most of the races are either without them, or have them very small; not turned downwards, as Bochart states, but rather straight, as correctly described by Pliny. Only two species of elephants are recognised—the African and the Indian—easily distinguished from each other by the size of the ear, which in the former is much larger than in the latter. The tusks of the African elephant attain sometimes a length of 8 or even 10 feet, and a weight of 100 to 120 pounds; but those of the Indian elephant are much shorter and lighter, while in the females they often scarcely project beyond the lips. "Elephant's tooth," or simply "elephant," is a common name for ivory, not only in the Oriental languages and in Greek, but also in the Western tongues, although in all of them teeth of other species may be included. There can be no doubt, for example, that the harder and more accessible ivory obtained from the hippopotamus was known in Egypt at least as early as that obtained from the elephant. This kind of ivory does not split, and therefore was anciently most useful for military instruments. See ELEPHANT.

The Egyptians at a very early period made use of this material in decoration. The cover of a small ivory box in the Egyptian collection at the Louvre is "inscribed with the prænomen Nefer-ka-re, or Neper-cheres, adopted by a dynasty found in the upper line of the tablet of Abydos, and attributed by M. Bunsen to the fifth. . . . In the time of Thothmes III ivory was imported in considerable quantities into Egypt, either 'in boats laden with ivory and ebony' from Ethiopia, or else in tusks and cups from the Ruten-nu. . . . The celebrated car at Florence has its linchpins tipped with ivory" (Birch, in *Trans. of Roy. Soc. of Lit.* iii, 2d series). The specimens of Egyptian ivory work, which are found in the principal museums of Europe, are, most of them, in the opinion of Mr. Birch, of a date anterior to the Persian invasion, and some even as old as the 18th dynasty. The practice of inlaying or covering the walls with ivory and other valuable substances was in very extensive use among the Egyptians, who used it likewise for ornamenting articles of furniture, as may be seen in the British Museum. Amongst the articles of household furniture there is a seat with four turned legs inlaid with ivory, brought from Thebes; also a high-backed chair on lion-footed legs; the back solid, inlaid with panels of darker wood, with lotus flowers of ivory. The ivory used by the Egyptians was principally brought from Ethiopia (Herod. iii, 114), though their elephants were originally from Asia. The Ethiopians, according to Diodorus Siculus (i, 55), brought to Sesostris "ebony and gold, and the teeth of elephants." Among the tribute paid by them to the Persian kings were "twenty large tusks of ivory" (Herod. iii, 97). The processions of human figures bearing presents, etc., still extant on the walls of palaces and tombs, attest, by the black, crisp-haired bearers of huge teeth, that some of these came from Ethiopia or Central Africa; and by white men similarly laden, who also bring an Asiatic elephant and a white bear, that others came from the East. In the Periplus of the Red Sea (c. 4), attributed to Arrian, Coloe (*Calai*) is said to be "the chief mart for ivory." It was thence carried down to Adouli (*Zulla*, or *Thulla*), a port on the Red Sea, about three days' journey from Coloe, together with the hides of hippopotami, tortoise-shell, apes, and slaves (Pliny, vi, 34). The elephants and rhinoceroses from which it was obtained were killed further up the country, and few were taken near the sea, or in the neighborhood of Adouli. At Ptolemais Theron was found a little ivory like that of Adouli (*Periplus*, c. 3). Ptolemy Philadelphus made this port the dépôt of the elephant trade (Pliny, vi, 34). According to Pliny (viii, 10), ivory was so plentiful on the borders of Ethiopia that the natives made door-posts of it, and even fences and stalls for their cattle. The author of the *Periplus* (c. 16) mentions Rhapta as another station of the ivory trade, but the ivory brought down to this port is said to have been of an inferior quality, and "for the most part found in the woods, damaged by rain, or collected from animals drowned by the overflow of the rivers at the equinoxes" (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geography*, s. v. Rhapta). The Egyptian merchants traded for ivory and onyx stones to Barygaza, the port to which was carried down the commerce of Western India from Ozene (*Periplus*, c. 49).

Tribute of Elephants' Tusks brought to Thothmes III. (Thebes.)

The Assyrians appear to have carried on a great traffic in ivory. Their early conquests in India had made them familiar with it, and (according to one rendering of the passage) their artists supplied the luxurious Tyr-

Apes, Elephant, and Ivory as Tribute. (From the Nimrud Obelisk.)

ians with carvings in ivory from the isles of Chittim (Ezek. xxvii, 6). On the obelisk in the British Museum the captives or tribute-bearers are represented as carrying tusks. Among the merchandise of Babylon enumerated in Rev. xviii, 12 are included "all manner vessels of ivory." Mr. Layard discovered several ornaments made from ivory in the Assyrian mounds (*Nineveh*, ii, 15), but they are of uncertain date, and exhibit marks of Egyptian workmanship (*ib.* p. 163, 168). Many specimens of Assyrian carving in ivory have been found in the excavations at Nimrud, and among the rest some tablets "richly inlaid with blue and opaque glass, lapis-lazuli, etc." (Bonomi, *Nineveh and its Palaces*, p. 334; comp. Cant. v, 14). Part of an ivory staff, apparently a sceptre, and several entire elephants' tusks, were discovered by Mr. Layard in the last stage of decay, and it was with extreme difficulty that these interesting rélics could be restored (*Nin. and Bab.* p. 195).

In the early ages of Greece ivory was frequently employed for purposes of ornament. The trappings of horses were studded with it (Homer, *Il.* v, 584): it was used for the handles of keys (*Odyssey*, xxi, 7) and for the bosses of shields (Hes. *Sc. Herc.* 141, 142). The "ivory house" of Ahab (1 Kings xxii, 39) was probably a palace, the walls of which were panelled with ivory, like the palace of Menelaus described by Homer (*Odys.* iv, 73; compare Eurip. *Iph. Aul.* 583, ἐλεφαντοδέτοι δόμοι. Comp. also Amos iii, 15, and Psa. xlv, 8, unless the "ivory palaces" in the latter passage were perfume-boxes made of that material, as has been conjectured). It is difficult to determine whether the "tower of ivory" of Cant. vii, 4 is merely a figure of speech, or whether it had its original among the things that were. Beds inlaid or veneered with ivory were in use among the Hebrews (Amos vi, 4; compare Homer, *Od.* xxiii, 200), as also among the Egyptians (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* iii, 169). The practice of inlaying and veneering wood with ivory and tortoise-shell is described by Pliny (xvi, 84). By the luxurious Phœnicians ivory was employed to ornament the boxwood rowing-benches (or "hatches" according to some) of their galleys (Ezek. xxvii, 6). The skilled workmen of Hiram, king of Tyre, fashioned the great ivory throne of Solomon, and overlaid it with pure gold (1 Kings x, 18; 2 Chron. ix, 17). The ivory thus employed was supplied by the caravans of Dedan (Isa. xxi, 13; Ezek. xxvii, 15), or was brought from the East Indies, with apes and peacocks, by the navy of Tarshish (1 Kings x, 22). As an instance of the superabundant possession and barbarian use of elephants' teeth may be mentioned the octagonal *ivory hunting-tower* built by Akbar, about twenty-four miles west of Agra: it is still standing, and bristles with 128 enormous tusks disposed in ascending lines, sixteen on each face. Mr. Roberts, remarking on the words of Amos (vi, 4), they "that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon couches," refers the last word, in conformity with the Tamul version, to swinging cots, often mentioned in the early tales of India, and still plentifully used by the wealthy. But it does not appear that they were known in Western Asia, or that figures of them occur on Egyptian bas-reliefs. It is more likely that *palkies* (those luxurious travelling litters) are meant, which were borne on men's shoulders, while the person within was stretched at ease. They were in common use even among the Romans, for Cicero fell into his assassin's hands while he was attempting to escape in one of them towards Naples. Among the Romans, inlaying with ivory seems to have become, at length, rather a common method of ornamenting the interiors of the mansions of the wealthy; for Horace mentions it as an evidence of his humble way of life that "no walls inlaid with ivory adorned his house."

Ivy (κισσός) is mentioned but once in the Scriptures, and that in the Apocrypha, namely, in 2 Macc. vi, 7, where it is said that the Jews were compelled, when the feast of Bacchus was kept, to go in procession carrying ivy to this deity, to whom it is well known this plant was sacred. Ivy, however, though not mentioned by name, has a peculiar interest to the Christian, as

Hedera Helix.

forming the "corruptible crown" (1 Cor. ix, 25) for which the competitors at the great Isthmian games contended, and which St. Paul so beautifully contrasts with the "incorruptible crown" that shall hereafter encircle the brows of those who run worthily the race of this mortal life. In the Isthmian contests the victor's garland was either *ivy* or *pine*. See CROWN.

The term κισσός or κιττός seems to have been applied by the Greeks in a general sense, and to have included many plants, and among them some climbers, as the *convolvulus*, besides the common ivy (*Hedera helix*), which was especially dedicated to Bacchus, and which was distinguished by the name of "*Hedera poetica, Dionysia aut Bacchica*, quod ex ea poëtarum coronæ consuerentur." It is well known that in the Dionysia, or festivals in honor of Dionysus, and in the processions called θίασοι, with which they were celebrated, women also took part, in the disguise of Bacchæ, Naiades, Nymphæ, etc., adorned with garlands of ivy, etc. (Ovid, *Fasti*, iii, 766). Bacchus is generally thought to have been educated in India, and the Indian *Bâghês* has been supposed to be the original of the name. The fact of Bâghês being a compound of two words signifying tiger and master or lord, would appear to confirm the identity, since Bacchus is usually represented as drawn in his chariot by a tiger and a lion, and tigers, etc., are described as following him in his Indian journey. As the ivy, however, is not a plant of India, it might be objected to its being characteristic of an Indian god. But in the mountains which bound India to the north both the ivy and the vine may be found, and the Greeks were acquainted with the fact that Mount Mero is the only part of India where ivy was produced. Indeed, Alexander and his companions are said to have crowned themselves with ivy in honor of Bacchus. The ivy, *Hedera helix*, being a native of most parts of Europe, is too well known to require special notice. See BACCHUS.

Ixora, a divinity of the East Indians, or the worshippers of Brahm. They hold him to be of infinite endurance, and illustrate this belief by saying that Brahm himself, desirous of seeing Ixora's head, ascend-

ed to heaven on wings, but failed to gain admittance, the power of Ixora preventing it. A very similar desire Vishnu cherished, but all his attempts also to this end Ixora frustrated. He is said to have two wives, one of whom constantly resides with him, and conceals herself in his hair; the other, strangely enough, they say, dies annually, and is by Ixora restored to life again. The Brahmins represent this idol standing on a pedestal, with no less than sixteen arms, each of them grasping something of value, or representing the natural elements, or weapons indicating his power. His head is adorned with long and beautiful hair; his face is white and shining; he has three eyes, and a crescent or half moon upon his forehead.—Broughton, *Bibliotheca Hist. Sac.* i, 561. See BRAHMINISM.

Iyar (אִיָּר; Ἰάρ, Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 3, 1; the Macedonian Ἀρτεμίσιος) is the late name of that month which was the second of the sacred, and the seventh of the civil year of the Jews, and which began with the new moon of May. The few memorable days in it are the 10th, as a fast for the death of Eli; the 14th, as the second or lesser Passover for those whom uncleanness or absence prevented from celebrating the feast in Nisan (Numb. ix, 11); the 23d, as a feast instituted by Simon the Maccabee in memory of his taking the citadel Acra, in Jerusalem (1 Macc. xiii, 51, 52); the 28th, as a fast for the death of Samuel. See CALENDAR.

Gesenius derives Iyar from the Hebrew root אור, *to shine;* but Benfey and Stern, following out their theory of the source from which the Jews obtained such names, deduce it from the assumed Zend representative of the Persian *bahar*, "spring" (*Monatsnamen*, p. 134). The name Iyar does not occur in the O. T., this month being always described as the second month, except in two places in which it is called *Zif* (1 Kings vi, 1, 37). See ZIF.

Iyim. See ISLAND; WILD BEAST.

Iz'ehar (Numb. iii, 19). See IZHAR.

Iz'eharite (Numb. iii, 27). See IZHAR.

Iz'har (Heb. *Yitshar'*, יִצְהָר, *oil*, as often; Sept. Ἰσσαάρ, Ἰσαάρ), the second son of Kohath (son of Levi), and father of three sons (Exod. vi, 18, 21; Numb. xvi, 1; 1 Chron. vi, 2, 18, 38; xxiii, 12, 18). In Numb. iii, 19, his name is Anglicized "Izehar." His descendants are called IZHARITES (Heb. *Yitshari'*, יִצְהָרִי; Sept. Ἰσσααρί, Ἰσσαρί, Ἰσσαάρ [Numb. iii, 27; 1 Chron. xxiv, 22; xxvi, 23, 29, in the first of which passages it is Anglicized "Izeharites"]). B.C. post 1856. See also ZOHAR. "In 1 Chron. vi, 22, *Amminadab* is substituted for *Izhar*, as the son of Kohath and father of Korah, in the line of Samuel. This, however, must be an accidental error of the scribe, as in ver. 38, where the same genealogy is repeated, Izhar appears again in his right place. The Codex Alex. in ver. 22 reads *Izhar* in place of *Amminadab*, and the Aldine and Complut. read *Amminadab* between Izhar and Kore, making another generation. But these are probably only corrections of the text. (See Burrington, *Geneal. of the O. T.*)" (Smith).

Izrahi'ah (Heb. *Yizrachyah'*, יִזְרַחְיָה, *sprout of Jehovah* sc. into the world), the name of one or two men.

1. (Sept. Ἰεζριά; Vulg. *Israhia.*) The "son" of Uzzi, and grandson of Tola, the son of Issachar (1 Chron. vii, 3). B.C. cir. 1014. See OBADIAH.

2. (Sept. omits, but some copies have Ἰεζρίας, others Ἰεσρίας; Vulg. *Jezraja;* A. V. "Jezrahiah.") The superintendent of the singers (doubtless a Levite) who celebrated the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the Exile (Neh. xii, 42). B.C. 446.

Iz'rahite (Heb. *Yizrach'*, יִזְרָח, only with the art. הַיִּזְרָח, *the indigenous*, prob. by error of transcription for יִזְרָחִי, a *Yizrachite* [but Fürst makes it a man's name =*Izrahiah*], and this again for אֶזְרָחִי, *Ezrachite;* Sept. has Ἰεζραέλ v. r. Ἰεσραέ; Vulg. *Jezerites*), a patronymic epithet of Shamhuth, one of David's generals (1 Chron. xxvii, 8), prob. so called as being descended from Zerah, Judah's son. See EZRAHITE.

Iz'ri (Heb. *Yitsri'*, יִצְרִי, the *Jezerite*, otherwise a *former;* Sept. Ἰεσδρί; Vulg. *Isari*), the leader of the fourth division of Levitical singers under David (1 Chron. xxv, 11); prob. the same with ZERI, of the sons of Jeduthun, mentioned in ver. 3. B.C. 1014.

J.

Ja'äkan (Heb. *Yaäkan'*, יַעֲקָן, *wrester;* Sept. has two names, Ἰωακὰν καὶ Οὐκάμ, other copies simply Ἀκάν or Ἰακίμ; Vulg. *Jacan*), the last named of the sons of Ezer, son of Seir the Horite (1 Chron. i, 42, where it is Anglicized "Jakan"); called in the parallel passage (Gen. xxxvi, 27) by a simpler form of the same name, AKAN. B.C. ante 1964. His descendants appear to have settled in the northern part of the Arabah. He was the forefather of the Bene-Jaakan (q. v.), round whose wells the children of Israel twice encamped, once after they left Moseroth, and just before they went on to Hor-Hagidgad (Numb. xxxiii, 30-32), and again in a reverse direction after they left Kadesh-barnea, and before they reached Mount Hor or Mosera (Deut. x, 6). See BEEROTH-BENE-JAAKAN.

Jaäk'obah [some *Jaako'bah*] (Heb. *Yaäko'bah*, יַעֲקֹבָה, a paragogic form of the name *Jacob;* Sept. Ἰακαβά), one of the prosperous descendants (נְשִׂיאִים, princes) of Simeon that emigrated to the valley of Gedor [Gerar] (1 Chron. iv, 36). B.C. apparently cir. 710.

Ja'äla [many *Jaä'la*] (Heb. *Yaäla'*, יַעֲלָא, *ibex;* Sept. Ἰεαήλ v. r. Ἰελήλ), one of the Nethinim ("servants of Solomon") whose descendants (or perhaps a place whose former inhabitants) returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii, 58); called in the parallel passage (Ezra ii, 56) by the equivalent [the final א or ה by Chaldæism] name JAALAH (יַעֲלָה, Sept. Ἰελά). B.C. ante 536.

Ja'älah [many *Jaä'lah*] (Ezra ii, 56). See JAALA.

Ja'älam [many *Jaä'lam*] (Heb. *Yalam'*, יַעְלָם, *concealer;* Sept. Ἰεγλόμ), the second named of Esau's three sons by Aholibamah in Canaan (Gen. xxxvi, 5, 14; 1 Chron. i, 35). B.C. post 1964.

Jaan. See DAN-JAAN.

Ja'änai [some *Jaä'nai*] (Hebrew *Yanay'*, יַעְנַי, *mourner*, otherwise, for יַעֲנְיָה, *answered* by *Jehovah;* Sept. Ἰαναί v. r. Ἰανίν, Vulg. *Janai*), one of the chief Gadites resident in Bashan (1 Chron. v, 12). B.C. between 1093 and 782.

Jaaphar Ibn-Tophail, a distinguished Arab of the 12th century, deserves our notice as the author of a philosophical treatise entitled the *History of Hoi Ibn-Yokdan* (translated into Latin by Pococke [Oxf. 1671] and into English by Ockley [Oxf. 1708, 8vo]). It aims to teach that "the light of nature is sufficient to lead mankind to a knowledge of the Deity without the aid of revelation." Of Jaaphar's personal history we know scarcely anything. He is supposed to have died about 1198. See Gorton's *Biographical Dictionary*, s. v.

Ja'arè-or'egim (Hebrew *Yaärey' Oregim'*, יַעֲרֵי אֹרְגִים; Sept. Ἀριωργίμ, Vulg. *Saltus polymitarius*), according to the present text of 2 Sam. xxi, 19, a Bethlehemite, and the father of Elhanan, who slew Goliath (the words "the brother of" are added in the A. Vers.). In the parallel passage (1 Chron. xx, 5), besides other differences, JAIR is found instead of *Jaare*, and *Oregim*

is omitted. Oregim is not elsewhere found as a proper name, nor is it a common word; and occurring as it does without doubt at the end of the verse (Auth. Vers. "weavers"), in a sentence exactly parallel to that in 1 Sam. xvii, 7, it is not probable that it should also occur in the middle of the same. The conclusion of Kennicott (*Dissertation*, p. 80) appears to be a just one—that in the latter place it has been interpolated from the former, and that Jair or Jaar is the correct reading instead of Jaare. See ELHANAN. Still the agreement of the ancient versions with the present Hebrew text affords a certain corroboration to that text, and should not be overlooked. See JAIR. The Peshito, followed by the Arabic, substitutes for Jaare-Oregim the name "*Maluph the weaver*," to the meaning of which we have no clew. The Targum, on the other hand, doubtless anxious to avoid any apparent contradiction of the narrative in 1 Sam. xvii, substitutes David for Elhanan, Jesse for Jaare, and is led by the word Oregim to relate or possibly to invent a statement as to Jesse's calling—"And David, son of Jesse, weaver of the veils of the house of the sanctuary, who was of Bethlehem, slew Goliath the Gittite." By Jerome Jaare is literally translated "damask-weavers' grove" (compare *Quæstionis Hebraica* on both passages). In Josephus's account (*Ant.* vii, 12, 2) the Israelitish champion is said to have been "Nephan, the kinsman of David" (Νεφάνος ὁ συγγενὴς αὐτοῦ); the word kinsman perhaps referring to the Jewish tradition of the identity of Jair and Jesse, or simply arising from the mention of Bethlehem. In the received Hebrew text Jaare is written with a small or suspended R, showing that in the opinion of the Masoretes that letter is uncertain.—Smith. The Jewish Midrashim generally identify David with Elhanan, and interpret Jaare-Oregim fancifully; e. g. (1) as David's own name, "because he was great among the forest [of the] Oregim or Weavers [of the Law]; i. e. the Sanhedrim, who brought the Halachah (legal decisions) before him that he might weave it," as it were (Jalkut on 2 Sam. xxi, 19 sq.); or (2) it is David's name as the son of a mother who "wove veils for the sanctuary;" or (3) as an epithet of Jesse. See OREGIM.

Ja'äsau [some *Jaä'sau*] (Heb. *Yaäsav'*, יַעֲשָׂו; Sept. translates ἐποίησαν q. d. יַעֲשׂוּ, but the margin has *Yaäsay'*, יַעֲשַׂי, *fabricator*, otherwise for יַעֲשִׂיָּה, *made* by *Jehovah*, and so Vulg. *Jasi*), an Israelite of the "sons" of Bani, who renounced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezra x, 37). B.C. 459.

Jaä'siël (Heb. *Yaasiël'*, יַעֲשִׂיאֵל, *made* by *God;* Sept. Ἐσσιήλ and Ἀσιήλ; Vulg. *Jasiel*), a Mesobaite, and one of David's body-guard (1 Chron. xi, 47, where the name is Anglicized "Jasiel"); probably the same with the son of Abner and viceroy over Benjamin (1 Chron. xxvii, 21). B.C. 1046–1014.

Jaäzani'ah (Heb. *Yaäzanyah'*, יַאֲזַנְיָה, *heard* by *Jehovah;* also in the prolonged form *Yaäzanya'hu*, יַאֲזַנְיָהוּ [2 Kings xxv, 23; Ezek. viii, 11]; sometimes in the contracted form *Yezanyah'*, יְזַנְיָה, "Jezaniah" [Jer. xlii, 1], or *Yezanyahu*, יְזַנְיָהוּ, "Jezaniah" [Jer. xl, 8]; Septuag. Ἰεζονίας, but Ἀζαρίας in Jer. xlii, 1; Vulg. *Jezanias*), the name of four men about the time of the Captivity.

1. The son of Jeremiah, and one of the chief Rechabites (i. e. sheik) whom the prophet tested with the offer of wine (Jer. xxxv, 3). B.C. 606. See JEHONADAB.

2. The son of Shaphan, whom Ezekiel in his vision saw standing in the midst of the seventy elders offering idolatrous incense in the "chambers of imagery" at Jerusalem (Ezek. viii, 11). B.C. 593.

3. The son of Azur, and one of the "princes" among the twenty-five men seen in vision by the same prophet at the east gate of the Temple, and represented as encouraging the city in its wicked pride (Ezek. xi, 1). B.C. 593

4. The son of Hoshaiah, a Maachathite, who acted in conjunction with Johanan, the son of Kareah, after the downfall of Jerusalem, first in submitting to the Babylonian governor Gedaliah, and, after his assassination, in requesting Jeremiah's advice as to the proper course for the people to pursue (2 Kings xxv, 23; Jer. xl, 8; xlii, 1). He appears to have assisted in recovering Ishmael's prey from his clutches (comp. Jer. xli, 11). After that he probably went to Egypt with the rest (Jer. xliii, 4, 5). He is doubtless the same person called AZARIAH, the son of Hoshaiah, who rejected the divine counsel thus asked, and insisted on fleeing into Egypt (Jer. xliii, 1). B.C. 587. See JEREMIAH.

Jaä'zer (Hebrew *Yaäzeyr'*, יַעְזֵיר, 1 Chron. vi, 81; xxvi, 31; elsewhere the more abbreviated form יַעְזֵר, *Yazer'*, *helper;* Sept. Ἰαζήρ [2 Sam. xxiv, 5, Ἐλιέζηρ]; Auth. Vers. "Jaazer" in Numb. xxi, 32; xxxii, 35; elsewhere "Jazer"), a city on the east of the Jordan, taken by the Israelites under Moses from the Amorites (Numb. xxi, 32), and assigned, with other neighboring places of Gilead, to the tribe of Gad (Numb. xxxiii, 1, 3, 35; Josh. xiii, 25); also constituted a Levitical city (Josh. xxi, 39; 1 Chron. vi, 81). It must have been a place of importance, for it gave its name to a large section of country. The "land of Jazer" was fertile, and its rich pastures attracted the attention of the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh (Numb. xxxii, 1). As it is mentioned between Dibon and Nimrah, it appears to have stood on the high plain north of Heshbon (Numb. xxxii, 3). It was allotted to the Merarite Levites (Josh. xxi, 39; 1 Chron. vi, 81), but in the time of David it would appear to have been occupied by Hebronites, i. e. descendants of Kohath (1 Chron. xxvi, 31). It seems to have given its name to a district of dependent or "daughter" towns (Numb. xxi, 32, A. V. "villages;" 1 Macc. v, 8). It is mentioned in connection with the census under David (2 Sam. xxiv, 5; 1 Chron. xxvi, 31), and was among the Moabitish places that experienced the desolating march of the Chaldæan invaders (Isa. xvi, 8; Jer. xlviii, 32, in which latter passage a "sea of Jazer" is spoken of). In the "burdens" proclaimed over Moab by the prophets, Jazer is mentioned so as to imply that there were vineyards there, and that the cultivation of the vine had extended thither from Sibmah (Isa. xvi, 8, 9; Jer. xlviii, 32). After the exile it remained in the hands of the Ammonites (1 Macc. v, 8). According to Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἰαζήρ), it lay 10 R. miles west (south-west) of Philadelphia (Rabbath-Ammon), and 15 from Heshbon. Josephus calls the place *Jazorus* (Ἰαζωρός, *Ant.* xii, 8, 1), and Ptolemy *Gazorus* (Γάζωρος, v, 16, 9). Seetzen (in Zach's *Monatl. Corresp.* xviii, 429) thinks it is found in the present ruins called *Syr* or *Sar* (Burckhardt's *Trav. in Syria*, p. 355, 357), but this is too near Rabbah according to Zimmerman's map, which also gives the village of *Seir* at the head of a wady of the same name, at about the proper location to correspond with that of Eusebius. Raumer (*Paläst.* p. 254) thinks it is rather the *Ain Hazir* (Burckhardt, *Trav.* p. 609); but this is in consequence of the statement of Eusebius in another place (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἀζώρ), that it lay eight miles from Philadelphia, confounding Jazer with Hazor (see Keil's *Comment. on Josh.* xiii, 25). As to the "sea of Jazer" mentioned by Jeremiah (xlviii, 32), which Gesenius (*Comment.* on Isa. xvi, 8) thinks an error, while Reland confounds it with the Jabbok (*Palæstina*, p. 825), and others with other streams (Büsching, *Erdbesch.* xi, 389); it is probably (see Hitzig, *Comm. zu Jes.* p. 196) the *Nahr Syr* or the above-named wady (see Prof. Stuart, in the *Bibl. Repos.* 1836, p. 157). With this identification Schwarz coincides (*Palestine*, p. 230). Porter (in Kitto's *Cyclop.* s. v.) suggests that "the land of Jazer" must have extended to the shore of the Dead Sea, and that "the sea of Jazer" may therefore have been so called by the inhabitants of the district, just as the northern lake took the name of "Tiberias," and "Gennesaret," and "Chinnereth." But this is unconfirmed by

any other passage. In Numb. xxi, 24, where the present Hebrew text has עַז (A.V. "strong"), the Sept. has put Ἰαζήρ. Burckhardt, in travelling from Es-Salt to Heshbon, passed the last-named-above ruined town, called *Sír*, situated on the side of a hill, and immediately below it was the source of a stream which ran down to the Jordan (*Trav. in Syria*, p. 364). The ruins appear to have been on the left (east) of the road, and below them and the road is the source of the wady *Szir* (Burckhardt), or *Mojeb es-Szir* (Seetzen), answering, though certainly in position, yet imperfectly in character, to the ποταμὸς μέγιστος of Eusebius. Seetzen conjectures that the sea of Jazer may have been at the source of this brook, considerable marshes or pools sometimes existing at these spots. (Comp. his earlier suggestion of the source of the wady *Serka*, p. 393.) Szîr, or Seir, is shown on the map of Van de Velde as 9 Roman miles W. of Ammân, and about 12 from Heshbon. There can be little doubt that this is the Jazer of the Bible (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 323). The prophecies of Scripture are fulfilled. The city and country are alike desolate. The vineyards that once covered the hill-sides are gone; and the wild Bedawîn from the eastern desert make cultivation of any kind impossible (Porter, *Hand-book for Syria and Palestine*, p. 298 sq.).

Jaäzi'ah (Heb. only in the paragogic form *Yaäziya'hu*, יַעֲזִיָּהוּ, *comforted* by *Jehovah;* Sept. Ὀζία), apparently a third son, or a descendant of Merari the Levite, and the founder of an independent house in that family (1 Chron. xxiv, 26, 27) (B.C. ante 1014); but neither he nor his descendants are mentioned elsewhere (compare the lists in xxiii, 21–23; Exod. vi, 19). The word Beno (בְּנוֹ), which follows Jaaziah, should probably be translated "his son," i. e. the son of Merari. But the text is in such a state that it is hard to know in what light to regard the person to whom it is assigned. Elsewhere the only sons of Merari mentioned are Mahli and Mushi (Exod. vi, 10; Numb. iii, 33; 1 Chron. vi, 4 [A.V. 19]; xxiii, 21).

Jaä'ziël (Heb. *Yaäziel'*, יַעֲזִיאֵל, *comforted* by *God;* Sept. Ἰηούλ v. r. Ὀζιήλ), a Levitical musician among those of the subordinate part (1 Chron. xv, 18); doubtless the same with the Aziel who was one of those that performed the *soprano* (ver. 20). B.C. 1014.

Jabajahites is the name of a modern Mohammedan sect which teaches "that the knowledge of God extends to all things, but is perfected by experience; and that he governs the world according to the chance of divers events, as not having had, from eternity, a perfect knowledge of all things future." Of course the orthodox Mohammedans look upon this doctrine as heretical, and condemn the Jabajahites as an impious and blasphemous set. See Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* i, 498. See Mohammedanism.

Ja'bal (Heb. *Yabal'*, יָבָל, a *stream*, as in Isa. xxx, 25; xliv, 4; Sept. Ἰωβήλ, Josephus Ἰώβηλος, *Ant.* i, 2, 2), a descendant of Cain, son of Lamech and Adah, and brother of Jubal; described in Gen. iv, 20 as "the father of such as dwell in tents, and have cattle." B.C. cir. 3500. This obviously means that Jabal was the first who adopted that nomadic life which is still followed by numerous Arabian and Tartar tribes in Asia (compare Buttman, *Mythologus*, i, 164 sq.). Abel had long before been a keeper of sheep (Gen. iv, 2); but Jabal invented such portable habitations (formed, doubtless, of skins) as enabled a pastoral people to remove their dwellings with them from one place to another, when they led their flocks to new pastures. See Tent. Bochart (*Hieroz.* i, ii, c. 44, near the end) points out the difference between his mode of life and Abel's. Jabal's was a migratory life, and his possessions probably included other animals besides sheep. The shepherds who were before him may have found the land on which they dwelt sufficiently productive for the constant sustenance of their flocks in the neighborhood of their fixed abodes. There is no need of supposing (with Hartmann, *Ueb. Pentat.* p. 395) any historical anticipation in Gen. iv, 17.

Jabalot, François Ferdinand, an Italian preacher of the Dominican order, was born at Parma in 1780, and educated at the university in that place. He paid particular attention to the study of Hebrew, and gained notoriety as a preacher and student of the Oriental languages. He was a distinguished member of the "Congregation of the Index," and one of the examiners of bishops. He died at Rome, March 9, 1834. His writings are, *Degli Ebrei nel loro rapporto colle nazioni Cristiane* (Rome, 1825, 12mo):—*Orazione funebre in morte del conte Antonio Cerati* (Parma, 1816, 4to). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 141.

Jab'bok (Heb. *Yabbok'*, יַבֹּק, according to Simonis, *Onomast.* p. 315, a *pouring out*, by Chaldaism from בָּקַק; otherwise, for יֵאָבֵק, a *wrestling*, from אָבַק, a coincidence that seems alluded to in Gen. xxxii, 24; Sept. Ἰαβώκ, but Ἰαβὼχ in Gen. xxxii, 22; Josephus Ἰάβακχος, *Ant.* iv, 5, 2; Chald. יוּבְקָא, Targ.), one of the streams which traverse the country east of the Jordan, and which, after a course nearly from east to west, between the districts of Merad and Belka (Seetzen, xviii, 427), falls into that river nearly midway between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea, or about forty-five miles below the Lake of Tiberias, another outlet for the water in time of freshets being situated a few miles higher up (Lynch, *Exped.* p. 253, and Map). It seems to rise in the Hauran mountains, and its whole course may be computed at sixty-five miles. It is mentioned in Scripture as the boundary which separated the kingdom of Sihon, king of the Amorites, or the territory of the Ammonites, from that of Og, king of Bashan (Josh. xii, 1–5; Numb. xxi, 24; Deut. ii, 37; Judg. xi, 13, 22); and it appears afterwards to have been the boundary between the tribe of Reuben and the half tribe of Manasseh (Numb. xxi, 6; Deut. iii, 16). The earliest notice of it occurs in Gen. xxxii, 22, in the account of Jacob's mysterious struggle with Jehovah in its vicinity (south bank). According to Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v.) it was between Gerasa (Jerash) and Philadelphia (Amman). Origen (*Opera*, ii, 43) says it was known in his day by the name *Jambice* (Ἰαμβίκη or Ἰαμβύκη).

"The stream is important in a geographical point of view, and a knowledge of its topography helps us to understand more easily some passages of Scripture. It was the boundary between the Amorites and the Ammonites. We are told that after the defeat of Sihon, king of the Amorites, at Jazer, 'Israel possessed his land from Arnon unto Jabbok, even unto the children of Ammon; for the border of the children of Ammon was strong' (Numb. xxi, 24). The Jabbok, flowing in a wild and deep ravine through the Gilead mountains, formed a strong natural frontier for the bordering principalities. It would seem that at the Exodus the Ammonites possessed the country eastward and northward of the upper sources and branches of the Jabbok, and that Sihon and Og occupied the whole region between the Ammonites and the Jordan, extending as far north as the Sea of Galilee (Josh. xii, 2–8; Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 5, 2 and 3). The Israelites conquered Sihon and Og, and took their kingdoms; and the possessions of the three tribes, thus acquired, extended from the Dead Sea to Hermon; but they were not permitted to touch the territory of Ammon (Deut. ii, 37; iii, 16). About fifteen miles from the Jordan the Jabbok forks, one branch coming down from Jerash on the north, and the other from Rabbath-Amman on the south; these branches formed the western frontier of the Ammonites, dividing them from the Amorites, and subseqently from the Israelites (Reland, *Pal.* p. 103). Previous to the Exodus the territory of the Ammonites was much more extensive, embracing the whole region between the Jabbok and the Arnon; but the Amorites drove them out of that portion, and forced them into the mountains around

the sources of the Jabbok, and into the plains eastward (Judg. xi, 13 22)" (Porter in Kitto, s. v.). It is now called the *Zerka* [or *Wady Zurka*] (from its "blue" color, Robinson's *Researches*, iii, Append. p. 326; but, according to Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 52, from a fortress of the same name on the caravan route from Damascus to Mecca). Its sources are chiefly on the eastern side of the mountains of Gilead, and it also drains a portion of the high plateau of Arabia beyond. In its passage westward across the plains it more than once passes under ground. The upper branches and tributaries are mere winter streams. At the point where the two main branches from Jerash and Ammon unite, the stream becomes perennial, and often, after heavy rain, is a foaming, impassable torrent. "The ravine through which it flows is narrow, deep, and in places wild. Throughout nearly its whole course it is fringed by thickets of cane and oleander, and the large clustering flowers of the latter give the banks a gay and gorgeous appearance during the spring and early summer" (Porter, *Handbook for S. and P.* p. 310). Higher up, the sides of the ravine are clothed with forests of evergreen oak, pine, and arbutus; and the undulating forest glades are carpeted with green grass, and strewn with innumerable wild flowers. The scenery along the banks of the Jabbok is probably the most picturesque in Palestine; and the ruins of town, and village, and fortress which stud the surrounding mountain sides render the country as interesting as it is beautiful. The water is pleasant, and, the bed being rocky, the stream runs clear (Burckhardt's *Syria*, p. 347; Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, p. 319; Buckingham, *Palestine*, ii, 109; Lindsay, ii, 123).

Ja'besh (Heb. *Yabesh'*, יָבֵשׁ, *dry*, as in Job xiii, 25; Ezek. xvii, 24, etc.; also written fully *Yabeysh'*, יָבֵישׁ, 1 Sam. xi, 1, 3, 5, 10; xxxi, 11; 2 Sam. ii, 4, 5; 1 Chron. x, 12, first time), the name of a place and also of a man.

1. (Sept. in Sam. Ἰαβίς, in Chron. Γαβείς.) The shorter form (1 Sam. xi, 3, 9, 10; xx, 12, 13; 1 Chron. x, 12, only) of the name of the city elsewhere called JABESH-GILEAD (q. v.).

2. (Sept. Ἰαβείς v. r. Ἀβείς, Joseph. Ἰάβησος, *Ant.* ix, 11, 1.) The father of Shallum, which latter usurped the throne of Israel by the assassination of Zachariah (2 Kings xv, 10, 13, 14). B.C. ante 770.

Ja'besh-gil'eäd (Heb. *Yabesh' Gilad'*, יָבֵשׁ גִּלְעָד [also יָבֵישׁ, see JABESH, by which simple form it is sometimes called]; Sept. Ἰαβείς or Ἰαβίς [in Chron. Γαβείς] Γαλαάδ or τῆς Γαλααδίτιδος; Josephus Ἰάβισος [*Ant.* v, 2, 11], Ἰαβίς [*Ant.* vi, 5, 1], and Ἰαβισσός [*Ant.* vi, 14, 8]), a town beyond the Jordan, in the land of Gilead, distant a night's journey from Bethshan (1 Sam. xxxi, 11; 2 Sam. ii, 4; xxi, 12). In the sense denoted in this juxtaposition, Gilead included the half tribe of Manasseh (1 Chron. xxvii, 21), as well as the tribes of Gad and Reuben (Numb. xxxii, 1-42) east of the Jordan; and of the cities of Gilead, Jabesh was the chief, lying within the limits of the half tribe of Manasseh east. It is first mentioned in connection with the cruel vengeance taken upon its inhabitants for not coming up to Mizpeh on the occasion of the fierce war between the children of Israel and the tribe of Benjamin. Every male of the city was put to the sword, and all the virgins—to the number of 400—seized to be given in marriage to the 600 men of Benjamin that remained (Judg. xxi, 8-14). Nevertheless the city survived the loss of its males, and is next memorable for the siege it sustained from Nahash, king of the Ammonites, the raising of which formed the first exploit of the newly-elected king Saul, and procured his confirmation in the sovereignty. The inhabitants had agreed to surrender, and to have their right eyes put out (to incapacitate them from military service), but were allowed seven days to ratify the treaty. In the mean time Saul collected a large army, and came to their relief (1 Sam. xi). This service was gratefully remembered by the Jabeshites, and about forty years after, when he and his three sons were slain by the Philistines in Mount Gilboa (1 Sam. xxxi, 8), the men of Jabesh-gilead came by night and took down their corpses from the walls of Bethshan, where they had been exposed as trophies, then burned the bodies, and buried the bones under a tree near the city, observing a strict funeral fast for seven days (ver. 13). "Jabesh-gilead was on the mountain, east of the Jordan, in full view of Bethshan, and these brave men could creep up to the tell along wady Jalûd without being seen, while the deafening roar of the brook would render it impossible for them to be heard" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 174). David does not forget to bless them for this act of piety towards his old master, and his more than brother (2 Sam. ii, 15), though he afterwards had the remains translated to the ancestral sepulchre in the tribe of Benjamin (2 Sam. xxi, 14). Jabesh still existed as a town in the time of Eusebius, who places it on a hill six miles from Pella, towards Gerasa (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἀριαώθ and Ἰαβείς). Mr. Buckingham thinks it may be found in a place called *Jehaz* or *Jejaz*, marked by ruins upon a hill in a spot not far from which, according to the above indications, Jabesh must have been situated (*Travels*, ii, 130, 134). It was more probably situated on the present wady *Jabes*, which Burckhardt (*Trav. in Syria*, p. 289) describes as entering the Jordan not far below Beisan. According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 234), there is a village of the same name still existing on this wady ten miles east of Jordan; but Dr. Robinson, during his last visit to this region, sought in vain for any village or ruins by that name (which, he says, is applied exclusively to the wady), but thinks the site of Jabesh-gilead may be marked by that of the ruins called by the Arabs *ed-Deir* (the convent), high up the wady, on the south side, on a hill, and containing columns as he was informed (new ed. of *Researches*, iii, 319). It is about six miles from the ruins of Pella, near the line of the ancient road to Gerasa (Van de Velde, *Travels*, ii, 349-52; Porter, *Handbook for Syria and Palest.* p. 317; Stanley, *Sinai and Pal.* p. 290).

Ja'bez (Heb. *Yabets'*, יַעְבֵּץ, according to 1 Chron. iv, 9, *affliction*, sc. to his mother, apparently by transposition from the root עָצַב; Sept. Ἰγαβής and Γαβής or Γάβης), the name of a man and also of a place.

1. A descendant of Judah (B.C. post 1612), but of what particular family is not apparent, although we have this remarkable account of him inserted among a series of bare pedigrees: "And Jabez was more honorable than his brethren: and his mother called his name Jabez, saying, Because I bare him with sorrow (עֹצֶב, *o'tseb*). And Jabez called on the God of Israel, saying, Oh that thou wouldst bless me indeed, and enlarge my coast, and that thine hand might be with me, and that thou wouldst keep me from evil, that it may not grieve me (עָצְבִּי, *otsbi'*)! And God granted him that which he requested" (1 Chron. iv, 9, 10). It is very doubtful whether any connection exists between this genealogy and that in ii, 50-55. Several names appear in both—Hur, Ephratah, Bethlehem, Zareathites (in A. V. iv, 2 inaccurately "Zorathites"), Joab, Caleb; and there is much similarity between others, as Rechab and Rechah, Eshton and Eshtaulites; but any positive connection seems undemonstrable. The Targum identifies Jabez and Othniel. For the traditionary notices of this person and his character, see Clarke's *Comment.* ad loc.

2. A place described as being inhabited by several families of the scribes descended from the Kenites, and allied to the Rechabites (1 Chron. ii, 55). It occurs in a notice of the progeny of Salma, who was of Judah, and closely connected with Bethlehem (ver. 51), possibly the father of Boaz; and also—though how is not clear—with Joab. The Targum states some curious particulars, which, however, do not much elucidate the difficulty, and which are probably a mixture of trustworthy tradition and of mere invention based on philological grounds. Rechab is there identified with Rechabiah, the son of Eliezer, Moses's younger son (1

Chron. xxvi, 25), and Jabez with Othniel the Kenezite, who bore the name of Jabez "because he founded by his counsel (עֵירָצָה) a school (תַּרְבִּיצָא) of disciples called Tirathites, Shimeathites, and Sucathites." See also the quotations from Talmud, *Temurah*, in Buxtorf's *Lex.* col. 966, where a similar derivation is given. As the place appears to have been situated within the territory of Judah, it may have been settled by the numerous posterity of the above person by the same name (comp. "the men of Rechah," 1 Chron. iv, 12). The associated names would seem to indicate a locality near, if not identical with Kirjath-jearim (comp. in the same region Kirjath-sepher, or *book-town*, implying the literary avocation of its inhabitants), where some of the same families appear to have dwelt (1 Chron. ii, 53), e. g. the Ithrites = Kenites, the Shumathites = Simeathites.

Jabez, Isaac BEN-SALOMO BEN-ISAAC BEN-JOSEPH, a Jewish commentator of some note, flourished in the 15th century. Of his personal history we are uninformed, but his works, of great celebrity in the 15th century, still continue to be considered valuable contributions to exegetical literature; and Frankfurter, in his "Rabbinic Bible," inserted the following, which are, however, rather compilations from different expositors than the original productions of Jabez: (1) תהלות יְהוָֹה, or *Commentary on the Psalms:*—(2) למודי יהוה, or *Commentary on Proverbs:*—(3) יראת שדי, or *Commentary on Proverbs:*—(4) קדש קדשים, or *Commentary on the Song of Songs:*—(5) צמח צדיק, or *Commentary on Ruth:*—(6) צדקת תמים, or *Commentary on Lamentations:*—(7) שערי מרע, or *Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes:*—(8) עטרת שלום, or *Commentary on the Book of Esther:*—(9) ברכת ישרים, or *Commentary on Daniel:*—(10) מושיע חוסים, or *Commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah.* Besides these, Jabez wrote יפק רצון, or *homiletical Commentary on the Haphtaroth*, or Sabbatic Lessons from the prophets (Belvidere, near Constantinople, 1593, folio):—סלת המנחה, or *Commentary on the Pentateuch.* See Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebræa*, i, 694; iii, 617 sq.; iv, 886; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 2; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. in Biblioth. Bodl.* col. 1125; C. D. Ginsburg, in Kitto, s. v.

Ja'bin (Heb. *Yabin'*, יָבִין, *discerner;* Sept. Ἰαβίς [v. r. Ἰαβὶν, but Ἰαβεὶν in Psa. lxxxiii, 9], Josephus Ἰαβῖνος, *Ant.* v, 5, 1), the name of two kings of the Canaanitish city Hazor. See HAZOR. It was possibly a royal title, like Agag among the Amalekites, and Abimelech among the Philistines.

1. A king of Hazor, and one of the most powerful of all the princes who reigned in Canaan when it was invaded by the Israelites (Josh. xi, 1-14). His dominion seems to have extended over all the north part of the country; and after the ruin of the league formed against the Hebrews in the south by Adonizedek, king of Jerusalem, he assembled his tributaries near the waters of Merom (the Lake Huleh), and called all the people to arms. This coalition was destroyed, as the one in the south had been, and Jabin himself perished in the sack of Hazor, his capital, B.C. cir. 1615. This prince was the last powerful enemy with whom Joshua combated, and his overthrow seems to have been regarded as the crowning act in the conquest of the Promised Land, leaving only the Anakim in the mountains of Judah and Ephraim to be dispossessed in detail (Josh. xi, 21-23; comp. xiv, 6-15).

2. Another king of Hazor, and probably descended from the preceding (Judg. iv, 2, 3), with whom some (Maurer, *Comment.* on Josh. xi; Hervey, *Genealogies*, p. 228) have confounded him (see Hävernick, *Einleit.* II, i, 53; Keil, on *Joshua* xi, 10-15). It appears that during one of the servitudes of the Israelites, probably when they lay under the yoke of Cushan or Eglon, the kingdom of Hazor was reconstructed. The narrative gives to this second Jabin even the title of "king of Canaan;" and this, with the possession of 900 iron-armed war-chariots, implies unusual power and extent of dominion. The iniquities of the Israelites having lost them the divine protection, Jabin gained the mastery over them; and, stimulated by the memory of ancient hostilities, oppressed them heavily for twenty years, B.C. 1429-1409. From this thraldom they were relieved by the great victory won by Barak in the plain of Esdraelon, over the hosts of Jabin, commanded by Sisera, one of the most renowned generals of those times (Judg. iv, 10-16). See SISERA. The well-compacted power of the king of Hazor was not yet, however, entirely broken. The war was still prolonged for a time, but ended in the entire ruin of Jabin, and the subjugation of his territories by the Israelites (Judg. iv, 24). This is the Jabin whose name occurs in Psa. lxxxiii, 10. See HAZOR.

Jabineau, Henri, a French religious writer, born at Etampes near the opening of the last century, was, after completing his studies at Paris, appointed professor at the Vitry-le-Français College on his refusal to subscribe the formulary generally submitted before a candidate is permitted to enter the priesthood. But his attainments were of such superior order that the archbishop of Châlons-sur-Marne waived this obligation, and Jabineau was consecrated a priest. He then became rector at the College of Vitry. But he soon exchanged the rostrum for the pulpit, where, on account of his liberal views, he was several times interdicted. In 1768 he entered the lawyer's profession, and during the Revolution wrote a number of vehement articles against the French clergy of the Roman Catholic Church. He died in July, 1792, shortly before the publication of the decree of the National Assembly against priests (Aug. 26, 1792). The most important of his writings are, *Compétence de la puissance temporelle relativement à l'érection et à la suppression des siéges épiscopaux* (Par. 1760, 8vo; 1790, and often):—*Exposition des principes de la foi Catholique sur l'Église, recueillie des instructions familières de M. Jab . . .* (published shortly after his death, Par. 1792, 8vo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 142.

Jablonski, Daniel Ernst, a distinguished German theologian, was born at a little village near Dantzic Nov. 26, 1660. The name of his father, a preacher, was originally Figulus, but he in after life exchanged it for Jablonski, deriving the name from that of his native place, Jablunka, a small village in Silesia. Young Jablonski was educated at the gymnasium of Lyssa, in Prussian Poland, and at the University of Frankfort on the Oder (now constituting the Berlin University), where he applied himself to literature and philosophy, but more especially to theology and the Oriental languages. In 1680 he visited the universities and libraries of Holland and England, and spent considerable time at Oxford. On his return in 1683 he was appointed preacher at one of the reformed churches of Magdeburg, which place he left two years later in order to assume the rectorship of the gymnasium at Lyssa. In 1690 he was made court preacher at Königsberg, and in 1693 his fame procured him the place of preacher to the king at Berlin. But still other honorable offices awaited him. Thus, in 1718, he was made a member of the Consistory, in 1729 a Church councillor, and in 1733 he was elected president of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin. At the request of the king, Frederick I, he labored earnestly, but unsuccessfully, to accomplish a union of the different Protestant churches. He died at Berlin May 25, 1741. The greater part of his life had been devoted to severe study, and he was eminently successful as a preacher. Dr. Hagenbach (Hurst's transl. of *Ch. Hist. of 18th and 19th Cent.* i, 410, 412) says that Jablonski was a bishop among the Moravians (1698), and even was "the eldest of the Moravian bishops," and that he consecrated both David Nitschmann (q. v.) and

count Zinzendorf for the episcopal office. At the instance of the queen, he was honored as early as 1706 with the degree of doctor of divinity. Jablonski translated into Latin the eight discourses of Richard Bentley against Atheism, the treatise of Joseph Woodward on the religious societies of London, and that of Burnet on predestination and grace; but he is especially celebrated by an edition of the Hebrew Bible, with notes and an introduction, published under the title of *Biblia Hebraica cum notis Hebraicis* (Berlin, 1699, 2 vols. 4to; 2d ed. 1712, 12mo). The preface has since been printed in other editions of the Hebrew Bible. Both editions have a list, by Leusden, of 2294 select verses, in which all the words to be found in the Bible are contained. He also published an edition of the Talmud, and wrote a number of religious works, the most important of which is *Christliche Predigten* (Berlin, 1716, etc., 10 parts, 4to). Many of Jablonski's writings bear on the state of the Church in Poland. One of the most able of them is the *Historia Consensus Sendomiriensis inter evangelicos regni Poloniæ et Lithuaniæ* (Berlin, 1731, 4to), etc. See Ersch u. Gruber, *Allg. Encyk.* s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvi, 145; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v.

Jablonski, Paul Ernst, a distinguished German theologian and philologist, and son of the former Jablonski, was born at Berlin in 1693. He was educated at the University of Frankfort on the Oder, where he acquired such great proficiency in the Coptic as well as other Oriental languages that the government of Prussia sent the young man of twenty-one years, at the expense of the king (in 1714), to visit the principal libraries and high schools of Europe, to perfect himself in his knowledge of the Oriental tongues, and decipher Coptic and other MSS. For this purpose he visited the universities of Oxford, Leyden, and Paris. After his return home he entered the ministry, and was appointed pastor at Liebenberg in 1720. He, however, soon found that his place was in the rostrum rather than in the pulpit, and in 1721 accepted the professorship of philosophy in his alma mater. In 1722 he was honored with the appointment of professor of theology, and shortly after was elected a member of the Royal Academy of Berlin. He died December 14, 1557. Jablonski was one of the most learned of the many who have endeavored to throw light on the language, literature, and antiquities of the Egyptians. His Egyptian Glossary, which makes the first volume of the *Opuscula quibus lingua et antiquitas Ægyptiorum*, etc., published by J. S. te Water (Leyden, 1804-10, 3 vols. 8vo), is pronounced by Quatremère the most complete work in that department. Another work of great value in this department, and certainly one of the best productions of Jablonski, is the *Pantheon Ægyptiorum sive de diis eorum commentarius, cum prolegomenis de religione et theologia Ægyptiorum* (Berlin, 1750-52, 3 vols. 8vo). The other works of especial value, and of interest to our readers, are, *Disquisitio de Lingua Lycaonica* (Berlin, 1714, 4to; 2d edition, Utrecht, 1724), an attempt to prove that the language of Lycaonia, mentioned in Acts xiv, 11, bore no relation to Greek:—*Exercitatio historico-theologica de Nestorianismo*, etc. (Berlin, 1724, 8vo; German by Immermann, Magdeburg, 1752, 4to); this work, intended as a defence of Nestorianism, excited great controversy among the German theologians:—*Remphan, Ægyptiorum Deus, ab Israelitis deserto cultus* (Francfort ad Oder, 1735, 4to):—*Dissert. exeg.-histor. de Serapi parabolico, ad Matt. xiii*, 31 *et* 32 (Francfort ad Oder, 1736, 4to):—*De ultimis Pauli apostoli laboribus a beato Luca prætermissis* (Berl. 1746, 4to):—*De Memnone Græcorum et Ægyptiorum, hujusque celeberrima in Thebaide statua, Syntagmata III* (Francfort ad Oder, 1753, 4to):—*Institutiones historiæ Christianæ antiquioris* (Francfort ad Oder, 1753, 8vo):—*Institutiones hist. Christianæ recentioris* (Francf. 1756, 8vo); the two latter works were published together under the title *Inst. Hist. Christianæ* (Francfort ad Oder, 1766, 1767, 2 vols. 8vo; revised and augmented by E. A. Schulze, id. 1783, 1784, 2 vols. 8vo; 3d vol. by E. H. D. Stosch, containing the history of the 18th century, idem. 1767, 8vo; revised and completed by A. P. G. Schickedanz, id. 1786, 8vo). See Ersch u. Gruber, *Allg. Encyklop.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 146 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bib. Lit.* s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, s. v.

Jab'neël (Hebrew *Yabneël'*, יַבְנְאֵל, *built* by *God*; Sept. Ἰαβνήλ, but Ἰαβιήλ in Josh. xix, 33), the name of two places.

1. A town on the northern boundary of Judah, between Mount Baalah and the Mediterranean (Josh. xv, 11); probably the same elsewhere (2 Chron. xxvi, 6) called JABNEH (q. v.) or JAMNIA (1 Macc. iv, 15, etc.).

2. A city on the border of Naphtali, mentioned between Nekeb and Lakum (Josh. xix, 33). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 181, 182) affirms that the later name of Jabneel was *Kefr Yamah*, "the village by the sea," and on Talmudical grounds (comp. Reland's *Palæst.* p. 545, 716) locates it on the southern shore of Lake Merom, and thinks it identical with the *Jamnia* or *Jamnith* mentioned by Josephus as lying in this section of Upper Galilee (Ἰάμνια, *Life*, 37; Ἰαμνιθ, *War*, ii, 20, 6). This is not improbable, as the boundary-line here described appears to have extended from the northern limit of Palestine along the eastern bounds of Naphtali to the Jordan proper. It is perhaps the village *Ja'uneh*, visited by Dr. Robinson, on the declivity of the western mountain south of Lake Huleh, with a wady containing a small stream on the south of the village, and a few ruins of the Jewish type (*Later Researches*, p. 361, 362).

Jab'neh (Heb. *Yabneh'*, יַבְנֶה, a *building*; Hamaker, *Miscell. Phœn.* p. 256, compares the Arabic *Yubnay*; Sept. Ἰαβήρ v. r. Ἰαβνῆ and Ἰαβείς, Vulg. *Jabnia*), a Philistine town near the Mediterranean, between Joppa and Ashdod, whose wall king Uzziah demolished (2 Chron. xxvi, 6). It is probably this place whose name many of the copies of the Sept. insert in Josh. xv, 56 (Ἰεμναΐ, Ἰαμναί, Ἰεμνάθ, Cod. Vat. Γεμνά). In later times (Josephus, *War*, i, 7, 7; Strabo, xvi, 759; Pliny, v, 14), under the name of *Jamnia* (Ἰαμνία, 1 Macc. iv, 15; Ἰάμνεια, 1 Macc. v, 58; x, 69; 2 Macc. xii, 8), it was inhabited by Jews as well as Gentiles (Philo, *Opp.* ii, 575). According to Josephus (*Ant.* xii, 8, 6), Gorgias was governor of it; but the text of the Maccabees (2 Macc. xii, 32) has Idumæa. At this time there was a harbor on the coast (see Ptol. v, 16, 2), to which, and the vessels lying there, Judas set fire, and the conflagration was seen at Jerusalem, a distance of about twenty-five miles (2 Macc. xii, 9). The harbor is also mentioned by Pliny, who, in consequence, speaks of the town as double—*duæ Jamnes* (see Reland, p. 823). Like Ascalon and Gaza, the harbor bore the title of Majumas, perhaps a Coptic word, meaning the "place on the sea" (Kenrick, *Phœnicia*, p. 27, 29). Pompey took the place from the Jews and joined it to the province of Syria (Josephus, *War*, i, 7, 7). Its distance from Jerusalem was 240 stadia (2 Macc. xii, 7), from Diospolis twelve Roman miles (*Itin. Anton.*), from Ascalon 200 stadia (Strabo, xvi, 759). At the time of the fall of Jerusalem, Jabneh was one of the most populous places of Judæa, and contained a Jewish school of great fame, whose learned doctors are often mentioned in the Talmud (Mishna, *Rosh Hasshana*, iv, 1; *Sanhedr.* xi, 4; comp. Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 285 sq.; Sperbach, *Diss. de Academia Jabhnensi ejusque rectoribus*, Viteb. 1740; Lightfoot, *Academ. Jabn. histor.*, in his *Opp.* ii, 87 sq.). The Jews called this school their Sanhedrim, though it only possessed a faint shadow of the authority of that great council (Milman, *History of the Jews*, iii, 95, 2d edit.; Lightfoot, ii, 141-143). In this holy city, according to an early Jewish tradition, was buried the great Gamaliel. His tomb was visited by Parchi in the 14th century (Zunz, in Asher's *Benj. of Tudela*, ii, 439, 440; also 98). In the time of Eusebius, however, it had dwindled to a small place (πολίχνη), merely requiring casual mention (*Onomasticon*, s. v. Ἰαμνεία). In the 6th cen-

tury, under Justinian, it became the seat of a Christian bishop (Epiphanius, *adv. Hær.* lib. ii, 730). Under the Crusaders, who thought it to be the site of Gath, and who built a fortress in it, it bore the corrupted name of *Ibelin*, and gave a title to a line of counts, one of whom, Jean d'Ibelin, about 1250, restored to efficiency the famous code of the "Assises de Jérusalem" (Gibbon, chap. lviii ad fin.). For the history in full, see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 822; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* ii, 2, p. 366; Raumer, *Paläst.* p. 200; comp. Thomson, *L. and B.* ii, 312 sq.

The name *Yebna* is still borne by a little village among the ruins of the ancient site, upon a small eminence on the western side of wady Rubin, about one hour from the sea (Irby and Mangles, p. 182; *Corresp. d'Orient*, v, p. 373, 374). According to Scholz (*Reisen*, p. 146), there are here the ruins of a former church, afterwards a mosque; also, nearer the sea, the ruins of a Roman bridge over the wady, with high arches, built of very large stones. On the eastern side of the wady, on a small eminence, is the tomb of Rubin (Reuben), the son of Jacob, from whom the wady takes its name; it is mentioned by Mejr ed-Din (1495) as having been formerly a noted place of pilgrimage for Moslems, as it still is in some degree (*Fundgr. des Orients*, ii, 138). It is about eleven miles south of Jaffa, seven from Ramleh, and four from Akir (Ekron). (See Robinson's *Researches*, iii, 22; Ritter, *Erdk.* xvi, 125.) It probably occupies its ancient site, for some remains of old buildings are to be seen, possibly relics of the fortress which the Crusaders built there (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 274).

This position likewise corresponds with that of JABNEEL (Josh. xv, 11) on the western end of the northern boundary of Judah (so Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 98; Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.), which is placed by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Jamneel) between Ashdod and Diospolis. There is no sign of its ever having been occupied by Judah. Josephus (*Ant.* v, 1, 22) correctly attributes it to the Danites. There was a constant struggle going on between that tribe and the Philistines for the possession of all the places in the lowland plain [see DAN], and it is not surprising that the next time we meet with Jabneel it should be in the hands of the latter (2 Chron. xxvi, 6).

Jabrūda (Ἰαβρουδά), a city of Palestine mentioned by Ptolemy (v, 15), and as an episcopal city by St. Paulo (*Geogr. Sacr.* p. 294); now *Yebrûd*, a village, but still the seat of a bishop; rather more than an hour to the west of the great caravan road from Damascus to Homs, nearly midway between these two cities (Porter, *Damascus*, i, 360).—Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 323; Robinson, *Later Researches*, p. 556.

Ja'chan (Heb. *Yakan'*, יַעְכָּן, *mourner;* Sept. Ἰαχάν v. r. Ἰωαχάν), one of seven chief Gadite "brothers" resident in Bashan (1 Chron. v, 13). B.C. between 1093 and 782. See also AKAN.

Ja'chin (Heb. *Yakin'*, יָכִין, *firm;* Sept. Ἰαχείν, Ἰαχίν), the name of three men and also of a pillar.

1. The fourth named of the sons of Simeon (Gen. xlvi, 10; Exod. vi, 15), called JARIB in 1 Chron. iv, 24. His descendants are called JACHINITES (Heb. *Yakini'*, יָכִינִי, Sept. Ἰαχινί, Numb. xxvi, 12). B.C. 1856.

2. The head of the twenty-first "course" of priests as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 17). B.C. 1014.

3. One of the priests that returned to Jerusalem after the Exile (1 Chron. ix, 10: Neh. xi, 10). B.C. 536.

4. JACHIN (Sept. in Kings Ἰαχούμ, Alex. Ἰαχούν; but in Chron. κατόρθωσις in both MSS.; Josephus Ἰαχίν; Vulg. *Jachin, Jachim*) AND BOAZ were the names of two columns (the former on the right hand [south], the latter on the left) set up (according to Phœnician style: compare Menander in Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 5, 3; see Vatke's *Bibl. Theol.* p. 324, 326; Movers, *Phön.* i, 293) in the porch (לְאֻלָם) of Solomon's Temple (1 Kings vii, 15-22; 2 Chron. iii, 17; comp. Jer. lii, 21), and doubtless of symbolical import (Simonis, *Onomasticon*, p. 430, 460). See ARCHITECTURE; TEMPLE. Each was eighteen cubits high and twelve in circumference, or four in diameter. They were formed of brass (copper or bronze, perhaps some more precious alloy) four fingers in thickness (Jer. lii, 21). The capitals (quadrangular, Jer. lii, 23), also of brass, were five cubits high (1 Kings vii, 16; Jer. lii, 22; 2 Chron. iii, 15). The description of the ornaments (of the same metal, Jer. lii, 22) of the capitals (1 Kings vii, 17 sq.; compare 2 Kings xxv, 17; 2 Chron. ii, 15; iv, 12; Jer. lii, 22) is much confused and obscure (Hitzig, *Jerem.* p. 423), either on account of the brevity or in consequence of some corruption in the text, and it is therefore no wonder that antiquarians (see Lamy,

The Column of Jachin or Boaz. (From Paine's *Temple of Solomon*, pl. xii.)

De Tabern. fœd. p. 1043 sq.; Meyer, *Blätt. f. höh. Warh.* i, 13 sq.; ix, 31 sq.; Grünersen, in the *Stuttgart. Kunstb.* 1831, No. 77 sq.; Keil, *Tempel Solomo's*, p. 95 sq.; Schnaase, *Gesch. der bild. Kunste*, i, 245, 280) and architects (Schmidt, *Biblic. Mathem.* p. 253 sq.) should have varied greatly in their views and reconstructions on this point (compare Lamy, *Tab.* 18; Scheuchzer, *Phys. sacr.* iii, tab. 443 sq.; see Meyer, *ut sup.*). It is clear, however, that the capitals were swelling at the top, and lily-shaped (1 Kings vii, 18, 20; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 3, 4). (For discussions of various points connected with the subject, see Rosenmüller on Jer. lii, 22; Meyer's *Bibelleut.* p. 257; Jahn, iii, 261; Movers, *Chron.* p. 253; Hirt, *Gesch. d. Baukunst*, tab. 3, fig. 20; Böttcher, *Prob. alttest. Schriftausl.* p. 335; Keil, *Comment.* on 1 Kings vi, 15. Monographs on the subject have been written by J. G. Michaelis, Frankft. 1733; Unger, Lugd. 1733; and Kilchberger, Berl. 1783; especially M. Plesken, *De columnis æneis*, Viteb. 1719; also in Ugolini *Thesaurus*, x; compare the treatises of Lightfoot, Keil, Hirt, and Bardwell on *Solomon's Temple.*)—Winer, i, 520. See BOAZ; PILLAR.

Jachini, ABRAHAM. See LEWI (*Sabbatai*).

Ja'chinite (Numb. xxvi, 12). See JACHIN 1.

Jacinth (ὑάκινθος, the *hyacinth*), properly a flower of a deep purple or reddish blue (so ὑακίνθινος, *hyacinthine*, i. e. hyacinth-colored, "of jacinth," Rev. ix, 17); hence a precious stone of like color (Rev. xxi, 20). Considerable doubt prevails as to the real mineral thus designated, if indeed any particular stone be intended, and not rather every purplish or azure gem. According to Dr. Moore (*Anc. Mineralogy*, p. 169), it is most nearly related to the *zircon* of modern mineralogists. The hyacinth or jacinth stone was of various colors, from white or pale green to purple-red. Pliny speaks of it as shining with a golden color, and in much favor as an amulet or charm against the plague (*Hist. Nat.* xxxvii, 9). It occurs in the Sept. for תַּחַשׁ, Exod. xxv, 5; also for תְּכֵלֶת, Exod. xxvi, 4; but is usually supposed to represent the Heb. לֶשֶׁם, "ligure" (q. v.) (Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterthumsk.* IV, i, p. 38). See GEM.

Jackal, the Persic *shaal*, Turkish *jakal*, *canis aureus* of Linnæus, has been thought to be denoted by several Hebrew words variously rendered in the Auth. Vers. See FOX; DRAGON; WHELP, etc. It is a wild animal of the canine family [see WOLF; DOG], which in Persia, Armenia, likewise Arabia (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* 166), and even in Syria (Russel, *Aleppo*, ii, 61) and Palestine (around Jaffa, Gaza, and in Galilee, Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 271; among the hills of Judæa, Robinson, ii, 432; iii, 188), is frequently met with, attaining a large size (three and a half feet in length), and so closely resembling a fox in color and general appearance as to be at first readily mistaken for that animal. But the jackal has a somewhat peculiarly formed head, not greatly unlike that of a shepherd's dog, about seven inches long, with a very pointed muzzle, and yellowish-red hair,

Eastern Jackals.

which resembles that of the wolf. The color of the body is yellowish-gray above, whitish below; the back and sides sometimes of mixed gray and black; the shoulders, thighs, and legs uniformly tawny-yellow. The tail is round, projecting, and reaching hardly to the heel. The eyes are large, with a round pupil. It is gregarious in its habits, hunting in packs (generally preying upon smaller animals and poultry, but frequently attacking the larger quadrupeds), the pest of the countries where it is found. It burrows in the earth, preferring forests and caverns, where it usually lies hid during the daytime; but at night it issues in companies (sometimes very large) on predatory incursions among the villages, and often the immediate vicinity of towns. Its favorite food is fowls or carrion, and it will break into graves to make a meal upon the corpse, and even carry off and devour young children if found unprotected. In a wild state, this animal has an intolerably offensive odor. Colonel Hamilton Smith, in his *Canidæ*, states that "jackals form a group of crepuscular and nocturnal canines, never voluntarily abroad before dark, and then hunting for prey during the whole night; entering the streets of towns to seek for offals, robbing the hen-roosts, entering out-houses, examining doors and windows, feasting upon all dressed vegetables and ill-secured provisions, devouring all the carrion they find exposed, and digging their way into sepulchres that are not carefully protected against their activity and voraciousness; and in the fruit season, in common with foxes, seeking the vineyards, and fattening upon grapes. They congregate in great numbers, sometimes as many as two hundred being found together, and they howl so incessantly that the annoyance of their voices is the theme of numerous apologues and tales in the literature of Asia. This cry is a melancholy sound, beginning the instant the sun sets, and never ceasing till after it has arisen. The voice is uttered and responded to by all within hearing, in an accent of every possible tone, from a short, hungry yelp to a prolonged crescendo cry, rising octave above octave in the shrillness, and mingled with dismal whinings, as of a human being in distress." Their nightly howl has a peculiar wailing tone (Russel, *Aleppo*, p. 62; Russegger, *Reise*, iii, 125), greatly resembling the cry of a child. "These sinister, guilty, woebegone brutes, when pressed with hunger, gather in gangs among the graves, and yell in rage, and fight like fiends over their midnight orgies; but on the battle-field is their great carnival" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 134). (See, generally, Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 180 sq., who maintains that the jackal was designated among the Greeks and Romans by the name θώς, θωός, Kämpfer, *Amoen.* ii, 406 sq.; Gmelin, *Reise*, ii, 81 sq. Güldenstädt, in *Nov. comment. acad. Petropol.* xx, 449 sq.; Oedmann, *Samml.* ii, 18 sq.)

This animal is very generally regarded as denoted by the name אִי (*i*, the *howler*, in the plural, אִיִּים, *iyim'*, "wild beasts of the islands"), represented as inhabiting deserts (Isa. xiii, 22; xxxiv, 14; Jer. xl, 39). It is more usually recognised as the שׁוּעָל, *shu-al'*, of Scripture (ἀλώπηξ, "fox"), especially in the instance of Samson's exploit (Judg. xv, 4; compare Rosenmüller, *Alterthumsk.* IV, ii, 156 sq., and *Scholia ad Judices*, p. 327). See Fox. We have, however, no proof that *shual'* denotes exclusively the fox, and that *iyim'*, and Solomon's little foxes, refer solely to jackals; particularly as these animals were, if really known, not abundant in Western Asia, even during the first century of the Roman empire; for they are but little noticed by the Greek writers and sportsmen who resided where now they are heard and seen every evening; these authorities offering no remark on the most prominent characteristic of the species, namely, the chorus of howlings lasting all night—a habit so intolerable that it is the invariable theme of all the Shemitic writers since the Hegira whenever they mention the jackal. We may therefore infer that *shual'*, if a general denomination, and that *iyim'*, if the etymology be just, is derived from howling or barking, and may designate the jackal, though more probably it includes also those wild Canidæ which have a similar habit. Indeed, as Ehrenberg (*Icon. et descript. mammal. dec.* 2) has remarked, it is likely that travellers have usually confounded the jackal with the *canis Syriacus*, while a thorough treatise on the *canis aureus* is still a desideratum (see Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 56).

There is also another term in the O. T., תַּן (*tan*, in plural by Chaldaism, תַּנִּין, *tannin'*, regarded by others as the singular, whence a true plur. תַּנִּינִים, *tanninim'*, "dragons"), described as a wild animal inhabiting deserts, and uttering a plaintive cry (Job xxx, 29; Mic. i, 8); often joined (in poetic parallelism) with בַּת יַעֲנָה, "daughter of the ostrich," and אִיִּים, *iyim'* (Isa. xiii, 22; xxxiv, 13; xliii, 20). The Syriac understands the *jackal*, and the Arabic the *wolf* (comp. Pococke, *Comm. in Mic.* ad loc.; Schnurrer, *Diss. philol.* p. 323 sq.). It is possibly no more than the *canis Syriacus* after all. Bochart (*Hieroz.* iii, 222 sq.) interprets it of an enormous kind of serpent. See Dragon.

Jackson, Arthur, an English Nonconformist divine, was born in Suffolk in 1593. He studied at Trinity College, Cambridge, became lecturer, and afterwards minister of St. Michael's, Wood Street, London. Subsequently he received the living of St. Faith's, but was ejected for nonconformity in 1662, and died in 1666. His annotations are still esteemed. His writings are principally in the exegetical department, and are generally considered valuable even in our day. Of these the best are, *A Help for the understanding of the Holy Scripture* (Camb. 1643, 3 vols. 4to):—*Annotations on*

the whole Book of Isaiah (London, 1682, 4to).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.

Jackson, Cyril, a celebrated English divine, was born in 1742. He was educated at Oxford University, and, after holding several benefices, was appointed dean of Christ Church, Oxford, which position he held until the time of his death, April 9, 1819.

Jackson, James B., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born and reared in Clarke County, Ga. The date of his birth is not known to us, neither are we aware of the date of his conversion, though it appears, from the minutes of the Florida Conference, of which he was a member, that it must have been about the age of fourteen. He was honored by his associates in the ministry as a man of superior abilities, and held some of the best appointments in the Florida Conference. He was also professor in Andrew Female College for a number of years. At the time of his death, Feb. 18, 1868, he was presiding elder of Jacksonville District. In all, he spent about thirty years in the ministry. See *Minutes of Ann. Conf. M. E. Ch. South*, iii, 227.

Jackson, John, an English Arian divine and great Hebraist of the last century, was born at Lensey, in Yorkshire, in 1686. He studied at Doncaster School and at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he took his bachelor's degree, but could not obtain that of master of arts on account of his Arian principles. In 1712 the corporation of Doncaster presented him with the rectory of Rossington, but the chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster having made him confrater of Wigston's Hospital, in Leicester, a position which required no subscription of him, he removed to the hospital, and in 1729 succeeded to its mastership. He died in 1763. Jackson carried on a lively controversy with several of England's most distinguished orthodox writers of divinity, more especially with bishop Warburton (q. v.). He also wrote a large number of works, the principal of which are, *The Duty of a Christian set forth and explained in several practical Discourses, being an Exposition of the Lord's Prayer*, etc. (Lond. 1728, 12mo):—*The Existence and Unity of God proved from his Nature and Attributes, being a Vindication of Dr. Clarke's Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God*, etc. (London, 1734, 8vo):—*The Belief of a future State proved to be a fundamental Article of the Religion of the Hebrews, and held by the Philosophers*, etc. (Lond, 1745, 8vo):—*Chronological Antiquities*, etc., *for the Space of five thousand Years* (Lond. 1752, 3 vols. 4to), and many other controversial pamphlets. See Dr. Sutton, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of J. J.*, etc. (Lond. 1764, 8vo); Chalmers, *Gen. Biog. Dictionary*, s. v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 149; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.; Gorton, *Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Jackson, John Frelinghuysen. See JACKSON, WILLIAM, 1.

Jackson, Samuel, a Wesleyan minister, who held the highest offices in the gift of the Wesleyans, and for many years was one of the greatest powers of English Wesleyanism, was born at Scranton, Yorkshire, Feb. 10, 1786. He was particularly prominent in the Sabbath-school movement. "To him alone," says a writer in the *London Quart. Rev.* 1863, p. 261, "must be attributed the awakening among them (the Wesleyans) of that religious jealousy for the younger members of their societies and congregations, which of late has so much elevated their system of Sunday-school instruction, and has thrown the hedge of a more direct ministerial oversight and training around multitudes of their youth, who might otherwise have passed unguarded through the perils that precede adult age. For some years before his death concern for the spiritual welfare of the young became a passion with Mr. Jackson; he wrote and spoke of little besides." As a preacher, he was plain in language, masculine in sentiment, ever abounding in simple but forcible illustrations. He died suddenly, Aug. 4, 1861. His brother Thomas, another celebrated minister of the Wesleyans, edited the sermons of Samuel Jackson, and prefaced them with a memoir of the author (London, 1863, 8vo).

Jackson, Thomas, D.D. an eminent English divine, was born at Willowing, Durham, in 1579. He studied at Queen's College, Oxford, and after 1596 at Corpus Christi, of which he became vice-president. He was afterwards appointed successively vicar of Newcastle, president of his college in 1630, prebendary of Winchester in 1633, and, finally, dean of Peterborough in 1638. He died in 1640. Dr. Thomas Jackson enjoyed a great reputation for piety and learning; he was profoundly read in the fathers, and possessed great depth of judgment. His works (commentaries, among these a valuable commentary on the Apostles' Creed, and sermons), which rank very high, form a magazine of theological knowledge, and are remarkable also for elegance and dignity of style. Southey places him among the very best of English divines, and George Herbert says, "I bless God for the confirmation Dr. Jackson has given me in the Christian religion against the Atheist, Jew, and Socinian, and in the Protestant against Rome." A new edition of his works, with a copious index, was published in 1844 (Oxford, 12 vols. 8vo). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.; *Biograph. Britannica*, s. v.; Fuller, *Worthies;* Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses* (see Index, vol. i); Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s. v.

Jackson, William (1), born in 1732, was one of the earliest ministers of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in New Jersey. He began his studies for the ministry with the Rev. John Frelinghuysen, whose daughter he married in 1757. The church at Bergen, N. J., which was the first of any denomination in the state, had existed ninety years without a pastor, being unable to procure one from the mother country. In 1753, in union with the Church on Staten Island, a call was made upon Mr. Jackson which bound him to go to Holland, complete his studies, and obtain ordination from the Classis of Amsterdam. These churches were to pay him £100 for his support while absent. Four years and three months elapsed before his return in 1757, when he assumed full pastoral charge, dividing his services equally between the two congregations. These facts show both the tenacity of Church life and the devotion of the people to the idea of a thoroughly educated ministry. The Cœtus and Conferentie troubles, which had so long rent the churches, and which grew out of this very question of an educated ministry, were finally adjusted in 1771, through the great exertions of Dr. John H. Livingston (q. v.) and his associates, and both Mr. Jackson and these churches rejoiced in the consummation. See REFORMED DUTCH CHURCH. His ministry lasted thirty-two years (1757–1789), when he became insane. He died in 1813. Mr. Jackson's literary and theological attainments were attested by academic degrees conferred by Yale, Columbia, and Princeton colleges. He was celebrated as a pulpit orator, preaching in the Dutch language. His voice was commanding, and his popularity was such that "in Middlesex and Somerset counties he was estimated as a field-preacher second only to Whitefield. On one occasion, at the Raritan church, the assembly was so large that he had to leave the pulpit and take a station at the church door to deliver his sermon," and the throng outside was greater than that which filled the building. His ministry was useful, acceptable, and crowned with great and permanent blessings. One of his five sons, the Rev. John Frelinghuysen Jackson, was for many years the pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church at Harlem, New York, where he died in 1836, at the age of sixty-eight years. He was a laborious, faithful, and devoted minister, and distinguished for his pecuniary liberality.—B. C. Taylor's *Annals of Classis and Township of Bergen;* Corwin's *Manual of the Reformed Church*, p. 120. (W. J. R. T.)

Jackson, William (2), an English divine, broth-

er of Cyril Jackson, born in 1750, was educated at Westminster School and Christ Church, Oxford. He obtained the degree of D.D. in 1799, and became, after having been preacher at Lincoln's Inn, canon of Christ Church, regius professor of Greek in 1811, and bishop of Oxford. He died in November, 1815. He published some of his sermons (1784-1804). See Rich, *Bibliotheca Americana Nova*, i, 317.

Jackson, William, D.D. (3), a Congregational minister, was born in Cornwall, Conn., Dec. 14, 1768. At the age of sixteen, when about commencing his studies preparatory for college, his mind became deeply impressed with religious truth, and he at once decided to devote his life to the ministry. He entered Dartmouth College in 1786, and graduated in 1790. For a time he taught a school in Wethersfield, Conn., but, finding that his services were needed in the Church, he commenced finally the study of theology under Drs. Spring and Emmons. In 1793 he was licensed to preach, and he performed ministerial labors first near his home, and afterwards in New Jersey. A call which had been given him by the Congregational Society at Dorset, Vt., in 1793, when feeble health obliged him to decline, was renewed three years after, and this time accepted. He was ordained Sept. 27, 1796. In 1837 he was obliged to ask his people for an assistant; and though his task had thus been made easier, his health continued to fail him, and he died Oct. 15, 1842. In 1837 Middlebury College, of which he had been a corporation member for several years, conferred on him the doctorate of divinity. Dr. Jackson possessed a mind of high order, sanctified by earnest devotion to the interests of the Church. "Dr. Porter, late of Andover, the companion of his youth, and particular friend in college, said of him, 'He is the only minister of his age who has kept up with the times.' His mental enterprise and panting for progress never left him."—Dr. J. Maltby, in Sprague, *Ann. of the American Pulpit*, ii, 336.

Ja'cob (Heb. *Yaȧkob'*, יַעֲקֹב, *supplanter*, from עָקַב, to bite the *heel* [to which signification there is allusion in Gen. xxv, 26; xxvii, 36; Hos. xii, 3]; Sept. and N.T. Ἰακώβ; Josephus Ἰάκωβος, which latter is identical with the Greek name for "James"), the name of two men in the Bible.

1. The second-born of the twin sons of Isaac by Rebekah (B.C. 2004). His importance in Jewish history requires a copious treatment, which we accordingly give in full detail.

1. His conception is stated to have been supernatural (Gen. xxv, 21 sq.). Led by peculiar feelings, Rebekah went to inquire of the Lord (as some think, through the intervention of Abraham), and was informed that she was about to become a mother, that her offspring should be the founders of two nations, and that the elder should serve the younger—circumstances which ought to be borne in mind when a judgment is pronounced on her conduct in aiding Jacob to secure the privileges of birthright to the exclusion of his elder brother Esau. He was born with Esau, when Isaac was 59 and Abraham 159 years old, probably at the well Lahai-roi.

As the boys grew, Jacob appeared to partake of the gentle, quiet, and retiring character of his father, and was accordingly led to prefer the tranquil safety and pleasing occupations of a shepherd's life to the bold and daring enterprises of the hunter, for which Esau had an irresistible predilection. The latter was his father's favorite, however, while Rebekah evinced a partiality for Jacob (Gen. xxv, 27, 28).

That selfishness, and a prudence which approached to cunning, had a seat in the heart of the youth Jacob, appears but too plainly in his dealing with Esau, when he exacted from a famishing brother so large a price for a mess of pottage as the surrender of his birthright (Gen. xxv, 29-34). B.C. cir. 1985. (See Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.)

The leaning which his mother had in favor of Jacob would naturally be augmented by the conduct of Esau in marrying, doubtless contrary to his parents' wishes, two Hittite women, who are recorded as having been a grief of mind to Isaac and Rebekah (Gen. xxvi, 34, 35). B.C. 1964.

Circumstances thus prepared the way for procuring the transfer of the birthright, when Isaac, being now old, proceeded to take steps to pronounce the irrevocable blessing, which acted with all the force of a modern testamentary bequest. This blessing, then, it was essential that Jacob should receive in preference to Esau. Here Rebekah appears as the chief agent; Jacob is a mere instrument in her hands. Isaac directs Esau to procure him some venison. This Rebekah hears, and urges her reluctant favorite to personate his elder brother. Jacob suggests difficulties; they are met by Rebekah, who is ready to incur any personal danger so that her object be gained (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 355). Her voice is obeyed, the food is brought, Jacob is equipped for the deceit; he helps out his fraud by direct falsehood, and the old man, whose senses are now failing, is at last with difficulty deceived (Gen. xxvii). B.C. 1927. It cannot be denied that this is a most reprehensible transaction, and presents a truly painful picture, in which a mother conspires with one son in order to cheat her aged husband, with a view to deprive another son of his rightful inheritance. Justification is here impossible; but it should not be forgotten, in the estimate we form, that there was a promise in favor of Jacob, that Jacob's qualities had endeared him to his mother, and that the prospect to her was dark and threatening which arose when she saw the negligent Esau at the head of the house, and his hateful wives assuming command over herself.

For the sale of his birthright to Jacob, Esau is branded in the N. Test. as a "profane person" (Heb. xii, 16). The following sacred and important privileges have been mentioned as connected with primogeniture in patriarchal times, and as constituting the object of Jacob's desire: (*a*) Superior rank in the family (see Gen. xlix, 3, 4). (*b*) A double portion of the father's property (so Aben-Ezra) (see Deut. xxi, 17, and Gen. xlvii, 22). (*c*) The priestly office in the patriarchal church (see Numb. viii, 17-19). In favor of this, see Jerome, *ad Evang. Ep.* lxxxiii, § 6; Jarchi, *in Gen.* xxv; Estius, *in Hebr.* xii; Shuckford, *Connexion*, bk. vii; Blunt, *Undes. Coinc.* i, 1, § 2, 3; and against it, Vitringa, *Observ. Sac.*, and J. D. Michaelis, *Mosaisch. Recht*, ii, § 64, cited by Rosenmüller *in Gen.* xxv. (*d*) A conditional promise or adumbration of the heavenly inheritance (see Cartwright in the *Crit. Sacr.* on Gen. xxv). (*e*) The promise of the Seed in which all nations should be blessed, though not included in the birthright, may have been so regarded by the patriarchs, as it was by their descendants (Rom. ix, 8, and Shuckford, viii). The whole subject has been treated in separate essays by Vitringa in his *Observat. Sacr.* i, 11, § 2; also by J. H. Hottinger, and by J. J. Schröder. See Eycke, *De venditione primogenituræ Esavi* (Wittemb. 1729); Gmelin, *De benedict. paterna Esavo a Jacobo prærepta* (Tüb. 1706); Heydegger, *Hist. Patriarch.* ii, 14. See BIRTHRIGHT.

With regard to Jacob's acquisition of his father's blessing (ch. xxvii), few persons will accept the excuse offered by St. Augustine (*Serm.* iv, § 22, 23) for the deceit which he practised: that it was merely a figurative action, and that his personation of Esau was justified by his previous purchase of Esau's birthright. It is not, however, necessary, with the view of cherishing a Christian hatred of sin, to heap opprobrious epithets upon a fallible man whom the choice of God has rendered venerable in the eyes of believers. Waterland (iv, 208) speaks of the conduct of Jacob in language which is neither wanting in reverence nor likely to encourage the extenuation of guilt: "I do not know whether it be justifiable in every particular; I suspect that it is not. There were several very good and laudable circumstances in what Jacob and Rebekah did, but I do not take

upon me to acquit them of all blame. Blunt (*Undes. Coinc.*) observes that none "of the patriarchs can be set up as a model of Christian morals. They lived under a code of laws that were not absolutely good, perhaps not so good as the Levitical; for, as this was but a preparation for the more perfect law of Christ, so possibly was the patriarchal but a preparation for the Law of Moses." The circumstances which led to this unhappy transaction, and the retribution which fell upon all parties concerned in it, have been carefully discussed by Benson (*Hulsean Lectures* [1822] *on Scripture Difficulties*, xvi, xvii). See also Woodgate (*Historical Sermons*, ix) and Maurice (*Patriarchs and Lawgivers*, v). On the fulfilment of the prophecies concerning Esau and Jacob, and on Jacob's dying blessing, see bishop Newton, *Dissertations on the Prophecies*, § 3, 4.

Punishment soon ensued to all the parties to this iniquitous transaction (see Jarvis, *Church of the Redeemed*, p. 47). Fear seized the guilty Jacob, who is sent by his father, at the suggestion of Rebekah, to the original seat of the family, in order that he might find a wife among his cousins, the daughters of his mother's brother, Laban the Syrian (Gen. xxviii). Before he is dismissed, Jacob again receives his father's blessing, the object obviously being to keep alive in the young man's mind the great promise given to Abraham, and thus to transmit that influence which, under the aid of divine Providence, was to end in placing the family in possession of the land of Palestine, and, in so doing, to make it "a multitude of people." The language, however, employed by the aged father suggests the idea that the religious light which had been kindled in the mind of Abraham had lost somewhat of its fulness, if not of its clearness also, since "the blessing of Abraham," which had originally embraced all nations, is now restricted to the descendants of this one patriarchal family. And so it appears, from the language which Jacob employs (Gen. xxviii, 16) in relation to the dream that he had when he tarried all night upon a certain plain on his journey eastward, that his idea of the Deity was little more than that of a local god: "Surely the Lord is in *this* place, and *I knew it not*." Nor does the language which he immediately after employs show that his ideas of the relations between God and man were of an exalted and refined nature: "If God will be with me, and will keep me in the way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace, then shall the Lord be my God." The vision, therefore, with which Jacob was favored was not without occasion, nor could the terms in which he was addressed by the Lord fail to enlarge and correct his conceptions, and make his religion at once more comprehensive and more influential. (Jacob's vision at Bethel is considered by Miegius in a treatise [*De Scalâ Jacobi*] in the *Thesaurus novus Theologico-Philologicus*, i, 195. See also Augustine, *Serm.* cxxii; Kurz, *History of the Old Covenant*, i, 309.)

2. Jacob, on coming into the land of the people of the East, accidentally met with Rachel, Laban's daughter, to whom, with true Eastern simplicity and politeness, he showed such courtesy as the duties of pastoral life suggest and admit (Gen. xxix). Here his gentle and affectionate nature displays itself under the influence of the bonds of kindred and the fair form of the youthful maiden. "Jacob kissed Rachel, and lifted up his voice and wept." It must be borne in mind, however, that Jacob himself had now reached the mature age of seventy-seven years, as appears from a comparison of Joseph's age (Gen. xxx, 25; xli, 46; xlv, 6) with Jacob's (Gen. xlvii, 9; xxxi, 41). After he had been with his uncle the space of a month, Laban inquires of him what reward he expects for his services. He asks for the "beautiful and well-favored Rachel." His request is granted on condition of a seven years' service—a long period, truly, but to Jacob "they seemed but a few days for the love he had to her." When the time was expired, the crafty Laban availed himself of the customs of the country in order to substitute his elder and "tender-eyed" daughter, Leah. In the morning Jacob found how he had been beguiled; but Laban excused himself, saying, "It must not be done in our country, to give the younger before the first-born." Another seven years' service gains for Jacob the beloved Rachel. Leah, however, has the compensatory privilege of being the mother of the first-born, Reuben; three other sons successively follow, namely, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, sons of Leah. This fruitfulness was a painful subject of reflection to the barren Rachel, who employed language on this occasion that called forth a reply from her husband which shows that, mild as was the character of Jacob, it was by no means wanting in force and energy (Gen. xxx, 2). An arrangement, however, took place, by which Rachel had children by means of her maid, Bilhah, of whom Dan and Naphtali were born. Two other sons, Gad and Asher, were born to Jacob of Leah's maid, Zilpah. Leah herself bare two more sons, namely, Issachar and Zebulun; she also bare a daughter, Dinah. At length Rachel herself bare a son, and she called his name Joseph. As this part of the sacred history has been made the subject of cavil on the alleged ground of anachronism (see Hengstenberg, *Auth. des Pentat.* ii, 851), it may be well to present here a table showing the chronological possibility of the birth of these children within the years allotted in the narrative (Gen. xxix, 32; xxx, 24).

No.	*By Leah.*	*By Rachel.*	*By Bilhah.*	*By Zilpah.*	B.C.
1	Reuben				Summer, 1919
2	Simeon				Spring, 1918
3	Levi				Spring, 1917
4	Judah				Beginning 1916
5			Dan		Spring, 1916
6			Naphtali		Spring, 1915
7				Gad	Summer, 1915
8	Issachar				Beginning 1914
9				Asher	Spring, 1914
10	Zebulon				Fall, 1914
11	Dinah				Summer, 1913
12		Joseph			Fall, 1913

Jacob's polygamy is an instance of a patriarchal practice quite repugnant to Christian morality, but to be accounted for on the ground that the time had not then come for a full expression of the will of God on this subject. The mutual rights of husband and wife were recognised in the history of the Creation, but instances of polygamy are frequent among persons mentioned in the sacred records, from Lamech (Gen. iv, 19) to Herod (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 1, 2). In times when frequent wars increased the number of captives and orphans, and reduced nearly all service to slavery, there may have been some reason for extending the recognition and protection of the law to concubines or half-wives, as Bilhah and Zilpah. In the case of Jacob, it is right to bear in mind that it was not his original intention to marry both the daughters of Laban. (See, on this subject, Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, xxii, 47-54.)

Most faithfully and with great success had Jacob served his uncle for fourteen years, when he became desirous of returning to his parents. At the urgent request of Laban, however, he is induced to remain for an additional term of six years. The language employed upon this occasion (Gen. xxx, 25 sq.) shows that Jacob's character had gained considerably during his service, both in strength and comprehensiveness; but the means which he employed in order to make his bargain with his uncle work so as to enrich himself, prove too clearly that his moral feelings had not undergone an equal improvement (see Baumgarten, *Comment.* I, i, 276), and that the original taint of prudence, and the sad lessons of his mother in deceit, had produced some of their natural fruit in his bosom. (Those who may wish to inquire into the nature and efficacy of the means which Jacob employed, may, in addition to the original narrative, consult Michaelis and Rosenmüller on the subject, as well as the following: Jerome, *Quæst. in Gen.*; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* vii, 10; Oppian, *Cyneg.* i, 330 sq.; Michaelis,

Verm. Schrift. i, 61 sq.; Hastfeer, *Ueber Schafzucht;* Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 619; Nitschmann, *De corylo Jacobi* in *Thesaur. novus Theologico-Philologicus*, i, 201. Winer [*Handwörterb.* s. v. Jacob] gives a parallel passage from Ælian, *Hist. Anim.* viii, 21.)

The prosperity of Jacob displeased and grieved Laban, so that a separation seemed desirable. His wives are ready to accompany him. Accordingly, he set out, with his family and his property, "to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan" (Gen. xxxi) (B.C. 1907). It was not till the third day that Laban learned that Jacob had fled, when he immediately set out in pursuit of his nephew, and, after seven days' journey, overtook him in Mount Gilead. Laban, however, is divinely warned not to hinder Jacob's return. Reproach and recrimination ensued. Even a charge of theft is put forward by Laban: "Wherefore hast thou stolen my gods?" In truth, Rachel had carried off certain images which were the objects of worship. Ignorant of this misdeed, Jacob boldly called for a search, adding, "With whomsoever thou findest thy gods, let him not live." A crafty woman's cleverness eluded the keen eye of Laban. Rachel, by an appeal which one of her sex alone could make, deceived her father. Thus one sin begets another; superstition prompts to theft, and theft necessitates deceit. Whatever opinion may be formed of the teraphim (q. v.) which Rachel stole, and which Laban was so anxious to discover, and whatever kind or degree of worship may in reality have been paid to them, their existence in the family suffices of itself to show how imperfectly instructed regarding the Creator were at this time those who were among the least ignorant in divine things. Laban's conduct on this occasion called forth a reply from Jacob, from which it appears that his service had been most severe, and which also proves that, however this severe service might have encouraged a certain servility, it had not prevented the development in Jacob's soul of a high and energetic spirit, which, when roused, could assert its rights, and give utterance to sentiments both just, striking, and forcible, and in the most poetical phraseology. Peace, however, being restored, Laban on the ensuing morning took a friendly, if not an affectionate farewell of his daughters and their sons, and returned home.

3. So far, things have gone prosperously with Jacob; the word of God to him at Bethel, promising protection and blessing, has been wonderfully verified, and, with a numerous family and large possessions, he has again reached in safety the borders of Canaan. But is there still no danger in front? Shortly after parting with Laban, he met, we are told, troops of angels, apparently a double band, and wearing somewhat of a warlike aspect, for he called the place in honor of them by the name of Mahanaim [*two hosts*] (Gen. xxxii, 1, 2). Whether this sight was presented to him in vision, or took place as an occurrence in the sphere of ordinary life, may be questioned, though the latter supposition seems best to accord with the narrative; but it is not of material moment, for either way the appearance was a reality, and bore the character of a specific revelation to Jacob, adapted to the circumstances in which he was placed. It formed a fitting counterpart to what he formerly had seen at Bethel; angels were then employed to indicate the peaceful relation in which he stood to the heavenly world when obliged to retire from Canaan, and now, on his return, they are again employed with a like friendly intent—to give warning, indeed, of a hostile encounter, but at the same time to assure him of the powerful guardianship and support of heaven. The former part of the design was not long in finding confirmation; for, on sending messengers to his brother Esau with a friendly greeting, and apprising him of his safe return after a long and prosperous sojourn in Mesopotamia, he learned that Esau was on his way to meet him with a host of 400 men. There could be no reasonable doubt, especially after the preliminary intimation given through the angelic bands, as to the intention of Esau in advancing towards his brother with such a force. The news of Jacob's reappearance in Canaan, and that no longer as a dependant upon others, but as possessed of ample means and a considerable retinue, awoke into fresh activity the slumbering revenge of Esau, and led him, on the spur of the moment, to resolve on bringing the controversy between them to a decisive issue. This appears from the whole narrative to be so plainly the true state of matters, that it seems needless to refer to other views that have been taken of it. But Jacob was not the man at any time to repel force with force, and he had now learned, by a variety of experiences, where the real secret of his safety and strength lay. His first impressions, however, on getting the intelligence, were those of trembling anxiety and fear; but, on recovering himself a little, he called to his aid the two great weapons of the believer—pains and prayer. He first divided his people, with the flocks and herds, into two companies, so that if the one were attacked the other might escape. Then he threw himself in earnest prayer and supplication on the covenant-mercy and faithfulness of God, putting God in mind of his past loving-kindnesses, at once great and undeserved; reminding him also of the express charge he had given Jacob to return to Canaan, with the promise of his gracious presence, and imploring him now to establish the hopes he had inspired by granting deliverance from the hands of Esau. So ended the first night; but on the following day further measures were resorted to by Jacob, though still in the same direction. Aware of the melting power of kindness, and how "a gift in secret pacifieth anger," he resolved on giving from his substance a munificent present to Esau, placing each kind by itself, one after the other, in a succession of droves, so that on hearing, as he passed drove after drove, the touching words, "A present sent to my lord Esau from thy servant Jacob," it might be like the pouring of live coals on the head of his wrathful enemy. How could he let his fury explode against a brother who showed himself so anxious to be on terms of peace with him? It could scarcely be, unless there were still in Jacob's condition the grounds of a quarrel between him and his God not yet altogether settled, and imperilling the success even of the best efforts and the most skilful preparations.

That there really was something of the sort now supposed seems plain from what ensued. Jacob had made all his arrangements, and had got his family as well as his substance transported over the Jabbok (a brook that traverses the land of Gilead, and runs into the Jordan about half way between the Lake of Galilee and the Dead Sea), himself remaining behind for the night. It is not said for what purpose he so remained, but there can be little doubt it was for close and solitary dealing with God. While thus engaged, one suddenly appeared in the form of a man, and in the guise of an enemy wrestling with him and contending for the mastery. Esau was still at some distance, but here was an adversary already present with whom Jacob had to maintain a severe and perilous conflict; and this plainly an adversary in appearance only human, but in reality the angel of the Lord's presence. It was as much as to say, "You have reason to be afraid of the enmity of one mightier than Esau, and, if you can only prevail in getting deliverance from this, there is no fear that matters will go well with you otherwise; right with God, you may trust him to set you right with your brother." The ground and reason of the matter lay in Jacob's deceitful and wicked conduct before leaving the land of Canaan, which had fearfully compromised the character of God, and brought disturbance into Jacob's relation to the covenant. Leaving the land of Canaan covered with guilt, and liable to wrath, he must now re-enter it amid sharp contending, such as might lead to great searchings of heart, deep spiritual abasement, and the renunciation of all sinful and crooked devices as utterly at variance with the childlike simplicity and confidence in God which it became him to exercise. In the ear-

nest conflict, he maintained his ground, till the heavenly combatant touched the hollow of his thigh and put it out of joint, in token of the supernatural might which this mysterious antagonist had at his command, and showing how easy it had been for him (if he had so pleased) to gain the mastery. But even then Jacob would not quit his hold; nay, all the more he would retain it, since now he could do nothing more, and since, also, it was plain he had to do with one who had the power of life and death in his hand; he would, therefore, not let him go till he obtained a blessing. Faith thus wrought mightily out of human weakness—strong by reason of its clinging affection, and its beseeching importunity for the favor of heaven, as expressed in Hos. xii, 4: "By his strength he had power with God; yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed; he wept and made supplication unto him." In attestation of the fact, and for a suitable commemoration of it, he had his name changed from Jacob to *Israel* (combatant or wrestler with God); "for as a prince," it was added, by way of explanation, "hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed." Jacob, in turn, asked after the name of the person who had wrestled with him—not as if any longer ignorant who it might be, but wishing to have the character or manifestation of Godhead, as this had now appeared to him, embodied in a significant and appropriate name. His request, however, was denied; the divine wrestler withdrew, after having blessed him. But Jacob himself gave a name to the place, near the Jabbok, where the memorable transaction had occurred: he called it Peniel (*the face of God*), "for," said he, "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved" (Gen. xxxii, 25–31). The contest indicated that he had reason to fear the reverse; but his preservation was the sign of reconciliation and blessing.

This mysterious wrestling has been a fruitful source of difficulty and misinterpretation (see Hofmann, *Varia Sacra*, 185 sq.; Heumann, *Syllog. diss.* i, 147 sq.). The narrator did not, we think, intend it for the account of a dream or illusion (see Ziegler in Henke's *Nat. Mag.* ii, 29 sq.; Hengstenberg, *Bileam*, p. 51; Herder, *Geist der Heb. Poesie*, i, 266; Tuch's *Gen.* p. 468). A literal interpretation may seem difficult, for it makes the Omnipotent vanquish one of his own creatures, not without a long struggle, and at last only by a sort of art or stratagem (compare similar accounts in heathen mythology, Bauer, *Heb. Mythol.* i, 251 sq.; Movers, *Phönic.* i, 433; Bohlen, *Indien*, i, 225). At the same time it must be said that the only way to expound the narrative is to divest ourselves of our own modern associations, and endeavor to contemplate it from the position in which its author stood (see Bush's *Note*, ad loc.). Still, the question recurs, What was the fact which he has set forth in these terms? (see De Wette, *Krit. d. Is. Gesch.* p. 132; Ewald, *Israeliten*, i, 405; Rosenmüller, *Scholia*, ad loc.) The design (says Wellbeloved, ad loc.), "was to encourage Jacob, returning to his native land, and fearful of his brother's resentment, and to confirm his faith in the existence and providence of God. And who will venture to say that in that early period any other equally efficacious means could have been employed?" (Comp. the language already quoted [ver. 28].) A very obvious end pursued throughout the history of Jacob was the development of his religious convictions; and the event in question, no less than the altars he erected and the dreams he had, may have materially conduced to so important a result. That it had a lasting spiritual effect upon Jacob is evident from the devout tenor of his after life. (For a beautiful exposition of this event, see Charles Wesley's poem entitled "Wrestling Jacob." Compare Krummacher, *Jacob Wrestling* [Lond. 1838].)

After this night of anxious but triumphant wrestling, Jacob rose from Peniel with the sun shining upon him (an emblem of the bright and radiant hope which now illuminated his inner man), and went on his way halting—weakened corporeally by the conflict in which he had engaged, that he might have no confidence in the flesh, but strong in the divine favor and blessing. Accordingly, when Esau approached with his formidable host, all hostile feelings gave way; the victory had been already won in the higher sphere of things, and he who turneth the hearts of kings like the rivers of water, made the heart of Esau melt like wax before the liberal gifts, the humble demeanor, and earnest entreaties of his brother. They embraced each other as brethren, and for the present at least, and for anything that appears during the remainder of their personal lives, they maintained the most friendly relations.

4. After residing for a little on the farther side of Jordan, at a place called Succoth, from Jacob's having erected there booths (Hebrew *sukkoth*) for his cattle, he crossed the Jordan, and pitched his tent near Shechem, —ultimately the centre of the Samaritans. [In the received text, it is said (Gen. xxxiii, 18), "He came to Shalem, a city of Shechem"—but some prefer the reading *Shalom:* "He came in peace to city of Shechem."] There he bought a piece of ground from the family of Shechem, and obtained a footing among the people as a man of substance, whose friendship it was desirable to cultivate. But ere long, having, by the misconduct of Hamor the Hivite (see DINAH) and the hardy valor of his sons, been involved in danger from the natives of Shechem in Canaan, Jacob is divinely directed, and, under the divine protection, proceeds to Bethel, where he is to "make an altar unto God, that appeared unto thee when thou fleddest from the face of Esau thy brother" (Gen. xxxiv, xxxv) (B.C. cir. 1900). Obedient to the divine command, he first purifies his family from "strange gods," which he hid under "the oak which is by Shechem," after which God appeared to him again, with the important declaration, "I am God Almighty," and renewed the Abrahamic covenant. While journeying from Beth-el to Ephrath, his beloved Rachel lost her life in giving birth to her second son, Benjamin (Gen. xxxv, 16–20) (B.C. cir. 1899). At length Jacob came to his father Isaac at Mamre, the family residence, in time to pay the last attentions to the aged patriarch (Gen. xxxv, 27) (B.C. 1898). The complete reconciliation between Jacob and Esau at this time is shown by their uniting in the burial rites of their father. Not long after this bereavement, Jacob was robbed of his beloved son, Joseph, through the jealousy and bad faith of his brothers (Gen. xxxvii) (B.C. 1896). This loss is the occasion of showing us how strong were Jacob's paternal feelings; for, on seeing what appeared to be proofs that "some evil beast had devoured Joseph," the old man "rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his loins, and mourned for his son many days, and refused to be comforted" (Gen. xxxvii, 33).

A widely extended famine induced Jacob to send his sons down into Egypt, where he had heard there was corn, without knowing by whose instrumentality (Gen. xlii sq.) (B.C. 1875). The patriarch, however, retained his youngest son Benjamin, "lest mischief should befall him," as it had befallen Joseph. The young men returned with the needed supplies of corn. They related, however, that they had been taken for spies, and that there was but one way in which they could disprove the charge, namely, by carrying down Benjamin to "the lord of the land." This Jacob vehemently refused (Gen. xliii, 36). The pressure of the famine, however, at length forced Jacob to allow Benjamin to accompany his brothers on a second visit to Egypt; whence, in due time, they brought back to their father the pleasing intelligence, "Joseph is yet alive, and he is governor over all the land of Egypt." How naturally is the effect of this on Jacob told—"and Jacob's heart fainted, for he believed them not." When, however, they had gone into particulars, he added, "Enough, Joseph my son is yet alive; I will go and see him before I die." Touches of nature like this suffice to show the reality of the history before us, and, since they are not unfrequent in the book of Genesis, they will of themselves avail to sustain

its credibility against all that the enemy can do. The passage, too, with others recently cited, strongly proves how much the character of the patriarch had improved. In the whole of the latter part of Jacob's life he seems to have gradually parted with many less desirable qualities, and to have become at once more truthful, more energetic, more earnest, affectionate, and, in the largest sense of the word, religious. Encouraged "in the visions of the night," Jacob goes down to Egypt (B.C. 1874), and was affectionately met by Joseph (Gen. xlvi, 29). Joseph proceeded to conduct his father into the presence of the Egyptian monarch, when the man of God, with that self-consciousness and dignity which religion gives, instead of offering slavish adulation, "blessed Pharaoh." Struck with the patriarch's venerable air, the king asked, "How old art thou?" What composure and elevation is there in the reply, "The days of the years of my pilgrimage are a hundred and thirty years; few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their pilgrimage" (Gen. xlvii, 8-10). Jacob, with his sons, now entered into possession of some of the best land of Egypt, where they carried on their pastoral occupations, and enjoyed a very large share of earthly prosperity. The aged patriarch, after being strangely tossed about on a very rough ocean, found at last a tranquil harbor, where all the best affections of his nature were gently exercised and largely unfolded (Gen. xlviii, sq.). After a lapse of time, Joseph, being informed that his father was sick, went to him, when "Israel strengthened himself, and sat up in his bed." He acquainted Joseph with the divine promise of the land of Canaan which yet remained to be fulfilled, and took Joseph's sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, distinguishing them by an adoption equal to that of Reuben and Simeon, the oldest of his own sons (Gen. xlviii, 5). How impressive is his benediction in Joseph's family (Gen. xlviii, 15, 16): "God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth." "And Israel said unto Joseph, Behold, I die; but God will be with you, and bring you again unto the land of your fathers" (ver. 21). Then, having convened his sons, the venerable patriarch pronounced on them also a blessing, which is full of the loftiest thought, expressed in the most poetical diction, and adorned by the most vividly descriptive and engaging imagery (see Stähelin, *Animadversiones in Jacobi vaticinium*, Heidelb. 1827), showing how deeply religious his character had become, how freshly it retained its fervor to the last, and how greatly it had increased in strength, elevation, and dignity: "And when Jacob had made an end of commanding his sons, he gathered up his feet into the bed [i. e. knelt towards the bed's head (see Delitzsch on Heb. xi, 21) rather than bowed over the top of his staff, as Stuart, ad loc. (see STAFF)], and yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people" (Gen. xlix, 33), at the ripe age of 147 years (Gen. xlvii, 28). B.C. 1857. His body was embalmed, carried with great care and pomp into the land of Canaan, and deposited with his fathers, and his wife Leah, in the cave of Machpelah. The route pursued by this funeral procession is ingeniously supposed by Dr. Kitto (*Pict. Hist. of Jews*, i, 136) to have been the more circuitous one afterwards taken by the Israelites by the way of Mount Seir and across the Jordan, the object being apparently in both cases the fear of the Philistines, who lay in the direct route. Dr. Thomson objects to this as an unnecessary deviation (*Land and Book*, ii, 385), urging that the Bethagla, which Jerome identifies with the Area-Atad or Abel-mizraim (q. v.), as the scene of the mourning ceremonies, lay near Gaza; but in this case it is certainly difficult to explain the constant statement that the spot in question was situated "beyond the Jordan," as it clearly implies a crossing of the river by the cavalcade.

In the list of Jacob's lineal descendants given in Gen. xlvi, 8-27, as being those that accompanied him on his removal to Egypt, there is evidence that the list was rather made up to the time of his decease, or perhaps even somewhat later (see Hengstenberg's *Pentateuch*, ii, 290 sq.); for we find mentioned not only numerous sons (some of whom will appear to be even grandsons) of Benjamin, at the date of that emigration a youth (see xliv, 20, 30-34), but also the children of Pharez, at that time a mere child (comp. xxxviii, 1). See BENJAMIN. There has, moreover, been experienced considerable difficulty in making out the total of seventy persons there stated, as well as the sum of sixty-six included in it, and likewise the aggregates of the posterity of the several wives as there computed. This difficulty is further enhanced by the number seventy-five assigned by Stephen (Acts vii, 14) to Jacob's family at the same date. This last statement, however, cannot be disposed of in the manner frequently adopted by including the wives of Jacob and his sons (for it does not appear that they are at all referred to, and it is probable that they would have swelled the number more largely if added), but is rather to be regarded as a quotation made (without indorsing or caring to discuss its accuracy) from the Sept., which gives that total in the passage in Genesis, but inconsistently attributes *nine* sons to Joseph in place of two. Of all the explanations of the other discrepancies, that of Dr. Hales is perhaps the most plausible (*Analysis of Chronology*, ii, 159), but it has the insuperable objections of including *Jacob himself* among the number of his own posterity, and of not conforming to the method of enumeration in the text. A comparison of Numb. xxvi, 8, shows that the name of Eliab, the son of Pallu and grandson of Reuben, has been accidentally dropped from the list in question; this restored, the whole, with its parallel accounts, may be adjusted with entire harmony, as in the table on the following pages.

The example of Jacob is quoted by the first and the last of the minor prophets. Hosea, in the latter days of the kingdom, seeks (xii, 3, 4, 12) to convert the descendants of Jacob from their state of alienation from God by recalling to their memory the repeated acts of God's favor shown to their ancestor. Malachi (i, 2) strengthens the desponding hearts of the returned exiles by assuring them that the love which God bestowed upon Jacob was not withheld from them. Besides the frequent mention of his name in conjunction with those of the other two patriarchs, there are distinct references to events in the life of Jacob in four books of the N. T. In Rom. ix, 11-13, Paul adduces the history of Jacob's birth to prove that the favor of God is independent of the order of natural descent. In Heb. xii, 16, and xi, 21, the transfer of the birthright and Jacob's dying benediction are referred to. His vision at Bethel, and his possession of land at Shechem, are cited in John i, 51, and iv, 5, 12. Stephen, in his speech (Acts vii, 12, 16), mentions the famine which was the means of restoring Jacob to his lost son in Egypt, and the burial of the patriarch in Shechem.

In Jacob may be traced a combination of the quiet patience of his father with the acquisitiveness which seems to have marked his mother's family; and in Esau, as in Ishmael, the migratory and independent character of Abraham was developed into the enterprising habits of a warlike hunter-chief. Jacob, whose history occupies a larger space, leaves on the reader's mind a less favorable impression than either of the other patriarchs with whom he is joined in equal honor in the N. T. (Matt. viii, 11). But, in considering his character, we must bear in mind that we know not what limits were set in those days to the knowledge of God and the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit. A timid, thoughtful boy would acquire no self-reliance in a secluded home. There was little scope for the exercise of intelligence, wide sympathy, generosity, frankness. Growing

Mothers.	Children.	Grand-children.	Number.	Total.	Units.	Names.	Genesis xlvi.	Exod. i.	Exod. vi.	Numb. xxvi.	1 Chron. ii.	1 Chron. iv.	1 Chron. v.	1 Chron. vi.	1 Chron. vii.	1 Chron. viii.
Leah			1		1	*Reuben*	8	2	14	5	1		1			
	Reuben		2		1	Hanoch	9		14	5			3			
			3		1	Pallu			14	5			3			
						(Phallu)	9									
			4		1	Hezron	9		14	6			3			
			5		1	Carmi	9		14	6			3			
		Pallu	6		1	Eliab				8						
			7		1	*Simeon*	10	2	15	12	1					
	Simeon		8		1	Jemuel	10		15							
						(Nemuel)				12		24				
			9		1	Jamin	10		15	12		24				
			10		1	Ohad	10		15							
			11		1	Jachin	10		15	12						
						(Jarib)						24				
			12		1	Zohar	10		15							
						(Zerah)				13		24				
			13		1	Shaul	10		15	13		24				
			14		1	*Levi*	11	2	16	57	1					
	Levi		15		1	Gershom								16		
						(Gershon)	11		16	57				1		
			16		1	Kohath	11		16	57				1		
			17		1	Merari	11		16	57				1		
			18		1	*Judah*	12	2		19	1					
	Judah					[Er]	12			19	3					
						[Onan]	12			19	3					
			19		1	Shelah	12			20	3					
			20		1	Pharez	12			20	4	1				
			21		1	Zerah				20	4					
						(Zarah)	12									
		Pharez	22		1	Hezron	12			21	5	1				
			23		1	Hamul	12			21	5					
			24		1	*Issachar*	13	3		23	1					
	Issachar		25		1	Tola	13			23					1	
			26		1	Puah									1	
						(Phuvah)	13									
						(Pua)				23						
			27		1	Jashub				24					1	
						(Job)	13									
			28		1	Shimron	13			24						
						(Shimrom)									1	
			29		1	*Zebulon*	14	3		26	1					
	Zebulon		30		1	Sered	14			26						
			31		1	Elon	14			26						
			32		1	Jahleel	14			26						
			33		1	*Dinah*, fem.	15									
				33			15									
Zilpah			34		1	*Gad*	16	4		15	2					
	Gad		35		1	Ziphion	16									
						(Zephon)				15						
			36		1	Haggi	16			15						
			37		1	Shuni	16			15						
			38		1	Ezhon	16									
						(Ozni)				16						
			39		1	Eri	16			16						
			40		1	Arod				17						
						(Arodi)	16									
			41		1	Areli	16			17						
			42		1	*Asher*	17	4		44	2					
	Asher		43		1	Jimnah	17									
						(Jimna)				44						
						(Imnah)									30	
			44		1	Ishuah	17									
						(Isuah)									30	
			45		1	Isui	17									
						(Iesui)				44						
						(Ishuai)										
			46		1	Beriah	17			44					30	
			47		1	Serah, fem.	17								30	
						(Sarah)				46						
		Beriah	48		1	Heber	17			45					31	
			49		1	Malchiel	17			45					31	
				16			18									
Bilhah			50		1	*Dan*	23	4		42	2				31	
	Dan		51		1	Shuham				42					31	
						(Hushim)	23									
			52		1	*Naphtali*	24	4		48	2					
	Naphtali		53		1	Jahzeel	24			48						
						(Jahziel)									13	
			54		1	Guni	24			48					13	
			55		1	Jezer	24			48					13	
			56		1	Shillem	24			48						
						(Shallum)									13	
				7			25									
					1	*Benjamin*	19	3		38	2					
			57		1	Belah	21									
						(Bela)				38					6	1
			58		1	Ashbel	21			38						1
						(? Jediael)									6	
			59		1	Ahiram				38						
						(Ehi)	21									
						(Aharah)										1
						(Aher)									12	
			60		1	Becher	21								6	
						(? Nohah)										2
						(? Ir)									12	
			61		1	Rosh	21									

Mothers.	Children.	Grand-children.	Number.	Total.	Units.	Names.	Genesis xlvi.	Exod. i.	Exod. vi.	Numb. xxvi.	1 Chron. ii.	1 Chron. iv.	1 Chron. v.	1 Chron. vi.	1 Chron. vii.	1 Chron. viii.
Rachel	Benjamin	Bela				(? Raphah)										2
			62		1	Ard	21			40						
						(Addar)										3
						(? ? Ezbon)									7	
			63		1	Naaman	21			40						4
						(? ? Uzzi)									7	
			64		1	Gera	21									3
						(? ? Uzziel)									7	
						[Abishua]										4
						(? ? Jerimoth)									7	
						[Ahoah]										4
						(Ahiah)										7
						(? ? Iri)									7	
						[Uzza]										7
						[Abihud]										3
						(? Ahihud)										7
		Ashbel				[Bilhan]									10	
		Ahiram				[Hushim]									12	
		Becher	65		1	Shupham				39						
						(Shuppim)									12	
						(? Shephuphan)										5
						(Muppim)	21									
						(? ? Zemira)									8	
			66		1	Hupham				39						
						(Huppim)	21								12	
						(? Huram)										5
						(? ? Joash)									8	
						[Eliezer]									8	
						[Elioenai]									8	
						[Omri]									8	
						[Jerimoth]									8	
						[Abiah]									8	
						[Anathoth]									8	
						[Alameth]									8	
						[Maachah, fem.]									15	
			66				26									
	Joseph		67			*[Benjamin]* (Already in Egypt)	19									
			68		1	*Joseph* (Already in Egypt)	20			28	2					
			69		1	Manasseh (Already in Egypt)	20			28						
			70		1	Ephraim (Already in Egypt)	20			28						
				14			22									
			70				27	5								

up a stranger to the great joys and great sorrows of natural life—deaths, and wedlock, and births; inured to caution and restraint in the presence of a more vigorous brother; secretly stimulated by a belief that God designed for him some superior blessing, Jacob was perhaps in a fair way to become a narrow, selfish, deceitful, disappointed man. But, after dwelling for more than half a lifetime in solitude, he is driven from home by the provoked hostility of his more powerful brother. Then, in deep and bitter sorrow, the outcast begins life afresh long after youth has passed, and finds himself brought first of all unexpectedly into that close personal communion with God which elevates the soul, and then into that enlarged intercourse with men which is capable of drawing out all the better feelings of human nature. An unseen world was opened. God revived and renewed to him that slumbering promise, over which he had brooded for threescore years since he had learned it in childhood from his mother. Angels conversed with him. Gradually he felt more and more the watchful care of an ever-present spiritual Father. Face to face he wrestled with the representative of the Almighty. And so, even though the moral consequences of his early transgressions hung about him, and saddened him with a deep knowledge of all the evil of treachery and domestic envy, and partial judgment, and filial disobedience, yet the increasing revelations of God enlightened the old age of the patriarch; and at last the timid "supplanter," the man of subtle devices, waiting for the salvation of Jehovah, dies the "soldier of God," uttering the messages of God to his remote posterity. (See Niemeyer, *Charakt.* ii, 260 sq.; Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i, 58 sq.) For reflections on various incidents in Jacob's life, see Bp. Hall's *Contemplations*, bk. iii; Blunt, *Hist. of Jacob* (Lond. 1832, 1860).

Many Rabbinical legends concerning Jacob may be found in Eisenmenger's *Ent. Judenth.*, and in the *Jerusalem Targum.* (See also Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 286; Hamburger, *Talmud. Wörterb.* s. v.). In the Koran he is often mentioned in conjunction with the other two patriarchs (chap. ii, and elsewhere). See MOHAMMEDANISM.

JACOB also occurs in certain poetical and conventional phrases, borrowed from the relations of the patriarch to the theocracy and state. "*God of Jacob*," אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב (Exod. iii, 6; iv, 5; 2 Sam. xxiii, 1; Psa. xx, 2; Isa. ii, 3); or simply "*Jacob*" (Psa. xxiv, 6, where the term אֱלֹהֵי appears to have fallen out of the text); also "*mighty One of Jacob*," אֲבִיר יַעֲקֹב (Psa. cxxxii, 2), are titles of *Jehovah* as the national deity. "*Jacob*" frequently stands for his posterity or the Israelitish people; but poetically chiefly, "*house of Jacob*," בֵּית יַעֲקֹב (Exod. xix, 3; Isa. ii, 5, 6; viii, 17; Amos iii, 13; ix, 8; Mic. ii, 7; Obad. 17, 18), "*seed of Jacob*," זֶרַע יַעֲקֹב (Isa. xlv, 19; Jer. xxxiii, 26), "*sons of Jacob*," בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב (1 Kings xviii, 37; Mal. iii, 6), "*congregation of Jacob*," קְהִלַּת יַעֲקֹב (Deut. xxxiii, 4), and simply "*Jacob*," יַעֲקֹב (Numb. xxiii, 7, 10, 21, 23; xxiv, 5, 17, 19; Deut. xxxii, 9; xxxiii, 10; Psa. xiv, 7, 11; xliv, 5; Isa. xxvii, 6, 9; Jer. x, 25; xxxi, 11; Amos vi, 8; vii, 2; viii, 7), all put for the house or family of Jacob; whence the expression "*in Jacob*," בְּיַעֲקֹב (Gen. xlix, 7; Lam. ii, 3), i. e. among the Jewish people. Very generally the name is used for the people as an individual, and with the epithets appropriate to their patriarchal progenitor, e. g. "Jacob, my servant" (Isa. xliv, 1; xlv, 4; xlviii, 20; Jer. xxx, 10; xlvi, 27, 28), "Jacob, thy (Edom's) brother" (Obad. 10). In like manner with the term *Israel*, "Jacob" is even spoken of the *kingdom of Ephraim*, which had arrogated to itself the title proper only to the entire nation (Isa. ix, 7; xvii, 4; Mic. i, 5; Hos. x, 11; xii, 3); and, after the destruction of the northern kingdom, the same expression is employed of the remaining kingdom of Judah (Nah. ii, 3; Obad. 18).

See Isham, *Discriminative uses of "Jacob" and "Israel"* (Lond. 1854). Comp. ISRAEL.

JACOB'S WELL (πηγὴ τοῦ Ἰακώβ), on the curb of which Christ sat down during his interview with the Samaritan woman of Sychar (John iv, 6). It was a deep spring (ver. 11) in the vicinity of Shechem, near the road from Jerusalem, probably so called from having been dug by the patriarch Jacob (ver. 8, 28) when dwelling in this neighborhood (Gen. xxxiii, 18). It is still known by the same title, about half a mile south-east of Nablûs (Robinson's *Researches*, iii, 112), at the foot of Mount Gerizim (Arvieux, ii, 66; Schubert, iii, 136). It is bored through the solid rock, and kept covered with a stone by the Arabs (see Hackett's *Illustrations*, p. 199 sq.). It is thus described by Porter in Murray's *Handbook for Syria*, ii, 340: "Formerly there was a square hole opening into a carefully built vaulted chamber, about ten feet square, in the floor of which was the true mouth of the well. Now a portion of the vault has fallen and completely covered up the mouth, so that nothing can be seen but a shallow pit, half filled with stones and rubbish." Dr. Wilson (*Lands of the Bible*, ii, 57) carefully measured the well, and found it nine feet in diameter, and seventy-five feet deep. It was probably much deeper in ancient times, as there are signs of considerable accumulation of stones and rubbish below its present bottom; and Maundrell (March 24) says that in his time it was thirty-five yards, or one hundred and five feet deep. It contains at times a few feet of water, but at others it is quite dry. Over the well there formerly stood a large church, built in the 4th century, but probably destroyed before the time of the Crusades, as Sæwulf (p. 45) and Phocas do not mention it. Its remains are just above the well, towards the south-west, merely a shapeless mass of ruins, among which are seen fragments of gray granite columns still retaining their ancient polish (Robinson's *Biblical Researches*, iii, 132). (For older descriptions, see Hamesveld, ii, 396 sq.) See SHECHEM.

2. JACOB (Ἰακώβ) was the name of the father of Joseph, the husband of the Virgin Mary (Matt. i, 15, 16). B.C. ante 40. See MARY.

Jacob OF EDESSA (so called after the name of his residence), one of the most celebrated Syrian writers and theologians, flourished in the second half of the 7th century. He was born in the village of Indâbâ (in Antioch), and in early life entered the monastic order. About the year 651 he was appointed bishop of Edessa; but his zeal for the cause of the Church often led him astray, and he made many enemies among the clergy, and finally resigned the episcopal dignity, retiring to a life of seclusion in a monastery at Toledo. He now began an extended study of the Syriac Version of the Old Testament, and made many valuable corrections and annotations, of which parts still remain to us (compare Sylvestre de Sacy, in Eichhorn's *Biblioth. d. bibl. Litter.* viii, 571 sq.; *Notices et extraits des MSS.* iv, 648 sq.; Eichhorn, *Bibl. d. bibl. Lit.* ii, 270; the same, *Einl. in d. A. T.* ii, § 260 sq.). After the decease of his successor at Edessa he was invited to reassume the duties of the bishopric, but he died while on his journey, June 5, 708. Jacob of Edessa was a zealous advocate of Monophysitism, and he is greatly revered by the Jacobites (q. v.), while he is highly esteemed also by the Maronites. He was distinguished for his thorough knowledge of the Syriac, Hebrew, and Greek, and translated a number of Greek works into Syriac, a task which he so ably discharged that he was honored with the surname of "interpreter of the books" (in the Syriac, קַפְּשְׁקָנָא דִכְתָבֵא). He wrote commentaries and scholia on the O. T. and N. T., of which extracts are contained in the works of Ephraem (comp. Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* i, 476 sq.). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 379 sq.; *Halle Encyklopädie*, 2d sect. xiii, 165–167. (J. H. W.)

Jacob OF HUNGARY, surnamed *the Master*, a fanatic and adventurer, and the chief of the Pastoureaux or Shepherds, is supposed to have been a native of Hungary, though nothing definite is known as to his origin. In his youth he joined the Cistercian order, but is said to have afterwards embraced Islamism: this, however, is a matter of doubt, some even reversing the order of his conversion from one faith to the other. He was also represented as having learned the occult arts from the Moors of Spain, and also as having been a traitor to France. At any rate, we find him at Easter, A.D. 1251, heading a popular movement in favor of king St. Louis, then a prisoner at Cæsarea. The king, apparently forsaken by the nobility and clergy, was the idol of the people. Jacob travelled through the provinces, preaching a crusade in which none but the poor and lowly should take part, God having forsaken the opulent and the great on account of their pride, and the clergy on account of their licentiousness. He claimed to have visions, to have received a direct message from the Virgin, etc. "He was an aged man," says Milman, "with a long beard, and pale, emaciated face; he spoke Latin, French, and German with the same fluent persuasiveness; he preached without authority of pope or prelate." The eloquence of the Master of Hungary stirred the lowest depths of society. The shepherds, the peasants, left their flocks, their stalls, their fields, their ploughs; in vain friends, parents, wives remonstrated; they took no thought of sustenance. So, drawing men after him "as the loadstone draws the iron," he soon had a large number of followers, who received the name of Pastourels or Pastoureaux, from the fact that the first and the most of his followers were shepherds or peasants. Both the magistrates and queen Blanche, thinking they might become instrumental in securing the liberation of the king, encouraged them for a time. Soon, however, their ranks were swelled by a number of vagrants, thieves, highwaymen, and all the scum of the population, attracted by the prospect of spoils. They had started from Flanders in the direction of Paris, and when they reached Amiens they numbered 30,000. These recruits wore daggers, swords, battle-axes, and all the implements of warfare. Received and entertained by the citizens of Amiens, they gained new adherents, and their number swelled to 50,000, and on their arrival at the gates of Paris they were a formidable band of 100,000 armed men. Sismondi says: "Their hatred of the priests was as great as their hatred of the infidels. They had preachers who never had been ordained; their teachings were far from orthodox, and they assumed the right of setting aside ecclesiastical discipline; they granted divorces, and permitted marriages which the priests denounced as contrary to the canons." They were especially bitter against the monastic orders, and a number of monks were murdered by them. The authorities began to regret having encouraged them; yet they were allowed to enter Paris, and Jacob went so far as to officiate publicly in the church of St. Eustache. Several murders marked their stay in the capital. Finding his forces considerably increased, Jacob divided them into several bands, under pretense of embarking them at different points for the Holy Land. One of these bands went to Orleans, where they massacred all the priests and monks they could find; and thence to Bourges, where, the priests carefully keeping out of the way, they attacked the Jews, demolishing their synagogues and plundering their houses. Effective measures were at last taken to put a stop to these excesses. They were excommunicated by the Church, and the authorities invited the people to arm against and war on them. Jacob was still in the capital. One day, by order of the queen, an executioner mingled with the crowd who surrounded him, and, while he was preaching, cut off his head with a single blow of the axe. At the same time, a number of knights charged on his followers, who were dispersed. The other bands met with the same fate, and an end was put at the same time to the depredations and to the sect. See Matthew Paris, *Hist. Angliæ;* Guillaume de Nangis, *Chron. in Spicil.;*

Matthew of Westminster, *Historia; Chron. de St. Denys;* Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, vii, 475 sq.; Dufey, *Dict. de la Conversation*, article Pastoureaux; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 167 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vi, 57 sq.; Semler, *Versuch e. Kirchengesch.* i, 545 sq.

Jacob OF JÜTERBOCK (or *Jacobus Cisterciensis*, etc.) was born at Jüterbock about 1383. When yet quite young he entered the Cistercian monastery *De Paradiso*, situated in Poland, and afterwards went to Cracow to procure the doctorate. Distinguished for scholarship and piety, he soon became the acknowledged leader among his fellow monks, and was finally elected abbot of his convent. Some time after he removed to Prague, but, growing dissatisfied with the many failings of men who professed to have quitted the world to seek an alliance with God, but who, in truth, had only entered the monastic order because it was the road to distinction, he advocated a reform of the Church, and at one time even fostered the thought of forsaking the monastic life altogether. He changed to the Carthusian order, removed to one of their monasteries at Erfurt, was here also greatly beloved for his superior abilities, and became prior of the monastery. He died in 1645. Jacob of Jüterbock may be justly regarded an associate of the mystics of the 14th century, and virtually a forerunner of the Reformation—one of the Johns preparing the way for Luther. Characteristic of his efforts for a reformatory movement are his *Sermones notabiles et formales de tempore et de sanctis:—Libelli tres de arte curandi vitia* (in Joh. Wesseli *Opp.*, Amst. 1617):—*Liber de veritate dicenda:—Tract. de causis multarum passionum* (in Pezelii *Biblioth. ascet.* vii):—*De indulgentiis:—De negligentia Prælatorum* (in Walch, *Monum. med. æv.* ii, Fasc. 1):—*De septem ecclesiæ statibus opusculum* (Walch, Fasc. 2). Especially in the last work he declares that a reform of the Church could only be effected by subjecting the whole clergy, from the pope downward, to a thorough change. He vehemently opposed the absolute power of the papal chair, the right of the pope to control the councils, and naturally enough denied the infallibility of the so-called "vicar of Christ." See Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, i, 208, 250; Trithemii *Catal. illustr. virorum*, i; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 380, 381; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, i, 434 sq.

Jacob OF LONDON, a Jewish Rabbi who flourished in England at the opening of the 13th century, was appointed by king John, at the commencement of his reign, when yet friendly to the Jews, and uninfluenced by the diabolical exertions of the Roman prelate Stephen Langton, as chief Rabbi of England ("presbyteratus omnium Judæorum totius Angliæ"). Jacob was a man of great learning, especially conversant with Jewish tradition, and held in high esteem by Jews and Gentiles. Even the king hesitated not to call him *his dear friend* ("dilectus et familiaris noster"). Unfortunately, we have no knowledge of any of his literary productions, which, by a man of his abilities, must have been valuable, especially as an index to the history of the Jews in England under king John. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 16. (J. H. W.)

Jacob OF MIES (*Jacobus de Misa*, also called, on account of his small stature, *Jacobellus*, i. e. Jacob the Short), one of the most prominent figures in the polemical controversy inaugurated by Huss, was born about the second half of the 14th century, at Misa, in Bohemia. He was educated at the University of Prague, and then became priest at Trina, and ultimately at Prague. At the instigation of Petrus Dresdensis, the Waldensian, he was led to inquire into the antiquity of the Roman Catholic mode of administering the sacrament, and, after a careful study of the writings of the early Church, became convinced that the Roman Church had no right or authority to deprive the laity of the cup, and by his tongue and by his pen he preached against the malpractice, himself also deviating from the usage, and administering the cup to the laity. Excommunicated by the archbishop of Prague, he challenged the university authorities to refute his arguments, and further defended his course by his pen: *Vindiciæ seu Replicatt. contra Andreas Brodum.* The approbation which his course received from the people seemed rather serious to the Council of Constance, just then in session, and every effort was made to refute Jacob of Mies. But soon Huss also came forward, and declared that the early fathers had been taught by the disciples that Christ desired both the wine and the bread to be given to the laity, and when arraigned as a heretic before the bar of the council, he still continued to reiterate his former statements (compare *Hist. et Monum. J. Hus atque Hieron. Pragensis*, Norimb. 1715, i, 52 sq.; V. d. Hardt, *Magnum œcumenicum Constantiense Concilium*, etc., iv, 291). Jacob of Mies, thus encouraged by the attitude of Huss, a classmate of his at the university, more vigorously than ever defended his position, and sought further to prove the accuracy of his statements in *Demonstratio per testimonia Scripturæ patrum atque doctorum communicationem calicis in plebe Christiana esse necessarium* (in V. d. Hardt, iii, 804 sq.). Of course his opponents could not long continue in silence, and they naturally, though awkwardly enough, endeavored to refute him by proofs from the Bible and the Church fathers. Perhaps the most able, i. e. the most ridiculous of all, and the most vehement of the opposition documents, was an anonymous *Epistola Elenchtica* (in V. d. Hardt). There were even some who attempted to prove that the deprivation of the cup had its sanction in the Old-Test. Scriptures! Thereupon the council convened at Constance (the 13th session, June 15, 1415) again condemned the course of Jacob of Mies, although it virtually admitted all that he claimed for the laity (see Gieseler, *Kirchen Gesch.* II, ii, 227 sq., in the 4th edit.). Jacob again defended his course by an *Apologia pro communione plebis*, which was replied to by the celebrated Gerson in his *Conc. publ. causam J. de Misa et Bohemorum quoad communionis laicalis sub utraque specie necessitatem uberius discutiendi.* Notwithstanding the frequent denunciations of his course, he continued to hold his parish, and even took up his pen in behalf of many other peculiar doctrines of the Romanists. Thus he opposed the Waldensians on the doctrine of purgatory and the mass, in *De purgatorio animæ post mortem* (in Walch, *Monum. medii ævi*, i, fasc. iii, p. 1 sq.). He also wrote *De juramento, de antichristo*, and prepared a translation of the works of Wycliffe. He died at Prague, Aug. 9, 1429. The result of the controversy on the cup resulted, as is well known, in a triumph for Jacob of Mies and for Huss. See Martini, *Diss. de J. de Misa*, etc., *primo Eucharist. Calicis per eccles: Boh. vindice* (Altdorf, 1753, 4to); Spittler, *Gesch. d. Kelchs i. heil. Abendmahl*, p. 49 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xxxiii. 332 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 394 sq.; Gillett, *Life of Huss* (1871, 2 vols. 8vo). (J. H. W.)

Jacob OF NISIBIS (often surnamed *Jacob the Great*), the instructor of Ephraem the Syrian, and a relative of Gregory the illuminator, flourished as bishop of Nisibis (Zoba) in the first half of the 4th century. The little that is known of him makes him out to have been a man "distinguished for ascetic holiness and for miraculous works," clothed, of course, like many of the early characters, in such a mythical dress that the character is often placed in a most ridiculous light (comp. Stanley, *Eastern Church*, p. 193). In his early life he "spent many years as a hermit in forests and caves, and lived like a wild beast on roots and leaves," clothed in a rough goat's-hair cloak; and this dress and mode of life he is said to have continued even after he became bishop of Nisibis. That he enjoyed the confidence and esteem of his contemporaries is evinced by the fact that he was a member of the Council of Nicæa (Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* i, 169; iii, 587), and by the distinction which he received at the hand of the emperor, who called him one of the three pillars of the world (comp. Schaff, *Ch. History*, iii

269). He died about 338. As a writer, Jacob of Nisibis hardly gained distinction; his authorship is even questioned by many. A number of works are attributed to him, but under his name are preserved only an Armenian translation of a letter to the bishops of Seleucia and eighteen sermons, of which a copy was prepared by direction of Assemani for the Vatican (*Bibl. Or.* i, 557 sq., 632). An edition, with a Latin translation and notes, was prepared and published by cardinal Antonelli (1756, folio; Venice, 1765; Const. 1824). See, besides Schaff and Stanley, Neumann, *Gesch. d. Armen. Lit.* p. 18 sq.; *Biographie Universelle*, art. Jacques de Nisibe; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 396. (J. H. W.)

Jacob of Sarûg, a celebrated writer and teacher of the Syrian Church, was born at Curtamum, on the Euphrates, in 452. He was made a presbyter in 503, and attained the distinction of bishop in 519. He was honored by the surname of "doctor" (Syr. *Malpâna*), and by that of "the universal" (Syr. *Tibelita*). He was the author of an innumerable number of works. Thus no less than 763 homilies in verse are attributed to him (of which Barhebræus had 182), besides expositions, an anaphora, a form of baptism, hymns, and letters. But evidently many works are falsely attributed to him, as Assemani (*Bibl. Orient.* ii, 332) has proved. Many of his writings are preserved in the Vatican. He died at Sarûg Nov. 29, 521. The Jacobites and Maronites both commemorate him, and the former hold him, with many other orthodox teachers, in great reverence, although it cannot be proved that he in the least deviated from the orthodox course. He certainly reproached Nestorius. His expositions are still used in the Syrian churches at public worship, and have also been translated into Arabic. Several of his hymns are contained in the *Brev. ferile Syr.* and in the *Offic. Domin.* (Rome, 1787). A poetic eulogy which he pronounced on Simeon the Stylite has been translated into German by Zingerle (in his *Leben und Wirken des heil. Simeon Stylites*, Innsbr. 1855, 8vo, p. 279–298). See Etheridge, *Syr. Churches* (Lond. 1846, 12mo), p. 241 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 397.

Jacob of Vitry (*Jacobus de Vitriaco*, or *Jacobus Vitriacus*), so named after his native place, was born in the second half of the 12th century. He was a presbyter at the village of Argenteuil, near Paris, when, attracted by the celebrated sanctity of Maria of Ognies, he removed to her place of residence, the diocese of Liege. She received him kindly, and influenced him to take a position in the diocese. At the request of the pope he began preaching against the Albigenses. and finally devoted himself to the interests of the sacred tomb at Jerusalem, travelling through France to levy contributions. While thus engaged he was elected bishop of Acre, and at the request of pope Honorius III went to the Holy Land. He there performed a noble work: among other things, he provided for the children of the Saracens whom the Christians had taken, baptized them, and intrusted them to the care of pious Christian women. After the retirement of the Christians from Damietta, he resigned in 1225 the episcopal office, and returned to Ognies. In 1229 pope Gregory IX appointed him cardinal and papal legate of France, Brabant, and the Holy Land. He died at Rome May 1, 1240. The writings of Jacob de Vitry are valuable. He profited greatly by his stay in the Holy Land, gathering much of the material necessary for the preparation of his principal work, the *Historia Orientalis*, generally entitled *History of Jerusalem*, published entire as "Cura Andreæ Hoji Brugensis" (1597); also by Martène and Durand, *Thesaur. nov. Anecdotorum*, t. iii (Par. 1717). This work of Jacob de Vitry is divided into three parts. The first contains the history (this as well as the others are mainly ecclesiastical) of Jerusalem in brief; the second, a short review of the history of the West, paying particular attention to the history of the different Church orders, and the extent and value of pilgrimages; in the third he returns to the East, and, beginning with the General Lateran Council, closes with the surrender of Damietta. This last part of the work does not seem to be the production of Jacob, but, in all probability, was written by some other hand, to add to the completeness of the work. Ceillier, however, attributes the whole work to Jacob, and defends his view by stating, in commendation of part third, "L'auteur avait vu de ses yeux ce qu'il raconte" (in accordance with the statement in the preface of the work, p. 1048). This work has been translated into French, and inserted in the *Collection des mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France*, tom. xxii. His letters are also of great importance to the historian: *Jacobi de Vitriaco epistola missa in Lotharingiam de capitione Damiatæ* (published by Bongarsius in the first part of the *Gesta Dei per Francos*), and *Ejusdem epistolæ quatuor ad Honorium III Papam* (in Martène and Durand's above-named work, and same volume); a life of the celebrated St. Mary of Ognies; and sermons on the Gospels and Epistles, of which a portion was published at Antwerp in 1575. See Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Sacrés*, xiii, 537 sq.; *Bibliotheca Belgica*, i, 542; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 398. (J. H. W.)

Jacob de Voragine, archbishop of Genoa, and author of the *Legenda aurea*, was born at Viraggio, near Genoa, in 1230. He joined the preaching friars at Genoa in 1244, and became provincial of the order for Lombardy in 1267. For services rendered to the Church and to his order in different circumstances, he was finally made archbishop of Genoa in 1292, and died in 1298. His reputation rests exclusively on a compilation of legends which he wrote under the title of *Legenda Sanctorum*, or *Legenda aurea* (also known as the *Historia Longobardica*, on account of a short Lombard chronicle it contains, attached to the life of pope Pelagius). The work consists of a series of fanciful biographies, some compiled from older works, others merely made up of the traditions current among the people and in convents. Many of the elements of these biographies are taken from apocryphal Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, and martyrologies, and are to be found in other anterior and contemporary works, such as the Passional, the legends of Mary, etc. Some of them are inventions of the Middle Ages, and show how quickly fables become mixed up with history: such are the lives of Dominic and of Francis of Assisi. These legends are, moreover, entirely devoid of poetic beauty, that redeeming feature of many works of this kind. Jacob was a mere compiler and chronicler, without taste and without talent; a specimen of his coarseness is to be found in what he relates of Vespasian in his life of the apostle James. The only original part of the work is the preface or introduction to the life of each saint, in which Jacob attempts to give an explanation of the meaning of their names, and these explanations consist in wonderful etymologies and wild speculations, such as could be expected from an ignorant monk unacquainted with either Greek or Hebrew. The work was soon esteemed at its just value. The superior of the order, Berengarius de Landora, subsequently archbishop of Compostella († 1330), commissioned Bernardus Guidonis, afterwards bishop of Lodève († 1331), to write a life of the saints from authentic sources. Bernardus, who was a zealous historian, set to work and produced a *Speculum sanctorum* in four volumes. This, however, did not meet with much success. The *Legenda* of Jacob became the *Legenda aurea*, and gained in popularity not only because it was shorter than the voluminous compilation of Bernardus, but especially on account of its extravagant descriptions and relations of miraculous occurrences, which suited the spirit of the Middle Ages much better than a plain, truthful narration of facts. Many translations of it were made into German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English, and after the discovery of printing many editions of it were published. (See Brunet, *Manuel de l'amateur de livres*, iv, 687 sq. The latest edition is by Dr. Grässe, librarian of the king of Saxony, Lpz. 1845, 8vo). To us

the book is very important as an index to the superstitious spirit of the Middle Ages. Among the other works of Jacob de Voragine we may mention *Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales* (Paris, 1500; Venice, 1589, 2 vols.):—*Sermones de dominicis per annum* (Venice, 1544, 4to, and 1566, fol.):—*Quadragesimale et de sanctis* (Venice, 1602, 2 vols. 4to):—*Sermones de Sanctis* (Lyon, 1494; Papiæ, 1500; Venice, 1580):—*Mariale sive sermones de B. Maria Virgine* (Venice, 1497, 4to; Paris, 1503; Mayence, 1616, 4to). The latest editions of his collected sermons appeared at Augsburg (1760, 4 vols. fol.). All these sermons are mere sketches; those on the saints are full of fables, and can be considered as a sort of supplement to the *Legenda aurea;* the 160 sermons on Mary treat, in alphabetical order, of the virtues, perfection, and miracles of the Virgin. Lentz, in his *Gesch. d. Homiletik* (Brunswick, 1839, i, 257), gives a German translation of one of them as a specimen. Jacob also wrote in defense of the Dominicans, and doubtless against the attacks of St. Amour, a *Defensorium contra impugnantes Fratres Prædicatores, quod non vivant secundum vitam apostolicam* (Venice, 1504). An abridgment which he prepared of the *Summa virtutum et vitiorum* of Wm. Peraldus, and his *De operibus et opusculis S. Augustini* have never been printed (Quétif and Echard, i, 458). His chronicle of Genoa, down to 1297, has been published by Muratori, *Scriptores rerum Italic.* ix, 1 sq. The assertion, made by Sixtus Senensis (*Biblioth. Sacra*, lib. iv), that Jacob wrote an Italian translation of the Bible, appears to be erroneous: no such work has ever been found, nor is it mentioned by contemporary writers; it is, moreover, highly improbable that the compiler of the *Legenda aurea* should have considered it desirable or profitable to give the fiction-loving people the Scriptures in the vernacular. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 399.

Jacob ben-Abba-Mari BEN-SIMON (*Simson*), generally known as **Jacob Anatoli** (ANATOLIO), a Jewish philosopher, was born in Provence in the latter half of the 12th century. He was the son-in-law of the celebrated writer Samuel Ibn-Tibbon, and, like him, became an ardent follower of Maimonides. In early life he acquired a thorough knowledge of the Arabic language, and this enabled him to translate many of the philosophical works for the benefit of his Jewish brethren. But, unlike his great master, he was inclined to rationalism to such a degree that he set about attempting to explain the miracles of the O.-T. Scriptures in a natural way. His fame soon spread abroad, and when the emperor Frederick II, the last of the Hohenstaufen, looked about for a translator of Aristotle, his eyes fell on Anatoli, and he was invited to Naples, and paid an annuity from the emperor's private purse to perform the arduous task, or, according to some, to assist in the undertaking. He prepared, in conjunction with Michael Scotus, a translation of the Greek philosopher, together with the commentary by the Arabian philosopher Averroes (Ibn-Roshd), into the Latin (comp. Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 105, note 1; Roger Bacon, *Opera*, ii, 140; Rénan, *Averroes et l'Averroisme*, p. 163 sq.). Jacob Anatoli died about 1250. See SCHOLASTICISM; SCOTUS (MICHAEL). (J. H. W.)

Jacob ben-Asheri BEN-JECHIEL BEN-URI BEN-ELIAKIM BEN-JEHUDAH, also called *Baal Ha-Turim*, after his celebrated ritual work, was born in Germany about A.D. 1280. At the age of eighteen he was an eye-witness of the fearful massacres of his Jewish brethren, which began in Bavaria April 20, 1298, under the leadership of Rindfleisch, and soon spread over France and Austria, and by which more than 100,000 persons were slaughtered in less than six months. The insecurity of the lives of Jews led him to emigrate in 1303. For more than two years he and his family moved from town to town, until they found a resting-place at Toledo, in Spain. Though in very straitened pecuniary circumstances, he began at once literary labors, and as the result we have (1) *A Commentary on the Pentateuch* (פֵּירוּשׁ עַל הַתּוֹרָה), the basis of which is Nachmanides's exposition. "He excluded from it Nachmanides's philosophico-cabalistic portions, inserted in their stead remarks of Rashi, Joseph Cara, Samuel ben-Meier, Abraham ben-Chija, R. Tam, Aben-Ezra, Joseph Kimchi, Jehudah the Pious, Simon ben-Abraham, Meier of Rothenburg, R. Asher, the father, and R. Jehudah, the brother of the author, as well as glosses of his own at the beginning of every Sabbatic section [see HAPHTARAH], which chiefly consist of explanations of words and whole sentences according to the hermeneutical rule called גימטריא (i. e. reducing every letter of a word to its numerical value, and explaining it by another word of the same quantity [see MIDRASH], and which he calls פרפראות, *dainty supplements*), and recondite reasons for the critical remarks of the Masorites upon the text (טעמי המסורות). This work is of great importance to the understanding of the original design of the Masorah. Such was the extraordinary popularity of *the Gematrical* portions of this commentary that they were detached from the exegetical part and printed in a separate form in Constantinople in 1514, in Venice in 1544, and have since appeared not only in the Rabbinic Bibles of Bomberg (Venice, 1546-48 and 1568), of Buxtorf (Basle, 1617-19), and Frankfurter (Amsterdam, 1724-27), under the title of קצר פרפראות חידושי בעל הטורים, but also in five editions of the Bible between 1595 and 1653, and in no less than twenty different editions of the Pentateuch between the years 1566 and 1804—whereas the exegetical part was not published till 1805 at Zolkiew, and again in 1838 at Hanover:—(2) אַרְבָּעָה טוּרִים, a celebrated religious code, so named because it consists of four parts or rows, respectively denominated אורח חיים, *the way of life;* יורה דעה, *the teacher of knowledge*; אבן העזר, *the stone of help;* and חשן המשפט, *the breastplate of justice.*" It treats of the ritual, moral, matrimonial, civil, and social observances of the Jews, and is, upon the whole, a very remarkable work; for a time it even supplanted the *Jod Ha-Chezaka* of the renowned Maimonides, and became the text-book of Jewish Rabbins throughout the entire known world. It is indispensable to the student of Jewish antiquities, and we refer here only to the best editions that have been published of this work (Augsburg, 1540; Hanover, 1610). He died in 1340. See Geiger, *Wissenschaftl. Zeitung IV* (Stuttg. 1839), p. 395 sq.; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 346 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 16 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catal. Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodleiana*, col. 1181 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* ii, 452 sq.

Jacob ben-Chajim BEN-ISAAC IBN-ADONIA, a celebrated Jewish writer, was born at Tunis about 1470. During the persecutions of the Jews in the first half of the 16th century he was obliged to flee his native country, and he went to Italy. After residing at Rome and Florence he removed to Venice, and engaged as corrector of the press proofs of the celebrated Bomberg edition of the Rabbinic Bible. This work he performed with great ability, and he afterwards published a second edition of this Bible in four volumes folio, called *Bomberg's Second Rabbinic Bible* (Venice, 1524-25). The first was prepared under the supervision of Felix Pratensis (q. v.). It contains the Hebrew text, with the Masorah, the Targums, the commentaries of several of the most noted early Jewish scholars, and copious introductions, etc., by the editor himself. Jacob ben-Chajim deserves especial credit for the able manner in which he labored on the Masorah (q. v.), displaying no small amount of erudition, sagacity, and patience. With the greatest of care he sifted the indigestible material which had gathered in the 1st and 2d centuries, and, having brought order out of chaos, he inserted it upon the margin of his edition of the Rabbinic Bible. In af-

ter life he embraced Christianity. He died about the middle of the 16th century. See Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 1863, p. 521; *Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 453; Rossi, *Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei*, s. v.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 17; Eichhorn, *Einleit. in d. A. T.* § 394. See RABBINICAL BIBLES. (J. H. W.)

Jacob ben-Eleazar, a Jewish grammarian, flourished at Toledo in the first half of the 12th century. He distinguished himself by a work entitled סֵפֶר הַשָּׁלֵם (the book of completion), which investigates the nature of the vowel-points of Hebrew, and also the etymology of proper Hebrew names; it was freely used by Kimchi, as is proved by frequent citations. "Jacob ben-Eleazar was a sound grammarian, laid down some excellent rules respecting the Hebrew syntax, and materially aided the development of philology in Spain at a time when Biblical exegesis was much neglected and the study of the Talmud was paramount" (Dr. Ginsburg, in Kitto, s. v.). He was also active in the correction of the Hebrew text of the O. Test., and for this purpose relied on the celebrated Codex Hillali or Helali, one of the most ancient and celebrated Hebrew codices. It was written, according to some, at Hilla, a town built near the ruins of the ancient Babel, and hence the name by which the MS. is designated; others, however, hold that it was the production of Rabbi Moses ben-Hillel. It bears date from the beginning of the 7th century, according to Sakkuto, who in his day (circa 1500) saw a portion of the Codex, and pronounced it to be 900 years old, and cites Kimchi (*Juchassin*, ed. Filipowski, Lond. 1857, p. 220) as saying in his grammar on Numb. xv, 4, that the Pentateuch of this Codex was in his day extant at Toledo. The probability is that a greater portion of it, if not the whole, was destroyed at Leon, in Spain, where it was last deposited, during the persecutions of the Jews and the destruction of all Jewish writings in 1197. Jacob ben-Eleazar's correction of the text of the O.-T. Scriptures by the aid of this celebrated Codex makes it, therefore, doubly valuable for all critical students of the Hebrew text. See Biesenthal and Lebrecht's *Radicum Liber* (Berlin, 1847), p. 15, 26; Geiger, in *Ozar Nechmad* II (Vienna, 1857), p. 159 sq.; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vi, 132; Kitto, s. v. See MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

Jacob ben-Machir TIBBON. See PROFIAT.

Jacob ben-Meier. See TAM.

Jacob ben-Sheshet GERUNDI, a celebrated Cabalist who flourished about the middle of the 13th century, deserves our notice because of his efforts to counteract the influence which some of the better educated and more liberal-minded Jewish Rabbins of the 13th and 14th centuries exerted in behalf of the introduction of a philosophical mode of interpretation inaugurated by the renowned Maimonides. Like many others of his conservative brethren, he confronted the liberals with harsh terms and low and vulgar epithets, and thereby only strengthened the cause of his adversaries. Thus he called the Maimonidists "heretics and transgressors of the law," and asserted that "they seek only the furtherance of the temporal good, of the earthly life, the defence of life and property, but deny all future rewards and punishments," etc. These gross misrepresentations are contained in a work which he published in defence of the cabalistic mode of interpretation. See Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vii, 85; note 3, p. 442-459. See CABALA; MAIMONIDES. (J. H. W.)

Jacob Baradæus. See JACOBITES.

Jacob Berab, a Jewish Rabbi, born A.D. 1474 at Maqueda, near Toledo, Spain, was obliged by persecution to leave his native land when only eighteen years old. After many years of travel through Egypt to Jerusalem, and thence to Damascus, he at last found a resting-place in Safet (about 1534). Possessing a large fortune and great thirst for honor, he sought distinction among his Palestinian brethren. Favored by the Rabbins of his own immediate vicinity, he succeeded in re-establishing (1538) the Sanhedrim in the Holy Land, which, no doubt, he intended to serve as the starting-point for the re-establishment of the Jewish kingdom. Unfortunately, however, for the Jewish cause, there was higher authority at Jerusalem than at Safet; and when Berab sought a reconciliation with the chief Rabbi, Levi ben-Chabib, by appointing him next in authority, the consummation of the project failed, to the great detriment of Judaism all over the world. A controversy between the two parties ensued, which ended with the death of Berab (January, 1541); it completely destroyed the hope of a re-establishment of ordination and of a Jewish state. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, ix, ch. ix and x; Jost, *Geschichte d. Judenthums*, iii, 128 sq. See JEWS. (J. H. W.)

Jacob Emden ASHKENASI (shortened *Jabez*), a Jewish Rabbi of great distinction among the Hebrews of the last century, was born at Amsterdam in 1696. He was the son of Chacham Zewi, another Rabbi of the celebrated Zewi family. Being banished from their homes, his father's family sought a refuge first in Poland, later in Moravia. Possessed of a considerable fortune, Jacob devoted most of his time to the study of the Jewish traditions, to the exclusion of all secular studies, which he considered likely to be derogatory to his firm belief in the authenticity of Rabbinical writings. Even the position of Rabbi, which was frequently offered him, he hesitated to accept, lest it should in the least interfere with his studies. But, once persuaded to assume the sacred duties at Emden, he was thereafter always called Jacob Emden, although in the official papers of the Danish government he is called Herschel. He soon returned to private life, and became a resident at Altona (about 1730), near Hamburg. But, if Jacob did not retain an official position in the synagogue, he certainly continued to work actively for the good of Israel; and as, by his zeal for the cause of the Jewish religion, he often censured, both by pen and tongue, those who departed from the old and wonted way, he thus made it possible for his adversaries, of whom, like his father, he had not a few, to stigmatize him as the Jewish "grand inquisitor," etc. If Jacob Emden ever deserved to be criticised for improper conduct, it is for his relation towards Rabbi Eibeschütz, who was his competitor for the rabbiship of the Altona, Hamburg, and Wandsbeck congregations, which Jacob did not care to fill, but which he would gladly have had the honor to decline. (Compare Grätz, v, 397 sq.) Emden was especially severe against all the Cabalists, and many were the books that he issued to contradict their teachings. He even denied the authorship of some of the cabalistic writings; thus he pronounced the book Zohar to be a spurious production of his own century, etc. He placed himself in a very ridiculous light by a judgment which he gave on Jewish traditional law, upon which the advice of Moses Mendelssohn had also been obtained, and in which, differing from this great man, he addressed him more like a teacher than a pupil. Jacob Emden died in 1776. One of his pupils was the celebrated Samuel Dubno. His writings, according to his own statement, cover no less than 34 different works. The most important of them are his contributions to the history of the fanatics of the last century, known as the followers of Sabbatai Zewi (q. v.). They are, קִצּוּר צִיצַת נוֹבֵל צְבִי, taken from the celebrated polemical work by Jacob Sasportas, on the sad fate of Sabbatai Zewi (Amst. 1737, 4to):—סֵ' הַשִּׁמּוּשׁ, the most ably conducted polemic against Zoharites and Sabbatians, consisting of different brochures (Alton. 1758, 4to):—תּוֹרַת הַקְּנָאוֹת, another collection against S. Zewi and his followers (Altona, 1752, 4to):—תְּשׁוּבָה אֶל אוֹדוֹת הַמִּינִין, on the Sabbatians who espoused the Christian faith (Altona,

1757, 8vo). Of his other works, the most able are, perhaps, סֵדֶר עֲבוֹדָה, on the Temple service, the sacrifice, etc. (Altona, 1745–69, 8vo; extract by S. Deutsch, Presb. 1835, 8vo):—עַמּוּדֵי שָׁמַיִם, first part of a great work on the Jewish ritual (Altona, 1745, 8vo, and often):—עֵץ אָבוֹת, the Mishnic tract *Aboth*, with commentaries by celebrated Jewish savans, etc. (Amst. 1751, 4to); etc. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, x (Index); Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, iii, 194, 252, 308; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 241 sq. (contains a list of all his writings); Sam. Dubno, אֵבֶל יָחִיד (Berl. 1776, 8vo); Fürst, *Jacob Emden* in the *Lib. d. Or.*, 1846, c. 442. See LUZATTO; JEWS (MODERN). (J. H. W.)

Jacob, Henry, an English Nonconformist, was born in the county of Kent in the second half of the 16th century. He was educated at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. He had secured the living of Cheriton, a place in his native county, but appearing before the public in print as an advocate of a reform of the English Church ("Reasons proving the Necessity of Reforming our Churches in England," Lond. 1604), he was deprived of his parish, and even obliged to flee the country. After residing some time in Holland he returned to England, and founded the first Independent (Congregational) church in that country. See INDEPENDENTS. In 1624 he emigrated to Virginia, and here he died soon after his arrival. Henry Jacob was an extensive writer, but his writings are almost without exception of a polemical nature, and at present very scarce. The most important are, a reply to bishop Bilson's *Sermons on Redemption* (preached in 1597, publ. 1598, 8vo), entitled *Treatise on the Sufferings and Victory of Christ* (Lond. 1598, 8vo), and *Defence* of the same (1600, 4to). See Strype, *Life of Whitgift*; Allibone, *Dict. of Auth.* i, 948; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 273.

Jacob, Stephen, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Argyle, N.Y., Feb. 23, 1789; was converted in Feb. 1810; entered the itinerancy in June, 1812; was superannuated in 1818; and died April 24, 1819. He was a zealous, acceptable, and useful preacher, and devotedly pious.—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 327.

Jacobi, FRIEDRICH HEINRICH, one of Germany's most eminent philosophers, was born at Düsseldorf January 25, 1743. His father was a wealthy merchant, and, anxious to be assisted by his son, he designed him for the mercantile profession. When only sixteen years old, Jacobi was sent to Frankfort on the Main to learn the business. But he daily evinced fondness for a literary profession, and a short time after, having removed to Geneva, he was further incited to study by association with learned men, among whom was the great mathematician Le Sage. The death of his father obliged him to return to Düsseldorf, to look after the business interests of the family. He, however, at the same time, continued his studies, which were now becoming multifarious, not to say contradictory, and, according to one of his biographers, "presented the strange appearance of a philosophical composite, including in his single personality the quadruple variety of an enlightened 18th century man, a mystic, an atheist, and a theist." Appointed a member of the Exchequer, he had much more leisure afforded him than while at the head of his father's business, and he now not only gave himself up to study, but also to authorship, to which he had been encouraged by his literary associates, among whom figured some of Germany's most noted names. His first productions were a collection of letters by an imaginary person named Allwill, and a romance called "Woldemar" (1777, and often), which, like some of the productions of his friend and present associate Göthe, incorporated the philosophical opinions of the writer. Brought more prominently to the notice of the government, he was honored with a financial position in the state's service, and he removed to Munich. But his unhesitating exposures of the imprudence and injurious tendency of the Bavarian system of finance made him many enemies, and he retired to his estate at Pempelfort, near Düsseldorf, where his hospitable nature soon gathered about him "celebrated guests from all quarters of the cultivated world," and it was only natural that he should now continue his literary productions. Among other literary enterprises which he ventured upon was a controversy with Mendelssohn (in *Briefe über d. Lehre d. Spinoza* [Bresl. 1785, and often]) on the doctrines that had been advocated by the pantheist Spinoza, whose philosophy had at this time been almost forgotten. This he further and most ably prosecuted in *Wider Mendelssohns Beschuldigungen* (Lpz. 1786); (comp. Kahnis, *Hist. of German Protestantism*, p. 156 sq.). It was this controversy with Mendelssohn, which had originated with the discovery by Jacobi that the friend of the former, Lessing, the author of Nathan, was a Spinozist, which Mendelssohn was determined to refute, but which actually laid even the latter open to the charge of advocating pantheistical doctrines, that first brought clearly to light the philosophical opinions of Jacobi, and stamped him as the "philosopher of faith." The points of Jacobi's position are thus stated by Schwegler (*History of Philosophy*, transl. by Seelye, p. 272): "(1.) Spinozism is fatalism and atheism; (2.) Every path of philosophic demonstration leads to fatalism and atheism; (3.) In order that we may not fall into these, we must set a limit to demonstrating, and recognise faith as the element of all metaphysical knowledge." Principles like these, advocated at a time when atheism was enthroned all over Germany and France, naturally enough aroused universal opposition in the philosophical world. "It was charged upon him that he was an enemy of reason, a preacher of blind faith, a despiser of science and of philosophy, a fanatic and a papist." To controvert these opinions, he determined to develop his principle of faith or immediate knowledge; he published *David Hume über d. Glauben, oder Idealismus u. Realismus* (Bresl. 1787, 8vo). This brought down upon him the followers of Kant, and shortly after he also estranged the admirers of Fichte by his *Sendschreiben an Fichte* (1799). His controversial opponents, however, never failed to acknowledge the great abilities of Jacobi, and the sincerity of his character and opinions. When the troubles arising out of the French Revolution extended to Germany, Jacobi retired to Holstein, whence he removed successively to Wandsbeck and Hamburg; from the latter he was called, in 1804, to Munich, to assist in the formation of the new Academy of Sciences, of which he was, in 1807, appointed president. In 1811 he further involved himself in a controversy with another philosophical school, that of Schelling, by the publication of a work *Von d. göttlichen Dingen u. ihrer Offenbarung* (Lpz. 1811). This time the dispute was waged rather bitterly; but, notwithstanding the unfavorable estimate which Schelling drew, in his reply, of the literary and philosophical merits of Jacobi, the latter continued to maintain a high rank among sincere and honest inquirers after truth; and even if it must be confessed that Jacobi was exclusively occupied with detached speculations, and that he rather prepared than established a system of philosophy, yet it remains undisputed that the profoundness and originality of his views have furnished materials of which more systematic minds have not scrupled to avail themselves for the construction of their own theories. Jacobi died at Munich March 10, 1819. Besides the philosophical productions already mentioned, he wrote *Ueber d. Unternehmen d. Kriticismus d. Vernunft z. Verstande zu bringen* (Bresl. 1802, 8vo). All his works were published collectively at Leipzig in 1812. "Jacobi stood to the philosophy of his day, as it had flowed down from Kant to Schelling, in a very peculiar relation. He was incited by each of these systems; he learned from each, and on each of them he exercised his strength. But he was not satisfied by either of them; yet he was most strongly repelled by pantheism, whether the earlier pantheism of Spinoza, whom he highly esteemed as a man,

or its later form in Schelling's natural philosophy. . . . Jacobi did not despise reason; he rather pleaded for it; but reason was not to him a faculty for the creation, discovery, or production of truth from itself. By reason he meant, according to the derivation of the word, that which perceives, the inmost and original sense. He did not regard reason and faith as being in conflict with each other, but as one. Faith inwardly supplies what knowledge cannot gain. Here Jacobi united with Kant in acknowledging the insufficiency of our knowledge to produce a demonstration of God and divine things. . . . But the vacant place which Kant had therefore left in his system for divine things . . . Jacobi filled up by the doctrine of faith" (Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* ii, 238 sq.). The whole philosophy of Jacobi is perhaps best stated thus: "All demonstrative systems must necessarily lead to fatalism, which, however, is irreconcilable with man's consciousness of the freedom of his rational nature. The general system of nature, indeed, and man himself, so far as he is a part of that system, is pure mechanism; but in man there is unquestionably an energy which transcends and is superior to sense, or that faculty which is bound up with and regulated by the laws of nature. This higher energy is liberty or reason, and consequently sense and reason reveal to man two distinct spheres of his activity—the sensible or visible world, and the invisible or intelligible. The existence of these worlds no more admits of demonstrative proof than that of sense and reason themselves. Now sense and reason are the supreme and ultimate principles of all intellectual operations, and as such legitimize them, while they themselves do not receive their legitimization from aught else; and the existence of sense and reason necessarily implies the existence of sensible and intelligible objects about which they are conversant. But this existing system of things cannot have originally proceeded either from nature or from man's intellect or reason, for both nature and the human mind are finite and conditionate, and there must be something infinite and unconditionate, superior to and independent both of nature and man, to be the source and principle of all things. This being is God. Now as man's liberty consists in his personality or absolute individuality, for this constitutes his proper essence, while the mechanism of nature is hereby distinguished from man, that none of its members are individual of character, therefore that which is superior both to nature and to man must be perfectly and supremely individual; God consequently is one only, and strictly personal. Moreover, as the ground of all subsistence, he cannot be without subsistence; and as the principle of reason, he cannot be irrational. Of the existence of this divine intelligence, however, all direct proof is as impossible as a demonstration of existence simply. Generally, indeed, nothing can be known except upon testimony, and whatever rests on testimony is not certainty, but *faith*, and such a faith or belief, when its object is the existence of a good and supreme being, is religion." It is apparent, then, that Jacobi may appropriately be looked upon as an advocate of religion, but by no means can he be admitted to have been a Christian philosopher; for, although he believed in a revelation of God, he was "far from taking sides with the believers of revelation, in the ecclesiastical sense of the word." If it is proper to class the influence of Jacobi's philosophy with that of Fichte and Schelling, as Farrar (*Critical History of Free Thought*, p. 238) does, it is well at least to concede that these philosophical systems all together certainly "formed one class of influences, which were operating about the beginning of the 18th century, and were tending to redeem alike German literature and theology." "Their first effect was to produce examination of the primary principles of belief, and to excite inquiry; and, though at first only re-enforcing the idea of morality, they ultimately drew men out of themselves into aspirations after the infinite spirit, and developed the sense of dependence, of humility, of unselfishness, of spirituality. They produced, indeed, evil effects in pantheism and ideology, but the results were partial, the good was general. The problem, What is truth? was through their means remitted to men for reconsideration; the answers to it elicited from the one school, It is that which I can know; from the other, It is that which I can intuitively feel, threw men upon those unalterable and infallible instincts which God has set in the human breast as the everlasting landmarks of truth, the study of which lifts men ultimately out of error." One of the most celebrated advocates of these views of Jacobi we find in Schleiermacher (compare Hagenbach, ii, 332 sq., 339), though, of course, the former only prepared the way for the latter; and, indeed, this "faith philosophy," "with some slight modifications in each case, consequent upon their philosophical system," is the theory not only of Jacobi and of Schleiermacher, but also of Nitzsch, Mansel (author of "Limits of Religious Thought"), and probably, also, of the Scotch philosopher Hamilton (compare Cocker, *Christianity and Greek Philosophy*, p. 70 sq.). See Herbst, *Biographie* in the *Bibliothek christlicher Denker* (Leipz. 1830), i; Max Jacobi, *Briefwechsel zwischen Göthe u. Fr. H. Jacobi* (Leipz. 1846); Gervinus, *Geschichte d. poet. Nat. Lit. d. Deutschen* (3d edit.), iv, 556 sq.; Chalybæus, *Hist. Specul. Phil.* p. 60 sq.; Ersch u. Gruber, *Allgem. Encyklop.; English Cyclop.* s. v.

Jacobites is the name by which the different communities in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia, who hold to the Monophysite doctrine, have been known since their union, about the middle of the 6th century. See EUTYCHIANISM; MONOPHYSITES. The most prominent party in accomplishing the union of these Monophysites, who, near the middle of the 6th century, were very weak, and threatened with extermination, was Jacob (or James) Albardai, or Baradæus (or Zanzalus), a zealous disciple of Severus, a monk and presbyter of the convent of Phasilta, near Nisibis, and it is after this Jacob that the united Monophysites were named after their union, and not, as some have supposed, after James, the brother of Christ, or Jacob the patriarch, or after Dioscorus, who was called Jacob before his ordination. It is true, however, that these communities are sometimes designated as the Severians, Dioscorians, Eutychians, and even as the Theodosians (for the Egyptian Monophysites, see COPTS; for the Armenian, see ARMENIAN CHURCH; and for the Abyssinian, see ABYSSINIAN CHURCH). The surnames of Jacob who united the Monophysites, however, have no bearing on his relation to the sects, but are strictly personal. Thus the coarseness of the dress in which he travelled through the East for the benefit of his party (says D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, p. 435) gained him the name of *Baradai* (i. e. a coarse horse-*blanket;* compare Assemani, ii, 66, 414; Makrizi, *Geschichte der Kopten*, edited by Wüstenfeld; Eutychius, *Annales*, ed. Pococke, ii, 144, 147). Jacob was made bishop of Edessa in 541, and then, says Dr. Schaff (*Ch. History*, iii, 775), "this remarkable man devoted himself for seven and thirty years with unwearied zeal to the interests of the persecuted Monophysites. 'Light footed as Asahel' (2 Sam. ii, 18), and in the garb of a beggar, he journeyed hither and thither amid the greatest dangers and privations; revived the patriarchate of Antioch; ordained bishops, priests, and deacons; organized churches; healed divisions; and thus saved the Monophysite body from impending extinction." He died in 578.

"The Jacobites have always protested against being considered followers of Eutyches; but, while they profess to anathematize that heresiarch, they merely reject some minor opinions of his, and hold fast his great distinguishing error of the absorption of the humanity of our Saviour in his divine nature. They think that in the incarnation, from two natures there resulted one. In other words, they believe that the Redeemer does not possess two natures, but one composed of two, illustrating their dogma in this way: 'Glass is made of sand;

but the whole is only glass, no longer sand: thus the divine nature of Christ has absorbed the human, so that the two have become one.'" A middle way between Eutychianism and orthodoxy was chosen by Xenayas (q. v.) and his school, who on the incarnation maintain "the existence in Christ of one nature, composed of the divinity and humanity, but without conversion, confusion, or commixture. He teaches that the Son, one of the Trinity, united himself with a human body and a rational soul in the womb of the Virgin. His body had no being before this union. In this he was born, in it he was nourished, in it he suffered and died. Yet the divine nature of the Son did not suffer or die. Nor was his human nature, or his agency, or death, merely visionary, as the Phantasmists taught, but actual and real. Moreover, the divine nature was not changed or transmuted *into the human*, or commixed or confused therewith; neither was the human nature converted into the divine, nor commixed or confused with it; but an adunation of the two natures took place, of a mode equivalent to that which, by the union of body and soul, makes a human being; for as the soul and body are united in one human nature, so, from the union of the Godhead and manhood of our Lord Jesus Christ, there has arisen a nature peculiar to itself, not simple, but complex; 'one double nature.'" Here is evidently maintained a distinction from the Eutychians that the flesh of Christ taken from the Virgin was actual and real, and united with the divine in Christ, "without confusion, change, or division;" and from the orthodox, in holding that, after the union, the two natures united in one, losing their distinctiveness. This view of Xenayas, says Etheridge (*Syrian Churches*, p. 143), seems to be at present the doctrine of the Jacobites; but, as the laity is very moderately educated, this remark applies only to the clergy. As an indication that they have only an imperfect idea on this point, Etheridge cites their usage of "making the sign of the cross with only the middle finger of their hand, holding the others so as to render them invisible," evincing thereby that the whole subject is to them an unsolved mystery.

Like the Greek Church, the Jacobites, as a rule, deny the *procession of the Holy Ghost* from the Son, holding, however, to the orthodox doctrine of the personality and deity.

Sacraments.—It is generally believed that the Jacobites, with the Roman Catholics, hold to the septenary number on the sacraments, but Etheridge says (p. 144) that "this must be taken in a qualified sense, as they have no distinct service of confirmation, nor do they use extreme unction, unless it be sometimes imparted to members of the priesthood. Auricular confession, too, is scarcely known among them. And in the Eucharist, while they profess to recognise the real presence, it must not be understood in the Papite sense of transubstantiation, but the presence of the Saviour which accompanies, in an undescribed manner, the elements of the bread and wine: a species of consubstantiation, illustrated by Bar Salib (in Matt. xxviii, *Codd. Syr. Clement. Vatic.* 16, fol. 29) under the idea of iron in union with fire, and receiving from it the properties of light and heat, while its own nature remains unaltered" (comp. Bar-Hebræus, *Menorath Kudshî*, or the "Lamp of the Saints," fundam. vi, sect. 2). At the celebration of the Eucharist they administer newly-made unleavened bread (Rödiger, however, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 400, asserts that they use *leavened* bread), commixed with salt and oil, and of both kinds, but generally dipping, like the Nestorians, the cake into the wine. The sacrament of baptism they are said, but very improbably, to have performed by imprinting on the subject (of course infants), with a burning iron, the figure of the cross, on some part of the body, generally the arm, sometimes even the face.

The doctrine of *purgatory* they wholly ignore, though it is true they follow the Syrian custom in praying for their dead.

Descent.—Their origin they attempt to trace lineally from the first Hebrew Christians. Dr. Wolff (*Journal*, 1839) says, "They call themselves the *Bnay Israel* (the children of Israel), whose ancestors were converted by the apostle James;" and continues, that "there cannot be the least doubt that their claim to being the descendants of the Jewish Christians of old is just. Their physiognomy, mode of worship, their attachment to the Mosaic law, their liturgy, their tradition, so similar to the Jewish, the technical terms in their theology, all prove that they are real descendants of Abraham." They certainly followed the Jews at one time in subjecting their male members to circumcision (comp. Saligniac, *Itinerancy*, viii, c. i). One thing is peculiarly characteristic of the Jacobites—they practise the adoration of the saints, and particularly worship the mother of Christ. As teachers and saints, they revere some of the most prominent actors in the Church History of the early centuries, particularly Jacob of Sarûg, Jacob of Edessa, Dioscorus, Severus, P. Fullo, and Jacob Baradæus; but Eutyches they ignore. (Compare Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* ii, diss. de Monophys. § 8 and 10; Renaudot, *Hist. Patriarch. Alex.* p. 133 sq.; id. *Liturg.* ii, 103).

The Jacobites also impose upon themselves excessive *fasts:* "five annual lents, during which both the clergy and the laity abstain not only from flesh or eggs, but even from the taste of wine, of oil, and of fish" (Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, iv, 551; comp. La Croze, *Christianisme de l'Éthiopie*, p. 352).

Their *clergy* are constituted on the model of a perfect hierarchy. "Extremely tenacious of their ecclesiastical status in this particular, they glory in an apostolical succession from St. Peter as the first bishop of Antioch, and exhibit what they hold to be an unbroken series of more than 180 bishops of that see from his day to our own." This assertion they make in the face of the fact that they only started in the 6th century under Jacob, but they certainly ought to enjoy the same privileges with all other churches that lay claim to a direct *apostolic succession* (q. v.).

By the side of the patriarch, who holds the highest office in the Church, there is a secondary officer at the head of the Eastern Jacobites, the Maphrian (Syriac, מַפְרְיָנָא, i. e. the fructifier), or *Primas Orientis*, whose mission it is to ordain bishops, and also to consecrate the patriarch elect by the laying on of hands. He occupies, to a certain degree, the same position as the now obsolete Katholikos (*Catholic*) of the Nestorian Church, and is sometimes designated by that name. He resides at Mosul, and his jurisdiction extends over the Jacobites of the East residing beyond the Tigris and a portion of Mesopotamia; the rest of Mesopotamia, Asia proper, Phœnicia, Palestine, Cilicia, and Armenia are under the immediate control of the patriarch of Antioch. (On *Ordination*, see Etheridge, *Syr. Ch.* p. 147 sq.) With the diocese of the patriarch there comes in contact the patriarchate of the Copts (q. v.), and of late years both churches have sustained a bishop at Jerusalem.

The Jacobites are distinguished for the number of their *convents*, from which, as is the custom in all the Eastern churches, the higher officers of the Church are all chosen. These institutions are, perhaps for this reason also, under the supervision of the bishops.

At the time of its greatest prosperity the Jacobite Church produced many men remarkable for the profoundness of their views, their teachings, and their writings. No less than 150 archbishops and bishops have been counted in the different ages of the sect, of whom an account is given in the second part of J. G. Assemani's *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. The most eminent of them are John, bishop of Asia; Thomas of Harkel, who, in the beginning of the 7th century, revised the Philoxenian translation of the N. T.; Jacob of Edessa; the patriarch Dionysius I, in the first half of the 9th century, author of a Syriac chronicle, of which Assemani has made much use, and of which a part has been published by

Tullberg (Upsala, 1850); John, bishop of Dara, in the 9th century; Moses Bar-Kipha († 913), whose treatise on Paradise was translated into Latin by Andr. Masius; Dionysius Bar-Salibi, bishop of Amid in the 12th century, author of commentaries on the Bible and other theological works (Assemani, ii, 156-211); Jacob, bishop of Tagrit in the 13th century; and especially Gregorius Abulfaragius; Bar-Hebræus, in the 13th century, who was perhaps the greatest and noblest man of the Eastern Church; his death was mourned alike by Jacobites and Nestorians, by Greeks and Armenians, all of whom forgot the disputes which were agitating at that time the Eastern Church, and gathered at his grave to mingle their tears for the loss of a truly virtuous and great man. The work of Biblical criticism known as *Recensio Karkaphensis* is also, as shown by Wiseman (*Horæ Syr.* Rome, 1828, 8vo, p. 206, 212), due to the Jacobite Church.

The *present condition* of this sect is thus described by the Rev. George Percy Badger (*Nestorians and their Rituals*, i, 60): "The present hierarchy of the Jacobites in Turkey consists of a patriarch, who claims the title of 'Patriarch of Antioch and successor of St. Peter,' eight metropolitans, and three bishops. Of these, one resides at Mosul, one in the convent of Mar Mattai, in the same district, one at Urfat, one at Diarbekir, or Kharpût, one at Jerusalem, one at Mardîn, three in Jebel Tûr, and two are called *Temeloyo*, i. e. universal, without any regular dioceses. . . . The bishops generally are illiterate men, but little versed in Scripture, and entirely ignorant of ecclesiastical history. They scarcely ever preach, and their episcopal visitations are confined to occasional ordinations, and to the collection of tithes from their several dioceses. All of them can, of course, read the Syriac of their rituals, but few thoroughly understand it. . . . As might naturally be expected, the lower orders of the Syrian clergy are generally more illiterate than the bishops; and how can it be otherwise? . . . Such being the awkwardness and inefficiency of their clergy, it is not to be wondered at that religious knowledge and vital godliness are at a very low ebb among the Syrian laity. Notwithstanding the comparative affluence of this community, I believe that there do not exist among them more than twenty small schools in the whole of Turkey, where their population amounts to something like 100,000 (Etheridge says 150,000). The following is a rough estimate in villages of the proportion of their numbers in the different districts: (1) Jebel Tûr, 150 villages; (2) district of Urfah and Gawar, 50 villages; (3) Kharpût, 15 villages; (4) Diarbekir, 6 villages; (5) Mosul, 5 villages; (6) Damascus, 4 villages, making in all 230 villages now inhabited by Syrians." (Comp. Richard Pococke, *Travels in the East*, II, i, 208; Niebuhr, *Reisebeschreib.* vol. ii; Buckingham, *Trav. in Mesopotamia*, i, 321, 341; Robinson, *Palestine*, iii, 460 sq.)

As early as the 14th century the Roman Catholic Church used her influence to effect a union of the Jacobite and Western churches under the sway of Rome. But, although many accessions have been obtained from the Jacobites, they have not yielded entire, as did the Copts in the 15th century. The first really important success the Romanists achieved in the 17th century, under Andreas Achigian, when the converts, at that time quite numerous, styling themselves "Syrian Catholics," elected him as a rival patriarch. He was followed by Petrus (Ignatius, vol. xxv), who did not continue long in office, as the opposition party proved too strong for Rome (Assemani, ii, 482). This, however, by no means discouraged the Papists, for the undertaking was resumed shortly afterwards; and they have for some time past sustained in Syria a patriarch who resides at Haleb, and they have even "Catholic Jacobite convents." The inferiority of the Syrian Catholics to the Jacobites has induced the Protestants of England and America to establish missions among them, and they have thus far met with tolerable success. See Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* ii; *Diss. de Monophys.* § 1-10; Neale, *East. Church*, iii (see Index); Abudachus, *Hist. Jacobitarum* (Oxf. 1700); Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Rom. Emp.* (Harper's ed.), iv, 551 sq.; Migne, *Dict. des Ordres religieux*, ii, 561; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 400 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jacobs, David, a minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in Franklin County, Pa., Nov. 22, 1805. He was educated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Penn. (class of 1825). While at college he was particularly distinguished as a linguist, and in the absence of the professor of languages was requested to hear the recitations in Latin and Greek. He commenced his theological studies under the direction of the Rev. Dr. B. Kurtz, and completed them in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg in 1827. The same year he took charge of the classical department established in connection with the seminary, from which Pennsylvania College took its origin. He was very successful as a teacher. No one ever pursued his work more nobly, or with an aim more exalted. He received license to preach the Gospel in 1829, but his health was so delicate that he seldom officiated in the pulpit. He died Nov. 30, 1830, in the twenty-fifth year of his age, at Shepherdstown, Va., as he was returning from a trip to the South, whither he had gone in pursuit of health. In talent he was above the ordinary standard, a ripe scholar, and those who were brought in contact with him appreciated his excellent character, and acknowledged his eminent services.

Jacomb, Thomas, D.D., a pious Nonconformist divine who took a prominent part in the ecclesiastical affairs of England in the 17th century, was born in Leicestershire in 1622. He studied at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and subsequently became fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. During the Rebellion he obtained the living of St. Martin, Ludgate, but was ejected in 1662, during the Bartholomew ejectment of Nonconformists, and died March 27, 1687. Stoughton (*Eccl. Hist. of Engl.* [*Ch. of the Restoration*], i, 165) says that Jacomb, while a member of the Savoy Conference [see Independents], in which he figured very prominently, "is described as a man of superior education, of a staid mind, of temperate passions, moderate in his counsels, and in the management of affairs, not vehement and confident, not imposing and overbearing, but receptive of advice, and yielding to reason." He was one of the continuators of Poole's *Annotations*. His works, which are now scarce, are, *A Treatise on Holy Dedication* [on Psa. xxx] (Lond. 1668, 8vo):—*Several Sermons on the viiith Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans* [18 on the 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th verses] (London, 1672, 4to).—Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.; Stoughton, *Eccles. History* (*Ch. of the Restoration*), ii, 504, 505.

Jacquelot, Isaac, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Vassy Dec. 16, 1647. He became a minister in 1668, and was colleague of his father, the pastor of Vassy, until obliged to leave in consequence of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He resided first at Heidelberg, then (1686) at La Haye, where he became pastor of a French congregation. In consequence of some trouble he had with Jurieu, Benoît, and others, he accepted an offer of the king of Prussia, who had heard him preach, and had learned to esteem Jacquelot, and in 1702 he settled at Berlin as pastor of a French church. He died there Oct. 20, 1708. He wrote *Dissertations sur l'Existence de Dieu* (La Haye, 1697, 4to; Par. 1744, 3 vols. 12mo):—*Dissertations sur le Messie* (La Haye, 1699, 8vo):—*La Conformité de la Foi avec la Raison* (Amst. 1705, 8vo):—*Réponse aux Entretiens composés par M. Bayle contre la Conformité*, etc. (Amsterd. 1707, 8vo):—*Traité de la vérité et de l'inspiration du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterd. 1715, 8vo):—*Sermons* (Gen. 1750, 2 vols. 12mo); and a number of controversial pamphlets against Benoît, Jurieu, Werenfels, etc. See *Hist. des Ouvrages des Savants* (Dec. 1708); *Vie de Jacquelot* (in the *Dissertat. sur l'Exist. de Dieu*, Paris ed.

1744); Chauffepié, *Dictionaire;* Nicéron, *Mémoires* (vol. vi); Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 367. (J. N. P.)

Jacquemin, James Alexis, a French Roman Catholic priest, was born at Nancy Aug. 4, 1750. He entered the Church in early life, and was for a time vicar in a parish of his native city. He met with considerable success in the pulpit, but when, in 1778, he was appointed professor of theology in the University of Nancy, he readily accepted this new position. During the first years of the French Revolution he was one of the editors of the newspaper called *Le Catholique de Nancy.* In 1791, refusing to adhere to the civil constitution of the clergy, he was obliged to leave France, and he settled in Germany, where he joined his bishop, De la Fare, also an exile. The latter having appointed him his vicar-general, Jacquemin returned to France, though exposed to great danger, during the "Reign of Terror." He subsequently became professor of philosophy in the College of Nancy. In 1823 he was made bishop of St. Dié, but age and infirmities soon compelled him to resign this office, and he retired to Nancy, where he died, June 15, 1832. He wrote *De Incarnatione Verbi Domini; Abrégé des mémoires de l'Abbé Barruel, pour servir à l'hist. du Jacobinisme* (Hamburg [Nancy], 1801; Par. 1817, 2 vols. 12mo). See Henrion, *Annuaire Biographique* (1830-34); *Biog. des Hommes vivants;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 219. (J. N. P.)

Jactitation of Marriage is a suit which was formerly competent in the English ecclesiastical courts, and now is competent in the English Divorce Court, to settle a question of disputed marriage. If a party boast or profess that he or she is married to another, the latter may institute the suit, and call upon the former to produce proof of the marriage. If this is not done, then a decree passes which enjoins the party to perpetual silence on the subject. This remedy is now scarcely ever resorted to, for, in general, since lord Hardwick's Act (1766), there is sufficient certainty in the forms of legal marriage in England to prevent any one being in ignorance whether he or she is really married or not—a reproach which, however, is often made against the law of Scotland. The Scotch suit of a declarator of putting to silence, which is equivalent to jactitation of marriage, is often resorted to, the latest and most notorious instance of its use being that in the Yelverton marriage case.

Jacu'bus (Ἰάκουβος v. r. Ἰάρσουβος, Vulg. *Accubus*), given in the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. ix, 48) as the name of one of the Levites who supported Ezra in reading the law; evidently the Akkub (q. v.) of the corresponding Heb. text (Neh. viii, 7).

Ja'da (Heb. *Yada'*, יָדָע, *knowing;* Sept. Ἰαδαέ and Δουδαί), the last named of the two sons of Onam, a descendant of Judah through Jerahmeel; his two sons are likewise mentioned (1 Chron. ii, 28, 32). B.C. post 1612.

Ja'dau (Heb. *Yaddav'*, יַדּו, probably by erroneous transcription for יִדּוֹ, *Yiddo'*, "Iddo;" rather than for יַדַּי, *Yadday'*, id., as in the margin; Sept. Ἰαδαΐ v. r. Ἀδιά, Vulg. *Jeddu*), one of the "sons" of Nebo who divorced their Gentile wives after the Exile (Ezra x, 43). B.C. 459.

Jaddai. See Jadau.

Jaddes, a name of the priests of the genii among the islanders of Ceylon. The pagodas or chapels where they officiate have no revenue, and any pious person who builds a chapel officiates in it himself as priest. The exteriors of these chapels are painted with representations of halberds, swords, arrows, shields, and the like. The natives call these chapels *Jacco*, i. e. the devil's tenement, Jacco or Jacca signifying *devil;* the islanders of Ceylon, like many other savage tribes, worshipping the devil because of his wickedness and evil propensities (comp. Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization*, p. 159 sq.). The Jaddes, when he celebrates the festival of Jacco, shaves his head. See Knox, *Description of Ceylon*, pt. iv, ch. v; Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* i, 499; Davy, *Account of Ceylon*, p. 118. (J. H. W.)

Jad'duä (Heb. *Yaddu'a*, יַדּוּעַ, *known;* Sept. Ἰεδδούα, Ἰαδού, Ἰδούα), the name of two men after the time of the Captivity.

1. One of the chiefs of the people who subscribed the sacred covenant drawn up by Nehemiah (Neh. x, 21). B.C. cir. 410.

2. The son of Jonathan, and the last high-priest mentioned in the Old Testament (Neh. xii, 11, 22). He is doubtless the person alluded to by Josephus (Ἰαδδοῦς, *Ant.* xi, 8, 3-6) as exercising the pontifical office at the time of the capture of Tyre by Alexander the Great (B.C. 332), and as coming forth from Jerusalem at the head of the priestly body to meet the advancing conqueror, and tender him the submission of the city. See Alexander. In that case his name must have been inserted by "the great Synagogue" after the Scripture canon (q. v.) had been made up by Ezra (B.C. cir. 406). See Chronicles. "We gather pretty certainly that he was priest in the reign of the last Persian king Darius, and that he was still high-priest after the Persian dynasty was overthrown, i. e. in the reign of Alexander the Great. For the expression 'Darius *the Persian*' (Neh. xii, 22) must have been used after the accession of the Grecian dynasty; and, had another high-priest succeeded, his name would most likely have been mentioned. Thus far, then, the book of Nehemiah bears out the truth of Josephus's history, which makes Jaddua high-priest when Alexander invaded Judæa. But Josephus's story of his interview with Alexander is not, on that account, necessarily true, nor his account of the building of the Temple on Mount Gerizim during Jaddua's pontificate, at the instigation of Sanballat, both of which, as well as the accompanying circumstances, may have been derived from some apocryphal book of Alexandrian growth, since lost, in which chronology and history gave way to romance and Jewish vanity. Josephus seems to place the death of Jaddua after that of Alexander (*Ant.* xi, 8, 7). Eusebius assigns twenty years to Jaddua's pontificate." See Hervey, *Genealogy of our Lord*, p. 323 sq.; Jarvis, *Church of the Redeemed*, p. 291. See High-priest.

Ja'don (Heb. *Yadon'*, יָדוֹן, *judge;* Sept. has Εὐάρων [but most eds. omit], Vulg. *Jadon*), a Meronothite who assisted in reconstructing the walls of Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (Neh. iii, 7). B.C. 446.

JADON (Ἰαδών) is the name attributed by Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 8, 5) to the man of God from Judah who withstood Jeroboam at the altar at Bethel—probably intending Iddo the seer. By Jerome (*Qu. Hebr.* on 2 Chron. ix, 29) the name is given as *Jaddo.*

Ja'ël (Heb. *Yaël'*, יָעֵל, a wild goat or *ibex*, as in Psa. civ, 18; Job xxxix, 1; Sept. Ἰαήλ, Josephus Ἰάλη), the wife of Heber the Kenite, and the slayer of the oppressor of the Israelites (Judg. iv, 17-22). B.C. 1409. Heber was the chief of a nomadic Arab clan who had separated from the rest of his tribe, and had pitched his tent under the oaks, which had, in consequence, received the name of "oaks of the wanderers" (A. V. plain of Zaanaim, Judg. iv, 11), in the neighborhood of Kedesh-Naphthali. See Heber. The tribe of Heber had maintained the quiet enjoyment of their pastures by adopting a neutral position in a troublous period. Their descent from Jethro secured them the favorable regard of the Israelites, and they were sufficiently important to conclude a formal peace with Jabin, king of Hazor. See Kenite.

In the headlong rout which followed the defeat of the Canaanites by Barak, Sisera, abandoning his chariot the more easily to avoid notice (comp. Homer, *Il.* v, 20), fled unattended, and in an opposite direction from that taken by his army. On reaching the tents of the nomad chief, he remembered that there was peace be-

tween his sovereign and the house of Heber, and therefore applied for the hospitality and protection to which he was thus entitled (Harmer, *Obs.* i, 460). "The tent of Jael" is expressly mentioned either because the harem of Heber was in a separate tent (Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* iii, 22), or because the Kenite himself was absent at the time. In the sacred seclusion of this almost inviolable sanctuary (Pococke, *East*, ii, 5) Sisera might well have felt himself absolutely secure from the incursions of the enemy (Calmet, *Fragm.* vol. xxv); and although he intended to take refuge among the Kenites, he would not have ventured so openly to violate all idea of Oriental propriety by entering a woman's apartments (D'Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, s. v. Haram) had he not received Jael's express, earnest, and respectful entreaty to do so. See HAREM. He accepted the invitation, and she flung the quilt (הַשְּׂמִיכָה, A. V. "a mantle;" evidently some part of the regular furniture of the tent) over him as he lay wearily on the floor. When thirst prevented sleep, and he asked for water, she brought him buttermilk in her choicest vessel, thus ratifying with the semblance of officious zeal the sacred bond of Eastern hospitality. Wine would have been less suitable to quench his thirst, and may possibly have been eschewed by Heber's clan (Jer. xxxv, 2). Curdled milk, according to the quotations in Harmer, is still a favorite Arab beverage, and that this is the drink intended we infer from Judg. v, 25, as well as from the direct statement of Josephus (γάλα διεφθορὸς ἤδη, *Ant.* v, 5, 4), although there is no reason to suppose with Josephus and the Rabbis (D. Kimchi, Jarchi, etc.) that Jael purposely used it because of its soporific qualities (Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 473). But anxiety still prevented Sisera from composing himself to rest until he had exacted a promise from his protectress that she would faithfully preserve the secret of his concealment; till at last, with a feeling of perfect security, the weary and unfortunate general resigned himself to the deep sleep of misery and fatigue. Then it was that Jael took in her left hand one of the great wooden pins (A. V. "nail") which fastened down the cords of the tent, and in her right hand the mallet (A. V. "a hammer") used to drive it into the ground, and, creeping up to her sleeping and confiding guest, with one terrible blow dashed it through Sisera's temples deep into the earth. With one spasm of fruitless agony, with one contortion of sudden pain, "at her feet he bowed, he fell; where he bowed, there he fell down dead" (Judg. v, 27). She then waited to meet the pursuing Barak, and led him into her tent, that she might in his presence claim the glory of the deed! See BARAK.

Many have supposed that by this act she fulfilled the saying of Deborah, that God would sell Sisera into the hand of a woman (Judg. iv, 9; Josephus, *Ant.* v, 5, 4), and hence they have supposed that Jael was actuated by some divine and hidden influence. But the Bible gives no hint of such an inspiration, and it is at least equally probable that Deborah merely intended to intimate the share of the honor which would be assigned by posterity to her own exertions. If, therefore, we eliminate the still more monstrous supposition of the Rabbis that Sisera was slain by Jael because he attempted to offer her violence—the murder will appear in all its hideous atrocity. A fugitive had asked and received *dakhil* (or protection) at her hands—he was miserable, defeated, weary—he was the ally of her husband—he was her invited and honored guest—he was in the sanctuary of the harem—above all, he was confiding, defenceless, and asleep; yet she broke her pledged faith, violated her solemn hospitality, and murdered a trustful and unprotected slumberer. Surely we require the clearest and most positive statement that Jael was instigated to such a murder by divine suggestion.—Smith. See HOSPITALITY.

It does not seem difficult to understand, on merely human grounds, the object of Jael in this painful transaction. Her motives seem to have been entirely prudential; and on prudential grounds the very circumstance which renders her act the more odious—the peace subsisting between the nomad chief and the king of Hazor—must to her have seemed to make it the more expedient. She saw that the Israelites had now the upper hand, and was aware that, as being in alliance with the oppressors of Israel, the camp might expect very rough treatment from the pursuing force, which would be greatly aggravated if Sisera were found sheltered within it. This calamity she sought to avert, and to place the house of Heber in a favorable position with the victorious party. She probably justified the act to herself by the consideration that, as Sisera would certainly be taken and slain, she might as well make a benefit out of his inevitable doom as incur utter ruin in the attempt to protect him. It is probable, however, that at first the woman was sincere in her proffers of Arab friendship; but the quiet sleep of the warrior gave her time to reflect how easily even her arm might rid her kindred people of the oppressor, and she was thus induced to plot against the life of her victim. It does not appear that she committed the falsehood, which she was requested by him to do, of denying the presence of any stranger if asked by a passer-by. See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustrations*, ad loc.

It is much easier to explain the conduct of Jael than to account for the apparently eulogistic notice which it receives in the triumphal ode of Deborah and Barak; but the following remarks will go far to remove the difficulty: There is no doubt that Sisera would have been put to death if he had been taken alive by the Israelites. The war-usages of the time warranted such treatment, and there are numerous examples of it. They had, therefore, no regard to her private motives, or to the particular relations between Heber and Jabin, but beheld her only as the instrument of accomplishing what was usually regarded as the final and crowning act of a great victory. The unusual circumstance that this act was performed by a woman's hand was, according to the notions of the time, so great a humiliation that it could hardly fail to be dwelt upon in contrasting the result with the proud confidence of victory which had at the outset been entertained (Judg. v, 30). Without stopping to ask when and where Deborah claims for herself any infallibility, or whether, in the passionate moment of patriotic triumph, she was likely to pause in such wild times to scrutinize the moral bearings of an act which had been so splendid a benefit to herself and her people, we may question whether any moral commendation is *directly* intended. What Deborah stated was a *fact*, viz. that the wives of the nomad Arabs would undoubtedly regard Jael as a public benefactress, and praise her as a popular heroine. "She certainly was not 'blessed' as a pious and upright person is blessed when performing a deed which embodies the noblest principles, and which goes up as a memorial before God, but merely as one who acted a part that accomplished an important purpose of heaven. In the same sense, though in the opposite direction, Job and Jeremiah cursed the day of their birth; not that they meant to make it the proper subject of blame, but that they wished to mark their deep sense of the evil into which it had ushered them—mark it as the commencement of a life-heritage of sorrow and gloom. In like manner, and with a closer resemblance to the case before us, the psalmist pronounces happy or blessed those who should dash the little ones of Babylon against the stones (Psa. cxxxvii, 9), which no one who understands the spirit of Hebrew poetry would ever dream of construing into a proper benediction upon the ruthless murderers of Babylon's children, as true heroes of righteousness. It merely announces, under a strong individualizing trait, the coming recompense on Babylon for the cruelties she had inflicted on Israel; her own measure should be meted back to her: and they who should be the instruments of effecting it would execute a purpose of God, whether they might themselves intend it or not. Let the poet-

ical exaltation of Jael be viewed in the light of these cognate passages, and it will be found to contain nothing at variance with the verdict which every impartial mind must be disposed to pronounce upon her conduct. It is, in reality, the work of God's judgment, through her instrumentality, that is celebrated, not her mode of carrying it into execution; and it might be as just to regard the heathen Medes and Persians as a truly pious people because they are called God's 'sanctified ones' to do his work of vengeance on Babylon (Isa. xiii, 3), as, from what is said in Deborah's song, to consider Jael an example of righteousness" See DEBORAH.

As to the morality of the act of Jael for which she is thus applauded, although it can not fairly be justified by the usages of any time or people, yet the considerations urged by Dr. Robinson (*Biblical Repos.* 1831, p. 607) are of some force: "We must judge of it by the feelings of those among whom the right of avenging the blood of a relative was so strongly rooted that even Moses could not take it away. Jael was an ally by blood of the Israelitish nation; [Sisera, the general of] their chief oppressor, who had mightily oppressed them for the space of twenty years, now lay defenceless before her; and he was, moreover, one of those whom Israel was bound by the command of Jehovah to extirpate. Perhaps, too, she felt called to be the instrument of God in working out for that nation a great deliverance by thus exterminating the chieftain of their heathen oppressor. At least Israel viewed it in this light; and, in this view, we can not reproach the heroine with that as a crime which both she and Israel felt to be a deed performed in accordance with the mandate of heaven." We must, moreover, not forget the halo with which military success gilds every act in the popular eye, and that, in times of war, many things are held allowable and even commendable which would be reprobated in peace. Dr. Thomson, indeed (*Land and Book*, ii, 146 sq.), justifies Jael's course by the following considerations: 1. Jabin, although nominally at peace with the Kenites, had doubtless inflicted much injury upon them in common with their neighbors the Israelites, and may have been —probably was—specially obnoxious to Jael herself. 2. We are not to assume that Bedouin laws were of strict force among the settled Kenites. 3. Jael must have known her act would be applauded, or she would not have ventured upon it. 4. There is every reason to believe she was in full sympathy with the Israelites, not only from friendly, but also religious grounds; and the neutrality of the Kenites seems to be mentioned merely to account for Sisera's seeking her tent, although he appears to have felt himself insecure. Nor did her promise of protection contain any warrant against violence at *her* hands, but only of secretion from the hostile army. See SISERA.

The Jael mentioned in Deborah's song (Judg. v, 6)— "In the days of Shamgar the son of Anath, in the days of Jael, the highways were unoccupied, and the travellers walked through byways"—has been supposed by some (e. g. Gesenius, *Lex.* s. v.; Dr. Robinson, *ut supra;* Fürst, and others) to have been a local judge of the Israelites in the interval of anarchy between Shamgar and Jabin. It is not necessary, for this supposition, to make Jael the name of a man, for the case of Deborah shows that the place of judge might be occupied by a female. The reasons for this supposition are, 1. That the state of things described in Judg. v, 6 as existing in Jael's days, is not the state of things existing in the days of Jael, the wife of Heber, whose time was famous for the restoration of the nation to a better. 2. That the wife of a stranger would hardly have been named as marking an epoch in the history of Israel. (See Bertheau in the *Exeget. Handbuch*, ad loc.) But there is no evidence either of such an interval or of such a judgeship; and it is, therefore, more natural to refer the name to the wife of Heber as the most prominent character of the period referred to, the recollection of her late act giving her a distinction that did not previously attach to her. The circumstance that the name Jael is *masculine* in the Hebrew is of no force, as it is freely used (literally) of the female deer (Prov. v, 19, "roe"). See JUDGES.

Jaffé, PHILIPP, a celebrated modern Jewish scholar, was born at Schwersenz, near the city of Posen, in Prussian Poland, about 1820. His early education he received first at the high school of his native town, and then under the care of the father of the writer of this article. After graduating at the Gymnasium of Posen, he began his university career by the study of medicine, and duly obtained his degree. He declined, however, to comply with the wishes of his friends to enter the medical profession, and continued his stay at the university, devoting himself to his favorite studies, history and philology. In 1843 he gave to the world a *History of the German Empire under Lothair the Saxon*, and, owing to the excellence of this work, he subsequently became a regular contributor to Pertz's *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica.* His articles and essays — the outgrowth of most laborious researches — were read eagerly, and admired by all scholars interested in the history and literature of Germany, and led ultimately to his appointment as "extraordinary" professor of history at the University of Berlin. He was the first Jew upon whom the honor of such a distinguished appointment was conferred by the Prussian government. He now further distinguished himself by a contribution to the history of the papacy—*Regesta Pontific. Roman.* ad MCXCVIII (Berol. 1851, 4to)—a work which at once was acknowledged a masterpiece in its department, and will forever remain valuable for the chronological records of the Roman hierarchy. In 1868 Jaffé embraced Christianity, evidently with a design to further promotion, from which, by his religious profession, he seemed to be barred. But he soon repented of the step, and so great became the conflict in his heart that he committed suicide in the summer of 1870. (J. H. W.)

Jagel, ABRAHAM, an Italian Rabbi, flourished at Monselice in the second half of the 16th and the first half of the 17th century. He is distinguished as the author of an able Jewish catechism of doctrine and morals, which he published under the title of לֶקַח טוֹב (Venice, 1587, 8vo, and often). It was translated into Latin by Carpzov, Odhel, Van der Hardt, and by De Veil. The latter published it with the Hebrew text: *Doctrina Bona* (London, 1689, 8vo). It was also translated into German, entitled *Das Buch von Guten Jüdischen Lehren* (Lpzg. 1694). Jagel became a convert to Romanism, and was baptized under the name of *Camillo* near the beginning of the 17th century, and was in 1619 and 1620 Roman censor of all Hebrew books. He wrote also several books on the Jewish doctrines and usages, of which a complete list, with the translations that have been made of them, is given by Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 10 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jagello. See POLAND.

Jäger, NATHAN, a Lutheran minister, born in 1823, was educated for the sacred ministry first at Gettysburg Theological Seminary, and, completing his course with the Rev. J. P. Hecht, of Easton, was dedicated to the pastoral office in the summer of 1845. His first charge was at Orwigsburg, whence he removed to Lyken's Valley; thence successively to Falkner's Swamp, Upper Mount Bethel, and Reiglesville, Bucks County, Penn., where he died, Jan. 2, 1864. He was one of a large family of Lutheran ministers, consisting of his grandfather, father-in-law, brother-in-law, and a number of other relatives of the same name. His literary and theological attainments were very respectable, acquired amid difficulties that would have disheartened most other men. He studied when others slept, performing during the day the laborious duties of large pastorates, and pursuing his studies at night. His theological knowledge was quite extensive. He was an earnest man, and an energetic laborer in the cause of Christ.

Jagger, Ezra, a Methodist minister, was born at Southampton, Long Island, N.Y., Feb. 27, 1806. He was licensed to preach in 1833, and joined the New York Conference the year following, and successively filled the circuits of Huntington, Hempstead, White Plains and Greenburg, Westport, Weston and Easton Village, Burlington, Derby, Southold and Cutchogue, Farmingdale, Smithtown, and, at last, once again Huntington. He died April 22, 1850. Jagger was a man of strict integrity, great benevolence, mild and unassuming in manner, and most beloved where best known. He was eminently a man of prayer, and devoted to his Master's work.—Smith (W. C.), *Sacred Memories* (N. Y. 1870, 12mo), p. 206, 207.

Jaggernaut, or **Jaggernaut Puri**, or **Puri**, is the name of a town on the sea-coast of Orissa (85° 54′ long., and 19° 45′ lat.), celebrated as one of the chief places of pilgrimage of the Hindus in India. It contains a temple erected to Vishnu in A.D. 1198, in which stands an idol of this Indian deity, called Jaggernaut (commonly *Juggernaut*), a corruption of the Sanscrit *Jagannâtha*, i. e. lord of the world. "The idol is a carved block of wood, with a frightful visage, painted black, with a distended mouth of a bloody color. On festival days the throne of the idol is placed upon a stupendous movable tower sixty feet high, resting on wheels, which indent the ground deeply as they turn slowly under the ponderous machine. Attached to it are six ropes of the length and size of a ship's cable, by which the people draw it along. The priests and attendants are stationed around the throne, on the car, and occasionally address the worshippers in libidinous songs and gestures. Both the walls of the temple and the sides of the car are covered with the most indecent emblems, in large and durable sculpture. Obscenity and blood are the characteristics of the idol's worship." The origin of this idolatrous worship (which gained its notoriety especially by the fanaticism which has induced, and still induces, thousands of Hindus to sacrifice their lives, in the hope of attaining eternal bliss, by throwing themselves under the wheels of the chariot bearing the idol) is as follows: "A king desirous of founding a city sent a learned Brahman to pitch upon a proper spot. The Brahman, after a long search, arrived upon the banks of the sea, and there saw a crow diving into the water, and, having washed its body, making obeisance to the sea. Understanding the language of the birds, he learned from the crow that if he remained there a short time he would comprehend the wonders of this land. The king, apprized of this occurrence, built on the spot where the crow had appeared a large city, and a place of worship. The rajah one night heard in a dream a voice saying, 'On a certain day cast thine eyes on the sea-shore, when there will arise out of the water a piece of wood fifty-two inches long, and one and a half cubits broad; this is the true form of the deity; take it up, and keep it hidden in thine house seven days; and in whatever shape it shall then appear, place it in the temple, and worship it.' It happened as the rajah had dreamed, and the image, called by him Jaggannâtha, became the object of worship of all ranks of people, and performed many miracles." Another legend, however, relates that "the image arising from the water was an avatâra, or incarnation of Vishnu; it was fashioned by Viswakarman, the architect of the gods, into a fourfold idol, which represented the supreme deity, and the temple itself was erected over it, and inaugurated by the god Brahmâ and his divine court." This may have given rise to the supposition that the worship of Jaggernâth (as Max Müller [*Chips*, i, 57] spells it) was originally in honor of Vishnu. See Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions*, p. 495: Sterling, *Account of Orissa* (see Index)

Jaguis are the hermits of the Banians, a sect in East India. There are three distinct classes of them: (1) the Van-aphrastas, (2) the San-jasiis, and (3) the Avadoutas. The *Van-aphrastas* live in forests, many of them married and having children, feeding on the herbs and fruits that grow wild; but they scruple to pluck up the root of anything, considering it a sinful act, as they believe the soul to be contained in the root, supposing everything to possess a spiritual life; and, of course, believing also the transmigration of souls. The *San-jasiis* affect greater abstinence, oppose matrimony, betel, and all pleasures whatsoever. They have but one daily meal, served only on earthen-ware, and live on alms. Their garments they dye with red earth, and always carry a long bamboo cane in their hands. This class is a regular nomad tribe; they do not even stay two nights in the same place. They are taught in their sacred writings to look forward with desire to the separation of the soul from the body. Lust, anger, avarice, pride, revenge, and the love of this world they consider their most formidable enemies, and pray to their gods to deliver them from one and all of these sins. The last-named class, the *Avadoutas*, forsake their families, both their wives and their offspring, and anything that would make one of them dependent on the other for production. Thus they deny themselves even the use of those things which the other two classes of Jaguis are wont to enjoy. They are habilitated only with a small piece of linen cloth to cover their sex. Their food they procure from strangers, to whose houses they go when hungry, and eat anything that is offered them. These devotees especially frequent the banks of the sacred Hindu rivers and the neighborhood of great temples, both for religious motives and in order to obtain most readily alms and food, particularly milk and fruits. They have one Oriental custom, viz. rubbing their body with ashes, no doubt to free themselves from the stain of sin. See *Dissert. on the Religion*, etc., *of the Banians*, apud *Relig. Cer.* vol. iii; Craufurd, *Sketches of the Hindoos*, i, 235 sq.; Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* i, 499. (J. H. W.)

Ja′gur (Heb. *Yagur′*, יָגוּר, place of *sojourn;* Sept. Ἰαγούρ v. r. Ἀσώρ), a city on the south or Idumæan border of Judah, mentioned between Eder and Kinah (Josh. xv, 21). "Its name might perhaps indicate that it was one of the fortified camping-grounds of the border Arabs" (Kitto). "The Jagur, quoted by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 99) from the Talmud as one of the boundaries of the territory of Ashkelon, must have been further to the north-west" (Smith). The position of the town here considered can only be conjectured as not very far from the Dead Sea. It is not mentioned among the towns set off to Simeon (Josh. xix, 2-8), though it probably was one of them. It was possibly situated in wady Jurrah, which runs into the south-west end of the Dead Sea.

Jah (Heb. *Yah*, יָהּ, a contraction for יְהוָֹה, *Jehovah*, Psa. lxviii, 4, elsewhere rendered "Lord"). See Jehovah; Hallelujah. It also enters into the composition of many Heb. names, as Adonijah, Isaiah, etc.

Ja′hath (Hebrew *Yach′ath*, יַחַת, prob. for יַחְדּוּת, *union*; Sept. Ἰέθ, but Ἰεέθ in 1 Chron. vi, 43, and Ἰγάθ v. r. Ἰάθ in 1 Chron. xxiv, 22), the name of a descendant of Judah and of several Levites.

1. A son of Shimei and grandson of Gershom, the son of Levi (1 Chron. xxiii, 10); yet no such son is mentioned in ver. 9, where the three sons of Shimei are by some error (probably the transposition of the latter clause) attributed to his brother Laadan, while in verse 11 Jahath is stated to have been "chief" (i. e. most numerous in posterity) of the *four* sons of Shimei. A similar disagreement appears in the parallel passage (1 Chron. vi), where Jahath (ver. 43) occurs as the son of Gershom (prob. by the transposition of Shimei's name into the preceding verse), and again (ver. 20) as a son of Libnah (i. e. Laadan), instead of Shimei (comp. Zimnah, the son of Jahath, ver. 20, 42). B.C. considerably post 1856.

2. Son of Reaiah (or Haroeh), of the posterity of Hezron, and father of two sons (1 Chron. iv, 2). B.C. post 1612.

3. One of the sons of Shelomoth (or Shelomith), a descendant of Izhar, of the family of Kohath, appointed to a prominent place in the sacred services by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 22). B.C. 1014.

4. One of the Levitical overseers of the Temple repairs instituted by Josiah; he belonged to the family of Merari (2 Chron. xxxiv, 12). B.C. 623.

Ja'haz (Heb. *Ya'hats*, יַהַץ, *trodden* down, Isa. xv, 4; Jer. xlviii, 34; Sept. Ἰασσά; also with ה local and in pause, יַהְצָה, *Yah'tsah*, Numb. xxi, 23, Sept. εἰς Ἰασσά; Deut. ii, 32, Sept. εἰς Ἰασά; and this even with a prefix, בְּיַהְצָה, Judg. xi, 20, Sept. εἰς Ἰασσά; but likewise with ה paragogic, יָהְצָה, *Yah'tsah*, Sept. Ἰασσά, Josh. xiii, 18; A. Vers. "Jahaza;" Ἰασά, Jer. xlviii, 21, "Jahazah;" Ἰασσά, Josh. xxi, 36, "Jahazah;" Ῥεφάς v. r. Ἰασσά, 2 Chron. vi, 78, "Jahzah"), a town beyond the Jordan, where Sihon was defeated, in the borders of Moab and the region of the Ammonites (Numb. xxi, 23; Deut. ii, 32; Judg. xi, 20); situated in the tribe of Reuben (Josh. xiii, 18), and assigned to the Merarite Levites (Josh. xxi, 36; 1 Chron. vi, 78). In Isa. xv, 4; Jer. xlviii, 21, it appears as one of the Moabitish places that suffered from the transit of the Babylonian conquerors through the "plain country" (i. e. the *Mishor*, the mod. Belka). The whole country east of the Dead Sea had originally been given to the Moabites and Ammonites (Gen. xix, 36–38; Deut. ii, 19–22); but the warlike Amorites from the west of the Jordan conquered them, and expelled them from the region north of the river Arnon. From the Amorites the Israelites took this country, but subsequently the Ammonites claimed it as theirs (Judg. xi, 13), and on the decline of Jewish power the Moabites and Ammonites again took possession of it. Hitzig (*Zu Jesa.* ad loc.) regards Jahaz and Jahzah as different places (so Keil on *Josh.* ad loc., urging that they are distinguished in the passages of Jer.); but this is unnecessary (so Winer, *Realw.* s. v. Jahaz), and at variance with the philology. It appears to have been situated on the edge of the desert (see Raumer, *Zug d. Isr.* p. 53; Hengstenberg, *Bileam*, p. 239). See EXODUS. From the terms of the narrative in Numb. xxi and Deut. ii we should expect that Jahaz was in the extreme south part of the territory of Sihon, but yet north of the River Arnon (see Deut. ii, 24, 36; and the words in verse 31, "begin to possess"), and in exactly this position a site named *Jazaza* is mentioned by Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 227, "a village to the south-west of Dhiban"); but this lacks confirmation, especially as Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἰεσσά, Jassa) place it between Medeba (Μηδαμών) and Dibon (Διβούς, Deblathaim); and the latter states that "Jahaz lies opposite the Dead Sea, at the boundary of the region of Moab." These requirements are met by supposing Jahaz to have been situated in the open tract at the head of wady Waleh, between Arnun on the east, and Jebel Humeh on the west.

Jaha'za (Josh. xiii, 18) or **Jaha'zah** (Josh. xxi, 36; Jer. xlviii, 21). See JAHAZ.

Jahazi'ah (Heb. *Yachzeyah'*, יַחְזְיָה, *beheld* by *Jehovah;* Sept. Ἰαζίας), son of Tikvah, apparently a priest, one of those deputed by Ezra to ascertain which of the Jews had married Gentile wives after the return from Babylon (Ezra x, 15). B.C. 459.

Jaha'ziël (Hebrew *Yachaziël'*, יַחֲזִיאֵל, *beheld* by *God;* Sept. Ἰεζιήλ, Ἰαζιήλ, Ὀζιήλ, Ἀζιήλ), the name of five men. See also JAHZEEL.

1. The third "son" of Hebron, the grandson of Levi through Kohath (1 Chron. xxiii, 19; xxiv, 33). B.C. probably post 1618, perhaps 1014.

2. One of the Benjamite warriors who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 4). B.C. 1055.

3. One of the priests who preceded the sacred ark with trumpets on its removal to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xvi, 6). B.C. cir. 1043.

4. The son of Zechariah, a Levite of the family of Asaph, who predicted to Jehoshaphat his triumph over the host of the Moabites with such decided assurances. See JEHOSHAPHAT. He is nowhere else mentioned in Scripture, but his prophecy on this occasion is given in full: "Then upon Jahaziel, the son of Zechariah, the son of Benaiah, the son of Jeiel, the son of Mattaniah, a Levite of the sons of Asaph, came the Spirit of the Lord in the midst of the congregation; and he said, Hearken ye, all Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem, and thou, king Jehoshaphat, thus saith the Lord unto you, Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle is not yours, but God's. To-morrow go ye down against them: behold, they come up by the cliff of Ziz; and ye shall find them at the end of the brook, before the wilderness of Jeruel. Ye shall not need to fight in this battle: set yourselves, stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord with you, O Judah and Jerusalem: fear not, nor be dismayed; to-morrow go out against them, for the Lord will be with you" (2 Chron. xx, 14–17). B.C. cir. 896.

5. One of the "sons" of Shechaniah, whose son (Ben-Jahaziel, but his name is not otherwise given; indeed, there is evidently some confusion in the text; comp. ver. 3) is said to have returned from Babylon with 300 males of his retainers (Ezra viii, 5). B.C. ante 459. See SHECHANIAH.

Jah'dai (Heb. *Yahday'*, יָהְדַּי, prob. *grasper;* Sept. Ἰαδαί), a descendant apparently of Caleb, of the family of Hezron; his sons' names are given, but, as his own parentage is not stated (1 Chron. ii, 47), it can only be conjectured that he was the son of the preceding Gazez, the son (different from the brother) of Haran (ver. 46). B.C. prob. post 1612. Various other suggestions regarding the name have been made, as that Gazez, the name preceding, should be Jahdai (Houbigant, ad loc.); that Jahdai was a concubine of Caleb (Grunenberg, quoted by Michaelis, *Adnot.* ad loc.), etc.; but these are mere groundless suppositions (see Burrington, i, 216; Bertheau, *Comment.* ad loc.).

Jah'diël (Heb. *Yachdiël'*, יַחְדִּיאֵל, *made joyful* by *God;* Sept. Ἰεδιήλ), one of the famous chieftains of the tribe of Manasseh resident in northern Bashan (1 Chron. v, 24). B.C. apparently 720.

Jah'do (Heb. *Yachdo'*, יַחְדּוֹ, *his union;* otherwise for יַחְדּוֹן, *united;* Sept. Ἰεδδαί), son of Buz and father of Jeshishai, of the descendants of Abihail, resident in Gilead (1 Chron. v, 14). B.C. between 1093 and 782.

Jah'leël (Heb. *Yachleël'*, יַחְלְאֵל, *hoping* in *God;* Sept. Ἀχοήλ), the last named of the three sons of Zebulon (Gen. xlvi, 14; Numb. xxvi, 26). His descendants are called JAHLEELITES (Heb. *Yachleëli'*, יַחְלְאֵלִי, Sept. Ἀχοηλί, Numb. xxvi, 26). B.C. 1856.

Jah'leëlite (Numb. xxvi, 26). See JAHLEEL.

Jah'mai (Heb. *Yachmay'*, יַחְמַי, *protector:* Sept. Ἰεμού), one of the "sons" of Tola, grandson of Issachar (1 Chron. vii, 2). B.C. cir. 1658.

Jahn, JOHANN, a distinguished German Roman Catholic theologian and Orientalist, was born at Taswitz, in Moravia, June 18, 1750. He studied at the Gymnasium of Znaym, the University of Olmütz, and the Rom. Cath. Theological Seminary of Bruck, entered the Church, and was for some time a priest at Mislitz. In 1782 he received the doctorate from Olmütz, and, after having filled with great distinction the position of professor of Oriental languages and Biblical hermeneutics at Bruck, he was, in 1789, called to the University of Vienna as professor of the Oriental languages, dogmatics, and Biblical archæology. At this high school he labored successfully for seventeen years, amid suspicions and petty persecutions from the court of Rome which pained his ingenuous spirit. Some words in the preface of his *Einleit. in d. göttl. Bücher d. alten Bundes* (Vienna, 1793, 1802, 1803, 2 vols. 8vo); the assertion that

the books of Job, Jonah, Judith, and Tobit are didactic poems; and that the dæmoniacs in the N. T. were possessed with dangerous diseases, not with the devil, were made charges against him. In 1792 complaints of his unsoundness were laid before the emperor Francis II by cardinal Migazzi, which resulted in the appointment of a special commission to examine the charges. Athough it was decided that Jahn's views were not heterodox, they cautioned him to be more careful in the future in expressing opinions likely to lead to interpretations contrary to the dogmas of *the Church*, and even suggested a change of the obnoxious passages (comp. Henke, *Archiv f. d. neueste Kirchengeschichte*, ii, 51 sq.; P. J. S. Huth, *Versuch einer Kirchengesch. d. 18ten Jahrh.* ii, 375, 376). Though he honestly and willingly submitted, his detractors continued their machinations till he was (in 1806) removed from the congenial duties of an office to which he had dedicated his life, and was made, merely, of course, to prevent scandal which might have resulted from a deprivation of all dignity, canon or Domherr in the metropolitan church of St. Stephen. Even before he was compelled to resign his professorship, two of his books, *Introductio in libros sacros Veteris Testamenti in compendium redacta* (Vienna, 1804), and *Archæologia Biblica in compendium redacta* (Vienna, 1805), which were then very popular among the university students, were condemned and placed on the Index, without their author being heard in his defence. Jahn died Aug. 16, 1816. Besides the works which we have had occasion to cite, and a series of grammars and chrestomathies on the Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, and Chaldee languages, he wrote, *Biblische Archäologie* (Vienna, 1797-1805, 5 vols.; vols. i and ii, 2d edition, 1817-1825):—*Lexicon Arabico-Latinum, Chrestomathiæ Arabicæ accommodatum* (Vien. 1802): this work was considered the best of its kind until the publication of a similar production by Sylvester de Sacy:—*Biblia Hebraica digessit, et graviores lectionum varietates adjecit* (Vien. 1806, 4 vols. royal 8vo): —*Enchiridion Hermeneuticæ generalis tabularum*, etc. (Vienna, 1812; with an *Appendix hermeneut., s. exercitationes exegeticæ*, Vienna, 1813):—*Vaticinia Prophetarum de Jesu Messia, commentarius criticus in libros propheticos Veteris Testamenti* (Vien. 1815), etc. Some time after his death appeared *Nachträge zu Jahn's theologischen Werken*, published from his MSS. (Tübingen, 1821), which contained six interesting dissertations on various Biblical subjects, and with them some letters of Jahn's, giving a clew to the motives of the persecutions directed against him. Jahn's memory deserves to be cherished by all true lovers of Oriental scholarship. He furnished text-books for the study of those languages superior to any of his time, and, although they are at present obsolete, he certainly aided modern scholarship by furnishing superior tools. As a theological writer he was clear and methodical, and his numerous works, of which several enjoy an English dress, "diffused a knowledge of Biblical subjects in places and circles where the books of Protestants would scarcely have been received. The latter, however, have appreciated his writings fully as much as Roman Catholics. He was not profound in any one thing, because he scattered his energies over so wide a field; but he was a most useful author, and one of his books (the *Archæology*) is still the largest and best on the subjects of which it treats." As a theologian of the Romish Church he was certainly exceedingly liberal, so much so that Hengstenberg (on the Pentateuch) rather finds fault with him. See Felder, *Gelehrt. Lex. d. Kathol. Geistlichkeit*, i, 337; H. Döring, *D. gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands*, ii, 7 sq.; Meusel, *Gelehrt. Deutschlands* (5th ed.), iii, 510; x, 13; xi, 994; xiv, 255; xviii, 254; xxiii, 18; Ersch u. Gruber, *Allg. Encyk.*; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v.; Werner, *Gesch. d. Kathol. Theol.* p. 273 sq.

Jah'zah (1 Chron. vi, 78). See JAHAZ.

Jah'zeël (Heb. *Yachtseël'*, יַחְצְאֵל, *allotted by God;* Sept. 'Ασιήλ), the first named of the sons of Naphtali (Gen. xlvi, 24). His descendants are called JAHZEELITES (Heb. *Yachtseëli'*, יַחְצְאֵלִי, Sept. 'Ασιηλί, Numb. xxvi, 48). In 1 Chron. vii, 13, the name is written JAHZIEL (יַחְצִיאֵל, *Yachtsiel'*, id.; Sept. 'Ιασιήλ). B. C. 1856.

Jah'zeëlite (Numb. xxvi, 48). See JAHZEEL.

Jah'zerah (Heb. *Yachze'rah*, יַחְזֵרָה, *returner;* but Gesenius prefers to read יַחְזְיָה, i. e. *Jahaziah;* Sept. 'Ιεζρίας v. r. 'Εζιρά, Vulg. *Jezra*), son of Meshullam and father of Adiel, a priest (1 Chron. ix, 12). B.C. long ante 536. He is probably the same with AHASAI, the father of Azareel (Neh. xi, 13), since the preceding and the following name are alike.

Jah'ziël (1 Chron. vii, 13). See JAHZEEL.

Jailor (δεσμοφύλαξ, *guard of a prisoner*, Acts xvi, 23, 27, 36). See PRISON.

Jainas, the name of a very powerful heterodox sect of Hindus particularly flourishing in the southern and western parts of Hindustan. Their name, *Jainas*, signifies, followers of *Jina*, the generic name of deified saints; but, as these saints are also called *Arhat*, the sect is frequently called *Arhatas*. The tenets of this sect are in several respects analogous to those of the Buddhists [see BUDDHISM], but they resemble in others those of the Brahmanical Hindus. Like the Buddhists, they deny the divine origin and authority of the Veda (which, however, they do not hesitate to quote if the doctrines of the latter are conformable to the Jaina tenets), and worship certain saints whom they consider superior to the other beings of their pantheon. They differ, indeed, from them in regard to the history of these personages, but the original notion which prevails in this worship is the same. Like the Brahmanical Hindus, on the other hand, they admit the institution of caste, and perform the essential ceremonies called *Sanskâras* (q. v.), and recognise some of the subordinate deities of the Hindu pantheon—at least apparently, as they do not pay especial homage to them, and as they disregard completely all those Brahmanical rites which involve the destruction of animal life. The Jainas have their own Purânas and other religious books, which in the main confine themselves to a delineation of their Tôrthankharas, or deified teachers of the sect. The Vedas of the Brahmans they supply by their *Siddhântas* and *Agamas*.

Their peculiar doctrines are that "all objects, material or abstract, are arranged under nine categories, called *Tattwas* (truths or principles), of which we need notice only the ninth and last, called *Moksha*, or liberation of the vital spirit from the bonds of action, i. e. final emancipation. In reference to it the Jainas not only affirm that there is such a state, but they define the size of the emancipated souls, the place where they live, their tangible qualities, the duration of their existence, the distance at which they are from one another, their parts, natures, and numbers. Final emancipation is only obtained 'in a state of manhood (not in that of a good demon, or brute), while in possession of five senses: while possessing a body capable of voluntary motion, in a condition of possibility; while possessing a mind, through the sacrament of the highest asceticism, in that path of rectitude in which there is no retrogression; through the possession of perfect knowledge and vision; and in the practice of abstinence.' Those who attain to final liberation do not return to a worldly state, and there is no interruption to their bliss. They have perfect vision and knowledge, and do not depend on works (see J. Stevenson, *The Kalpa Sûtra and Nava Tattwa*). The principles of faith, as mentioned before, are common to all classes of Jainas, but some differences occur in the practice of their duties, as they are divided into religious and lay orders—*Yatis* and *Srâvakas*. Both, of course, must place implicit belief in the doctrines of their saints; but the *Yati* has to lead a life of abstinence, taciturnity, and continence; he should wear a thin cloth

over his mouth to prevent insects from flying into it, and he should carry a brush to sweep the place on which he is about to sit, to remove any living creature out of the way of danger; but, in turn, he may dispense with all acts of worship, while the *Srâvaka* has to add to the observance of the religious and moral duties the practical worship of the saints, and a profound reverence for his more pious brethren. The secular Jaina must, like the ascetic, practice the four virtues—liberality, gentleness, piety, and penance; he must govern his mind, tongue, and acts; abstain at certain seasons from salt, flowers, green fruits, roots, honey, grapes, tobacco; drink water thrice strained, and never leave a liquid uncovered, lest an insect should be drowned in it; it is his duty, also, to visit daily a temple where some of the images of the Jaina saints are placed, walk round it three times, make an obeisance to the image, and make some offerings of fruits or flowers, while pronouncing some such formula as 'Salutation to the Saints, to the Pure Existences, to the Sages, to the Teachers, to all the Devout in the world.' The reader in a Jaina temple is a Yati, but the ministrant priest is not seldom a Brahman, since the Jainas have no priests of their own, and the presence of such Brahmanical ministrants seems to have introduced several innovations in their worship. In Upper India the ritual in use is often intermixed with formulas belonging more properly to the Saiva and Sákta worship (see Hindu Sects under INDIA), and images of Siva and his consort take their place in Jaina temples. In the south of India they appear, as mentioned before, to observe also all the essential rites or Sanskâras of the Brahmanical Hindu. The festivals of the Jainas are especially those relating to events in the life of their deified saints; but they observe, also, several common to other Hindus, as the spring festival, the Srîpanchamî, and others."

The sect is divided into two principal factions—the Digambaras and the Swetâmbaras. The name of the former signifies "sky-clad," or naked, and designated the ascetics who went unclad; but at present they wear colored garments, and dishabilitate only at meal-times. The name of the latter faction means "one who wears white garments." But it is not mainly in dress that these two factions are distinct from each other; there are said to be no less than seven hundred different points upon which they split, 84 of which are considered vital by each party. Thus, e. g. "the Swetâmbaras decorate the images of their saints with ear-rings, necklaces, armlets, and tiaras of gold and jewels, whereas the Digambaras leave their images without ornaments. Again, the Swetâmbaras assert that there are twelve heavens and sixty-four Indras, whereas the Digambaras maintain that there are sixteen heavens and 100 Indras. In the south of India the Jainas are divided into two castes; in Upper Hindustan, however, they are all of one caste. It is remarkable that amongst themselves they recognise a number of families between which no intermarriage can take place, and that they resemble in this respect also the ancient Brahmanical Hindus, who established similar restrictions in their religious codes.

"As regards the pantheon of the Jaina creed, it is still more fantastical than that of the Brahmanical sects (whence it is borrowed to a great extent), but without any of the poetical and philosophical interest which inheres in the gods of the Vedic time. The highest rank amongst their numberless hosts of divine beings—divided by them into four classes, with various subdivisions—they assign to the deified saints, whom they call *Jina*, or *Arhat*, or *Tirthakara*, besides a variety of other generic names. The Jainas enumerate twenty-four Tirthakaras of their past age, twenty-four of the present, and twenty-four of the age to come; and they invest these holy personages with thirty-six superhuman attributes of the most extravagant character. Notwithstanding the sameness of these attributes, they distinguish the twenty-four Jinas of the present age from each other in color, stature, and longevity. Two of them are red, two white, two blue, two black; the rest are of a golden hue, or a yellowish-brown. The other two peculiarities are regulated by them with equal precision, and according to a system of decrement, from *Rishabha*, the first Jina, who was 500 poles in stature, and lived 8,400,000 great years, down to *Mahâvira*, the twenty-fourth, who had degenerated to the size of a man, and was no more than forty years on earth—the age of his predecessor, *Pârswanâtha*, not exceeding 100 years. The present worship is almost restricted to the last two Tirthakaras; and, as the stature and years of these personages have a reasonable possibility, H. T. Colebrooke inferred that they alone are to be considered as historical personages. As, moreover, amongst the disciples of Mahâvîra there is one, Indrabhûti, who is called *Gautama*, and as Gautama is also a name of the founder of the Buddha faith, the same distinguished scholar concluded that, if the identity between these names could be assumed, it would lead to the further surmise that both these sects are branches of the same stock. But against this view, which would assign to the Jaina religion an antiquity even higher than 543 B.C. (the date which is commonly ascribed to the apotheosis of Gautama Buddha), several reasons are alleged by professor Wilson. As to the real date, however, of the origin of the Jaina faith, as the same scholar justly observes, it is immersed in the same obscurity which invests all remote history amongst the Hindus. We can only infer from the existing Jaina literature, and from the doctrines it inculcates, that it came later into existence than the Buddhist sect." See Colebrooke, *Miscellaneous Essays;* Wilson, *Works*, i (Lond. 1862); Trevor, *India, its Natives and Missions*, p. 109 sq. Comp. INDIA; HINDUISM.

Ja'ïr (Hebrew *Yaïr'*, יָאִיר, *enlightener;* Sept. Ἰαΐρ, Ἰαείρ; but in 1 Chron. ii, 22, some copies Ἀείρ; in Esth. ii, 5, Ἰαΐρος; compare Ἰάειρος, Mark v, 22; Josephus. *War*. vi. 1, 8), the name of three men, also of one other of different form in the Hebrew.

1. The son of Segub, which latter was of the tribe of Manasseh on his mother's side [see ADOPTION], but of Judah on his father's (1 Chron. ii, 22); but Jair is reckoned as belonging to Manasseh (Numb. xxxii, 41; Deut. iii, 14; 1 Kings iv, 13), probably on account of his exploits and possessions in Gilead, where he appears to have been brought up with his mother (comp. 1 Chron. ii, 21), being perhaps an illegitimate child (see Raumer in Tholuck's *Liter. Anz.* 1836, p. 11), or, at all events, her heir (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 185), although his possessions might strictly be claimed as an appanage to the tribe of Judah (Josh. xix, 34). See JUDAH UPON JORDAN. He distinguished himself in an expedition against the kingdom of Bashan, the time of which is disputed, but may probably be referred to the last year of the life of Moses (B.C. 1618), and which seems to have formed part of the operations connected with the conquest of the country east of the Jordan (1 Chron. iii, 23; Numb. xxxiii, 41; Deut. iii, 14). He settled in the part of Argob bordering on Gilead, where we find the small towns thus taken (retaken) by him named collectively Havoth-jair, or "Jair's villages" (Numb. xxxii, 41; Deut. iii, 14; Josh. xiii, 30; 1 Kings iv, 13; 1 Chron. ii, 22). See HAVOTH-JAIR. These are variously stated to have been *twenty-three* (1 Chron. ii, 22), *thirty* (Judg. x, 4), and *sixty* in number (1 Chron. ii, 23; Josh. xiii, 30; 1 Kings iv, 13, in which last passage they are said to have been "great cities, with walls and brazen bars"). The discrepancy may easily be reconciled by the supposition (warranted by Numb. xxxii, 39, 40) that although Jair, in conjunction with his relatives, captured the whole sixty cities composing the Gileadite district of the kingdom of Og in Bashan (Deut. iii, 4), only twenty-three of these were specially assigned to him; whereas, at a later date, his portion may have received some accessions; or the number attributed to his descendant of the same name may be only a round or approximate estimate, as being about one half the entire

number. (For other methods of adjustment, see Winer's *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Jair.)

2. The eighth judge of Israel, a native of Gilead, in Manasseh (Josephus, *Ant.* v, 7, 6, Ἰαείρης), beyond the Jordan, and therefore probably descended from the preceding, with whom, indeed, he is sometimes confounded. He ruled twenty-two years (B.C. 1296–1274), and his opulence is indicated in a manner characteristic of the age in which he lived; "He had thirty sons, that rode on thirty ass-colts (עֲיָרִים), and they had thirty cities (עֲיָרִים again), which are called Havoth-jair, in the land of Gilead" (Judg. x, 3, 4). A young ass was the most valuable beast for riding then known to the Hebrews; and that Jair had so many of them, and was able to assign a village to every one of his thirty sons, is very striking evidence of his wealth (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustrat.* or Judg. v, 6–10). The twenty-three villages of the more ancient Jair were probably among the thirty which this Jair possessed. His burial-place was Camon, doubtless in the same region (Judg. x, 5). It is probably one of his descendants (so numerous) that is called a JAIRITE (Heb. *Yaïri'*, יָאִירִי, Sept. Ἰαρί, 2 Sam. xx, 26). Possibly, however, the genuine reading was יִתְרִי, *the Jathrite.* See IRA.

3. A Benjamite, son of Shimei and father of Mordecai, Esther's uncle (Esth. ii, 5). B.C. ante 598.

4. (Heb. *Yaïr'*, יָעִיר marg., but text *Yaör'*, יָעוּר; perh. *awake;* Sept. Ἰαείρ, Vulg. corruptly *saltus.*) The father of Elhanan, which latter slew the brother of Goliath (1 Chron. xx, 5). In the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxi, 19) we find, instead of Jair, "JAARE-" (יַעֲרֵי, apparently the plur. of the other word, q. d. יַעַר, a *forest;* Sept. Ἰαρέ, Vulg. again *saltus*), with the addition "Oregim" (אֹרְגִים, *weavers;* Sept. ὑφαίνοντες, Vulg. *polymitarius*), which has probably been erroneously taken by transcribers from the latter part of the same verse (see Kennicott's *Diss. on the Hebrew Text*, i, 78). B.C. ante 1018. See ELHANAN.

Ja'ïrite (2 Sam. xx, 26). See JAIR, 2.

Jaï'rus (Ἰάειρος, see JAIR), an otherwise unknown ruler of the synagogue at Capernaum, whose only daughter Jesus restored to life (Mark v, 22; Luke viii, 41; comp. Matt. ix, 18). A.D. 27. Some have wrongly inferred from our Saviour's words, "The maid is not dead, but sleepeth" (Rautenberg, in the *Hannöv. Beiträg. z. Nutz. u. Vergnüg.* 1761, p. 88; Olshausen, *Comment.* i, 321), that the girl was only in a swoon (see Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 347).

JAÏ'RUS (Ἰαΐρος) also occurs in the Apocrypha (Esth. xi, 2) as a Græcized form of the name of JAIR (q. v.), the father of Mordecai (Esth. ii, 5).

Ja'kan (1 Chron. i, 42). See JAÄKAN.

Ja'keh (Heb. *Yakeh'*, יָקֶה, *pious;* Sept. δεξάμενος [reading קְהָה], Vulg. *vomens* [reading יָקָא]), a name given as that of the father of Agur, the author of the apothegms in Prov. xxx, 1 sq. Interpreters greatly differ as to the person intended. See AGUR. The traditional view is that which gives the word a figurative import (q. d. יְקָהָה, *obedience*, sc. to God); and it will then become an epithet of David, the father of Solomon, a term appropriate to his character, and especially so as applied to him by a son. Others understand a real name of some unknown Israelite; and, in that case, the most probable supposition is that it denotes the father of the author of some popular maxims selected by "the men of Hezekiah" (perhaps composed by them, or in their time), and thus incorporated with the proverbs of Solomon. But the allusion to these latter compilers in Prov. xxv, 1, appears only to relate to an *editing* on their part of literary effusions (in part, perhaps, retained in the memory by oral recitation) which are expressly assigned to Solomon as their author. See PROVERBS. Prof. Stuart (*Comment.* ad loc.) adopts the suggestion of Hitzig (in Zeller's *Theol. Yahrb.* 1844, p. 283), assented to by Bertheau (*Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb.* ad loc.), and renders the clause thus: "The words of Agur, the son of her who was obeyed (reading יִקְּהָה) in Massa;" and in an extended comparison with the parallel passage (xxi, 1), defends and illustrates this interpretation, making Jakeh to have been the son and successor of a certain queen of Arabia Petræa, chiefly on the ground that the phrase דִּבְרֵי לְמוּאֵל מֶלֶךְ מַשָּׂא will bear no other translation than *The words of Lemuel, king of Massa.* But if the construction be thus rendered more facile in this passage, it is more difficult in the other, where בֶּן־יָקֶה הַמַּשָּׂא cannot be brought nearer his version than *The son of Jakeh of Massa.* Even this rendering violates in both passages the Masoretic punctuation, which is correctly followed in the Auth. Vers.; and the interpretation proposed, after all, attributes both names (Agur and Lemuel) to the same person, without so good reason for such variation as there would be if they were ascribed as epithets to Solomon. See ITHIEL.

Ja'kim (Heb. *Yakim'*, יָקִים, *establisher*), the name of two men. See also JEHOIAKIM.

1. (Sept. Ἐλιακείμ v. r. Ἰακίμ, Vulg. *Jacim.*) The head of the twelfth division of the sacerdotal order as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 12). B.C. 1014.

2. (Sept. Ἰακείμ v. r. Ἰακίμ, Vulg. *Jacim.*) One of the "sons" of Shimhi, a Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 19). B.C. apparently cir. 588.

Jakusi, the Japanese divinity of physic. "His idol is placed in a small temple richly adorned, standing upright on a gilt tarate flower, or *faba Ægyptiaca*, under one half of a large cockle-shell extended over his head, which is encircled with a crown of rays. He has a sceptre in his left hand, and in his right hand something unknown. The idol is gilt all over. The Japanese, as they pass by, never fail to pay their reverence to this golden idol, approaching the temple with a low bow, and bareheaded, when they ring a little bell hung up at the entrance, and then, holding both their hands to their foreheads, repeat a prayer. The Japanese relate that this temple was erected to Jakusi by a pious but poor man, who, having discovered an excellent medicinal power, gained so much money by it as to be able to give this testimony of his gratitude to the God of physic."—Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* i, 499.

Jakut. See SIBERIA.

Ja'lon (Heb. *Yalon'*, יָלוֹן, *lodger;* Sept. Ἰαλών v. r. Ἰαμών), the last-named of the four sons of Ezra, of the tribe of Judah, and apparently of a family kindred with that of Caleb (1 Chron. iv, 17). B.C. prob. cir. 1618.

Jamabo. See YAMABO.

Jamaica, one of the largest islands of the West Indies, was discovered by Columbus in 1494, and received in 1514 the name *Isla de San Jago.* In 1560 the native population had become nearly extinct. For a time Jamaica remained under the administration of the descendants of Diego, the son of Columbus; subsequently it fell by inheritance to the house of Braganza; in 1655 it was occupied by the English, and in 1670 formally ceded to England, which has ever since retained possession of it. The importation of slaves ceased in 1807, and in 1838 the slaves obtained their entire freedom. The negro population increased very rapidly, and, according to a census taken in 1861, there were, in a total population of 441,264, only 13,816 whites, mostly English, against 346,374 negroes and 81,065 mulattoes. The colored population has always complained of being oppressed and ill-treated by the former slaveholders, who own nearly the whole of the landed property, and a large number of them have withdrawn from the towns and plantations into the interior of the island, where they have formed a number of new settlements. In October, 1865, a negro insurrection broke out, in the course of which several government buildings were stormed by

the insurgents, and a number of plantations plundered. The English governor, Eyre, suppressed the insurrection with a severity which caused his suspension from office, and the appointment of a special commission of investigation. The latter had, however, no practical result, and the Queen's Bench, to which the case of governor Eyre had been referred by the jury, declined to institute a trial.

Before the abolition of slavery the planters were in general opposed to the religious instruction of the slaves. In 1754 the Moravian Brethren commenced a mission in Jamaica, encouraged by several of the planters, who presented them an estate called Carmel. Their progress was but slow. From the beginning of the mission to 1804 the number of negroes baptized was 938. From 1838, when complete liberty was granted to the negroes, the Moravian mission prospered greatly; and in 1850, the number of souls under the care of the mission at the several stations was estimated at 1300. In 1842 an institution for training native teachers was established. In 1867 the mission numbered 14 churches and chapels, with 11,850 sittings, 9350 attendants at divine worship, and 4460 members. The number of schools was 17, and of scholars 30. The mission of English Wesleyans was commenced by Dr. Coke in 1787. It soon met with violent opposition, and the Legislative Assembly of the island and the town council of Kingston repeatedly passed stringent laws for cutting off the slave population from the attendance of the Wesleyan meetings, and for putting a stop to the labors of the missionaries. From 1807 to 1815 the missionary work was accordingly interrupted, and it was only due to the interference of the home government and the English governors of Jamaica that it could be resumed. But every insurrectionary movement among the negroes led to a new outcry against the missionaries, in particular the Wesleyan, against whom, at different times, special laws were issued. A great change, however, took place in public opinion after the abolition of slavery, when the House of Assembly of the island and the Common Council of Kingston made grants to aid in the erection of Wesleyan chapels and schools. In 1846 the number of Church members in connection with the Wesleyan mission amounted to 26,585; but from that time it began to decrease, and in 1853 had declined to 19,478. In 1867 the Wesleyans had 75 churches and chapels, with 34,105 sittings, 24,210 attendants of public worship, 26 ministers, 14,661 members, 5107 Sunday-scholars, and 36 day-schools, with 2563 scholars. The English Baptists entered upon their mission in Jamaica in 1814. It soon became very prosperous: in 1839 it numbered 21,000. and in 1841, 27,706 members; in 1887, 32,342 members, 144 churches, and 78 out-stations. They have a college at Calabar, with theological instruction. In 1888 the United Presbyterians had in Jamaica 46 churches, 32 ministers, and 8814 members; the United Methodists 10 churches, 9 ministers, and 3403 members. The general religious statistics in 1867 were as follows:

	Churches and Chapels.	Attendants of pub. worship.	Ministers.	Members.
Ch. of England..	87	39,710	33	....
London Missionary Society....	33	5610	8	2150
United Presbyt's	26	7955	18	4684
United Free Ch. Methodists....	6	....	..	....
Roman Catholics	8	2920	11	1794
Amer. Mission...	6	750	..	....
Ch. of Scotland..	1	450	..	....

Altogether, the number of persons under religious instruction was estimated in 1867 at 154,000, and the churches and chapels together could seat 174,000 persons. Formerly the Church of England was the State church, and was supported by the local Legislature, but in 1868 the state grant was abolished. The island is the see of an Anglican bishop and of a Roman Catholic vicar apostolic. (A. J. S.)

Jamblichus, or Iamblichus (Ἰάμβλιχος), a celebrated Neoplatonic philosopher of the 4th century, was born at Chalcis, in Cœle-Syria. What little we know of his life is derived from the works of Eunapius, a Sophist, whose love of the marvelous renders his testimony doubtful authority. He seems, however, to have studied under Anatolius and Porphyry, and resided in Syria until his death, which occurred during the reign of Constantine the Great, and probably before A.D. 333 (Suidas, s. v. Ἰάμβλιχος; Eunapius, *Iamblich.*). He was deeply versed in the philosophical system of Plato and Pythagoras, as well as in the theology and philosophy of the Egyptians and Chaldæans, and enjoyed great reputation, being by some of his contemporaries considered even the equal of Plato. In his life of Pythagoras he appears as a Syncretist, or compiler of different systems, but without critical talent. So far as can be gathered from fragments in his works in Proclus's commentary on the Vimæus, he went even further than his teachers in subtlety of arguments, subdividing Plotinus's trinity, and deriving therefrom a series of triads. "Iamblichus distinguishes first three purely *intelligible* triads, then three *intellectual* ones, thus forming the *νοητήν* enneatical series, and the *νοεράν*. By the side of the great triad he places inferior ones, *νέοι δημιούργοι*, whose mission it is to transmit the action of the former. He is also distinguished from Plotinus and Porphyry by an almost superstitious regard for numerical formulas. All the principles of his theology can be represented by numbers: the monad, the supreme unit, principle of all unity, as well as of all diversity; two, the intellect, the first manifestation or development of unity; three, the soul, or *δημιούργοι*, the principle which brings all progressive beings back to unity; four, the principle of universal harmony, which comprises the causes of all things; eight, the source of motion (*χώρησις*), taking all beings away from the supreme principle to disperse them through the world; nine, the principle of all identity and of all perfection; and finally, ten, the result of all the emanations of the *τὸ Ἕν*. Neither Plotinus nor Porphyry, whatever their regard for Pythagoras's doctrines, ever went to such an extent in reducing their principles to numerical abstractions" (Vacherot, *Hist. Critique de l'École d'Alexandrie*, vol. ii). Jamblichus did not acquiesce in the doctrine of the earlier Neoplatonists, but thought that man could be brought into direct communication with the Deity through the medium of theurgic rites and ceremonies, and thus attached great importance to mysteries, initiations, etc. He wrote a number of works, the most important of which are: 1. *Περὶ Πυθαγόρου αἱρέσεως*, intended as a preparation for the study of Plato, and consisting originally of ten books, five of which are now lost. The principal extant are *Περὶ τοῦ Πυθαγορικοῦ βίου* (published first by J. Arcerius Theodoretus, Franeker, 1598, 4to; best ed. L. Kuster, Amst. 1707, 4to; and Th. Kiessling, Lpz. 1815, 2 vols. 8vo); —*Προτρεπτικοὶ λόγοι εἰς φιλοσοφίαν* (Th. Kiessling, Lpz. 1813, 8vo);—*Περὶ κοινῆς μαθηματικῆς ἐπιστήμης* (Villoison, *Anecdota Græca*, ii, 188 sq.; J. G. Fries, Copenhagen, 1790, 40):—*Τὰ θεολογούμενα τῆς ἀριθμητικῆς* (Ch. Wechel, Paris, 1543, 4to; Tr. Ast, Lpz. 1817, 8vo). 2. The *Περὶ μυστηρίων*, in one book, in which a priest named Abammon is introduced as replying to a letter of Porphyrius. He endeavors to vindicate the truth, purity, and divine origin of Egyptian and Chaldee theology, and maintains that man, through theurgic rites, may commune with the Deity. There has been some controversy concerning the authenticity of this work, but Tennemann and other eminent critics think there are no good reasons why the authorship should be denied to Iamblichus. It was published by Ficinus (Venice, 1483, 4to, with a Latin transl.); N. Scutellius (Rome, 1556, 4to), and Th. Gale (Oxf. 1678, fol., with a Latin transl.), etc. See Eunapius, *Vitæ Sophist.*; Julian, *Orat.* iv, 146: *Epist.* 40; Dodwell, *Excercit. de Ætate Pythag.* 1704; Hebenstreit, *Dissertatio de Jamablici Doctrina*, Leipz. 1704, 4to; Brucker, *Historia critica Philosophiæ*, ii, 260, 431; Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs*, vi, 246; Tenne-

mann, *Gesch. der Philosophie*, vi, 246; Ritter, *Gesch. der Philosophie*, iv, 647; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vol. iv, pt. iii, p. 50; Tiedmann, *Geist der Spekulat. Philosophie*, iii, 453; Jules Simon, *Histoire de l'École d'Alexandrie*, ii, 187-265.—Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii, 549; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 305 sq.; Lardner, *Works*, vol. viii; Butler, *Hist. Anc. Philos.* i, 76, 77; ii, 321, 329. See NEOPLATONISM.

Jam'brēs (Ἰαμβρῆς, prob. of Egyptian etymology), a person mentioned as one of those who opposed Moses (2 Tim. iii, 8). B.C. 1658. See JANNES.

Jam'bri. Shortly after the death of Judas Maccabæus (B.C. 161), "the children of Jambri" are said to have made a predatory attack on a detachment of the Maccabæan forces, and to have suffered reprisals (1 Macc. ix, 36-41). The name does not occur elsewhere, and the variety of readings is considerable: Ἰαμβρί, Ἰαμβρεῖν, Ἀμβροί, Ἀμβρί; Syr. *Ambrei*. Josephus (*Ant.* xiii, 1, 2) read οἱ Ἀμαραίου παῖδες, and it seems almost certain that the true reading is Ἀμρί (-ει), a form which occurs elsewhere (1 Kings xvi, 22; Joseph. *Ant.* viii, 12, 5, Ἀμαρῖνος; 1 Chron. xxvii, 18, Heb. עָמְרִי, Vulg. *Amri*; 1 Chron. ix, 4, Ἀμβραΐμ, i. e. Amorites.

It has been conjectured (Drusius, Michaelis, Grimm, 1 Macc. ix, 36) that the original text was בני אמורי, "the sons of the Amorites," and that the reference is to a family of the Amorites who had in early times occupied the town Medeba (ver. 36), on the borders of Reuben (Numb. xxi, 30, 31).

James, or rather JACŌBUS (Ἰάκωβος, the Græcized form of the name *Jacob*), the name of two or three persons mentioned in the New Test.

1. JAMES, THE SON OF ZEBEDEE (Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου), and elder brother of the evangelist John, by one or the other of which relationships he is almost always designated. Their occupation was that of fishermen, probably at Bethsaida, in partnership with Simon Peter (Luke v, 10). On comparing the account given in Matt. iv, 21, Mark i, 19, with that in John i, it would appear that James and John had been acquainted with our Lord, and had received him as the Messiah, some time before he called them to attend upon him statedly —a call with which they immediately complied. A.D. 27. Their mother's name was Salome (Matt. xx, 20; xxvii, 56; comp. with Mark xv, 40; xvi, 1). We find James, John, and Peter associated on several interesting occasions in the Saviour's life. They alone were present at the transfiguration (Matt. xvii, 1; Mark ix, 2; Luke ix, 28); at the restoration to life of Jairus's daughter (Mark v, 42; Luke viii, 51); and in the garden of Gethsemane during the agony (Mark xiv, 33; Matt. xxvi, 37; Luke xxi, 37). With Andrew they listened in private to our Lord's discourse on the fall of Jerusalem (Mark xiii, 3). James and his brother appear to have indulged in false notions of the kingdom of the Messiah, and were led by ambitious views to join in the request made to Jesus by their mother (Matt. xx, 20-23; Mark x, 35). From Luke ix, 52, we may infer that their temperament was warm and impetuous. On account, probably, of their boldness and energy in discharging their apostleship, they received from their Lord the appellation of Boanerges (q. v.), or *Sons of Thunder* (for the various explanations of this title given by the fathers, see Suiceri *Thes. Eccles.* s. v. Βροντή, and Lücke's *Commentar*, Bonn, 1840, Einleitung, c. i, § 2, p. 17). See JOHN. James was the first martyr among the apostles (Acts xii, 1), A.D. 44. Clement of Alexandria, in a fragment preserved by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* i, 9), reports that the officer who conducted James to the tribunal was so influenced by the bold declaration of his faith as to embrace the Gospel and avow himself also a Christian; in consequence of which, he was beheaded at the same time.

For legends respecting his death and his connection with Spain, see the Roman Breviary (*in Fest. S. Jac. Ap.*), in which the healing of a paralytic and the conversion of Hermogenes are attributed to him, and where it is asserted that he preached the Gospel in Spain, and that his remains were translated to Compostella. See also the fourth book of the Apostolical History written by Abdias, the (pseudo) first bishop of Babylon (Abdias, *De historia certaminis Apostolici*, Paris, 1566); Isidore, *De vitâ et obitu SS. utriusque Testam.* No. LXXIII (Hagonoæ, 1529); Pope Calixtus II's four sermons on St. James the Apostle (*Bibl. Patr. Magn.* xv, 324); Mariana, *De Adventu Jacobi Apostoli Majoris in Hispaniam* (Col. Agripp. 1609); Baronius, *Martyrologium Romanum* ad Jul. 25, p. 325 (Antwerp, 1589); Bollandus, *Acta Sanctorum* ad Jul. 25, vi, 1-124 (Antwerp, 1729); Estius, *Comm. in Act. Ap.* c. xii; *Annot. in difficiliora loca S. Script.* (Col. Agripp. 1622); Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, i, 899 (Brussels, 1706). As there is no shadow of foundation for any of the legends here referred to, we pass them by without further notice. Even Baronius shows himself ashamed of them; Estius gives them up as hopeless; and Tillemont rejects them with as much contempt as his position would allow him to show. Epiphanius, without giving, or probably having any authority for or against his statement, reports that St. James died unmarried (S. Epiph. *Adv. Hær.* ii, 4, p. 491, Paris, 1622), and that, like his namesake, he lived the life of a Nazarite (*ibid.* iii, 2, 13, p. 1045).

2. JAMES, THE "SON" OF ALPHÆUS (Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου), one of the twelve apostles (Mark iii, 18; Matt. x, 3; Luke vi, 15; Acts i, 13). A.D. 27-29. His mother's name was Mary (Matt. xxvi, 56; Mark xv, 40); in the latter passage he is called JAMES THE LESS (ὁ μικρός, *the Little*), either as being younger than James, the son of Zebedee, or on account of his low stature (Mark xvi, 1; Luke xxiv, 10). There has been much dispute as to whether this is the same with "JAMES, THE LORD'S BROTHER" (Gal. i, 19); but the express title of *Apostle* given to him in this last passage, as well as in 1 Cor. xv, 7 (comp. also Acts ix, 27), seems decisive as to their identity—no other James being mentioned among the Twelve except "James, the brother of John," who was no near relative of Christ. Another question is whether he was the same with the James mentioned along with Joses, Simon, and Judas, as Christ's brethren (Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3). This depends upon the answer to two other questions: 1st. Is the term "brother" (ἀδελφός) to be taken in the proper sense, or in the general signification of *kinsman*, in these texts? The use of the title in the last two passages, as well as in John ii, 12; Matt. xii, 46-50; Mark iii, 31-35; Luke viii, 19-21; Acts i, 14, in explicit connection with his mother, and in relations which imply that they were members of his immediate family, most naturally requires it to be taken in its literal sense, especially as no intimation is elsewhere conveyed to the contrary. See BROTHER. Nor can the term "sisters" (ἀδελφαί), employed in the same connection (Matt. xiii, 56; Mark vi, 3), be referred to other than uterine relatives. This inference is sustained by the striking coincidence in the names of the brothers in the list of the apostles (namely, James, Judas, and apparently Simon, Luke vi, 15, 16; Acts i, 13) with those in the reference to Christ's brothers (namely, James, Judas, Simon, and Joses, Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3), and also by the fact that "James the Less and Joses" are said to be the sons of the same Mary who was "the wife of Cleophas" (Mark xv, 40; and Matt. xxvii, 56; comp. with John xix, 25). 2d. Who is this "Mary, the wife of Cleophas?" In the same verse (John xix, 25) she is called "his [Christ's] mother's sister" (ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, καὶ ἡ Μαγδαληνή); and, although some interpreters distinguish between these appellations, thus making four females in the enumeration instead of three, yet the insertion of the distinctive particle καί, "and," between each of the other terms, and its omission between these, must be understood to denote their identity. It is manifest, however, that no two sisters *german* would ever have

the same name given to them, an unprecedented oversight that would produce continual confusion in the family; besides, the law did not allow a man to be married to two sisters at the same time (Lev. xviii, 18), as Joseph in that case would have been; nor would either of these objections be obviated by supposing the two Marys to have been half-sisters. The only plausible conjecture is that they are called sisters (i. e. sisters-in-law), because of their marriage to two brothers, Cleophas and Joseph; a supposition that is strengthened by their apparent intimacy with each other, and their similar connection with Jesus intimated in John xix, 25. Cleophas (or Alphæus) seems to have been an elder brother of Joseph, and dying without issue, Joseph married his wife (probably before his marriage with the Virgin, as he seems to have been much older than she) according to the Levirate law (Deut. xxv, 5); on which account his oldest son by that marriage is styled the (legal) son of Cleophas, as well as (reputed half-) brother of Jesus. See ALPHÆUS; MARY. This arrangement meets all the statements of Scripture in the case, and is confirmed by the declarations of early Christian writers. (See No. 3, below.) The only objection of any force against such an adjustment is the statement, occurring towards the latter part of our Saviour's ministry, that "neither did his brethren believe on him" (John vii, 5), whereas two of them, at least, are in this way included among his disciples (namely, James and Jude, if not Simon); and, although they are mentioned in Acts i, 14 as subsequently yielding to his claims, yet the language in John vii, 7 seems too decisive to admit the supposition that those there referred to sustained so prominent a position as apostles among his converts. A more likely mode of reconciling these two passages is to suppose that there were still other brothers besides those chosen as apostles, not mentioned particularly anywhere (perhaps only Joses and one younger), who did not believe on him until a very late period, being possibly convinced only by his resurrection. Indeed, if three of these brethren were apostles, the language in Acts i, 13, 14, requires such a supposition; for, after enumerating the eleven (including, as usual, James, Simon, and Jude), that passage adds, "*and* with *his brethren*." Whether these mentioned brothers (as indeed may also be said of the *sisters*, and perhaps of Simon) were the children of Mary, Cleophas's widow, or of the Virgin Mary, is uncertain; yet in the expression "her *first*-born son," applied to Jesus (Luke ii, 7). as well as in the intimation of temporary abstinence only in Matt. i, 25, there seems to be implied a reference to other children (see VIRGIN); but, be that as it may, there can be no good reason given why such should not have been the case; we may therefore conjecture that while James, Simon, Jude, and Joses were Joseph's children by Cleophas's widow, and the first three were of sufficient age to be chosen apostles, all the others were by the Virgin Mary, and among them only some sisters were of sufficient age and notoriety at Christ's second visit to Nazareth to be specified by his townsmen (Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3), Joses and the children of the Virgin generally being the "brethren" that did not believe in Jesus till late (John vii, 5; Acts i, 14). See JUDE. To the objection that if the Virgin had had other children, especially sons (and still more, a half-son, James, older than any of them), she would not have gone to live with the apostle John, a comparative stranger, it may be replied that they may have been still too young (except James, who was already charged with the care of his own mother), or otherwise not suitably circumstanced to support her; and if it had been otherwise, still the express direction of Jesus, her eldest son, would have decided her residence with "the beloved disciple," who was eminently fitted, as Christ's favorite, no less than by his amiable manners and comparative affluence, to discharge that duty. See JOHN. (See *Meth. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1851, p. 670–672.) See on the No. 3, below.

There have been three principal theories on the subject: 1. For the identity of James, the Lord's brother, with James the apostle, the son of Alphæus, we find (see Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.* i, 16, 43, 230 [Oxon. 1846]) Clement of Alexandria (*Hypotyposeis*, bk. vii, apud Eusebius, *H. E.* i, 12; ii, 1) and Chrysostom (*in Gal.* i, 19). This hypothesis, being warmly defended by St. Jerome (*in Matt.* xii, 49) and supported by St. Augustine (*Contra Faust.* xxii, 35, etc.), became the recognised belief of the Western Church. 2. Parallel with this opinion, there existed another in favor of the hypothesis that James was the son of Joseph by a former marriage, and therefore not identical with the son of Alphæus. This is first found in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter (see Origen, *in Matt.* xiii, 55), in the Protevangelium of James, and the Pseudo-Apostolical Constitution of the 3d century (Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.* i, 228; *Const. Apost.* vi, 12). It is adopted by Eusebius (*Comm. in Esai.* xvii, 6; *H. E.* i, 12; ii, 1). Perhaps it is Origen's opinion (see *Comm. in Joh.* ii, 12). St. Epiphanius, St. Hilary, and St. Ambrose we have already mentioned as being on the same side. So are Victorinus (Vict. Phil. *in Gal.* apud Maii *Script. vet. nov. coll.* [Romæ, 1828]) and Gregory Nyssen (*Opp.* ii, 844, D. [Paris ed. 1618)], and it became the recognised belief of the Greek Church. 3. The Helvidian hypothesis, put forward at first by Bonosus, Helvidius, and Jovinian, and revived by Herder and Strauss in Germany, is that James, Joses, Jude, Simon, and the sisters were all children of Joseph and Mary, while James the apostle and James the son of Alphæus (whether one or two persons) were different from, and not akin with these "brothers and sisters" of our Lord. English theological writers have been divided between the first and second of these views, with, however, a preference on the whole for the first hypothesis. See, e. g. Lardner, vi, 495 (London, 1788); Pearson, *Minor Works*, i, 350 (Oxf. 1844), and *On the Creed*, i, 308; ii, 224 (Oxford, 1833); Thorndike, i, 5 (Oxf. 1844); Horne's *Introd. to H. S.* iv, 427 (Lond. 1834), etc. On the same side are Lightfoot, Witsius, Lampe, Baumgarten, Semler, Gabler, Eichhorn, Hug, Bertholdt, Guericke, Schneckenburger, Meier, Steiger, Gieseler, Theile. Lange, Taylor (*Op.* v, 20 [London, 1849]), Wilson (*Op.* vi, 673 [Oxf. 1859]), and Cave (*Life of St. James*) maintain the second hypothesis with Vossius, Basnage, Valesius, etc. The third is held by Dr. Davidson (*Introd. New Test.* vol. iii) and by Dean Alford (*Greek Test.* iv, 87). Our own position, it will be perceived, combines parts of each of these views, maintaining with (1) the identity of the two Jameses, with (2) the Levirate marriage of Joseph and the widow of Alphæus, and with (3) that these were all the children of Joseph and in part of Mary. See JAMES, EPISTLE OF (below).

3. JAMES, THE BROTHER OF THE LORD (ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου [Gal. i, 19]). Whether this James is identical with the son of Alphæus is a question which Dr. Neander pronounces to be the most difficult in the apostolic history; it may be well, therefore, to consider more particularly under this head the arguments that have been urged in support of the negative. We read in Matt. xiii, 55, "Is not his mother called Mary, and his brethren James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas?" and in Mark vi, 3, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James and Joses, and of Juda and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us?" Those critics who suppose the terms of affinity in these and parallel passages to be used in the laxer sense of near relations, have remarked that in Mark xv, 40 mention is made of "Mary, the mother of James the Less and of Joses;" and that in John xix, 25 it is said "there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother and his mother's sister, Mary, the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene;" they therefore infer that the wife of Cleophas is the same as the sister of the mother of Jesus, and consequently that James (supposing Cleophas and Alphæus to be the same name, the former according to the Hebrew, the latter according to the Greek orthography) was a *first cousin* of our Lord, and on that account termed his *brother*, and that

the other individuals called the brethren of Jesus stood in the same relation. It is also urged that in the Acts, after the death of James, the son of Zebedee, we read only of one James; and, moreover, that it is improbable that our Lord would have committed his mother to the care of the beloved disciple had there been sons of Joseph living, whether the offspring of Mary or of a former marriage. Against this view it has been alleged that in several early Christian writers, James, the brother of the Lord, is distinguished from the son of Alphæus, that the identity of the names Alphæus and Cleophas is somewhat uncertain, and that it is doubtful whether the words "his mother's sister," in John xix, 25, are to be considered in apposition with those immediately following—"Mary, the wife of Cleophas," or intended to designate a different individual, since it is highly improbable that two sisters should have had the same name. Wieseler (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1840, iii, 648) maintains that not three, but four persons are mentioned in this passage; and that, since in Matt. xxvii, 56, and Mark xv, 40, besides Mary of Magdala, and Mary, the mother of James and Joses, Salome also (or the mother of the sons of Zebedee) is named as present at the Crucifixion, it follows that she must have been the sister of our Lord's mother. But, even allowing that the sons of Alphæus were related to our Lord, the narrative in the Evangelists and the Acts presents some reasons for suspecting that they were not the persons described as "the brethren of Jesus." (1.) The brethren of Jesus are associated with his mother in a manner that strongly indicates their standing in the filial relation to her (Matt. xii, 46; Mark iii, 31; Luke viii, 19; Matt. xiii, 56, where "sisters" are also mentioned); they appear constantly together as forming one family (John ii, 12): "After this he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples" (Kuinoel, *Comment. in Matt.* xii, 46). (2.) It is explicitly stated that at a period posterior to the appointment of the twelve apostles, among whom we find "the son of Alphæus," "neither did his brethren believe in him" (John vii, 5; Lücke's *Comment.*). Attempts, indeed, have been made by Grotius and Lardner to dilute the force of this language, as if it meant merely that their faith was imperfect or wavering—"that they did not believe as they should;" but the language of Jesus is decisive: "My time is not yet come, but your time is always ready; the world cannot hate you, but me it hateth" (compare this with John xv, 18, 19: "If the world hate you," etc.). As to the supposition that what is affirmed in John's Gospel might apply to only some of his brethren, it is evident that, admitting the identity, only *one* brother of Jesus would be left out of the "company of the apostles." (3.) Luke's language in Acts i, 13, 14, is opposed to the identity in question; for, after enumerating the apostles, among whom, as usual, is "James, the son of Alphæus," he adds, "they all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication with the women, and Mary, the mother of Jesus, and *with his brethren.*" From this passage, however, we learn that by this time his brethren had received him as the Messiah. That after the death of the son of Zebedee we find only one James mentioned, may easily be accounted for on the ground that probably only one, "the brother of the Lord," remained at Jerusalem; and, under such circumstances, the silence of the historian respecting the son of Alphæus is not more strange than respecting several of the other apostles, whose names never occur after the catalogue in i, 13. Paul's language in Gal. i, 19 has been adduced to prove the identity of the Lord's brother with the son of Alphæus by its ranking him among the apostles, but others contend that it is by no means decisive (Winer, *Grammatik*, 4th edit., p. 517; Neander, *History of the Planting*, etc., ii, 5 [Engl. translation]). Dr. Niemeyer (*Charakteristik der Bibel*, i, 399 [Halle, 1830]) enumerates not less than five persons of this name, by distinguishing the son of Alphæus from James the Less, and assuming that the James last mentioned in Acts i, 13 was not the brother, but the father of Judas. Amidst this great disagreement of views (see in Winer's *Realwör.* s. v. Jacobus; Davidson's *Introd. to the N. T.* iii, 302 sq.; Horne's *Introduction*, new ed. iv, 591, n.; *Princeton Review*, Jan. 1865), the most probable solution of the main question is that given above (No. 2), identifying James, the son of Alphæus or Cleophas with one of the apostles, the literal brother of our Lord, and the son of Mary, the sister-in-law of the Virgin by virtue of the marriage of both with Joseph (but see Alford, Prolegg. to vol. iv, pt. 1 of his *Comment.* p. 88 sq.). This Levirate explanation is summarily dismissed by Andrews (*Life of our Lord*, p. 108) and Mombert (in the Am. edit. of Lange's *Commentary*, introd. to epist. of James, p. 19) as "needing no refutation;" but, although conjectural, it is the only one that makes it possible for James to have been at once *Christ's brother* and yet *the son of Alphæus.* If he was likewise the same with *the son of Mary, the wife of Cleophas*, the theory may be said to be demonstrated. Other treatises on the subject are Dr. Mill's *Accounts of our Lord's Brethren Vindicated* (Cambridge, 1843); Schaff, *Das Verhältniss des Jacobus, Bruders des Herrn, und Jacobus Alphäi* (Berlin, 1842); Gabler, *De Jacobo, epistolæ eidem ascriptæ auctori* (Altorf, 1787). For other monographs, see Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 31.

If we examine the early Christian writers, we shall meet with a variety of opinions on this subject. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 1) says that James, the first bishop of Jerusalem, brother of the Lord, son of Joseph, the husband of Mary, was surnamed the Just by the ancients on account of his eminent virtue. He uses similar language in his *Evangelical Demonstration* (iii, 5). In his commentary on Isaiah he reckons fourteen apostles, viz. the twelve, Paul, and James, the brother of our Lord. A similar enumeration is made in the "*Apostolic Constitutions*" (vi, 14). Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Theophylact speak of James, the Lord's brother, as being the same as the son of Cleophas. They suppose that Joseph and Cleophas were brothers, and that the latter dying without issue, Joseph married his widow for his first wife, according to the Jewish custom, and that James and his brethren were the offspring of this marriage (Lardner's *Credibility*, ii, 118; *Works*, iv, 548; i, 163; v, 160; *Hist. of Heretics*, ch. xi, § 11; *Works*, viii, 527; *Supplement to the Credibility*, ch. xvii, *Works*, vi, 188). A passage from Josephus is quoted by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 23), in which James, the brother of "him who is called Christ," is mentioned (*Ant.* xx, 9, 1); but in the opinion of Dr. Lardner and other eminent critics, this clause is an interpolation (Lardner's *Jewish Testimonies*, ch. iv; *Works*, vi, 496). That James was formally appointed bishop of Jerusalem by the Lord himself, as reported by Epiphanius (*Hæres.* lxxviii), Chrysostom (*Hom. xi in* 1 *Cor. vii*), Proclus of Constantinople (*De Trad. Div. Liturg.*), and Photius (*Ep.* 157), is not likely. Eusebius follows this account in a passage of his history, but says elsewhere that he was appointed by the apostles (*H. Eccl.* ii, 23). Clement of Alexandria is the first author who speaks of his episcopate (*Hypotyposeis*, bk. vi, apud Eusebius, *Hist. Ecc.* ii, 1), and he alludes to it as a thing of which the chief apostles, Peter, James, and John, might well have been ambitious. The same Clement reports that the Lord, after his resurrection, delivered the gift of knowledge to James the Just, to John, and Peter, who delivered it to the rest of the apostles, and they to the seventy. These views of the leadership of James in the college of the apostles agree with the account in Acts (ix, 27; xii, 17; xv, 13, 19). According to Hegesippus (a converted Jew of the 2d century) James, the brother of the Lord, undertook the government of the Church along with the apostles (μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων). He describes him as leading a life of ascetic strictness, and as held in the highest veneration by the Jews (ap. Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 23). But in the account he gives of his martyrdom some circumstances are highly improbable (see Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, i, 228), although the event itself is quite credible (A.D. 62). In the apoc-

ryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews, he is said to have been precipitated from a pinnacle of the Temple, then assaulted with stones, and at last dispatched by a blow on the head with a fuller's pole (Lardner's *Supplement*, ch. xvi, *Works*, vi, 174; Neander, *Planting*, etc., ii, 9, 22). Epiphanius gives the same account that Hegesippus does, in somewhat different words, having evidently copied it for the most part from him. He adds a few particulars which are probably mere assertions or conclusions of his own (*Hæres.* xxix, 4; lxxviii, 13). He calculates that James must have been ninety-six years old at the time of his death, and adds (on the authority, as he says, of Eusebius, Clement, and others) that he wore the πέταλον on his forehead, in which he probably confounds him with St. John (Polycr. apud Eusebius, *Histor. Eccles.* v, 24. But see Cotta, *De lam. pont. App. Joan. Jac. et Marci* [Tüb. 1755]). Gregory of Tours reports that he was buried, not where he fell, but on the Mount of Olives, in a tomb in which he had already buried Zacharias and Simon (*De glor. mart.* i, 27). The monument—part excavation, part edifice—which is now commonly known as the "Tomb of St. James," is on the east side of the so-called Valley of Jehoshaphat. The tradition about the monument in question is that St. James took refuge there after the capture of Christ, and remained, eating and drinking nothing, until our Lord appeared to him on the day of his resurrection (see Quaresmius, etc., quoted in Tobler, *Siloah*, etc., p. 299). The legend of his death there seems to be first mentioned by Maundeville (A.D. 1320: see *Early Trav.* p. 176). By the old travellers it is often called the "Church of St. James." Eusebius tells us that his chair was preserved down to his time (on which see Heinichen's Excursus [*Exc. xi, ad Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* vii, 19, vol. iv, p. 957, ed. Burton]). We must add a strange Talmudic legend which appears to relate to James. It is found in the *Midrash Koheleth*, or Commentary on Ecclesiastes, and also in the Tract *Abodah Zarah* of the Jerusalem Talmud. It is as follows: "R. Eliezer, the son of Dama, was bitten by a serpent, and there came to him Jacob, a man of Caphar Secama, to heal him by the name of Jesu, the son of Pandera; but R. Ismael suffered him not, saying, 'That is not allowed thee, son of Dama.' He answered, 'Suffer me, and I will produce an authority against thee that is lawful,' but he could not produce the authority before he expired. And what was the authority? This: 'Which if a man do, he shall live in them' (Lev. xviii, 5). But it is not said that he shall die in them." The son of Pandera is the name that the Jews have always given to our Lord when representing him as a magician. The same name is given in Epiphanius (*Hæres.* lxxviii) to the grandfather of Joseph, and by John Damascene (*De Fide Orth.* iv, 15) to the grandfather of Joachim, the supposed father of the Virgin Mary. For the identification of James of Secama (a place in Upper Galilee) with James the Just, see Mill (*Historic. Criticism of the Gospel*, p. 318, Camb. 1840). For the apocryphal works attributed to James, see JAMES, SPURIOUS WRITINGS OF.

JAMES, EPISTLE OF; said, according to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 23), to be the first of the so-called Catholic epistles (καθολικαί), as being addressed to classes of Christians rather than to individuals or particular communities. See EPISTLES, CATHOLIC.

I. *Authorship.*—As the writer simply styles himself "*James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ*," the question as to whom this may designate has been a subject of keen and prolonged controversy, since, as Eusebius has again remarked, there were several of this name. James the Great, or the son of Zebedee, was put to death under Herod Agrippa about the year 44, and, therefore, the authorship cannot with any propriety be ascribed to him, though a Syriac MS., published by Widmandstadt, and an old Latin version, published by Martianay and Sabatier, make the assertion. The authorship has been assigned by not a few to James the Less, ὁ μικρός, the son of Alphæus or Cleophas, and by others to James, the Lord's brother. Many, however, maintain that the two names were borne by the same individual, James being called the Lord's brother either as being a cousin or adoptive brother of Jesus (Lange, art. Jacobus in Herzog's *Encyklopädie*), or as a son of Joseph by a Levirate connection with the widow of Cleophas—the opinion of Epiphanius and Theophylact; or as a son of Joseph by a former marriage—the view of St. Chrysostom, Hilary, Cave, and Basnage. On the other hand, it is held by some that James, son of Alphæus, and James, brother of our Lord, were distinct persons, the latter being a uterine brother of Jesus, and standing, according to the representation of the Gospels, in the same relation with him to their common mother Mary—as in Matt. xii, 47; xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3; John ii, 12; Acts i, 14. On the whole, we are inclined to the former hypothesis, but we cannot enter into the question, referring the reader to the previous article, and to that on BROTHERS OF OUR LORD. There are also three excellent monographs on the subject: Blom, *Theol. Dissert. de τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς κυρίου* (Lugd. Bat. 1839); Schaff, *Das Verhältniss des Jacobus Bruders des Herrn* (Berlin, 1842); Wijbelingh, *Quis est epistolæ Jacobi Scriptor?* (Groningen, 1854). For the other side, see Mill on the *Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, p. 219, ed. sec., 1861. Dr. Mill held the perpetual virginity of Mary, or that she was, in ecclesiastical language, ἀειπαρθένος, and thus virtually forecloses the entire investigation. It serves little purpose to sneer at those who hold the opposite theory as having their prototypes in the Antidicomarianites or Helvidians of the 4th century.

According to our view, the author of this epistle was the Lord's brother, and an apostle, or one of the twelve. In Gal. ii, 9, Paul classes him with Peter and John, all three being pillars (στῦλοι). He is said by Hegesippus (Eusebius, *Hist.* ii, 23) to have received the government of the Church, μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, not *post apostolos*, as Jerome wrongly renders it, but *along with the apostles*—as the natural rendering is—or was received by them into a collegiate relation. In the pseudo-Clementines, and in the Apostolical Constitutions, however, he is traditionally separated from the apostles. It is quite groundless on the part of Wieseler (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1842), Stier, and Davidson to argue that the James mentioned in the first chapter of Galatians is a different person from the James referred to in the second chapter. Again, we have Paul distinctly acknowledging the high position of the brethren of the Lord when he ranges them between "other apostles" and "Cephas" in 1 Cor. ix, 5. By universal consent James was called ὁ δίκαιος, and, being martyred, was succeeded by a cousin, Symeon, second of the cousins of the Lord, and a son of Alphæus (ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ Κυρίου δεύτερον). Thus James was the superintendent of the Church at Jerusalem, and, probably on account of continuous residence, possessed of higher influence there than Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, who could only be an occasional visitor. "Certain from James" (τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου) went down to Antioch, before whom Peter prevaricated, as if he had stood in awe of the stricter Judaic principles of James and his party (Acts xv; Gal. ii). It seems, therefore, very natural that one occupying this position in the theocratic metropolis should write to his believing brethren of the Dispersion. He sympathized so strongly with the myriads of the Jews who believed and yet were zealous of the law—ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου—that for their sakes, and to ward off their hostility, he advised the apostle Paul to submit to an act of conformity. This conservative spirit, this zeal for the law at least as the moral rule of life, and this profession of Christianity along with uniform obedience to the "customs," seem to us characteristic elements of the epistle before us.

The opinion that the author of this epistle was different from James, the son of Alphæus, and not an apostle, is held by Clement, Herder, De Wette, Neander, Kern,

Schaff, Winer, Stier, Rothe, and Alford. Davidson, while holding the opinion that the Lord's brother and James the apostle are different persons, ascribes the epistle to the latter. But the theory seems to violate all the probabilities that may be gathered from the early fathers and historians. That James, the Lord's brother, is James the apostle, is an opinion maintained by Baronius, Lardner, Pearson, Gabler, Eichhorn, Hug, Guericke, Meier, Gieseler, Theile, and the most of other writers.

II. *Canonical Authority.*—The epistle is found in the Syriac Peshito in the 2d century, a version which circulated in the neighborhood of that country to which James and his readers belonged, and the translator and his coadjutors must have had special historical reasons for inserting James in their canon, as they exclude the Second and Third Epistles of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse. There are clauses in Clement of Rome (*Ad Cor.* xxxii) and in Hermas (*Mandat.* xii, 15) which probably may refer to correspondent portions of this epistle, though, perhaps, they may only allude directly to the Septuagint. The quotation from the Latin version of Irenæus (*Advers. Hæres.* iv, 16) appears to be more direct in the phrase "et amicus Dei vocatus est." But this phrase, found also in Clement, seems to have been a current one, and Philo calls Abraham by the same appellation. We cannot, therefore, lay such immediate stress on these passages as is done by Kern, Wiesinger, and others, though there is a presumption in favor of the opinion that passages in the apostolical fathers, bearing any likeness of style or thought to the apostolical writings, were borrowed from them, as either direct imitations or unconscious reproductions. This epistle is quoted by Origen (*In Joan.*, in *Opera*, iv, 306); and the Latin version of Rufinus uses the phrase *Jacobus apostolus* as a preface to a quotation. This father quotes the epistle also as ascribed to James—ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ; though, as Kern remarks, Origen says that the doctrine "faith without works is dead" is not received by all—οὐ συγχωρηθέν. Clement of Alexandria does not quote it, but Eusebius says that he expounded all the catholic epistles, including, however, in the range of his comments the Epistle of Barnabas and the so-called Apocalypse of Peter. Tertullian seems to make no reference to it, though Credner supposes an allusion to ii, 23 in the second book *Adversus Judæos* (*Opera*, ed. Oehler, ii, 704). Eusebius places it among the Antilegomena (*Histor. Eccles.* ii, 23; iii, 25), saying of the epistle, under the first reference, after he had just spoken of its author's death, ἰστέον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μέν, etc., "It is reckoned spurious—not many of the ancients have mentioned it;" subjoining, however, that it and Jude were used in most of the churches. In other places Eusebius quotes James without hesitation, calling the epistle by the sacred title of γραφή, and its author ὁ ἱερὸς ἀπόστολος. Jerome is very explicit, saying that James wrote one epistle, which some asserted had been published by another in his name, but that by degrees and in process of time ("paullatim tempore procedente") it obtained authority. Jerome's assertion may arise from the fact that there were several persons named James, and that confusion on this point was one means of throwing doubt on the epistle. There seems to be also an allusion in Hippolytus (ed. Lagarde, p. 122) to ii, 13, in the words ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνίλεως ἐστι τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος. It was at length received by the Council of Carthage in 397, and in that century it seems to have been all but universally acknowledged, both by the Eastern and Western churches—Theodore of Mopsuestia being a marked exception, because of the allusion in it (v, 11) to the book of Job. At the period of the Reformation its genuineness was again called in question. Luther, in his preface to the N. T. in 1522, comparing it "with the best books of the N. T.," stigmatized it as "a right strawy epistle (*eine recht stroherne Epistel*), being destitute of an evangelic character." Cyril Lucar had a similar objection, that Christ's name was coldly mentioned, and that only once or twice, and that it treated merely of morality—("sola a la moralita attende"—*Lettres Anecdotes*, p. 85, Amsterdam, 1718). Erasmus had doubts about it, and so had cardinal Cajetan, Flacius, and the Magdeburg centuriators. Grotius and Wetstein shared in these doubts, and they are followed by Schleiermacher, Schott, De Wette, Reuss, the Tübingen critics Baur and Schwegler, and Ritschl in his *Entstehung der Alt-kathol. Kirche*, p. 150. These recent critics deny its apostolic source, and some of them place it in the 2d century, from its resemblance in some parts to the Clementine homilies. But it is plain that the objections of almost all these opponents spring mainly from doctrinal and not from critical views, being rather originated and sustained by the notion formed of the contents of the epistle than resting on any proper historical foundation. We have not space to go over the several objections, such as the absence of the term *apostle* from the inscription, though this is likewise not found in several of Paul's epistles; the want of individuality in the document, though this may easily be accounted for by the circumstances of the author in relation to his readers; and the apparent antagonism to the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, which we shall afterwards consider. It is of no avail to object, with Wetstein and Theile, that James refers to the apocryphal writings, a practice unknown till a later period, for Theile's array of passages (*Prolegomena*, p. 46) does not prove the statement, as Huther's reply to this and other similar objections has shown at length, and step by step. Nor, lastly, can it be said that the Greek style of the epistle betrays a culture which the author could not possess. The style is nervous, indeed, and is more Hebraistic in its general structure than in its individual phrases, as in its short and pithy clauses, the absence of logical formulæ, the want of elaborate constructions, its oratorical fervor, and the simple and direct outflow of thoughts in brief and often parallelistic clauses. Intercourse with foreign Jews must have been frequent in those days, and there are always minds which, from natural propensity, are more apt than others to acquire a tasteful facility in the use of a tongue which has not been their vernacular. Taking all these things into account, we have every reason to accept the canonical authority of this epistle, the trial it has passed through giving us fuller confidence in it, since the principal objections are the offspring either of polemical prejudice, or of a subjective criticism based more on æsthetic tendencies than historical results. Rauch has faintly objected to the integrity of the epistle, asserting that the conclusion of v, 12-20, may be an interpolation, because it is not in logical harmony with what precedes; but he has had no followers, and Kern, Theile, Schneckenburger, and others have refuted him—logical sequence being a form of critical argument wholly inapplicable to this epistle. (See Davidson, *Introd. to N. T.* iii, 331 sq.) See ANTILEGOMENA.

III. *The Persons for whom the Epistle is intended.*—The salutation is addressed "to the Twelve Tribes which are scattered abroad" (ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ). They were Jews, ἀδελφοί—*brethren* or believing Jews, and they lived beyond Palestine, or in the Dispersion. Such are the plain characteristics, national and religious, of the persons addressed. There are, however, two extremes of religious opinion about them. Some, as Lardner, Macknight, Theile, Credner, and Hug, imagine that the epistle is meant for *all Jews.* But the inscription forbids such a supposition. The tone of the epistle implies that "the servant of the Lord Jesus Christ" addressed fellow-believers—"brethren"—"begotten" along with himself (ἡμᾶς) "by the word of truth," and all of them bearing the "good name" (καλὸν ὄνομα). The first verse of the second chapter implies also that they held "the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory," and they are exhorted not to hold it inconsistently, along with manifest respect of persons, or showing unfounded social preferences. They are told besides, in v, 7, to exercise patience, ἕως τῆς παρου-

σίας τοῦ Κυρίου, till the public promised advent of the Lord their Saviour. The rich men denounced in v, 1 may not have belonged to the Church in reality, but this startling denunciation carried in it warning to them and comfort to the poor and persecuted. May there not be, in a letter to a church, holy invective against those without it, who annoy and oppress its unresisting members? Dean Alford, after Huther, inclines to include in the διασπορά Jews also in Palestine—Judæa being regarded as the centre. He refers to the phrase, Acts viii, 1 (πάντες δὲ διεσπάρησαν κατὰ τὰς χώρας τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας). But the use of the verb here in its general sense and in an easy narrative cannot modify the popular meaning of διασπορά as the technical or geographic title of Jews beyond Palestine.

On the other hand, it has been maintained by Köster (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1831), Kern, Neudecker, and De Wette, that the title in the inscription is a symbolic one, and signifies simply Christians out of Palestine, as the true Israel of God. A modification of this view is held by others, viz., that while the epistle is addressed to believing Jews, believing heathen and unconverted Jews are not excluded. But the phrase in the inscription, as in Acts xxvi, 7, is to be taken in its natural sense, and with no spiritualized meaning or reference. The entire tone and aspect also are Jewish. The place of ecclesiastical meeting is συναγωγή; the law, νόμος, is of supreme authority. The divine unity is a primary and distinctive article of faith, the ordinary terms of Jewish obtestation are introduced, as is also the prophetic epithet symbolizing spiritual unfaithfulness, μοιχαλίδες (iv, 4). Anointing with oil is mentioned, and the special regard to be paid (i, 27) to orphans and widows finds its basis in repeated statutes of the Mosaic law. The errors refuted also are such as naturally arose out of Pharisaic pride and formalism, and the acceptance of the promised Christ in a spirit of traditional carnality. The fact that the Dispersion was found principally in the East—that is, in Syria and adjacent countries—countenances the presumption that this epistle is found in the Peshito at so early a period because it had immediate circulation in that region, and there had proved the fitness and usefulness of its counsels and warning. Josephus says of the Dispersion, that the Jews were scattered everywhere, πλεῖστον δὲ τῇ Συρίᾳ ἀναμεμιγμένον (*War*, vii, 3, 3). The persons addressed were poor; the rich were their persecutors, their own partialities and preferences were worldly and inconsistent; they wanted perfect confidence in God, and stumbled at the divine dispensations; sins of the tongue were common, eagerness to be public teachers was an epidemic among them; they spoke rashly and hardly of one another; and they felt not the connection between a living faith and a holy life. Society was under a process of apparent disintegration, wars and fightings were frequent, with loss of life and property. Its extremes were the rich and the poor, with no middle class between; for, though tradings and journeyings quite in Jewish style are referred to (iv, 13, 14), the principal occupation was husbandry, with no social grade between those who owned and those who reaped the fields. See DISPERSION.

IV. *Time and place of writing the Epistle.*—The place most probably was Jerusalem, where James had his residence. Many allusions in the epistle, while they apply to almost any Eastern locality, carry in them a presumption in favor of that country, in the metropolis of which James is known to have lived and labored. These allusions are to such natural phenomena as parching winds, ver. 1-11; long drought, v, 17, 18; the early and latter rain, v, 7; saline springs, iii, 12; proximity to the sea, i, 6; iii, 4 (Hug's *Einleitung*, ii, 439). Naturally from the holy capital of Judæa goes forth from the "servant of the Lord Jesus Christ" a solemn circular to all the believing brethren in the Dispersion—for to them James was a living authority to which they bowed, and Jerusalem a holy centre that stirred a thousand loyal associations within them.

It is not so easy to determine the time at which the epistle was written. Many place the date about the year 60—close on the martyrdom of James the Just, or not long before the destruction of Jerusalem—as Michaelis, Pearson, Mill, Guericke, Burton, Macknight, Bleek (*Einleit.* p. 547, 1862), and the older commentators generally. Hug and De Wette place it after the Epistle to the Hebrews, to which they imagine it contains some allusions—Hug holding that it was written (überlegt) on set purpose against Paul and his doctrine of justification by faith. So also Baur (*Paulus*, p. 677). But these reasons are by no means conclusive. The great argument that the Epistle of James was written to oppose either the doctrine or counteract the abuses of the doctrine of justification by faith has, as we shall see, no foundation. The notion that this epistle is in some sense corrective in its tone and purpose appears plausible to us, as Paul is so usually read by us before James that we gain an earlier acquaintance with him, while James occupies also a later place in the ordinary arrangement of the books of the New Testament.

But it is claimed by many that the state of the Judæo-Christians addressed in the epistle is not that which we know to have existed at and before the year 60. There is no allusion to the fierce disputations as to the value and permanence of circumcision, the authority and meaning of the ceremonial law, or the conditions on which Gentile converts should be admitted into the Church—the questions discussed at the Council of Jerusalem. Controversies on these points, it is asserted, saturated the Church during many years before the fall of Jerusalem, and no one could address Jewish converts at any length without some allusion to them. The myriads who believed, as James said, were "all zealous of the law" (Acts xxi, 20); and that zeal assumed so many false shapes, threw up so many barriers in the way of ecclesiastical relationship, nay, occasionally so infringed on the unconditioned freeness of the Gospel as to rob it of its simplicity and power, that no Jew addressing Jewish believers with the authority and from the position of James could fail to dwell on those disturbing and engrossing peculiarities. The inference, therefore, on the part of many critics, is, that the epistle was written prior to those keen and universal discussions, and to that state of the Church which gave them origin and continuance; prior, therefore, also to the time when the labors of the apostle Paul among the Gentiles called such attention to their success that "certain from James came down" to Antioch to examine for themselves and carry back a report to the mother Church in Jerusalem (Acts xv; Gal. ii). The epistle, on this view, might be written shortly before the Council of Jerusalem—probably about the year 45. Such is the opinion of Neander, Schneckenburger, Theile, Thiersch, Huther, Davidson, and Alford.

On the other hand, Wiesinger and Bleek justly object that the interval supposed is too limited for such a growth of Christianity as this epistle implies. Moreover, although the argument in favor of an early date, drawn from the supposed design of counteracting the misinterpretation of some of Paul's doctrines (comp. 2 Pet. iii, 16), is scarcely tenable, yet the epistle manifestly presupposes such a general intelligence of Gospel terms and truth as could hardly have obtained, especially abroad, so early as prior to the first council at Jerusalem (Acts xv). Indeed, many of the above arguments in favor of this very early date are self-contradictory; for it was precisely at this period that the disputes and controversies in question raged most fiercely, not having yet been authoritatively determined by any ecclesiastical consultation (comp. Paul's strong contention with Peter and Barnabas); whereas the official edict of that council precluded any further public discussion. In this respect the Epistle of James will fairly compare with that to the Hebrews, written about the same time. The reasoning, however, may be allowed to hold good against so late a date as immediately preceding Jerusalem's

fall (so Macknight infers from v, 1); for at that time the old controversy appears to have been somewhat revived. De Wette adduces the allusion to the name "Christians" in ii, 7, as an evidence in favor of the late date; but this would only require a date later than that of Acts xi, 26. On the whole, the evidence decidedly preponderates in favor of the interval between Paul's two imprisonments at Rome, or about A.D. 62.

V. *Object of Writing.*—The main design of the epistle is not to teach doctrine, but to improve morality. James is the moral teacher of the N. Test.; not in such sense a moral teacher as not to be at the same time a maintainer and teacher of Christian doctrine, but yet mainly in this epistle a moral teacher. There are two ways of explaining this characteristic of the epistle. Some commentators and writers see in James a man who had not realized the essential principles and peculiarities of Christianity, but was in a transition state, half Jew and half Christian. Schneckenburger thinks that Christianity had not penetrated his spiritual life. Neander is of much the same opinion (*Pflanzung und Leitung*, p. 579). The same notion may perhaps be traced in Prof. Stanley and dean Alford. But there is another and much more natural way of accounting for the fact. James was writing for a special class of persons, and knew what that class especially needed; and therefore, under the guidance of God's Spirit, he adapted his instructions to their capacities and wants. Those for whom he wrote were, as we have said, the Jewish Christians, whether in Jerusalem or abroad. James, living in the centre of Judaism, saw what were the chief sins and vices of his countrymen, and, fearing that his flock might share in them, he lifted up his voice to warn them against the contagion from which they not only might, but did in part suffer. This was his main object; but there is another closely connected with it. As Christians, his readers were exposed to trials which they did not bear with the patience and faith that would have become them. Here, then, are the two objects of the epistle: 1. To warn against the sins to which, as Jews, they were most liable. 2. To console and exhort them under the sufferings to which, as Christians, they were most exposed. The warnings and consolations are mixed together, for the writer does not seem to have set himself down to compose an essay or a letter of which he had previously arranged the heads; but, like one of the old prophets, to have poured out what was uppermost in his thoughts, or closest to his heart, without waiting to connect his matter, or to throw bridges across from subject to subject. While, in the purity of his Greek and the vigor of his thoughts, we mark a man of education, in the abruptness of his transitions and the unpolished roughness of his style we may trace one of the family of the Davideans, who disarmed Domitian by the simplicity of their minds, and by exhibiting their hands hard with toil (Hegesippus *apud Euseb.* iii, 20.

The Jewish vices against which he warns them are—formalism, which made the service (θρησκεία) of God consist in washings and outward ceremonies, whereas he reminds them (i, 27) that it consists rather in active love and purity (see Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*, Aph. 23; note also active love = Bp. Butler's "benevolence," and purity = Bp. Butler's "temperance"); fanaticism, which, under the cloak of religious zeal, was tearing Jerusalem to pieces (i, 20); fatalism, which threw its sins on God (i, 13); meanness, which crouched before the rich (ii, 2); falsehood, which had made words and oaths playthings (iii, 2-12); partisanship (iii, 14); evil speaking (iv, 11); boasting (iv, 16); oppression (v, 4). The great lesson which he teaches them, as Christians, is patience—patience in trial (i, 2); patience in good works (i, 22-25); patience under provocations (iii, 17); patience under oppression (v, 7); patience under persecution (v, 10); and the ground of their patience is, that the coming of the Lord draweth nigh, which is to right all wrongs (v, 8).

VI. There are two points in the epistle which demand a somewhat more lengthened notice. These are, (*a*) ii, 14-26, which has been represented as a formal opposition to Paul's doctrine of justification by faith; and (*b*) v, 14, 15, which is quoted as the authority for the sacrament of extreme unction.

(*a*) Justification being an act, not of man, but of God, both the phrases "justification by faith" and "justification by works" are inexact. Justification must either be by grace or of reward. Therefore our question is, Did or did not James hold justification by grace? If he did, there is no contradiction between the apostles. Now there is not one word in James to the effect that a man can *earn* his justification by works; and this would be necessary in order to prove that he held justification of reward. Still Paul does use the expression "justified by faith" (Rom. v, 1), and James the expression "justified by works, not by faith only." Here is an apparent opposition. But, if we consider the meaning of the two apostles, we see at once that there is no contradiction either intended or possible. Paul was opposing the Judaizing party, which claimed to earn acceptance by good works, whether the works of the Mosaic law, or works of piety done by themselves. In opposition to these, Paul lays down the great truth that acceptance cannot be earned by man at all, but is the free gift of God to the Christian man, for the sake of the merits of Jesus Christ, appropriated by each individual, and made his own by the instrumentality of faith. James, on the other hand, was opposing the old Jewish tenet that to be a child of Abraham was all in all; that godliness was not necessary, if but the belief was correct. This presumptuous confidence had transferred itself, with perhaps double force, to the Christianized Jews. They had said, "Lord, Lord," and that was enough, without doing his Father's will. They had recognised the Messiah: what more was wanted? They had *faith:* what more was required of them? It is plain that their "faith" was a totally different thing from the "faith" of Paul. Paul tells us again and again that his "faith" is a "faith that worketh by love;" but the very characteristic of the "faith" which James is attacking, and the very reason why he attacked it, was that it did not work by love, but was a bare assent of the head, not influencing the heart; a faith such as devils can have, and tremble. James tells us that "*fides informis*" is not sufficient on the part of man for justification; Paul tells us that "*fides formata*" is sufficient: and the reason why *fides informis* will not justify us is, according to James, because it lacks that special quality, the addition of which constitutes its *fides formata.* See, on this subject, Bull's *Harmonia Apostolica et Examen Censuræ;* Taylor's *Sermon on "Faith working by Love,"* viii, 284 (Lond. 1850); and, as a corrective of Bull's view, Laurence's *Bampton Lectures*, iv, v, vi. Other discussions may be found in Knapp, *Scripta*, p. 511; Reuss, *Théologie*, ii, 524; Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i, 639; Wardlaw's *Sermons;* Wood's *Theology*, ii, 408; Watson's *Institutes*, ii, 614; Lechler, *Das Apostol. und nachapostolische Zeitalter*, p. 163. For monographs, see Walch, *Biblische Theologie*, iv, 941; Danz, *Wörterbuch*, s. v. Jacobus. See JUSTIFICATION; FAITH.

(*b*) With respect to v, 14, 15, it is enough to say that the ceremony of extreme unction and the ceremony described by James differ both in their subject and in their object. The subject of extreme unction is a sick man who is about to die, and its object is not his cure. The subject of the ceremony described by James is a sick man who is not about to die, and its object is his cure, together with the spiritual benefit of absolution. James is plainly giving directions with respect to the manner of administering one of those extraordinary gifts of the Spirit with which the Church was endowed only in the apostolic age and the age immediately succeeding the apostles.

VII. *Contents.*—The errors and sins against which James warns his readers are such as arose out of their

situation. *Perfection*—τελειότης is a prominent idea, and τέλειος is a frequent epithet—the "perfect work" of patience, the "perfect" gift of God, the "perfect law" of liberty or the new covenant, faith "made perfect," and the tongue-governing man is a "perfect man." He writes from a knowledge of their circumstances, does not set before them an ethical system for their leisurely study, but selects the vices of opinion and life to which their circumstances so markedly and so naturally exposed them. Patience is a primary inculcation, it being essential to that perfection which is his central thought. Trials develop patience, and such evils as produce trials are not to be ascribed in a spirit of fatalism to God. Spiritual life is enjoyed by believers, and is fostered by the reception, and specially by the doing of the word; and true religious service is unworldly and disinterested beneficence. Partial preferences are forbidden by the royal law—faith without works is dead—tongue and temper are to be under special guard, and under the control of wisdom—the deceits of casuistry are to be eschewed—contentious covetousness is to be avoided as one of the works of the devil, along with censorious pride. Rich oppressors are denounced, and patience is enjoined on all; the fitting exercises in times of gladness and of sickness are prescribed; the efficacy of prayer is extolled and exemplified; while the conclusion animates his readers to do for others what he has been doing for them—to convert them "from the error of their way" (see Stanley's *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age*, p. 297).

The epistle contains no allusion to the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, though they are implied. It was not the writer's object either to discuss or defend them. It would be unwarranted, on that account, to say that Christianity had not penetrated his own spiritual life, or that he was only in a transition state between Judaism and Christianity. He might not, indeed, have the free and unnational views of Paul in presenting the Gospel. But a true Christianity is implied, and his immediate work lay in enforcing certain Christian duties, which he does in the style of the Master himself.

VIII. *Style and Language.*—The similarity of this epistle in tone and form to the Sermon on the Mount has often been remarked. In the spirit of the Great Teacher, he sharply reprobates all externalism, all selfishness, inconsistency, worldliness, ostentation, self-deception, and hypocrisy. Thus in the first chapter as a sample. comp. i, 2, Matt. v, 10–12; i, 4, Matt. v, 48; i, 5, Matt. vii, 7, i, 9, Matt. v, 3; i, 20, Matt. v, 22, etc. The epistle, in short, is a long and earnest illustration of the final warning given by our Lord in the figures of building on the rock and building on the sand. The composition is the abrupt and stern utterance of an earnest, practical soul—a rapid series of censures and counsels—not entirely disconnected, but generally suggested by some inner link of association. Often a general law is epigrammatically laid down, while a peculiar sin is reprobated or a peculiar virtue enforced—or a principle is announced in the application of it. The style is vigorous—full of imperatives so solemn and categorical as to dispel all idea of resistance or compromise, and of interrogations so pointed that they carry their answer with them. It is also marked by epithets so bold and forcible that they give freshness and color to the diction. The clauses have a rhetorical beauty and power, and as in men of fervent oratorical temperament, the words often fall into rhythmical order, while the thoughts occasionally blossom into poetry. An accidental hexameter is found in i, 17 [provided it be lawful to make the last syllable of δόσις long].

The Greek is remarkably pure, and it is difficult to account for this comparative purity. Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius, says that James's believing brethren desired him to address the crowds assembled at the Passover; for there were brought together "all the tribes, with also the Gentiles"—πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ μετὰ καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν; and Greek must have been the language employed. It is therefore quite preposterous on the part of Bolten, Betholdt, and Schott to suspect that the Greek of this epistle is a translation from an Aramæan original.

Resemblances have sometimes been traced between this epistle and the first Epistle of Peter, and these may be accounted for by the fact that both authors were somewhat similarly circumstanced in relation to their readers. But Hug's and Bleek's inference is a rash one—that Peter must have read the epistle of James.

In a word, the Epistle of James is a noble protest against laxity of morals—against supine and easy acquiescence in the truths of the Gospel without feeling their power or acting under their influence, while it presents such ethical lessons as the Church, placed in multiple relations to a world of sense and trial, has ever need of to animate and sustain it in its progress towards perfection.

IX. *Commentaries.*—The following are the exegetical treatises expressly on the whole epistle; to a few of the most important we prefix an asterisk (*): Didymus Alexandrinus, *In Ep. Jacobi* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* v, 320); Althamer, *Auslegung* (Arg. 1527, 8vo); Zuingle, *Adnotationes* (Tigur. 1533. 8vo; also in *Opp.* iv, 534); Foleng, *Commentarius* (Lugdun. 1555, 8vo); Logenhagen, *Adnotationes* (Antw. 1571, 8vo; 1572, 12mo); Heminge, *Commentary* (London, 1577, 4to); Feuardent, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1599, 8vo); Rung, *Commentarius* (Wittenb. 1600, 8vo); Bracche, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1605, 4to); Turnbull, *Lectures* (Lond. 1606, 4to); Winckelmann, *Explicatio* (Giess. 1608, 8vo); Steuart, *Commentarius* (Ingolst. 1610, 4to); Paez, *Commentaria* (Antwerp, 1617, 1623: Lugd. 1620, 4to); Lorin, *Commentarius* [includ. Jude] (Moguut. 1622; Colon. 1633, fol.); Wolzogen, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.*); Laurent, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1635, 1662, 4to); Kerner, *Predigten* (Ulm, 1639, 8vo); Mayer, *Exposition* (London, 1639, 4to); Price, *Commentarii* (Lond. 1646, fol.; also in the *Crit. Sacri*); *Manton, *Commentary* (London, 1653, 4to; 1840, 1842, 1844, 8vo); Brochmand, *Commentarius* (Hafn. 1641, 1706, 4to; Frankfurt, 1658, fol.); Schmidt, *Disputationes* [includ. Ephes. etc.] (Argent. 1685, 1699, 4to); Creid, *Predigten* (Frankf. 1694, 8vo); Smith, *Vitbreiding* (Amst. 1698, 4to); Creyghton, *Verklaaring* [includ. John's ep.] (Franeck. 1704, 4to); Griebner, *Predigten* (Lpz. 1720, 8vo); Grammlich, *Anmerk.* (Stuttgard, 1721, 8vo); Michaelis, *Introductio* (Hal. 1722, 4to); Benson, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1738, 4to; with the other cath. ep. ib. 1749, 1756, 4to; in Latin, Hal. 1747, 4to); Heisen, *Dissertationes* (Brem. 1739, 4to); Janson, *Verklaar.* (Gron. 1742, 4to); Damm, *Anmerk.* (Berl. 1747, 8vo); Baumgarten, *Auslegung* (Hal. 1750, 4to); Semler, *Paraphrasis* (Hal. 1781; in Germ. Potsd. 1789); Storr, *Dissertationes* (Tüb. 1784, 4to; also in his *Opusc. Acad.* ii, 1–74); E. F. K. Rosenmüller, *Anmerk.* (Leipzig, 1787, 8vo); Morus, *Prælectiones* [including Pet.] (Lips. 1794, 8vo); Goltz, *Verklaaring* (Amster. 1798, 4to); Scherer, *Erklär.* (vol. i, Marb. 1799, 8vo); Antonio, *Verklaaringe* (Leyd. 1799, 4to); Hensler, *Erläut.* (Hamb. 1801, 8vo); Clarisse, *Bearbeid.* (Amst. 1802, 8vo); Stuart, *Verklaar.* (Amst. 1806, 8vo); Van Kosten, *Verklaaring* (Amst. 1821, 8vo); *Schulthess, *Commentar.* (Turici, 1824, 8vo); Gebser, *Erklär.* (Berl. 1828, 8vo); *Schneckenburger, *Annot.* (Stuttg. 1832, 8vo); *Theile, *Commentar.* (Lipsiæ, 1833, 8vo); Jacobi, *Predigten* (Berl. 1835, 8vo; tr. by Ryland, London, 1838, 8vo); Kern, *Erklärung* (Tüb. 1838, 8vo); Scharling, *Commentarius* [including Jude] (Havn. 1840, 8vo); *Stier, *Auslegung* (Barmen, 1845, 8vo); Cellerier, *Commentaire* (Par. 1850, 8vo); Stanley, *Sermons* (in *Sermons and Essays*, p. 291); *Neander, *Erläuter.* (Berlin, 1850, 8vo, being vol. vi of his ed. of the *Heilige Schrift.*; tr. by Mrs. Conant, N. Y. 1852, 12mo); Dräseke, *Predigten* (Lpz. 1851, 8vo); Patterson, *Commentary* (in the *Jour. of Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1851, p. 250 sq.); *Wiesinger, *Commentar* (Königs. 1854, 8vo, being vol. vi of Olshausen's Commentary); Viedebrandt, *Bibelstunden* (Berl. 1859, 8vo); Porubszky, *Predigten* (Vienna, 1861, 8vo); Wardlaw, *Lectures* (London, 1862, 12mo); Hermann [edit. Bouman],

Commentarius (Tr. ad Rh. 1865, 8vo); *Adam, *Discourses* (Edinb. 1867, 8vo); Ewald, *Erklärung* [includ. Heb.] (Gött. 1870, 8vo). See EPISTLE.

JAMES, SPURIOUS WRITINGS OF.—The following pseudepigraphal works have been attributed to the apostle James: 1. The *Protevangelium*. 2. *Historia de Nativitate Mariæ*. 3. *De miraculis infantiæ Domini nostri*, etc. Of these, the *Protevangelium* is worth a passing notice, not for its contents, which are a mere parody on the early chapters of Luke, transferring the events which occurred at our Lord's birth to the birth of Mary his mother, but because it appears to have been early known in the Church. It is possible that Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tryph.* c. lxxviii) and Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata*, lib. viii) refer to it. Origen speaks of it (*in Matt.* xiii, 55); Gregory Nyssen (*Opp.* p. 346, edit. Paris), Epiphanius (*Hær.* lxxix), John Damascene (*Orat.* i, ii, *in Nativ. Mariæ*), Photius (*Orat. in Nativ. Mariæ*), and others, allude to it. It was first published in Latin in 1552, in Greek in 1564. The oldest MS. of it now existing is of the 10th century. (See Thilo's *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, i, 45, 108, 159, 337, Lips. 1852.) See APOCRYPHA.

James, St. (OF COMPOSTELLA), CHURCH OF, a very famous church in Spain, dedicated to St. James Major, the patron saint of the kingdom. A wooden bust of the saint, with tapers ever burning before it, has stood on the high altar for nine hundred years, and the church is the resort of numerous pilgrims, who kiss the image. Miracles are ascribed to St. James, such as appearing on a white horse defeating the Moors. See COMPOSTELLA.

James's, St., DAY, is a festival in some churches, falling in the Western churches on the 25th of July, and in the Eastern on the 23d of October, and commemorating St. James the Elder, son of Zebedee, and brother of St. John. No trace of this festival at an early period can be found in any country but Spain. James was the first of the apostles that suffered martyrdom. This particular day was chosen for the commemoration, not with reference to the date of the apostle's death, which took place probably a little before Easter, but in connection with the legend of a miraculous translation of the relic of the apostle from Palestine to Compostella, in Spain.

James, St. (THE LESS), FESTIVAL OF. See ST. PHILIP.

James, St., LITURGY OF, a form of service which was very early used in the patriarchate of Antioch; the Monophysites using it in Syriac and the orthodox in Greek, this last having in it many interpolations from the liturgies of other places. Palmer, in his *Origines Liturgicæ*, with which Neale (*Introd. East. Ch.* p. 318) agrees, says, "There are satisfactory means of ascertaining the order, substance, and generally the expressions of the solemn liturgy used all through the patriarchate of Antioch and Jerusalem before the year 451; that the liturgy thus ascertained coincides with the notices which the fathers of that country give concerning their liturgy during the 5th and 4th centuries; that this liturgy was used in the whole patriarchate of Antioch in the 4th century with little variety; that it prevailed there in the 3d century, and even in the 2d. The liturgy of St. James may therefore be considered to have originated near the time of the birth of Christianity; at least in the first century of our æra" (comp. Neale, *Introd. East. Ch.* bk. iii, ch. i, especially p. 319).

James OF EDESSA, etc. See JACOB OF EDESSA, etc.

James I OF ENGLAND and VI OF SCOTLAND was the only offspring of Mary, queen of Scots, by her second husband, Henry Stuart, lord Darnley, who, through his father, Matthew Stuart, earl of Lennox, being descended from a daughter of James II, had some pretensions to the succession of the Scottish throne in case of Mary dying without issue. He was the grandson, as Mary was the granddaughter, of Margaret Tudor, through whom the Scottish line claimed and eventually obtained the inheritance of the crown of England after the failure of the descendants of Henry VIII. The son of Mary and Darnley (or king Henry, as he was called after his marriage) was born in the castle of Edinburgh June 19, 1566, and was baptized according to the Roman Catholic ritual in Stirling Castle December 17 following, by the names of Charles James. The murder of Darnley took place Feb. 18, 1567, and was followed by Mary's marriage with Bothwell on May 15 of the same year; her capture by the insurgent nobles, or Lords of the Congregation as they called themselves, at Carberry, on June 14; her consignment as a prisoner to the castle of Lochleven on the 17th, and her forced resignation of the crown on July 24, in favor of her son, who was crowned at Stirling on the 28th as James VI, being then an infant of a little more than a year old. It was at this time that the final struggle was raging in Scotland between the two great interests of the old and the new religion, which, besides their intrinsic importance, were respectively identified with the French and the English alliance, and which, together with the old and the new distribution of the property of the kingdom, made the minority of James stormy beyond even the ordinary experience of Scottish minorities. Before his mother's marriage with Bothwell he had been committed by her to the care of the earl of Mar; and James's education was mainly intrusted to Mar's brother, Alexander Erskine, and other distinguished Scotch scholars, among whom figured most prominently the Protestant George Buchanan, a zealous adherent of the Presbyterian Church. During the minority of the young king, the earl of Morton had been assigned the regency; but James's guardians being anxious to control themselves the affairs of state, in 1578 Morton was driven from power, and James nominally assumed the direction of affairs. Morton, however, soon succeeded in re-establishing himself, and held the government for another short period, when he was finally deposed, and the young king again obtained the control of state affairs. He was at this time only twelve years of age, and was assisted by a council of twelve nobles. Once more great rejoicings were manifest throughout the land. All parties hailed the event as the inauguration of a new æra, and to all it seemed to bring the prospects of power and prosperity. Presbyterians relied on the early training of the prince; Romanists on the descendency of the young ruler, and, regarding his mother as in some sense a martyr to their cause, supposed that it would naturally enough influence James to incline to, if not openly espouse Romanism. The pope wrote pleasant letters to the young monarch, and Jesuits were dispatched with all haste to serve, in the garb of Puritans, the cause of Rome. The greater, then, was the discontent among his Roman Catholic subjects when James showed predilections for the Presbyterian Church. Shortly after his accession, the "Book of Policy," which up to our day remains the guide of the Scottish Church in ecclesiastical government and other affairs of a similar nature, was issued. Another very important step taken was the publication of a confession of faith by the General Assembly, which the king approved and swore to (comp. Sack, *Church of Scotland*, ii, 5 sq.). New presbyteries were established throughout the realm, and it seemed as if the Puritans were to be the only favorites, when, on a sudden, by a successful conspiracy of a party of nobles, James was imprisoned, with the endeavor to force him to more favorable actions in behalf of his Roman Catholic subjects. The whole affair is known in English history as the "Raid of Ruthven." A counterplot in 1583 secured the freedom of the monarch, but from henceforth a new policy was inaugurated, in which he was wholly controlled by the nobles of his court. In 1584 five resolutions were published, known as the "black resolutions," which aimed at the total abrogation of the Pres-

byterian Church. Severe persecutions followed, and it seemed for a time as if James had actually turned to Romanism. After the death of his mother, Elizabeth courted the favor of James, and a treaty was finally concluded between them, by which the two kingdoms bound themselves to an offensive and defensive alliance against all foreign powers who should invade their territories, or attempt to disturb the reformed religious establishments of either. This action, of course, at once favored the Protestant subjects of James; for his severity assumed towards them previous to this alliance was due, no doubt, to his endeavor to secure, in view of the persecution of his mother by Elizabeth, an alliance with Spain, a strong Roman Catholic power. It was supposed that the execution of his mother would naturally drive him to an alliance with Spain, but James, although "he blustered at first under the sting of the insult that had been offered him," was soon pacified, reflecting upon the necessity of a friendly relation with Elizabeth if he would maintain his chance for the English throne. Accordingly, James lent his assistance to Elizabeth in the preparations to repel the attack of the Spanish armada. Still more gracious seemed the attitude of James towards the Puritans on his return from Norway (1589), whither he had gone to espouse princess Anne, the second daughter of Frederick II, king of Denmark. At the meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterians in 1590 he attended and spoke highly of their establishment, and in 1592 he caused, by an act of Parliament, the establishment of the Presbyterian Church as a national form of religion. This action the Scottish Church regarded as their true charter, but they soon learned that James had only favored them because outward circumstances had necessitated this course, and that inwardly he had changed to an avowed admirer of episcopacy, and inclined even towards popery; "so that the alliance of Church and State in this case was one of a very frangible nature." To make matters worse, both parties cherished the loftiest opinions of their powers and rights. Various unsuccessful treasonable attempts against the government had kept the people in a high pressure of excitement, and when it was ascertained that these attempts were supported, if not instigated, by the court and nobility of Spain, having for their especial object the intimidation of the irresolute monarch, and the re-establishment of Romanism, first in Scotland, and finally in England also, the people desired the severe punishment of the traitors. James, however, inflicted only a very mild punishment, and the dissatisfied multitude began loudly to condemn the policy of their king. The Church also criticised James's course, and a contest ensued that assumed very much the appearance of the commencement of a civil war. Nearly all the aristocracy and the upper classes, however, were with the king; and by an unusual exertion of vigor and firmness, very seldom manifested in his personal history, James was enabled not only completely to crush the insurrection, but to turn the occasion to account in bringing the Church into full subjection to the civil authority. In the course of the following year, 1598, the substance of episcopacy, which James by this time had come to espouse openly, and in which he was governed by the maxim "No bishop, no king," was restored, in a political sense, by seats in Parliament being given to about fifty ecclesiastics on the royal nomination. Even the General Assembly was gained over to acquiesce in this great constitutional change.

By the death of Elizabeth in 1603 James finally reached the object for which he had striven for many years, and which had induced him even to court the favor of the murderer of his own mother. On March 24 he succeeded to the throne of England, and by virtue of this act became spiritual head of the Church of England. "That Church had already enjoyed the honor of having the grossest of voluptuaries for its supreme head; it was now to enjoy the honor of having the greatest liar, and one of the greatest drunkards of his age, in the same position" (Skeats). As in the Church of Scotland the contest had been waged between Romanists and Protestants for the favor of the throne, so in England the Established Church, the Episcopal, and the Puritans were arrayed against each other, and James was called upon to settle the dispute. Biased in favor of the episcopacy, James, however, decided on a conference of the two parties, anxious to display his "proficiency in theology," and "determined on giving both sides an opportunity of applauding his polemical skill, and making his chosen line of conduct at least appear to result from partial inquiry" (Baxter, *Engl. Ch. History*, p. 550). As yet no separation had taken place, neither had the Puritans even renounced episcopacy, nor did they question regal supremacy; they only objected to being bound against the dictates of their conscience to the observance of certain performances; they desired purity of doctrine, good pastors, a reform in Church government and in the Book of Common Prayer; in short, a removal of all usages which savored of Romanism. A conference (q. v.) was consequently assembled at Hampton Court in January, 1604, and the points of difference discussed in James's presence, he himself taking, as might have been expected, a conspicuous and most undignified part. "Church writers, in dealing with this subject, have felt compelled to employ language of shame and indignation at the conduct of the king and the bishops of this period, which a Nonconformist would almost hesitate to use" (Skeats). On the episcopal side appeared archbishop Whitgift, assisted by bishops Bancroft, Bilson, and others; on the side of the Puritans appeared four divines, headed by the celebrated Dr. Reynolds, at that time president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. "It is obvious, from the whole proceedings, that the conference was summoned for a purpose opposed to its ostensible aim. It was not intended to bring the two parties in the Church into harmony, but to give occasion for casting out one of them" (Skeats). The attitude of the king pleased the church men, and "the prelates accepted him with devout gratitude. The more his character became revealed to them, the greater was their satisfaction. When he almost swore at the Puritans, Whitgift declared that his majesty spoke by the especial assistance of God's Spirit (comp. Baxter, *Ch. Hist. of England*, p. 559), and Bancroft that he was melted with joy, for that, since Christ's time, such a king had not been. When he drivelled they held up their hands in amaze at his wisdom." Indeed, it seems that "the two parties fully understood each other. James had quite sufficient cunning to detect the ambitious designs of the prelates, and the prelates had sufficient learning, and sufficient knowledge of the theory of morals, to know that they were dealing with a dissembler and a fool. But it served their purposes to play into each other's hands. The king could put down Puritanism in the Church, and 'harry' all Brownists and Anabaptists out of the land, and the bishops, in their turn, could exalt the supremacy of the monarch" (Skeats). But, as if the ungenerous and ungracious action of the king had not yet reached the climax, the Hampton Court Conference Convocation met in the year following, and framed a new set of canons to insure conformity. "These laws—laws so far as the clergy are concerned—still deface the constitution and character of the English Episcopalian Church.... They are now little else than monuments of a past age of intolerance, and of the combined immobility and timidity of the ecclesiastical establishments of the present day. Old bloodhounds of the Church, with their teeth drawn and their force exhausted, they are gazed at with as much contempt as they once excited fear" (Skeats). Baxter (p. 563) says of these laws, "Some of them have become obsolete, others inoperative through counter legislation; but no consistent clergyman can forget that they constitute the rule of his pledged obedience, although *there may* be cases in which attention to the

spirit rather than the letter will best insure the object of their enactment." But some good sprang also from the Hampton Court Conference; results which none probably had anticipated. "Reynolds, the Puritan, had suggested a new translation of the Bible by his majesty's special sanction and authority. The vanity of the king was touched, and the great work was ordered to be executed." See ENGLISH VERSIONS. But what, perhaps, decided him in his course, if decision could ever become manifest in the actions of James I, to identify himseif wholly with the Episcopalians, was the *gunpowder plot* (q. v.), which was maturing about this time (1604–5). It exterminated in James the last vestiges of favor for Romanism when he found that from Rome he never could expect anything but a death-warrant unless the English Church changed to a Roman Catholic State Church. And if James had declared in Parliament in 1604 "that he had never any intention of granting toleration to the Catholics," he could now be justified in adding "that he would drive every one of them from the land," as he did threaten to do towards all Nonconformists. As if the conspiracy, which had fortunately failed, was not worthy the censure even of Rome, but deserved commendation, one of the principal leaders, the Jesuit Garnet, was even canonized by the Roman court, of course not openly on the strength of his assistance in the diabolical project, but "on the faith of a *pretended miracle*, his face having, *it was said*, been seen in a straw sprinkled with his blood." Thus Rome "did its very best to identify, or at least to confound, one of the most diabolical projects ever conceived, with the evidences of transcendent sanctity" (Baxter, p. 565), and for Rome's treachery the honest Puritans of England were made to suffer. The policy of the king (who by this time had assumed the title of king of Great Britain) was, however, not to be confined to England. In Scotland also the power of the Puritans was to be utterly broken, and the episcopate to be re-established. In August, 1606, a Parliament was held at Perth which had this object in view, and the decision arrived at, by a union of the nobility and the prelatical faction, to erect seventeen bishoprics, and to bestow on these newly-created prelates the benefices, honors, and privileges heretofore awarded to those of the Roman Catholic Church. After having properly disposed of the leaders of the Scottish Church, a General Assembly was unconstitutionally convened at Linlithgow on Dec. 10, 1606. As most of the synods opposed its acts, new persecutions were the issue. Feb. 16, 1610, the king established two ecclesiastical tribunals, to be presided over by the two archbishops, and designated these tribunals as "Courts of High Commission," uniting the two shortly after their establishment. This ecclesiastical tribunal, a sort of Inquisition, combined the attributes of a temporal and spiritual tribunal; but it was bound to no definite laws, and was armed with the united terrors of civil and ecclesiastical despotism. On June 8, 1610, a meeting was finally held at Glasgow, and there, by means of bribes, which are said to have reached the not inconsiderable sum of £300,000 sterling, the prelatical measures were carried, and all opposition nominally overcome. But the people by no means seemed ready to coincide with the opinion of the king, and many were the disturbances that prevailed throughout the land. Whatever work had to be done to further the royal schemes was done quietly, and no General Assembly met until August, 1616, this time held at Aberdeen, and especially celebrated in the history of Scotland by the issue of a new confession of faith projected by the prelatical party, and which, although tolerably orthodox, was remarkably at variance with the discipline of the Established Church. Affairs assumed another and more serious turn in the summer of 1617, when James, on a visit which he paid to Scotland, succeeded, though not without great difficulty, in securing from Parliament, which he had newly summoned, as well as from the General Assembly, the approbation of such regulations as, along with other innovations previously made since his accession to the throne of England, brought the Scottish Church—in government, in ceremonies, and in its position in relation to the civil power—very nearly to the model of the ecclesiastical establishment of England. Change, however, as the king might, the constitution and ordinances, almost without number, published again and again, public opinion by no means altered even for a moment, and the 19th century still finds Scotland true to her Puritanic notions of the 16th century. The king had succeeded in securing the adoption of the "five articles of Perth" (q. v.); he had succeeded in suppressing the Scotch Presbyterian Church, but he failed to conquer it.

In England, also, the shortsighted policy of James now brought distrust and discredit. The execution of Raleigh and the denial of assistance to the Protestant Bohemians, both sacrifices to the court of Spain, the latter even at the expense of his son-in-law, whom the Bohemians had chosen for their king, hardly justify Baxter in the statement that king James's object was the consolidation of the Protestant interests, and that "his treatment of the Puritans was marked by a leniency strongly contrasting with the more vigorous course adopted by his predecessors, and naturally occasioning a difference of opinion as to its wisdom and propriety" (p. 568). If toleration was the policy of James I, it did not manifest itself against the Independents, who, "after repeated and fruitless applications for toleration" (Baxter, p. 572), were obliged to go to distant lands to find a place where they could follow the dictates of their conscience. Certainly the state did not pay the expenses of these pilgrim fathers in 1619 because they were Puritans, but simply because they were likely to settle and to cultivate land otherwise almost worthless. In 1624 James was finally driven, both by the opposition of Parliament to his policy in seeking a closer alliance with Spain and by the clamor of the people for a war with that country, to dispatch an army into Germany to recover his son-in-law's possessions. But, as if his measure of tribulation was not yet full, this enterprise proved a total failure, and brought discredit upon the English name. The king also assumed a ridiculous attitude on the question of the observance of the Sabbath. Roman Catholicism is wont to look upon Sunday as a holiday; the Puritans, however, desired it observed as a Christian day of rest. To counteract these efforts, James published a "Book of Sports," advising the people that Sunday was not to be a day mainly for religious rest and worship, but of games and revels (Skeats, p. 47). See SABBATARIAN CONTROVERSY. This reign, so detrimental to the interests of the English and Scottish State and the Church of Christ, were finally brought to a termination by the death of James, March 27, 1625. Severe as may have been some of the historians who have written the fate of this king, none can be said to have exaggerated the many despicable features of his character; and we need not wonder that his vacillating course towards his subjects, favoring first the Puritans, then the Episcopalians; tightening first the reins, and then loosening them against the Romanists—all inspired, not by the true spirit of toleration, but by artful designs, well enable us to repeat of him Macaulay's judgment, that James I was "made up of two men—a witty, well-read scholar, who wrote, disputed, and harangued, and a nervous, drivelling idiot who acted."

James I was a voluminous writer, and, though he was far from deserving the surname which the flattery of his contemporaries accorded him, "Solomon the Second," he was certainly not wholly destitute of literary ability, and, had he pursued a literary life instead of governing a state, it is barely possible that he might have earned a much higher position among his fellow-beings. It brings to mind the prophetic utterance of his tutor, that James was better fitted to be a scholar than a ruler. The writings of James which deserve mention here are, *Fruitful Meditation* upon a part of

the Revelation of St. John (Lond. 1588):—*Dæmonologia*, a dialogue in three books *in defence of the belief in Witches* (Lond. 1597, 4to); and yet the king withal hesitated not to punish his subjects for a like faith:—Βασιλικὸν Δῶρον; instructions to his son Henry (who died Nov. 6, 1612), in which James laid down his opinions on the power of the throne over the State and Church, and which, for the doctrines it contained on Church government, was censured as libellous by the Synod of St. Andrew's (Lond. 1599):—*Triplici Nodo Triplex Cuneus*, an apology for the oath of allegiance that James exacted of his Roman Catholic subjects, which was answered by cardinal Bellarmine, and produced a long controversy and many other publications on both sides, for an account of which, see a note by Dr. Birch in the Appendix to Harris's *Life of James*:—*Protestatio Antivorstia, in qua rex suam exponit sententiam de confœderatorum ordinum effectu et actis in causa Vorstii* (London, 1612), the successor of Arminius as professor of divinity at the University of Leyden, whom he accused of heresy [see VORSTIUS], etc. A complete edition of his works was published in folio (London, 1616), and a Latin translation by bishop Mountague in 1619. A more complete edition was published at Frankfort-on-the-Main in folio in 1689. He is also said to have written a metrical version of the Psalms, completed up to the 31st Psalm (Oxf. 1631, 12mo). See James Welwood, *Memoirs of the most material Transactions in England for the last* 100 *Years preceding the Revolution* (London, 1700, 8vo); Peyton, *Divine Catastrophe of the kingly Family of the House of Stuart* (1731, 8vo); Wilson, *Life and Reign of King James I* (1653, fol., and reprinted in Bp. Kennet's *Complete History*, vol. ii); Lingard, *History of England*, vols. viii and ix; Baxter, *Ch. Hist.* ch. xiii; Collier, *Eccles. Hist.*; Hallam, *Constit. Hist.* (see Index); Raumer, *Gesch. v. Europe*, vol. v; Rudloff, *Gesch. d. Reformation in Schottland*, vol. i; Soame, *Elizabethean History*, p. 515 sq.; Skeats, *History of the Free Churches of England*, p. 35 sq.; Hunt (the Rev. John), *Religious Thought in England* (Lond. 1870, 8vo), vol. i, ch. ii and iii; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 381 sq. See ENGLAND (CHURCH OF); PURITANS. (J. H. W.)

James II OF ENGLAND and VII OF SCOTLAND, son of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, was born October 15, 1633. In 1643 he was created duke of York. In 1648, during the civil war, which resulted in the decapitation of his father, he made his escape to Holland, and thence to France, where his mother resided. The early education of the duke of York had, by the wish of his father, been intrusted to Protestants, but his mother, a bigoted Romanist, now improved her opportunity, and the young prince was surrounded by Roman Catholic influences, and, to be more readily inclined to Popery, was assured that the unfortunate end of his father was due only to his strict adherence to Protestantism, and that no prince could hold the reins of government successfully who was not supported by Rome. In 1652 he entered the French army under general Turenne, and served in it until the peace concluded with Cromwell (October, 1655) obliged James to quit the territory of Louis XIV. He was then offered a position in the army of Spain, which he accepted. At the Restoration (May, 1660) he returned to England, and was immediately made lord high admiral of England. In the ensuing wars with Holland (1664-1672), which are generally supposed to have been instigated by this prince and his brother for the especial purpose of crushing the Dutch as a Protestant people, and to disable them from interfering with the re-establishment of popery in England, to which they themselves inclined, he twice commanded the English fleet, and was eminently successful. In 1660 he married Anne, daughter of lord chancellor Hyde, and the reason generally assigned for this act is that the lady was far gone with child when the marriage was contracted. But she lived only a few years (she died March 31, 1671), suffering, it is supposed, from neglect, if not the positive ill-usage of her husband, who, notwithstanding his professions of zeal for religion, indulged in a large share of the reigning licentiousness, and kept a mistress almost from the date of his marriage. A few months before her death the duchess had signed a declaration of her reconciliation to the ancient religion (Romanism, of course), and shortly afterward the duke also publicly avowed his conversion to popery, an act which, although his concealed inclinations had been long suspected, did not fail to create a great sensation, especially as, from his brother's want of issue, he was now looked upon as Charles's probable successor to the throne of England. On the passage, in the beginning of 1673, of the Test Act, which required all officers, civil and military, to receive the sacrament according to the usage of the Established Church, the duke was, of course, obliged to resign the command of the fleet and the office of lord high admiral. These duties were, however, assigned to a board of commissioners, consisting of his friends and dependants, so that he still virtually remained at the head of the naval affairs. On Nov. 21, 1673, he married again; this time a Roman Catholic princess, Mary Beatrix Eleanora, daughter of Alphonso IV, duke of Modena, a lady then only in her fifteenth year.

During the great irritation against the Roman Catholics which followed the publication of the Titus Oates (q. v.) popish plot in 1678-79, the duke of York, by the advice of king Charles II, quitted England and took up his residence on the Continent. While he was absent efforts were made to exclude him from the throne, which would have been successful had not Parliament suddenly been prorogued (May 27, 1679). In 1680 he returned again to England, but so great was the opposition towards him that Charles was obliged to send him down to govern Scotland. The odium in which the duke of York now stood among the English was further manifest by a second attempt to pass in Parliament a bill excluding him from the right of succession to the throne, which again failed by another prorogation of the council of the nation. This time, no doubt, the effort was mainly the result of the discreditable relation which the prince sustained towards the Meal-tub Plot, an attempt on the part of his co-religionists to counteract—and in this they were grievously disappointed—the effect of the Titus Oates plot discoveries. In 1682, when Charles was involved in difficulties with his concubine, the duke of York was invited over, and he improved the opportunity, and knew so well how to make himself an indispensable counsellor of his brother, that, in spite of the Test Act, he became (much more than Charles himself) "the mainspring and director of the conduct of public affairs." On the death of Charles II, Feb. 6, 1685, he succeeded to the throne, strangely enough, without the least opposition. His pledge to the people was, "I shall make it my endeavor to preserve this government, both in Church and State, as it is now by law established," a declaration which seemed rather necessary from a disciple of popery. It must, however, also be acknowledged that James II "began his reign with a frank and open profession of his religion, for the first Sunday after his accession he went publicly to mass, and obliged father Huddleston, who attended his brother in his last hours, to declare to the world that he died a Roman Catholic" (Neale, *Puritans*, Harper's edition, ii, 315). But if the people, though hesitatingly, yet tacitly, submitted to the freedom of the king to worship according to the dictates of his conscience, and even suffered Romanism, the very name of which, just at this time, was despised by nearly every English subject, to claim their ruler for its convert, yet his display of the theory that a king was not subject to the criticisms of his people—in short, his theory of *absolute supremacy* soon aroused the nation from their lethargy, though it did not at once appear that the community would ever seek to relieve itself from the calamity which it had just incurred. Greater still became the anxiety of the nation when it appeared that, "in spite of his own solemn en-

gagements to govern constitutionally, and heedless of ominous intimations which reached him, in the shape of addresses, that the religion of his subjects was dearer to them than their lives, he proceeded to carry out his projects with a recklessness amounting to infatuation" (Baxter, *Ch. Hist.* p. 637). Right in his first measures, king James showed, says Hume (*Hist. of England*, Harper's edition, vi, 286), "that either he was not sincere in his professions of attachment to the laws, or that he entertained so lofty an idea of his own legal power that even his utmost sincerity would tend very little to secure the liberties of the people." Not satisfied with his avowed confession of Romanism, he even made unnecessary and offensive displays of his religious principles, and thereby greatly wounded the pride of his subjects. The mass was openly celebrated with great pomp at Westminster in Passion Week of this year (1685); an agent was sent to Rome to announce the king's submission to the so-called vicar of Christ; a close alliance was entered into with France; and it was even generally hinted that "the Church of England was in principle so closely allied to the Roman Catholic that it would not be difficult to prepare the way for the readmission of the English into the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church" (comp. Sir John Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain*, Append. pt. i, p. 100–113; Fox, *Hist. of early Part of the Reign of James II*). All this, too, was done at a time when "there was among the English a strong conviction that the Roman Catholic, where the interests of his religion were concerned, thought himself free from all the ordinary rules of morality; nay, that he thought it meritorious to violate those rules, if by so doing he could avert injury or reproach from the Church of which he was a member;" at a time when "Roman Catholic casuists of great eminence had written in defence of equivocation, of mental reservation, of perjury, and even of assassination," and the fruits of this odious school of sophists were seen in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the murder of the first William of Orange, the murder of Henry III of France, the numerous conspiracies which had been formed against the life of Elizabeth, and, above all, the Gunpowder Plot, and when all these could constantly be cited "as instances of the close connection between vicious theory and vicious practice"—a series of crimes which, it was alleged, had every one of them been prompted or applauded by Roman Catholic priests (comp. Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, Harper's edit., ii, 5 sq.). It was certainly sheer madness (and we need not wonder that the so-claimed successor of Peter even so declared it) to still further aggravate the opposition of his subjects by persecution for religious belief. Himself anxious to obtain for the members of his own confession complete toleration, which, after all, was only "natural and right," it seems simply preposterous to find him persecuting the Puritans. Almost immediately after his accession to the throne James II convoked the Parliament of Scotland, where the majority of the population was firmly attached to the Presbyterian discipline, and where prelacy was abhorred "as an unscriptural and as a foreign institution," and demanded new laws against the unruly Presbyterians, who already "closely associated the episcopal polity with all the evils produced by twenty-five years of corrupt and cruel maladministration." In a slavish spirit, the Scottish Parliament complied with the royal request, forbidding under the *death* penalty preaching in any Presbyterian conventicle whatever, and even attendance on such a conventicle in the open air (May 8, 1685). A short time after, the Parliament of England also was convoked (May 19), which, as readily as the Scottish, complied with the demands of the king, but, to his great sorrow, nevertheless evinced the possibility of opposition to popery, for which he was anxious to secure concessions. But while both Parliaments were thus slavishly submitting to the wishes of the absolutist, the countries were invaded, and this afforded the king a favorable pretext for the introduction of Romanists into the ranks of the army, in spite of the legal test of conformity to the Established Church which was required to be taken by every person filling any public office; and when, after a successful suppression of the insurrectionary attempts, the king reassembled Parliament in November, he not only stated that these Roman Catholics would now be continued, but requested extra supplies for the increase of the army, evidently for the purpose of adding largely men of his own confession to the rank and file of the army; and when the people seemed unwilling to grant this request, the king peremptorily prorogued Parliament, after it had sat a little more than a week. James, however, was determined to continue the policy initiated, and ordered patents to be made out under the great seal for every Roman Catholic officer that he had appointed, and upon the same principle continued the benefices of some Protestant divines who claimed to have been converted to Romanism. Quite different continued to be his dealings with the dissenters. Everywhere they were made to feel "the weight of the arm of the conqueror," especially in the provinces that had lately been subject to invasion, to which the Papists, as well as High-Churchmen, claimed that dissenters had lent their aid. "Thus were the Nonconformists ground between the Papists on the one hand and the High-Church clergy on the other, while the former made their advantage of the latter, concluding that when the dissenters were destroyed, or thoroughly exasperated, and the clergy divided among themselves, they should be a match for the hierarchy, and capable of establishing that religion which they had been so long aiming to introduce" (Neale, *Puritans*, ii, 319). Roman Catholic churches were everywhere opened, Jesuits and regular priests came in numbers from abroad, schools were opened under their control in the English metropolis even, men were forbidden to speak disrespectfully of the king's religion, and all seemed turning in favor of Rome, when at length the eyes of the clergy of the State Church were opened, and they deemed it high time to preach against the dangerous tendencies. An open rupture with the State Church had become inevitable; for the king, having been made acquainted with the position which the clergy of the Church of England had taken to recover the people, who were deserting their churches in numbers, and to rescue the Protestant religion from the danger into which it had fallen, sent circular letters to the bishops, accompanying them with an order to prohibit the inferior clergy from preaching on the controverted points of religion. It could not be otherwise than that these persevering attempts of his against the established religion, as well as upon the law of the land, should eventually involve him in a dispute with the Episcopalians, to be productive of the most important consequences. Finding that to carry his schemes in favor of Romanism he must strengthen himself by the opponents of the State Church, he suddenly, in the beginning of April, 1687, published the famous Declaration of Indulgence, a paper at once suspending and dispensing with all the penal laws against dissenters, and all tests, including even the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, heretofore required of persons appointed to offices civil or military; but at the same time he repeated his promise, "already often repeated and often violated, that he would protect the Established Church in the enjoyment of her legal rights." At first the dissenters hailed the seeming approach of a new æra, and great were the rejoicings in behalf of a declaration which secured them liberty of conscience, and threw open the doors of the prison that had so long barred them; and the king felt not a little encouraged in his new-chosen course when addresses came to him from some of the dissenters (though they afterwards proved to have represented only a small faction; comp. Neale, *Puritans*, ii, 328). Emboldened, he immediately showed his predilections for his own Church. In Ireland, all places of power under the crown were put into the hands of Romanists. The earl of Castlemaine was at the same time

publicly sent as embassador extraordinary to Rome to express the king's obeisance to the pope, and to effect the reconcilement of the kingdom with the "holy see." In return the pope sent a nuncio to England, who resided openly in London during the remainder of the reign, and was solemnly received at court, in the face of the act of Parliament declaring any communication with the pope to be high treason. Four Roman Catholic bishops were consecrated in the king's chapel, and sent to exercise the episcopal function, each in his particular diocese. In Scotland and England, as well as in Ireland, offices of all kinds, both in the army and in the state, were now filled with Roman Catholics; even those of the ministers and others who had shown themselves disposed to go furthest along with the king were dismissed, or visibly lost his favor, if they refused to conform to the ancient religion. At last James's "eye was delighted with the aspect of catholicity imparted to his metropolis by the spectacle of monks traversing its streets in the habits of their respective orders, he was gratified by the presence of an Italian prelate, D'Adda, as nuncio from the pope; and he entertained a sanguine hope of obtaining a Parliament elected under the new corporation charters, which should furnish a majority of his adherents, while the lords were to be swamped by a creation of peers compliant with his wishes. The Nonconformists, he calculated, would support his views as long as their support would be important, and he was weak enough to imagine that his declaration of indulgence placed him in favorable contrast with the French monarch, to whose exiled Protestant subjects, since the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1684), England was affording its hospitality, not aware that his subjects were sufficiently acquainted with the genius and tactics of his religion to know that indulgence and persecution were but indifferent instruments for its propagation, adapted to the different circumstances of an ascendant or a declining Protestantism—one and the same spirit actuating the sovereigns of France and of Great Britain, in pursuance of common religions, in subservience to similar political objects" (Baxter, *Ch. Hist.* p. 639). The dissenters, in particular, soon learned to comprehend the reality of the situation—that a league of the court and Romanism was dependent on their assistance for its success to overawe the Episcopalians and secure victory to popery; and when they did comprehend the scheme, "notwithstanding the renewed sufferings to which they might be exposed, they took part against it. . . . Independents, Baptists, and Quakers vied with each other in showing them (the Episcopal clergy) their sympathy. . . . None of them—not even Penn (q. v.)—was in favor of the toleration of Roman Catholicism. No man who valued the civil liberties of England dreamed of giving a foothold to the professors of that intolerant creed. Three generations had not sufficed to wipe out the memory of its curse on England. Thousands still living could recollect the Vaudois massacres, and the streets of London were at that moment crowded with sufferers from the revocation of the Edict of Nantes" (Skeats, p. 83). The Nonconformists, almost as a body, refused to recognise the legality of the indulgence, mainly, of course, because they saw in the encroachment against the law a prerogative which, if not resisted, might lead ultimately to the establishment of popery as the religion of the state. But, whatever were the reasons of the dissenters, the attempt of the king to gain their support evidently failed, and it became daily more apparent that the war which the king had opened with the Church must soon reach a climax. An attempt had already been made to compel the University of Cambridge to confer a degree of master of arts on a Benedictine monk. This was not persevered in; but soon after, a vacancy having happened in the presidency of Magdalen College, Oxford, the vice-president and fellows were ordered by royal mandate to fill it up by the election of a person named Farmer, a late convert to popery (for whom was afterwards substituted Parker, bishop of Oxford, who avowed himself a Romanist at heart), and on their refusal were cited before an ecclesiastical commission and expelled. See HOUGH, JOHN (1). Determined, if possible, to gain over the Nonconformists, whose aid he evidently needed to carry out successfully his projects, James published, April 27, 1688, a second declaration of indulgence to dissenters, and commanded it to be read by the clergy immediately after divine service in all the churches of England. On this, Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, and six bishops—Lloyd of St. Asaph, Ken of Bath and Wells, Turner of Ely, Lake of Chichester, White of Peterborough, and Trelawney of Bristol—met in the archbishop's palace at Lambeth, May 18, and drew up a petition to the king, representing their aversion to obey the order, for many reasons, and especially because the declaration was founded upon such a dispensing power as Parliament had often declared illegal. For this they were all, June 8, sent to the Tower, on the charge of publishing a false, fictitious, malicious, pernicious, and seditious libel. The history of the trial, and the verdict of *Not guilty* by the jury, June 29, 1688, which the nation approved, and which was hailed by the whole kingdom as a great national triumph, forms one of the most glowing passages in the splendid narrative of Macaulay (ii, 293). This defeat, however, in no degree checked for a moment the infatuated king. To quote the summary of Hume, "He struck out two of the judges, Powel and Holloway, who had appeared to favor the bishops; he issued orders to prosecute all those clergymen who had not read his declaration, that is, the whole Church of England, two hundred excepted; he sent a mandate to the new fellows whom he had obtruded on Magdalen College to elect for president, in the room of Parker, lately deceased, one Gifford, a doctor of the Sorbonne, and titular bishop of Madaura; and he is even said to have nominated the same person to the see of Oxford." It was in the midst of this great contest with the Church and the nation that, June 10, a son was claimed to have been born to James, received, however, by the people with a strong suspicion that the child was supposititious, and that the queen had never been delivered or been pregnant at all. For this notion, however, it is now generally admitted that there was no good ground. But the fact that a direct heir had been born, who, in all probability, would restore popery, in which, no doubt, he would be instructed from earliest infancy, turned the Protestants' eyes towards James's son-in-law, the prince of Orange, "for the deliverance of their country from the perils with which it was threatened; and James, before the end of September, learned with consternation that his own son-in-law, in obedience to their call, was preparing to land upon his coasts." On the night of the same day on which the seven prelates of the English Church had been pronounced *not guilty*, an invitation was dispatched to William, prince of Orange, signed by seven of the leading English politicians, to come over to England and occupy the throne. November 5, William landed at Torbay with 14,000 men. Vainly did James now attempt to regain his subjects' confidence by retracing his steps; no one would trust his promises, made in the hour of misfortune, and, finding himself deserted not only by the nation, but even by his own children, he retired to France, where he was hospitably received by his co-religionist and royal friend, Louis XIV, and obliged to live upon a pension settled upon him by the king of the French until his death, Sept. 6, 1701. For England his exit "effected a revolution (November, 1688) which has deserved the epithet of glorious, not less through its bloodless character than from its identification with those civil and religious liberties which it secured to every class of Englishmen." See, besides the authorities cited under James I, Hetherington, *Ch. of Scotland*, ii, 146 sq.; Stoughton, *Ecclesiastical Hist. of England* (see Index); Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, vol. i and ii; Clarke, *Life of James II* (Lond. 1816, 2 vols. 4to), De-

bary, *Hist. of the Church of England from James II to 1717* (Lond. 1860, 8vo), chap. i–v; Macpherson, *Hist. of Great Britain*, i, 450 sq.; Burnet, *Reign of James II* (ed. 1852). See PRESBYTERIANS; SCOTLAND; IRELAND; ENGLAND. (J. H. W.)

James, John, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Buckingham County, Va., August 1, 1782. He entered the Kentucky Conference in 1820, and successively "filled some of the most important and responsible appointments acceptably and successfully." He was an ardent worker in the vineyard of the Lord, and espoused the cause of his Master amid persecutions and heavy loss of property: his father-in-law, a wealthy man, disinherited his daughter (the wife of John James) because her husband was a Methodist preacher. Mr. James died, after a service of half a century in the Church, in 1860. As a preacher, his ability was superior, but his sermons were more of a hortatory nature than severe logical doctrinal discussions. "During his ministerial life he won many souls to Christ, and was regarded in his old age as a father in Israel. He loved his work to the last, and may be said to have descended from his horse to the grave."—*Min. Ann. Conf. M. E. Ch. S.* ii, 193 sq.

James, John Angell, an eminent Congregational minister, born at Blandford, Dorsetshire, June 6, 1785, was educated at the college at Gosport, and entered the ministry when only seventeen years old. He was a very popular preacher, and, before twenty, was settled as pastor of the "Church Meeting in Carr's Lane," Birmingham, where he remained till his death, October 1, 1859. "In the course of years Angell James came to be considered the most important and influential public man in connection with his own denomination, and on account of his evangelical views of religion, he was also much esteemed both by the Low-Church party in the English Establishment, and by Dissenters generally in Scotland and America." Mr. James published, besides a multitude of sermons, tracts, addresses, a number of small religious volumes, the best known being the *Anxious Inquirer, Christian Fellowship, and Christian Professor*, which had, and still have, a vast circulation both in England and in this country. See Dale's *Life and Letters of John Angell James* (London, 1862); *Pen-Pictures of popular English Preachers* (London, 1853, p. 274 sq.); *New York Literary and Theological Review*, i, 595. (J. H. W.)

James, John Thomas, an English prelate, born in 1786, was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He was appointed bishop of Calcutta in 1727, and died in 1829. He published several works of travels in the northern and eastern portions of Europe.—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, p. 952.

James, Peter, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Pennsylvania in 1789, and removed to Virginia in 1799, and from thence, a year later, to Mississippi. In 1812 he joined the Mississippi Conference. He filled several prominent positions within the limits of his Conference, and was for a time presiding elder. The Memphis Conference being formed out of a part of the Mississippi, he was invited to join the latter, which he did; but his health declining, he became a superannuate. He died March 18, 1869. "Peter James possessed but limited literary attainments; but, by dint of application, he became an able minister of the Gospel. In all the relations of life he maintained his integrity as a Christian, and exemplified the virtues and graces of our holy religion."—*Min. Ann. Conf. M. E. Ch. S.* iii, 340.

James, Thomas, D.D. (1), a learned divine and an able critic, was born at Newport, Isle of Wight, in 1571. He studied at Winchester School and New College, Oxford, of which he became fellow in 1593. He was appointed keeper of the Bodleian Library at its foundation in 1602, and afterwards subdean of Wells, and rector of Mongeham, Kent. He died in 1629. Dr. James, it is said, was one of the most learned critics of his day. His principal works are, *Bellum Papale, sive concordia discors Sixti V ad Clementis VIII, circa Hieronymianam editionem*, etc. (Lond. 1600, 4to; 1841, 12mo):—*A Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, by the Prelates, Pastors, and Pillars of the Church of Rome for Maintenance of Popery and Irreligion* (Lond. 1612, 4to; reprinted 1688, 1843).—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 952.

James, Thomas (2), a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Madison County, Tenn., October 19, 1832. He joined the Church at thirteen years of age, was admitted to the St. Louis Conference in 1852, and appointed to Carthage Circuit. He then removed first to Mount Vernon Circuit, next to Osceola Circuit, then to Fredericktown, and finally to Ozark Circuit. He died in the midst of the work in the fall of 1857.—*Min. Ann. Conf. Methodist Episcopal Church South*, ii, 14.

Jameson, MRS. ANNA, an English authoress, deserves our notice as the writer of a series of works on Christian art and archæology of most superior order. She was born in Dublin May 19, 1797, and was married in 1827 to Mr. Jameson, a barrister, but soon after separated from her husband, and devoted herself to literature. She died March 17, 1860. Her works of interest to us are, *Sacred and Legendary Art* (Lond. 1848, 8vo):—*Legends of the Monastic Orders* (1850):—*Legends of the Madonna* (1852):—*Scriptural and Legendary History of our Lord*, etc., *as represented in Christian Arts* (1860).

Jami is a Turkish name for the temples in which worship is performed on Fridays (the worship itself bearing the name of *Jema-namazi*), it being unlawful to use the lesser temples (mosques) on that day. The first Jami, called *Selalyn* (i. e. royal), being founded by a sultan, was built by Orkhan the Second, sultan of the Turks, who began his reign in 1326.—Broughton, *Bib. Hist. Sac.* i, 501.

Jamieson, JOHN, D.D., a divine and philologist, was born at Glasgow March 3, 1759. He became minister of the Anti-Burgher Secession Church in Scotland, was stationed first at Forfar (in 1781), and afterwards (1797) for forty-three years at Edinburgh. He died July 12, 1838. His principal works are, *A Vindication of the Doctrines of Scripture and of the Primitive Faith concerning the Deity of Christ* (Edinb. 1794, 2 vols. 8vo): "a very able and learned reply to Priestly's history of early opinions:"—*An Alarm to Britain, or an Inquiry into the Causes of the rapid Progress of Infidelity* (Perth, 1795, 12mo):—*Sermons on the Heart* (Edinb. 1789-90, 2 vols. 8vo):—*The Use of Sacred History, confirming the Doctrine of Revelation* (Edinb. 1802, 2 vols. 8vo):—*An Historical Account of the ancient Culdees of Iona, and of their Settlement in England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Edinb. 1811, 4to), etc. His reputation, however, rests chiefly on his *Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language* (1808–1809), of which he published an abridgment in 1818, and to which he added a supplement in 1825. See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s. v.

Ja'min (Hebrew *Yamin'*, יָמִין, lit. the *right* hand, hence *luck*, as often; i. q. Felix; Sept. Ἰαμείν and Ἰαμίν, but v. r. Ἰαβείν in 1 Chron. ii, 27, and omits in Neh. viii, 7), the name of three men. See also BENJAMIN.

1. The second named of the sons of Simeon (Gen. xlvi, 11; Exod. vi, 15; Numb. xxvi, 12; 1 Chron. iv, 24). B.C. 1856. His descendants were called JAMINITES (Heb. *Yamini'*, יָמִינִי, Sept. Ἰαμινί, Numb. xxvi, 12).

2. The second named of the three sons of Ram, the fourth in descent from Judah (1 Chron. ii, 26). B.C. cir. 1658.

3. One of the priests that interpreted the law to the

people after the return from Babylon (Neh. viii, 7). B. C. cir. 410.

Ja'minite (Numb. xxvi, 12). See JAMIN, 1.

Jam'lech (Heb. *Yamlek'*, יַמְלֵךְ, *kingly*; Sept. Ἀμαλήχ v. r. Ἀμαλήκ, Ἰεμολόχ; Vulg. *Jemlech*), a chieftain (נָשִׂיא) of the tribe of Simeon, apparently one of those whose family increased so greatly that they invaded the valley of Gedor in the time of Hezekiah, and dispossessed the Hamites (1 Chron. iv, 34). B.C. cir. 711.

Jam'nia (Ἰαμνία v. r. Ἰαμνεια), a Græcized or later form of the name of the city JABNEEL (q. v.), used in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. iv, 15; v, 58; x, 69; xv, 40), and Josephus (*Ant.* v, 1, 22; xiv, 4, 4; *War*, i, 7, 7).

Jam'nite (ὁ ἐν Ἰαμνεία, ὁ Ιαμνίτης), an inhabitant of JAMNIA (2 Macc. xii, 8, 9, 40) or JABNEEL (q. v.).

Janduno. See JOHN OF JANDUNO.

Janeway, Jacob J., D.D., a Presbyterian minister of some note, was born in the city of New-York in 1774, and graduated at Columbia College in 1794. He joined the Presbyterians, but also served the (Dutch) Reformed Church for some time with great distinction. The infirmities of age obliged him to retire from the pastorate, and he resided the last years of his life at New Brunswick, N. J., where he died in 1858. Mr. Janeway wrote quite extensively. His most important contributions are commentaries on *Romans*, *Hebrews*, and *Acts* (Philadel. 3 vols. 18mo):—*Internal Evidence of the Holy Bible*:—*Review of Dr. Schaff on Protestantism*, etc. See (Pha.) *Presb. Mag.* May, 1853.

Janeway, James, an English divine, was born in Hertfordshire, and educated at Christ Church, Oxford. In 1652 he left the State Church and set up a dissenting congregation (Presbyterian) at Rotherhithe. He died in 1674. Besides a life of his brother John (q. v.) and his sermons, he published *The Saint's Encouragement* (1675, 8vo):—*Token for Children* (1676, 8vo, and often):—*Heaven upon Earth* (1677, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 954; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 276.

Janeway, John, a very pious and promising young man, was born at Lilly, Hertfordshire, in 1633, of religious parents, entered Cambridge at seventeen, and at eighteen was converted, in part by means of Baxter's *Saint's Rest.* He now glowed for the salvation of souls, especially of those nearly related to him; secret prayer became his element. On leaving college, his father being dead, he went to live in the family of Dr. Cox, where his health sank under his studies and labors, and he finished his short course suddenly in June, 1657. His dying bed was a scene of triumph.—Middleton, *Works*, iii, 362.

Jangling, VAIN (ματαιολογία, *frivolous* or empty *talk*).

Janitōrēs, persons appointed to take care of the doors of the churches in time of divine service, and to make a distinction between the faithful and the catechumens, and excommunicated persons, and others not entitled to admission. See DOOR-KEEPERS.

Janizaries (*Jeni-tsheri*, "new soldiers"), a Turkish military force which was for some time recruited from Christian prisoners taken by the Turks, more especially during the Crusades. They were originated by the Osmanli Emir Orchan, about 1330, of young Christian prisoners, which, after having been distributed among the Turkish husbandmen in Asia, there to learn the Turkish language, religion, and manners, were compelled to embrace Mohammedanism. This treatment of Christian prisoners sprang from the Mohammedan doctrine that "all children at their birth are naturally disposed to Islamism," and they reasoned that, by enforcing the conversion of the young captives to the true faith, and enrolling them in the ranks of the army of the faithful, they were serving both their temporal and eternal interests. But after a time the recruiting of the Janizaries was also undertaken among the Christian subjects of the Mohammedans, and the execution of this terrible scheme inspired terror and consternation among the vanquished Christian populations of Asia Minor, Thrace, and Anatolia, where the new tax of flesh and blood on families severed the nearest and dearest ties. For a period of 300 years it was the custom to raise annually for this branch of the Turkish army no less than 1000 Christian youths; and it is estimated by Von Hammer that no less than 500,000 young Christians were thus converted into Mohammedan Turkish soldiers (compare Creasy, *Hist. Ottoman Turks*, i, 21 sq.). In the second half of the 17th century the old system of filling the ranks of the Janizaries exclusively with compulsory conscripts from the Christian subjects of the Turk was finally abandoned, as the many privileges which these soldiers enjoyed as body-guard of the sultan, etc., induced many young Turks to seek admission to their body. There were two classes of Janizaries, one regularly organized, dwelling in barracks in Constantinople and a few other towns, and whose number at one time amounted to no less than 60,000, afterwards, however, reduced to 25,000; and the other composed of irregular troops, called *Jamaks*, scattered throughout all the towns of the empire, and amounting in number to 300,000 or 400,000. At the head of the whole Janizary force was the *Aga*, who held his appointment for life, and whose power was almost without limit. In times of peace they acted as a police force; in war they generally formed the reserve of the Turkish army, and were noted for the wild impetuosity of their attack. But the many privileges which were bestowed on them soon began to make them very unruly; and their history abounds in conspiracies, assassinations of sultans, viziers, agas, etc., and atrocities of every kind; so that, by degrees, they became more dangerous to the country than any foreign enemies. Attempts to reform or dissolve them were always unsuccessful, till sultan Mahmoud II, in 1826, being opposed in some of his measures by them in Constantinople, displayed the flag of the Prophet, and succeeded in arousing on his own behalf the fanatical zeal of other portions of his troops. Their own aga deserted them, they were defeated, and their barracks burned, when 8000 of them perished in the flames. June 17, 1826, a proclamation announced the Janizaries forever abolished. Everywhere in the empire they were persecuted until "upwards of 40,000 of these troops were annihilated, and an equal number driven into exile." See Frazer (the Rev. R. W.), *Turkey, Ancient and Modern* (London, 1854, 8vo), p. 406; Creasy, *Hist. of Ottoman Turks*, chiefly founded on Von Hammer (London, 1858, 2 vols. 8vo), Vol. ii; Knolles, *Turkish History*, i, 132 sq.; Madden (R. R.), *Turkish Empire* (Lond. 1862, 8vo), ch. xiii; Macfarland, *Constantinople in* 1828.

Jan'na (Ἰαννά, prob. for Heb. יַנָּה, *yannah'*, *flourishing*, although no corresponding name occurs in the O. T.), the father of Melchi and son of Joseph, named as the sixth in ascent from Christ on his mother's side (Luke iii, 24). B.C. cir. 200. See GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

Jannæus. See ALEXANDER JANNÆUS.

Jan'nēs (Ἰαννῆς, probably of Egyptian etymology [see below]). Jannes and Jambres are thought to have been two of the Egyptian magicians who attempted by their enchantments (לָטִים, Exod. vii, 22, etc.; or לְהָטִים, Exod. vii, 11, *secret arts*) to counteract the influence on Pharaoh's mind of the miracles wrought by Moses (see Exod. vii, viii). Their names occur nowhere in the Hebrew Scriptures, and only once in the New Testament (2 Tim. iii, 8), where Paul says no more than that they "withstood Moses," and that their folly in doing so became manifest (2 Tim. iii, 8, 9). He became acquainted with them, most probably, from an ancient Jewish tradition, or, as Theodoret expresses it, "from the unwritten teaching of the Jews." They are found frequently in the Talmudical and Rabbinical writings.

but with some variations. Thus, for Jannes we meet with יוחנא, יוחנר, יואנר, יונוס, יניס. Of these, the last three are forms of the Hebrew יוחנן, which has led to the supposition that Ἰαννῆς is a contracted form of the Greek Ἰωάννης. Some critics (Pfeiffer, *Dub. vex.* i, 253) consider these names to be of Egyptian origin, and in that case the Jewish writers must have been misled by a similarity of sound to adopt the forms above mentioned, as the Mishna (*Sanhedr.* 98, b; *Chol.* 19, a) has done in the case of other unknown proper names (Majus, *Observat. sacr.* ii, 42). For Jambres we find ימברים, יומברוס, ממרא, ממרי, and in the *Shalsheleth Hakkabala* (xiii, 2) the two names are given יואני ואמברוטיאו, i. e. Johannes and Ambrosius! The Targum of Jonathan inserts them in Exod. vii, 11. The same writer also gives as a reason for Pharaoh's edict for the destruction of the Israelitish male children that "this monarch had a dream in which the land of Egypt appeared in one scale and a lamb in another; that on awakening he sought for its interpretation from his wise men; whereupon Jannes and Jambres (ינים וימברים) said, "A son is to be born in the congregation of Israel who will desolate the whole land of Egypt." Several of the Jewish writers speak of Jannes and Jambres as the two sons of Balaam (Talmud, *Jalkut Ruben*, lxxxi, 3), and assert that they were the youths (נְעָרִים, Auth. Version *servants*) who went with him to the king of Moab (Numb. xxii, 22). Arabian tradition assigns them a place in Egyptian history (see the *Asiatic Journal*, 1843, No. 7, p. 73). Their graves were located in Egypt (Pallad. *Lausiac.* 20). The Pythagorean philosopher Numenius mentions these persons in a passage preserved by Eusebius (*Præparatio Evang.* ix, 8), and by Origen (*c. Cels.* iv, p. 198, ed. Spencer); also Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xxx, 1), and apparently Apuleius *Apol.* p. 94). The Arabs mention the names of several magicians who opposed Moses; among them is none resembling Jannes and Jambres (D'Herbelot, s. v. Moussa Ben Amran). There was an ancient apocryphal writing entitled *Jannes and Mambres*, which is referred to by Origen (*in Matt. Comment.* § 117; *Opera*, v, 29), and by Ambrosiaster, or Hilary the Deacon: it was condemned by pope Gelasius.

Jannes appears to be a transcription of the Egyptian name Aän, probably pronounced Ian. It was the nomen of two kings: one of the eleventh dynasty, the father or ancestor of Sesertesen I of the twelfth; the other, according to our arrangement, fourth or fifth king of the fifteenth dynasty, called by Manetho Ἰάννας or Ἰανίας (Josephus), or Σταὰν (Africanus). See Poole, *Horæ Ægyptiacæ*, p. 174 sq. There is also a king bearing the name Annu, whom we assign to the second dynasty (*Hor. Æg.* p. 101). The significations of Aän is doubtful: the cognate word Aänt means a valley or plain. The earlier king Aän may be assigned to the 21st century B.C.; the later one is thought to have been the second predecessor of Joseph's Pharaoh. This shows that a name which may be reasonably supposed to be the original of Jannes was in use at or near the period of the sojourn in Egypt. The names of the ancient Egyptians were extremely numerous, and very fluctuating in use; generally, the most prevalent at any time were those of kings then reigning or not long dead.

See Wetstenii *Nov. Test. Græc.* ii, 362; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm. Rabb.* col. 945; Lightfoot's *Sermon on Jannes and Jambres* (in *Works*, vii, 89); *Erubhin, or Miscellanies*, ch. xxiv (in *Works*, iv, 33); Lardner's *Credibility*, pt. ii, ch. xxxv (in *Works*, vii, 381); Fabric. *Pseudepigr. V. T.* i, 813; Thilo, *Cod. Apocryph.* i, 553; the dissertations *De Janne et Jambre* of Zentgrav (Argent. 1699); Grotius (Hafn. 1707); Michaelis (Hal. 1747); and Hermann, *De pseudothaumaturgio Pharaonis* (Jen. 1745).

Janning, Conrad, a Dutch theologian, was born at Groningen Nov. 16, 1650. He received his early education from his uncle, J. Tinga, a pastor at Groningen. As his parents were devoted Romanists, they were unwilling to have him educated at the Protestant university of his native city. He was therefore sent to a Jesuit College in Westphalia, and afterwards to Antwerp. In 1679 he was associated with the Bollandists in the gigantic labor of preparing the *Acta Sanctorum.* In 1661 he visited Rome, where he completed his theological studies, and was consecrated to the priesthood. In Rome and throughout Italy, and on his whole route, he collected materials for the above-named work. He returned to Antwerp in 1686, but soon made another tour, visiting different parts of Germany and Bohemia in quest of further materials. In 1697 he again went to Rome, and rendered important service in the work to which his life was devoted. To his indefatigable labors this stupendous task is under very great obligations, as thirteen volumes are ascribed to his pen. Different judgments may be formed of this work. Prof. H. De Groot, of the Groningen University, a man of eminent attainments in Church History, and distinguished by his writings in this department, thus speaks of the work of the Bollandists: "With many fables and worthless legends, they communicate a great number of important biographies, elucidated generally with great learning, and in the earlier portions, for the most part, also with impartiality. For a knowledge of Church History in the primitive times, and, above all, in the Middle Ages, both the lives and the elucidations are often of inestimable value." Janning died August 13, 1723. See B. Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, ii, 159 sq.; *Geschiedenis der Christelijke Kerk*, door Profs. De Groot, Ter Haar, Kist, Moll, etc., v, 34. (J. P. W.)

Jano'äh (Heb. *Yano'äch*, יָנוֹחַ, *rest;* 2 Kings xv, 29; Sept. Ἀνώχ v. r. Ἰανώχ; but in Josh. xvi, 6, 7 with ה local, *Yano'chah*, יָנוֹחָה, *to Janoah;* Sept. Ἰανωχά v. r. Ἰανωκά and Ἰανώ, or even Μαχώ; Vulg. *Janoe;* A. V. "Janohah"), the name probably of two places.

1. A town on the N.E. border of Ephraim (see Keil and Delitzsch, *Comment. on Joshua*, etc., p. 177, Clarke's ed.), and consequently in or near the Jordan valley (Josh. xvi, 6, 7). Euseb. and Jerome state that in their time it was still a village in the district of Acrabatine, twelve miles east of Neapolis, the ancient Sichem (*Onomasticon* s. v. Ἰανώ, Janon). About three and a half hours (12 miles) east by south of Nablus stands the little village of *Yanûn*, situated in a vale which descends the eastern slope of the mountains of Ephraim to the Jordan. The village is now mostly in ruins, but it has a few houses inhabited, and its ancient remains "are extensive and interesting. Entire houses and walls are still existing, but covered with immense heaps of earth and rubbish. The dwellings of the present inhabitants are built upon and between the dwellings of the ancient Janohah" (Van de Velde, *Travels*, ii, 303). Janohah being situated on the side of the mountain range, the border "went down" to Ataroth, which lay in the valley of the Jordan. About a mile up the vale of Janohah is a little fountain, and on a hill above it the prostrate ruins of another ancient town which is now called *Khirbet Yanûn* ("ruined Yanûn") (Robinson, *B. R.* iii, 297).

2. A town of Northern Palestine, situated apparently between Abel-beth-Maachah and Kedesh, and within the boundaries of Naphtali. It was taken, with several other cities, on the first invasion of Palestine by Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria (2 Kings xv, 29). It is mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome, but they strangely confound it with Janohah, a town of Ephraim (*Onomasticon*, s. v. Janon), and in this they are followed by Reland (*Palæstina*, p. 826), Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, s. v.), Schwarz *Palest.* p. 147), and others. The modern village of *Hunîn*, which stands on the brow of a mountain between Abel and Kedesh, and which contains the massive ruins of a large and strong castle, would answer to the situation, and the names have some slight radical affinity. For a description of Hunin, see Porter, *Handbook for*

Syria and Palestine, p. 444.—Kitto, s. v. A ruin called *Yanuh*, on a hill S.W. of Haddata (Robinson, *Later Researches*, p. 58), seems by its name to have more correspondence to Janoah than Hunnin; but it lies in the centre of Gentile Galilee, and Tiglath-Pileser's march seems rather to have followed the hills along the Huleh plain.—Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 324.

Jano'hah (Josh. xvi, 6, 7). See JANOAH, 1.

Janow, MATTHIAS VON, one of the most celebrated reformers before the Reformation, and one of the three distinguished forerunners of Huss [see WALDHAUSER and MILICZ], on whose teachings in their day, more than on all the territorial aggrandizements of the German empire, the most important results of the latter half of the 14th century were staked (Gillett, *Huss*, i, 37), was the son of a Bohemian knight. Of the early history of Matthias we know but very little. He was educated at the University of Prague, where he was a zealous disciple of Milicz (q. v.), and he is often called *Magister Parisiensis*, because he spent six years at the University of Paris, and obtained his master's degree there. He travelled extensively, and no doubt had attained great popularity as a scholar and divine when quite young. He was ambitious to secure some prominent position, and succeeded, on a visit to Rome in 1380, in obtaining the appointment of prebendary at Prague, and confessor of Charles IV. He entered upon the duties of this office Oct. 12, 1381, and continued therein until his death, Nov. 30, 1394. Matthias of Janow does not seem to have been a very eloquent preacher, but he was certainly a man of very earnest and deep piety, zealous for his Master's cause, anxious to purify the Church from the evils and corruptions which then threatened the extirpation of all religious feeling; and however small may have been his influence in the pulpit, "it was more than compensated by the influence which he exerted through his writings, and by his scientific exposition of principles. In his works we may find not only the reformatory ideas which passed over from him to Huss, but also the incipient germ of those Christian principles which at a later period were unfolded in Germany by Luther, although the latter never came under the influence of Matthias of Janow" (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v, 192). In his earlier period of life, disgusted with that spiritual pride and contempt of the laity which characterized the priests in the 14th and 15th centuries, he was impressed by Milicz's ideas of the universal priesthood of all Christians, more especially after he had been placed in the confessional, where he had great opportunity to inform himself more minutely of the good or bad in all classes of society, and of the religious wants of the people. This may be clearly seen not only from his own narration of the change which he experienced (see Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v, 194 sq.; Gillett, *Huss*, i, 28 sq.), but also from his writings, collected under the title of *De regulis Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, of which, unfortunately, the greater part still remains in MS. form (for extracts, see Jordan, *Vorläufer d. Husitenthums in Böhmen* [Lpz. 1846]). Pressel, in Herzog (s. v.), says that the work might more appropriately have been entitled *Inquiries concerning true and false Christianity*. "It is chiefly taken up with reflections on the history of the times, and hints concerning the future, based on the rules of the Old and New Testaments, on the prophetical elements which they contain. Although there is a great deal in the details which is arbitrary, particularly in the apocalyptic calculations, yet grand prophetic glances into the future are also to be found. He portrays the utter corruption of the Church in all its parts, and explains the causes of it" (Neander). The main object of the work, however, was the rejection of the authority of human traditions and popish decretals, and the substitution in their stead of the supreme authority of the divine Word. He tries everything by this test. The conduct of the bishops and the priests is severely arraigned. The antichrist, he asserts, has already come. He is neither Jew, Pagan, Saracen, nor worldly tyrant persecuting Christendom, but the man who opposes Christian truth and the Christian life in the way of deception; he is and will be the most wicked Christian, falsely styling himself by that name, assuming the highest station in the Church, and possessing the highest consideration, arrogating dominion over all ecclesiastics and laymen; one who, by the working of Satan, knows how to make subservient to his own ends and to his own will the corporations of the rich and wise in the entire Church; one who has the preponderance in honors and in riches, but who especially misappropriates the goods of Christ, the Holy Scriptures, the sacraments, and all that belongs to the hopes of religion, to his own aggrandizement and to the gratification of his own passions; deceitfully perverting spiritual things to carnal ends, and in a crafty and subtle manner employing what was designed for the salvation of a Christian people, as means to lead them astray from the truth and power of Christ (Neander, v, 196 sq.; Gillett, p. 30 sq.). It is apparent, from the tenor of Janow's writings, that he took higher ground than the other Hussite forerunners, Waldhausen and Milicz—the earliest Bohemian reformers—and that he was, in truth, the Wickliffe of the Bohemian Church. The efforts of his predecessors were simply toward a reform in morals and in doctrine, but the efforts of Janow were directed to a reformation of the corrupt Latin system, with a view to remove wholly the yoke of that system. He strove not simply to elevate the moral and religious condition of the priest and the layman, but demanded alike privileges for both. Not to the priesthood only, but to the laity also belonged the communion of both kinds; not to the popes only, who had haughtily exalted themselves, belonged the right to govern, but all bishops should share the same privileges; in short, his idea was that the organism of the Church is one in which all the members should be connected according to their several ranks, and co-operate together like the head and members in the human body (comp. Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 600). We need not wonder that Janow, although he did not suffer the punishment of a heretic, was not long permitted to cast abroad seeds which must result in the overthrow of the papal hierarchy, and the removal of many strong barriers which protected the priesthood in these days of darkness and of sin. Having urged upon the emperor the need of a council, the pope declared Janow guilty of disseminating heretical opinions, and he was obliged to leave Prague. It is said that he recanted in 1389 before the Synod of Prague, which had arraigned him, but it is evident from his writings that he never changed his opinions, for one of his last declarations was, "All that remains for us is to desire a reformation by the overthrow of the antichrist himself, to lift up our heads and see our redemption near." Sixteen years after his death (1410), his writings, it is generally admitted, were committed to the flames, together with those of Wickliffe. See Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, III, i, 173 sq.; Neander, *Church History*, v, 192 sq.; Gillett, *Huss and his Times*, i, 26 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jansen or **Jansenius, Cornelius** (1), a distinguished Belgian theologian, was born at Hulst in 1510. He studied theology at the University of Louvain, and acquired at the same time a thorough knowledge of Greek and Hebrew. In 1538 he went to Tongerloo as professor of theology, and became successively curate of St. Martin at Courtray in 1550, dean of the theological faculty of Louvain in 1562, and was soon after sent by Philip II to the Council of Trent. On his return to the Netherlands he was made bishop of Ghent in 1568. He died April 10, 1576. His works on Scripture enjoyed great reputation. He wrote *Concordia Evangelica et ejusdem Concordiæ ratio* (Louvain, 1549, 8vo):—*Paraphrasis in omnes Psalmos Davidicos* (Louv. 1849, 4to):—*Commentarii in Concordiam ac totam Historiam Evangelicam* (Louvain, 1572, 1577, and 1617, fol.; Lyon, 1597

and 1606, folio; often reprinted at Antwerp and Venice [this is his chief work]):—*Annotationes in librum Sapientiæ Salomonis* (Antwerp, 1589, 4to):—*Commentarii in Proverbia Salomonis et Ecclesiasticam*, etc. See Simonis, *Oratio in funere Jansenii; Gallia Christiana* (vol. vi); Sander, *De illustribus Gandis;* Genebrardus, *Chronicon;* Foppens, *Bibl. Belgica;* Miræus, *De Scriptoribus Sæculi xvi;* Pope-Blount, *Censura Autorum;* Fabricius, *Hist. Biblioth.*—Hoefer, *Nouvelle Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 344. (J. N. P.)

Jansen(ius) Cornelius (2), a celebrated Dutch divine and founder of the JANSENISTS, born at Accoy, near Leerdam, in Northern Holland, Oct. 28, 1585, was a nephew of the above Cornelius Jansen, the Bp. of Ghent. He received his early education at Utrecht, and in 1602 entered the university at Louvain as a student of philosophy and theology. While at this high-school he seems to have formed an acquaintance with the Frenchman, Jean Baptiste Duvergier (q. v.) de Hauranne, generally known by the name of St. Cyran. "Both he (i. e. Cyran) and Jansenius were there brought into contact with some who in secret cherished the doctrines of grace although in the communion of Rome, and thus they received many principles of truth utterly opposed to those ordinarily held in the Church. There also they both saw and felt the evil workings of the Jesuits; they marked the inroads which that system was making on all doctrinal truth and practical morality." But Jansenius's severe industry brought on sickness, and he was obliged to quit the university, and for a time the two bosom-friends were separated. Advised to seek a change of air, he undertook a journey through France, and finally stopped at Paris to prosecute his studies anew. Again the two friends met, and together they removed to Bayonne, and spent another series of years in earnest study and meditation, particularly on the writings of the Church fathers, of whom Augustine became their special favorite. So interested became Jansenius in the writings of Augustine, that from henceforth he determined to make it his life-business to arrange and methodize everything in the productions of this Church father treating on the subjects of the grace of God, the condition of man as fallen, free-will and human impotence, original sin, election, efficacious grace, faith, and other points of like importance, with a view to a reformatory movement in the Church to which he belonged, by combating the increasing Pelagianism of the Jesuits. In 1617 the two friends again parted, Jansenius returning to Louvain to obtain the doctorate and to assume the duties of an extraordinary professorship in the university. In a controversy which ensued between this high-school and the Jesuits Jansenius greatly distinguished himself, and was twice sent to Spain (1624 and 1625) in the interest of the university, Holland being, at that time, dependent on Spain. In 1621, Jansenius and Cyran, who had become convinced of the necessity of a reform within the pale of the Roman Catholic communion, met again at Louvain with a view to bringing about such a change. They divided the work among themselves, Jansenius taking the field of doctrine, Duvergier that of organization and life. At the same time, they entered into intimate connections with distinguished priests in Ireland and with some of the leaders of the Congregation of the Oratory (q. v.). The Spanish Inquisition seems to have had wind of this great and daring undertaking of the two noble spirits, and when, in 1630, Jansenius was nominated for the regular professorship of sacred literature at Louvain, a great effort was made to prevent the appointment. But Jansenius was made the recipient of this honorable distinction in spite of the Jesuits and the "Holy Office." He further secured the favor of the Spanish court by his opposition to France and its alliances with Protestant powers, to which course he seems to have been mainly incited by the tardiness of Richelieu to enter into an alliance with Jansenius and Duvergier in the intended reformatory movement. He severely attacked the pretensions of France, which at this time, by her attitude, was threatening the Spanish provinces of the Netherlands, in a work entitled *Mars Gallicus*, the publication of which occasioned the imprisonment of Duvergier, who was known to have been in constant epistolary intercourse with Jansenius, while to the latter it secured the see of Ypres (1636). In this city he died of the plague May 6, 1638, just as he had finished his *Augustinus*, a work embodying the result of 22 years' study of the writings of St. Augustine, and which, according to his own statement, he had read, pen in hand, at least ten times, and the portions relating to sin and grace no less than thirty times, determined to exhibit, expound, and illustrate, not his own views, but the exact views of the celebrated Church father (compare *Augustinus*, ii, Proœm. xxix, 65).

Jansenius was a learned theologian, but a plain, retiring man, who spent most of his life in his study, and was hardly known in his day beyond the immediate circle surrounding him. It is thought likely that the impulse communicated by Baius (q. v.) to the school of Louvain may have influenced Jansenius in giving this direction to his studies, as Cornelius Jansen, the bishop of Ghent, who was one of the instructors of our Jansen at Louvain, was himself a pupil of Baius, and that through him he had imbibed a strong dislike to the lax views of theology and morality advocated by the Jesuits. Jansenius took the ground, in opposing the Jesuits, that life stands in the closest relation to practical doctrinal precepts. He thought it impossible to attain true spiritual and Christian life without the fullest faith in this doctrine, which alone inculcates true humility. On the ground that pride was the cause of the fall, he sought to destroy all feeling of individual power, giving up human free agency to divine grace, and declaring human nature to be thoroughly corrupt, and unable by itself to do any good. While he believed these to have been the doctrines of Augustine himself, yet, as an obedient son of the Church of Rome, which, while he was anxious to purge her from the Pelagianism of the Jesuits, he dearly loved, he in his will, written half an hour before his death, said of his yet unpublished *Augustinus*, "I feel that it would be difficult to make any changes in it; yet, should the Holy See require such, remember that I am an obedient son, and willing to submit to the Church in which I have lived till death." He willed the MS. to Lamé, Fromond, and Calenus, who published it under the title *Augustinus . . . seu doctrina sancti Augustini de humanæ naturæ sanctitate, ægritudine, medicina, adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses* (Louvain, 1640, folio).

The *Augustinus* is divided into three parts. In the first Jansenius gives a historical account of Pelagianism, which heresy exalted the power of free-agency, and denied the original depravity of human nature, and, consequently, original sin. In the second part the writer sets forth the views of St. Augustine on human nature, both in its state of primitive purity and in its state of degradation after the fall. In the third part, finally, he presents the ideas of St. Augustine touching grace, by which Christ redeems us from our fallen state, also the predestination of men and angels. The fundamental proposition of the work is that, "since the fall of Adam, free-agency exists no longer in man, pure works are a mere gratuitous gift of God, and the predestination of the elect is not an effect of his prescience of our works, but of his free volition." This, it will be perceived, is a close reproduction of the views presented by Calvin in the preceding century. Such principles were, of course, in direct opposition with those advocated in Spain and Holland by the Jesuits Molina and Lessius, who wished to conciliate the doctrine of salvation by grace with a certain amount of human free-agency. Jansenius, besides, had personally incurred the hatred of the "Order of Jesus" by causing the Jesuits to be excluded as professors from the University of Louvain; and, though the work had failed to excite much attention, the Jesuits were determined now to be revenged on their enemy. The *Augustinus* thus became the occasion of a theological

controversy by far the most important in its doctrinal, social, and even political results which has agitated the Roman Catholic Church since the great Reformation of the 16th century. The whole weight of the order of the Jesuits having been brought into play to cause the condemnation of the work at Rome, it was accordingly and speedily done by pope Urban VIII, in his bull *In eminenti*, March 6, 1642. "So decisive a point would not have been gained by the Jesuits had they not succeeded in directing the attention of the papal court to a passage in which Jansenius brought forward a statement of St. Augustine as authoritative, although the same point (without reference, of course, to that father) had been condemned at Rome. *This was an inroad on papal infallibility, and this caused the rejection of the work.*" But if the book of Jansenius had failed to excite much attention, the issuing of a bull against its use, and all this at the instigation of the Jesuits, provoked no little interest. Especially strong was the opposition against the bull in Belgium and in France, and many were the partisans thus secured for the *Augustinus*, a number of whom—perhaps even the most—were animated, in all likelihood, less by doctrinal predilection than by an antipathy to the laxity of the moral teachings of the Jesuits, with which the opposition to the *Augustinus* was, of course, always identified. The very strongest of the partisans of the *Augustinus* were the recluses of Port-Royal (q. v.), a celebrated association of scholars and divines, among whom figured some of the brightest names in the Church of France of the 17th century. One of these, Antoine Arnauld (q. v.), in 1643 published his *De la fréquente Communion*, based on the predestination doctrine of Augustine and Jansenius, and thereby heaped more live coals on the heads of the now already much-distracted Jesuits. Even the Dominicans in different countries divided in opinion, those of Spain and Italy enlisting on the side of the Jansenists (as the advocates of the *Augustinus* came by this time to be called), those of France siding with the Jesuits. Even the Sorbonne, of whom Arnauld was a member, was divided; and, after an earnest strife between the contending parties had waged in France for some time, both decided in 1651 to carry it to Rome, and plead their cause before the *infallible* (!) judge. In 1649, Cornet Syndic, of the theological faculty at Paris, at the instigations of the Jesuits, had drawn up, in connection with some of them, five propositions, and had submitted them to the Sorbonne as forming the substance of Jansenius's work. These the Jesuits now presented at Rome, satisfied that if they could only once obtain the condemnation of these as heretical, the fall of Jansenism was of course secured. On May 31, 1653, the Jesuits finally secured their end, and Innocent X, in his bull *Cum occasione*, at the instigation of his cardinal Chigi, condemned the five propositions, which had been "mostly couched in somewhat ambiguous language, so as to admit of very different explanations," the object of the Jesuits being "to procure their condemnation in any sense or in any form." They are as follows: (1.) That there are divine commands which virtuous and pious persons, though they would gladly perform the same, cannot possibly obey, because God has not given them that measure of grace which is absolutely necessary to enable them to render such obedience. (2.) That no one in this depraved state of nature can resist the influence of divine grace when it operates on the heart. (3.) That, in order to make the actions of men meritorious, it is not necessary that they be free from *necessity*, but only from *restraint*. (4.) That the semi-Pelagians greatly err when they affirm that the will of man has power to receive or to resist the influence of prevenient grace. (5.) That they are semi-Pelagians who assert that Jesus Christ, by his passion and death, made an atonement for the sins of all men. The pope pronounced the first and the last proposition presumptuons, impious, and blasphemous, but the other three simply heretical. The friends and adherents of Jansenius admitted the propriety and justice of condemning these propositions, but maintained that they were not found in the work of Jansenius.

France was at this time at enmity with Rome, and cardinal Mazarin, though but little interested in these theological questions, believed this a favorable opportunity to re-establish amicable relations with Rome, offended with him on account of his arrest of cardinal Retz (q. v.). He held an assembly at the Louvre, March 26, 1654, in which thirty-eight bishops took part, and which declared that the pope's decision should be considered as applying positively to Jansenius's doctrine, and that all who held in any way the five condemned propositions should be dealt with as heretics. This decision was communicated to the heads of all the dioceses throughout France, and approved by the pope September 29. In January, 1656, the Sorbonne also took direct action against the Jansenists by condemning two letters of Arnauld, in which the latter declared that he could not find the five condemned propositions in Jansenius's writings. He also hit upon an expedient which not only rendered the bull for a time harmless, but which initiated a new movement against the doctrine of papal infallibility. "True," he said, "the see of Rome has authority to decide with respect to doctrine, and every good Catholic must submit to its decree; but the Holy See may misapprehend *fact* (as in the papal condemnation of Galileo's theory of planetary movement), whether a book contains certain statements or no: the meaning also of a writer may be misunderstood. Let the five propositions be heretical, yet, with the exception of the first, they are to be found neither in letter nor in spirit in the writings of Jansen." Thus arose the celebrated distinction of *de facto* and *de jure*. The Sorbonne now demanded of Arnauld that he should discontinue his opposition and submit to her decisions. He, and sixty others with him, still refusing to submit, they were expelled from the theological faculty. A general assembly of the clergy was also convened in September of this year, and the following formula was adopted on the motion of De Marca, archbishop of Toulouse: "I condemn with heart and lips the doctrine of the five propositions of Cornelius Jansenius, contained in his book entitled *Augustinus*, and which the pope and bishops have condemned, said doctrine not being that of St. Augustine, whom Jansenius has explained wrongly, against the real meaning of that holy doctor." A bull of Alexander VII, October 16, indorsed the decisions of the assembly, and affirmed that the condemned propositions were a part of the doctrines of Jansenius. The signing of the above formula, which was required of all French priests and members of religious orders, was everywhere opposed. Louis XIV, confounding the Jansenists with the Fronde, gave the Church the help of the civil authorities. But the members of Port-Royal continued in their opposition, thinking it perjury for them to sign it. Another royal edict of April 29, 1664, was now issued, which was more moderate in its demands. It merely required the signing as a matter of form, but at the same time threatened such as refused with seizure of their income, and even with excommunication. The opposition still continuing, headed by Port-Royal, persecution now commenced in earnest. The dungeons of the Bastile were crowded with those who refused to violate their consciences by subscribing a formula which they did not believe to set forth their views. The very passages of the fortress were occupied by prisoners. Among those who were thus treated was Lemaître de Sacy, spiritual director of the nuns of Port-Royal, who, accused of inciting them to resist, was imprisoned in the Bastile in 1666. As for Duvergier de Hauranne, he had already been sent to Vincennes thirty years before.

The government and the Jesuits, determined to suppress the rebellious spirit of Port-Royal (q. v.), now used every effort that could be devised to gain their end. Two months had elapsed since the expulsion of Arnauld from the Sorbonne, when the civil authorities ordered

that every novice and scholar should be removed from Port-Royal. This sharpened the pen of Pascal, and forth came the eighteen famous Provincial Letters (*Lettres à un provincial*). "In these remarkable letters the author showed with extraordinary force how narrow the question really was—whether five propositions are in the *Augustinus* or not, when no one had there pointed them out; he showed by what unworthy compromises the condemnation of Dr. Arnauld had been obtained; and, besides touching on doctrinal points which were involved, he firmly and manfully attacked the shameless casuistry of the Jesuits. These letters had a wonderful efficiency, for their power was felt even by those who had no apprehension of the present subject of controversy." Voltaire has said that in wit the earlier of them were not excelled by the comedies of Molière, while the latter rivalled the productions of Bossuet in eloquence; in fact, that they constituted an epoch in French literature. Says Hallam (*Introd. Literature of Europe*, Harper's edition, ii, 335): "These letters did more to ruin the name of Jesuit than all the controversies of Protestantism, or all the fulminations of the Parliament of Paris." "All Europe," says Macaulay (*History of England*, ii, 46), "read, admired, and laughed." But not only the Jesuits felt this heavy blow; even the incumbent of St. Peter's chair staggered and reeled under the sudden attack, and, as a set-off for it, cardinal Chigi, now Alexander VII, not only confirmed the position of his predecessor, and again declared that the five propositions were contained *de facto* in *Augustinus*, but, imitating the French authorities, accompanied it by the requisition that every one holding a spiritual office in the Church of Rome should abjure these errors by subscribing a formula prescribed for that purpose. This injudicious and oppressive act subjected the Jansenists to still severer persecutions, and continued the heated controversy, in which the ablest pens on both sides were enlisted. A great point was made by the Jesuits of the infallibility question. See INFALLIBILITY. But, as the controversy continued, it took a wider range, and came to embrace such topics as the rights of the bishops as contradistinguished from those of the pope; the Jesuitical views of theology and morality, so ably censured by Pascal, as we have already seen; the vast and alarming power of the Jesuits, and even many usages of the Church of Rome. The opposition, which thus far had seemed to come mainly from Port-Royal recluses, was found to have spread even among high dignitaries of the Church: four bishops refused to sign the formulary which Rome dictated, and many others of this high position in France took the ground of "respectful silence." In 1668 king Louis succeeded in obtaining the sanction of Rome for a compromise, substantially on the basis of Arnauld's distinction of *de facto* and *de jure*, and of *respectful silence.*

"Jansenistic principles now became far more widely diffused. The authorities of the Church of Rome thought a Jansenist was not necessarily a heretic; the schools of Port-Royal flourished even more than before the persecution and imprisonment;" the learned Tillemont became one of her recluses, and Racine one of her students. The incumbents of the papal chair even became the friends of Port-Royal, and obtained no little aid from it in their opposition to the Jesuits, which Innocent XI more especially manifested. This, of course, exasperated the Jesuits more than ever, and the great friend and protector of Jansenism at court, the duchess of Longueville, having died, they succeeded in gaining over Louis XIV, who, it is said, "abhorring Jansenism quite as much as he abhorred Protestantism, and very much more than he abhorred atheism," had abstained from open violence only at the instance of the duchess of Longueville. An edict was issued forbidding the admission of new members to Port-Royal, and the recluses were ordered to "quit the valley of Port-Royal *at once* and *forever*;" while Dr. Arnauld, the principal support of Jansenism, was obliged to flee from France, and to seek a refuge in the Low Countries, where he died in 1694. Another and last personal disciple of Cyran died in 1695. In the same and the following year passed away also the other great supports of Jansenism, and it was already whispered among the Jesuits and at the French court that the heretical movement had been successfully eradicated, when suddenly the crippled Jansenism received a fresh start. A priest of the Oratory of Paris, P. Quesnel, a man of learning, zeal, and spirituality of mind, had published the New Testament with annotations which were of a practical and edifying character, but strongly tinged with Jansenistic doctrines. It had been published in successive portions from 1671 to 1687. It had met at first with a most favorable reception. The Sorbonne had approved it; pope Clement XI had commended it; François Harlé, archbishop of Paris, an avowed enemy of the Jansenists, had expressed his approbation of it; Louis Antoine de Noailles, bishop of Chalons, subsequently archbishop of Paris, and finally a cardinal, who was *then* a zealous advocate of the Jansenistic doctrines, had even taken the work under his special protection, and enjoined its perusal in his diocese. It had been and still was eagerly read, and had already passed through many editions. Another edition had just (1702) become necessary, which was published under the title of *Le nouveau Testament en François, avec des reflexions morales sur chaque verse, pour en rendre la lecture plus utile, et la meditation plus aisée.* The author had never signed the five propositions, and his confessor now put the question to the Sorbonne "whether he might admit to communion a spiritual person who had done no more than maintain the 'reverential silence,' as some of the bishops had done," and the reply from the Sorbonne came that, with regard to points of fact, respectful obedience was sufficient obedience. But hardly had the *cas de conscience*, as it is technically termed, become known at Rome, when pope Clement XI condemned it in the most severe terms (Feb. 12, 1703), and complained to the king of those who so thoughtlessly stirred up the old controversy. Finally, the bull *Vineam Domini* (July 15, 1705) confirmed and renewed all preceding condemnations of the five propositions. This bull was accepted by the assembly of the clergy, and registered in Parliament. But with it the Jesuits were by no means quieted. They desired complete victory. Another edition of Quesnel's *Réflexions morales* having become necessary, and it being the production of a decided Jansenist, popularizing the Port-Royalists, who made it one of their duties to distribute it freely among the people, they determined that it also should be suppressed. They persisted in their efforts to secure the condemnation of the work by the papal see until at last success crowned their undertaking. In 1708 Clement XI pronounced against it, and in 1712 it was prohibited by a papal edict as "a text-book of undisguised Jansenism." By this time the king of France (Louis XIV) and the Jesuits were in league together, and we need not wonder that the Jansenists, as opponents of the Jesuits, were severely dealt with. Indeed, it is asserted that this bull, as well as many others that were issued about this time in Rome, and aiming at the French Church, were one and all dictated in Paris. Says Tregelles (*Jansenists*, p. 38), "The king and the Jesuits procured whatever bulls they wanted from the pope, and when they did not sufficiently set forth the Jansenist heresy, they were returned from Paris to Rome with corrections and alterations, to which the pope acceded." No wonder, then, that the bull of 1712 was in 1713 followed by another still severer, famous as the bull *Unigenitus*, by which were condemned all of the writings of Quesnel, and all that had ever been or might ever be written in their defence. It also singled out 101 propositions from the works of Quesnel "as false, captious, evil sounding, offensive to pious (!) ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, and injurious to the Church and its customs; contumelious, not against the Church merely, but also against the secular authorities;

seditious, impious, blasphemous, suspected of heresy, and also savoring of heresy itself; also favoring heretics; heresies, and schism, erroneous, nearly allied to heresy, often condemned; and, furthermore, also heretical; and sundry *heresies*, especially those contained in the well-known propositions of Jansenius, and that, too, in the sense in which those were condemned." The bull did not specify *which* of the propositions belonged severally to each of these heads of condemnation. "This was the triumph of doctrinal Jesuitism: Le Tellier, the king's Jesuit confessor, arranged the terms of the bull. It seemed as if every feeling of piety towards God, and every apprehension of his grace, was to be extinguished throughout the Papal Church—as if all who adhered at all to many doctrines that had been regarded as orthodox were to have their feelings and their consciences outraged." But the Gallican clergy was by no means agreed as to the acceptance of the bull, although the Jesuits earnestly pressed it. Some were in favor of its unconditional acceptance, others desired to make a qualifying declaration, and still others wished the qualification to be made by the pope himself. After much disputation, the king himself decided the matter by making submission to the bull binding in Church and State. From three to four thousand volumes, including pamphlets, relating to the controversy which this famous bull provoked, are found in the great Parisian library.

The death of Louis XIV left the fate of Jansenism still unsettled, while it also caused a relaxation of the repressive measures. The regent, duke of Orleans, was urged to refer the whole controversy to a national council, and the leaders of the Jansenist party appealed to a general council. The Jansenist party thus formed, which numbered four bishops and many inferior ecclesiastics, were called, from this circumstance, the *Appellants* (q. v.). The firmness of the pope, and a change in the policy of the regent, brought the Appellants into disfavor. Even the Parliament of Paris was forced to submit, and registered the papal bull in a *lit de justice* (June 4, 1720), although with a reservation in favor of the liberties of the Gallican Church. The Appellants for the most part submitted, the recusants being visited with severe penalties; and, on the accession of the new king, Louis XV, the unconditional acceptance of the bull was at length formally accomplished, so far as the general public were concerned. From this time forward the Jansenists were rigorously repressed, and their great stronghold, Port-Royal, having been already, in 1709-11, destroyed by connivances of the king and the Jesuits, a large number emigrated to the Netherlands, where they formed a community, with Utrecht as a centre. (See below, Jansenists in Holland.)

"During the 18th century Jansenism degenerated in France. In 1727 François de Paris died, and was buried in the cemetery of St. Medard, in Paris. He was of an honorable family, and had early shown a religious turn of mind. His patrimony he bestowed upon the poor, and earned his livelihood by weaving hose. In 1720, at the age of thirty, he was made deacon of St. Medard. Cardinal de Noailles would gladly have invested him with a higher office, but he declined. In 1722 he resigned his deaconship, and retired to a wilderness. He soon returned to Paris, where he lived in seclusion and poverty, denying himself the ordinary comforts of life, and shortening his days by self-inflicted torments. A magnificent monument was erected to his memory by his brother, a member of the French Parliament, who subsequently renounced his worldly position and property, and lived a life of seclusion and asceticism. To the grave of Francis de Paris multitudes flocked. There, in various ways, they testified their superstitious regard and veneration, and there marvellous cures were claimed to be wrought and miracles said to be performed. Strong religious emotions were manifested, and some were seized with convulsions. Some were favored with the spirit of prophecy, and predicted the overthrow of Church and State. Such predictions were heard until within a short time previous to, and even during the revolution of 1789. As late as 1840 multitudes of religious pilgrims still resorted to the spot, on the anniversary of his death, and crowned with garlands the grave of De Paris. The superstition and fanaticism which prevailed at his grave soon after his death were not wholly confined to the common people, but were shared by a considerable number of men of learning and rank. Those of the latter class who made themselves most conspicuous were Hieronymus N. de Paris, the parliamentary member just alluded to; C. Folard, widely and favorably known by his observations on the history of Polybius; and Louis Basilius Carré de Montgerou, a member of Parliament, who experienced a wonderful conversion at the grave of this venerated saint, and who subsequently narrated the marvellous phenomena there witnessed, and vindicated their supernatural and divine character. These superstitious and fanatical excesses, combined with the austerities and even inhuman mortifications practiced by many of the more zealous Jansenists, tended to prejudice the more enlightened against their cause, and greatly weakened its moral power. Petitpied, Asveld, Rollin, and others, attempted in vain to stem the tide of superstition and fanaticism. These excesses ruined the cause of the Jansenists—at least in France, or, in the words of Voltaire, 'the grave of St. Francis of Paris became the grave of Jansenism,' for thenceforth the whole ecclesiastical authority lost its importance" (Hurst's *Hagenbach*, ii, 426). Yet men were slow to give it up: they clung to it even in its death-hours. Such as were desirous of a reformation of the Roman Catholic Church secretly or openly espoused the cause of the Jansenists. Those who desired to see the arrogance of the pope checked and his power restrained favored the Jansenistic cause. All who were opposed to the Jesuits were regarded as Jansenists. Enlightened men everywhere sympathized with the Jansenists in their efforts to restrict papal encroachments and the demoralizing influence of Jesuitism; and, when its sun went down in France, the friends of reform in the Roman Catholic Church turned towards Holland, and hoped that from it would go out a great power for good. The most distinguished theologians of Italy, such as Zola, Tamburini, and others, held a regular epistolary correspondence with the Jansenists at Utrecht. (See below.)

Had the Roman Catholic Church been susceptible of a thorough reformation, it is reasonable to think that it would have been effected by the enlightened, zealous, self-sacrificing, and persevering efforts of the Jansenists. They were true sons of the Church—they sincerely desired its inward and outward prosperity—they cherished an almost servile devotion to it. Though their system of faith and morals was essentially Augustinian, and thus in substantial agreement with that of the Reformers, yet they had no sympathy with the Reformers, and their minds were filled with prejudice against them. But they made common cause with these in their appreciation of the New-Testament Scriptures, in their efforts to promote their use among the people, and in their inculcation of holiness of heart and life. To their praise it should be mentioned that a Bible Society was established by the Jansenists of France as early as 1726, which flourished for thirty years. Though the Jansenistic movement was unsuccessful in reforming the Romish Church, yet it did good service to the cause of Christ by counteracting the prevalent spirit of corruption, and by promoting a spirit of sincere piety. The piety which it fostered was never, it is true, as enlightened as that which prevailed in the Protestant Church: the piety of even its most enlightened advocates was not wholly free from certain admixtures of superstition, fanaticism, mysticism, and asceticism. We add, in conclusion, that Gallicanism, as revived and formulated in the four famous propositions adopted by the Council of French Clergy in 1682, was also under great obligations to the Jansenists.

Jansenists in Holland.—Although the fanatical ex-

cesses to which Jansenism had gone in France for a time darkened its prospects of ultimate success, it must be conceded, even by Roman Catholics of the most ultramontane class, that Jansenists in the 18th and 19th centuries "preserved a close association with greater purity of morals and a deeper faith" than their opponents the Jesuits, who for the last 200 years have appeared in behalf of the infallibility of the pope only to strengthen and to preserve their own existence as an order. It was this characteristic feature of the Jansenists that "everywhere smoothed the way for them." When persecution had driven them from France, "we find traces of them in Vienna and in Brussels, in Spain and in Portugal, and in every part of Italy" (Ranke, *Hist. Papacy*, London, 1851, ii, 293). Everywhere they now disseminated their doctrines, but it is especially in Protestant Holland that the sect has been most successful, and has maintained itself to our own day. In the days of Philip II of Spain, Utrecht had been raised to the dignity of an archiepiscopal see (A.D. 1557). The other United Provinces, on throwing off the Spanish shackles, became Calvinists, but Utrecht and Haarlem continued faithful to the Roman hierarchy. To this part of a country, where the evangelical life had taught even the Roman Catholic communist a spirit of toleration, the Jansenists directed their steps, and it is here alone that they still appear as a definite, tangible body. Their organization in Holland dates partly from the forced emigration of the French Jansenists under king Louis XIV, and partly from the controversy about Quesnel at the opening of the last century; but their success as an independent sect (if we may thus style adherents of the Roman Catholic communion, but defenders of the evangelical doctrine) dates from the day when the vicar apostolic, Peter Codde, an intimate friend of Arnauld, was suspended by Clement XI in 1702 from his position on account of his firm adherence to Jansenistic principles, was allured to Rome, treacherously detained there for three years in defiance of all canonical regulations, and a certain Theodore de Cock, a *friend* of the Jesuits (so a Jesuit sometimes designates himself), appointed in his stead. The chapter of Utrecht, thus deprived of the man of their choice, refused to acknowledge the new vicar named in Codde's place, and angrily joined themselves to the Appellant party in France, many of whom had come thither. The government of Holland also interfered in 1703, suspended the operation of the papal bull, and deprived De Cock of the archbishopric. Codde, on his return, did all that he could to repair the injuries sustained by the Jansenists during the incumbency of De Cock, who had made many changes, had deprived many priests, some even of thirty years' standing, of their livings, and had appointed his Jesuitical friends instead. At length, in 1723, they elected an archbishop, Cornelius Steenhoven, for whom the form of episcopal consecration was obtained from the French bishop Vorlet (titular of Babylon), who had been suspended for Jansenistic opinions. A later Jansenist archbishop of Utrecht, Meindarts, established in 1742 Haarlem and in 1758 Deventer as his suffragan sees; and in 1763 a synod was held, which sent its acts to Rome, in recognition of the primacy of that see, which the Church of Utrecht professes to acknowledge. Since that time the formal succession has been maintained, each bishop, on being appointed, notifying the pope of his election, and craving confirmation. The popes, however, have uniformly rejected all advances, except on the condition of the acceptance of the bull *Unigenitus*. But the Jansenists have steadfastly refused to comply with this demand, and have even refused to be *bought* over to the Church of Rome, as was attempted in 1823. The recent act of the Roman see in defining as of catholic faith the dogma of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin Mary has been the occasion of a new protest. Their language is firm and explicit: "We owe it to ourselves, to the Catholic faith," say they, "and to the defence of the truth, *to reject boldly the new and false dogma of the immaculate conception.* We should therefore fail in our duty if we kept silence any longer. . . . Our Church (the Jansenist sect) has often appealed to an œcumenical council to be lawfully appointed. We renew this appeal. . . . We make our appeal at this time and place because of the violation done to the faith, and the injury which the bishops have suffered, since they were not consulted when the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin Mary, mother of our Saviour, was set up as of divine authority. May the Father of lights enlighten us, and work his will in us. We sign ourselves, with veneration, very holy father, the humble servants of your holiness." Then follow the signatures of the metropolitan archbishop and the two bishops. This letter, dated Sept. 6, 1856, is accompanied by a pastoral exhortation addressed to the faithful. The Romish court replied by a formal anathema dated Dec. 4, of which the following is an extract: "The sacred congregation of the most eminent and most reverend cardinals of the holy Romish Church, inquisitors general throughout the Christian republic against heretical perversity, having heard the report of the committee acting in the name of our holy father, pope Pius IX, do now condemn the views published by the *three false, schismatical bishops of the province of Utrecht*. . . . The sacred congregation forbid all persons, of every state and condition, in any way, and under any pretext, to print the said document containing these views, to keep it in their house, or read it; every one must instantly give it up to the bishops or to the inquisitors." The Jansenists are genuine Roman Catholics, but they refuse a servile obedience to Rome. They have also come to deny the infallibility of the pope altogether, and recognise him only as the "head of the bishops," placing the highest authority of the Church in a general council. They circulate the Scriptures, and insist on inward piety. They denominate themselves *Roman Catholics* of the *episcopal clergy*. They still number about 5000 souls, and are divided over twenty-five parishes in the dioceses of Utrecht and Haarlem. Their clergy are about thirty in number, with a seminary at Amersfoort, which was founded in 1726. The name of their present archbishop is Van Santen, whom Rome has again and again vainly endeavored to induce, by the basest of means, to sign the prescribed formulary (comp. Tregelles, *Jansenists*, p. 80 sq.). So far as they can be said to possess a theological system, it may be described as a compound of Jansenist and ultra-Gallican principles.

Other Works of Jansenius.—Besides the work which gave rise to the schismatical movement in the Roman Catholic Church, he wrote also *Oratio de interioris hominis Reformatione* (1627; translated into French by Arnauld d'Andilly):—*Alexipharmacum pro civibus Silvæ Ducensibus, adversus ministrorum suorum fascinum, sive Responsio brevis ad libellum eorum provocatorium* (Louvain, 1630):—*Spongia notarum, quibus Alexipharmacum aspersit Gisbertus Vœtius* (Louvain, 1631, 8vo):—*Tetrateuchus, sive commentarius in quatuor Evangelia* (Louvain, 1639, 4to):—*Pentateuchus, sive commentarius in quinque libros Moysis* (Louvain, 1641, 4to):—*Analecta in Proverbia, Ecclesiasten, Sapientiam, Habacum et Sophoniam* (Louvain, 1644, 4to):—*Mars Gallicus, seu de justitia armorum et fœderum regis Galliæ, Libri II* (1633). See Foppens, *Bibl. Belgica*; Bayle, *Dict. Critique*; Dumas, *Hist. des cinq Propositions*; Leydecker, *Historia Jansenismi* (Utrecht, 1695, 8vo); Frick, *Uebersetzung der Bulla Unigenitus*, etc. (Ulm, 1717, 4to); *Geschiedenis van de Christelijke Kerk in de 18de eeuw*, door A. Ijpeij, xii, 335-387; Harenberg, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*; Fontaine, *Mém. p. servir à l'Histoire du Port-Royal* (1738); *Divers écrits touchant la signature du formulaire* (1706); Hulsemannus, *De auxiliis gratiæ*; Nieuwlands, *Vermaaklijkheden uit de Kerkgeschiedenis*; *La Constitution Unigenitus avec des Remarques* (Utrecht); Walchii *Bibl. Theolog.*; Henke's *Kirchengeschichte des 18ten Jahrhunderts*; *La Verité des Miracles, operés var*

l'intercession de Mr. de Paris (1737, 1745; written by Montgerou); Reuchlin, *Gesch. von Port-Royal* (Hamb. 1839, 1844); *Traité dogmatique sur les miracles du temps* (1737); *Geschiedenis der Christelijke Kerk*, door Profs. De Groot, Ter Haar, Kist, Moll, Nieuwenhuis, etc., vol. v (Amsterdam, 1859); Colonia, *Dict. des livres Jansénistes*, etc.; Ste. Beuve, *Port Royal*, vol. i and ii; Tregelles, in Kitto's *Journ. Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1851, and since in separate and enlarged form, *The Jansenists* (London, 1851, 12mo); Mrs. Schimmelpenninck, *Select Memoirs of Port-Royal; Déclaration des Evêques de Hollande*, etc. (Paris, 1827); Gerberon, *Hist. de Jansenism;* Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV*, ii, 264; Rapin (Jesuit), *Histoire de Jansenisme*, edit. by Domenech (Paris, 1861, 8vo); *Am. Bib. Rep.* 3d ser. iii, 689 sq.; *Am. Theol. Rev.* 1860, Aug. vol. ii. See JESUITS; PORT-ROYAL.

Jansen, Ellert, an Anabaptist martyr, suffered during the persecutions of the Anabaptists near the middle of the 16th century in the Low Countries, then under the government of Charles V. In the year 1549 he was imprisoned at Amsterdam, with nineteen other Anabaptists. He was a tailor by trade, but his mental capacity and force of character designated him as a man well qualified even for one of the learned professions. While his other friends escaped from prison, he remained behind, determined to profess openly his peculiar Christian views, or die in defence of them. March 20, 1549, he finally suffered the so much coveted martyrdom by burning. See Brown, *Baptist Mart.* p. 67.

Jansenism. See JANSENIUS, 2.

Jansse, LUCAS, a distinguished French Protestant theologian and writer, was born at Rouen about 1605. He studied theology at the Huguenot seminary situated at the lately celebrated Sedan, and was pastor at Rouen from 1632 to 1682, when age and infirmities obliged him to resign. At the revocation of the Edict of Nantes he retired to Rotterdam, where he died April 24th, 1686. Jansse was a man of solid learning and lively imagination. He made himself especially conspicuous by a pamphlet—*La Messe trouveé dans l'Ecriture* (Villefranche [Rouen], 1647, 12mo)—in which he ridiculed Véron for having, in an edition of the Louvain Bible published at Paris in 1646, translated the beginning of Acts xiii, 2 by "As they said mass unto the Lord." In order to avoid persecution, Jansse destroyed a large number of copies; but it was often reprinted, as in *Recueil de plusieurs pièces curieuses* (Villefranche [Holland], 1678, 12mo), and alone under the title *Le Miracle du P. Véron sur la Messe* (Lond. 1699, 12mo). He wrote, also, *Traité de la Fin du Monde* (Rouen and Quevilly, 1656, 8vo):—*Le Chrétien au Pied de la Croix* (Rouen, 1683, 8vo), etc. See Chauffepié, *Dict. Hist.*; Haag, *La France Protest.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 354. (J. N. P.)

Janssenboy, the family name of several Dutch theologians quite distinguished in the Roman Catholic Church, mostly as missionaries of the Dominican order.

1. CORNELIUS, born near the beginning of the present century, was educated at Louvain, then went to Italy, and, after preaching and teaching for some time, the Congregation of the Propaganda sent him in 1623 to the northern provinces on mission work, and, as his especial field, Saxony was designated. Failing, however, to make many converts in this country, the very cradle of Protestantism, he was ordered to remove to Flanders. On his return to Italy in 1637, he was lost at sea (Oct. 11). He wrote several works of some note, mostly of a polemical nature, amongst which, of especial interest to us, his *Défense de la Foi Catholique.*

2. DOMINICUS, brother of the former, born at Amsterdam March 14, 1647, was also dispatched to the northern provinces at the same time as his brother Cornelius. He resided at Hamburg, but the opposition he here encountered by imprudent conduct finally resulted in his expulsion from the city; and although the order was afterwards revoked, by reason of his pledges to be more considerate and fair in his representations of the Reformers, he quitted Hamburg in 1634 and retired to a Dominican convent at Cologne. In 1643 his superiors sent him to Amsterdam, where he died March 14, 1647. While at Cologne, Dominicus published several works in defence of the doctrines and usages of the Roman Catholic Church, but they are rather of an inferior order.

3. NICHOLAS was born at Zierickzee, on the island of Schouwen, Zealand, in the second half of the 16th century. After having taken the Dominican garb at Anvers, he was appointed regent and then superior of the college at Lire, in Brabant, and afterwards professor of theology at Louvain. His superior ability pointed him out as one of the ablest men for missionary labor among the Lutherans of Denmark, and he was intrusted with this work. After a stay of several years in Holstein, Norway, and other northern provinces, he went to Rome to give an account of his labors, and to propose the measures necessary to re-establish Romanism in those countries. In 1623 he was again dispatched to the same countries, this time reinforced by his brothers above mentioned. He failed, however, in making much of an impression on the Protestants, who had heard and seen enough of Romanism and its workings to be satisfied that salvation did not flow through that channel. While he was treated with the utmost liberality by both the government and the people among whom he came to proclaim the doctrines of the Roman Catholic religion, the converts for his religion were few, if any. But it must be conceded that Rome had well chosen the man who was likely to make converts for popery, if such a thing had been possible. Nicholas was certainly a man of great erudition, and well qualified to gain even the admiration of his opponents. He died November 21, 1634. His works are, *Panegyrique de St. Thomas d'Aquin* (Louvain, 1621, 8vo):—*Vie de St. Dominique* (Anvers, 1622, 8vo):—*Defensio Fidei Cathol.* (Anvers, 1631, 8vo), etc. See Touron, *Hommes illustres de l'ordre de St. Dominique;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvi, 355 sq. (J. H. W.)

Janssens, ERASMUS (Lat. ERASMUS JOHANNES), a Dutch Unitarian theologian, was born about 1540. He was rector of the College of Antwerp, but his advocacy of Socinianism obliged him to resign that office in 1576. He was next rector of the College of Embden (Oost Frize), but, in consequence of new persecutions, he went in 1579 to Frankfort, and thence to Poland, where he settled at Cracovia in 1584. Here he asked to be permitted publicly to defend his opinions. The demand was granted, and the renowned Faustus Socinius was his opponent. Their conference lasted two days (29th and 30th of November, 1584), and passed off calmly; but, both having subsequently published an account of the proceedings, they accused each other of incorrectness. Janssens, however, on being offered the pastorship of a Unitarian congregation at Clausemburg, in Transylvania, retracted his former principles, and adopted those of Socinius (q. v.), who, as is well known, by his great ability not only silenced all the anti-Trinitarians that differed from his views, but finally even gained them all over to his side (comp. Krasinski, *Reformation in Poland* [Lond. 1840, 2 vols. 8vo], ii, 366). Janssens is supposed to have died near the close of the 16th century. His principal works were, *Clara Demonstratio Antichristum immediate post mortem apostolorum cœpisse regnare in Ecclesia Christi* (1584, 12mo) [this work gave rise to the persecutions which obliged Janssens to retire to Poland]:—*Antithesis doctrinæ Christi et Anti-Christi de uno vero Deo* (anon. 1585, 12mo; with a refutation by Jerome Zanchio, Neustadt, 1586, 4to):—*Scriptum quo causas propter quas vita æterna contingat complectitur*, etc. (1589):—*Epistola ad Faustum Socinum*, with an answer of the latter dated April the 20th, 1590:—*De Unigeniti Filii Dei existentia, sive disputatio inter Erasmum Johannem et Faustum Socinum*, etc. (Cracov. 1595, 12mo):—*De Quatuor Monarchiis:—Commentarius in Apocalypsin.* He published, also, the *Bibliorum Pars IV. id est Libri Prophetici, Latina recensio ex Hebræa facta,*

brevibusque scholiis illustrata ab Immanuele Tremellio et Franc. Junio (Francf. 1579). See Diercksen's *Antuerpia Christo nascens*, etc., p. 678; Vriemoet, *Athen. Fris.* p. 182; Fauste Socin, *Epist. III ad Matth. Radecium*, p. 386, 437); Sandius, *Bibl. Antitrinit.* p. 72, 84, 87, 88, 105; Paquot, *Mém. pour servir a l'hist. des Pays-Bas*, vii, 328–333.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxvi, 357. (J. N. P.)

Jansson, Hans Hendrick, a Dutch theologian, born at Siddeburen Sept. 3, 1701, was educated at the University of Groningen. His theological instructors there were Otto Verbrugge and Antonius Driessen. Attracted by the spirit and fame of Vitringa, he resorted to the Franeker University, and imbibed the spirit of that celebrated divine. After becoming a candidate for the ministry, he repaired to Utrecht to enjoy the instructions of the distinguished Lampe. He was settled successively at Dirksland (1723–31), Embden (1731–45), Finsterwolde (1745–48), Veendam (1748–52), and Groningen (1752–80). His first work, by which he made himself known as a worthy disciple of Vitringa, was an exposition of the Epistle of James. It was commended by competent theologians of his day as being of sterling merit. He occupies in this work high evangelical ground, insisting not on a heathenish morality, but on practical piety. In 1750 he gave to the public an exposition of the Epistle of Jude. In this work he opposes the enthusiasm and mysticism which prevailed around him, and which tended to subvert vital godliness. His next work was on the third chapter of the Prophecy of Zechariah. These were all quarto volumes. Several smaller volumes of an experimental and practical character were also published by him. He enjoyed in a very high degree the love and esteem of the congregations which he successively served. He died March 1, 1780, universally lamented. See B. Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, ii, 169 sq. (J. P. W.)

Jansson, Hillebrand, a Dutch theologian, was born at Zandeweer April 20, 1718. He was fitted for the university by his father, who was also named Hillebrand, and who was successively settled at Sebaldeburen, Noordhorn, and Zandeweer. The younger Hillebrand first settled at Noordhorn, where he remained from 1741–50; then removed to Kropswolde, where he labored till 1753, when he accepted a call to Veendam. This was at the time one of the largest and most populous parishes of Holland. Here he labored for nearly half a century with zeal and fidelity. He died Oct. 12, 1789. His name is famous in the history of the Reformed Church of Holland by reason of the conspicuous part he took in the controversy on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Francis Gomar, noted as the opponent of Arminius, was one of the first to give a latitudinarian interpretation to what is said on this point in the Confession of Faith (Article 35), and in the Heidelberg Catechism (81st Q. and A.). According to him, every one who openly acknowledged the Christian religion might come to the table of the Lord irrespective of personal piety. This view was adopted by many, and from time to time found public advocates. In 1764 E. Van Eerde defended it against J. K. Appelius. He appealed to the standards, and he is said to have maintained his views with decided ability. Jansson entered the lists on the side of Van Eerde, and henceforth became the principal combatant. The position he took was this: "Every one who has a historical faith confesses the same, and deports himself inoffensively and exemplarily, and in accordance with his confession not only may, but also must come to the Supper; and in so far as he does it in obedience to Christ's command, in expectation of his blessing, promised in connection with the administration of the Word and the seals of the covenant, he does not sin in the thing itself, although he always does it ill as to the manner so long as he does not do it spiritually." He seems to have placed the observance of this ordinance on the same footing with that of hearing the Word preached and other acts of divine worship, such as singing and prayer. Appelius, on the contrary, maintained "that the Supper was, according to the teaching of the Scriptures and that of the Reformed Church, instituted for the regenerate, who possess spiritual life and its attributes." This controversy greatly agitated the Church, and its effect was in some places to restrain men from a public profession of their faith, and to deter those who had already made a profession from coming to the communion. A somewhat intermediate view, presented and advocated by the accomplished P. Bosveld, served to allay the agitation, and finally prevailed in the Church. His view is substantially this: All who have made a public profession of their faith, whether they possess the internal evidence of having been truly converted or not, must be regarded as believers, and, as such, entitled to and bound to observe this ordinance; and the minister must invite all such to come to the communion, as being their privilege and duty. This view is substantially in harmony with the theory and practice of most evangelical denominations in this country. See *Geschiedenis van de Christelijke Kerk in de 18de eeuw*, door A. Ijpeij, vii, 401 sq.; *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk*, door A. Ijpeij en J. Dermout, iii, 612 sq.; Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, ii, 175 sq. (J. P. W.)

Januarius is a name under which some fourteen martyrs are honored in the Roman Catholic Church. A *gens Januaria*, or family of that name, is found among the old inscriptions. There is a monument in Turin to the memory of a certain Januarius Vintius. The name seems to have belonged especially to Africa and Southern Italy. Its popularity is proved by the large number of martyrs bearing it, which is surpassed by few others (perhaps Alexander, Felix, John, etc.). The best known among them is St. Januarius, bishop of Benevento, who was beheaded in the early part of the 4th century (according to the Neapolitan tradition, at Pozzuoli, where many Christians suffered a like fate, in 305). The saint's day is Sept. 19. Januarius is the patron saint of Naples. His head and blood, preserved in vials and looked upon as holy relics, are kept in the chapel El Tesoro, in the cathedral of Naples, where they were placed Jan. 13, 1497. According to tradition, a pious woman gathered at the place of his execution two bottles of his blood, and presented them to bishop Severus of Naples. On three festivals each year, the chief of which is the day of the martyrdom, Sept. 19, and on occasions of public danger or calamity, as earthquakes or eruptions, the head and the phials of the blood are carried in solemn procession to the high altar of the cathedral, or of the church of St. Clare, where, after prayer of greater or less duration, the blood, on the phials being brought into contact with the head, is believed to liquefy, and in this condition is presented for the veneration of the people, or for the conviction of the doubter. It occasionally happens that a considerable time elapses before the liquefaction takes place, and sometimes it altogether fails. The latter is regarded as an omen of the worst import; and on those occasions when the miracle is delayed beyond the ordinary time, the alarm and excitement of the congregation rise to the highest pitch, as it is represented in such a case to be an evil sign for the city and the people. The blood is exposed three times every year, particularly on the first Sunday in May, and in cases of especial public affliction. The process of the performance of this so-called miracle is kept secret by the clergy of Naples. Of late years the liquefaction of the blood was interpreted as a sign of the saint's good-will towards the government; but it has done so for Ferdinand II, for Garibaldi, and for Victor Emanuel with equal ease, which would seem to indicate that the saint is indifferent to the political fate at least of his devout worshippers. Addison, in his *Travels*, speaks of the performance (in his notices of Naples) thus: "I had twice an opportunity of seeing the operation of this pretended miracle, and must confess that, so far from thinking it a real miracle, I look upon it as *one of the most bungling tricks I ever saw.*"

Another Januarius, said to have suffered under Felix, has Jan. 7 assigned to him in the Martyrologium of the Romish Church. Still another, said to have suffered martyrdom in Africa with Paul and Gerontius, has Jan. 19. Veda names April 8 for a Januarius of Africa, along with Macaria and Maxima. July 10 is kept in honor of two saints of like name, one of which belonged to the seven sons of Felicitas, who are said to have been put to death towards the end of the 2d century at Rome; the other suffered martyrdom in Africa with Felix and Nabor. Their remains were transferred to Milan. July 11 is sacred to a Januarius who died at Nicopolis. Another suffered martyrdom at Carthage, together with Philippus, Catulinus, etc., July 15. A Januarius, together with Felicissimus and Agapetus, fell a martyr under Decius at Rome, and the Church observes Aug. 6 in his memory. October 13 is the anniversary of the Spanish martyrs Faustus and Januarius, who suffered at Cordova. On Oct. 24 there is mention made of a Januarius who, after being long persecuted, was, together with Felix, Audactus, etc., put to death and buried near Carthage. The island of Sardinia has also a Januarius, in whose honor they keep Oct. 25. On Dec. 2 we find a Januarius, with Severus, etc.; and another in Africa Dec. 15. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 433 sq.; Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* s. v.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v, 500; Zell, *Römische Epigraphik*, ii, 88; *Monumenta Taurinensia*, ii, 119; J. G. Keysler, *Neueste Reisen* (Hanov. 1751); *Acta Sancta*, vol. vi; Chambers, *Cyclopæd.* s. v.; Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* i, 502.

Ja'num (Heb. *Yanum'*, יָנוּם, *slumber*, otherwise for יָנוּן, *propagation;* Septuag. Ἰανούμ v. r. Ἰεμαΐν, Vulg. *Janun*), a town in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Eshean and Beth-tappuah (Josh. xv, 53). The Heb. text has יָנִים (as if *Yanim'*, יָנִים) by a manifest error, which is corrected in the Masoretic marg.; many copies have *Yanus'*, יָנוּס, *flight*, as in the Eng. margin "Janus." The Syriac version has *Yalum.* Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἰανουά) mentions a place, *Janua*, three miles south of Legio, but admits that it cannot be the locality in question. M. de Saulcy (*Nar.* i, 437) thinks the site may possibly be marked by the ruins of *Jenheh*, at the foot of a hill nearly south of Hebron; but, according to Dr. Robinson, the remains are little more than those of caves (*Bib. Res.* ii, 472). The associated names appear to indicate a district immediately north-west of Hebron (Keil, *Comment. on Josh.* ad loc). The position corresponds with that of a ruined site, *Ras Jabreh*, marked on the first edition of Van de Velde's map immediately on the west of the road directly north from Hebron to Jerusalem, and adjoining Khurbet en-Nasara; but the second edition of the map omits both these sites, though the latter is explicitly mentioned in the *Memoir* (p. 247) as "a ruined village" visited by him as well as by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, i, 317).

Janus. See JANUM.

Janus, a very old Roman divinity, whose name is merely a different form of *Dianus* (probably the sun). The worship of this divinity held a high place in the regards of the Romans. "In every undertaking his name was first invoked, even before that of Jupiter, which is the more singular, as Jupiter was unquestionably the greatest of the Roman gods. Perhaps it may be taken as a verification of the tradition that Janus was the oldest of them, and ruled in Italy before any of the others came thither. (See below, our reference to Romulus.) He presided not only over the beginning of the year, but over the beginning of each month, each day, and the commencement of all enterprises. On New Year's day people made each other presents of figs, dates, honey-cakes, sweetmeats, etc.; wore a holiday-dress, saluted each other kindly, etc. The pious Romans prayed to him every morning, whence his name of *Matutinus Pater* (Father of the Morning)." Janus is represented with a sceptre in his right hand and a key in his left, sitting on a beaming throne (probably a relic of the original, or at least very old worship of Janus as the sun). He has also two (and sometimes even three) faces (whence the expression, applied to a deceitful person, "Janus-faced" [compare Ovid, *Fasti*, i, 135]), one youthful and the other aged; the one looking forward, and the other backward, in which some have professed to see a symbol of the wisdom of the god, who beholds both the past and the future, and others simply of the return of the year. Although it is related that Romulus himself erected a temple to Janus in Rome, it seems that a special impulse to the cultus of this god was first acquired by the action in his favor of Numa, who dedicated to him the passage, close by the Forum, on the road connecting the Quirinal with the Palatine. This passage (erroneously called a temple, but which was merely a sacred gateway containing a statue of Janus) was open in times of war, and closed in times of peace. The speculations as to the origin of this Latin deity has been very extended and varied: thus some have even supposed Janus of the Romans the parallel of Noah of the Hebrews, deriving his name from יַיִן, *wine*, because Noah was the first planter of vines, and because of his two faces, the one representing his sight of the world before, the other his sight of the world after the Deluge! See Chambers, *Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Vollmer, *Wörterb. der Mythol.* p. 913 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.*

Coin with head of Janus.

Janvier, Levi, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, born at Pittsgrove, N. J., April 25, 1816, graduated at Princeton College with the highest honors of his class in 1835, and then pursued a theological course of study at Princeton Seminary, teaching at the same time in Lafayette College, where he so ably discharged his duties that he was urged to accept a professorship. But Janvier preferred the missionary work, and he was licensed and ordained by the West Jersey Presbytery, his father, also a minister, preaching on the occasion. He went to India, and there was for several years superintendent of the mission press; he also prepared a translation of the Pentateuch and Psalms into Punjabi, and aided in the preparation of a Punjabi dictionary and other works in this department. Impaired health obliged him to seek recreation, and he came on a visit to his native country in 1859. In 1860 he returned again to the missionary work, but he continued only a short time to serve his Master here on earth: March 25, 1864, he was murdered by a Sikh at Anandpore, India. "He was a missionary of a high order; learned, wise, gentle, humble, winning; whose loving, benevolent life preached most touchingly the Gospel of his Master," was the testimony of one of the papers of India after the assassination of Mr. Janvier. Another colaborer (the Rev. J. T. Gracey) wrote to the *Methodist*, New York, in April, 1864, that "great excitement prevailed among the people," and that Janvier's funeral "was attended, with marked respect, by thousands of natives." See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1866, p. 117 sq. (J. H. W.)

Janvier, René-Ambroise, a French Benedictine monk, was born at Sainte-Osmane, on the Main, in 1613. He was one of the most distinguished Hebraists of the 17th century, and is celebrated for his Latin translations of several Jewish commentaries, among which are a translation of Kimchi's commentary on the Psalms entitled *R. Dav. Kimchi Commentarii in Psalmos* (Paris, 1666, 4to). He died at Paris April 25, 1682. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvi, 363; Hauréau, *Hist. Littéraire du Main*, ii, 115; *Hist. littér. de la Congreg. de St. Maur*, p. 101.

Jao. See JEHOVAH; VALENTINIANISM.

Japan, a country in Eastern Asia, consisting of a great number (about 3850) of large and small islands, which are situated between 30° 10′ and 54° 24′ N. lat., and between 147° 34′ and 164° 30′ E. long. It is divided into Japan proper, which embraces the large islands Japan or Nipon (with Sado, Oki, and Awadsi), Sitkokf, and Kiusiu (with a number of adjacent islands), and the dependencies, to which belong Jeso, with adjacent islands, the 174 Kuriles, the less known (89) Bomie, and the Lieu Kieu Islands. The population is generally estimated at from 35 to 40 millions; its area at about 150,000 square miles.

The history of Japan, according to the traditions of the country, begins with the dynasty of the heavenly gods, consisting of seven generations, and reigning from four to five million years. It was followed by the dynasty of the earthly gods, consisting of five generations, and reigning 2,342,167 years. The native population (the Ainos) was at a very early period (according to some as early as B.C. 1240) pushed back by the immigrants from China. Probably Simnu (the divine warrior), the founder of the Japanese empire, with whom the authenticated history of the country begins, was also a Chinese. He first conquered Kiusiu (about B.C. 667), subsequently Nipon, where he erected a palacious temple (Dairi) to the sun goddess (Miako), and constituted himself ruler, under the honorary title of Mikado. When he died he was regarded as a national hero. His successors were called Mikado or Kin Rey (emperor); also Ten Oo (Heavenly Prince) or Ten Zin (Heavenly Child). In the century before Christ the dignity of the four commanders-in-chief (Djogoon) was created in the war against the Ainos. As chiefs of the army, they concentrated the executive power in their hands, steadily enlarged it, and, under the reign of a weak Mikado, succeeded in making it hereditary in their families. This was, in particular, the case with the Kubo (crown general) Yoritimo, who had rescued the country from a perilous situation during the administration of the Mikado Koeyei (1141–55); he added to his title Kubo the word Sama (lord). Henceforth he and his successors resided in Yeddo, while Miako remained the residence of the Mikados; his dynasty was in 1334 supplanted by another, but the separation of the ecclesiastical and secular authority remained unchanged.

In the middle of the 16th century the first Europeans visited Japan, which, up to this time, had been only known to them from Arabian geographers, and from the accounts given in the 13th century by the traveller Marco Polo, after his return from China. Through the efforts of three runaway Portuguese sailors, who in 1545 had found a refuge on board a Chinese merchantman, and who, having by storms been driven to the Japanese island Yanega, had found a kind reception at the residence of the prince of Bungo, in Kiusiu, a lively commercial intercourse arose with Portugal, which soon proved to be of immense value to the latter country. In 1549, the celebrated Jesuit missionary Francis Xavier, who had converted a Japanese at Goa, arrived in Japan. During a stay of two years he visited the territories of several princes and founded missions, which he confided to zealous priests of his order. The Roman Catholic faith spread rapidly, and soon the Catholic Church numbered about 250 churches and 13 seminaries. The Buddhist priests made a desperate resistance to the progress of Christianity, but a number of the Daimios favored it, as they expected from the success of Christianity great commercial advantages. In 1562 the prince of Omura, and soon after the princes of Bungo and Arima, embraced Christianity, and sent a splendid embassy (embracing also three princes), with rich presents, to pope Gregory XIII and to king Philip II of Spain. But when the suspicion arose that the Daimios who had embraced Christianity intended, with the aid of foreign Christian governments and of the native Christian population, to establish their entire independence, the Kubo Sama Fide Yose, an upstart who, being of low birth, had in 1585 usurped the dignity of Kubo Sama, curtailed the rights of the subordinate princes, took from the Mikado everything except the administration of the ecclesiastical affairs, and issued a stringent edict against Christianity, which had been favored by his predecessor Nabunanga. The edict provided for the exile of all the missionaries and the destruction of the churches. It was not executed at once, but in 1596 a real persecution of the Christians began, the beginning of a religious and civil war which lasted for forty years. Fide Yose died in 1598, while preparing for the invasion and conquest of China; and he was succeeded by the guardian of his minor son, Yie Yazoo, prince of Mikava, whose descendants have reigned at Yeddo until the present day. Yie Yazoo made the dignity of Kubo hereditary in the three houses founded by his sons, shut the Mikado up in his palace at Miaco, and gave to the country a legislation and constitution under which it remained at peace for more than two hundred years.

In the mean while the Dutch had gained a footing in Japan, and, from commercial jealousy against the Portuguese, aided and encouraged the Kubo Sama in his proceedings against the Christians. With their aid, at the close of the 16th century, 70,000 Christians who had intrenched themselves on the peninsula Simabara were crushed. Since then the Roman Catholic faith became gradually extinct. The number of Christians put to death has been estimated at nearly two millions, and the annals of the Jesuits, Franciscans, and Dominicans are filled with narratives of the deaths of members of their orders in Japan. Besides Xavier, the greatest missionaries were Valignani, father John Baptist, a Spanish Franciscan, Philip of Jesus, a Mexican Franciscan, both crucified at Nagasaki, father Charles Spinola, etc. The last Catholic priest who entered Japan was Sedotti, who in 1709 found means to land, but was never again heard of.

The hatred of Christianity, the religion of the detested foreigners, induced the rulers of Japan to break off all intercourse with Christian nations. Even the allied Dutch had soon to suffer from this isolation. They had to give up in 1641 the island of Firando (north of Nagasaki), which in 1609 had been assigned to them as a trading station, and to remove to the island of Desima, where their officers were subjected to a very rigorous superintendence. They were only allowed to export annually goods to the value of 750,000 florins (the Chinese 1,000,000) in two ships (the Chinese in ten); moreover, they had to send for a long time annually, and since 1790 every fourth year, tribute to Yeddo. All the efforts made by the governments of Christian nations (the English from 1613 to 1623, and in 1803, the Russians in 1792 and 1804, and the North Americans in 1837) to re-establish commercial relations were unsuccessful. When China was partly opened to the Christian nations in virtue of the treaty of Nanking (1842), king William II of the Netherlands (by a letter dated Feb. 15, 1844) made another attempt to prevail upon the Japanese government to open several ports and to allow commercial intercourse, but again his request was declined, as was also that of the American commodore Biddle, who in 1846 appeared in the bay of Yeddo, and proposed the conclusion of a commercial treaty. More successful, however, was the American commodore Perry, who, towards the close of 1852, was sent with a flotilla to Yeddo. After long-protracted and most difficult negotiations, he concluded on March 31, 1853, at Kanagava, a treaty of peace and friendship, by which the American vessels received access to the ports of Simoda and Hakodade, to the former immediately, to the latter from March 31, 1855, in order to take in fuel, water, provisions, and other necessaries. The long isolation of Japan from the Christian world having thus come to an end, treaties with other Christian nations soon followed. Thus England obtained the conclusion of a treaty similar to the American on Oct. 14, 1854; Russia on Feb. 7, 1855; the Netherlands on Nov. 9, 1855. The

last-named treaty abrogated the disgraceful stipulations concerning Christianity to which the Dutch had formerly been compelled to submit, and an additional stipulation of Jan. 30, 1856, allowed them to celebrate divine worship in the opened ports. In 1857 and 1858 new treaties made further concessions to the four treaty powers, and the same rights were, by a treaty of Oct. 9, 1858, extended to France. From Jan. 1, 1859, the ports of Nagasaki, Hakodade, and Kanagava; from Jan. 1, 1860, the port of Negato, and another port on the western coast of Nipon; and on Jan. 1, 1863, Hiogo, the port of Osaca, were opened. Foreigners were allowed to reside in these places, to purchase landed property, to build houses and churches, and to celebrate their divine worship; from Jan. 1, 1862, they were also permitted to reside in Yeddo. Gradually other Christian nations, as Portugal, Prussia, Spain, and Austria, likewise sent expeditions to Japan, which requested and obtained the conclusion of similar treaties.

The first step towards opening intercourse with foreign nations was soon followed by others. In 1860 a Japanese embassy was sent to the United States; another visited in 1862 the London Exhibition, as well as courts of Europe. At the Paris Exhibition of 1867 even the brother of the Tycoon appeared with a numerous retinue. A number of young Japanese, including many sons of princes, were sent to the schools of foreign countries, in particular those of the United States; several distinguished foreigners were called to high offices in Japan, and a Japanese consul general was appointed for San Francisco in 1869.

The great change which, during the period from 1854 to 1870, took place in the relation of Japan to the world abroad, was not completed without producing many violent commotions, and effecting important transformations at home. The policy pursued by the Tycoon at Yeddo was bitterly opposed and resisted by many of the most influential Daimios, and a large portion of the Japanese people at large. On this occasion it was found out that the European governments which had concluded treaties with the Tycoon had been greatly mistaken concerning the true nature of the office of Tycoon. They had regarded him as being the absolute ruler of Japan; whereas, in fact, the Mikado, although actually confined to the exercise of his religious functions, was still universally looked upon as the head of the state, and the highest arbiter in all quarrels between the Tycoon and the Daimios. In union with the Daimios, the Mikado now asserted his sovereignty with considerable success. When some of the Daimios committed outrages against the foreigners, the Tycoon confessed his inability to bring them to punishment, and the European powers had themselves to enforce their claims against the princes of Satsuma and Negato. Ultimately a fierce civil war broke out between the Tycoon and a number of the northern Daimios on the one hand, and the Mikado and the majority of the Daimios on the other, which resulted in the abolition of the office of the Tycoon (1868), and the restoration of the Mikado to the full power of actual ruler. The successful Mikado, however, did not, as many expected, change the foreign policy, but showed himself eager to cultivate the most friendly relations with foreigners, and to elevate the country to a level with the most civilized nations of Europe and America. In May, 1869, a large congress of Daimios was held at Yeddo, and from that time to the middle of the year 1871 many important reforms in the administration have partly been carried through, partly begun.

The authorization given by the Japanese government to foreign residents of a free exercise of the Christian religion in the open ports was, of course, eagerly embraced by both the Protestant and the Roman Catholic churches. Missionaries of both established themselves in several of the ports, attending both to the religious wants of the foreign residents, and preparing for missionary operations among the natives. The appearance of Roman Catholic missionaries at Nagasaki brought to light the fact that a number of the descendants of former Christians in Japan still secretly adhered to the Roman Catholic faith, and now hoped for permission to exercise it publicly. The Japanese government, however, did not give the expected permission, but in 1867 arrested and imprisoned some twenty of the native Christians. After an imprisonment of six months, the French chargé d'affaires obtained in December their liberation. In the following year, however, the persecution was renewed with great cruelty. The following is one of the official decrees published by the government: "As the abominable religion of the Christians is strictly prohibited, every one shall be bound to denounce to the proper authorities such persons as appear suspicious to him, and a reward shall be given to him for so doing. Although the sect of the Christians has been many centuries ago persecuted most rigorously by the Rankfu government, its entire extermination had not been arrived at. As, however, the number of the followers of the Christian doctrine has lately considerably augmented in the village of Urakami, near Nagasaki, whose peasants secretly adhere to it, after mature consideration it has been ordered by the highest authority that Christians shall be taken into custody, according to the rules laid down in the annexed document: 'As the Christian doctrine has been prohibited in this country since the oldest times, this matter ought not to be lightly treated. Those to whose custody Christians shall be confided shall therefore instruct them of what is right, with leniency and humanity, and shall do their best to again make good men of them. But if some should not repent and acknowledge their errors, they shall be most severely punished without any mercy. Those whom it concerns shall keep this well in mind, and denounce to the proper authorities every one who shall prove incorrigible. Those men (Christians), until they have repented, shall not be allowed to have any intercourse with the inhabitants of the places where they are consigned. They shall be used to clear land, or to work in the lime-pits, or the gold and coal mines, or for any work their officers may think fit to employ them on. They shall live in the mountains and forests. One portion of rice shall be allowed per head to the respective Daimios for the space of three years, to commence from a day to be determined hereafter. They shall be brought in small detachments to the places mentioned below. The Daimios shall, as soon as they receive the information of the arrival of the persons allotted to them, send soldiers to take them over. The above imperial orders are hereby published for observance. The following Daimios shall take over the Christians allotted to them at their respective palaces at Osaca.'" This decree was followed by a list of thirty-four Daimios who had Christian prisoners allotted to them, in numbers varying from 30 to 250 each. The following decree was posted at the gates of Yokohama: "The Christian religion being still forbidden in the same manner as formerly, is strictly interdicted. The devilish sect is strictly prohibited."

On the 7th of July 114 native Christians, chiefly men and heads of families, were put on board the Japanese steamer Sir H. Parkes at Nagasaki, and carried away to the mines of the north for penal servitude. The protest of the consuls at Nagasaki and the ministers at Yeddo were of no avail. The Congress of Daimios which met in 1869 showed itself likewise very hostile to Christianity. Only one member dared to defend it, while 210 voted for a resolution declaring Christianity to be opposed to the state. Another resolution to inflict severe penalties for bringing back the apostates to one of the religions of the country was negatived by 176 against 44 votes.

Japan has long had many religious sects which have lived peaceably together. The three principal sects are the Sinto religion, Buddhism, and the sect of Siu. The original and most ancient is the Sinto or Sinsyoo

sect, which is founded on the worship of spirits, called in the Japanese language Kami, in the Chinese Sin, who control the actions of men, and all visible and invisible things. The chief of these spirits is Yen Zio Dai Sin, which means Great Spirit of the Heavenly Light, who receives the highest honors from all religious parties. Besides this sun-goddess, thousands of inferior Kamis receive divine honors. Most of these are the spirits of distinguished men, who were canonized on account of their merits. Their number is not limited, but the Mikado still possesses the right to canonize prominent men, and thus to elevate them to the dignity of a Kami. The Sinto religion has five commandments: 1. Preservation of the pure fire as an emblem of purity and a means of purification; 2. Purity of the soul, of the heart, and the body; 3. Observation of festivals; 4. Pilgrimages; 5. Worship of the Kami in the temples and at home. The numerous temples (Mya) contain no idols, but large metal mirrors and packets of white paper scraps, as symbols of purity. The priests are called Kaminusi, or keepers of the gods. They live near the temples, and derive their income chiefly from the money offerings made on feast-days. Among the twenty-two places of pilgrimage, the temple Nykoo, in the province of Jsyay, which is sacred to the sun-goddess, is the most prominent, and every one is bound to visit it at least once in the course of his life. The second religion is Buddhism, which was introduced about 532 from Corea, but received many modifications in Japan, and gradually became the religion of the vast majority of Japanese. The sect known as Siuto, or the school of philosophers, comprises the followers of Confucius, and includes the people of the best education.

The great political revolution through which Japan passed in 1868, by the abolition of the office of the Tycoon and the re-establishment of the supreme power of the Mikado, was accompanied by an effort to effect a complete change in the state religion of the country. An American missionary writes on this subject, under date of Dec. 26, 1868, as follows: "Here the Buddhist religion is, or was, the established religion, and the priests have a monopoly of burying people, and praying for them afterwards. The aboriginal Sinto religion has fallen into disuse, poverty, and consequent disfavor and disgrace. This state of things commenced about three hundred years ago under Yie Yazoo, the founder of the Tycoon dynasty. In the wars which he waged he was often beaten, and in his flight, and in other times of calamity, he and his adherents found shelter and sympathy in many a Buddhist monastery. At last, when he reached the throne, he liberally rewarded all those priests who had befriended him in his adversity, paying them a fixed sum out of the public treasury, and bestowing grants of land to be held as temple grounds, the revenue from which was devoted to the support of the temple. From that time Buddhism flourished in Japan, and Sintoism decayed. The nation followed the example of the victorious Tycoon, and thus Buddhism became established and popular. Still, as the Tycoon did not ignore the Mikado, but allowed him to be the nominal head of Japan, and even paid some outward respect to him, in the same way Buddhism did not ignore or displace Sintoism, of which the Mikado is pontifex maximus. Where the aboriginal Sinto gods were worshipped before, the Buddhist divinities did not replace or supersede them, but were added to them, and thus, in many places, a singular union was effected. Buddhism and Sinto divinities are worshipped together, and the priests of both divisions often reside in the same temple. When this is the case such temples are called Ryoby, i. e. 'union temples.' Thus there are pure Buddhist, pure Sinto, and the mixed or union temples. During the recent revolution a great effort has been made by the adherents of the Mikado to revive the ancient faith, and cast off whatever is of foreign origin, whether derived from China or India. Efforts are made to eliminate the whole mass of Chinese characters from the language and literature of the land, and to return to the ancient, simple, and alphabetical manner of writing. The same principle is at work in the reaction against the established religion, which is of foreign origin, introduced from China and India 1500 years ago. Since the Mikado's government has been established, it has decreed that, where Buddhist and Sinto divinities are worshipped in the same temple, the former are to be set aside, and the latter alone reverenced. The priests of the former religion are urged to embrace the ancestral and national faith, in which case they may continue to hold their places. At various points over the empire there are deserted Sinto temples. The ancient god holds his place, but, not being a popular god, his shrine is forsaken by officiating priests and worshippers. The present government has made inspection, and found that in many cases these shrines, so sadly neglected, are the shrines of the true and ancient gods. These are to be re-erected, and endowed with government support. What has been taken from the disendowed Buddhists will, no doubt, most of it be given to the Sintos. Now, when one of these old temples is re-erected and endowed, the office of priest in it becomes desirable. Not only has it a revenue from government, but the people suddenly wake up to a knowledge of the fact that this same forgotten god, in the olden time, worked wonders. The early history of the divinity is involved in obscurity, and on the principle 'Omne ignotum pro magnifico,' it is magnified; worshippers bring their offerings, new votive tablets are set up, and the revenue hence accruing, added to what is bestowed by government, makes a priest's office a desirable one, especially as he is exempt from all military service. Many, therefore, now seek to obtain this position; but, on presenting their petitions at the seat of government, it is generally decided that it is desirable to have these places filled by adherents of the Mikado from the south." In 1870 the Buddhist priests were compelled to pay to the Mikado the sum of 8,000,000 rios, or $10,000,000, for the privilege of remaining in possession of their temples and monuments, and of observing their religious rites and customs without restriction.

The reports on the number of natives who desire to reconnect themselves with the Roman Catholic Church greatly vary. According to a recent (1870) report of the Japanese government their number amounts to 3600, of whom 2000 were at Urakami, near Nagasaki, 100 at Omura, and 1500 at Fubahori. Besides, there were Christians in Shimabara, Amakusa, Hirado, and other places, but their number could not be accurately stated. There is a strong force of French Jesuits at Kanagawa. They have lately opened a school for young men, for the purpose of teaching the French language and literature, and the sciences. The pope has erected Japan into a vicariate apostolic. The Roman Catholic missionaries assert that at least 100,000 Japanese would openly join their Church if religious toleration should be established.

Protestant missions were in 1870 supported in Japan by three American denominations: the Presbyterian Church, the Dutch Reformed Church, and the Protestant Episcopal Church. Several missionaries teach secular branches in the government schools. Progress has been made with the translation of the Bible into Japanese, and Bible-classes have been formed, but up to 1871 but few of the natives had made a profession of Christianity. The Presbyterian missionaries, who had stations at Yokohama (begun in 1859) and Yeddo (begun in 1869), had, according to their report of 1870, baptized three natives. The Protestant Episcopal Church supported one missionary bishop and one missionary. See Charleroix et Crasset, *Histoire de Japan* (Paris, 1754); Sir Rutherford Alcock, *The Capital of the Tycoon* (Lond. 1863); Siebold, *Nipon; Archiv zur Beschreibung von Japan* (Leyd. 1832-51); *American Annual Cyclopedia*, 1868, 1870. (A. J. S.) See our *Supplement*, s. v.

Japha. See JAPHIA, 3.

Ja'pheth (Heb. *Ye'pheth*, יֶפֶת, in pause *Ya'pheth*, יָפֶת, wide-*spreading* [comp. Gen. ix, 27], although some make it signify *fair*, referring to the light complexion of the Japhethites; Sept. Ἰάφεθ; Josephus Ἰαφέθας, *Ant.* i, 4, 1), one of the three sons of Noah, mentioned last in order (Gen. v, 32; vi, 10; vii, 13; ix, 18; x, 1; 1 Chron. i, 4), although it appears from Gen. x, 21 (comp. ix, 24) that he was the eldest of Noah's sons, born one hundred years before the flood (Michaelis, *Spicil.* ii, 66). B.C. 2616. He and his wife were two of the eight persons (1 Pet. iii, 20) preserved in the ark (Gen. vii, 7). In Gen. x, 2 sq. he is called the progenitor of the extensive tribes in the west (of Europe) and north (of Asia)—of the Armenians, Medes, Greeks, Thracians, etc. (comp. Syncellus, *Chron.* p. 49; Mala, *Chronogr.* p. 16; see Tuch on ver. 27). See ETHNOGRAPHY. De Wette (*Kritik*, p. 72) justly repudiates the opinion of the *Targumim*, both Jonathan and Hieros., who make Japheth the progenitor of the African tribes also. The Arabian traditions (D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.*) attribute to Japheth wonderful powers (Weil, *Biblische Legenden*, viii, 46), and enumerate eleven of his sons, the progenitors of as many Asiatic nations, viz. Gin or Dshin (Chinese), Seklah (Slavonians), Manshuge, Gomari, Turk (Turks), Khalage, Khozar, Ros (Russians), Sussan, Gaz, and Torage. In these traditions he is called *Aboultierk* (Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* p. 37). To the seven sons of Japheth mentioned in Gen. x, 2 and 1 Chron. i, 5, the Sept. and Eusebius add an eighth, *Elisha*, though not found in the text. Some (Buttmann, *Mytholog.* i, 222; Bochart, *Phal.* iii, 1; and Hasse, *Entdeckung*, ii, 131) identify Japheth with the Ἰάπετος of Greek fable, the depository of many ethnographical traditions (see Smith's *Dict. of Classic. Biogr.* s. v. Japetus), while others, again, connect him with Hereus, mentioned by the ancient historian Sanchoniathon. His act of filial piety, in conjunction with Shem, as related in Gen. ix, 20–27 (where some understand the clause, "He shall dwell in the tents of Shem," to refer to God, and not to Japheth), became the occasion of the prophecy of the extension of his posterity (see Hengstenberg's *Christology*, i, 42). See SHEM.

Japheth ben-Ali HA-LEVI (called in Arabic *Abu-Ali Hassan ben-Ali al-Levi al-Bozrii*), a very able Karaite grammarian and commentator on the Old Test., flourished at Bassra, in Arabia, during the latter half of the 10th century. He is reputed to have written a history of the Karaites (q. v.), of which traces still remain (see Rule, *Karaites*, p. 106), and commentaries which cover twenty MS. volumes preserved in Paris and Leyden. He distinguished himself by his literary labors, and obtained the honorable appellation of המלמד הגדול, *the great teacher*, and a place among those who are mentioned in the Karaite Prayer-book. The late eminent Orientalist Munk brought, in 1841, from Egypt to the royal library at Paris, eleven volumes of this commentary, five of which are on Genesis and many sections of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers; two volumes are on the Psalms, one is on Proverbs, and one on the Five Megilloth. They are written in Arabic, preceded by the Hebrew text and an Arabic translation. The indefatigable Pinsker has examined the entire twenty volumes, and made extracts from them. This work, of such gigantic magnitude, although it has exercised great influence on the development of Biblical exegesis (as may be concluded from the fact that Aben-Ezra had them constantly before him when writing his expositions of the O. T., and that he quotes them with the greatest respect), has not as yet been published, and we have still only the fragments which Aben-Ezra gives us. Japheth was also an extensive polemical writer, and engaged in controversies with the disciples of Saadia (q. v.); but for polemics he does not seem to have possessed the proper requisites. See Ginsburg in Kitto, s. v.; Jost, *Israelitische Annalen* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1841), p. 76; Bargès, *Rabbi Japhet ben-Heli Bassorensis Karaitis in Psal. Commentarii Prefatio* (1846); Pinsker, *Likkute Kadmoniot* (Vienna, 1863), p. 169; Supplement, p. 181, etc.; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, v, 342.

Japheth ben-Said, a descendant of the above, and another great Karaite, in all probability also born at Bassra, flourished about 1160–1200. Besides the celebrated work in defence of Karaism entitled *Ha-Atakat ha-Tora*, which he is supposed to have written about 1167, he wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch and other books of the O. T. Pinsker fancies, and not without reason, that this is the Japheth whom the Karaites describe as the instructor of Aben-Ezra, and asserts that Ezra's quotations from the commentary on Exod. iv, 20; viii, 13; ix, 16; x, 5, 21, belong to this Japheth, and not to the former. His commentaries are still in MS., both in the Paris and Leyden libraries. See Pinsker, *Likkute Kadmoniot*, p. 222 sq. and 185 sq., Supplement; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vi, 305 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v. See KARAITES.

Japhi'a (Heb. *Yaphi'a*, יָפִיעַ, *splendid;* Sept. Ἰαφιέ v. r. Ἰαφαγαί and Φαγγαί, but Ἰεφιέ in 2 Sam. v, 15), the name of two men, and also of a place.

1. The king of Lachish, who joined the confederacy at the instance of Adoni-zedek against Joshua, but was defeated and slain after confinement in the cave of Makkedah (Josh. x, 3 sq.). B.C. 1618.

2. One of the sons of David (q. v.) by some one of his full wives whose name is not given, born at Jerusalem (2 Sam. v, 15; 1 Chron. iii, 7; xiv, 6). B.C. post 1046.

3. A town on the eastern part of the southern boundary of Zebulon, situated on high ground between Daberath and Gath-hepher on the north (Josh. xix, 12). Reland (*Palæst.* p. 826) thinks it is the town *Sycaminum* (ἡ Συκαμίνος or Συκαμίνων, Steph. Byz. Συκάμινον), on the Mediterranean, opposite Carmel, between Ptolemais and Cæsarea (Pliny, v, 15, 5), according to the *Itin. Anton.* twenty Roman miles from the latter; called *Hepha* (Ἡφά) in the time of Eusebius (*Onom.* s. v. Ἰαφιέ), and still extant (Golii *Not. ad Alfrag.* p. 132) under the name of *Haifa* (Robinson's *Researches*, iii, 194). He also regards it as the *Jebba* of Pliny (v, 18), which Gesenius, however (*Thesaur.* p. 613), shows is distinguished from Sycaminum. This position does not agree with the requirements of the text. The place has been identified by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, iii, 200) with the modern village *Yafa*, about a mile and a half southwest of Nazareth (Schubert, *Reise*, iii, 203), where the Italian monks fix the residence of the apostle James (Raumer, *Paläst.* p. 127). See Quaresmius, *Elucidatio*, ii, 843; and *Early Travels*, p. 186: Maundeville calls it the "Castle of Saffra." So, too, Von Harff, A.D. 1498 (*Pilgerfahrt*, p. 195). Although situated in a valley, the tribal line must have crossed ("went up," text of Joshua) the hills on the south of it (Keil, *Comment.* ad loc.). It contains about thirty houses, with the remains of a church, and has a few single palm-trees. Eusebius and Jerome doubtless refer to this place, as "Japhet, in the tribe of Zebulon, still called Jophe, or the ascent of Japho" (*Onom.* s. v. Japhic). The *Japha* (Ἰαφά) fortified by Josephus (*Life*, 37, 45) was probably the same, a large and strong village of Galilee, afterwards captured by Trajan and Titus, under the orders of Vespasian. In the storm and sack of the place, according to the same writer, 15,000 of the inhabitants were put to the sword, and 2130 made captives (*War*, ii, 20, 6; iii, 7, 31). With this location De Saulcy (*Narrat.* i, 73) and Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 170) coincide, as also Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 321) and Porter (*Handbook*, p. 385).

Japh'let (Heb. *Yaphlet'*, יַפְלֵט, *deliverer;* Sept. Ἰαφαλήτ), a son of Heber and great-grandson of Asher; several of his sons are also named (1 Chron. vii, 32, 33). B.C. between 1856 and 1658. It appears to have been a branch of his descendants (*Japhletites*, יַפְלֵטִי, Heb. *Yaphleti'*, Sept. Ἰαφλητί, Vulg. *Jephleti*, Auth. Version "Japhleti") that are mentioned in Josh. xvi, 3 as hav-

ing settled along the border between Ephraim and Dan, near (north of) the present Jaffa road, apparently east of Beth-horon, possibly at the present *Beit Unia*. Others, however, regard the name in this locality as a trace of one of the petty tribes of aboriginal Canaanites (compare the Archite, "Archi," in the verse preceding, and in 2 Sam. xv, 32; the Ophnite, "Ophni," Josh. xviii, 24).

Japh'leti (Josh. xvi, 3). See JAPHLET.

Ja'pho (Josh. xix, 46). See JOPPA.

Jaquelot. See JACQUELOT.

Ja'rah (1 Chron. ix, 42). See JEHOADAH.

Jarchi. See RASHI.

Jard, FRANÇOIS, a very celebrated French Jansenist preacher, born at Bolléne, near Avignon, March 3, 1675, was one of the appellants against the bull Unigenitus. He died April 10, 1768. Besides his sermons, he published *La religion Chrétienne méditée dans le veritable esprit de ses maximes* (Paris, 1743, 1763, 6 vols. 12mo; new ed. Lyons, 1819, 6 vols. 12mo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génerale*, xxvi, 372.

Ja'reb (Heb. *Yareb'*, יָרֵב, i. q. יָרִיב, *contentious*, i. e. an adversary) occurs as a proper name in the Auth. Vers. of Hos. v, 13; x, 6, where a "king Jareb" (מֶלֶךְ יָרֵב, Sept. βασιλεὺς Ἰαρείμ, Vulg. *rex ultor*) is spoken of as the false refuge and final subjugator of the kingdom of Israel. It probably is a figurative title of the king of Assyria (mentioned in the same connection), who, like the Persian monarchs, affected the title of "the great king" (Michaelis, *Supplem.*, actually derives it from the Syriac *irêb*, "to be great"); here spoken in irony towards the faithless nation as their greatest scourge (Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1286). Had Jareb been the proper name of the king of Assyria, as it would be if this rendering were correct, the word preceding (מֶלֶךְ, *melek*, "king") would have required the article. That it is rather to be applied to the country than to the king may be inferred from its standing in parallelism with Asshur. Such is the opinion of Fürst (*Handw.* s. v.), who illustrates the symbolical usage by a comparison with Rahab as applied to Egypt. At the same time he hazards a conjecture that it may have been an old Assyrian word, adopted into the Hebrew language, and so modified as to express an intelligible idea, while retaining something of its original form. The clause in which it occurs is supposed by many to refer to Judah, in order to make the parallelism complete; and, with this in view, Jarchi interprets it of Ahaz, who sent to Tiglath-Pileser (2 Kings xvi, 8) to aid him against the combined forces of Syria and Israel. But there is no reason to suppose that the two clauses do not both refer to Ephraim, and the allusion would then be, as explained by Jerome, to Pul, who was subsidized by Menahem (2 Kings xv, 19), and Judah would be indirectly included. Other interpretations of the most fanciful character have been given (Glass, *Phil. Sacr.* iv, 3, 17, p. 644).

Ja'red (Heb. *Ye'red*, יֶרֶד, in pause *Ya'red*, יָרֶד, *descender;* Sept. Ἰάρεδ, N. T. Ἰαρέδ, Josephus Ἰαρέδης), the name of two men.

1. The fourth antediluvian patriarch in descent from Seth, son of Mahalaleel and father of Enoch; born B.C. 3712, died B.C. 2750, aged 962 years; 162 years old at the birth of his heir (Gen. v, 15–20; 1 Chron. i, 2, "Jered;" Luke iii, 37).

2. A son apparently of Ezra, of the tribe of Judah, by his wife Jehudijah, although in the latter part of the same verse a different parentage is spoken of; he is named as the "father" (i. e. founder) of Gedor (1 Chron. iv, 18, where the name is Anglicized "Jered"). B.C. cir. 1612. The Rabbins, however, give an allegorical interpretation to the passage, and treat this and other names therein as titles of Moses—Jered because he caused the manna to descend.

Jarenton, a celebrated abbot of St. Benigne, at Dijon, France, born at Vienna towards the year 1045, was educated in the monastery at Clugny. After leading for some time a life of dissipation, he retired in 1074 to the little monastery of La Chaise-Dieu, of which he soon became the prior, distinguishing himself among his monastic associates by a display of brilliant abilities and great erudition. In 1082 he was, after filling various other positions of trust, dispatched on a very important mission by the French papal legate. In 1084 he went to Rome to report the success of his mission to pope Gregory VII, at that time confined by the emperor in the castle of Sant-Angelos, and he effected the pope's liberation by encouraging the papal legions to offer resistance to the imperial troops. We need not wonder that such service was well repaid by the papal court, and that hereafter Jarenton figures prominently in the Roman Catholic Church. In 1097 he retired to his abbey, which he left only to attend, in 1100, the Council of Valencia. He died, apparently, Feb. 10, 1113. He is supposed to have written extensively, but only a letter to Thierry, the abbot of St. Hubert, is now known. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 375.

Jaresi'ah (Heb. *Yaareshyah'*, יַעֲרֶשְׁיָה, *nourished by Jehovah;* Sept. Ἰααρασία), one of the "sons" of Jeroham, a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 27). B.C. apparently ante 588.

Jar'ha (Heb. *Yarcha'*, יַרְחָע, etymology unknown, but probably Egyptian; Sept. Ἰωχήλ, Vulg. *Jaraa*), the Egyptian slave of a Hebrew named Sheshan, who married the daughter of his master, and was, of course, made free. As Sheshan had no sons, his posterity is traced through this connection (1 Chron. ii, 34–41), which is the only one of the kind mentioned in Scripture. Jarha thus became the founder of a chief house of the Jerahmeelites, which continued at least to the time of king Hezekiah, and from which sprang several illustrious persons, such as Zabad in the reign of David, and Azariah in the reign of Joash (1 Chron. ii, 31 sq). B.C. prob. ante 1658.—Kitto. It is supposed by some that the name of Sheshan's daughter whom Jarha married was Ahlai, from the statement in ver. 31, compared with that in ver. 34; but the masculine form of the word, and the use of Ahlai elsewhere (1 Chron. xi, 41) for a man, is adverse to this conclusion. As Sheshan's oldest grandson by this marriage was called Attai, and as the genealogy would run through him, it is supposed by others that Ahlai is a clerical error for Attai; while others think Ahlai (אחלי, *disjoiner*, from אחל) was a name given to Jarha on his incorporation into the family of Sheshan. Others conjecture that Ahlai was a son of Sheshan, born after the marriage of his daughter. At what time this marriage occurred we cannot certainly determine, but as Sheshan was the seventh in descent from Hezron, the grandson of Judah, it could not well have been much later than the settlement in Canaan (B.C. 1612), and on the presumption that there are no lacunæ in the pedigree, it would naturally fall much prior to the Exode (B.C. 1658). In 1 Sam. xxx, 13, mention is made of an Egyptian who was servant to an Amalekite, and there is no reason why it should seem strange that an Egyptian should also be found in the family of a Hebrew, especially as, being a Jerahmeelite, he had (supposing the event to have occurred in Palestine) his possessions in the same district as the Amalekites, in the south of Judah, nearest to Egypt (1 Sam. xxvii, 10; comp. 2 Sam. xxiii, 20, 21; Josh. xv, 21; 1 Chron. xv, 18). See Burrington's *Geneal.;* Beeston, *Genealogy;* Hervey's *Geneal.* p. 34; Bertheau on 1 Chron. ii, 24, etc.). See SHESHAN.

Ja'rib (Heb. *Yarib'*, יָרִיב, an *adversary*, as in Psa. xxxv, 1, etc.; Sept. Ἰαρείβ, Ἰαρίβ), the name of three or four men. See also JAREB.

1. A son of Simeon (1 Chron. iv, 24); elsewhere (Gen. xlvi, 10, etc.) called JACHIN (q. v.).

2. One of the popular chiefs dispatched by Ezra to

procure the company of priests in the return to Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 16). B.C. 459.

3. One of the priests of the kindred of Jeshua that divorced their Gentile wives after the Exile (Ezra x, 18). B.C. 459.

4. A Græcized or corrupt form (1 Macc. xiv, 29; compare ii, 1) of JOIARIB (q. v.).

Jar'imoth (Ἰαριμώθ), a Græcized form (1 Esd. ix, 28) of the Heb. name (Ezra x, 27) JEREMOTH (q. v.).

Jarkon. See ME-JARKON.

Jarlath is the name of the second successor of St. Patrick to the see of Armagh, Ireland, near the middle of the 6th century. Scarcely anything is known of his personal history. See IRELAND.

Jarmoch (Reland, *Palæstina*, p. 283) or **Jarmuk** (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 53), a river of Palestine (ירמוך) mentioned in the Talmud (*Parah*, viii, 10; *Baba Bathra*, 746) as emptying into the Jordan; the *Hieromax* (q. v.) of the Greek and Roman writers, and the modern *Yarmuk.*

Jar'muth (Heb. *Yarmuth'*, יַרְמוּת, *height;* Sept. Ἰεριμούθ), the name of two places.

1. A town in the plain of Judah (Josh. xv, 35), inhabited after the Babylonian captivity (Neh. xi, 29); originally the seat of one of the Canaanitish kings [see PIRAM] defeated by Joshua (Josh. x, 3, 5, 23; xii, 11; xv, 35). Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v. Ἰεριμοῦς, also Ἰερμοχώς) sets down *Jarmucha* or *Jermus* as ten Roman miles from Eleutheropolis towards Jerusalem, but elsewhere Jarmuth (s. v. Ἰεριμούθ, doubtless the same place) less correctly at four miles' distance, although in the neighborhood of Eshtaol, which is ten miles from Eleutheropolis. Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, ii, 344) identified the site as that of *Yarmuk*, a village about seven miles north-east of Beit-Jibrin (Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 85). As the name implies, it is situated on a ridge (tell *Ermud* or *Armuth*, a different pronunciation for Yarmuth: Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 193). It is a small and poor place, but contains a few traces, in its hewn stones and ruins, of former strength and greatness (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 281; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 324; Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, p. 120, 462).

2. A Levitical city in the tribe of Issachar (Josh. xxi, 29), elsewhere called REMETH (Josh. xix, 21) and RAMOTH (1 Chron. vi, 73). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 157) supposes it was the Ramah of Samuel (1 Sam. xix, 22), which he identifies with the modern village of *Rameh*, north-west of Shechem; but this place lies within the territory of Manasseh. The associated names seem to indicate a locality on the eastern edge of the plain of Esdraelon. See REMETH.

Jaro'ăh (Heb. *Yaro'ăch*, יָרוֹחַ, perhaps born under the new *moon;* Sept. has Ἀδαΐ v. r. Ἰδαΐ, Vulg. *Jara*), son of Gilead and father of Huri, of the Gadites resident in Bashan (1 Chron. v, 14). B.C. long ante 782.

Jarque or **Xarque**, D. FRANCISCO, a South American Jesuit, flourished in the 17th century. He is distinguished as the author of *Estado presente de las Misiones en el Tucuman, Paraguay e Rio de la Plata* (1687, 4to), for which his intimate knowledge of the native element eminently fitted him. It is remarkable how the Jesuits have succeeded in acquiring foreign languages, and how thorough and accurate is their knowledge of the nations with whom they are brought in contact. (J. H. W.)

Jarratt, DEVEREUX, an early Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in the county of New Kent, Va., Jan. 6 (O. S.), 1732-33. His early education was neglected, and he had few opportunities of receiving instruction in youth; but he so far improved himself as to be able, at the age of nineteen, to take charge of a neighboring school. Soon after, he entered a family, in which one part of his duties was to read a sermon of Flavel's every night—a task which he performed at first with reluctance. The effect of these discourses was to convince him of sin. He now perused Russell's Sermons and Burkett's Exposition of the N. T.; but, being subjected to many temptations, he relapsed into his former state. He was finally relieved by a passage in Isaiah (lxii, 12), and resolved to enter the ministry, for which purpose he went to England in 1762. On his return he served at Bath, Va., where he was eminently successful after some time, although at first his labors appear to have been disregarded. He died January 29, 1801. He was the author of three volumes of *Sermons*, and *A Series of Letters to a Friend*, republished in 1806 in connection with his *Autobiography.*—Sprague, *Ann.* v, 214; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, 1855, p. 502.

Jarrige, PIERRE, a French Jesuit, who was born at Tulle in 1605, is celebrated in history by his desertion from and severe attacks upon the Jesuitical order. He was a very popular teacher and preacher at the time, when he joined the Calvinists in 1647; but, meeting with great opposition in France, and his life even being threatened, he went to Leyden, Holl., where he preached under the auspices of the State Church. Meanwhile the Jesuitical order condemned him to suffer death, first by hanging, then by burning. This provoked the so celebrated work of his, *Les Jésuites mis sur l'échafaud* (Leyden, 1649, 12mo, and often), in which he thoroughly exposed the workings of that nefarious clerical order. A controversy ensued, which finally resulted in the return of Jarrige, in 1650, to the Jesuits—due, no doubt, more to the threats against his life than anything else. He certainly turned the table like a zealous Jesuit, and now again condemned as *heretics* the very Christians with whom he had so lately associated, and whose cause he had professed to have embraced. He died Sept. 20, 1660. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvi, 383 sq.; Bayle, *Historical Dictionary*, s. v.

Jarry, PIERRE-FRANÇOIS THÉOPHILE, a French Roman Catholic religious writer, was born at St. Pierre, Normandy, in March, 1764. After completing his studies at Paris, he was appointed curate at Escots; but, refusing to sign the clerical obligation demanded by the revolutionists, he was obliged to leave the country in 1791. In 1798 the bishop of Auxerre met Jarry in Germany, and appointed him grand-vicar, and a short time after the exiled Pius VI appointed him archdeacon and canon of Liege, Belgium. Prevented, however, from assuming the functions of this position, he resided at Munster, where he was instrumental in the conversion of count Stolberg (q. v.). After the Restoration, he retired to Falaise. He died at Lisieux Aug. 31, 1820. Jarry wrote quite extensively, especially against the usurpations of the Revolutionists of France. His theological works of note are, *Dissert. sur l'épiscopat de St. Pierre à Antioche, avec la défense de l'authenticité des écrits des Saints Pères* (Paris, 1807, 8vo):—*Examen d'une Dissert.* (of the abbot Emery) *sur la mitigation des peines des damnis* (Leipz. 1810, 8vo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biographie Générale*, xxvi, 386.

Jarvis, Abraham, D.D., a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Norwalk, Conn., May 6 (O. S.) 1739. He passed A.B. in Yale College in 1761, and became a lay reader at Middletown, where, two years after, he settled as rector, having previously received ordination in England. In 1776 he presided at a convention of the Episcopal clergy held at New Haven, when it was resolved to suspend all religious worship. In 1797 he was elected bishop. He subsequently removed to Cheshire, N. H., and died May 3, 1813. His style of preaching is said to have resembled that of Tillotson and Sherlock. He published *Two Sermons.* See Sprague, *Annals*, v, 237.

Jarvis, Samuel Farmar, D.D., LL.D., was born at Middletown, Conn., Jan. 20, 1786, and passed A.B. at Yale College in 1805. In 1811 he took charge of St. Michael's Church, Bloomingdale, and in 1813 became rector of St. James's, N. Y. He afterwards became pro-

fessor of Biblical literature in the Gen. Theol. Seminary, N.Y. In 1819 the doctorate of divinity was conferred on him by the University of Pennsylvania, and the degree of LL.D. in 1837, by Trinity College, Hartford. When rector of St. Paul's, Boston, in 1826, he embarked for Europe to procure materials for a work on Church history. During an absence of nine years, he examined all the important libraries of Europe on the subject to which his attention was directed, and, on his return, commenced *A Complete History of the Christian Church* [portions of it were published in 1844 and 1850], which remains unfinished. He was appointed historiographer of the Church, and occupied various posts of honor in the diocese of Connecticut. He died in 1851. A list of his writings is given by Allibone, *Dict. of Auth.* i, 956.

Jas'aël (Ἰασαῆλος v. r. Ἀσαῆλος), a Græcized, or, rather, corrupt form (1 Esdr. ix, 30) of the Hebrew name (Ezra x, 29) SHEAL (q. v.).

Ja'shen (Heb. *Yashen'*, יָשֵׁן, *sleeping*, as in Cant. vii, 10, etc.; Septuag. Ἰασὲν v. r. Ἀσάν), a person, several of whose "sons" are named as among David's famous body-guard (2 Sam. xxiii, 32), called in the parallel passage HASHEM the Gizonite (1 Chron. xi, 34). Other discrepancies also occur between the two passages: the former names three, while the latter makes the first (Jonathan) son of the next, and both (with slight verbal variations) assign special patronymics to the last two. Perhaps the two accounts may best be reconciled by understanding the two braves referred to as being Jonathan Ben-Shammah (or Ben-Shageh), and Ahiam Ben-Sharar (or Ben-Sacar), grandsons of Jashen (or Hashem) of Gizon, in the mountains of Judah—hence called Hararites. B.C. considerable ante 1046. This name Kennicott believes (*Dissertation*, i, 201-3) lies concealed in the word rendered "the Gizonite" in Chronicles, and accordingly proposes to read in both places "Gouni, of the sons of Hashem; Jonathan, the son of Shamha the Hararite;" his view being supported by the Alex. copy of the Sept., which reads *υἱοὶ Ἀσὰμ ὁ Γωϋνὶ Ἰωνάθαν υἱὸς Σαγὴ ὁ Ἀραρί*. However, the want of the מ before בְּנֵי, and the הַ prefixed to the name read by him as Gouni, are objections to this view, and Bertheau may probably be right (*Chronik.* p. 134), that בְּנֵי is due to a repetition of the last three letters of the preceding word, "the Shaalbonite" (הַשַּׁעַלְבֹנִי), and that we should simply read Hashem the Gizonite. In the list given by Jerome, in his *Quæstiones Hebraicæ*, Jashen and Jonathan are both omitted. See DAVID.

Ja'sher (Heb. *Yashar'*, יָשָׁר, *upright*). A volume by this title (סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר, the *book of the upright* man; Auth. Vers. "book of Jasher") appears anciently to have existed among the Hebrews, containing the records of honored men, or other praiseworthy transactions. The work is no longer extant, but is cited in two passages of the O. T. in the following manner: "And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the *book of Jasher?* So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day," etc. (Josh. x, 13). The other passage is 2 Sam. i, 17, 18: "And David lamented with this lamentation over Saul and over Jonathan his son (also he bade them teach the children of Judah [the use of] the bow: behold, it is written in the *book of Jasher*)." After this follows the lamentation of David.

I. *Views of the Incident in Joshua's Career.*—The book of Jasher has attracted attention because it is appealed to in connection with the account of the sun and moon standing still. The compiler of the book of Joshua refers to it as containing a record of the miracle in question. It is therefore impossible to do justice to our subject without entering into an interpretation of the wonderful phenomenon on which so much ingenuity has been wasted. The misspent time which has been devoted to the passage in Joshua makes a critic sad indeed. Instead of looking at the words in their natural and obvious sense, men have been led away by their adherence to the letter into recondite, foolish, and absurd conjectures. One thing is a key to the right interpretation, viz. that the passage recording the miracle is a quotation from the poetical book of Jasher. The only difficulty is to discover where the quotation begins and where it ends. But, whatever difference of opinion there may be as to this point, it is clear that a strictly literal signification of the language ought not to be pressed upon a statement professedly extracted from a popular poetical work

1. The most obvious and ancient interpretation of this difficult passage is the *literal* one. At first it was contended that the sun itself, which was then believed to have revolved round the earth, stayed his course for a day. Those who take this view argue that the theory of the *diurnal motion of the earth*, which has been the generally received one since the time of Galileo and Copernicus, is inconsistent with the Scripture narrative. Notwithstanding the general reception of the Copernican system of the universe, this view continued to be held by many divines, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, and was strenuously maintained by Buddeus (*Hist. Eccles. V. T.* Halle, 1715, 1744, p. 828 sq.) and others in the last century.

But in more recent times the miracle has been explained so as to make it accord with the now received opinion respecting the earth's motion, and the Scripture narrative supposed to contain rather an optical and popular than a literal account of what took place on this occasion; so that it was in reality the earth, and not the sun, which stood still at the command of Joshua (Clarke's *Commentary*, ad loc.).

2. Another opinion is that first suggested by Spinoza (*Tract. Theolog.-Politic.* c. ii, p. 22, and c. vi) and afterwards maintained by Le Clerc (*Comment.* ad loc.), that the miracle was produced by refraction only, causing the sun to appear above the horizon after its setting, or by some other atmospherical phenomena, which produced sufficient light to enable Joshua to pursue and discomfit his enemies. This seems to be the only view which grants the reality of the miracle, without encumbering it with unnecessary difficulties.

3. The last opinion we shall mention is that of the learned Jew Maimonides (*More Nebochim*, ii, c. liii), viz. that Joshua only asked of the Almighty to grant that he might defeat his enemies before the going down of the sun, and that God heard his prayer, inasmuch as before the close of the day the five kings, with their armies, were cut in pieces. This opinion is favored by Vatablus, in the marginal note to this passage (see Robert Stephens's edition of the Bible, folio 1557), "Lord, permit that the light of the sun and moon fail us not before our enemies are defeated." Grotius, while he admitted that there was no difficulty in the Almighty's arresting the course of the sun, or making it reappear by refraction, approved of the explanation of Maimonides, which has been since that period adopted by many divines, including Jahn among the Roman Catholics (who explains the whole as a sublime poetical trope, *Introd.* p. ii, § 30), and, among orthodox Protestants, by a writer in the Berlin *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, Nov. 1832, supposed to be the editor, the late professor Hengstenberg (Robinson's *Biblical Repository*, 1833, iii, 791 sq. See Seiler's *Biblical Hermeneutics*, English translator's note, p. 175, 176). See JOSHUA.

II. *Opinions as to the Character of the Book itself.*—As the word Jasher signifies *just* or *upright*, by which term it is rendered in the margin of our Bibles, this book has generally been considered to have been so entitled as containing a history of *just men*. The former of the above passages in which the book is cited in Scripture is omitted by the Sept., while in the latter the expression is rendered βιβλίον τοῦ εὐθοῦς: the Vulg. has *liber justorum* in both instances. The Peshito Syriac in Joshua has "the book of *praises* or *hymns*,"

reading הַשִּׁיר for הַיָּשָׁר, and a similar transposition will account for the rendering of the same version in Sam., "the book of *Ashir.*" The Targum interprets it "the book of the law," and this is followed by Jarchi, who gives, as the passage alluded to in Joshua, the prophecy of Jacob with regard to the future greatness of Ephraim (Gen. xlviii, 19), which was fulfilled when the sun stood still at Joshua's bidding. The same Rabbi, in his commentary on Samuel, refers to Genesis, "the book of the upright, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," to explain the allusion to the book of Jasher; and Jerome, while discussing the "etymology of Israel," which he interprets as "rectus Dei," incidentally mentions the fact that Genesis was called "the book of the just" (liber Genesis appellatur εὐθέων, id est, justorum), from its containing the histories of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel (*Comm. in Jes.* xliv, 2). The Talmudists attribute this tradition to R. Johanan. R. Eliezer thought that by the book of Jasher was signified the book of Deuteronomy from the expressions in Deut. vi, 18; xxxiii, 7, the latter being quoted in proof of the skill of the Hebrews in archery. In the opinion of Rabbi Samuel ben-Nachman, the book of Judges was alluded to as the book of Jasher (*Aboda Zara*, c. ii); and that it was the book of the twelve minor prophets was held by some Hebrew writers, quoted without name by Sixtus Senensis (*Bibl. Sanct.* lib. ii). R. Levi ben-Gershom recognises, though he does not follow, the tradition given by Jarchi, while Kimchi and Abarbanel adopt the rendering of the Targum. This diversity of opinions proves, if it proves nothing more, that no book was known to have survived which could lay claim to the title of the book of Jasher.

Josephus, in relating the miracle narrated in Josh. x, appeals for confirmation of his account to certain documents deposited in the Temple (*Ant.* v, 1, 17), and his words are supposed to contain a covert allusion to the book of Jasher as the source of his authority. But in his treatise against Apion he says the Jews did not possess myriads of books, discordant and contradictory, but twenty-two only; from which Abicht concludes that the books of Scripture were the sacred books hinted at in the former passage, while Masius understood by the same the Annals which were written by the prophets or by the royal scribes. Theodoret (*Quæst.* xiv *in Jesum Nave*) explains the words in Josh. x, 13, which he quotes as τὸ βιβλίον τὸ εὑρεθὲν (prob. an error for εὐθές, as he has in *Quæst.* iv *in* 2 *Reg.*), as referring to the ancient record from which the compiler of the book of Joshua derived the materials of his history, and applies the passage in 2 Sam. ii, 18 to prove that other documents, written by the prophets, were made use of in the composition of the historical books. Jerome, or, rather, the author of the *Quæstiones Hebraicæ*, understood by the book of Jasher the books of Samuel themselves, inasmuch as they contained the history of the just prophets, Samuel, Gad, and Nathan. Another opinion, quoted by Sixtus Senensis, but on no authority, that it was the book of eternal predestination, is scarcely worth more than the bare mention.

That the book of Jasher was one of the writings which perished in the Captivity was held by R. Levi ben-Gershom, though he gives the traditional explanation above mentioned. His opinion has been adopted by Junius, Hottinger (*Thes. Phil.* ii, 2, § 2), and many other modern writers (Wolfii *Bibl. Heb.* ii, 223).

What the nature of the book may have been can only be inferred from the two passages in which it is mentioned and their context, and, this being the case, there is clearly wide room for conjecture. The theory of Masius (quoted by Abicht) was, that in ancient times, whatever was worthy of being recorded for the instruction of posterity was written in the form of annals by learned men, and that among these annals or records was the book of Jasher, so called from the trustworthiness and methodical arrangement of the narrative, or because it contained the relation of the deeds of the people of Israel, who are elsewhere spoken of under the symbolical name Jeshurun. Of the latter hypothesis Fürst approves (*Handw.* s. v.). Sanctius (*Comment.* ad 2 Reg. 1) conjectured that it was a collection of pious hymns, written by different authors, and sung on various occasions, and that from this collection the Psalter was compiled. That it was written in verse may reasonably be inferred from the only specimens extant, which exhibit unmistakable signs of metrical rhythm; but that it took its name from this circumstance is not supported by etymology. Lowth, indeed (*Præl.* p. 306-7), imagined that it was a collection of national songs, so called because it probably commenced with אָז יָשִׁיר, *âz yâshir*, "then sang," etc., like the song of Moses in Exod. xv, 1; his view of the question was that of the Syriac and Arabic translators, and was adopted by Herder. But, granting that the form of the book was poetical, a difficulty still remains as to its subject. That the book of Jasher contained the deeds of national heroes of all ages embalmed in verse, among which David's lament over Saul and Jonathan had an appropriate place, was the opinion of Calovius. A fragment of a similar kind is thought to appear in Numb. xxi, 14. Gesenius conjectured that it was an anthology of ancient songs, which acquired its name, "the book of the just or upright," from being written in praise of upright men. He quotes, but does not approve, the theory of Illgen, that, like the Hamasa of the Arabs, it celebrated the achievements of illustrious warriors, and from this derived the title of "the book of valor." But the idea of warlike valor is entirely foreign to the root *yâshar*. Dupin contended, from 2 Sam. i, 18, that the contents of the book were of a military nature; but Montanus, regarding rather the etymology, considered it a collection of political and moral precepts. Abicht, taking the lament of David as a sample of the whole, maintained that the fragment quoted in the book of Joshua was part of a funeral ode composed upon the death of that hero, and narrating his achievements. At the same time, he does not conceive it necessary to suppose that one book only is alluded to in both instances. It must be admitted, however, that there is very slight ground for any conclusion beyond that which affects the form, and that nothing can be confidently asserted with regard to the contents.

From the passage above referred to (2 Sam. i, 18—"Also he bade them teach the children of Israel [the use of] the bow"), it has been supposed by some (see Dr. Adam Clarke's *Comment.* ad loc., and Horne's *Introd.* vol. i) that the book of Jasher contained a treatise on archery; but it has been observed (see Parker's translation of De Wette's *Introd.* i, 301) that, according to the ancient mode of citation, which consisted in referring to some particular word in the document, "the bow" which the children of Israel were to be taught indicated the poetical passage from the book of Jasher in which the "bow of Jonathan" is mentioned (2 Sam. i, 22). One writer (Rev. T. M. Hopkins, in the *Biblical Repository*, 1845, p. 97 sq.) rashly proposes to reject both references to the book in question as spurious, and even the whole account of the miracle in Joshua.

De Wette (*Einleitung*, § 169) endeavors to deduce an argument in favor of the late composition of the book of Joshua from the circumstance of its citing a work (viz. the book of Jasher) which "points to the time of David, inasmuch as his lamentation over Saul and Jonathan is contained in it." But it has been supposed by others (although the American translator of De Wette's *Introd.* looks upon this as quite improbable) that the book may, as a collection of poems, have received accessions at various periods, and, nevertheless, been still quoted by its original name. Dr. Palfrey, who adopts this view of the book of Jasher in his *Lectures*, still refers the composition of Joshua to the time of Saul.

III. *Attempted Reproductions of the Work.* — 1. Although conjecture might almost be thought to have exhausted itself on a subject so barren of premises, a scholar of our own day has not despaired of being able not

only to decide what the book of Jasher was in itself, but of reconstructing it from the fragments which, according to his theory, he traces throughout the several books of the Old Test. In the preface to his *Jashar*, or *Fragmenta Archetypa Carminum Hebraicorum in Masorethico Veteris Testamenti textu passim tessellata* (London, 1854, 1860, 8vo), Dr. Donaldson advances a scheme for the restoration of this ancient record in accordance with his own idea of its scope and contents. Assuming that, during the tranquil and prosperous reign of Solomon, an unwonted impulse was given to Hebrew literature, and that the worshippers of Jehovah were desirous of possessing something on which their faith might rest, the book of "Jashar," or "uprightness," he asserts, was written, or, rather, compiled to meet this want. Its object was to show that in the beginning man was upright, but had, by carnal wisdom, forsaken the spiritual law; that the Israelites had been chosen to preserve and transmit this law of uprightness; that David had been made king for his religious integrity, leaving the kingdom to his son Solomon, in whose reign, after the dedication of the Temple, the prosperity of the chosen people reached its culminating point. The compiler of the book was probably Nathan the prophet, assisted, perhaps, by Gad the seer. It was thus "the first offspring of the prophetic schools, and ministered spiritual food to the greater prophets." Rejecting, therefore, the authority of the Masoretic text, as founded entirely on tradition, and adhering to his own theory of the origin and subject of the book of Jasher, Dr. Donaldson proceeds to show that it contains the religious marrow of holy Scripture. In such a case, of course, absolute proof is not to be looked for, and it would be impossible here to discuss what measure of probability should be assigned to a scheme elaborated with considerable ingenuity. Whatever ancient fragments in the sacred books of the Hebrews exhibit the nature of uprightness, celebrate the victories of the true Israelites, predict their prosperity, or promise future blessedness, have, according to this theory, a claim to be considered among the relics of the book of Jasher. Following such a principle of selection, the fragments fall into seven groups. The first part, the object of which is to show that man was created upright (יָשָׁר, *yâshâr*), but fell into sin by carnal wisdom, contains two fragments—an Elohistic and a Jehovistic, both poetical, the latter being the more full. The first of these includes Gen. i, 27, 28; vi, 1, 2, 4, 5; viii, 21; vi, 6, 3; the other is made up of Gen. ii, 7-9, 15-18, 25; iii, 1-19, 21, 23, 24. The second part, consisting of four fragments, shows how the descendants of Abraham, as being upright (יְשָׁרִים, *yeshârim*), were adopted by God, while the neighboring nations were rejected. Fragment 1, Gen. ix, 18-27; fragment 2, Gen. iv, 2-8, 8-16; fragment 3, Gen. xvi, 1-4, 15, 16; xvii, 9-16, 18-26; xxi, 1-14, 20, 21; fragment 4, Gen. xxv, 20-34; xxvii, 1-10, 14, 18-20, 25-40; iv, 18, 19; xxvi, 34; xxxvi, 2; iv, 23, 24; xxxvi, 8; xxviii, 9; xxvi, 35; xxvii, 46; xxviii, 1-4, 11-19; xxix, 1, etc., 24, 29; xxxv, 22-26; xxiv, 25-29; xxxv, 9-14, 15; xxxii, 31. In the third part is related, under the figure of the Deluge, how the Israelites escaped from Egypt, wandered forty years in the wilderness, and finally, in the reign of Solomon, built a temple to Jehovah. The passages in which this is found are Gen. vi, 5-14; vii, 6, 11, 12; viii, 6, 7, 8, 12; v, 29; viii, 4; 1 Kings vi; viii, 43; Deut. vi, 18; Psa. v, 8. The three fragments of the fourth part contain the divine laws to be observed by the upright people, and are found in (1) Deut. v, 1-22; (2) vi, 1-5; Lev. xix, 18; Deut. x, 12-21; xi, 1-5, 7-9; and (3) viii, 1-3; vi, 6-18, 20-25. The blessings of the upright, and their admonitions, are the subject of the fifth part, which contains the songs of Jacob (Gen. xlix), Balaam (Numb. xxiii, xxiv), and Moses (Deut. xxxii, xxxiii). The wonderful victories and deliverances of Israel are celebrated in the sixth part, in the triumphal songs of Moses and Miriam (Exod. xv, 1-19), of Joshua (Josh. x, 12, 13), and of Deborah (Judg. v, 1-20). The seventh is a collection of various hymns composed in the reigns of David and Solomon, and contains David's song of triumph over Goliath (!) (1 Sam. ii, 1-10); his lament for Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i, 19-27), and for Abner (2 Sam. iii, 33, 34); his psalm of thanksgiving (Psa. xviii; 2 Sam. xxii); his triumphal ode on the conquest of the Edomites (Psa. lx), and his prophecy of Messiah's kingdom (2 Sam. xxiii, 1-7), together with Solomon's Epithalamium (Psa. xlv), and the hymn sung at the dedication of the Temple (Psa. lxviii).

It cannot be denied that the critic has shown great ingenuity and constructive skill in elaborating his theory. His commentaries on the individual fragments composing the parts often exhibit striking and just remarks, with a right perception of the genius of some portions of the O. T. Yet we must pronounce the attempt a failure. The leading positions are untenable. Donaldson's arguments are often weak and baseless. Most of the contents which he assigns to the book of Jashar never belonged to it, such as the pieces of Genesis which he selects, etc. But it is needless to enter into a refutation of the hypothesis, ingeniously set forth in elegant Latin, and supported with considerable acuteness. Most of the book of Jashar cited in Joshua and 2d Samuel is lost. It is very improbable that laws such as those in Deut. vi, x, xi, or historical pieces like Gen. xvi, 1-4, ever belonged to it. It is also a most unfortunate conjecture that שִׁילֹה, in Gen. xlix, 10, is abridged from שְׁלֹמֹה; or, even if it were, that it furnishes a proof of the poem being written while *Solomon* was king (p. 27). We are persuaded that the critic gives great extension of meaning to the Hebrew word יָשָׁר, in making it almost, if not altogether, an appellation of the Israelitish people. When he assumes that it is contained in יִשְׂרָאֵל, the notion is erroneous (p. 23).

Among the many strange results of Donaldson's arrangement, Shem, Ham, and Japheth are no longer the sons of Noah, who is Israel under a figure, but of Adam; and the circumstances of Noah's life related in Gen. ix, 18-27 are transferred to the latter. Cain and Abel are the sons of Shem, Abraham is the son of Abel, and Esau becomes Lamech, the son of Methuselah.

2 and 3. There are also extant, under the title of "the book of Jasher," two Rabbinical works, one a moral treatise, written in A.D. 1394 by R. Shabbatai Carmuz Levita, of which a copy in MS. exists in the Vatican library; the other was written by Jacob ben-Meir, or R. Tam, who died in 1171, and contains a treatise on Jewish ritual questions. It was published at Cracow in 1586, 4to, and again at Vienna in 1811, but incorrectly. No translation of either was ever made.

4. An anonymous work under the same name was published at Venice in 1625, at Cracow in 1628, and at Prague in 1668. It contains the histories of the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges, and intermixes many fabulous things. It gives (lxxxviii, 64) the account of Joshua's miracle nearly in the words of Scripture, making the sun to stand still "thirty-six times" (עִתִּים), i. e. *hours;* but does not bring the history down later than the conquest of Canaan. The preface itself states that it was discovered at the destruction of Jerusalem by Sidrus, one of the officers of Titus, who, while searching a house for the purpose of plunder, found in a secret chamber a vessel containing the books of the law, the prophets, and Hagiographa, with many others, which a venerable man was reading. Sidrus took the old man under his protection, and built for him a house at Seville, where the books were safely deposited, and thence this one was conveyed to Naples, where it was printed. The book in question is probably the production of a Spanish Jew of the 13th century (Abicht, *De libr. Recti*, in *Thes. Nov. Theol. Phil.* i, 525-34). A German version of it, with additions, was published by R. Jacob at Frankfort-on-the-Main (1674, 8vo), with the title תָּם וְיָשָׁר, *perfect and right*. A stereotyped translation of this

work was published in New York in 1840, under the direction of M. M. Noah, with certificates of its fidelity to the original by eminent Hebrew scholars who had examined it.

5. The above works must not be confounded with the various editions of a fabrication which was first secretly printed at Bristol, and published in London in 1751 (4to), by an infidel type-founder of Bristol named Jacob Ilive, who was its real author. It was entitled "*The Book of Jasher, with Testimonies and Notes explanatory of the Text: to which is prefixed Various Readings:* translated into English from the Hebrew by Alcuin of Britain, who went a pilgrimage into the Holy Land." This book was noticed in the *Monthly Review* for December, 1751, which describes it as "a palpable piece of contrivance, intended to impose upon the credulous and ignorant, to sap the credit of the books of Moses, and to blacken the character of Moses himself." The preface, purporting to be written by Alcuin, contains an account of the finding of the book in MS. at Gazna, in Persia, and the way in which it was translated. Having brought it to England, Alcuin says that he left it, among other papers, with a clergyman in Yorkshire. After two pages of various readings, the book itself follows, divided into thirty-seven chapters. Testimonies and notes are appended. The editor states, in a dedication at the beginning, that he bought the MS. at an auction in the north of England, and affirms that Wickliffe had written on the outside, "I have read the book of Jasher twice over, and I much approve of it as a piece of great antiquity and curiosity, but I cannot assent that it should be made a part of the canon of Scripture." This clumsy forgery was reprinted at Bristol in 1827, and published in London in 1829 (4to), as a new discovery of the book of Jasher. A prospectus of a second edition of this reprint was issued in 1833 by the editor, who therein styles himself the *Rev.* C. R. Bond. This literary fraud has obtained a notoriety far beyond its merits in consequence of the able critiques to which it gave rise, having been again exposed in the Dublin *Christian Examiner* for 1831, and elaborately refuted by Horne in his *Introduction* (ut sup.; new edition, iv, 741-6).

See, besides the literature above referred to, Hilliger, *De Libro Recti* (Lips. 1714); Nolte, *De Libro Justorum* (Helmst. 1719); Wolf, *De Libro Rectorum* (Lips. 1742); Steger, *De vocabulo* יָשָׁר (Kiel, 1808); Anon. *Jasher referred to in Josh. and Sam.* (London, 1842); Hopkins, *Plumbline Papers* (Auburn, 1862, ch. vii); and the periodicals cited by Poole, *Index*, s. v. Compare JOSHUA.

Jasho'beäm (Heb. *Yashobam'*, יָשָׁבְעָם, *dweller* among the *people*, or *returner* to the *people*, otherwise, to whom the *people returns*, or a *returning people;* Sept. in 1 Chron. xi, 11, Ἰεβαάμ v. r. Ἰεσαβαδά; in 1 Chron. xii, 6, Ἰεσβαάμ v. r. Σοβοκάμ; in 1 Chron. xxvii, 2, Ἰσβοάμ v. r. Ἰσβοάζ; Vulg. *Jesbaam*, but *Jesboam* in 1 Chron. xxvii, 2), the name of several of David's favorite officers.

1. One of the Korhites, or Levite of the family of Korah (and therefore probably not identical with the following), who joined David's band at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 6). B.C. 1053.

2. "Son" of Hachmoni, one of David's worthies, and the first named in the two lists which are given of them (2 Sam. xxiii, 8; 1 Chron. xi, 11). One of these texts is held to have suffered through the negligence of copyists, and, as Jashobeam is not otherwise historically known, commentators have been much embarrassed in comparing them. The former passage attributes to him the defeat of 800, the latter of 300 Philistines; and the question has been whether there is a mistake of figures in one of these accounts, or whether two different exploits are recorded. Further difficulties will appear in comparing the two texts. We have assumed Jashobeam to be intended in both, but this is open to question. In Chronicles we read, "Jashobeam, the Hachmonite, chief of the captains: he lifted up his spear against 300 men, slain by him at one time;" but in Samuel [margin], "Josheb-bassebet the Tachmonite, chief among the three, Adino, of Ezni, who lifted up his spear against 800 men, whom he slew." That Jashobeam the Hachmonite and Josheb-bash-shebeth the Tachmonite are the same person, is clear; but may not Adino of Ezni, whose name forms the immediate antecedent of the exploit, which, as related here, constitutes the sole discrepancy between the two texts, be another person? Many so explain it, and thus obtain a solution of the difficulty. But a further comparison of the two verses will again suggest that the whole of the verse last cited must belong to Jashobeam; for not only is the parallel incomplete if we take the last clause from him and assign it to another, but in doing this we leave the "chief among the captains" without an exploit, in a list which records some feat of every hero. We incline, therefore, to the opinion of those who suppose that Jashobeam, or Josheb-bash-shebeth, was the name or title of the chief, Adino and Eznite being descriptive epithets, and Hachmonite the patronymic of the same person; and the remaining discrepancy we account for, not on the supposition of different exploits, but of one of those corruptions of numbers of which several will be found in comparing the books of Chronicles with those of Samuel and Kings. B.C. 1014. See ADINO; DAVID; EZNITE.

The exploit of breaking through the host of the Philistines to procure David a draught of water from the well of Bethlehem is ascribed to the three chief heroes, and therefore to Jashobeam, who was the first of the three (2 Sam. xxiii, 13-17; 1 Chron. xi, 15-19). B.C. 1045.

3. We also find a Jashobeam who commanded 24,000, and did duty in David's court in the month Nisan (1 Chron. xxvii, 2). He was the son of Zabdiel; if, therefore, he was the same as the foregoing Jashobeam, his patronymic of "the Hachmonite" must be referred to his race or office rather than to his immediate father. See HACHMONI.

Ja'shub [or *Jash'ub*] (Heb. *Yashub'*, יָשׁוּב, *returner;* once by error, יָשִׁיב, *Yashib'*, in text 1 Chron. vii, 1; Samar. Pent. in Numb. *Yosheb'*, יושב; Sept. Ἰασούβ), the name of two men, or, perhaps, the last is rather a place. See also SHEAR-JASHUB.

1. The third named of the four sons of Issachar (1 Chron. vii, 1; Numb. xxvi, 24); called JOB (perhaps by contraction or corruption [or possibly only by substitution, both having the same meaning, one from שׁוּב, and the other from אוּב]) in the parallel passage (Gen. xlvi, 13). B.C. 1856. His descendants were called JASHUBITES (Hebrew *Yashubi'*, יָשֻׁבִי, Sept. Ἰασουβί, Numb. xxvi, 24).

2. One of the "sons" (? former residents) of Bani, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Exile (Ezra x, 29). B.C. 459.

Jash'ubi-le'hem (Heb. *Yashu'bi-Le'chem*, יָשֻׁבִי לֶחֶם ["in pause" *La'chem*, לָחֶם], *returning* home from *battle* or for *food;* Sept. ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτούς v. r. ἀπέστρεψαν εἰς Λεέμ; Vulg. *reversi sunt in Lahem*), apparently a person named as a descendant of Shelah, the son of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 22). B.C. perhaps cir. 995, since it added at the end of the list, "And these are ancient things. These were the potters, and those that dwelt among plants and hedges; there they dwelt with the king [? Solomon; but, according to some, Pharaoh, during the residence in Egypt] for his work." Possibly, however, "it is a place, and we should infer from its connection with Maresha and Chozeba—if Chozeba be Chezib or Achzib—that it lay on the western side of the tribe, in or near the Shephelah or 'plain.' The Jewish explanations, as seen in Jerome's *Quæst. Hebr.* on this passage, and, in a slightly different form, in the Targum on the Chronicles (ed. Wilkins, p. 29, 30), mention of Moab as the key to the whole. Chozeba is Elimelech; Joash and Saraph are Mahlon and Chilion, who 'had

the dominion in Moab' from marrying the two Moabite damsels: Jashubi-Lehem is Naomi and Ruth, who *returned* (Jashubi) to bread, or to Beth-*lehem*, after the famine: and the 'ancient words' point to the book of Ruth as the source of the whole"

Jash'ubite (Numb. xxvi, 24). See JASHUB, 1.

Jasideans. See YEZIDÎS.

Ja'siël (1 Chron. xi, 46). See JAASIEL.

Ja'son (Ἰάσων, he *that will cure*, originally the name of the leader of the Argonauts), a common Greek name, which was frequently adopted by Hellenizing Jews as the equivalent of *Jesus, Joshua* (Ἰησοῦς; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 5, 1; Aristeas, *Hist.* apud Hody, p. 7), probably with some reference to its supposed connection with ἰᾶσθαι (i. e. the *healer*). A parallel change occurs in *Alcimus* (Eliakim), while *Nicolaus, Dositheus, Menelaus*, etc., were direct translations of Hebrew names. It occurs with reference to several men in the Apocrypha, and one in the New Testament.

1. JASON, THE SON OF ELEAZER (comp. Ecclus. l, 27, Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Σιρὰχ Ἐλεάζαρ, Codex A), was one of the commissioners sent by Judas Maccabæus, in conjunction with Eupolemus, to conclude a treaty of amity and mutual support with the Romans, B.C. 161 (1 Macc. viii, 17; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 10, 6).

2. JASON, THE FATHER OF ANTIPATER, who was an envoy to Rome to renew the treaty, at a later period, under Jonathan Maccabæus, in conjunction with Numenius, the son of Antiochus (1 Macc. xii, 16; xiv, 22), is probably the same person as No. 1.

3. JASON OF CYRENE, in Africa, was a Hellenizing Jew of the race of those whom Ptolemy Soter sent into Egypt (2 Macc. i; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 1; Prideaux, *Connection*, ii, 176). He wrote in five books the history of Judas Maccabæus and his brethren, and the principal transactions of the Jews during the reigns of Seleucus IV Philopator, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and Antiochus V Eupator (B.C. 187-162), from which five books most of the second book of Maccabees (q. v.) is abridged. In all probability it was written in Greek, and, from the fact of its including the wars under Antiochus V Eupator, it must have been written after B.C. 162. The sources from which Jason obtained his information are unknown, and it is not certain when either he or his epitomizer lived. All that we know of his history is contained in the few verses of the 2d Macc. ii, 19-23.

4. JASON, THE HIGH-PRIEST, was the second son of Simon II, and the brother of Onias III. His proper name was JESUS, but he had changed it to that of Jason (Ἰησοῦς Ἰάσονα ἑαυτον μετωνόμασεν [Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 5, 1]). Shortly after the accession of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Jason offered to the king 440 talents of yearly tribute if he would invest him with the high-priesthood, to the exclusion of his elder brother (4 Macc. iv, 17) (B.C. cir. 175). Josephus says that Onias III was dead on the accession of Jason to the high-priesthood, and that Jason received this post in consequence of his nephew, Onias IV, the son of Onias III, being as yet an infant (*Ant.* xii, 5, 1). Jason also offered a further 150 talents for the license "to set him up a place of exercise, and for the training up of youth in the fashions of the heathen" (2 Macc. iv, 7-9; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 5, 1). This offer was immediately accepted by Antiochus, and Jason built a gymnasium at Jerusalem. The effect of this innovation was to produce a stronger tendency than ever for Greek fashions and heathenish manners, and they so increased under the superintendence of the wicked Jason that the priests despised the Temple, and "hastened to be partakers of the unlawful allowance in the place of exercise, after the game of Discus (q. v.) called them forth" (2 Macc. iv, 14). Some of the Jews even "made themselves uncircumcised," that they might appear to be Greeks when they were naked (1 Macc. i, 15; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 5, 1). At last, as was the custom of the cities who used to send embassies to Tyre in honor of Hercules (Curtius, iv, 2; Polybius, *Reliq.* xxxi, 20, 12), Jason sent special messengers (θεωρούς) from Jerusalem, who were the newly-elected citizens of Antioch (Ἀντιοχεῖς ὄντας; comp. 2 Macc. iv, 9), to carry 300 drachmæ of silver to the sacrifice of that god. See HERCULES. The money, however, contrary to the wish of the sender, was not used for the sacrifice of Hercules, but reserved for making triremes, because the bearers of it did not think it proper (διὰ τὸ μὴ καθήκειν) to employ it for the sacrifice (2 Macc. iv, 19, 20). In B.C. 172 Jason also gave a festival to Antiochus when he visited Jerusalem, Jason and the citizens leading him in by torch-light and with great shoutings (2 Macc. iv, 22). Josephus mentions this visit, but says that it was an expedition *against* Jerusalem, and that Antiochus, upon obtaining possession of the city, slew many of the Jews, and plundered it of a great deal of money (*Ant.* xii, 5, 3). The crafty Jason, however, soon found a yet more cunning kinsman, who removed him from his office in much the same manner as he had done with his brother, Onias III. Menelaus, the son of Simon (Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 5, 1; Simon's brother, 2 Macc. iv, 23), governor of the Temple, having been sent by Jason to Antiochus, knew how, through flattery and by offering 300 talents more than Jason, to gain the favor of the king. Antiochus immediately gave him the office of high-priest, and Jason was forced to flee into the country of the Ammonites (2 Macc. iv, 26). See MENELAUS. In B.C. 170, Antiochus having undertaken his second expedition into Egypt, there was a rumor that he was dead, and Jason made an attack upon Jerusalem and committed many atrocities. He was, however, forced again to flee into the country of the Ammonites (2 Macc. v, 5-7). At length, being accused before Aretas, king of the Arabians, he was compelled "to flee from city to city, pursued of all men, and being held in abomination as an open enemy of his country and countrymen," and eventually retired into Egypt (2 Macc. v, 8). He afterwards retired to take refuge among the Lacedæmonians, "thinking there to find succor by reason of his kindred" (2 Macc. v, 9; compare 1 Macc. xii, 7, 21; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 4, 10; see Prideaux, *Connect.* ii, 140; Frankel, *Monatschrift*, 1853, p. 456), and perished miserably "in a strange land" (comp. Dan. xii, 30 sq.; Macc. i, 12 sq.). His body remained without burial, and he had "none to mourn for him" (2 Macc. v, 9, 10). See HIGH-PRIEST.

5. JASON OF THESSALONICA was the host of Paul and Silas at that city. In consequence, his house was assaulted by the Jews in order to seize the apostle, but, not finding him, they dragged Jason and other brethren before the ruler of the city, who released them on security (Acts xvii, 5-9). A.D. 48. He appears to have been the same as the Jason mentioned in Rom. xvi, 21 as one of the kinsmen of Paul, and probably accompanied him from Thessalonica to Corinth (A.D. 54). He was not one of those who accompanied the apostle into Asia, though Lightfoot conjectures that Jason and Secundus were the same person (Acts xx, 4). Alford says Secundus is altogether unknown (Acts, l. c.). According to tradition, Jason was bishop of Tarsus (Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, p. 91, 92).

Jasper (יָשְׁפֶה, *yashepheh'*, prob. *polished* or *glittering*, ἴασπις), a gem of various colors, as purple, cerulean, but mostly green like the emerald, although duller in hue (Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxxvii, 8, 9; Epiphanius, *De Gemmis*, § 6; Braun, *De Vest. Sacerdot.* ii, 19). "It was the last of the twelve inserted in the high-priest's breastplate (Exod. xxviii, 20; xxxix, 13), and the first of the twelve used in the foundation of the new Jerusalem (Rev. xxi, 19): the difference in the *order* seems to show that no emblematical importance was attached to that feature. It was the stone employed in the superstructure (ἐνδόμησις) of the wall of the new Jerusalem (Rev. xxi, 18). It further appears among the stones which adorned the king of Tyre (Ezek. xxviii, 13). Lastly, it is the emblematical image of the glory of the divine Being (Rev. iv, 3). The characteristics of the stone, as far as they are specified in Scripture (Rev. xxi, 11), are

that it was 'most precious,' and 'like crystal' (*κρυσταλλίζων*); not exactly 'clear as crystal,' as in the A. V., but of a crystal hue: the term is applied to it in this sense by Dioscorides (v. 160: *λίθος ἰάσπις ὁ μὲν τίς ἐστι σμαραγδίζων, ὁ δὲ κρυσταλλῴδης*). We may also infer from Rev. iv, 3 that it was a stone of brilliant and transparent light." The ancient jasper thus appears to have been frequently translucent, but the modern is opaque. A brown variety existed in Egypt. The jasper of the ancients, therefore, comprehended various precious stones not readily identifiable (Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterthum*, IV, i, 42; Moore's *Anc. Min.* p. 163). What is now properly called jasper by mineralogists is a sub-species of rhomboidal quartz, of several varieties, mostly the *common*, the *Egyptian*, and the *striped;* of different colors—whitish, yellow, green, reddish, etc., sometimes spotted or banded; occurring either in masses or loose crystals, and susceptible of a fine polish (see the *Lond. Encyclopædia*, s. v.). See GEM.

Jaspis, GOTTFRIED SIEGMUND, a German theologian, was born at Meissen April 8, 1766. He was educated at the University of Leipzig, and entered the ministry in 1792 as pastor at Püchau. In 1814 he was called to the Nicolai church at Leipzig, where he died, Feb. 15, 1823. While he distinguished himself greatly as a preacher, it is particularly as a writer in Biblical literature that Jaspis's name deserves to be mentioned here. He published an excellent Latin translation of the apostolic epistles (Lips. 1793-95; new ed. 1821, 8vo). His polemical and homiletical works are now no longer regarded as of any value. "He was a man of pure aims and cheerful piety, and a good scholar and preacher."—Kitto, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Adelung's Addenda to Jöcher, *Gelehrten Lexikon*, s. v.

Jassasa, AL (or *the Spy*), a Mohammedan name for a beast which is to be one of their signs of the approach of the day of judgment: *When the sentence shall be ready to fall upon them, we will cause a beast to come forth unto them out of the earth, which shall speak unto them.* It is supposed by them that it will appear first in the temple of Mecca, or on Mount Safa, or in the territory of Tayef. She is to be a monster in size, and so swift that no human being shall be able to pursue her in her rapid flight through this world, marking the believers from the unbelievers, "that every person may be known at the day of judgment for what he really is." See Sale, *Prelim. Dissert. to the Koran*, p. 79; Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* i, 506.

Jasu'bus (Ἰασοῦβος), the Græcized form (1 Esd. ix, 30) of the Heb. name (Ezra x, 29) JASHUB (q. v.).

Jataka (literally *relating to birth*) is the name of a Buddhistic work consisting of a series of books which contain an account of 550 previous births of Sâkya Muni, or the Buddha. Several tales that pass under the name of Æsop's fables are to be found in this collection of legends. See BUDDHISM.

Ja'tal (Ἀτάρ v. r. Ἰατάλ), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esd. v, 28) of the Heb. name (Ezra ii, 42; Neh. vii, 45) ATER (q. v.).

Jath'niël (Heb. *Yathniël'*, יַתְנִיאֵל, *given* by *God*, otherwise *praiser of God;* Sept. Ναθανά v. r. Ναθαναήλ, Ἰαθαναήλ), the fourth son of Meshelemiah, one of the Levitical (Korhite) gate-keepers of the Temple (1 Chron. xxvi, 2). B.C. 1014.

Jat'tir (Heb. *Yattir'*, יַתִּיר [in Josh. xv, 48, elsewhere "defectively" יַתִּר], *pre-eminent;* Sept. Ἰεθέρ or Ἰέθερ), a city in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv, 48, where it is named between Shamir and Socoh) assigned to the priests (Josh. xxi, 14; 1 Chron. vi, 57). It was one of the places in the south where David used to haunt in his freebooting days, and to his friends in which he sent gifts from the spoil of the enemies of Jehovah (1 Sam. xxx, 27). The two Ithrite heroes of David's guard (2 Sam. xxiii, 38; 1 Chron. xi, 40) were possibly from Jattir, living memorials to him of his early difficulties. According to Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v. Jether), it was in their day a very large hamlet inhabited by Christians, twenty Roman miles from Eleutheropolis, in the district of the Daroma, near Molatha (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 885). It is named by Hap-Parchi, the Jewish traveller; but the passage is defective, and little can be gathered from it (Zunz, in Asher's *Benj. of Tudela*, ii, 442). The required position answers nearly to that of the modern village of *'Attir*, discovered by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, ii, 194, 625) in this region, "marked by caves upon a hill" (comp. Wilson, *Lands of Bible*, i, 353), and situated fifteen miles south of Hebron, and five north of Moladah (Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 105). It contains extensive ruins (Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 388).

Jauffret, GASPARD JEAN ANDRÉ JOSEPH, a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born at La Roque-Brussane, Provence, Dec. 13, 1759. He was educated at Toulon and Aix, then entered the Church, and was made canon of Aulp. He subsequently went to Paris, where he continued his theological studies under the priests of St. Roch and St. Sulpice, and in 1791 established the periodical *Annales de la Religion et du Sentiment*, aimed against the civil constitution of the clergy. He afterwards became one of the editors of the *Annales Religieuses.* About 1801 he acted as vicar-general of cardinal Fesch, at Lyon, during the latter's embassy to Rome, and he here labored with the people to reconcile them to the Concordat. Cardinal Fesch subsequently called him to Paris, where Jauffret established a number of religious societies, and obtained many privileges for divers congregations of monks and nuns through the influence of his patron. Made chaplain of the emperor, he was in July, 1806, appointed bishop of Metz, and consecrated Dec. 3 of the same year, still retaining his imperial chaplaincy. This position he improved by establishing a number of seminaries and Roman Catholic schools of all kinds. In 1810 he was one of the persons sent to meet the archduchess Maria Louisa, and subsequently became her confessor. In 1811 he was rewarded for his zeal in promoting the divorce of Napoleon from his first wife by the archbishopric of Aix; but he never really held this position, on account of the difficulties between the pope and the emperor, and finally felt constrained to renounce it. He died at Paris May 13, 1823. He wrote *De la Religion à l'Assemblée Nationale* (1790-1, 8vo; often reprinted under divers titles):—*Du Culte public* (1795, 2 vols. 8vo; 3d ed. 1815):—*Mémoire pour servir à l'Hist. de la Religion et de la Philosophie* (Anon. Paris, 1803, 2 vols. 8vo), besides a number of controversial and practical works. See *Ami de la Religion et du Roi*, xxxvi, 65-74; *Chronique Religieuse*, vi, 289-305; Quérard, *La France Littéraire.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 410 sq. (J. N. P.)

Java, an island in the Malay archipelago, and, after Sumatra and Borneo, the largest in the Sunda group, is the principal seat of the Dutch power in the East. The island is 630 miles long, by 35 to 120 miles broad, and has an area of 49,730 square miles. The population has very rapidly increased since the beginning of the 19th century. While in 1812 it amounted only to 4,500,000 inhabitants, it numbered in 1845 9,560,000 (of whom 106,033 were Chinese, 31,216 Arabs, 16,308 Europeans and their descendants, and 5111 slaves); in 1864, 13,649,680 (26,460 Europeans, and 156,390 Chinese); and in 1884, 20,931,654 (Europeans, 35,000; Chinese, 215,000). The natives belong to the Malay race, but to two different nations—the Javanese in the east, and the less numerous Sundanese in the west. The Javanese are a peaceable, frugal, and industrious people, who have made greater progress in agriculture than any other people of Asia except the Chinese and Japanese. In 1327 Java was invaded by the Arabs, who subjugated the whole island, and established in it the Mohammedan religion and customs. Only in the remote mountains a few thousand worshippers of Buddha and Brahma remain. The ruins of many temples, images, and

tombs prove, however, that at an early period Brahmanism struck deep root among the people. The Portuguese, who came to Java in 1579, as well as the English who arrived later, were expelled by the Dutch, who established themselves in Java in 1594, and steadily advanced in the conquest of the island until only two native states were left—Soerakarta, or Solo, with 690,000 inhabitants, and Djodjkarta, with 340,000 inhabitants. From 1811 to 1816 the island was under the rule of the British, who had conquered it, but in 1816 it was restored to the Dutch. In consequence of the bad administration a number of outbreaks took place, among which, in particular, that of Djepo Negoro, in 1825, was very dangerous, until at length the governors, Van der Capellen and Jan van den Busch, succeeded, by encouraging agriculture, and by other measures, in developing the productivity and prosperity of the island to a high degree. In accordance with a decree of Jan. 1, 1860, slavery was abolished in Java, as well as in all the Dutch colonies. During the rule of the Portuguese the Catholic missionaries formed some native congregations, of which only a few remnants are left at Batavia and Depok. The Dutch government was decidedly opposed to missionary labor, and Protestant missions were not begun until the island passed, in 1811, under the rule of England. The first society in the field was the London Missionary (since 1813), which was soon followed by the English Baptists. But both societies confined their efforts chiefly to the Chinese and the Malays. Their missionaries were allowed to remain after the restoration of the Dutch administration, but they had to submit to many restrictions, until, in 1842, all non-Dutch missionaries in the Dutch colonies were forbidden to perform any missionary labors. Thus only the Rotterdam Missionary Society, which had begun its operations in Batavia and the neighborhood in 1820, was able to continue the missionary work. A new impulse was given to the labors of this society by a journey of visitation on the part of its inspector. A mission station was established at Samarang, and a second very promising field opened in the province of Surabaya, with Modjo Warno as centre, whence the mission extended to Kediri and Malang. The society, in 1886, supported in Java seven missionaries and seven native agents. In 1851 a society for home and foreign missions was formed at Batavia, with which the Dutch section of the Java Committee at Amsterdam associated itself. The society labored in Batavia and the neighborhood, in particular among the Malays and Chinese, and took several brethren of the Society of Gossner into its service. In 1854 the Mennonite Missionary Society at Amsterdam (Doopgezinde Vereeniging) began its operations at Djapara, while the Nederland Zendings Vereeniging, which was established in 1858, opened missions among the Sundanese, to whom it has also undertaken to give a translation of the Bible. It employed in 1866 five missionaries, and had four stations. The Nederl. Gereformeerde Zendings Vereeniging has also established several missions (in 1866 three missionaries) in Java, and the Utrecht Missionary Society has begun missionary operations on the neighboring island of Bali, where Buddhism is still prevalent. The Dutch government continues to be anything but favorable to the missions, but patronizes the diffusion of education, and has recently established for that purpose a native normal school at Bandong. The Roman Catholic Church has a vicar apostolic in the city of Batavia. The government pays the salaries of eight priests. The Catholic population consists almost exclusively of Dutch soldiers and Indo-Portuguese.—Newcomb, *Cyclopædia of Missions*; Grundemann, *Missions-Atlas*; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, xii, 569, 591. (A. J. S.)

Javan (Hebrew *Yavan'*, יָוָן, of foreign origin), the name of a person (borrowed from that of his descendants) and also of a city.

1. (Sept. Ἰαύαν in Gen. x, 2, 4; Ἰαϋάν in 1 Chron. i, 5, 7; ἡ Ἕλλας in Isa. lxvi, 19 and Ezek. xxvii, 13; elsewhere οἱ Ἕλληνες.) The fourth son of Japheth, and the father of Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim (Gen. x, 2, 4; 1 Chron. i, 5, 7). B.C. post 2514. Hence for the country settled by his posterity, supposed to be *Greece*, i. e. *Ionia* (whence the Heb. name), which province, settled by colonists from the mother country, was better known to the Orientals, as lying nearer to them, than Hellas itself (see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 587). It is mentioned among the places where the Syrians obtained articles of traffic (comp. Bochart, *Phaleg*, iii, 3), namely, brass and slaves (Ezek. xxvii, 13); as a distant country among the "isles of the sea" (Isa. lxvi, 19). Alexander the Great is styled king of Javan ("Græcia," Dan. viii, 21; x, 20; comp. xi, 2; Zech. ix, 13). In Joel iii, 6, the patronymic occurs בְּנֵי־הַיְּוָנִים, sons of "the Grecians," like the poetic υἷες Ἀχαιῶν. See ETHNOLOGY. This name, or its analogue, is found as a designation of Greece not only in all the Shemitic dialects, but also in the Sanscrit, the Old Persic, and the Egyptian (Knobel, *Völkertafel*, p. 78 sq.), and the form Ἰάονες appears in Homer as the designation of the early inhabitants of Attica (*Iliad*, xiii, 685), while Æschylus and Aristophanes make their Persian interlocutors call the Greeks Ἰάονες (Æschylus, *Pers.* 174, 555, 911, etc.; Aristoph. *Acharn.* 104, 106), and the Scholiast on the latter of these passages from Aristophanes expressly says, Πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας Ἰάονας οἱ βάρβαροι ἐκάλουν. "The occurrence of the name in the cuneiform inscriptions of the time of Sargon (about B.C. 709), in the form of *Yavnan* or *Yunan*, as descriptive of the isle of Cyprus, where the Assyrians first came in contact with the power of the Greeks, further shows that its use was not confined to the Hebrews, but was widely spread throughout the East. The name was probably introduced into Asia by the Phœnicians, to whom the Ionians were naturally better known than any other of the Hellenic races on account of their commercial activity and the high prosperity of their towns on the western coast of Asia Minor. The extension of the name westward to the general body of the Greeks, as they became known to the Hebrews through the Phœnicians, was but a natural process, analogous to that which we have already had to notice in the case of Chittim. It can hardly be imagined that the early Hebrews themselves had any actual acquaintance with the Greeks; it is, however, worth mentioning, as illustrative of the communication which existed between the Greeks and the East, that, amongst the artists who contributed to the ornamentation of Esarhaddon's palaces, the names of several Greek artists appear in one of the inscriptions (Rawlinson's *Herod.* i, 483). At a later period the Hebrews must have gained considerable knowledge of the Greeks through the Egyptians. Psammetichus (B.C. 664–610) employed Ionians and Carians as mercenaries, and showed them so much favor that the war-caste of Egypt forsook him in a body: the Greeks were settled near Bubastis, in a part of the country with which the Jews were familiar (Herod. ii, 154). The same policy was followed by the succeeding monarchs, especially Amasis (B.C. 571–525), who gave the Greeks Naucratis as a commercial emporium. It is tolerably certain that any information which the Hebrews acquired in relation to the Greeks must have been through the indirect means to which we have adverted; the Greeks themselves were very slightly acquainted with the southern coast of Syria until the invasion of Alexander the Great. The earliest notices of Palestine occur in the works of Hecatæus (B.C. 594–486), who mentions only the two towns Canytis and Cardytus; the next are in Herodotus, who describes the country as Syria Palæstina, and notices incidentally the towns Ascalon, Azotus, Ecbatana (Batanæa?), and Cadytis, the same as the Canytis of Hecatæus, probably Gaza. These towns were on the border of Egypt, with the exception of the uncertain Ecbatana, and it is therefore highly probable that no Greek had, down to this late period, travelled through Palestine" See GREECE.

2. (Sept. οἶνος v. r. Ἰωνάν, Ἰαουάν.) A region or

town of Arabia Felix, whence the Syrians procured manufactures of iron, cassia, and calamus (Ezek. xxvii, 19); probably the *Javan* mentioned in the *Camûs* (p. 1817) as "a town of Yemen," and "a port of Ispahan." Some confound this with the preceding name (Credner and Hitzig, *on Joel* iii, 6; see Meier *on Joel*, p. 166), but Tuch (*on Gen.* p. 210) suggests that it may have been so named as having been founded by a colony of Greeks. By a change of reading (see Hävernick, ad loc.) in an associated word (מֵאוּזָל, *from Uzal*, for מְאוּזָּל, *spun*, i. e. thread), some critics have thought they find another place mentioned in the same vicinity (see Bochart, *Phaleg*, I, ii, 21; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geog.* iii, 296–305).

Javelin is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of two Heb. terms: חֲנִית (*chanith'*, so called from its *flexibility*), a lance (1 Sam. xviii, 10, 11; xix, 9, 10; xx, 33; elsewhere "spear"); and רֹמַח (*ro'mach*, from its *piercing*), a lance for heavy-armed troops (Numb. xxv, 7; "lancet," i. e. spear-head, 1 Kings xviii, 28; "buckler," incorrectly, 1 Chron. xii, 8; elsewhere "spear"). See ARMOR.

Jaw (usually and properly לְחִי, *lechi'*, rendered also "jaw-bone;" once מַלְקוֹחִים, *malkochim'*, "jaws," Psa. xxii, 15, elsewhere "prey;" also מְתַלְּעוֹת, *methalleoth'*," "jaws," Job xxix, 17: "jaw teeth," Prov. xxx, 14; "cheek teeth," Joel i, 6). The denuded jaw-bone of an ass afforded Samson (q. v.) a not unsuitable weapon (see Seifferheld, *De maxilla asini*, Tübing. 1716) for the great carnage which he once effected (Judg. xv, 15). See LEHI.

Jay, WILLIAM, a very distinguished English Independent minister, was born at Tisbury, county of Wilts, May 8, 1769. He was the son of a poor stone-cutter, and obtained his education by the influence and charity of friends he made as a youth, distinguishing himself even then by great natural abilities and ready acquisition. When not quite sixteen years of age he began preaching, and before he had passed his minority he is said to have delivered no less than 1000 sermons. Like Wesley, he often preached out-doors; and he himself relates the history of his early life thus: "In the milder seasons which would allow of it, we often addressed large numbers out of doors; and many a clear and calm evening I have preached down the day on the corner of a common, or upon the green turf before the cottage door. These neighborhoods were supplied sometimes weekly and sometimes fortnightly, both on the week-days and on the Sabbaths. We always on the Sabbaths avoided, if possible, the church hours; and on week-days we commonly omitted the services during the hay and corn harvest, that we might not give reasonable offence to the farmers, or entice the peasants away from their labor before their usual time. I would also remark that we did not always, in these efforts, encounter much opposition; indeed, I remember only a few instances in which we suffered persecution from violence or rudeness." Jan. 31, 1791, he was made preacher of Argyle Chapel, Bath, and here he labored for sixty-two years with great distinction. Jay was not excelled even by the greatest of pulpit orators for which England has been so justly celebrated within the last 100 years. John Foster calls him the "prince of preachers;" Sheridan pronounced him "the most natural orator" he had ever heard; Dr. James Hamilton as a preacher who filled him "with wonder and delight;" and Beckford as possessing a mind like "a clear, transparent stream, flowing so freely as to impress us with the idea of its being inexhaustible." He died Dec. 27, 1853, "beloved and trusted by religious professors of all sects" (*London Athenæum*, Sept. 30, 1854). "Mr. Jay was not only a pious and eminently successful preacher, but a very genial and interesting man; a sagacious observer, yet of childlike simplicity in taste and disposition; possessed of a fine, though sometimes quaint humor; a most instructive and pleasant companion, rich in anecdote and reminiscence, and able, from personal knowledge, to give living sketches of most of the eminent men who had appeared in the religious world, high-flying bigots excepted, during the latter part of the 18th and the earlier part of the present century. . . . . He was not a strict Calvinist, for he did not believe in the 'exclusive' part of the Calvinistic creed in any form. He believed in 'two grand truths'—'that if we are saved, it is entirely of God's grace; and if we are lost, it will be entirely from ourselves.' He held to these firmly, though he might not see the connection between them. 'The connection,' he says, 'is like a chain across the river; I can see the two ends, but not the middle; not because there is no real union, but because it is under water.' As to Church polity, Mr. Jay inclined, on the whole, to Presbyterianism, with a special leaning, perhaps, on one point—that of mutual ministerial oversight and responsibility—to Wesleyan Methodism. But he did not believe any particular *form* of polity to be of divine authority" (*London Quart. Review*, 1854, p. 553 sq.). Best known of his varied and extensive writings are *Morning and Evening Exercises* (vol. i–iv of the collective edition of his *Works*, ed. of 1842):—*The Christian contemplated* (vol. vi of his *Works*):—*Mornings with Jesus* (1854, 8vo). His *Works* were published entire (Bath, 1842-44, 12 vols. 8vo; New York, 3 vols. 8vo). See *Autobiography of the Rev. William Jay, with Reminiscences of some distinguished Contemporaries, Selections from his Correspondence*, etc., edited by George Redford, D.D., LL.D., and John Angell James (Lond. 1854, 8vo; 3d ed. 1855); Wilson, *Memoir of Jay* (1854, 8vo); Wallace, *Portraiture of Jay* (1852, 12mo); Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 857; *Princeton Review*, v, 369 sq.; *Meth. Quart. Review*, v, 335. (J. H. W.)

Jayadéva, a celebrated Hindu poet, who, according to some, lived about the middle of the 11th, according to others about the middle of the 16th century after Christ. His most renowned work is the *Gitagovinda*, an erotic poem in honor of the Hindû deity Krishna (an incarnation of Vishnu) and his wife Râdhâ. It is interpreted both in a literal and a mystical sense.

Jayne, PETER, a pioneer Methodist Episcopal minister, born at Marblehead, Mass., in 1778, entered the itinerancy in 1797, and in 1805–6 was stationed in Boston, where he died Sept. 5, 1806. Mr. Jayne was a man of great promise and rare abilities. His style was terse and vigorous, his piety consistent, and his manners ingenuous. His early death was deplored by his brethren as the eclipse of a morning star. See *Minutes of Conferences*, i, 146; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, i, ch. xxvi. (G. L. T.)

Ja'zar (ἡ Ἰαζήρ v. r. Ἰαζήν), a Græcized form (1 Macc. v, 8) of JAAZER (q. v.).

Ja'zer (Numb. xxxii, 1, 3; Josh. xxi, 39; 2 Sam. xxiv, 5; 1 Chron. vi, 81; xxvi, 31; Isa. xvi, 8, 9; Jer. xlviii, 32). See JAAZER.

Ja'ziz (Heb. *Yaziz'*, יָזִיז, *prominent*; Sept. Ἰωαζίζ v. r. Ἰαζίζ), a Hagarite overseer of David's flocks (1 Chron. xxvii, 31), which were probably pastured on the east of Jordan, in the nomad country where the forefathers of Jaziz had for ages roamed (comp. v, 19–22). B.C. 1014. See HAGARITE.

Jealousy (קִנְאָה, ζῆλος), properly the feeling of suspicion of a wife's purity (Numb. v, 14); often used of Jehovah's sensitive regard for the true faith of his Church (Exod. xx, 5, etc.; 2 Cor. xi, 2). See MARRIAGE. The same term is sometimes used for anger or indignation, or an intense interest for the honor and prosperity of another (Psa. lxxix, 5; 1 Cor. x, 22; Zech. i, 14; viii, 2). Conjugal jealousy is one of the strongest passions of our nature (Prov. vi, 34; Cant. viii, 6). When God is said to be a *jealous God*, or to be moved to *jealousy*, or when the still stronger expression is used, "*Jehovah, whose name is Jealous*" (Exod. xxiv, 14), we are

to understand this language as employed to illustrate, rather than to represent, the emotions of the divine mind. The same causes operating upon the human mind would produce what we call anger, jealousy, repentance, grief, etc.; and therefore, when these emotions are ascribed to the mind of God, this language is used because such emotions can be represented to us by no other. Thus God is represented to us as a husband, related to his Church by a marriage covenant that binds her to be wholly for him, and not for another. The more sincere and constant the love, the more sensitive is the heart to the approach of a rival; and the thought of such affection being alienated or corrupted fills the soul with grief and indignation. So God commends the purity, the fervency, and the sincerity of his love to his Church by the most terrific expressions of jealousy. See IDOLATRY.

JEALOUSY, IMAGE OF (סֶמֶל הַקִּנְאָה, Sept. *εἰκὼν τοῦ ζήλους*, Vulg. *idolum zeli*), an idolatrous object seen by the prophet in that remarkable vision which portrayed to him the abominations that called down the divine vengeance on Jerusalem (Ezek. viii, 3, 5). See IMAGERY, CHAMBER OF. It stood upon a *pedestal* (מוֹשָׁב, "seat") within the inner or priests' court of the Temple, adjoining the great altar, and seems to have been identical with the statue of Astarte, which Manasseh had the audacious effrontery to erect within the sacred precincts (2 Kings xxi, 7). See ASHTORETH. This idol, arresting the attention of all who came to worship just as they entered, claimed, as the rival of Jehovah, their adoration, and thus was peculiarly offensive to the God of heaven (see Henderson, *Commentary*, ad loc.; Biedermann, *De idolo zeli*, Freib. 1757). See IDOL.

JEALOUSY-OFFERING (מִנְחַת קְנָאוֹת, Septuag. *θυσία ζηλοτυπίας*, Vulgate *oblatio zelotypiæ*) was the name of a "meat-offering" which a husband was to bring when he subjected his wife, under charge of adultery, before the priest, to the ordeal of the bitter waters (Numb. v, 11 sq.). It consisted of a tenth of an ephah of barley-meal, without oil or frankincense. The priest must wave it (ver. 25), and burn a handful on the altar (ver. 26). The Mishna gives more minute directions (*Sotah*, ii, 1; iii, 1, 6). See ADULTERY. Barley, as an inferior grain to wheat (Phædrus, ii, 8, 9), was symbolical of the suspected condition of the wife (Philo, *Opp.* ii, 307). Oil and incense, as emblems of joy and piety, were obviously unsuitable to the occasion. See OFFERING.

JEALOUSY, WATERS OF (מֵי הַמָּרִים הַמְאָרְרִים, Numb. v. 19, *bitter waters that curse*, Sept. *τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ ἐλεγμοῦ τοῦ ἐπικαταρωμένου*, Vulg. *aquæ istæ amarissimæ in quas maledicta congessi*, A. V. "this bitter water that causeth the curse"). (See Acoluthi. *De aquis amaris maledictionem inferentibus* [Lips. 1862]). When a Hebrew wife was suspected of adultery, her husband brought her first before the judges, and, if she still asserted her innocence, he required that she should drink the *waters of jealousy*, that God might, by these means, discover what she attempted to conceal (Numb. v, 12, etc.). The further details are thus described by Dr. Clarke (*Com.* ad loc.) from the rabbinical authorities (comp. Wagenseil's *Sota*, pass.): "The man then produced his witnesses, and they were heard. After this, both the man and the woman were conveyed to Jerusalem, and placed before the Sanhedrim; and if she persisted in denying the fact, she was led to the eastern gate of the court of Israel, stripped of her own clothes, and dressed in black, before great numbers of her own sex. The priest then told her that, if she was really innocent, she had nothing to fear; but if guilty, she might expect to suffer all that the law had denounced against her, to which she answered 'Amen, amen.' The priest then wrote the terms of the law in this form: 'If a strange man hath not come near you, and you are not polluted by forsaking the bed of your husband, these bitter waters, which I have cursed, will not hurt you; but if you have polluted yourself by coming near to another man, and gone astray from your husband, may you be accursed of the Lord, and become an example for all his people; may your thigh rot, and your belly swell till it burst; may these cursed waters enter into your belly, and, being swelled therewith, may your thighs putrefy.' After this, the priest filled a pitcher out of the brazen vessel near the altar of burnt-offerings, cast some dust of the pavement into it, mingled something with it as bitter as wormwood, and then read the curses, and received her answer of Amen. Another priest in the mean time tore off her clothes as low as her bosom, made her head bare, untied the tresses of her hair, fastened her clothes (which were thus torn) with a girdle under her breast, and then presented her with the tenth part of an ephah, or about three pints of barley-meal. The other priest then gave her the *waters of jealousy* or bitterness to drink, and, as soon as the woman had swallowed them, he gave her the meal, in a vessel like a frying-pan, into her hand. This was stirred before the Lord, and part of it thrown into the fire of the altar. If the wife was innocent, she returned with her husband, and the waters, so far from injuring her, increased her health, and made her more fruitful; but if she was guilty, she grew pale immediately, her eyes swelled, and, lest she should pollute the Temple, she was instantly carried out with these symptoms upon her, and died immediately, with all the ignominious circumstances related in the curses."

This ordeal appears to have contained the essence of an oath varied for the purpose of peculiar solemnity, so that a woman would naturally hesitate to take such an oath, understood to be an appeal to heaven of the most solemn kind, and also to be accompanied, in case of perjury, by most painful and fatal effects. The drinking appears to have been a symbolical action. When "the priest wrote the curses in a book," and washed those curses into the water which was to be drunk, the water was understood to be impregnated as it were, or to be tinctured with the curse, the acrimony of which it received; so that now it was metaphorically bitter, containing the curse in it. The drinking of this curse, though conditionally effective or non-effective, could not but have a great effect on the woman's mind, and an answerable effect on the husband's jealousy, which it was designed to cure and to dissipate. We read of no instance in which the trial took place; and, if the administration of the ordeal were really infrequent, we may regard that as an evidence of its practical utility, for it would seem that the trial and its result were so dreadful that the guilty rather confessed their crime, as they were earnestly exhorted to do, than go through it. The rabbins say that a woman who confessed in such circumstances was not put to death, but only divorced without dowry. It has been well remarked that this species of ordeal could not injure the innocent at all, or punish the guilty except by a miracle, whereas in the ordeals by fire, etc., in the Dark Ages, the innocent could scarcely escape except by a miracle. See ADULTERY.

Jeanes, HENRY, an English divine, was born at Allensay, county of Somerset, in 1611, and was educated at Oxford University. He held first the rectory of Beercrocomb and Capland, and, after Walter Raleigh's expulsion, the rectory of Chedzoy. He died in 1662. Jeanes wrote several theological treatises: (1) *Abstinence from Evil:*—(2) *Indifference of Human Actions:*—(3) *Original Righteousness;* besides several polemical tracts in a controversy which he waged against Dr. Hammond, Jeremy Taylor, Goodwin, etc. An answer to Milton's *Iconoclasts*, entitled *The Image Unbroken*, was generally believed to be written by Jeanes, but Watt ascribes the work to Joseph Jane (see Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, p. 957).—Hook, *Eccles. Biogr.* vi, 280.

Je'ärim (Heb. *Yeärim'*, יְעָרִים, *forests;* Sept. *Ἰαρείμ*), the name of a mountain on the border of Judah, between Mount Seir and Beth-shemesh (Josh. xv, 10):

stated to be the site of CHESALON (q.v.). Kesla stands, seven miles due west of Jerusalem, "on a high point on the north slope of the lofty ridge between wady Ghurâb and wady Ismail. The latter of these is the south-western continuation of wady Beit-Hanina, and the former runs parallel to and northward of it, and they are separated by this ridge, which is probably Mount Jearim" (Robinson, *New Researches*, p. 154). *Forests*, in our sense of the word, there are none; but we have the testimony of the latest traveller that "such thorough woods, both for loneliness and obscurity, he had not seen since he left Germany" (Tobler, *Wanderung*, 1857, p. 178).—Smith. Perhaps the hill behind Kuryet el-Enab may be Mount Seir; from it the border "passed over (wady Ghurâb) to the shoulder (ויעבר אל־כתף) of Mount Jearim . . . . and then *went down* to Beth-shemesh." It may be that a considerable district of the mountains in this locality was called Jearim, for Baalah is called Kirjath-*Jearim* ("the town of Jearim"); and if so, then we can see the reason why the explanatory phrase is added, "Mount Jearim, *which is Chesalon*," to limit the more general appellative to the narrow ridge between the two wadys (see Keil *on Joshua*, ad loc.; Porter, *Handbook for S. and Pal.* p. 285). See KIRJATH-JEARIM.

Jeät'erai (Heb. *Yeätheray'*, יְאָתְרַי, perhaps for יַעְתְּרַי, *rich;* Sept. Ἰεθρί, Vulg. *Jethrai*), son of Zerah, a Levite of the family of Gershom (1 Chron. vi, 21); apparently the same called ETHNI in ver. 41.

Jebb, John (1), M.D., F.R.S., a Socinian writer, was born in London in 1736. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin, and Peterhouse, Cambridge, of which latter he became fellow. He was made rector of Ovington, Norfolk, in 1764, but, having changed from orthodoxy to Socinianism, he declined any longer serving the Church, and resigned in 1775, to apply himself to the study of medicine. He died at London in 1786. His writings have been published entire, entitled *Works, Theological, Medical*, etc., with memoirs by John Disney, D.D. (London, 1787, 3 vols. 8vo). See *A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Jebb with Relation to his Sentiments*, etc. (Lond. 1778, 8vo); *Resignation no Proof, a Letter to Mr. Jebb*, by a member of the University of Cambridge (London, 1776, 8vo); *A Letter to the Rev. John Jebb, M.A.*, etc. (Lond. 1776, 8vo); Atkins, *General Biography;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxvi, 609; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 957.

Jebb, John (2), bishop of Limerick, an eminent Irish theologian, was born at Drogheda Sept. 27, 1775. He studied at Dublin University, where his proficiency attracted the notice of Broderick, bishop of Kilmore, who made him curate of Swanlibar. When Broderick became archbishop of Cashel, he gave Jebb the living of Abington, one of the richest in Ireland. He was finally made bishop of Limerick in 1823. A Protestant bishop in a district chiefly inhabited by Roman Catholics, he overcame the prejudices of the people by his liberal spirit, and staunchly defended their rights. He died at Limerick Dec. 7, 1833. His principal works are *Sermons on Subjects chiefly practical*, etc. (Lond. 1815, 8vo, and often):—*Practical Theology* (Lond. 1830, and again 1837, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Pastoral Instructions on the Character of the Church of England* (London, 1831 [new ed. 1844], sm. 8vo):—*Thirty Years' Correspondence with Alexander Knox, Esq.* (London, 1834, 2 vols. 8vo). But by far his most important work is his *Sacred Literature* (London, 1820, 8vo, and often), intended chiefly as a review of the works of Lowth on Hebrew poetry and Isaiah. "Bishop Jebb undertakes to controvert some of the principles of Dr. Lowth, and to show that the criteria by which the latter would determine what is poetry in Hebrew are to be found in the New Testament as well as the Old. Aside from this controversy with Lowth, the work contains many illustrations and explanations of difficult or obscure passages, valuable to the Biblical scholar. 'No book of criticism has lately appeared more worthy the attention of the student of the Bible.'" See *Life of Bishop Jebb*, with a selection from his letters, by Rev. Charles Forster (2d ed. Lond. 1837, 8vo); Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Jeberechi'ah (Heb. *Yeberekyah'*, only in the paragogic form *Yeberekya'hu*, יְבֶרֶכְיָהוּ, *blessed* by *Jehovah;* Sept. Βαραχίας), the father of Zechariah, which latter Isaiah took as one of the witnesses of his marriage with "the prophetess" (Isa. viii, 2). B.C. cir. 739. Both the Sept. and the Vulg. give the name in its ordinary form, *Barachiah*, and, as we do not find it elsewhere, the initial י is probably an error, which may be accounted for by supposing the preceding word בן to have been originally plural, בני, the two witnesses being both sons of Barachiah, and the final letter, by a mistake of the copyist, to have been prefixed to the following word. The same pair of names seems to have been of no unfrequent occurrence in the priestly houses. Zechariah the prophet was son of Berechiah (Zech. i, 1), and we have "Zacharias, son of Barachias" (Matt. xxiii, 3, 5). Josephus also (*War*, iv, 5, 4) mentions another Zacharias, son of Baruch. See ZECHARIAH.

Je'bus (Heb. *Yebus'*, יְבוּס, *trodden* hard, i. e. perh. *fastness;* Sept. Ἰεβούς), the name of the ancient Canaanitish city which stood on Mount Zion, one of the hills on which Jerusalem was built (*Jebusi*, Josh. xv, 8; xviii, 16, 28). In Judg. xix, 10 it is identified with Jerusalem, and in 1 Chron. xi, 4, 5, the only other passage in which the name occurs, it is identified with the castle of Zion, subsequently called the castle or city of David. The sides of Zion descended precipitously on the west and south into the deep valley of Hinnom, and on the east into the Tyropœon, which separated it from Moriah. On the north side a branch valley, the upper part of the Tyropœon, swept round it; and here was a ledge of rock on which a massive tower was afterwards founded, perhaps on the site of an older one. Recent excavations on the site remarkably corroborate these facts. See JERUSALEM. Jebus was thus naturally a place of great strength; and, being strongly fortified besides, it is not strange that the Jebusites should have gloried in it as impregnable (see Rose, *Præmium Jebusæorum castri expugnati*, Alt. 1729), and that the capture of it by David should have been considered one of his most brilliant achievements (2 Sam. v, 8). Even after Jebus was captured, and Jerusalem founded and made the capital of Israel, Zion was separately fortified. It seems that in addition to the "castle" on the summit of the hill there was a lower city or suburb, perhaps lying in the bottom of the adjoining valleys; for we read that the children of Judah had captured and burned Jerusalem (Judg. i, 7, 8), while afterwards it is said "the Benjamites did not drive out the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem" (ver. 21). The Jebusites still held the "castle," which was within the allotted territory of Benjamin, but the children of Judah drove them out of the lower town, which was situated within their borders. This is, in substance, the explanation given by Josephus (*Ant.* v, 2, 2 and 5). See JEBUSITE.

Jeb'usi (Heb. *Yebusi'*), a word used in the original of a place and its inhabitants.

1\. "Jebusi" (הַיְבוּסִי = *the Jebusite;* Sept. Ἰεβουσαί, Ἰεβούς, Vulg. *Jebusæus*), the name employed for the city of JEBUS, only in the ancient document describing the landmarks and the towns of the allotment of Judah and Benjamin (Josh. xv, 8; xviii, 16, 28). In the first and last place, the explanatory words, "which is Jerusalem," are added. In the first, however, our translators have given it as "the Jebusite." A parallel to this mode of designating the town by its inhabitants is found in this very list in Zemaraim (xviii, 22), Avim (ver. 23), Ophni (ver. 24), and Japhletite (xvi, 3), etc.

2\. "Jebusite" or "Jebusites," forms indiscriminately employed in the A. Vers., although in the original the

name, whether applied to individuals or to the nation, is never found in the plural; always singular. The full form is הַיְבוּסִי; but in a few places—viz. 2 Sam. v, 6; xxiv, 16, 18; 1 Chron. xxi, 18 only—it is "defectively" written הַיְבֻסִי. Without the article, יְבוּסִי, it occurs in 2 Sam. v, 8; 1 Chron. xi, 6; Zech. ix, 7. In the first two of these the force is much increased by removing the article introduced in the A. Vers., and reading "and smiteth a Jebusite." See JEBUSITE.

Jeb'usite (Heb. *Yebusi'*, יְבוּסִי, Sept. Ἰεβουσαῖος, but Ἰεβοῦς in Josh. xv, 8; xviii, 28, or Ἰεβούς in Judg. xix, 11; 1 Chron. xi, 4; also Ἰεβουσαί in Josh. xviii, 16, and Ἰεβουσί in Ezra ix, 1; A. V. "Jebusi" in Josh. xviii, 16, 28), the name of the original inhabitants of Jebus, frequently mentioned (usually last in the list) amongst the seven Canaanitish nations doomed to destruction (Gen. x, 16; xv, 21; Exod. iii, 8, 17; xiii, 5; xxiii, 23; xxxiii, 2; xxxiv, 11; Numb. xiii, 29; Deut. vii, 1; xx, 17; Josh. iii, 10; ix, 1; xi, 3; xii, 8; xxiv, 11; Judg. iii, 5; 1 Kings ix, 20; 1 Chron. i, 14; 2 Chron. viii, 7; Ezra ix, 1; Neh. ix, 8). They appear to have descended from a grandson of Ham (Gen. x, 16). "His place in the list is between Heth and the Amorites (Gen. x, 16; 1 Chron. i, 14), a position which the tribe maintained long after (Numb. xiii, 29; Josh. xi, 3); and the same connection is traceable in the words of Ezekiel (xvi, 3, 45), who addresses Jerusalem as the fruit of the union of an Amorite with a Hittite" (Smith). At the time of the arrival of the Israelites (see *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Oct. 1851, p. 167) they were found to be a considerable tribe on the west of Jordan (Josh. ix, 1), seated on one of the hills of Judah (some have wrongly inferred Moriah from 2 Chron. iii, 1, but in 2 Sam. v, 9 it is clearly identified with Zion), near the Hittites and Amorites (Numb. xiii, 30; Josh. xi, 3), where they had founded a city called JEBUS (Josh. xviii, 28; comp. xix, 10), probably after the name of their progenitor, and established a royal form of government, being then ruled by Adoni-zedek (Josh. x, 1, 23). See SALEM. They seem to have been a warlike tribe; and, although they were defeated with much slaughter, and Adoni-zedek, their king, slain by Joshua (Josh. x), and though a part of their city seems to have been afterwards taken, sacked, and burned by the warriors of Judah (Judg. i, 8), yet they were not wholly subdued, but were able to retain at least their acropolis (Judg. i, 21), and were not entirely dispossessed of it till the time of David (2 Sam. v). Being situated on the border (Josh. xv, 8; xviii, 16), between Judah and Benjamin, to either of which it is indifferently assigned (Josh. xv, 63; xviii, 28; Judg. i, 21), it was only at this late date secured to the actual territory of David's tribe (1 Chron. xi). He made it the capital of his kingdom instead of Hebron (Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* ii, 583), but did not wholly expel the natives (1 Kings ix, 20). By that time the inveteracy of the enmity between the Hebrews and such of the original inhabitants as remained in the land had much abated, and the rights of private property were respected by the conquerors. This we discover from the fact that the site on which the Temple afterwards stood belonged to a Jebusite named Araunah, from whom it was purchased by king David, who declined to accept it as a free gift from the owner (2 Sam. xxiv; 1 Chron. xxi). This afterwards became the site of Solomon's Temple (2 Chron. iii, 1). It appears that the Jebusites subsisted under his reign in the state of tributaries or slaves (2 Chron. viii, 7), and even so continued to the times of the return from Babylon (Ezra ix, 1). See JERUSALEM.

The name "Jebusite" is sometimes put for the city itself inhabited by them (i. q. "city of the Jebusites," Judg. xix, 11), as in Josh. xv, 8; xviii, 16; also poetically, in later times, for its successor, Jerusalem (Zech. ix, 7). See JEBUSI.

"In the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, the ashes of Barnabas, after his martyrdom in Cyprus, are said to have been buried in a cave where the race of the Jebusites formerly dwelt, and previous to this is mentioned the arrival in the island of a pious Jebusite, a kinsman of Nero (*Act. Apost. Apocr.* p. 72, 73, ed Tisch.)"

Jecami'ah (1 Chron. iii, 18). See JEKAMIAH.

Jechiel ben-Joseph, of Paris, a Rabbi, flourished in the 13th century. He was a disciple of the celebrated Jehudah Sir-Leon (q. v.). But little is known of the early history of his life. In the prime of life we find him in Paris, at the head of a theological school, and an officiating Rabbi in the capital of France. During the reign of Louis IX the Romanists made every effort to cause the expulsion of the Jews from France, where they were enjoying at this time special favors. They accused the Jews of manifold crimes, and asserted that the Talmud contained disrespectful language towards Jesus, etc.; and though the king hesitated to believe this, he was finally persuaded to appoint a commission of both Christians and Jews to search the Talmud for obnoxious passages. Of the four Rabbis appointed, Jechiel ben-Joseph headed the Jewish commission, and he alone, in the main, carried on the disputation, which resulted unfavorably to the Jews. In the dispute Jechiel displayed great ability and learning, but it is to be deplored that he injured his cause in the eyes of the historian by the assertion which he made that the name of Jesus occurring in the Talmud does not refer to Jesus the Christ. See *Jews in France;* Wagenseil, *Tela ignea Satanæ* (2 vols. 4to); Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vii, 115 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jecholi'ah (2 Kings xv, 2). See JECOLIAH.

Jechoni'as (Ἰεχονίας), a Græcized form of two Hebrew names occurring in the Apocrypha and N. T.

1. In Esth. xi, 4; Bar. i, 3, 9; Matt. i, 11, 12, for king JEHOIAKIN (q. v.).

2. In 1 Esd. viii, 92 for SHECHANIAH (q. v.), who encouraged Ezra in the matter of divorcing the Gentile wives (Ezra x, 2).

Jecoli'ah (Heb. *Yekolyah'*, יְכָלְיָה, 2 Chron. xxvi, 3, where the text erroneously has יְכִילְיָה; Auth. Vers. "Jecholiah;" in 2 Kings xv, 2, the paragogic form *Yekolya'hu*, יְכָלְיָהוּ, *able* through *Jehovah;* Sept. Ἰεχελία; Josephus Ἀχιάλας, *Ant.* ix, 10, 1; Vulg. *Jechelia*), a female of Jerusalem, mother of king Uzziah, and consequently wife of king Amaziah, whom she appears to have survived: her character may be inferred from the general piety of her son. B.C. 824–807.

Jeconi'ah (1 Chron. iii, 16, 17; Jer. xxiv, 1; xxvii, 20; xxviii, 4; xxix, 1; Esth. ii, 6). See JEHOIACHIN.

Jeconi'as (Ἰεχονίας), a Græcized form (1 Esd. i, 9) of the name elsewhere given (2 Chron. xxxv, 9) as CONANIAH (q. v.).

Jedæ'us (Ἰεδαῖος), a less correct form (1 Esd. ix, 30) of the Hebrew name (Ezra x, 29) ADAIAH (q. v.).

Jedaï'ah (Heb. *Yedayah'*), the name of several men, of different form in the original.

1. (יְדָיָה, *invoker of Jehovah;* Sept. Ἐδιά v. r. Ἰεδιά and Ἰεδαΐα.) Son of Shimri and father of Allon, of the ancestors of Ziza, a chief Simeonite who migrated to the valley of Gedor (1 Chron. iv, 37). B.C. long ante 711.

2. (Same Hebrew name as preceding; Sept. Ἰεδαΐα.) Son of Harumaph, and one of those that repaired the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh. iii, 10). B.C. 446.

3. (יְדַעְיָה, *knowing Jehovah;* Sept. Ἰδεία.) The chief of the second division of priests as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 7). B.C. 1014.

4. (Same Heb. name as preceding; Sept. Ἰωδαέ, Ἰεδουά, Ἰαδία, Ἰδεΐας, Ὠδουΐας, Ἔδιος, Ἰεδεϊού, Αἰδειού.) A priest who officiated in Jerusalem after the exile (1 Chron. ix, 10; Neh. xi, 10; in which latter passage, however, he is styled the son of Joiarib, evidently the same as the Jehoiarib with whom he is merely associated in the former passage). From Ezra ii, 36; Neh. vii, 39,

he appears to have belonged to the family of Jeshua (973 of his relatives having returned with him from Babylon), so that he is probably the same with the priest Jedaiah enumerated (Neh. xii, 6) amongst the contemporaries of Jeshua who returned with Zerubbabel (the name apparently being repeated in verse 7; comp. ver. 19, 21, where the same repetition occurs, although with the mention of different sons), and probably also identical with the Jedaiah whom the prophet was directed to crown with the symbolical wreath (Zech. vi, 10, 14). B.C. 536-520.

Jed'du (Ἰεδδού), a corrupt form (1 Esd. v, 24) for the Hebrew name (Ezra ii, 36) JEDAIAH (q. v.).

Jedia'ël [most *Jedi'aël*] (Heb. *Yediaël'*, יְדִיעֲאֵל, *known* by *God;* Sept. Ἰαδιήλ, Ἀδιήλ, Ἰεδιήλ), the name of at least three men.

1. One of the sons of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii, 6), whose sons (ver. 10) and descendants are enumerated as being 17,200 warriors in David's census (ver. 11). He is, perhaps, the same elsewhere called ASHBEL (1 Chron. viii, 1). See BENJAMIN; JACOB.

2. A Shimrite (q. v.); one of David's famous body-guard (1 Chron. xi, 45); probably the Manassite of the same name who joined David's troop at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 20). B.C. 1053-1046.

3. A Korhite of the Levitical family of Ebiasaph, second son of Meshelemiah, and one of the gate-keepers to the tabernacle or Temple (1 Chron. xxvi, 2). B.C. 1014.

Jedi'dah (Heb. *Yedidah'*, יְדִידָה, *beloved;* Septuag. Ἰεδδιδά; Josephus Ἰεδή, *Ant.* xi, 4, 1), daughter of Adaiah of Boskath and mother of king Josiah, consequently wife of king Amon, whom she appears to have survived (2 Kings xxii, 1). Her character may be inferred from the piety of her son. B.C. 648-639.

Jedidi'ah (Heb. *Yedideyah'*, יְדִידְיָה, *beloved* by *Jehovah;* Sept. Ἰεδιδιά), the name specially given by the Lord to SOLOMON (q. v.) at his birth, through Nathan, in token of the divine favor purposed towards him (2 Sam. xii, 25).

Jedithun. See JEDUTHUN.

Jedna (Ἰεδνά), a town mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v.) as lying "in the desert, six miles from Eleutheropolis towards Hebron," precisely in which location stands the modern village *Idhna* (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 404).

Jed'uthun (Hebrew *Yeduthun'*, יְדוּתוּן or יְדֻתוּן; also יְדִיתוּן, *Yedithun'*, in 1 Chron. xvi, 38; Neh. xi, 17; Psa. xxx and lxxvii, titles; *lauder;* Sept. Ἰδιθούν, but Ἰδιθών in 1 Chron. ix, 16), a Levite of Merari's family, and one of the four great masters of the Temple music appointed by David (1 Chron. xvi, 41, 42; xxv, 1, etc.). B.C. 1014. From a comparison of 1 Chron. xv, 17, 19, with xvi, 41, 42; xxv, 1, 3, 6; 2 Chron. xxxv, 15, some infer that he was identical with ETHAN (q. v.). In 2 Chron. xxxv, 15, he bears the title of "the king's seer." His sons sometimes appear as exercising the same office (1 Chron. xxv, 1, 3), at others as door-keepers of the sacred edifice (1 Chron. xvi, 42). His name is also put for his descendants (*Jeduthunites*, "sons of Jeduthun"), who occur later as singers and players on instruments (2 Chron. xxxv, 15; Neh. xi, 17). In the latter signification it occurs in the superscriptions to Psa. xxxix, lxii, lxxvii; but Aben-Ezra supposes it to denote here a species of song, and Jarchi a musical instrument. The form of the phrase (עַל יְדֻתוּן, "upon Jeduthun") favors the latter interpretation (Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 569), indicating a kind of instrumental music, or perhaps a style or tune of performance (Ewald, *Heb. Poesie*, p. 176) invented or introduced by Jeduthun; a conclusion strengthened by finding a phrase indicative of authorship (לִידוּתוּן, "*to* Jeduthun," i. e. composed *by* him), ascribed in a similar connection (Psa. xxxix, title), since he is elsewhere recognised as an inspired character (2 Chron. xxxv, 15). See MUSICIAN.

Jeejeebhoy, Sir JAMSETJEE, a Parsee merchant prince and great philanthropist, who was born of poor parents at Bombay, July 15, 1783, and at the age of twenty had already amassed a fortune which secured him the universal acknowledgment as the "first merchant in the East," spent a good portion of his fortune in the endowment of schools and hospitals. From 1822 to 1858 he is reported to have spent "upwards of a quarter of a million pounds sterling in founding, endowing, or supporting undertakings of a purely benevolent character;" but what is more noteworthy still is that this Parsee merchant by no means confined his charitable efforts to his own confession: Christian, Hindu, and Mussulman also shared the benefits of his magnanimous acts. In 1857 queen Victoria conferred on him the honor of knighthood—the first occasion on which that dignity was bestowed on an Eastern. He died April 15, 1859.

Jeë'li (Ἰεηλί v. r. Ἰειηλεί), a corrupt Græcized form (1 Esd. v. 33) of the Heb. name (Ezra ii, 56) JAALAH (q. v.).

Jeë'lus (Ἰέηλος v. r. Ἰεήλ), a Græcized form (1 Esd. viii, 92) of the Heb. name (Ezra x, 2) JEHIEL (q. v.).

Jeë'zer (Hebrew *Ië'zer*, אִיעֶזֶר, abridged for *Abiezer;* Sept. Ἀχιέζερ), a son of Gilead of Manasseh (Numb. xxvi, 30); elsewhere (Josh. xvii, 2, etc.) called ABIEZER (q. v.). The patronymic JEEZERITES (אִיעֶזְרִי, Heb. *Iezeri'*, Sept. Ἀχιεζερί) is in like manner applied to his descendants (Numb. xxvi, 30), elsewhere called ABIEZRITES (Judg. vi, 11, etc.).

Jeë'zerite (Numb. xxvi, 30). See JEEZER.

Jeffery, JOHN, an English theologian, was born at Ipswich in 1647. He studied at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, entered the Church, and was appointed rector of Dennington, Suffolk; then of a parish in Norwich. His exemplary conduct, sound teachings, and great erudition rendered him very popular. In 1687 he obtained the livings of Kirton and Falkenham, and in 1694, Tillotson, with whom he was intimately acquainted, made him archdeacon of Norwich. He died in 1720. Jeffery was much opposed to religious controversies, holding that they generated "more heat than light." He published Sir Thomas Browne's *Christian Morals; Moral and Religious Aphorisms*, taken from Dr. Wichcote's papers. A complete collection of his own *Sermons and Tracts* was published (London, 1753, 2 vols. 8vo). See Memoirs prefixed to the collection; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 632; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 959.

Jeffries, GEORGE, an English lawyer of the crown, born about 1640, was chief justice of the King's Bench during the reign of James II, and is execrated in ecclesiastical history for his conduct towards Baxter (q. v.) and Fairfax (q. v.). He seems to have been a man of low inclinations, and a ready tool in the hands of the court. In the year 1688, after the flight of king James, he was recognised at London during the riots by the rabble, and, after "having suffered far more than the bitterness of death, he was safely lodged in the fortress (the Tower of London), where some of his most illustrious victims had passed their last days, and where his own life was destined to close in unspeakable ignominy and horror." He died April 18, 1689. No one has better delineated his character than Macaulay (*History of England*, vol. ii), and we refer our readers to this able master for further details. See also Neale, *History of the Puritans*, ii, 317 sq., 341.

Je'gar-sahadu'tha (Chald. *Yegar'-Sahadutha'*, יְגַר שָׂהֲדוּתָא, *pile of the testimony;* Sept. βουνὸς τῆς μαρτυρίας, Vulgate *tumulus testis*), the Aramæan name given by Laban as a Syrian to the mound of stones erected as a memorial of his league with Jacob, whereas the latter styled it (Gen. xxxi, 47) by the equivalent Hebrew name of GAL-EËD (q. v.).

Jehale'leël [many *Jehal'eleël*] (Heb. *Yehallelel'*, יְהַלֶּלְאֵל, *praiser of God*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ἰαλλελήλ, Vulg. *Jaleleel.*) A descendant of Judah, several of whose sons are enumerated, although his own immediate parentage is not mentioned (1 Chron. iv, 16). B.C. apparently cir. 1618.

2. (Sept. Ἰαλλήλ, Vulg. *Jalaleel*, Auth. Vers. "Jehalelel.") A Levite of the family of Merari, whose son Azariah aided in restoring the Temple services under Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix, 12). B.C. ante 726.

Jehal'elel (2 Chron. xxix, 12). See Jehaleleel, 2.

Jehdei'ah [some *Jehde'iah* or *Jehdeï'ah*] (Hebrew *Yechdeyah'*, only in the paragogic form יֶחְדְּיָהוּ, *Yechdeya'hu*, *rejoicer* in *Jehovah*; Sept. Ἰαδαΐα, Ἰαδίας), the name of two men.

1. A descendant of Shubael or Shebuel, of the family of Gershom, who appears to have been head of a division of the Levitical Temple attendants as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 20; comp. xxiii, 16). B.C. 1014.

2. A Meronothite, and herdsman of the royal asses under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 30). B.C. 1014.

Jehez'ekel (1 Chron. xxiv, 16). See Ezekiel, 1.

Jehi'ah (Hebrew *Yechiyah'*, יְחִיָּה, *Jehovah's living* one; Sept. Ἰεαϊά), a Levite associated with Obed-edom as door-keeper of the sacred ark when brought by David to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xv, 24); elsewhere (ver. 18) called Jehiel (q. v.).

Jehi'ël (Heb. *Yechiël'*, יְחִיאֵל, *God's living* one), the name of several men.

1. (1 Chron. ix, 35.) See Jeiel, 1.

2. (1 Chron. xi, 44.) See Jeiel, 2.

3. (Sept. Ἰεϊήλ or Ἰειήλ, but v. r. Ἰαδιήλ in 1 Chron. xvi, 5.) One of the Levites "of the second degree" appointed by David to execute the music on the occasion of the removal of the ark to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xv, 18, 20, in which latter passage they are said to have performed "with psalteries on Alamoth"). He is apparently the same with the person mentioned (verse 24) by the synonymous name Jehiah, although, from the similar collocation of names, others have confounded this with the Jeiel of ch. xvi, 5, a name of different signification. He is probably identical with the one named as chief amongst the three descendants of Laadan (i. e. Libni) arranged by David in charge of the Temple porters (1 Chron. xxiii, 8), and hence likewise with the Gershonite with whom were deposited the gems offered by the people for the sacred structures and utensils (1 Chron. xxix, 8). B.C. 1043–1014. It is doubtless his descendants who were called Jehielites (Hebrew *Yechiëli*, יְחִיאֵלִי, Sept. Ἰειήλ, A. V. "Jehieli," 1 Chron. xxvi, 21, 22).

4. (Sept. Ἱεριήλ v. r. Ἰεήλ, Vulg. *Jahiel.*) A Hachmonite ("son of Hachmoni") who appears to have been tutor in the royal family towards the close of David's reign (1 Chron. xxvii, 32). B.C. cir. 1030. "The mention of Ahithophel (ver. 33) seems to fix the date of this list as before the revolt. In Jerome's *Quæst. Hebraicæ* on this passage, Jehiel is said to be David's son Chileab or Daniel; and 'Achamoni,' interpreted as *Sapientissimus*, is taken as an *alias* of David himself" (Smith).

5. (Sept. Ἰεϊήλ.) The second-named of the six sons of king Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xxi, 2), exclusive of his first-born and heir, Jehoram, who, on his accession, murdered all his brothers (verse 4). B.C. 887.

6. (Sept. Ἰεϊήλ.) A descendant of Heman, and one of the Levites who assisted Hezekiah in his reformation of the public religion (2 Chron. xxix, 14, where the Hebrew text has יְחוּאֵל, *Yechuël'*), and who eventually was appointed one of the superintendents of the sacred offerings (xxxi, 13). B.C. 726.

7. (Sept. Ἰεϊήλ.) One of those who contributed liberally to the renewal of the Temple sacrifices under Josiah; stated to have been a "prince" or courtier, and, at the same time, a "ruler of the house of God," which implies some union of civil and religious functions (2 Chron. xxxv, 8). B.C. 623.

8. (Sept. Ἰεειήλ v. r. Ἰεϊήλ.) The father of Obadiah, which latter returned with his relatives of the sons of Joab, 218 males, from Babylon with Ezra (Ezra viii, 9). B.C. ante 459.

9. (Sept. Ἰεήλ v. r. Ἰεειήλ, also Ἰαϊήλ v. r. Αἰειήλ.) One of the "sons" of Elam (? Persian) who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 26); probably the same with the father of Shechaniah, who proposed that measure (verse 2). B.C. 459.

10. (Sept. Ἰειήλ v. r. Ἰεήλ.) One of the priests, "sons" of Harim, who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Ezra x, 21). B.C. 459.

Jehi'ëli (1 Chron. xxvi, 21, 22). See Jehiel, 3.

Jehizki'ah (Heb. *Yechizkiyah'*, only in the paragogic form *Yechizkiya'hu*, יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ, i. q. Hezekiah; Sept. Ἐζεκίας), son of Shallum, one of the Ephraimitish leaders who, at the instance of the prophet Oded (q. v.), insisted upon the liberation and humane treatment of the captives taken and brought to Samaria in the incursion of Pekah upon the kingdom of Judah (2 Chron. xxviii, 12; comp. 8, 13, 15). B.C. cir. 738.

Jeho'ädah (Heb. *Yehoäddah'*, יְהוֹעַדָּה, *Jehovah* is his *ornament*; Sept. Ἰωιαδά v. r. Ἰαδά), son of Ahaz, and father of Alemeth and others of the descendants of Saul through Mephibosheth (1 Chron. viii, 36), called Jarah (יַעְרָה, *Yarah'*, *dropping* of honey, as in 1 Sam. xiv, 27, otherwise *woodsman*, but more probably a corrupt reading for יַעְדָּה, *Yahda'*, i. q. *Jehoadah*; Sept. Ἰαδά, Vulg. *Jara*) in the parallel passage (1 Chron. ix, 42). B.C. considerably post 1037.

Jehoäd'dan (Heb. *Yehoäddan'*, יְהוֹעַדָּן, i. q. *Jehoadah*; Sept. Ἰωαδέν), a female of Jerusalem, mother of king Amaziah, and consequently wife of king Jehoash, whom she appears to have survived (1 Kings xiv, 2; 2 Chron. xxv, 1; in the former of which passages the text has יְהוֹעַדִּין, *Yehoaddin'*). Her character may perhaps be inferred from the partially good conduct of her son. B.C. 862–837.

Jeho'ähaz (Heb. *Yehoächaz'*, יְהוֹאָחָז, *Jehovah* is his *holder*, i. e. sustainer; Sept. Ἰωάχαζ; written also in the contracted form יוֹאָחָז, *Yoächaz'*, 2 Kings xiv, 1; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 8; xxxvi, 2, 4; Sept. Ἰωάχαζ; A. V. "Jehoahaz"), the name of three kings. See also Joahaz.

1. One of the names of the youngest son of Jehoram of Judah (2 Chron. xxi, 17, Sept. Ὀχοζίας), and father of Josiah (2 Chron. xxv, 23, Sept. Ἰωάχαζ); usually called Ahaziah (q. v.).

2. The son and successor of Jehu, the twelfth separate king of Israel (2 Kings x, 35). He reigned seventeen years, B.C. 855-838 (Josephus Ἰώαζος, *Ant.* ix, 8, 5). As he followed the evil courses of the house of Jeroboam, the Syrians, under Hazael and Benhadad, were suffered to prevail over him; so that at length he had only left, of all his forces, fifty horsemen, ten chariots, and 10,000 foot. Overwhelmed by his calamities, Jehoahaz at length acknowledged the authority of Jehovah over Israel, and humbled himself before him, in consideration of which a deliverer was raised up for Israel in the person of Jehoash, this king's son (B.C. 841, whence the latter's viceroyship is dated, 2 Kings xiii, 10), who was enabled to expel the Syrians and re-establish the affairs of the kingdom (2 Kings xiii, 1-9, 25). See Israel, Kingdom of.

3. The third of the four sons of Josiah by Hamutal, born B.C. 632, originally called Shallum, seventeenth separate king over Judah for three months only, B.C. 609 (Josephus Ἰωάχαζος, *Ant.* x, 5, 2). After his father had been slain in resisting the progress of Pharaoh-necho, Jehoahaz, who was then twenty-three years of age, was raised to the throne by the people in preference to his elder brother Jehoiakim (2 Kings xxiii, 31, 36), and received at Jerusalem the regal anointing, which seems

to have been usually omitted in times of order and of regular succession (the oldest brother, Johanan [1 Chron. iii, 15], having apparently died without issue, and Zedekiah being yet too young [2 Chron. xxvi, 11]). He found the land full of trouble, but free from idolatry. Instead, however, of following the excellent example of his father, Jehoahaz fell into the accustomed crimes of his predecessors, and, under the encouragements which his example or indifference offered, the idols soon reappeared. He is therefore described by his contemporaries as an evil-doer (2 Kings xxiii, 32) and an oppressor (Ezek. xix, 3), and such is his traditional character in Josephus (*Ant.* x, 5, 2); but his deposition seems to have been lamented by the people (Jer. xxii, 10; Ezek. xix, 1). Pharaoh-necho, on his victorious return from the Euphrates, thinking it politic to reject a king not nominated by himself, removed him from the throne, and set thereon his brother Jehoiakim. The deposed king was at first taken as a prisoner to Riblah, in Syria, but was eventually carried to Egypt, where he died (2 Kings xxiii, 30-35; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 1-4; 1 Chron. iii, 15; Jer. xxii, 10, 12). See Prideaux, *Connection*, an. 610; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* iii, 719; Rosenmüller, *Schol. in Jer.* xxii, 11. See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

Jeho'äsh (Heb. *Yehoäsh'*, יְהוֹאָשׁ, *Jehovah-given;* in most of the passages in 2 Kings only; more usually in the contracted form *Yoäsh'*, יוֹאָשׁ, "Joash," Sept. Ἰωάς, Josephus Ἰώασος), the name of two kings. See also JOASH.

1. The son of king Ahaziah by Libnah of Beersheba, was born B.C. 884; made king at the age of seven years, and reigned eighth over the separated kingdom of Judah forty years, B.C. 877-837. Jehoash, when an infant, was secretly saved by his aunt Jehoshebath, who was married to the high-priest Jehoiada, from the general massacre of the family by Athaliah, who had usurped the throne. See JEHOIADA. Jehoram having himself killed all his own brethren, and all his sons, except Ahaziah, having been killed by the irruption of the Philistines and Arabians, and all Ahaziah's remoter relations having been slain by Jehu, and now all his sons being put to death by Athaliah (2 Chron. xxi, 4, 17; xxii, 1, 8, 9, 10), the house of David was reduced to the lowest ebb, and Jehoash appears to have been the only surviving descendant of Solomon. By the high-priest and his wife the child was privately brought up in the chambers connected with the Temple till he was in his eighth year, when Jehoiada deemed that the state of affairs required him to produce the youthful heir of the throne to the people, and claim for him the crown which his grandmother had so unrighteously usurped. Finding the influential persons whom he consulted favorable to the design, everything was secretly but admirably arranged for producing Jehoash, and investing him with the regalia, in such a manner that Athaliah could have no suspicion of the event till it actually occurred. On the day appointed, the sole surviving scion of David's illustrious house appeared in the place of the kings, by a particular pillar in the Temple court, and was crowned and anointed with the usual ceremonies. The high-wrought enthusiasm of the spectators then found vent in clapping of hands and exulting shouts of "Long live the king!" The joyful uproar was heard even in the palace, and brought Athaliah to the Temple, from which, at a word from Jehoiada, she was led to her death. See ATHALIAH.

Jehoash behaved well during his minority, and so long after as he remained under the influence of the high-priest. Excepting that the high-places were still resorted to for incense and sacrifice, pure religion was restored, large contributions were made for the repair of the Temple, which was accordingly restored, and the country seems to have been free from foreign invasion and domestic disturbance. But when this venerable adviser died the king seems to have felt himself relieved from a yoke, and, to manifest his freedom, began to take the contrary course to that which he had followed while under pupilage. Gradually the persons who had possessed influence formerly, when the house of David was contaminated by its alliance with the house of Ahab, insinuated themselves into his councils, and ere long the worship of Jehovah and the observances of the law were neglected, and the land was defiled with idolatries and idolatrous usages. The prophets then uttered their warnings, but were not heard; and the infatuated king had the atrocious ingratitude to put to death Zechariah, the son and successor of his benefactor Jehoiada. For these deeds Jehoash was made an example of the divine judgments. He saw his realm devastated by the Syrians under Hazael; his armies were cut in pieces by an enemy of inferior numbers; and he was even besieged in Jerusalem, and only preserved his capital and crown by giving up the treasures of the Temple. Besides this, a painful malady embittered all his latter days, and at length he became so odious that his own servants conspired against him, and slew him on his bed. They are said to have done this to avenge the blood of Zechariah, who at his death had cried, "The Lord look upon it and require it;" and it is hence probable that public opinion ascribed all the calamities of his life and reign to that infamous deed. See ZECHARIAH. Jehoash was buried in the city of David, but a place in the sepulchre of the kings was denied to his remains (2 Kings xi; xii; 2 Chron. xxiv). He is one of the three kings (Ahaziah, Jehoash, Amaziah) omitted by Matthew in the genealogy of Christ (Matt. i, 8).

With regard to the different accounts of the Syrian invasion given in 2 Kings and in 2 Chron., which have led some (as Thenius and many other commentators) to imagine two distinct Syrian invasions, and others to see a direct contradiction, or at least a strange incompleteness in the narratives, as Winer, the difficulty exists solely in the minds of the critics. See SYRIA. The narrative given above, which is also that of Keil and E. Bertheau (*Exeg. handb. z. A. T.*) as well as of Josephus (*Ant.* ix, 8, 4), perfectly suits the two accounts, which are merely different abridgments of the one fuller account contained in the original chronicles of the kingdom. See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

2. The son and successor of Jehoahaz, king of Israel; reigned thirteenth over the separate kingdom sixteen (nominal) years, B.C. 838-823, and for about one year contemporaneously with his namesake of Judah (2 Kings xiv, 1; comp. with xii, 1, xiii, 10). When he succeeded to the crown the kingdom was in a deplorable state from the devastations of Hazael and Benhadad, kings of Syria, of whose power at this time we had also evidence in the preceding article. Jehoash, it is true, followed the example of his predecessors in the policy of keeping up the worship of the golden calves; but, apart from this, he bears a fair character, and had intervals, at least, of sincere piety and true devotion to the God of his fathers (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 8, 6). Indeed, custom and long habit had so established the views of political expediency on which the schismatical establishments at Dan and Bethel were founded, that at length the reprehension which regularly recurs in the record of each king's reign seems rather to apply to it as a mark of the continuance of a public crime than as indicative of the character or disposition of the reigning prince, which is to be sought in the more detailed accounts of his own conduct. These accounts are favorable with respect to Jehoash. He held the prophet Elisha in high honor, looking up to him as a father. When he heard of his last illness he repaired to the bedside of the dying prophet, wept over his face, and addressed him as "the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof." The prophet promised him deliverance from the Syrian yoke in Aphek, the scene of Ahab's great victory over a former Benhadad (1 Kings xx, 26-30). He then bid him smite upon the ground, and the king smote thrice and then stayed. The prophet rebuked him for staying, and limited to three his victories over Syria.

These promises were accomplished after the prophet's death. God took compassion upon the extreme misery of Israel, and, in remembrance of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, interposed to save them from entire destruction. In three signal and successive victories Jehoash overcame the Syrians, and retook from them the towns which Hazael had rent from Israel. These advantages rendered the kingdom of Israel more potent than that of Judah. Jehoash, however, sought no quarrel with that kingdom, but he nevertheless became involved in a war with Amaziah, king of Judah. The grounds of this war are given fully in 2 Chron. xxv. See AMAZIAH. The hiring of 100,000 men of Israel for 100 talents of silver by Amaziah is the only instance on record of such a transaction, and implies that at that time the kingdom of Israel was free from all fear of the Syrians. These mercenary soldiers, having been dismissed by Amaziah, at the instigation of a prophet, without being allowed to take part in the Edomitish expedition, returned in great wrath to their own country, and sacked and plundered the cities of Judah in revenge for the slight put upon them, and also to indemnify themselves for the loss of their share of the plunder. It was to avenge this injury that Amaziah, on his return from his triumph over the Edomites, declared war against Jehoash, in spite of the warning of the prophet; but Jehoash, when he received the defiance from Amaziah, answered with becoming spirit in a parable (q. v.), which by its images calls to mind that of Jotham; the cool disdain of the answer must have been, and in fact was, exceedingly galling to Amaziah: "The thistle that was in Lebanon sent to the cedar that was in Lebanon, saying, Give thy daughter to my son to wife; and there came by a wild beast that was in Lebanon and trod down the thistle." This was admirable; nor was the application less so: "Thou hast indeed smitten Edom, and thine heart hath lifted thee up: glory of this, and tarry at home; for why shouldest thou meddle to thy hurt, that thou shouldest fall, even thou, and Judah with thee." In the war, or, rather, action which followed, Jehoash was victorious. Having defeated Amaziah at Beth-shemesh, in Judah, he advanced to Jerusalem, broke down the wall to the extent of 400 cubits, and carried away the treasures both of the Temple and the palace, together with hostages for the future good behavior of the crestfallen Amaziah. Jehoash himself did not long survive this victory; he died in peace, and was buried in Samaria (2 Kings xiv, 1-17). See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

Jeho'hanan (Heb. *Yehochanan'*, יְהוֹחָנָן, *Jehovah-granted*, q. d. Θεόδωρος), the name of several men. See also JOHANAN; JOHN, etc.

1. (Sept. Ἰωνάν.) A Korhite, and head of the sixth division of Levitical Temple porters (1 Chron. xxvi, 3). B.C. 1014.

2. (Sept. Ἰωανάν.) Jehoshaphat's second "captain," in command of 280,000 (?) men (2 Chron. xvii, 15); probably the same whose son Ishmael supported Jehoiada in his restoration of prince Jehoash (2 Chron. xxiii, 1). B.C. cir. 910.

3. (Sept. Ἰωανάν, Auth. Vers. "Johanan.") The father of Azariah, which latter was one of the Ephraimite chiefs who insisted upon the return of the captives from the rival kingdom (2 Chron. xxviii, 12). B.C. ante 738.

4. (Sept. Ἰωανάν, A. Vers. "Johanan.") A priest, the "son" of Eliashib, into whose chamber Ezra retired to bewail the profligacy of his countrymen in marrying Gentile wives (Ezra x, 6); doubtless the same elsewhere called JOHANAN in the original (Neh. xii, 22, 23), and perhaps identical with No. 7 below.

5. (Sept. Ἰωανάν.) One of the "sons" of Bebai, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Babylonian exile (Ezra x, 28). B.C. 459.

6. (Sept. Ἰωνάθαν v. r. Ἰωνάν, Auth. Vers. "Johanan.") Son of Tobiah, the Samaritan enemy of the Jews, and son-in-law of Meshullam (Neh. vi, 18). B.C. 446.

7. (Sept. Ἰωνάν.) One of the priests who celebrated with music the reparation of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 42). B.C. 446. He was perhaps the same with No. 4 or No. 8.

8. (Sept. Ἰωανάν.) A leading priest, the "son" of Amariah, and contemporary with Joiakim (Neh. xii, 13). B.C. cir. 406. He may have been identical with the preceding.

Jehoi'achin (Heb. *Yehôyakin'*, יְהוֹיָכִין, *Jehovah-appointed;* Sept. Ἰωαχίμ in 2 Kings xxiv, 6, 8, 12, 15; xxv, 27; Ἰεχονίας in 2 Chron. xxxvi, 8, 9; Ἰωακείμ in Jer. lii, 31; Josephus Ἰωάχιμος, *Ant.* x, 6, 3; 7, 1; N. Test. Ἰεχονίας, "Jechonias," Matt. i, 11, 12; contracted once יוֹיָכִין, *Yoyakin'*, Ezek. i. 2, Sept. Ἰωακείμ, Auth. Vers. "Jehoiachin"), also in the contracted forms JECONIAH (יְכָנְיָה, *Yekonyah'*, Sept. Ἰεχονίας in Jer. xxvii, 20; xxviii, 4; xxix, 2; 1 Chron. iii, 16, 17; but omits in Esth. ii, 6; likewise paragogic יְכָנְיָהוּ, *Yekonya'hu*, Jer. xxiv. 1, Sept. Ἰεχονίας), and CONIAH (*Konyah'*, only paragogic כָּנְיָהוּ, *Konya'hu*, Jer. xxii, 24, 28; xxxvii, 1, Sept. Ἰεχονίας), son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, by Nehushta, daughter of Elnathan of Jerusalem; he succeeded his father as the nineteenth monarch of that separate kingdom, but only for three months and ten days, B.C. 598. He was then eighteen years of age according to 2 Kings xxiv, 8, but only eight according to 2 Chron. xxxvi, 9. Many attempts have been made to reconcile these dates (see J. D. Müller, *De reb. duor. tribuum regni Jud. adversis*, Lipsiæ, 1745; Oeder, *Freie Untersuch. über einige Alttest.-Bücher*, p. 214; Offerhaus, *Spicileg.* p. 193), the most usual solution being that he had reigned ten years in conjunction with his father, so that he was eight when he began his joint reign, but eighteen when he began to reign alone. There are, however, difficulties in this view which, perhaps, leave it the safest course to conclude that "eight" in 2 Chron. xxxvi, 9, is a corruption of the text, such as might easily occur from the relation of the numbers eight and eighteen. (All the versions read eighteen in Kings, and so the Vulg. and many MSS. of the Sept. in Chron., as well as at 1 Esd. i, 43. Among recent commentators, Keil, Thenius, and Hitzig favor the reading eighteen, while Bertheau prefers eight. The language in Jer. xxii, 24-30 is not decisive, for the epithets there applied to Jechoniah do not necessarily imply adult age, although they more naturally agree with it. The same remark applies to the allusion in Ezek. xix, 5-9. The decided reprobation, however, in 2 Kings xxiv, 9, and in 2 Chron. xxxvi, 9, would hardly be used of a mere child. The mention of his mother in 2 Kings xxiv, 12 does not imply his minority, for the queen-dowager was a very important member of the royal family. The number eight, indeed, would bring Jehoiachin's birth in the year of the beginning of the captivity by Nebuchadnezzar's invasion, and thus exactly agree with the language in Matt. i, 11; but the expression "and his brethren" added there, as well as the language of the following verse, agrees better with a less precise correspondence, as likewise the qualifying "about" indicates. The argument drawn from his father's age at death, thirty-six [2 Kings xxiii, 36], is favorable to Jehoiachin's maturity at the time, for most of these kings became fathers very early, Josiah, e. g., at fifteen [2 Kings xxii, 1, comp. with xxiii, 36].) He was, therefore, born in B.C. 616.

Jehoiachin followed the evil courses which had already brought so much disaster upon the royal house of David, and upon the people under its sway. He seems to have very speedily indicated a political bias adverse to the interests of the Chaldæan empire, for in three months after his accession we find the generals of Nebuchadnezzar again laying siege to Jerusalem, according to the predictions of Jeremiah (xxii, 24-30). Jehoiachin had come to the throne at a time when Egypt was still prostrate in consequence of the victory at Carchemish, and when the Jews had been for three or four years harassed and distressed by the in-

roads of the armed bands of Chaldæans, Ammonites, and Moabites, sent against them by Nebuchadnezzar in consequence of Jehoiakim's rebellion. See JEHOIAKIM. Jerusalem at this time, therefore, was quite defenceless, and unable to offer any resistance to the regular army which Nebuchadnezzar sent to besiege it in the eighth year of his reign, and which he seems to have joined in person after the siege was commenced (2 Kings xxiv, 10, 11). In a very short time, apparently, and without any losses from famine or fighting which would indicate a serious resistance, Jehoiachin surrendered at discretion; and he, and the queen-mother, and all his servants, captains, and officers, came out and gave themselves up to Nebuchadnezzar, who treated them, with the harem and the eunuchs, as prisoners of war (Jer. xxix, 2; Ezek. xvii, 12; xix. 9). He was sent away as a captive to Babylon, with his mother, his generals, and his troops, together with the artificers and other inhabitants of Jerusalem, to the number of ten thousand. (This number, found in 2 Kings xxiv, 14, is probably a round number, made up of the 7000 soldiers of ver. 16, and the 3023 nobles of Jer. lii, 28, exclusive of the 1000 artificers mentioned in 2 Kings xxiv, 16; see Brown's *Ordo Sæclorum*, p. 186.) Among these was the prophet Ezekiel. Few were left but the poorer sort of people and the unskilled laborers; few, indeed, whose presence could be useful in Babylon or dangerous in Palestine. See CAPTIVITY. Neither did the Babylonian king neglect to remove the treasures which could yet be gleaned from the palace or the Temple, and he now made spoil of those sacred vessels of gold which had been spared on former occasions. These were cut up for present use of the metal or for more convenient transport, whereas those formerly taken had been sent to Babylon entire, and there laid up as trophies of victory. If the Chaldæan king had then put an end to the show of a monarchy and annexed the country to his own dominions, the event would probably have been less unhappy for the nation; but, still adhering to his former policy, he placed on the throne Mattaniah, the only surviving son of Josiah, whose name he changed to Zedekiah (2 Kings xxiv, 11-16; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 9, 10; Jer. xxxvii, 1). See NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

Jehoiachin remained a captive at Babylon—actually in prison (בֵּית כֶּלֶא), and wearing prison-garments (Jer. lii, 31, 33)—for thirty-six years, viz. during the lifetime of Nebuchadnezzar; but, when that prince died, his son, Evil-merodach, not only released him, but gave him an honorable seat at his own table, with precedence over all the other dethroned kings who were kept at Babylon, and an allowance for the support of his rank (2 Kings xxv, 27-30; Jer. lii, 31-34). B.C. 561. To what he owed this favor we are not told, but the Jewish commentators allege that Evil-merodach had himself been put into prison by his father during the last years of his reign, and had there contracted an intimate friendship with the deposed king of Judah. We learn from Jer. xxviii, 4 that, four years after Jehoiachin had gone to Babylon, there was a great expectation at Jerusalem of his return, but it does not appear whether Jehoiachin himself shared this hope at Babylon. The tenor of Jeremiah's letter to the elders of the captivity (chap. xxix) would, however, indicate that there was a party among the captivity, encouraged by false prophets, who were at this time looking forward to Nebuchadnezzar's overthrow and Jehoiachin's return; and perhaps the fearful death of Ahab, the son of Kolaiah (verse 22), and the close confinement of Jehoiachin through Nebuchadnezzar's reign, may have been the result of some disposition to conspire against Nebuchadnezzar on the part of a portion of the captivity. But neither Daniel or Ezekiel, who were Jehoiachin's fellow-captives, make any further allusion to him, except that Ezekiel dates his prophecies by the year "of king Jehoiachin's captivity" (i, 2; viii, 1; xxiv, 1, etc.); the latest date being "the twenty-seventh year" (xxix, 17; xl, 1). We also learn from Esth. ii, 6 that Kish, the ancestor of Mordecai, was Jehoiachin's fellow-captive. But the apocryphal books are more communicative. Thus the author of the book of Baruch (i, 3) introduces "Jechonias, the son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah," into his narrative, and represents Baruch as reading his prophecy in his ears and in the ears of the king's sons, and the nobles, and elders, and people, at Babylon. At the hearing of Baruch's words, it is added, they wept, and fasted, and prayed, and sent a collection of silver to Jerusalem, to Joiakim, the son of Hilkiah, the son of Shallum the high-priest, with which to purchase burnt-offerings, and sacrifices, and incense, bidding them pray for the prosperity of Nebuchadnezzar, and Belshazzar his son. The history of Susanna and the elders also apparently makes Jehoiachin an important personage, for, according to the author, the husband of Susanna was Joiakim, a man of great wealth, and the chief person among the captives, to whose house all the people resorted for judgment—a description which suits Jehoiachin. Africanus (*Ep. ad Orig.*; Routh, *Rel. Sac.* ii, 113) expressly calls Susanna's husband king, and says that the king of Babylon had made him his royal companion (*σύνθρονος*). He is also mentioned in 1 Esd. v, 5, but the text seems to be corrupt. That Zedekiah, who in 1 Chron. iii, 16 is called "his son," is the same as Zedekiah his uncle (called "his brother" in 2 Chron. xxxvi, 10), who was his successor on the throne, seems certain. But it is probable that "Assir" (אַסִּר = captive), who is reckoned amongst the family of Jeconiah in 1 Chron. iii, 17, may really have been only an appellative of Jeconiah himself (see Bertheau on 1 Chron. iii, 16). See ASSIR. In the genealogy of Christ (Matt. i, 11) he is named in the received text as the "son of Josias" his grandfather, the name of Jehoiakim having probably been omitted by erroneous transcription. See GENEALOGY. In the dark portrait of his early character by the prophet (Jer. xxii, 30), the expression "Write ye this man childless" refers to his having no successor on the throne, for he had children (see *Meth. Quar. Review*, Oct., 1852, p. 602-4). See SALATHIEL. Josephus, however (*Ant.* x, 7, 1), gives him a fair character (see Keil, *Commentary on Kings*, p. 602). The compiler of 1 Esd. gives the name of Jechonias to Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah, who reigned three months after Josiah's death, and was deposed and carried to Egypt by Pharaoh-necho (1 Esd. i, 34; 2 Kings xxiii, 30). He is followed in this blunder by Epiphanius (i, 21), who says "Josiah begat Jechoniah, who is also called Shallum. This Jechoniah begat Jechoniah who is called Zedekiah and Joakim." It has its origin, doubtless, in the confusion of the names when written in Greek by writers ignorant of Hebrew. See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

Jehoi'ada (Hebrew *Yehôyada'*, יְהוֹיָדָע, *Jehovah-known*; Sept. Ἰωιαδά, Ἰωιαδέ, Ἰωδαέ), the name of two or more priests.

1. The father of Benaiah, which latter was one of David's chief warriors (2 Sam. viii, 18; xx, 23; xxiii, 20, 22; 1 Kings i, 8, 26, 32, 36, 38, 44; ii, 25. 29, 34. 35, 46; iv, 4; 1 Chron. xi, 22, 24; xviii, 17; xxvii, 5). B.C. ante 1046. He is probably the same mentioned as assisting David at Hebron as leader (נָגִיד) of 3700 armed Aaronites (1 Chron. xii, 27); Josephus, who calls him Ἰώδαμος, says 4700 Levites (*Ant.* vii, 2, 3). In 1 Chron. xxvii, 34, his name seems to have been erroneously transposed with that of his son.

2. The high-priest at the time of Athaliah's usurpation of the throne of Judah (B.C. 883-877), and during the most of the reign of Jehoash. It does not appear when he first became high-priest, but it may have been as early as the latter part of Jehoshaphat's reign. He married Jehosheba or Jehoshabeath, daughter of king Jehoram, and sister of king Ahaziah (2 Chron. xxii, 11): and when Athaliah slew all the royal family of Judah after Ahaziah had been put to death by Jehu, he and his wife stole Jehoash from amongst the king's sons and hid him for six years in the Temple, and eventually replaced

him on the throne of his ancestors. See ATHALIAH. In effecting this happy revolution, by which both the throne of David and the worship of the true God according to the law of Moses were rescued from imminent danger of destruction, Jehoiada displayed great ability and prudence. Waiting patiently till the tyranny of Athaliah—and, we may presume, her foreign practices and preferences—had produced disgust in the land, he at length, in the 7th year of her reign, entered into secret alliance with all the chief partisans of the house of David and of the true religion. He also collected at Jerusalem the Levites from the different cities of Judah and Israel, probably under cover of providing for the Temple services, and then concentrated a large and concealed force in the Temple by the expedient of not dismissing the old courses of priests and Levites when their successors came to relieve them on the Sabbath. By means of the consecrated shields and spears which David had taken in his wars, and which were preserved in the treasury of the Temple (comp. 1 Chron. xviii, 7-11; xxvi, 20-28; 1 Kings xiv, 26, 27), he supplied the captains of hundreds with arms for their men. Having then divided the priests and Levites into three bands, which were posted at the principal entrances, and filled the courts with people favorable to the cause, he produced the young king before the whole assembly, and crowned and anointed him, and presented to him a copy of the Law according to Deut. xvii, 18-20. See HILKIAH. The excitement of the moment did not make him forget the sanctity of God's house. None but the priests and ministering Levites were permitted by him to enter the Temple, and he gave strict orders that Athaliah should be carried without its precincts before she was put to death. In the same spirit he inaugurated the new reign by a solemn covenant between himself as high-priest, and the people and the king, to renounce the Baal-worship which had been introduced by the house of Ahab, and to serve Jehovah. This was followed up by the immediate destruction of the altar and temple of Baal, and the death of Mattan, his priest. He then gave orders for the due celebration of the Temple service, and, at the same time, for the perfect re-establishment of the monarchy, all which seems to have been effected with great vigor and success, and without any cruelty or violence. The young king himself, under this wise and virtuous counsellor, ruled his kingdom well and prosperously, and was forward in works of piety during the lifetime of Jehoiada. The reparation of the Temple, in the 23d year of his reign, of which a full and interesting account is given in 2 Kings xii and 2 Chron. xxiv, was one of the most important works at this period. At length, however, Jehoiada died, and for his signal services to his God, his king, and his country, which have earned him a place amongst the very foremost well-doers in Israel, he had the unique honor of burial amongst the kings of Judah in the city of David.—Smith. His decease, though at an advanced age, yet occurred too soon for the welfare of the nation and of Jehoash, who thereupon immediately fell into idolatry, and was even guilty of the most cruel ingratitude towards the family of Jehoiada. See JEHOASH, 1. His age at his death is stated (2 Chron. xxiv, 15) to have been 130 years, which Hervey (*Genealogy of our Lord*, p. 304) proposes to change to 103, in order to lessen the presumed disparity between Jehoiada's age and that of his wife, as well as on the ground that a man of 90 could hardly have exhibited such energy as he displayed in displacing Athaliah; but the change is wholly arbitrary and unnecessary. Josephus, in his history (*Ant.* ix, 7, 1, where he Græcizes the name, Ἰώδαος), follows the Bible account; but in his list of the high-priests (*Ant.* x, 8, 6), the corresponding name seems to be *Axioramus* (Ἀξιώραμος, perhaps by corruption for "Joram"). In the Jewish chronicle (*Seder Olam*), however, it correctly appears as *Jehoiadah*, and with a date tolerably answering to the scriptural requirements. In both authorities, many of the adjoining names are additional to those mentioned in the O. T. See HIGH-PRIEST. It is probably this Jehoiada who is alluded to in Jer. xxix, 26 as a pre-eminent incumbent of the office (see Rosenmüller and Hitzig, ad loc.), and he is doubtless the same with the BERECHIAH (Βαραχίας) of Matt. xxiii, 25. See ZEDEKIAH.

3. (Neh. iii, 6). See JOIADA.

Jehoi'akim (Heb. *Yehôyakim'*, יְהוֹיָקִים, *Jehovah-established*; Sept. Ἰωακίμ, oftener Ἰωακείμ, Josephus Ἰωάκιμος; compare JOIAKIM, JOKIM), the second son of Josiah by Zebudah, daughter of Pedaiah of Rumah (probably the Dumah of Josh. xv, 52); born B.C. 634, and eighteenth king of the separate throne of Judah for a period of eleven years, B.C. 609-598. He is mentioned in 2 Kings xxiii, 34, 35, 36; xxiv, 1, 5, 6, 19; 1 Chron. iii, 15, 16; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 4, 5, 8; Jer. i, 3; xxii, 18, 24; xxiv, 1; xxv, 1; xxvi, 1, 21, 22, 23; xxvii, 1, 20; xxviii, 4; xxxv, 1; xxxvi, 1, 9, 28, 29, 30, 32; xxxvii, 1; xlv, 1; xlvi, 2; lii, 2; Dan. i, 1, 2. His original name was ELIAKIM (q. v.), but the equivalent name of Jehoiakim was given him by the Egyptian king who set him on his father's throne (2 Kings xxiii, 34). This change is significant of his dependence and loss of liberty, as heathen kings were accustomed to give new names to those who entered their service (Gen. xli, 45; Ezra v, 14; Dan. i, 7), usually after their gods. In this case, as the new name is Israelitish, it is probable that Pharaoh-necho gave it at the request of Eliakim himself, whom Hengstenberg supposes to have been influenced by a desire to place his name in closer connection with the promise (2 Sam. vii, 12), where not *El*, but *Jehovah* is the promiser; and to have done this out of opposition to the sentence of the prophets respecting the impending fall of the house of David (*Christol.* ii, 401, Eng. trans.). There exists the most striking contrast between his beautiful name and his miserable fate (Jer. xxii, 19). (See Eckhird, *Vom Esels-Begräbniss*, Lpz. 1716.) See NAME.

Jehoiakim's younger brother Jehoahaz, or Shallum, as he is called Jer. xxii, 11, had been in the first instance made king by the people of the land on the death of his father Josiah, probably with the intention of following up Josiah's policy, which was to side with Nebuchadnezzar against Egypt, being, as Prideaux thinks, bound by oath to the kings of Babylon (i, 50). See JEHOAHAZ. Pharaoh-necho, therefore, having borne down all resistance with his victorious army, immediately deposed Jehoahaz, and had him brought in chains to Riblah, where, it seems, he was on his way to Carchemish (2 Kings xxiii, 33, 34; Jer. xxii, 10-12). See NECHO. He then set Eliakim, his elder brother, upon the throne—changed his name to Jehoiakim (see above)—and, having charged him with the task of collecting a tribute of 100 talents of silver and one talent of gold = nearly $200,000, in which he mulcted the land for the part Josiah had taken in the war with Babylon, he eventually returned to Egypt, taking Jehoahaz with him, who died there in captivity (2 Kings xxiii, 34; Jer. xxii, 10-12; Ezek. xix, 4). Pharaoh-necho also himself returned no more to Jerusalem; for, after his great defeat at Carchemish in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, he lost all his Syrian possessions (2 Kings xxiv, 7; Jer. xlvi, 2), and his successor Psammis (Herod. ii, clxi) made no attempt to recover them. Egypt, therefore, played no part in Jewish politics during the seven or eight years of Jehoiakim's reign. After the battle of Carchemish Nebuchadnezzar came into Palestine as one of the Egyptian tributary kingdoms, the capture of which was the natural fruit of his victory over Necho. He found Jehoiakim quite powerless. After a short siege he entered Jerusalem, took the king prisoner, bound him in fetters to carry him to Babylon (2 Chron. xxxvi, 6, 7), and took also some of the precious vessels of the Temple and carried them to the land of Shinar, to the temple of Bel his god. It was at this time, in the fourth, or, as Daniel reckons, in the third year of

his reign [see NEBUCHADNEZZAR], that Daniel and Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah, were taken captives to Babylon (Dan. i, 1, 2); but Nebuchadnezzar seems to have changed his purpose as regarded Jehoiakim, and to have accepted his submission, and reinstated him on the throne, perhaps in remembrance of the fidelity of his father Josiah (q. v.). The year following the Egyptians were defeated upon the Euphrates (Jer. xlvi, 2), and Jehoiakim, when he saw the remains of the defeated army pass by his territory, could not but perceive how vain had been that reliance upon Egypt against which he had been constantly cautioned by Jeremiah (Jer. xxxi, 1; xlv, 1). In the same year the prophet caused a collection of his prophecies to be written out by his faithful Baruch, and to be read publicly by him in the court of the Temple. This coming to the knowledge of the king, he sent for it, and had it read before him. But he heard not much of the bitter denunciations with which it was charged before he took the roll from the reader, and, after cutting it in pieces, threw it into the brazier which, it being winter, was burning before him in the hall. The counsel of God against him, however, stood sure; a fresh roll was written, with the addition of a further and most awful denunciation against the king, occasioned by this foolish and sacrilegious act. "He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David: and his dead body shall be cast out in the day to the heat and in the night to the frost" (Jer. xxxvi). All this, however, appears to have made little impression upon Jehoiakim, who still walked in his old paths. See JEREMIAH.

After three years of subjection, Jehoiakim, deluded by the Egyptian party in his court (compare Josephus, *Ant.* x, 6, 2), ventured to withhold his tribute, and thereby to throw off the Chaldæan yoke (2 Kings xxiv, 1). This step, taken contrary to the earnest remonstrances of Jeremiah, and in violation of his oath of allegiance, was the ruin of Jehoiakim. What moved or encouraged Jehoiakim to this rebellion it is difficult to say, unless it were the restless turbulence of his own bad disposition and the dislike of paying the tribute to the king of Babylon, which he would have rather lavished upon his own luxury and pride (Jer. xxii, 13–17), for there was really nothing in the attitude of Egypt at this time to account for such a step. It seems more probable that, seeing Egypt entirely severed from the affairs of Syria since the battle of Carchemish, and the king of Babylon wholly occupied with distant wars, he hoped to make himself independent. Though Nebuchadnezzar was not able at that time to come in person to chastise his rebellious vassal, he sent against him numerous bands of Chaldæans, with Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites, who were all now subject to Babylon (2 Kings xxiv, 7), and who cruelly harassed the whole country, being for the most part actuated by a fierce hatred against the Jewish name and nation. It was perhaps at this time that the great drought occurred described in Jer. xiv (compare Jer. xv, 4 with 2 Kings xxiv, 2, 3). The closing years of this reign must have been a time of extreme misery. The Ammonites appear to have overrun the land of Gad (Jer. xlix, 1), and the other neighboring nations to have taken advantage of the helplessness of Israel to ravage their land to the utmost (Ezek. xxv). There was no rest or safety out of the walled cities. We are not acquainted with the details of the close of the reign. Probably, as the time approached for Nebuchadnezzar himself to come against Judæa, the desultory attacks and invasions of his troops became more concentrated. Either in an engagement with some of these forces, or else by the hand of his own oppressed subjects, who thought to conciliate the Babylonians by the murder of their king, Jehoiakim seems to have come to a violent end in the eleventh year of his reign. His body, as predicted, appears to have been cast out ignominiously on the ground; perhaps thrown over the walls to convince the enemy that he was dead; and then, after being left exposed for some time, to have been dragged away and buried "with the burial of an ass," without pomp or lamentation, "beyond the gates of Jerusalem" (Jer. xxii, 18, 19; xxxvi, 30; see 1 Chron. iii, 15; 2 Kings xxiii, 34-37; xxiv, 1–7; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 4–8). Yet it was not the object of Nebuchadnezzar to destroy altogether a power which, as tributary to him, formed a serviceable outpost towards Egypt, which seems to have been the great final object of all his designs in this quarter. He therefore still maintained the throne of Judah, and placed on it Jehoiachin, the son of the late king. Nor does he appear to have removed any considerable number of the inhabitants until provoked by the speedy revolt of this last appointee. See JEHOIACHIN.

The expression in Jer. xxxvi, 30, "He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David," is not to be taken strictly; and yet, as the reign of Jehoiachin was for only thirteen weeks, Jehoiakim may be said to have been comparatively without a successor, since his son scarcely sat down upon his throne before he was deposed. The same explanation applies to 2 Kings xxiii, 34, where Eliakim or Jehoiakim is said to have succeeded his father Josiah, whereas the reign of Jehoahaz intervened. This was also so short, however, as not to be reckoned in the succession. In Matt. i, 11, in the received text, the name of Jehoiakim (Ἰωακείμ, "Jakim") is omitted, making Jehoiachin appear as the son of Josiah; but in some good MSS. it is supplied, as in the margin (see Strong's *Greek Harmony of the Gospels*, note on § 9). See GENEALOGY.

Josephus's history of Jehoiakim's reign is consistent neither with Scripture nor with itself. His account of Jehoiakim's death and Jehoiachin's succession appears to be only his own inference from the Scripture narrative. According to Josephus (*Ant.* x, 6), Nebuchadnezzar came against Judæa in the 8th year of Jehoiakim's reign, and compelled him to pay tribute, which he did for three years, and then revolted, in the 11th year, on hearing that the king of Babylon had gone to invade Egypt. Such a campaign at this time is extremely improbable, as Nebuchadnezzar was fully occupied elsewhere; it is possible, however, that such a rumor may have been set afloat by interested parties. Josephus then inserts the account of Jehoiakim's burning Jeremiah's prophecy in his fifth year, and concludes by saying that a little time afterwards the king of Babylon made an expedition against Jehoiakim, who admitted Nebuchadnezzar into the city upon certain conditions, which Nebuchadnezzar immediately broke; that he slew Jehoiakim and the flower of the citizens, and sent 3000 captives to Babylon, and set up Jehoiachin for king, but almost immediately afterwards was seized with fear lest the young king should avenge his father's death, and so sent back his army to besiege Jerusalem; that Jehoiachin, being a man of just and gentle disposition, did not like to expose the city to danger on his own account, and therefore surrendered himself, his mother, and kindred to the king of Babylon's officers on condition of the city suffering no harm, but that Nebuchadnezzar, in direct violation of the conditions, took 10,832 prisoners, and made Zedekiah king in the room of Jehoiachin, whom he kept in custody. See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

All the accounts we have of Jehoiakim concur in ascribing to him a vicious and irreligious character. The writer of 2 Kings xxiii, 37 tells us that "he did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah," a statement which is repeated in ch. xxiv, 9, and 2 Chron. xxxvi, 5. The latter writer uses the yet stronger expression "the acts of Jehoiakim, and the abominations which he did" (ver. 8). But it is in the writings of Jeremiah that we have the fullest portraiture of him. If, as is probable, the 19th chapter of Jeremiah belongs to this reign, we have a detail of the abominations of idolatry practiced at Jerusalem under the king's sanction, with which Ezekiel's vision of what was going on six years later, within the very precincts of the Temple, exactly agrees: incense offered up to "abominable beasts," "women weeping for

Thammuz," and men in the inner court of the Temple, "with their backs towards the temple of the Lord," worshipping "the sun towards the east" (Ezek. viii). The vindictive pursuit and murder of Urijah, the son of Shemaiah, and the indignities offered to his corpse by the king's command, in revenge for his faithful prophesying of evil against Jerusalem and Judah, are samples of his irreligion and tyranny combined. Jeremiah but narrowly escaped the same fate (Jer. xxvi, 20-24). The curious notice of him in 1 Esd. i, 38—that he put his nobles in chains, and caught Zaraces, his brother, in Egypt, and brought him up thence to Jerusalem—also points to his cruelty. His daring impiety in cutting up and burning the roll containing Jeremiah's prophecy, at the very moment when the national fast was being celebrated, has been noticed above (see also Stanley, *Jewish Church*, ii, 597 sq.). His oppression, injustice, covetousness, luxury, and tyranny are most severely rebuked (Jer. xxii, 13-17); and it has frequently been observed, as indicating his thorough selfishness and indifference to the sufferings of his people, that, at a time when the land was so impoverished by the heavy tributes laid upon it by Egypt and Babylon in turn, he should have squandered large sums in building luxurious palaces for himself (Jer. xxii, 14, 15). See IMAGERY, CHAMBERS OF.

Jehoi'arib (Hebrew *Yehôyarib'*, יְהוֹיָרִיב, whose cause *Jehovah defends;* Sept. Ἰωαρείβ or Ἰαρείβ v. r. Ἰωαρίμ; 1 Chron. ix, 10; xxiv, 7 only; elsewhere, both in Heb. and A. V., the name is abbreviated to JOIARIB), a distinguished priest at Jerusalem (1 Chron. ix, 10), head of the first of the twenty-four sacerdotal "courses" (1 Chron. xxiv, 7). B.C. 1014. Of these courses, only four are mentioned as having returned from Babylon—those of Jedaiah, Immer, Pashur, and Harim (Ezra ii, 36-39; Neh. vii, 39-42); and Jewish tradition says that each of these was divided into six, so as to preserve the original number with the original names (Talm. Hieros. *Taanith*, ch. iv, p. 68, col. 1 in ed. Bomberg). This might account for our finding, at a later period, Mattathias described as of the course of Joarib (1 Macc. ii, 1), even though this course did not return from Babylon (Prideaux, *Connection*, i, 136, 8th ed.). We find, however, that some of the descendants of Jehoiarib did return from Babylon (1 Chron. ix, 10; Neh. xi, 10; see JEDAIAH); we find, also, that in subsequent lists other of the priestly courses are mentioned as returning, and in one of these that of Jehoiarib is expressly mentioned (Neh. x, 2-8; xii, 1-7), and mention is made of Mattenai as chief of the house of Joiarib in the days of Jeshua (xii, 19). The probability, therefore, is, that the course of Jehoiarib did go up, but at a later date, perhaps, than those four mentioned in Ezra ii, 36-39, and Neh. vii, 39-42. To the course of Joiarib Josephus tells us he belonged (*Ant.* xi, 6, 1; *Life*, § 1). See PRIEST.

Jehon'adab (Heb. *Yehonadab'*, יְהוֹנָדָב, to whom *Jehovah* is *liberal*, 2 Sam. xiii, 5; 2 Kings x, 15, 23; Jer. xxxv, 8, 14, 16, 18; Sept. Ἰωναδάβ, Auth. Version "Jonadab," except in 2 Kings x, 15, 23), also in the contracted form JONADAB (יוֹנָדָב, *Yonadab'*, 2 Sam. xiii, 3, 32, 35; Jer. xxxv, 6, 10, 19; Sept. Ἰωναδάβ), the name of two men.

1. A son of Shimeah and nephew of David, a very crafty person (חָכָם מְאֹד; the word is that usually translated "wise," as in the case of Solomon, 2 Sam. xiii, 3), i. e. apparently one of those characters who, in the midst of great or royal families, pride themselves, and are renowned, for being acquainted with the secrets of the whole circle in which they move. His age naturally made him the friend of his cousin Amnon, heir to the throne (2 Sam. xiii, 3). He perceived from the prince's altered appearance that there was some unknown grief—"Why art *thou*, the king's son, so lean?"—and, when he had wormed it out, he gave him the fatal advice for ensnaring his sister Tamar (ver. 5, 6). B.C. cir. 1033. See AMNON. Again, when, in a later stage of the same tragedy, Amnon was murdered by Absalom, and the exaggerated report reached David that all the princes were slaughtered, Jonadab was already aware of the real state of the case. He was with the king, and was able at once to reassure him (2 Sam. xiii, 32, 33). See ABSALOM.

2. A son or descendant of Rechab, the progenitor of a peculiar tribe, who held themselves bound by a vow to abstain from wine, and never to relinquish the nomadic life (Jer. xxxv, 6-19). See RECHAB. It appears from 1 Chron. ii, 55 that his father or ancestor Rechab ("the rider") belonged to a branch of the Kenites, the Arabian tribe which entered Palestine with the Israelites. One settlement of them was to be found in the extreme north, under the chieftainship of Heber (Judg. iv, 11), retaining their Bedouin customs under the oak which derived its name from their nomadic habits. The main settlement was in the south. Of these, one branch had nestled in the cliffs of Engedi (Judg. i, 16; Numb. xxiv, 21). Another had returned to the frontier of their native wilderness on the south of Judah (Judg. i, 16). A third was established, under a fourfold division, at or near the town of Jabez, in Judah (1 Chron. ii, 55). See KENITE. To which of these branches Rechab and his son Jehonadab belonged is uncertain; he was evidently, however, the chieftain of an important family, if not the generally acknowledged head of the entire clan. The Bedouin habits, which were kept up by the various branches of the Kenite tribe (see Judg. i, 16; iv, 11), were inculcated by Jehonadab with the utmost minuteness on his descendants or retainers; the more so, perhaps, from their being brought into closer connection with the inhabitants of the settled districts. The vow or rule which he prescribed to them is preserved to us: "Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye nor your sons forever. Neither shall ye build houses, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any: but all your days ye shall dwell in tents; that ye may live many days in the land where ye be strangers" (Jer. xxxv, 6, 7). This life, partly monastic, partly Bedouin, was observed with the tenacity with which, from generation to generation, such customs are continued in Arab tribes; and when, many years after the death of Jehonadab, the Rechabites (as they were called from his father) were forced to take refuge from the Chaldæan invasion within the walls of Jerusalem, nothing would induce them to transgress the rule of their ancestor, and, in consequence, a blessing was pronounced upon him and them by the prophet Jeremiah (xxxv, 19): "Jonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me forever." See RECHABITE.

Bearing in mind this general character of Jehonadab as an Arab chief, and the founder of a half-religious sect, perhaps in connection with the austere Elijah, and the Nazarites mentioned in Amos ii, 11 (see Ewald, *Alterthümer*, p. 92, 93), we are the better able to understand the single occasion on which he appears before us in the historical narrative (2 Kings x, 15 sq.). B.C. 883. Jehu was advancing, after the slaughter of Beth-eked, on the city of Samaria, when he suddenly met the austere Bedouin coming towards him (2 Kings x, 15). It seems that they were already known to each other (Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 6, 6). The king was in his chariot; the Arab was on foot. It is not altogether certain which was the first to speak. The Hebrew text—followed by the A. V.—implies that the king blessed (A. Vers. "saluted") Jehonadab. The Sept. and Josephus (*Ant.* ix, 6, 6) imply that Jehonadab blessed the king. Each would have its peculiar appropriateness. The king then proposed their close union. "Is thy heart right, as my heart is with thy heart?" The answer of Jehonadab is slightly varied. In the Hebrew text he vehemently replies, "It is, it is: give me thine hand." In the Sept. and in the A. V., he replies simply, "It is;" and Jehu then rejoins, "If it is, give me thine hand." The hand, whether of Jehonadab or Jehu, was offered

and grasped. The king lifted him up to the edge of the chariot, apparently that he might whisper his secret into his ear, and said, "Come with me, and see my zeal for Jehovah." It was the first indication of Jehu's design upon the worship of Baal, for which he perceived that the stern zealot would be a fit coadjutor. Having intrusted him with the secret, he (Sept.) or his attendants (Heb. and A.V.) caused Jehonadab to proceed with him to Samaria in the royal chariot. Jehonadab was evidently held in great respect among the Israelites generally; and Jehu was alive to the importance of obtaining the countenance and sanction of such a man to his proceedings; and as it is expressly said that Jehonadab went out to meet Jehu, it seems probable that the people of Samaria, alarmed at the menacing letter which they had received from Jehu, had induced Jehonadab to go to meet and appease him on the road. His venerated character, his rank as the head of a tribe, and his neutral position, well qualified him for this mission; and it was quite as much the interest of Jehonadab to conciliate the new dynasty, in whose founder he beheld the minister of the divine decrees, as it was that of Jehu to obtain his concurrence and support in proceedings which he could not but know were likely to render him odious to the people. So completely had the worship of Baal become the national religion, that even Jehonadab was able to conceal his purpose under the mask of conformity. No doubt he acted in concert with Jehu throughout; but the only occasion on which he is expressly mentioned is when (probably from his previous knowledge of the secret worshippers of Jehovah) he went with Jehu through the temple of Baal to turn out any that there might happen to be in the mass of pagan worshippers (2 Kings x, 23). See JEHU.

Jehon'athan (Heb. *Yehonathan'*, יְהוֹנָתָן, *Jehovah-given;* Sept. Ἰωνάθαν), the full form of the name of four men.

1. The oldest son of king Saul (1 Sam. xiv, 6, 8, 21; xviii, 1, 3, 4; xix, 2, 4, 6, 7; xx throughout, and all later passages except 1 Chron. x, 2, in all which the A.V. has "JONATHAN" [q. v.], as the Hebrew likewise elsewhere has).

2. Son of Uzziah, and superintendent of certain of king David's storehouses (אֹצָרוֹת, the word rendered "treasures" earlier in the verse, and in 27, 28 "cellars") (1 Chron. xxvii, 25). B.C. 1014.

3. One of the Levites who were sent by Jehoshaphat through the cities of Judah, with a book of the Law, to teach the people (2 Chron. xvii, 8). B.C. 910.

4. A priest (Neh. xii, 18), and the representative of the family of Shemaiah (verse 6) when Joiakim was high-priest—that is, in the next generation after the return from Babylon under Zerubbabel and Jeshua. B.C. post 536.

Jeho'ram (Heb. *Yehoram'*, יְהוֹרָם, *Jehovah-exalted*, 1 Kings xxii, 50; 2 Kings i, 17; iii, 1, 6; viii, 16, 25, 29; ix, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24; xii, 18; 2 Chron. xvii, 8; xxi, 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 16; xxii, 1, 5, 6, 7, 11; Septuag. Ἰωράμ, A. V. "Joram" in 2 Kings ix, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23), also in the contracted form JORAM (יוֹרָם, *Yoram'*, 2 Sam. viii, 10; 2 Kings viii, 16, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29; ix, 14, 16, 29; xi, 2; 1 Chron. iii, 11; xxvi, 25; 2 Chron. xxii, 5, 7; Sept. Ἰωράμ, but Ἰεδδουράμ in 2 Sam. viii, 10), the name of five men.

1. Son of Toi, king of Hamath, sent by his father to congratulate David upon his victory over Hadadezer (2 Sam. viii, 10; Heb. and A. V. "Joram"); elsewhere called HADORAM (1 Chron. xviii, 10).

2. A Levite of the family of Gershom, employed with his relatives in special sacred services connected with the Temple treasury (1 Chron. xxvi, 25; Heb. and A. V. "Joram"). B.C. 1014.

3. One of the priests sent by Jehoshaphat to instruct the people in the Law throughout the land (2 Chron. xvii, 8). B.C. 910.

4. (Josephus Ἰώραμος, *Ant.* ix, 2, 2.) The son of Ahab and Jezebel, and successor to his elder brother Ahaziah, who died childless. He was the tenth king on the separate throne of Israel, and reigned 12 years, B.C. 894–883 (2 Kings i, 17; iii, 1). The date of his accession, in the second year of the reign of Jehoram of Judah (2 Kings i, 17), must be computed from a viceroyship of the latter during his father Jehoshaphat's war at Ramoth-gilead (1 Kings xxii, 2 sq.). The reckoning in 2 Kings ix, 29 is according to Jehoram's actual reign; that in 2 Kings viii, 25, according to the years of his reign as beginning proleptically with the Israelitish calendar or regnal point, i. e. the autumn, as those of Judah do in the spring. See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

The Moabites had been tributary to the crown of Israel since the separation of the two kingdoms; but king Mesha deemed the defeat and death of Ahab so heavy a blow to the power of Israel that he might safely assert his independence. He accordingly did so, by withholding his tribute of "100,000 lambs and 100,000 rams, with the wool." The short reign of Ahaziah had afforded no opportunity for any operations against the revolters, but the new king hastened to reduce them again under the yoke they had cast off. The good king of Judah, Jehoshaphat, was too easily induced to take a part in the war. He perhaps feared that the example of Moab, if allowed to be successful, might seduce into a similar course his own tributary, the king of Edom, whom he now summoned to join in this expedition. Accordingly, the three kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom marched through the wilderness of Edom to attack Mesha. The three armies were in the utmost danger of perishing for want of water. The piety of Jehoshaphat suggested an inquiry of some prophet of Jehovah, and Elisha, the son of Shaphat, at that time, and since the latter part of Ahab's reign, Elijah's attendant (2 Kings iii, 11; 1 Kings xix, 19-21), was found with the host. From him Jehoram received a severe rebuke, and was bid to inquire of the prophets of his father and mother—the prophets of Baal. Nevertheless, for Jehoshaphat's sake, Elisha inquired of Jehovah, and received the promise of an abundant supply of water, and of a great victory over the Moabites, a promise which was immediately fulfilled. The same water which, filling the valley, and the trenches dug by the Israelites, supplied the whole army and all their cattle with drink, appeared to the Moabites, who were advancing, like blood when the morning sun shone upon it. Concluding that the allies had fallen out and slain each other, they marched incautiously to the attack, and were put to the rout. The allies pursued them with great slaughter into their own land, which they utterly ravaged and destroyed, with all its cities. Kirharaseth alone remained, and there the king of Moab made his last stand. An attempt to break through the besieging army having failed, he resorted to the desperate expedient of offering up his eldest son, the heir to his throne, as a burnt-offering upon the wall of the city, in the sight of the enemy. Upon this, the Israelites retired and returned to their own land (2 Kings iii). B.C. cir. 890. See MESHA.

It was, perhaps, in consequence of Elisha's rebuke, and of the above remarkable deliverance granted to the allied armies according to his word, that Jehoram, on his return to Samaria, put away the image of Baal which Ahab, his father, had made (2 Kings iii, 2); for in 2 Kings iv we have an evidence of Elisha's being on friendly terms with Jehoram in the offer made by him to speak to the king in favor of the Shunammitess. (He is highly spoken of in the Talmud [*Berachoth*, 10]; but he did not remove the golden calves introduced by Jeroboam.) The impression on the king's mind was probably strengthened by the subsequent incident of Naaman's cure, and the temporary cessation of the inroads of the Syrians, which doubtless resulted from it (2 Kings v). See NAAMAN. Accordingly, when, a little later, war again broke out between Syria and Israel, we find Elisha befriending Jehoram. The king was made acquainted by

the prophet with the secret counsels of the king of Syria, and was thus enabled to defeat them; and, on the other hand, when Elisha had led a large band of Syrian soldiers, whom God had blinded, into the midst of Samaria, Jehoram reverentially asked him, "My father, shall I smite them?" and, at the prophet's bidding, not only forbore to kill them, but made a feast for them, and then sent them home unhurt. This procured another cessation from the Syrian invasions for the Israelites (2 Kings vi, 23). See BEN-HADAD. What happened after this to change the relations between the king and the prophet we can only conjecture. But, putting together the general bad character given of Jehoram (2 Kings iii, 2, 3) with the fact of the prevalence of Baal-worship at the end of his reign (2 Kings x, 21-28), it seems probable that when the Syrian inroads ceased, and he felt less dependent upon the aid of the prophet, he relapsed into idolatry, and was rebuked by Elisha, and threatened with a return of the calamities from which he had escaped. Refusing to repent, a fresh invasion by the Syrians and a close siege of Samaria actually came to pass, according probably to the word of the prophet. Hence, when the terrible incident arose, in consequence of the famine, of a woman boiling and eating her own child, the king immediately attributed the evil to Elisha, the son of Shaphat, and determined to take away his life. The message which he sent by the messenger whom he commissioned to cut off the prophet's head, "Behold, this evil is from Jehovah, why should I wait for Jehovah any longer?" coupled with the fact of his having on sackcloth at the time (2 Kings vi, 30, 33), also indicates that many remonstrances and warnings, similar to those given by Jeremiah to the kings of his day, had passed between the prophet and the weak and unstable son of Ahab. The providential interposition by which both Elisha's life was saved and the city delivered is narrated in 2 Kings vii, and Jehoram appears to have returned to friendly feelings towards Elisha (2 Kings viii, 4). B.C. cir. 888-884. See ELISHA.

It was very soon after the above events that Elisha went to Damascus, and predicted the revolt of Hazael, and his accession to the throne of Syria in the room of Ben-hadad; and it was during Elisha's absence, probably, that the conversation between Jehoram and Gehazi, and the return of the Shunammitess from the land of the Philistines, recorded in 2 Kings viii, took place. Jehoram seems to have thought the revolution in Syria, which immediately followed Elisha's prediction, a good opportunity to pursue his father's favorite project of recovering Ramoth-gilead from the Syrians. He accordingly made an alliance with his nephew, Ahaziah, who had just succeeded Jehoram on the throne of Judah, and the two kings proceeded to strengthen the eastern frontier against the Syrians by fortifying Ramoth-gilead, which had fallen into Jehoram's hands, and which his father had perished in the attempt to recover from the Syrians. This strong fortress thenceforth became the head-quarters of the operations beyond the river. Hazael was scarcely settled on the throne before he took arms and marched against Ramoth, in the environs of which the Israelites sustained a defeat. Jehoram was wounded in the battle, and obliged to return to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds (2 Kings viii, 29; ix, 14, 15), leaving his army in the charge of Jehu, one of his ablest and most active generals, to hold Ramoth-gilead against Hazael. Jehu, however, in this interval was anointed king of Israel by the messenger of Elisha, and immediately he and the army under his command revolted from their allegiance to Jehoram (2 Kings ix), and Jehu, hastily marching to Jezreel, surprised Jehoram, wounded and defenceless as he was. Jehoram, going out to meet him, fell pierced by an arrow from Jehu's bow on the very plat of ground which Ahab had wrested from Naboth the Jezreelite, thus fulfilling to the letter the prophecy of Elijah (1 Kings xxi, 21-29). B.C. 883. See JEHU.

5. (Josephus Ἰώραμος, *Ant.* ix, 5, 1.) The eldest son and successor of Jehoshaphat, and fifth king on the separate throne of Judah, who began to reign (alone) at the age of thirty-six years, and reigned three years, B.C. 887-884. It is indeed said in the general account (2 Chron. xxi, 5, 20; 2 Kings viii, 16) that he began to reign at the age of thirty-two, and that he reigned eight years; but the conclusions deducible from the fact that his reign began in the fifth year of Jehoram, king of Israel (2 Kings viii, 16), show that the reign thus stated dates back three years into the reign of his father, who from this is seen to have associated his eldest son with him in the later years of his reign, as, indeed, is expressly stated in this last cited passage (see Keil's *Com.* on 2 Kings i, 17; Reime, *Harmon. vitæ Josaphat*, Jen. 1713, and *Diss. de num. annor. regni Josaph.*, ib.). This appears to have been on the occasion of Jehoshaphat's absence in the conflict with confederate invaders, the Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites (2 Chron. xx); and must be distinguished from a still earlier copartnership (2 Kings i, 17), apparently during the allied attack upon the Syrians at Ramoth-gilead, in which Ahab lost his life. See JEHOSHAPHAT. Jehoram's daughter Jehosheba was married to the high-priest Jehoiada (q. v.). He had himself unhappily been married to Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, and her influence seems to have neutralized all the good he might have derived from the example of his father. One of the first acts of his reign was to put his six brothers to death and seize the valuable appanages which their father had in his lifetime bestowed upon them. After this we are not surprised to find him giving way to the gross idolatries of that new and strange kind—the Phœnician—which had been brought into Israel by Jezebel, and into Judah by her daughter Athaliah. For these atrocities the Lord let forth his anger against Jehoram and his kingdom. The Edomites revolted, and, according to old prophecies (Gen. xxvii, 40), established their permanent independence. It was as much as Jehoram could do, by a night-attack with all his forces, to extricate himself from their army, which had surrounded him. Next Libnah, the city of the priests (Josh. xxi, 13), one of the strongest fortified cities in Judah (2 Kings xix, 8), and perhaps one of those "fenced cities" (2 Chron. xxi, 3) which Jehoshaphat had given to his other sons, renounced allegiance to Jehoram because he had forsaken Jehovah, the God of his fathers. But this seemed only to stimulate him to enforce the practice of idolatry by persecution. He had early in his reign received a writing from Elijah the prophet admonishing him of the dreadful calamities which he was bringing on himself by his wicked conduct, but even this failed to effect a reformation in Jehoram. See ELIJAH. At length the Philistines on one side, and the Arabians and Cushites on the other, grew bold against a king forsaken of God, and in repeated invasions spoiled the land of all its substance; they even ravaged the royal palaces, and took away the wives and children of the king, leaving him only one son, Ahaziah. Nor was this all: Jehoram was in his last days afflicted with a frightful disease in his bowels, which, from the terms employed in describing it, appears to have been malignant dysentery in its most shocking and tormenting form (see R. Mead, *Bibl. Krankh.* 44; but comp. Bartholin. *Morb. Bibl.* c. 12; G. Detharding, *De morbo reg. Jorami*, Rostock, 1731). See DISEASE. After a disgraceful reign and a most painful death, public opinion inflicted the posthumous dishonor of refusing him a place in the sepulchre of the kings. Jehoram was by far the most impious and cruel tyrant that had as yet occupied the throne of Judah, though he was rivalled or surpassed by some of his successors (2 Kings viii, 16-24; 2 Chron. xxi). His name appears, however, in the royal genealogy of our Saviour (Ἰωράμ, "Joram," Matt. i, 8). See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

Jehoshab'eäth (2 Chron. xxii, 11). See JEHOSHEBA.

Jehosh'aphat (Heb. *Yehoshaphat'*, יְהוֹשָׁפָט, *Je-*

hovah-judged, i. e. vindicated; Sept. Ἰωσαφάτ), sometimes in the contracted form JOSHAPHAT (יוֹשָׁפָט, *Yoshaphat'*, 1 Chron. xi, 43; xv, 24; Ἰωσαφάτ, A. Vers. in the latter passage "Jehoshaphat;" N. T. Ἰωσαφάτ, "Josaphat," Matt. i, 8; Josephus Ἰωσάφατος), the name of six men.

1. A Mithnite, one of David's famous body-guard (1 Chron. xi, 43; Heb. and A. V. "Josaphat"). B.C. 1046.

2. One of the priests appointed to blow the trumpets before the ark on its removal to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xv, 24; Heb. "Josaphat"). B.C. cir. 1043.

3. Son of Ahilud, and royal chronicler (q. v.) under David and Solomon (2 Sam. viii, 16; xx, 24; 1 Kings iv, 3; 1 Chron. xviii, 15). B.C. 1014.

4. Son of Paruah, and Solomon's purveyor (q. v.) in Issachar (1 Kings iv, 17). B.C. cir. 995. See SOLOMON.

5. The fourth separate king of Judah ("Israel" in 2 Chron. xxi, 2, last clause, is either a transcriber's error or a general title), being son of Asa (by Azubah, the daughter of Shilhi), whom he succeeded at the age of thirty-five, and reigned twenty-five years, B.C. 912-887 (1 Kings xxii, 41, 42; 2 Chron. xx, 31). He commenced his reign by fortifying his kingdom against Israel (2 Chron. xvii, 1, 2); and, having thus secured himself against surprise from the quarter which gave most disturbance to him, he proceeded to cleanse the land from the idolatries and idolatrous monuments by which it was still tainted (1 Kings xxii, 43). Even the high-places and groves which former well-disposed kings had suffered to remain were by the zeal of Jehoshaphat in a great measure destroyed (2 Chron. xvii, 6), although not altogether (2 Chron. xx, 33). In the third year of his reign, chiefs, with priests and Levites, proceeded from town to town, with the book of the Law in their hands, instructing the people, and calling back their wandering affections to the religion of their fathers (2 Chron. xvii, 7-9). The results of this fidelity to the principles of the theocracy were, that at home he enjoyed peace and abundance, and abroad security and honor. His treasuries were filled with the "presents" which the blessing of God upon the people, "in their basket and their store," enabled them to bring. His renown extended into the neighboring nations, and the Philistines, as well as the adjoining Arabian tribes, paid him rich tributes in silver and in cattle. He was thus enabled to put all his towns in good condition, to erect fortresses, to organize a powerful army, and to raise his kingdom to a degree of importance and splendor which it had not enjoyed since the revolt of the ten tribes (2 Chron. xvii, 10-19).

The weak and impious Ahab at that time occupied the throne of Israel; and Jehoshaphat, after a time, having nothing to fear from his power, sought, or at least did not repel, an alliance with him. This is alleged to have been the grand mistake of his reign, and that it was such is proved by the consequences. Ahab might be benefited by the connection, but under no circumstances could it be of service to Jehoshaphat or his kingdom, and it might, as it actually did, involve him in much disgrace and disaster, and bring bloodshed and trouble into his house. Jehoshaphat's eldest son Jehoram married Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. It does not appear how far Jehoshaphat encouraged that ill-starred union. The closeness of the alliance between the two kings is shown by many circumstances: Elijah's reluctance when in exile to set foot within the territory of Judah (Blunt, *Und. Coinc.* ii, § 19, p. 199); the identity of names given to the children of the two royal families; the admission of names compounded with the name of Jehovah into the family of Jezebel, the zealous worshipper of Baal; and the alacrity with which Jehoshaphat accompanied Ahab to the field of battle. Accordingly, we next find him on a visit to Ahab in Samaria, being the first time any of the kings of Israel and Judah had met in peace. He here experienced a reception worthy of his greatness; but Ahab failed not to take advantage of the occasion, and so worked upon the weak points of his character as to prevail upon him to take arms with him against the Syrians, with whom, hitherto, the kingdom of Judah never had had any war or occasion of quarrel. However, Jehoshaphat was not so far infatuated as to proceed to the war without consulting God, who, according to the principles of the theocratic government, was the final arbiter of war and peace. The false prophets of Ahab poured forth ample promises of success, and one of them, named Zedekiah, resorting to material symbols, made him horns of iron, saying, "Thus saith the Lord, with these shalt thou smite the Syrians till they be consumed." Still Jehoshaphat was not satisfied; and the answer to his further inquiries extorted from him a rebuke of the reluctance which Ahab manifested to call Micah "the prophet of the Lord." The fearless words of this prophet did not make the impression upon the king of Judah which might have been expected; or, probably, he then felt himself too deeply bound in honor to recede. He went to the fatal battle of Ramoth-gilead, and there nearly became the victim of a plan which Ahab had laid for his own safety at the expense of his too-confiding ally. He persuaded Jehoshaphat to appear as king, while he himself went disguised to the battle. This brought the heat of the contest around him, as the Syrians took him for Ahab; and, if they had not in time discovered their mistake, he would certainly have been slain (1 Kings xxii, 1-33). Ahab was killed, and the battle lost; but Jehoshaphat escaped, and returned to Jerusalem (2 Chron. xviii). B.C. 895. See AHAB.

On his return from this imprudent expedition he was met by the just reproaches of the prophet Jehu (2 Chron. xix, 1-3). The best atonement he could make for this error was by the course he actually took. He resumed his labors in the further extirpation of idolatry, in the instruction of the people, and the improvement of his realm. He now made a tour of his kingdom in person, "from Beersheba to Mount Ephraim," that he might see the ordinances of God duly established, and witness the due execution of his intentions respecting the instruction of the people in the divine law. This tour enabled him to discern many defects in the local administration of justice, which he then applied himself to remedy (see Selden, *De Synedr.* ii, ch. 8, § 4). He appointed magistrates in every city for the determination of causes civil and ecclesiastical; and the nature of the abuses to which the administration of justice was in those days exposed may be gathered from his excellent charge to them: "Take heed what ye do, for ye judge not for man, but for the Lord, who is with you in the judgment. Wherefore now let the fear of the Lord be upon you, take heed and do it; for there is no iniquity with the Lord our God, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts." Then he established a supreme council of justice at Jerusalem, composed of priests, Levites, and "the chiefs of the fathers," to which difficult cases were referred, and appeals brought from the provincial tribunals. This tribunal also was inducted by a weighty but short charge from the king, whose conduct in this and other matters places him at the very head of the monarchs who reigned over Judah as a separate kingdom (2 Chron. xix, 4-11).

The activity of Jehoshaphat's mind was next turned towards the revival of that maritime commerce which had been established by Solomon. The land of Edom and the ports of the Elanitic Gulf were still under the power of Judah, and in them the king prepared a fleet for the voyage to Ophir. Unhappily, however, he yielded to the wish of the king of Israel, and allowed him to take part in the enterprise. For this the expedition was doomed of God, and the vessels were wrecked almost as soon as they quitted port. Instructed by Eliezer, the prophet, as to the cause of this disaster, Jehoshaphat equipped a new fleet, and, having this time declined the co-operation of the king of Israel, the voyage prospered. The trade, however, was not prosecuted

with any zeal, and was soon abandoned (2 Chron. xx, 35-37; 1 Kings xxii, 48, 49). B.C. 895. See COMMERCE.

After the death of Ahaziah, king of Israel, Jehoram, his successor, persuaded Jehoshaphat to join him in an expedition against Moab. B.C. cir. 891. This alliance was, however, on political grounds, more excusable than the two former, as the Moabites, who were under tribute to Israel, might draw into their cause the Edomites, who were tributary to Judah. Besides, Moab could be invaded with most advantage from the south, round by the end of the Dead Sea; and the king of Israel could not gain access to them in that quarter but by marching through the territories of Jehoshaphat. The latter not only joined Jehoram with his own army, but required his tributary, the king of Edom, to bring his forces into the field. During the seven days' march through the wilderness of Edom the army suffered much from want of water, and by the time the allies came in sight of the army of Moab they were ready to perish from thirst. In this emergency, the pious Jehoshaphat thought, as usual, of consulting the Lord, and, hearing that the prophet Elisha was in the camp, the three kings proceeded to his tent. For the sake of Jehoshaphat, and for his sake only, deliverance was promised, and it came during the ensuing night in the shape of an abundant supply of water, which rolled down the exhausted wadys, and filled the pools and hollow grounds. Afterwards Jehoshaphat took his full part in the operations of the campaign till the armies were induced to withdraw in horror by witnessing the dreadful act of Mesha, king of Moab, in offering up his eldest son in sacrifice upon the wall of the town in which he was shut up (2 Kings iii, 4-27). See JEHORAM.

This war kindled another much more dangerous to Jehoshaphat. The Moabites, being highly exasperated at the part he took against them, turned all their wrath upon him. They induced their kindred, the Ammonites, to join them, obtained auxiliaries from the Syrians, and even drew over the Edomites, so that the strength of all the neighboring nations may be said to have been united for this great enterprise. The allied forces entered the land of Judah and encamped at Engedi, near the western border of the Dead Sea. In this extremity Jehoshaphat felt that all his defence lay with God. A solemn fast was held, and the people repaired from the towns to Jerusalem to seek help of the Lord. In the presence of the assembled multitude, the king, in the court of the Temple, offered up a fervent prayer to God, concluding with, "O our God, wilt *thou* not judge them, for *we* have no might against this great company that cometh against us, neither know we what to do; but our eyes are upon thee." He ceased; and in the midst of the silence which ensued, a voice was raised pronouncing deliverance in the name of the Lord, and telling them to go out on the morrow to the cliffs overlooking the camp of the enemy, and see them all overthrown without a blow from them. The voice was that of Jahaziel, one of the Levites. His words came to pass. The allies quarrelled among themselves, and destroyed each other; so that when the Judahites came the next day they found their dreaded enemies all dead, and nothing was left for them but to take the rich spoils of the slain. This done, they returned with triumphal songs to Jerusalem. This great event was recognised even by the neighboring nations as the act of God; and so strong was the impression which it made upon them, that the remainder of Jehoshaphat's reign was passed in quiet (2 Chron. xx). B.C. 890. His death, however, took place not very long after this, at the age of sixty, after having reigned twenty-five years, B.C. 887. He left the kingdom in a prosperous condition to his eldest son Jehoram, whom he had in the last years of his life associated with him in the government. See JEHORAM, 5.

"Jehoshaphat, who sought the Lord with all his heart," was the character given to this king by Jehu, when, on that account, he gave to his grandson an honorable grave (2 Chron. xxii, 9). This, in fact, was the sum and substance of his character. The Hebrew annals offer the example of no king who more carefully squared all his conduct by the principles of the theocracy. He kept the Lord always before his eyes, and was in all things obedient to his will when made known to him by the prophets. Few of the kings of Judah manifested so much zeal for the real welfare of his people, or took measures so judicious to promote it. His good talents, the benevolence of his disposition, and his generally sound judgment, are shown not only in the great measures of domestic policy which distinguished his reign, but by the manner in which they were executed. No trace can be found in him of that pride which dishonored some and ruined others of the kings who preceded and followed him. Most of his errors arose from that dangerous facility of temper which sometimes led him to act against the dictates of his naturally sound judgment, or prevented that judgment from being fairly exercised. The kingdom of Judah was never happier or more prosperous than under his reign; and this, perhaps, is the highest praise that can be given to any king. His name (Ἰωσαφάτ, "Josaphat") occurs in the list of our Saviour's ancestors (Matt. i, 8). See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

6. The son of Nimshi, and father of king Jehu of Israel (2 Kings ix, 2, 14). B.C. ante 883.

JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF (עֵמֶק יְהוֹשָׁפָט, Sept. Κοιλὰς Ἰωσαφάτ, Vulg. *Vallis Josaphat*), a valley mentioned in Scripture by the prophet Joel only, as the spot in which, after the return of Judah and Jerusalem from captivity, Jehovah would gather all the heathen (Joel iii, 2 [iv, 2]), and would there sit to judge them for their misdeeds to Israel (Joel iii, 12 [v, 4]). The nations referred to seem to be those who specially oppressed Israel and aided in their overthrow, particularly the Sidonians, Tyrians, and Phœnicians generally (ver. 4). The passage is one of great boldness, abounding in the verbal turns in which Hebrew poetry so much delights; and, in particular, there is a play between the name given to the spot—Jehoshaphat, i. e. "Jehovah's judgment"—and the "judgment" there to be pronounced. The Hebrew prophets often refer to the ancient glories of their nation: thus Isaiah speaks of the "day of Midian," and of the triumphs of David and of Joshua in "Mount Perazim" and in the "valley of Gibeon," and in like manner Joel, in announcing the vengeance to be taken on the strangers who were annoying his country (iii, 14), seems to have glanced back to that triumphant day when king Jehoshaphat—the greatest king the nation had seen since Solomon, and the greatest champion of Jehovah—led out his people to a valley in the wilderness of Tekoah, and was there blessed with such a victory over the hordes of his enemies as was without a parallel in the national records (2 Chron. xx: see J. E. Gerhardt, *Dissert. v. d. Citation ins Thal Josaphat* [Bayreuth, 1775]). See JOEL.

But, though such a reference to Jehoshaphat is both natural and characteristic, it is not certain that it is intended. The name may be only an imaginary one, conferred on a spot which existed nowhere but in the vision of the prophet. Such was the view of some of the ancient translators. Thus Theodotion renders it χώρα κρίσεως, and so the Targum of Jonathan—"the plain of the division of judgment." Michaelis (*Bibel für Ungelehrte*, Remarks on Joel) takes a similar view, and considers the passage to be a prediction of the Maccabæan victories. By others, however, the prophet has been supposed to have had the end of the world in view (see Henderson, Keil, etc., ad loc.).

The name "Valley of Jehoshaphat" (generally simply *el-Jôs*, more fully wady *Jusafat*, also wady *Shafat* or *Faraun*), in modern times, is attached to the deep ravine which separates Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives, through which at one time the Kedron forced

its stream. At what period the name was first applied to this spot is not known. There is no trace of it in the Bible or in Josephus. In both the only name used for this gorge is KIDRON (N. T. "CEDRON"). We first encounter its new title in the middle of the 4th century, in the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius and Jerome (s. v. Cœlas), and in the commentary of the latter father on Joel. Since that time the name has been recognised and adopted by travellers of all ages and all faiths. It is used by Christians—as Arculf, in 700 (*Early Trav.* p. 4); the author of the *Citez de Jherusalem*, in 1187; and Maundrell, in 1697 (*Early Trav.* p. 469)—and by Jews, as Benjamin of Tudela, about 1170 (Asher i, 71; see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 356). By the Moslems it is still said to be called by the traditional name (Seetzen, ii, 23, 26), though the name usually given to the valley is wady *Sitti-Maryam*. Both Moslems and Jews believe that the last judgment is to take place there. To find a grave there is a frequent wish of the latter (Briggs, *Heathen and Holy Lands*, p. 290), and the former show —as they have shown for certainly two centuries—the place on which Mohammed is to be seated at the last judgment: a stone jutting out from the east wall of the Haram area, near the south corner—one of the pillars which once adorned the churches of Helena or Justinian, and of which multitudes are now imbedded in the rude masonry of the more modern walls of Jerusalem. This pillar is said to be called *et-Tarik*, "the road" (De Saulcy, *Voyage*, ii, 199). From it will spring the bridge of *As-Sirat*, the crossing of which is to test the true believers. Those who cannot stand the test will drop off into the abyss of Gehenna, in the depths of the valley (Ali Bey, p. 224, 5; Mejr ed-Dîn in Robinson's *Research.* i, 269). The steep sides of the ravine, wherever a level strip affords the opportunity, are crowded—in places almost paved—by the sepulchres of the Moslems, or the simpler slabs of the Jewish tombs, alike awaiting the assembly of the last judgment. (For a full description of this valley, see Robinson, *Bibl. Researches*, i, 342, 355, 396-402; ii, 249.)

So narrow and precipitous a glen is quite unsuited to the Biblical event, but this inconsistency does not appear to have disturbed those who framed or those who hold the tradition. It is, however, implied in the Heb. terms employed in the two cases. That by Joel is *émek* (עֵמֶק), a word applied to spacious valleys such as those of Esdraelon or Gibeon (Stanley, *Syria and Palest.*, Appendix, § 1). On the other hand, the ravine of the Kidron is invariably designated by *náchal* (נַחַל), answering to the modern Arabic *wady*. There is no instance in the O. T. of these two terms being convertible, and this fact alone would warrant the inference that the tradition of the identity of the émek of Jehoshaphat and the náchal Kidron did not arise until Hebrew had begun to become a dead language. The grounds on which it did arise were probably these:

1. The frequent mention throughout this passage of Joel of Mount Zion, Jerusalem, and the Temple (ii, 32; iii, 1, 6, 16, 17, 18) may have led to the belief that the locality of the great judgment would be in the immediate neighborhood. This would be assisted by the mention of the Mount of Olives in the somewhat similar passage in Zechariah (xiv, 3, 4).

2. The belief that Christ would reappear in judgment on the Mount of Olives, from which he had ascended. This was at one time a received article of Christian belief, and was grounded on the words of the angels, "He shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven" (Adrichomius, *Theatr. Terræ Sanctæ*, s. v. Jerusalem, § 192; Corn. à Lapide on Acts i). Sir John Maundeville gives a different reason for the same. "Very near this"—the place where Christ wept over Jerusalem—"is the stone on which our Lord sat when he preached; and on that same stone shall he sit on the day of doom, right as he said himself." Bernard the Wise, in the 8th century, speaks of the church of St. Leon, in the valley, "where our Lord will come to judgment" (*Early Travels*, p. 28).

3. There is the alternative that the valley of Jehoshaphat was really an ancient name of the valley of the Kidron, and that, from the name, the connection with Joel's prophecy and the belief in its being the scene of Jehovah's last judgment have followed. This may be so, but then we should expect to find some trace of the existence of the name before the fourth century after Christ. It was certainly used as a burying-place as early as the reign of Josiah (2 Kings xxiii, 6), but no inference can fairly be drawn from this.

But, whatever originated the tradition, it has held its ground most firmly, as is evinced by several local circumstances. (*a*) In the valley itself, one of the four remarkable monuments which exist at the foot of Olivet was at a very early date connected with Jehoshaphat. At Arculf's visit (about 700) the name appears to have been borne by that now called "Absalom's tomb," but then the "tower of Jehoshaphat" (*Early Travels*, p. 4). In the time of Maundrell, the "tomb of Jehoshaphat" was what it still is—an excavation, with an architectural front, in the face of the rock behind "Absalom's tomb." A tolerable view of this is given in plate 33 of Munk's *Palestine;* and a photograph by Salzmann, with a description, in the *Texte* (p. 31) to the same. The name may, as already observed, really point to Jehoshaphat himself, though not to his *tomb*, as he was buried, like the other kings, in the city of David (2 Chron. xxi, 1). See ABSALOM'S TOMB. (*b*) One of the gates of the city in the east wall, opening on the valley, bore the same name. This is plain from the *Citez de Jherusalem*, where the *Porte de Iosafas* is said to have been a "postern" close to the golden gate-way (*Portez Oiris*), and *to the south* of that gate (*pars devers midi*, § 4). It was, therefore, at or near the small walled-up door-way, to which M. de Saulcy has restored the name of the *Pôterne de Josaphat*, and which is but a few feet to the south of the golden gate-way. However this may be, this "postern" is evidently of later date than the wall in which it occurs, as some of the enormous stones of the wall have been cut through to admit it, and in so far, therefore, it is a witness to the date of the tradition being subsequent to the time of Herod, by whom this wall was built. It is probably the "little gate leading down by steps to the valley" of which Arculf speaks. Benjamin of Tudela (1163) also mentions the gate of Jehoshaphat, but without any nearer indication of its position than that it led to the valley and the monuments (Asher, i, 71). (*c*) Lastly, leading to this gate was a street called the street of Jehoshaphat (*Citez de Jherusalem*, § 7).

If the "king's dale" (or valley of Shaveh) of Gen. xiv, 17, and of 2 Sam. xviii, 18, be the same, and if the commonly received location of them be correct, then we have the valley of Jehoshaphat identified with that of Melchizedek, and its history carries us back to Salem's earliest days. But at what time it became a cemetery we are not informed. See SHAVEH.

Cyril, in the 4th century, mentions it in a way which indicates that in his day tradition had altered, or that the valley was supposed to embrace a wider sweep of country than now, for he speaks of it as some furlongs east of Jerusalem—as bare, and fitted for equestrian exercises (Reland, *Palæstina*, p. 355). Some old travellers say that it was "three miles in length, reaching from the vale of Jehinnon to a place without the city which they call the sepulchres of the kings" (*Travels of Two Englishmen* two centuries ago). Some of the old travellers—such as Felix Fabri, in the 15th century—call it *Cele*, from the Koilas of Eusebius and the Cœlas of Jerome; and they call that part of the Kidron which is connected with it *Crinarius* or Krinarius—the place of judgment (*Evag.* i, 371). We may add that these old writers extend this valley considerably upwards, placing Gethsemane and the traditional tomb of the Virgin in it. They seem to have divided the Kidron bed into

two parts: the lower, called the valley of Siloam or Siloe; the upper, the valley of Jehoshaphat, from which the eastern gate of the city in early times was called, not, as now, St. Stephen's, but "the gate of the valley of Jehoshaphat."

The present valley of Jehoshaphat occupies the Kidron hollow and the adjoining acclivities on both sides. Its limits have not been defined, but it is supposed to begin a little above the fountain of the Virgin (Um ed-Deraj), and to extend to the bend of the Kidron, under Scopus. The acclivity to the eastern wall of Jerusalem is—at least towards the top—a Turkish burying-ground; and the white tombs, with the Koran (in stone) at the one end, and a turban at the other, look picturesque as they dot for several hundred yards the upper part of the slope. The other acclivity, ascending the steep between Olivet and the Mount of Corruption, is crowded all over with flat Jewish tombs, each with the Hebrew inscription, and speckled here and there with bushy olive-trees. Thus Moslems and Jews occupy the valley of Jehoshaphat between them, with their dead looking across the Kidron into each others' faces, and laid there in the common belief that it was no ordinary privilege to die in Jerusalem and be buried in such a spot. The valley of the present day presents nothing remarkable. It is rough to the feet and barren to the eye. It is still, moreover, frequently a solitude, with nothing to break the loneliness but perhaps a passing shepherd with a few sheep, or a traveller on his way to Anâta, or some inhabitant of Silwân or Bethany going into the city by the gate of St. Stephen. Tombs, and olives, and rough, verdureless steeps are all that meet the eye on either side. See JERUSALEM.

The Valley of Jehoshaphat from the S.W., with the so-called Tombs of Absalom, Jehoshaphat, and Zechariah; the Jewish Burial-plot in the foreground, and the Mt. of Olives in the background.

Jehosh'eba (Heb. *Yehoshe'ba*, יְהוֹשֶׁבַע, *Jehovah-swearing;* Septuag. Ἰωσαβεέ, Josephus Ἰωσαβέδη), the daughter of Jehoram, sister of Ahaziah, and aunt of Joash, kings of Judah. The last of these owed his life to her, and his crown to her husband, the high-priest Jehoiada (2 Kings xi, 2). In the parallel passage (2 Chron. xxii, 11) the name is written JEHOSHABEATH (יְהוֹשַׁבְעַת, *Yehoshabath';* Sept. Ἰωσαβεθ). B.C. 882. See JEHOASH, 1. Her name thus exactly corresponds in meaning to that of the only two other wives of Jewish priests who are known to us, viz. ELISHEBA, the wife of Aaron (Exod. vi, 23), and ELISABETH, the wife of Zechariah (Luke i, 7). As she is called (2 Kings xi, 2) "the daughter of *Joram*, sister of Ahaziah," it has been conjectured that she was the daughter, not of Athaliah, but of Joram by another wife (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 7, 1, Ὀχοζίᾳ ὁμοπάτριος ἀδελφή). She is the only recorded instance of the marriage of a princess of the royal house with a high-priest. On this occasion it was a providential circumstance—"for she was the sister of Ahaziah" (2 Chron. xxii, 11)—as inducing and probably enabling her to rescue the infant Jehoash from the massacre of his brothers. By her he and his nurse were concealed in the palace, and afterwards in the Temple (2 Kings xi, 2, 3; 2 Chron. xxii, 11), where he was brought up probably with her sons (2 Chron. xxiii, 11), who assisted at his coronation. One of these was Zechariah, who succeeded her husband in his office, and was afterwards murdered (2 Chron. xxiv, 20).—Smith. Needless doubt has been thrown upon her marriage with Jehoiada (Newman, *Heb. Monarch.* p. 195), which is not expressly mentioned in Kings, as "a fiction of the chronicler to glorify his greatness." This, however, is certainly assumed in 2 Kings xi, 3, and is accepted by Ewald (*Geschichte*, iii, 575) as perfectly authentic. See JEHOIADA.

Jehosh'uä (Numb. xiii, 16), or **Jehosh'uah** (1 Chron. vii, 27). See JOSHUA.

Jeho'vah (יְהוָֹה, *Yehovah'*, Sept. usually ὁ Κύριος, Auth. Vers. usually "the LORD"), the name by which God was pleased to make himself known, under the covenant, to the ancient Hebrews (Exod. vi, 2, 3), although it was doubtless in use among the patriarchs, as it occurs even in the history of the creation (Gen. ii, 4). The theory of Schwind (*Semitische Denkm.* 1792), that the record is of later origin than the Mosaic age, is based upon the false assumption that the Hehrews had previously been polytheistic. See GENESIS; GOD.

I. *Modern Pronunciation of the Name.*—Although ever since the time of Galatinus, a writer of the 16th century (*De arcanis catholicæ veritatis*, lib. 3)—not, as according to others, since Raymund Martin (see Gusset. *Lex.* p. 383)—it has been the almost universal custom to pronounce the name יְהוָֹה (in those copies where it is furnished with vowels), *Jehovah*, yet, at the present day, most scholars agree that this pointing is not the original and genuine one, but that these vowels are derived from those of אֲדֹנָי, *Adonai.* For the later Hebrews, even before the time of the Sept. version, either following some old superstition (compare Herod. ii, 86; Cicero, *De nat. deor.* iii, 56) or deceived by a false interpretation of a certain Mosaic precept (Lev. xxiv, 16), have always regarded this name as too sacred even to be pronounced (Philo, *De vit. Mosis*, iii, 519, 529, ed. Colon.; Joseph. *Ant.* ii, 12, 4; Talmud, *Sanhed.* ii, 90, a; Maimonides in *Jad. Chasaka*, xiv, 10; also in *More Nebochim*, i, 61; Theodoret, *Quæst.* 13 in Exod.; Eusebius, *Præp. Evangel.* ii, 305). Wherever, therefore, this ineffable name is read in the sacred books, they pronounced אֲדֹנָי, "*Adonay*," *Lord*, in its stead; and hence, when the Masoretic text came to be supplied with the vowels, the four letters יהוה were pointed with the vowels of this word, the initial י taking, as usual, a simple instead of a compound Sheva. This derivation of the vowels is evident from the peculiar pointing after the prefixes, and from the use of the Dagesh after it, in both which particulars it exactly imitates the peculiarities of אֲדֹנָי, and likewise from the varied pointing when following אֲדֹנָי, in which case it is written יֱהוִֹה and pronounced אֱלֹהִים, "*Elohim*," *God*, the vowels of which it then borrows, to prevent the repetition of the sound *Adonay.* That a similar law or notion prevailed even before the Christian æra may be inferred from the fact that the Septuag. renders יְהוָֹה by ὁ Κύριος, like אֲדֹנָי;

and even the Samaritans observed the same custom, for they used to pronounce יהוה by the word שִׁימָא, *Shima*, i. e. THE NAME (Reland, *De Samaritanis*, p. 12; Huntington, *Letters*, p. 33). (See, on this subject generally, Hadr. Reland, *Decas exercitationum philol. de vera pron. nominis Jehova* [Traj. ad Rhen. 1707]).

II. *True Pointing of the Word.*—Maimonides (*More Nebochim*, i, 62) gives an obscure account of the traditional and secret method of teaching its true pronunciation to the priests, but avers that it was unknown from its form. Many adduce the statements of Greek writers, as well profane as Church fathers, that the deity of the Hebrews was called *Jao*, ΙΑΩ (a few Ιευω, Ιαου), Theodoret alone adding that the Samaritan pronunciation was ΙΑΒΕ (Diod. Sic. i, 94; Porphyry in Eusebius, *Præp. Ev.* x, 11; Tzetzes, *Chiliad.* vii, 126; Hesychius often; Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v, p. 666, Oxon.; Origen, *in Dan.* vol. ii, p. 45; Irenæus, *Hæres.* ii, 66; Jerome, *in Psa. viii;* Theodoret, *Quæst.* 15 in Exod.; Epiphanius, *Hær.* xx). The Gnostics classed Ιαω, as the Hebrew divinity, among their sacred emanations (Irenæus, i, 34; Epiph. *Hær.* 26), along with several of his appellations (see Mather, *Histoire du Gnosticisme*, tab. 8-10; Bellermann, *Ueber die Gemmen der Alten mit dem Abraxasbilde*, fasc. i, ii, Berlin, 1817, 1818); and that famous oracle of Apollo, quoted by Macrobius (*Sat.* i, 18), ascribing this name (Ἰαώ) to the sun, appears to have been of Gnostic origin (Jablonski, *Panth. Ægypt.* i, 250 sq.).

Hence many recent writers have followed the opinion of those who think that the word in question was originally pronounced יַהְוֹה, *Yahvoh'*, corresponding to the Greek Ἰαώ. But this view, as well as that which maintains the correctness of the common pointing יְהֹוָה (Michaelis, *Supplem.* p. 524; Meyer, *Blätter für höhere Wahrheit*, xi, p. 306), is opposed to the fact that verbs of the class (ל״ה) from which this word appears to be derived do not admit such a pointing (Cholem) with their second radical. Moreover, the simple letters יהוה would naturally be pronounced *Jao* by a Greek without any special pointing. Those, therefore, appear to have the best reason who prefer the pointing יַהְוֶה, *Yahveh'* (not יַהֲוֶה, *Yahaveh'*, for the first ה being a *mappik-he* [as seen in the form יָהּ, kindred *sum, esse*] does not take the compound Sheva), as being at once agreeable to the laws of Hebrew vocalization, and a form from which all the Greek modes of writing (including the Samaritan, as cited by Theodoret) may naturally have sprung (י = ι, ו = ο as a "mater lectionis," and ה being silent; thus leaving α as the representative of the first vowel). From this, too, the apocapated forms יָהוּ and יָהּ may most readily be derived; and it is further corroborated by the etymology. Ewald was the first who used in *all* his writings, especially in his translations from the O.-T. Scriptures, the form *Jahve*, although in his youth he had taken ground in favor of *Jehovah* (comp. his *Ueber d. Composition der Genesis*, Brunswick, 1823). Another defender of *Jahveh* was Hengstenberg (*Beiträge zur Einleit. ins A. T.* Berlin, 1831-39, vol. ii). Strongest in defence of *Jehovah* is, among prominent German theologians, Hölemann, *Bibelstudien* (Leipzig, 1859-60), vol. i.

III. *Proper Signification of the Term.*—A clew to the real import of this name appears to be designedly furnished in the passage where it is most distinctively ascribed to the God of the Hebrews, Exod. iii, 14: "And God said to Moses, *I shall be what I shall be* (אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה); and he said, Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, *The* I SHALL BE *has sent me to you*" (where the Sept. and later versions attempt to render the spirit of the Hebrew אֶהְיֶה by ὁ ὤν, the Venetian Greek barbarously ἡ ὀντώτης, Vulg. *qui sum*, A. Vers. "I am"). Here the Almighty makes known his unchangeable character, implied in his eternal self-existence, as the ground of confidence for the oppressed Israelites to trust in his promises of deliverance and care respecting them. The same idea is elsewhere alluded to in the Old Test., e. g. Mal. iii, 6, "I am Jehovah; I change not;" Hos. xii, 6, "Jehovah is his memento." The same attribute is referred to in the description of the divine Redeemer in the Apocalypse (Rev. i, 4, 8, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, a phrase used indeclinably, with designed identification with Jehovah, see Stuart, *Commentary*, ad loc.), with which has been aptly compared the famous inscription on the Saitic temple of Isis (Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὂν καὶ ἐσόμενον, Plutarch, *De Isid. et Osir.* 9), and various parallel titles of heathen mythology, especially among Eastern nations. Those, however, who compare the Greek and Roman deities, *Jupiter*, *Jove*, Διός, etc., or who seek an Egyptian origin for the name, are entirely in error (see Tholuck's treatise transl. in the *Bib. Repos.* 1834, p. 89 sq.; Hengstenberg, *Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, i, 213; for other Shemitic etymologies, see Fürst, s. v.). Nor are those (as A. M'Whorter, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1857, who appears to have borrowed his idea from the *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1854, p. 393 sq.; see Tyler, *Jehovah the Redeemer*, Lond. 1861) entirely correct (see Fürst's *Heb. Wörterb.* s. v.) who regard יַהְוֶה as = יַחֲוֶה, and this as the actual fut. Kal of the verb הָוָה = הָיָה, and so render it directly *he shall be*, i. e. *He that shall be;* since this form, if a verb at all, would be in the Hiphil (see Koppe *ad Exod.* loc., in Pottii *Syll.* iv, p. 59; Bohlen, *ad Gen.* p. 103; Vatke, *Theolog. Bibl.* p. 671) and would signify *he that shall cause to be*, i. e. the Creator; for the real fut. Kal is יִהְיֶה, *Yihyeh'*, as frequently occurs. It is rather a denominative, i. e. noun or adj., formed by the prepositive י prefixed to the verb-root, and pointed like יַבְנֶה and other nouns of similar formation (Nordheimer's *Hebr. Gram.* § 512; Lee's *Hebr. Gram.* § 159). The word will thus signify the *Existent*, and designate one of the most important attributes of Deity, one that appears to include all other essential ideas.

IV. *Application of the Title.*—The supreme Deity and national God of the Hebrews is called in the O. T. by his own name *Jehovah*, and by the appellative ELOHIM, i. e. *God*, either promiscuously, or so that one or the other predominates according to the nature of the context or the custom of the writer. *Jehovah Elohim*, commonly rendered the "Lord God," is used by apposition, and not, as some would have it, *Jehovah of gods*, i. e. chief or prince of gods. This is the customary appellation of Jehovah in Gen. ii and iii; Exod. ix, 30, etc. Far more frequent is the compounded form when followed by a genitive, as "Jehovah God of Israel" (Josh. vii, 13; viii, 30); "Jehovah God of thy fathers" (Deut. i, 21; vi, 3); "Jehovah God, thy God" (Deut. i, 31; ii, 7); "Jehovah of hosts," i. e. of the celestial armies. See HOST.

It will be evident to the attentive reader that the term *Lord*, so frequently applied to Christ in the N. T., is generally synonymous with *Jehovah* in the Old Test. As Christ is called "The Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty;" and also, "of him it is said, Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever;" he must be *Jehovah*, the eternally existing and supreme God (Psa. cii, 25-27; Heb. i, 10-12; xiii, 8; Rev. i, 4, 8). See LOGOS. JAH (יָהּ, *Yah*, Sept. Κύριος, Auth. Vers. "Lord," except in Psa. lxviii, 4) is a poetic form abbreviated from *Jehovah*, or perhaps from the more ancient pronunciation *Jahveh*. It is chiefly employed in certain customary formulas or refrains (as a proper title in Psa. lxxxix, 9; xciv, 7, 12; Isa. xxxviii, 11; Exod. xv, 2; Psa. cxviii, 4; Isa. xii, 2; Psa. lxviii, 5; Isa. xxvi, 4). This, as well as a modification of JEHOVAH, frequently occurs in proper names. See HALLELUJAH.

It should be remembered that the Hebrew name *Jehovah* is generally rendered, in the English version, by the word LORD (sometimes GOD), and printed in small capitals, to distinguish it from the rendering of אֲדֹנָי and Κύριος by the same word; it is rendered "Jehovah" only in Exod. vi, 3; Psa. lxxxiii, 18; Isa. xii, 2; xxvi, 4, and in the compound proper names following.

VI. *Literature.*—For a full discussion of the questions connected with this sacred name, see, in addition to the above-cited works, Gataker, *De nom. Dei tetragram.*, in his *Opp. Crit.* (Traj. ad Rhen. 1698); Meier, *Lectio nom. tetragram. exam.* (Viterbo, 1725); Capellus, *Or. de nom. Jehova*, in his *Critica Sac.* p. 690; Crusius, *Comment. de nominis tetragram. signif.* (Lips. 1758); Malani, *De Dei nom. juxta Heb. comment. crit.* (Luccæ, 1767); Koppe, *Interpretat. formulæ*, etc. (Göttingen, 1783), and in Pott's *Sylloge*, iv, 50–66; Eichhorn, *Biblioth.* v, 556–560; Wahl, *D. Namen Gottes Jehova*, excurs. i to his *Habbakuk;* J. D. Michaelis, *De Jehova ab Ægyptiis culto*, etc., in his *Zerst. kl. Schrift.* (Jena, 1795); Brendel, *War Jehova bei den Heb. bloss ein Nationalgott?* (Landsb. 1821) [see *Theol. Annal.* for 1822, p. 384]; R. Abr. ben-Ezra, *Sepher Hasshem, mit Comm.* by Lippmann (Fulda, 1834); Landauer, *Jehova u. Elohim* (Stuttg. 1836); Gambier, *Titles of Jehovah* (London, 1853); De Burgos, *De nomine tetragrammato* (Frankf. 1604; Amsterd. 1634); Fischer, *id.* (Tüb. 1717); Jahn, *De* יהוה (Wittenb. 1755); Rafael ben-David, תַּצְלוּמוֹת (Venice, 1662); Reineccius, *De* יהוה (Leipz. 1695–6); Snoilshik, *id.* (Wittenb. 1621); Stephani, *id.* (Leips. 1677); Sylburg, *De Jehova* (Strasburg, 1643); Volkmar, *De nominibus divinis* (Wittenb. 1679); Köchler, *De pronunciatione et vi* יהוה (Erlangen, 1867); Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant*, i, 18 sq.; ii, 98, 215. See ELOHIM.

Jeho'vah-ji'reh (Hebrew *Yehovah' Yireh'*, יְהוָֹה יִרְאֶה, *Jehovah will see*, i. e. provide; Sept. Κύριος εἶδεν, Vulg. *Dominus videt*), the symbolical epithet given by Abraham to the scene of his offering of the ram providentially supplied in place of his son (Gen. xxii, 14), evidently with allusion to his own reply to Isaac's inquiry (verse 8). See MORIAH.

Jeho'vah-nis'si (Hebrew *Yehovah' Nissi'*, יְהוָֹה נִסִּי, *Jehovah is my banner;* Septuag. Κύριος καταφυγή μου, Vulg. *Dominus exaltatio mea*), the symbolical title bestowed by Moses upon the altar which he erected on the hill where his uplifted hands in prayer had caused Israel to prevail, stated in the text to have been intended as a memento of God's purpose to exterminate the Amalekites (Exod. xvii, 15). See REPHIDIM. The phraseology in the original is peculiar: "For [the] hand [is] on [the] throne (כֵּס, ? read נֵס, banner) of Jah," which the A. V. glosses, "Because the Lord hath sworn," q. d. lifted up his hand. See OATH; HAND. "The significance of the name is probably contained in the allusion to the staff which Moses held in his hand as a banner during the engagement, and the raising or lowering of which turned the fortune of battle in favor of the Israelites or their enemies. God is thus recognised in the memorial-altar as the deliverer of his people, who leads them to victory, and is their rallying-point in time of peril. On the figurative use of 'banner,' see Psa. lx, 4; Isa. xi, 10" See BANNER.

Jeho'vah-sha'lom (Hebrew *Yehovah' Shalom'*, יְהוָֹה שָׁלוֹם, *Jehovah* gives *peace*, i. e. prosperity; Sept. Εἰρήνη κυρίου, Vulgate *Domini pax*), the appellation given by Gideon to an altar erected by him on the spot where the divine angel appeared to him and wrought the miracles which confirmed his mission; in commemoration of the success thus betokened to him ("Peace be unto thee"); stated to have been extant at a late day in Ophrah (Judg. vi, 24). (See *Critici Sacri*, ii, 949; Balthasar, *De Altari Gideonis*, Gryph. 1746.) See GIDEON.

Jeho'vah-sham'mah (Heb. *Yehovah' Sham'mah*, יְהוָֹה שָׁמָּה, *Jehovah is there;* Sept. Κύριος ἐκεῖ, Vulg. *Dominus ibidem*, Auth. Vers. "The Lord is there"), the symbolical title conferred by Ezekiel upon the spiritual representation of Jerusalam seen by him in his vision (Ezek. xlviii, 35); under a figure evidently of like import with the description of the new Jerusalem in the Apocalypse (Rev. xxi, 3; xxii, 3). In the Old-Test. prophecy it appears to have been a type of the Gospel Church (comp. IMMANUEL), probably through a primary reference to the restoration of the Jewish metropolis after the Exile, and perhaps of the recovery of the Jews to Christianity, whereas the N.-T. seer carries forward the symbol to the heavenly abode of the saints (comp. Jer. xxxiii, 16).

Jeho'vah-tsid'kenu (Heb. *Yehovah' Tsidke'nu*, יְהוָֹה צִדְקֵנוּ, *Jehovah* is *our righteousness*, i. e. deliverer, see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 1151, b; Sept. Κύριος δικαιοσύνη ἡμῶν, but κύριος· Ἰωσεδὲκ in Jer. xxiii, 6; Vulg. *Dominus justus noster;* Auth. Vers. "The Lord our righteousness"), an epithet applied by the prophet to the Messiah (Jer. xxiii, 6), and likewise to Jerusalem (Jer. xxiii, 16), as symbolical of the spiritual prosperity of God's people in the Christian dispensation. (See Clarke's *Comment.* on the passages.) By some, the epithet in the former passage, at least, is regarded as ascribing to the Messiah the name Jehovah, and asserting that he is or brings righteousness to man (Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, i, 271, 4th ed.; Henderson's note on the passage; Alexander's *Connection and Harmony of the O. and N. T.* p. 287, 2d ed.); while others think that the appellation here given to the Messiah is, like that given by Moses to the altar he erected, and which he called Jehovah-nissi, simply a concise utterance of the faith of Israel, that by means of the Messiah God will cause righteousness to flourish (Hengstenberg's *Christology*, ii, 417). The strongest argument in favor of the latter is derived from Jer. xxxiii, 16, where the same name is given to the city of Jerusalem, and where it can only receive such an explanation.

Jehoz'abad (Heb. *Yehozabad'*, יְהוֹזָבָד, *Jehovah-given;* Sept. Ἰωζαβάδ, but Ἰωζαβέδ in 2 Chron. xxiv, 26), the name of three men. See also JOZABAD.

1. The second son of Obed-edom (q. v.), the Levitical gate-keeper of the Temple (1 Chron. xxvi, 4). B.C. 1014.

2. The last-named of Jehoshaphat's generals (Josephus Ὀχόβατος, *Ant.* viii, 15, 2) in command of (?) 180,000 troops (2 Chron. xvii, 18). B.C. cir. 910.

3. Son of Shomer (or Shimrith, a Moabitess), one of the two servants who assassinated king Jehoash of Judah in that part of the city of Jerusalem called Millo (2 Kings xii, 21; 2 Chron. xxiv, 26). B.C. 837.

Jehoz'adak (Heb. *Yehotsadak'*, יְהוֹצָדָק, *Jehovah-justified;* Sept. Ἰωσεδέκ; Auth. Vers. "Josedech" in Hag. and Zech.), also in the contracted form JOZADAK (יוֹצָדָק, *Yotsadak'*, in Ezra and Neh.; Sept. Ἰωσεδέκ), the son of the high-priest Seraiah at the time of the Babylonian captivity (1 Chron. vi, 14, 15). Although he succeeded to the high-priesthood after the slaughter of his father at Riblah (2 Kings xxv, 18–21), he had no opportunity of performing the functions of his office (Selden, *De success. in Pont.* in *Opp.* ii, 104). He was carried into captivity by Neduchadnezzar (1 Chron. vi, 15), and evidently died in exile, as, on the return from the captivity, his son Joshua was the first high-priest who officiated (Hag. i, 1, 12, 14; ii, 2, 4; Zech. vi, 11; Ezra iii, 2, 8; v, 2; x, 18; Neh. xii, 26). B.C. 588. See HIGH-PRIEST.

Je'hu (Heb. *Yehu'*, יֵהוּא, according to Gesenius for יְהֵוהוּא, i. q. יְהוֹהוּא, *Jehovah* is *He;* but according to Fürst from חָיָא=חָיָה, to *live*, q. d. the *living;* Sept. Ἰού, Ἰηού, but Ἰούδα in Hos. i, 4), the name of five men.

1. Son of Obed and father of Azariah, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 38). B.C. post. 1612.

2. An Antothite, one of the Benjamite slingers that joined David's band at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 3). B.C. 1055.

3. The son of Hanani, a prophet (Josephus Ἰηοῦς, *Ant.* viii, 12, 3) of Judah, but whose ministrations were chiefly directed to Israel. His father was probably the seer who suffered for having rebuked Asa (2 Chron. xvi, 7). He must have begun his career as a prophet when very young. He first denounced upon Baasha, king of Israel, and his house the same awful doom which had been already executed upon the house of Jeroboam (1 Kings xvi, 1, 7); a sentence which was literally fulfilled (ver. 12). The same prophet was, many years after, commissioned to reprove Jehoshaphat for his dangerous connection with the house of Ahab (2 Chron. xix, 2). He appears to have been the public chronicler during the entire reign of Jehoshaphat, and a volume of his records is expressly referred to (2 Chron. xx, 34). B.C. 928-886.

4. The eleventh king of the separate throne of Israel (Josephus Ἰηοῦς, *Ant.* viii, 13, 7), and founder of its fourth dynasty; he reigned twenty-eight years, B.C. 883-855 (2 Kings ix, x; 2 Chron. xxii, 7-9). His history was told in the lost "Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" (2 Kings x, 34). His father's name was Jehoshaphat (2 Kings ix, 2); his grandfather's (which, as being better known, was sometimes affixed to his own—2 Kings ix) was Nimshi. In his youth he had been one of the guards of Ahab. His first appearance in history is when, with a comrade in arms, Bidkar, or Bar-Dakar (Ephraem Syrus, *Opp.* iv, 540), he rode (either in a separate chariot, Sept., or on the same seat, Josephus) behind Ahab on the fatal journey from Samaria to Jezreel, and heard, and laid up in his heart, the warning of Elijah against the murderer of Naboth (2 Kings ix, 25). But he had already, as it would seem, been known to Elijah as a youth of promise, and, accordingly, in the vision at Horeb he is mentioned as the future king of Israel, whom Elijah is to anoint as the minister of vengeance on Israel (1 Kings xix, 16, 17). This injunction, for reasons unknown to us, Elijah never fulfilled. It was reserved long afterwards for his successor Elisha. See AHAB.

Jehu meantime, in the reigns of Ahaziah and Jehoram, had risen to importance. The same activity and vehemence which had fitted him for his earlier distinctions still continued, and he was known far and wide as a charioteer whose rapid driving, as if of a madman (2 Kings ix, 21), could be distinguished even from a distance. Accordingly, in the reign of Jehoram, Jehu held a command in the Israelitish army posted at Ramoth-gilead to hold in check the Syrians, who of late years had made strenuous efforts to extend their frontier to the Jordan, and had possessed themselves of much of the territory of the Israelites east of that river. The contest was, in fact, still carried on which had begun many years before in the reign of Ahab, Jehoram's father, who had lost his life in battle before this very Ramoth-gilead. Ahaziah, king of Judah, had taken part with Jehoram, king of Israel, in this war; and as the latter had been severely wounded in a recent action, and had gone to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds, Ahaziah had also gone thither on a visit of sympathy to him (2 Kings viii, 28, 29). B.C. 883. According to Ephraem Syrus (who omits the words "saith the Lord" in 2 Kings ix, 26, and makes "I" refer to Jehu), he had, in a dream the night before, seen the blood of Naboth and his sons (Ephr. Syr. *Opp.* iv, 540). In this state of affairs, a council of war was held among the military commanders in camp, when, very unexpectedly, a youth of wild appearance (2 Kings ix, 11), known by his garb to be one of the disciples of the prophets, appeared at the door of the tent, and called forth Jehu, declaring that he had a message to deliver to him (2 Kings ix, 1-5). They retired into a secret chamber. The youth uncovered a vial of the sacred oil (Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 6, 1) which he had brought with him, poured it over Jehu's head, and after announcing to him the message from Elisha, that he was appointed to be king of Israel and destroyer of the house of Ahab, rushed out of the house and disappeared (2 Kings ix, 7, 8). Surprising as this message must have been, and awful the duty which it imposed, Jehu was fully equal to the task and the occasion. He returned to the council, probably with an altered air, for he was asked what had been the communication of the young prophet to him. He tried at first to evade their questions, but then revealed the situation in which he had found himself placed by the prophetic call. In a moment the enthusiasm of the army took fire. They threw their garments—the large square *beged*, similar to a wrapper or plaid—under his feet, so as to form a rough carpet of state, placed him on the top of the stairs (q. v.), as on an extempore throne, blew the royal salute on their trumpets, and thus ordained him king (2 Kings ix, 11-14). Jehu was not a man to lose any advantage through remissness. He immediately cut off all communication between Ramoth-gilead and Jezreel, and then set off at full speed with his ancient comrade Bidkar, whom he made captain of the host in his place, and a band of horsemen. From the tower of Jezreel a watchman saw the cloud of dust raised by the advancing party, and announced his coming (2 Kings ix, 17). The messengers that were sent out to him he detained, on the same principle of secrecy which had guided all his movements. It was not till he had almost reached the city, and was identified by the watchman, that apprehension was felt. But even then it seems as if the two kings in Jezreel anticipated news from the Syrian war rather than a revolution at home. Jehoram went forth himself to meet him, and was accompanied by the king of Judah. They met in the field of Naboth, so fatal to the house of Ahab. The king saluted him with the question, "Is it peace, Jehu?" and received the answer, "What peace, so long as the whoredoms (idolatries) of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many?" This completely opened the eyes of Jehoram, who exclaimed to the king of Judah, "There is treachery, O Ahaziah!" and turned to flee. But Jehu felt no infirmity of purpose, and knew that the slightest wavering might be fatal to him. He therefore seized his opportunity, and taking full aim at Jehoram, with the bow which, as captain of the host, was always with him, shot him through the heart (2 Kings ix, 24). Jehu caused the body to be thrown back into the field of Naboth, out of which he had passed in his attempt at flight, and grimly remarked to Bidkar, his captain, "Remember how that, when I and thou rode together after Ahab his father, the Lord laid *this* burden upon him." The king of Judah endeavored to escape, but Jehu's soldiers pursued and inflicted upon him at Beth-gan (A. V. "the garden-house"), probably Engannim, a wound of which he afterwards died at Megiddo. See AHAZIAH. Jehu himself entered the city, whither the news of this transaction had already preceded him. As he passed under the walls of the palace, Jezebel herself, studiously arrayed for effect, appeared at one of the windows, and saluted him with a question such as might have shaken a man of weaker nerves, "Had Zimri peace, who slew his master?" But Jehu was unmoved, and, instead of answering her, called out, "Who is on my side—who?" when several eunuchs made their appearance at the window, to whom he cried, "Throw her down!" and immediately this proud and guilty woman lay a blood-stained corpse in the road, and was trodden under foot by the horses. See JEZEBEL. Jehu then went in and took possession of the palace (2 Kings ix, 16-37). He was now master of Jezreel, which was, next to Samaria, the chief town of the kingdom; but he could not feel secure while the capital itself was in the hands of the royal family, and of those who might be supposed to feel strong attachment to the house of Ahab. The force of the blow

which he had struck was, however, felt even in Samaria. When, therefore, he wrote to the persons in authority there the somewhat ironical but designedly intimidating counsel, to set up one of the young princes in Samaria as king and fight out the matter which lay between them, they sent a very submissive answer, giving in their adhesion, and professing their readiness to obey in all things his commands. A second letter from Jehu tested this profession in a truly horrid and exceedingly Oriental manner, requiring them to appear before him on the morrow, bringing with them the heads of all the royal princes in Samaria. A fallen house meets with little pity in the East; and when the new king left his palace the next morning, he found seventy human heads piled up in two heaps at his gate. There, in the sight of these heaps, Jehu took occasion to explain his conduct, declaring that he must be regarded as the appointed minister of the divine decrees, pronounced long since against the house of Ahab by the prophets, not one of whose words should fall to the ground. He then continued his proscriptions by exterminating in Jezreel not only all in whose veins the blood of the condemned race flowed, but also—by a considerable stretch of his commission—those officers, ministers, and creatures of the late government who, if suffered to live, would most likely be disturbers of his own reign. He next proceeded to Samaria. So rapid had been these proceedings, that on his way, at "the shearing-house" (or Betheked), he encountered forty-two sons or nephews (2 Chron. xx, 8) of the late king of Judah, and therefore connected by marriage with Ahab, on a visit of compliment to their relatives, of whose fall, seemingly, they had not heard. These also were put to the sword at the fatal well, as, in the later history, of Mizpah, and, in our own days, of Cawnpore (2 Kings x, 14). (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.) As he drove on he encountered a strange figure, such as might have reminded him of the great Elijah. It was Jehonadab, the austere Arab sectary, the son of Rechab. In him his keen eye discovered a ready ally. The austere virtue and respected character of the Rechabite would, as he felt, go far to hallow his proceedings in the eyes of the multitude. He took him into his chariot, and they concocted their schemes as they entered Samaria (2 Kings x, 15, 16). See JEHONADAB. In that capital Jehu continued the extirpation of the persons more intimately connected with the late government. This, far from being in any way singular, is a common circumstance in Eastern revolutions. But the great stroke was yet to come; and it was conceived and executed with that union of intrepid daring and profound secrecy which marks the whole career of Jehu. His main object was to exterminate the ministers and more devoted adherents of Baal, who had been so much encouraged by Jezebel. There was even a temple to this idol in Samaria; and Jehu, never scrupulous about the means of reaching objects which he believed to be good, laid a snare by which he hoped to cut off the main body of Baal's ministers at one blow. He professed to be a more zealous servant of Baal than Ahab had been, and proclaimed a great festival in his honor, at which none but his true servants were to be present. The prophets, priests, and officers of Baal assembled from all parts for this great sacrifice, and sacerdotal vestments were given to them, that none of Jehovah's worshippers might be taken for them. Soldiers were posted so that none might escape. The vast temple at Samaria raised by Ahab (1 Kings xvi, 32; Josephus, *Ant.* x, 7, 6) was crowded from end to end. The chief sacrifice was offered, as if in the excess of his zeal, by Jehu himself. Jehonadab joined in the deception. There was some apprehension lest worshippers of Jehovah might be found in the temple; such, it seems, had been the intermixture of the two religions. As soon, however, as it was ascertained that all, and none but the idolaters were there, the signal was given to eighty trusted guards, and a sweeping massacre removed at one blow the whole heathen population of the kingdom of Israel. The innermost sanctuary of the temple (translated in the A. V. "the city of the house of Baal") was stormed, the great stone statue of Baal was demolished, the wooden figures of the inferior divinities sitting round him were torn from their places and burnt (Ewald, *Gesch.* iii, 526), and the site of the sanctuary itself became the public resort of the inhabitants of the city for the basest uses (2 Kings x).

Notwithstanding this zeal of Jehu in exterminating the grosser idolatries which had grown up under his immediate predecessors, he was not prepared to subvert the policy which had led Jeroboam and his successors to maintain the schismatic establishment of the golden calves in Dan and Beth-el. See JEROBOAM. This was, however, a crime in him—the worship rendered to the golden calves being plainly contrary to the law; and he should have felt that he who had appointed him to the throne would have maintained him in it, notwithstanding the apparent dangers which might seem likely to ensue from permitting his subjects to repair at the great festivals to the metropolis of the rival kingdom, which was the centre of the theocratical worship and of sacerdotal service. Here Jehu fell short: and this very policy, apparently so prudent and far-sighted, by which he hoped to secure the stability and independence of his kingdom, was that on account of which the term of rule granted to his dynasty was shortened. For this it was foretold that his dynasty should extend only to four generations; and for this the divine aid was withheld from him in his wars with the Syrians under Hazael on the eastern frontier. Hence the war was disastrous to him, and the Syrians were able to maintain themselves in the possession of a great part of his territories beyond the Jordan (2 Kings x, 29-33). He died in quiet, and was buried in Samaria, leaving the throne to his son Jehoahaz (2 Kings x, 34-36). B.C. 855. His name is thought to be the first of the Israelitish kings which appears in the Assyrian monuments. It seems to be found on the black obelisk discovered at Nimrûd (Layard, *Nineveh*, i, 396), and now in the British Museum, among the names of kings who are bringing tribute (in this case gold and silver, and articles manufactured in gold) to Shalmaneser I. His name is given as "Jehu" (or "Yahua"), "the son of Khumri" (Omri). This substitution of the name of Omri for that of his own father may be accounted for either by the importance which Omri had assumed as the second founder of the northern kingdom, or by the name of "Beth-Khumri," only given to Samaria in these monuments as "the House or Capital of Omri" (Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 643; Rawlinson's *Herodot.* i, 465; *Meth. Rev.* 1888, p. 711).

There is nothing difficult to understand in the character of Jehu. He was one of those decisive, terrible, and ambitious, yet prudent, calculating, and passionless men whom God from time to time raises up to change the fate of empires and execute his judgments on the earth. He boasted of his zeal—"Come and see my zeal for the Lord"—but at the bottom it was zeal for Jehu. His zeal was great so long as it led to acts which squared with his own interests, but it cooled marvellously when required to take a direction in his judgment less favorable to them. Even his zeal in extirpating the idolatry of Baal is not free from suspicion. The altar of Baal was that which Ahab had associated with his throne, and in overturning the latter he could not prudently let the former stand, surrounded as it was by attached adherents of the house which he had extirpated. He must be regarded, like many others in history, as an instrument for accomplishing great purposes rather than as great or good in himself. In the long period during which his destiny—though known to others and perhaps to himself—lay dormant; in the suddenness of his rise to power; in the ruthlessness with which he carried out his purposes; in the union of profound silence and dissimulation with a stern, fanatic, wayward zeal, he has not been without his likenesses in modern times.

The Scripture narrative, although it fixes our attention on the services which he rendered to the cause of religion by the extermination of a worthless dynasty and a degrading worship, yet, on the whole, leaves the sense that it was a reign barren in great results. His dynasty, indeed, was firmly seated on the throne longer than any other royal house of Israel (2 Kings x), and under Jeroboam II it acquired a high name among the Oriental nations. But Elisha, who had raised him to power, as far as we know, never saw him. In other respects it was a failure; the original sin of Jeroboam's worship continued; and in the prophet Hosea there seems to be a retribution exacted for the bloodshed by which he had mounted the throne: "I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu" (Hos. i, 4), as in the similar condemnation of Baasha (1 Kings xvi, 2). See a striking poem to this effect on the character of Jehu in the *Lyra Apostolica*. See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

5. Son of Josibiah, apparently one of the chief Simeonites who migrated to the valley of Gedor in quest of pasturage during the reign of Hezekiah, and expelled the aboriginal Hagarites (1 Chron. iv, 35). B.C. cir. 711.

Jehub'bah (Heb. *Yechubbah'*, יְחֻבָּה, for which the margin has וְחֻבָּה, *ve-Chubbah'*, i. e. *and Hubbah*, as if the proper form were חֻבָּה, *Chubbah'*, i. e. *hidden;* Sept. Ὀβά v. r. Ἰαβά, Vulg. *Haba*), one of the sons of Shamer, or Shomer, of the tribe of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 34). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618.

Jehu'cal (Heb. *Yehukal'*, יְהוּכַל, *able;* Sept. Ἰωάχαλ), son of Shelemiah, one of two persons sent by king Zedekiah to the prophet Jeremiah to request his prayers on behalf of the kingdom; but who joined with his associates on his return in demanding the prophet's death on account of his unfavorable response (Jer. xxxvii, 3). In Jer. xxxviii, 1 his name is written in the contracted form JUCAL (יוּכַל, *Yukal'*, Sept. Ἰωάχαλ), and in verse 4 he is styled one of "the princes." B.C. 589.

Je'hud (Heb. *Yehud'*, יְהֻד, apocopated from JUDAH, as in Dan. ii, 25, etc.; Sept. Ἰούδ v. r. Ἰούθ and Ἀζώρ), a town on the border of Dan, named between Baalah and Bene-barak (Josh. xix, 45). It is perhaps the present village el-*Yehudiyeh*, seven and a half miles south of east from Jaffa (Robinson's *Researches*, iii, 45; new ed. iii, 140, 141, notes; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 141).

Jehudah (HA-LEVI) **DE MODENA.** See MODENA.

Jehudah ben-Balaam. See IBN-BALAAM.

Jehudah ben-David. See CHAJUG.

Jehudah ben-Koreish. See IBN-KOREISH.

Jehudah (HA-LEVI) **ben-Samuel** (called in Arabic *Abulhassan*) a distinguished Spanish Jew, great alike as linguist, philosopher, and poet, one of the greatest lights in Jewish literature, was born in Castile about 1086 according to Grätz, or 1105 according to Rappoport. But little is known of the early history of his life; when a youth of fifteen he was already celebrated as a promising poetical genius. In the vigor of manhood we find Jehudah endeavoring to spread a knowledge of Rabbinical and Arabian literature, both by poetical productions and by disciples whom he gathered about him at Toledo, where he founded a college. About 1141 he is supposed to have completed his Kozari (כוזרי), generally called *Cusari*, the best work ever written in defence of the Jewish religion, and aiming to refute the objections urged against Judaism by Christians, Mohammedans, philosophical infidels, and that sect of the Jews known to be bitterly opposed to the recognition of the authority of tradition—the Karaites. Many eminent critics, among whom ranks Bartolocci, have long discredited the supposition that it is the production of Jehudah, but of late all seem agreed that he was really the author of the work, which is entitled כתאב אלחג׳ה ואלדליל פי נצר אלדין אלדליל (*The Book of Evidence and Argument in Apology for the despised Religion*, i. e. Judaism). In style, this work is an imitation of Plato's dialogues on the immortality of the soul. According to Grätz (*Geschichte der Juden*, v, 214 sq.; vi, 146 sq.), the Khozars, a tribe of the Finns, which was akin to the Bulgarians, Avarians, and Ugurians, or Hungarians, had settled on the borders of Asia and Europe, and founded a dominion on the mouth of the Volga and the Caspian Sea, very near Astrachan. After the destruction of the Persian empire, this Finnish tribe invaded the Caucasus, made inroads into Armenia, conquered the Crimea, exacted tribute from the Byzantine emperors, made vassals of the Bulgarians, etc., and compelled the Russians to send annually to their kings a sword and a costly fur. Like their neighbors, the Bulgarians and Russians, they were idolaters, and gave themselves up to gross sensuality and licentiousness, until they became acquainted with Christianity and Mohammedanism through commercial intercourse with the Greeks and Arabs, and with Judaism through the Greek Jews who fled from the religious persecutions of the Byzantine emperor Leo (A.D. 723). Of these strangers called Khozarians the Jews gained the greater admiration, as they especially distinguished themselves as merchants, physicians, and councillors of state; and the Khozars came to contrast the Jewish religion with the then corrupt Christianity and Mohammedanism. King Bulan, the officials of state, and the majority of the people, who had determined to forsake their idolatrous worship, embraced Judaism, A.D. 731. This important item of Jewish history, which is rigidly contended for as authentic by some of the best students of Oriental history (compare Vivien de St. Martin, *Les Khazars, mémoire lu à l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres* [Paris, 1851]; Carmoly, *Itinéraires de la Terre Sainte* [Bruxelles, 1847], p. 1-104; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, v, 210 sq.), throws light upon Eldad Ha-Dani's description of the lost tribes; the references in the Chaldee paraphrase on Chron. i, 5, 26; the allusion in Josippon ben-Gorion, ch. x, ed. Breithaupt; and many other theories about the whereabouts of the ten tribes. See RESTORATION. It is this item of Eastern history that furnished Jehudah a basis for his work. In his *Kozari* he represents Bulan as determined to forsake idolatry, and earnestly desirous to find the true religion. To this end he sends for two philosophers, a Christian and a Mohammedan, listens to the expositions of their respective creeds, and, as they all refer to the Jews as the fountain-head, he at last sends for an Israelite, one Rabbi Isaac of Sanger, probably a Bithynian, to propound his religious tenets, becomes convinced of their divine origin, and embraces the Jewish religion. The real importance of this work, however, rests on the discussions into which it enters on many subjects bearing upon the exposition of the Hebrew Scriptures, Jewish literature, history, philosophy, etc., all of which are in turn reviewed. Thus, for instance, synagogual service, feasts, fasts, sacrifices, the Sanhedrim, the development of the Talmud, the Masorah, the vowel-points, the Karaites, etc., are all minutely discussed in this work, which De Sacy (see *Biographie Universelle*, xxii, 101 sq.) has pronounced to be one of the most valuable and beautiful productions of the Jewish pen. Aben-Ezra and David Kimchi frequently refer to it, the former in his Commentary, the latter in his Lexicon. A Hebrew translation of *Kozari* was prepared by Jehudah Ibn-Tibbon, who named it ספר הכוזרי (*The Book of Kozari*), after the heroes of it, and it was first published at Fano in 1506, then at Venice in 1547, with an introduction and commentary by Muscato (Venice, 1594); with a Latin translation and dissertations by Jo. Buxtorf, fil. (Basle, 1660); a Spanish translation of it was made by Abendana without the Hebrew text (Amsterd. 1663). The work has more lately been published with a commentary by Satorow (Berl. 1795); with a commentary, various readings, index, etc., by G.

Brecher (Prague, 1838–40); and the very latest, with a German translation, explanatory notes, etc., by Dr. David Cassel (Leipzig, 1853), which is generally considered the most useful edition. Jehudah, like many other eminent Jewish literati of his day, seems to have practised medicine to secure to himself a sufficient income, which his literary labors evidently failed to provide for him. After the completion of his *Kozari* he determined to emigrate to the Holy Land, and die and be buried in the land of his forefathers. Tradition says that he was murdered by an Arab (about 1142) while he was lying on his face under the walls of Jerusalem, overcome by his contemplations at the ruins of Zion, of "the depopulation of a region once so densely inhabited, the wilderness and desolation of a land formerly teeming with luxuriance"—a gift which God had given unto his forefathers, who had failed to appreciate the goodness of their Lord. He is said to be buried at Kephar Kabul. See Geiger, *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift*, i, 158 sq.; ii, 367 sq.; Cassel, *Das Buch Kusari* (Leipzig, 1853), p. v–xxxv; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vi, 140–167; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1338–1342; Sachs, *Relig. Poesie der Juden in Spanien*, p. 287; Turner, *Jewish Rabbis*, p. 22 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v.; Rule, *Karaites* (London, 1870), p. 80 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* ii, 35 sq.

Jehudah (Arje-Loeb) **ben-Zebi** (Hirsh), a Jewish writer of some note, was born at Krotoschin (Polish Prussia) about 1680. He afterwards became rabbi at Carpentras and Avignon. His works are: (1) A Hebrew Lexicon, entitled אָהֳלֵי יְהוּדָה (*The Tents of Judah*) (Jesnitz, 1719, 4to), consisting of two parts; the first part, שֵׁם עוֹלָם (*the everlasting name*), confines itself mainly to proper names; the second part, יָד וָשֵׁם (*place and name*), supplies the words omitted in the first part. This work partakes of the nature of a concordance as well as of a lexicon, inasmuch as it gives the places in Scripture in which every word is to be found:—(2) A Hebrew Grammar, called חֵלֶק יְהוּדָה (*The Portion of Judah*); of this work, the introduction only, יסוד לשון הקודש (*The Foundation of the Sacred Language*), was ever published (Wilmersdorf, 1721, 4to); it contains fifteen canons and paradigms, with a German translation:—and (3) a Concordance, entitled גֶּזַע יְהוּדָה (*The Stem of Judah*), which only goes as far as the root צנח (Offenbach, 1732, 4to).—Kitto, *Biblic. Cyclop.* s. v.; Steinschneider, *Libri Hebræi in Biblioth. Bodleiana*, col. 1378; *Bibliogr. Handb. f. Hebr. Sprachkunde* (Leipzig, 1859), p. 70; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 145 sq.

Jehudah, ha-Kodesh, etc. See Judah, etc.

Jehu'di (Hebrew *Yehudi'*, יְהוּדִי, a *Jew*, as often; Sept. Ἰουδεὶν v. r. Ἰουδίν, Ἰουδί, Ἰουδεί) son of Nethaniah, sent by the princes to invite Baruch to read Jeremiah's roll to them, and who afterwards read it to the king himself (Jer. xxxvi, 14, 21). B.C. 605.

Jehudi'jah (Heb. *Yehudiyah'*, יְהוּדִיָּה [with the art., *the*], *Jewess*, as in the Engl. margin; Sept. Ἰδία v. Ἀδία, Vulg. *Judaja*), a female named as the second wife apparently of Mered, and mother of several founders of cities in Judah (1 Chron. iv, 18); probably the same with Hodiah in the ensuing verse, mentioned as the sister of Naham, etc. The latter name is possibly by a corruption of *ha-Yehudiyah*. See Mered. B.C. cir. 1612.

Je'hush (Chron. viii, 39). See Jeush.

Jeï'el (Heb. *Yeïel'*, יְעִיאֵל, *snatched* away by *God*), the name of several men. See also Jehiel; Jeuel.

1. (Text יְעוּאֵל [i. e. *Jeuel*], Sept. Ἰειήλ v. r. Ἰεήλ, Vulg. *Jehiel*, Auth. Version "Jehiel.") A descendant of Benjamin, apparently named as the founder of and resident at Gibeon, the husband of Maachah, and the father of a large family (1 Chron. ix, 35; comp. viii, 29). B.C. prob. cir. 1618.

2. (Text יְעוּאֵל [i. e. *Jeuel*], Sept. Ἰεϊήλ or Ἰεήλ, Vulg. *Jediel*, Auth. Vers. "Jehiel.") An Aroerite, son of Hothan, and brother of Shama, one of David's supplementary heroes (1 Chron. xi, 44). B.C. 1046.

3. (Sept. Ἰεϊήλ, Vulg. *Jehiel*, but *Jahiel* in the first occurrence in 1 Chron. xvi, 5.) One of the Levites appointed by David to celebrate the divine praises before the ark on its removal to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xvi, 5); apparently the same mentioned again in the latter part of the same verse as a performer on "psalteries and harps;" named elsewhere in like connection with Obededom, either as a gate-warden of the Temple (1 Chron. xv, 18, 21), or as one of the sacred musicians "with harps on the Sheminith to excel" (1 Chron. xv, 21). B.C. 1043. See Jehiel, 1.

4. (Sept. Ἐλεήλ v. r. Ἐλεϊήλ, Ἐλειήλ, also Ἰειήλ, Vulg. *Jehiel.*) A Levite, son of Mattaniah and father of Benaiah, great-grandfather of Jahaziel, who predicted success to Jehoshaphat against the Ammonites and Moabites (2 Chron. xx, 14). B.C. considerably ante 890.

5. (Text יְעוּאֵל [i. e. *Jeuel*], Sept. Ἰεϊήλ, Vulg. *Jehiel.*) A scribe charged, in connection with others, with keeping the account of Uzziah's troops (2 Chron. xxvi, 11). B.C. 803.

6. (Sept. Ἰωήλ, Vulg. *Jehiel.*) A chief Reubenite at the time of the taking of some census, apparently on the deportation of the trans-Jordanic tribes by Tilgath-pilneser (1 Chron. v, 7). B.C. 782.

7. (Text יְעוּאֵל [i. e. *Jeuel*], Sept. Ἰεϊήλ, Vulg. *Jahiel.*) A Levite of the "sons" of Elizaphan, one of those who assisted in expurgating the Temple in the reign of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix, 13). B.C. 726.

8. (Sept. Ἰεϊήλ, Vulg. *Jehiel.*) One of the chief Levites who made an offering for the restoration of the Passover by Josiah (2 Chron. xxxv, 9). B.C. 623.

9. (Text יְעוּאֵל [i. e. *Jeuel*], Sept. Ἰεήλ v. r. Ἐϊήλ, Vulg. *Jehiel.*) One of the "last sons" of Adonikam, a leading Israelite, who, with seventy males, returned from Babylon with Ezra (Ezra viii, 13). B.C. 459.

10. (Sept. Ἰεειήλ v. r. Ἰαήλ, Vulg. *Jehiel.*) An Israelite, one of the "sons" of Nebo, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Exile (Ezra x, 43). B.C. 459.

Jeins. See Jains.

Jeish. See Jeüsh.

Jejunia quatuor tempŏrum is the original name for the fasts of the four seasons of the year, which are now commonly called *Ember Weeks* (q. v.). See Bingham, *Antiq. of the Christian Church*, p. 155, 1190.

Jejunium. See Fasting.

Jekab'zeël (Heb. *Yekabtseël'*, יְקַבְצְאֵל, *gathered* by *God;* Sept. Καβσεήλ, Vulg. *Cabseel*), the name of a place in the tribe of Judah (Neh. xi, 25); elsewhere (Josh. xv, 21) called by the equivalent but shorter name Kabzeel (q. v.).

Jekame'äm (Heb. *Yekamam'*, יְקַמְעָם, *gatherer* of the *people;* Sept. Ἰεκεμίας, Ἰεκεμία), the fourth in rank of the "sons" of Hebron in the Levitical arrangement established by David (1 Chron. xxiii, 19; xxiv, 23). B.C. 1014.

Jekami'ah (Heb. *Yekamyah'*, יְקַמְיָה, *gathered* by *Jehovah*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ἰεκομίας v. r. Ἰεχεμίας, Vulg. *Icamia.*) Son of Shallum, and father of Elishama, of the descendants of Sheshan of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 41). B.C. prob. cir. 588.

2. (Sept. Ἰεκενία v. r. Ἰεκεμία, Vulg. *Jecemia*, Auth. Version "Jecamiah.") The fifth named of the sons of king Jeconiah (1 Chron. iii, 18), born to him during the Babylonian exile, and, according to tradition, by Susanna. See Jehoiachin. B.C. post 598.

Jeku'thiël (Heb. *Yekuthiël'*, יְקוּתִיאֵל, *reverence*

of God; Sept. Ἰεκθιήλ v. r. ὁ Χετιήλ), "father" of Zanoah, and one of the sons apparently of Mered by his second wife Hodiah, or Jehudijah (1 Chron. iv, 18). B.C. cir. 1618. See MERED.

"In the comment of Rabbi Joseph, Jered is interpreted to mean Moses, and each of the names following are taken as titles borne by him. Jekuthiel—'trust in God'—is so applied 'because in his days the Israelites trusted in the God of heaven for forty years in the wilderness.' In a remarkable prayer used by the Spanish and Portuguese Jews in the concluding service of the Sabbath, Elijah is invoked as having had 'tidings of peace delivered to him by the hand of Jekuthiel.' This is explained to refer to some transaction in the life of Phineas, with whom Elijah is, in the traditions of the Jews, believed to be identical (see Allen, *Modern Judaism*, p. 229)."

Jekuthiel. See LUZATTO.

Jekuthiel ben-Isaac BLITZ, also called by his father's name, *Isaac Blitz*, was corrector of the press at the printing establishment of Uri Febes Levi at Amsterdam, and was the first Jew who translated the whole O. T. into German (in Hebrew type). It was published under the title תנ"ך בלשון אשכנז (*The four-and-twenty Books translated into German*), with (תועליות הרלב"ג בלשון אשכנז) Ralbag's תועליות, or *Usus* on Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, and a threefold introduction, viz. a Hebrew introduction by the translator, a Latin diploma from the Polish king, John Sobieski III, a Judæo-German introduction by the publisher, and a German introduction by the translator (Amsterd. 1676-78). A specimen of this translation is given by Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, iv, 183-187. Comp. also ii, 454 of the same work; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 175; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, x, 329 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 120 sq.

Jekuthiel ben-Jehudah COHEN (also called SALMAN NAKDON, i. e. *the Punctuator*, and by contraction IEHABI), a distinguished Masorite and editor of the Hebrew Scriptures, flourished in Prague in the latter half of the 13th century. He edited a very correct text of the Pentateuch (published for the first time by Heidenheim in his edition of the Pentateuch called מאור עינים [Rödelheim, 1818-21]) and the book of Esther (also published by Heidenheim in his סדר ימי הפורים [Rödelheim, 1825]), with the vowels and accents, for the preparation of which he consulted six old Spanish codices, which he denominates אמ"ס, א"ח, א"ק, ת"א, א"ט, א"ז, and which Heidenheim explains to mean טוב, זקן, מסוריות, השוב, קדמון, היקון אחד, the prefix א denoting Spain (comp. עין הקורא *on Numb. xxxiv*, 28). The results of his critical labors he further embodied in a work entitled עין קורא (*The Eye of the Reader*), and makes frequent quotations from the writings of many distinguished Jewish commentators of his and the preceding age. An appendix to the work contains a grammatical treatise entitled דרכי הנקוד, or כללי הנקוד (*The Laws of the Vowel Points*). Comp. Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur* (Berl. 1845), p. 115; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 53; Geiger, *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift f. Jüdische Theologie*, v, 418-420; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Heb. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1381.

Jemi'ma (Heb. *Yemimah'*, יְמִימָה, *dove*, from the Arab.; Sept. Ἡμέρα, Vulg. *Dies*, both mistaking the derivation as if from יוֹם, *day*), the name of the first of Job's three daughters born after his trial (Job xlii, 14). B.C. cir. 2200. "The Rev. C. Forster (*Historical Geography of Arabia*, ii, 67), in tracing the posterity of Job in Arabia, thinks that the name of Jemima survives in *Jemama*, the central province of the Arabian peninsula, which, according to an Arabian tradition (see Bochart, *Phaleg*, ii, § 26), was called after Jemama, an ancient queen of the Arabians" (Smith).

Jemini. See BENJAMIN.

Jem'naan (Ἰεμναάν, Vulg. omits), a place mentioned in the Apocrypha (Judith ii, 20) among those on the sea-coast of Palestine to which the panic of the incursion of Holofernes extended, no doubt JABNEEL or JAMNIA (q. v.).

Jemu'ël (Heb. *Yemuël'*, יְמוּאֵל, *day*-light of *God*, Sept. Ἰεμουήλ, Vulg. *Jamuel*), the first-named of the sons of Simeon (Gen. xlvi, 10; Exod. vi, 15); elsewhere (Numb. xxvi, 12) called NEMUEL (נְמוּאֵל, *Nemuel';* Sept. Ναμουήλ, Vulg. *Namuel*), apparently by an error of copyists, and his descendants NEMUELITES (Hebrew *Nemueli*, נְמוּאֵלִי, Sept. Ναμουηλί, Vulg. *Namuelitæ*, Numb. xxvi, 12). B.C. 1856.

Jenisch, DANIEL, a German theologian of some note, was born at Heiligenbeil, in East Prussia, April 2, 1762, and educated at the University of Königsberg. In 1786 he became pastor at the Mary Church, and afterwards at the Nicholas Church. Endowed with great natural abilities, and a very earnest worker, Jenisch soon secured for himself one of the foremost places as a theologian and a philosophical writer. But too close application to study resulted in a derangement of his mental powers, and he is supposed to have violently ended his life Feb. 9, 1804. His works of interest to us are *Ueber Grund u. Werth d. Entdeckungen Kant's in der Metaphysik, Moral, u. Aesthetik* (Berl. 1796, large 8vo):—*Sollte Religion dem Menschen jemals entbehrlich werden* (ibid. 1797, 8vo). Besides these, he published, after his mind began to be seriously affected, *Ueber Gottesverehrung u. Kirchliche Reformen* (ibid. 1802, 8vo), rather the work of a sceptical Christian, if we may use the expression, though it contains also many just criticisms on the liturgy and homiletics of the Lutheran Church of his day; and *Kritik des dogmatisch-idealischen u. hyperidealischen Religions- u. Moralsystems* (Lpz. 1804, 8vo), which was the last work of Jenisch. See Döring, *Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands*, ii, 20 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jenkin, Robert, an English theologian, was born at Minster, Thanet, in 1656. He studied at Canterbury and Cambridge, of which he became fellow. He was successively appointed rector of St. John's College, professor of theology, and chaplain to Dr. Lake, bishop of Chichester. In 1688 he refused to take the oath required of all holding benefices, and retired to private life. He died in 1727. His principal work is *The Reasonableness of the Christian Religion* (six editions; the best 1734, 2 vols. 8vo). He wrote also *Examination of the Authority of General Councils* (Lond. 1688, 4to):—*Defensio sancti Augustini versus J. Phereponum* (London, 1707, 8vo):—*Remarks upon four Books just published* (on Basnage's *History of the Jews*, Lake's *Paraphrase of St. Paul's Epistle*, Le Clerc's *Bibliothèque choisie*, etc.). He also translated into English Tillemont's *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. See Gorton, *General Biograph. Dict.* s. v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxvi, 650; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 962. (J. N. P.)

Jenkin, William. See JENKYN.

Jenks, Benjamin, an English divine, was born in 1646. Of his early history but little is known. He was at first rector at Harley, then at Kenley, and afterwards chaplain to the earl of Bradford. He died at Harley in 1724. He published *Prayers and Offices of Devotion for Families, and for particular Persons upon most Occasions* (London, 1697, 8vo; of which the 27th edition was published in 1810 by the Rev. Charles Simeon, fellow of King's College, Cambridge, with alterations and amendments in style; there is also an edition by Barnes, 12mo, and an abridgment, 12mo):—*Submission to the Righteousness of God* (1700, 8vo; 4th ed. 1755, 12mo):—*Meditations, with short Prayers annexed* (1701, 8vo; 2d edit. 1756, 2 vols. 8vo, with a recommendatory

Preface by Mr. Hervey):—*Ouranography, or Heaven Opened* (1710, 8vo):—*The Poor Man's Companion, a lesser Prayer-book for Families on common Days and other Occasions* (Lond. 1713, 8vo), besides a number of sermons on various topics. See Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 963.

Jenks, Hervey, a Baptist minister, was born at Brookfield, Mass., June 16, 1787, and was educated at Brown University. After teaching a short time at the academy at that time connected with the university, he entered the ministry, and was successively pastor at West Stockbridge, Mass., and Hudson, N. Y.; then at Hudson alone; next at Beverly, Mass., whence he again returned to Hudson. He died July 15, 1814. He was a young man of great promise, and, though he was only twenty-eight years old when he died, his abilities had already been generally recognised.—Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vi, 587 sq.

Jenks, William, D.D., a Congregational minister of great ability and distinction, was born at Newton, Mass., in 1778, but when only four years of age his father removed to Boston. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1797. He was first settled in the ministry over the Congregational Church in Bath, Me., where he remained twelve years; he next filled the professorship of Oriental and English literature in Bowdoin College three years; then he went to Boston, and was very active in originating plans to secure religious and social privileges for seamen, till that time a neglected class of men. Some of the more prominent institutions for the benefit of sailors now existing in that city owe their origin to him. He was pastor at the same time of the Green Street church, which he served for twenty-five years. He died Nov. 13, 1866. Dr. Jenks was one of the chief founders of the American Oriental Society, and a prominent member of the Massachusetts Historical Society. He was particularly distinguished as an Orientalist, and edited the *Comprehensive Commentary on the Holy Bible* (Brattleborough, 1834, 5 vols. roy. 8vo; Supplem. 1 vol. roy. 8vo), which "still stands without a rival for the purpose for which it was intended." He also published an *Explanatory Bible Atlas and Scripture Gazetteer* (1819, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 963; Appleton, *Amer. Annual Cyclop.* 1866, p. 420. (J. H. W.)

Jenkyn, Robert. See JENKIN.

Jenkyn, William, an English Nonconformist divine, was born at Sudbury, Suffolk, in 1612, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. He first became lecturer of St. Nicholas Acons, London, and in 1641 minister of Christ Church, Newgate Street, and lecturer of St. Ann's, Blackfriars. Refusing to observe (in 1662) the public thanksgiving appointed by Parliament on occasion of the destruction of the monarchy, he was ejected for nonconformity. Soon after he was sent to the Tower for participation in Love's plot, but, upon petition, was pardoned, and restored to the ministry. Mr. Feak, who had in the interim become minister of Christ Church, was removed, and Mr. Jenkyn reinstated. Upon this he devoted himself with zeal to his work. On the passage of the Oxford Act he refused to take the oath, and retired from London to Hertfordshire, where he preached privately. After the Act of Indulgence in 1671, he returned again to London; but when, in 1682, the tempest broke out against the Nonconformists, he fell into the hands of his enemies, and was sent to Newgate under the Conventicle Act, where he died, from the air and infection of the prison, in 1685. Jenkyn enjoyed a very enviable reputation among his contemporaries for Christian piety and great ability. Richard Baxter pronounced him "a sententious and elegant preacher." He published *An Exposition of the Epistle of Jude* (London, 1652–54, 4to; another ed., revised by the Rev. James Sherman, with memoir of the author, London, 1839, imp. 8vo, and often). See Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 963; *Nonconformists' Memorial;* Calamy, *Ministers ejected* (1728); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biograph. Générale*, xxvi, 649.

Jennings, David, D.D., an eminent Independent minister, was born at Kibworth, Leicestershire, in 1691. In 1718 he became pastor of a congregation in Old Gravel Lane, Wapping, where he remained for forty-four years. In 1744 he went as divinity tutor to Coward's Academy, and died Sept. 16, 1762. His principal works are, *Jewish Antiquities*, with a Dissertation on the Hebrew Language (London, 1766; 10th edition, 1839, 8vo); a work which "has long held a distinguished character for its accuracy and learning," and certainly one of the best works of the kind in the English language:—*The Beauty and Benefit of early Piety* (Lond. 1731, 18mo):—*A Vindication of the Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin* [Anonym.] (London, 1740, 8vo):—*An Appeal to Reason and Common Sense* (1755, 12mo):—*Sermons to the Young* (1743, 12mo), etc. See Orton, *Life of Doddridge*, p. 16, 243; *Protestant Dissent. Mag.* vol. v; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxvi, 660; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 964.

Jennings, John, an English dissenting minister, brother of David Jennings (see above), became, after preaching for some time, a theological tutor at Kibworth. He was also tutor to Dr. Doddridge. He died in 1723. He wrote *Two Discourses on Preaching* (London, 1754, 12mo; also in E. Williams's *Preacher's Assistant*), etc. See Wilson, *Hist. of Dissenters;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 660; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 964.

Jennings, Samuel Kennedy, a Protestant Methodist lay minister of great ability and distinction, was born in Essex County, N. J., June 6, 1771. He was educated at Rutgers (then Queens) College. After the completion of his collegiate course he studied medicine, and for a time even practiced as a physician. In his youth he was a decided infidel, although he sprang from a family of ministers and zealous Christian workers. In 1794 he was converted, and two years after he entered the lay ministry, and served his Church very ably. In 1805 bishop Asbury ordained him a deacon, and in 1814 bishop M'Kendree made him an elder. In 1817 he took up his residence at Baltimore, after having filled in various places the position of physican and minister, and in this city also he made many friends by his Christian kindness and liberality. He was one of the prime movers for the introduction of lay representation in the Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was one of those who were expelled from the Methodist Episcopal Church, and finally organized the "Methodist Protestant Church." See LAY DELEGATION. He died Oct. 19, 1854. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, vii, 279; Stevens, *Hist. Meth. Episc. Church.* (J. H. W.)

Jenyns, SOAME, an English politician, and a writer on theological subjects, born at London in 1704, was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. He was in his early years a well-known infidel, but extended Biblical studies caused his conversion, and he at once entered the lists in active defence of the Gospel truths. His ablest work, and one which has given rise to the supposition on the part of some that Jenyns published it only with intent to injure the Christian cause, now generally refuted on good grounds, is, *View of the Internal Evidence of the Christian Religion* (1776, 12mo; 10th ed. 1798, 8vo, and often since). Baxter (*Ch. History*, p. 659) says that the work "brought out the internal evidence to the truth of Christianity arising from its peculiar and exalted morality," and points to it as one of the efforts by which "infidelity, if not convinced, was silenced." (See, for the pamphlets on the controversy which this work elicited, Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* xviii, 520, note 8). He also wrote *A free Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Evil* (1756, 8vo, and often), which was rather a failure as a theological treatise, and was very severely criticised by Dr. Johnson (see Boswell's

Johnson, year 1756). The entire writings of Jenyns are collected in 4 vols. 8vo (Lond. 1790-93), together with his biography by Charles Nelson Cole. Jenyns died Dec. 18, 1787. See Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, i, 965; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Jeph'thaë (Heb. xi, 32). See JEPHTHAH.

Jeph'thah (Heb. *Yiphtach'*, יִפְתָּח, *opened* or *opener*), the name of a man and also of a place. See also JIPHTHAH-EL.

1. (Sept. Ἰεφθά v. r. Ἰεφθαέ and Ἰεφθάε, Josephus Ἰεφθής, Vulg. *Jephte*, N. T. Ἰεφθάε, "Jephthaë"), the ninth judge of the Israelites for a period of six years, B.C. 1256-1250. He belonged to the tribe of Manasseh east, and was the son of a person named Gilead by a concubine, or perhaps harlot. After the death of his father he was expelled from his home by the envy of his brothers, who, taunting him with illegitimacy, refused him any share of the heritage, and he withdrew to the land of Tob, beyond the frontier of the Hebrew territories. It is clear that he had before this distinguished himself by his daring character and skill in arms; for no sooner was his withdrawal known than a great number of men of desperate fortunes repaired to him, and he became their chief. His position was now very similar to that of David when he withdrew from the court of Saul. To maintain the people who had thus linked their fortunes with his, there was no other resource than that sort of brigandage which is accounted honorable in the East, so long as it is exercised against public or private enemies, and is not marked by needless cruelty or outrage. So Jephthah confined his aggressions to the borders of the small neighboring nations, who were in some sort regarded as the natural enemies of Israel, even when there was no actual war between them (Judg. xi, 1-3).

The tribes beyond the Jordan having resolved to oppose the Ammonites, to whom the Israelites had fallen under subjection after the death of Jair, in consequence of relapsing into idolatry, Jephthah seems to have occurred to every one as the most fitting leader. A deputation was accordingly sent to invite him to take the command. After some demur, on account of the treatment he had formerly received, he consented to become their captain on the condition—solemnly ratified before the Lord in Mizpeh—that, in the event of his success against Ammon, he should still remain as their acknowledged head. The rude hero commenced his operations with a degree of diplomatic consideration and dignity for which we are not prepared. The Ammonites being assembled in force for one of those ravaging incursions by which they had repeatedly desolated the land, he sent to their camp a formal complaint of the invasion, and a demand of the ground of their proceeding. This is highly interesting, because it shows that, even in that age, a cause for war was judged necessary, no one being supposed to war without provocation; and, in this case, Jephthah demanded what cause the Ammonites alleged to justify their aggressive operations. Their answer was, that the land of the Israelites beyond the Jordan was theirs. It had originally belonged to them, from whom it had been taken by the Amorites, who had been dispossessed by the Israelites, and on this ground they claimed the restitution of these lands. Jephthah's reply laid down the just principle which has been followed out in the practice of civilized nations, and is maintained by all the great writers on the law of nations. The land belonged to the Israelites by right of conquest from the *actual* possessors, and they could not be expected to recognise any antecedent claim of former possessors, for whom they had not acted, who had rendered them no assistance, and who had themselves displayed hostility against the Israelites. It was not to be expected that they would conquer the country from the powerful kings who had it in possession, for the mere purpose of restoring it to the ancient occupants, of whom they had no favorable knowledge, and of whose previous claims they were scarcely cognizant. But the Ammonites reasserted their former views, and on this issue they took the field. Animated by a consciousness of divine aid, Jephthah hastened to meet them, defeated them in several pitched battles, followed them with great slaughter, and utterly broke their dominion over the eastern Israelites (Judg. xi, 4-33). See Pagenstecher, *Jephtes* (Lemgo, 1746).

The victory over the Ammonites was followed by a quarrel with the proud and powerful Ephraimites on the west side of the Jordan. This tribe was displeased at having had no share in the glory of the recent victory, and a large body of men belonging to it, who had crossed the river to share in the action, used very high and threatening language when they found their services were not required. Jephthah, finding his remonstrances had no effect, reassembled some of his disbanded troops and gave the Ephraimites battle, when they were defeated with immense loss. The victors seized the fords of the Jordan, and, when any one came to pass over, they made him pronounce the word "Shibboleth" (*an ear of corn*); but if he could not give the aspiration, and pronounced the word as "Sibboleth," they knew him for an Ephraimite, and slew him on the spot (Judg. xii, 1-6).

The remainder of Jephthah's rule was peaceful, and, at his death, he left the country quiet to his successor Ibzan. He was buried in his native region, in one of the cities of Gilead (Judg. xii, 7).

JEPHTHAH'S VOW.—When Jephthah set forth against the Ammonites, he solemnly vowed to the Lord, "If thou shalt without fail deliver the children of Ammon into my hands, then it shall be that whatsoever cometh forth [i. e. first] of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt-offering" (Judg. xi, 30, 31). He *was* victorious: the Ammonites sustained a terrible overthrow. He *did* return in peace to his house in Mizpeh. As he drew nigh his house, the one that came forth to meet him was his own daughter—his only child, in whom his heart was bound up. She, with her fair companions, came to greet the triumphant hero "with timbrels and with dances." But he no sooner saw her than he rent his robes, and cried, "Alas! my daughter, thou hast brought me very low .... for I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and cannot go back." Nor did she ask it. She replied, "My father, if thou hast opened thy mouth unto the Lord, do to me according to that which has proceeded out of thy mouth, forasmuch as the Lord hath taken vengeance for thee of thine enemies, the children of Ammon." But, after a pause, she added, "Let this thing be done for me: let me alone two months, that I may go up and down upon the mountains and bewail my virginity, I and my fellows." Her father, of course, assented, and when the time expired she returned, and, we are told, "he did with her according to his vow." It is then added that it became "a custom in Israel that the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite three days in the year" (Judg. xi, 34-40).

Volumes have been written on the subject of "Jephthah's rash vow," the question being whether, in doing to his daughter "according to his vow," he really did offer her in sacrifice, or whether she was merely doomed to perpetual celibacy.

That the daughter of Jephthah was really offered up to God in sacrifice—slain by the hand of her father and then burned—is a horrible conclusion, but one which it seems impossible to avoid. This was understood to be the meaning of the text by Jonathan the paraphrast, and Rashi, by Josephus (*Ant.* v, 7, 10), and by perhaps all the early Christian fathers, as Origen (*in Joannem.* tom. vi, cap. 36), Chrysostom (*Hom. ad pop. Antiochen.* xiv, 3; *Opp.* ii, 145), Theodoret (*Quæstiones in Judices*, xx), Jerome (*Ep. ad Jul.* 118; *Opp.* i, 791, etc.), Augustine (*Quæstiones in Jud.* viii, 49; *Opp.* iii, 1, 610);

so also in the Talmud (*Tanchuma to Bechu-Kothai*, p. 171) and Midrash (R. 1, § 71), in both of which great astonishment is expressed with the dealings of the high-priest. For the first eleven centuries of the Christian æra this was the current, perhaps the universal opinion of Jews and Christians. Yet none of them extenuates the act of Jephthah. Josephus calls it neither lawful nor pleasing to God. Jewish writers say that he ought to have referred it to the high-priest, but either he failed to do so, or the high-priest culpably omitted to prevent the rash act. Origen strictly confines his praise to the heroism of Jephthah's daughter.

The other interpretation was suggested by Joseph Kimchi. He supposed that, instead of being sacrificed, she was shut up in a house which her father built for the purpose, and that she was there visited by the daughters of Israel four days in each year as long as she lived. This interpretation has been adopted by many eminent men — as by Levi ben-Gerson and Bechai amongst the Jews, and by Drusius, Grotius, Estius, De Dieu, bishop Hall, Waterland, Dr. Hales, and others. More names of the same period, and of not less authority, might, however, be adduced on the other side. Lightfoot once thought (*Erubhin*, § 16) that Jephthah did not slay his daughter, but, upon more mature reflection, he came to the opposite conclusion (*Harmony*, etc.; Judges xi, *Works*, i, 51).

1. The advocates for the actual death of the maiden contend that to *live* unmarried was required by no law, custom, or devotement amongst the Jews: no one had a right to impose so odious a condition on another, nor is any such condition implied or expressed in the vow which Jephthah uttered. It is certain that human sacrifice was deemed meritorious and propitiatory by the neighboring nations [see SACRIFICE]; and, considering the manner of life the hero had led, the recent idolatries in which the people had been plunged, and the peculiarly vague notions of the tribes beyond the Jordan, it is highly probable that he contemplated from the first a human sacrifice, as the most costly offering to God known to him (comp. the well-known story of the immolation of Iphigenia, *Iliad*, ix, 144 sq.). It is difficult to conceive that he could expect any other creature than a human being to come forth *out of the door of his house* to meet him on his return. His affliction when his daughter actually came forth is quite compatible with the idea that he had not even exempted her from the sacredness of his promise, and the depth of that affliction is scarcely reconcilable with any other alternative than the actual sacrifice. In that case, the circumstance that she "knew no man" is added as setting in a stronger light the rashness of Jephthah and the heroism of his daughter. If we look at the text, Jephthah vows that whatsoever came forth from the door of his house to meet him "shall surely be the Lord's, and [Kimchi's rendering '*or*' is a rare and harsh one] I will offer it up for a burnt-offering," which, in fact, was the regular way of making a thing wholly the Lord's. Afterwards we are told that "he did with her according to his vow," that is, according to the plain meaning of plain words, offered her for a burnt-offering. (This circumlocutory phrase, and the omission of any direct term expressive of death, are attributed to euphemistic motives.) Then follows the intimation that the daughters of Israel lamented her four days every year. People lament the dead, not the living. The whole story is consistent and intelligible while the sacrifice is understood to have taken place, but becomes perplexed and difficult as soon as we begin to turn aside from this obvious meaning in search of recondite explanations. The Jewish commentators themselves generally admit that Jephthah really sacrificed his daughter, and even go so far as to allege that the change in the pontifical dynasty from the house of Eleazar to that of Ithamar was caused by the high-priest of the time having suffered this transaction to take place. It is true, human sacrifices were forbidden by the law; but in the rude and unsettled age in which the judges lived, when the Israelites had adopted a vast number of erroneous notions and practices from their heathen neighbors (see 2 Kings iii, 27), many things were done, even by good men, which the law forbade quite as positively as human sacrifice. Such, for instance, was the setting up of the altar by Gideon at his native Ophrah (Judg. viii, 27), in direct but undesigned opposition to one of the most stringent enactments (Deut. vii) of the Mosaical code. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustrations*, ad loc.)

2. On the other hand, it has been well replied that the text expressly, and in varied terms, alludes to the obligation of the girl to lead a life of perpetual virginity (ver. 37, 38, 39). Such a state was generally considered a calamity by the Israelitish women, probably on account of the early prophecy of the incarnation (Gen. iii, 15). See BARRENNESS. But, besides this, the celibacy of Jephthah's daughter involved the extinction of his whole house as well as dynasty, and removed from him his only child, the sole prop and solace of his declining years. For it was her duty, as the Lord's property, to dwell separately at Shiloh, in constant attendance on the service of the sanctuary (compare Luke iii, 37; 1 Cor. vii, 34), far from her father, the companions of her youth, and the beloved haunts of her childhood; all this was sufficient cause for lamentation. But the idea that she was put to death by her father as a consequence of his vow shocks all the feelings of humanity, could only have horrified her as well as all other parties concerned, is inconsistent with the first principles of the Mosaic law, and was impossible from the very nature of its requisitions in several points. For instance, human sacrifices were among the abominations for which the idolatrous nations of Canaan were devoted to destruction (Deut. xviii, 9–14); and the Israelites were expressly forbidden to act like them in sacrificing their sons and daughters by fire (Deut. xii, 29–31). Again, for the redemption of any person devoted to God (Exod. xiii, 11–13), and even for the very case of Jephthah's singular vow, if understood to refer to his daughter's immolation, provision was expressly made (Lev. xxvii, 2–5), so that he might, with a safe conscience, have redeemed her from death by a small payment of money. It must be remembered, too, that by the law he could not offer any victim as a burnt-sacrifice except where the Lord had chosen to place his name (Deut. xvi, 2, 6, 11, 16, compare with Lev. i, 2–13; xvii, 3–9), that is, in the tabernacle at Shiloh: moreover, none but a Levite could kill, and none but a priest could offer any victim; and the statement of the Chaldee paraphrast (ad loc.) that the sacrifice took place through a neglect to consult Phinehas, the high-priest, besides involving an anachronism, is utterly at variance with all the known conditions of the case. Moreover, none but a *male* victim could be presented in sacrifice in any case. It is true that if Jephthah had been an idolater he might have offered his daughter in any of the high-places to a false god; but he was evidently made the deliverer of his people from the yoke of Ammon because he was not an idolater (see Judg. xi, 29–36; comp. Lev. xx, 1–5); and his whole conduct is commended by an inspired apostle (Heb. xi, 32; comp. 1 Sam. xii, 11) as an act of faith in the true God. Such sanction is very different from the express condemnation of the irregular and mischievous proceeding on the part of Gideon (Judg. viii, 27), for there is nowhere the least intimation that Jephthah's conduct was other than entirely praiseworthy, although his vow is evidently recorded as a warning against inconsiderate oaths (Jarvis's *Church of the Redeemed*, p. 115–117). Indeed, it is very doubtful whether he had the power to sacrifice his daughter, and it is incredible that she should have been the first to claim the fulfilment of such a vow, as well as inconceivable how she should have so readily inferred so unusual an import from the brief terms in which he first intimated to her his fatal pledge (ver. 35, 36); whereas it is altogether likely that (with her prompt consent) he

had the right of dooming her to perpetual singleness of life and religious seclusion (compare 1 Cor. vii, 36–38). See NAZARITE. It is also worthy of note that the term employed to express his promise of devotement in this case is נֶדֶר, *ne'der*, a *consecration*, and not חֵרֶם, *che'rem*, *destruction*. See VOW; ANATHEMA. Nor can we suppose (with Prof. Bush, ad loc.) that during the two months' respite he obtained better information, in consequence of which the immolation was avoided by a ransom-price; for it is stated that he literally fulfilled his vow, whatever it was (ver. 39). The word rendered "lament" in verse 40 is not the common one (בכה) translated "bewail" in verse 37, 38, but the rare expression (תנה) rendered "rehearse" in ch. v, 11, and meaning to *celebrate*, as implying joy rather than grief.

For a full discussion of the question, see the notes of the *Pictorial Bible*, and Bush's *Notes on Judges*, ad loc.; comp. Calmet's *Dissertation sur le Vœu de Jephte*, in his *Comment. Littéral*, tom. ii; Dresde, *Votum Jephthæ ex Antiq. Judaica illustr.* (Lips. 1767, 1778); Randolf, *Erklärung d. Gelübdes Jephtha*, in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, viii, 13, Lightfoot's *Harmony*, under Judg. xi, *Erubhin*, cap. xvi, *Sermon* on Judg. xi, 39; Bp. Russell's *Connection of Sacred and Profane History*, i, 479–492; Hales's *Analysis of Chronology*, ii, 288–292; Gleig's edition of Stackhouse, ii, 97; Clarke's *Commentary*, ad loc.; Rosenmüller, ad loc.; Hengstenberg's *Pentat.* ii, 129; Markii *Dissert. phil. theol.* p. 530; Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, iii, 30; Ziegler, *Theolog. Abhandl.* i, 337; Paulus, *Conservat.* ii, 197; Vatke, *Bibl. Theolog.* p. 275; Capellus, *De voto Jeph.* (Salmur. 1683); Dathe in Döderlein's *Theolog. Bibl.* iii, 327; Jahn, *Einleit.* ii, 198, Eckermann, *Theolog. Beitr.* V, i, 62; Reland, *Antiq. sacr.* iii, 10, 6, p. 363; Vogel in Biedermann's *Act. scholast.* ii, 250; Georgi, *De voto Jephtæ* (Viteb. 1751); Heumann, *Nov. sylloge dissert.* ii, 476; Bernhold, *De voto per Jiphtach. nuncupato* (Altd. 1740); Schudt, *Vita Jepht.* (Groning. 1753), ii, 77; Bruno in Eichhorn's *Repertor.* viii, 43; Buddæi *Hist. V. T.* i, 893; Hess, *Gesch. Jos. u. der Heerführer*, ii, 156; Niemeyer, *Charakt.* iii, 496; Ewald, *Isr. Geschichte*, ii, 397; Selden, *Jus nat. et gent.* i, 11; Anton, *Comparat. libror. V. T. cet.* pt. ii, iii; F. Spanheim, *De voto Jephthæ*, in his *Dissert. theol. hist.* p. 135–211; H. Benzel, *De voto Jepth. incruento* (Lond. 1732); Rathlef's *Theol.* for 1755, p. 414; Seiler, *Gemeinnütz. Beitr.* 1779, p. 386; Hasche, *Ueber Jeph. u. s. Gelübde* (Dresd. 1778; see in the *Dresden Anzeig.* 1787); Pfeiffer, *De voto Jephthæ*, in his *Opp.* p. 591; Tieroff, *id.* (Jena, 1657); Münch, *id.* (Altd. 1740); *Bib. Repos.* Jan. 1843, p. 143 sq.; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* October, 1855, p. 558 sq.; *Universalist Review*, Jan. 1861; *Evangelical Rev.* July, 1861; Cassel, in Herzog's *Encykl.* s. v.; also the works cited by Darling, *Cyclop.* col. 284.

2. See JIPHTAH.

Jephun'ne (Ἰεφοννῆ), a Græcized form (Ecclus. xlvi, 7) for the Hebrew name JEPHUNNEH (q. v.).

Jephun'neh (Heb. *Yephunneh'*, יְפֻנֶּה, *nimble*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ἰεφοννή, also Ἰεφονῆ and Ἰεφοννῆ.) The father of Caleb (q. v.), the faithful fellow-explorer of Canaan with Joshua, in which paternal connection alone his name occurs (Numb. xiii, 6; xiv, 6, 30, 38; xxvi, 65; xxxii, 12; xxxiv, 19; Deut. i, 36; Josh. xiv, 6, 13, 14; xv, 13; xxi, 12; 1 Chron. iv, 15; vi, 56). B.C. 1698.

2. (Sept. Ἰεφινά.) One of the sons of Jether or Ithran, of the descendants of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 38). B.C. prob. ante 1017.

Je'rah (Heb. *Ye'rach*, יֶרַח, in pause יָרַח, *Ya'rach*, the *moon*, as often; Sept. Ἰαράχ, but omits in 1 Chron. i, 20, where, however, some copies have Ἰαδέρ; Vulg. *Jare*), the fourth in order of the sons of Joktan, apparently the founder of an Arab tribe, who probably had their settlement near Hazarmaveth and Hadoram, between which the name occurs (Gen. x, 26), the general location of all the Joktanidæ being given in verse 30 as extending from Mesha eastward to Mount Sephar. Bochart (*Phaleg*, ii, 19) thinks the word is Hebrew, but a translation of an equivalent Arabic name, and understands the *Alilæi* to be meant, a tribe inhabiting the auriferous region on the Red Sea (Agatharch. 49; Strabo, xvi, p. 277; Diod. Sic. iii, 44), and conjectures that their true name was *Benay Haila*, "Sons of the Moon," on account of their worship of that luminary under the title *Alilat* (Herodotus, iii, 8). He also observes that a tribe exists near Mecca with the title sons *of the moon*, probably the *Hilalites* mentioned by Niebuhr (*Description of Arabia*, p. 270). That the Alilæi, however, were worshippers of Alilat is an assumption unsupported by facts; but, whatever may be said in its favor, the people in question are not the Bene-Hilál, who take their name from a kinsman of Mohammed, in the fifth generation before him, of the well-known stock of Keys (Caussin, *Essai*, Tab. X A; Abu-l-Fidá, *Hist. anteisl.* ed. Fleischer, p. 194). The connection renders the opinion of J. D. Michaelis more probable, who (*Spicileg.* ii, 60, 161) refers the name to the *Moon-coast*, or *Mount of the Moon*, in the neighborhood of Hadramaut (Hazarmaveth), not far from Shorma (Edrisi, p. 26, 27). Pococke has some remarks on the subject of El-Látt, which the reader may consult (*Spec. Hist. Arab.* p. 90); and also Sir G. Wilkinson, in his notes to Herodotus (ed. Rawlinson, ii, 402, foot-note, and Essay i to bk. iii): he seems to be wrong, however, in saying that the Arabic "'awel,' 'first'" [correctly, "awwal"], is "related to" אל, or Allah, etc., and that Alitta and Mylitta are Shemitic names derived from "*weled*, *walada*, 'to bear children'" (*Essay* i, p. 537). The comparison of Alitta and Mylitta is also extremely doubtful; and probably Herodotus assimilated the former name to the latter. Indeed, Jerah has not been satisfactorily identified with the name of any Arabian place or tribe, though a fortress (and probably an old town, like the numerous fortified places in the Yemen, of the old Himyerite kingdom) named *Yerákh* is mentioned as belonging to the district of the Nijjád (*Marásid*, s. v. Yerákh), which is in Mahreh, at the extremity of the Yemen (*Kámús*). See ARABIA.

Jerah'meël (Heb. *Yerachmeël'*, יְרַחְמְאֵל, *loving God* or *beloved* by *God*), the name of three men.

1. (Sept. Ἰραμεήλ and Ἰερεμεήλ v. r. Ἰεραμεήλ.) First-born of Hezron, brother of Caleb, and father of Ram (not Aram), of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 9, 25, 26. 27, 33, 42). B.C. ante 1658. His descendants were called JERAHMEELITES (Hebrew *Yerachmeëli'*, יְרַחְמְאֵלִי, Sept. Ἰεριμιήλ and Ἰεριμιήλ v. r. Ἰερμεήλ, 1 Sam. xxvii, 10; xxx, 29).

2. (Sept. Ἰραμαήλ v. r. Ἰεραμεήλ.) Son of Kish, a Levite whose relationship is undefined otherwise (1 Chron. xxiv, 29). B.C. apparently 1014.

3. (Sept. Ἰερεμιήλ v. r. Ἰερεμεήλ.) Son of Hammelech (q. v.), one of the two persons commanded by Jehoiakim to apprehend Jeremiah and Baruch, who providentially escaped (Jer. xxxvi, 26). B.C. 605.

Jerah'meëlite (1 Sam. xxvii, 10; xxx, 29). See JERAHMEEL, 1.

Jer'echus (Ἰέρεχος), a Græcized form (1 Esdr. v, 22) of the name of the city of JERICHO (q. v.).

Je'red (*a*, 1 Chron. i, 2; *b*, 1 Chron. iv, 18). See JARED.

Jer'emai (Hebrew *Yeremay'*, יְרֵמַי, dwelling in *heights;* Sept. Ἰερεμί v. r. Ἰεραμί), one of the "sons" of Hashum, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezra x, 33). B.C. 459.

Jeremi'ah (Heb. *Yirmeyah'*, יִרְמְיָה, often in the paragogic form יִרְמְיָהוּ, *Yirmeya'hu*, especially in the book of Jeremiah; *raised* up [i. e. appointed] by *Jehovah;* Sept. and N. T. Ἱερεμίας; "Jeremias," Matt. xvi, 14; "Jeremy," Matt. ii, 17; xxvii, 9; but in this last passage it probably occurs only by error of copyists; see Zech. xi, 12, 13), the name of eight or nine men.

1. The fifth in rank of the Gadite braves who joined David's troop in the wilderness (1 Chron. xii, 10). B.C. 1061.

2. The tenth of the same band of adventurers (1 Chron. xii, 13). B.C. 1061.

3. One of the Benjamite bowmen and slingers who repaired to David while at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 4). B. C. 1053.

4. A chief of the tribe of Manasseh east, apparently about the time of the deportation by the Assyrians (1 Chron. v, 24). B.C. 782.

5. A native of Libnah, the father of Hamutal, wife of Josiah, and mother of Jehoahaz and Zedekiah (2 Kings xxiii, 31; xxiv, 18). B.C. ante 632.

6. Son of Habaziniah, and father of Jaazaniah, which last was one of the Rechabites whom the prophet tested with the offer of wine (Jer. xxxv, 3). B.C. ante 606.

7. The second of the "greater prophets" of the O. T., a son of Hilkiah, a priest of Anathoth, in the tribe of Benjamin (i, 1; comp. xxxii, 6). The following brief account of the prophet's career, which is fully detailed in his own book, is chiefly from Kitto's *Cyclopædia.*

1. *Relatives of Jeremiah.*—Many (among ancient writers, Clement. Alex., Jerome; among moderns, Eichhorn, Calovius, Maldonatus, Von Bohlen, etc.) have supposed that his father was the high-priest of the same name (2 Kings xxii, 8), who found the book of the law in the eighteenth year of Josiah (Umbreit, *Praktischer Commentar über den Jeremia*, p. x). This, however, seems improbable on several grounds (see Carpzov, *Introd.* iii, 130; also Keil, Ewald, etc.): first, there is nothing in the writings of Jeremiah to lead us to think that his father was more than an ordinary priest ("Hilkiah [one] of the priests," Jer. i, 1); again, the name Hilkiah was common among the Jews (see 2 Kings xviii, 13; 1 Chron. vi, 45; xxvi, 11; Neh. viii, 4; Jer. xxix, 3); and, lastly, his residence at Anathoth is evidence that he belonged to the line of Abiathar (1 Kings ii, 26-35), who was deposed from the high-priest's office by Solomon: after which time the office appears to have remained in the line of Zadok.

2. *History.*—Jeremiah was very young when the word of the Lord first came to him (i, 6). This event took place in the thirteenth year of Josiah (B.C. 628), while the youthful prophet still lived at Anathoth. It would seem that he remained in his native city several years; but at length, in order to escape the persecution of his fellow-townsmen (xi, 21), and even of his own family (xii, 6), as well as to have a wider field for his exertions, he left Anathoth and took up his residence at Jerusalem. The finding of the book of the Law, five years after the commencement of his predictions, must have produced a powerful influence on the mind of Jeremiah, and king Josiah no doubt found him an important ally in carrying into effect the reformation of religious worship (2 Kings xxiii, 1-25). B.C. 623. During the reign of this monarch, we may readily believe that Jeremiah would be in no way molested in his work; and that from the time of his quitting Anathoth to the eighteenth year of his ministry, he probably uttered his warnings without interruption, though with little success (see ch. xi). Indeed, the reformation itself was nothing more than the forcible repression of idolatrous and heathen rites, and the re-establishment of the external service of God, by the command of the king. No sooner, therefore, was the influence of the court on behalf of the true religion withdrawn, than it was evident that no real improvement had taken place in the minds of the people. Jeremiah, who hitherto was at least protected by the influence of the pious king Josiah, soon became the object of attack, as he must doubtless have long been the object of dislike to those whose interests were identified with the corruptions of religion. The death of this prince was bewailed by the prophet as the precursor of the divine judgments for the national sins (2 Chron. xxxv, 25). B.C. 609. See LAMENTATIONS.

We hear nothing of the prophet during the three months which constituted the short reign of Jehoahaz; but "in the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim" (B.C. 607) the prophet was interrupted in his ministry by "the priests and the prophets," who, with the populace, brought him before the civil authorities, urging that capital punishment should be inflicted on him for his threatenings of evil on the city unless the people amended their ways (ch. xxvi). The princes seem to have been in some degree aware of the results which the general corruption was bringing on the state, and if they did not themselves yield to the exhortations of the prophet, they acknowledged that he spoke in the name of the Lord, and were quite averse from so openly renouncing his authority as to put his messenger to death. It appears, however, that it was rather owing to the personal influence of one or two, especially Ahikam, than to any general feeling favorable to Jeremiah, that his life was preserved; and it would seem that he was then either placed under restraint, or else was in so much danger from the animosity of his adversaries as to make it prudent for him not to appear in public. In the fourth year of Jehoiakim (B.C. 605) he was commanded to write the predictions which had been given through him, and to read them to the people. From the cause, probably, which we have intimated above, he was, as he says, "shut up," and could not himself go into the house of the Lord (xxxvi, 5). He therefore deputed Baruch to write the predictions after him, and to read them publicly on the fast-day. These threatenings being thus anew made public, Baruch was summoned before the princes to give an account of the manner in which the roll containing them had come into his possession. The princes, who, without strength of principle to oppose the wickedness of the king, had sufficient respect for religion, as well as sagacity enough to discern the importance of listening to the voice of God's prophet, advised both Baruch and Jeremiah to conceal themselves, while they endeavored to influence the mind of the king by reading the roll to him. The result showed that their precautions were not needless. In his bold self-will and reckless daring the monarch refused to listen to any advice, even though coming with the professed sanction of the Most High. Having read three or four leaves, "he cut the roll with the penknife and cast it into the fire that was on the hearth, until all the roll was consumed," and gave immediate orders for the apprehension of Jeremiah and Baruch, who, however, were both preserved from the vindictive monarch. At the command of God the prophet procured another roll, in which he wrote all that was in the roll destroyed by the king, "and added besides unto them many like words" (xxxvi, 32). See BARUCH.

Near the close of the reign of Jehoiakim (B.C. 599), and during the short reign of his successor Jehoiachin or Jeconiah (B.C. 598), we find him still uttering his voice of warning (see ch. xiii, 18; comp. 2 Kings xxiv, 12, and Jer. xxii, 24-30), though without effect; and, after witnessing the downfall of the monarchs which he had himself predicted, he sent a letter of condolence and hope to those who shared the captivity of the royal family (ch. xxix-xxxi). It was not till the latter part of the reign of Zedekiah that he was put in confinement, as we find that "they had not put him into prison" when the army of Nebuchadnezzar commenced the siege of Jerusalem (xxxvii, 4, 5) (B.C. 589). On the investment of the city, the prophet had sent a message to the king declaring what would be the fatal issue, but this had so little effect that the slaves who had been liberated were again reduced to bondage by their fellow-citizens (ch. xxxiv). Jeremiah himself was incarcerated in the court of the prison adjoining the palace, where he predicted the certain return from the impending captivity (xxxii, 33). The Chaldæans drew off their army for a time on the report of help coming from Egypt to the besieged city, and now, feeling the danger to be imminent, and yet a ray of hope brightening their prospects, the king entreated Jeremiah to pray to the

Lord for them. The hopes of the king were not responded to in the message which Jeremiah received from God. He was assured that the Egyptian army would return to their own land, that the Chaldæans would come again, and that they would take the city and burn it with fire (xxxvii, 7, 8). The princes, apparently irritated by a message so contrary to their wishes, made the departure of Jeremiah from the city (for he appears to have been at this time released from confinement), during the short respite, the pretext for accusing him of deserting to the Chaldæans, and he was forthwith cast into prison, where he might have perished but for the humanity of one of the royal eunuchs (xxxvii, 12–xxxviii, 13). The king seems to have been throughout inclined to favor the prophet, and sought to know from him the word of the Lord; but he was wholly under the influence of the princes, and dared not communicate with him except in secret (xxxviii, 14-28), much less could he follow advice so obnoxious to their views as that which the prophet gave. Jeremiah, therefore, more from the hostility of the princes than the inclination of the king, was still in confinement when the city was taken, B.C. 588. Nebuchadnezzar formed a more just estimate of his character and of the value of his counsels, and gave a special charge to his captain, Nebuzar-adan, not only to provide for him, but to follow his advice (xxxix, 12). He was accordingly taken from the prison and allowed free choice either to go to Babylon, where doubtless he would have been held in honor in the royal court, or to remain with his own people (B.C. 587). With characteristic patriotism he went to Mizpah with Gedaliah, whom the Babylonian monarch had appointed governor of Judæa, and, after his murder, sought to persuade Johanan, who was then the recognised leader of the people, to remain in the land, assuring him and the people, by a message from God in answer to their inquiries, that, if they did so, the Lord would build them up, but if they went to Egypt, the evils which they sought to escape should come upon them there (ch. xlii). The people refused to attend to the divine message, and, under the command of Johanan, went into Egypt, taking Jeremiah and Baruch along with them (xliii, 6). In Egypt the prophet still sought to turn the people to the Lord, from whom they had so long and so deeply revolted (ch. xliv), but his writings give us no subsequent information respecting his personal history. Ancient traditions assert that he spent the remainder of his life in Egypt. According to the pseudo-Epiphanius, he was stoned by the people at Taphnæ (ἐν Τάφναις), the same as Tahpanhes, where the Jews were settled (*De Vitis Prophet.* ii, 239, quoted by Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphus V. T.* i, 1110). It is said that his bones were removed by Alexander the Great to Alexandria (Carpzov, *Introd.* pt. iii, p. 138, where other traditions respecting him may be found).

JEREMIAH, Book of. Jeremiah was contemporary with Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Ezekiel, and Daniel. No one who compares them can fail to perceive that the mind of Jeremiah was of a softer and more delicate texture than that of his illustrious contemporary Ezekiel, with whose writings his are most nearly parallel. His whole history convinces us that he was by nature mild and retiring (Ewald, *Propheten des Alt. Bund.* p. 2), highly susceptible and sensitive, especially to sorrowful emotions, and rather inclined, as we should imagine, to shrink from danger than to brave it. Yet, with this acute perception of injury, and natural repugnance from being "a man of strife," he never in the least degree shrinks from publicity; nor is he at all intimidated by reproach or insult, or even by actual punishment and threatened death, when he has the message of God to deliver.

1. The *style* of Jeremiah corresponds with this view of the character of his mind: though not deficient in power, it is peculiarly marked by pathos. He delights in the expression of the tender emotions, and employs all the resources of his imagination to excite corresponding feelings in his readers. He has an irresistible sympathy with the miserable, which finds utterance in the most touching descriptions of their condition.

The style of Jeremiah is marked by the peculiarities which belong to the later Hebrew, and by the introduction of Aramaic forms (Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, iii, 122; Gesenius, *Geschichte der Heb. Sprache*, p. 35). It was, we imagine, on this account that Jerome complained of a certain rusticity in Jeremiah's style. Lowth, however, says he can discover no traces of it, and regards Jeremiah as nearly equal in sublimity in many parts to Isaiah (*De Sacra Poesi Heb.* p. 426).

2. The *canonicity* of the writings of Jeremiah in general are established both by the testimony of ancient writers, and by quotations and references which occur in the New Testament. Thus the son of Sirach refers to him as a prophet consecrated from the womb, and quotes from Jer. i, 10 the commission with which he was intrusted (Ecclus. xlix, 7). In 2 Macc. ii, 1-8, there is a tradition respecting his hiding the tabernacle and the ark in a rock, in which he is called "Jeremiah the prophet." Philo speaks of him under similar titles, as προφήτης, μύστης, ἱεροφάντης, and calls a passage which he quotes from Jer. iii, 4 an oracle—χρησμόν (Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, i, 95). Josephus refers to him by name as the prophet who predicted the evils which were coming on the city, and speaks of him as the author of Lamentations (μέλος θρηνητικόν) which are still existing (*Ant.* x, 5, 1). His writings are included in the list of canonical books given by Melito, Origen (whose words are remarkable: Ἱερεμίας σὺν θρήνοις καὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ἐν ἑνί), Jerome, and the Talmud (Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, iii, 184). In the New Testament Jeremiah is referred to by name in Matt. ii, 17, where a passage is quoted from Jer. xxxi, 15, and in Matt. xvi, 14; in Heb. viii, 8-12, a passage is quoted from Jer. xxxi, 31-34. There is one other place in which the name of Jeremiah occurs—Matt. xxvii, 9—which has occasioned considerable difficulty, because the passage there quoted is not found in the extant writings of the prophet (see Kuinöl, *Com.* ad loc.). Jerome affirms that he found the exact passage in a Hebrew apocryphal book (Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphus*, i, 1103), but there is no proof that that book was in existence before the time of Christ. It is probable that the passage intended by Matthew is Zech. xi, 12, 13, which in part corresponds with the quotation he gives, and that the name is a gloss which has found its way into the text (see Olshausen, *Commentar über d. N. Test.* ii, 493).

3. The *genuineness* of some portions of the book has of late been disputed by German critics. Movers, whose views have been adopted by De Wette and Hitzig, attributes x, 1-16, and ch. xxx, xxxi, and xxxiii to the author of the concluding portion of the book of Isaiah. His fundamental argument against the last-named portion is, that the prophet Zechariah (viii, 7, 8) quotes from Jer. xxxi, 7, 8, 33, and in verse 9 speaks of the author as one who lived "in the day that the foundation of the house of the Lord of hosts was laid." But there is nothing in ver. 7 and 8 of Zechariah to prove that it is intended to be a quotation from any written prophecy, much less from this portion of Jeremiah. Hence Hitzig (*Jeremia*, p. 230) gives up the external evidence on which Movers had relied. The internal evidence arising from the examination of particular words and phrases is so slight, especially when the authenticity of the latter portion of Isaiah is maintained, that even Ewald agrees that the chapters in question, as well as the other passage mentioned (x, 1-16), are the work of Jeremiah. It seems, however, not improbable that the Chaldee of verse 11 is a gloss which has crept into the text, both because it is (apparently without reason) in another language, and because it seems to interrupt the progress of thought. The predictions against Babylon in ch. l and li are objected to by Movers, De Wette, and others on the ground that they contain many interpola-

tions. Ewald attributes them to some unknown prophet, who imitated the style of Jeremiah. Their authenticity is maintained by Hitzig (p. 391) and by Umbreit (p. 290-293), to whom we must refer for an answer to the objections made against them. The last chapter is generally regarded as an appendix added by some later author. It is almost verbally the same as the account in 2 Kings xxiv, 18; xxv, 30, and it carries the history down to a later period, probably, than that of the death of Jeremiah. That it is not his work seems to be indicated in the last verse of ch. li. (See generally Hävernick's *Einleitung*, ii, 232, etc.)

4. Much difficulty has arisen with respect to the writings of Jeremiah from the apparent disorder in which they stand in our present copies, and from the many disagreements between the Hebrew text and that found in the Septuagint version, and many conjectures have been hazarded respecting the occasion of this disorder. The following are the principal diversities between the two texts:

(*a.*) The chapters containing prophecies against foreign nations are placed in a different part of the book, and the prophecies themselves arranged in a different order, as in the following table:

Hebrew.	Septuagint.	Chronological.	
All nations, xxv, 14-38.	Elam, xxv, end (xlix, 34-39).	Egypt, xlvi, 1-12.	B.C. 607.
Egypt, xliii, 8-13.	Egypt, xxvi, entire (xlvi, 1-28).	Surrounding nations, xxv.	" 607.
" xliv, 1-30.	Babylon, xxvii, entire (l, 1-46).	Moab, Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Kedar, and Elam, xlviii, xlix.	" 595.
" xlvi, 1-28.	" xxviii, entire (li, 1-64).	Babylon, l, li.	" 594
Philistines, xlvii, 1-7.	Philistines, xxix, begin. (xlvii, 1-7).	Philistines, xlvii.	" 589.
Moab, xlviii, 1-47.	Edom, xxix, end (xlix, 7-22).	Egypt, xliii, 8-13, xliv, xlvi, 13-28.	" 587.
Ammon, xlix, 1-6.	Ammon, xxx, begin. (xlix, 1-5).		
Edom, xlix, 7-22.	Kedar, xxx, middle (xlix, 28-33).		
Damascus, xlix, 23-27.	Damascus, xxx, end (xlix, 23-27).		
Kedar, xlix, 28-33.	Moab, xxxi, entire (xlviii, 1-44).		
Elam, xlix, 34-39.	All nations, xxxii, entire (xxv, 15-38).		
Babylon, l, 1-46.	The other chaps. (xxxiii-li) follow in the same order as the Heb. (xxvi-xlv).		
" li, 1-64.			

(*b.*) Various passages which exist in the Hebrew are not found in the Greek copies (e.g. xxvii, 19-22; xxxiii, 14-26; xxxix, 4-14; xlviii, 45-47). Besides these discrepancies, there are numerous omissions and frequent variations of single words and phrases (Movers, *De utriusque Vaticiniorum Jeremiæ recensionis indole et origine*, p. 8-32). To explain these diversities, recourse has been had to the hypothesis of a double recension, a hypothesis which, with various modifications, is held by most modern critics (Movers, *ut supra;* De Wette, *Lehrbuch der Hist.-Crit. Einleit. in d. Alt. Test.* p. 303; Ewald, *Propheten des Alt. Bund.* ii, 23; Keil, *Einleit.* p. 300 sq.; Wichelhaus, *De Jeremiæ vers. Alex.* Hal. 1847).

Various attempts have been made to account for the present (apparently) disordered arrangement of Jeremiah's predictions. Rejecting those that proceed upon the assumption of accident (Blayney, *Notes*, p. 3) or the caprice of an amanuensis (Eichhorn, *Einl.* iii, 134), we notice that of Ewald (with which Umbreit substantially agrees, *Praktisch. Comment. über den Jeremia*, p. xxvii), who finds that various portions are prefaced by the same formula, "The word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord" (vii, 2; xi, 1; xviii, 1; xxi, 1; xxv, 1; xxx, 1; xxxii, 1; xxxiv, 1, 8; xxxv, 1; xl, 1; xliv, 1), or by the very similar expression, "The word of the Lord which came to Jeremiah" (xiv, 1; xlvi, 1; xlvii, 1; xlix, 34). The notices of time distinctly mark some other divisions which are more or less historical (xxvi, 1; xxvii, 1; xxxvi, 1; xxxvii, 1). Two other portions are in themselves sufficiently distinct without such indication (xxix, 1; xlv, 1), while the general introduction to the book serves for the section contained in ch. i. There are left two sections (chap. ii, iii), the former of which has only the shorter introduction, which generally designates the commencement of a strophe; while the latter, as it now stands, seems to be imperfect, having as an introduction merely the word "saying." Thus the book is divided into twenty-three separate and independent sections, which, in the poetical parts, are again divided into strophes of from seven to nine verses, frequently distinguished by such a phrase as "The Lord said also unto me." These separate sections are arranged by Ewald so as to form five distinct books: I. The introduction, ch. i. II. Reproofs of the sins of the Jews, ch. ii-xxiv, consisting of seven sections, viz. 1. ch. ii; 2. ch. iii-vi; 3. ch. vii-x; 4. ch. xi-xiii; 5. ch. xiv-xvii, 18; 6. ch. xvii, 19-xx; 7. ch. xxi-xxiv. III. A general review of all nations, the heathen as well as the people of Israel, consisting of two sections: 1. ch. xlvi-xlix (which he thinks have been transposed); 2. chap. xxv, and a historical appendix of three sections: 1. ch. xxvi; 2. ch. xxvii; and 3. ch. xxviii, xxix. IV. Two sections picturing the hopes of brighter times: 1. ch. xxx, xxxi; and 2. ch. xxxii, xxxiii; to which, as in the last book, is added a historical appendix in three sections: 1. ch. xxxiv, 1-7; 2. ch. xxxiv, 8-22; 3. ch. xxxv. V. The conclusion, in two sections; 1. ch. xxxvi; 2. ch. xlv. All this, he supposes, was arranged in Palestine during the short interval of rest between the taking of the city and the departure of Jeremiah with the remnant of the Jews to Egypt. In Egypt, after some interval, Jeremiah added three sections, viz. ch. xxxvii, xxxix, xl-xliii, and xliv. At the same time, probably, he added xlvi, 13-26, to the previous prophecy respecting Egypt, and, perhaps, made some additions to other parts previously written.

For a purely topical analysis of the book, see Dr. Davidson, in Horne's *Introd.* new ed. ii, 870 sq. The exact chronological position of some of the prophecies is exceedingly difficult to determine.

The principal predictions relating to the Messiah are found in chapter xxiii, 1-8; xxx, 31-40; xxxiii, 14-26 (Hengstenberg's *Christologie*, iii, 495-619).

5. The following are the special exegetical works on the whole of Jeremiah's prophecies, to a few of the most important of which we prefix an asterisk [*]: Origen, *Homiliæ* (in *Opp.* iii, 125); also *Selecta* (*ibid.* iii, 287); Ephraem Syrus, *Explanatio* (Syriac and Lat. in *Opp.* v, 98); Jerome, *In Jer.* (in *Opp.* iv, 833); Theodoret, *Interpretatio* (Greek, in *Opp.* II, i); Rabanus Maurus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.*); Rupertus Tuitiensis, *In Hierem.* (in *Opp.* i, 466); Thomas Aquinas, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* ii); Melancthon, *Argumentum* (in *Opp.* ii); Arama, אורים, etc. [includ. Isa.] (Ven. 1608, 4to; also in Frankfurter's Rabb. Bible); Zuingle, *Complanatio* (Tiguri, 1531, fol.; also in *Opp.* iii); Œcolampadius, *Commentarii* [includ. Lam.] (Argent. 1533, 4to); Bugenhagen, *Adnotationes* (Vitemb. 1546, 4to); De Castro, *Commentarius* [includ. Lam. and Baruch] (Par. 1559, Mogunt. 1616, fol.); Zichemius, *Enarrationes* (Colon. 1559, 8vo); Pintus, *Commentarius* [includ. Isa. and Lam.] (Lugdun. 1561, 1584, 1590, Salmant. 1581, fol.); Calvin, *Prælectiones* (Genev. 1563, 1576, 1589, fol.; in French, ib. 1565, fol.; trans. in English by Owen, Edinburgh, 1850, 5 vols. 8vo); Strigel, *Conciones* (Lips. 1566, 8vo); Selnecker, *Auslegung* (Lpz. 1566, 4to); Bullinger, *Conciones* (Tigurini, 1575, folio); Taillepied, *Commentarius* (Par. 1583, 4to); Heilbrunner, *Quæstiones* (Lauing. 1586, 8vo); Capella, *Commentaria* (Tarracon. 1586, 4to); Figuiero, *Paraphrasis* (Lugdun. 1596, 8vo); Brenz, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* iv); Broughton, *Commentarius* [includ. Lam.] (Geneva, 1606, 4to); Polan, *Commentarius* [includ. Lam.] (Basil. 1608, 8vo); Sanctius, *Commentarius* [includ. Lam.] (Lugdun. 1618, fol.); A Lapide, *In Jerem.* etc. (Antw. 1621, fol.); Ghisler, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1633, 3 vols. fol.); De Beira, *Considerationes* (Olyssip. 1633, fol.); Hulsemann, *Commentarius* [includ. Lam.] (Rudolphop. 1663, Lips. 1696, 4to); Forster, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1672, 1699, 4to);

Alting, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1688, folio; also in *Opp.* i, 649); *Seb. Schmidt, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1685, Fr. ad M. 1697, 1705, 2 vols. 4to); De Sacy, *Explication* (in French, Paris, 1691, 12mo); Noordbeek, *Vitligginge* (Franck. 1701, 4to); *Lowth, *Commentary* [includ. Lam.] (Lond. 1718, 4to; also in the "Commentary of Patrick," etc.); Petersen, *Zeugniss* (Francf. 1719, 4to); Rapel, *Predigten* (Lunenb. 1720, 1755, 2 vols. 4to); Ittig, *Predigten* (Dresden, 1722, 4to); Michaelis, *Observationes* [on parts, includ. Lam.] (Gotting. 1743, 4to); Burscher, *Erläuterung* (Leipzig, 1756, 8vo); Venema, *Commentarius* (Leov. 1765, 2 vols. 4to); *Blayney, *Notes* [includ. Lam.] (Oxf. 1784, 4to; 3d ed. Lond. 1836, 8vo); Schnurrer, *Observationes* [on parts] (Tub. 1793-4, 4 pts. 4to; also in Velthusen et cet. *Comment.* ii-iv); Leiste, *Observationes* [on parts] (Gotting. 1794, 8vo, and also in Pott. et cet. *Comment.* ii); Spohn, *Notæ* (Lips. 1794-1824, 2 vols. 8vo); Volborth, *Anmerkungen* (Celle, 1795, 8vo); Uhrich, *De Vatib. sacris* (Dresden, 1797, 4to); Schulz, *Scholia* (Norimburg, 1797, 8vo); Hensler, *Bemerkungen* [on parts] (Lpz. 1805, 8vo); Dereser, *Erklärung* [includ. Lam. and Baruch] (F. ad M. 1809, 8vo); Shalom-Kohen, *Uebersetzung* [with Hebrew commentary] (Fürth, 1810, 8vo); *Horsley, *Notes* [including Lam.] (in *Bibl. Crit.* ii, 1); Gaab, *Erklärung* [on parts] (Tüb. 1824, 8vo); Roorda, *Commentaria* [on parts] (Groning. 1824, 8vo); *Dahler, *Notes* (in French, Strasb. 1825-30, 2 vols. 8vo); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia* [including Lam.] (Lips. 1826-7, 2 vols. 8vo); Movers, *Recensiones Jerem.* (Hamb. 1827, 8vo); Knobel, *De Jerem. Chaldaizante* (Vratislav. 1831, 4to); Küper, *Jeremiæ interpres* (Berlin, 1837, 8vo); *Hitzig, *Erklärung* (Leipzig, 1841, 8vo); *Umbreit, *Commentar* (Hamb. 1842, 8vo); *Henderson, *Commentary* [includ. Lam.] (London, 1851, 12mo); Neumann, *Auslegung* [including Lam.] (Lpz. 1856, 8vo); Graf, *Erklärung* (Lpz. 1862, 2 vols. 8vo); Cowles, *Notes* (N. York, 1869, 12mo). See PROPHETS.

JEREMIAH, EPISTLE OF, one of the apocryphal writings, purporting to proceed from the pen of the prophet Jeremiah (q. v.).

1. *Title and Position.*—This apocryphal piece, which derives its title, ἐπιστολὴ Ἰερεμίου (Sept., Vulg., Syriac, etc.), from purporting to be an epistle sent by the prophet Jeremiah "to them which were to be led captive to Babylon," has different positions in the different MSS. It is placed after the Lamentations in Origen's Hexaplas, according to the Syriac Hexapla codex in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, in the Cod. Alex., the Arabic versions, etc.; in some editions of the Sept., in the Latin, and the Syriac, which was followed by Luther, the Zurich Bible, and the A. Vers. ("*Epistle of Jeremy*"), it constitutes the sixth chapter of the apocryphal book of Baruch, while Theodoret, Hilary of Poitiers, and several MSS. of the Sept. entirely omit it. It is, however, an independent production, and has nothing to do with Baruch. See BARUCH, BOOK OF.

2. *Design and Contents.*—The design of this epistle is to admonish the Jews who were going into captivity with the king to beware of the idolatry which they would see in Babylon. It tells the people of God not to become idolaters like the strangers, but to serve their own God, whose angel is with them (verse 1-7), and it exposes in a rhetorical declamation the folly of idolatry (verse 8-72), concluding every group of verses, which contains a fresh proof of its folly, with the reiterated remarks, "Seeing that they are no gods, fear them not" (ver. 16, 23, 29, 66), "How can a man think that they are gods?" (ver. 40, 44, 56, 64, 69), "How can a man not see that they are not gods?" (ver. 49, 53).

3. *Author, Date, original Language, Canonicity, etc.*—The inscription claims the authorship of this epistle for Jeremiah, who, it is said, wrote it just as the Jews were going to Babylon, which is generally reckoned to be the first year of Nebuchadnezzar the Great, or B.C. 606. This is the general opinion of the Roman Church, which, as a matter of course, regards it as canonical. But modern critics, both Jewish and Christian, who deny the power to any Church to override internal evidence, and defy the laws of criticism, have shown satisfactorily that its original language is Greek, and that it was written by Hellenistic Jews in imitation of Jeremiah, ch. x and xxix. This is corroborated by the fact that this epistle does not exist in the Hebrew, was never included in the Jewish canon, is designated by Jerome, who knew more than any father what the Jewish canon contained, as Ψευδεπίγραφος (*Proem. Commentar. in Hierom.*), was marked with *obeli* by Origen in his Hexapla, as is evident from the note of Cod. Chislianus (Βαροὺχ ὅλος ὠβέλισται κατὰ τοὺς ό), and was passed over by Theodoret, though he explained the book of Baruch. The date of this epistle cannot be definitely settled. It is generally supposed that 2 Macc. ii, 2 alludes to this epistle, and that it must, therefore, be older than this book of Maccabees. Herzfeld (*Geschichte d. V. Israel vor der Zerstörung des ersten Tempels*, Brunswick, 1847, p. 316) infers from it the very reverse, namely, that this epistle was written *after* the passage in 2 Macc., while Fritzsche and Davidson are utterly unable to see the appropriateness of the supposed reference. It is most probable that the writer lived towards the end of the Maccabæan period.

4. *Literature.*—Arnald, *A Critical Commentary on the Apocryphal Books, being a Continuation of Patrick and Lowth;* Eichhorn, *Einleitung in die apokryph. Schriften des Alten Testaments* (Lpz. 1795), p. 390 sq.; De Wette, *Einleit. in d. Alte Testament*, sec. 324; Fritzsche, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch z. d. Apokr. d. Alten Testamentes*, part i (Lpzg. 1851), p. 205 sq.; Keil, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1859), p. 731 sq.; Davidson, *The Text of the Old Testament considered* (London, 1856), p. 1038; also in Horne's *Introduction* (London, 1856), ii, 1038, 1039. See APOCRYPHA.

JEREMIAH, LAMENTATIONS OF. See LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH.

8. A priest who accompanied Zerubbabel from Babylon to Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 1). B.C. 536.

9. One of those who followed the princes in the circuit of the newly-repaired walls with the sound of trumpets (verse 34); apparently the same with one of the priests who subscribed the sacred covenant along with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 2). B.C. 446-cir. 410. He was possibly identical with No. 8.

Jeremiah II, patriarch OF CONSTANTINOPLE, was born in 1536. He was elected patriarch May 5, 1572; in 1579 he was driven from his see, but after the death of Metrophanes (1580) he regained his position. Shortly after he was imprisoned by order of the sultan on a charge of high treason. Liberated through the intervention of the ambassadors of France and Venice, he was again exiled to Rhodes in 1585. Finally, in 1587, he was again reinstated in the patriarchate by paying 500 ducats yearly to the party who had held it during his exile. The Church funds had been so reduced in consequence of all these struggles that there was no money to meet the expenses for worship. Under these circumstances, Jeremiah was obliged to seek help from the czar, in return for which he was obliged to create the metropolitan of Moscow a patriarch. This was accordingly done; but, Jeremiah having stopped at Kief on his return to Moscow, a number of bishops, who had accompanied him on his journey, and who had vehemently opposed his course, left him, and joined the Church of Rome. Some writers say that Jeremiah was persecuted for attempting to unite the Greek and the Latin churches. He was the patriarch with whom the Tübingen theologians entered into a correspondence in 1573, with the intention to bring over the Greek Church to the Reformers, and which resulted, as is well known, in the rejection of Luther's doctrines by the Greek Church. (See Chr. F. Schnurrer, *Orationes acad. historiam liter. illustrantes*, ed. H. E. G. Paulus, Tüb. 1828, p. 113 sq.). Jeremiah II died in 1594. See *Acta et Scripta Theologorum Wirtembergensium et Patriarchæ Constantinopolitani D. Hieremiæ* (Wirtemberg, 1584); *Acta*

Orientalis Ecclesiæ contra Lutheri heresim, monumentis, notis ac dissertationibus illustrata (Rome, 1739). See also *Sobranie Gosoudarst. Gramot*, vol. ii; Haigold, *Beilagen zum neuveränderten Russland* (Riga, 1769), vol. i; Levesque, *Hist. de Russie*, iii, 117; *Vicissitudes de l'Église des deuxcrites en Pologne et en Russie*, i, 47); *Document relatif au Patriarcat Moscovite* (Paris, 1857); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 668. See GREEK CHURCH.

Jeremiah, archbishop OF SENS, flourished in the latter half of the 8th and the early part of the 9th century. But little is known of his personal history. He was the successor of Magnus in 818 to the ecclesiastical office, and is supposed to have died in 827. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxv, 667.

Jeremi'as (Ἱερεμίας), a Græcized form of the name of two men.

1. JEREMIAH (q. v.) the prophet (Ecclus. xlix, 6; 2 Macc. xv, 14; Matt. xvi, 14).

2. (1 Esdr. ix, 34.) See JEREMAI.

Jer'emoth (Heb. *Yereymoth'*, יְרֵימוֹת, or *Yeremoth'*, יְרֵמוֹת, *heights*), the name of several men. See also JERIMOTH.

1. (Sept. Ἰαριμώθ.) The last named of the three sons of Mushi, grandson of Levi (1 Chron. xxiii, 23); called JERIMOTH in 1 Chron. xxiv, 30. B.C. post 1856.

2. (Sept. Ἱεριμώθ v. r. Ἱεριμούθ, Vulg. *Jerimoth*, A. V. "Jerimoth.") One of the "sons" of Becher, son of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii, 8). B.C. apparently 1017.

3. (Sept. Ἱεριμώθ.) A Levite, chief of the fifteenth division of Temple musicians as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxv, 22); probably the same called JERIMOTH in ver. 4. B.C. 1014.

4. (Sept. Ἰαριμώθ v. r. Ἀριμώθ.) One of the "sons" of Beriah, a Benjamite (1 Chron. viii, 14). B.C. appar. cir. 588. Probably the same with JEROHAM in ver. 27.

5. (Sept. Ἱεριμώθ v. r. Ἰαριμώθ.) An Israelite, one of the "sons" (? inhabitants) of Elam, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 26). B.C. 459.

6. (Ἰαρμώθ v. r. Ἀρμώθ, Vulg. *Jerimuth.*) Another Israelite, one of the "sons" (? inhabitants) of Zattu, who likewise divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Ezra x, 27). B.C. 459.

7. (Ezra x, 29, "and Ramoth.") See RAMOTH.

Jer'emy, a familiar form (1 Esdr. i, 28, 32, 47, 57; ii, 1; 2 Esdr. ii, 18; Baruch vi, title; 2 Macc. ii, 1, 5, 7; Matt. ii, 17; xxvii, 9) of the name of the prophet JEREMIAH (q. v.).

JEREMY, EPISTLE OF. See JEREMIAH, EPISTLE OF.

Jeri'ah (Heb. *Yeriyah'*, יְרִיָּה, *founded* by *Jehovah*, otherwise *fearer of Jehovah*, 1 Chron. xxvi, 31; Sept. Ἰωρίας v. r. Ἰουρίας, Vulg. *Jeria*, A. Vers. "Jerijah;" also in the paragogic form *Yeriya'hu*, יְרִיָּהוּ; Sept. Ἱεριά in 1 Chron. xxiii, 19, but Ἰεδιοῦ in 1 Chron. xxiv, 23; Vulgate *Jeriau*, Auth. Vers. "Jeriah"), the first in rank of the "sons" of Hebron in the Levitical arrangements instituted by David (1 Chron. ut sup.). B.C. 1014.

Jer'ibai (Heb. *Yeribay'*, יְרִיבַי, *contentious*; Sept. Ἰαριβαΐ v. r. Ἰαριβί), a son of Elnaam, and (together with his brother Joshaviah) one of David's famous bodyguard (1 Chron. xi, 46). B.C. 1046.

Jer'icho (Heb. *Yericho'*, יְרִיחוֹ, place of *fragrance*, prob. from balsamous herbs growing there; Josh. ii, 1, 2, 3; iii, 16; iv, 13, 19; v, 10, 13; vi, 1, 2, 25, 26; vii, 2; viii, 2; ix, 3; x, 1, 28, 30; xii, 9; xiii, 32; xvi, 1, 7; xviii, 12, 21; xx, 8; xxiv, 11; 2 Kings ii, 4, 15, 18; also written יְרֵחוֹ, *Yerecho'*, Numb. xxii, 1; xxvi, 3, 63; xxxi, 12; xxxiii, 48, 50; xxxiv, 15; xxxv, 1; xxxvi, 13; Deut. xxxii, 49; xxxiv, 1, 3; 2 Sam. x, 5; 2 Kings xxv, 5; 1 Chron. vi, 78; xix, 5; 2 Chron. xxviii, 15; Ezra ii, 34; Neh. iii, 2; vii, 36; Jer. xxxix, 5; lii, 8; once יְרִיחֹה, *Yerichoh'*, 1 Kings xvi, 34; Sept. and N. T. Ἱεριχώ, Josephus Ἱεριχοῦς [Gen. -οῦντος]; Strabo, xvi, 2, 41, Ἱερικοῦς; Ptolem. v, 16, 7; Ἱερεικοῦς; Vulg. *Jericho*; Justin. *Hierichus*), a city situated in a plain traversed by the Jordan, and exactly over against where that river was crossed by the Israelites under Joshua (Josh. iii, 16). It is first mentioned in connection with their approach to Palestine; they "pitched in the plains of Moab, on this side Jordan by Jericho" (Numb. xxii, 1). It was then a large and strong city, and must have existed for a long period. The probability is that on the destruction of the cities of the plain by fire from heaven Jericho was founded, and perhaps by some who had resided nearer the scene of the catastrophe, but who abandoned their houses in fear. Had the city existed in the time of Abraham and Lot, it would scarcely have escaped notice when the latter looked down on the plain of Jordan from the heights of Bethel (Gen. xiii). From the manner in which it is referred to, and the frequency with which it is mentioned, it was evidently the most important city in the Jordan valley at the time of the Exodus (Numb. xxxiv, 15; xxxi, 12; xxxv, 1, etc.). Such was either its vicinity or the extent of its territory that Gilgal, which formed their primary encampment, stood in its east border (Josh. iv, 19). That it had a king is a very secondary consideration, for almost every small town had one (xii, 9-24); in fact, monarchy was the only form of government known to those primitive times—the government of the people of God presenting a marked exception to prevailing usage. But Jericho was further inclosed by walls—a fenced city—its walls were so considerable that at least one person (Rahab) had a house upon them (ii, 15), and its gates were shut, as throughout the East still, "when it was dark" (v, 5). Again, the spoil that was found in it betokened its affluence—Ai, Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Hebron, Debir, and even Hazor, evidently contained nothing worth mentioning in comparison—besides sheep, oxen, and asses, we hear of vessels of brass and iron. These possibly may have been the first-fruits of those brass foundries "in the plain of Jordan" of which Solomon afterwards so largely availed himself (2 Chron. iv, 17). Silver and gold were found in such abundance that one man (Achan) could appropriate stealthily 200 shekels (100 oz. avoird.; see Lewis, *Heb. Rep.* vi, 57) of the former, and "a wedge of gold of 50 shekels (25 oz.) weight;" "a goodly Babylonish garment," purloined in the same dishonesty, may be adduced as evidence of a then existing commerce between Jericho and the far East (Josh. vi, 24; vii, 21). In fact, its situation alone—in so noble a plain, and contiguous to so prolific a river—would bespeak its importance in a country where these natural advantages have always been so highly prized, and in an age when people depended so much more upon the indigenous resources of nature than they are compelled to do now. Jericho was the city to which the two spies were sent by Joshua from Shittim: they were lodged in the house of Rahab the harlot upon the wall, and departed, having first promised to save her and all that were found in her house from destruction (Josh. ii, 1-21). The account which the spies received from their hostess tended much to encourage the subsequent operations of the Israelites, as it showed that the inhabitants of the country were greatly alarmed at their advance, and the signal miracles which had marked their course from the Nile to the Jordan. The strange manner in which Jericho itself was taken (see Hacks, *De ruina murorum Hierichuntiorum*, Jena, 1690) must have strengthened this impression in the country, and appears, indeed, to have been designed for that effect. The town was utterly destroyed by the Israelites, who pronounced an awful curse upon whoever should rebuild it; and all the inhabitants were put to the sword, except Rahab and her family (Josh. vi). Her house was recognised by the scarlet line bound in the window from which the spies were let down, and she and her relatives were taken out of it, and "lodged without the camp;" but it is nowhere said or implied that her house escaped the general conflagration. That she "dwelt in Israel" for the future; that she married Salmon, son of Naas-

son, "prince of the children of Judah," and had by him Boaz, the husband of Ruth and progenitor of David and of our Lord; and, lastly, that hers is the first and only Gentile name that appears in the list of the faithful of the O. T. given by Paul (Josh. vi, 25; 1 Chron. ii, 10; Matt. i, 5; Heb. xi, 31)—all these facts surely indicate that she did not continue to inhabit the accursed site; and, if so, and in the absence of all direct evidence from Scripture, how could it ever have been inferred that her house was left standing? (See Hoffmann, *Rahabs Erettung*, Berl. 1861.) See RAHAB.

Such as it had been left by Joshua, such it was bestowed by him upon the tribe of Benjamin (Josh. xviii, 21; it lay also on the border of Ephraim [Josh. xvi, 7]), and from this time a long interval elapses before Jericho appears again upon the scene. It is only incidentally mentioned in the life of David in connection with his embassy to the Ammonitish king (2 Sam. x, 5). The solemn manner in which its second foundation under Hiel the Bethelite is recorded—upon whom the curse of Joshua is said to have descended in full force (1 Kings xvi, 34)—would certainly seem to imply that up to that time its site had been uninhabited. It is true, mention is made of "a city of palm-trees" (Judg. i, 16, and iii, 13) in existence apparently at the time when spoken of, and Jericho is twice—once *before* its first overthrow, and once *after* its second foundation—designated by that name (see Deut. xxxiv, 3, and 2 Chron. xxviii, 15); but these designations must be understood to apply only to the *site*, in whatever condition at the time. (On the presence of these trees, see below.) However, once actually rebuilt, Jericho rose again slowly in importance. In its immediate vicinity the sons of the prophets sought retirement from the world, and Elisha "healed the spring of the waters;" and over and against it, beyond Jordan, Elijah "went up by a whirlwind into heaven" (2 Kings ii, 1-22). In its plains Zedekiah fell into the hands of the Chaldæans (2 Kings xxv, 5; Jer. xxxix, 5). By what may be called a retrospective account of it, we may infer that Hiel's restoration had not utterly failed, for in the return under Zerubbabel the "children of Jericho," 345 in number, are comprised (Ezra iii, 34; Neh. vii, 36); and it is even implied that they removed thither again, for the *men of Jericho* assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding that part of the wall of Jerusalem which was next to the sheep-gate (Neh. iii, 2). It was eventually fortified by the Syrian general Bacchides (1 Macc. ix, 50; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 1, 3).

The Jericho of the days of Josephus was distant 150 stadia from Jerusalem, and sixty from the Jordan. It lay in a plain overhung by a barren mountain, whose roots ran northward towards Scythopolis, and southward in the direction of Sodom and the Dead Sea. These formed the western boundaries of the plain. Eastward, its barriers were the mountains of Moab, which ran parallel to the former. In the midst of the plain—the great plain, as it was called—flowed the Jordan, and at the top and bottom of it were two lakes: Tiberias, proverbial for its sweetness, and Asphaltites for its bitterness. Away from the Jordan, it was parched and unhealthy during summer; but during winter, even when it snowed at Jerusalem, the inhabitants here wore linen garments. Hard by Jericho, bursting forth close to the site of the old city which Joshua took on his entrance into Canaan, was a most exuberant fountain, whose waters, before noted for their contrary properties, had received (proceeds Josephus) through Elisha's prayers their then wonderfully salutary and prolific efficacy. Within its range—seventy stadia (Strabo says 100) by twenty—the fertility of the soil was unexampled. Palms of various names and properties—some that produced honey scarcely inferior to that of the neighborhood; opobalsamum, the choicest of indigenous fruits; cyprus (Arabic "el-henna"), and myrobalanum ("zukkum") throve there beautifully, and thickly dotted about the pleasure-grounds (*War*, iv, 8, 3). These and other aromatic shrubs were here of peculiar fragrance (Justin. xxxvi, 3; Josephus, *Ant.* iv, 6, 1; xiv, 4, 1; xv, 4, 2; *War*, i, 6, 6; i, 18, 5). Wisdom herself did not disdain comparison with "the rose-plants of Jericho" (Ecclus. xxiv, 14). Well might Strabo (*Geog.* xvi, 2, § 41, ed. Müller) conclude that its revenues were considerable. The peculiar productions mentioned, in addition to those noticed above, were honey (Cedren. p. 104) and, in later times, the sugar-cane (see Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 290 sq.). See ROSE OF JERICHO.

By the Romans, Jericho was first visited under Pompey. He encamped there for a single night, and subsequently destroyed two forts—Threx and Taurus—that commanded its approaches (Strabo, *Geogr.* § 40). Dagon (Josephus, *War*, i, 2, 3) or Docus (1 Macc. xvi, 15; comp. ix, 50), where Ptolemy assassinated his father-in-law, Simon the Maccabee, may have been one of these strongholds, which were afterwards infested by banditti. Gabinius, in his resettlement of Judæa, made Jericho one of the five seats of assembly (Josephus, *War*, i, 8, 5). With Herod the Great it rose to still greater prominence: it had been found full of treasure of all kinds; as in the time of Joshua, so by his Roman allies who sacked it (*ibid.* i, 15, 6); and its revenues were eagerly sought and rented by the wily tyrant from Cleopatra, to whom Antony had assigned them (*Ant.* xv, 4, 2). Not long afterwards he built a fort there, which he called "Cyprus," in honor of his mother (*ibid.* xvi, 5); a tower, which he called, in honor of his brother, "Phasaelis;" and a number of new palaces, superior in their construction to those which had existed there previously, which he named after his friends. He even founded a new town higher up the plain, which he called, like the tower, Phasaelis (*War*, i, 21, 9). If he did not make Jericho his habitual residence, he at least retired thither to die—and to be mourned, if he could have got his plan carried out; and it was in the amphitheatre of Jericho that the news of his death was announced to the assembled soldiers and people by Salome (*War*, i, 33, 8). Soon afterwards the place was burned and the town plundered by one Simon, a revolutionary that had been slave to Herod (*Ant.* xvii, 10, 6); but Archelaus rebuilt the former sumptuously, founded a new town in the plain, that bore his own name, and, most important of all, diverted water from a village called Neæra to irrigate the plain, which he had planted with palms (*Ant.* xvii, 13, 1). Thus Jericho was once more "a city of palms" when our Lord visited it. As the city that had so exceptionally contributed to his own ancestry—as the city which had been the first to fall, amidst so much ceremony, before "the captain of the Lord's host and his servant Joshua"—we may well suppose that his eyes surveyed it with unwonted interest. It is supposed to have been on the rocky heights overhanging it (hence called by tradition the Quarentana) that he was assailed by the tempter; and over against it, according to tradition likewise, he had been previously baptized in the Jordan. Here he restored sight to the blind (two certainly, perhaps three [Matt. xx, 30; Mark x, 46]: this was in *leaving* Jericho; Luke says "as he was *come nigh unto* Jericho," etc. [xviii, 35]). Here the descendant of Rahab did not disdain the hospitality of Zacchæus the publican—an office which was likely to be lucrative enough in so rich a city. Finally, between Jerusalem and Jericho was laid the scene of his story of the good Samaritan, which, if it is not to be regarded as a real occurrence throughout, at least derives interest from the fact that robbers have ever been the terror of that precipitous road (comp. Phocas, ch. 20; see Schubert, iii, 72); and so formidable had they proved only just before the Christian æra, that Pompey had been induced to undertake the destruction of their strongholds (Strabo, as before, xvi, 2, § 40; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* xx, 6, 1 sq.). The way from Jerusalem to Jericho is still described by travellers as the most dangerous about Palestine. (See Hackett's *Illustra. of Script.* p. 206.) As lately as 1820, an English traveller, Sir Frederick Henniker, was attacked on this road by the Arabs with fire-

arms, who stripped him naked and left him severely wounded.

Posterior to the Gospels, Vespasian found it one of the toparchies of Judæa (*War*, iii, 3, 5), but deserted by its inhabitants in a great measure when he encamped there (*ibid.* iv, 8, 2). He left a garrison on his departure (not necessarily the 10th legion, which is only stated to have marched *through* Jericho) which was still there when Titus advanced upon Jerusalem. Is it asked how Jericho was destroyed? Evidently by Vespasian; for Josephus, rightly understood, is not so silent as Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* i, 566, 2d ed.) thinks. The city pillaged and burnt in Josephus (*War* iv, 9, 1) was clearly Jericho, with its adjacent villages, and not Gerasa, as may be seen at once by comparing the language there with that of 8, 2, and the agent was Vespasian. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s. v.) say that it was destroyed when Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans. They further add that it was afterwards rebuilt—they do not say by whom—and still existed in their day; nor had the ruins of the two preceding cities been obliterated. Could Hadrian possibly have planted a colony there when he passed through Judæa and founded Ælia? (Dion Cass. *Hist.* lxix, c. 11, ed. Sturz; more at large *Chron. Paschal.* p. 254, ed. Du Fresne.) The discovery which Origen made there of a version of the O. T. (the 5th in his Hexapla), together with sundry MSS., Greek and Hebrew, suggests that it could not have been wholly without inhabitants (Euseb. *E. H.* vi, 16; Epiphan. *Lib. de Pond. et Mensur.* circa med.); or again, as is perhaps more probable, did a Christian settlement arise there under Constantine, when baptisms in the Jordan began to be the rage? That Jericho became an episcopal see about that time under Jerusalem appears from more than one ancient Notitia (*Geograph. S.* a Carolo Paulo, p. 306, and the Parergon appended to it; comp. William of Tyre, *Hist.* lib. xxiii, ad f.). Its bishops subscribed to various councils in the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries (*ibid.*, and Le Quien's *Oriens Christian.* iii, 654). Justinian, we are told, restored a hospice there, and likewise a church dedicated to the Virgin (Procop. *De ædif.* v, 9). As early as A.D. 337, when the Bordeaux pilgrim (ed. Wesseling) visited it, a house existed there which was pointed out, after the manner of those days, as the house of Rahab. This was roofless when Arculfus saw it; and not only so, but the third city was likewise in ruins (Adamn. *De Locis S.* ap. Migne, *Patrolog. C.* lxxxviii, 799). Had Jericho been visited by an earthquake, as Antoninus reports (ap. Ugolini *Thesaur.* vii, p. mccxiii, and note to c. 3), and as Syria certainly was, in the 27th year of Justinian, A.D. 553? If so, we can well understand the restorations already referred to; and when Antoninus adds that the house of Rahab had now become a hospice and oratory, we might almost pronounce that this was the very hospice which had been restored by that emperor. Again, it may be asked, did Christian Jericho receive no injury from the Persian Romizan, the ferocious general of Chosroes II, A.D. 614? (Bar-Hebræi *Chron.* p. 99, Lat. v., ed. Kirsch). It would rather seem that there were more religious edifices in the 7th than in the 6th century round about it. According to Arculfus, one church marked the site of Gilgal; another the spot where our Lord was supposed to have deposited his garments previously to his baptism; a third within the precincts of a vast monastery dedicated to John, situated upon some rising ground overlooking the Jordan. Jericho meanwhile had disappeared as a town to rise no more. Churches and monasteries sprung up around it on all sides, but only to moulder away in their turn. The anchorite caves in the rocky flanks of the Quarentana are the most striking memorial that remains of early or mediæval enthusiasm. Arculfus speaks of a diminutive race—Canaanites he calls them—that inhabited the plain in great numbers in his day. They have retained possession of those fairy meadowlands ever since, and have made their head-quarters for some centuries round the "square tower or castle" first mentioned by Willebrand (ap. Leon. Allat. Συμμικτ. p. 151) in A.D. 1211, when it was inhabited by the Saracens, whose work it may be supposed to have been, though it has since been dignified by the name of the house of Zacchæus. Their village is by Brocardus (ap. Canis. *Thesaur.* iv, 16), in A.D. 1230, styled "a vile place;" by Sir J. Maundeville, in A.D. 1322, "a little village;" and by Henry Maundrell, in A.D. 1697, "a poor, nasty village;" in which verdict all modern travellers that have ever visited it must concur. (See *Early Travels in Pal.* by Wright, p. 177 and 451.) They are looked upon by the Arabs as a debased race, and are probably nothing more or less than veritable Gipsies, who are still to be met with in the neighborhood of the Frank mountain near Jerusalem, and on the heights round the village and convent of St. John in the desert, and are still called "Scomunicati" by the native Christians—one of the names applied to them when they first attracted notice in Europe in the 15th century (i. e. from feigning themselves "penitents" and under censure of the pope. See Hoyland's *Historical Survey of the Gipsies*, p. 18; also *The Gipsy*, a poem by A. P. Stanley).

Jericho does not seem to have ever been restored as a town by the Crusaders; but its plains had not ceased to be prolific, and were extensively cultivated and laid out in vineyards and gardens by the monks (Phocas ap. Leon. Allat. Συμμικτ. [c. 20], p. 31). They seem to have been included in the domains of the patriarchate of Jerusalem, and, as such, were bestowed by Arnulf upon his niece as a dowry (William of Tyre, *Hist.* xi, 15). Twenty-five years afterwards we find Melisendis, wife of king Fulco, assigning them to the convent of Bethany, which she had founded A.D. 1137.

The site of ancient (the first) Jericho is with reason placed by Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* i, 552–568) in the immediate neighborhood of the fountain of Elisha; and that of the second (the city of the New Test. and of Josephus) at the opening of the wady Kelt (Cherith), half an hour from the fountain. The ancient, and, indeed, the only practicable road from Jerusalem zigzags down the rugged and bare mountain side, close to the south bank of wady el-Kelt, one of the most sublime ravines in Palestine. In the plain, half a mile from the foot of the pass, and a short distance south of the present road, is an immense reservoir, now dry, and round it are extensive ruins, consisting of mounds of rubbish and ancient foundations. Riding northward, similar remains were seen on both sides of wady el-Kelt. Half a mile farther north we enter cultivated ground, interspersed with clumps of thorny *nubk* ("lote-tree") and other shrubs; another half mile brings us to Ain es-Sultân, a large fountain bursting forth from the foot of a mound. The water, though warm, is sweet, and is extensively used in the irrigation of the surrounding plain. The whole plain immediately around the fountain is strewn with ancient ruins and heaps of rubbish.

The village traditionally identified with Jericho now bears the name of *Riha* (in Arabic *er-Riha*) and is situated about the middle of the plain, six miles west from the Jordan, in N. lat. 34° 57′, and E. long. 35° 33′. Dr. Olin describes the present village as "the meanest and foulest of Palestine." It may perhaps contain forty dwellings, with some two hundred inhabitants. The houses consist of rough walls of old building-stones, roofed with straw and brushwood. Each has in front of it an inclosure for cattle, fenced with branches of the thorny nubk; and a stronger fence of the same material surrounds the whole village, forming a rude barrier against the raids of the Bedawin. Not far from the village is a little square castle or tower, evidently of Saracenic origin, but now dignified by the title of "the house of Zacchæus." This village, though it bears the name of Jericho, is about a mile and a half distant both from the Jericho of the prophets and that of the evangelists. Very probably it may occupy the site of Gilgal (q. v.). The ruinous state of the modern houses is in part owing to a comparatively recent event. Ibrahim Pasha, on his retreat from Damascus, near the close of 1840, having

been attacked by the Arabs in crossing the Jordan, sent a detachment of his army and razed Jericho to the ground.

The soil of the plain is unsurpassed in fertility; there is abundance of water for irrigation, and many of the old aqueducts are almost perfect; yet nearly the whole plain is waste and desolate. The grove supplied by the fountain is in the distance. The few fields of wheat and Indian corn, and the few orchards of figs, are enough to show what the place might become under proper cultivation. But the people are now few in number, indolent, and licentious. The palms which gave the ancient city a distinctive appellation are gone; even that "single solitary palm" which Dr. Robinson saw exists no more. The climate of Jericho is exceedingly hot and unhealthy. This is accounted for by the depression of the plain, which is about 1200 feet *below* the level of the sea. The reflection of the sun's rays from the bare white cliffs and mountain ranges which shut in the plain, and the noisome exhalations from the lake, and from the numerous salt-springs around it, are enough to poison the atmosphere.

For further details respecting Jericho, see Reland's *Palæst.* p. 383, 829 sq.; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 85 sq.; Otho's *Lex. Rabb.* p. 298 sq.; Bachiene, ii, 3, § 224 sq.; Hamesveld, ii, 291 sq.; Cellar. *Notit.* ii, 552 sq.; Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 267 sq.; Olin's *Travels*, ii, 195 sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 439 sq.

Jeri'ël (Heb. *Yeriël'*, יְרִיאֵל, *fearer of God*, or i. q. *Jeruel;* Sept. Ἰεριήλ), one of the sons of Tola, the son of Issachar, mentioned as a valiant chief of his tribe, which were enrolled in the time of David (1 Chron. vii, 2). B.C. post 1856.

Jeri'jah (1 Chron. xxvi, 31). See JERIAH.

Jer'imoth (Heb. *Yerimoth'*, יְרִימוֹת, *heights*, i. q. Jeremoth), the name of several men. See also JEREMOTH.

1. (Sept. Ἰεριμούθ.) One of the five sons of Bela, son of Benjamin, a valiant chief of his tribe (1 Chron. vii, 7). B.C. post 1856.

2. (Sept. Ἰεριμώθ.) The last named of the three sons of Mushi, grandson of Levi (1 Chron. xxiv, 30); elsewhere (1 Chron. xxiii, 23) called JEREMOTH (q. v.).

3. (Sept. Ἰαριμούθ v. r. Ἀριμώθ.) One of the famous Benjamite archers and slingers that joined David's band at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 5). B.C. 1055.

4. (Sept. Ἰεριμούθ v. r. Ἰεριμώθ.) One of the fourteen sons of Heman, and appointed a Levitical musician under his father in the arrangement of the sacred services by David (1 Chron. xxv, 4); probably the same elsewhere (ver. 22) called JEREMOTH.

5. (Sept. Ἰεριμούθ v. r. Ἰεριμώθ.) Son of Azriel, and "captain" of Naphtali under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 19). B.C. 1014.

6. (Sept. Ἐρμούθ v. r. Ἰεριμούθ.) A son of David, whose daughter Mahalath was Rehoboam's first wife (2 Chron. xi, 18). B.C. ante 973. He appears to have been different from any of David's sons elsewhere enumerated (2 Sam. iii, 2-5; 1 Chron. xiv, 4-7), having, perhaps, been born of a concubine (compare 2 Sam. xvi, 21). See DAVID. "This, in fact, is the Jewish tradition respecting his maternity (Jerome, *Quæstiones*, ad loc.). It is, however, somewhat questionable whether Rehoboam would have married the grandchild of a concubine even of the great David. The passage 2 Chron. xi, 18 is not quite clear, since the word 'daughter' is a correction of the *Keri:* the original text had בֵּן, i. e. 'son'"

7. (Sept. Ἰεριμώθ.) A Levite, one of the overseers of the Temple offerings in the time of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxxi, 13). B.C. 726.

Je'rioth (Heb. *Yerioth'*, יְרִיעוֹת, *timidity*, otherwise *curtains;* Ἰεριώθ), a person apparently named as the latter of the first two wives of Caleb, son of Hezron, several children being mentioned as the fruit of the marriage with one or the other (1 Chron. ii, 18). B.C. post 1856. The Vulgate renders this as the son of Caleb by the first-mentioned wife, and father of the sons named; but contrary to the Heb. text, which is closely followed by the Sept. There is probably some corruption; possibly the name in question is an interpolation: compare ver. 19; or perhaps we should render the connective by *even*, thus making Jerioth but another name for Azubah.

Jerment, GEORGE, D.D., a minister of the Secession Church of Scotland, was born in 1759 at Peebles, Scotland, where his father was at the time pastor of a church of that branch of the Secession Church denominated before their union in 1819 as Anti-burgher. On the completion of his collegiate course he entered the divinity hall of his denomination, situated at Alloa, and, while a student there, took a high standing in his class. After preaching a short time in Scotland he went to London, to become the colleague of Mr. Wilson, at the Secession Church in Bow Lane, Cheapside, and was ordained in the last week of Sept. 1782. In the English metropolis Jerment was well received, and he labored there for the space of thirty-five years, his preaching attracting large and respectable congregations from the Scottish residents of London. He died May 23, 1819. "His character stood very high in the estimate of all who knew him, as a man of sense, learning, prudence, and exalted piety." He was one of the first directors of the London Missionary Society, and greatly encouraged the enterprise. The writings of Jerment intrusted to the press are mainly public lectures and sermons (London, 1791-1813). Among these his *Early Piety, illustrated and recommended in several Discourses;* and *Religion, a Monitor to the Middle-aged and the Glory of old Men*, deserve to occupy a conspicuous place. See Morison, *Fathers and Founders of Lond. Miss. Society*, p. 506 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jerobo'äm (Heb. *Yarobam'*, יָרָבְעָם, *increase of the people;* Sept. Ἱεροβοάμ, Josephus Ἱεροβόαμος), the name of two of the kings of the separate kingdom of Israel.

1. The son of Nebat (by which title he is usually distinguished in the record of his infamy) by a woman named Zeruah, of the tribe of Ephraim (1 Kings xi, 26). He was the founder of the schismatical northern kingdom, consisting of the ten tribes, over which he reigned twenty-two (current) years, B.C. 973-951. At the time he first appears in the sacred history his mother was a widow, and he had already been noticed by Solomon as a clever and active young man, and appointed one of the superintendents of the works which that magnificent king was carrying on at Jerusalem, having special charge of the services required of the leading tribe of Ephraim (1 Kings xi, 26-28; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 7, 7). B.C. 1010-998. This appointment, the reward of his merits, might have satisfied his ambition had not the declaration of the prophet Ahijah given him higher hopes. When informed that, by the divine appointment, he was to become king over the ten tribes about to be rent from the house of David, he was not content to wait patiently for the death of Solomon, but began to form plots and conspiracies, the discovery of which constrained him to flee to Egypt to escape condign punishment, B.C. cir. 980. The king of that country was but too ready to encourage one whose success must necessarily weaken the kingdom which had become great and formidable under David and Solomon, and which had already pushed its frontier to the Red Sea (1 Kings xi, 29-40).

When Solomon died, the ten tribes sent to call Jeroboam from Egypt; and he appears to have headed the deputation that came before the son of Solomon with a demand of new securities for the rights which the measures of the late king had compromised. It may somewhat excuse the harsh answer of Rehoboam that the demand was urged by a body of men headed by one whose pretensions were so well known and so odious to

the house of David. It cannot be denied that, in making their applications thus offensively, they struck the first blow, although it is possible that they, in the first instance, intended to use the presence of Jeroboam for no other purpose than to frighten the king into compliance. The imprudent answer of Rehoboam rendered a revolution inevitable, and Jeroboam was then called to reign over the ten tribes by the style of "King of Israel" (1 Kings xii, 1-20). Autumn, B.C. 973. See REHOBOAM. (For the general course of his conduct on the throne, see the article ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.) The leading object of his policy was to widen the breach between the two kingdoms, and to rend asunder those common interests among all the descendants of Jacob, which it was one great object of the law to combine and interlace. To this end he scrupled not to sacrifice the most sacred and inviolable interests and obligations of the covenant people by forbidding his subjects to resort to the one temple and altar of Jehovah at Jerusalem, and by establishing shrines at Dan and Beth-el—the extremities of his kingdom—where "golden calves" were set up as the symbols of Jehovah, to which the people were enjoined to resort and bring their offerings. See CALF, GOLDEN. The pontificate of the new establishment he united to his crown, in imitation of the Egyptian kings (1 Kings xii, 26-33). He was officiating in that capacity at Beth-el, offering incense, when a prophet (Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 8, 5, calls him Jadon, i. e. probably Iddo; compare *Ant.* viii, 15, 4; Jerome, *Quæst. Hebr.* on 2 Chron. x, 4) appeared, and in the name of the Lord announced a coming time, as yet far off, in which a king of the house of David, Josiah by name, should burn upon that unholy altar the bones of its ministers. He was then preparing to verify, by a commissioned prodigy, the truth of the oracle he had delivered, when the king attempted to arrest him, but was smitten with palsy in the arm he stretched forth. At the same time the threatened prodigy took place—the altar was rent asunder, and the ashes strewed far around. Awe-struck at this twofold miracle, the king begged the prophet to intercede with God for the restoration of his hand, which was accordingly healed (1 Kings xiii, 1-6). B.C. 973. This measure had, however, no abiding effect. The policy on which he acted lay too deep in what he deemed the vital interests of his separate kingdom to be even thus abandoned; and the force of the considerations which determined his conduct may in part be appreciated from the fact that no subsequent king of Israel, however well disposed in other respects, ever ventured to lay a finger on this schismatical establishment (1 Kings xiii, 33, 34). Hence "the sin of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, wherewith he sinned and made Israel to sin," became a standing phrase in describing that iniquity from which no king of Israel departed. See IDOLATRY.

The contumacy of Jeroboam eventually brought upon him the doom which he probably dreaded beyond all others—the speedy extinction of the dynasty which he had taken so much pains and incurred so much guilt to establish on firm foundations. His son Abijah being sick, he sent his wife, disguised, to consult the prophet Ahijah, who had predicted that he should be king of Israel. The prophet, although he had become blind with age, knew the queen, and saluted her with, "Come in, thou wife of Jeroboam, for I am sent to thee with heavy tidings." These were not merely that the son should die—for that was intended in mercy to one who alone, of all the house of Jeroboam, had remained faithful to his God, and was the only one who should obtain an honored grave—but that his race should be violently and utterly extinguished: "I will take away the remnant of the house of Jeroboam as a man taketh away dung, till it be all gone" (1 Kings xiv, 1-18). The son died as soon as the mother crossed the threshold on her return; and, as the death of Jeroboam himself is the next event recorded, it would seem that he did not long survive his son (1 Kings xiv, 20). B.C. early in 951. (See Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustrations*, ad loc.)

"Jeroboam was at constant war with the house of Judah, but the only act distinctly recorded is a battle with Abijah, son of Rehoboam, in which, in spite of a skilful ambush made by Jeroboam, and of much superior force, he was defeated, and for the time lost three important cities—Beth-el, Jeshanah, and Ephraim. The Targum on Ruth iv, 20 mentions Jeroboam's having stationed guards on the roads, which guards had been slain by the people of Netophah; but what is here alluded to, or when it took place, we have at present no clew to." The Sept. has a long addition to the Biblical account (at 1 Kings xii, 24), evidently taken from some apocryphal source. Josephus simply follows the Hebrew text. (See Cassel, *König Jeroboam*, Erfurt, 1857.)

2. The son and successor of Jehoash, and the fourteenth king of Israel, for a period of forty-one years, B.C. 823-782 (2 Kings xiv, 23). He followed the example of the first Jeroboam in keeping up the idolatry of the golden calves (2 Kings xiv, 24). Nevertheless, the Lord had pity upon Israel (2 Kings xiv, 26), the time of its ruin had not yet come, and this reign was long and flourishing, being contemporary with those of Amaziah (2 Kings xiv, 23) and Uzziah (2 Kings xv, 1) over Judah. Jeroboam brought to a successful result the wars which his father had undertaken, and was always victorious over the Syrians (comp. 2 Kings xiii, 4; xiv, 26, 27). He even took their chief cities of Damascus (2 Kings xiv, 28; Amos i, 3-5) and Hamath, which had formerly been subject to the sceptre of David, and restored to the realm of Israel the ancient eastern limits from Lebanon to the Dead Sea (2 Kings xiv, 25; Amos vi, 14). Ammon and Moab were reconquered (Amos i, 13; ii, 1-3); the Transjordanic tribes were restored to their territory (2 Kings xiii, 5; 1 Chron. v, 17-22). But it was merely an outward restoration. The sanctuary at Beth-el was kept up in royal state (Amos vii, 13), while drunkenness, licentiousness, and oppression prevailed in the country (Amos ii, 6-8; iv, 1; vi, 6; Hos. iv, 12-14; i, 2), and idolatry was united with the worship of Jehovah (Hos. iv, 13; xiii, 6). During this reign lived the prophets Hosea (Hos. i, 1), Joel (comp. Joel iii, 16 with Amos i, 12), Amos (Amos i, 1), and Jonah (2 Kings xiv, 25). In Amos vii, 11, Amaziah, the high-priest of Beth-el, in reporting what he called the conspiracy of Amos against Jeroboam, represents the prophet as declaring that Jeroboam should die by the sword; and some would regard this as a prophecy that had failed of its fulfilment, as there is no evidence that his death was other than natural, for he was buried with his ancestors in state (2 Kings xiv, 29), although the interregnum of eleven years which intervened before the accession of his son Zechariah (2 Kings xiv, 23, comp. with xv, 8) argues some political disorder at the time of his death (see the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1847, iii, 648). But the probability rather is that the high-priest, who displayed the true spirit of a persecutor, gave an unduly specific and offensive turn to the words of Amos, in order to inflame Jeroboam the more against him. The only passages of Scripture where his name occurs are 2 Kings xiii, 13; xiv, 16, 23, 27, 28, 29; xv, 1, 8; 1 Chron. v, 17; Hos. i, 1; Amos i, 1; vii, 9, 10, 11; in all others the former Jeroboam is intended. See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

Jero'ham (Heb. *Yerocham'*, יְרֹחָם, *cherished*), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Ἱερεμεήλ, Ἱεροβοάμ, Ἱεοεάμ.) The son of Elihu (Eliab, Eliel), and father of Elkanah, Samuel's father (1 Sam. i, 1; 1 Chron. vi, 27, 34). B.C. ante 1142.

2. (Sept. Ἰεροάμ v. r. Ἰροάμ.) An inhabitant of Gedor, and father of Joelah and Zebadiah, two of the Benjamite archers who joined David's band at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 7). B.C. ante 1055.

3. (Sept. Ἰωράμ v. r. Ἰρωάβ.) The father of Azareel, which latter was "captain" of the tribe of Dan under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 22). B.C. ante 1017.

4. (Sept. Ἰωράμ.) Father of Azariah, which latter is the first mentioned of the two of that name among the "captains of hundreds" with whom Jehoiada planned the restoration of prince Jehoash to the throne (2 Chron. xxiii, 1). B.C. ante 876.

5. (Sept. Ἰεροάμ v. r. Ἰροάμ.) The father of several Benjamite chiefs resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. vii, 27). B.C. appar. ante 588. See No. 6; also JEREMOTH, 4.

6. (Sept. Ἰεροάμ v. r. Ἰεροβοάμ.) The father of Ibneiah, which latter was one of the Benjamite chiefs resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. ix, 8). B.C. apparently ante 536. Possibly identical with the preceding.

7. (Sept. Ἰεραάμ v. r. Ἰραάμ.) The son of Pashur, and father of Adaiah, which last was one of the chief priests resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. ix, 12). B.C. apparently ante 536.

8. (Sept. Ἰεροάμ.) The son of Pelaliah, and father of Adaiah, which last was one of the chief priests resident at Jerusalem after the Exile (Neh. xi, 12). B.C. ante 440. Perhaps, however, this Jeroham was the same with No. 7.

Jerome (fully Latinized *Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus*), generally known as SAINT JEROME, one of the most learned and able among the fathers of the Western Church, was born at Stridon, a town on the confines of Dalmatia and Pannonia (but whose site is now unknown, as the place was destroyed by the Goths in A.D. 377), at some period between 331 and 345—according to Schaff, it probably occurred near 345. His parents were both Christians. His early education was superintended by his father, after which he studied Greek and Latin rhetoric and philosophy under Ælius Donatus at Rome. While a resident in this Christian city he was admitted to the rite of baptism, and decided to devote his life, in rigid abstinence, to the service of his Master. It seems uncertain whether a visit which he made to Gaul was undertaken before or after this important event. At any rate, about 370 we find him at Treves and at Aquileia, busy in transcribing the commentaries of Hilarius on the Psalms, and a work on the synods by the same author; and in composing his first theological essay, *De muliere septies percussa*, the letter to Innocentius. In 373 he set out on a journey to the East, in company with his friends Innocentius, Evagrius, and Heliodorus, and finally settled for a time at Antioch. During his residence at this place he was seized with a severe fever, and in a dream which he had in this sickness he fancied himself called before the judgment bar of God, and as a heathen Ciceronian (he had hitherto given much of his time to the study of the classical writers) so severely reprimanded and scourged that even the angels interceded for him from sympathy with his youth, and he himself was led to take the solemn vow hereafter to forsake the study and reading of worldly books, a pledge which, however, he did not adhere to in after life. A marked religious fervor thenceforth animated Jerome; a devotion to monastic habits became the ruling principle, we might say the ruling passion of his life he retired to the desert of Chalcis in 374, and there spent four years in penitential exercises and in study, paying particular attention to the acquirement of the Hebrew tongue. But his active and restless spirit soon brought him again upon the public stage, and involved him in all the doctrinal and ecclesiastical controversies of those controversial times. See MELETIUS. In 379 he was ordained a presbyter by bishop Paulinus in Antioch, without receiving charge of a congregation, as he preferred the itinerant life of a monk and student to a fixed office. About 380 he journeyed to Constantinople, where, although past a student's age, he was not ashamed to take his seat at the feet of the celebrated Gregory Nazianzen, and to listen to the anti-Arian sermons of this learned father of the Church. Indeed, the pupil and instructor soon became great friends; and there resulted from his study of the Greek language and literature, to which much of his time and attention was here devoted, several translations from the writings of the early Greek fathers, among which the most important are the Chronicle of Eusebius, and the homilies of Origen on Jeremiah and Ezekiel. It cost Jerome no small sacrifice to tear himself away from his friend and instructor to return in 382 to Rome as mediator in the Meletian schism, which greatly agitated the Church of Antioch at this time. In a council which was convened at Rome Jerome took a prominent part, and afterwards acted as secretary to the Roman pontiff. By his adherence to Damasus a close friendship sprang up between these two great men, which was broken only by the death of the pontiff. Some writers have criticised the conduct of Jerome against the Eastern churches, and believe that Damasus purchased the influence of Jerome for his party; but for this opinion, as well as for that of others, that the domineering manner of Damasus made Jerome pliant and servile, there are no good grounds; indeed, Jerome was too independent and determined in character ever to be swayed in his opinion by the will of others. It is more likely that the flattery which Damasus bestowed on Jerome by recognising his abilities as superior, and urging him to undertake those vast exegetical labors which finally resulted in presenting the Church with a revised Latin version of the Bible (see below on the *Vulgate*), was what drew Jerome to Damasus, and made him one of the bishop's most faithful adherents.

Jerome's fame as a man of eloquence, learning, and sanctity was at this period in its zenith, and he improved his advantages to further the interests of monasticism. Everywhere he extolled the merit of that mode of life, though it had hitherto found few advocates at Rome, and the clergy had even violently opposed it. He commended monastic seclusion even against the will of parents, interpreting the word of the Lord about forsaking father and mother as if monasticism and Christianity were the same. "Though thy mother, with flowing hair and rent garments, should show thee the breasts which have nourished thee: though thy father should lie upon the threshold; yet depart thou, treading over thy father, and fly with dry eyes to the standard of the cross. . . . The love of God and the fear of hell easily rend the bonds of the household asunder. The holy Scripture indeed enjoins obedience to parents, but he who loves them more than Christ loses his soul. . . . O desert, where the flowers of Christ are blooming! O solitude, where the stones for the new Jerusalem are prepared! O retreat, which rejoices in the friendship of God! What doest thou in the world, my brother, with thy soul greater than the world? How long wilt thou remain in the shadow of roofs, and in the smoky dungeon of cities? Believe me, I see here more of the light" (Ep. xiv). Many pious persons placed themselves under his spiritual direction; "even the senator Pammachius, son-in-law to Paula (one of Jerome's most celebrated female converts), and heir to a fortune, gave his goods to the poor, exchanged the purple for the cowl, exposed himself to the mockery of his colleagues, and became, in the flattering language of Jerome, the general-in-chief of Roman monks, the first of monks in the first of cities" (Schaff, ii, 211). His converts for the monastic life were, however, mainly of the female sex, and mostly daughters and widows of the most wealthy and honorable classes of Rome. These patrician converts "he gathered as a select circle around him; he expounded to them the holy Scriptures, in which some of those Roman ladies were very well read; he answered their questions of conscience; he incited them to celibate life, lavish beneficence, and enthusiastic asceticism; and flattered their spiritual vanity by extravagant praises. He was the oracle, biographer, admirer, and eulogist of these holy women, who constituted the spiritual nobility of Catholic Rome." . . . But "his intimacy with these distinguished women, whom he admired more, perhaps, than they admired him, together with his unsparing at-

tacks upon the immoralities of the Roman clergy and of the higher classes, drew upon him much unjust censure and groundless calumny, which he met rather with indignant scorn and satire than with quiet dignity and Christian meekness;" and when his patron Damasus died, in A.D. 384, he found it necessary, or, at least, thought it the more prudent course, to quit Rome, and to seek a home in the East. As "the solitudes of Europe were not yet sufficiently sanctified to satisfy a passion for holy seclusion," by which Jerome was now wholly controlled, and "as the celebrity attending on ascetic privations was still chiefly confined to the Eastern world, Jerome bade adieu to his native hills, to his hereditary property, to pontifical Rome herself," and, after touching at Rhegium and Cyprus, where he enjoyed a visit with Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, and a short stay at Antioch, he continued his journey to the Holy Land, and finally settled in 386 at Bethlehem. "In a retreat so well qualified to nourish religious emotion even in the most torpid heart, the zeal of Jerome did not slumber, but rather seemed to catch fresh fire from the objects and the recollections which surrounded him.... In that peaceful, pure, and pious solitude, where it was natural enough that he should exaggerate the merits of mortification, and fasting, and celibacy, and pilgrimage, and disparage the substantial virtues, which he could rarely witness, and which he could never practice," he gave himself up wholly to the further study of the sacred language, and here completed the great literary labor of his life, the translation of the Scriptures. He was followed to this place by several of his lady friends, one of whom, Paula (q. v.), founded here four convents—three for nuns, one for monks—the last of which she placed under the care of Jerome. But his life, even in this retreat, was by no means a quiet or peaceful one: wild and awful as the abode was, it did not deter him from sending forth from these solitudes fiery and vehement invectives not only against the opponents of Church orthodoxy, like Helvidius (against whom he had appeared before in 384), Jovinian (q. v.), Vigilantius (q. v.), and the Pelagians (q. v.), but he engaged in controversies even with his former friend Rufinus (q. v.; see also ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSY), and in a moderate form even with St. Augustine (see Möhler, *Vermischte Schriften*, i, 1 sq.; Hieron. *Opera*, ed. Vall. i, 632 sq.) By his controversy with the Pelagians he had endangered his life, and he was obliged to flee from Bethlehem, and to live in concealment for over two years. In 418 he returned again to his monastery at Bethlehem, worn out in body and mind by unceasing toil, privations, and anxieties, and, seized by sickness, his feeble frame soon gave way, and he died in 419 or 420 (some say Sept. 30, 420).

The influence which Jerome exerted on his contemporaries, the prominence which they assigned him, and the regard which the Christian Church has ever since bestowed upon him, may be justified in view of the customs of the period in which he lived. It is by considering both the sunny and shadowy side, not only of his own life, but also of the Christian Church in the 4th century, that we can accord to him a place among the great teachers and holy men of the early Church, and can afford to overlook the glaring inconsistencies and violent passions which disfigure him so greatly, and which have inclined Protestant writers not unfrequently to call him "a Church father of doubtful character." We think Dr. Vilmar (*Jahrbücher deutscher Theol.* x, 746) has best delineated Jerome's character when he says, "Jerome yielded to the spirit which animated the Church in his day, and willingly intrusted his spiritual development to her care in so far as he lacked independent judgment. And it is in this that his greatness consists, in his ability well to discern the true wants and opinions of his day from the vacillating views of the masses, and the capricious inclinations of the men of momentary power. No opposition could move him from the defence of anything when once discerned by him as a truth. . . . Where he judged himself to be in the right, he manifested the energy worthy of a Roman, even though the world was against him." Thus he hesitated not to encounter the opposition of all Rome when once he believed it to be his duty to come forward as a promoter of monasticism "in a country where it was as yet but little loved, in the great capital, where the rigidly ascetic tendency came into collision with the propensities and interests of many," and where "he could not fail, even on this score, to incur the hatred of numbers, both of the clergy and laity" (Neander, ii, 683). Still, to his praise be it said, that however greatly we regret this attitude of Jerome in behalf of monachism, which, at this early period of the life of the Christian Church, may be pardoned on the ground that such great personal sacrifices and privations were the only proofs which the young convert could bring to evince his earnestness and zeal for the cause of his Master, yet "no one has denounced, no one has branded more energetically than he the false monks, the false penitents, the false widows and virgins. He points out with a bold hand all the faults and dangers of the institution," so far, of course, as an advocate of monasticism could have ventured to do it at all (compare Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, i, 406 sq.; Lea, *Celibacy*, p. 72 sq.). Jerome, in short, was in the service of the popular opinion, and yet never yielded to the opinion of the day. In the opinion of Neander, Jerome's "better qualities were obscured by the great defects of his character, by his mean passions, his easily offended vanity, his love of controversy and of rule, his pride, so often concealed under the garb of humility." Much milder is the judgment of Dr. Schaff, who pronounces Jerome "indeed an accomplished and most serviceable scholar, *and a zealous enthusiast for all which his age counted holy* . . . . and that he reflected with the virtues the failings also of his age and of the monastic system," adding in a foot-note that "among later Protestant historians opinion has become somewhat more favorable," though he again modifies this statement by saying that this has reference "rather to his learning than to his moral character."

The Vulgate.—Jerome gave also great offence to his contemporaries by his attempt to correct the Latin version of the Bible, then "become greatly distorted by the blending together of different translations, the mixing up with each other of the different Gospels, and the ignorance of transcribers." This he successfully completed, and it is regarded by all Biblical scholars as "by far the most important and valuable" work of Jerome, in itself constituting "an immortal service" to the Christian Church. "Above all his contemporaries, and even all his successors down to the 16th century, Jerome, by his linguistic knowledge, his Oriental travel, and his entire culture, was best fitted, and, in fact, the only man to undertake and successfully execute so gigantic a task—a task which just then, with the approaching separation of East and West, and the decay of the knowledge of the original languages of the Bible in Latin Christendom, was of the highest necessity. Here, as so often in history, we plainly discern the hand of divine Providence" (Schaff). He had been urged to undertake this work by bishop Damasus, and it was commenced, as already noted, while Jerome was yet a resident at Rome, and had there amended the translation of the Gospels and the Psalms. In his retreat at Bethlehem he extended this work to the whole Bible, supported in his task, it is generally believed, by the Hexapla of Origen, which he is supposed to have obtained from the library at Cæsarea. "Even this was a bold undertaking, by which he must expose himself to being loaded with reproaches on the part of those who, in their ignorance, which they identified with a pious simplicity, were wont to condemn every deviation from the traditional text, however necessary or salutary it might be. They were very ready to see, in any change of the only text which was known to them, a falsification, without in-

quiring any further into the reason of the alteration. Yet here he had in his favor the authority of a Roman bishop, as well as the fact that in this case it was impossible to oppose to him a translation established and transmitted by ecclesiastical authority, or a divine inspiration of the text hitherto received. . . . But he must have given far greater offence by another useful undertaking, viz. a new version of the Old Testament, not according to the Alexandrian translation, which before this had alone been accepted, but according to the Hebrew. This appeared to many, even of those who did not belong to the class of ignorant persons, a great piece of impiety—to pretend to understand the Old Testament better than the seventy inspired interpreters—better than the apostles who had followed this translation, and who would have given another translation if they had considered it to be necessary—to allow one's self to be so misled by Jews as for their accommodation to falsify the writings of the Old Testament!" (Neander, *Church History*, ii, 684 sq.) But with the opposition there came also friends, and among his supporters he counted even Augustine, until gradually it was introduced in all the churches of the West. Of this great work, as a whole, Dr. Schaff thus speaks (*Ch. History*, iii, 975 sq.): "The Vulgate takes the first place among the Bible versions of the ancient Church. It exerted the same influence upon Latin Christendom as the Septuagint upon Greek, and it is directly or indirectly the mother of most of the earlier versions in the European vernaculars. It is made immediately from the original languages, though with the use of all accessible helps, and is as much superior to the Itala as Luther's Bible is to the older German versions. From the present stage of Biblical philology and exegesis the Vulgate can be charged, indeed, with innumerable faults, inaccuracies, inconsistencies, and arbitrary dealing in particulars; but, notwithstanding these, it deserves, as a whole, the highest praise for the boldness with which it went back from the half-deified Septuagint directly to the original Hebrew; for its union of fidelity and freedom; and for the dignity, clearness, and gracefulness of its style. Accordingly, after the extinction of the knowledge of Greek, it very naturally became the *clerical* Bible of Western Christendom, and so continued to be till the genius of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland, Holland, and England, returning to the original text, and still further penetrating the spirit of the Scriptures, though with the continual help of the Vulgate, produced a number of *popular* Bibles, which were the same to the evangelical laity that the Vulgate had been for many centuries to the Catholic clergy. This high place the Vulgate holds even to this day in the Roman Church, where it is unwarrantably and perniciously placed on an equality with the original." See VULGATE.

Jerome's other Writings.—As the result of his critical labors on the Holy Scriptures, we have also commentaries on Genesis, the major and minor prophets, Ecclesiastes, Job, on some of the Psalms, the Gospel of Matthew, and the epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Titus, and Philemon, besides translations of different parts of the Old and New Testaments. All these productions Dr. Schaff pronounces "the most instructive we have from the Latin Church of that day, not excepting even those of Augustine, which otherwise greatly surpass them in theological depth and spiritual unction." Alban Butler thus speaks of Jerome's exegetical labors: "Nothing has rendered St. Jerome so famous as his critical labors on the holy Scriptures. For this the Church acknowledges him to have been raised by God through a special providence, and particularly assisted from above, and she styles him the greatest of all her doctors in expounding the divine oracles." To works of an exegetical character in a wider sense belong also his *Liber de interpretatione nominum Hebraicorum*, or *De nominibus Hebr.* (*Opera*, iii, 1-120), the book *On the Interpretation of the Hebrew Names*, an etymological lexicon of the proper Names of the Old and New Testaments, useful for its time, but in many respects defective, and now worthless; and *Liber de situ et nominibus locorum Hebraicorum*, usually cited under the title *Eusebii Onomasticon* (urbium et locorum S. Scripturæ) (*Opera*, iii, 121-290), a free translation of the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius, a sort of Biblical topology in alphabetical order, still considered valuable to antiquarian scholarship.

Yet the busy life which Jerome led, and the controversies which he waged in behalf of rigid orthodoxy in Christian belief, prove that, so far from confining himself to the production of exegetical works, he was employed on almost every subject—biography, history, and the vast field of theology, and in all he wielded the pen of a scholar, in a (Latin) style acknowledged by all to be both pure and terse. "The phraseology of Jerome," says Prof. W. Ramsay (Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* s. v.), "is exceedingly pure, bearing ample testimony to the diligence with which he must have studied the choicest models. No one can read the Vulgate without being struck by the contrast which it presents in the classic simplicity of its language to the degenerate affectation of Apuleius, and the barbarous obscurity of Ammianus, to say nothing of the ecclesiastical writers." We lack the space to go into further details on his varied productions, and are obliged to refer for a more detailed statement to Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* (Lond. 1859, roy. 8vo), ii, 461 sq., and Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 681 sq. In short, "Jerome excelled" (says Dr. Eadie, in Appleton's *Cyclop. Biogr.*) "all his contemporaries in erudition. He wanted the glowing fancy of Chrysostom, and the serene temper and symmetrical intellect of Augustine, but he was beyond them both in critical skill and taste. His faults lie upon the surface—a hot and hasty disposition, which so resented every opposition, and magnified trifles, that, in his towering passion, he heaped upon opponents opprobrious epithets and coarse invective. Haste, eagerness, and acerbity appear also in his letters and expositions. His mode of life must have greatly aggravated this touchiness and irascibility, as it deprived him of the mollifying influence of society and friendship. His heart was estranged from human sympathies; and, save when lighted up by the ardors of his indignant passion, it was, like his own cell, cold, gloomy, and uninviting. The works of Jerome will always maintain for him the esteem of Christendom. There is in them a great deal that is baseless, fanciful, and one-sided, but very much that is useful and instructive in exegesis and theology." A still greater, and to us nearer authority, Dr. Schaff (*Ch. History*, iii, 987 sq.), thus sums up the position and work of Jerome in the Christian Church: "Orthodox in theology and Christology, semi-Pelagian in anthropology, Romanizing in the doctrine of the Church and tradition, anti-chiliastic in eschatology, legalistic and ascetic in ethics, a violent fighter of all heresies, a fanatical apologist of all monkish extravagances, Jerome was revered throughout the Catholic middle age as the patron saint of Christian and ecclesiastical learning, and, next to Augustine, as *maximus doctor ecclesiæ*: but by his enthusiastic love for the holy Scriptures, his recourse to the original languages, his classic translation of the Bible, and his manifold exegetical merits, he also played materially into the hands of the Reformation, and as a scholar and an author still takes the first rank, and as an influential theologian the second (after Augustine), among the Latin fathers."

Of the various editions of Jerome's works a detailed account is given by Schönemann (*Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum*, i, c. 4, § 3). Parts of them were early published, but the first critical edition of his writings collectively was given to the public in 1516. It was superintended by Erasmus, with the assistance of Œcolampadius (Basle, 9 vols. fol.; reprinted in 1536 and 1537, the last edition being the best; and also at Lyons, 1530, in 8 vols. fol.). Another critical edition was prepared by Marianus Victorinus (Rome, 1566-72,

9 vols. fol.; reprinted at Paris, 1578, 1608, 4 vols., and in 1643, 9 vols.). The Protestant Adam Tribbechovius prepared an edition which was published at Frankfort-on-the-Main and at Leipsic, 1684, 12 vols. fol.; then appeared the Benedictine edition prepared by John Martianay and Anton Pouget (Paris, 1693-1706, 5 vols. fol.), which was, however, far inferior to, and was wholly superseded by, the last and best of all, prepared by Dominicus Vallarsi and Scipio Maffei (Verona, 1734-42, 11 vols. fol.; reprinted, with improvements, Ven. 1766-72). The edition of Migne, Paris (Petit-Montrouge), 1845-46, also in 11 vols. (tom. xxii-xxx of the *Patrologia Lat.*), "notwithstanding the boastful title, is only an uncritical reprint of the edition of Vallarsi, with unessential changes in the order of arrangement; the *Vita Hieronymi* and the *Testimonia de Hieronymo* being transferred from the eleventh to the first volume, which is more convenient" (Dr. Schaff). The so-called *Comes* of Hieronymus (*Liber Comitis Lectionarius*), a work of great value for the history of liturgies, is falsely attributed to Jerome, and belongs to a later period; likewise his *Martyrologium*, and some of the epistles.

See Du Pin, *Nouvelle Biblioth. des auteurs Eccles.* iii, 100-140; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* xii, 1-356; Martianay, *La Vie de St. Jerôme* (Paris, 1706); Joh. Stilting, in the *Acta Sanctorum, Sept.* viii, 418-688 (Antw. 1762); Butler, *Lives of the Saints* (sub. Sept. 30); Vallarsi (in *Op. Hieron.* xi, 1-240); Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* viii, 359 sq., and especially xi, 3-254; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 682 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. History*, ii, § 41; iii, § 177; Sebastian Dolci, *Maximus Hieronymus Vitæ suæ Scriptor.* (Ancon. 1750, 4to); Engelstoft, *Hieron. Stridonensis, interpres, criticus, exegeta, apologeta, historicus, doctor, monachus* (Havn. 1798); Ersch und Gruber's *Encycl.* sect. ii, vol. viii; Collombet, *Histoire de St. Jerôme* (Lyons, 1844); O. Zöckler, *Hieronymus, sein Leben und Wirken.* (Gotha, 1865, 8vo); *Revue des Deux Mondes* (1865, July 1). (J. H. W.)

Jerome of Prague, one of the earliest and ablest of the reformers before the Reformation, a brave defender of the truth, and a most devoted friend and follower of John Huss, was a descendant of a noble Bohemian family, whose real name was *Faulfisch.* Of his early history all data are wanting, but he appears to have been born about 1375, as he is known to have been somewhat younger than his friend Huss, who was born in 1369 (comp. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v, 246). After studying for several years at the university of his native place, "Jerome, full of life and ardor, of an enterprising spirit, not disposed to remain still and quiet a long time in one place," continued his studies at the universities of Paris, Cologne, Heidelberg, and Oxford, from each of which he received the doctorate of divinity (about 1398-1400). Endowed with great natural ability, Jerome obtained from such an extended course of study advantages which soon gave him great reputation for learning, especially as he was one of the few knights in Bohemia who had manifested any zeal for science and literary culture. But if, by a careful cultivation of his superior natural abilities, he secured for himself the admiration and homage of the men of letters, it is unquestionable that his attachment to the cause of the great ante-reformer was due, in the main, to his stay at Oxford, where he became acquainted with the writings of Wickliffe (q. v.), and at once enlisted with great enthusiasm in defence of the doctrines of the English reformer. "Until now," he is reported to have said when he commenced his copy of the *Dialogus et Trialogus*, "we had nothing but the shell of science; Wickliffe first laid open the kernel." It is thought possible by some that Jerome had read these works before he went to Oxford, and that his esteem for the writer, whom he could conceive only as a man of a noble, acute, and remarkable mind, had attracted him to Oxford (compare Böhringer, *Kirche Christi u. d. Zeugen*, p. 611); but, be this as it may, so much is certain, that, on his return to Prague, Jerome "professed himself an open favorer of him (Wickliffe), and, finding his doctrines had made considerable progress in Bohemia, and that Huss was at the head of that party which had espoused them, he attached himself to that leader" (Gilpin, *Lives*, p. 234; compare, however, Gillett, *Life of Huss*, i, 69). May 28, 1403, the University of Prague, at the instigation of the archiepiscopal officials and the cathedral chapter of Prague, publicly condemned the writings of John Wickliffe as heretical, in spite of a strong opposition, headed by John Huss, Jerome, and Master Nicholas of Leitomysl (q. v.). For some time past there had been growing a discontent between the native and foreign element represented at the university. When that institution of learning was founded, Prague was the residence of the German emperor, but that city was also the capital of Bohemia, a country which "seemed fitted by location and general features to become one of the foremost states of Europe," and the people, aware of their great natural resources, were unwilling to submit to the policy of the rulers to make their country a province of Germany. A strong feeling of nationality, such as is again witnessed in our day, developed itself in every Slavic heart, and gradually Bohemian literature, a nation's strength, which had before succumbed to the German, began to revive, and with it there came a longing desire to force from the Germans the control of the university, in which the native Bohemians saw themselves outvoted by strangers. The Germans were Nominalists, Wickliffe a Realist; no wonder, then, that his writings were condemned, even though the Bohemians were in favor of the Englishman (see Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 602 sq.; *Studien und Kritiken*, 1871, ii, 297 sq.). Here, then, came an opportunity for Huss and his friends to strike not only in behalf of the religious interests of their countrymen, but to become champions of their nation's rights, "and on this side they might count on receiving the support of many who did not agree with them in religious and doctrinal matters." They could count on the most influential of the nobility; even king Wenzel himself was won for their cause. He was induced to change the relation of votes at the University at Prague in such a manner that the Bohemians could gain the ascendency, and, this once done, the election of Huss to the rectorate of the university followed. The Germans, of course, were unwilling to submit readily to such changes, and left Prague in large numbers, to found a university at Leipzig. They also circulated the most injurious reports respecting the Hussites (as we will hereafter call the adherents of Huss and Jerome for convenience sake). In the mean time also, "by the express admonition of the pope," the archbishop of Prague, Zybneck, had issued (in 1406) a decree "that henceforth no one, under severe penalty, should hold, teach, or, for purposes of academic debate, argue in favor of Wickliffe's doctrines." This same Zybneck was the legate of Gregory XII. To this last pope the king of Bohemia adhered at this time, but in 1409, when the Council of Pisa renounced the rival popes, Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, and declared Alexander V the legitimate incumbent of the papal chair, Huss inclined to favor the action of the Council of Pisa, and won also the king over to his side, through the influence of Jerome, who seems to have been a favorite at court. This brought about an open rupture with Zybneck, who had hitherto hesitated openly to attack Huss and Jerome. Now there was no longer any need for delaying the decisive conflict. "He issued an ordinance forbidding all teachers of the university who had joined the party of the cardinals (who controlled the Council of Pisa) against the schismatic popes, and had thus abandoned the cause of Gregory, to discharge any priestly duties within his diocese." The Bohemians refused to obey the mandate; the archbishop then complained to the king, and found that he was powerless to enforce obedience to his decrees; neither was his master, Gregory XII, able to do it. Determined to conquer, the archbishop now suddenly espoused the cause

of the stronger rival in the papacy, and appealed to Alexander V for his decision in the conflict with the Bohemians. A papal bull was secured condemning the articles of Wickliffe, forbidding preaching in private chapels, and authorizing the archbishop to appoint a commission to enforce the measures adopted by him for the extirpation of the spreading heresy. In addition to a renewal of his former decrees, the archbishop now condemned not only the writings of Wickliffe, but also those of Huss and Jerome, as well as those of their predecessors Milicz and Janow, and caused them to be publicly burned. "The deed was done. The books were burned. The ban of the Church rested on those who had dared to object. Doubtless the archbishop felt that he had secured a triumph. He had executed the papal sentence, and proved himself an able instrument of the Church party who had instigated him to the bold deed. But it provoked more than it overawed. The king, the court, and a large proportion of the citizens of Prague were enraged and embittered by it. A cry of indignation ran throughout Bohemia" (Gillett, *Huss*, i, 157). Acts of violence followed, and, as is too apt to be the case, excesses were committed by marauders, and the crime charged to the reformers. The king and the people siding with the Hussites, it remained for the papal party to adopt severer measures; these were soon found in the proclamation of an interdict on the city of Prague, and the excommunication of the leaders. Huss left the city to avoid an open conflict between his countrymen, and Jerome also soon quitted the place, and went to Ofen (1410). But Zybneck was unwilling to see his opponent abroad proclaiming everywhere the doctrines of Wickliffe, and denouncing even popery. Jerome dared to propose even such questions as these: Whether the pope possessed more power than another priest, and whether the bread in the Eucharist or the body of Christ possessed more virtue in the mass of the Roman pontiff than in that of any other officiating ecclesiastic. Nay, one day, while in an open square, surrounded by several of his friends and adherents, he exposed two sketches, in one of which Christ's disciples, on one side, following, with naked feet, their Master mounted on an ass; while on the other the pope and the cardinals were represented in great state on superb horses, and preceded, as usual, with drums and trumpets. Zybneck caused the arrest of Jerome by the archbishop of Grau, who, recognising the superior abilities and great influence of Jerome, dismissed him five days after. More vehement and serious became Jerome's opposition to the papal party in 1412, after the publication of the papal bull granting plenary indulgence (q. v.) to all who should engage in "holy warfare" against king Ladislaus (q. v.) of Naples. Huss, who had returned to Prague, and who now was excommunicated, simply preached with all his power against this bull, but Jerome, urged on by his impulsive nature, was carried far beyond the limits of prudence and of decency. He caused (if he did not head the movement he undoubtedly inspired it) the bull to be carried about the streets by two lewd women, heading a long procession of students, and, after displaying it in this manner for some time, it was publicly burnt, with some indulgence briefs, at the pillory of the new town. "That similar scenes not unfrequently occurred is most probable. Among the charges brought against Jerome at the Council of Constance are some which imply that his conduct in this respect had been far from unexceptionable. Some of these are denied; but the evidence is strong, if not decisive, in regard to his course on the reception of the papal bulls for the Crusade. On another occasion he is said to have thrown a priest into the Moldau, who, but for timely aid, would have been drowned. But such violence was bitterly provoked. The burning of the books by Sbynco (Zybneck), the execution of three men for asserting the falsehood of the indulgences, the excommunication of Huss, to say nothing of the course pursued by his assailants, had excited a strong feeling against the patrons of papal fraud and ecclesiastical corruption. We are only surprised that the deep resentment felt was confined in its expression within such limits" (Gillett, i, 257). Both he and Huss were obliged to flee from Prague, as the safety of their lives was threatened. Huss (q. v.) retired to the castle of Kozi Hradek, while Jerome went to Poland and Lithuania. But the seed which they had widely sown sprang up quickly, and a council which had in the mean time convened at Constance cited Huss for a defence of his course. When the tidings of the imprisonment of his friend reached Jerome he determined to go to Constance himself. He went there at first incognito and secretly (April 4, 1415), but, fearing danger for himself without the possibility of affording relief to his friend, he left for a town four miles distant, and thence demanded of the emperor a safe-conduct to Constance, that he might publicly answer before any one to every charge of heresy that might be brought against him. Not being able to obtain such a safe-conduct, he caused to be affixed the next day, on the gates of the emperor's palace, on the doors of the principal churches, the residences of the cardinals, and other eminent prelates, a notice in the Bohemian, Latin, and German languages, wherein he declared himself ready, provided only he should have full liberty and security to come to Constance and to leave it again, to defend himself in public before the council against every accusation made against his faith. Not obtaining what he demanded, he procured a certificate to be drawn up to that effect by the Bohemian knights resident in Constance and sealed with their seals, and with this to serve as a vindication of himself to his friends, he prepared to turn his face towards Bohemia. The papists determining to secure his attendance at the council, a passport was now sent him from the council, guaranteeing his safety from violence, but not from punishment, if he were adjudged guilty of the heresy charged against him; but this Jerome—Huss having been already sent to prison—deemed insufficient, and he proceeded on his journey. But his enemies succeeded in waylaying him, and on the road he was arrested near Hirschau, a small town in Suabia, April 25, 1415, and delivered over into the power of the council May 23. He was immediately brought before a public convocation of that body. A citation was sent to him, which, it was said, had been posted up in Constance in reply to his declarations to the council. He denied to have seen them before he left the vicinity of Constance, where he had waited sufficiently long to be reached by any reply made within a reasonable limit of time, and that he would have complied with the summons had it reached him even on the confines of Bohemia. But this declaration rather aggravated, if anything, the members of the council, so eager to find a plea to condemn the prisoner. Many members of this council came from the universities of Paris, Heidelberg, and Cologne, and recollecting him, they desired to triumph over the man who had always far outstripped them. "Accordingly one after another addressed him, and reminded him of the propositions which he had set forth. The first among these was the learned chancellor Gerson, who captiously charged him with wishing to set himself up as an angel of eloquence, and with exciting great commotions at Paris by maintaining the reality of general conceptions. We may observe here, as well as in other like examples, the strong propensity which now prevailed to mix up together philosophical and theological disputes. But Jerome distinguished one from the other, and declared that he, as a university master, had maintained such philosophical doctrines as had no concern with faith. In reference to all that had been objected to him by different parties, he held himself ready to recant as soon as he was taught anything better. Amid the noisy shouts was heard the cry, 'Jerome must be burnt.' He answered with coolness, 'Well, if you wish my death, let it come, in God's name!'" Wiser counsels, however, prevailed at the mo-

ment, and Jerome was remitted to prison, where he was bound to a stake, with his hands, feet, and neck so that he could scarcely move his head. Thus he lay two days, with nothing to eat but bread and water. Then for the first time he obtained, through the mediation of Peter Maldonisuritz, who had been told of his situation by his keepers, other means of subsistence. This severe imprisonment threw him into a violent fit of sickness. He demanded a confessor, which was at first refused, and then granted with difficulty. After he had spent several months in this severe confinement, he heard of the martyrdom of his friend, whose death and the imprisonment of Jerome produced the greatest exasperation of feeling among the knights in Bohemia and Moravia. On the 2d of September they put forth a letter to the council, in which they expressed their indignation, declared that they had known Huss but as a pious man, zealous for the doctrines of the Gospel; and that he had fallen a victim only to his enemies and the enemies of his country. They entered a bitter complaint against the captivity of the innocent Jerome, who had made himself famous by his brilliant gifts; perhaps he, too, had already been murdered like Huss. They declared themselves resolved to contend, even to the shedding of their blood, in defence of the law of Christ and of his faithful servants" (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v, 375). This decided stand of Jerome's friends forced the council to milder terms, and they determined, if possible, to induce him to recant of his heretical opinions, a point which the effect of Jerome's close confinement, and the sufferings that he had endured for the past six months, made them believe might be carried without much difficulty. They mainly pressed him to recant his opinion on the doctrine of transubstantiation; and on the third examination, Sept. 11, 1415, Jerome, by this time worn out both in body and mind, made a public and unqualified recantation of the Hussite statement of the eucharistic theory. Here the disreputable conduct of the Romanists might well have rested, and Jerome have been permitted to return to his native land. But there were men in the council who well understood that Jerome had been induced to recant only because he saw no other door to lead from the prison, and that, his liberty once regained, he would return to his friends, to preach anew the truth as he had heard it from the lips of Huss, and as he had received it from the writings of Wickliffe. Indeed, they had reasons to fear that if he ever escaped with his life, it would be given to the cause in which Huss had just fallen. On the other hand, there were men of honor in the council—men who, though they had narrowed themselves down until they could see Christ exemplified only in those who bowed submissively before the papal chair, yet would not make pledges only to break them as soon as they found it to their interest to do so. One of these was the cardinal of Cambray, who insisted that Jerome ought now to be liberated, as had been promised him before his recantation. The counsel of the more cunning, however, prevailed, and Jerome was detained to answer other and more serious accusations. Tired of the crooked ways of these so-called defenders of the Christian faith, Jerome finally declined to be any longer subjected to private examinations, and declared that publicly only would he be ready to answer the calumnies of his accusers. May 23, 1416, he finally succeeded in obtaining a public hearing. On this day, and on the 26th, he spent from six in the morning until one in the afternoon in replying to the different accusations made against him, and closed, to the surprise of all the council, by passionately disclaiming his former cowardly recantation. "Of all the sins," he exclaimed now, with great feeling, "that I have committed since my youth, none weigh so heavily on my mind and cause me such poignant remorse as that which I committed in this fatal place when I approved of the iniquitous sentence rendered against Wickliffe and against the holy martyr John Huss, my master and friend." If his defence had been delivered with such presence of mind, with so much eloquence and wit as to excite universal admiration and to incline his judges to mercy, the closing declaration against his former recantation certainly sealed his own death-warrant, and left not the least hope for escape from martyrdom. Yet there were some among his judges in whom he had excited so deep a sympathy that they would not declare against him; there were also some who dared not, by this new martyrdom, provoke still further the angry feelings of the Bohemians. He was granted a respite of forty days for reflection, and an opportunity was afforded to those who still wavered in condemning the heretic to influence him possibly to recant of this decided opposition to the Church. But Jerome remained steadfast this time. If he had seen a period when, like Cranmer's, his faith faltered, it had passed, and he was now ready to die rather than again deny that he thought and felt as a Hussite. May 30 had been appointed to pass final judgment. He still refusing to recant, the council pronounced against him, and he was handed over for execution to the secular authorities. The whole trial and his last hours are vividly pictured by a Roman Catholic eye-witness, Poggio, a Florentine, who is freely cited by Neander (*Ch. Hist.* v, 378 sq.), and is given in full by Gilpin (*Lives*, p. 255 sq.). Of his last hours Poggio relates as follows: "With cheerful looks he went readily and willingly to his death; he feared neither death nor the fire and its torture. No stoic ever suffered death with so firm a soul as that with which he seemed to demand it. Jerome endured the torments of the fire with more tranquillity than Socrates displayed in drinking his cup of hemlock." Jerome was burned like his friend and master Huss, and his ashes likewise thrown into the Rhine. "Historians, [Roman] Catholic and Protestant alike, vie with each other in paying homage to the heroic courage and apostolic resignation with which Jerome met his doom. Posterity has confirmed their verdict, and reveres him as a martyr to the truth, who, unwearied in life and noble in death, has acquired an immortal renown for his share in the Reformation." Indeed we question whether to Jerome and Huss sufficient credit is given for their share in the Reformation of the 16th century. We fear that it is through neglect alone that to Huss and Jerome is denied a place by the side of Luther and Calvin, to which, as Gillett (*Huss and his Times*, Preface) rightly says, they are justly entitled. "It is true, indeed, that the great reform movement, of which Huss was the leader, was, to human view, after a most desperate and prolonged struggle, crushed out; not, however, without leaving behind it most important results." See Gillett, *Huss and his Times* (2 vols. 8vo, new edit. 1871); Neander, *Church History*, vol. v (see Index); Tischer, *Leben d. Hieron. v. Prag.* (Lpz. 1835); Helfert, *Hus u. Hieron.* (Prag. 1853, p. 151 sq., 208 sq.; perhaps the most important, though rather partial); Czerwenka, *Gesch. der evangel. Kirche in Böhmen* (Bielef. 1869), vol. i; Böhringer, *Die Kirche Christi*, ii, 4, 608 sq.; Krummel, *Gesch. der böhm. Reformation* (Gotha, 1867, 8vo); Palacky, *Gesch. v. Böhm.* vol. iii and iv. See HUSS. (J. H. W.)

Jeromites. See HIERONYMITES.

Jerubb'aäl (Heb. *Yerubba'al*, יְרֻבַּעַל, *contender with Baal;* comp. ISHBAAL; Sept. Ἱεροβάαλ), a surname of GIDEON (q. v.), the judge of Israel, given him in consequence of his overthrow of the idol (Judg. vi, 32; vii, 1; viii, 29, 35; ix, 1, 2, 5, 16, 19, 24, 28, 57; 1 Sam. xii, 11). "The name Jerubbaal appears in the Græcized form of *Hierombal* (Ἱερόμβαλος) in a fragment of Philo-Byblius preserved by Eusebius (*Præp. Evang.* i, 9); but the identity of name does not authorize us to conclude that it is Gideon who is there referred to. In the Palmyrene inscriptions, Ἰαρίβολος appears as the name of a deity (Gesenius, *Monum. Phœnic.* p. 229; Movers, *Phönicier*, i, 434)." Josephus omits all reference to the incident (*Ant.* v, 6). See JERUBBESHETH.

Jerub'besheth (Heb. *Yerubbe'sheth*, יְרֻבֶּשֶׁת, *con-*

tender with the *shame*, i. e. *idol;* compare ISHBOSHETH; Sept. Ἰεροβάαλ), a surname (probably to avoid mentioning the name of a false god, Exod. xxiii, 13) of GIDEON (q. v.), the Israelitish judge, acquired on account of his contest with the idolatry of Baal (2 Sam. xi, 21). See JERUBBAAL.

Jeru'ël (Heb. *Yeruël'*, יְרוּאֵל, *founded* by *God*, otherwise *fear of God;* compare JERIEL; Sept. Ἰεριήλ), a desert (מִדְבָּר, i. e. open common) mentioned in the prediction by Jahaziel of Jehoshaphat's victory over the Moabites and Ammonites, where it is described as being situated on the ascent from the valley of the Dead Sea towards Jerusalem, at the foot of the valley leading towards the cliff Ziz (1 Chron. xx, 16). The "desert" was probably so called as adjoining some town or village of the same name. From the context it appears to have lain beyond the wilderness of Tekoa (ver. 20), in the direction of Engedi (ver. 2), near a certain watch-tower overlooking the pass (ver. 24). It appears to correspond to the tract *el-Hussasah*, sloping from Tekoa to the precipice of Ain-Jidy, described by Dr. Robinson as fertile in the north-western part (*Researches*, ii, 212), but sterile as it approaches the Ghor (p. 243), and forming part of the Desert of Judæa. The invading tribes, having marched round the south of the Dead Sea, had encamped at Engedi. The road thence to Jerusalem ascends from the shore by a steep and "terrible pass" (Walcott, *Bib. Sac.* i, 69), and thence leads northward, passing below Tekoa (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* i, 501, 508). The valley ("brook," ver. 16), at the end of which the enemy were to be found, was probably the wady Jehar, which, with its continuation wady el-Ghar, traverses the southern part of this plateau (Robinson's *Res.* ii, 185); and its upper end appears to have been the same through which the triumphant host passed on their return, and named it BERACHAH (q. v.), i. e. *blessing*, in commemoration of the victory (ver. 26).

Jeru'salem (Heb. יְרוּשָׁלַםִ, *Yerushala'îm*, fully [in 1 Chron. iii, 5; 2 Chron. xxv, 1; Esth. ii, 6; Jer. xxvi, 18] יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, *Yerushala'yim* [with final ה directive, יְרוּשָׁלֵמָה, 1 Kings x, 2; fully יְרוּשָׁלַיְמָה, 2 Chron. xxxii, 9]; Chald. יְרוּשְׁלֶם or יְרוּשְׁלֵם, *Yerushelem';* Syr. *Urishlem;* Gr. Ἱερουσαλήμ or [τὰ] Ἱεροσόλυμα [Gen. -ύμων]; Latin *Hierosolyma*), poetically also SALEM (שָׁלֵם, *Shalem'*), and once ARIEL (q. v.); originally JEBUS (q. v.): in sacred themes the "City of God," or the "Holy City" (Neh. xi, 1, 16; Matt. iv, 5), as in the modern Arab. name *el-Khuds, the Holy* (comp. ἱερόπολις, Philo, *Opp.* ii, 524); once (2 Chron. xxv, 28) the "city of Judah." The Heb. name is a *dual* form (see Gesenius, *Lehrg.* p. 539 sq.; Ewald, *Krit. Gramm.* p. 332), and is of disputed etymology (see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 628; Rosenmüller, *Altherth.* II, ii, 202; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* ii, 584), but probably signifies *possession of peace* (q. d. יְרוּשׁ־שָׁלֵם [rather than יְרוּ שָׁלֵם, i. e. *foundation of peace*, as preferred by Gesenius and Fürst]), the dual referring to the two chief mountains (Zion and Moriah) on which it was built, or the two main parts (the Upper and the Lower City, i. e. Zion and Acra). It has been known under the above titles in all ages as the Jewish capital of Palestine.

I. *History*.—This is so largely made up of the history of Palestine itself in different ages, and of its successive rulers, that for minute details we refer to these (see especially JUDÆA); we here present only a general survey, but with references to sources of more detailed information.

1. This city is mentioned very early in Scripture, being usually supposed to be the Salem of which Melchizedek was king (Gen. xiv, 18). B.C. cir. 2080. Such was the opinion of the Jews themselves; for Josephus, who calls Melchizedek king of Solyma (Σόλυμα), observes that this name was afterwards changed into Hierosolyma (*Ant.* i, 10, 3). All the fathers of the Church, Jerome excepted, agree with Josephus, and understand Jerusalem and Salem to indicate the same place. The Psalmist also says (lxxvi, 2), "In Salem is his tabernacle, and his dwelling-place in Zion." See SALEM.

The mountain of the land of Moriah, which Abraham (Gen. xxii, 2) reached on the third day from Beersheba, there to offer Isaac (B.C. cir. 2047), is, according to Josephus (*Ant.* i, 13, 2), the mountain on which Solomon afterwards built the Temple (2 Chron. iii, 1). See MORIAH.

The question of the identity of Jerusalem with "Cadytis, a large city of Syria," "almost as large as Sardis," which is mentioned by Herodotus (ii, 159; iii, 5) as having been taken by Pharaoh-Necho, need not be investigated in this place. It is interesting, and, if decided in the affirmative, so far important as confirming the Scripture narrative, but does not in any way add to our knowledge of the history of the city. The reader will find it fully examined in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, ii, 246; Blakesley's *Herodotus—Excursus on Bk.* iii, ch. v (both against identification); and in Kenrick's *Egypt*, ii, 406, and *Dict. of Gk. and Rom. Geogr.* ii, 17 (both for it).

Nor need we do more than refer to the traditions—if traditions they are, and not mere individual speculations—of Tacitus (*Hist.* v, 2) and Plutarch (*Is. et Osir.* ch. xxxi) of the foundation of the city by a certain Hierosolymus, a son of the Typhon (see Winer's note, i, 545). All the certain information to be obtained as to the early history of Jerusalem must be gathered from the books of the Jewish historians alone.

2. The name Jerusalem first occurs in Josh. x, 1, where Adonizedek (q. v.), king of Jerusalem, is mentioned as having entered into an alliance with other kings against Joshua, by whom they were all overcome (comp. Josh. xii, 10). B.C. 1618. See JOSHUA.

In drawing the northern border of Judah, we find Jerusalem again mentioned (Josh. xv, 8; compare Josh. xviii, 16). This border ran through the valley of Ben-Hinnom; the country on the south of it, as Bethlehem, belonged to Judah; but the mountain of Zion, forming the northern wall of the valley, and occupied by the Jebusites, appertained to Benjamin. Among the cities of Benjamin, therefore, is also mentioned (Josh. xviii, 28) "Jebus, which is Jerusalem" (comp. Judg. xix, 10; 1 Chron. xi, 4). At a later date, however, owing to the conquest of Jebus by David, the line ran on the northern side of Zion, leaving the city equally divided between the two tribes. See TRIBE. There is a rabbinical tradition that part of the Temple was in the lot of Judah, and part of it in that of Benjamin (Lightfoot, i, 1050, Lond. 1684). See TEMPLE.

After the death of Joshua, when there remained for the children of Israel much to conquer in Canaan, the Lord directed Judah to fight against the Canaanites; and they took Jerusalem, smote it with the edge of the sword, and set it on fire (Judg. i, 1-8), B.C. cir. 1590. After that, the Judahites and the Benjamites dwelt with the Jebusites at Jerusalem; for it is recorded (Josh. xv, 63) that the children of Judah could not drive out the Jebusites inhabiting Jerusalem; and we are farther informed (Judg. i, 21) that the children of Benjamin did not expel them from Jerusalem (comp. Judg. xix, 10-12). Probably the Jebusites were removed by Judah only from the lower city, but kept possession of the mountain of Zion, which David conquered at a later period. This is the explanation of Josephus (*Ant.* v, 2, 2). See JEBUS. Jerusalem is not again mentioned till the time of Saul, when it is stated (1 Sam. xvii, 54) that David took the head of Goliath and brought it to Jerusalem, B.C. cir. 1063. When David, who had previously reigned over Judah alone in Hebron, was called to rule over all Israel, he led his forces against the Jebusites, and conquered the castle of Zion which Joab first scaled (1 Sam. v, 5-9; 1 Chron. xii, 4-8). He then fixed his abode on this mountain, and called it "the city of David," B.C. cir. 1044. He strengthened its fortifications [see MILLO], but does not appear to have enlarged it.

General View of Ancient Jerusalem Restored. From the Mount of Olives.

Thither he carried the ark of the covenant; and there he built to the Lord an altar in the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite, on the place where the angel stood who threatened Jerusalem with pestilence (2 Sam. xxiv, 15-25). But David could not build a house for the name of the Lord his God on account of the wars which were about him on every side (2 Sam. vii, 13; 1 Kings v, 3-5). Still the Lord announced to him, through the prophet Nathan (2 Sam. vii, 10), "I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own and move no more," B.C. cir. 1043. From this it would seem that even David had, then at least, no assurance that Jerusalem in particular was to be the place which had so often been spoken of as that which God would choose for the central seat of the theocratical monarchy, and which it became after Solomon's Temple had been built. See TEMPLE.

3. The reasons which led David to fix upon Jerusalem as the metropolis of his kingdom are noticed elsewhere [see DAVID], being, chiefly, that it was in his own tribe of Judah, in which his influence was the strongest, while it was the nearest to the other tribes of any site he could have chosen in Judah. The peculiar strength also of the situation, inclosed on three sides by a natural trench of valleys, could not be without weight. Its great strength, according to the military notions of that age, is shown by the length of time the Jebusites were able to keep possession of it against the force of all Israel. David was doubtless the best judge of his own interests in this matter; but if those interests had not come into play, and if he had only considered the best situation for a metropolis of the whole kingdom, it is doubtful whether a more central situation with respect to *all* the tribes would not have been far preferable, especially as the law required all the adult males of Israel to repair three times in the year to the place of the divine presence. Indeed, the burdensome character of this obligation to the more distant tribes seems to have been one of the excuses for the revolt of the ten tribes, as it certainly was for the establishment of schismatic altars in Dan and Beth-el (1 Kings xii, 28). Many travellers have suggested that Samaria, which afterwards became the metropolis of the separated kingdom, was far preferable to Jerusalem for the site of a capital city; and its central situation would also have been in its favor as a metropolis for all the tribes. But as the choice of David was subsequently confirmed by the divine appointment, which made Mount Moriah the site of the Temple, we are bound to consider the choice as having been providentially ordered with reference to the contingencies that afterwards arose, by which Jerusalem was made the capital of the separate kingdom of Judah, for which it was well adapted. See JUDAH.

The promise made to David received its accomplishment when Solomon built his Temple upon Mount Moriah, B.C. 1010. He also added towers to the walls, and otherwise greatly adorned the city. By him and his father Jerusalem had been made the imperial residence of the king of all Israel; and the Temple, often called "the house of Jehovah," constituted at the same time the residence of the King of kings, the supreme head of the theocratical state, whose vicegerents the human kings were taught to regard themselves. It now belonged, even less than a town of the Levites, to a particular tribe: it was the centre of all civil and religious affairs, the very place of which Moses spoke, Deut. xii, 5: "The place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come" (comp. ix, 6; xiii, 14; xiv, 23; xvi, 11-16; Psa. cxxii). See SOLOMON.

Jerusalem was not, indeed, politically important: it was not the capital of a powerful empire directing the affairs of other states, but it stood high in the bright prospects foretold by David when declaring his faith in the coming of a Messiah (Psa. ii, 6; l, 2; lxxxvii; cii, 16-22; cx, 2). In all these passages the name Zion is used, which, although properly applied to the southernmost part of the site of Jerusalem, is often in Scripture put poetically for Jerusalem generally, and sometimes for Mount Moriah and its Temple. See ZION.

The importance and splendor of Jerusalem were considerably lessened after the death of Solomon, under whose son Rehoboam ten of the tribes rebelled, Judah and Benjamin only remaining in their allegiance, B.C. 973. Jerusalem was then only the capital of the very small state of Judah. When Jeroboam instituted the worship of golden calves in Beth-el and Dan, the ten tribes went no longer up to Jerusalem to worship and sacrifice in the house of the Lord (1 Kings xii, 26-30). See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

After this time the history of Jerusalem is continued in the history of Judah, for which the second book of the Kings and of the Chronicles are the principal sources of information. After the time of Solomon, the kingdom of Judah was almost alternately ruled by good kings, "who did that which was right in the sight of the Lord," and by such as were idolatrous and evil-disposed; and the reign of the same king often varied, and was by turns good or evil. The condition of the kingdom, and of Jerusalem in particular as its metropolis, was very much affected by these mutations. Under good kings the city flourished, and under bad kings it suffered greatly. Under Rehoboam (q. v.) it was conquered by Shishak (q. v.), king of Egypt, who pillaged the treasures of the Temple (2 Chron. xii, 9), B.C. 970. Under Amaziah (q. v.) it was taken by Jehoash, king of Israel, who broke down four hundred cubits of the wall of the city, and took all the gold and silver, and all the vessels that were found in the Temple (2 Kings xiv, 13, 14), B.C. cir. 830. Uzziah (q. v.), son of Amaziah, who at first reigned well, built towers in Jerusalem at the corner-gate, at the valley-gate, and at the turning of the wall, and fortified them (2 Chron. xxvi, 9), B.C. cir. 807. His son, Jotham (q. v.), built the high gate of the Temple, and reared up many other structures (2 Chron. xxvii, 3, 4), B.C. cir. 755. Hezekiah (q. v.) added to the other honors of his reign that of an improver of Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxix, 3), B.C. 726. At a later date, however, he despoiled the Temple in some degree in order to pay the levy imposed by the king of Assyria (2 Kings xviii, 15, 16), B.C. 713. But in the latter part of the same year he performed his most eminent service for the city by stopping the upper course of Gihon, and bringing its waters by a subterraneous aqueduct to the west side of the city (2 Chron. xxxii, 30). This work is inferred, from 2 Kings xx, to have been of great importance to Jerusalem, as it cut off a supply of water from any besieging enemy, and bestowed it upon the inhabitants of the city. The immediate occasion was the threatened invasion by the Assyrians. See SENNACHERIB. Hezekiah's son, Manasseh (q. v.), was punished by a capture of the city in consequence of his idolatrous desecration of the Temple (2 Chron. xxxiii, 11), B.C. cir. 690; but in his later and best years he built a strong and very high wall on the west side of Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14). The works in the city connected with the names of the succeeding kings of Judah were, so far as recorded, confined to the defilement of the house of the Lord by bad kings, and its purgation by good kings, the most important of the latter being the repairing of the Temple by Josiah (2 Kings xx, xxiii), B.C. 623, till for the abounding iniquities of the nation the city and Temple were abandoned to destruction, after several preliminary spoliations by the Egyptians (2 Kings xxiii, 33-35), B.C. 609, and Babylonians (2 Kings xxiv, 14). B.C. 606, and again (2 Kings xxiv, 13), B.C. 598. Finally, after a siege of three years, Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar, who razed its walls, and destroyed its Temple and palaces with fire (2 Kings xxv; 2 Chron. xxxvi; Jer. xxxix), B.C. 588. Thus was Jerusalem smitten with the calamity which Moses had prophesied would befall it if the people would not keep the com-

Ancient Assyrian delineation of a hostile city resembling Jerusalem in situation.

mandments of the Lord, but broke his covenant (Lev. xxvi, 14; Deut. xxviii). The finishing stroke to this desolation was put by the retreat of the principal Jews, on the massacre of Gedaliah, into Egypt, B.C. 587, where they were eventually involved in the conquest of that country by the Babylonians (Jer. xl–xliv). Meanwhile the feeble remnant of the lower classes, who had clung to their native soil amid all these reverses, were swept away by a final deportation to Babylon, which left the land literally without an inhabitant (Jer. lii, 30). B.C. 582. See NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

Moses had long before predicted that if, in the land of their captivity, his afflicted countrymen repented of their evil, they should be brought back again to the land out of which they had been cast (Deut. xxx, 1–5; comp. 1 Kings viii, 46–53; Neh. i, 8, 9). The Lord also, through Isaiah, condescended to point out the agency through which the restoration of the holy city was to be accomplished, and even named, long before his birth, the very person, Cyrus, under whose orders this was to be effected (Isa. xliv, 28; comp. Jer. iii, 2, 7, 8; xxiii, 3; xxxi, 10; xxxii, 36, 37). Among the remarkably precise indications should be mentioned that in which Jeremiah (xxv, 9–12) limits the duration of Judah's captivity to seventy years. See CAPTIVITY. These encouragements were continued through the prophets, who themselves shared the captivity. Of this number was Daniel, to whom it was revealed, while yet praying for the restoration of his people (Dan. ix, 16, 19), that the streets and the walls of Jerusalem should be built again, even in troublous times (ver. 25). See SEVENTY WEEKS.

4. Daniel lived to see the reign of Cyrus, king of Persia (Dan. x, 1), and the fulfilment of his prayer. It was in the year B.C. 536, "in the first year of Cyrus," that, in accomplishment of the prophecy of Jeremiah, the Lord stirred up the spirit of this prince, who made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, expressed in these remarkable words: "The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and *he has charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah.* Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel" (Ezra i, 2, 3). This important call was answered by a considerable number of persons, particularly priests and Levites; and the many who declined to quit their houses and possessions in Babylonia committed valuable gifts to the hands of their more zealous brethren. Cyrus also caused the sacred vessels of gold and silver which Nebuchadnezzar had taken from the Temple to be restored to Sheshbazzar, the prince of Judah, who took them to Jerusalem, followed by 42,360 people, besides their servants, of whom there were 7337 (Ezra i, 5–11).

On their arrival at Jerusalem they contributed, according to their ability, to rebuild the Temple; Jeshua the priest, and Zerubbabel, reared up an altar to offer burnt-offerings thereon; and when, in the following year, the foundation was laid of the new house of God, "the people shouted for joy, but many of the Levites who had seen the first Temple wept with a loud voice" (Ezra iii, 2, 12). When the Samaritans expressed a wish to share in the pious labor, Zerubbabel declined the offer, and in revenge, the Samaritans sent a deputation to king Artaxerxes of Persia, carrying a presentment in which Jerusalem was described as a rebellious city of old time, which, if rebuilt, and its walls set up again, would not pay toll, tribute, and custom, and would thus endamage the public revenue. The deputation succeeded, and Artaxerxes ordered that the building of the Temple should cease. The interruption thus caused lasted to the second year of the reign of Darius (Ezra iv, 24), when Zerubbabel and Jeshua, supported by the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, again resumed the work, and would not cease though cautioned by the Persian governor of Judæa, B.C. 520. On the matter coming before Darius Hystaspis, and the Jews reminding him of the permission given by Cyrus, he decided in their favor, and also ordered that the expenses of the work should be defrayed out of the public revenue (Ezra vi, 8). In the sixth year of the reign of Darius the Temple was finished, when they kept the dedicatory festival with great joy, and next celebrated the Passover (Ezra vi, 15, 16, 19), B.C. 516. Afterwards, in the seventh year of the second Artaxerxes (Longimanus), Ezra, a descendant of Aaron, came up to Jerusalem, accompanied by a large number of Jews who had remained in Babylon, B.C. 459. He was highly patronized by the king, who not only made him a large present in gold and silver, but published a decree enjoining all treasurers of Judæa speedily to do whatever Ezra should require of them; allowing him to collect money throughout the whole province of Babylon for the wants of the Temple at Jerusalem, and also giving him full power to appoint magistrates in his country to judge the people (Ezra vii, viii). At a later period, in the twentieth year of king Artaxerxes, Nehemiah, who was his cupbearer, obtained permission to proceed to Jerusalem, and to complete the rebuilding of the city and its wall, which he happily accomplished, in spite of all the opposition which he received from the enemies of Israel (Neh. i, ii, iv, vi), B.C. 446. The city was then capacious and large, but the people in it were few, and many houses still lay in ruins (Neh. vii, 4). At Jerusalem dwelt the rulers of the people and "certain of the children of Judah and of the children of Benjamin;" but it was now determined that the rest of the people should cast lots to bring one of ten to the capital (Neh. xi, 1–4), B.C. cir. 440. On Nehemiah's return, after several years' absence to court, all strangers, Samaritans, Ammonites, Moabites, etc., were removed, to keep the chosen people from pollution; ministers were appointed to the Temple, and the service was performed according to the law of Moses (Ezra x; Neh. viii, x, xii, xiii), B.C. cir. 410. Of the Jerusalem thus by such great and long-continued exertions restored, very splendid prophecies were uttered by those prophets who flourished after the exile; the general purport of which was to describe the Temple and city as destined to be glorified far beyond the former, by the advent of the long and eagerly-expected Messiah, "the desire of all nations" (Zech. ix, 9; xii, 10; xiii, 3; Hagg. ii, 6, 7; Mal. iii, 11). See EZRA; NEHEMIAH.

5. For the subsequent history of Jerusalem (which is closely connected with that of Palestine in general), down to its destruction by the Romans, we must draw chiefly upon Josephus and the books of the Maccabees.

It is said by Josephus (*Ant.* xi, 8) that when the dominion of this part of the world passed from the Persians to the Greeks, Alexander the Great advanced against Jerusalem to punish it for the fidelity to the Persians which it had manifested while he was engaged in the siege of Tyre. His hostile purposes, however, were averted by the appearance of the high-priest Jaddua at the head of a train of priests in their sacred vestments. Alexander recognised in him the figure which in a dream had encouraged him to undertake the conquest of Asia. He therefore treated him with respect and reverence, spared the city against which his wrath had been kindled, and granted to the Jews high and important privileges. The historian adds that the high-priest failed not to apprise the conqueror of those prophecies in Daniel by which his successes had been predicted. The whole of this story is, however, liable to suspicion, from the absence of any notice of the circumstance in the histories of this campaign which we possess. See ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

After the death of Alexander at Babylon (B.C. 324), Ptolemy surprised Jerusalem on the Sabbath day, when the Jews would not fight, plundered the city, and carried away a great number of the inhabitants to Egypt, where, however, from the estimation in which the Jews of this period were held as citizens, important privileges were bestowed upon them (Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 1). In the contests which afterwards followed for the possession of Syria (including Palestine), Jerusalem does not appear to have been directly injured, and was even spared when Ptolemy gave up Samaria, Acco, Joppa, and Gaza to pillage. The contest was ended by the treaty in B.C. 302, which annexed the whole of Palestine, together with Arabia Petræa and Cœle-Syria to Egypt. Under easy subjection to the Ptolemies, the Jews remained in much tranquillity for more than a hundred years, in which the principal incident, as regards Jerusalem itself, was the visit which was paid to it, in B.C. 245, by Ptolemy Euergetes, on his return from his victories in the East. He offered many sacrifices, and made magnificent presents to the Temple. In the wars between Antiochus the Great and the kings of Egypt, from B.C. 221 to 197, Judæa could not fail to suffer severely; but we are not acquainted with any incident in which Jerusalem was principally concerned till the alleged visit of Ptolemy Philopator in B.C. 211. He offered sacrifices, and gave rich gifts to the Temple, but, venturing to enter the sanctuary in spite of the remonstrances of the high-priest, he was seized with a supernatural dread, and fled in terror from the place. It is said that on his return to Egypt he vented his rage on the Jews of Alexandria in a very barbarous manner. See ALEXANDRIA. But the whole story of his visit and its results rests upon the sole authority of the third book of Maccabees (chaps. i and iii), and is therefore not entitled to implicit credit. Towards the end of this war the Jews seemed to favor the cause of Antiochus; and after he had subdued the neighboring country, they voluntarily tendered their submission, and rendered their assistance in expelling the Egyptian garrison from Mount Zion. For this conduct they were rewarded by many important privileges by Antiochus. He issued decrees directing, among other things, that the outworks of the Temple should be completed, and that all the materials for needful repairs should be exempted from taxes. The peculiar sanctity of the Temple was also to be respected. No foreigner was to pass the sacred walls, and the city itself was to be protected from pollution; it being strictly forbidden that the flesh or skins of any beasts which the Jews accounted unclean should be brought into it (Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 3, 3). These were very liberal concessions to what the king himself must have regarded as the prejudices of the Jewish people.

Under their new masters the Jews enjoyed for a time nearly as much tranquillity as under the generally benign and liberal government of the Ptolemies. But in B.C. 176, Seleucus Philopator, hearing that great treasures were hoarded up in the Temple, and being distressed for money to carry on his wars, sent his treasurer, Heliodorus, to bring away these treasures. But this personage is reported to have been so frightened and stricken by an apparition that he relinquished the attempt, and Seleucus left the Jews in the undisturbed enjoyment of their rights (2 Macc. iii, 4–40; Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 3, 3). His brother and successor, Antiochus Epiphanes, however, was of another mind. He took up the design of reducing them to a conformity of manners and religion with other nations; or, in other words, of abolishing those distinctive features which made the Jews a peculiar people, socially separated from all others. This design was odious to the great body of the people, although there were many among the higher classes who regarded it with favor. Of this way of thinking was Menelaus, whom Antiochus had made high-priest, and who was expelled by the orthodox Jews with ignominy, in B.C. 169, when they heard the joyful news that Antiochus had been slain in Egypt. The rumor proved untrue, and Antiochus, on his return, punished them by plundering and profaning the Temple. Worse evils befell them two years after; for Antiochus, out of humor at being compelled by the Romans to abandon his designs upon Egypt, sent his chief collector of tribute, Apollonius, with a detachment of 22,000 men, to vent his rage on Jerusalem. This person plundered the city and razed its walls, with the stones of which he built a citadel that commanded the Temple Mount. A statue of Jupiter was set up in the Temple; the peculiar observances of the Jewish law were abolished, and a persecution was commenced against all who adhered to these observances, and refused to sacrifice to idols. Jerusalem was deserted by priests and people, and the daily sacrifice at the altar was entirely discontinued (1 Macc. i, 29–40; 2 Macc. v, 24–26; Joseph. *Ant.* xii, 5, 4). See ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES.

This led to the celebrated revolt of the Maccabees, who, after an arduous and sanguinary struggle, obtained possession of Jerusalem (B.C. 163), and repaired and purified the Temple, which was then dilapidated and deserted. New utensils were provided for the sacred services: the old altar, which had been polluted by heathen abominations, was taken away, and a new one erected. The sacrifices were then recommenced, exactly three years after the Temple had been dedicated to Jupiter Olympius. The castle, however, remained in the hands of the Syrians, and long proved a sore annoyance to the Jews, although Judas Maccabæus surrounded the Temple with a high and strong wall, furnished with towers, in which soldiers were stationed to protect the worshippers from the Syrian garrison (1 Macc. i, 36, 37; Joseph. *Ant.* vii, 7). Eventually the annoyance grew so intolerable that Judas laid siege to the castle. This attempt brought a powerful army into the country under the command of the regent Lysias, who, however, being constrained to turn his arms elsewhere, made peace with the Jews; but when he was admitted into the city, and observed the strength of the place, he threw down the walls in violation of the treaty (1 Macc. vi, 48–65). In the ensuing war with Bacchides, the general of Demetrius Soter, in which Judas was slain, the Syrians strengthened their citadel, and placed in it the sons of the principal Jewish families as hostages (1 Macc. ix, 52, 53; Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 1, 3). The year after (B.C. 159) the temporizing high-priest Alcimus directed the wall which separated the court of Israel from that of the Gentiles to be cast down, to afford the latter free access to the Temple; but he was seized with palsy as soon as the work commenced, and died in great agony (1 Macc. ix, 51–57). When, a few years after, Demetrius and Alexander Balas sought to outbid each other for the support of Jonathan, the hostages in the castle were released; and subsequently all the Syrian garrisons in Judæa were evacuated, excepting those of Jerusalem and Bethzur, which were chiefly occupied by apostate Jews, who were afraid to leave their places of

refuge. Jonathan then rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem, and repaired the buildings of the city, besides erecting a palace for his own residence (1 Macc. x, 2-4; Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 2, 1). The particular history of Jerusalem for several years following is little more than an account of the efforts of the Maccabæan princes to obtain possession of the castle, and of the Syrian kings to retain it in their hands. At length, in B.C. 142, the garrison was forced to surrender by Simon, who demolished it altogether, that it might not again be used against the Jews by their enemies. Simon then strengthened the fortifications of the mountain on which the Temple stood, and built there a palace for himself (1 Macc. xiii, 43-52; Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 6, 6). This building was afterwards turned into a regular fortress by John Hyrcanus (q. v.), and was ever after the residence of the Maccabæan princes (Joseph. *Ant.* xv, 11, 4). It is called by Josephus "the castle of Baris," in his history of the Jews; till it was strengthened and enlarged by Herod the Great, who called it the castle of Antonia, under which name it makes a conspicuous figure in the Jewish wars of the Romans. See MACCABEES.

6. Of Jerusalem itself we find no notice of consequence in the next period till it was taken by Pompey (q. v.) in the summer of B.C. 63, and on the very day observed by the Jews as one of lamentation and fasting, in commemoration of the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. Twelve thousand Jews were massacred in the Temple courts, including many priests, who died at the very altar rather than suspend the sacred rites (Joseph. *Ant.* xiv, 1-4). On this occasion, Pompey, attended by his generals, went into the Temple and viewed the sanctuary; but he left untouched all its treasures and sacred things, while the walls of the city itself were demolished. From this time the Jews are to be considered as under the dominion of the Romans (Joseph, *Ant.* xiv, 4, 5). The treasures which Pompey had spared were seized a few years after (B.C. 51) by Crassus. In the year B.C. 43, the walls of the city, which Pompey had demolished, were rebuilt by Antipater, the father of that Herod the Great under whom Jerusalem was destined to assume the new and more magnificent aspect which it bore in the time of Christ, and which constituted the Jerusalem which Josephus describes. See HEROD. Under the following reign the city was improved with magnificent taste and profuse expenditure; and even the Temple, which always formed the great architectural glory of Jerusalem, was taken down and rebuilt by Herod the Great, with a splendor exceeding that of Solomon's (Mark xiii, 1; John ii, 20). See TEMPLE. It was in the courts of the Temple as thus rebuilt, and in the streets of the city as thus improved, that the Saviour of men walked up and down. Here he taught, here he wrought miracles, here he suffered; and this was the Temple whose "goodly stones" the apostle admired (Mark xiii, 1), and of which he foretold that ere the existing generation had passed away not one stone should be left upon another. Nor was the city in this state admired by Jews only. Pliny calls it "longe clarissimam urbium orientis, non Judææ modo" (*Hist. Nat.* v, 16).

Jerusalem seems to have been raised to this greatness as if to enhance the misery of its overthrow. As soon as the Jews had set the seal to their formal rejection of Christ by putting him to death, and invoking the responsibility of his blood upon the heads of themselves and of their children (Matt. xxvii, 25), its doom went forth. After having been the scene of horrors without example, during a memorable siege, the process of which is narrated by Josephus in full detail, it was, in A.D. 70, captured to the Romans, who razed the city and Temple to the ground, leaving only three of the towers and a part of the western wall to show how strong a place the Roman arms had overthrown (Joseph. *War*, vii, 1, 1). Since then the holy city has lain at the mercy of the Gentiles, and will so remain "until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled."

The destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans did not cause the site to be utterly forsaken. Titus (q. v.) left there in garrison the whole of the tenth legion, besides several squadrons of cavalry and cohorts of foot. For these troops, and for those who ministered to their wants, there must have been dwellings; and there is no reason to suppose that such Jews or Christians as appeared to have taken no part in the war were forbidden to make their abode among the ruins, and building them up so far as their necessities might require. But nothing like a restoration of the city could have arisen from this, as it was not likely that any but poor people, who found an interest in supplying the wants of the garrison, were likely to resort to the ruins under such circumstances. However, we learn from Jerome that for fifty years after its destruction, until the time of Hadrian, there still existed remnants of the city. But during all this period there is no mention of it in history.

Up to A.D. 131 the Jews remained tolerably quiet, although apparently awaiting any favorable opportunity of shaking off the Roman yoke. The then emperor, Hadrian (q. v.), seems to have been aware of this state of feeling, and, among other measures of precaution, ordered Jerusalem to be rebuilt as a fortified place wherewith to keep in check the whole Jewish population. The works had made some progress when the Jews, unable to endure the idea that their holy city should be occupied by foreigners, and that strange gods should be set up within it, broke out into open rebellion under the notorious Barchochebas (q. v.), who claimed to be the Messiah. His success was at first very great, but he was crushed before the tremendous power of the Romans, so soon as it could be brought to bear upon him; and a war scarcely inferior in horror to that under Vespasian and Titus was, like it, brought to a close by the capture of Jerusalem, of which the Jews had obtained possession. This was in A.D. 135, from which period the final dispersion of the Jews has often been dated. The Romans then finished the city according to their first intention. It was made a Roman colony, inhabited wholly by foreigners, the Jews being forbidden to approach it on pain of death: a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus was erected on Mount Moriah, and the old name of Jerusalem was sought to be supplanted by that of *Ælia Capitolina*, conferred upon it in honor of the emperor Ælius Hadrianus and Jupiter Capitolinus. By this name was the city known till the time of Constantine, when that of Jerusalem again became current, although Ælia was still its public designation, and remained such so late as A.D. 536, when it appears in the acts of a synod held there. This name even passed to the Mohammedans, by whom it was long retained; and it was not till after they recovered the city from the Crusaders that it became generally known among them by the name of *El-Khuds*—"the holy"—which it still bears.

7. From the rebuilding by Hadrian the history of Jerusalem is almost a blank till the time of Constantine, when its history, as a place of extreme solicitude and interest to the Christian Church, properly begins. Pilgrimages to the Holy City now became common and popular. Such a pilgrimage was undertaken in A.D. 326 by the emperor's mother Helena, then in the eightieth year of her age, who built churches on the alleged site of the nativity at Bethlehem, and of the resurrection on the Mount of Olives. This example may probably have excited her son to the discovery of the site of the holy sepulchre, and to the erection of a church thereon. He removed the temple of Venus, with which, in studied insult, the site had been encumbered. The holy sepulchre was then purified, and a magnificent church was, by his order, built over and around the sacred spot. This temple was completed and dedicated with great solemnity in A.D. 335. There is no doubt that the spot thus singled out is the same that has ever since been regarded as the place in which Christ was entombed; but the correctness of the identification

then made has of late years been much disputed, on grounds which have been examined in the article GOLGOTHA. The very cross on which our Lord suffered was also, in the course of these explorations, believed to have been discovered, under the circumstances which have elsewhere been described. See CROSS.

By Constantine the edict excluding the Jews from the city of their fathers' sepulchres was so far repealed that they were allowed to enter it once a year to wail over the desolation of "the holy and beautiful house" in which their fathers worshipped God. When the nephew of Constantine, the emperor Julian (q. v.), abandoned Christianity for the old Paganism, he endeavored, as a matter of policy, to conciliate the Jews. He allowed them free access to the city, and permitted them to rebuild their Temple. They accordingly began to lay the foundations in A.D. 362; but the speedy death of the emperor probably occasioned that abandonment of the attempt which contemporary writers ascribe to supernatural hinderances. The edicts seem then to have been renewed which excluded the Jews from the city, except on the anniversary of its capture, when they were allowed to enter the city and weep over it. Their appointed wailing-place remains, and their practice of wailing there continues to the present day. From St.

The Jews "Wailing-Place," in the western wall of the Haram inclosure.

James, the first bishop, to Jude II, who died A.D. 136, there had been a series of fifteen bishops of Jewish descent; and from Marcus, who succeeded Simeon, to Macarius, who presided over the Church of Jerusalem under Constantine, there was a series of twenty-three bishops of Gentile descent, but, beyond a bare list of their names, little is known of the Church or of the city of Jerusalem during the whole of this latter period.

In the centuries ensuing the conversion of Constantine, the roads to Zion were thronged with pilgrims from all parts of Christendom, and the land abounded in monasteries, occupied by persons who wished to lead a religious life amid the scenes which had been sanctified by the Saviour's presence. After much struggle of conflicting dignities, Jerusalem was, in A.D. 451, declared a patriarchate by the Council of Chalcedon. See PATRIARCHATE OF JERUSALEM. In the theological controversies which followed the decision of that council with regard to the two natures of Christ, Jerusalem bore its share with other Oriental churches, and two of its bishops were deposed by Monophysite fanatics. The Synod of Jerusalem in A.D. 536 confirmed the decree of the Synod of Constantinople against the Monophysites. See JERUSALEM, COUNCILS OF. In the same century it found a second Constantine in Justinian, who ascended the throne A.D. 527. He repaired and enriched the former structures, and built upon Mount Moriah a magnificent church to the Virgin, as a memorial of the persecution of Jesus in the Temple. He also founded ten or eleven convents in and about Jerusalem and Jericho, and established a hospital for pilgrims in each of those cities.

In the following century, the Persians, who had long harassed the empire of the East, penetrated into Syria, and in A.D. 614, under Chosroes II, after defeating the forces of the emperor Heraclius, took Jerusalem by storm. Many thousands of the inhabitants were slain, and much of the city, including the finest churches—that of the Holy Sepulchre among them—was destroyed. When the conquerors withdrew they took away the principal inhabitants, the patriarch, and the true cross; but when, the year after, peace was concluded, these were restored, and the emperor Heraclius entered Jerusalem in solemn state, bearing the cross upon his shoulders.

The damage occasioned by the Persians was speedily repaired. But Arabia soon furnished a more formidable enemy in the khalif Omar, whose troops appeared before the city in A.D. 636, Arabia, Syria, and Egypt having already been brought under the Moslem yoke. After a long siege the austere khalif himself came to the camp, and the city was at length surrendered to him in A.D. 637. The conqueror of mighty kings entered the holy city in his garment of camel's hair, and conducted himself with much discretion and generous forbearance. By his orders the magnificent mosque which still bears his name was built upon Mount Moriah, upon the site of the Jewish Temple.

8. Jerusalem remained in possession of the Arabians, and was occasionally visited by Christian pilgrims from Europe till towards the year 1000, when a general belief that the second coming of the Saviour was near at hand drew pilgrims in unwonted crowds to the Holy Land, and created an impulse for pilgrimages thither which ceased not to act after the first exciting cause had been forgotten. The Moslem government, in order to derive some profit from this enthusiasm, imposed the tribute of a piece of gold as the price of entrance into the holy city. The sight, by such large numbers, of the holy place in the hands of infidels, the exaction of tribute, and the insults to which the pilgrims, often of the highest rank, were exposed from the Moslem rabble, excited an extraordinary ferment in Europe, and led to those remarkable expeditions for recovering the Holy Sepulchre from the Mohammedans which, under the name of the Crusades, will always fill a most important and curious chapter in the history of the world. (See Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.*) See CRUSADES.

The dominion over Palestine had passed in A.D. 960 from the khalifs of Bagdad to the Fatimite khalifs of Egypt, and these in their turn were dispossessed in A.D. 1073 by the Turkomans, who had usurped the powers of the Eastern khalifat. The severities exercised by these more fierce and uncivilized Moslems upon both the native Christians and the European pilgrims supplied the immediate impulse to the first Eastern expedition. But by the time the Crusaders, under Godfrey of Bouillon, appeared before Jerusalem, on the 17th of June, 1099, the Egyptian khalifs had recovered possession of Palestine, and driven the Turkomans beyond the Euphrates.

After a siege of forty days, the holy city was taken by storm on the 15th day of July, and a dreadful massacre of the Moslem inhabitants followed, without distinction of age or sex. As soon as order was restored, and the city cleared of the dead, a regular government was established by the election of Godfrey as king of Jerusalem. One of the first cares of the new monarch was to dedicate anew to the Lord the place where his presence had once abode, and the Mosque of Omar be-

LATIN KINGS OF JERUSALEM.

1. Godfrey de Bouillon, elected July, 1099; died July, 1100.
2. Baldwin I., brother of Godfrey, died 1118.
3. Baldwin II. (de Burgo), a relative of Godfrey, died 1131.

4. Foulques d'Anjou, d. 1144. = Melisseude. | Three other daughters.

5. Baldwin III., d. 1162. | Agnes de Courtenai first wife, m. 1157. = 6. Amauri (or Almeric) I., d. 1173. = Maria, daughter of Isaac Comnenus, second wife, m. 1167.

7. Baldwin IV., the leper, struggles with Saladin; d. 1185. | William de Montferrat, first husband. = Sibylla, d. 1189. = 9. Guy de Lusignan, second husband, loses Jerusalem to Saladin 1187; loses the title of king 1189; made king of Cyprus by Richard Cœur-de-Lion 1192. | Humphrey de Thoron, first husband. = Isabell = 11. Henri de Champagne, third husband, appointed by Richard 1192; d. 1197. = 12. Amauri de Lusignan, fourth husband, d. 1205.

8. Baldwin V., d. 1186, six years old. | 10. Conrad de Montferrat, second husband, appointed to the title by Richard Cœur-de-Lion 1192; assassinated 1192.

13. John de Brienne, crowned at Acre 1210; d. 1237. = Mary, married John de Brienne 1210.

Frederick II., emperor of Germany, assumed the title of king of Jerusalem during the lifetime of John de Brienne. = Yoleude, m. 1222.

came a Christian cathedral, which the historians of the time distinguish as "the Temple of the Lord" (*Templum Domini*). The Christians kept possession of Jerusalem eighty-eight years. See below, JERUSALEM, KNIGHTS OF. During this long period they appear to have erected several churches and many convents. Of the latter, few, if any, traces remain; and of the former, save one or two ruins, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which they rebuilt, is the only memorial that attests the existence of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem. In A.D. 1187 the holy city was wrested from the hands of the Christians by the sultan Saladin, and the order of things was then reversed. The cross was removed with ignominy from the sacred dome, the holy places were purified from Christian stain with rose-water brought from Damascus, and the call to prayer by the muezzin once more sounded over the city. From that time to the present day the holy city has remained, with slight interruption, in the hands of the Moslems. On the threatened siege by Richard of England in 1192, Saladin took great pains in strengthening its defences. New walls and bulwarks were erected, and deep trenches cut, and in six months the town was stronger than it ever had been, and the works had the firmness and solidity of a rock. But in A.D. 1219, the sultan Melek el-Moaddin of Damascus, who then had possession of Jerusalem, ordered all the walls and towers to be demolished, except the citadel and the inclosure of the mosque, lest the Franks should again become masters of the city and find it a place of strength. In this defenceless state Jerusalem continued till it was delivered over to the Christians in consequence of a treaty with the emperor Frederick II, in A.D. 1229, with the understanding that the walls should not be rebuilt. Yet ten years later (A.D. 1239) the barons and knights of Jerusalem began to build the walls anew, and to erect a strong fortress on the west of the city. But the works were interrupted by the emir David of Kerek, who seized the city, strangled the Christian inhabitants, and cast down the newly erected walls and fortress. Four years after, however (A.D. 1243), Jerusalem was again made over to the Christians without any restriction, and the works appear to have been restored and completed; for they are mentioned as existing when the city was stormed by the wild Kharismian hordes in the following year, shortly after which the city reverted for the last time into the hands of its Mohammedan masters, who have substantially kept it to the present day, although in 1277 Jerusalem was nominally annexed to the kingdom of Sicily.

9. From this time Jerusalem appears to have sunk very much in political and military importance, and it is scarcely named in the history of the Mameluke sultans who reigned over Egypt and the greater part of Syria in the 14th and 15th centuries. At length, with the rest of Syria and Egypt, it passed under the sway of the Turkish sultan Selim I in 1517, who paid a hasty visit to the holy city from Damascus after his return from Egypt. From that time Jerusalem has formed a part of the Ottoman Empire, and during this period has been subject to few vicissitudes; its history is accordingly barren of incident. The present walls of the city were erected by Suleiman the Magnificent, the successor of Selim, in A.D. 1542, as is attested by an inscription over the Jaffa gate. As lately as A.D. 1808, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was partially consumed by fire; but the damage was repaired with great labor and expense by September, 1810, and the traveller now finds in this imposing fabric no traces of that calamity.

In A.D. 1832 Jerusalem became subject to Mohammed Ali, the pasha of Egypt, the holy city opening its gates to him without a siege. During the great insurrection in the districts of Jerusalem and Nablûs in 1834, the insurgents seized upon Jerusalem, and held possession of it for a time; but by the vigorous operations of the government order was soon restored, and the city reverted quietly to its allegiance on the approach of Ibrahim Pasha with his troops. In 1841 Mohammed Ali was deprived of all his Syrian possessions by European interference, and Jerusalem was again subjected to the Turkish government, under which it now remains.

In the same year took place the establishment of a Protestant bishopric at Jerusalem by the English and Prussian governments, and the erection upon Mount Zion of a church calculated to hold 500 persons, for the celebration of divine worship according to the ritual of the English Church. See JERUSALEM, SEE OF (below).

In 1850 a dispute about the guardianship of the holy places between the monks of the Greek and Latin churches, in which Nicholas, emperor of Russia, sided with the Greeks, and Louis Napoleon, emperor of the French, with the Latins, led to a decision of the question

by the Porte, which was unsatisfactory to Russia, and which resulted in a war of considerable magnitude, known as "the Crimean War," between that country on the one side, and the allied forces of England and France on the other. This war has led to greater liberties of all classes of citizens in the enjoyment of their religious faith, and to a partial adjustment of the rival claims of the Greek and Latin monks to certain portions of the holy places; it has also resulted in much more freedom towards Frank travellers in visiting the city, so that even ladies have been allowed to enter the mosque inclosure; but it has caused no material alteration in the city or in its political relations.

For details, see Witsius, *Hist. Hierosolymæ*, in his *Miscell. Sacr.* ii, 187 sq.; Spalding, *Gesch. d. Christl. Königsreichs Jerusalem* (Berlin, 1803); Devling, *Æliæ Capitolinæ Origg. et Historia* (Lips. 1743); Wagnitz, *Ueb. d. Phänomane vor d. Zerstörung Jer.* (Halle, 1780); R. Bessoie, *Storia della Basilica di P. Croce in Gerus.* (Rome, 1750); C. Cellarius, *De Ælia Capitolina*, etc., in his *Programmata*, p. 441 sq.; Poujoulat, *Histoire de Jérusalem* (Brux. 1842); F. Münter's treatise on the *Jewish War under Hadrian*, transl. in the *Biblioth. Sacra* for 1843 p. 393 sq.; Raumer's *Palästina;* Robinson's *Bib. Res in Palestine;* and especially Williams, *Holy City*, vol. i.

II. *Ancient Topography.*—This has been a subject of no little dispute among antiquarian geographers. We prefer here briefly to state our own independent conclusions, with the authority on which each point rests, and we shall therefore but incidentally notice the controversies, which will be found discussed under the several heads elsewhere in this Cyclopædia.

1. *Natural Features.*—These, of course, are mostly the same in all ages, as the surface of the region where Jerusalem is situated is generally limestone rock. Yet the wear of the elements has no doubt caused some

Map of Ancient Jerusalem.

minor changes, and the demolition of large buildings successively has effected very considerable differences of level by the accumulation of rubbish in the hollows, and even on some of the hills; while in some cases high spots were anciently cut away, valleys partially filled, and artificial platforms and terraces formed, and in others deep trenches or massive structures have left their traces to this day.

(A.) *Hills*.—(1.) *Mount Zion*, frequently mentioned in the Old Testament, only once in the New (Rev. xiv, 1), called by Josephus "the Upper City" (*War*, v, 4, 1), was divided by a valley (Tyropœon) from another hill opposite (Acra), than which it was "higher, and in length more direct" (*ibid.*). It is almost universally assigned, in modern times, as the south-western hill of the city. See ZION.

(2.) *Mount Moriah*, mentioned in 2 Chron. iii, 1, as the site of the Temple, is unmistakable in all ages. Originally, according to Josephus (*War*, v, 5, 1), the summit was small, and the platform was enlarged by Solomon, who built up a high stone terrace wall on three sides (east, south, and west), leaving a tremendous precipice at the (south-eastern) corner (*Ant.* xv, 11, 3 and 5). Some of the lower courses of these stones are still standing. See MORIAH.

(3.) The hill *Acra* is so called by Josephus, who says it "sustained the Lower City, and was of the shape of a moon when she is horned," or a crescent (*War*, v, 4, 1). It was separated from another hill (Bezetha) by a broad valley, which the Asmonæans partly filled up with earth taken from the top of Acra, so that it might be made lower than the Temple (*ibid.*). Concerning the position of this hill there is much dispute, which can only be settled by the location of the valleys on either side of it (see Caspari, in the *Stud. und Krit.* ii, 1864). See ACRA.

(4.) The hill *Bezetha*, interpreted by Josephus as meaning "New City," placed by him opposite Acra, and stated to be originally lower than it, is said by him also to lie over against the tower Antonia, from which it was separated by a deep fosse (*War*, v, 4, 1 and 2). See BEZETHA.

(5.) *Ophel* is referred to by Nehemiah (iii, 26, 27), as well as by Josephus (*War*, v, 4, 2), in such connection with the walls as to show that none other can be intended than the ridge of ground sloping to a point southward from the Temple area. See OPHEL.

Probable contour of the Hill Ophel. (From Lieutenant Warren's Sketch, Feb. 1, 1869, in Tracings of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

(6.) *Calvary*, or more properly Golgotha, was a small eminence, mentioned by the evangelists as the place of the crucifixion. Modern tradition assigns it to the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but this is greatly contested; the question turns chiefly upon the course of the second wall, outside of which the crucifixion undoubtedly took place (John xix, 17). See CALVARY.

(7.) The *Mount of Olives* is so often referred to by Josephus, as well as in the Bible, that it can be taken for no other than that which now passes under the same name. See OLIVET.

(8.) *Scopus* is the name assigned by Josephus to an elevated plain about seven furlongs distant from the city wall in a northerly direction (*War*, ii, 19, 4; v, 2, 3), an interval that was leveled by Titus on his approach from Samaria (*ibid.* iii, 2). By this can therefore be meant neither the rocky prominences on the southern, nor those on the northern edge of that part of the valley of Jehoshaphat which sweeps around the city on the north, for the former are too near, and the latter intercepted by the valley; but rather the gentle slope on the north-west of the city.

Besides these, there is mentioned in Jer. xxxi, 39, "the hill Gareb," apparently somewhere on the north-west of the city, and Goath, possibly an eminence on the west. "Mount Gihon," so confidently laid down on certain maps of the ancient city, is a modern invention.

(B.) *Valleys*.—(1.) The principal of these was the one termed by Josephus that of the *Tyropœon*, or Cheese-makers, running between Zion and Acra, down as far as Siloam (*War*, v, 4, 1). The southern part of this is still clearly to be traced, although much choked up by the accumulated rubbish of ages; but as to the northern part there is considerable discrepancy. Some (as Dr.

Section of the Tyropœon Valley and Mt. Moriah, showing the present as well as the original surface. (From Lt. Warren's Sketch, Oct. 21, in Tracings of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

Robinson) make it bend around the northern brow of Zion, and so end in the shallow depression between that hill and the eminence of the Holy Sepulchre; while others (Williams, with whose views in this particular we coincide) carry it directly north, through the depression along the western side of the mosque area, and eastward of the church, in the direction of the Damascus Gate. See TYROPŒON.

(2.) The only other considerable valley within the city was that above referred to as lying between Acra and Bezetha. The language of Josephus, in the passage where he mentions this valley (*War*, v, 4, 1), has been understood by some as only applicable to the upper portion of that which is above regarded as the Tyropœon, because he calls it "a *broad* valley," and this is the broadest in that vicinity. But the Jewish historian only says that the hills Acra and Bezetha "were *formerly* divided by a broad valley; but in those times when the Asmonæans reigned, they filled up that valley with earth, and had a mind to join the city to the Temple: they then took off a part of the height of Acra, and reduced it to a less elevation than it was before, that the Temple might be superior to it." From this it is clear that in the times of Josephus this valley was not so distinct as formerly, so that we must not look for it in the plain and apparently unchanged depression west of the Temple, but rather in the choked and obscure one running northward from the middle of the northern side of the present mosque inclosure. The union of the city and Temple across this valley is also more explicable on this ground, because it not only implies a nearly level passage effected between the Temple area and that part of the city there intended—which is true only on the northern side, but it also intimates that there had previously been no special passage-way there—whereas on the west the Temple was connected with Zion by a bridge or causeway, besides at least two other easy avenues to the parts of the city in that direction.

(3.) The longest and deepest of the valleys outside the walls was the *Valley of Jehoshaphat*, which ran along the entire eastern and north-eastern side, forming the bed of the brook Kedron. Respecting the identity of this, the modern name leaves no room for dispute. See JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF.

(4.) On the south side ran the *Valley ben-Hinnom* (i.

e. "son of Hinnom"), corrupted in our Saviour's time into Gehenna, and anciently styled Tophet. Of this also the modern name is still the same. See GEHENNA.

(5.) On the west, forming the northern continuation of the last, was what has acquired the appellation of the *Valley of Gihon*, from the pools of that name situated in it. See GIHON.

(C.) *Streams.*—Of these none were perennial, but only brooks formed by the winter rains that collected in the valleys and ran off at the south-eastern corner towards the Dead Sea. The brook *Kedron* was the principal of these, and is mentioned in both the Old and New Testaments (2 Sam. xv, 23; John xviii, 1), and by Josephus (*War*, v, 2, 3), as lying between the city and the Mount of Olives. See KEDRON.

(D.) *Fountains.*—(1.) *En-rogel*, first mentioned in Josh. xv, 7, 8, as a point in the boundary-line of Judah, on the south side of the hill Zion. It is generally identified with the deep well still found at the junction of the valleys of Hinnom and Jehoshaphat, and currently known as the well of Joab or Nehemiah. It is evidently the same as that called by Josephus "the fountain in the king's garden" (*Ant.* vii, 14, 4). Its water is peculiar, but no underground connection has been traced with any other of the fountains. See EN-ROGEL.

(2.) *Siloam* or *Shiloah* is mentioned in the Old and New Testaments, as well as by Josephus, and the last indicates its site at the mouth of the Valley of Tyropœon (*War*, v, 4, 1). It is identical with the modern fount of Selwan. See SILOAM.

(3.) The only remaining one of the three natural springs about Jerusalem is that now known as the Fountain of the Virgin (Um ed-Deraj, "the mother of steps"), above the Pool of Siloam. It is intermittent, the overflow apparently of the Temple supply; and it is connected by a passage through the rock with the Pool of Siloam (Robinson, *Researches*, i, 502 sq.). It is apparently the same with the "king's pool" (Neh. ii, 14; comp. iii, 16) and "Solomon's Pool" (Josephus, *War*, v, 4, 2). This we are inclined (with Lightfoot and Robinson) to identify with the "*Pool of Bethesda*" in John v, 2. See BETHESDA.

There are several other wells adjoining the Temple area which have the peculiar taste of Siloam, but whether they proceed from a living spring under Moriah, or are conducted thither by the aqueduct from Bethlehem, or come from some distant source, future explorations can alone determine. Some such well has, however, lately been discovered, but how far it supplies these various fountains has not yet been fully determined (*Jour. Sac. Lit.* April, 1864). See SOLOMON'S POOL.

(E.) *Reservoirs, Tanks, etc.*—(1.) The *Upper Pool of Gihon*, mentioned in Isa. vii, 3; 2 Chron. xxxii, 30, etc., can be no other than that now found in the northern part of the valley at the west of the city. This is probably what is called the "*Dragon Well*" by Nehemiah (ii, 13), lying in that direction. Josephus also incidentally mentions a "*Serpent's Pool*" as lying on the north-western side of the city (*War*, v, 3, 2), which the similarity of name and position seems to identify with this. See GIHON.

(2.) The *Lower Pool* (*of Gihon*), referred to in Isa. xxii, 9, is also probably that situated in the southern part of the same valley. See POOL.

(3.) There still exists on the western side of the city another pool, which is frequently termed the *Pool of Hezekiah*, on the supposition that it is the one intended to hold the water which that king is said (2 Kings xx, 20; 2 Chron. xxii, 30) to have brought down to the city by a conduit from the upper pool. It is to this day so connected by an aqueduct, which renders the identification probable. But it does not follow (as some argue) that this pool was within the second wall in the time of Christ, if, indeed, it ever lay strictly within the city; the statements above referred to only show that it was designed as a reservoir for supplying the inhabitants, especially on Mount Zion, within the bounds of which it could never have been embraced. This pool is perhaps also the same as one mentioned by Josephus, under the title of *Amygdalon*, as opposite the third of the "banks" raised by Titus (*War*, v, 11, 4). He there locates it "a great way off" from Antonia, yet "on the north quarter" of the city; and a more suitable place for an assault could not have been selected, as it was in the corner where the three walls joined, being evidently within the outer one, and in front of the inner one (yet to be taken), but not necessarily within the middle wall (which had been taken and demolished). See HEZEKIAH'S POOL.

(4.) Josephus also mentions a deep *trench* which was dug on the north of the tower Antonia for its defence (*War*, v, 4, 2). The western part of this seems to have been filled up during the siege, in order to prepare a way for the approach of the Roman engines first to the tower and afterwards to the Temple wall (*War*, v, 11, 4; vii, 2, 7). The eastern portion still exists, and appears to have been wider and deeper than elsewhere (being uninclosed by the wall), forming, indeed, quite a receptacle for rain-water. This pit we are inclined to identify with the pool *Struthius*, which Josephus locates at this spot (*War*, v, 11, 4). In modern times it has often been assigned as the site of the Pool of Bethesda, but this can hardly be correct. What is now known as the pool of Bethesda is perhaps a reservoir built in the pit from which Herod quarried the stone for reconstructing the Temple.

(5.) Of aqueducts, besides the two already mentioned as supplying respectively the pools of Siloam and Hezekiah, there still exists a long subterranean *conduit* that brings water from the pools of Bethlehem (attributed to Solomon); which, passing along the south-western side of the Valley of Hinnom, then crossing it above the lower pool, and winding around the northern brow of Zion, at last supplies one or more wells in the western side of the mosque inclosure. This is undoubtedly an ancient work, and can be no other than the aqueduct which the Talmud speaks of (as we shall see) as furnishing the Temple with an abundance of water. It was probably reconstructed by Pilate, as Josephus speaks of "aqueducts whereby he brought water from the distance of 400 [other editions read 300, and even 200] furlongs" (*War*, ii, 9, 4). (See below, water supply of modern Jerusalem.)

2. Respecting the ancient *walls*, with their *gates* and *towers*, our principal authority must be the description of ancient Jerusalem furnished by Josephus (*War*, v, 4, 2), to which allusion has so often been made. The only other account of any considerable fulness is contained in Nehemiah's statement of the portions repaired under his superintendence (ch. iii). Besides these, and some incidental notices scattered in other parts of these authors and in the Bible generally, there are left us a few ruins in particular places, which we may combine with the natural points determined above in making out the circuit and fortifications of the city. (See below, fortifications of the city.)

(F.) *The First or Old Wall.*—Josephus's account of this is as follows: "Beginning on the north from the tower Hippicus (so called), and extending to the Xystus (so called), thence touching the council-[house], it joined the western cloister of the Temple; but in the other direction, on the west, beginning from the same tower, and extending through the place Bethso (so called) to the gate of the Essenes, and thence on the south turning above the fountain Siloam, and thence again bending on the east to the Pool of Solomon, and reaching as far as a certain place which they call Ophla, it joined the eastward cloister of the Temple." It was defended by sixty towers (*ibid.* § 3), probably at equal distances, and of the same average dimensions (but probably somewhat smaller than those of the outer wall), exclusive of the three towers specially described.

(1.) On the north side it began at the *Tower of Hippicus.* This has been with great probability identified

with the site of the present citadel or Castle of David, at the north-western corner of Zion. This tower is stated by Josephus to have been 25 cubits (about 45 feet square), and solid to the height of 30 cubits (*War*, v, 4, 3). At the north-western corner of the modern citadel is a tower 45 feet square, cut on three sides to a great height out of the solid rock, which (with Mr. Williams) we think can be no other than Hippicus. This is probably the tower at the Valley Gate mentioned in 2 Chron. xxvi, 9. See HIPPICUS.

(2.) Not far from Hippicus, on the same wall, Josephus places the *Tower of Phasaëlus*, with a solid base of 40 cubits (about 73 feet) square as well as high (*ibid.*). To this the tower on the north-eastern corner of the modern citadel so nearly corresponds (its length being 70 feet, and its breadth now shortened to 56 feet, the rest having probably been masonry), that they cannot well be regarded as other than identical.

(3.) Not far from this again, Josephus locates the *Tower of Mariamne*, 20 cubits (about 36 feet) square and high (*ibid.*). This we incline (with Mr. Williams) to place about the same distance east of Phasaëlus.

(4.) The *Gate Gennath* (i. e. "garden"), distinctly stated by Josephus as belonging to the first wall (*War*, v, 4, 2), apparently not far east of Mariamne. The arch now known by this name, near the south end of the bazaars, evidently is comparatively recent. See GENNATH.

Modern "Gate of Gennath," explored by Lieutenant Warren in his excavations at Jerusalem. (From Tracing of Feb. 1, 1867, of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

(5.) There is another "*obscure* gate" referred to by Josephus, as lying near Hippicus, through which the Jews made a sally upon the Romans (*War*, v, 6; vi, 5). This could not have been on the north side, owing to the precipice. It must be the same as that through which he says elsewhere (*ibid.* vii, 3) water was brought to the tower Hippicus, evidently from the Upper and Lower Pools, or from Siloam. It can therefore only be located just south of Hippicus. It appears to be identical with that mentioned in the Old Testament as the *Valley Gate* (Neh. iii, 13; compare 2 Chron. xxvi, 9; xxxiii, 14).

(6.) On the southern side of this wall we next come (omitting "Bethso" for the present) to Josephus's "*Gate of the Essenes.*" This we should naturally expect to find opposite the modern Zion Gate; but as the ancient city took in more of this hill than the modern (for the Tomb of David is now outside), we must look for it along the brow of Zion at the south-west corner. Here, accordingly, the *Dung-gate* is mentioned in Neh. ii, 13, and iii, 13, as lying next to the Valley-gate; and in this latter passage it is placed at 1000 cubits (1820 feet) from it—the accordance of the modern distance with which may be considered as a strong verification of the correctness of the position of both these gates. The Dung-gate is also referred to in Neh. xii, 31, as the first (after the Valley-gate, out of which the company appear to have emerged) toward the right (i. e. south) from the north-west corner of the city (i. e. facing the wall on the outside).

From this point, the escarpments still found in the rock indicate the line of the wall as passing along the southern brow of Zion, as Josephus evidently means. Beyond this, he says it passed above the fountain Siloam, as indeed the turn in the edge of Zion here requires.

(7.) At this south-east corner of Zion probably stood the *Pottery-gate*, mentioned (Jer. xix, 2, where it is mistranslated "east-gate") as leading into the Valley of Hinnom; and it apparently derived its name from the "Potter's Field," lying opposite. See POTTER'S FIELD.

Beyond this, it becomes more difficult to trace the line indicated by Josephus. His language plainly implies that in skirting the southern brow of Zion it curved sufficiently to exclude the Pool of Siloam, although it has been strongly contended by some that this fountain must have been within the city.

(8.) At the mouth of the Tyropœon we should naturally look for a gate, and accordingly we find mention of a *Fountain-gate* along the Valley of Hinnom beyond the Dung-gate (Neh. ii, 14; xii, 37), and adjoining the Pool of Siloah (Neh. iii, 15), which seems to fix its position with great certainty. The next bend beyond Siloam would naturally be at the termination of the ridge coming down from the Temple. From this point, according to Josephus, it curved so as to face the east, and extended to the Fountain of the Virgin (Solomon's Pool), thus passing along the verge of Ophel. If this fountain really be the Pool of Bethesda, we must locate here

(9.) The *Sheep-gate*, which, on the whole, we are inclined to fix in this vicinity (Neh. xii, 39; iii, 1, 32; John v, 2).

The line of the wall, after this, according to Josephus, ran more definitely upon the edge of Ophel (thus implying a slight bend to the east), and continued along it till it reached the Temple. We are not compelled, by his language, to carry it out to the extreme south-eastern corner of the Temple area, because of the deep precipice which lay there (*Ant.* xv, 11, 4). Just so, the modern wall comes up nearly in the middle of the south side of this area. The ancient point of intersection has been discovered by the recent excavations of the English engineers. (See the sketch of Ophel above.)

From this account of the first wall, we should naturally conclude that Josephus's Upper City included the Tyropœon as well as Ophel; but from other passages it is certain that Zion had a separate wall of its own on its eastern brow, and that Josephus here only means to speak of the outer wall around the west, south, and east. Thus he states (*War*, vi, 7, 2) that, after the destruction of the Temple, the Romans, having seized and burned the whole Lower City as far as Siloam, were still compelled to make special efforts to dislodge the Jews from the Upper City; and from his account of the banks raised for this purpose between the Xystus and the bridge (*ibid.* 8, 1), it is even clear that this wall extended around the north-eastern brow of Zion quite to the north part of the old wall, leaving a space between the Upper City and the Temple. He also speaks (*ibid.* 6, 2) of the bridge as parting the tyrants in the Upper City from Titus in the western cloister of the Temple. This part of the Tyropœon was therefore inclosed by barriers on all its four sides, namely, by the wall on the west and north, by the Temple on the east, and by the bridge on the south. The same conclusion of a branch from the outer wall, running up the western side of the Tyropœon, results from a careful inspection of the account of the repairs in Neh. iii. The historian there states that adjoining ("after him") the part repaired around the Fountain-gate at Siloah (verse 15) lay a portion extending opposite the "sepulchres of David" (verse 16). By these can only be meant the tomb of David, still extant on the crown of Zion, to which Peter alludes (Acts

ii, 29) as existing in his day within the city. But we cannot suppose Nehemiah to be here returning along the wall in a westerly direction, and describing repairs which he had just attributed to others (verses 14 and 15); nor can he be speaking of the wall eastward of Siloam, which would in no sense be opposite David's tomb, but actually intercepted from it by the termination of Ophel: the only conclusion therefore is, that he is now proceeding along this branch wall northward, lying opposite David's tomb on the east. By "the pool that was made," mentioned as situated here (verse 16), cannot therefore be meant either Siloam, or the Lower Pool, or even the Virgin's Fountain, but some *tank* in the valley, since filled up, probably the same with the "*ditch* made between the two walls for the water of the old pool" (Isa. xxii, 11), which might easily be conducted (from either of the pools of Gihon) to this spot, along the line of the present aqueduct from Bethlehem. Moreover, it was evidently along this branch wall ("the going up of the wall") that one party of the priests in Neh. xii, 37 ascended to meet the other. This double line of wall is also confirmed, not only by this passage, but likewise by the escape of Zedekiah "by the way of the [Fountain-] Gate between the two walls, which is by the king's garden" (i. e. around Siloam), in the direction of the plain leading to Jericho (2 Kings xxv, 4, 5; Jer. xxix, 4; lii, 7). From 2 Chron. xxvii, 3; and xxiii, 14, it is also evident that Ophel was inclosed by a separate wall. We will now endeavor to trace this branch wall around to the Temple and to the gate Gennath as definitely as the intricate account in Nehemiah, together with other scattered notices, will allow.

We may take it for granted that this part of the wall would leave the other at the south-eastern corner of Zion, near the Pottery-gate, where the hill is steep, and keep along the declivity throughout its whole extent, for the sake of more perfect defence. There were *stairs* in this wall just above the wall that continued to the Fountain-gate (Neh. xii, 37; iii, 15), which imply at least a small gate there, as they led into the Upper City. They would naturally be placed within the outer wall for the sake of security, and at the eastern side of this corner of Zion, where the rock is still precipitous (although the stairs have disappeared), so that they afford additional confirmation to the wall in question.

(10.) Above the Sepulchre of David, and beyond "the pool that was made," Nehemiah (chap. iii, 16) places "the house of the mighty," apparently a *Giants' Tower*, to defend the wall. Immediately north of this we may conjecture would be a *gate*, occurring opposite the modern Zion-gate, and over against the ancient Sheep-gate, although the steepness of the hill would prevent its general use.

Farther north is apparently mentioned (Neh. iii, 19) another minor *entrance*, "the going up to the armory at the turning of the wall," meaning probably the bend in the brow of Zion opposite the south-western corner of the Temple, near where the bridge connected them.

Farther on, another "turning of the wall, even unto the corner," is mentioned (Neh. iii, 24), but in what direction, and how far off, cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. It may mean the junction with the wall of the bridge.

From this point it becomes impossible to trace the order pursued by Nehemiah in the rest of the third chapter, as he does not describe the wall from point to point, but mostly refers to certain objects *opposite* which they lay, and frequently omits the sign of continuity ("after him"). All that can be definitely gathered as to the consecutive course of the wall is that, by various turns on different sides, its respective parts faced certain fixed points, especially "the tower lying out" (verses 25, 26, 27); that it contained three gates (the "Water-gate," verse 26; the "Horse-gate," verse 28; and the gate "Miphkad," verse 31); that it adjoined Ophel (verse 27); and that it completed the circuit of walls in this direction (verse 32). It needs but a glance to see that all this strikingly agrees, in general, with the above-mentioned inclosure in the valley of the Tyropœon just above the bridge, which certainly embraced all the objects referred to by Nehemiah, as we shall see; and this fact of the quadrilateral form of these portions of the wall will best account for the apparent confusion of this part of his statement (as our total ignorance of many of the elements of elucidation makes it now seem), as well as his repeated use of the peculiar mode of description, "over against." Our best course is to follow the presumed line, which the nature of the ground seems to require, and identify the points as they occur, trusting to the naturalness with which they may fall in with our scheme for its vindication.

After leaving the bend at the junction with the bridge, we should therefore indicate the course of the wall as following the natural declivity on the north-east edge of Zion in a gentle curve, till it joined the northern line of the old wall, about half way between the gate Gennath and the Temple. Indeed, the language of Nehemiah (xii, 37) implies that "the going up of the [branch] wall" extended "above the house of David" (i. e. the "king's house"), and thence bent "even unto the Water-gate eastward."

(11.) On this part of the wall, at its junction with the bridge, we think must be placed the *Horse-gate* (2 Kings xi, 16; 2 Chron. xxiii, 15; Neh. iii, 28; Jer. xxxi, 38-40).

(12.) Not far to the north of this must be placed "the *Tower lying out*" (Neh. iii, 25, 26, 27).

(13.) On the north side of the space included by the parts of this wall we place the *Water-gate* (Neh. iii, 26; xii, 37; comp. Neh. viii, 1, 3, 16); probably the same with the *Middle-gate* (Jer. xxxix, 3; compare 2, 4, 5).

(14.) The only remaining gate in this part of the walls is the *Prison-gate*, in the middle of the bridge opposite the Water-gate (Neh. xii, 30-40); probably the same with the gate *Miphkad*, referred to by Nehemiah as lying between the Horse-gate and the Sheep-gate (chap. iii, 28, 31, 32), an identity which the name favors —being literally Gate of *reviewing*, perhaps from the census being taken at this place of concourse, or (with the Vulgate) Gate of *judgment*, from its proximity to the prison.

(G.) *The Second or Middle Wall.*—Josephus's statement of the course of this wall is in these words: "But the second [wall] had (first) its beginning from the gate which they called Gennath, belonging to the first wall, and then, encircling the northern slope only, went up [or, returned] as far as Antonia" (*War*, v, 4, 2). It had fourteen towers (*ibid.* 3), probably of the same general size as those of the outer wall. If we have correctly identified Acra, it must be this hill that Josephus calls "the northern slope;" and the direction of this will require that the wall, after leaving Gennath, should skirt the lowest edge of Golgotha in nearly a straight line till it reached the upper end of the Tyropœon, opposite the western edge of Acra. This direct course agrees with the absence of any special remark in Josephus respecting its line between these two points. Neither is there mention of any gate or tower along it, near Gennath nor opposite Golgotha; so that,

(1.) The first point of note in this direction is the *Tower of Furnaces*, which may be located on the north-eastern slope of the elevation assumed to be that of Golgotha (Neh. iii, 8, 11, 13; xii, 38; comp. 2 Chron. xxvi, 9); and (2.) on the western bank of this entrance of the Tyropœon would be situated the *Corner-gate* (compare Jer. xxxi, 38).

From this point the wall would run directly across the broad beginning of the Tyropœon, to meet the north-western brow of Acra, which Josephus intimates it only served to include. This part spanning the valley must be the *Broad Wall*, referred to in Neh. iii, 8; xii, 38, as lying here. A stronger wall would be needed here, as there was no natural breastwork of rock, and it was on this side that invaders always approached the city. Ac-

cordingly, this strengthening of the wall in this part by an additional thickness was first effected by Manasseh (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14); and having been broken down in Hezekiah's time, it was rebuilt by him as a defence against the Assyrians (2 Chron. xxxii, 5), and again broken down by the rival Jehoash, on his capture of the city (2 Kings xiv, 13).

(3.) On the eastern slope of this depression, we think, must be placed the *Ephraim-gate* (Neh. iii, 38, 39; 2 Kings xiv, 13; comp. Neh. viii, 16), corresponding to the modern "Damascus-gate," and probably identical with the *Benjamin-gate* (Jer. xxxvii, 12, 13; comp. xxxviii, 7; see Zech. xiv, 10), but different from the "*High* gate of Benjamin, that was by the house of the Lord" (Jer. xx, 2). The character of the masonry at the present Damascus-gate, and the rooms on each side of it, indicate this as one of the ancient entrances (Robinson, *Researches*, i, 463, 464).

From this point the wall probably ran in a circular north-east course along the northern declivity of Acra, about where the modern wall does, until it reached,

(4.) The *Old-gate*, which appears to have stood at the north-east corner of Acra (Neh. iii, 3, 6, 8; xii, 39); apparently the same as the *First-gate* (Zech. xiv, 10).

Here, we conceive, the wall took a bend to the south, following the steep eastern ridge of Acra; for Josephus states that it "only inclosed" this hill, and then joined the tower Antonia. For this latter reason, also, it must have passed along the edge of the valley which connects this point with the western end of the pseudo-Bethesda (evidently the valley separating Acra and Bezetha); and this will give one horn of the "crescent-shape" attributed by him to the Upper City, including the Temple in the middle, and Ophel as the other horn. We should therefore indicate for the line of the rest of this wall a very slight outward curve from near Herod's Gate to about the middle of the northern side of the mosque area.

(5.) The only remaining gate expressly referred to as lying in this wall is the *Fish-gate*, which stood not very far from the junction with Antonia (Neh. iii, 1, 3, 6; xii, 39; comp. 2 Chron. xxxiii, 14; Zeph. i, 10).

(6.) The *Tower Antonia*, at which we thus arrive, was situated (according to Josephus, *War*, v, 5, 8) at the corner of the Temple court where the northern and western cloisters met. This shows that it did not cover the whole of the platform north of the Temple, but only had "courts and broad spaces" occupying this entire area, with a tower at each of the four corners (*ibid.*). Of these latter the proper Antonia seems to have been one, and they were all doubtless connected by porticoes and passages. They were all on a precipitous rock, fifty cubits high, the proper tower Antonia being forty cubits above this, the south-eastern tower seventy, and the others fifty cubits (*ibid.*). It was originally built by the Asmonæan princes for the safe keeping of the high-priest's vestments, and called by them *Baris* (*ibid.*, *Ant.* xv, 11, 4). It was "the castle" into which Paul was taken from the mob (Acts xxi, 34, 37). See ANTONIA.

(7.) That one of these four towers which occupied the north-east corner of the court of Antonia we are inclined to identify with the ancient *Tower of Hananeël*, between the tower of Meah and the Fish-gate (Neh. iii, 1, 3; xii, 39), and at the most north-eastern point of the city (Jer. xxxi, 38, compared with Zech. xiv, 10).

(8.) The south-east one of these towers, again, we take to be the ancient *Tower of Meah*, referred to in the above passages of Nehemiah.

Pierotti has found a subterraneous passage extending from the Golden-gate in a north-westerly direction (*Jerusalem Explored*, i, 64). He could not trace it completely; only in two unconnected fragments, one 130 feet long, and another 150 feet. This may be the secret passage (κρυπτὴ διῶρυξ) which Herod excavated from Antonia to the eastern gate, where he raised a tower, from which he might watch any seditious movement of the people; thus establishing a private communication with Antonia, through which he might pour soldiers into the heart of the Temple area as need required (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 11, 7).

This will make out the circuit of the general tower of Antonia, the proper castle standing on the south-west corner, and thence extending a wing to reach the tower on the north-west corner; and the two towers on the east side being built up on the basis of the ancient ones. It had gates doubtless on all sides, but, besides that on the south (which will be considered under the Temple), there is distinct evidence of none except,

(9.) The *Golden-gate*, so called in modern times. It is a double-arched passage in the outer wall of the Haram, now closed up, but evidently a work of antiquity, from its Roman style of architecture, which would naturally refer it to this time of Herod's enlargement of Antonia. Its position, as we shall see, is such as to make it a convenient entrance to this inclosure. See FENCED CITY.

The eastern wall of the Temple area, which evidently served for that of the city, and connects Josephus's first and second walls on this part, we reserve for consideration under the head TEMPLE.

(H.) *The Third or Outer Wall.*—This was not yet built in the time of Christ, having been begun by Herod Agrippa I about A.D. 43. Josephus's account of its course is in the following words (*War*, v, 4, 2): "The starting-point of the third [wall], however, was the tower Hippicus, whence stretching as far as the northern slope to the tower Psephinos, thence reaching opposite the monuments of Helena, . . . and prolonged through [the] royal vaults, it bent in the first place with a corner tower to the (so-styled) Fuller's monument, and then joining the old circuit [i. e. the former wall], ended at the (so-called) valley Kedron." It inclosed that part of the town called Bezetha, or the "New City," and was (in parts at least) ten cubits thick and twenty-five high (*ibid.*). It was defended by ninety towers twenty cubits square and high, two hundred cubits apart (*ibid.* 3).

(1.) The first mark, then, after leaving Hippicus, was the *Tower Psephinos*, described (*ibid.*) as being an octagon, seventy cubits high, at the north-west corner of the city, opposite Hippicus. It was situated quite off the direct road by which Titus approached the city from the north (*ibid.* ii, 2), and lay at a bend in the northern wall at its western limit (*ibid.* iii, 5). All these particulars agree in identifying it with the foundations of some ancient structure still clearly traceable on the north-western side of the modern city, opposite the Upper Pool. Indeed, the ruins scattered along the whole distance between this point and the present Jaffa-gate suffice to indicate the course of this part of the third wall along the rocky edge of the Valley of Gihon. We therefore locate Psephinos opposite the southernmost two of four square foundations (apparently the towers at intervals) which we find marked on Mr. Williams's Plan, and indicating a salient point in the wall here, which is traceable on either side by a line of old foundations. These we take to be remnants of that part of this outer wall which Josephus says was begun with enormous stones, but was finished in an inferior manner on account of the emperor's jealousy (*War*, ut sup.). Although no *gate* is referred to along this part of the wall, yet there probably was one not far below Psephinos, where the path comes down at the north-west corner of the present city wall.

(2.) Between the tower Psephinos and the gate leading to the north-west were the *Women's Towers*, where a sallying party came near intercepting Titus (Joseph. *War*, v, 2; compare 3, 3). They appear to have issued from the gate and followed him to the towers.

(3.) Not very far beyond this, therefore, was the *gate* through which the above party emerged. This could have been none other than one along the present public road in this direction, a continuation of that leading through the Ephraim-gate up the head of the Tyropœ-

Street in modern Jerusalem.

on. It appears that the gates in this outer wall had no specific names.

(4.) The language of Josephus implies that after the sweep of the wall (in its general northern course) at the tower Psephinos, it took, on the whole, a pretty direct line till it passed east of the *Monuments of Helena*. It should therefore be drawn with a slight curve from the old foundations above referred to (north-east of Psephinos) to the base of a rocky eminence just to the north of the present north-west road, upon which, we think, must be placed the monuments in question (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 4, 3).

(5.) The next point referred to by Josephus is the *Royal Vaults*, which have been with most probability identified with the ruins still found on the north of the city at and around the "Tombs of the Kings."

(6.) Next in Josephus's description comes the *Corner Tower*, at which the wall bent in a very marked manner (hence doubtless the name), evidently on meeting the Valley of Jehoshaphat.

For the rest of the way the wall therefore must have followed the ridge of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, and our only task is to identify points of interest along it.

(7.) A little to the east of this corner tower, in the retreating angle of the wall, which accommodates a small ravine setting up southward from the Valley of Jehoshaphat, we locate the *gate* which Titus was approaching when he met the above-mentioned sally.

(8.) The last point mentioned by Josephus is the *Fuller's Monument*, which we locate on the eminence not very far east of the above gate, and it would thus be the north-east corner of the outer wall. Amid the numerous sepulchral caves, however, with which the whole face of the hill is perforated, it is impossible to identify any one in particular.

From this point the wall naturally returned in a distinctly southern course, along the edge of the valley, until it joined the ramparts of the court of Antonia, at the tower of Hananeël. Although there is no allusion to any *gate* along this part, yet there could scarcely have failed to be one at the notch opposite the north-east corner of the present city. Below this spot the ancient and modern walls would coincide in position.

3. As to the *internal subdivisions* of the city, few data remain beyond the arrangement necessarily resulting from the position of the hills and the course of the walls. Little is positively known respecting the *streets* of ancient Jerusalem. Josephus says (*War*, v, 4, 1) that the corresponding rows of houses on Zion and Acra terminated at the Tyropœon, which implies that there were streets running across it; but we must not think here of wide thoroughfares like those of our cities, but of covered *alleys*, which constitute the streets of Oriental cities, and this is the general character of those of modern Jerusalem. The same remark will apply to the "narrow streets leading obliquely to the [second] wall" on the inside, several times referred to in the account of the capture of the city (*War*, v, 8, 1). The principal thoroughfares must be gathered from the position of the gates and the nature of the ground, with what few hints are supplied in ancient authors. In determining their position, the course of the modern roads or paths around the city is of great assistance, as even a mule-track in the East is remarkably permanent.

We must not, however, in this connection, fail to notice the famous *bridge* mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* xiv, 4, 2; *War*, i, 7, 2; ii, 16, 3; vi, 6, 2; vi, 8, 1) as having anciently connected the hill Zion with the Temple near its south-west angle. Dr. Robinson (who was in Palestine in 1838, and published his book in 1841) claims to have discovered this (*Researches*, i, 425 sq.) in the three ranges of immense stones still jutting out from the Haram wall at this point; whereas Dr. Olin (who visited Palestine in 1840, and published in 1843) asserts that this relic had hitherto been unmentioned by any traveller, although well known to the citizens of Jerusalem (*Travels*, ii, 26). The controversy which arose on the subject was closed by a letter from the Rev. H. A. Homes, of Constantinople, stating that the existence and probable character of the remains in question were suggested in his presence to Dr. Robinson by the missionaries then resident at Jerusalem. The excavations of the English engineers on the spot have demonstrated the truth of the identification thus proposed. See TEMPLE.

Remains of Arch of Bridge at the south-west angle of the Temple Area.

Doubtless Jerusalem anciently, like all other cities, had definite *quarters* or districts where particular classes of citizens especially resided, but there was not the same difference in religion which constitute such marked divisions within the bounds of the modern city. It is clear, however, as well from the great antiquity of the Upper City, as from its being occupied in part by palaces, that it was the special abode of the nobility (so

Recovery of the Pier of the ancient Arch across the Tyropœon at the south-west corner of the Temple. (From Lieutenant Warren's Sketch, August 22, 1868, in Tracings of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

to speak), including perhaps the higher order of the priesthood. Ophel appears (from Neh. iii, 26; x, 21) to have been the general residence of the Levites and lower officers connected with the Temple. The Lower City, or Acra, would therefore constitute the chief seat of business, and consequently of tradesmen's and mechanics' residence, while Bezetha would be inhabited by a miscellaneous population. There are, besides these general sections, but three particular districts, the names of which have come down to us; these are:

(1.) *Bethso*, which is named by Josephus as lying along the western side of the first wall; but we are ignorant of its extent or special appropriation.

(2.) *Millo* is mentioned in several places in the Old Testament (2 Sam. v, 9; 1 Kings ix, 15, 24; xi, 27; 2 Kings xii, 20) in such connections as to imply that it was the name of some tract adjoining Zion in the interior of the city, and we have therefore ventured to identify it with the space so singularly inclosed by the walls on the north side of the bridge. See MILLO.

(3.) The *Suburbs* mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* xv, 16, 5) as the quarter to which the middle two of the four western Temple-gates led, we think, must be not simply Bezetha in general (which was separated from the Temple by the intervening Lower City), but rather the low ground (naturally, therefore, indifferently inhabited) lying immediately north of Zion and in the upper expansion of the Tyropœon, including a tract on both sides of the beginning of the second wall.

4. It remains to indicate the location of other *public*

Double-vaulted Passage below the Mosque el-Aksa. (From Lieutenant Warren's Sketch, Dec. 21, 1867, in Tracings of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

buildings and objects of note connected with the ancient city. The topography of the TEMPLE will be considered in detail under that article.

(*a*.) Within the Upper City—*Zion*.—(1.) *Herod's Palace.* This, Josephus states (*War*, v, 4, 4), adjoined the towers Hippicus, etc., on the north side of the old wall, being "entirely walled about to the height of 30 cubits, with towers at equal distances." Its precise dimensions in all are not given, but it must have covered a large area with its "innumerable rooms," its "many porticoes" and "courts," with "several groves of trees, and long walks through them, with deep canals and cisterns." Similar descriptions are also given in *Ant.* xv, 9, 3; *War*, i, 21, 1. We do not regard it, however, as identical with the *dining-hall* built by Herod Agrippa on Zion (*Ant.* xx, 8, 11), for that was only a wing to the former palace of the Asmonæans (apparently a reconstruction of the ancient "king's house"), and lay nearer the Temple (*War*, ii, 16, 3)—the adjoining "portico" or "gallery" mentioned in these passages being probably a covered portion of the Xystus. One of the ground apartments of this building appears to have been the procurator's *prætorium*, mentioned in the account of Christ's trial before Pilate (John xviii, 28, 33; xix, 9; Mark xv, 16), as Josephus informs us (*War*, ii, 14, 8) that the Roman governors took up their quarters in the palace, and set up their tribunal (compare Matt. xxvii, 19) in front (i. e. at the eastern entrance) of it (namely, on the "*Pavement*" of John xix, 13).

(2.) There is no reason to suppose that *David's Tomb* occupied any other position than that now shown as his burial-place on Mount Zion. It was within the precincts of the old city (1 Kings ii, 10); Nehemiah mentions it as surviving the first overthrow of the city (Neh. iii, 16); Peter refers to it as extant at Jerusalem in his time (Acts ii, 29); and Josephus alludes to it as a costly and noble vault of sepulture (*Ant.* xiii, 8, 4; xvi, 7, 1). The present edifice, however, is doubtless a comparatively modern structure, erected over the site of the ancient monument, now buried by the accumulated rubbish of ages.

(3.) The *Armory* referred to in Neh. iii, 19, has already been located at the bend of the branch wall from a north-east to a north-west direction, a little below the bridge. Its place was probably represented in our Saviour's time by an improved building for some similar public purpose.

(4.) The *King's House*, so often mentioned in the Old Testament, has also been sufficiently noticed above, and its probable identity with Herod Agrippa's "dining-hall" pointed out.

(*b*.) Within the Lower City—*Acra and Ophel*.—(1.) Josephus informs us (*War*, vi, 6, 3) that "Queen *Helena's Palace* was in the middle of Acra," apparently upon the summit of that hill, near the modern site of the traditionary "palace of Herod." It is also mentioned as the (north-east) limit of Simon's occupancy in the Lower City (*War*, v, 6, 1).

(2.) There were doubtless *Bazaars* in ancient as in modern Jerusalem, but of these we have no account except in two or three instances. Josephus mentions "a place where were the merchants of wool, the braziers, and the market for cloth," just inside the second wall, not far from its junction with the first (*War*, v, 8, 1). It would also seem from Neh. viii, 1, 16, that there was some such place of general resort at the head of the Tyropœon. A "baker's street" or row of shops is referred to in Jer. xxxvii, 21, but its position is not indicated, although it appears to have been in some central part of the city. See also MAKTESH. Perhaps bazaars were stretched along the low tract between the Ephraim-gate and the northern brow of Zion.

(3.) The *Xystus* is frequently mentioned by Josephus as a place of popular assemblage between Zion and the Temple, and between the bridge and the old wall (*War*, v, 4, 2; vi, 3, 2; 6, 2; 8, 1). We have therefore thought that it would scarcely be included within the Upper

City, the abode of the aristocracy, where, moreover, it would not be so generally accessible.

(4.) The *Prison*, so often referred to in the Old Testament (Neh. iii, 24, 25; Jer. xxxii, 2; xxxviii, 6), must have been situated in the north-west corner of the inclosure which we have designated as "Millo," near the "Prison-gate" (Neh. xii, 39), and Peter's "iron gate" (Acts xii, 10). See PRISON.

(5.) On the ridge of Ophel, not far from the "Fountain of the Virgin," appears to have stood the *Palace of Monobazus*, otherwise styled that of *Grapte* (Josephus, *War*, v, 6, 1; 4, 2; iv, 9, 11; vi, 7, 1).

(6.) Josephus states (*Ant.* xv, 8, 1) that Herod "built a theatre at Jerusalem, as also a very great amphitheatre in the plain;" but this notice is too indefinite to enable us to fix the site of these buildings. He also speaks elsewhere (*Ant.* xvii, 10, 2) of a hippodrome somewhere near the Temple, but whether it was the same as the amphitheatre is impossible to determine; the purposes of the three edifices, however, would appear to have been different.

(*c.*) Within the New City—*Bezetha.*—(1.) The *Monuments of* king *Alexander*, referred to by Josephus (*War*, v, 7, 3) were on the south-west edge of the proper hill Bezetha, nearly opposite the Fish-gate, as the circumstances there narrated seem to require. This will also agree with the subsequent erection of the second engine by the Romans (evidently by the same party of besiegers operating on this quarter, "a great way off" from the other), which was reared at 20 cubits' distance from the pool Struthius (*ibid.* xi, 4), being just south of this monument.

(2.) The *Sepulchre of Christ* was not far from the place of the Crucifixion (John xix, 42); if, therefore, the modern church occupy the true Calvary, we see no good reason to dispute the identity of the site of the tomb still shown in the middle of the west rotunda of that building. See GOLGOTHA.

(3.) The *Camp of the Assyrians* was on the north-west side of the city (Isa. xxvi, 2; 2 Kings xviii, 17), identical with the site of Titus's second camp within the outer wall, but sufficiently outside the second wall to be beyond the reach of darts from it (Josephus, *War*, v, 7, 3; 12, 2), so that we can well refer it only to the western part of the general swell which terminates in the knoll of Calvary.

(4.) The *Monument of* the high-priest *John* is to be located near the bottom of the north edge of Zion, a little east of the tower Mariamne (Josephus, *War*, v, 11, 4; 6, 2; 9, 2; 7, 3).

(*d.*) In the *Environs* of the city.—(1.) *Herod's Monuments* we incline to locate on the brow of the ridge south of the "upper pool of Gihon" (see Josephus, *War*, v, 3, 2; 12, 2).

(2.) The *Village of the Erebinthi* is mentioned by Josephus (*ibid.*) as lying along this line of blockade south of Herod's Monuments, and therefore probably on the western edge of Gihon, near the modern hamlet of Abu-Wa'ir.

(3.) The *Fullers' Field* we take to be the broad Valley of Gihon, especially between the two pools of that name; for not only its designation, but all the notices respecting it (Isa. vii, 3; xxxvi, 2; 2 Kings xviii, 17), indicate its proximity to these waters. See FULLERS' FIELD.

(4.) *Pompey's Camp* is placed by Josephus (*War*, v, 12, 2) on a mountain, which can be no other than a lower spur of the modern "Hill of Evil Counsel." This must have been that general's preliminary camp, for, when he captured the city, "he pitched his camp within [his own line of circumvallation, the outer wall being then unbuilt], on the north side of the Temple" (*Ant.* xiv, 4, 2).

Jerusalem from "the Well of Joab"

(5.) There is no good ground to dispute the traditionary site of *Aceldama* or the *Potter's Field* (Matt. xxvii, 7, 8), in the face of the south brow of the Valley of Hinnom. See ACELDAMA.

(6.) The *Monument of Ananus* [i. e. Annas or Hananiah], the high-priest, mentioned by Josephus (*War*, v, 12, 2), must have been just above the site of Aceldama.

(7.) The *King's Garden* (Neh. iii, 15) could have been no other than the well-watered plot of ground around the well of En-Rogel, where were also the *king's winepresses* (Zech. xiv, 10).

(8.) The rock *Peristereon* (literally "pigeon-holes"), referred to by him in the same connection, has been not inaptly identified with the perforated face of the Valley of Jehoshaphat at the foot of the Mount of Olives, where modern tradition assigns the graves of Jehoshaphat, Absalom, James, and Zechariah.

(9.) The second of these ruins from the north is probably the veritable *Pillar of Absalom*, referred to in the Scriptures (2 Sam. xviii, 18), and by Josephus as if extant in his day ("a marble pillar in the king's dale [the Valley of Jehoshaphat, which led to 'the king's gardens'], *two furlongs distant from Jerusalem*" (*Ant.* vii, 10, 3). See ABSALOM'S TOMB.

(10.) The last and most interesting spot in this survey is the garden of *Gethsemane*, which tradition has so consistently located that nearly every traveller has acknowledged its general identity. Respecting its size, however, we know very little; but we are unable to perceive the propriety of supposing a village of the same name to have been located near it. See GETHSEMANE.

(11.) Finally, we may briefly recapitulate the different points in the Romans' *wall of circumvallation*, during the siege by Titus, as given by Josephus (*War*, v, 12, 2), at the same time indicating their identity as above determined: "Titus began the wall from the camp of the Assyrians, where his own camp was pitched [i. e., near the north-west angle of the modern city wall], and drew it [in a north-east curve] down to the lower parts of the New City [following the general direction of the present north wall]; thence it went [south-easterly] along [the eastern bank of] the Valley of Kedron to the Mount of Olives; it then bent [directly] towards the south, and encompassed the [western slope of that] mountain as far the rock Peristereon [the tombs of Jehoshaphat, etc.], and [of] that other hill [the Mount of Offence] which lies next it [on the south], and [which] is over [i. e. east of] the Valley [of Jehoshaphat] which reaches to Siloam; whence it bent again to the west, and went down [the hill] to the Valley of the Fountain [the wady En-Nar], beyond which it went up again at the monument of Ananus the high-priest [above Aceldama],

and encompassing that mountain where Pompey had formerly pitched his camp [the extremity of the Hill of Evil Counsel], it returned to [i. e. towards] the north side of the city, and was carried [along the south-western bank of Gihon Valley] as far as a certain village called the house of the Erebinthi [at Abu-Wa'ir]; after which it encompassed [the foot of the eminence on which stood] Herod's monument [south of Upper Gihon], and there on the east [end] was joined to Titus's own camp, where it began. Now the length of this wall was forty furlongs less one." Along the line thus indicated it would be precisely this length; it would make no sharp turns nor devious projections, and would keep on commanding eminences, following the walls at a convenient distance so as to be out of the reach of missiles.

For a further discussion of the various points connected with the ancient topography of Jerusalem, see Villalpandi, *Apparatus urbis Hierosol.* in pt. 3 of Pradi and Villalp. *Explanat. in Ezech.* (Rome, 1604); Lamy, *De Tab. fœd. sanct. civ.* etc., vii (Paris, 1720), bk. iv, p. 552-687; Reland, *Palæst.* p. 832 sq.; Offenhaus, *Descript. vet. Hierosol.* (Daventr. 1714); Faber, *Archæol.* i, 273 sq.; Hamesveld, ii, 2 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* II, ii, 202 sq.; Robinson, *Researches*, i, 408-516; Williams, *Holy City*, ii, 13-64; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, p. 154 sq.; 1846, p. 413 sq., 605 sq.; 1848, p. 92 sq.; Reisner, *Ierusalem Vetustissima Descripta* (Francof. 1563); Olshausen, *Zur Topographie d. alten Jerusalem* (Kiel, 1833); Adrichomius, *Hierusalem sicut Christi tempore floruit* (Colon. 1593); Chrysanthi (Beat. Patr. Hierosolymorum) *Historia et Descriptio Terræ Sanctæ, Urbisque Sanctæ Hierusalem* (Venet. 1728) [this work is in Greek]; D'Anville, *Dissert. sur l'Etendue de l'Ancienne Jerusalem* (Paris, 1747); Thrupp, *Ancient Jerusalem* (Lond. 1855); Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels*, Append. ii; Sepp, *Jerusalem* (Münich, 1863); Barclay, *City of the Great King* (Phila. 1858); Fergusson, *Ancient Topography of Jerusalem* [altogether astray] (Lond. 1847); Lewin, *Jerusalem* (London, 1861); Pierotti, *Jerusalem Explored* (London, 1864); Unruh, *Das alte Jerusalem* (Langens. 1861); Scholz, *De Hierosolymæ situ* (Bonn, 1835).

III. *Modern City.*—1. *Situation.*—The following able sketch of the general position of Jerusalem is extracted from Dr. Robinson's *Researches* (i, 380-384): "Jerusalem lies near the summit of a broad mountain-ridge, extending without interruption from the plain of Esdraelon to a line drawn between the south end of the Dead Sea and the south-east corner of the Mediterranean; or, more properly, perhaps, it may be regarded as extending as far south as to Jebel Arâif, in the Desert, where it sinks down at once to the level of the great western plateau. This tract, which is everywhere not less than from 20 to 25 geographical miles in breadth, is, in fact, high, uneven table-land. It everywhere forms the precipitous western wall of the great valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, while towards the west it sinks down by an offset into a range of lower hills, which lie between it and the great plain along the coast of the Mediterranean. The surface of this upper region is everywhere rocky, uneven, and mountainous, and is, moreover, cut up by deep valleys which run east or west on either side towards the Jordan or the Mediterranean. The line of division, or water-shed, between the waters of these valleys—a term which here applies almost exclusively to the waters of the rainy season—follows for the most part the height of land along the ridge, yet not so but that the heads of the valleys, which run off in different directions, often interlap for a considerable distance. Thus, for example, a valley which descends to the Jordan often has its head a mile or two westward of the commencement of other valleys which run to the western sea.

"From the great plain of Esdraelon onwards towards the south, the mountainous country rises gradually, forming the tract anciently known as the mountains of Ephraim and Judah, until, in the vicinity of Hebron, it attains an elevation of nearly 3000 Paris feet above the level of the Mediterranean Sea. Further north, on a line drawn from the north end of the Dead Sea towards the true west, the ridge has an elevation of only about 2500 Paris feet, and here, close upon the water-shed, lies the city of Jerusalem. Its mean geographical position is in lat. 31° 46′ 43″ N., and long. 35° 13′ E. from Greenwich.

"Six or seven miles north and north-west of the city is spread out the open plain or basin round about el-Jib (Gibeon), extending also towards el-Bîreh (Beeroth), the waters of which flow off at its south-east part through the deep valley here called by the Arabs wady Beit Hanîna, but to which the monks and travellers have usually given the name of the 'Valley of Turpentine,' or of the Terebinth, on the mistaken supposition that it is the ancient Valley of Elah. This great valley passes along in a south-west direction an hour or more west of Jerusalem, and finally opens out from the mountains into the western plain, at the distance of six or eight hours south-west from the city, under the name of wady es-Sŭrâr. The traveller, on his way from Ramleh to Jerusalem, descends into and crosses this deep valley at the village of Kulônieh, on its western side, an hour and a half from the latter city. On again reaching the high ground on its eastern side, he enters upon an open tract sloping gradually downward towards the east, and sees before him, at the distance of about two miles, the walls and domes of the holy city, and beyond them the higher ridge or summit of the Mount of Olives. The traveller now descends gradually towards the city along a broad swell of ground, having at some distance on his left the shallow northern part of the Valley of Jehoshaphat; close at hand, on his right, the basin which forms the beginning of the Valley of Hinnom. Farther down both these valleys become deep, narrow, and precipitous; that of Hinnom bends south and again east nearly at right angles, and unites with the other, which then continues its course to the Dead Sea. Upon the broad and elevated promontory within the fork of these two valleys lies the holy city. All around are higher hills; on the east, the Mount of Olives; on the south, the Hill of Evil Counsel, so called, rising directly from the Vale of Hinnom; on the west the ground rises gently, as above described, to the borders of the great wady; while on the north, a bend of the ridge, connected with the Mount of Olives, bounds the prospect at the distance of more than a mile. Towards the south-west the view is somewhat more open, for here lies the plain of Rephaim, commencing just at the southern brink of the Valley of Hinnom, and stretching off south-west, where it runs to the western sea. In the north-west, too, the eye reaches up along the upper part of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, and from many points can discern the Mosque of Neby Samwîl, situated on a lofty ridge beyond the great wady, at the distance of two hours.

"The surface of the elevated promontory itself, on which the city stands, slopes somewhat steeply towards the east, terminating on the brink of the Valley of Jehoshaphat. From the northern part, near the present Damascus-gate, a depression or shallow wady runs in a southern direction, and is joined by another depression or shallow wady (still easy to be traced) coming down from near the Jaffa-gate. It then continues obliquely down the slope, but with a deeper bed, in a southern direction, quite to the Pool of Siloam and the Valley of Jehoshaphat. This is the ancient Tyropœon. West of its lower part Zion rises loftily, lying mostly without the modern city; while on the east of the Tyropœon lie Bezetha, Moriah, and Ophel, the last a long and comparatively narrow ridge, also outside of the modern city, and terminating in a rocky point over the Pool of Siloam. These last three hills may strictly be taken as only parts of one and the same ridge. The breadth of the whole site of Jerusalem, from the brow of the Valley of Hinnom, near the Jaffa-gate, to the brink of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, is about 1020 yards, or nearly half a

Map of the Euvirons of Jerusalem.

geographical mile, of which distance 318 yards are occupied by the area of the great mosque el-Haram esh-Sherif. North of the Jaffa-gate the city wall sweeps round more to the west, and increases the breadth of the city in that part.

"The country around Jerusalem is all of limestone formation, and not particularly fertile. The rocks everywhere come out above the surface, which in many parts is also thickly strewed with loose stones, and the aspect of the whole region is barren and dreary; yet the olive thrives here abundantly, and fields of grain are seen in the valleys and level places, but they are less productive than in the region of Hebron and Nablûs. Neither vineyards nor fig-trees flourish on the high ground around the city, though the latter are found in the gardens below Siloam, and very frequently in the vicinity of Bethlehem."

"The elevation of Jerusalem is a subject of constant reference and exultation by the Jewish writers. Their fervid poetry abounds with allusions to its height, to the ascent thither of the tribes from all parts of the country. It was the habitation of Jehovah, from which 'he looked upon all the inhabitants of the world' (Psa. xxxiii, 14): its kings were 'higher than the kings of the earth' (Psa. lxxxix, 27). In the later Jewish literature of narrative and description this poetry is reduced to prose, and in the most exaggerated form. Jerusalem was so high that the flames of Jamnia were visible from it (2 Macc. xii, 9). From the tower of Psephinus, outside the walls, could be discerned on the one hand the Mediterranean Sea, on the other the country of Arabia (Josephus, *War*, v, 4, 3). Hebron could be seen from the roofs of the Temple (Lightfoot, *Chor. Cent.* xlix). The same thing can be traced in Josephus's account of the environs of the city, in which he has exaggerated what is, in truth, a remarkable ravine [and has, by late excavations, been proved to have been much greater anciently], to a depth so enormous that the head swam and the eyes failed in gazing into its recesses (*Ant.* xv, 11, 5)."

The heights of the principal points in and round the city, above the Mediterranean Sea, as given by lieutenant Van de Velde, in the *Memoir* (p. 179, 180) accompanying his *Map*, 1858, are as follow:

	Feet.
North-west corner of the city (*Kasr Jalud*)	2610
Mount Zion (*Cœnaculum*)	2537
Mount Moriah (*Haram esh-Sherif*)	2429
Bridge over the Kedron, near Gethsemane	2281
Pool of Siloam	2114
Bir-Eyub, at the confluence of Hinnom and Kedron	1996
Mount of Olives, Church of Ascension on summit	2724

A table of levels differing somewhat from these will be found in Barclay's *City of the Great King*, p. 103 sq.

2. Respecting the supply of the city with *water*, we learn from Strabo's account of the siege of Jerusalem by Pompey that the town was well provided with water within the walls, but that there was none in the environs (*Geog.* xvi, 2, 40). Probably the Roman troops then suffered from want of water, as did other armies which laid siege to Jerusalem. In the narratives of all such sieges we never read of the besieged suffering from thirst, although driven to the most dreadful extremities and resources by hunger, while the besiegers are frequently described as suffering greatly from want of water, and as being obliged to fetch it from a great distance. The agonies of thirst sustained by the first Crusaders in their siege of Jerusalem will be remembered by most readers from the vivid picture drawn by Tasso, if not from the account furnished by William of Tyre. Yet when the town was taken plenty of water was found within it. This is a very singular circumstance, and is perhaps only in part explained by reference to the system of preserving water in cisterns, as at this day in Jerusalem. Solomon's aqueduct near Bethlehem to Jerusalem could have been no dependence, as its waters might easily have been cut off by the besiegers. All the wells, also, are now outside the town, and no interior fountain is mentioned save that of Hezekiah, which is scarcely fit for drinking. At the siege by Titus the well of Siloam may have been in possession of the Jews, i. e. within the walls; but at the siege by the Crusaders it was certainly held by the besieging Franks, and yet the latter perished from thirst, while the besieged had "ingentes copias aquæ." We cannot here go through the evidence which by combination and comparison might throw some light on this remarkable question. There is, however, good ground to conclude that from very ancient times there has been under the Temple an unfailing source of water, derived by secret and subterraneous channels from springs to the west of the town, and communicating by other subterranean passages with the Pool of Siloam and the Fountain of the Virgin in the east of the town, whether they were within or without the walls of the town.

The existence of a perennial source of water below the Temple has always been admitted. Tacitus knew of it (*Hist.* v, 12); and Aristeas, in describing the ancient Temple, informs us that "the supply of water was unfailing, inasmuch as there was an abundant natural fountain flowing in the interior, and reservoirs of admirable construction under ground, extending five stadia round the Temple, with pipes and conduits unknown to all except those to whom the service was intrusted, by which the water was brought to various parts of the Temple and again conducted off." The Moslems also have constantly affirmed the existence of this fountain or cistern; but a reserve has always been kept up as to the means by which it is supplied. This reserve seems to have been maintained by the successive occupants of Jerusalem as a point of civic honor; and this fact alone intimates that there was danger to the town in its becoming known, and points to the fact that the supply came from without the city by secret channels, which it was of importance not to disclose. Yet we are plainly told in the Bible that Hezekiah "stopped the upper water-course of Gihon, and brought it down to the west side of the city of David" (1 Kings i, 33, 38); from 2 Chron. xxxii, 30, it seems that all the neighboring fountains were thus "stopped" or covered, and the brook which they had formed diverted by subterraneous channels into the town, for the express purpose of preventing besiegers from finding the "much water" which previously existed outside the walls (comp. also Ecclus. xlviii, 17). Perhaps, likewise, the prophet Ezekiel (xlvii, 1-12) alludes to this secret fountain under the Temple when he speaks of waters issuing from the threshold of the Temple towards the east, and flowing down towards the desert as an abundant and beautiful stream. This figure may be drawn from the waters of the inner source under the Temple, being at the time of overflow discharged by the outlets at Siloam into the Kidron, which takes the eastward course thus described.

There are certainly wells, or rather shafts, in and near the Temple area, which are said to derive their waters through a passage of masonry four or five feet high, from a chamber or reservoir cut in the solid rock under the grand mosque, in which the water is said to rise from the rock into a basin at the bottom. The existence of this reservoir and source of water is affirmed by the citizens, and coincides with the previous intimations, but it must be left for future explorers to clear up all the obscurities in which the matter is involved. Even Dr. Barclay, who gave great attention to this subject, was unable fully to clear it up (*City of the Great King*, p. 293).

The pools and tanks of ancient Jerusalem were very abundant, and, each house being provided with what we may call a bottle-necked cistern for rain-water, drought within the city was rare; and history shows us that it was the besiegers, not the besieged, that generally suffered from want of water (Gul. Tyr. bk. viii, p. 7; De Waha, *Labores Godfredi*, p. 421), though occasionally this was reversed (Josephus, *War*, v, 9, 4). Yet neither in ancient nor modern times could the neighborhood of Jerusalem be called "waterless," as Strabo

describes it (*Geogr.* xvi, 2, 36). In summer the fields and hills around are verdureless and gray, scorched with months of drought, yet within a radius of seven miles there are some thirty or forty natural springs (Barclay's *City of the Great King*, p. 295). The artificial provision for a supply of water in Jerusalem in ancient times was perhaps the most complete and extensive ever undertaken for a city. Till lately this was not fully credited; but Barclay's, and, more recently, Whitty's and Pierotti's subterraneous excavations have proved it. The aqueduct of Solomon (winding along for twelve miles and a quarter) pours the waters of the three immense pools into the enormous Temple wells, cut out like caverns in the rock; and the pools, which surround the city in all directions, supply to a great extent the want of a river or a lake (Traill's *Josephus*, vol. i; Append. p. 57, 60). For a description of these, see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 523 sq.

The ordinary means taken by the inhabitants to secure a supply of water have been described under the article CISTERN; for interesting details, see Raumer's *Palästina*, p. 329–333; Robinson's *Researches*, i, 479–516; Olin's *Travels*, ii, 168–181; and Williams's *Holy City*, ii, 453–502.

3. We present in this connection some additional remarks on the *fortifications* of the city. Dr. Robinson thinks that the wall of the new city, the Ælia of Hadrian, nearly coincided with that of the present Jerusalem; and the portion of Mount Zion which now lies outside would seem then also to have been excluded; for Eusebius and Cyril, in the 4th century, speak of the denunciation of the prophet being fulfilled, which describes Zion as "a ploughed field" (Mic. iii, 2).

In the Middle Ages there appear to have been two gates on each side of the city, making eight in all; a number not greatly short of that assigned in the above estimate to the ancient Jerusalem, and probably occupying nearly the places of the most important of the ancient ones.

On the west side were two gates, of which the principal was the *Porta David*, gate of David, often mentioned by the writers on the Crusades. It was called by the Arabs *Bab el-Mihrab*, and corresponds to the present Jaffa-gate, or *Bab el-Khulil*. The other was the gate of the Fuller's Field (*Porta Villæ Fullonis*), so called from Isa. vii, 3. This seems to be the same which others call *Porta Judiciaria*, and which is described as being in the wall over against the church of the Holy Sepulchre, leading to Silo (Neby Samwîl) and Gibeon. This seems to be that which the Arabian writers call *Serb*. There is no trace of it in the present wall.

On the north there were also two gates, and all the Middle-Age writers speak of the principal of them as the gate of St. Stephen, from the notion that the death of the protomartyr took place near it. This was also called the gate of Ephraim, in reference to its probable ancient name. Arabic writers called it *Bab 'Amud el-Ghurab*, of which the present name, *Bab el-'Amud*, is only a contraction. The present gate of St. Stephen is on the *east* of the city, and the scene of the martyrdom is now placed near it; but there is no account of the change. Further east was the gate of Benjamin (*Porta Benjaminis*), corresponding apparently to what is now called the gate of Herod.

On the east there seem to have been at least two gates. The northernmost is described by Adamnanus as a small portal leading down to the Valley of Jehoshaphat. It was called the gate of Jehoshaphat from the valley to which it led. It seems to be represented by the present gate of St. Stephen. The Arabian writers call it *Bab el-Usbat*, gate of the Tribes, being another form of the modern Arabic name *Bab es-Subat*. The present gate of St. Stephen has four lions sculptured over it on the outside, which, as well as the architecture, show that it existed before the present walls. Dr. Robinson suggests that the original "small portal" was rebuilt on a larger scale by the Franks when they built up the walls of the city, either in A.D. 1178 or 1239. The other gate is the famous Golden Gate (*Porta aurea*)

Interior of the "Golden Gate."

in the eastern wall of the Temple area. It is now called by the Arabs *Bab ed-Dahariyeh*, but formerly *Bab er-Rameh*, "Gate of Mercy." The name Golden Gate appears to have come from a supposed connection with one of the ancient gates of the Temple, which are said to have been covered with gold; but this name cannot be traced back beyond the historians of the Crusades. This gate is, from its architecture, obviously of Roman origin, and is conjectured to have belonged to the inclosure of the temple of Jupiter which was built by Hadrian upon Mount Moriah. The exterior is now walled up; but, being double, the interior forms within the area a recess, which is used for prayer by the Moslem worshipper. Different reasons are given for the closing of this gate. It was probably because it was found inconvenient that a gate to the mosque should be open in the exterior wall. Although not walled up, it was kept closed even when the Crusaders were in possession of the city, and only opened once a year, on Palm Sunday, in celebration of our Lord's supposed triumphal entry through it to the Temple.

Of all the towers with which the city was anciently adorned and defended, the most important is that of Hippicus, which Josephus, as we have already seen, assumed as the starting-point in his description of all the walls of the city. Herod gave to it the name of a friend who was slain in battle. It was a quadrangular structure, twenty-five cubits on each side, and built up entirely solid to the height of thirty cubits. Above this solid part was a cistern twenty cubits; and then, for twenty-five cubits more, were chambers of various kinds, with a breastwork of two cubits, and battlements of three cubits upon the top. The altitude of the whole tower was consequently eighty cubits. The stones of which it was built were very large, twenty cubits long by ten broad and five high, and (probably in the upper part) were of white marble. Dr. Robinson has shown that this tower should be sought at the north-west corner of the upper city, or Mount Zion. This part, a little to the south of the Jaffa-gate, is now occupied by the citadel. It is an irregular assemblage of square towers, surrounded on the inner side towards the city by a low wall, and having on the outer or west side a deep fosse. The towers which rise from the brink of the fosse are protected on that side by a low sloping bulwark or buttress, which rises from the bottom of the trench at an angle of forty-five degrees. This part bears evident marks of antiquity, and Dr. Robinson is inclined to ascribe these massive outworks to the time of the rebuilding and fortifying of the city by Hadrian. This fortress is described by the Middle-Age historians as the tower or citadel of David. Within it, as the traveller enters the city by the Jaffa-gate, the north-eastern tower attracts his notice as bearing evident marks of higher antiquity than any of the others. The

upper part is, indeed, modern, but the lower part is built of larger stones, bevelled at the edges, and apparently still occupying their original places. This tower has been singled out by the Franks, and bears among them the name of the tower of David, while they sometimes give to the whole fortress the name of the castle of David. Taking all the circumstances into account, Dr. Robinson thinks that the antique lower portion of this tower is in all probability a remnant of the tower of Hippicus, which, as Josephus states, was left standing by Titus when he destroyed the city. This discovery, however, is not new, the identity having been advocated by Raumer and others before Dr. Robinson travelled. This view has been somewhat modified by Mr. Williams, who shows that the *north-western* angle of the present citadel exactly corresponds in size and position to the description of Josephus, while other portions of the same general structure have been rebuilt upon the old foundations of the adjoining towers of Mariamne and Phasaelus (*Holy City*, ii, 14-16).

The "Castle of David."

The present Damascus-gate in particular, from its massive style and other circumstances, seems to have occupied a prominent point along the ancient "second wall" of the city. Connected with its structures are the immense underground quarries, *on* which, as well as *out of* which, the city may be said to be built. From them have been hewn, in past ages, the massive limetone blocks which appear in the walls and elsewhere. In these dark chambers one may, with the help of torches, wander for hours, scrambling over mounds of rubbish; now climbing into one chamber, now descending into another, noting the various cuttings, grooves, cleavages and hammer-marks; and wondering at the different shapes—bars here, slices there, boulders there, thrown up together in utter confusion. Only in one corner do we find a few drippings of water and a tiny spring; for these singular excavations, like the great limestone cave at Khureitun (beyond Bethlehem, probably Adullam), are entirely free from damp; and though the only bit of intercourse with the upper air is by the small twenty-inch hole at the Damascus-gate, through which the enterprising traveller wriggles into them like a serpent, yet the air is fresh and somewhat warm (Stewart's *Tent and Khan*, p. 263-266). These are no doubt the subterranean retreats referred to by Josephus as occupied by the despairing Jews in the last days of Jerusalem (*War*, vi, 7, 3; vi, 8, 4); and to which Tasso alludes when relating the wizard's promise to conduct the "Soldan" through Godfrey's leaguer into the heart of the city (*Gerus. Liber.* x, 29). The native name for the quarries is *Maghâret el-Kotton*, the Cotton Cave. For a full description of these caverns, see Barclay, *City of the Great King*, p. 460 sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 491 sq.; Wilson in the *Ordnance Survey* (1865, p. 63).

4. The following *description* of the present city is chiefly abridged from the excellent account of Dr. Olin (*Travels*, vol. ii, chap. iv). The general view of the city from the Mt. of Olives is mentioned more or less by all travellers as that from which they derive their most distinct and abiding impression of Jerusalem.

The summit of the Mount of Olives is about half a mile east from the city, which it completely overlooks, every considerable edifice and almost every house being visible. The city, seen from this point, appears to be a regular inclined plain, sloping gently and uniformly from west to east, or towards the observer, and indented by a slight depression or shallow vale, running nearly through the centre in the same direction. The south-east corner of the quadrangle—for that may be assumed as the figure formed by the rocks—that which is nearest to the observer, is occupied by the mosque of Omar and its extensive and beautiful grounds. This is Mount Moriah, the site of Solomon's Temple; and the ground embraced in this inclosure occupies about an eighth of the whole modern city. It is covered with greensward, and planted sparingly with olive, cypress, and other trees, and it is certainly the most lovely feature of the town, whether we have reference to the splendid structures or the beautiful lawn spread out around them.

Plan of Quarries under Jerusalem.

The south-west quarter, embracing that part of Mount Zion

Map of Modern Jerusalem.

which is within the modern town, is to a great extent occupied by the Armenian convent, an enormous edifice, which is the only conspicuous object in this neighborhood. The north-west is largely occupied by the Latin convent, another very extensive establishment. About midway between these two convents is the castle or citadel, close to the Bethlehem-gate, already mentioned. The north-east quarter of Jerusalem is but partially built up, and it has more the aspect of a rambling agricultural village than that of a crowded city. The vacant spots here are green with gardens and olive-trees. There is another large vacant tract along the southern wall, and west of the Haram, also covered with verdure. Near the centre of the city also appear two or three green spots, which are small gardens. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre is the only conspicuous edifice in this vicinity, and its domes are striking objects. There are no buildings which, either from their size or beauty, are likely to engage the attention. Eight or ten minarets mark the position of so many mosques in different parts of the town, but they are only noticed because of their elevation above the surrounding edifices. Upon the same principle the eye rests for a moment upon a great number of low domes, which form the roofs of the principal dwellings, and relieve the heavy uniformity of the flat plastered roofs which cover the greater mass of more humble habitations. Many ruinous piles and a thousand disgusting objects are concealed or disguised by the distance. Many inequalities of surface, which exist to so great an extent that there is not a level street of any length in Jerusalem, are also unperceived.

From the same commanding point of view a few olive and fig trees are seen in the lower part of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, and scattered over the side of Olivet from its base to the summit. They are sprinkled yet

more sparingly on the southern side of the city on Mounts Zion and Ophel. North of Jerusalem the olive plantations appear more numerous as well as thriving, and thus offer a grateful contrast to the sunburnt fields and bare rocks which predominate in this landscape. The region west of the city appears to be destitute of trees. Fields of stunted wheat, yellow with the drought rather than white for the harvest, are seen on all sides of the town.

Within the gates, however, the city is full of inequalities. The passenger is always ascending or descending. There are no level streets, and little skill or labor has been employed to remove or diminish the inequalities which nature or time has produced. Houses are built upon mountains of rubbish, which are probably twenty, thirty, or fifty feet above the natural level, and the streets are constructed with the same disregard to convenience, with this difference, that some slight attention is paid to the possibility of carrying off surplus water. The streets are, without exception, narrow, seldom exceeding eight or ten feet in breadth. The houses often meet, and in some instances a building occupies both sides of the street, which runs under a succession of arches barely high enough to permit an equestrian to pass under them. A canopy of old mats or of plank is suspended over the principal streets when not arched. This custom had its origin, no doubt, in the heat of the climate, which is very intense in summer, and it gives a gloomy aspect to all the most thronged and busy parts of the city. These covered ways are often pervaded by currents of air when a perfect calm prevails in other places. The principal streets of Jerusalem run nearly at right angles to each other. Very few, if any of them, bear names among the native population. They are badly paved, being merely laid irregularly with raised stones, with a deep square channel for beasts of burden in the middle; but the steepness of the ground contributes to keep them cleaner than in most Oriental cities.

The houses of Jerusalem are substantially built of the limestone of which the whole of this part of Palestine is composed: not usually hewn, but broken into regular forms, and making a solid wall of very respectable appearance. For the most part, there are no windows next to the street, and the few which exist for the purposes of light or ventilation are completely masked by casements and lattice-work. The apartments receive their light from the open courts within. The ground plot is usually surrounded by a high inclosure, commonly forming the walls of the house only, but sometimes embracing a small garden and some vacant ground. The rain-water which falls upon the pavement is carefully conducted, by means of gutters, into cisterns, where it is preserved for domestic uses. The people of Jerusalem rely chiefly upon these reservoirs for their supply of this indispensable article. Every house has its cistern, and the larger habitations are provided with a considerable number of them, which occupy the ground story or cells formed for the purpose below it. Stone is employed in building for all the purposes to which it can possibly be applied, and Jerusalem is hardly more exposed to accidents by fire than a quarry or subterranean cavern. The floors, stairs, etc., are of stone, and the ceiling is usually formed by a coat of plaster laid upon the stones, which at the same time form the roof and the vaulted top of the room. Doors, sashes, and a few other appurtenances, are all that can usually be afforded of a material so expensive as wood. The little timber which is used is mostly brought from Mount Lebanon, as in the time of Solomon. A rough, crooked stick of the fig-tree, or some gnarled, twisted planks made of the olive—the growth of Palestine, are occasionally seen. In other respects, the description in the article HOUSE will afford a sufficient notion of those in Jerusalem. A large number of houses in Jerusalem are in a dilapidated and ruinous state. Nobody seems to make repairs so long as his dwelling does not absolutely refuse him shelter and safety. If one room tumbles about his ears he removes into another, and permits rubbish and vermin to accumulate as they will in the deserted halls. Tottering staircases are propped to prevent their fall; and, when the edifice becomes untenable, the occupant seeks another a little less ruinous, leaving the wreck to a smaller or more wretched family, or, more probably, to a goatherd and his flock. Habitations which have a very respectable appearance as seen from the street, are often found, upon entering them, to be little better than heaps of ruins.

Nothing of this would be suspected from the general appearance of the city as seen from the various commanding points without the walls, nor from anything that meets the eye in the streets. Few towns in the East offer a more imposing spectacle to the view of the approaching stranger. He is struck with the height and massiveness of the walls, which are kept in perfect repair, and naturally produce a favorable opinion of the wealth and comfort which they are designed to protect. Upon entering the gates, he is apt, after all that has been published about the solitude that reigns in the streets, to be surprised at meeting large numbers of people in the chief thoroughfares, almost without exception decently clad. A longer and more intimate acquaintance with Jerusalem, however, does not fail to correct this too favorable impression, and demonstrate the existence and general prevalence of the poverty and even wretchedness which must result in every country from oppression, from the absence of trade, and the utter stagnation of all branches of industry. Considerable activity is displayed in the bazaars, which are supplied scantily, like those of other Eastern towns, with provisions, tobacco, coarse cottons, and other articles of prime necessity. A considerable business is still done in beads, crosses, and other sacred trinkets, which are purchased to a vast amount by the pilgrims who annually throng the holy city. The support and even the existence of the considerable population of Jerusalem depend upon this transient patronage — a circumstance to which a great part of the prevailing poverty and degradation is justly ascribed. The worthless articles employed in this pitiful trade are, almost without exception, brought from other places, especially Hebron and Bethlehem—the former celebrated for its baubles of glass, the latter chiefly for rosaries, crucifixes, and other toys made of mother-of-pearl, olive-wood, black stones from the Dead Sea, etc. These are eagerly bought up by the ignorant pilgrims, sprinkled with holy water by the priests, or consecrated by some other religious mummery, and carried off in triumph and worn as ornaments to charm away disease and misfortune, and probably to be buried with the deluded enthusiast in his coffin, as a sure passport to eternal blessedness. With the departure of the swarms of pilgrims, however, even this poor semblance of active industry and prosperity deserts the city. With the exception of some establishments for soap-making, a tannery, and a very few weavers of coarse cottons, there do not appear to be any manufacturers properly belonging to the place. Agriculture is almost equally wretched, and can only give employment to a few hundred people. The masses really seem to be without any regular employment. A considerable number, especially of the Jews, professedly live on charity. Many Christian pilgrims annually find their way hither on similar resources, and the approaches to the holy places are thronged with beggars, who in piteous tones demand alms in the name of Christ and the blessed Virgin. The general condition of the population is that of abject poverty. A few Turkish officials, ecclesiastical, civil, and military; some remains of the old Mohammedan aristocracy—once powerful and rich, but now much impoverished and nearly extinct; together with a few tradesmen in easy circumstances, form almost the only exceptions to the prevailing indigence. There is not a single broker among the whole population, and not the smallest sum can be obtained on the best bills of exchange short of Jaffa or Beirût.

5. The *population* of Jerusalem has been variously estimated by different travellers, some making it as high as 30,000, others as low as 12,000. An average of these estimates would make it somewhere between 12,000 and 15,000; but the Egyptian system of taxation and of military conscription in Syria has lately furnished more accurate data than had previously been obtainable, and on these Dr. Robinson estimates the population at not more than 11,500, distributed thus:

Mohammedans	4,500
Jews	3,000
Christians	3,500
	11,000

If to this be added something for possible omissions, and the inmates of the convents, the standing population, exclusive of the garrison, would not exceed 11,500. Dr. Barclay is very minute in regard to the Christian sects, and his details show that Robinson greatly underestimated them when he gave their number as 3500. Barclay shows them to be in all 4518 (p. 588). The latest estimate of the population is that of Pierotti, who gives the entire sum as 20,330, subdivided as follows: Christian sects, 5068; Moslems (Arabs and Turks), 7556; Jews, 7706.

The language most generally spoken among all classes of the inhabitants is the Arabic. Schools are rare, and consequently facility in reading is not often met with. The general condition of the inhabitants has already been indicated.

The Turkish governor of the town holds the rank of pasha, but is responsible to the pasha of Beirût. The government is somewhat milder than before the period of the Egyptian dominion; but it is said that the Jewish and Christian inhabitants at least have ample cause to regret the change of masters, and the American missionaries lament that change without reserve (*Am. Bib. Repos.* for 1843). Yet the Moslems reverence the same spots which the Jews and Christians account holy, the holy sepulchre only excepted; and this exception arises from their disbelief that Christ was crucified, or buried, or rose again. Formerly there were in Palestine monks of the Benedictine and Augustine orders, and of those of St. Basil and St. Anthony; but since 1304 there have been none but Franciscans, who have charge of the Latin convent and the holy places. They resided on Mount Zion till A.D. 1561, when the Turks allowed them the monastery of St. Salvador, which they now occupy. They had formerly a handsome revenue out of all Roman Catholic countries, but these sources have fallen off since the French Revolution, and the establishment is said to be poor and deeply in debt. The expenses arise from the duty imposed upon the convent of entertaining pilgrims, and the cost of maintaining the twenty convents belonging to the establishment of the Terra Santa is estimated at 40,000 Spanish dollars a year. Formerly it was much higher, in consequence of the heavy exactions of the Turkish government. Burckhardt says that the brotherhood paid annually £12,000 to the pasha of Damascus. But the Egyptian government relieved them from these heavy charges, and imposed instead a regular tax on the property possessed. For the buildings and lands in and around Jerusalem the annual tax was fixed at 7000 piastres, or 350 Spanish dollars. It is probable that the restored Turkish government has not yet, in this respect, recurred to its old oppressions. The convent contains fifty monks, half Italians and half Spaniards. In it resides the intendant or the principal of all the convents, with the rank of abbot, and the title of guardian of Mount Zion and custos of the Holy Land. He is always an Italian, and has charge of all the spiritual affairs of the Roman Catholics in the Holy Land. There is also a president or vicar, who takes the place of the guardian in case of absence or death: he was formerly a Frenchman, but is now either an Italian or Spaniard. The procurator, who manages their temporal affairs, is always a Spaniard. A council, called Discretorium, composed of these officials and three other monks, has the general management of both spiritual and temporal matters. Much of the attention of the order is occupied, and much of its expense incurred, in entertaining pilgrims and in the distribution of alms. The native Roman Catholics live around the convent, on which they are wholly dependant. They are native Arabs, and are said to be descended from converts in the times of the Crusades.

There is a Greek patriarch of Jerusalem, but he usually resides at Constantinople, and is represented in the holy city by one or more vicars, who are bishops residing in the great convent near the church of the Holy Sepulchre. At present the vicars are the bishops of Lydda, Nazareth, and Kerek (Petra), assisted by the other bishops resident in the convent. In addition to thirteen monasteries in Jerusalem, they possess the convent of the Holy Cross, near Jerusalem; that of St. Helena, between Jerusalem and Bethlehem; and that of St. John, between Jerusalem and the Dead Sea. All the monks of the convents are foreigners. The Christians of the Greek rite who are not monks are all native Arabs, with their native priests, who are allowed to perform the Church services in their mother tongue—the Arabic.

The Armenians in Jerusalem have a patriarch, with three convents and 100 monks. They have also convents at Bethlehem, Ramleh, and Jaffa. Few of the Armenians are natives: they are mostly merchants, and among the wealthiest inhabitants of the place, and their convent in Jerusalem is deemed the richest in the Levant. Their church of St. James, upon Mount Zion, is very showy in its decorations, but void of taste. The Coptic Christians at Jerusalem are only some monks residing in the convent of es-Sultan, on the north side of the pool of Hezekiah. There is also a convent of the Abyssinians, and one belonging to the Jacobite Syrians.

The estimate of the number of the Jews in Jerusalem at 3000 is given by Dr. Robinson on the authority of Mr. Nicolayson, the resident missionary to the Jews; yet in the following year (1839) the Scottish deputation set them down at six or seven thousand on the same authority. (See Dr. Barclay's estimate above.) They inhabit a distinct quarter of the town, between Mount Zion and Mount Moriah. This is the worst and dirtiest part of the holy city, and that in which the plague never fails to make its first appearance. Few of the Jerusalem Jews are natives, and most of them come from foreign parts to die in the city of their fathers' sepulchres. The greater proportion of them are from different parts of the Levant, and appear to be mostly of Spanish and Polish origin. Few are from Germany, or understand the German language. They are, for the most part, wretchedly poor, and depend in a great degree for their subsistence upon the contributions of their brethren in different countries. These contributions vary considerably in amount in different years, and often occasion much dissatisfaction in their distribution (see the *Narrative* of the Scottish deputation, p. 148). An effort, however, is now making in Europe for the promotion of Jewish agriculture in Palestine, and a society formed for that purpose, under whose auspices several Jewish families have emigrated to their sacred fatherland, and are engaged in the culture of the productions for which the soil was anciently so famous. Prominent among these philanthropic exertions are those of Sir Moses Montefiore, of London, who has established a farm in the vicinity of Jerusalem for the benefit of his Jewish brethren (Benjamin, *Eight Years in Asia and Africa* p. 34). Under the reforms and religious toleration introduced by the present sultan an amelioration of the condition of the Jewish and Christian inhabitants of Jerusalem may be expected. It should also be added that European enterprise has projected a railway from Jaffa to Jerusalem as one of the fruits of the alliance during the late war, and on its completion an additional impulse will doubtless be given to this ancient metropolis by the facilities of travel and transportation thus afforded.

6. The most recent and complete works on modern Jerusalem are Dr. Titus Tobler's *Zwei Bücher Topographie von Jerusalem und seine Umgebungen* (Berl. 1853, et seq.), which contains (vol. i, p. xi–civ) a nearly full list of all works by travellers and others on the subject, with brief criticisms (continued in an appendix to his *Dritte Wanderung*, Gotha, 1859, and greatly enlarged in his *Bibliographia Geographica Palæstinæ*, Lpz. 1867), and Prof. Sepp's *Jerusalem und das Heilige Land* (München, 1864, 2 vols.), which almost exhaustively treats the sacred topography from the Roman Catholic point of view. The city has been more or less described by nearly all who have visited the Holy Land; see especially Bartlett's *Walks about Jerusalem* (Lond. 1842). The map of Van de Velde (Gotha, 1858), with a memoir by Tobler, has remained the most exact one of the present city till the publication of the English *Ordnance Survey* (London, 1864–5, 1866; N. Y., 1871), which contains minute details. The most perfect pictorial representation is the *Panorama of Jerusalem, taken from the Mount of Olives*, in three large aquatint engravings, with a key, published in Germany (Munich, 1850). Many new and interesting details have been furnished by the scientific surveys and subterranean explorations of the engineers lately employed under the auspices of the "Palestine Exploration Fund" of England, the results of which are detailed in their successive *Quarterly Statements*, and popularly summed up in their volume entitled *Jerusalem Recovered* (Lond. and N. Y. 1871, 8vo). See PALESTINE.

JERUSALEM, COUNCILS OF (*Concilia Hierosolymitana*). Much depends, in determining the number of *councils* held, on the significance of the name. See the article COUNCIL. We have room here only for the principal councils held at Jerusalem. They are, I. The *first* ecclesiastical council mentioned in Acts xv, which is believed to have been held during the year 47, under James the Less, bishop of Jerusalem, in consequence of the dispute in the Church of Antioch on the propriety of dispensing with circumcision (probably provoked by Judaizers). By the decisions of this council, the faithful were commanded to abstain (1) from meats which had been offered to idols (so as not even to appear to countenance the worship of the heathen), (2) from blood and strangled things (probably to avoid giving offence to the prejudices of the Jewish converts), and (3) from fornication (the prevailing vice of the Gentiles). See COUNCIL, APOSTOLICAL, AT JERUSALEM. II. In 335, when many bishops had met in the sacred city to consecrate the church of the Holy Sepulchre, Constantine directed that an effort should be made to heal the divisions of the Church. It was by this council that Arius was restored to fellowship, and allowed to return to Alexandria. Eusebius (*Vit. Const.* iv, 47) pronounces it the largest he knew next to the Council of Nice, with which he even compares it. III. One in 349, by Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, and some sixty bishops, upon the return of Athanasius (q.v.) to Alexandria, after the death of Gregory. They rescinded the decree which had been published against him, and drew up a synodal letter to the Church in Alexandria. IV. Held in 399, in consequence of a synodal letter from Theophilus of Alexandria on the decrees passed in council against the Origenists. They concurred in the judgment, and stated their resolution not to hold communion with any who denied the equality of the Son and the Father. See ORIGEN; TRINITY. V. In 453, on Juvenal's restoration, by the emperor Marcian, to the bishopric of Jerusalem (from which he had been deposed on account of his concurrence in the oppression of Flavianus in the Latrocinium at Ephesus), and the expulsion of Theodosius, a Eutychian heretic, who had become bishop by prejudicing the empress Eudoxia and the monks against Juvenal (q. v.). VI. Held in 518, under the patriarch John III, and composed of thirty-three bishops. They addressed a synodal letter to John of Constantinople indorsing the decisions of the council of that city, and condemned the Severians and Eutychians. VII. About 536, under patriarch Peter, attended by forty-five bishops. They indorsed the acts of the Council of Constantinople (536) concerning the deposition of the Monothelite patriarch Anthymus and the election of Menai in his stead. The Acephalists were also condemned by them. VIII. Held in 553, where the acts of the fifth œcumenical council of Constantinople were received by all the bishops of Palestine with the exception of Alexander of Abilene, who was therefor deposed. IX. In 634. In this council the patriarch Sophronius addressed a synodal letter to the different patriarchs, informing them of his election, and urging them to oppose the Monothelites. X. In 1443, under Arsenius of Cæsarea, ordering that no ordination of a clerk should be considered valid if performed by a bishop in communion with Rome, unless the clerk proved to the orthodox bishops his adhesion to the faith of the Greek Church. XI. By far the most important council held there was that of 1672. It was convened by Dositheus, at that time patriarch of Jerusalem. There were present fifty-three prelates of his diocese, including the ex-patriarch Nectarius; six metropolitans, archimandrates, presbyters, deacons, and monks. The council called itself ἀσπὶς ὀρθοδοξίας ἢ ἀπολογία. Its main object was to eradicate Calvinism, which threatened to find many adherents amongst this branch of the Eastern Church, into which it had been introduced by Cyrillus Lucaris. The declarations of belief put forth by this council gave rise to considerable trouble in the Eastern Church. Many charged it with Romanistic tendencies, especially because it avoided all utterance on points of difference between the two churches; and it was claimed, also, that their confession directly opposed the confession of Cyril. (Consult Harduin, xi, 179; Kimmel, *Libri Symbolici eccles. Orient.*) See Mansi, *Suppl.* i, coll. 271; Baronius, iv, Conc. p. 1588; v, Conc. p. 275, 739; Mansi, note to Raynaldus, ix, 420; Landon, *Man. Councils*, p. 271 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 501 sq.

JERUSALEM CREED. The early churches of the sacred city are now generally acknowledged to have had a creed of their own, which some believe to have been the production of Cyril of Jerusalem, while others claim that it originated before his time. It has been preserved in the catechetical discourses of Cyril, and reads as follows: "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds; very God by whom all things were made, who was incarnate and made man, crucified and buried, and the third day ascended into the heavens, and sat down at the right hand of the Father, and is coming to judge quick and dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, who spake by the prophets; and in one holy catholic Church; and resurrection of the flesh; and in life everlasting." See *Library of the Fathers* (Oxford transl. 1838), ii, 52 sq.; Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, xxxiii, 505 sq.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 474.

JERUSALEM, FRIENDS OF, is the name of a fanatical sect in Würtemberg who claim it to be the duty of the believers of the Bible to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem, and to congregate there, according to Ezek. xl and sq.

JERUSALEM, KNIGHTS OF. The possession of Jerusalem by a Christian power during the period of the Latin kings (see above, *history of Jerusalem*), gave birth to the two great orders of knighthood, that of the Temple, and that of St. John of Jerusalem; the former of which was distributed throughout Europe, and the latter—known also under the name of Knights Hospitallers (q. v.)—first fixed themselves at Rhodes, and afterwards dwindled down into the little society of the Knights of Malta (q. v.). The Teutonic order sprung up at Acre in 1191, and its grand masters, who became hereditary, were the ancestors of the house of Brandenburg and the kings of Prussia. See TEMPLARS.

JERUSALEM, NEW, the symbolic name of the Christian Church; also called "the Bride, the Lamb's wife"

(Rev. xxi, 2-21; iii, 12). The apostle, from the summit of a high mountain, beheld, in a pictorial symbol or scenic representation, a city resplendent with celestial brightness, which seemed to descend from the heavens to the earth. It was built upon terraces, one rising above another, each terrace having its distinct wall supporting or encircling it; and thus, although each wall was only 144 cubits = 252 feet high, the height of the whole city was equal to its diameter. This was stated to be a square of about 400 miles; or 12,000 stadia = about 1600 miles in circumference—of course a mystical number, denoting that the city was capable of holding almost countless myriads of inhabitants. In its general form, the symbolic city presents a striking resemblance to that of the new city in Ezek. xl-xlviii. The pictorial symbol must be regarded as the representation not of a place or state, but of the Church as a *society*, the "body of Christ" (Eph. v, 23-30; Gal. iv, 26). As Jerusalem and Zion are often used for the inhabitants and faithful worshippers, so the new Jerusalem is emblematical of the Church of God, part on earth and part in heaven. To suppose the invisible world to be exclusively referred to would deprive the contrast between the Law and the Gospel economy, Sinai and Zion, of its appositeness and force. Moreover, the distinction between "the general assembly of the enrolled citizens," and "the spirits of the just made perfect" (Heb. xii, 22-24), can be explained only by interpreting the former of the Church militant, or the body of Christ on earth, and the latter of the Church triumphant in heaven. Thus we see why the New Jerusalem was beheld, like Jacob's ladder, extending from earth to heaven. See ZION.

JERUSALEM, NEW, CHURCH. See NEW-JERUSALEM CHURCH.

JERUSALEM, PATRIARCHATE OF. See PATRIARCHATE OF JERUSALEM.

JERUSALEM, THE NEW SEE OF ST. JAMES IN. The city, sacred alike to the Jew, the Gentile, and the Turk, never felt the influence of Protestant teachings until the opening of the present æra, and, strange to say, the destitute condition of the Jews first caused the appointment of two missionaries to Palestine. These were sent in 1818 by the North American Missionary Society, of Boston. In Europe, no action was taken until 1832: in this year the London Jewish Missionary Society also entered the field. In 1840, at last, the expedition of the great European Powers to the East gave rise to the hope that, though Protestantism might not immediately secure a strong foothold, the power of the Mohammedans at least would be broken, and an opening be made for Christian influences on the inhabitants of the sacred land. The great ambition of king Frederick William IV. of Prussia was to establish a Protestant bishopric in the holy city; and when, at the ratification (July 15, 1840) of the treaty between the Christian and Mussulman Powers, he failed to obtain the desired support for his proposition in favor of entire religious liberty for Eastern Christians, he dispatched a special embassy to the queen of England, the archbishop of Canterbury, and the bishop of London (recognising in them the spiritual heads of the English Church), and proposed a plan for these two great Protestant nations—Prussia and England—to establish and support in common a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem, which should be equally shared in (i. e. alternately) by both the German Evangelical and the Anglican churches. "It was anticipated," says Dr. Hagenbach (*Church Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* ii, 397 sq.), "that by this means Protestantism would be more firmly established, and an important centre formed for missionary labors. While Prussia had formally united with England in the attainment of great ecclesiastical ends, it now seemed that England, by the position which Providence had given her, was adapted to the realization of this plan; and the influence which she had gained as a European Power in the East and in Jerusalem, encouraged the hope without, while it was inwardly strengthened by the fixed forms of her ecclesiastical character, and by the halo of her episcopal dignity." Of course, people differed in their opinion concerning the proposition. There were many eminent German theologians who doubted the wisdom of affiliating with the English Church, which they decried as one of exterior formalism, etc., while, amongst the English, many hesitated to cast in their lot with German rationalistic divines. But the plan was, after all, adopted by the higher clergy of England, as well it might be, for it secured to them not only the first selection, but Prussia also stipulated that the bishopric to be formed at the Church of St. James, in Jerusalem, should be after the plan of the Established Church in England, and that the stationed bishop, though he be a German, *should receive his appropriate consecration at the hands of the primate of the Anglican Church* (the archbishop of Canterbury), *and subscribe to the 39 articles of the Establishment.* The plea which the English clergy made on its adoption was that it gave rise to the hope of bringing about by this means a reconciliation between the two denominations: the archbishop even expressed, on the occasion, the hope that this would lead to "a unity *of discipline* as well as *of doctrine* between our own Church and *the less perfectly constituted* of the Protestant churches of Europe." The endowment of the bishopric was fixed at £30,000 sterling, to insure the bishop a yearly income of £1200. The bishop was to be named alternately by England and Prussia, the primate of England, however, having the right to veto the nomination of the latter. The protection to be afforded to the German Evangelists is provided for by the ordinances of 1841-2, containing the following specifications: 1st. The bishop will take the German congregation under his protection, and afford them all the assistance in his power. 2d. He will be assisted by competent German ministers, ordained according to the ritual of the Church of England, and required to yield him obedience. 3d. The liturgy is to be taken from the received liturgies of the Prussian Church, carefully revised by the primate. 4th. The rite of confirmation is to be administered according to the form of the English Church. In the mean while, an act of Parliament, under date of Oct. 5, 1841, decided that persons could be consecrated bishops of the Church of England in foreign countries without thereby becoming subjects of the crown, but that such would also take the oath of allegiance to the archbishop, in order that they, and such deacons and ministers as they might ordain, may have the right to fulfil the same functions in England and Ireland. In consequence, Dr. M'Caul, of Ireland, having declined the appointment, Dr. Michael Salomon Alexander, professor of Hebrew and Rabbinical literature at Christ's College, London, a converted Jew, and formerly a Prussian subject (having been born in Polish Prussia in 1799), was made first incumbent of the new bishopric. He died Nov. 23, 1845, near Cairo. His successor was Samuel Gobat, of Cremine, canton Berne, a student of the Basle Mission House, nominated by Prussia, and experienced for missionary labors by his residence in Abyssinia. Since then, the news from Jerusalem has been gratifying. Jan. 21, 1849, a newly-created Evangelical church, called Christ Church, situated on Mount Zion, was dedicated. The Gospel is preached there in Hebrew, English, German, French, Spanish, and Arabic. Belonging to it are a burial-ground; a school attended by the children of Jews, Mohammedans, and different Christian denominations; a hospital for the Jews, in which they have an opportunity of hearing the Scriptures; a hospital for proselytes, etc., which is attended to by deaconesses; a house of industry for proselytes, and an industrial school for Jewish females. The number of Jewish converts averages from seven to nine annually. In consequence of the firman granting to Protestants the same rights as are possessed by other churches, they have established small schools in Bethlehem, Jaffa, Nablûs, and Nazareth.

For accurate accounts, see Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 503 sq.; Abeken, *Das evangelische Bisthum in Jerusalem* (Berlin, 1842). (J. H. W.)

Jerusalem, Johann Friedrich Wilhelm, a German theologian—one of the best apologetic and practical theologians of the last century, was born at Osnabrück Nov. 22, 1709, and was educated at the Universities of Leipzig and Wittenberg; at the latter he took his master's degree. Disinclined to enter the ministry, for which he had prepared himself, and too young to enter the ranks of academical instructors, he went to the Low Countries, and studied at Leyden, where he enjoyed the counsels of such men as Albert Schultens, Peter Burman, etc. He sought and secured the friendship of the leading minds of the different Christian denominations of Holland, and learned to appreciate men out of the pale of his own band. After his return to his native place, still only twenty-four years old, he received the most flattering offers, one of which was a position at the newly-created University of Göttingen, which he inclined to accept. Fearing that he might not be thoroughly prepared, he again set out on a journey, this time to spend a year of further preparatory study in England, more especially at London. He there became acquainted with the master theologians of that age and country. Thomas Sherlock, Daniel Waterland, Samuel Clarke freely admitted the young scholar to their studies, and so interested became he in English theology that he remained there three years and declined to go to Göttingen. In 1740 he returned to Germany, and was appointed tutor and preacher of prince Charles William Ferdinand of Brunswick. In 1743 he was appointed provost of the monasteries of St. Crucis and Ægidi; in 1749 he was made abbot of Marienthal, and in 1752 abbot of the convent of Riddagshausen, a theological training-school of the Brunswick ministry, with which he remained associated for two scores of years, and in which he labored earnestly to promote especially the religious spirit of the young preachers. Indeed, so well were his labors performed, that a late biographer of Jerusalem is found to say that in no small measure the religious spirit of Brunswick of our day is due to the work which he performed at this institution. In 1771 he became vice-president of the consistory of Wolfenbüttel. In the latter part of his life he was severely afflicted by the suicide of his son (1775), who had gone to Wetzlar to practice law. Jerusalem died Sept. 2, 1789. His most important work, *Betrachtungen ü. d. fornehmsten Warheiten der Religion,* written for the instruction of the hereditary prince of Brunswick (Braunsch. 1768–79, 1785, 1795, 2 vols.), has been translated into most European languages. Of his other works, we notice two collections of sermons (Braunsch. 1745–53, 1788–89); for a full list, see Döring's *D. deutschen Kanzelredner d. 18 u. 19 Jahrhunderts; Jerusalems Selbstbiographie* (Braun. 1791).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Jöcher, *Gelehrt. Lex.* (Adelung's Addenda), s. v.; Dorner, *Geschichte der Protest. Theolog.* bk. ii, divis. iii, § 1; Tholuck, *Gesch. des Rationalismus,* pt. i; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* i (see Index); *Zeitschr. hist. Theol.* 1869, p. 530 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jeru'sha (Heb. *Yerusha',* יְרוּשָׁא, *possession;* Sept. Ἱερουσά), the daughter of Zadok, and mother of king Jothan, consequently wife of Uzziah, whom she appears to have survived (2 Kings xv, 33); written Jerushah (יְרוּשָׁה, *Yerushah', id.;* Sept. Ἱερουσά) in the parallel passage (2 Chron. xxvii, 1). B.C. 806.

Jeru'shah (2 Chron. xxvii, 1). See Jerusha.

Jesaï'ah [many *Jesai'ah*] (*a,* Neh. xi, 7, *b,* 1 Chron. iii, 21). See Jeshaiah.

Jeshaï'ah [many *Jeshai'ah*] (Hebrew *Yeshayah',* יְשַׁעְיָה, *deliverance of Jehovah;* 1 Chron. iii, 21; Ezra viii, 7, 19; Neh. xi, 7; elsewhere in the paragogic form יְשַׁעְיָהוּ, *Yeshaya'hu*), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Ὠσαίας v. r. Ἰωσίας, Vulg. *Isajas,* Author. Vers. "Jeshaiah.") Son of Rehabiah, and father of Joram, of the Levitical family of Eliezer (1 Chron. xxvi, 25). B.C. considerably ante 1014.

2. (Sept. Ἰεσία v. r. Ἰσέας; Ἰσίας v. r. Ἰωσιά; Vulg. *Jesejas,* Auth. Vers. "Jeshaiah.") One of the sons of Jeduthun, appointed under him among the sacred harpers (1 Chron. xxv, 3), at the head of the eighth division of Levitical musicians (ver. 15). B.C. 1014.

3. See Isaiah.

4. (Septuag. Ἰεσσεία v. r. Ἰεσία, Vulg. *Isaja,* Auth. Vers. "Jesaiah.") Father of Ithiel, a Benjamite, whose descendant Sallu resided in Jerusalem after the exile (Neh. ix, 7). B.C. long ante 539.

5. (Septuagint Ἰεσεία v. r. Ἰεσίας, Vulgate *Jesejas,* Auth. Vers. "Jesaiah.") The second of the three sons of Hananiah, son of Zerubbabel (1 Chron. iii, 21; see Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gosp.* p. 17). B.C. post 536.

6. (Septuag. Ἡσαΐα v. r. Ἰσαΐας, Vulg. *Isajas,* Auth. Vers. "Jeshaiah.") Son of Athaliah, of the "sons" of Elam, who returned with 70 male relatives from Babylon (Ezra viii, 7). B.C. 459.

7. (Sept. Ἰσαΐα, Vulg. *Isajas,* Author. Vers. "Jeshaiah.") A Levite of the family of Merari, who accompanied Hashabiah to the river Ahava, on the way from Babylon to Palestine (Ezra viii, 19). B.C. 459.

Jesha'nah [many *Jesh'anah*] (Heb. *Yeshanah',* יְשָׁנָה, *old,* q. d. Παλαιόπολις; Sept. Ἰεσυνά v. r. Ἀνά), a city of the kingdom of Israel, taken with its suburbs from Jeroboam by Abijah, and mentioned as situated near Bethel and Ephraim (2 Chron. xiii, 19). It appears to be the "village *Isanas*" (Ἰσάνας), mentioned by Josephus as the scene of Herod's encounter with Pappus, the general of Antigonus, in Samaria (*Ant.* xiv, 15, 12; compare Ἰσανά, *Ant.* viii, 11, 3). It is not mentioned by Jerome in the *Onomasticon,* unless we accept the conjecture of Reland (*Palæst.* p. 861), that "Jethaba, urbs antiqua Judææ" is at once a corruption and a translation of the name Jeshana. According to Schwarz (*Palestine,* p. 158), it is the modern village al-*Sanin,* two miles west of Bethel; but no such name appears on Zimmermann's map, unless it be Ain *Sinia,* a village surrounded by vineyards and fruit-trees, with vegetable gardens watered from a well, situated at a fork of the valley about a mile N.E. of Jufna (Robinson's *Researches,* iii, 80).

Jeshar'elah [some *Jeshare'lah*] (Heb. *Yeshare'lah,* יְשַׂרְאֵלָה, *upright towards God;* some copies read יְשַׂרְאֵלָה, *Yesare'lah;* Septuag. Ἰσρεηλά v. r. Ἰσεριήλ; Vulg. *Isreela*), the head of the seventh division of Levitical musicians (1 Chron. xxv, 14); elsewhere called by the equivalent name Asarelah (ver. 2). B.C. 1014.

Jesheb'eäb (Heb. *Yeshebab',* יֶשֶׁבְאָב, *seat of his father;* Sept. Ἰσβαάλ v. r. Ἰεσβαάλ, Vulg. *Ishbaab*), the head of the fourteenth division of priests as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 13). B.C. 1014.

Je'sher (Heb. *Ye'sher,* יֵשֶׁר, *upright;* Sept. Ἰωασάρ v. r. Ιασάρ), the first named of the three sons of Caleb (son of Hezron) by his first wife Azubah (1 Chron. ii, 18). B.C. ante 1658. See Jerioth.

Jesh'imon is the rendering in the Auth. Version (Numb. xxi, 20; xxiii, 28; 1 Sam. xxiii, 19, 24; xxvi, 1, 3) of יְשִׁימוֹן (*yeshimon'*), which simply denotes a *wilderness,* as in the margin (so the Sept.), and elsewhere in the text (Deut. xxxii, 10; Psa. lxviii, 7; "desert," Psa. lxxviii, 40; cvi, 14; Isa. xliii, 19, 20, "solitary" way, Psa. cvii, 4). See Desert.

Jeshimoth. See Beth-jeshimoth.

Jesh'ishai [many *Jeshish'aï,* some *Jeshisha'ï*] (Heb. *Yeshishay',* יְשִׁישַׁי, *grayish,* perh. q. d. born of an *old* man; Sept. Ἰεσσαΐ v. r. Ἰεσαΐ), the son of Jahdo and father of Michael, of the ancestry of Abihail, a Gadite chief in Bashan (1 Chron. v, 14). B.C. long ante 782.

Jeshohaï'ah (Heb. *Jeshochayah',* יְשׁוֹחָיָה, *wor-*

shipper of Jehovah; Sept. Ἰασουΐα), a chief Simeonite, apparently one of those who migrated to the valley of Gedor (1 Chron. iv, 36). B.C. prob. cir. 711.

Jesh'uä (Heb. *Yeshu'ä*, יֵשׁוּעַ, a contracted form of JOSHUA, i. q. JESUS; Sept. Ἰησοῦς), the name of several men, also of a place.

1. (Neh. viii, 17.) See JOSHUA.

2. The head of the ninth sacerdotal "class" as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 11, where the name is Anglicized "Jeshuah"). B.C. 1014. He is thought by some to be the Jeshua of Ezra ii, 36. But see No. 6.

3. One of the Levites appointed by Hezekiah to distribute the sacred offerings in the sacerdotal cities (2 Chron. xxxi, 15). B.C. 726.

4. A descendant (or native) of Pahath-moab (q. v.) mentioned along with Joab as one whose posterity, to the number of 2812 (2818), returned from Babylon (Ezra ii, 6; Neh. vii, 11). B.C. ante 536.

5. A Levite named along with Kadmiel as one whose descendants (called "children" [? inhabitants] of Hodaviah or Hodeviah), to the number of 74, returned from Babylon (Ezra ii, 40; Neh. vii, 43). B.C. ante 536. See Nos. 9 and 10.

6. Jeshua (or JOSHUA as he is called in Hag. i, 1, 12; ii, 2, 4; Zech. iii, 1, 3, 6, 8, 9), the "son" of Jozadak or Jozedech, and high-priest of the Jews when they returned, under Zerubbabel, from the Babylonian exile (Neh. vii, 7; xii, 1, 7, 10, 26; Ezra ii, 2; x, 18). B.C. 536. He was doubtless born during the exile. His presence and exhortations greatly promoted the rebuilding of the city and Temple (Ezra v, 2). B.C. 520-446. The altar of the latter being first erected enabled him to sanctify their labor by the religious ceremonies and offerings which the law required (Ezra iii, 2, 8, 9). Jeshua joined with Zerubbabel in opposing the machinations of the Samaritans (Ezra iv, 3); and he was not found wanting in zeal (comp. Ecclus. xlix, 12) when the works, after having been interrupted, were resumed in the second year of Darius Hystaspis (Ezra v, 2; Hagg. i, 12). Several of the prophet Haggai's utterances are addressed to Jeshua (Hagg. i, 1; ii, 2), and his name occurs in two of the symbolical prophecies of Zechariah (iii, 1-10; vi, 11-15). In the first of these passages, Jeshua, as pontiff, represents the Jewish people covered at first with the garb of slaves, and afterwards with the new and glorious vestures of deliverance. In the second he wears for a moment crowns of silver and gold, as symbols of the sacerdotal and regal crowns of Israel, which were to be united on the head of the Messiah.—Kitto. See HIGH-PRIEST. He is probably the person alluded to in Ezra ii, 36; Neh. vii, 39. See JEDAIAH.

7. Father of Jozabad, which latter was one of the Levites appointed by Ezra to take charge of the offerings for the sacred services (Ezra viii, 33). B.C. ante 459.

8. The father of Ezer, which latter is mentioned as "the ruler of Mizpah" who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh. iii, 19). B.C. ante 446.

9. A Levite, son of Azaniah (Neh. x, 9), who actively co-operated in the reformation instituted by Nehemiah (Neh. viii, 7; ix, 4, 5; xii, 8). B.C. cir. 410. He was possibly identical with No. 5.

10. Son of Kadmiel, one of the Levites in the Temple on its restoration after the captivity, in the time of Eliashib (Neh. xii, 24). B.C. cir. 406. Perhaps, however, "son" is here a transcriber's error for "and;" so that this Jeshua will be the same as No. 5.

11. A city of Judah inhabited after the captivity, mentioned in connection with Jekabzeel, Moladah, and other towns in the lowlands of Judah (Neh. xi, 26). According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 116), it is the village *Yesuè*, near Khulda, five English miles east of Ekron; doubtless the village *Yeshua* [locally pronounced *Eshwa*] seen by Dr. Robinson (new edit. of *Researches*, iii, 154, 155), and laid down on Van de Velde's *Map* on wady Ghurab, between Zorah and Chesalon.

Jesh'uah (1 Chron. xxiv, 11). See JESHUA, 2.

Jesh'urun (Heb. *Yeshurun'*, יְשֻׁרוּן), a poetical appellation of the people of Israel, used in token of affection and tenderness, occurring four times (Deut. xxxii, 15, Sept. Ἰακώβ, Vulg. *dilectus;* Deut. xxxiii, 5, 26, and Isa. xliv, 2 [A. Vers. in this latter passage "Jesurun"]; Sept. ἠγαπημένος, Vulgate *rectissimus*). The term is (according to Mercer in Pagnini, *Thes.* i. p. 1105; Mich. in *Suppl.*, and others) a diminutive (after the form of Zebulun, Jeduthun, etc.) from יָשׁוּר i. q. יָשָׁר (compare שָׁלוֹם and שָׁלֵם), q. d. *rectulus*, a "rightling," i. e. the dear upright people. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion have in Isaiah εὐθύς, elsewhere εὐθύτατος; Kimchi says, "Israel is so called as being *just* among the nations;" so also Aben-Ezra and Saadias (in the *Pent.*) interpret. Others, as Grotius, understand the word as a diminutive from "Israel" itself, and so apparently the Chald., Syriac, and Saadias (in Isaiah), but against the analogy of derivation. Ilgen (*De imbre lapideo*, p. 25, and in Paulus, *Memorabil.* vi, p. 157) gives a far-fetched derivation from the Arabic, and other fanciful explanations may be seen in Jo. Olpius's *Diss. de* ישרון (preside Theod. Hasæo, Bremæ, 1730). The passages where it is employed seem to express the idea that in the character of *righteous* Jehovah recognised his people in consideration of their covenant relation to him, whereby, while they observed the terms of that covenant, they stood legally justified before him and clean in his sight. It is in this sense that the pious kings are said to have done הַיָּשָׁר, "that which was right" in the eyes of Jehovah, i. e. what God approved (1 Kings xi, 34, etc.).

Jesi'ah (*a*, 1 Chron. xii, 6; *b*, 1 Chron. xxiii, 20). See ISHIAH, 2, 4.

Jesim'iël (Heb. *Yesimiël'*, יְשִׂימִיאֵל, *appointed of God;* Sept. Ἰσμαήλ), apparently one of the chief Simeonites who migrated to the valley of Gedor in search of pasture (1 Chron. iv, 36). B.C. cir. 711.

Jessæans. According to Epiphanius, the first distinctive appellation of Christians was Ἰεσσαῖοι, Jessæans, but it is doubtful from whom the title was derived, or in what sense it was applied. Some suppose it was from Jesse, the father of David; others (and with far greater probability of accuracy) trace it to the name of the Lord Jesus. Philo is known to have written a work on the first Church of St. Mark at Alexandria, which he himself entitled περὶ Ἰεσσαίων, which is now extant under the title of περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ (of the contemplative life), and so is cited by Eusebius even: Jerome, however, knew the work intimately, and for this reason gave Philo a place in his list of ecclesiastical writers. Eusebius also mentions the name *Jessæans* as a distinctive appellation of the early Christians. Comp. Bingham, *Antiq.* bk. i, ch. i, § 1; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 181.

Jes'sè (Heb. *Yishay'*, יִשַׁי, perhaps *firm*, otherwise *living;* once אִישַׁי, *Ishay'*, either by prosthesis, or *manly*, 1 Chron. ii, 13; Sept. and N. T. Ἰεσσαί; Josephus Ἰεσσαῖος, *Ant.* vi, 8, 1), a son (or descendant) of Obed, the son of Boaz and Ruth (Ruth iv, 17, 22; Matt. i, 5, 6; Luke iii, 32; 1 Chron. ii, 12). He was the father of eight sons (1 Sam. xvii, 12), from the youngest of whom, David, is reflected all the distinction which belongs to the name, although the latter, as being of humble birth, was often reproached by his enemies with this parentage (1 Sam. xx, 27, 30, 31; xxii, 7, 8; xxv, 10; 2 Sam. xx, 1; 1 Kings xii, 16; 2 Chron. x, 16). "*Stem of Jesse*" is used poetically for the family of David (Isa. xi, 1), and "*Root* [i. e. root-shoot, or sprout from the stump, i. q. *scion*] *of Jesse*" for the Messiah (Isa. xi, 10; Rev. v, 5; comp. xxii, 16). He seems to have been a person of some note and substance at Bethlehem, his property being chiefly in sheep (1 Sam. xvi, 1, 11; xvii, 20; comp. Psa. lxxviii, 71). It would seem from 1 Sam. xvi, 10,

that he must have been aware of the high destinies which awaited his son, but it is doubtful if he ever lived to see them realized (see 1 Sam. xvii, 12). The last historical mention of Jesse is in relation to the asylum which David procured for him with the king of Moab (1 Sam. xxii, 3). B.C. cir. 1068-1061. See DAVID.

"According to an ancient Jewish tradition, recorded in the Targum on 2 Sam. xxi. 19. Jesse was a weaver of the vails of the sanctuary; but as there is no contradiction, so there is no corroboration of this in the Bible, and it is possible that it was suggested by the occurrence of the word *oregim*, 'weavers,' in connection with a member of his family. See JAARE-OREGIM. Who the wife of Jesse was we are not told. The family contained, in addition to the sons, two female members—Zeruiah and Abigail; but it is uncertain whether these were Jesse's daughters, for, though they are called the sisters of his sons (1 Chron. ii, 16), yet Abigail is said to have been the daughter of Nahash (2 Sam. xvii, 25). Of this, two explanations have been proposed. (1.) The Jewish: that Nahash was another name for Jesse (Jerome, *Quæst. Hebr.* on 2 Sam. xvii, 25, and the Targum on Ruth iv, 22). (2.) Prof. Stanley's: that Jesse's wife had formerly been wife or concubine to Nahash, possibly the king of the Ammonites (*Jewish Church*, ii, 50, 51)." See NAHASH.

Jesse, TREE OF, in ecclesiastical architecture, is a representation of the genealogy of Christ on scrolls of foliage so arranged as to represent a tree, and was quite a common subject for sculpture, painting, and embroidery. In ancient churches, the candlesticks often took this form, and was therefore called a Jesse. See Parker, *Gloss. Archit.* s. v.; Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 333.

Jes'suë ('Ιεσσουέ v. r. 'Ιησουέ and 'Ιησοῦς, 1 Esdr. v, 26), or **Je'su** ('Ιησοῦς, 1 Esdr. viii, 63), corrupt forms (see Ezra ii, 40; viii, 33) of the name of JESHUA (q. v.).

JESU is likewise used in modern poetry for the name of JESUS, our Saviour, especially as a vocative or genitive.

Jesuates, a monastic order, so called because its members frequently pronounced the name of Jesus. The founders were John of Colombini, gonfalonière, and Francis Mino Vincentini of Sienna. This institution was confirmed by Urban V in the year 1368, and continued till the seventeenth century, when it was suppressed by Clement IX. The persons belonging to it professed poverty, and adhered to the institute of Augustine. They were not, however, admitted to holy orders, but professed to assist the poor with their prayers and other offices, and prepared medicine for them, which they distributed gratuitously: we find them, for that reason, called sometimes *Apostolic Clerks*. They were also known as the *Congregation of Saint Hieronymus*, their patron. Having become largely interested in the distillery of brandies, etc., they were by the people called *Padri dell aqua vitæ*. A female order of the same name, and a branch of the male order, was founded by Catharina Colombina. They still continue to exist in Italy as a branch organization of the Augustinian order. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Farrar, *Ecclesiast. Dict.* p. 340; Helyot, *Geschichte d. Klöster und Ritterorden*, iii, 484 sq.

Jes'uï, Jes'uite (Numb. xxvi, 44). See ISHUI, 1.

Jesuits, or the *Society of Jesus* (*Societas Jesu*), the most celebrated among the monastic institutions of the Roman Catholic Church.

I. *Foundation of the Order.*—It was founded by the Spanish nobleman Don Iñigo (Ignatius) of Loyola (q. v.). Thirst for glory caused him at an early age to enter the army. Having been wounded, May 20, 1521, during the siege of Pamplona by the French, he turned during the slow progress of his recovery from his former favorite reading of knights' novels to the study of the life of Jesus and the saints. His heated imagination suggested to him an arena in which even greater distinction could be won than in military life, and he resolved henceforth to devote his life to the service of God and of the Church. Having recovered, he first went to the Benedictine abbey of Montserrat, where, after a general confession, he took the vow of chastity, hung up his sword and dagger on the altar, and then proceeded to Manresa, where, after a short stay in the hospital, he hid himself in a rocky cavern near the town, in order to devote himself wholly to prayer and ascetic exercises. Here he is believed to have made his first draft of the "Spiritual Exercises" (*Exercitia Spiritualia*), a work which in 1548 a brief of pope Paul III warmly commended to all the faithful, and to which the thorough soldier-like discipline that characterizes the order of the Jesuits, and the ultra papal system of which they have been the pioneers, are greatly due. As Ignatius himself subsequently states, the idea of a new religious order which was to take a front rank under the banner of Christ in the combat against the prince of darkness likewise originated with him at this time. During a brief pilgrimage which Ignatius made in 1523 to Palestine, he became aware that he utterly lacked the necessary literary qualification for carrying out the plans which he had conceived. Accordingly, when he had returned to Spain, he entered a grammar-school at Barcelona, and subsequently visited the universities of Alcala and Salamanca, and at last went to Paris, where he studied from 1528 to 1535, and in 1533 acquired the title of doctor of philosophy. In Paris Ignatius gradually gathered around himself the first members of the order he intended to found. His first associates were Lefevre (Petrus Faber), from Savoy, Francis of Xavier, from Navarre, and the Spaniards Jacob Lainez, Alfons Salmeron, Nicolaus Bobadilla, and Simon Rodriguez. They were for the first time called together by Ignatius in July, 1534, and soon after, on August 15, the festival of the Assumption of Mary, they took the vows of poverty, chastity, and of making a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, in order to labor in the Holy Land for the conversion of the infidels. In case they should be unable to carry out this project within one year after their arrival in Venice, they would go to Rome and place themselves at the disposal of the pope. On Jan. 6, 1537, Ignatius was joined in Venice by all of his disciples and three more Frenchmen—Le Jay, Codure, and Brouet. All took, two months later, holy orders, but their plan to go to Jerusalem they could not execute, as the republic of Venice was at war with sultan Soleiman II. They consequently went to Rome to await the orders of the pope. Paul III received them kindly, gave to Faber and Lainez chairs in the Sapienza, and requested Ignatius to labor as a city missionary for the improvement of the religious life. In March, 1538, the other associates also arrived in Rome, and it was now formally resolved to establish a new religious order. Ignatius was elected to submit their plan to the pope, and to obtain his sanction. This was given on Sept. 27, 1540, in the bull *Regimini Militantis ecclesiæ*, which, however, restricted the number of *professi* to forty. Three years later (March 14, 1543), another bull, *Injunctum Nobis*, removed this restriction. Reluctantly Ignatius accepted the dignity of the first general of the order, to which he had been unanimously elected. He entered upon his office on April 17, 1541; and soon after, in accordance with the request of Paul III, the draft of the constitution of the new order was made by him (not, as is often maintained, by Lainez; see Genelli, *Leben des heil. Ignatius*, p. 212). Before being finally sanctioned, the constitution was to undergo several revisions; but before these were made, Ignatius died, July 31, 1556.

II. *Constitution and Form of Government.*—The laws regulating the order are contained in the so-called *Institutum* (official edition, Prague, 1757, 2 vols.; new edit. Avignon, 1827-38). The work opens with a collection of all the bulls and decrees of the apostolic see concerning the new society. This is followed by a list of the privileges which have been granted to the order, and by the General Examination, which serves as an introduction to the constitutions, and is laid before every ap-

plicant for admission. The most important portion of the code, the constitutions, consists of ten chapters, to each of which are added explanations (*Declarationes*), which, according to the intentions of the founder, are to be equally valid as the constitutions. Next follow the decrees and canons of the general congregations; the plan of studies (*Ratio Studiorum*), which, however, in 1832 was considerably changed by the general John Roothahn; the decrees of the generals (*Ordinationes Generalium*), as they were revised by the eighth General Congregation in 1615; and, in conclusion, by three ascetic writings—the *Industriæ ad curandos animæ morbos* of general Claudius Aquaviva, the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius, and the *Directorium*, an official instruction for the right use of these exercises. At the head of the order is a general (*Præpositus Generalis*), who is elected for life, must reside at Rome, and is only subject to the pope. His power is unlimited, as the Council of Assistants has only a deliberative vote. He is, however, bound to the constitutions, which he can neither change nor set aside. The constitution provides for the deposition of a general in particular cases by the General Congregation, but the case has not yet occurred. For the administration of the provinces into which the order is divided the general appoints provincials for the term of three years. Several provinces are united into an *assistentia*, which is represented in the council of the general by an assistant. There were in 1871 five assistants for Italy, France, Spain, England, and Germany. The assistants are appointed by the General Congregation, but in case of the death or a long absence of an assistant the general can substitute another, with the consent of the majority of the provincials. Subordinate to the provincial are the præpositi, who govern the houses of the professed, and the rectors, who govern the colleges and the novitiates. They are likewise appointed by the general. At the head of the minor establishments (*residentiæ*) are "superiors." Each of these officers has by his side a consultor to advise, and a monitor to watch and admonish him. As in every religious order, the members are divided into priests and lay brothers (*Coadjutores temporales*). The latter take the simple vows after a two-years' novitiate, and the solemn vows after having been in the order for at least ten years. Those candidates who, on entering the order, leave their future employment entirely to the disposition of their superiors, are called *Indifferentes;* but, according to a decree of the General Congregation, their final destination must be assigned to them at least within two years. The candidates for the priesthood are, during the first two years, *Novitii scholastici;* then, after binding themselves to the order by taking simple vows, they become *Scholastici approbati*, devote themselves for several years to classical and philosophical studies, and are for some time employed as teachers or educators in the colleges, before they begin the study of theology, which lasts for four years. After the completion of the theological course they are ordained priests, and now enter into a third novitiate, the sole object of which is to increase their zeal. At the end of this novitiate the candidate is admitted to the solemn profession of the vows, and enrolled either in the class of the professed or that of the spiritual coadjutors. Only the former class, the professed, who take the fourth vow of an unconditional obedience to the pope, possess the full rights of members of the society. The professed of a province every third year meet in a provincial congregation, and out of their midst choose a *procurator*, who has to make a report on the affairs and condition of the province to the general. On the death of a general the Provincial Congregation elects two deputies, who, together with the provincials, constitute the General Congregation, which elects the new general. In this General Congregation the supreme legislative power is vested; it can be called together on extraordinary occasions by the general, and, in case the latter neglects his duty, by the assistants. Thus the order bears the aspect of military aristocracy, and never, during the whole history of the Church of Rome, have the popes had in their service a body of men so thoroughly disciplined. "Before any one could become a member, he was severely and appropriately tested in the novitiate. Of the actual members, only a few choice spirits reached the perfect dignity of the professed, from whom alone were chosen the principal officers, the superiors and the provincials, constituting a well-organized train of authorities up to the general. Every individual was powerful in his appropriate sphere, but in every act he was closely watched and guarded lest he should transcend his proper limits. So perfect was the obedience inculcated by a long course of discipline, and strengthened by every spiritual means, that a single arbitrary but inflexible will controlled every movement of the order in all parts of the world. Although every individual possessed no more will of his own than the particular members of the human body, he expected to be placed in precisely that position in which his talents would be best developed for the common benefit: in exercises of monastic devotion, in literary and scientific pursuits, in the secular life of courts, or in strange adventures and eminent offices among savage nations" (Hase, *Church History*, § 383).

III. *History from* 1540 *to* 1750.—On the death of Ignatius the General Congregation could not meet immediately, as the Spaniards, who were at war with the pope, blocked up the roads to Rome. On June 19, 1557, Jacob Lainez, the most gifted member of the order, was elected the second general of the order. The constitutions were once more revised, and unanimously adopted; but the pope (Paul IV) disliked several of its provisions, and in particular wished to have the general elected for a term of only three years, and an observance of the canonical hours. The Jesuits had to submit in the latter points, but when the aged pope soon after died they returned to their original practice. The society spread rapidly, and numbered at the death of Lainez (Jan. 19. 1565) eighteen provinces and 130 houses. During the administration of the two following generals, the Spaniard Francis Borgia (1565–72) and the Belgian Mercurian (1572–80), the order was greatly favored by the popes, and new provinces were organized in Peru, Mexico, and Poland. The fourth General Congregation, on Feb. 19, 1581, elected as general the Neapolitan Claudius Aquaviva (1581–1615), a man of rare administrative genius, who successfully carried the society through the only internal commotion of importance through which it has passed, and who, next to its founder, has done more than any other general in moulding its character. The leading Spanish Jesuits, mortified at seeing the generalship, which they had begun to regard as a domain of their nationality, pass into the hands of an Italian, meditated an entire decentralization of the order and the hegemony of the Spaniards at the expense of the unity and the monarchical principle. The plan met with the approval of Philip II; but the energy of pope Sixtus V, who took sides with Aquaviva, foiled it. Under Clement VIII the Spaniards renewed their scheme, and the commotion produced by them became so great that in 1593 the fifth General Congregation (the first extraordinary one) was convoked. The Spaniards hoped that Aquaviva would be removed, but again their designs were defeated, and the centralistic administration of the general sustained. The administrative crisis was followed by violent doctrinal controversies. The book of the Portuguese Jesuit Molina involved the order in a quarrel with the Dominicans, and a work (published in 1599) in which the Spanish Jesuit Mariana justified tyrannicide raised a storm of indignation against the society throughout Europe, although Aquaviva, in 1614, strictly forbade all members of the order to advance this doctrine. During the administration of Aquaviva (about 1680) the order numbered 27 provinces, 21 houses of professed, 287 colleges, 33 novitiates, 96 residences, and 10,581 members. During the admin-

istration of the Roman Mutius Vitelleschi (1615-45) the order celebrated its first centenary (1640). The eighth General Congregation, on Jan. 7, 1646, elected as general the Neapolitan Vincenz Caraffa. On January 1 of this year pope Innocent X had issued a brief, according to which a General Congregation was to be held every ninth year, and the administration of the superiors was limited to three years. The latter provision was repealed by Alexander VII (Jan. 1, 1663); the former did not take effect until 1661, as the short administration of the generals Vincenz Caraffa († June 8, 1649), Francis Piccolomini († June 17, 1651), and Aloys Gottifredi had practically suspended it. On March 17, 1652, the General Congregation for the first time elected as general a German, Goswin Nickel, of Julich, to whom, on account of his great age, the eleventh Congregation, on June 7, 1661, gave Paul Oliva as coadjutor, with the right of succession. Oliva was general for more than seventeen years, and was succeeded by the Belgian Noyelle (1682-86) and the Spaniard Thyrsus Gonzalez (1687-1705). Pope Innocent XI was unfavorable to the order, and in 1684 the Congregation of the Propaganda forbade it to receive any more novices; but in 1686 this decree was cancelled by Innocent himself. Gonzalez caused considerable excitement by publishing a work against the doctrine of Probabilism, which had been generally taught by the theologians of the society. He was succeeded by the generals Tamburini (1706-30), Retz (1730-50), Visconti (1751-55), Centurione (1755-57), Ricci (1758-73); under the latter the order was suppressed (1773). The order during all this time had steadily, though not rapidly increased in strength. It numbered in 1720 5 assistants, 37 provinces, 24 houses of professed, 612 colleges, 59 novitiates, 340 residences, 157 seminaries, 200 missions, and 19,998 members, among whom were 9957 priests. In 1762 the order had increased to 39 provinces, 669 colleges, 61 novitiates, 176 seminaries, 335 residences, 223 missions, and 22,787 members, among whom were 11,010 priests.

Soon after the establishment of the order, the pope, the bishops, and those monarchs who were opposed to the Reformation recognised the Jesuits as the most efficient organization for saving the old Church. Thus the spread of the order was rapid. At the Council of Trent the Spanish ambassadors declared that their king, Philip II, knew only two ways to stay the advance of the Reformation, the education of good preachers, and the Jesuits. Calls were consequently received from various countries for members of the order, but, as they not only opposed Protestantism, but defended the most excessive claims of the popes with regard to secular governments, they soon encountered a violent resistance on the part of those governments which refused a servile submission to the dictates of the papacy. In many cases the bishops sided against them, as the Jesuits were found to be always ready to extend the papal at the cost of the episcopal authority. This was especially the case in the republic of Venice, where the patriarch Trevisani showed himself their decided opponent. Subsequently, when they defended the interdict which Paul V had pronounced against Venice, they were expelled (in 1606), and not until 1656 did pope Alexander VII succeed in obtaining from the republic a reluctant consent to their return. At the beginning of the 18th century the Piedmontese viceroy in Sicily, Maffei, expelled them from that island, because they were again the most eager among the clergy to enforce a papal interdict. Nowhere did the order render to the Church of Rome so great services as in Germany and the northern countries of Europe, where Protestantism had become predominant. While taking part in all the efforts against the spread of Protestantism, they labored with particular zeal for the establishment of educational institutions, and for gaining the confidence of the princes. In both respects they met with considerable success. Their colleges at Ingolstadt, Munich, Vienna, Prague, Cologne, Treves, Mentz, Augsburg, Ellwangen, and other places became highly prosperous, and attracted a large number of pupils, especially from the aristocratic families, most of whom remained throughout life warm supporters of all the schemes of the order. Under emperor Rudolph II the Jesuits established themselves in all parts of Germany. At most of the courts Jesuits were confessors of the reigning princes, and invariably used the influence thus gained for the adoption of forcible measures against Protestantism. At the instigation of the Jesuits a counter-reformation was forcibly carried through in a number of provinces in which Protestantism, before their arrival, appeared to be sure of success. Thus, in particular, Austria, Styria, Bavaria, or Baden, were either gained back by them or preserved for the Church of Rome, and from 1648 to 1748 they are said to have persuaded no less than forty-five princes of the empire to join the Roman Catholic Church. As advisors of the princes, they became to so high a degree involved in political affairs that frequently even the generals of the order and the popes deemed it necessary to recommend to them a greater caution. They were called into Hungary by the archbishop of Gran as early as 1561, but there, as well as in Transylvania, the vicissitudes of the religious wars for a long time prevented them from gaining a firm footing. When, however, the policy of the Austrian government finally succeeded in breaking the strength of the Protestant party, the Jesuits became all-powerful. In 1767 they had in these two countries 18 colleges, 20 residences, 11 missionary stations, and 990 members. In Poland, Petrus Canisius appeared in 1558 at the Diet of Petrikau; about twenty years later the favor of king Stephen Bathori empowered the Jesuits to found a number of colleges, and to secure the education of nearly the whole aristocracy. John Casimir, the brother of Vladislav IV, even entered the order on Sept. 25, 1643, and, although not yet ordained priest, was appointed cardinal in 1647; yet, after the death of his brother, he became king of Poland (1648-68). The Jesuit Possevin was in 1581 sent as embassador of Gregory XIII to Ivan IV of Russia, and subsequently the Jesuit Vota made a fruitless attempt to unite the Greek with the Roman Catholic Church. Peter the Great, in 1714, expelled the few Jesuits who at that time were laboring in his dominions. In Sweden, in 1578, the Jesuits induced the king, John III, to make secretly a profession of the Roman Catholic faith; and queen Christina, the daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, was likewise prevailed upon in 1654, by the Jesuits Macedo and Casati, to join the Church of Rome; but, with regard to the people at large, the efforts of the Jesuits were entirely fruitless. To England, Salmeron and Brouet were sent by Ignatius. They were unable to prevent the separation of the English Church from Rome, but they confirmed James V of Scotland in the Roman Catholic faith, encouraged the people of Ireland in their opposition to the English king and the Anglican reformation, and, having returned to the Continent, established several colleges for the education of Roman Catholic priests for England. Elizabeth expelled all the Jesuits from her dominions, and forbade them, upon penalty of death, to return. During her reign the Jesuit Campion was put to death. In 1605 father Garnet was executed, having been charged with complicity in the Gunpowder Plot, which had been communicated to him in the confessional. In 1678 the Jesuits were accused by Titus Oates of having entered into a conspiracy against Charles II and the state, in consequence of which six members of the order were put to death. The first Jesuits who were brought to the Netherlands were some Spanish members of the order, who, during the war between France and Charles V, were ordered to leave France. The bishops showed them, on the whole, less favor than in the other countries, and the magistrates in the cities, on whose consent the authorization to establish colleges was made contingent, generally opposed them; but they overcame the opposition, and in the southern provinces (Belgium) soon became more

numerous and influential than in most of the other European countries. They attracted great attention by their attacks upon Bajus and the Jansenists, both of whom were condemned at Rome at their instigation. In the northern provinces (Holland) stringent laws were repeatedly passed against them, and they were charged with the assassination of William of Orange, as well as with the attempt against the life of Maurice of Nassau, but both charges were indignantly denied by the order. In France, where the Jesuits established a novitiate at Paris as early as 1540, they encountered from the beginning the most determined opposition of the University and the Parliament, and the bishop of Paris forbade them to exercise any priestly functions. In 1550 the cardinal of Lorraine obtained for them a favorable patent from Henry II, but the Parliament refused to record it. In 1561 Lainez received from the Synod of Poissy the concession that the Jesuits should be permitted to establish themselves at Paris under the name of "Fathers of the College of Clermont." This college, which was sanctioned by Charles IX in 1565, and by Henry III in 1580, attained a high degree of prosperity, and in the middle of the 17th century numbered upwards of 2000 pupils. In the south of France the Jesuits gained a greater influence than in the north, and were generally regarded as the leaders in the violent struggle of the Catholic party for the arrest and suppression of Calvinism. They were closely allied with the Ligue, but general Aquaviva disapproved the openness of this alliance, and removed fathers Matthieu and Sommier, who had been chiefly instrumental in bringing about the alliance, to Italy and Belgium. The Jesuit Toletus brought about the reconciliation between the Ligue and Henry IV, who remained a warm protector of the order. Nevertheless, Jesuits were charged with the attempts made upon the life of Henry by Chastel (1594) and Ravaillac (1610), as they had before been charged with complicity in the plot of Clement (1589) against Henry III. The Parliament of Paris instituted, accordingly, proceedings against the Jesuit Guignard, who had been the instructor of Chastel, sentenced him to death, deprived the Jesuits of their goods, and exiled them from France. Henry IV was, however, prevailed upon to recall them, continued to be their protector, and again chose a Jesuit as his confessor. The same office was filled by members of the order during nearly the whole reigns of Louis XIII, Louis XIV, and Louis XV, and through the royal confessors the order therefore did not cease to exercise a very conspicuous influence upon the policy of the kings both at home and abroad. The connivance of these confessors with the scandalous lives of the kings did more than anything else to undermine the respect for the Roman Catholic Church, and for religion in general, among the educated classes. To Rome, however, they rendered invaluable services by heading the opposition against Louis XIV and the bishops when the latter conjointly tried to enforce throughout the Catholic Church of France submission to the four Gallican articles, and after effecting a full reconciliation between Rome and Louis, by securing the aid of the secular arm for arresting the progress and averting a victory of Jansenism, which had obtained full control of the best intellects in the Church of France. In Spain, which had been the cradle of the order, its success was remarkably rapid. As early as 1554 three provinces of the order (Castile, Aragon, and Andalusia) had been organized. They were, however, opposed by the learned Melchior Canus; in Saragossa they were expelled by the archbishop, and the Inquisition repeatedly drew them before their tribunal as suspected of heresy. But the royal favor of the three Philips (Philip II, III, and IV) kept their influence unimpaired. In Portugal, Francis Xavier and Simon Rodriguez visited Lisbon on their way to India. They were well received by the king, and Rodriguez was induced to remain, and became the founder of a province, which soon belonged to the most prosperous of the order.

IV. *Suppression of the Order* (1750-73).—In the middle of the 18th century the order was at the zenith of its power. As confessors of most of the reigning princes and a large number of the first aristocratic families, and as the instructors and educators of the children, they wielded a controlling influence on the destinies of most of the Catholic states. At the same time they had amassed great wealth, which they tried to increase by bold commercial speculations. Both influence and wealth they used with untiring energy, and with a consistency of which the history of the world hardly knows a parallel, for the development of their ultra papal system. In point of doctrine, extermination of Protestantism, and every form of belief opposed to the Church of Rome, and within the Church blind and immediate submission to the doctrinal decision of the infallible pope; in point of ecclesiastical polity, the weakening of the episcopal for the benefit of the papal authority, the defence of the most exorbitant claims of the popes with regard to secular government, and a controlling influence upon the popes by the order—these were the prominent features of the Jesuit system. As the Jesuits were anxious to crush out everything opposed to the Roman Catholic system, as they understood it, it was natural that all these elements should, in self-defence, combine for planning the destruction of so formidable an antagonist. As the Jesuits had attained their influential position chiefly through the favor of the princes, the same method was adopted for crushing them. The first great victory was won against them in Portugal. Sebastian Jose Calvalho, better known under the title (which he received in 1770) of marquis of Pombal, probably the greatest statesman which Portugal has ever had, was fully convinced that commerce and industry, and all the material interests of the country, could be successfully developed only when the monarchy and the nation were withdrawn from the depressing connection with the hierarchy and the nobility, and that the first step towards effecting such a revolution was the removal of the Jesuits. Opportunities for disposing the king against the order soon offered. In Paraguay, a portion of which had in 1753 been ceded by Spain to Portugal, an insurrection of the natives broke out against the new rule. The Jesuits, according to their own accounts, had established in Paraguay a theocratic form of government, which gave them the most absolute power over the minds of the natives. They were therefore opposed to the cession of a portion of this territory to Portugal, and spared no efforts to prevent it. When, therefore, the natives rose generally in insurrection, it was the general opinion that an insurrection in a country like Paraguay was impossible without at least the connivance of the order. The Jesuits themselves denied, however, all participation in the insurrection, and asserted that the provincial of the order in Paraguay, Barreda, in loyal compliance with the order of the general, Visconti, had endeavored to induce the natives to submit to the partition of the country. Pope Benedict XIV was prevailed upon to forbid the Jesuits to engage in commercial transactions (1758), and the patriarch of Lisbon, who was commissioned by the pope to reform them, withdrew from them all priestly functions. An attempt to assassinate the king (Sept. 3, 1758) supplied an occasion for impeaching them of high treason, as the duke of Aveiro, when tortured, named two Jesuits as his accomplices. The two accused denied the guilt, and the writers of the order generally represent the whole affair as arranged by Pombal in order to give him a new pretext for criminal proceedings against the order. On Sept. 3, 1759, a royal decree forever excluded the order from Portugal and confiscated its property. Most of the members were, on board of government ships, sent to Italy; and one of their prominent members, Malagrida, was in 1761 burned at the stake. The pope, in vain, had interceded for them; the nuncio had to leave the country in 1760, and all connection with Rome was broken off.

In France the numerous enemies of the order found a welcome opportunity for arousing public opinion against it in the commercial speculations of the Jesuit Lavalette, the superior of the mission of Martinique. When, in the war between France and England, his ships were captured, his creditors applied for payment to father De Sacy, the procurator-general of all the Jesuit missions in Paris. He satisfied them, and instructed Lavalette to abstain from speculations in future. When Lavalette disregarded these instructions, and when, consequently, new losses occurred, amounting to 2,400,000 livres, Sacy refused to hold himself responsible. The creditors applied to the Parliament, whose jurisdiction was (1760) recognised by the Jesuits. The Parliament demanded a copy of the constitution of the order for examination. On April 18, 1761, a decree of Parliament suppressed the congregations of the Jesuits; on May 8 the whole order was declared to be responsible for the debt of Lavalette; on August 6 the constitution of the order was declared to be an encroachment upon Church and State, twenty-four works of Jesuit authors were burned as heretical and dangerous to good morals, and the order was excluded from educational institutions. A protest from the king (Aug. 29, 1761), who annulled these decrees of the Parliament for one year, was as unavailing as the intercession of the majority of the French bishops and of pope Clement XIII. Other Parliaments of France followed the example given by the Paris Parliament: on April 1, 1762, eighty colleges of the order were closed; and on August 6 a decree of the Parliament of Paris declared the constitution of the Jesuits to be godless, sacrilegious, and injurious to Church and State, and the vows of the order to be null and void. In the beginning of 1764 all the members were ordered to forswear their vows, and to declare that their constitution was punishable, abominable, and injurious. Only five complied with this order; among them father Cerutti, who two years before had written the best apology of the order. On Nov. 26, 1764, Choiseul obtained the sanction of the king for a decree which banished the Jesuits from France as dangerous to the state. Clement XIII, the steadfast friend of the order, replied to the royal decree on Jan. 8, 1765, by the bull *Apostolicam*, in which he again approved the order and its constitution.

In Spain, Aranda, the minister of Charles III, was as successful as Pombal in Portugal and Choiseul in France. During the night from Sept. 2 to Sept. 3, 1768, all the Jesuits of the kingdom, about 6000 in number, were seized and transported to the papal territory. When the pope refused to receive them, they were landed in Corsica, where they remained a few months, until, in 1768, that island was annexed to France. They were then again expelled, and this time found refuge in the papal territory. In Naples from 3000 to 4000 Jesuits were seized in the night from Nov. 3 to 4, 1767, by order of the regent Tanucci, the guardian of the minor Ferdinand IV, and likewise transported to the States of the Church. The government of Parma seized the Jesuits on Feb. 7, 1768, because the pope, claiming to be the feudal sovereign of Parma, had issued a brief declaring an order of the Parmese government (the Pragmatic Sanction of Jan. 16, 1768) null and void, and excommunicating its authors. All the Bourbon courts took sides in this question with Parma, forbade the publication of the papal brief, and when Clement XIII refused to repeal it, France occupied Avignon, and the government of Naples Benevent and Pontecorvo. At the same time, the grand master of the Knights of St. John, Fonseca, was induced to seize the Jesuits of Malta and transport them to the Papal States. When Clement XIII, who had steadfastly refused the demand of the Bourbons to abolish the order of the Jesuits for the whole Church, died, on Feb. 2, 1769, there was a severe struggle in the conclave between the friends (Zelanti) and the enemies of the Jesuits. The demands of the French and Spanish ambassadors to pledge the new pope that he would abolish the order were firmly repelled by the College of Cardinals; but, on the other hand, the ambassadors succeeded in securing the election of cardinal Ganganelli (Clement XIV), who, while before the election he was regarded by both parties as a friend, soon disclosed an intention to sacrifice the hated order to the combined demands and threats of the Bourbon courts. The reconciliation with the courts of Portugal and Parma was obtained by making to them great concessions; the brother of Pombal was appointed cardinal; the general of the Jesuits, Ricci, was alone, among all the generals of religious orders, excluded from the usual embrace; and when he solicited the favor of an audience he was twice refused. Papal letters to Louis XV (Sept. 30, 1769) and Charles III (Nov. 20) admitted the guilt of the Jesuits and the necessity of abolishing the order, but asked for delay. When, on July 4, 1772, the mild Azpura had been succeeded as ambassador of Spain by the more energetic Joseph Monino (subsequently count of Florida Blanca), other measures against the order followed in more rapid succession. In September the Roman college was closed, in November the college at Frascati. At last the brief *Dominus ac Redemptor noster* (which had been signed on July 21, at three o'clock in the morning) announced on August 16 to the whole world the abolition of the order, on the ground that the peace of the Church required such a step.

IV. *From the Abolition of the Order until its Restoration*, 1773-1814.—The suppression of the order in the city of Rome was carried through with particular severity by a committee of five cardinals and two prelates, all of them violent enemies of the order. The general, Ricci, his five assistants, and several other Jesuits, were thrown into prison, where they had to remain for several years. Pius VI confirmed the decree of abolition, and did not dare to release the imprisoned Jesuits; when, finally, they were released, they had to promise to observe silence with regard to their trial. Some of them took the demanded oath, but others refused. The general, Ricci, had previously died, Nov. 24, 1775, emphatically asserting his own and the order's innocence. The brief of abolition was received with great satisfaction in Portugal. Spain and Naples were dissatisfied because they wished a bull of excommunication (as a more weighty expression of the papal sentence) instead of a brief. In Germany, where the empress Maria Theresa had long opposed the abolition of the order, the brief was promulgated, but the Jesuits, after laying down the habit of the order, were allowed to live together in their former colleges as societies of secular priests. In France the brief was not officially promulgated, and the Jesuits, otherwise so ultra papal in their views of the validity of papal briefs, now inferred from this circumstance that the order had not been abolished in France at all. In Prussia Frederick II forbade the promulgation of the brief, and in 1775 obtained permission from Pius VI to leave the Jesuits undisturbed. Soon, however, to please the Bourbon courts, the Prussian Jesuits were requested to lay aside the dress of the order, and Frederick William II abolished all their houses. In Russia Catharine II also forbade the promulgation of the brief, and ordered the Jesuits to continue their organization. The Jesuits reasoned that, since the brief in Rome itself had not been published in due form, they had a right to comply with the imperial request until the brief should be communicated to them by the bishops of the dioceses. This official communication was never made, and Clement XIV himself, in a secret letter to the empress, permitted the continuation of the Jesuit colleges in Russia. When the archbishop of Mohilev, in 1779, authorized the Jesuits to open a novitiate, Pius VI was prevailed upon by the Bourbon courts to represent the step taken by the Russian bishop as unauthorized; orally, however, as the Jesuits maintain, he repeatedly confirmed what officially he had disowned. Thus the Jesuits attempt to clear themselves from the charge of having disobeyed the pope, by charging the latter with deliberate duplicity. The Russian Jesuits were placed

under the vice-generals Czerniewicz (1782–85), Lienkiewicz (1785–98), and Careu (1799–1802). The brief of Clement XIV was in 1801 repealed by Pius VII, so far as Russia was concerned, and the next superior of the Russian Jesuits, Gabriel Gruber (1802–5), assumed the title of a general for Russia, and since July 31, 1804, also for Naples. The successor of Gruber, Brzozowski (1805–20), lived to see the restoration of the order by the pope. Soon after (1815) the persecution of the order began in Russia; Dec. 20, 1815, they were expelled from St. Petersburg, in 1820 from all Russia. In other countries of Europe the ex-Jesuits had formed societies which were to serve as substitutes of the abolished order. In Belgium the ex-Jesuits De Broglie and Tournély established in 1794 the *Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus*, which, after its expulsion from Belgium, established its centre in Austria. In accordance with the wish of the pope, and through the mediation of archbishop Migazzi, of Vienna, this society, under the successor of Tournély († 1797), father Varin, united, on April 8, 1799, with the Baccanarists (q. v.), or *Fathers of the Faith of Jesus.* Under this name Baccanari (or Paccanari), a layman of Trent, had, in union with several ex-Jesuits, established in 1798 a society in Italy, which, after the union with the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, made considerable progress in Italy, France, Germany, and England. Most of the members hoped gradually to smooth the way for a reunion with the Jesuits in Russia; but as Baccanari, who in the mean while had become a priest, did not appear to be in sincere sympathy with this project, he was abandoned by many members and by whole houses. In 1807 he was even arrested by order of Pius VII, but the French liberated him in 1809, since which year he entirely disappears. The last house of the society, that of St. Sylvester, in Rome, joined the restored Jesuits in 1814.

V. *History of the Order from its Restoration in* 1814 *to* 1871.—Soon after his return from the French captivity, Pius VII promulgated (Aug. 7, 1814) the bull *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, by which he restored the order of the Jesuits for the whole earth. Father Panizzone, in the name of the general of the order, Brozowski, who resided in Russia, received back from the pope the church Al Gesu, in Rome. When Brozowski died, the order had to pass through a severe trial. The vicar-general, father Petrucci, in union with father Pietroboni, tried to curtail the electoral freedom of the General Congregation, and his plans were supported by cardinal Della Genga; but the other members invoked the intervention of the pope, and, freedom of election having been secured, elected as general father Fortis, of Verona (1820–29), who was succeeded by father Roothan, of Amsterdam (1829–53), and father Becks, a Belgian (elected July 2, 1853). Within a few years after the restoration the order had again established itself in all parts of Italy. Ferdinand III, in 1815, called them to Modena; and the ex-king of Sardinia, Emanuel IV, entered the order in 1815; he died in 1819. The fear which the election of cardinal Della Genga as pope in 1823 caused to the order proved to be ungrounded, for the new pope (Leo XII) was henceforth the warm patron of the Jesuits, and restored to them the Roman college (1824). They were expelled from Naples and Piedmont in consequence of the revolutionary movements in 1820 and 1821, but were soon restored. In 1836 they were admitted to the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, and in Verona cardinal Odescalchi in 1838 entered the novitiate, but died in 1841. General Roothan witnessed the expulsion of the Jesuits from all Italy, and even from Rome, in 1848, but he lived to see their restoration in Naples and Rome in 1850. The war of 1859 again destroyed the provinces of Naples and Sicily; in 1866 also Venice. In Spain, Ferdinand VII, by decree of May 15, 1815, declared the charges which former Spanish governments had made against the Jesuits false. The revolution of 1820 drove them from their houses, and on Nov. 17, 1822, twenty-five of them were killed; but when the insurrection was in 1824 subdued by the French, the Jesuits returned. In the civil war of 1834 they were again expelled; in Madrid a fearful riot was excited against them by the report that they had poisoned the wells, and fourteen were massacred. On July 7, 1835, the order was abolished in the Spanish dominions by a decree of the Cortes. Since 1848 they began silently to return, but the law, which had not been repealed, was again enforced against them by the revolution of 1868. Only in Cuba they remained undisturbed. To Portugal the Jesuits were recalled by Dom Miguel in 1829, and in 1832 they received the college of Coimbra, where they numbered the great-grandson of Pombal among their pupils. After the overthrow of Dom Miguel, the laws of Pombal were again enforced against them by Dom Pedro, and ever since they have been excluded from Portugal. In France a number of bishops expressed, immediately after the restoration of the order, a desire to place the boys' seminaries under their charge, and Talleyrand declared himself in favor of their legal restoration, but the king did not consent. Nevertheless, the number and the influence of the Jesuits steadily increased, and they labored with particular zeal for the restoration of the Church of Rome by means of holding "missions." They re-established the "congregations" among the laymen, and other religious associations. In 1826 they had two novitiates, two residences, and eight colleges, the most celebrated of which was St. Acheul. La Mennais in vain endeavored to gain the Jesuits for his revolutionary ideas. As all the liberal parties, and even many Legitimists, like count Montlosier, united for combating the Jesuits, royal ordinances of July 16, 1828, took from the Jesuits all their schools, and limited the number of pupils in the boys' seminaries to 20,000. The revolution of July, 1830, dissolved all the houses of the order, and drove all the members out of France; but gradually many returned, and Ravignan, in Paris, gained the reputation of being one of the first pulpit orators of his country. On motion of Thiers, the Chamber of Deputies, in 1845, requested the government to abolish the order in France; but the government preferred to send a special ambassador (Rossi) to Rome in order to obtain the suppression of the Jesuits from the pope. Gregory XVI declined to make any direct concessions, but the general of the order deemed it best to reduce the number of members in France in order to evade the storm rising against the order. The revolution of 1848, the government of Louis Napoleon, and the revolution of 1870, left them undisturbed, and they were allowed to erect a considerable number of colleges in the four provinces into which France is divided. In England the Jesuits continued, after the abolition of the order, to live in common. In 1790 they received from Thomas Weld the castle of Stonyhurst, which soon became one of the most popular educational institutions of the English Roman Catholics. In 1803 they were allowed to join the Russian branch of the order. In Belgium the Fathers of the Faith joined in 1814 the restored order. The Dutch government expelled the Jesuits, but they returned after the Belgian revolution of 1830, and soon became very numerous. The Jesuits who in 1820 had been expelled from Russia, came to Gallicia, and opened colleges at Tarnopol and Lemberg. Others were called to Hungary by the archbishop of Colocza, and father Landes made his appearance in Vienna. As they secured the special patronage of the emperor and the imperial family, they gained a great influence, and were, as in all other countries, regarded by the Liberal party as the most dangerous enemies of religious and civil liberty. They were therefore expelled by the revolution of 1848, but returned again when the revolutionary movement was subdued, and received from the Austrian government in 1857 the theological faculty of the University of Innspruck. To Switzerland eight Fathers of the Faith were in 1805 called from Rome by the govern-

ment of Valais. They soon broke off the connection with Baccanari, and in 1810 were incorporated with the society in Russia. After the restoration of the order, they soon established colleges in other Catholic cantons, particularly in Freiburg, Lucerne, and Schwytz. When the government of the canton of Lucerne, on Oct. 24, 1844, resolved to place the episcopal seminary of the city of Lucerne under the charge of the Jesuits, two volunteer expeditions (Dec. 1844, and March, 1845) were undertaken for the purpose of overthrowing the goverment of Lucerne, but both were unsuccessful. As most of the Protestant cantons demanded the expulsion of the Jesuits from the whole of Switzerland, those cantons which either had called Jesuits to cantonal institutions or which patronized them (namely, Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Zug, Freiburg, and Valais) strengthened a separate alliance (the "Sonderbund"), which had already been formed in 1843, and appointed a council of war for the emergency of a civil conflict. In September, 1847, the Federal Diet decreed the dissolution of the Sonderbund and the expulsion of the Jesuits, and when the seven cantons refused submission, the Sonderbund war broke out, which, in November, 1847, ended in the defeat of the Sonderbund and the expulsion of the Jesuits. The revised federal constitution of Switzerland forbids the establishment of any Jesuit settlement. From the German States, with the exception of Austria, the Jesuits remained excluded until the revolutionary movements of 1848 established the principle of religious liberty, and gained for them admission to all the states, in particular to Prussia, where they established in rapid succession houses in Munster, Paderborn, Aix-la-Chapelle, Cologne, Bonn, Coblentz, Treves, and other cities. They gained a considerable influence on the Catholic population in particular by holding numerous missions in all parts of Germany.

The membership of the order, during the period from 1841 to 1866, increased from 3566 to 8155. At the beginning of 1867 the numerical strength of the order was as follows:

Assistant's District.	Province.	Membrs.	Priests.
1. Italy..........	1. Rome...............	483	245
	2. Naples (scattered)..	352	194
	3. Sicily (scattered)...	222	141
	4. Turin (scattered)...	292	173
	5. Venice (scattered)..	223	128
2. Germany	1. Austria............	443	160
	2. Belgium...........	602	260
	3. Gallicia............	185	70
	4. Germany..........	653	260
	5. Holland...........	263	95
3. France........	1. Champagne........	566	224
	2. Paris..............	650	306
	3. Lyons..............	702	316
	4. Toulouse..........	546	271
4. Spain.........	1. Aragon (scattered).	492	144
	2. Castile (scattered).	708	183
	3. Mexico (scattered).	18	10
5. England......	1. England........ ...	312	151
	2. Ireland............	167	77
	3. Maryland..........	238	80
	4. Missouri...........	204	75

Total, 21 provinces, 8331 members (3563 priests, 2332 scholastics, and 2436 brothers).

VI. *The Labors of the Order in the Missionary Field.* -From the beginning of the order, the extension of the Church of Rome in pagan countries constituted one of the chief aims of the Jesuits, whose zeal in this field was all the greater, as they hoped that here the losses inflicted upon the Church by Protestantism would be more than balanced by new gains. The energy which they have displayed as foreign missionaries is recognised on all sides; the spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice of many of their members, which is illustrated by the martyrdom of about 800 of the order, has also met with deserved recognition even among Protestants. On the other hand, within their own Church, charges were brought against Jesuit missions, as a class, that they received candidates for baptism too easily, and without having sufficient proofs of their real conversion, and that they were too accommodating to pagan views and customs. These charges led to long controversies between the Jesuits and other monastic orders, and to several decisions of the popes against them. In India, the first missionary ground occupied by the Jesuits, Xavier and his companions, Camero and Mansilla, induced a large number of natives to join the Church of Rome. In Travancore forty churches had to be built for the converts, and Francis Xavier is reported to have baptized 10,000 pagans within one month. As it was soon discovered that the chief obstacle to the mission was the rigid caste system, the Jesuits concluded to let some members of the order adopt the mode of life of the Brahmins, and others that of other castes. Accordingly, the Jesuits Fernandez, De Nobili, and others began to practice the painful penances of the Brahmins, endeavored even to outdo them in the rigor of these penances, and thus, making the people believe that they were Brahmins, or Indians of other castes, they made in some districts considerable progress. The Catholic congregations in Madura, Carnate, Mogar, and Ceylon are said to have numbered a native population of upwards of 150,000. Japan was also visited by Francis Xavier, who arrived there with two other missionaries in 1549. They gained the favor of several Daimios, and, with their efficient aid, made considerable progress. In 1575 the number of Roman Catholics was estimated at 40,000; in 1582 three Christian Daimios sent ambassadors to pope Gregory XIII; in 1613 they had houses of professed at Nagasaki, Miaco, and Fakata, colleges at Nagasaki and Arima, and residences at Oasaca and seven other places. During the persecution which broke out in the 17th century and extirpated Christianity, more than a hundred members of the order perished, together with more than a million of native Christians. The first Catholic missionaries in China were the Jesuits Roger and Ricci. The latter and several of his successors, in particular father Adam Schall, gained considerable influence upon the emperors by means of their knowledge of astronomy and Chinese literature, and the number of those whom they admitted to the Church was estimated as early as 1663 at 300,000. They showed, however, so great an accommodation with regard to the pagan customs that they were denounced in Rome by other missionaries, and several popes, in particular Benedict XIV, condemned their practices. In Cochin China the first Jesuits arrived in 1614, in Tunkin in 1627. In both countries they succeeded, in spite of cruel persecutions, in establishing a number of congregations which survived the downfall of the order. They met with an equal success in the Philippine Islands, and in the Marianas; but their labors on the Caroline Islands were a failure. Their labors in Abyssinia, Morocco, and other parts of Africa, likewise, did not produce any lasting results. Congo and Angola were nominally converted to Christianity by Jesuit and other missionaries, but even Roman Catholic writers must admit that the religion of the mass of the population differed but little from paganism, into which they easily relapsed as soon as they found themselves without European missionaries. In 1549, Ignatius Loyola, at the request of king John III of Portugal, sent Emanuel de Nobrega and four other Jesuits to Brazil, where they gathered many man-eating Indians in villages, and civilized them. Among the many Jesuits who followed these pioneer missionaries, Joseph de Anchieta († 1597) and the celebrated pulpit orator Anthony Vieira (about the middle of the 17th century) are the most noted. Among the Jesuits who labored in the American provinces of Spain was Peter Claver, who is said to have baptized more than 300,000 negroes, and is called the apostle of the negroes. In 1586 they were called by the bishop of Tucuman to Paraguay, which soon became the most prosperous of all their missions. The Christian tribes were gathered by the missionaries into the so-called missions, and in 1736 the tribe of the Guaranis alone numbered in thirty-two towns from 30,000 to 40,000

families. When, in 1753, the Spaniards ceded seven reductions to Portugal, and 30,000 Indians were ordered to leave their villages, an insurrection broke out, which led to the expulsion of the Jesuits by the Spanish government. In Mexico the Jesuits joined in 1572 the other monastic orders in the missionary work. They directed their attention chiefly to the unsubdued tribes, and in 1680 numbered 500 missionaries in 70 missionary stations. The Jesuit Salvatierra and his companion Pacolo in 1697 gained firm footing in California, where they gradually established sixteen stations. In New California, which was first discovered by the Jesuit Kühn, they encountered more than usual obstacles, but gradually the number of their stations rose to fourteen. In Florida they met with hardly any success. In New France, where the first Jesuit missionary appeared in 1611, father Brebeuf became the first apostle of the Hurons. The Abenakis were fully Christianized in 1689; subsequently nearly the whole tribe of the Illinois, on the Mississippi, was baptized. In Eastern Europe and in Asia Minor the Jesuits succeeded in inducing a number of Greeks and Armenians to recognise the supremacy of the pope. After the restoration of the order the Jesuits resumed their missionary labors with great zeal.

VII. *The Work at Home.*—While abroad the order was endeavoring to extend the territory of the Church, their task at home was to check the further progress of Protestantism, and every other form of opposition to the Church of Rome, and to become within the Church the most powerful organization. They regarded the pulpit as one of the best means to establish an influence over the mass of the Catholic people, and many members gained considerable reputation as pulpit orators. Bourdaloue, Ravignan, and Felix in France, Segneri in Italy, Tolet in Spain, Vieyra in Portugal, were regarded as among the best pulpit orators in those countries; but, on the whole, the effect of their preaching was more sensational than lasting. In order to train the youth in the principles of rigid ultramontanism, the constitution of the order enjoined upon the members to cultivate with particular zeal catechetics. A large number of catechisms were accordingly compiled by Jesuit authors, among which those of Canisius and cardinal Bellarmine gained the greatest reputation and the widest circulation. In modern times the gradual introduction of the catechism of the Jesuit Deharbe by the ultramontane bishops is believed to have been one of the chief instruments in the revival of ultramontane principles among the German people. As confessors, the Jesuits were famous for their indulgent and lax conduct not only towards licentious princes, but towards all who, in their opinion, might be expected to benefit the order. In their works on moral theology they developed a comparatively new branch, casuistry; and many of their writers developed on the theory of *Probabilism* (q. v.) ideas which a large portion of the Church indignantly repudiated as dangerous innovations, and which, in some instances, even the popes deemed it necessary to censure. In order to effect among their adherents as strict an organization as the order itself possessed, so-called "congregations" were formed among their students, and among all classes of society, who obeyed the directions of the order as absolutely as its own members. Wherever there were or are houses of Jesuits, there is a Jesuitic party among the laity which pursues the same aims as the order. Thus the Jesuits have become a power wherever they have established themselves, while, on the other hand, the fanaticism invariably connected with their movements has always and naturally produced against them a spirit of bitterness and hatred which has never manifested itself to the same degree against any other institution of the Roman Catholic Church. The importance of schools for gaining an influence upon society was appreciated by the Jesuits more highly than had ever before been the case in the Roman Catholic Church. The most famous of their educational institutions was the Roman College (*Collegium Romanum*). Paul IV conferred upon it in 1556 the rank and privileges of a university; Gregory XIII, in 1581, a princely dotation. In 1584 it numbered 2107 pupils. Eight of its pupils (Urban VIII, Innocent X, Clement IX, Clement X, Innocent XII, Clement XI, Innocent XIII, and Clement XII) ascended the papal throne; several others (Aloysius of Gonzaga, Camillus of Lellis, Leonardo of Porto Maurizio) were enrolled among the canonized saints. In 1710 the Jesuits conferred the academical degrees at 24 universities and 612 colleges, and 157 boarding-schools were under their management. After the restoration of the order the Jesuits displayed the same zeal in establishing schools and colleges, and have revived their reputation of strict disciplinarians, who know how to curb the impetuosity and passions of youth; but neither in the former nor in the present period of their history have they been able to raise one of their schools to that degree of eminence which, as in the case of some of the German universities, must be admitted by friend and foe. The number of writers which the order has produced is immense. As early as 1608 Ribadeneyra published a catalogue of the writers of the order containing 167 pages. Alegambe (1643) and Southwell (1675) extended it into a large volume in folio. More recently the Belgian Jesuits Augustine and Aloys de Backer began a bibliography of the order, which, though not yet completed, numbered in 1870 seven volumes (quarto). A new edition of this work, to be published in three volumes (in folio), is in the course of preparation. The following writers of the order belong among those who are best known: Bellarmine, Less, Molina, Petavius, Suarez, Tolet, Vasquez, Maldonat, Salmeron, Cornelius à Lapide, Hardouin, Labbe, Sirmond, the Bollandists, Mariana, Perrone, Passaglia, Gury, Secchi (astronomer). Quite recently the order has also attempted to establish its own organs in the province of periodical literature. Publications of this kind are the semi-monthly *Civilta Cattolica* of Rome, which is generally regarded as the most daring expounder of the principles of the most advanced ultramontane school; *Etudes historiques* of France, *The Month* in England, and the *Stimmen von Maria Laach* (a monthly published by the Jesuits of Maria Laach since August, 1871) in Germany.

VIII. *Some Errors concerning the Jesuits.*—As the Jesuits, by their systematic fanaticism, provoked a violent opposition on the part of all opponents of ultramontane Catholicism, it is not to be wondered at that occasionally groundless charges were brought against them, and that some of these were readily believed. Among the erroneous charges which at one time have had a wide circulation, but from which the best historians now acquit them, are the following: 1. That they are responsible for the sentiments contained in the famous volume *Monita Secreta* (q. v.). This work was not written by a Jesuit, but is a satire, the author of which was, however, as familiar with the movements of the Jesuits as with their history (see Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* iii, 2, 656 sq.). 2. That the superior of the order has the power to order a member to commit a sin. It is now generally admitted that the passage of the constitution on which the charge is based (*visum est nobis nullas constitutiones declarationes vel ordinem ullum vivendi posse* obligationem ad peccatum *inducere, nisi Superior* ea *juberet*) has been misunderstood. 3. That the order holds to the maxim that "the end justifies the means." Although many works of Jesuits (in particular those on tyrannicide) were well calculated to instil such an opinion into the minds of the reader, the order has never expressly taught it.

IX. *Literature.*—The number of works on the Jesuits is legion. The titles of most may be found in Carayon, *Bibliographie hist. de la Comp. de Jesus* (Paris, 1864). The most important work in favor of the Jesuits is Crétineau-Joly, *Hist. de la Comp. de Jesus* (3d ed. Par. 1859, 6 vols.). The best that has been written on the subject are the chapters concerning the Jesuits in Ranke's work on the Roman popes. (A. J. S.)

Jes'urun (Isa. xliv, 2). See JESHURUN.

Je'sus (Ἰησοῦς, Gen., Dat., and Voc. -οῦ, Acc. -οῦν; from the Heb. יֵשׁוּעַ, *Yeshu'ă*, "Jeshua" or "Joshua;" Syr. *Yeshu*), the name of several persons (besides our Saviour) in the New Testament, the Apocrypha, and Josephus. For a discussion of the full import and application of the name, see JESUS CHRIST.

1. JOSHUA (q. v.) the son of Nun (2 Esdr. vii, 37; Ecclus. xlvi, 1; 1 Macc. ii, 55; Acts vii, 45; Heb. iv, 8; so also Josephus, passim).

2. JOSHUA, or JESHUA (q. v.) the priest, the son of Jehozadak (1 Esdr. v, 5, 8, 24, 48, 56, 68, 70; vi, 2; ix, 19; Ecclus. xlix, 12; so also Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 3, 10 sq.).

3. JESHUA (q. v.) the Levite (1 Esdr. v, 58; ix, 48).

4. JESUS, THE SON OF SIRACH (Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Σειράχ; Vulgate *Jesus filius Sirach*), is described in the text of Ecclesiasticus (l, 27) as the author of that book, which in the Sept., and generally in the Eastern Church, is called by his name—the *Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach*, or simply the *Wisdom of Sirach*, but in the Western churches, after the Vulgate, the *Book of Ecclesiasticus.* The same passage speaks of him as a native of Jerusalem, and the internal character of the book confirms its Palestinian origin. The name JESUS was of frequent occurrence (see above), and was often represented by the Greek *Jason* (see Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 5, 1). In the apocryphal list of the seventy-two commissioners sent by Eleazar to Ptolemy it occurs twice (Aristophanes, *Hist.* ap. Hody, *De Text.* p. vii), but there is not the slightest ground for connecting the author of Ecclesiasticus with either of the persons there mentioned. The various conjectures which have been made as to the position of the son of Sirach from the contents of his book—as, for instance, that he was a priest (from vii, 29 sq.; xlv; xlix, 1), or a physician (from xxxviii, 1 sq.)—are equally unfounded. The evidences of a date B.C. cir. 310-270, are as follows: 1. In ch. xliv, 1-l, 21, the praises of the ancient worthies are extolled down to the time of Simon, who is doubtless Simon I, or "the Just" (B.C. 370-300). 2. The Talmud most distinctly describes the work of Ben-Sira as *the oldest* of the apocryphal books (comp. *Tosefoth Idaim*, ch. ii). 3. It had a general currency, and was quoted at least as early as the 2d century B.C. (comp. *Aboth*, i, 5; *Jerusalem Nazier*, v, 3), which shows that it must have existed a considerable period to have obtained such circulation and respect; and, 4. In the description of these great men, and throughout the whole of the book, there is not the slightest trace of those Hagadic legends about the national worthies which were so rife and numerous in the second century before Christ. On the other hand, the mention of the "38th year of king Euergetes" (translator's prologue) argues a later date. See ECCLESIASTICUS.

Among the later Jews the "Son of Sirach" was celebrated under the name of Ben-Sira as a writer of proverbs, and some of those which have been preserved offer a close resemblance to passages in Ecclesiasticus; but in the course of time a later compilation was substituted for the original work of Ben-Sira (Zunz).

According to the first prologue to the book of Ecclesiasticus, taken from the *Synopsis* of the Pseudo-Athanasius (iv, 377, ed. Migne), the translator of the book bore the same name as the author of it. If this conjecture were true, a genealogy of the following form would result: 1. Sirach. 2. Jesus, son (father) of Sirach (*author* of the book). 3. Sirach. 4. Jesus, son of Sirach (*translator* of the book). It is, however, most likely that the last chapter, "*The prayer of Jesus, the Son of Sirach*," gave occasion to this conjecture. The prayer was attributed to the translator, and then the table of succession followed necessarily from the title attached to it.

As to the history and personal character of Ben-Sira, this must be gathered from his book, as it is the only source of information which we possess upon the subject. Like all his co-religionists, he was trained from his early life to fear and love the God of his fathers. He travelled much both by land and sea when he grew up, and was in frequent perils (Ecclus. xxxiv, 11, 12). Being a diligent student, and having acquired much practical knowledge from his extensive travels, he was intrusted with some office at court, and his enemies, who were jealous of him, maligned him before the king, which nearly cost him his life (li, 6, 7). To us, however, his religious life and sentiments are of the utmost importance, inasmuch as they describe the opinions of the Jews during the period elapsing between the O. and N. Test. Though deeply penetrated with the fear of God, which he declared was the only glory of man, rich, noble, or poor (x, 22-24), still the whole of Ben-Sira's tenets may be described as limited, and are as follows: Resignation to the dealings of Providence (xi, 21-25); to seek truth at the cost of life (iv, 28); not to use much babbling in prayer (vii, 14); absolute obedience to parents, which in the sight of God atones for sins (iii, 1-16; vii, 27, 28); humility (iii, 17-19; x, 7-18, 28); kindness to domestics (iv, 30; vii, 20, 21; xxxiii, 30, 31); to relieve the poor (iv, 1-9); to act as a father to the fatherless, and a husband to the widow (iv, 10); to visit the sick (vii, 35); to weep with them that weep (vii, 34); not to rejoice over the death of even the greatest enemy (vii, 7), and to forgive sins as we would be forgiven (xxviii, 2, 3). He has nothing in the whole of his book about the immortality of the soul, a future judgment, the existence of spirits, or the expectation of a Messiah. See SIRACH.

5. See BARABBAS.

6. (Col. iv, 11). See JUSTUS.

JESUS is also the name of several persons mentioned by Josephus, especially in the pontifical ranks. See HIGH-PRIEST.

1. A high-priest displaced by Antiochus Epiphanes to make room for Onias (*Ant.* xii, 5, 1; xv, 3, 1).

2. The son of Phabet, deprived by Herod of the high-priesthood in order to make way for his own father-in-law Simon (*Ant.* xv, 9, 4).

3. Son of Sie, successor of Eleazar (*Ant.* xvii, 13, 1).

4. The son of Damnæus, made high-priest by Agrippa in place of Ananus (*Ant.* xx, 9, 1).

5. The son of Gamaliel, and successor of the preceding in the high-priesthood (*Ant.* xx, 9, 4; compare *War*, iv, 4, 3).

6. Son of Ananus, a plebeian, and the utterer of the remarkable doom against Jerusalem, which was fulfilled during the last siege simultaneously with his own death (*War*, vi, 5, 3).

7. A priest, son of Thebuthus, who surrendered to Titus the sacred utensils of the Temple (*War*, vi, 8, 3).

8. Son of Sepphias, one of the chief priests and governor of Tiberias (*War*, ii, 20, 4).

9. Son of Saphat, a ringleader of the Sicarii during the last war with the Romans (*War*, iii, 9, 7).

Jesus Christ (Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός; sometimes by Paul in the reverse order "Christ Jesus"), the ordinary designation of the incarnate Son of God and Saviour of mankind. This double designation is not, like Simon Peter, John Mark, Joses Barnabas, composed of a name and a surname, but, like John the Baptist, Simon Magus, Bar-Jesus Elymas, of a proper name and an official title. JESUS was our Lord's proper name, just as Peter, James, and John were the proper names of three of his disciples. To distinguish our Lord from others bearing the name, he was termed Jesus of Nazareth (John xviii, 7, etc., strictly *Jesus the Nazarene*, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος), and Jesus the son of Joseph (John vi, 42, etc.).

I. *Import of the name.*—There can be no doubt that *Jesus* is the Greek form of a Hebrew name, which had been borne by two illustrious individuals in former periods of the Jewish history—the successor of Moses and introducer of Israel into the promised land (Exod. xxiv, 13), and the high-priest who, along with Zerubbabel (Zech. iii, 1), took so active a part in the re-establish-

ment of the civil and religious polity of the Jews on their return from the Babylonish captivity. Its original and full form is *Jehoshua* (Numb. xiii, 16). By contraction it became *Joshua*, or *Jeshua;* and when transferred into Greek, by taking the termination characteristic of that language, it assumed the form *Jesus.* It is thus that the names of the illustrious individuals referred to are uniformly written in the Sept., and the first of them is twice mentioned in the New Testament by this name (Acts vii, 45; Heb. iv, 8).

The original name of Joshua was *Hoshea* (הוֹשֵׁעַ, *saving*), as appears in Numb. xiii, 8, 16, which was changed by Moses into *Jehoshua* (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, *Jehovah is his salvation*), as appears in Numb. xiii, 16; 1 Chron. vii, 27, being elsewhere Anglicized "Joshua." After the exile he is called by the abridged form of this name, *Jeshua* (יֵשׁוּעַ, *id.*), whence the Greek name Ἰησοῦς, by which this is always represented in the Sept. This last Heb. form differs little from the abstract noun from the same root, יְשׁוּעָה, *yeshuah'*, *deliverance*, and seems to have been understood as equivalent in import (see Matt. i, 22; comp. Ecclus. xlvi, 1).

The "name of Jesus" (Phil. ii, 10) is not the name Jesus, but "the name above every name" (ver. 9); i. e. the supreme dignity and authority with which the Father has invested Jesus Christ as the reward of his disinterested exertions in the cause of the divine glory and human happiness; and the bowing ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ is obviously not an external mark of homage when the name Jesus is pronounced, but the inward sense of awe and submission to him who is raised to a station so exalted.

The conferring of this name on our Lord was not the result of accident, or of the ordinary course of things, but was the effect of a direct divine order (Luke i, 31; ii, 21), as indicative of his saving function (Matt. i, 21). Like the other name *Immanuel* (q. v.), it does not necessarily import the divine character of the wearer. This, however, clearly results from the attributes given in the same connection, and is plainly taught in numerous passages (see especially Rom. i, 3, 4; ix, 5).

For the import and application of the name CHRIST, see MESSIAH.

For a full discussion of the name Jesus, including many fanciful etymologies and explanations, with their refutation, see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* ii, 582; Simon. *Onom. V. T.* p. 519 sq.; Fritzsche, *De nomine Jesu* (Freiburg, 1705); Clodius, *De nom. Chr. et Mariæ Arabicis* (Lips. 1724); Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* p. 153, 157; Seelen, *Meditat. exeg.* ii, 413; Thiess, *Krit. Comment.* ii, 395; A. Pfeiffer, *De nomine Jesu*, in his treatise *De Talmude Judæorum*, p. 177 sq.; Baumgarten, *Betracht. d. Namens Jesu* (Halle, 1736); Chrysander, *De vera forma atque emphasi nominis Jesu* (Rintel. 1751); Osiander, *Harmonia Evangelica* (Basil. 1561), lib. i, c. 6; Chemnitius, *De nomine Jesu*, in the *Thes. Theol. Philol.* (Amst. 1702), vol. ii, p. 62; Canini, *Disquis. in loc. aliq. N. T.*, in the *Crit. Sac.* ix; Gass, *De utroque J. C. nomine, Dei filii et nominis* (Vratistl. 1840); and other monographs cited in Volbeding's *Index*, p. 6, 7; and in Hase's *Leben Jesu*, p. 51.

II. *Personal Circumstances of our Lord.*—These, of course, largely affected his history, notwithstanding his divinity.—1. *General View.*—The following is a naked statement of the facts of his career as they may be gathered from the evangelical narratives, supposing them to be entitled simply to the credit due to profane history. (For literature, see Volbeding, p. 56; Hase, p. 8.) The founder of the Christian religion was born (B.C. 6) at Bethlehem, near Jerusalem, under the reign of the emperor Augustus, of Mary, at the time betrothed to the carpenter (τέκτων) Joseph, and descended from the royal house of David (Matt. i, 1 sq.; Luke iii, 23 sq.; comp. John vii, 42). Soon after his birth he was compelled to escape from the murderous designs of Herod the Great by a hasty flight into the adjacent parts of Egypt (Matt. ii, 13 sq.; according to the tradition at Matarea, see *Evangel. infant. Arab.* c. 24; apparently a place near old Heliopolis, where is still shown a very old mulberry-tree under which Mary is said to have rested with the babe, see Prosp. Alpin, *Rer. Æg.* i, 5, p. 24; Paulus, *Samml.* iii, 256 sq.; Tischendorf, *Reisen*, i, 141 sq.; comp. generally Hartmann, *Erdbeschr. v. Africa*, i, 878 sq.). See EGYPT; HEROD. But immediately after the death of this king his parents returned to their own country, and settled again (Luke i, 26) in Nazareth (q. v.), in Lower Galilee (Matt. ii, 23; comp. Luke iv, 16; John i, 46, etc.), where the youthful Jesus so rapidly matured (Luke ii, 40, 52), that in his twelfth year the boy evinced at the metropolis traits of an uncommon religious intelligence, which excited astonishment in all the spectators (Luke ii, 41 sq.). With this event the history of his youth concludes in the canonical gospels, and we next find him, about the thirtieth year of his age (A.D. 25), in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, at the Jordan, where he suffered himself to be consecrated for the introduction of the new divine dispensation (βασίλεια τοῦ Θεοῦ) by the symbol of water baptism at the hands of John the Baptist (Matt. iii, 13 sq.; Mark i, 9 sq.; Luke iii, 21 sq.; John i, 32 sq.). He now began, after a forty-days' fast (comp. 1 Kings xix, 8) spent in the wilderness of Judæa (Matt. iv, 1-11; Mark i, 12 sq.; Luke iv, 1-13) in quiet meditation upon his mission, to publish openly in person this "kingdom of God," by earnestly summoning his countrymen to repentance, i. e. a fundamental reformation of their sentiments and conduct, through a new birth from the Holy Spirit (John iii, 3 sq.). He repeatedly announced himself as the mediator of this dispensation, and in pursuance of this character, in correction of the sensual expectations of the people with reference to the long-hoped-for Redeemer (comp. Luke iv, 21), he chose from among his early associates and Galilæan countrymen a small number of faithful disciples (Matt. x), and with them travelled, especially at the time of the Paschal festival and during the summer months, in various directions through Palestine, seizing every opportunity to impress pure and fruitful religious sentiments upon the populace or his immediate disciples, and to enlighten them concerning his own dignity as God's legate (υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ), who should abolish the sacrificial service, and teach a worship of God, as the common Father of mankind, in spirit and in truth (John iv, 24). With these expositions of doctrine, which all breathe the noblest practical spirit, and were so carefully adapted to the capacity and apprehension of the hearers that in respect to clearness, simplicity, and dignified force they are still a pattern of true instruction, he coupled, in the spirit of the Old-Testament prophets, and as his age expected from the Messiah, wonderful deeds, especially charitable cures of certain diseases at that time very prevalent and regarded as incurable, but to these he himself appears to have attributed a subordinate value. By this means he gathered about him a considerable company of true adherents and thankful disciples, chiefly from the middle class of the people (John vii, 49; and even from the despicable publicans, Matt. ix, 9 sq.; Luke v, 27 sq.); for the eminent and learned were repelled by the severe reproofs which he uttered against their corrupt maxims (Mark xii, 38 sq.), their sanctimonious (Luke xii, 1; xviii, 9 sq.) and hypocritical punctiliousness (Luke xi, 39 sq.; xviii, 9 sq.), and against their prejudices, as being subversive of all true religion (John viii, 33; ix, 16), as well as by the slight regard which (in comparison with their statutes) he paid to the Sabbath (John v, 16); and as he in no respect corresponded to their expectations of the Messiah, full of animosity, they made repeated attempts to seize his person (Mark xi, 18; John vii, 30, 44). At last they succeeded, by the assistance of the traitor Judas, in taking him prisoner in the very capital, where he had just partaken of a parting meal in the familiar circle of his friends (the Passover), upon which he engrafted the initiatory rite of a new covenant; and thus, without exciting any

surprise on his part, in surrendering him into the hands of the Roman authorities as a popular insurrectionist. He was sentenced to death by crucifixion, as he had often declared to his disciples would be his fate, and suffered himself, with calm resignation, to be led to the place of execution between two malefactors (on their traditional names, see Thilo, *Apocryph.* i, 580 sq.; comp. *Evang. infant. Arab.* c. 23); but he arose alive on the third day from the grave which a grateful disciple had prepared for him, and after tarrying forty days in the midst of his disciples, during which he confidently intrusted the prosecution of the great work into their hands, and promised them the divine help of a Paraclete (παράκλητος), he finally, according to one of the narrators, soared away visibly into the sky (A.D. 29). (See Volbeding, p. 6.)

2. *Sources of Information.*—The only trustworthy accounts respecting Jesus are to be derived from the evangelists. (See Volbeding, p. 5.) See GOSPELS, SPURIOUS. They exhibit, it is true, many chasms (Causse, *De rationibus ob quas non plura quam quæ extant ad J. C. vitam pertinentia ab Evang. literis sint consignata,* Franckf. 1766), but they wear the aspect of a true, plain, lively narrative. Only two of these derive their materials from older traditions, doubtless from the apostles and companions of Jesus; but they were all first written down a long time after the occurrences: hence it has often been asserted that the historical matter was even at that time no longer extant in an entirely pure state (since the objective and the subjective, both in views and opinions, are readily interchanged in an unscientifically formed style); but that after Jesus had been so gloriously proved to be the Messias, the incidents were improved into prodigies, especially through a consideration of the Old-Testament prophecies (Kaiser, *Bibl. Theol.* i, 199 sq.). Yet in the synoptical gospels this could only be shown in the composition and connection of single transactions; the facts themselves in the respective accounts agree too well in time and circumstances, and the narrators confine themselves too evidently to the position of writers of memoirs, to allow the supposition of a (conscious) transformation of the events or any such developments from Old-Testament prophecy: moreover, if truth and pious poetry had already become mingled in the verbal traditionary reports, the eye-witnesses Matthew and John would have known well, in a fresh narration, how to distinguish between each of these elements with regard to scenes which they had themselves passed through (for memory and imagination were generally more lively and vigorous among the ancients than with us) (*Br. üb. Rationalismus,* p. 248 sq.; compare Heydenreich, *Ueb. Unzulässigkeit d. myth. Auffassung des Histor. im N. T. und im Christenth.* Herborn, 1831-5; see Hase, p. 9). Sooner would we suppose that the fertile-minded John, who wrote latest, has set before us, not the pure historical Christ, but one apprehended by faith and confounded with his own spiritual conceptions (*Br. über Rational.* p. 352). But while it is altogether probable that even he, by reason of his individuality and spiritual sympathy with Jesus, apprehended and reflected the depth and spirituality of his Master more truly than the synoptical evangelists, who depict rather the exterior phenomena of his character, at the same time there is actually nothing contained in the doctrinal discourses of Jesus in John, either in substance or form, that is incompatible with the Christ of the first three evangelists (see Heydenreich, in his *Zeitschr. für Predigermiss.* i, pt. 1 and 2); yet these latter represent Jesus as speaking comparatively seldom, and that in more general terms, of his exaltation, dignity, and relation with the Father, whereas that Christ would have explained himself much more definitely and fully upon a point that could not have remained undiscussed, is of itself probable (see Hase, p. 10). Hence also, although we cannot believe that in such representations we are to understand the identical words of Christ to be given (for while the retention of all these extended discourses in the memory is improbable, on the other hand a writing of them down is repugnant to the Jewish custom), yet the actual sentiments of Jesus are certainly thus reported. (See further, Bauer, *Bibl. Theol. N. T.* ii, 278 sq.; B. Crusius, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 81; Fleck, *Otium theolog.* Lips. 1831; and generally Krummacher, *Ueber den Geist und die Form der evang. Gesch.* Lpz. 1805; Eichhorn, *Einleit.* i, 689 sq.; on the mythicism of the evangelists, see Gabler, *Neuest. theol. Journ.* vii, 396; Bertholdt, *Theol. Journ.* v, 235 sq.)

In the Church fathers, we find very little that appears to have been derived from clearly historical tradition, but the apocryphal gospels breathe a spirit entirely foreign to historical truth, and are filled with accounts of petty miracles (Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigkeit,* p. 406 sq.; Ammon, *Leb. Jesu,* i, 90 sq.; compare Schmidt, *Einl. ins N. T.* ii, 234 sq., and *Biblioth. f. Krit. u. Exegese,* ii, 481 sq.). The passage of Josephus (*Ant.* xviii, 3, 3; see Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* § 24), which Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* i, 11; *Demonstr. Ev.* iii, 7) was the first among Christian writers to make use of, has been shown (see Hase, p. 12), although some have ingeniously striven to defend it (see, among the latest, Bretschneider, in his *Diss. capita theolog. Jud. dogmat. e Josepho collect.* Lips. 1812; Böhmert, *Ueber des Jos. Zeugniss von Christo,* Leipz. 1823; Schödel, *Fl. Joseph. de J. Chr. testatus,* Lips. 1840), to be partly, but not entirely spurious (see Eichstädt, *Flaviani de Jesu Christo testimonii αὐθεντία quo jure nuper rursus defensa sit,* Jena, 1813; also his 6 *Progr. m. einem auctar.* 1841; Paulus, in the *Heidelberg Jahrb.* 1813, i, 269 sq.; Theile, in the *N. kritisch. Journ. d. theolog. Lit.* ii, 97 sq.; Heinichen, *Exc.* 1 *zu Euseb. H. E.* iii, 331 sq.; also *Suppl. notarius ad Eusebium,* p. 73 sq.; Ammon, *Leben Jesu,* i, 120 sq.). See JOSEPHUS. (See Volbeding, p. 5.) The Koran (q. v.) contains only palpable fables concerning Jesus (Hottinger, *Histor. Or.* 105 sq.; Schmidt, in his *Bibl. f. Krit. u. Exegese,* i, 110 sq.; D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orientale,* ii, 349 sq.; compare Augusti, *Christologiæ Koran lineam.* Jena, 1799), and the Jewish *History of Jesus* (תולדות ישוע, edit. Huldrici, Lugd. Bat. 1703; and in Wagenseil, *Tela ign. Satan.* Altdorf, 1681) betrays itself as an abortive fabrication of Jewish calumny, destitute of any historical value (see Ammon, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 263), while the allusions to Jesus in the Talmud and the Rabbins have only a polemical aim (see Meelführer, *Jesus in Talmude,* Altdorf, 1699, ii, 4; Werner, *Jesus in Talmude,* Stadæ, 1731; comp. Bynæus, *De natali J. C.* ii, 4). (See Volbeding, p. 5.) The genuine *Acts of Pilate* ("Acta Pilati," Eusebius, *Chron. Arm.* ii, 267; compare Henke, *Opusc.* p. 199 sq.) are no longer extant [see PILATE]; what we now possess under this title is a later fabrication (see Ammon, i, 102 sq.). In the Greek and Roman profane authors, Jesus is only incidentally named (Tacitus, *Annal.* xv, 44, 3; Pliny, *Epist.* x, 97; Lamprid. *Vit. Alex. Sev.* c. 29, 43; Porphyry, *De philosoph. ex. orac.* in Euseb. *Demonstr. Evang.* iii, 7; Liban. in Socr. *Hist. Ev.* iii, 23; Lucian, *Mors peregr.* c. 11, 13). On Suidas, s. v. Ἰησοῦς, see Walter, *Codex in Suida mendax de Jesu* (Lips. 1724). Whether by *Chrestus* in Suetonius (*Claud.* p. 25) is to be understood Christ, is doubted by some (comp. Ernesti and Wolf, ad loc.; see CLAUDIUS), but the unusual name *Christus* might easily undergo this change (see also Philostr. *Soph.* ii, 11) in popular reference (see generally Eckhard, *Non-Christianor. de Christo testimonia,* Quedlinb. 1737; Kœcher, *Hist. Jesu Christo ex scriptorib. profan. eruta,* Jena, 1726; Meyer, *Versuch e. Vertheid. u. Erläut. der Geschichte Jesu u. d. Apostol. a. griech. u. röm. Profanscrib.* Hannov. 1805; Fronmüller, in the *Studien der würtemb. Geistl.* x, 1. On the Jesus of the book of Sirach, xliii, 25, see Seelen, *De Jesu in Jesu Sirac. frustra quæsito,* Lubec. 1724; also in his *Medit. exeg.* i, 207 sq.).

3. The scientific treatment of the life of Jesus belongs to the modern period of theological criticism. Among earlier contributions of a critico-chronological character is that of Offerhaus (*De vita J. C. privata et publica,* in his *Spicil. histor. chronol.* Groningen, 1739). Greiling

(Halle, 1813) first undertook the adjustment, in a lively narrative, of the recent (rationalistic) exposition that has resulted, to the actual career of Christ. An independent but, on the whole, unsatisfactory treatise is that of Planck (*Gesch. d. Christenth. in der Periode seiner ersten Einführ. in die Welt durch Jesum u. die Apostel*, Göttingen, 1818). Kaiser has attempted an analysis (*Bibl. Theol.* i, 230 sq.). Still more severe in his method of criticism is Paulus (*Das Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reinen Gesch. d. Urchristenth.* Heidelb. 1828), and bold to a degree that has alarmed the theological world is D. F. Strauss (*Leben J. krit. bearbeit.* Tübing. 1835, and since). The latter anew reduced the evangelical histories (with the exception of a few plain transactions) to a mythical composition springing out of the Old-Test. prophecies and the expectations of the Messiah in the community, and, in his criticism upon single points, generally stands upon the shoulders of the preceding writers. In opposition to him, numerous men of learning and courage rose up to defend the "historical Christ," some of them insisting upon the strictly supernatural interpretation (Lange; Harless; Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigkeit der evangel. Gesch.* Hamb. 1838; Krabbe, *Vorles. über das Leben Jesu*, Hamb. 1839), while others concede or pass over single points in the history (Neander, *Leben J. Chr.* Hamburg, 1837). Into this controversy, which grew highly personal, a philosophical writer (Weisse, *Evang. Geschichte Krit. u. philosoph. Bearbeitung*, Leipz. 1840) became involved, and attempted, by an ingenious but decidedly presumptuous criticism, to distinguish the historical and the unhistorical element in the evangelical account. At the same time, Theile (*Zur Biographie Jesu*, Leipzig, 1837) gave a careful and conciliatory summary of the materials of the discussion, but Hase has published (in the 4th ed. of his *Leben Jesu*, Leipz. 1840) a masterly review, showing the gradual rejection of the extravagances of criticism since 1829. The substance of the life of Jesus has thus now become established in general belief as historical truth; yet Bauer (*Krit. der evangel. Gesch. d. Synoptiker*, Leipz. 1841), after an analysis of the gospels as literary productions, calls the original narrative concerning Jesus "a pure creation of the Christian consciousness," and he pronounces the evangelical history generally to be "solved." Thenius has met him with a proof of the evangelical history, drawn from the N.-Test. epistles, in a few but striking remarks (*Das Evang. ohne die Evangelien*, Leipz. 1843), but A. Ebrard (*Wiss. Krit. d. evang. Gesch.* Frankf. 1842) has fully refuted him in a learned but not unprejudiced work (see also Weisse, in the *Jen. Lit.-Zeit.* 1843, No. 7–9, 13–15). But this heartless and also peculiarly insipid criticism of Bauer—which, indeed, often degenerates into the ridiculous—appears to have left no impression upon the literary world, and may therefore be dismissed without further consideration (comp. generally Grimm, *Glaubwürdigkeit d. evangel. Gesch. in Bezug auf Strauss und Bauer*, Jena, 1845). Lately, Von Ammon (*Gesch. d. Leb. Jesu*, Leipz. 1842) undertook, in his style of combination, carefully steering between the extremes, a narrative of the life of Jesus full of striking observations. Whatever else has been done in this department (Gfrörer, *Geschichte des Urchristenth.* Stuttg. 1838; Salvador, *Jésus Christ et sa doctrine*, Par. 1838) belongs rather to the origin of Christianity than to the data of the life of Jesus. In Catholic literature little has appeared on this subject (Kuhn, *Leben Jesu wissensch. bearbeitet*, Mainz, 1838; of a more general character are the works of Francke, Leipz. 1838, and Storch, Leipz. 1841). (On the bearing of subjective views upon the treatment of the Gospel history, there are the monographs cited in Volbeding, p. 6.) See literature below, and compare the art. CHRISTOLOGY.

4. *Chronological Data.*—*a.* The year of Christ's birth (for the general condition of the age, see Knapp, *De statu temp. nato Christo*, Hal. 1757; and the Church histories of Gieseler, Neander, etc.; on a special point, see Masson, *Jani templ. Christo nascente reseratum*, Rotterdam, 1700) cannot, as all investigations on this point have proved (Fabricii *Bibl. antiquar.* p. 187 sq., 342 sq.; Thiess, *Krit. Comment.* ii, 339 sq.; comp. especially S. van Tilde, *De anno, mense et die nati Chr.* Lugd. Bat. 1700, præf. J. G. Walch, Jena, 1740; K. Michaeles, *Ueber das Geburts- u. Sterbejahr J. C.* Wien, 1796, ii, 8), be determined with full certainty (Reccard, *Pr. in rationes et limites incertitudinis circa temp. nat. Christi*, Reg. 1768); yet it is now pretty generally agreed that the vulgar æra (Hamberger, *De epochæ Dionys. ortu et auctore*, Jen. 1704; also in Martini *Thes. Diss.* III, i, 341 sq.), of which the first year corresponds to 4714 of the Julian Period, or 754 (and latter part of 753; see Jarvis, *Introd. to Hist. of the Church*, p. 54, 610) of Rome (Sanclemente, *De vulg. æræ emendat.* Rom. 1793; Ideler, *Chronol.* ii, 383 sq.), has assigned it a date too late by a few years (see Strong's *Harm. and Expos.* Append. i), since the death of Herod the Great (Matt. ii, 1 sq.), according to Josephus (*Ant.* xvii, 8, 1; comp. xiv, 14, 5; xvii, 9, 3), must have occurred before Easter in B.C. 4 (see Browne's *Ordo Sæclorum*, p. 27 sq.). Hence Jesus may have been born in the beginning of the year of Rome 750, four years before the epoch of our æra, or even earlier (Uhland, *Christum anno ante ær. vulg. 4 exeunte natum esse*, Tubing. 1775; so Bengel, Anger, Wieseler, Jarvis), but in no case later (comp. also Offerhaus, *Spicileg.* p. 422 sq.; Paulus, *Comment.* i, 206 sq.; Vogel, in Gabler's *Journ. f. auserl. theolog. Lit.* i, 244 sq.; and in the *Studien der würtemberg. Geistlichk.* I, i, 50 sq.). A few passages (as Luke iii, 1, 23; Matt. ii, 2 sq.) afford a closer determination [see CYRENIUS]; the latter gave occasion to the celebrated Kepler to connect the star of the Magi with a planetary conjunction (of Jupiter and Saturn), and more recent writers have followed this suggestion (Wurm, in Bengel's *Archiv.* II, i, 261 sq.; Ideler, *Handb. d. Chronol.* ii, 399 sq., and *Lehrb. d. Chronol.* p. 428 sq.; compare also Münter, *Stern der Weisen*, Copenh. 1827; Klein's *Oppositionsschr.* V, i, 90 sq.; Schubert, *Lehrb. d. Sternkunde*, p. 226 sq.), fixing upon B.C. 6 as the true year of the nativity. See NATIVITY. But Matt. ii, 16 seems to state that the Magi, who must have arrived at Jerusalem soon after the birth of Jesus, had indicated the first appearance of the phenomenon as having occurred a *long* time previously (probably not exactly two years before), and on that view Jesus might have been born earlier than B.C. 6, the more so inasmuch as the accession of Mars to the same conjunction, occurring in the spring of B.C. 6, according to Kepler, may have first excited the full attention of the Magi. Lately Wieseler (*Chronolog. Synopse*, p. 67 sq.) has brought down the nativity to the year B.C. 4, and in additional confirmation of this date holds that a comet, which, according to Chinese astronomical tables, was visible for more than two months in this year, was identical with the star of the wise men, at the same time adducing Luke ii, 1 sq.; iii, 23, as pointing to the same year. But if the Magi had first been incited to their journey by the appearance of that comet, they could not well have designated to Herod as the Messianic star the planetary conjunction of A.U.C. 747 or 748, then almost two years ago, seeing this was an entirely distinct phenomenon. Under this supposition, too, Herod would have made more sure of his purpose if he had put to death children three years old. According to this view, then, we should place Christ's birth rather in B.C. 7 than B.C. 4. Some uncertainty, however, must always attend the use of these astronomical data. See STAR IN THE EAST. As an element in determining the year of the nativity, Luke iii, 1, comp. 23, must also be taken into the account. Jesus is there positively stated to have entered upon his public ministry at thirty years of age, and indeed soon after John the Baptist, whose mission began in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, so that by reckoning back about thirty years from this latter date (August, 781, to August, 782, of Rome, A.D. 28–29), we arrive at about B.C. 3 as the year of Christ's birth, which corresponds to the statements of Irenæus (*Hæret.* iii, 25), Tertullian (*Adv. Jud.* 8), and Eusebius (*Hist. Ec.* i, 5), that Jesus

was born in the year 41 (42) of the reign of Augustus, i. e. 751 of Rome, or B.C. 3 (Ideler, *Chronolog.* ii, 385). As Luke's language in that passage is somewhat indefinite ("about," ὡσεί), we may presume that Christ was rather over than under thirty years of age; and this will agree with the computation of the fourth year before the Dionysian æra, i. e. 750 of Rome. If, however, we suppose (but see Browne, *Ordo Sæclorum*, p. 67) the joint reign of Tiberius with Augustus, i. e. his association with him in the government especially of the provinces (Vell. Paterc. *Hist. Rom.* ii, 121; Sueton. iii, 20, 21; Tacitus, *Annal.* i, 3; Dio Cass. *Hist. Rom.* ii, 103), three and a half years before his full reign (Jarvis, *Introd.* p. 228-239), to be meant, we shall again be brought to about B.C. 6, or possibly 7, as the year of the nativity. The latest conclusion of Block (*Das wahre Geburtsjahr Christi*, Berl. 1843), that Jesus was born in the year 735 of Rome, or nineteen years before the beginning of the vulgar æra, based upon the authority of the later Rabbins, does not call for special examination (yet see Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 132). See ADVENT.

The month and day of the birth of Christ cannot be determined with a like degree of approximation, but it could not, at all events, have fallen in December or January, since at this time of the year the flocks are not found in the open fields during the night (Luke ii, 8), but in pens ("the first rain descends the 17th of the month Marchesvan [November], and then the cattle returned home; nor did the shepherds any longer lodge in huts in the fields," Gemara, *Nedar.* 63); moreover, a census (ἀπογραφή), which made travelling necessary (Luke ii, 2 sq.), would not have been ordered at this season. We may naturally suppose that the month of March is the time for driving out cattle to pasture, at least in Southern Palestine (Süskind, in Bengel's *Archiv.* i, 215; comp. A. J. u. d. Hardt, *De momentis quibusd. hist. et chron. ad determin. Chr. diem natal.* Helmst. 1754; Körner, *De die natali Servatoris*, Lips. 1778; Funck, *De die Servat. natali*, Rint. 1735; also in his *Dissert. Acad.* p. 149 sq.; Münter, *Stern der Weisen*, Copenh. 1827, p. 110 sq.). If we can rely upon a statement of the Jewish Rabbins, that the first of the twenty-four courses of priests entered upon their duties in the regular cycle the very week in which the Temple was destroyed by the Romans (Mishna, iii, 298, 3), we are furnished with the means, by comparison with the time of the service of Zachariah (Luke i, 5, 8), who belonged to the eighth division (1 Chron. xxiv, 10), of determining with considerable certainty (Browne's *Ordo Sæclorum*, p. 33 sq.) the date of the nativity as occurring, if in B.C. 6, about the month of August (Strong's *Harm. and Expos.* Append. i, p. 23). The attempts of Scaliger and Bengel to determine the month of the nativity from this element (compare Maurit. *De sortit.* p. 334 sq.) are unsatisfactory (see Van Til, *ut sup.* p. 75 sq.; Allix, *Diatr. de anno et mense J. C. nat.* p. 44 sq.; Paulus, *Comment.* i, 36 sq.). Lately Jarvis (*Introd.* p. 535 sq.) has endeavored to maintain the traditionary date of Christmas of the Latin Church; and Seyffarth has anew adopted the conclusion (*Chronolog. Sacra*, p. 97 sq.) that John the Baptist was born on the 24th of June, and consequently Jesus on the 25th (22d in his *Summary of recent Discoveries in Chronology*, N. York, 1857, p. 236) of December, based on the supposition that the Israelites reckoned by solar months: this pays no regard to Luke ii, 8 (see Hase, p. 67). See CHRISTMAS.

b. The year of Christ's *crucifixion* is no less disputed (comp. Paulus, *Comment.* iii, 784 sq.). The two extreme limits of the date are the above-mentioned 15th year of Tiberius, in which John the Baptist began his career (Luke iii, 1), i. e. Aug. 781 to Aug. 782 of Rome (A.D. 28-29), and the year of the death of that emperor, 790 of Rome (A.D. 37), in which Pilate had already left the province of Judæa. Jesus appears to have begun his public teaching soon after John's entrance upon his mission; for the message of the Sanhedrim to John, which is placed in immediate connection with the beginning of Christ's public ministry (John i, 19; comp. xxix, 35; ii, 1), and comes in just before the Passover (John ii, 12 sq.), must have been within a year after John's public appearance. This being assumed, a further approximation would depend upon the determination of the number of Passovers which Jesus celebrated during his ministry; but this itself is quite a difficult question (see under No. 5, below). It is now generally conceded that he could not well have passed less than three Paschal festivals, and probably not more than four (i. e. one at the beginning of each of Christ's three years, and a fourth at the close of the last); thus we ascertain as the *terminus a quo* of these festivals the year A.D. 28, and as the probable *terminus ad quem* the year A.D. 32; or, on the supposition (as above) that the joint reign of Tiberius is meant, we have as the limits of the Passovers of Jesus A.D. 25-29. This result would be rendered more definite and certain if we could ascertain whether in the last of these series of years (A.D. 29 or 32) the Jewish Passover fell on a *Friday* (Thursday evening and the ensuing day), as this was the week-day on which the death of Christ is generally held to have taken place. There have been various calculations by means of lunar tables (Linbrunn, in the *Abhandlung der bayerschen Akademie der Wiss.* vol. vi; Wurm, in Bengel's *Archiv.* II, i, 292 sq.; Anger, *De temporum in Act. Apost. ratione diss.* i, Lips. 1830, p. 30 sq.; Browne, *Ordo Sæclorum*, Lond. 1844, p. 504), to determine during which of the years of this period the Paschal day must have occurred on Friday (see Strong's *Harm. and Exposit.* Append. i, p. 8 sq.); but the inexactness of the Jewish calendar makes every such computation uncertain (Wurm, *ut sup.* p. 294 sq.). Yet it is worthy of notice that the two most recent investigations of Wurm and Anger both make the year A.D. 31, or 784 of Rome, to be such a calendar year as we require. Wieseler, *Chronol. Synops.* p. 479), on the other hand, protests against the foregoing computations, and insists that in A.D. 30 alone the Paschal day fell on Friday. According to other calculations, A.D. 29 and 33 are the only years of this period in which the Paschal eve fell on Thursday (see Browne, *Ordo Sæclorum*, p. 55), while so great discrepancy prevails between other computations (see Townsend's *Chronological N. T.* p. *159) that little or no reliance can be placed upon this argument (see Strong's *Harm. and Exposit.* Append. i, p. 8 sq.). See PASSOVER. The opinion of some of the ancient writers (Irenæus, ii, 22, 5), that Jesus died at 40 or 50 years of age (compare John viii, 57), is altogether improbable (see Pisanski, *De errore Irenæi in determinanda ætate Christi*, Regiom. 1777). The most of the Church fathers (Tertull. *Adv. Jud.* 8; Lactantius, *Institut.* iv, 10; Augustine, *Civ. dei*, xviii, 54; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i, p. 147, etc.) assign but a *single* year as the duration of Christ's ministry, and place his death in the consulship of the two Gemini (VIII Cal. April. Coss. C. Rubellio Gemino et C. Rufio Gemino), i. e. 782 of Rome, A.D. 29, the 15th year of Tiberius's reign, which Ideler (*Chronology*, ii, 418 sq.) has lately (so also Browne, *Ordo Sæclorum*, p. 80 sq.) attempted to reconcile with Luke iii, 1 (but see Seyffarth, *Chronol. Sacra*, p. 115 sq.; Eusebius, in his *Chron. Armen.* ii, p. 264, places the death of Jesus in the 19th year of Tiberius, which Jerome, in his Latin translation, calls the 18th; on the above reckoning of the fathers, see Petavius, *Animadvers.* p. 146 sq.; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.* i, 497 sq.). On the observation of the sun at the crucifixion (Matt. xxvii, 45; Mark xv, 33; Luke xxiii, 44), see ECLIPSE. (On the chronological elements of the life of Jesus, see generally Hottinger, *Pentas dissertat. bibl.-chronol.* p. 218 sq.; Voss, *De annis Christi dissertat.* Amst. 1643; Lupi, *De notis chronolog. anni mortis et nativ. J. C. dissertat.* Rom. 1744; Horix, *Observat. hist. chronol. de annis Chr.* Mogunt. 1789; compare Volbeding, p. 20; Hase, p. 52.) See CHRONOLOGY.

5. The two family registers of Jesus (Matt. i and Luke iii), of which the first is descending and the latter ascending, vary considerably from each other; inasmuch as not only entirely different names of ancestors are giv-

en from Joseph upwards to Zerubbabel and Salathiel (Matt. i, 12 sq.; Luke iii, 27), but also Matthew carries back Joseph's lineage to David's son Solomon (ver. 6 sq.), while Luke refers it to another son Nathan (ver. 31). Moreover, Matthew only goes back as far as Abraham (as he wrote for Jewish readers), but Luke (in agreement with the general scope of his gospel) as far as Adam (God). This disagreement early engaged the attention of the Church fathers (see Eusebius, *Hist. Ev.* i, 7), and later interpreters have adopted various hypotheses for the reconcilement of the two evangelists (see especially Surenhus. Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς, p. 320 sq.; Rus, *Harmon. evang.* i, 65 sq.; Thiess, *Krit. Commentar*, ii, 271 sq.; Kuinöl, *Proleg. in Matt.* § 4). There are properly only two general representations possible. For the history of Christ's parents, see JOSEPH; MARY.

(*a*) Matthew traces the lineage through *Joseph*, Luke gives the *maternal* descent (comp. also Neander, p. 21); so that the person called Eli in Luke iii, 23, appears to have been the father of Mary (see especially Helvicus, in Crenii *Exercitat. philol. hist.* iii, p. 332 sq.; Spanheim, *Dubia evang.* i, 13 sq.; Bengel, Heumann, Paulus, Kuinöl, in their *Commentaries;* Wieseler, in the *Studien u. Krit.* 1845, p. 361 sq.; on the contrary, Bleek, *Beiträge z. Evangelienkrit.* p. 101 sq.). But, in the first place, in that case Luke would hardly have written so expressly "the son of Eli" (τοῦ 'Ηλί), since we must understand all the following genitives to refer to the actual *fathers* and not to the fathers-in-law (the appeal to Ruth i, 11 sq., for the purpose of showing that a daughter-in-law could be called daughter among the Hebrews, is unavailing for the distinction in question); although, in the second place, we need not understand the Salathiel and Zerubbabel named in one genealogy to have been both different persons from those mentioned in the other (Paulus, *Comment.* i, 243 sq.; Robinson, *Gr. Harmony*, p. 186), which is a very questionable expedient (see especially Hug, *Einleitung*, ii, 266; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1852, p. 602 sq.). Aside from the fact that Luke does not even mention the mother of Jesus (but only Matt. i, 16), and from the further fact that the Jews were not at all accustomed to record the genealogies of women (*Baba Bathra*, f. 110, "The father's family, not the mother's, is accounted the true lineage;" compare Wetstein, i, 231), we might make an exception in the case of the Messiah, who was to be descended from a *virgin* (compare also Paulus, *Leben J.* i, 90). A still different explanation (Voss, *ut sup.;* comp. also Schleyer, in the *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1836, p. 403 sq., 539 sq.), namely, that Eli, although the father of Mary, is here introduced as being the grandfather of Joseph (according to the supposition that Mary was an heiress, Numb. xxvii, 8), proceeds upon an entirely untenable interpretation (see Paulus, *Comment.* i, 243, 261). Notwithstanding the foregoing objection to the view under consideration, it meets, perhaps better than any other, the difficulties of the subject. See GENEALOGY.

(*b*) Some assume that the proper father of Joseph was Eli: he, as a brother, or (as the difference of the names up to Salathiel necessitates) as the nearest relative (half-brother?), had married Mary, the wife of the deceased childless Jacob, and according to the Levirate law (q. v.) Joseph would appear as the son of Jacob, and would, in fact, have two fathers (so Ambrosius); or conversely, we may suppose that Jacob was the proper father of Joseph, and Eli his childless deceased uncle (comp. Julius Afric. in Eusebius, *Hist. Ev.* i, 7; Calixtus, Clericus). This hypothesis, which still conflicts with the Levirate rule that only the deceased is called father of the posthumous son (Deut. xxv, 6), Hug (*Einl.* ii, 268 sq.), has been so modified as to presume a Levirate marriage as far back as Salathiel, by which the mention of Salathiel and Zerubbabel in both lists would be explained; and Hug also introduces such a marriage between the parents of Joseph, and still another among more distant relatives. This is ingenious, but too complicated (see generally Paulus, *ut sup.* p. 260). If a *direct* descent of Jesus could have been laid down from David, there remains no reason why, when the natural extraction of the Messiah straight from David was so important, the very evangelist who wrote immediately for Jewish readers should have traced the indirect lineage. But if so many as three Levirate marriages had occurred together (as Hug thinks), we should suppose that Matthew, on account of the infrequency of such a case, would have given his readers some hint, or at least not have written (ver. 16) "begat" (ἐγέννησε) in a manner quite calculated to mislead. Moreover, this hypothesis of Hug rests upon an interpretation of 1 Chron. iii, 18 sq., which that scholar himself could only have chosen in a genealogical difficulty. See LEVIRATE LAW.

(*c*) If both the foregoing explanations be rejected, there remains no other course than to renounce the attempt to reconcile the two family lines of Jesus, and frankly acknowledge a discrepancy between the evangelists, as some have done (Stroth, in Eichhorn's *Repert.* ix, 131 sq.; Ammon, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 266; Thiess, *Krit. Comment.* ii, 271 sq.; Fritzsche, *ad Matt.* p. 35; Strauss, i, 105 sq.; De Wette, B. Crusius, Alford, on Luke iii). In the decayed family of Joseph it might not have been possible, especially after so much misfortune as befell the country and people, to recover any written elements for the construction of a family register back to David. Were the account of Julius Africanus (in Eusebius, i, 7; compare Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* p. 885), that king Herod had caused the family records of the Jews to be burned, correct, the want of such information would be still more evident (but see Wetstein, i, p. 232; Wieseler, in the *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1845, p. 369). In that case, after the need of such registers had arisen, persons would naturally have set themselves to compiling them from traditional recollections, and the variations of these may readily have resulted in a double lineage. But even on this view it has been insisted that both lines present the descent of *Joseph* and not of Mary, since it was unusual to exhibit the maternal lineage, and the Jews would not have regarded such an extraction from David as the genuine one. There are, at all events, but two positions possible: either the supernatural generation of Jesus by the Holy Spirit was admitted, or Jesus was considered a son of Joseph (Luke iii, 33). In the latter case a family record of Joseph entirely sufficed for the application of the O.-T. oracles to Jesus; in the former case it has been conceived that such a register would have been deemed superfluous, and every natural lineage of Jesus from David (Rom. i, 3) would have thrown his divine origin into the background. This has been alleged as the reason why John gives no genealogy at all, and generally says nothing of the extraction of Jesus from the family of David (see Von Ammon, *Leb. Jes.* i, 179 sq.). The force of these arguments, however, is greatly lessened by the consideration that the early Christians, in meeting the Jews, would be very anxious, if possible, to prove Christ's positive descent from David through both his reputed and his real parent; the more so, as the former was avowed to be only nominally such, leaving the whole actual lineage to be made out on the mother's side. (See generally Baumgarten, *De genealogia Chr.* Hal. 1749; Dürr, *Genealogia Jesu*, Gott. 1778; Büsching's *Harmon. d. Evang.* p. 187 sq., 264 sq.) See GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

6. The wonderful birth of Jesus through the intervention of the Holy Spirit, which only the synoptical gospels relate (Luke i, 26 sq.; Matt. i, 18 sq.; the apocryphal gospels, in order to remove all idea of the conception of Mary by Joseph, make him to have been absent a long time from home at work, *Histor. Josephi*, c. 5; *Hist. de Nativ. Mariæ*, c. 10), has been imagined by many recent interpreters (Ammon, *Biblic. Theol.* ii, 251 sq., and *Comm. in narrationum de primordiis J. C. fontes, incrementa et nexum c. rel. Chr.* Gott. 1798; also in his *Nov. Opusc.* p. 25 sq.; Bauer, *Theol. N. T.* i, 310 sq.; *Briefe über Rationalismus*, p. 229 sq.; Kaiser, *Bibl. Theolog.* i, 231 sq.; Greiling, p. 24 sq.) to have been a

myth suggested by the O.-Test. prophecies (Isa. vii, 14), and they have held Joseph to be the proper father of Jesus (as it is well known that many in the earliest Church, and individuals later, from time to time, have done, *Unschuld. Nachr.* 1711, p. 622 sq.; Walther, *Vers. eines schriftmäss. Beweisse dass Joseph der wahre Vater Christi sei*, Berl. 1791; on the contrary, Oertel, *Antijosephismus oder Kritik des Schriftm. Bew.*, etc., Germ. 1793; Hasse, *Josephum verum patrem e Scriptura non fuisse*, Reg. 1792; Ludewig, *Histor. Untersuch. über die versch. Meinungen v. d. Abkunft Jes.* Wolfenbüttel, 1831; comp. also Korb, *Anticarus oder histor.-krit. Beleuchtung der Schrift; "Die natürl. Geburt Jesu u. s. w."* Leipzig, 1831) on the following noways decisive grounds: (*a*) "John, who stands in so near a relation to Jesus, and must have known the family affairs, relates nothing at all of this wonderful birth, although it was very apposite to his design." But this evangelist shows the high dignity of Jesus only from his discourses, the others from public evidences and a few astonishing miracles; moreover, his prologue (i, 1-18) declares dogmatically pretty much the same thing as the synoptical gospels do historically in this respect. (Compare also the deportment of Mary, John ii, 3 sq.; see Neander, p. 16 sq.) (*b*) "Neither Jesus nor an apostle ever appeals in any discourse to this circumstance. Paul always says simply that Jesus was born 'of the seed of David' (Rom. i, 3; 2 Tim. ii, 8); once (Gal. iv, 4), more definitely, 'of a woman' (ἐκ γυναικός, not παρθένου)." It must be admitted, however, that an appeal to a fact which only *one* individual could positively know by experience would be very ineffectual; and an apostle would be very likely to subject himself to the charge of irrelevancy if he resorted to such an appeal (comp. Niemeyer, *Pr. ad illustrand. plurimor. N. T. scriptorum silentium de primordiis vitæ J. C.* Halle, 1790). But this would be laying as improper an emphasis upon the word γυνή (Gal. iv, 4) as that of the older theologians upon עַלְמָה (Isa. vii, 14). (*c*) "Mary calls Joseph, without qualification, the *father of Jesus* (Luke ii, 48), and also among the Jews Jesus was generally called Joseph's son (Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3; Luke iii, 23; iv, 22; John i, 46; vi, 42)." This last argument is wholly destitute of force; but Mary might naturally, in common parlance, call Joseph Jesus's *father*, just as, in modern phrase, a foster-father is generally styled father when definiteness of expression is not requisite. (*d*) "The brothers of Jesus did not believe in him as the Messiah (John vii, 5), which would be inexplicable if the Deity had already indicated him as the Messiah from his very birth." Yet these brothers had not themselves personally known the fact; and it is, moreover, not uncommon that one son in a family who is a general favorite excites the ill-will of the others to such a degree that they even deny his evident superiority, or that brothers fail to appreciate and esteem a mentally distinguished brother. (*e*) "History shows in a multitude of examples that the birth of illustrious men has been embellished with fables (Wetstein, *N. T.* i, p. 236); especially is the notion of a birth without connection with a man (παρθενογενής) wide spread in the ancient world (Georgi, *Alphabet. Tibet.* Rom. 1762, p. 55 sq., 369 sq.), and among the Indians and Chinese it is even applied to the founders of religion (Paul. a Bartholom. *System. Brahman.* p. 158; Du Halde, *Beschr. d. Chines. Reichs*, iii, 26)." In case it is meant by this that a wonderful generation of a holy man, effected immediately by the Spirit of God, was embraced in the circle of Oriental belief (Rosenmüller, in Gabler's *Journ. f. ausserl. theol. Liter.* ii, 253 sq.), this argument might make the purely historical character of the doctrine in question dubious, were it capable of proof that such an idea also harmonizes with the principles of the Israelitish monotheism, or could it be made probable (Weisse, *Leben Jesu*, i, 176 sq.) that this account of the birth of Jesus is a heathen production (see, on the contrary, Neander, p. 12 sq.). On the other hand, however, this statement stands so isolated in the Christian tradition, and so surpasses the range of the profane conceptions, that we can hardly reject the idea that it must have operated to enhance the estimate of Christ's dignity. It has been suggested as possible (Paulus, *Leben Jesu*, i, 97 sq.) that the hope had already formed itself in the soul of Mary that she would become the mother of the Messiah (which, however, is contradicted by her evident surprise and difficulty at the announcement, Luke i, 29, 34), and that this had drawn nourishment from a vision in a dream, as the angelic annunciation (Luke i, 26 sq.) has been (but with the greatest violence) interpreted (see, however, Van Oosterzee, *De Jesu e Virgine nato*, Utr. 1840). See CONCEPTION.

Bethlehem, too (Wagner, *De loco nat. J. Chr.* Colon. Brandenb. 1673), as the place of Christ's birth, has been deemed to belong to the mythical dress of the narrative (comp. Mic. v, 1; see Thiess, *Krit. Comment.* ii, 414), and it has therefore been inferred that Jesus was not only begotten in Nazareth, but also born there (Kaiser, *Bibl. Theol.* i, 230)—which, nevertheless, does not follow from John i, 46. That Jesus was born in Bethlehem is stated in two of the evangelical accounts (Matt. ii, 1; Luke ii, 4), as may also be elsewhere gathered from the events which follow his birth. But a more direct discrepancy between Matthew and Luke (Hase, p. 44), respecting Joseph's belonging to Bethlehem (Matt. ii, 22, 23; Luke i, 26; ii, 4), cannot be substantiated (compare generally Gelpe, *Jugendgesch. d. Herrn*, Berne, 1841.) See BETHLEHEM.

7. Among the *relatives* of Jesus, the following are named in the N. Test.: (*a*) *Mary*, Jesus's mother's sister (John xix, 25). According to the usual apprehension of this passage [see SALOME], she was married to one Clopas or Alphæus (q. v.), and had as sons James (q. v.) the younger (Acts i, 13) and Joses (Matt. xxvii, 56; Mark xv, 40). See MARY. (*b*) *Elizabeth*, who is called the relative (συγγενής, "cousin") of Mary (Luke i, 36). Respecting the degree of relationship, nothing can be determined: it has been questioned (Paulus, *Comment.* i, 78) whether she was of the tribe of Levi, but this appears certain from Luke i, 5. In a fragment of Hippolytus of Thebes (in Fabricii *Pseudepigr.* ii, 290) she is called *Sube*, the daughter of Mary's mother's sister. She was married to the priest Zacharias, and bore to him John the Baptist (Luke i, 57 sq.). See ELIZABETH. (*c*) *Brethren* of Jesus (ἀδελφοί, Matt. xii, 46, and parallel passages; John ii, 12; vii, 3, 5, 10; Acts i, 14; ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, 1 Cor. ix, 5), by the name of James, Joses (q. v.), Simon, and Judas (Matt. xiii, 55, and the parallel passage, Mark vi, 3). (On these see Clemen, in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* iii, 329 sq.; A. H. Bloom, *De τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς et ταῖς ἀδελφ. τοῦ κυρίου*, Lugd. Bat. 1839; Wieseler, in the *Studien u. Kritik.* 1842, i, 71 sq.; Schaff, *Das Verhältn. des Jacob. Brud. d. Herrn zu Jacob. Alphäi*, Berl. 1842, p. 11 sq., 34 sq.; Grimm, in the *Hall. Encycl.* 2, sect. xxiii, p. 80 sq.; *Method. Quar. Rev.* Oct. 1851, p. 670-672; on their descendants, Euseb. *Hist. Ev.* iii, 20, 33; see Körner, *De propinquor. Servatoris persecutione*, Lips. 1782.) In the passages Matt. xii, 46; xiii, 55; John ii, 12; Acts i, 14, are unquestionably to be understood proper brothers, as they are all together named conjointly with the mother of Jesus (and with Joseph, Matt. xiii, 55); the same is the natural inference from the statement (John vii, 5) that the brethren (ἀδελφοί) of Jesus had not believed in him as the Messiah. On "James, the brother of the Lord" (Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς Κυρίου, Gal. i, 19), see JAMES. These brethren were regarded as mere relatives, or, more exactly, cousins (namely, sons of Mary, Jesus's mother's sister), by the Church fathers (especially Jerome, *ad Matt.* xii, 46); also lately by Jessieu (*Authentic. epist. Jud.* p. 36 sq.), Schneckenburger (*Ep. Jac.* p. 144 sq.), Olshausen (*Comment.* i, 465 sq.), Glöckler (*Evang.* i, 407), Kuhn (*Jahrb. f. Theol. und christl. Philos.* 1834, iii, pt. i), and others, partly on the ground that the names James and Joses appear among the sons of the other Mary (Matt. xxvii,

56), partly that it is not certain that Mary, after her first conception by the Holy Spirit, ever became the mother of other children by her husband (see Origen, *in Matt.* iii, 463, ed. de la Rue; comp. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii, 1). The latter argument is of no force (see Schaff, p. 29); on the former, see below. But the term "brethren" (ἀδελφοί), since it does of itself indicate blood relatives, cannot without utter confusion be used of mere cousins in immediate connection with the mother. And if it denotes proper brothers, as also Bloom and Wieseler suppose, the question still remains whether these had both parents the same with Jesus (i. e. were his full brothers), or were the sons of Joseph by a former marriage (half-brothers; compare Theophyl. *ad* 1 *Cor.* 9). The latter opinion [see JOSEPH], which is based upon an old (Ebionitic) tradition (see Fabricius, *Pseudepigr.* i, 291; Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.* i, 109, 208, 362 sq.), is held as probable by Grotius (*ad Jac.* i, 1), Vorstius (*De Hebr. Nov. Test.* ed. Fischer, p. 71 sq.), Paulus (*Comment.* i, 6113), Bertholdt (*Einleit.* v, 656 sq.), and others; the former by Herder (*Briefe zweener Brüder J.* p. 7 sq.), Pott (*Proleg. in Ep. Jac.* p. 90), Ammon (*Bibl. Theol.* ii, 259), Eichhorn (*Einl. ins N. T.* iii, 570 sq.), Kuinöl (*ad Matt.* xii, 46), Clement (*ut sup.*), Bengel (in his *N. Archiv*, ii, 9 sq.), Stier (*Andeut.* i, 404 sq.), Fritzsche (*ad Matt.* 481), Neander (*Leb. Jesu*, p. 39 sq.), Wieseler and Schaff (*ut sup.*), and others. An intimation that favors this last view is contained in the expression "first-born" (Matt. i, 25; Luke ii, 7), which is further corroborated by the statement of abstinence from matrimonial intercourse *until* the birth of Jesus (Matt. i, 25; but see Olshausen, ad loc.), which seems to imply that the brothers in question were later sons of Joseph and Mary. The circumstance that the sister of Jesus's mother had two sons similarly named—James and Joses (or three, if we understand Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου [Luke vi, 16] to mean "*brother* of James" [see JUDAS])—is not conclusive against this view, since in two nearly-related families it is not even now unusual to find children of the same name, especially if, as in the present case, these names were in common use. Eichhorn's explanation (*ut sup.* p. 571) is based upon a long since exploded hypothesis, and requires no refutation. John xix, 26, contains no valid counter-argument: the brothers of Jesus may have become convinced by his resurrection (Matt. xxviii, 10), and, even had they been so at his death, yet perhaps the older and more spiritually-kindred John may have seemed to Jesus more suitable to carry out his last wishes than even his natural brothers (see Pott, *ut sup.* p. 76 sq.; Clement, *ut sup.* p. 360 sq.). At all events, the brothers of Jesus are not only expressed as having become at length believers in him, but they even appear somewhat later among the publishers of the Gospel (Acts i, 14; 1 Cor. ix, 5). See BROTHERS. (*d*) *Sisters* of Jesus are mentioned in Matt. xiii, 56; Mark vi, 3 (in Mark iii, 32, the words καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί are of very doubtful authenticity). Their names are not given. That we are to understand own sisters is plain from the foregoing remarks respecting his brothers. (*e*) Finally, an ecclesiastical tradition makes *Salome*, the wife of Zebedee, and mother of the apostles James and John (Mark xv, 40; xvi, 1, etc.), to have been a relative of Jesus. (See Hase, p. 55.) See SALOME.

8. Jesus was educated at Nazareth (Hase, p. 57; Weisse, *De J. C. educatione*, Helmst. 1698; Lange, *De profectib. Christi adolesc.* Altdorf, 1699), but attended no (Rabbinical) schools (John vii, 15). He appears, according to the custom of the times, to have learned the trade of his adopted father (Justin Mart. c. *Tryph.* 88, p. 316, ed. Col.; comp. Theodor. *Hist. Eccl.* iii, 23; Sozomen, vi, 2, etc.), but this he did not continue to practice at the same time with his career of teaching, as was usual with all the Rabbins (compare Neander, p. 54). By this means he may in part have acquired his subsistence (comp. Mark vi, 3; but Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 6, p. 299, denies this statement, and Tischendorf omits ὁ τέκτων). Besides, his followers supplied him with liberal presents, and, on his journeys, the Oriental usages of hospitality (John v, 45; xii, 2) served him in good stead (see Rau, *Unde Jes. alimenta vitæ acceperit*, Erlang. 1794). See HOSPITALITY. A number of grateful women also accompanied him for a considerable time, who cared for his maintenance (Luke viii, 2; Mark xv, 41). He had a common travelling-purse with the apostles (John xii, 6; xiii, 29), from which the stock of provisions for the journey was provided (Luke ix, 13; Matt. xiv, 17 sq., etc.). We certainly cannot regard Jesus as properly *poor* in the sense of indigent (see Walch, *Miscell. Sacr.* p. 866 sq.), for this appears (Henke's *Mus.* ii, 610 sq.) neither from Matt. viii, 20 (see Lunze, *De Christi divitiis et paupertate*, Lips. 1784), nor yet from 2 Cor. viii, 9 (see *Beiträge z. vernünftigen Denk.* iv, 160 sq.), and John xix, 23, rather shows the contrary (comp. Bar-Hebræus, *Chron.* p. 251); yet his parents were by no means in opulent circumstances (see Luke ii, 24; comp. Lev. xii, 8), and he himself possessed (Matt. viii, 20) at least no real estate whatever (see generally Rau, *De causis cur J. C. paupertati se subjecerit præcipuis*, Erlang. 1787; Siebenhaar, in the *Sächs. eget. Stud.* ii, 168 sq.). See HUMILIATION. During his public career of teaching, Jesus (when not travelling) staid chiefly and of choice at Capernaum (Matt. iv, 13), and only on one or two occasions (Luke iv, 16; Mark vi, 1) visited Nazareth (see Kiesling, *De J. Nazar. ingrata patria exule*, Lips. 1741). In exterior he constantly observed the customs of his people (see A. Gesenius, *Christ. decoro gentis suæ se accommodasse*, Helmst. 1734; Gude, *De Christo et discipulis ejus decori studiosis*, in the *Nov. miscellan. Lips.* iii, 563 sq.), and, far from wishing to attract attention by singularity or austerity, he took part in the pleasures of social life (John ii, 1 sq.; Luke vii, 31 sq.; Matt. xi, 16 sq.; compare ix, 14 sq.). Nevertheless, he never married (compare Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii, 191 sq.; see Schleiermacher, *Der Christliche Glaube*, 1st ed. ii, 526), for the supposition of Schulthess (*Neutest. theolog. Nachr.* 1826, i, 20 sq.; 1828, i, 102 sq.) that Jesus was married according to Jewish usage, with the addition that his wife (and, perhaps, several children by her) had died before his entrance upon public life, is a pure hypothesis that at least deserves no countenance from the silence in the N. T. as to any such occurrences; and the stupendous design already in the mind of the youthful Jesus afforded no motive for marriage, and, indeed, did not admit (compare Matt. xix, 12) such a confinement to a narrower circle (see Weisse, *Leben Jesu*, i, 249 sq.; comp. Hase, p. 109). Additional literature may be seen in Volbeding, p. 17, 18; Hase, p. 59. See NAZARENE.

9. The length of Jesus's public ministry (beginning about the 30th year of his age, Luke iii, 24; see Rosch, in the *Brem. u. Verd. Biblioth.* iii, 813 sq.), as well as the chronological sequence of the single events related in the Gospels, is very variously estimated. (See Hase, p. 17.) The first three evangelists give, as the scene of their transactions (after his temptation and the imprisonment of the Baptist, Matt. iv, 1–13), almost exclusively *Galilee* (*De Galilæa opportuno Servatoris miraculor. theatro*, Gött. 1775), inasmuch as Jesus had his residence then in the city Capernaum, especially in the winter months (Matt. iv, 13; viii, 5; xvii, 24; Mark i, 21; ii, 1, etc.). For the most part, we find him in the romantic and thickly settled neighborhood of the Sea of Tiberias, or upon its surface (Matt. viii, 23 sq.; xiii, 1 sq.; xiv, 13; Luke viii, 22), also on the other side in Peræa (Matt. viii, 28; Luke viii, 26; Mark vii, 31). Once he went as far as within the Phœnician boundaries (Matt. xv, 21; Mark vii, 24 sq.). But in the synoptical gospels he only appears *once* to have visited Jerusalem, at the time of the last Passover (Matt. xxi sq.; Mark xi sq.; Luke xix sq.). According to this, the duration of his teaching might be limited to a *single* year (Euseb. iii, 24), and many (appealing to Luke iv, 19; comp. Isa. lxi, 1 sq.; see Origen, *Hom.* 32; comp. Tertull. *Adv. Jud.* c. 8; but see Körner, p. 4) already in the ancient Church (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i, p. 147; Origen, *Princip.* iv, 5) only

allow this space to his public mission (compare Mann, *Three Years of the Birth and Death of Christ*, p. 161; Priestly, *Harmony of the Evangelists*, London, 1774, ii, 4; Browne, *Ordo Sæclorum*, p. 634 sq.); although, independently of all the others, Luke vi, 1 (*second-first* Sabbath) affords indication of a second Passover which Jesus celebrated during his public career. See SABBATH.

On the other hand, John's Gospel shows (comp. Jacobi, *Zur Chronol. d. Lebens J. im Evang. Joh.* in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, iv, 845 sq.) that Jesus was not only oftener, but generally in Judæa (whence he once travelled through Samaria to Galilee, John iv, 4; compare his return, Luke xvii, 11), namely, in the holy city Jerusalem (but this difference agrees with the respective designs of the several gospels; see Neander, p. 385 sq.), and informs us of *five* Jewish festivals which Jesus celebrated at Jerusalem. The first, occurring soon after the baptism of Jesus (John ii, 13), is a Passover; the second (John v, 1) is called indefinitely "a feast of the Jews" (ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων); the third was the Festival of Tabernacles (John vii, 2); the fourth the Feast of Dedication (John x, 22); and, lastly, the fifth (John xii, xiii) again a Passover: mention is also made (John vi, 4) of still another Passover which Jesus spent in Galilee. Hence it would seem that Jesus was engaged some three years (Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii, p. 67) as a public teacher; and if by the "feast" of John v, 1 we are also to understand a Passover (Paulus, *Comm.* i, 901 sq.; Süskind, in Bengel's *Archiv.* i, 182 sq.; B. Crusius, ad loc.; Seyffarth, *Chronol. Sacra*, p. 114; Robinson, *Harmony*, p. 193), which, however, is not certain (Lücke, ad loc.; Anger, *De temp. in Act. Apost. ratione*, i, 24 sq.; Jacobi, *ut sup.* p. 864 sq.), we must assign a period of three and a half years (Eusebius, i, 10, 3), as lately Seyffarth has done (*Summary of recent Discoveries in Chronol.* N. Y. 1857, p. 183), although on the most singular grounds (see Alford, *Commentary* on John v, 1). Otherwise the evangelists hardly afford more than two years and a few months (see Anger, *ut sup.* p. 28; Hase, p. 17 sq.) to the public labors of Jesus (see generally Laurbeck, *De annis ministerii Chr.*, Altdorf, 1700; Körner, *Quot Paschata Christus post baptism. celebraverit*, Lips. 1779; Pries, *De numero Paschatum Christi*, Rostock, 1789; Lahode, *De die et anno ult. Pasch. Chr.* Hal. 1749; Marsh's remarks in Michaelis's *Introd.* ii, 46 sq.). Again, as the apostles were not uninterruptedly in company with Jesus, the time of their proper association with him might be still further reduced somewhat, although we can not (with Hänlein, *De temporis, quo J. C. cum Apostol. versatus est, duratione*, Erl. 1796) assume it to have been barely some nine months. Under these three (or four) Paschal festivals writers have repeatedly endeavored, for historical and particularly apologetic purposes, to arrange all the single occurrences which the first evangelists mention without chronological sequence, and so to obtain a complete chronological view of Jesus's entire journeys and teaching. Yet, notwithstanding so great a degree of ingenuity has been expended upon this subject, none of the Gospel Harmonies hitherto constructed can be regarded as more than a series of historical conjectures, since the narrative of the first three evangelists presents but little that can guide to a measurably certain conclusion in such an arrangement, and John himself does not appear to relate the incidents in strictly chronological order according to these Passovers (see generally Eichhorn, *Einl. ins N. T.* i, 692 sq.). The most important of these attempts are, Lightfoot, *Chronicle of the O. and N. T.* Lond. 1655; Doddridge, *Expositor of the N. T.* London. 1739; Rus, *Harmonia Evangelistar.* Jen. 1727; Macknight, *Harmony of the four Gospels*, London, 1756, Latine fecit notasque adjecit Rückersfelder, Brem. 1772; Bengel, *Richt. Harmonie der 4 Evangel.* 3d edit. Tübing. 1766; Newcome, *Harmony of the Gospels*, Dublin, 1778; Paulus, *Comment.* i, 446 sq.; ii, 1 sq., 384 sq.; iii, 82 sq.; Kaiser, *Ueb. die synopt. Zusammenstell. der 4 Evang.* Nuremb. 1828; Clausen, *Quat. evangel. tabulæ synopt. sec. rationem tempor.* Copenhagen, 1829; Wieseler, *Chronolog. Synopse der 4 Evang.* Hamb. 1843; Townsend's *Chronol. Arrang. of the N. Test.* Lond. 1821, Bost. 1837; Greswell, *Harmonia Evang.* Lond. 1830; Robinson, *Harmony of the Gospels* (Greek), Bost. 1845 (Engl. id.); Tischendorf, *Synopsis Evangel.* Leipz. 1851; Strong, *Harmony of the Gospels* (English), N. Y. 1852 (Greek), ib. 1854; Stroud, *Greek Harmony*, Lond. 1853. See HARMONIES.

10. Besides the twelve apostles (q. v.), Jesus also chose seventy (q. v.) persons as a second more private order (Luke x, 1 sq.), who have been supposed by some to correspond to some Jewish notion of the seventy nations of the world, inasmuch as Luke shows a tendency to such generalization; but this number was probably selected (see Kuinöl, ad loc.) with reference to the seventy elders of the Jews (Numb. xi, 16 sq.), composing the Sanhedrim, just as the twelve apostles represented the twelve tribes of Israel (compare generally Burmann, *Exercit. Acad.* ii, 95 sq.; Heumann, *De 70 Christi legatis*, Gotting. 1743). Their traditional names (see Assemani, *Biblioth. Or.* III, i, 319 sq.: Fabric. *Lux*, p. 115 sq.), some of which are cited by Eusebius (i, 12), might have some historical ground but for the manifest endeavor to place in the illustrious rank of the seventy every conspicuous individual of the apostolical age, concerning whom nothing positive was known to the contrary. The account of Luke himself has sometimes been called in question as unhistorical (Strauss, i, 566 sq.; Schwegler, *Nachapost. Zeitalter*, ii, 45; see, on the other hand, Neander, p. 541 sq.).

Respecting the characteristics of Jesus's teaching (see especially Winkler, *Ueber J. Lehrfähigkeit und Lehrart*, Leipz. 1797; Behn, *Ueb. die Lehrart Jesu u. seiner Apostel*, Lübeck, 1791; Hauff, *Bemerkungen über die Lehrart Jesu*, Offenbach, 1788; H. Ballauf, *Die Lehrart Jesu als vortrefflich gezeigt*, Hannov. 1817; H. N. la Clé, *De Jesu Ch. instituendi methodo hom. ingenia excolente*, Groning. 1835; Ammon, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 328 sq.; Planck, *Geschichte d. Christenth.* i, 161 sq.; Hase, *Leben Jes.* p. 123 sq.; Neander, p. 151 sq.; Weisse, i, 376 sq.), we may remark that all his discourses, which were delivered sometimes in the synagogues (Matt. xiii, 54; Luke iv, 22, etc.), sometimes in public places, and even in the open field, sometimes in the Temple court, were suggested on the occasion (John iv, 32 sq.; vii, 37 sq.), either by some transaction or natural phenomenon, or else by some recital (Luke xiii, 1), or expression of others (Matt. viii, 10). He loved especially to clothe his sentiments in comparisons (see Greiling, p. 201 sq.), parables (Matt. xiii, 11 sq., 34 sq.) (for these are pre-eminently distinguished for simplicity, conciseness, natural beauty, intelligibleness, and dignity; see especially Unger, *De parabolar. Jesu natura, interpretatione, usu*, Leipz. 1828), allegories (John vi, 32 sq.; x; xv), and apothegms (Matt. v), sometimes also paradoxes (John ii, 19; vi, 53; viii, 58), which exactly suited the comprehension of his audience (Mark iv, 33; Luke xiii, 15 sq.; xiv, 5 sq.); and he even adapted the novelty and peculiarity of his doctrines to familiar Jewish forms, which in his mouth lose that ruggedness and unæsthetic character in which they have come down to us in the Talmud (comp. Weisse, *De more Domini acceptos a magistris Jud. loquendi ac disserendi modos sapienter emendandi*, Viteb. 1792). See ALLEGORY; PARABLE. In contests with learned Jews, Jesus knew how, by simple clearness of intellect, to defeat their arrogant dialectics, and yet was able to pursue their own method of inferential argument (Matt. xii, 25). When they proposed to him captious questions, he brought them, not unfrequently by similar questions, mostly in the form of a dilemma (Matt. xxi, 24; xxii, 20; Luke x, 29 sq.; xx, 3 sq.), or by appeal to the explicit written law or to their sacred history (Matt. ix, 13; xii, 3 sq.; xix, 4 sq.; Luke vi, 2 sq.; x, 26 sq.; xx, 28 sq.), or by analogies from ordinary life (Matt. xii, 10 sq.), to maintain silence, or put them to embarrassment with all their sagacity and legal zeal (Matt. xxii, 42 sq.; John viii, 3 sq.); sometimes he disarmed them by the exercise of his miraculous power (Luke v, 24). With a

few exceptions, John alone assigns longer speeches of a dogmatic character to Jesus; nor is it any matter of surprise that the Wisdom which delivered itself to the populace in maxims and similes should permit itself to be understood, in the circle of the priests and those erudite in the law, connectedly and mystically on topics of the higher *gnosis*, although even in John, of course, we can not expect the *ipsissima verba*. In a formal treatment, moreover, his representations, especially those addressed to the people, could not be free from *accommodation* (P. van Hemert, *Ueb. Accommod. im N. T.* Dortmund and Leipz. 1797); but whether he made use of the material (not merely negative) species of accommodation is not a historical, but a dogmatic question (comp. thereon Bretschneider, *Handb. d. Dogm.* i, 420 sq.; Wegscheider, *Institut.* p. 119 sq.; De Wette, *Sittenlehre*, iii, 131 sq.; Neander, p. 216 sq.). See ACCOMMODATION. Like the O.-T. prophets, he sometimes also employed symbolical acts (John xiii, 1 sq., 20, 22; comp. Luke ix, 47 sq.). A dignified expression, a keen but affectionate look, a gesticulation reflecting the inward inspiration (Hegemeister, *Christum gestus pro concione usurpasse*, Servest. 1774), may have contributed not a little to the force of his words, and gained for him, in opposing the Pharisees and lawyers, the eulogium of eloquence (compare John vii, 46; xviii, 6; Matt. vii, 28 sq.). The tuition which Jesus imparted to the apostles (comp. Greiling, p. 213 sq.), was apparently private (Matt. xiii, 11 sq.; see Cölln, *Bibl. Theol.* ii, 14). See APOSTLE. Finally, Jesus commonly spoke Syro-Chaldee (comp. e. g. Mark iii, 17; v, 41; vii, 34; Matt. xxvii, 47; see Malala, *Chronograph.* p. 13), like the Palestinian Jews generally [see LANGUAGE], not Greek (Diodati, *De Christo Græce loquente*, Neap. 1767, translated in the *Am. Bibl. Repos.* Jan. 1844, p. 180 sq.; comp. on the contrary, Ernesti, *Neueste theol. Bibl.* i, 269 sq.), although he might have understood the latter language, or even Latin (Wernsdorf, *De Christo Latine loquente*, Viteb.; see generally Reiske, *De lingua vern. J. C.* Jen. 1670; Bh. de Rossi, *Della lingua propria di Christo*, Parm. 1773; Zeibich, *De lingua Judæor. temp. Christi et. Apost.* Vitebsk, 1791; Wisemann, in his *Hor. Syriac.* Rom. 1828). No *writings* of his are extant (the spuriousness of the so-called letter to the king of Edessa, given by Eusebius, i, 13, is evident; comp. also Röhr's *Krit. Prediger-biblioth.* i, 161 sq. [see ABGAR]: the alleged written productions of Jesus may be seen in Fabricii *Cod. Apocr.* i, 303 sq.), nor was there need of any, since he had provided for the immediate dissemination of his doctrines through the apostles, and he wished even to turn away attention from the literature of the age to the spirit and life of a thorough piety (compare Hauff, *Briefe d. Werth der schriftl. Rel.-Urkund. betreffend*, i, 94 sq.; Sartorius, *Cur Christus scripti nihil reliquerit*, Leipz. 1815; Witting, *Warum J. nichts Schriftl. hinterlassen*, Bschw. 1822; Giesecke, *Warum hat J. C. über sich u. s. Relig. nichts Schriftl. hinterlassen*, Lüneb. 1823; B. Crusius, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 22 sq.; Neander, p. 150; comp. Hase, p. 11). Jesus has been improperly entitled a Rabbi, or high rank of religious teacher (רַבִּי, ῥαββί), in the sense of the Jewish schools, as having been thus styled not only by the populace (Mark x, 51; John xx, 16), or his disciples (John i, 39, 50; iv, 31; ix, 2; xi, 8; Matt. xxvi, 25, etc.), but also by Nicodemus (John iii, 2), and even his enemies (vi, 25) themselves (Vitringa, *Synag. vet.* p. 706; Paulus, *Leben Jes.* i, 122 sq.; see, on the contrary, C. E. Schmid, *De promotione acad. Christo ejusque discipulis perperam tributa*, Lips. 1740). In the time of Jesus persons had no occasion to aspire to the formality of learned honors, as in later ages (Neander, p. 50), and Jesus had little sympathy with such an ostentatious spirit (John vii, 15). See RABBI. (Additional literature may be seen in Volbeding, p. 25.) See PROPHET.

11. The Jews expected miracles of the Messiah (John vii, 31; 4 Esdr. xiii, 50; comp. Matt. viii, 17; John xx, 30 sq.; see Bertholdt, *Christologia Judæor.* p. 168 sq.), such as Jesus performed (τέρατα, σημεῖα, δυνάμεις). These all had a moral tendency, and aimed at beneficent results (on Matt. viii, 28 sq., see Paulus, ad loc.; Bretschneider, *Handb. d. Dogm.* i, 307 sq.; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 134; on Matt. xxi, 18 sq., see Fleck, *Vertheid. d. Christenth.* p. 138 sq.), in which respects they are in striking contrast with the silly thaumaturgy of the apocryphal gospels (see Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigk. d. evang. Gesch.* p. 406 sq.), consisting mostly of raising the dead and the cure (Mark vi, 56) of such maladies as had baffled all scientific remedies (insanity, epilepsy, palsy, leprosy, blindness, etc.). He asked no reward (comp. Matt. x, 8), and performed no miracles to gratify curiosity (Matt. xvi, 1 sq.; Mark viii, 11 sq.), or to excite the astonishment of a sensuous populace; rather he repeatedly forbade the public report of his extraordinary deeds (Matt. ix, 30; Mark i, 44; vii, 36; viii, 26; Luke v, 14; viii, 56; Plitt, in the *Hess. Hebopfer*, 1850, p. 890 sq., takes an erroneous view of Mark v, 19, for in verse 20 Jesus bids the man relate his cure to *his relatives* only), and he avoided the popular outbursts of joy, which would have swelled loudly at his particularly successful achievements (John v, 13), only suffering these miracles to be acknowledged to the honor of God (Luke viii, 39 sq.; xvii, 16 sq.): In effecting cures he sometimes made use of some means (Mark vii, 33; viii, 23; John ix, 6 sq.; comp. Spinoza, *Tract. theol. pol.* c. 6, p. 244, ed. Paul.; *Med.-herm. Untersuch.* p. 335 sq.; Paulus, *Leben Jesu*, i, 223), but in general he employed simply a word (Matt. viii, 1 sq.; John v, 8, etc.), even at a distance (Matt. viii, 5 sq.; Luke vii, 6 sq.; John iv, 50), or merely a touch of the invalid (Matt. viii, 3, 15) or the afflicted member (blind eyes, Matt. ix, 29; xx, 34; see Seiler, *Christ. an in operibus mirabilib. arcanis usus sit remediis*, Erlang. 1795; also, *Jesus an miracula suis ipsius viribus ediderit*, ib. 1799); on the other hand, likewise, a cure was experienced when the infirm touched his garment (Matt. ix, 20 sq.; xiv, 36), but in such a case always on the presumption of a firm faith (Matt. ix, 28; compare John v, 6), so that when this failed the miraculous power was not exercised (Matt. xiii, 58; Mark xi, 5). On this very account some moderns have asserted (Gutsmuth, *Diss. de Christo Med.* Jen. 1812 [on the opposite, Ammon's *Theolog. Journ.* i, 177 sq.]; Ennemoser. *Magnetism.* p. 473 sq.; Kieser, *Syst. des Tellurism.* ii, 502 sq.; Meyer, *Naturanalogien od. die Erschein. d. anim. Magnet. mit Hins. auf Theol.* Hamb. 1839; comp. Weisse, i, 349 sq.) that these cures were principally effected by Jesus through the agency of animal magnetism (comp. Luke viii, 48; see generally Pfau, *De Christo academ. N. T. medico primario*, Erlang. 1743; Schulthess, in the *Neuest. theol. Nachr.* 1829, p. 360 sq.). See HEALING. That the Jewish Rabbis and the Essenes performed, or perhaps only pretended to perform, similar cures, at least upon dæmoniacs, appears from Matt. xii, 27; Luke xi, 19; Mark ix, 38 sq.; comp. Josephus, *War*, ii, 8, 6; *Ant.* viii, 2, 5). The sentiments of Jesus himself as to the value and tendency of his miracles are undeniable: he disapproved that eagerness for wonders displayed by his contemporaries (Matt. xvi, 1; John ii, 18) which sprung from sensuous curiosity or from pure malevolence (Matt. xii, 39; xvi, 4; Mark viii, 11 sq.), or else had a thankless regard merely to their own advantage (John iv, 48; vi, 24), but which ever desired miracles merely as such, while he regarded them as a national method for attaining his purpose of awakening and calling forth faith (John xi, 42; comp. Matt. xi, 4 sq.; Luke vii, 21 sq.), and hence often lamented their ineffectualness (Matt. xi, 20 sq.; Luke x, 13; see especially Nitzsch, *Quantum Christus miraculis tribuerit*, Viteb. 1796; Schott, *Opusc.* i, 111 sq.; Lehnerdt, *De nonnullis Chr. effatis unde ipse quid quantumq. tribuerit miraculis cognoscetur*, Regiom. 1833; comp. Paulus, in the *Neu. theol. Journ.* ix, 342 sq., 413 sq.; Storr, in Flatt's *Magaz.* iv, 178 sq.; Eiseln. in the *Kirchenblätter für das Bisth. Rottenburg*, i, 161 sq.; De Wette, *Biblisch. Dogm.* p. 196 sq.; Strauss, *Glaubenslehre*, i, 86 sq.). As an undeniably effective means of introducing Christianity, these miracles have ever retained a profound significance, of which they cannot be

deprived by any efforts to explain them on natural principles (*Br. üb. Rationalismus*, p. 215 sq.), or to ascribe them to traditional exaggeration; for all investigations of this character have as yet generally resulted only in a contorted exegesis, and are oftentimes more difficult of belief than the miraculous incidents themselves (see on the subject generally Köster, *Immanuel oder Charact. der neutest. Wundererzählungen*, Lpz. 1821; Johannsen, in Schröter and Klein's *Opposi.ionschr.* v, 571 sq.; vi, 31 sq.; Müller, *De mirac. J. Ch. nat. et necess.* Marburg and Hal. 1839; Neander, p. 256 sq.). See MIRACLE.

12. Several of the circumstances of Christ's passion (q. v.) are explained under BLOODY SWEAT, CROSS, LITHOSTROTON, PILATE, ECLIPSE, etc. (compare Merillii *Notæ in passion. J. Chr.* Par. 1622, Frcf. and Lips. 1740; Walther, *Jurist.-histor. Betracht. üb. d. Geschichte u. d. Leid. u. Sterb. Christi*, Breslau, 1738, 1774; *Die Leidensgesch. Jesu exegetisch und archäolog. bearbeitet*, Stuttg. 1809; Hug, in the *Zeitschr. f. d. Erzbisth. Freiburg*, v, 1 sq.; Friedlieb, *Archäol. d. Leidensgesch.* Bonn, 1843). The question of the legality or illegality of the sentence of death pronounced upon Jesus by the Sanhedrim and procurator has of late been warmly discussed (see, for the former view, Salvador, *Histoire des institutions de Moïse*, Bruxel. 1822, ii, c. 3; also, *Jésus Christ et sa doctrine*, Par. 1838; Hase, *Leben Jes.* p. 197 sq.; on the opposite, Dupin, *L'ainé Jésus devant Caïphe et Pilate*, Par. 1829; Ammon, *Fortbild.* i, 341 sq.; B. Crusius, *Opusc.* p. 149 sq.; Neander, p. 683 sq.; comp. also Daumer, *Syst. der specul. Philos.* p. 41 sq.; and Neubig, *Ist J. mit voll. Rechte den Tod eines Verbrechers gestorben?* Erl. 1836). The Sanhedrim condemned Jesus as a blasphemer of God (Matt. xxvi, 65 sq.; Mark xiv, 64; compare John xix, 7), for which the Law prescribed capital punishment (Lev. xxiv, 16); but he would have been guilty of this crime if he had falsely claimed (Matt. xxvi, 63 sq.; Luke xxii, 67 sq.) to be the Messiah (Son of God), and the fact of this profession was substantiated indirectly by witnesses (Matt. xxvi, 60 sq.; Mark xiv, 57 sq.), and directly by Jesus's own declaration (Matt. xxvi, 63 sq.; Mark xiv, 61 sq.). So far the transaction might seem to be tolerably regular, except that swearing the prisoner as to his own crime is an unheard-of process in law. Moreover, there was more than a single superficial examination of witnesses (Matt. xxvi, 60), and Jesus had really uttered (John ii, 19) what the deponents averred. But that Jesus could not be the Messiah was presupposed by the Sanhedrim on the ground of their Christological views; and here were they chiefly to blame. More exact inquiries concerning the teachings and acts of Jesus would have surely corrected their impression that Jesus was a blasphemer, and perhaps led them to a rectification of their expectations respecting the Messiah. Another point is entitled to consideration in estimating their judicial action. The Sanhedrim's broader denunciation of Jesus before Pilate as a usurper of royal power, and their charging him with treason (*crimen læsæ majestatis*) (Matt. xxvii, 11; Mark xv, 2; Luke xxiii, 2; John xviii, 33), is explained by the fact that the Messiah was to be a theocratic king, and that the populace for a few days saluted Jesus with huzzas as the Son of David (Matt. xxi: John xii). Jesus certainly did not aspire to royalty in the political sense, as he declared before Pilate (John xviii, 36 sq.): this the Sanhedrim, if they had been dispassionate judges, must have been assured of, even if they had not previously inquired or ascertained how far Jesus was from pretensions to political authority. The sentence itself is therefore less to be reprobated than that the high court did not, as would have been worthy itself, become better informed respecting the charges; their indecorous haste evinces an eagerness to condemn the prisoner at all hazards, and their vindictive manner clearly betrays their personal malice against him. That Pilate passed and executed the sentence of death contrary to his better judgment as a civil officer is beyond all doubt. See PILATE.

That Jesus passed through a merely apparent death has been supposed by many (see especially Bahrdt, *Zwecke Jesu*, x, 174 sq.; Paulus, *Comment.* iii, 810 sq., and *Leben Jesu*, I, ii, 281 sq.; on the contrary, see Richter, *De morte Servatoris in cruce*, Gött. 1757, also in his *Diss.* 4 *med.* p. 1 sq.; Gruner, *De Jes. C. morte vera, non simulata*, Jena, 1805; Schmidtmann, *Medic.-philos. Beweis, dass J. nach s. Kreuzigung nicht von einer todtähnl. Ohnmacht befallen gewesen*, Osnabr. 1830). The piercing of the side of Jesus by the lance of a Roman soldier (John xix, 34; his name is traditionally given as *Longinus*, see Thilo, *Apocr.* p. 586) has been regarded as the chief circumstance upon which everything here depends (Triller, *De mirando lateris cordisque Christi vulnere*, in Gruner's *Tract. de dæmoniacis*, Jena, 1775; Eschenbach, *Scripta med.-bibl.* p. 82 sq.; Bartholini, *De latere Christi aperto*, Lugd. Bat. 1646), inasmuch as *before* this puncture the above cited physicians assume but a torpor and *swoon*, which might seem the more probable because crucifixion could hardly have caused death in so short a time (Mark xv, 44). See CRUCIFY. But the account of the wound in the side is not such as to allow the question to be by that means fully and absolutely determined (see *Briefe über Rationalismus*, p. 236 sq.), since the evangelist does not state *which* side (πλευρά) was pierced, nor *where*, nor *how deeply*. It is therefore surely a precarious argument to presume the *left* side (although the position of the soldier, holding the spear in his right hand and thrusting it opposite him, would strongly countenance this supposition), and equally so to assume a very deep incision, penetrating the pericardium and *heart*, thus changing a swoon into actual death; nevertheless, comp. John xx, 25, 26, in favor of this last particular. The purpose of the stab—to ascertain whether the crucified person was still alive—also demanded a forcible thrust, and the issue of blood and water vouched for by the evangelist (ἐξῆλθεν εὐθὺς αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ, perhaps a hendiadys for *bloody water*) would certainly point to real death as immediately resulting. By this we must understand the clotted blood (*cruor*) in connection with the watery portion (*serum*), which both flow together from punctures of the larger blood-vessels (*veins*) of bodies just dead (from the *arteries* of the breast, as supposed by Hase [*Leb. Jesu*, 2d ed. p. 193], no blood would issue, for these are usually empty in a corpse), and the piercing of the *side* would therefore not cause, but only indicate death. See BLOOD AND WATER. In fine, the express assertion of the evangelists, that Jesus breathed his last (ἐξέπνευσε [Mark xv, 37; Luke xxiii, 46], a term exactly equivalent to the Latin *expiravit*, he *expired*, and so doubtless to be understood in its common acceptance of death), admits no other hypothesis than that of actual and complete dissolution. See AGONY.

The fact of the return of Jesus alive from the grave (comp. Ammon, *De vera J. C. reviviscentia*, Erlang. 1808; Griesbach, *De fontib. unde Evangel. suas de resurrectione Domini narrationes hauserint*, Jena, 1783; Friedrich, in Eichhorn's *Biblioth.* vii, 204 sq.; Döderl. *De J. C. in vit. reditu*, Utr. 1841) is not invalidated by Strauss's ingenious hypotheses (ii, 645; see Hase, p. 212; Theile, p. 105 sq.; comp. Kühn, *Wie ging Ch. durch des Grabes Thür*, Stral. 1838); but if Jesus had been merely dead in appearance, so delicate a constitution, already exhausted by sufferings before crucifixion, would certainly not have revived without special—that is, medical—assistance (Neander, p. 708): in the cold rock-vault, in an atmosphere loaded with the odor of aromatics, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes, in utter prostration, he would, in the *ordinary* course of things, have rather been killed than resuscitated. His return to life must therefore be regarded as a true miracle. See RESURRECTION. On the grave of Jesus, see GOLGOTHA.

After he had risen (he lay some thirty-six hours in the grave; not three full days, as asserted by Seyffarth, *Summary of Chronol. Discor.* N. Y. 1857, p. 188), he first showed himself to Mary Magdalene (Matt. xxviii, 9;

Mark xvi, 9; John xx, 14; but about the same hour to the other women, see Strong's *Greek Harmony*, p. 364), then to his apostles in various places in and about Jerusalem (Luke xxiv, 13 sq., 36 sq.; John xx, 19 sq.), and was recognised by them—not immediately, it is true (for the few past days of suffering may have considerably disfigured him bodily), but yet unequivocally—as their crucified teacher (Neander, p. 715 sq.), and even handled, although with some reserve (Luke xxiv, 37; John xxi, 12). He did not appear in public; had he done so, his enemies would have found opportunity to remove him a second time out of the way, or to represent him to the people as a sham Jesus: his resurrection could have its true significance to his believers only (see generally Jahn, *Nachträge*, p. 1 sq.). After a stay of 40 days, he was visibly carried up into the sky before the eyes of his disciples (Luke xxiv, 51; Acts i, 9. Mark xvi, 19, is of doubtful authenticity). Of this, three evangelical witnesses (Matthew, Mark, and John) relate nothing (for very improbable reasons of this, see Flatt's *Magaz.* viii, 55 sq.), although the last implies it in the words of Jesus, "I ascend to my Father," and closes his Gospel with the last interview of Jesus in Galilee, at the Sea of Tiberias (John xxi; compare Matt. xxviii, 16). The apostles, in the doctrinal expositions, occasionally allude to this ascension (ἀνάληψις) of Jesus (Acts iii, 21; 1 Tim. iii, 16; Rev. xii, 5), and often speak (Acts ii, 33; v, 31; vii, 55, 56; Rom. viii, 34; Eph. i, 20; Col. iii, 1) of Christ as seated at the right hand of God (see Griesbach, *Sylloge locor. N. T. ad adscens. Christi in cœl. spectantium*, Jena, 1793; also in his *Opuscul.* ii, 471 sq.; B. Crusius, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 400). Over the final disposal of the body of Christ after its ascension from the earth, an impenetrable veil must ever rest. The account of the ascension (see *Stud. und Krit.* 1841, iii, 597 sq.) is still treated by many of the critical theologians (comp. Ammon, *Ascensus J. C. in cœl. histor. Bibl.* Gotting. 1800, also in his *Nov. opusc. theol.*; Horst, in Horn's *Götting. Museum f. Theol.* I, ii, 3 sq.; *Br. über Rational.* p. 238 sq.; Strauss, ii, 672 sq.; Hase, p. 220) as one of the myths (moulded on the well-known O.-T. examples, Gen. v, 24; 2 Kings ii, 11, and serving as a basis of the expectation of his visible return from heaven, Acts i, 11; for, that the Jews of that day believed in an ascension of the Messiah to heaven [comp. John vi, 62], appears from the book *Zohar* [Schöttgen, *Horæ Hebr.* ii, 596]: the comparisons with heathen apotheoses are not in point [B. Hasse, *Historiæ de Chr. in vitum et cœl. redeunte ex narrat. Liv. de Romulo illustratio*, Regiom. 1805; Gfrörer, *Urchristenth.* I, ii, 374 sq.], and the theories of Bauer in Flatt's *Mag.* xvi, 173 sq., Seiler, Weichert, and Himly [see Bretschneider, *Syst. Entwickel.* p. 589; Otterbein, *De adscensione in cœlum adspectabili modo facta*, Duisb. 1802; or Fogtmann, *Comm. de in cœlum adscensu*, Havn. 1826] are as little to the purpose) that originated among the Christians, or were even invented by the apostles (Gramberg, *Religionsid.* ii, 461)—a view that is forbidden by the close proximity of the incident in point of time (*London* [Wesleyan] *Review*, July, 1861). It can, therefore, only be regarded as a preternatural occurrence (Neander, p. 726). See ASCENSION.

13. Respecting the *personal appearance* of Jesus we know nothing with certainty. According to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* vii, 18), the woman who was cured of her hæmorrhage (Matt. ix, 20) had erected from thankfulness a brazen statue (see Hasæi *Dissertat. sylloge*, p. 314 sq.; comp. Heinichen, *Exc.* 10 *ad Eusebius*, iii, 397 sq.; Thilo, *Cod. apocr.* i, 562 sq.) of Jesus at Paneas (Cæsarea-Philippi), which was destroyed (Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* v, 21) at the command of the emperor Julian (compare Niceph. *Hist. Eccl.* vi, 15). Jesus himself, according to several ancient (but scarcely trustworthy) statements (Evagr. iv, 27; Niceph. ii, 7), sent his likeness to Abgarus (q. v.) at Edessa (comp. Bar-Hebr. *Chron.* p. 118), where was also said to have been found the handkerchief of Christ with an imprint of his countenance (Cedrenus, *Hist.* p. 176; Bar-Hebræus, *Chron.* p. 163). Still another figure of Jesus is also mentioned (Nicephorus, *ut supr.*; this credulous historian names the evangelist Luke as the painter successively of Jesus, Mary, and several apostles), and a certain Publius Lentulus, a Roman officer (according to one MS. a *proconsul*) is reported to have composed a description of Christ's personal appearance, which (with great variation of the text) is still exhibited as extant (comp. Fabricii *Cod. apocr. N. Test.* i, 301 sq.; *Pseudolentuli, Joa. Damasc. et Niceph.* [*Hist. Eccles.* i, 40] *prosopograph. J. C.* edit. Carpzov, Helmst. 1774). This last, according to the text of Gabler (in Latin), reads as follows: "A man of tall stature, good appearance, and a venerable countenance, such as to inspire beholders both with love and awe. His hair, worn in a circular form and curled, rather dark and shining, flowing over the shoulders, and parted in the middle of the head, after the style of the Nazarenes. His forehead, smooth and perfectly serene, with a face free from wrinkle or spot, and beautified with a moderate ruddiness, and a faultless nose and mouth. His beard full, of an auburn color like his hair, not long, but parted. His eyes quick and clear. His aspect terrible in rebuke, placid and amiable in admonition, cheerful without losing its gravity: a person never seen to laugh, but often to weep," etc. (compare Niceph. i, 40). (See Volbeding, p. 6.) The description given by Epiphanius (*Monach.* p. 29, ed. Dressel) has lately been discovered by Tischendorf (*Cod. Ven.* cl. i, cod. 3, No. 12,000) in a somewhat different and perhaps more original form (in Greek), as follows: "But my Christ and God was exceedingly beautiful in countenance. His stature was fully developed, his height being six feet. He had auburn hair, quite abundant, and flowing down mostly over his whole person. His eyebrows were black, and not highly arched; his eyes brown, and bright. He had a family likeness, in his fine eyes, prominent nose, and good color, to his ancestor David, who is said to have had beautiful eyes and a ruddy complexion. He wore his hair long, for a razor never touched it; nor was it cut by any person, except by his mother in his childhood. His neck inclined forward a little, so that the posture of his body was not too upright or stiff. His face was full, but not quite so round as his mother's; tinged with sufficient color to make it handsome and natural; mild in expression, like the blandness in the above description of his mother, whose features his own strongly resembled." This production bears evident marks of being a later fabrication (see Gabler, 2 *Progr. in authentiam epist. Lentuli*, etc., Jen. 1819, 1822; also in his *Opusc.* ii, 638 sq.). There is still another notice of a similar kind (see the *Jen. Lit.-Zeit.* 1821, sheet 40), and also an account of the figure of Jesus, which the emperor Alexander Severus is said to have had in his *lararium* or household shrine (see Zeibich in the *Nov. Miscell. Lips.* iii, 42 sq.). See CHRIST, IMAGES OF.

From the New Test. the following particulars only may be gathered: Jesus was free from bodily defects (for so much is implied in the type of an unblemished victim under the law, and otherwise the people would not have recognised in him a prophet, while the Pharisees would have been sure to throw any physical deformity in his teeth), but his exterior could have presented nothing remarkable, since Mary-Magdalene mistook him for the gardener (John xx, 15), and the two disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luke xxiv, 16), as well as the apostles at his last appearance by the Sea of Gennesareth (John xxi, 4 sq.), did not at first recognise him; but his form then probably bore many permanent marks of his severe sufferings. The whole evangelical narrative indicates sound and vigorous bodily health. In look and voice he must have had something wonderful (John xviii, 6), but at the same time engaging and benevolent: his outward air was the expression of the high, noble, and free spirit dwelling within him. The assertions of the Church fathers (Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* iii, 92; *Strom.* vi, 93; Origen, *Cels.* vi, 327, ed. Spenc.) that Christ had an unprepossessing appearance are of no authority, being

evidently conformed to Isa. liii (but see Piiartii *Assertio de singulari J. Ch. pulchritudine*, Par. 1651; see generally, in addition to the above authorities, F. Vavassor, *De forma Christi*, Paris, 1649; on the portraits of Jesus, Reiske, *De imaginibus Christi*, Jena, 1685; Jablonsky, *Opusc.* edit. Te Water, iii, 377; Junker, *Ueber Christusköpfe*, in Meusel's *Miscell. artist. Inh.* pt. 25, p. 28 sq.; Ammon, *Ueb. Christusköpfe*, in his *Magazin. f. christl. Pred.* I, ii, 315 sq.; Tholuck, *Literar. Anzeig.* 1834, No. 71; Grimm, *Die Sage und Ursprung der Christusbilder*, Berl. 1843; Mrs. Jameson, *Hist. of our Lord exemplified in Works of Art* [Lond. 1865]). (See further in Volbeding, p. 19; Hase, p. 65; *Meth. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1862, p. 679.)

14. It might be an interesting question, had we the means of accurately determining, how and by what instrumentalities Jesus, in a *human* point of view, attained his spiritual power, or to what influence (aside from divine inspiration) he owed his intellectual formation as a founder of religion (Ammon, *Bibl. Theolog.* i, 234 sq.; *Handbuch der christl. Sittenlehre*, i, 43 sq.; Kaiser, *Bibl. Theolog.* i, 234 sq.; De Wette, *Bibl. Dogm.* p. 185 sq.; Cölln, *Bibl. Theolog.* ii, 8 sq.; Hase, p. 56 sq.; compare Rau, *De momentis iis quæ ad Jes. divinar. rerum scientia imbuendum viri habuisse, videantur*, Erlang. 1796; Greiling, *Leben Jesu*, p. 58 sq.; Planck, i, 23 sq.; *Briefe über Rational.* p. 154 sq.). But while there has evidently been on the one side a general tendency to exaggerate the difficulties which the natural improvement of Jesus had to overcome (Reinhard, *Plan Jesu*, p. 485 sq.), yet none of the hypotheses proposed for the solution of the question has satisfied the conditions of the problem, or been free from clear historical difficulties. Many, for instance, suppose that Jesus had his religious education in the order of the Essenes (q. v.), and they think that in the Christian morals they especially find many points of coincidence with the doctrines of that Jewish sect (Reim, *Christus und die Vernunft.* p. 668 sq.; Stäudlein, *Gesch. d. Sittenlehre Jesu*, i, 570 sq.; see, on the contrary, Lüderwald, in Henke's *Magaz.* iv, 378 sq.; Bengel, in Flatt's *Magaz.* vii, 126 sq.; J. H. Dorfmüller, *De dispari Jesu Essæorumque disciplina*, Wunsidel. 1803; Wegnern, in Illgen's *Zeitschr.* 1841, pt. 2; comp. Heubner, 5th Append. to his edit. of Reinhard's *Plan Jesu*). Others attribute the culture of Jesus to the Alexandrio-Jewish religious philosophy (Bahrdt, *Briefe über die Bibel im Volkston*, i, 376 sq.; Gfrörer, in the *Gesch. des Urchristenth.*). Still others imagine that Sadducæism [see SADDUCEE], or a comparison of this with Pharisæism [see PHARISEE], was the source of the pure religious views of Jesus (Henke, *Magaz.* v, 426 sq.; Des Côtes, *Schutzschr. für Jesus von Nazareth*, p. 128 sq.). Although single points in the teaching and acts of Jesus might be illustrated by each of these theories (as could not fail to be the case with respect to one who threw himself into the midst of the religious efforts of the age, and combined efficiency with right aims), yet the whole of his spiritual life and deeds, the high clearness of understanding, the purity of sentiment, and, above all, the independence of spirit and matchless moral power which stamp each particular with a significance that was his alone, cannot be thus explained (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 86 sq.). A richly-endowed and profound mind is, moreover, presupposed in all such hypotheses (comp. Paulus, *Leb. Jesu*, i, 89). Our object is simply to investigate the influences that aroused these spiritual faculties, unfolded them, and directed them in that path. And in determining these, it is clear at the outset that a powerful impulse must have been given to the natural development of Jesus's mind (Luke ii, 52) by a diligent study of the Holy Scriptures, especially in the prophetical books (Isaiah and the Psalms, Paulus, *Leben Jesu*, i, 119 sq.), which contained the germs of an improved monotheism, and are, for the most part, free from Jewish niceties. He would also derive assistance from a comparison of the Pharisaical statutes, which were unquestionably known to Jesus, and particularly of the Jewish Hellenism (Alexandrianism; see ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL), with those simple doctrines of the old Mosaism, especially as spiritualized by the prophets. How much may have been derived from outward circumstances we do not know; that the maternal training, and even the open (Luke iv, 29) and romantic situation of Nazareth, had a beneficial influence in unfolding and cultivating his mind (Greiling, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 48), scarcely admits a doubt, nor that the neighborhood of Gentile inhabitants in the entire vicinity might have already weakened and repressed in the youthful soul of Jesus the old Jewish narrow-mindedness. The age also afforded a crisis for bringing out and determining the bent of his genius. Learned instruction (see No. 6 above) Jesus had not enjoyed (Matt. xiii, 54 sq.; John vii, 15), although the Jewish fables (*Toledoth Jesu*, p. 5) assign him a youthful teacher named Elhanan (אֶלְחָנָן), and Christian tradition (*Historia Josephi*, c. 48 sq.) attributes to him wonderful aptness in learning (see generally Paulus, *Leben Jesu*, i, 121 sq.). In addition to all these natural influences operating upon his human spirit, there was, above all, the plenary inspiration (John iii, 34) which he enjoyed from the intercommunication of the divine nature; for the bare facts of his career, even on the lowest view that can be taken of the documents attesting these, are incapable of a rational explanation on the ground of his mere humanity (see J. Young, *Christ of History*, Lond. 1855, N. Y. 1857). See CHRIST. (For additional literature, see Volbeding, p. 36 sq.) His prediction of future events would not of itself be an evidence of a higher character than that of other prophets. See PROPHECY.

15. Respecting the enterprise on behalf of mankind which Jesus had conceived, and which he undeviatingly kept in view (see especially Reinhard, *Versuch. üb. d. Plan den der Stifter der chr. Rel. zum Besten der Mensch. entwarf*, 5th edit. by Heubner, Wittemb. 1830 [compare the *Neues theol. Journ.* xiv, 24 sq.]; *Der Zweck Jesu geschichtl. u. seelkundl. dargestellt*, Leipz. 1816; Planck, i, 7 sq., 86 sq.; Greiling, p. 120 sq.; Strauss, i, 463 sq.; Neander, p. 115 sq.; Weisse, i, 117 sq.), a few observations only can here be indulged. See REDEMPTION. That Jesus sought not simply to be a reformer of Judaism (John iv, 22; Matt. xv, 24; compare Matt. v, 17) [see LAW], much less the founder of a secret association (Klotzsch, *De Christo ab instituenda societate clandestina alieno*, Viteb. 1786), but to unite all mankind in one great sacred family, is vouched for by his own declarations (John iv, 23; x, 16), by the whole tendency of his teaching, by his constant expression of the deepest sympathy with humanity in general, and finally by the selection of the apostles to continue his work; only he wished to confine himself personally to the boundaries of Judæa in the publication of the kingdom of God (Matt. xv, 24), whereas his disciples, led by the Holy Spirit, should eventually traverse the world as heralds of the truth (Matt. xxviii, 19 sq.). It is evident that to Jesus himself the outline of his design was always clearly defined in the course of his labors, but, on account of the dogmatic conformity of the delineations in John's Gospel, and the loose, unchronological development of it in the synoptical gospels, it is impossible accurately to show historically the gradual realization of this subjective scheme. But that Jesus at any moment of his life whatever had stated the *political* element of the theocracy as being blended with his *spiritual* emoluments (Hase, *Leb. Jesu*, p. 86 sq., 2d edit.) is an unwarrantable position (comp. Heubner, in Reinhard, *ut sup.* p. 394 sq.; Lücke, *Pr. examinatur sententia de mutato per eventa adeoque sensim emendato Christi consilio*, Gött. 1831; Neander, p. 121 sq.). The reason why he did not directly announce himself to the popular masses as the expected *Messiah* (indeed, he even evaded the question, Luke xx, 1 sq., and forbade the spread of this report, Matt. xvi, 20) unquestionably was, that the minds of the Jews were incapable of separating their carnal anticipations from the true idea of the Messiah (q. v.). He

strove, therefore, on every occasion to set this idea itself in a right position before them, and occasionally suggested the identification of his person with the Messiah, partly by the epithet "Son of Man," which he applied to himself (see especially Matt. xii, 8), partly by explicit statements (Matt. xiii, 16 sq.; Luke iv, 21). Hence it is not surprising that the opinion of the people respecting him declined, and the majority regarded him only as a great prophet, chiefly interesting for his wonder-working. He decidedly announced himself as the Messiah only to individual susceptible hearts (John iv, 26; ix, 36 sq.), and also to the high-priest at the conclusion of his career (Matt. xxvi, 64). The disciples required it merely for the confirmation of the faith they had already attained (Matt. xvi, 13 sq.; Luke ix, 20). See KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

The moral and religious character of Jesus (humanly considered), which even in the synoptical gospels, that are certainly chargeable with no embellishment, appears in a high ideality, has never yet been depicted with accurate psychological skill (see Volbeding, p. 35), but usually as a model of virtue in general (yet see Jerusalem, *Nachgelass. Schrift*, i, 75 sq.; Greiling, p. 9 sq.; E. G. Winckler, *Vers. e. Psychocographie Jesu*, Lpz. 1826; Ullmann, *Sündlosigk. Jes.* p. 35 sq.; Ammon, *Leb. Jes.* i, 240 sq.; Thiele, in the *Darmst. Kirch.-Zeit.* 1844, No. 92–94). (Comp. Hase, p. 62, 64.) On the (choleric) temperament of Jesus, see J. G. Walch, *De temperamento Christi hom.* Jen. 1753. Deep humility before God (Luke xviii, 19), and ardent love towards men in view of the determined sacrifice (John x, 18), were the distinguishing traits of his noble devotion, while the divine zeal that stirred his great soul concentrated all his virtues upon his one grand design. Jesus appears as the harmonious complete embodiment of religious resignation; but this was so far from being a result of innate weakness (although Jesus might have had a slender physical constitution), that his natural force of character subsided into it (for examples of high energy in feeling and act, see John ii, 16 sq.; viii, 44 sq.; Matt. xvi, 23; xxiii, 5, etc.). Everywhere to this deep devotion was joined a clear, prudent understanding—a combination which alone can preserve a man of sensibility and activity from the danger of becoming a reckless enthusiast or a weak sentimentalist. This is most unmistakably exhibited in the account of his passion and death. Neither do we find in Jesus any trace of the austerity and gloomy sternness of other founders of religion, or even of his contemporary the Baptist (Matt. xi, 18 sq.). In the midst of eager listeners in the public streets or in the Temple, he spoke with the high dignity of a messenger of God; yet how affectionately sympathetic (John xi, 35), how solicitous, how self-sacrificing did he exhibit himself in the bosom of the family, in the dear circle of his friends! What tender sympathy expressed itself in him on every occasion (Luke vii, 13; Matt. ix, 36. xiv, 14, xxx, 34). He was both (compare Rom. xii, 15) tearful among the tearful (John xi, 35), and cheerful among the cheerful (John ii, 1 sq.; Luke vii, 34). On this very account the character of Jesus has at all times so irresistibly won the hearts of the good and noble of *all* people, since it evinces not merely the rarest magnanimity, such as to cause amazement, but at the same time the purest, most disinterested humanity, and thus presents to the observer not simply an object of esteem, but also of love. The history of Jesus's life is equally interesting to the child and the full-grown man, and certainly his example has effected at all times not less than his precepts. In accordance with this unmistakable sum of his character, certain single passages of the Gospels (e. g. Matt. xii, 46 sq.; xv, 21 sq.; John ii, 4), which, verbally apprehended [see CANA], might perplex us concerning Jesus (comp. J. F. Volbeding, *Utrum Christus matrem genusque suum dissimulaverit et despexerit*, Viteb. 1784; K. J. Klemm, *De necessitudine J. Christo c. consanguineis intercedente*, Lips. 1846), may be more correctly explained (see Ammon, *Leb. Jesu*, i, 243 sq.), and may be placed in harmony with others (e. g. Luke ii, 51; compare Lange, *De subjectione Chr. sub parentib.* Lips. 1738). See EXAMPLE.

The task of the world's redemption, acting as an ever-present burden upon the Saviour's mind, produced that pensiveness, not to say sadness, which was a marked characteristic of all his deportment. Rarely did his equanimity rise to exuberant joy, and that only in connection with the great ruling object of his life (Luke x, 21); oftener did it experience dejection of spirit (John xii, 27), at times to the depths of mental anguish (Mark xiv, 34). See AGONY. It was this interior pressure that so frequently burst forth in sighs and tears (John xi, 33; Luke xix, 41), and made Jesus the ready sympathizer with human affliction (John xi, 35). It is such spiritual and unselfish trials that ripen every truly great moral character, and it was accordingly needful that God, "in bringing many sons unto glory, should make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." The fact that Jesus was emphatically "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," is the real key to the subdued and self-collected tone of his entire demeanor. See KENOSIS.

For an adequate explanation of the astonishing power which our Saviour exercised over his auditors, and, indeed, exerted over all who came within his circle of influence, we are doubtless to look to two or three facts which have never yet been exhibited, at least in connection, with such graphic portraiture as to make his life stand out to the modern reader in its true moral grandeur, force, and vividness. These elements are partly suggested in the evangelist's statement that those who first hung upon the Redeemer's lips found in his discourses a new and divine assurance: "He taught them *as one having authority*, and *not as the scribes*" (Matt. vii, 29).

(1.) His doctrines were novel to his hearers. It was not so much because he announced to them the ushering in of a new dispensation, for upon this he merely touched in his introductory addresses and by way of arresting their attention; all details respecting that fresh æra which could gratify curiosity, or even awaken it, he sedulously avoided, and he seemed anxious to divert the popular expectation from himself as the central figure in the coming scenes. It was the spiritual truths he communicated that burned upon the hearts of the listening populace with a strange intensity. True, the essential features of a religious life had been illustrated in their sacred books for centuries by holy men of old, and the most vital doctrines of the Gospel may be said to have been anticipated in the Mosaic code and the prophetical comments; nay, living examples were not wanting to confirm the substantial identity of religious experience under whatever outward economy. Yet, at the time of our Lord's advent, the fundamental principles of sound piety seem to have been forgotten or overlooked, especially by the Pharisees, whose views and practices were regarded as the models by the nation at large. When, therefore, our Lord brought back the popular attention to the simple doctrines of love to God and man, not only as lying at the foundation of the O.-T. ethics, but as comprising the whole duty of man, the simplicity, pertinence, and truthfulness of the sentiment came with an irresistible freshness of conviction to the minds of the humblest hearers. For this, too, they had already been prepared by the sad contrast between the precepts and the conduct of the highest sectaries of the day, by the tedious burden of the Mosaic ritual, and, above all, by the bitter yearnings after religious liberty in their own souls, which the current system of belief failed to supply. Sin yet lay as a load of anguish upon their hearts, and they eagerly embraced the gentle invitations of the Redeemer to the bosom of their offended heavenly Father. It was precisely the resurrection of these again obscured teachings that gave such power to the preaching of Luther, Whitefield, Wesley, Edwards, and others in subsequent times, and which converted

the moral desert of their day into a spiritual Eden. But there was this to enhance the effect in the Saviour's promulgátions, that they awakened the expectation of a millennial reign; an idea misconstrued, indeed, by many of the Jews into that of a temporal dominion, but on that very account productive of a more boundless and extravagant enthusiasm. The national spirit was roused, and Jesus even found it necessary to repress and avoid the fanatical and disloyal manifestations to which it was instantly prone. Yet in those hearts which better understood "the kingdom of heaven," there arose the dawn of that Sabbatic day of which the Pentecostal effusion brought the meridian glory. (For the best elucidation of this difference between Christ's and his predecessors', as well as rivals' teaching, see Stier's *Words of Jesus*, passim.)

(2.) He spoke as God. Later preachers and reformers have felt a heroic boldness, and have realized a marvelous effect in their utterances, when fully impressed with the conviction of the divinity of their mission and the sacred character of their communications; but Jesus was no mere ambassador from the court of heaven; he was the Word of the Lord himself. Ancient prophets had made their effata by an inspired impulse, and corroborated them by outward miracles that enforced respect, if they did not command obedience; but Jesus possessed no restricted measure of the Spirit, and wrought wonders in no other's name; in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and the Shekinah stood revealed in his every act, look, and breath. "Never *man* spake like this," was the significant confession extorted from his very foes. He who came from the bosom of the Father told but the things he had seen and known when he unveiled eternal verities to men. His daily demeanor, too, under whatever exigency, or temptation, or provocation, was a most pungent and irrefragable comment on all he said—a faultless example reflecting a perfect doctrine. Unprecedented as were his miracles, his life itself was the greatest wonder of all. The manner, it is often truly observed, is quite as important in the public speaker as the matter; and, we may add, his personal associations with his hearers are often more influential with them than either. In all these particulars Christ has no parallel—he had no defect. (See this argument admirably treated in Bushnell's *Nature and the Supernatural*, chap. x.)

(3.) The author of *Ecce Homo* (a work which admirably illustrates the human side of Christ and his religion, although it lamentably ignores the *divine* element in both) forcibly points (chap. v) to the fact that the bare *miracles* of Jesus, although they were so public and so stupendous as to compel the credit and awe of all, were in themselves not sufficient to command even reverence, much less a loving trust; nay, that, had they been too freely used, they were even calculated to repel men in affright (comp. Luke v, 8) and consternation (see Luke viii, 37). It was the self-restraint which the Possessor of divine power evidently imposed upon himself in this respect, and especially his persistent refusal to employ his supernatural gift either for his own personal relief and comfort, or for the direct promotion of his kingdom by way of a violent assault upon hostile powers, that intensified the astonished regard of his followers to the utmost pitch of devoted veneration. This penetrating sense of attachment to one to whom they owed everything, and who seemed to be independent of their aid, and even indifferent to his own protection while serving others, culminated at the final tragedy, which achieved a world's redemption at his own expense. "It was the combination of greatness and self-sacrifice which won their hearts, the mighty powers held under a mighty control, the unspeakable condescension, the *Cross of Christ*" (p. 57)—a topic that ever called forth the full enthusiasm of Paul's heart, and that fired it with a heroic zeal to emulate his Master.

III. *Narrative of our Saviour's Life and Ministry.*—(For the further literature of each topic, see the articles referred to at each.) See GOSPELS. About four hundred years had elapsed since Malachi, the last of the prophets, had foretold the coming of the Messiah's forerunner, and nearly the same interval had transpired since Ezra closed the sacred canon, and composed the concluding psalm (cxix); a still greater number of years had intervened since the latest miracle of the Old Test. had been performed, and men not only in Palestine, but throughout the entire East, were in general expectation of the advent of the universal Prince (Suetonius, *Vesp.* 4; Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 13)—an event which the Jews knew, from their Scriptures (Dan. ix, 25), was now close at hand (see Luke ii, 26, 38). See ADVENT. It was under such circumstances, at a time when the Roman empire, of which Judæa then formed a part, was in a state of profound and universal peace (Orosius, *Hist.* vi, *fin.*), under the rule of Augustus (Luke ii, 1), that an incident occurred which, although apparently personal and inconsiderable, broke like a new oracle the silence of ages (comp. 2 Pet. iii, 4), and proved the dawn of the long-looked-for day of Israel's glory (see Luke i, 78). A priest named Zachariah was performing the regular functions of his office within the holy place of the Temple at Jerusalem, when an angel appeared to him with the announcement that his hitherto childless and now aged wife, Elisabeth, should bear him a son, who was to be the harbinger of the promised Redeemer (Luke i, 5-25). See ZACHARIAS. To punish and at the same time remove his doubts, the power of articulate utterance was miraculously taken from him until the verification of the prediction (probably May, B.C. 7). See JOHN THE BAPTIST. Nearly half a year after this vision, a still more remarkable annunciation (q. v.) was made by the same means to a maiden of the now obscure lineage of David, resident at Nazareth, and betrothed to Joseph, a descendant of the same once-royal family [see GENEALOGY]: namely, that she was the individual selected to become the mother of the Messiah who had been expected in all previous ages (Luke i, 26-38). See MARY. Her scruples having been obviated by the assurance of a divine paternity [see INCARNATION], she acquiesced in the providence, although she could not have failed to foresee the ignominy to which it would expose her [see ADULTERY], and even joined her relative Elizabeth in praising God for so high an honor (Luke i, 39-56). As soon as her condition became known [see CONCEPTION], Joseph was divinely apprised, through a dream, of his intended wife's innocence, and directed to name her child *Jesus* (see above), thus adopting it as his own (Matt. i, 18-25; probably April, B.C. 6). See JOSEPH.

Although the parents resided in Galilee, they had occasion just at this time to visit Bethlehem (q. v.) in order to be enrolled along with their relatives in a census now in progress by order of the Roman authorities [see CYRENIUS], and thus Jesus was born, during their stay in the exterior buildings of the public khan [see CARAVANSERAI], at that place (Luke ii, 1-7), in fulfilment of an express prediction of Scripture (Mic. v, 2), prob. Aug. B.C. 6. See NATIVITY. The auspicious event was heralded on the same night by angels to a company of shepherds on the adjacent plains, and was recognised by two aged saints at Jerusalem [see SIMEON; ANNA], where the mother presented the babe at the usual time for the customary offerings at the Temple, the rite of circumcision (q. v.) having been meanwhile duly performed (Luke ii, 8-39; prob. Sept. B.C. 6). Public notice, however, was not attracted to the event till, on the arrival at the capital of a party of Eastern philosophers [see MAGI], who had been directed to Palestine by astronomical phenomena as the birthplace of some noted infant [see STAR OF THE WISE MEN], the intelligence of their inquiries reached the jealous ears of Herod (q. v.), who thereupon—first ascertaining from the assembled Sanhedrim the predicted locality—sent the strangers to Bethlehem, where the holy family appear to have continued, pretending that he wished himself to do the illustrious babe reverence, but really only to render himself more

sure of his destruction (Matt. ii, 1–12). This attempt was foiled by the return of the Magi home by another route, through divine intimation, and the child was preserved from the murderous rage of Herod by a precipitous flight of the parents (who were in like manner warned of the danger) into Egypt [see ALEXANDRIA] under a like direction (prob. July, B.C. 5). Here they remained [see EGYPT] until, on the death of the tyrant, at the divine suggestion, they returned to Palestine; but, avoiding Judæa, where Archelaus, who resembled his father, had succeeded to the throne, they settled at their former place of residence, Nazareth, within the territory of the milder Antipas (Matt. ii, 19–23; prob. April, B.C. 4). See NAZARENE. The evangelists pass over the boyhood of Jesus with the simple remark that his obedience, intelligence, and piety won the affections of all who knew him (Luke ii, 40, 51, 52). A single incident is recorded in illustration of these traits, which occurred when he had completed his twelfth year—an age at which the Jewish males were expected to take upon them the responsibility of attaching themselves to the public worship, as having arrived at years of discretion (Luke ii, 41–50; see Lightfoot and Wetstein, ad loc.). Having accompanied his parents, on this occasion, to the Passover at Jerusalem, the lad tarried behind at the close of the festal week, and was discovered by them, as they turned back to the capital from their homeward journey, after considerable search, sitting in the midst of the Rabbis in one of the anterooms of the sacred edifice, seeking information from them on sacred themes (or probably rather imparting than eliciting truth, after the manner of the Socratic questionings) with a clearness and profundity so far beyond his years and opportunities as to excite the liveliest astonishment in all beholders (April, A.D. 8). His pointed reply to his mother's expostulation for his seeming neglect of filial duty evinces a comprehension already of his divine character and work: "Knew ye not that I must be at my Father's?" (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρός μου).

1. *Introductory Year.*—Soon after John the Baptist had opened his remarkable mission at the Jordan, among the thousands of all classes who flocked to his preaching and baptism (q. v.), Jesus, then thirty years old, presented himself for the same initiatory rite at his hands as the only acknowledged prophet extant who was empowered to administer what should be equivalent to the holy anointing oil of the kingly and priestly offices (Matt. iii, 13–17; Luke iii, 1–18, 23; and parallels). See MESSIAH. John did not at once recognise Jesus as the Messiah, although he had just declared to the people the near approach of his own Superior; yet, being doubtless personally well acquainted with his relative, in whom he must have perceived the tokens of an extraordinary religious personage, he modestly declined to perform a ceremony that seemed to imply his own pre-eminence; but upon his compliance with the request of Jesus, on the ground of the propriety of this preliminary ordinance, a divine attestation, both in a visible [see DOVE] and an audible [see BATH-KOL] form, was publicly given as to the sacred character of Jesus, and in such clear conformity to a criterion which John himself had already received by the inward revelation, that he at once began to proclaim the advent of the Messiah in his person (prob. August, A.D. 25). See JOHN THE BAPTIST. After this inauguration of his public career, Jesus immediately retired into the desert of Judæa, where, during a fast of forty days, he endured those interior temptations of Satan which should suffice to prove the superiority of his virtue to that power to which Adam had succumbed; and at its close he successfully resisted three special attempts of the devil in a personal form to move him first to doubt and then to presume upon the divine care, and finally to bribe him to such barefaced idolatry that Jesus indignantly repelled him from his presence (Matt. iv, 1–11, and parallels). See TEMPTATION. The effect of John's open testimony to the character of Jesus, as he began his preaching afresh the next season on the other side of the Jordan, was such as not only to lead to a deputation of inquiry to him from the Sanhedrim on the subject, but also to induce two of the Baptist's disciples to attach themselves to Christ, one of whom immediately introduced his own brother to his newly-found Master, and to these, as he was departing for Galilee, were added two others of their acquaintance (John i, 19–36). On arriving at Cana (q. v.), whither he had been invited with his relatives and friends to a wedding festival, Jesus performed his first miracle by changing water into wine for the supply of the guests (John ii, 1–11; prob. March, A.D. 26).

Map of our Lord's Journeys during the introductory Year of his Ministry.

N.B.—The *heavy* lines on the Map indicate those parts of the route along which Jesus likewise returned.

2. *First more public Year.*—After a short visit at Capernaum, Jesus returned to Judæa in order to attend the Passover; and finding the entrance to the Temple choked with various kinds of merchant-stalls, he forcibly expelled their sacrilegious occupants, and vindicated his authority by a prediction of his resurrection, which was at the time misunderstood (John ii, 12–22). His

Map of our Saviour's Travels during the first more public Year of his Ministry.

miracles during the Paschal week confirmed the popular impression concerning his prophetic character, and even induced a member of the Sanhedrim to seek a private interview with him [see NICODEMUS]; but his doctrine of the necessity of a spiritual change in his disciples [see REGENERATION], and his statement of his own passion [see ATONEMENT], were neither intelligible nor agreeable to the worldly minds of the people (John ii, 23-25; iii, 1-21). Jesus now proceeded to the Jordan, and by the instrumentality of his disciples continued the inaugural baptism of the people instituted by John, who had meanwhile removed further up the river, where, so far from being jealous of Jesus's increasing celebrity, he gave still stronger testimony to the superior destiny of Jesus (John iii, 22-36); but the imprisonment of John not long afterwards by order of Herod (Matt. xiv, 3 sq.; Mark vi, 17 sq.; Luke iii, 19) rendered it expedient (Matt. iv, 12; Mark i, 14), in connection with the odium excited by the hierarchy (John iv, 1-3), that Jesus should retire into Galilee (Luke iv, 14). On his way thither, his conversation with a Samaritan female at the well of Jacob (q. v.), near Shechem, on the spiritual blessings of God's true worshippers, led to her conversion, with a large number of her fellow-citizens, among whom he tarried two days (John iv, 4-42; prob. December, A.D. 26). On his arrival in Galilee he was received with great respect (John iv, 43-45), and his public announcements of the advent of the Messianic age (Matt. iv, 17; Mark i, 14, 15) in all the synagogues of that country spread his fame still more widely (Luke iv, 14, 15). In this course of preaching he revisited Cana, and there, by a word, cured the son of one of Herod's courtiers that lay at the point of death at Capernaum (John iv, 46-54). Arriving at Nazareth, he was invited by his townsmen to read the Scripture lesson (Isa. lxi, 1, 2) in the synagogue, but they took such offence at his application of it to himself, and still more at his comments upon it, that they hurried him tumultuously to the brink of a precipice, and would have thrown him off had he not escaped from their hands (Luke iv, 16-30). Thenceforward he fixed upon Capernaum (q. v.) as his general place of residence

Ruins of the "Synagogue" at Tell-Hum (probably Capernaum). (From Photograph 54 of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

(Matt. iv, 13-16). In one of his excursions in this neighborhood, after addressing the people on the lake shore from a boat on the water, he directed the owners of the boat to a spot further out from the shore, where they caught so evidently miraculous a draught of fish as to convince both them and their partners of his superhuman character, and then invited all four of the fishermen to become his disciples, a call which they promptly obeyed (Luke v, 1-10; Matt. iv, 19-22; and parallels). On his return to Capernaum he restored a dæmoniac among the assembly whom he addressed in the synagogue, to the astonishment of the audience and vicinity (Mark i, 21-29, and parallels), and, retiring to the house of one of these lately chosen followers, he cured his mother-in-law of a fever, as well as various descriptions of invalids and deranged persons, at sunset of the same day (Mark i, 29-34; Matt. viii, 17; and parallels). Rising the next morning for solitary prayer before any of the family were stirring, he set out, notwithstanding the remonstrances of his host as soon as he had discovered him, to make a general tour of Galilee, preaching to multitudes who flocked to hear him from all directions, and supporting his doctrines by miraculous cures of every species of physical and mental disease (Mark i, 35-38; Matt. iv, 23-25; and parallels; prob. February, A.D. 27). One of these cases was a leper, whose restoration to purity caused such crowds to resort to Jesus as compelled him to avoid public thoroughfares (Mark i, 40-45, and parallels). On his return to Capernaum his door was soon thronged with listeners to his preaching, including many of the learned Pharisees from Jerusalem; and the cavils of these latter at his pronouncing spiritual absolution upon a paralytic whom earnest friends had been at great pains to let down at the feet of Jesus by removing the balcony roof above him, he refuted by instantly enabling the helpless man to walk

home, carrying his couch (Luke v, 17-26, and parallels; prob. March, A.D. 27). On another excursion by the lake shore, after preaching to the people, he summoned as a disciple the collector of the Roman imposts (Mark ii, 13, 14, and parallels; probably April, A.D. 27). See MATTHEW.

3. *Second more public Year.*—The Passover now drew near, which Jesus, like the devout Jews generally, was careful to attend at Jerusalem (Saturday, April 12, A.D. 27). See PASSOVER. As he passed by the pentagonal pool of Bethesda, near the sheep-gate of the city, he observed in one of its porches an invalid awaiting the intermittent influx of the water, to which the populace had attributed a miraculously curative power to the first bather thereafter; but, learning that he had been thus infirm for thirty-eight years, and ascertaining from him that he was even too helpless to reach the water in time to experience its virtue, he immediately restored him to vigor by a word. See BETHESDA. This, happening to occur on the Sabbath, so incensed the hierarchy that they charged the author of the cure with a profanation of the day, and thus drew from Jesus a public vindication of his mission and an exposure of their inconsistency (John v, 1-47). As he was preparing to return to Galilee, on the Sabbath ensuing the Paschal week (Saturday, April 19, A.D. 27), his disciples chanced to pluck, as strangers were privileged to do (Deut. xxiii, 25), a few of the ripe heads from the standing barley, through which they were at the time passing, in order to allay their hunger; and this being captiously alleged by some Pharisee by-standers as a fresh violation of the sacred day, Jesus took occasion to rebuke their over-scrupulousness as being confuted by the example of David (1 Sam. xxi, 1-6), the practice of the priests themselves (Numb. xxviii, 9-19), and the tenor of Scripture (Hos. vi, 6; compare 1 Sam. xv, 22), and, at the same time, to point out the true design of the Sabbath (q. v.), namely, man's own benefit (Matt. xii, 1-8, and parallels). On an ensuing Sabbath (prob. Saturday, April 26, A.D. 27), entering the synagogue (apparently of Capernaum), he once more excited the same odium by curing a man whose right hand was palsied; but his opponents, who had been watching the opportunity, were silenced by his appeal to the philanthropy of the act, yet they thenceforth began to plot his destruction (Mark iii, 1-6, and parallels). Retiring to the Sea of Galilee, he addressed the multitudes who thronged here from all quarters, and cured the sick and dæmoniacs among them (Mark iii, 7-12; Matt. xii, 17-21, and parallels). After a night spent in prayer on a mountain in the vicinity, he now chose twelve persons from among his followers to be his constant attendants and future witnesses to his career (Luke vi, 12-16, and parallels). See APOSTLE. Then, descending to a partial plain, he cured the diseased among the assembled multitude (Luke vi, 17-19), and, seating himself upon an eminence, he proceeded to deliver his memorable sermon exhibiting the spirituality of the Gospel in opposition to the formalism of the prevalent theology (Matt. v, 1-12; Luke vi, 24-26; Matt. v, 17-24, 27-30, 33-48; vi, 1-8, 16-18; vii, 1-5, 12, 15-18, 20, 21, 24-27; viii, 1, and parallel passages; prob. May, A.D. 27). See SERMON ON THE MOUNT. On his return to Capernaum, Jesus, at the instance of the Jewish elders, cured the son of a modest and pious centurion, who, although a Gentile, had built the village synagogue, and whose faith in the power of Jesus to restore by his mere word the distant invalid excited the liveliest interest in the mind of Jesus himself (Luke vii, 1-10, and parallel). The ensuing day, passing near Nain, he met a large procession issuing from the village for the interment of the only son of a widow, and, commiserating her double bereavement, he restored the youth instantly to life, to the astonishment of the beholders (Luke vii, 11-17). John the Baptist, hearing while in prison of these miracles, sent two messengers to Jesus to obtain more explicit assurance from his own lips as to the Messiah, which he seemed so slow plainly to avow; but, instead of returning a direct answer, Jesus proceeded to perform additional miracles in their presence, and then referred them to the Scripture prophecies (Isa. lxi, 1; xxxv, 5, 6) of these distinctive marks of the Messianic age; but as soon as the messengers had departed, he eulogized the character of John, although the introducer of an æra less favored than the period of Jesus himself, and concluded by severe denunciations of the cities (especially Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida) which had continued impenitent under his own preaching (Luke vii, 18-35; Matt. xi, 20-24; and parallels). About this time, a Pharisee invited him one day to dine with him, but, while he was reclining at the table, a female notorious for her immorality came penitently behind him and bedewed with her tears his unsandaled feet extended beyond the couch, then wiped them with her hair, and finally affectionately anointed them with ointment brought for that purpose, while the host scarcely restrained his surprise that Jesus should suffer this familiarity; but, in a pointed parable of two debtors released from dissimilar amounts,

Map of our Saviour's Travels during the second more public Year of his Ministry.

Ruins of the "Synagogue" at Kerazeh (Chorazin). (From Photograph 51 of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

Jesus at once justified the love of the woman and rebuked the sordidness of the host, who had neglected these offices of respect, and then confirmed the woman's trembling hopes of pardon for her past sins (Luke vii, 36-50). He next set out on his second tour of Galilee (summer of A.D. 27), accompanied by several grateful females who bore his expenses (Luke viii, 1-3). No sooner had he returned to Capernaum (prob. Oct. A.D. 27) than such crowds reassembled at his house that his friends sought to restrain what they deemed his excessive enthusiasm to address them, while the jealous hierarchy from Jerusalem, who were present, scrupled not to attribute to collusion with Satan the cure of a blind and dumb dæmoniac which he wrought. But, refuting this absurd cavil (since his act was directly in opposition to diabolical influences), he denounced it as an unpardonable crime against the Holy Spirit, who was the agent, and proceeded to characterize the rancor of heart that had prompted it; then, after refusing to gratify the curiosity of one of his enemies, who interrupted him by demanding some celestial portent in confirmation of his claims (for he declared no further miracle should be granted to *them* except his eventual resurrection, which he compared to the restoration of Jonah from the maw of the fish), he contrasted the obduracy of the generation that heard him with the penitence of the Ninevites and the eagerness of the queen of Sheba to listen to far inferior wisdom, and closed by comparing their aggravated condition to that of a relapsed dæmoniac (Mark iii, 19-21; Matt. xii, 22-45; and parallels). A woman present pronounced his mother happy in having such a son, but he declared those rather happy who obeyed his teaching (Luke xi, 27). At that moment, being informed of the approach of his relatives, and their inability to reach him through the crowd, he avowed his faithful followers to be dearer than his earthly kindred (Matt. xii, 46-50, and parallels). A Pharisee (q. v.) present invited him to dinner, but, on his evincing surprise that his guest did not perform the ablutions customary before eating, Jesus inveighed against the absurd and hypocritical zeal of the sect concerning externals, while they neglected the essentials of piety; and when a devotee of the law [see LAWYER] complained of the sweeping character of these charges, he denounced the selfish and ruinous casuistry of this class likewise with such severity that the whole party determined to entrap him, if possible, into some unguarded expression against the religious or civil power (Luke xi, 37-42, 44-46, 52-54, and parallel). See SCRIBE. On his way home he continued to address the immense concourse, first against the hypocrisy which he had just witnessed, and then—taking occasion from the demand of a person present that he would use his authority to compel his brother to settle their father's estate with him, which he refused on the ground of its irrelevancy to his sacred functions—he proceeded to discourse on the necessity and propriety of trust in divine Providence for our temporal wants, illustrating this duty by the parable of the sudden death of a rich worldling, by a comparison with various natural objects, by contrast with the heathen, and by the higher importance of a preparation for heaven (Luke xii, 1, 6, 7, 13-31, 33, 34, and parallels). Being informed of a recent atrocity of Herod against some Galileans, he declared that an equally awful fate awaited the impenitent among his hearers, and enforced the admonition by the parable of the delay in cutting down a fruitless tree (Luke xiii, 1-9). Again leaving his home the same day, he delivered, while sitting in a boat, to a large audience upon the lake-shore, the several parables of the different fate of various portions of seed in a field, the true and false wheat growing together till harvest, the gradual but spontaneous development of a plant of grain, the remarkable growth of the mustard-shrub from a very small seed, and the dissemination of leaven throughout a large mass of dough (Matt. xiii, 1-9, 24-30; Mark iv, 26-29; Matt. xiii, 31-36; and parallels); but it was only to the privileged disciples (as he informed them) in private that he explained, at their own request, the various elements of the first of these parables as referring to the different degrees of improvement made by the corresponding classes of his own hearers, adding various admonitions (by comparisons with common life) to diligence on the part of the apostles, and then, after explaining the parable of the false wheat as referring to the divine forbearance to eradicate the wicked in this scene of probation, he added the parable of the assortment of a heterogeneous draught of fish in a common net, indicative of the final discrimination of the foregoing characters, with two minor parables illustrating the paramount value of piety, and closed with an exhortation to combine novelty with orthodoxy in religious preaching, like the varied stores of a skilful housekeeper (Matt. xiii, 10, 11, 13-23; v, 14-16; vi, 22, 23; x, 26, 27; xiii, 12, 36-43, 47-50, 44-46, 51-53; and parallels). See PARABLE. As Jesus was setting out, towards evening of the same day, to cross the lake, a scribe proposed to become his constant disciple, but was repelled by being reminded by Jesus of the hardships to which he would expose himself in his company; two others of his attendants were refused a temporary leave of absence to arrange their domestic affairs, lest it might wean them altogether from his service (Matt. viii, 18-22; Luke xi, 61, 62; and parallels). While the party were crossing the lake, Jesus, overcome with the labors of the day, had fallen asleep on the stern bench of the boat, when so violent a squall took them that, in the utmost consternation, they appealed to him for preservation, and, rebuking their distrust of his defending presence, he calmed the tempest with a word (Matt. viii, 23-27, and parallels). See GALILEE, SEA OF. On reaching the eastern shore, they were met by two frantic dæmoniacs, roaming in the deserted catacombs of Gadara, who prostrated themselves before Jesus, and implored his forbearance; but the Satanic influence that possessed them, on being expelled by him, with his permission seized upon a large herd of swine feeding near (probably raised, contrary to the law, for supplying the market of the Greek-imitating Jews), and caused them to rush headlong into the lake, where they were drowned [see DÆMONIAC]; and this loss so offended the worldly-minded owners of the swine that the neighbors generally requested Jesus to return home, which he immediately did, leaving the late maniacs to fill the country with the remarkable tidings of their cure (Mark v, 1-21, and parallels). Not long afterwards, on occasion of a large entertainment made for Jesus by Matthew, the Pharisees found fault with the disciples because their Master had condescended to associate with the tax-gatherers and other disreputable persons that were guests; but Jesus declared that such had most need of his intercourse, his mission being to reclaim sinners (Matt. ix, 10-13, and parallels). At the same time he explained to an inquirer why he did not enjoin seasons of fasting like the Baptist, that his presence as yet should rather be a cause of gladness to his followers,

and he illustrated the impropriety of such severe requirements prematurely by the festivity of a marriage week, and by the parables of a new patch on an old garment, and new wine in old skin-bottles (Matt. ix, 14-17, and parallels). In the midst of these remarks he was entreated by a leading citizen named Jaïrus (q. v.) to visit his daughter, who lay at the point of death; and while going for that purpose he cured a female among the crowd of a chronic hæmorrhage (q. v.) by her secretly touching the edge of his dress, which led to her discovery and acknowledgment on the spot; but in the meantime information arrived of the death of the sick girl: nevertheless, encouraging the father's faith, he proceeded to the house where her funeral had already begun, and, entering the room with her parents and three disciples only, restored her to life and health by a simple touch and word, to the amazement of all the vicinity (Mark v, 22-43, and parallels). As he was leaving Jaïrus's house two blind men followed him, whose request that he would restore their sight he granted by a touch; and on his return home he cured a dumb dæmoniac, upon which the Pharisees repeated their calumny of his collusion with Satan (Matt. ix, 27-34). Visiting Nazareth again shortly afterwards, his acquaintances were astonished at his eloquence in the synagogue on the Sabbath, but were so prejudiced against his obscure family that but few had sufficient faith to warrant the exertion of his miraculous power in cures (Mark vi, 1-6, and parallel). About this time (probably Jan. and Feb. A.D. 28), commiserating the moral destitution of the community, Jesus sent out the apostles in pairs on a general tour of preaching and miracle-working in different directions (but avoiding the Gentiles and Samaritans), with special instructions, while he made his third circuit of Galilee for a like purpose (Matt. ix, 35-38; x, 1, 5-14, 40-42; xi, 1; Mark vi, 12, 13; and parallels). Upon their return, Jesus, being apprized of the execution of John the Baptist by Herod (Mark vi, 21-29; probably March, A.D. 28), and of the tetrarch's views of himself (Mark vi, 14-16; see JOHN THE BAPTIST), retired with them across the lake, followed by crowds of men, with their families, whom at evening he miraculously fed with a few provisions at hand (Mark vi, 30-44, and parallels), an act that excited such enthusiasm among them as to lead them to form the plan of forcibly proclaiming him their political king (John vi, 14, 15); this design Jesus defeated by dismissing the multitude, and sending away the disciples by themselves in a boat across the lake, while he spent most of the night alone in prayer on a neighboring hill; but towards daylight he rejoined them, by walking on the water to them as they were toiling at the oars against the wind and tempestuous waves, and suddenly calming the sea, brought them to the shore, to their great amazement; then, as he proceeded through the plain of Gennesareth, the whole country brought their sick to him to be cured (Matt. xiv, 22-36, and parallels), the populace whom he had left on the eastern shore meanwhile missing him, returned by boats to Capernaum (John vi, 22-24; prob. Thursd. and Friday, March 25 and 26, A.D. 28). Meeting them in their search next day in the synagogue, he took occasion, in alluding to the recent miracle, to proclaim *himself* to them at large as the celestial "manna" for the soul, but cooled their political ambition by warning them that the benefits of his mission could only be received through a participation by faith in the atoning sacrifice shortly to be made in his own person; a doctrine that soon discouraged their adherence to him, but proved no stumbling-block to the steadfast faith of eleven of his apostles (John vi, 25-71; prob. Saturday, March 27, A.D. 28).

4. *Third more public Year.*—Avoiding the malicious plots of the hierarchy at Jerusalem by remaining at Capernaum during the Passover (John vii, 1; probably Sunday, March 28, A.D. 28), Jesus took occasion, from the fault found by some Pharisees from the capital against his disciples for eating with unwashed hands

Map of our Saviour's Travels during the third more public Year of his Ministry.

[see ABLUTION], to rebuke their traditional scrupulousness as subversive of the true intent of the Law, and to expound to his disciples the true cause of moral defilement, as consisting in the corrupt affections of the heart (Mark vii, 1-16; Matt. xv, 12-20; and parallels). Retiring to the borders of Phœnicia, he was besought with such importunity by a Gentile woman to cure her dæmoniac daughter, that, after overcoming with the most touching arguments his assumed indifference, her faith gained his assent, and on reaching home she found her daughter restored (Matt. xv, 21-28, and parallel; prob. May, A.D. 28). Thence returning through the Decapolis, publicly teaching on the way, he cured a deaf and dumb person, with many other invalids, and, miraculously feeding the great multitude that followed him, he sailed across to the western shore of the lake (Mark vii, 31-37; Matt. xv, 30-39; and parallels), where he rebuked the Pharisees' demand of some celestial prodigy by referring them to the tokens of the existing æra, which were as evident as signs of the weather, and admonishing them of the coming retribution (Matt. xvi, 1-3;

25, 26), and, again hinting at the crowning miracle of his resurrection, he returned to the eastern side of the lake, warning his disciples on the way of the pernicious doctrine of the sectaries, which he compared to *leaven* (Matt. xvi, 4-12, and parallels). Proceeding to Bethsaida (in Peræa), he cured a blind man in a gradual manner by successive touches of his eyes (Mark viii, 22-26), and on his way through the environs of Cæsarea-Philippi, after private devotion, he elicited from the disciples a profession of their faith in him as the Messiah, and conferred upon them the right of legislating for his future Church, but rebuked Peter for demurring at his prediction of his own approaching passion, and enjoined the strictest self-denial upon his followers, in view of the eventual retribution shortly to be foreshadowed by the overthrow of the Jewish nation (Matt. xvi, 13-28, and parallels; prob. May, A.D. 28). A week afterwards, taking three disciples only with him, he ascended a lofty mountain in the vicinity (prob. Hermon), where his person experienced a remarkable luminousness [see TRANSFIGURATION], with other prodigies, that at first alarmed the disciples; and, on descending the mountain, he explained the allusion (Mal. iv, 5, 6) to Elijah (who, with Moses, had just conversed with him in a glorified state) as meaning John the Baptist, lately put to death (Matt. xvii, 1-13, and parallels). On his return to the rest of the disciples, he found them disputing with the Jewish sectaries concerning a dæmoniac deaf-mute child whom the former had vainly endeavored to cure; the father now earnestly entreating Jesus to exercise his power over the malady, although of long duration, he immediately restored the lad to perfect soundness, and privately explained to the disciples the cause of their failure as lying in their want of faith (Mark ix, 14-28, and parallels), which would have rendered them competent to any requisite miracle (Luke xvii, 5, 6, and parallel) if coupled with devout humility (Mark ix, 29, and parallel). Thence passing over into Galilee, he again foretold his ignominious crucifixion and speedy resurrection to his disciples, who still failed to apprehend his meaning (Mark ix, 30-32, and parallels). On the return of the party to Capernaum, the collector of the Temple-tax waited upon Peter for payment from his Master, who, although stating his exemption by virtue of his high character, yet, for the sake of peace, directed Peter to catch a fish, which would be found to have swallowed a piece of money sufficient to pay for them both (Matt. xvii, 24-27; prob. June, A.D. 28). About this time Jesus rebuked the disciples for a strife into which they had fallen for the highest honors under their Master's reign by placing a child in their midst as a symbol of artless innocence; and upon John's remarking that they had lately silenced an unknown person acting in his name, he reprimanded such bigotry, enlarging by various similes upon the duty of tenderly dealing with new converts, and closing with rules for the expulsion of an unworthy member from their society, adding the parable of the unmerciful servant to enforce the doctrine of leniency (Mark ix, 33-40, 42, 49, 50; Matt. xviii, 10, 15-35; and parallels). Some time afterwards (prob. September, A.D. 28) Jesus sent seventy of the most trusty among his followers, in pairs, through the region which he intended shortly to visit, with instructions similar to those before given to the apostles, but indicative of the opposition they would be likely to meet with (Luke x, 1-3; Matt. vii, 6; x, 23-26; and parallels); and then, after declining to accompany his worldly-minded brothers to the approaching festival of Tabernacles at Jerusalem, to which they urged him as a favorable opportunity for exhibiting his wonderful powers, near the close of the festal-week he went thither privately (John vii, 2-10), experiencing on the way the inhospitality of the Samaritans with a patience that rebuked the indignation of one of his disciples (Luke ix, 51-56), and receiving the grateful acknowledgments of a single Samaritan among ten lepers whom he cured (Luke xvii, 11-19).

5. *Last half Year.*—On the opening of the festival at Jerusalem (Sunday, Sept. 21, A.D. 28), the hierarchy eagerly inquired for Jesus among the populace, who held discordant opinions concerning him; but, on his arrival, he boldly taught in the Temple, vindicating his course and claims so eloquently that the very officers sent by his enemies to arrest him returned abashed, while the people continued divided in their sentiments, being inclined to accept his cordial invitations (Matt. xi, 28-30), but deterred by the specious objections of the hierarchy (John vii, 11-53). Next morning, returning from the Mt. of Olives (prob. the residence of Lazarus at Bethany), in the midst of his teaching in the Temple he dismissed, with merely an admonition, a female brought to him as an adulteress (q. v.), with a view to embarrass him in the disposal of the case, none of his conscience-stricken accusers daring to be the first in executing the penalty of the law when allowed to do so by Jesus (John viii, 1-11). He then continued his expostulations with his captious hearers respecting his own character, until at length, on his avowing his divine pre-existence, they attempted to stone him as guilty of blasphemy, but he withdrew from their midst (John viii, 12-59). The seventy messengers returning shortly afterwards (prob. Oct. A.D. 28) with a report of great success, Jesus expressed his exultation in thanks to God for the humble instrumentality divinely chosen for the propagation of the Gospel (Luke x, 17-21, and parallel). Being asked by a Jewish sectary the most certain method of securing heaven, he referred him to the duty, expressed in the law (Deut. vi, 5; Lev. xix, 8), of supreme love to God and cordial philanthropy, and, in answer to the other's question respecting the extent of the latter obligation, he illustrated it by the parable of the benevolent Samaritan (Luke x, 25-37). Returning at evening to the home of Lazarus, he gently reproved the impatient zeal of the kind Martha in preparing for him a meal, and defended Mary for being absorbed in his instructions (Luke x, 38-42). After a season of private prayer (prob. in Gethsemane, on his way to Jerusalem, next morning), he dictated a model of prayer to his disciples at their request, stating the indispensableness of a placable spirit towards others in order to our own forgiveness by God, and adding the parable of the guest at midnight to enforce the necessity of urgency in prayer, with assurances that God is more willing to grant his children's petitions for spiritual blessings than earthly parents are to to supply their children's temporal wants (Luke xi, 1-13, and parallels). As he entered the city, Jesus noticed a man whom he ascertained to have been blind from his birth, and to the disciples' inquiry for whose sin the blindness was a punishment, he answered that it was providentially designed for the divine glory, namely, in his cure, as a means to which he moistened a little clay with spittle, touched the man's eyes with it, and directed him to wash them in the Pool of Siloam (Saturday, Nov. 28, A.D. 28); but the hierarchy, learning the cure from the neighbors, brought the man before them, because the transaction had taken place on the Sabbath, and disputed the fact until testified to by his parents, and then alleging that the author of the act, whose name was yet unknown even to the man himself, must have been a sinner, because a violator of the sacred day, they were met with so spirited a defence of Jesus by the man himself, that, becoming enraged, they immediately excommunicated him. Jesus, however, meeting him shortly after, disclosed to his ready faith his own Messianic character, and then discoursed to his captious enemies concerning the immunities of true believers in him under the simile of a fold of sheep (John ix; x, 1-21). The same figure he again took up at the ensuing Festival of Dedication, upon the inquiry of the Jewish sectaries directly put to him in Solomon's portico of the Temple, as to his Messiahship, and spoke so pointedly of his unity with God that his auditors would have stoned him for blasphemy had he not hastily withdrawn from the place (cir. Dec. 1, A.D. 28), and retired

to the Jordan, where he gained many adherents (John x, 22-42). Lazarus at this time falling sick, his sisters sent to Jesus, desiring his presence at Bethany; but after waiting several days, until Lazarus was dead, he informed his disciples of the fact (which he assured them would turn out to the divine glory), and proposed to go thither. On their arrival, he was met first by Martha, and then by Mary, with tearful expressions of regret for his absence, which he checked by assurances (not clearly apprehended by them) of their brother's restoration to life; then causing the tomb to be opened (after overruling Martha's objection), he summoned the dead Lazarus forth to life, to the amazement of the spectators (John xi, 1-46; probably Jan. A.D. 29). See LAZARUS. This miracle aroused afresh the enmity of the Sanhedrim, who, after consultation, at the haughty advice of Caiaphas, determined to accomplish his death, thus unwittingly fulfilling the destined purpose of his mission (John xi, 47-53). Withdrawing in consequence to the city of Ephron (John xi, 54), and afterwards to Peræa, Jesus continued his teaching and miracles to crowds that gathered about him (Mark x, 1, and parallel). As he was preaching in one of the synagogues of this vicinity one Sabbath, he cured a woman of chronic paralysis of the back, and refuted the churlish cavil of one of the hierarchy present at the day on which this was done, by a reference to ordinary acts of mercy even to animals on the Sabbath (Luke xiii, 10-17; prob. Feb. A.D. 29). Jesus now turned his steps towards Jerusalem, teaching on the way the necessity of a personal preparation for heaven, without trusting to any external recommendations (Luke xiii, 22-30); and replying to the Pharisees' insidious warning of danger from Herod, that Jerusalem alone was the destined place of peril for him (Luke xiii, 31-33). On one Sabbath, while eating at the house of an eminent Pharisee, he cured a man of the dropsy, and silenced all objections by again appealing to the usual care of domestic animals on that day; he then took occasion, from the anxiety of the guests to secure the chief places of honor at the table, to discourse to the company on the advantages of modesty and charity, closing by an admonition to prompt compliance with the offers of the Gospel in the parable of the marriage-feast and the wedding-garment (Luke xiv, 1-15; Matt. xxii, 1-14, and parallel; prob. March, A.D. 29). To the multitudes attending him he prescribed resolute self-denial as essential to true discipleship (Luke xv, 25, 26, and parallel), under various figures (Luke xiv, 28-33); while he corrected the jealousy of the Jewish sectaries at his intercourse with the lower classes (Luke xv, 1, 2), by teaching the divine interest in penitent wanderers from him (Luke xix, 10, and parallel), under the parables of stray sheep (Luke xv, 3-7, and parallel), the lost piece of money, and the prodigal son (Luke xv, 8-32). At the same time, he illustrated the prudence of securing the divine favor by a prudent use of the blessings of this life in the parable of the fraudulent steward (Luke xvi, 1-12), showing the incompatibility of worldliness with devotion (Luke xvi, 13, and parallel); and the self-sufficiency of the Pharisees he rebuked in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi, 14, 15, 19-31), declaring to them that the kingdom of the Messiah had already come unobserved (Luke xvii, 20, 21). He impressed upon both classes of his hearers the importance of perseverance, and yet humility, in prayer, by the parables of the importunate widow before the unjust judge, and the penitent publican in contrast with the self-righteous Pharisee (Luke xviii, 1-14). To the insidious questions of the Jewish sectaries concerning divorce, he replied that it was inconsistent with the original design of marriage, being only suffered by Moses (with restrictions) on account of the inveterate customs of the nation, but really justifiable only in cases of adultery; but at the same time explained privately to the disciples that the opposite extreme of celibacy was to be voluntary only (Matt. xix, 3-12, and parallels). He welcomed infants to his arms and blessing, as being a symbol of the innocence required by the Gospel (Mark x, 13-16, and parallels). A rich and honorable young man visiting him with questions concerning the way of salvation, Jesus was pleased with his frankness, but proposed terms so humbling to his worldly attachments that he retired without accepting them, which furnished Jesus an opportunity of discoursing to his followers on the prejudicial influence of wealth on piety, and (in reply to a remark of Peter) of illustrating the rewards of self-denying exertion in religious duty by the parables of the servant at meals after a day's work, and the laborers in the vineyard (Mark x, 17-29; Matt. xix, 28, 29; Luke xvii, 7-10; Matt. xx, 1-16; and parallels). As they had now arrived at the Jordan opposite Jerusalem, Jesus once more warned the timid disciples of the fate awaiting him there (Mark x, 32-34); but they so little understood him (Luke xvii, 34), that the mother of James and John ambitiously requested of him a prominent post for her sons under his administration, they also ignorantly professing their willingness to share his sufferings, until Jesus checked rivalry between them and their fellow-disciples by enjoining upon them all a mutual deference in imitation of his self-sacrificing mission (Matt. xx, 20-28). As they were passing through Jericho, two blind men implored of him to restore their sight, and, although rebuked by the by-standers, they urged their request so importunately as at length to gain the ear of Jesus, who called them, and with a touch enabled them to see (Mark x, 46-52, and parallels). Passing along, he observed a chief publican, named Zacchæus (q. v.), who had run in advance and climbed a tree to get a sight of Jesus, but who now, at Jesus's suggestion, gladly received him to his house, and there vindicated himself from the calumnies of the insidious hierarchy by devoting one half his property to charity, an act that secured his commendation by Jesus (Luke xix, 2-9), who took occasion to illustrate the duty of fidelity in improving religious privileges by the parable of the "talents" or "pounds" (Luke xix, 11-28, and parallel). Reaching Bethany a week before the Passover, when the Sanhedrim were planning to seize him, Jesus was entertained at the house of Lazarus, and vindicated Mary's act in anointing (q. v.) his head with a flask of precious ointment, from the parsimonious objections of Judas, declaring that it should ever be to her praise as highly significant in view of his approaching burial (John xi, 55-57; xii, 1-11; and parallels).

6. *Passion Week.*—The entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem next morning (Monday, March 14, A.D. 29) was a triumphal one, the disciples having mounted him upon a young ass, which, by his direction, they found in the environs of the city, and spread their garments and green branches along the road, while the multitude escorting him proclaimed him as the expected descendant of David, to the chagrin of the hierarchy, who vainly endeavored to check the popular declamations [see HOSANNA]; Jesus meanwhile was absorbed in grief at the ruin awaiting the impenitent metropolis (Matt. xxi, 1-9; John xii, 16, 17, 19; Luke xix, 39-44; and parallels). Arriving at the Temple amid this general excitement, he again cleared the Temple courts of the profane tradesmen, while the sick resorted to him for cure, and the children prolonged his praise till evening, when he returned to Bethany for the night (Matt. xxi, 10-17, and parallels). On his way again to the city, early in the morning, he pronounced a curse upon a green but fruitless fig-tree (q. v.) (to which he had gone, not having yet breakfasted, as if in hopes of finding on it some of last year's late figs), as a symbol of the unproductive Jewish nation, the day being occupied in teaching at the Temple (where the multitude of his hearers prevented the execution of the hierarchal designs against him), and the night, as usual, at Bethany. On the ensuing morning the fig-tree was found withered to the very root, which led Jesus to impress upon the disciples the efficacy of faith, especially in their public functions

SUNDAY.
FEAST AT BETHANY.
MONDAY.
PROCESSION
TEMPLE CLEANSED

Map of our Saviour's Journeys on the first Day of Passion Week.

N.B.—The localities of Jerusalem on this Map are in accordance with the views of Dr. Robinson. For more exact identifications, see the art. JERUSALEM. For the arguments assigning our Lord's triumphal entry into the city to *Monday*, see PALM SUNDAY.

TUESDAY
FIG TREE CURSED.
TEACHING AND CURING.

(Matt. xxi, 18, 19; Luke xxi, 37, 38; xix, 47, 48; Matt. xxi, 20-22). This, the last day of Jesus's intercourse with the public, was filled with various discussions (Wednesday, March 16, A.D. 29). The hierarchy, demanding the authority for his public conduct, were perplexed by his counter-question as to the authority of the Baptist's mission, and he seized the occasion to depict their inconsistency and criminality by the parables of the two sons sent by their father to work, and the murderous gardeners, with so vivid a personal reference as to cover them with confusion (Matt. xxi, 23-46, and parallels). The mooted question of the lawfulness of tribute to a Gentile power, being insidiously proposed to him by a coalition of the Pharisees and Herodians, was so readily solved by him by an appeal to the very coin paid in tribute, that they again retired, unable to make it a ground for public charges against him (Matt. xxii, 15-22, and parallels). The case of seven brothers successively married (under the Levirate law) to the same woman being next supposed by the Sudducees, he as easily disposed of the imaginary difficulty concerning her proper husband in the other world by declaring the non-existence of such relations there, and refuted their infidelity as to the future life by citing a passage of Scripture (Matt. xxii, 23-33, and parallels). Seeing the Sadducees so completely silenced, one of the Pharisaical party undertook to puzzle Jesus by raising that disputed point, What Mosaic injunction is the most important? but Jesus cited the duties of supreme devotion to God and general benevolence to man as comprising all other moral enactments, to which the other so cordially assented as to draw a commendation from Jesus on his hopeful sentiments (Mark xii, 28-34, and parallel). Jesus now turned the tables upon his opponents by asking them, Whose descendant the Messiah should be? and on their replying, David's, of course, he then asked how (as in Psa. cx, 1) he could still be David's *Lord?* which so embarrassed his enemies that they desisted from this mode of attack (Matt. xxii, 41-46). Jesus then in plain terms denounced before the concourse the hypocrisy and ostentation of the hierarchy, especially their priestcraft, their sanctimony, their ambition, their extortion, their casuistry, and their intolerance, and bewailed the impending fate of the city (Matt. xxiii, 1-12, 14-21, 29-39, and parallels). Observing a poor widow drop a few of the smallest coins into the contribution-box in the Temple, he declared that she had shown more true liberality than wealthier donors, because she had given more in proportion to her means, and with greater self-denial (Mark xii, 41-44, and parallel). A number of proselytes [see HELENIST] requesting through Philip an interview with Jesus, he met them with intimations of his approaching passion, while a celestial voice announced the glory that should thereby accrue to God, and he then retired from the unbelieving public with an admonition to improve their present spiritual privileges (John xii, 20-50). As he was crossing the Mount of Olives, his disciples calling his attention to the noble structure of the Temple opposite, he declared its speedy demolition, and on their asking the *time* and *tokens* of this catastrophe, he discoursed to them at length, first on the coming downfall of the city and nation (warning them to escape betimes from the catastrophe), and then (by a gradual transition, in which, under varied imagery, he represented both events more or less blended) he passed to the scenes of the final judgment (described as a forensic tribunal), interspersing constant admonitions (especially in the parable of the ten virgins) to preparation for an event the date of which was so uncertain (Matt. xxiv, 1-8; x, 17-20, 34-36; xxiv, 9, 10; x, 28; xxiv, 13-37; Luke xxi, 34-36; Matt. xxiv, 43, 44; Luke xii, 41, 42; Mark xiii, 31, 34; Matt. xxiv, 45-51; Luke xii, 47, 48; Matt. xxiv, 42; xxv, 1-12; Luke xii, 35-38; Matt. xxv, 13, 31-46). As the Passover was now approaching, the Sanhedrim held a secret meeting at the house of the high-priest, where they resolved to get possession, but by private means, of the person of Jesus (Thursday, March 17, A.D. 29), and Judas Iscariot, learning their desire, went and engaged to betray his Master into their hands, on the first opportunity, for a fixed reward (Matt. xxvi, 1-5, 14-16, and parallels).

The same day Jesus sent two of his disciples into the city, with directions where to prepare the Passover meal (Luke xxii, 7-13), and at evening, repairing thither to partake of it with the whole number of his apostles [see LORD'S SUPPER], he affectionately reminded them of the interest gathering about this last repast with them; then, while it was progressing, he washed their feet to reprove their mutual rivalry and enforce condescension to one another by his own example [see WASHING THE FEET], and immediately declared his own betrayal by one of their number, fixing the individual (by a sign recognised by him alone) among the amazed disciples (Luke xxii, 14-17, 24; John xiii, 1-15; Luke xxii, 25-30; John xiii, 17-19, 21, 22; Matt. xxvi, 22-24; John xiii, 23-26; Matt. xxvi, 25; and parallels). Judas immediately withdrew, full of resentment, but without the rest suspecting his purpose; relieved of his presence, Jesus now began to speak of his approaching fate, when he was interrupted by the surprised inquiries of his disciples, who produced their weapons as ready for his defence, while Peter stoutly maintained *his* steadfastness, although warned of his speedy defection (John xiii, 27-33, 36-38; Matt. xxvi, 31-33; Luke xxii, 31-38; and parallels); then, closing the meal by instituting the Eucharist (q. v.) (Matt. xxvi, 26-29, and parallels), Jesus lingered to discourse at length to his disciples (whose questions showed how little they comprehended him) on his departure at hand, and the gift (in consequence) of the Holy Spirit, with exhortations to religious activity and mutual love, and, after a prayer for the divine safeguard upon them (John xiv, 1-xv, 17; xiii, 34, 35; xv, 18-xvii, 26), he retired with them to the Mount of Olives (John xviii, 1, and parallels). Here, entering the garden of Gethsemane, he withdrew, with three of the disciples, a short distance from the rest, and, while they fell asleep, he three times prayed, in an agony (q. v.) that forced blood-tinged sweat from the pores of his forehead, for relief from the horror-stricken anguish of his soul [see BLOODY SWEAT], and was partially relieved by an angelic message; but Judas, soon appearing with a force of Temple guards and others whom he conducted to this frequent place of his Master's retirement, indicated him to them by a kiss (q. v.); Jesus then presented himself to them with such a majestic mien as to cause them to fall back in dismay, but while Peter sought to defend him by striking off with his sword the ear of one of the assailants (which Jesus immediately cured with a touch, at the same time rebuking his disciple's impetuosity), Jesus, after a short remonstrance upon the tumultuous and furtive manner of his pursuers' approach, and a stipulation for his disciples' security, suffered himself to be taken prisoner, with scarcely one of his friends remaining to protect him (Matt. xxvi, 36-50; John xviii, 4-9; Luke xxii, 49; Matt. xxvi, 51-56; Mark xiv, 51, 52; and parallels). See BETRAYAL. He was first led away to the palace of the ex-pontiff Annas, who, after vainly endeavoring to extract from him some confession respecting himself or his disciples (while Peter, who, with John, had followed after, three times denied any connection with him [see PETER], when questioned by the various servants in the court-yard, but was brought to pungent penitence by a look from his Master within the house), sent him for further examination to the acting high-priest Caiaphas (John xviii, 13-16, 18, 17, 25, 19-23, 26, 27; Luke xxii, 61, 62; John xxiii, 24; and parallels). This functionary, assembling the Sanhedrim at daylight (Friday, March 18, A.D. 29), at length, with great difficulty, procured two witnesses who testified to Jesus's threat of destroying the Temple (see John ii, 19), but with such discrepancy between themselves that Caiaphas broke the silence of Jesus by adjuring him respecting his Messianic claims, and on his avowal of his character made

WEDNESDAY.

FIG TREE WITHERED.—QUESTIONS, &c. IN TEMPLE.
1. HIERARCHY.—AUTHORITY.—TWO SONS.—ONLY SON.
2. HERODIANS.—TRIBUTE.
3. SADDUCEES SEVEN BROTHERS
4. LAWYER. GREAT COMMANDMENT.—DAVID'S SON.
5. WIDOW'S MITE.——6. GREEKS.
7. DESTRUCTION OF JERUS.

THURSDAY.

JUDAS'S TREACHERY.
PASSOVER MEAL PREPARED AND EATEN,
GETHSEMANE.——ANNAS.

FRIDAY.

CAIAPHAS.——PILATE.
HEROD.—PILATE.——CALVARY.

Map of our Saviour's Journey on the last Day of his Life.

use of this admission to charge him with blasphemy, to which the Sanhedrim present assented with a sentence of death; the officers who held Jesus thereupon indulged in the vilest insults upon his person (Matt. xxvi, 57, 59-63; Luke xxii, 67-71, 63-65; and parallels). See CAIAPHAS. After a formal vote of the full Sanhedrim (q. v.) early in the forenoon, Jesus was next led to the procurator Pilate's mansion for his legal sanction upon the determination of the religious court, where the hierarchy sought to overcome his reluctance to involve himself in the matter (which was increased by his examination of Jesus himself, who simply replied to their allegations by giving Pilate to understand that his claims did not relate to temporal things) by charging him with sedition, especially in Galilee, an intimation that Pilate seized upon to remand the whole trial to Herod (who chanced to be in Jerusalem at the time), as the civil head of that province (John xviii, 28-38; Matt. xxvii, 12-14; Luke xxiii, 4-7). Herod, however, on eagerly questioning Jesus, in hopes of witnessing some display of his miraculous power, was so enraged at his absolute silence that he sent him back to Pilate in a mock attire of royalty (Luke xxiii, 8-12). The procurator, thus compelled to exercise jurisdiction over the case, convinced of the prisoner's innocence (especially after a message from his wife to that effect), proposed to the populace to release him as the malefactor which custom required him to set at liberty on the holiday of the Passover (q. v.); but the hierarchy insisted on the release of a notorious criminal, Barabbas, instead, and enforced their clamor for the crucifixion of Jesus with so keen an insinuation of Pilate's disloyalty to the emperor, that, after varied efforts to exonerate himself and discharge the prisoner (whose personal bearing enhanced his idea of his character), he at length yielded to their demands, and, after allowing Jesus to be beaten [see FLAGELLATION] and otherwise shamefully handled by the soldiers [see MOCKING], he pronounced sentence for his execution on the cross (Luke xxiii, 13-16; Matt. xv, 17-19, 16, 20-30; John xix, 4-16; and parallels). See PILATE. The traitor Judas, perceiving the enormity of his crime, now that, in consequence of his Master's acquiescence, there appeared no chance of his escape, returned to the hierarchy with the bribe, which, on their cool reply of indifference to his retraction, he flung down in the Temple, and went and hung himself in despairing remorse (Matt. xxvii, 3-10). See JUDAS. On his way out of the city to Golgotha, where he was to be crucified, Jesus fainted under the burden of his cross, which was therefore laid upon the shoulders of one Simon, who chanced to pass at the time, and as they proceeded Jesus bade the disconsolate Jewish females attending him to weep rather for themselves and their nation than for him; on reaching the place of execution [see GOLGOTHA], after refusing the usual narcotic, he was suspended on the cross between two malefactors, while praying for his murderers; and a brief statement of his offence (which the Jews in vain endeavored to induce Pilate to change as to phraseology) was placed above his head, the executioners meanwhile having divided his garments among themselves: while hanging thus, Jesus was reviled by the spectators, by the soldiers, and even by one of his fellow-sufferers (whom the other penitently rebuking, was assured by Jesus of speedy salvation for himself [see THIEF ON THE CROSS]), and committed his mother to the care of John; then, at the close of the three hours' preternatural darkness [see ECLIPSE], giving utterance (in the language of Psa. xxii) to his agonized emotions [see SABACTHANI] amid the scoffs of his enemies, he called for something to quench his thirst, which being given him, he expired with the words of resignation to God upon his lips, while an earthquake (q. v.) and the revivification of the sleeping dead bore witness to his sacred character, as the by-standers [see CENTURION] were forced to acknowledge (Matt. xxvii, 31, 32; Luke xxiii, 27-31; Mark xv, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28; Luke xxiii, 34; John xix, 19-24; Matt. xxvii, 36, 39-43; Luke xxiii, 36, 37, 39, 43; John xix, 25-27; Matt. xxvii, 45-47, 49; John xix, 28-30; Luke xxiii, 46; Matt. xxvii, 51-53; Luke xxiii, 47, 48; and parallels). See PASSION. Towards evening, on account of the approaching Sabbath, the Jews petitioned Pilate to cause the crucified persons to be killed by the usual process of hastening their death [see CRUCIFIXION], and their bodies removed from so public a place; and as the soldiers were executing this order, they were surprised to find Jesus already dead; one of the soldiers, however, tested the body by plunging a spear into the side, when water mixed with clots of blood issued from the wound (John xix, 31-37). See BLOOD AND WATER. A rich Arimathæan, named Joseph (q. v.), a secret believer in Jesus, soon came and desired the body of Jesus for burial, and Pilate, as soon as he had ascertained the actual death of Jesus, gave him permission; accordingly, with the help of Nicodemus, he laid it in his own new vault, temporarily wrapped in spices, while the female friends of Jesus observed the place of its sepulture (Mark xv, 42-44; John xix, 38-42; Luke xxiii, 25, 26; and parallels). See SEPULCHRE. Next day (Saturday, March 19, A.D. 29) the hierarchy, remembering Jesus's predictions of his own resurrection, persuaded Pilate to secure the entrance to the tomb by a large stone, a seal, and a guard [see WATCH] at the door (Matt. xxvii, 62-66). The women, meanwhile, prepared additional embalming materials in the evening for the body of Jesus (Mark xvi, 1). See EMBALM.

Very early next morning (Sunday, March 20, A.D. 29) Jesus arose alive from the tomb [see RESURRECTION], which an angel opened, the guards swooning away at the sight (Matt. xxviii, 2-4, and parallel). The women soon appeared on the spot with the spices for completing the embalming, but, discovering the stone removed from the door, Mary Magdalene hastily returned to tell Peter, while the rest, entering, missed the body, but saw two angels at the entrance, who informed them of the resurrection of their Master, and, as they were returning to inform the disciples, they met Jesus himself; but the disciples, on their return, disbelieved their report (Mark xxi, 2-4; John xx, 2; Luke xxiv, 3-8; Matt. xxviii, 7-10; Luke xxiv, 9, 10; and parallels). The guard, however, had by this time recovered, and, on reporting to the hierarchy, they were bribed to circulate a story of the abreption of the body during their sleep (Matt. xxxiii, 11-15). Mary Magdalene meanwhile had roused Peter and John with the tidings of the absence of the body, and, on their hastening to the tomb, they both observed the state of things there, without arriving at any satisfactory explanation of it); but Mary, who arrived soon after they had left, as she stood weeping, saw a person of whom, mistaking him for the keeper of the garden, she inquired for the body, but was soon made aware by his voice that it was Jesus himself, when she fell at his feet, being forbidden a nearer approach, but bidden to announce his resurrection to the disciples (John xx, 11-18; Mark xvi, 11; and parallels). On the same day Jesus appeared to two of the disciples who were going to Emmaus, and discoursed to them respecting the Christology of the Old Test., but they did not recognise him till they were partaking the meal to which, at their journey's end, they invited him, and then they immediately returned with the news to Jerusalem, where they found that he had in the meanwhile appeared also to Peter (Luke xxiv, 13-33, and parallels). At this moment Jesus himself appeared in their midst, and overcame their incredulity by showing them his wounds and eating before them, and then gave them instructions respecting their apostolical mission (Luke xxiv, 36-49; John xx, 21; Mark xvi, 15-18; John x, 4, 22, 23; and parallels). Thomas, who had been absent from this interview, and therefore refused to believe his associates' report, was also convinced, at the next appearance of Jesus a week afterwards (Sunday evening, March 27, A.D. 29), by handling him personally (John

xx, 24–29). Some time afterwards (prob. Wednesday, March 30, A.D. 29) Jesus again appeared to his disciples on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias, as they were fishing; and, after they had taken a preternatural quantity of fish at his direction, coming ashore, they partook of a meal which he had prepared, after which he tenderly reproved Peter for his unfaithfulness, and intimated to him his future martyrdom (Matt. xxviii, 16; John xxi, 1–23). Soon afterwards (probably Thursday, March 31, A.D. 29) he appeared to some five hundred of his disciples (1 Cor. xv, 6) at an appointed meeting on a mountain in Galilee, where he commissioned his apostles afresh to their work (Matt. xxviii, 16–20). Next he appeared to James (1 Cor. xv, 7), and finally to all the apostles together [see APPEARANCE (OF RISEN CHRIST)], to whom, at the end of forty days from his passion (Thursday, April 28, A.D. 29), he now gave a general charge relative to their mission [see APOSTLE], and, leading them towards Bethany, while blessing them he was suddenly carried up bodily into the sky [see ASCENSION] and enfolded from their sight in a cloud [see INTERCESSION], angels at the same time appearing and declaring to them, in their astonishment, his future return in a similar manner (Acts i, 2–12, and parallels). (For a fuller explanation of the details of the foregoing narrative, see Strong's *Harmony and Exposition of the Gospels*, N. Y., 1852.) See GOSPELS.

IV. *Literature.*—Much of this has been cited under the foregoing heads. We present here a general summary.

1. The efforts to produce a biography of the Saviour of mankind may be said to have begun with the attempts to combine and harmonize the statements of the evangelists (see Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 20). See HARMONIES. The early Church contented itself simply with collating the narratives of the different apostles and an occasional comment on some passages. See MONOTESSARON. In the Middle Ages, as also later in the Roman Catholic Church, the works written on the life of Christ were uncritical, fantastic, and fiction-like, being mere religious tracts (Hase, p. 26). Even after the Reformation had given rise to speculation and religious theory, the works on the life of Christ continued to be of a like character. It was not till near the close of the 18th century, when the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentists had attacked Christianity [see LESSING], that the Apologists felt themselves constrained to treat the history of Christ in his twofold nature, as God and also as man. This period was therefore the first in which the life of Christ was treated in a critical and pragmatical manner (comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, 1864, p. 1). Soon, however, these efforts degenerated into humanitarianism, and even profanity. Herder, the great German poet and theologian, wrote distinct treatises on the life of "the Son of God" and on the life of "the Son of man." Some treated of the *prophet* of Nazareth (Bahrdt, Venturini; later Langsdorf); others even instituted comparisons with men like Socrates, oftentimes drawing the parallel in favor rather of the latter. Others (Paulus, Greiling), in order to suit the tendency of the age, hesitated not to strip the life of Christ of all the miraculous, and painted him simply as the humane and wise teacher. Such a theory was, of course, "the *reductio ad absurdum* of a rationalism pure and simple" (compare Plumptre, *Christ and Christendom*, Boyle Lect. 1866, p. 329). The more modern theology (we refer here mainly to German theology since Schleiermacher) attempted to crowd forward the *ideal*. Thus Hase proposed for his task the treatment "how Jesus of Nazareth, according to divine predestination, by the free exercise of his own mind, and by the will of his age, had become the Saviour of the world."

A still more destructive attitude (comp. Lange, I, x sq.) was assumed by Strauss, who, while not denying that Jesus had lived, yet recognised in the accounts of the gospels simply a mythical reflex of what the young Christian society had invented to connect with the prophetical announcements of the old covenant, though, of course, he added that it had been done unconsciously and thoughtlessly. Thus the (poetico-speculative) truth of the ideal Christ was to be maintained, but it soon vanished in the clouds like a mist. In a modified form this mythical theory was advocated by Weisse, who, like others before him, endeavored to solve the miraculous in the life of Christ by the introduction of higher biology (magnetism, etc.), and used Strauss's hypotheses in order to dispose of whatever he found impracticable in his own view. The Tübingen theologian, Bruno Bauer (*Kritik. der evangel. Gesch.* vol. iii), went further, and declaring that he could not see in the accounts of the apostles a harmless poesy, branded them as downright imposture. A much more moderate position was taken by one who utterly disbelieved the fulfilment of the prophecies, Salvador the Jew. He acknowledged the historical personality of Jesus, though the Saviour, in his treatment, came to be nothing but a Jewish reformer (and, of course, a demagogue also).

It must be acknowledged, however, that these criticisms provoked a more thorough study of the subject, and that orthodox Christianity is therefore in no small measure indebted to German rationalism for the great interest which has since been manifested in the history of our Lord. The rationalistic works called forth innumerable critiques and rejoinders (most prominent among which were those of W. Hoffmann, Stuttg. 1838 sq.; Hengstenberg, in the *Evangel. Kirchenzeitung*, 1836; Schweizer, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1837, No. iii; Tholuck, Hamburg, 1838; Ullmann, Hamb. 1838); and finally resulted in the publication of a vast number of productions on the life of Jesus.

We call attention, likewise, to the efforts of the Dutch theologians, among whom are Meijboom (Groning. 1861), Van Osterzee, and others. A new treatment of the subject was promised by the late chevalier Bunsen (Preface to his *Hippolytus*, p. xlix) but it never made its appearance. Ewald, however, continued his work on the Jews (*Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*), closing in a fifth volume with the life of Christ (*Leben Christus*). The author evidently is a non-believer in our Lord's godhead (compare Liddon, *Bampt. Lecture*, 1866, p. 505). His method of dealing with the subject has something of the same indefiniteness which characterized the work of Schleiermacher (compare Plumptre, *Boyle Lecture*, 1866, p. 336). Ewald views Jesus "as the fulfilment of the O. T.—as the final, highest, fullest, clearest revelation of God—as the true Messiah, who satisfies all right longing for God and for deliverance from the curse—as the eternal King of the kingdom of God. But with all this, and while he depicts our Lord's person and work, in its love, activity, and majesty, with a beauty that is not often met with, there is but one nature accorded to this perfect Person, and that nature is human." Of a very different character from all these works are the lectures of Prof. C. J. Riggenbach, of Basle, who presents us the picture of our Lord from a harmonistico-apologetic point of view.

Here deserve mention also the labors of Neander, who, "in the conviction, which runs through his *Church History*, that Christendom rests upon the personality of Christ," was not a little alarmed by the production of Strauss, and "with fear and trembling, feeling that controversy was a duty, and yet also that it marred the devotion of spirit in which alone the life of his Lord and Master could be contemplated rightly," entered the lists against rationalistic combatants. His excellent work has found a worthy translator in the late Rev. Dr. M'Clintock. We pass over men like Hare, "who reproduce more or less the rationalism of Paulus" (perhaps the first conspicuous work of the rationalistic Germans, though it failed to awaken the general interest that Strauss's work did; comp. Plumptre, *Boyle Lect.* 1866, p. 329); others also, who, like Ebrard and Lange, "avowedly assume the position of apologists, though their works are at least evidence (as are bishop Ellicott's *Hulsean Lect.*, and the many elaborate commentaries on the Gospels in our country and abroad) that orthodox theo-

logians do not shrink from the field of inquiry thus opened."

A time of quiet and rest seemed now to have dawned upon this polemical field of Christian theology, when suddenly, in 1863, the learned Frenchman Rénan appeared with his *Vie de Jésus*, and stirred anew the spirits, as Strauss had done thirty years before. Most arbitrarily did Mr. Rénan deal with the data upon which his work professed to be based; while theologically he proceeded throughout "on a really atheistic assumption, disguised beneath the veil of a pantheistic phraseology. . . . It is, however, when we look at the *Vie de Jésus* from a moral point of view that its shortcomings are most apparent in their length and breadth. Its hero is a fanatical impostor, who pretends to be and to do that which he knows to be beyond him, but who, nevertheless, is held up to our admiration as the ideal of humanity" (Liddon, p. 506). It is sufficient to reply to this caricature by Mr. Rénan that, "If this be the founder of Christianity, and if Christianity be the right belief, then all religion must cease from the earth; for not only is this character unfit to sustain Christianity, but it is unfit to sustain any religion; it wants the *bond*" (Lange, I, xviii). Yet "it *may* be that to the thousands whose thoughts have either rested in the symbols of the infancy and the death which the *cultus* of the Latin Church brings so prominently before them, or who, having rejected these, have accepted nothing in their place, the *Vie de Jésus* has given a sense of human reality to the Gospel history which they never knew before, and led them to study it with a more devout sympathy" (Plumptre, p. 337). Countless editions and translations were made of the work, and it was read everywhere with as much interest as if it had been simply a work of fiction; indeed German theologians, even the Rationalists, hesitated not to rank it among French novels. Innumerable are the works which were written against and in defence of this legendary hypothesis. In Germany, especially, the contest raged fiercely, and for a time it seemed as if the materialistic Frenchman was to uproot all Christian feelings in the hearts of the common people of Germany, when Strauss suddenly reappeared on the stage in behalf of his mythical theory with a new edition of his *Leben Jesu*, this time prepared *for the wants of the German people*, "and the new work, more popular in form, more caustic and sneering in its hostility, has been read as widely as the old. . . . Mustering all old objections and starting anew, he seeks to prove that the first three gospels contradict each other and the fourth. Without entering into the more elaborate theories as to their origin and their relation to the several parties and sects in early *Christendom*, as Baur did afterwards, he has a general theory which accounts for them. Men's hopes and wishes, their reverence and awe, tend at all times to develop themselves into *myths*. . . . The *myths* were not 'cunningly devised,' but were the spontaneous, unconscious growth of the time in which they first appeared. If men asked what, then, was left them to believe in—what was the idea which had thus developed itself through what had been worked on as the facts of Christianity, the answer was that God manifested himself, not in Christ, but in humanity at large—humanity is the union of the two natures, the finite and the infinite, the child of the visible mother and the invisible father. . . . The outcry against the book was, as might be expected, enormous. It opened the eyes of those who had dallied with unbelief to see that they were naked, and it stripped off the fig-leaf covering of words and phrases with which they had sought to hide their nakedness. What was offered as the compensation for all this work of destruction, if it were offered in any other spirit than that of the mockery even then, and yet more now, so characteristic of the author, was hardly enough to give warmth and shelter to any human soul" (Plumptre, p. 334). The ablest among Christian divines and scholars came forward to refute the naked falsehoods, and up to our day the contest rages, nor can it be said how soon it will be ended; it is certain, however, that orthodox Christianity is daily gaining ground, even in the very core of the heart of Rationalism. In France it drew forth the able work of Pressensé, *Jésus Christ son Temps, sa Vie son Œuvre* (Paris, 1865), which has since appeared in an English dress in this country. In England, *Ecce Homo*, a survey of the life and work of Jesus Christ (London, 1866), was a response to French and German Rationalists, in so far as the reality of our Saviour's human career is concerned. (See above, II, 3.)

Great service has also been done for the truth by the productions of Weiss (*Sechs Vorträge über die Person Jesu Christi*, Ingolst. 1864), Liddon (*Bampton Lecture*, 1866; see *Christian Remembrancer*, Jan. 1868, article vi), and particularly by Row (London, 1868; N. Y. 1871; see *Princeton Rev.* 1810, art. v), Plumptre (*Boyle Lect.* 1866), R. Payne Smith (*Bampton Lecture*, 1869), Leathes, *Witness of St. John to Christ* (*Boyle Lect.* 1870), Andrews, and Hanna. Several popular treatises on the subject were also produced in Germany, England, and America, among which are those of Abbott and Eddy. Henry Ward Beecher has just published vol. i of a similar work.

2. The following is a list of the most important of the very numerous works relating to the person and history of Christ, of which Germany has been especially fruitful (comp. Walch, iii, 404; Hase, p. 28, 37, 41; Andrews, Preface).

(1.) Of a general character are treatises by the following authors, respecting the proper method of investigating the career of Christ: Döderlein (Jena, 1783 sq.), Semler (Hal. 1786), Eberhard (Hal. 1787), Albers (Gött. 1793), Ammon (Gött. 1794), Brüggeman (Gött. 1795), Stuckert (Francfort, 1797), Müller (Stuttg. 1785), Piper (Gött. 1835), Sextroh (Gött. 1785), Peterson (Lüb. 1838), Scholten (Traj. 1840), Wiggers (Rost. 1837). On profane and apocryphal materials: Köcher (Jena, 1726), Meyer (Hamb. 1805), Augusti (Jena, 1799), Huldric (L. B. 1705), Werner (Stad. 1781). *Diatessura* of the Gospel history have been composed by the following: J. F. Bahrdt (Lpz. 1772), Roos (Tübingen, 1776), Mutschelle (Münch. 1784), C. F. Bahrdt (Berl. 1787), Bergen (Giessen, 1789 sq.), White (Oxon. 1800), Keller (Stuttg. 1802), Horn (Nürnburg, 1803), Sebastiani (Lpzg. 1806), Hummer (Wien, 1807), Langsdorf (Mannheim, 1830), Küchler (Lips. 1835), and others. See HARMONIES.

Discussions on the *life* of Jesus, in a more historical form, of a *hostile* character, are by the following: Reimar (Braunschweig, 1778 sq.), C. F. Bahrdt (Halle, 1782; Berl. 1784 sq.), J. G. Schulthess (Zür. 1783), Venturini (Kopen. 1800), Langsdorf (Mannh. 1831), D. F. Strauss (Tübing. 1835, 1837, 1838 [the work which provoked the innumerable critiques and rejoinders, as above stated], Sack (Bonn, 1836), Theile (Lpzg. 1832), Hahn (Leipzig, 1839).

Of an *apologetic* character [besides those in express opposition to Strauss] are the following: Reinhard (Wittenburg, 1781; 5th edition, with additions by Heubner, 1830), Hess (Zürich, 1774, rewritten 1823), Vermehren (Halle, 1799), Opitz (Zerbst, 1812), Planck (Gött. 1818), Bodent [Rom. Cath.] (Gernünd. 1818 sq.), Paulus (Heidelb. 1828), J. Schulthess (Zürich, 1830), Hase (Lpzg. 1829, 1835), Neander (Hamb. 1837; translated by M'Clintock and Blumenthal, N. Y. 1840), Kleuker (Brem. 1776; Ulm. 1793), Basedow (Lpz. 1784), Wizenman (Lpz. 1780), Herder (Riga, 1796), Hacker (Leipzig, 1801-3), Schorch (Lpzg. 1841), Kolthoff (Hafn. 1852), Hofmann (Leipzig, 1852), Keim (Zür. 1861, 1864), Wisenmann (1864), Weiss (Ingolst. 1864). See RATIONALISM.

Among those of a more *practical* character are the following: Walch (Jena, 1740), Hüniber (Frankf. 1763), Hoppenstedt (Hannov. 1784 sq.), Hunter (Lond. 1785), Fleetwood (Lond.), Cramer (Lpz. 1787), Marx (Münster, 1789, 1830), Gosner (Leipzig, 1797; Zürich, 1818), Sintenis (Zerbst, 1800), Meister (Basel, 1802), Reichenberger (Wien, 1793, 1826), Gerhard and Müller (Erfurt, 1801), Bauriegel (Neustadt, 1801, 1821), Greiling (Halle, 1813), Jacobi (Gotha, 1817; Sonders. 1819), Pflaum (Nürnburg,

1819), Ammon (Lpzg. 1842-7, 3 vols.), Müller (Berlin, 1819, 1821), Schmidt (Wien, 1822, 1826), Francke (Bresl. 1823, Lpzg. 1838, 1842), Buchfelner (Münch. 1826), Nevels (Aachen, 1826), Stephani (Magdeb. 1830), Onymus (Sulzb. 1831), Blunt (London, 1835), Hartmann (Stuttg. 1837), Weisse (Lpzg. 1838), Kuhn (Mainz, 1838), Lehrreich (Quedl. 1840), Hirscher (Tübing. 1839), Würkerts (Meiss. 1840), Hug (1840), Krane (Cass. 1850), Lichtenstein (Erl. 1855), Rougemont (Paris and Lausanne, 1856), J. Bucher (Stuttgard, 1859), Krummacher (Bielf. 1854), Baumgarten (Brunsw. 1859), Uhlhorn (Hamb. 1866; Bost. 1868), Ellicott (London, 1859), Andrews (N. Y. 1862).

Among those pictorially illustrated are the works of Schleich (Münch. 1821), Langer (Stuttgart, 1823), Kitto (Lond. 1847), Abbott (N. Y. 1864), Crosby (N. Y. 1871).

Among those of a *poetical* character are Juvencus, ed. Arevalus (Rom. 1792), Vida (L. B. 1566, ed. Müller; Hamb. 1811), Wilmsen (Berlin, 1816, 1826), Gittermann (Hannov. 1821), Schincke (Hal. 1826), Klopstock (Hal. 1751, and often), Lavater (Winterth. 1783), Halem (Hannov. 1810), Weihe (Elberf. 1822, 1824), Wilmy (Sulzb. 1825), Kirsch (Lpz. 1825), Göpp (Lpz. 1827).

(2.) Of a more special nature are treatises on particular portions of Christ's *outward* history or circumstances, e. g. his relatives: Walther (Berl. 1791), Oertel (Germ. 1792), Hasse (Regiom. 1792; Berl. 1794), Ludewig (Wolfenb. 1831), Tiliander (Upsal. 1772), Geyer (Viteb. 1777), Blom (L. Bat. 1839), Oosterzee (Traj. a. R. 1840); and his country: Königsman (Slesvic. 1807). Among those on his birth: Korb (Lpz. 1831), Meerheim (Viteb. 1785), Reimer (Lubec, 1653), Oetter (Nürnb. 1774); and in a chronological point of view, among others: Masson (Roterd. 1700), Maius (Kilon. 1708; id. 1722), Heineccius (Hal. 1708), Liebknecht (Giess. 1735), Hager (Chemnit. 1743), Mann (Lond. 1752), Jost (Wirceb. 1754), Haiden (Prague, 1759), Reccared (Regiom. 1768; id. 1766), Horix (Mogunt. 1789), Sanclemente (Rome, 1795), Michaelis (Wien, 1797), Münter (Kopenh. 1827), Feldhoff (Frankf. 1832), Mayer (Gryph. 1701), Hardt (Helmstädt, 1754), Körner (Lipsiæ, 1778), Mynster (Kopenh. 1837), Huschke (Bresl. 1840), Caspari (Hamb. 1869); compare *Stud. u. Krit.* 1870, ii, 357; 1871, ii; *Baptist Quarterly*, 1871, p. 113 sq.; and see Zumpt, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi* (Leipzig, 1869). On his infancy, education, etc.: Niemeyer (Halle, 1790), Ammon (Götting. 1798), Schubert (Gryph. 1813), Carpzov (Helmst. 1771), Weise (Helmst. 1798), Lange (Ald. 1699), Arnold (Regiom. 1730), Rau (Erl. 1796), Bandelin (Lüb. 1809). On the duration of his ministry: Chrysander (Brunsw. 1750), Pisanski (Regiom. 1778), Loeber (Altenb. 1767), Körner (Lips. 1779), Priestley (Birmingham, 1780), Newcome (Dublin, 1780), Priess (Rost. 1789), Hänlein (Erlang. 1796). See APOSTLE. On his baptism, see JOHN THE BAPTIST. On his travels: Schmidt (Ilmenau, 1833; Paris, 1837). On his celibacy: Niedner (Schneeberg, 1815). On his teaching: Tschucke (Lipsiæ, 1781), Bahrdt (Berlin, 1786), Manderbach (Elberf. 1813), Martini (Rost. 1794), Stier (Leipzig, 1853 sq.; Edinb. 1856 sq.). See SERMON ON THE MOUNT. On his alleged writings: Ittig (Lipsiæ, 1696), *Epistola apocrypha J. C. ad Petrum* (Rom. 1774), Sartorius (Basil. 1817), Gieseke (Lünenb. 1822), Witting (Braunschw. 1823). See ABGAR. On his miracles (q. v.): Heumann (Gött. 1747), Pfaff (Tübingen, 1752), Pauli (Riga, 1773), Trench (Lond. 1848; N. Y. 1850). On his transfiguration (q. v.): Reusmann (Götting. 1747), Georgi (Viteb. 1744), anonymous *Essay* (Lond. 1788), Haubold (Gött. 1791), Eger (1794), Rau (Erl. 1797); and his white garment, Franke (Lips. 1672), Sagittarius (Jena, 1673). On his temptation (q. v.): Baumgarten (Halle, 1755), De Saga (Gött. 1757), Farmer (London, 1671), Sauer (Bonn, 1789), Postius (Zweibr. 1791), Ziegenhagen (Franckfort, 1791), Domey (Upsal. 1792), Schütze (Hamb. 1793), Dahl (Upsal. 1800), Bertholdt (Erl. 1812), Gellerichts (Altenb. 1815), Richter (Viteb. 1825), Schweizer (Zürich, 1833), Ewald (Bayreuth, 1833); comp. the *Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.* 1870, p. 188 sq. On his passion (q. v.): Iken (Brem. 1743; Tr. a. R. 1758), Baumgarten (Halle, 1757), Glanz (Stuttg. 1809), Henneberg (Lpzg. 1823), Schlegel (Lpzg. 1775), Mosche (Franckfort, 1785), Ewald (Lemgo, 1785), Fischer (Lpzg. 1794), Kindervater (Lpzg. 1797), Mösler (Eisenb. 1816), Krummacher (Berl. 1817), Jongh (Tr. a. R. 1827), Adriani (Tr. a. R. 1827), Walther (Bresl. 1738; Lpzg. 1777). On his crucifixion (q. v.): Schmidtman (Osnabr. 1830), Neubig (Erl. 1836), Hasert (Berl. 1839), Karig (Lpzg. 1842), Stroud (Lond. 1847). See AGONY; ATONEMENT. On his words upon the cross: Höpner (Lips. 1641), Dankauer (Arg. 1641), Luger (Jena, 1739), Scharf (Viteb. 1677), Niemann (Jena, 1671), Lokerwitz (Viteb. 1680). On his burial: Te Water [i. e. Wesseling] (Traj. a. Rh. 1761). See CALVARY. On his resurrection (q. v.): among others, Buttstedt (Geræ, 1749), Sherlock (London, 1751), Seidel (Helmst. 1758), Weickhmann (Viteb. 1767), Burkitt (Meining. 1774), Rehkopf (Helmstadt, 1775), Lüderwald (Helmst. 1778), Less (Gött. 1779), Scheibel (Frankf. 1779), Mosche (Frankf. 1779), Semler (Halle, 1780), Moldenhauer (Hamb. 1779), Velthusen (Helmst. 1780), Pfeiffer (Erlang. 1779, 1787), Michaelis (Hal. 1783), Schmid (Jena, 1784), Plessing (Hal. 1788), Volkmar (Bresl. 1786), Henneberg (Lpzg. 1826), Frege (Hamb. 1833), Griesbach (Jena, 1784), Niemeyer (Hal. 1824), Rosenmüller (Erlang. 1780), Paulus (Jena, 1795), Pisansky (Regiom. 1782), Zeibich (Geræ, 1784), Rusmeyer (Gryph. 1734), Feuerlein (Gött. 1752), Gutschmidt (Halle, 1753), Müller (Hafn. 1836). On his ascension (q. v.), among others: Griesbach (Jena, 1793), Seiler (Erlang. 1798, 1803), Ammon (Gött. 1800), Otterbein (Duisb. 1802), Flügge (Argent. 1811), Weichert (Viteb. 1811), Fogtmann (Havn. 1826), Hanna, *The Forty Days after our Lord's Resurrection* (London, 1863).

The following are some of the treatises on the *personal* traits of Jesus, e. g. his physical constitution: Weber (Hal. 1825), Engelmann (Lpz. 1834), Gieseler (Götting. 1837). On his dress: Zeibich (Witt. 1754), Gerberon (Par. 1677). His language: Reiske (Jena, 1670), Klæden (Viteb. 1739), Diodati (Neapol. 1767), Pfannkuche (in Eichhorn's *Allg. Bibl.* vii, 365-480), Wiseman (in his *Hor. Syr.* Rome, 1828), Zeibich (Viteb. 1791), Paulus (Jena, 1803). On his mode of life: Lunze (Lips. 1784), Rau (Erl. 1787, 1796), Jacobæus (Hafn. 1703), Schreiber (Jena, 1743), Tragard (Gryph. 1781). On his intercourse with others: Gesenius (Helmstadt, 1734), Jetze (Liegn. 1792). Respecting the *inner* nature of his character, the following may be named, e. g. on his (human) disposition and temperament: Woytt (Jena, 1753), Bücking (Stendal. 1793), Schinmaier (Flensb. 1774 sq.), Winkler (Lpz. 1826), Dorner (Stuttg. 1839); on his psychology, see the *Biblioth. Sacra*, April, 1870. On his sinlessness, among others: Walther (Viteb. 1690), Baumgarten (Hal. 1740), Erbstein (Meiss. 1787), Weber (Viteb. 1796), Ewald (Hannov. 1798; Geræ, 1799), Ullmann (Hamburg, 1833, translated in Clark's *Biblical Cabinet*, Edinburgh), Fritzsche (Halle, 1835). See MESSIAH.

Jesus Christ, Orders of. These were formed of temporal knights in the countries paying homage to the Roman see for the protection and promotion of the Roman Catholic religion.

I. Such was the order founded under this name, also known as the *Order of Dobrin*, in 1213, by duke Conrad of Masovia and Kujavia, Poland. They followed the rules of St. Augustine as a religious society, and their aim was to counteract the influences of the heathenish Prussians, their western neighbors. Their stronghold was the burgh of Dobrin, in Prussia. The insignia and dress of the order were a white mantle, on the left breast a red sword, and a five-pointed red star. The order was merged into the German order in 1234.

II. In Spain such an order was founded in 1216 by Dominicus. The knights bound themselves to practise monastic duties, and to battle in defence of their Church. It was approved by pope Honorius III, and confirmed, under various names, by different popes. When Pius V founded the congregation of St. Peter the Martyr at Rome, composed of the cardinals, grand inquisitors, and other dignitaries of the Holy Office, this order was

merged into it. In 1815 king Ferdinand VII commanded the members of the Inquisition to wear the insignia of the order.

III. Another of like name was started in Portugal in 1317 by king Dionysius of Portugal, in concert with pope John XXII, and was composed of the knights of the former Knights Templars (q. v.). See CHRIST, ORDER OF, vol. ii, p. 268.

IV. Another of this class was the *Order of Jesus and Mary*, and was founded in 1643 by Eudes (q. v.). Their insignia are a gilded Maltese cross, enamelled with blue, surrounded by a golden border, and in the centre of which is the name of Jesus: it is worn at the buttonhole. The full-dress cloak is of white camlet, with the cross of the order in blue satin, with gilt border, and name on the left side. The order consists of a grand master, thirty-three commanders (in commemoration of the years of Christ's life), knights of uprightness and of grace, chaplains, and serving brethren. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 615; Pierer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 809.

Jesus (Holy Child), Congregation of, THE DAUGHTERS OF THE, is the name of a society existing in Rome, and was founded by Anna Moroni, of Lucca, who in early years went to Rome, and there amassed a fortune, which she decided to devote to a religious purpose. In its character, she made it an institution similar to that of the "Hospital Sisters," for the education of young women, so as to enable them to earn a livelihood. The congregation was confirmed by pope Clement X in 1673. The number of the members is set down at thirty-three, corresponding with the years Jesus spent on earth; they assume the vow of poverty, chastity, and obedience. The novitiate lasts three years, but they may withdraw before taking the vow, leaving, however, to the congregation whatever they may have brought there on their admission. The discipline of the congregation is strict; the dress is a full dark brown garment and white cowl. There existed also a similar order under the name of "Sisters of the good Jesus" early in the 15th century. Their main object was the promotion of a life of chastity among females.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 615. See HOSPITAL SISTERS.

Jesus' Sacred Heart, Society of. In the beginning of the 18th century, the Jesuits, fearing the suppression of their own order, actively engaged in the establishment of other orders likely to continue the same peculiar work. More particularly these were the Societies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, which they formed in nearly every part of the world where Roman Catholicism, especially Jesuitism, had a foothold. Ostensibly they were to be societies of a purely *religious* character, but in reality they proved to be nothing more nor less than the society of the *Baccanarists*—an asylum for the ex-Jesuits, a society in the Church of Rome advocating the doctrines of the Jesuits under a new name and form. Such was evidently the aim of this society in 1794, when the ex-Jesuit abbés Charles de Broglie, Pey, Tournély, and others of lesser note, organized it at a country retreat near Löwen, in Belgium, with Tournély (q. v.) as superior. After the battle of Fleurus (June 26, 1794), not only the fate of Belgium seemed determined, but also that of this society, and it was post-haste removed to more congenial climes. They found a protector in the elector Clemens Wenceslaus, and settled at Trèves. "The Jesuits who dwelt there," says a Roman Catholic writer, "would gladly have welcomed them as of their own number if these Frenchmen had only been masters of the German language." They flourished at Trèves for more than two years, when the approach of the victorious French army obliged them again to pull up stakes, and they settled first at Passau, next at Vienna, and, when driven from the imperial city, removed to its very shades, entering, even after this (1797), quite frequently the limits of Vienna. In 1799 the order was merged into that of the *Baccanarists* (q. v.).

A female order of like name with the above, whose origin is also attributed to the Jesuits, was founded in 1800 at Paris. The first leader of it was the maiden Barat, and it was approved by Leo XII December 22, 1826. As they engage in the education of young females, they enjoy, not only in Roman Catholic countries, a favorable reputation, but are in a flourishing condition in many Protestant countries also. They have in Europe alone more than a hundred establishments. They exist also in America and Africa. Their private aims, no doubt, are those of the Jesuitical order. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* v, 116; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iv, 485 sq.; Henrian-Fehr, *Mönchsorden*, ii, 62 sq.; Schlör, *Die Frauen v. heil. Herzen Jesu* (Grätz, 1846, 8vo). See SACRED HEART.

Jesus, Society of. See JESUITS.

Je'ther (Heb. *Ye'ther*, יֶתֶר, *surplus*), the name of six men, and perhaps also of a place.

1. (Sept. Ἰεθέρ.) A son of Jada and great-grandson of Jerahmeel, of the family of Judah; he had a brother Jonathan, but no children (1 Chron. ii, 32). B.C. considerably post 1856.

2. (Sept. Ἰοθόρ, Vulg. *Jethro*, Auth. Vers. "Jethro.") The father-in-law of Moses (Exod. iv, 18, first clause), elsewhere (last clause of the same verse) called JETHRO (q. v.).

3. (Sept. Ἰεθέρ.) The first named of the sons of Ezra (? Ezer), of the tribe of Judah (his brothers being Mered [q. v.], Epher, and Jalon), but whose connections are not otherwise defined (1 Chron. iv, 17). B.C. prob. cir. 1618. In the Sept. the name is repeated: "and Jether begat Miriam," etc. By the author of the *Quæst. Hebr. in Par.* he is said to have been Aaron, Ezra being another name for Amram (q. v.). Miriam (q. v.) in the second part of the verse—explained by the Targum to be identical with Efrath—is taken by many to be a male name.

4. (Sept. Ἰέθερ.) The oldest son of Gideon, who, when called upon by his father to execute the captured Midianite kings, Zebah and Zalmunna, timidly declined on account of his youth (Judg. viii, 20). B.C. 1362. According to Judg. ix, 8, he was slain, together with 69 of his brothers—Jonathan alone escaping—"upon one stone" at Ophrah, by the hands of Abimelech, the son of Gideon's concubine, of Shechem. See GIDEON.

5. (Sept. Ἰέθερ, Ἰεθέρ.) The father of Amasa, David's general (1 Kings ii, 5, 32; 1 Chron. ii, 17); elsewhere (2 Sam. xvii, 6) called ITHRA (q. v.). He is described in 1 Chron. ii, 17 as an Ishmaelite, which, again, is more likely to be correct than the "Israelite" of the Hebrew in 2 Sam. xvii, or the "Jezreelite" of the Sept. and Vulg. in the same passage. "Ishmaelite" is said by the author of the *Quæst. Hebr. in lib. Reg.* to have been the reading of the Hebrew, but there is no trace of it in the MSS. The Talmud records two divergent opinions on the subject (Jer. *Jebam.* 9, c; comp. Babl. *Jeb.* 77, a). According to R. Samuel bar-Nachmani, Jether was an Ishmaelite by birth, but became a proselyte: hence the two appellations. Another opinion is that a staunch upholder of David's reign, he, when the king's descent through Ruth, a Moabitish woman, was made a pretext by some of his antagonists to deprive him of his crown, "girded his loins like an Israelite," and threatened to uphold by the sword, if need be, the authority of the Halacha, which had decided that "a Moabitish *man*, but *not a Moabitish woman*, an Ammonitish *man*, but not an Ammonitish *woman*, should be prohibited from entering into the congregation." Similarly we find in the Targ. to 1 Chron. ii, 17 (Wilkins's edition—this verse belongs to those wanting in Beck) that the father of Amasa was Jether *the Israelite*, but that he was called Jether *the Ishmaelite* because he aided David בערכאה (=בית דין) before the tribunal [Wilkins, "*cum Arabibus!*"]. Later commentators (Rashi, Abrabanel, David Kimchi) assume that he was an Israelite by birth, but dwelt in the land of Ishmael,

and was for this reason also called the Ishmaelite, as Obed Edom is also called the Gittite (2 Sam. vi), or Hiram's father the Zuri or Tyrian (1 Kings vi). David Kimchi also adduces a suggestion of his father, to the effect "that in the land of Ishmael Jether was called the Israelite from his nationality, and in that of Israel they called him the Ishmaelite on account of his living in the land of Ishmael." Josephus calls him Ἰεθάρσης (*Ant.* vii, 10, 1). He married Abigail, David's sister, probably during the sojourn of the family of Jesse in the land of Moab, under the protection of its king. See AMASA.

6. (Sept. Ἰεθέρ v. r. Ἰεθήρ.) An Asherite (head of a warrior family numbering 26,000) whose three sons are named in 1 Chron. vii, 38; possibly the same with ITHRAN of the preceding verse.

7. Whether the *Ithrites* (יִתְרִי, Sept. Ἐθιραῖος, Ἰεθρί, Ἰεθερί, Τεθρίτης, Vulg. *Jethrites, Jethræus*, etc.) Ira and Gareb, mentioned in 2 Sam. xxiii, 38, etc., were natives of an otherwise unknown place called Jether, or of Jathir, יַתִּיר, one of David's places of refuge (1 Sam. xxx, 27), or descendants of one Jether—the least probable suggestion—cannot now be determined. See ITHRITE.

Je'theth (Heb. *Yetheth'*, יְתֵת, prob. a *peg*, or fig. a *prince;* Sept. Ἰεθέθ and Ἰεθέρ, the last apparently from falsely reading יֶתֶר; Vulg. *Jetheth*), the third named of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (Gen. xxxvi, 40; 1 Chron. i, 51). B.C. ante 1658. See ESAU. As to identification, *El-Wetideh* is a place in Nejd, said to be in the Dahnà [see ISHBAK]; there is also a place called *El-Wetid*, and *El-Wetidát*, which is the name of mountains belonging to Bene Abd-Allah Ibn-Ghatfán (*Marásid.* s. v.) (Smith). See ARABIA.

Jeth'lah (Heb. *Yithlah'*, יִתְלָה, *suspended*, i. e. lofty; Sept. Ἰεθλά v. r. Σιλαθά, Vulg. *Jethela*), a city on the borders of the tribe of Dan, mentioned between Ajalon and Elon (Josh. xix, 42). The associated names seem to indicate a locality in the eastern part of the tribe, not far from the modern el-Atrun (Ataroth), perhaps the ruined site marked on Van de Velde's *Map* (last ed.) as *Amwas* (Nicopolis). See EMMAUS, 2.

Jeth'ro (Heb. *Yithro'*, יִתְרוֹ, i. q. יִתְרוֹן, *excellence* or *gain*, as often in Eccles.; occurs in Exod. iii, 1; iv, 18; xviii, 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12; Sept. Ἰοθόρ) or JETHER (יֶתֶר, *abundance*, as often; occurs with reference to this person, Exod. iv, 18, where it is Anglicized "Jethro" in the Auth. Vers., though in the Heb.-Sam. text and Sam. version the reading is יתרו, as in the Syriac and Targ. Jon., one of Kennicott's MSS., and a MS. of Targ. Onk., No. 16 in De Rossi's collection; Sept. Ἰοθόρ), a "priest or prince (for the word כֹּהֵן carries both significations, and both these offices were united in the patriarchal sheiks) of Midian, a tract of country in Arabia Petræa, on the eastern border of the Red Sea, at no great distance from Mount Sinai, where Moses spent his exile from the Egyptian court, B.C. 1698. The family of this individual seems, in the sequel at least, to have observed the worship of the true God in common with the Hebrews (Exod. xviii, 11, 12), and from this circumstance some suppose it to have been a branch of the posterity of Midian, fourth son of Abraham, by Keturah, while others, on the contrary, maintain that the aspersion cast upon Moses for having married a Cushite is inconsistent with the idea of its genealogical descent from that patriarch (Calmet). See MIDIAN.

"Considerable difficulty has been felt in determining who this person was, as well as his exact relation to Moses; for the word חֹתֵן, which, in Exod. iii, 1; Numb. x, 29; Judg. iv, 11, is translated *father-in-law*, and in Gen. xix, 14, *son-in-law*, is a term of indeterminate signification, denoting simply relationship by marriage; and besides, the transaction which in one place (Exod. xviii, 27) is related of Jethro, seems to be in another related of Hobab (Numb. x, 28). Hence some have concluded that, as forty years had elapsed since Moses's connection with this family was formed, his father-in-law (Exod. ii, 18), Reuel or Raguel (the same word in the original is used in both places), was dead, or confined to his tent by the infirmities of age, and that the person who visited Moses at the foot of Sinai was his brother-in-law, called *Hobab* in Numb. x, 29; Judg. iv, 11; *Jethro* in Exod. iii, 1; and in Judg. i, 16, *Keni* (קֵינִי, which there, as well as in iv, 11, is rendered 'the Kenite')" (Kitto). Against this explanation, however, there lies this serious objection, that in Numb. x, 29 Hobab is expressly called the son of Raguel (or Reuel), who in Exod. ii, 16–21 is evidently made the father-in-law of Moses, and in iii, 1 is clearly the same as Jethro. Nor will the interpretation of the Targum avail, which makes Reuel the grandfather of Moses's wife (by a frequent Hebraism of "daughter" for granddaughter, etc.); for then Moses's real father-in-law would be nowhere named; and it is clearly Jethro whose flocks he kept, and to whom he "made obeisance" (Exod. xviii, 7); which, with other incidental allusions, are all natural on the supposition that Moses was his son-in-law, but are out of place in a brother-in-law. Besides, it is Jethro who is called the sacerdotal and tribal head of the clan, which could not, under the patriarchal domestic constitution, have been the case had his father Reuel been still alive. If, indeed, we could accept the ingenious conjecture of Ewald (*Gesch. des Isr.* sec. ii, 33) that, by an ancient clerical error, the words יתרו בן, "Jethro, son of," had dropped out before the name of Reuel, it would then be easy, with the Targum Jonathan, Aben-Ezra, Rosenmüller, etc., to assume that Jethro was Reuel's *son;* but there is no trace of such an error. All those methods of adjusting these accounts must therefore be abandoned which maintain the identity of Jethro and Hobab, in whatever way they seek (see Winer's *Realwörterbuch*, s. v. Raguel) to reconcile the discrepancies; and the whole of the statements may be cleared up by understanding, with Von Lengerke (*Kenaan*, i, 393), Bertheau (*Gesch. Isra.* sec. 242), Kalisch (*Exod.* p. 35), and others, that Jethro and Raguel were but different names of Moses's father-in-law, and that the son Hobab was his brother-in-law (referring חֹתֵן in Numb. x, 29 to Raguel, and in Judg. iv, 11 taking it in the general sense of *affinis*, relative by marriage). Josephus, in speaking of Raguel, remarks once (*Ant.* ii, 12, 1) that he "had *Iothor* (Ἰοθόρ, i. e. Jethro) for a surname" (Ἰεθεγλαῖος ἦν ἐπίκλημα τῷ Ῥαγουήλ). "The abbreviated form of his name (Jether or Jethro, for Jethron) is enumerated by the Midrash as the first of the seven (or, according to another version, eight) names by which this Midianitish priest was known [viz. Jether or Jethro, because he heaped up (הותיר) good deeds, or because 'he added a Parasha to the Torah;' Cheber (חבר), because he was a friend of the Lord; Chobeb (חבב), because he was beloved by the Lord, or because 'he loved the Torah;' Reuel, because he was a companion (רע) to the Lord; Petuel, because he freed himself (פטר) from idolatry]. Indeed, Jether is considered his original name, to which, when he became a believer and a convert to the faith, an additional letter (ו) was affixed. According to the Midrash (fol. 53, 54), he had been one of Pharaoh's musicians, and had got possession of Adam's staff, which had belonged to Joseph; but he was driven from Egypt because he opposed the decree for drowning the Israelitish infants." See HOBAB; RAGUEL.

"The hospitality, free-hearted and unsought, which Jethro at once extended to the unknown, homeless wanderer, on the relation of his daughters that he had watered their flock, is a picture of Eastern manners no less true than lovely. We may perhaps suppose that Je-

thro, before his acquaintance with Moses, was not a worshipper of the true God. Traces of this appear in the delay which Moses had suffered to take place with respect to the circumcision of his son (Exod. iv, 24-26): indeed, it is even possible that Zipporah had afterwards been subjected to a kind of divorce (Exod. xviii, 2, שִׁלּוּחֶיהָ), on account of her attachment to an alien creed, but that growing convictions were at work in the mind of Jethro, from the circumstance of Israel's continued prosperity, till at last, acting upon these, he brought back his daughter, and declared that his impressions were confirmed, for '*now* he knew that the Lord was greater than all gods, for in the thing wherein they dealt proudly, he was above them:' consequently we are told that 'Jethro, Moses's father-in-law, took a burnt-offering and sacrifices for *God:* and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses's father-in-law *before God,*' as if to celebrate the event of his conversion" See MOSES.

"Shortly after the Exodus (B.C. 1658), Jethro paid a visit to Moses, while the Hebrew camp was lying in the environs of Sinai, bringing with him Zipporah, Moses's wife, who, together with her two sons, had been left with her family while her husband was absent on his embassy to Pharaoh. The interview was on both sides affectionate, and was celebrated first by the solemn rites of religion, and afterwards by festivities, of which Aaron and the elders of Israel were invited to partake. On the following day, observing Moses incessantly occupied in deciding causes that were submitted to him for judgment, his experienced kinsman remonstrated with him on the speedy exhaustion which a perseverance in such arduous labors would superinduce; and in order to relieve himself, as well as secure a due attention to every case, he urged Moses to appoint a number of subordinate officers to divide with him the duty of the judicial tribunals, with power to decide in all common affairs, while the weightier and more serious matters were reserved to himself. This wise suggestion the Hebrew legislator adopted (Exod. xviii). As the Hebrews were shortly afterwards about preparing to decamp from Sinai, the kinsmen of Moses announced their intention to return to their own territory," and Moses interposed no special objection to the purpose on the part of his father-in-law, whose presence was doubtless essential at home, and who accordingly took his deparure (Exod. xviii, 27). His brother-in-law Hobab naturally purposed to accompany his father back to Midian, and at first expressed a refusal to the invitation of Moses to accompany the Israelites to Canaan (Numb. x, 29, 30). It is not stated whether he actually returned with his father, "but if he did carry that purpose into execution, it was in opposition to the urgent solicitations of the Jewish leader, who entreated him, for his own advantage, to cast in his lot with the people of God; at all events to continue with them, and afford them the benefit of his thorough acquaintance with the wilderness. 'Leave us not, I pray thee,' said Moses, 'forasmuch as thou knowest how we are to encamp in the wilderness, and thou *mayest be to us instead of eyes;*' which the Sept. has rendered 'and thou shalt be an elder among us.' But there can be little doubt that the true meaning is that Hobab might perform the office of a *hybêr* or guide (see Bruce's *Travels,* iv, 586)—his influence as an Arab chief, his knowledge of the routes, the situation of the wells, the places for fuel, the prognostics of the weather, and the most eligible stations for encamping, rendering him peculiarly qualified to act in that important capacity. See CARAVAN. It is true that God was their leader, by the pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, the advancement or the halting of which regulated their journeys and fixed their encampments. But beyond these general directions the tokens of their heavenly guide did not extend. As smaller parties were frequently sallying forth from the main body in quest of forage and other necessaries, which human observation or enterprise were sufficient to provide, so Moses discovered his wisdom and good sense in enlisting the aid of the son of a native sheik, who, from his family connection with himself, his powerful influence, and his long experience, promised to render the Israelites most important services." To these solicitations we may infer, from the absence of any further refusal, that Hobab finally yielded; a conclusion that, indeed, seems to be explicitly referred to in Judg. i, 16; iv, 11. See KENITE; ITHRITE.

No other particulars of the life of Jethro are known, but the Arabs, who call him *Shoaib,* have a variety of traditions concerning him. They say that Michael, the son of Taskir, and grandson of Midian, was his father; this last was the immediate son of Ishmael, according to the author of *Leb-Tarik,* but Moses makes no mention of Midian among the sons of Ishmael (Gen. xxv, 13, 14). Jethro gave his son-in-law Moses the miraculous rod; it had once been the rod of Adam, and was of the myrtle of Paradise, etc. (Lane's *Koran,* p. 190; Weil's *Bibl. Legends,* p. 107-109). Although blind (Lane, p. 180, note), he was favored with the gift of prophecy, and God sent him to the Midianites to preach the unity of God, and to withdraw them from idolatry. A commentator on the Koran affirms that whenever Jethro performed his devotions on the top of a certain mountain, the mountain became lower, in order to render his ascent more easy. Another Arabian commentator says that Jethro took pains to reform the bad customs of the Midianites, such as stealing, having two sorts of weights and measures, for buying by the larger and selling by the smaller. Besides these frauds of the Midianites in their trading, they offered violence to travellers, and robbed them on the highways. They threatened even Jethro for his remonstrances. This insolence obliged God to manifest his wrath: he sent the angel Gabriel, who, with a voice of thunder, made the earth to tremble, which destroyed them all except Jethro, and those who, like him, believed the unity of God (Lane, p. 179-181). After this punishment Jethro went to Moses, as related in Exod. xviii. 1-3. The Mohammedans term him, from the advice he gave to Moses, "The preacher of the prophets" (D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* iii, 273 sq.; comp. J. C. Maier, *De Jethrone,* Helmst. 1715). "The name of Sho'eib still remains attached to one of the wadys on the east side of the Jordan, opposite Jericho, through which, according to the tradition of the locality (Seetzen, *Reisen,* 1854. ii, 319, 376), the children of Israel descended to the Jordan. Other places bearing his name and those of his two daughters are shown at Sinai and on the Gulf of Akaba (Stanley, *Syr. and Pal.* p. 33)"

Je'tur (Heb. *Yetur',* יְטוּר, prob. i. q. טוּר, an *enclosure,* i. e. nomadic camp; Sept. Ἰετούρ, Ἰεττούρ, but Ἰτουραῖοι in 1 Chron. v, 19), one of the twelve sons of Ishmael (Gen. xxv, 15; 1 Chron. i, 31). B.C. post 2063. His name stands also for his descendants, the *Itureans* (1 Chron. v, 19), a people living east of the northern Jordan (Luke iii, 1), where he appears to have settled. See ITURÆA.

Jetzer, JOHANN, a religious fanatic, a tailor by trade, who lived in the early part of the 16th century, was a lay brother of the Dominican convent at Berne. The order to which he belonged about this time were engaged in a controversy with the Franciscans on the doctrine of the immaculate conception. Some noted monks and priests of the former had so fiercely assailed it that they had been summoned to Rome to answer for their conduct. The Dominicans of Wimpfen thereupon determined to appear to one of their novitiates at Berne—this very Jetzer—at midnight, and, representing departed spirits, assured him that in the other world the doctrine of immaculate conception was denied, and that those who had in this world persecuted the opponents of the doctrine were still in Purgatory, and there expiating their crime. He at first was completely duped, and created a great excitement among the masses, which was all that the monks had desired in order to secure

the liberation of their comrades at Rome. But when Jetzer found that he had been imposed upon, he seriously opposed the plot at the danger of his life. For further particulars, see Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* book iv, cent. xvi, sec. 1, ch. i, § 12. See also BERNE CONFERENCE.

Jeü'el (Heb. *Yeüel'*, יְעוּאֵל, *snatched* away by *God*, i. e. protected; Sept. Ἰεήλ, Vulg. *Jehuel*), a descendant of Zerah, who, with his kindred to the number of 690, resided in Jerusalem after the captivity (1 Chron. ix, 6). B.C. 536. This name is also everywhere written in the text for יְעִיאֵל. See JEIEL. In the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. viii, 39) it stands for the Heb. Jeuel (Ezra viii, 13) as the name of one of the Bene-Adonikam who returned to Jerusalem after the captivity.

Je'üsh (Hebrew *Yeüsh'*, יְעוּשׁ, *assembler;* written יְעִישׁ, *Yeïsh'*, in the text of Gen. xxxvi, 5, 14; 1 Chron. vii, 10), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Ἰεούς, but Ἰεούλ in 1 Chron. i, 35; Vulg. *Jehus*). The oldest of the three sons of Esau by Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah, born in Canaan, but afterwards a sheik of the Edomites (Gen. xxxvi, 5, 14, 18; 1 Chron. i, 35). B.C. post 1964.

2. (Sept. Ἰεώς v. r. Ἰαούς, Vulg. *Jehus*.) The first named of the sons of Bilhan, grandson of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii, 10). B.C. considerably post 1856.

3. (Sept. Ἰωάς, Vulg. *Jaus*.) A Levite, one of the four sons of Shimei; not having many sons, he was reckoned with his brother Beriah as the third branch of the family (1 Chron. xxiii, 10, 11). B.C. 1014.

4. (Sept. Ἰεούς, Vulg. *Jehus*.) One of the three sons of Rehoboam, apparently by Abihail, his second wife (2 Chron. xi, 19). B.C. post 973.

5. (Sept. Ἰδιάς v. r. Ἰάς, Vulg. *Jehus*, A. Vers. "Jehush.") The second son of Eshek, brother of Azel, of the descendants of Saul (1 Chron. viii, 39). B.C. cir. 588.

Je'üz (Heb. *Yeüts'*, יְעוּץ, *counsellor*, q. d. Εὔβουλος; Sept. Ἰεούς v. r. Ἰεβούς, Vulg. *Jehus*), a chief Benjamite, one of the sons apparently of Shaharaim, born of his wife Hodesh or Baara in the land of Moab (1 Chron. viii, 10). B.C. perh. cir. 1618.

Jew (Heb. *Yehudi,'* יְהוּדִי, plur. יְהוּדִים, sometimes יְהוּדִיִּים, Esth. iv, 7; viii, 1, 7, 13; ix, 15, 18 text; fem. יְהוּדִיָּה, 1 Chron. iv, 18; Chald. in plur. emphat. יְהוּדָיֵא, Dan. iii, 8; Ezra iv, 12; v, 1, 5; adv. יְהוּדִית, *Judaicè*, in the Jews' language, 2 Kings xviii, 26; Neh. xiii, 24; Sept. and N. T. Ἰουδαῖος, hence verb Ἰουδαΐζω, to *Judaize*, Gal. ii, 14; adj. Ἰουδαικός, *Jewish*, Tit. i, 14, etc.), a name formed from that of the patriarch Judah, and applied in its first use to one belonging to the tribe or country of Judah, or rather, perhaps, to a subject of the separate kingdom of Judah (2 Kings xvi, 6; xxv, 5; Jer. xxxii, 12; xxxviii, 19; xl, 11; xli, 3; xliv, 1; lii, 28), in contradistinction from the seceding ten tribes, who retained the name of Israel or Israelites. During the captivity the term seems to have been extended (see Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 5, 6) to all the people of the Hebrew language and country, without distinction (Esth. iii, 6, 9; Dan. iii, 8, 12); and this loose application of the name was preserved after the restoration to Palestine (Hag. i, 14; ii, 2; Ezra iv, 12; v, 1, 5; Neh. i, 2; ii, 16; v, 1, 8, 17), when it came to denote not only every descendant of Abraham in the largest possible sense (2 Macc. ix, 17; John iv, 9; Acts xviii, 2, 24, etc.), especially in opposition to foreigners ("Jews and Greeks," Acts xiv, 1; xviii, 4; xix, 10; 1 Cor. i, 23, 24), but even proselytes who had no blood-relation to the Hebrews (Acts ii, 5; comp. 10). An especial use of the term is noticeable in the Gospel of John, where it frequently stands for the chief Jews, the *elders*, who were opposed to Christ (John i, 19; v, 15, 16; vii, 1, 11, 13; ix, 22; xviii, 12, 14, etc.; comp. Acts xxiii, 20). See JUDAH.

The original designation of the Israelitish nation was the *Hebrews*, by which all the legitimate posterity of Abraham were known, not only among themselves (Gen. xl, 15; Exod. ii, 7; iii, 18; v, 3; vii, 16; ix, 13; Jonah i, 9; comp. 4 Macc. ix—although the name Jew was in later times prevalent; see the Targum of Jonathan on Exod., ut sup.), but also among foreigners (as the Egyptians, Gen. xxxix, 14; xli, 12; Exod. i, 16; the Philistines, 1 Sam. iv, 6, 9; xiii, 19; xxix, 3; the Assyrians, Judith xii, 11; and even the Greeks and Romans, see Plutarch, *Sympos.* iv, 5; Appian, *Civ.* ii, 71; Pausan. i, 6, 24; v, 7, 3; x, 12, 5; Porphyry, *Vit. Pythag.* p. 185; Tacit. *Hist.* v, 2). See ISRAELITE. After the exile, the title *Jews* became the usual one (compare 1 Macc. viii), while the term "Hebrews" fell into disuse, being still applied, however, to the Samaritans (Josephus, *Ant.* xi, 8, 6), or more commonly to designate the vulgar Syro-Chaldee spoken by the Palestinian Jews (comp. Acts ix, 29; Eusebius iii, 24), in distinction from the Hellenists (Acts vi, 1; comp. the title of the "Epistle to the Hebrews," and see Bleek, *Einleit. in d. Br. a. d. Hebr.* p. 32 sq.; Euseb. vi, 14). See HELLENIST. Yet Paul, who spoke Greek, was appropriately styled a Hebrew (2 Cor. xi, 22; Phil. iii, 5); and still later the terms Hebrew and Jew were applied with little distinction to persons of Jewish descent (Eusebius, *Hist. Ev.* ii, 4; Philo, iii, 4). See HEBREW. (For a further discussion of these epithets, see Gesenius, *Gesch. d. Hebr. Sprache*, 9 sq.; Hengstenberg, *Bileam*, p. 207 sq.; Ewald, *Krit. Gramm.* p. 3, and *Israel. Gesch.* i, 334; Hoffmann, in the *Hall. Encyclop.* II, iii, 307 sq.; Henke's *Mus.* ii, 639 sq.; Carpzov, *Crit. Sacra*, p. 170 sq.)

The *history* of the Jewish nation previous to the Christian æra, is interwoven with that of their country and capital. See PALESTINE; JERUSALEM. During the Biblical periods it consists mostly of the narratives of the progenitors and rulers of the people, or of the events that marked its leading epochs. See ABRAHAM; JACOB; MOSES; JOSHUA; JUDGES; DAVID; SOLOMON; JUDAH; ISRAEL; CAPTIVITY; MACCABEES; HEROD; JUDÆA. (For further details, see list of works below.)

1. Strictly speaking, a history of the Jews ought perhaps to commence with the return of the remnant of the chosen people of God from the exile (q. v.), but this portion of their history, down even to the time of their final dispersion, A.D. 135, has already been treated at length in other parts of this work (we refer the reader to the articles HADRIAN; BAR-COCHEBA; DISPERSED; JERUSALEM). It was the effort, under the leadership of Bar-Cocheba, to regain their independence, that brought about a repetition of scenes enacted under Titus, and resulted actually in the depopulation of Palestine. Talmud and Midrash (especially *Midrash Echa*) alike exhaust even Eastern extravagance in describing the terrible consequences that followed the capture by the Romans of the last of the Jewish forts—Bither, their greatest stronghold. The whole of Judæa was turned into a desert; about 985 towns and villages were laid in ashes; fifty of their fortresses were razed to the ground; even the name of their capital was changed to Ælia Capitolina, and they were forbidden to approach it on pain of death; thousands of those who had escaped death were reduced to slavery, and such as could not be thus disposed of were transported into Egypt. "The previous invasions and conquests, civil strifes and oppressions, persecution and famine, had carried hosts of Jewish captives, slaves, fugitives, exiles, and emigrants into the remotest provinces of the Medo-Persian empire, all over Asia Minor, into Armenia, Arabia, Egypt, Cyrene, Cyprus, Greece, and Italy. The Roman conquest and persecutions completed this work of dispersion;" and thus suddenly scattered abroad into almost every part of the empire, in the regions of Mt. Atlas, on both sides of the Pyrenees, on the Rhine, the Danube, and the Po, the Jews were deprived of the bond of connection which the possession of a common country only can afford. Their lot henceforth was oppression, poverty, and scorn.

Yet even in their utmost depression, their religious

life asserted, as it has ever done, its superiority over all the disasters of time. No sooner had the war terminated than, as if rising from the ruins of the tomb, the Sanhedrim (q. v.) and the synagogue reappeared. Out of Palestine innumerable congregations of various sizes had long been established; but the late events in Egypt, Cyrenaica, Cyprus, and Mesopotamia, as well as Palestine, would have insured their annihilation but for the religious idiosyncrasy of the people. If but three persons were left in a neighborhood, they would rally at the trysting-place of the law. The sense of their common dangers, miseries, and wants bound the Jewish people more closely to one another. A citizen of the world, having no country he could call his own, the Jew nevertheless lived within certain well-defined limits, beyond which, to him, there was no world. Thus, though scattered abroad, the Israelites had not ceased to be a nation; nor did any nation feel its oneness and integrity so truly as they. Jerusalem, indeed, had ceased to be their capital; but the school and the synagogue, and not a Levitical hierarchy, now became their impregnable citadel, and the law their palladium. The old men, schooled in sorrows, rallied about them the manhood that remained and the infancy that multiplied, resolving that they would transmit a knowledge of their religion to future generations. They founded schools as well as synagogues, until their efforts resulted in the writing of a code of laws second only to that of Moses—a system of traditionary principles, precepts, and customs to keep alive forever the peculiar spirit of Judaism (see Rule, *Karaites*, p. 59).

Among the first things to be accomplished by the Jews of Palestine at this period of their history was the election, in place of the late Gamaliel II (q. v.), of a patriarch from the eminent rabbins who had escaped the sword of the Roman conqueror. A synod congregated at Uscha (q. v.), and Simon ben-Gamaliel, presenting the best hereditary claims for this distinguished office, was chosen, and intrusted with the reconstruction of the synagogue and school at Jamnia (q. v.), there to re-establish with fresh efficiency a rabbinical apparatus. Soon another and more important institution was founded on the banks of the Lake Gennesareth, in the pleasant town of Tiberias (q. v.). Here also was reorganized the Sanhedrim (q. v.), until Judaism was brought to stand out even in bolder relief than it had dared to do since the calamities under Titus. In a great measure this success of the Jews was due to the Romans, who, under the government of the Antonines, mitigated their severity against this unfortunate people, restoring to them many ancient privileges, and permitting them to enjoy even municipal honors in common with other citizens. Indeed, of Antoninus Pius, Jewish writers assert that he had secretly become a convert to their faith (comp. Jost, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, bk. xiii, ch. ix), but for this statement there seems to be no very good reason; at least Grätz (*Gesch. der Juden*, iv, 225, 226) does not even allude to it. Most prominently associated with Gamaliel II in this work of reconstruction, among the Jews of the West, were Meir, Juda, José, Simon ben-Jochai, to whose respective biographical articles we refer for further details; also Juda Ha-Nasi, the successor of Gamaliel II. In Babylonia likewise the Jews had strained every nerve to regain their lost power and influence, and they had established a patriarchate very much like that of the West. At first they had looked to the Roman Jews for counsel, and had virtually acknowledged the superiority of their Jerusalem brethren in all spiritual matters, confining to temporal matters alone the office of the *Resh Gelutha* (q. v.), or, "Prince of the Captivity," as they called their rulers; but as the chances for a rebuilding of the Temple and a return to power in the holy city grew less and less, they determined, encouraged by the growing celebrity of their own schools at Nisibis (q. v.) and Nahardea (q. v.), to establish their total independence of the schools of Palestine, and to unite in their officer Resh Gelutha, who was chosen from those held to be descended from the house of David, both spiritual and temporal authority (see Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Lit.* p. 152, 153). We are told of the Resh Gelutha that, after the consolidation of the temporal and spiritual offices, he exercised a power almost despotic, and, though a vassal of the king of Persia, he assumed among his own people the style of a monarch, lived in great splendor, had a body-guard, counsellors, cup-bearers, etc.; in fact, his government was quite an *imperium in imperio*, and possessed a thoroughly sacerdotal, or at least theocratic character. His subjects were, many of them at least, extremely wealthy, and pursued all sorts of industrial occupations. They were merchants, bankers, artisans, husbandmen, and shepherds, and, in particular, had the reputation of being the best weavers of the then famous Babylonian garments. What was the condition of the Jews at this time further east we cannot tell, but it seems quite certain that they had obtained a footing in China, if not before the time of Christ, at least during the 1st century. They were first discovered by the Jesuit missionaries of the 17th century. They did not appear ever to have heard of Christ, but they possessed the book of Ezra, and retained, on the whole, a very decided nationalism of creed and character. From their language, it was inferred that they had originally come from Persia. At one time they would appear to have been highly honored in China, and to have held the highest civil and military offices. In India also they gained a foothold, and since the Russian embassies into Asia Jews have been found in many places (see *North American Review*, 1831, p. 244).

Reverting to the Jews of the Roman empire, we find them perfectly resigned to their fate, and comparatively prosperous, until the time of Constantine the Great (q. v.). Indeed, the closing part of the 2d and the first part of the 3d century will ever remain among the most memorable years in the annals of Jewish history. It was during this period that Judah Hakkodesh (q. v.) flourished, and it was under his presidency over the school at Tiberias that the Jews proved to the world that, though they were now left without a metropolis, without a temple, and even without a country, they could still continue to be a nation. Driven from the sacred city, they changed Tiberias into a kind of Jerusalem, where, instead of building in wood and stone, they employed workmen in rearing another edifice, which even to this day continues to proclaim the greatness of the chosen people of God after their dispersion—the Mishna (q. v.), and the Gemara, better known as the Babylonian *Talmud* (q. v.), the so-called *Oral Law* reduced to writing, arranged, commented upon, and explained, which became in the course of a few centuries a complete Digest or Encyclopædia of the law, the religion, and the nationality of the Jews. See Rabbinism.

2. We have already said that under the Roman emperors of the 2d and 3d centuries the Jews were in a somewhat flourishing condition. Quite different became their fate in the 4th century, when the emperor of Rome knelt before the cross, and the empire became a Christian state. Not only were converts from Judaism protected from the resentment of their countrymen, but Christians were prohibited from becoming Jews. The equality of rights to which the pagan emperors had admitted them was by degrees restricted. In short, from the establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire dates the great period of humiliation of the Jews; hereafter they change to a condemned and persecuted sect. But if the ascendency of Christianity became baneful to the Jews, it does by no means follow that Christianity is to bear the blame. Nay, the Jews of that age and country are altogether responsible for their sufferings. They appeared as the persecutors of the new religion whenever the opportunity presented itself. Thus they allied themselves to Arians during the revolution of 353 in destroying the property and lives of the Catholics. See Alexandria. Yet, though

decried "as the most hateful of all people," they continued to fill, after this period, important civil and military situations, had especial courts of justice, and exercised the influence which springs from the possession of wealth and knowledge. Under the rule of Julian the Apostate everything changed again in their favor. The heathen worshipper felt that the Jew, as the opponent of the Christian, was his natural ally; and, fresh from oppression and tyranny which a Christian government had heaped upon them, the Jews hesitated not to unsheath the sword in union with the Apostate's legions. A gleam of splendor seemed to shine on their future destiny; and when Julian (q. v.) determined "to belie, if possible, the fulfilment of the prophecies," and gave them permission to rebuild their Temple at Jerusalem, the transport which they manifested, it is said, is one of the most sublime spectacles in their history. (Comp., as to the views of Christian writers on the miracle said to have been wrought here, preventing the Jews from the rebuilding of the Temple, especially, Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Lit.* p. 134 sq.) The attempt, as is well known, was signally defeated. The emperor suddenly died, and from that event the policy adopted by the Roman government towards the Jews was more or less depressive, though never severe. "In short, down to the time that terminated the Western patriarchate (A. D. 415), the conduct of the emperors towards the Jews appears to have been marked by an inflexible determination to keep them in order, tempered by a wise and worthy moderation." Thus, in the code of Theodosius II, their patriarchs and officers of the synagogue are honorably mentioned as "*Viri spectatissimi, illustres, clarissimi.*" They enjoyed absolute liberty and protection in the observance of their ceremonies, their feasts, and their sabbaths. "Their synagogues were protected by law against the fanatics, who, in some parts of Asia and Italy, attacked and set them on fire. Throughout the empire the property of the Jews, their slaves, and their lands were secured to them. Yet the Christians were exhorted to hold no intercourse with the unbelieving people, and to beware of the doctrines of the synagogue. The laws, however, could not prevent the zeal of several bishops from stirring up the hatred of the populace against the Jews. Even Ambrose imputed as a crime to some Asiatic bishops and monks the effort to rebuild, at their own expense, a synagogue which they had demolished." Nor ought we to omit here the disreputable acts of another great father of the Christian Church, Cyril (q. v.), who, in A.D. 415, during the reign of Theodosius II, caused the expulsion of all Jews from the bishopric of Alexandria.

3. The condition of this people became even worse after the division of the Roman world (A.D. 395) into the Eastern and Western empires, especially in the East, under Justin I (A.D. 518-27), where they were deprived of their citizenship, which they had hitherto enjoyed, and were classed with heretics. Justinian (A. D. 527-65) went still further. He not only confirmed former enactments, but made others still more onerous, intended, no doubt, to drive the Jews into the Church. "The emperor, laying it down as a principle that civil rights could only belong to those who professed the orthodox faith, entirely excluded the Jews in his code (codex) and his edicts (novellæ). Anything which could in the least interfere with the festivals of the Christian Church was strictly forbidden them; all discussion with Christians was looked upon as a crime, and all proselytism punished with death. Even their right of holding property was restricted in many ways, especially in the matter of wills. The emperor declared himself with especial severity against the traditions and precepts of the Talmud." Such oppression naturally enough provoked the Jews to repeated rebellion, only to be subjected, after complete failure to regain their freedom, to increased bitterness of their cup of degradation [see JUSTINIAN], until, deprived of the last degree of political importance, many of their number quitted the Byzantine empire to seek a refuge in Persia and Babylon, where the Israelite was treated with more leniency. Compare also SAMARITANS.

As we have said, their condition was more tolerable in the Western empire, where, upon the irruption of the barbarous tribes, they were more favorably regarded than their Christian neighbors. The Jews also formed a part of all the kingdoms which rose up out of the ruins of ancient Rome; but, unfortunately, our information respecting them, for a considerable period at least, is very imperfect. "In the absence of a literature of their own, we know of them only through ecclesiastical writers, who take notice of them chiefly as the objects of the converting zeal of the Catholic Church. The success of the Christian priesthood among their barbarous invaders inspired them with hopes of gaining converts among the Jews. But the circumstances of the two classes were altogether different. Among the heathen, when a prince or a successful warrior was converted to the faith, he carried along with him all his subjects or his companions in war. But the Jews moved in masses only in matters connected with their own religion; in every other respect they were wholly independent of each other. Their conversion, therefore, could only be the effect of conviction on the part of each individual. The character of the Christian clergy did not fit them for so arduous an undertaking. Their ignorance and frequent immorality placed them at a disadvantage in regard to the Jews, who were in possession of the O.-T. Scriptures, and had arguments at command which their opponents could not answer. Besides, there were no inducements of a worldly nature at this period to influence the Jews in exchanging their religion. They had no wish for the retreat of the cloister, nor did they stand in need of protection on account of deeds of violence and rapine. Their habits were of a description altogether different from those of the monk or brigand. The attempts of the clergy, however, were unremitted, and threats and blandishments were alternately resorted to, so that the struggle was constant between Catholicism and Judaism . . . till the appearance of a new religion wrought a diversion in favor of the latter."

4. According to Grätz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, v, 81), the history of the Jews in Arabia a century preceding Mohammed's appearance and during his activity presents a beautiful page in Jewish annals. Many were the Arabian chiefs and their tribes who had assimilated with the Jews or become actual converts to the Mosaic religion. Indeed, for several centuries previous to Mohammed's appearance, a Jewish kingdom had existed in the south-west of Arabia, and some even claim that it extended back previous to the birth of Christ. Others assert that a Jew did not mount the throne of Yemen (q. v.) until about A.D. 320; while Grätz (v, 91 sq., 442 sq., especially p. 443, 447) holds that the conversion of the Himyaritic kingdom to Judaism did not take place until the 5th century. So much, however, is now settled, that in the early part of the 6th century (about A.D. 520-530) the last king who reigned over the country Zunaan or Zu-n-Nuwas was a Jew (comp. Perron, *Sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme*, in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1838, Oct., Nov., p. 353 sq., 443 sq.), and that only with his death Judaism ceased to be the religion of the Himyarites (q. v.). See article ARABIA (*Religion*). The influence, then, which the Jews must have exerted in the Arabian peninsula at the time of Mohammed's appearance failed not to be perceived by the prophet, and he hastened to secure the aid of these countrymen of his, who were equally, with his other Arabian brethren, the descendants of Abraham, and had with them at least the common cause of extirpating idolatry and Christianity. There was, perhaps, also another reason why the prophet of Arabia should have sought an association with the Jews. His own mother was a Jewess by descent, and had only in after life been converted to Christianity by the Syrian monk Sergius. To her maternal instructions he is supposed to have

been indebted for his first religious impressions; and though he did not remain long under her care, yet the slight knowledge of pure religion which he thus obtained must certainly have inclined him to draw the Jewish influence to his side in his attacks against the idolatrous hordes of Arabia (comp. Ockley, *Saracens*, i, 98; Von Hammer, *Assassins*, chap. i). The Jews, however, soon became convinced that the cause of Mohammed was not their own; that his object was a union of all forces under his sceptre, the supremacy of Islam, and the subjugation, if not ultimately utter extinction of all rival religions; and the compact so lately formed was as quickly broken by an open revolt. Mohammed, however, proved the stronger, and in the wars which he waged against the different Jewish tribes he came forth conqueror. From 624 to 628 several of the latter were subjugated or wholly destroyed, or obliged to quit the Arabian territory. In 632 all Jews were finally driven from Arabia, and they settled in Syria. A greater display of heroism than the Jews exhibited during these struggles with the Islamitish impostor has never been witnessed, and we do not wonder that a Jewish writer should point to the epoch as one of which every Jew has reason to be proud. The prophet himself very nearly paid by his life for the victories which he had gained over Mosaism; but it seems that, when Mohammedanism had acquired sufficient strength to spread beyond Arabia, the animosity towards the Jews was forgotten, and they were kindly treated. So much is certain, that the extension of the religion of the Crescent through Asiatic Turkey, Persia, Egypt, Africa, and the south of Spain, proved, on the whole, advantageous to the Jews. Excepting accidental persecutions, such as those in Mauritania A.D. 790, and in Egypt A.D. 1010, they enjoyed, under the caliphs and Arabian princes, comparative peace. The Jews actually entered upon a prosperous career in every country to which the Moslem arms extended. In North Africa, in Egypt, in Persia, their condition greatly improved, and in Moorish Spain, where their religion enjoyed full toleration, their numbers greatly increased, and they became famous for their learning as well as for trade. "In the new impulse given to trade by the progress of the Moslem arms, the Jews, ever awake to their own interests, took their advantage. In the wide extent of conquest, new wants were created by the advance of victorious armies: kingdoms which had long ceased to hold intercourse with each other were brought into union, and new channels of commercial intercourse were opened up; and, leaving the pursuits of agriculture, which were placed at a disadvantage by the policy of the caliphs, the Jews became the merchants by whom the business between the Eastern and the Western world was conducted. In the court of the caliphs they were favorably received, and for centuries the whole management of the coinage was intrusted to them, from the superior accuracy and elegance with which they could execute it, and from their opportunities, by the extent and variety of their commercial relations, to give it the widest circulation, and at the same time to draw in all the previous mintages." But, as we have already said, it was not only in commercial greatness that they flourished. Not a few of them distinguished themselves in the walks of science and literature. They were counsellors, secretaries, astrologers, or physicians to the Moorish rulers; and this period may well be considered the golden age of Jewish literature. Poets, orators, philosophers of highest eminence arose, not isolated, but in considerable numbers; and it is a well-established fact, that to them is chiefly due—through the Arab medium—the preservation and subsequent spreading in Europe of ancient classical literature, more especially of philosophy. (Compare, on the efforts of Nestorian Christians in this direction, Etheridge, *Syrian Churches*, p. 239 sq.) Their chief attention, however, continued to be even then directed to the Talmud and its literature, especially in Babylonia, where they still had a *Resh-gelutha* as their immediate ruler. Here their great schools, reorganized under the *Seboraim* (thinkers), were put in a still more flourishing condition by the *Geonim* (eminent), of whom the most prominent are Saadias (q. v.) (about 892–942), the translator of the Pentateuch into Arabic, whom, for his great linguistic attainments, Aben-Ezra designates as the רֹאשׁ הַמְדַבְּרִים בְּכָל מָקוֹם; Sherira Gaon (q. v.) (died 997), grandson of Judah, to whom we owe our most accurate knowledge of the Jewish schools in Babylonia. In this period (from the 6th to the 8th centuries) the Masora was developed, followed by numerous commentaries on it and on the *Targum of Jerusalem*, besides a collection of the earlier *Haggadas* (e. g. *Bereshith-rabba*), now mostly known as *Midrashim*. See MIDRASH. From Palestine, also, came about this time signs of freshness and vigor in Jewish literature: the admirable vowel system; talmudical compends and writings on theological cosmogony. See CABALA. The Karaites (q. v.) likewise, according to some authorities, originated about the 8th century (this is, however, disputed now by Rule, *Karaite Jews*, Lond. 1870, sm. 8vo, who believes them to be of much earlier date), and under their influence a whole kingdom, named Khozar, is believed to have been converted to Judaism, on the shores of the Caspian Sea. See JEHUDAH (HA-LEVI) BEN-SAMUEL. Here deserve mention, also, the most celebrated of the Jews in Africa under the Saracen princes, the grammarians Ibn-Koraish (q. v.), Dunash (q. v.), Chayug (q. v.); the lexicographer Hefetz, and Isaac ben-Soleyman.

Very different was the fate of the Jews under Christian rulers. Few were the monarchs of Christendom who rose above the barbarism of the Middle Ages. By considerable pecuniary sacrifices only could the sons of Israel enjoy tolerance. In Italy their lot had always been most severe. Now and then a Roman pontiff would afford them his protection, but, as a rule, they have received only intolerance in that country. Down even to the time of the deposition of Pius IX from the temporal power, it has been the barbarous custom, on the last Saturday before the Carnival, to compel the Jews to proceed "en masse" to the capitol, and ask permission of the pontiff to reside in the sacred city another year. At the foot of the hill the petition was refused them, but after much entreaty, they were granted the favor when they had reached the summit, and, as their residence, the Ghetto was assigned them.

Their circumstances were most favorable among the Franks. Charlemagne is said to have had implicit confidence not only in the ability, but also in the integrity of the Jewish merchants in his realm, and he even sent the Jew Isaac as his ambassador to the court of Haroun Alraschid. To Isaac's faithfulness and ability may perhaps be attributed the great privileges which the Jews enjoyed under Louis le Débonnaire, who is said to have made them "all-powerful." But if these two Christian rulers were noble and generous towards the Jews, the clergy of their day by no means shared the same feeling towards the despised race. Many a bishop of the Church of Rome, and many a member of the lower orders, were heard before the throne and before the people complaining of the kind treatment which the Jews received. One prelate hesitated not to condemn the Jews because the "country people looked upon them as the only people of God!" Hence we cannot wonder that after the decease of these two noble monarchs, when the weaker Carlovingians began to rule, and the Church to advance with imperious strides, a melancholy change ensued—kings, bishops, feudal barons, and even the municipalities, all joined in a carnival of persecution, and the history of the Jews became nothing else than a successive series of massacre. (See below, 5; *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1842, p. 459 sq.)

In England the Jews made their first appearance during the period of the Saxons. They are mentioned in the ecclesiastical constitutions of Egbert, archbish-

op of York, A.D. 740; they are also named in a charter to the monks of Croyland, A.D. 833. They enjoyed many privileges under William the Conqueror and his son, William Rufus, who favored them in many ways. The lands of the vacant bishoprics were farmed out to them, which proves that the Jews must have been agriculturists at this time: while in the schools they held many honorable positions. Thus, at Oxford, even at this time a great seat of learning, they possessed themselves three halls—Lombard Hall, Moses Hall, and Jacob Hall, to which Christians as well as Jews went for instruction in the Hebrew tongue. They enjoyed these and other privileges until the period of the Crusades suddenly changed everybody against them. (See below.)

In Germany their position was perhaps more servile than in any other European country. They were regarded as the sovereign's property (*kammerknechte*, chamber-servants), and were bought and sold. They had come to that country as early as the days of Constantine, but they did not become a numerous class until the days of the Crusaders, and we therefore postpone further treatment to the next section.

In Spain their circumstances at first were most fortunate. Especially during the whole brilliant period of Moorish rule in the Peninsula they shared the same favorable condition as in all other countries to which the Moslem arms had extended; "they enjoyed, indeed, what must have seemed to them, in comparison with their ordinary lot, a sort of Elysian life. They were almost on terms of equality with their Mohammedan masters, rivalled them in civilization and letters, and probably surpassed them in wealth. The Spanish Jews were consequently of a much higher type than their brethren in other parts of Europe. They were not reduced to the one degrading occupation of usury, though they followed that too; on the contrary, they were husbandmen, landed proprietors, physicians, financial administrators, etc.; they enjoyed special privileges, and had courts of justice for themselves. Nor was this state of things confined to those portions of Spain under the sovereignty of the Moors; the Christian monarchs of the north and middle gradually came to appreciate the value of their services, and we find them for a time protected and encouraged by the rulers of Aragon and Castile. But the extravagance and consequent poverty of the nobles, as well as the increasing power of the priesthood, ultimately brought about a disastrous change. The estates of the nobles, and, it is also believed, those attached to the cathedrals and churches, were in many cases mortgaged to the Jews; hence it was not difficult for 'conscience' to get up a persecution, when goaded to its 'duty' by the pressure of want and shame. Gradually the Jews were deprived of the privilege of living where they pleased; their rights were diminished, and their taxes augmented" (Chambers). More in the next paragraph.

5. In tracing the history of the Jewish people in the Middle Ages, the Crusades form a distinct epoch amid these centuries of darkness and turmoil. If the Jew had hitherto suffered at the hand of the Christian, and had been gradually reduced in social privilege, he was now grossly abused in the name of the religion of him who taught, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." Undertaken to bring about a union of the Christians of the world—"that ideal of a Christian commonwealth which forms the centre of the polemical and religious life of the Middle Ages"—the crusading movement was inaugurated by a wholesale massacre and persecution first of the Jew, and afterwards of the Mussulman. The latter, perhaps, had given just provocation by his endeavors to supplant the Cross by the Crescent, but what had the inoffensive and non-proselyting Jew done to deserve such acts of violence and rapine? Shut out from all opportunities for the development of their better qualities, the Jews were gradually reduced to a decline both in character and condition. From a learned, influential, and powerful class of the community, we find them, after the inauguration of the Crusades, sinking into miserable outcasts; the common prey of clergy, and nobles, and burghers, and existing in a state worse than slavery itself. The Christians deprived the Jews even of the right of holding real estate, and confined them to the narrower channels of traffic. "Their ambition being thus fixed upon one subject, they soon mastered all the degrading arts of accumulating gain; and prohibited from investing their gains in the purchase of land, they found a more profitable employment of it in lending it at usurious interest to the thoughtless and extravagant. The effect of this was inevitable. At a time when commercial pursuits were held in contempt, the assistance of the Jews became indispensable to the nobles, whose hatred rose in proportion to their obligations; and, where there was the power, the temptation to cancel the debt by violence became irresistible." A raid against the Jews was a favorite pastime of a bankrupt noble, and we need not wonder that the Jew had recourse to the only revenge that was left him to atone for this gross injustice—the exaction of a more exorbitant gain when the opportunity was afforded him. Thus, in England, at the enthronement of Richard I (1189), the Crusaders, on their departure for the Holy Land, hesitated not to inaugurate their warfare by a pillage of the Jews. In the desperate defence which the latter waged against the knights of England in the castle at York, finding resistance useless, 500 of them, having first destroyed everything of value that belonged to them, murdered their wives and children, and then deprived themselves of life, rather than fall a prey to Christian warriors. (See Hume, *History of England*.) A like treatment the Jews received under the two following monarchs; their lives and wealth were protected only for a *consideration*. With the tyrannical treatment they received at the hand of king John (q. v.) every reader of history is familiar. Under Henry III they were treated still worse, if possible. The reign of Edward I (1272-1307) finally brought suddenly to a terminus the miserable condition of this people by a wholesale expulsion from the kingdom (A.D. 1290), after a vain attempt on the part of the priesthood to convert them to Christianity, preceded, of course, by a wholesale confiscation of their property. These exiles amounted to about 16,000. They emigrated mostly to Germany and France. In the former country the same sort of treatment befell them. In the Empire they had to pay all manner of iniquitous taxes—body-tax, capitation tax, trade taxes, coronation tax, and to present a multitude of gifts, to mollify the avarice or supply the necessities of emperor, princes, and barons. It did not suffice, however, to save them from the loss of their property. The populace and the lower clergy also must be satisfied; they, too, had passions to gratify. A wholesale slaughter of the "enemies of Christianity" was inaugurated. Trèves, Metz, Cologne, Mentz, Worms, Spires, Strasburg, and other cities, were deluged with the blood of the "unbelievers." The word *Hep* (said to be the initials of *Hierosolyma est perdita*, Jerusalem is taken) throughout all the cities of the empire became the signal for massacre, and if an insensate monk sounded it along the streets, it threw the rabble into paroxysms of murderous rage. The choice of death or conversion was given to the Jews, but few were found willing to purchase their life by that form of perjury. Rather than subject their offspring to conversion and such Christian training, fathers presented their breast to the sword after putting their children to death, and wives and virgins sought refuge from the brutality of the soldiers by throwing themselves into the river with stones fastened to their bodies. (Comp. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* [Harpers' edit.], v, 554.) Not less than 17,000 were supposed to have perished in the German empire during these persecutions; yet those who survived clung to the land that had given them birth, and suffered from pillage and maltreatment until they were expelled by force—from Vienna (A.D. 1196), Mecklenburg (1225), Breslau (1226),

Brandenburg (1243), Frankfort (1241), Munich (1285), Nurenburg (1390), Prague (1391), and Ratisbon (1476). The "Black Death," in particular, occasioned a great and widespread persecution (1348–1350). They were murdered and burned by thousands, and many even sought death amidst the conflagrations of their synagogues. From Switzerland to Silesia the land was drenched with innocent blood, and even the interference of the emperor and the pope long proved insufficient to put an end to the atrocities that were perpetrated. When the race had almost disappeared from Germany, feelings of humanity as well as the interests of his kingdom caused Charles IV to concede them some privileges; and in the Golden Bull (1356) the future condition of the Jews was so clearly pointed out, that it prevented, in a great measure, further bloodshed, though it still continued to leave them subject to oppression and injustice. Their residence was forbidden in some places, and in many cities to which they had access they were confined to certain quarters or streets, known as ghettos or Jews' streets (*Judenstrasse*).

No better, nay worse, if possible, was their condition in France from the 11th to the 16th centuries. All manner of wild stories were circulated against them: it was said that they were wont to steal the host, and to contemptuously stick it through and through; to inveigle Christian children into their houses and murder them; to poison wells, etc. They were also hated here as elsewhere on plea of excessive usury. Occasionally their debtors, high and low, hesitated not to have recourse to what they called Christian religion as a very easy means of getting rid of their obligations. Thus Philippe Augustus (1179-1223), under whose rule the Jews seem to have held mortgages of enormous value on the estates of Church and state dignitaries, simply confiscated the debts due to them, forced them to surrender the pledges in their possession, seized their goods, and finally even banished them from France; but the decree appears to have taken effect chiefly in the north; yet in less than twenty years the same proud but wasteful monarch was glad to let them come back and take up their abode in Paris. Louis IX (1226–1270), who was a very pious prince, among other *religious* acts, cancelled a third of the claims which the Jews had against his subjects, "*for the benefit of his soul.*" An edict was also issued for the seizure and destruction of their sacred books, and we are told that at Paris twenty-four carts filled with copies of the *Talmud*, etc., were consigned to the flames. See TALMUD. The Jews were also forbidden to hold social intercourse with their Christian neighbors, and the murderer of a Jew, if he were a Christian, went unpunished. Need we wonder, then, that when, in the following century, a religious epidemic, known as the Rising of the Shepherds, seized the common people in Languedoc and the central regions of France (A.D. 1321), they indulged in horrible massacres of the detested race; so horrible, indeed, that in one place, Verdun, on the Garonne, the Jews, in the madness of their agony, threw down their children to the *Christian* mob from the tower in which they were gathered, hoping, but in vain, to appease the dæmoniacal fury of their assailants. "One shudders to read of what followed; in whole provinces every Jew was burned. *At Chinon a deep ditch was dug, an enormous pile raised, and* 160 *of both sexes burned together!* Yet Christianity never produced more resolute martyrs; as they sprang into the place of torment, they sang hymns as though they were going to a wedding;" and, though "savage and horrible as such self-devotion is, it is impossible not to admire the strength of heart which it discovers; and, without inspiration, one might foretell that, so long as a solitary heart of this description was left to beat, it would treasure its national distinction as its sole remaining pride." At last, in 1594, they were indefinitely banished from France, and the sentence rigidly executed (see Schmidt, *Gesch. Frankreichs*, i, 504 sq.).

Such is the frightful picture of horrors and gloom which the Jews of Germany, France, England, and Italy offer in their mediæval history. "Circumscribed in their rights by decrees and laws of the ecclesiastical as well as civil power, excluded from all honorable occupations, driven from place to place, from province to province, compelled to subsist almost exclusively by mercantile occupations and usury, overtaxed and degraded in the cities, kept in narrow quarters, and marked in their dress with signs of contempt, plundered by lawless barons and penniless princes, an easy prey to all parties during the civil feuds, again and again robbed of their pecuniary claims, owned and sold as serfs (chamber-servants) by the emperors, butchered by mobs and revolted peasants, chased by the monks, and finally burned in thousands by the Crusaders, who also burned their brethren at Jerusalem in their synagogues, or tormented by ridicule, abusive sermons, monstrous accusations and trials, threats and experiments of conversion."

In Spain and Portugal, indeed, the days of prosperity to the Jews lingered longest. As we have already noticed, they enjoyed in these countries, while they remained under Moorish rule, almost equality with the Moslems. As in France under the Carlovingians, so in Spain under Saracen rule, their literature betokens an uncommon progress in civilization—a progress which left far in the distance all other nations, even those who professed to unfurl the banner of the Cross. But this was especially true of the Spanish Jews. Acquainted with the Arabic, they could easily dive into the treasures of that language; and the facility with which the Jews mastered all languages made them ready interpreters between Mussulman and Christian. It was through their original thinkers, such as Avicebron (Ibn-Gebirol, q. v.) and Moses Maimonides (q. v.), that the West became leavened with Greek and Oriental thought (Lewes, *Philos.* ii, 63), and the same persecuted and despised race must be regarded as the chief instruments whereby the Arabian philosophy was made effective on European culture. "Dans le monde Musulman comme dans le monde chrétien," said the late professor Munk, of Paris (*Mélanges*, p. 335), "les Juifs exclus de la vie publique, voués à la haine et au mépris par la religion dominante, toujours en présence des dangers dont les menaçait le fanatisme de la foule, ne trouvaient la tranquillité et le bonheur que dans un isolement complet. Ignorés de la société les savants Juifs vouaient aux sciences un culte désintéressé." But all their ability, learning, and wealth did not long ward off the unrestrained religious hatred of the common people, who felt no need of culture, and enjoyed no opportunities to borrow money from them. The world, which before seemed to have made a kind of tacit agreement to allow them time to regain wealth that might be plundered, and blood that might be poured out like water, now seemed to have entered into a conspiracy as extensive to drain the treasures and the life of this devoted race. Kingdom after kingdom, and people after people, followed the dreadful example, and strove to peal the knell of the descendants of Israel; till at length, what we blush to call Christianity, with the Inquisition in its train, cleared the fair and smiling provinces of Spain of this industrious part of its population, and brought a self-inflicted curse of barrenness upon the benighted land (Milman, *Hist. of Jews*, iii; comp. Prescott, *Ferd. and Isabella*, pt. i, ch. vii; Jost, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, vi, 75, 110, 184, 216, 290; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 221).

The condition of the Jews in Spain continued to be favorable from near the close of the 11th century (to which time we traced them in the preceding section) until the middle of the 14th century, when the star of their fortune may be said to have culminated. It is true, the Mohammedan power was now on the wane, but then the Christian rulers felt not yet sufficiently well established in the peninsula to take severe measures against the Jews (Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 189 sq., 224). A capitation tax was paid by the numerous synagogues, and presents were made to

the infante, the nobility, or the Church; but in every other respect the Jews lived like a separate nation, framing and executing their own civil and criminal jurisdiction. It is true they had not here a *Reshgelutha* as their authority, but a substitute was afforded them in the "rabbino mayor," the Jewish magistrate, who "exercised his right in the king's name, and sealed his decrees, which the king alone could annul, with the royal arms. He made journeys through the country to take cognizance of all Jewish affairs, and inquire into the disposal of the revenues of the different synagogues. He had under him a 'vice-rabbino mayor,' a chancellor, a secretary, and several other officers. Two different orders of rabbins, or judges, acted under him in the towns and districts of the kingdom." The first important danger that threatened them was in 1218, when a multitude of foreign knights and soldiers gathered together at Toledo preparatory to a crusade against the Moors. The campaign was to be opened, as had been done in Germany, by a general massacre of the Jews; but, by the intervention of Alphonso IX, surnamed the Good, the attempt was in a great measure defeated, and the Jews continued to prosper, after a similar attempt made by the Cortes of Madrid had failed, until the middle of the 14th century. By this time the general hatred against the Jews had spread alarmingly in all countries of Europe, as we have already had occasion to see, in consequence of the terror which the black death caused throughout that portion of the globe. They were now also in Spain confined to particular quarters of cities in which they resided, and attempts were made for their conversion. In 1250 an institution had even been erected for the express purpose of training men to carry on successfully controversies with the Jews, and, if possible, to bring about their conversion. But very different results followed the bloody persecutions which were actually and successfully inaugurated against them at Seville in 1391, 1392. These were the outbursts of priestly and popular violence, and had no sooner commenced in that city than Cordova, Toledo, Valencia, Catalonia, and the island of Majorca followed in its train; immense numbers were murdered, and wholesale theft was perpetrated by the religious rabble. Escape was possible only through flight to other countries, or by accepting baptism at the point of the sword, and the number of such enforced converts to Christianity is reckoned at no less than 200,000. If the persecutions in Germany, England, France, and elsewhere had severely tried the Jewish race, these persecutions in Spain completely extinguished all hope of further joy, for they hit, so to speak, the very core of the Jewish heart, and form a sad turning-point in the history of the Jews, and the 15th of March, 1391, forms a memorable day not only for the Jew, not only for the Spaniard, but for all the world; it was the seed from which germinated that monster called the *Inquisition* (Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, viii, 61 sq.). Daily now the condition of this people, even in the Spanish peninsula, grew worse and worse, until it fairly beggars description. A.D. 1412-1414 they had to endure another bloody persecution throughout the peninsula, and by the middle of the 15th century we read of nothing but persecution, violent conversion, massacre, and the tortures of the Inquisition. "Thousands were burned alive. 'In one year 280 were burned in Seville alone.' Sometimes the popes, and even the nobles, shuddered at the fiendish zeal of the inquisitors, and tried to mitigate it, but in vain. At length the hour of final horror came. In A.D. 1492, Ferdinand and Isabella issued an edict for the expulsion, within four months, of all who refused to become Christians, with the strict inhibition to take neither gold nor silver out of the country. The Jews offered an enormous sum for its revocation, and for a moment the sovereigns hesitated; but Torquemada, the Dominican inquisitor-general, dared to compare his royal master and mistress to Judas; they shrank from the awful accusation; and the ruin of the most industrious, the most thriving, the most peaceable, and the most learned of their subjects—and consequently of Spain herself—became irremediable." (See INQUISITION in this volume, p. 601 sq.) This is perhaps the grandest and most melancholy hour in their modern history. It is considered by themselves as great a calamity as the destruction of Jerusalem. 300,000 (some even give the numbers at 650,000 or 800,000) resolved to abandon the country, which a residence of seven centuries had made almost a second Judæa to them. The incidents that marked their departure are heart-rending. Almost every land was shut against them. Some, however, ventured into France, others into Italy, Turkey, and Morocco, in the last of which countries they suffered the most frightful privations. Of the 80,000 who obtained an entrance into Portugal on payment of eight gold pennies a head, but only for eight months, to enable them to obtain means of departure to other countries, many lingered after the expiration of the appointed time, and the poorer were sold as slaves. In A.D. 1495, king Emanuel commanded them to quit his territories, but at the same time issued a secret order that all Jewish children under 14 years of age should be torn from their mothers, retained in Portugal, and brought up as Christians. Agony drove the Jewish mothers into madness; they destroyed their children with their own hands, and threw them into wells and rivers, to prevent them from falling into the hands of their persecutors. Neither were the miseries of those who embraced Christianity, but who, for the most part, secretly adhered to their old faith (*Onssim, Anussim*—"yielding to violence, forced ones") less dreadful. It was not until the 17th century that persecution ceased. *Autos-da-fè* of suspected converts happened as late as A.D. 1655 (Chambers, s. v.). See MARRANOS.

6. The discovery of America, the restoration of letters occasioned by the invention of the art of printing, and the reformation in the Christian Church opened in a certain sense a somewhat more beneficial æra to the Jews. It is true, they reaped the benefits of this transformation less than any other portion of European society; "still, the progress of civilization was silently preparing the way for greater justice being done to this people; and their conduct, in circumstances where they were allowed scope for the development of their better qualities, tended greatly to the removal of the prejudices that existed against them." They found a friend in Reuchlin (q. v.), who made strenuous exertions in behalf of the preservation of Jewish literature. Luther, in the earlier part of his public career, is supposed to have favored the conversion of the Jews *by violent means* (questioned by some; comp. Grätz, *Geschichte des Juden*, ix, 220 sq.; 338 sq.; Etheridge, p. 440 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums u. s. Sekten*, iii, 217); and it is a fact that all through Germany, where the Protestant element, if any where, was strong in those days, their lot actually became harder than it had ever been before. See below. On the other hand, we find a Roman pontiff (Sixtus V, 1585-90) animated by a far more wise and kindly spirit towards them than any Protestant prince of his time. In 1588 he abolished all the persecuting statutes of his predecessors, allowed them to settle and trade in every city of his dominions, to enjoy the free exercise of their religion, and, in respect to the administration of justice and taxation, placed them on a footing with the rest of his subjects. Of course, all this was done for a consideration. The Jews had *money*, and it he made them furnish freely, but then they enjoyed at least certain advantages by virtue of their possessions.

Strange indeed must it appear to the student of history that one of the first countries in modern days that rose above the barbarism of the Middle Ages, and granted the Jews the most liberal concessions, was a part of the possessions of their most inveterate enemy, Philip II of Spain, and that one of the principal causes contributing to this change was the very instrument selected

by the hatred of the Dominicans—the bloody Inquisition. It was the active, energetic, intelligent Hollander, readily appreciating the business qualifications of his Jewish brother, that permitted him to settle by his side as early as 1603. It is true, the Jew did not enjoy even in Holland the rights of citizenship until, after nearly two hundred years of trial (1796), he had been found the equal of his Christian neighbor whenever he was permitted to exchange the garb of a slave for that of a master. It was Holland that afforded to the hunted victims of a cruel and refined fanaticism a resting-place on which they could encamp, and finally enjoy even equality with the natives of the soil. Many of the Portuguese Jews (so the Jews of the Spanish peninsula are termed) left their mother country, and in this new republic vied with its citizens in the highest qualities of commercial greatness. Soon came the Jews of Poland and Germany also to enjoy the special privileges which the Dutch stood ready to administer to them. Denmark and Hamburg partook of the liberal spirit, and there also the Jews were heartily welcomed. In England, also, they soon after (1655), by the success of the Independents, gained anew a foothold. It is true, they did not really obtain public permission to settle again in the island until the reign of Charles II (1660-85), but Cromwell, it is generally believed, favored their admission to the country, and no doubt permitted it quietly in a great many instances. The right to possess land, however, they did not acquire until 1723, and the right of citizenship was not conferred on them until 1753. Into France, also, they were, in the middle of the 16th century, admitted again, though, of course, at first the places which opened their gates to them were few indeed. Most of those who came thither were relics of that mighty host of exiles which had left Spain and Portugal after the establishment of the Inquisition (see above). They went in considerable numbers to the provinces Avignon, Lorraine, and Alsace, and of the cities among the first to bid them enter were Bayonne and Bordeaux. The outbreak of the French Revolution, towards the close of the 18th century, finally caused here, as elsewhere, a decided change in their favor (of which more below). In Germany, as we have already said, their worth failed to be recognised. They were maltreated even under the great and otherwise liberal monarch, Frederick II; and, as Prussia (Brandenburg) was even then in the vanguard of German affairs, the intolerant treatment which they here received was aped in the other and less important realms of the empire. They were driven out of Bavaria in 1553, out of Brandenburg in 1573, and similar treatment befell them elsewhere. They also excited numerous popular tumults (as late even as 1730 in Hamburg, of whose liberal treatment of the Jews we spoke above in connection with the Low Countries), and, in fact, during the whole of the 17th and nearly the whole of the 18th century, the hardships inflicted on them by the German governments became positively more and more grievous. Russia also failed to treat with the least consideration the Jewish people. Admitted into the realm by Peter the Great (1689-1725), they were expelled from the empire, 35,000 strong, in 1743 by the empress Elizabeth. They were, however, readmitted by the empress Catharine II. The only other two countries which truly afforded the Jews protection were Turkey and Poland. The Mohammedans, as we have already had opportunity to observe, have, ever since the decease of the founder of their religion, been considerate in their dealings with their Jewish subjects. In Turkey, the Jews were at this period held in higher estimation than the conquered Greeks; the latter were termed *teshir* (slaves), but the Jews *monsaphir* (visitors). They were permitted to re-establish schools, rebuild synagogues, and to settle in all the commercial towns of the Levant. In Poland, where they are to this day more numerously represented than in any other European country, they met a most favorable reception as early as the 14th century by king Casimir the Great, whose friendship for the Jews is attributed to the love he bore a Jewish mistress of his. For many years the whole trade of the country was in their hands. During the 17th and the greater part of the 18th century, however, they were much persecuted, and sank into a state of great ignorance and even poverty. The French Revolution—which, in spite of the severity and barbarism of Russian intolerance, affected more or less the Polish people—also greatly benefited the Jews of Poland. See below.

7. *The Modern Period.*—The appearance of Moses Mendelssohn (q. v.), the Jewish philosopher, on the stage of European history greatly improved the status of the Jews not only in Germany, but all over Europe, and we might say the world. Various other causes, among which, especially, the American and French revolutions, and the great European war of 1812-15, also contributed to this change. Efforts to ameliorate the condition of the Jews, indeed, began to be manifested even before these important events. In Italy, as early as 1740, Charles of Naples and Sicily gave to the Jews the right to resettle in his kingdom, with the privileges of unrestricted commerce. In England we notice as early as 1753 a Jews' Naturalization Bill pass the houses of Parliament, and in Austria the emperor Francis published his celebrated toleration edict, which gave the Jews a comfortable standing in his dominions, in 1782. With this last date virtually opens the new æra.

The low ebb to which Rabbinism had sunk about the middle of the 18th century made a Jewish Reformation not only possible, but necessary. In the preceding centuries, before and even after the Christian Reformation, again and again false Messiahs had come forward, and sought to impose themselves upon the unfortunate leaders as embassadors from on high to ameliorate their condition, and to fulfil the law and the prophets. See SABBATHAI ZEWI; CHASIDIM; JACOB FRANK. The people, in their forlorn condition, had gravitated with their teachers, and had fallen deep in the slough of ignorance and superstition. No man was better qualified to raise them up from this low estate, and transform the Jewish race into a higher state, than the "third Moses," who—born in Germany (in 1729), an ardent disciple of the great Moses of the 12th century [see MAIMONIDES], the associate of the master minds of Germany of the last half of the 18th century, and the bosom friend of Lessing—eminently possessed every quality necessary to constitute a leader and a guide; and it is to Moses Mendelssohn that pre-eminently belong the honor and glory of having transformed the Jewish race all over the world to a position of equality with their fellow-beings of the Christian faith, not only mentally and morally, but politically also. It is true the change was slowly wrought, and there is even yet much to be accomplished. Still, in Germany, there is hardly an avenue of temporal pursuit in which the Jew is not found occupying the first positions. In the rostrum of the best German universities he is largely represented; on the bench, however great the obstacles that might seem to bar him from promotion, he has secured the most honorable distinctions. As physicians, the Jews are among the élite of the profession; and so in all the other vocations of life they have proved that they are worthy of the trust reposed in them. The country in Europe, however, in which the Jew holds the highest social position is France. There Napoleon, in 1806, conferred upon them many privileges, and they have since entered the highest offices in the government, in the army, and navy. At present they enjoy like privileges in England also. The progress in removing "Jewish disabilities" was rather slow, but it was finally effected in 1860, when the Jew was admitted to Parliament. In Holland and Belgium all restrictions were swept away by the revolution of 1830. In Russia, which contains about two thirds of the Jewish population of Europe, their condition has been very variable since the opening of the present century. In 1805 and 1809 the emperor Alex-

ander issued decrees granting them liberty of trade and commerce, but the barbarous Nicholas deprived them of all these, and treated them quite inhumanly, especially in Poland, where they were known to be in sympathy with the Revolutionists. Since the accession of Alexander II their condition has been improving, and there is reason to hope for still further amelioration of their circumstances. In Italy they were subject, more or less, to intolerance and oppression until the dethronement of the papal power. Since the establishment of a united kingdom they enjoy there the same high privileges as in France. In Spain, too, the establishment of a republican government, so lately remodelled into a monarchy, brought "glad tidings" to the Jews. They had suffered under the yoke of Romanism the general fate of the heretic; the downfall of the Bourbon dynasty, and the establishment of a popular government, at once secured for all religious toleration, and it has since been ascertained that Spain contains many adherents to the Jewish faith among the attendants of the Romish service. In Denmark they were granted equality with other natives in 1814. In Norway they were excluded until 1860, and in Sweden their freedom is as yet limited. In Austria, as in other countries where Roman Catholicism has so long swayed the sceptre with mediæval barbarity, the political changes of late years have placed the Jew on an equality with his Christian neighbor, and not a few of the higher positions of the state are filled by Jews. Our notice of their condition in other countries (aside from the United States of America, for which see notice below) must be necessarily brief on account of our limited space. In Turkey, in spite of the exaction of pashas, the insolence of janizaries, and the miseries of war, they are quite numerous and thriving. In Palestine, where they are rapidly increasing, they are very poor, and depend mainly on their European brethren for assistance. See JERUSALEM. In Arabia their number is small, and they enjoy much independence. In Persia they are quite numerous, but their condition is rather pitiable. They exist also in Afghanistan, a country whose importance will now be more realized since the occupation of Turkistan (June, 1871) by Russia leaves Afghanistan the only independent country separating the Russian empire from the wealth of India. The Jews here thrive as traffickers between Cabul and China. Jews are likewise found in India and Cochin-China, where they are both agriculturists and artisans; as a flourishing colony in Surinam; in Bokhara, where they possess equal rights with the other inhabitants, and are skilled in the manufacture of silks and metals; in Tartary and China, where, however, their number is believed not to be adequately known. In Africa, also, they exist in large numbers; especially numerous are they all along the North-African coast, where, indeed, they have had communities for perhaps more than a thousand years, which were largely re-enforced in consequence of the great Spanish persecutions. They are numerous in Fez and Morocco, are found in small numbers in Egypt and Nubia, more numerous in Abyssinia, and it is ascertained that they have even made their way into the heart of Africa; they exist in Sudan, and are also found further south. America, too, has invited their spirit of enterprise. In the United States, as in Great Britain, they enjoy absolute liberty. (See, for further particulars of the history of the Jews in our country, the article JUDAISM.) They have been in Brazil since 1625, and in Cayenne since 1639, and are also settled in some parts of the West Indies.

The entire number of Jews in the world is reckoned variously at between 3½ and 15 millions. Chambers, taking the former estimate, distributes them as follows: about 1,700,000 to Russian, Austrian, and Prussian Poland, about 600,000 to Germany, about 240,000 to Hungary and Transylvania, about 200,000 to Galicia, about 300,000 to Turkey, about 47,000 to Italy, about 30,000 to Great Britain; Asia, about 138,000; Africa, about 504,000; and America, about 30,000. We are inclined to estimate the number of Jews to be no less than *six* millions, and of these give to Europe about 4,000,000, and to the United States of America about 500,000. The estimate of Chambers for the United States might be more accurately adopted as the census of the city of New York only. The *Handbuch der Vergleichenden Statistik* by G. von Kolb (Leipzig, 1868) gives the following as the number of Jews in the countries named:

Germany	478,500	Denmark	4,200
Austria	1,124,000	Sweden	1,000
Great Britain	40,000	Greece	500
France	80,000	European Turkey	70,000
European Russia	2,277,000	Asiatic Turkey and	
Italy	20,200	Syria	52,000
Portugal	3,000	Morocco and North	
Switzerland	4,200	Africa	610,000
Belgium	1,500	Eastern Asia	500,800
Netherlands	64,000	America	400,000
Luxemburg	1,500		

See Jost, *Geschichte d. Israeliten* (since the time of the Maccabees) (Berlin, 1820–29, 9 vols. 8vo), his *Neuere Gesch.* (Berl. 1846–7, 3 vols. 8vo), and also his *Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten* (Leipzig, 1857–9, 3 vols. 8vo); Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden* (vol. iii–xi; vols. i and ii, treating of the earliest period of Jewish history, have not yet made their appearance); Milman, *History of the Jews* (London and N. York, new edit., revised and augmented, 1869–70, 3 vols. sm. 8vo); Geiger, *Judenthum u. s. Gesch.* (Lpz. 1864–5, 2 vols. 8vo); Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten* (Leipzig, 1845); Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles* (Lond. 1850, 12mo); Kaiserling, *Gesch. der Juden in Portugal* (Lpz. 1859, 8vo); Morgoliouth, *History of Jews in Great Britain* (Lond. 1851, 3 vols. 8vo); Capefigue, *Hist. philos. des Juifs* (Par. 1838); Depping, *Les Juifs dans le moyen-âge* (Paris, 1834); Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Literature*, (Lond. 1856, 12mo); Haller, *Des Juifs en France* (Paris, 1845); Bedanide, *Les Juifs en France, en Italie et en Espagne* (Paris, 1859); Smucker, *Hist. of Modern Jews* (N. Y. 1860); Beer, *Gesch. Lehren u. Meinung. der Juden* (Lpz. 1825, 8vo); Jenks (William), *History of the Jews* (Bost. 1847, 12mo); Mills, *British Jews, their Religious Ceremonies* (Lond. 1862); Ockley, *History of the present Jews* (translated from the Italian of Jeh. Arj. da Modena, Lond. 1650); Schirnding, *Die Juden in Oesterreich, Preussen und Sachsen* (Lpz. 1842); Toway, *Anglia Judaica* (Oxf. 1738); Benjamin, *Eight Years in Asia and Africa* (Hanover, 1859); Finn, *Sephardim, or History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal* (London, 1841, 8vo; reviewed in *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1842, p. 459 sq.); *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1837, p. 402 sq.; *Lond. Quarterly Review*, xxxviii, 114 sq.; *Christian Examiner*, 1848, p. 48 sq.; 1830, p. 290 sq.; *North Am. Rev.* 1831, p. 254 sq. The work of Basnage (*Hist. de la Religion des Juifs depuis Jésus-Christ jusqu'à présent* (Haag, 1716, 15 vols. 8vo) was compiled from second-hand sources, and so teems with errors and unjust statements towards Jews that we can hardly advise its perusal to any who seek accuracy and erudition. For the *religious views*, etc., of the Jews, see JUDAISM. (J. H. W.)

Jew, THE WANDERING. While the tradition obtained in the Christian Church that the "disciple whom Jesus loved" should not die (John xxi. 23), we find as a counterpart the tradition of an enemy of the Redeemer, whom remorse condemned to ceaseless wanderings until the second coming of the Lord. This tradition of the Wandering Jew has, like other traditions, undergone various changes. The first Christian writer by whom we find it mentioned is the Benedictine chronicler Matthæus Parisius († 1259). According to the account he gives in his *Historia Major*—an account which he professes to have received from an Armenian bishop, to whom the Wandering Jew had himself told it—his history was as follows: His name was *Cartaphilus*, and he was door-keeper of the palace, in the employ of Pilate. When the Jews dragged Jesus out of the palace, after his sentence had been pronounced, the door-keeper struck him, saying mockingly, "Go on, Jesus, go faster; why dost thou linger?" Jesus turned around sternly, and said, "I am going, but thou shalt remain waiting

until I return." The door-keeper was then about thirty years old; but since, whenever he reaches his hundredth year, a sudden faintness overcomes him, and when he awakes from his swoon he finds himself returned to the age he was at the time the Lord pronounced his punishment. Cartaphilus was baptized with Ananias under the name of *Joseph*, which caused him afterwards to be confounded with Joseph of Arimathea. As a Christian, he led a life of strict penitence, in the hope of obtaining forgiveness. The scene of action of this Wandering Jew is in the East—namely, Armenia.

The tradition of the West is somewhat different. Here we find him first mentioned in the 16th century, under the name of *Ahasuerus*, and he is said to have appeared in 1547 in Hamburg, then in Dantzig and in other cities of Germany, and in other countries also. Dr. Paulus, of Eizen, bishop of Schleswig—the story goes—heard him relate his history as follows: Ahasuerus was a shoemaker in Jerusalem during the life of Jesus, and one of the loudest in crying "Crucify him." When Jesus was led to the place of execution, he passed before the shoemaker's house. Tired with the weight of the cross, the Saviour leaned against the porch for rest; but the shoemaker, who stood at his door with a child in his arms, bade him harshly move on (according to some he even struck him), when Christ, turning round and looking severely at him, said, "I shall stay and rest, but thou shalt move on until the last day."

Towards the end of the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th, the tradition of the Wandering Jew, in England, changed to the original Eastern account. A stranger made his appearance claiming to be an officer of the upper council of Jerusalem, and that he had done what was generally attributed to Cartaphilus—namely, had struck Jesus as the latter left Pilate's palace, and said to him, "Go, move on; why dost thou yet linger here?" The English universities sent their ablest professors to question him. He proved himself able to answer them all; he related a great deal concerning the apostles, as also about Mohammed, Tamerlane, Soliman, etc., all of whom he professed to have known personally; he knew all the dates of the events connected with the Crusades, etc. Some considered him an impostor or a visionary, while others believed him.

Whether the allegory of Ahasuerus, or this ever-restless being, is to be understood as a type of the anti-Christian spirit of scepticism, or whether, in a more concrete sense, it is meant to typify the ever-wandering, homeless, yet still unchanged Jewish people, is a question for critics to decide. We will only add that this fanciful tradition has become the theme for a great number of works of imagination. It has been worked up into songs, as by Schubert, Schlegel, etc.; into epics, as by Julius Mösen, Nich. Lenaw, etc.: into dramas, as by Klingemann. French writers also have used it; Edgar Quinet and Béranger have composed songs on the Wandering Jew. But the most remarkable production to which this legend has given rise is Eugène Sue's novel, *The Wandering Jew* (*Le Juif errant*, Paris, 1844). See Dr. J. G. Th. Grässe, *Sage v. ewigen Juden, historisch entwickelt* (Dresden u. Leipz. 1844, 8vo); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vii, 131 sq. (J. N. P.)

Jewel is the representative in the A. V. of the following terms in the original: נֶזֶם (*ne'zem*, a *ring*), a *nose-ring* (Prov. xi, 22; Isa. iii, 21; Ezek. xvi, 12; everywhere else rendered "ear-ring," Gen. xxiv, 22, 30, 47; see Jerome on Ezek. ad loc.; Hartmann's *Hebräerin*, ii, 166; iii, 205), or an *ear-ring* (Gen. xxxv, 4; Exod. xxxii, 2, 3); elsewhere without specifying the part of the person on which it was worn (Judg. viii, 24-26; Exod. xxxv, 32; Job xlii, 11; Prov. xxv, 12; Hos. ii, 15). חֲלִי (*chali'*, so called as being *polished*), a necklace or trinket (Cant. vii, 1; "ornament," Prov. xxv, 12), and חֶלְיָה (*chelyah'*, fem. of preced.), a necklace or female ornament (Hos. ii, 13). כְּלִי (*keli'*, an *implement* or *vessel* of any kind), an article of silver-ware or other precious material (Gen. xxiv, 53; Exod. iii, 22; xi, 2; xii, 35; Numb. xxxi, 50, 51; 1 Sam. vi, 8, 15; Job xxviii, 17; Prov. xx, 15), or any elegant *trappings* or piece of finery in dress (Isa. lxi, 10; Ezek. xvi, 7, 39; xxiii, 16), elsewhere rendered "vessel," etc. סְגֻלָּה (*segullah'*, *property*), wealth or *treasure* (Mal. iii, 17; elsewhere usually "peculiar treasure," Exod. xix, 5; Psa. cxxxv, 4, etc.). See DRESS; PRECIOUS STONE; etc.

Jewell, JOHN, a learned English writer and bishop, one of the fathers of the English Protestant Church, was born May 24, 1522, at Buden, in the county of Devon, and educated at Oxford, where he took the degree of bachelor of arts in 1541, became a noted tutor, and was soon after chosen lecturer on rhetoric in his college. He had early imbibed the principles of the Reformation, and inculcated them upon his pupils, though it had to be done privately till the accession of king Edward the Sixth, which took place in 1546, when he made a public declaration of his faith, and entered into a close friendship with Peter Martyr, who was visiting Oxford about this time. On the accession of queen Mary in 1553, he was one of the first to feel the rage of the storm then raised against the Reformation; he was obliged to flee, and, after encountering many difficulties, joined the English exiles at Frankfort, in the second year of queen Mary's reign, and here made a public recantation of his forced subscription to the popish doctrines. He then went to Strasburg, and afterwards to Zürich, where he resided with Peter Martyr. He returned to England in 1559, after the death of queen Mary, and in the following year was consecrated bishop of Salisbury. He now preached and wrote anew in favor of the Reformation, and sought in every way to extinguish any attachment still remaining for the Roman Catholics. It was at this time, after more than twenty years spent in researches, that he published his famous *Apologia pro Ecclesia Anglicana* (translated into six different languages, and into English by lady Bacon [wife of the councillor], under the title, *An Apology or Answer in defence of the Church of England*, 1562, 4to). But his watchful and laborious manner of life impaired his health, and brought him quickly to the grave. He died at Monkton Farley Sept. 22, 1571. "He was a prelate of great learning, piety, and moderation; irreproachable in his private life; extremely generous and charitable to the poor, to whom, it is said, his doors always stood open. He was of a pleasant and affable temper, modest, meek, and temperate, and a great master of his passions. His memory was naturally strong and retentive, but he is said to have greatly improved it by art, insomuch that marvellous things are related of it by his biographers." The writings of bishop Jewell, which are chiefly controversial, are greatly valued even in our day, and are freely used in two departments of Church controversy—on the question between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, and on the question respecting the devotional sentiments of the English Protestant fathers. Besides his *Apology*, he wrote, in reply to Thomas Harding (q. v.), *A Defence of the Apology* (1565 and 1567, folio), the reading of which was obligatory in all parishes until the time of Charles I:—*A View of a seditious Bull sent into England by Pope Pius V* in 1569:—*A Treatise on the Holy Scriptures* (Lond. 1582, 8vo):—*An Exposition of the two Epistles to the Thessalonians*:—*A Treatise on the Sacraments* (Lond. 1583, 8vo); besides several sermons and controversial treatises. His works were collected and published in one folio volume (Lond. 1609, 1611, 1631, 1711; recent editions, Camb. 1845-50, 4 vols. sm. fol.; Oxf. 1847, 1848, 8 vols. 8vo). See Fuller, *Church Hist.*; Burnet, *Hist. of Reformation*; L. Humfrey, *Life of John Jewell* (1573); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvi, 710; Allibone, *Dict. of Auth.* i, 967; Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.* vol. i (see Index); Chas. Webb le Bas, *Life of Bishop Jewell* (1835); Middleton, *Reformers*, iii, 8 [illegible] sq. (J. H. W.)

Jewess (Ἰουδαία), a woman of Hebrew birth, without distinction of tribe (Acts xvi, 1; xxiv, 24). It is

applied in the former passage to Eunice, the mother of Timothy, who was unquestionably of Hebrew origin (comp. 2 Tim. iii, 15), and in the latter to Drusilla, the wife of Felix and daughter of Herod Agrippa I.—Smith. See JEW.

Jewett, William, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Sharon, Conn., in the year 1789. At the age of seventeen he was converted, commenced preaching the year following, and travelled a circuit by direction of a presiding elder. In 1808 he joined the New York Annual Conference. His ministerial labors were uninterrupted from 1807 to 1851, a period of forty-four years, during nineteen of which he held the office of presiding elder. His appointments were Middletown, Conn.; Poughkeepsie, New York City, and from 1832 on the Hudson River, White Plains, Newburgh, Poughkeepsie, and Rhinebeck districts. The last six years of his life he sustained to the Conference a superannuated relation. As a man, Mr. Jewett possessed many estimable traits of character. As a Christian, he was distinguished for a marked decision and firmness of character. As a preacher, he was plain, simple, and eminently practical. As a pastor, he was wise, diligent, faithful, and unusually successful, leaving behind him, wherever he went, a holy influence. As a presiding elder, he commanded the confidence and respect of his brethren. He died at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., June 27, 1857. (G. L. T.)

Jewett, William D., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Ballston, N. Y., about 1788; was converted in 1811; was licensed to preach in 1821, and preached much, and was ordained deacon previous to entering the Genesee Conference in 1830; was superannuated in 1845, and died at Huron, N. Y., Nov. 10, 1855. Mr. Jewett was a man of "unobtrusive piety, and a pattern of ministerial fidelity." He labored with all faithfulness and love until his strength failed him. At death he left his property, about $3000, to the Bible and Missionary societies, and the superannuated brethren of his own Conference.—*Minutes of Conf.* vi, 102. (G. L. T.)

Jewish (Ἰουδαϊκός), of or belonging to Jews: an epithet applied to the Rabbinical legends against which the apostle Paul warns his younger brother (Tit. i, 14). See JEW.

JEWISH CHRISTIANS. See JUDAIZERS.

Jew'ry (יְהוּד, *Yehud'*, Chald., Dan. v, 13, last clause; "Judæa" in Ezra v, 8; elsewhere "Judah;" Ἰουδαῖα, Luke xxiii, 5; John vii, 1; elsewhere "Judæa"), the nation of the Jews, i. e. the kingdom of JUDAH, later JUDÆA. "Jewry" also occurs frequently in the A. V. of the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. i, 32; ii, 4; iv, 49; v, 7, 8, 57; vi, 1; viii, 81; ix, 3; Bel 33; 2 Macc. x, 24).

Jews. See JEW.

Jezani'ah (Jer. xl, 8; xlii, 1). See JAAZANIAH, 4.

Jez'ebel (Hebrew *Ize'bel*, אִיזֶבֶל, *not-cohabited*, q. d. ἄλοχος, compare Plato, p. 249; Lat. *Agnes*, i. e. *intacta*, chaste; an appropriate female name, remarks Gesenius, and not to be estimated from the character of Ahab's queen; comp. *Isabella;* Sept. Ἰεζάβελ; N. T. Ἰεζαβήλ, Rev. ii, 20; Joseph. Ἰαζεβέλις, *Ant.* ix, 6, 4; Vulg. *Jezabel*), the consort of Ahab, king of Israel (1 Kings xvi, 31), was the daughter of Ethbaal (q. v.), king of Tyre and Sidon, and originally a priest of Astarte (Josephus, *Apion*, i, 18). This unsuitable alliance proved most disastrous to the kingdom of Israel; for Jezebel induced her weak husband not only to connive at her introducing the worship of her native idols, but eventually to become himself a worshipper of them, and to use all the means in his power to establish them in the room of the God of Israel. The worship of the golden calves, which previously existed, was, however mistakenly, intended in honor of Jehovah; but this was an open alienation from him, and a turning aside to foreign and strange gods, which, indeed, were no gods (but see Vatke, *Bibl. Theol.* i, 406). Most of the particulars of this bad but apparently highly-gifted woman's conduct have been related in the notices of AHAB and ELIJAH. From the course of her proceedings, it would appear that she grew to hate the Jewish system of law and religion on account of what must have seemed to her its intolerance and its anti-social tendencies. She hence sought to put it down by all the means she could command; and the imbecility of her husband seems to have made all the powers of the state subservient to her designs. The manner in which she acquired and used her power over Ahab is strikingly shown in the matter of Naboth, which, perhaps, more than all the other affairs in which she was engaged, brings out her true character, and displays the nature of her influence. B.C. cir. 897. When she found him puling, like a spoiled child, on account of the refusal of Naboth to gratify him by selling him his patrimonial vineyard for a "garden of herbs," she taught him to look to her, to rely upon her for the accomplishment of his wishes; and for the sake of this impression, more perhaps than from savageness of temper, she scrupled not at murder under the abused forms of law and religion (1 Kings xxi, 1-29). She had the reward of her unscrupulous decisiveness of character in the triumph of her policy in Israel, where, at last, there were but 7000 people who had not bowed the knee to Baal, nor kissed their hand to his image. Nor was her success confined to Israel; for through Athaliah — a daughter after her own heart—who was married to the son and successor of Jehoshaphat, the same policy prevailed for a time in Judah, after Jezebel herself had perished and the house of Ahab had met its doom. It seems that after the death of her husband, Jezebel maintained considerable ascendency over her son Jehoram; and her measures and misconduct formed the principal charge which Jehu cast in the teeth of that unhappy monarch before he sent forth the arrow that slew him. The last effort of Jezebel was to intimidate Jehu as he passed the palace by warning him of the eventual rewards of even successful treason. It is eminently characteristic of the woman that, even in this terrible moment, when she knew that her son was slain, and must have felt that her power had departed, she displayed herself, not with rent veil and dishevelled hair, "but tired her head and painted her eyes" before she looked out at the window. The eunuchs, at a word from Jehu, having cast her down, she met her death beneath the wall [see JEHU]; and when afterwards the new monarch bethought him that, as "a king's daughter," her corpse should not be treated with disrespect, nothing was found of her but the palms of her hands and the soles of her feet: the dogs had eaten all the rest (1 Kings xvi, 31; xviii, 4, 13, 19; xxi, 5-25; 2 Kings ix, 7, 22, 30-37). B.C. 883.

The name of Jezebel appears anciently (as in modern times) to have become proverbial for a wicked termagant (comp. 2 Kings ix, 22), and in this sense it is probably used in Rev. ii, 20, where, instead of "that woman Jezebel" (τὴν γυναῖκα Ἰεζαβήλ), many editors prefer the reading "thy wife Jezebel" (τὴν γυναῖκά σου Ἰεζάβελ), i. e. of the bishop of the Church at Thyatira, who seems to have assumed the office of a public teacher, although herself as corrupt in doctrine as in practice. In this address to the representative of the Church she is called his wife, i. e. one for whose character and conduct, as being a member of the congregation over which he had charge, he was responsible, and whom he should have taken care that the Church had long since repudiated. Her proper name is probably withheld through motives of delicacy. We need not suppose that she was literally guilty of licentiousness, but only that she disseminated and acted upon such corrupt religious principles as made her resemble the idolatrous wife of Ahab in her public influence. (See Jablonski, *Diss. de Jezabele Thyatirenor. pseudo-prophetessa*, Frankf. 1739; Stuart's *Comment.* ad loc.) Others, however, maintain a more literal interpretation of the passage (see Clarke and Alford, ad loc.). See NICOLAITAN.

Jeze'lus (Ἰέζηλος), the Græcized form (in the Apocrypha) of the name of two Jews whose sons are said to have returned from Babylon with Ezra; but a comparison with the Hebrew text seems to indicate an identity or else confusion.

1. (Vulgate *Zecheleus.*) The father of Sechenias, of "the sons of Zathoe" (1 Esdr. viii, 32); evidently the JAHAZIEL of Ezra viii, 5.

2. (Vulg. *Jehelus.*) The father of Abadias, of "the sons of Joab" (1 Esdr. viii, 35); evidently the JEHIEL of Ezra viii, 9.

Je'zer (Heb. *Ye'tser*, יֵצֶר, *formation;* Sept. Ἰσσάαρ, Ἰέσερ, but in Chron. Σαάρ v. r. Ἀσήρ), the third named of the four sons of Naphtali (Gen. xlvi, 24; Numb. xxvi, 49; 1 Chron. vii, 13), and progenitor of the family of JEZERITES (Heb. *Yitsri'*, יִצְרִי, Septuag. Ἰεσερί, Numb. xxvi, 49; see IZRI). B.C. 1856.

Je'zerite (Numb. xxvi, 49). See JEZER.

Jezi'ah (Heb. *Yizziyah'*, יִזִּיָּה, for יְזִי־יָה, *sprinkled* by *Jehovah;* or perhaps to be written יְזִיָּה, *Yizyah'*, for יְזִי־יָה, *assembled* by *Jehovah*, comp. JEZIEL; Sept. Ἀζία, Vulgate *Jezia*), an Israelite, one of the "sons" of Parosh, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 25). B.C. 459.

Je'ziël [some *Jezi'ël*] (Heb. *Yezië'l*, יְזִיאֵל, as in the margin, *assembled* by *God;* Sept. Ἀζιήλ v. r. Ἰωήλ, etc.; Vulg. *Jaziel*), a "son" of Azmaveth, who, with his brother, was one of the Benjamite archers that reinforced David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 3). B.C. 1055.

Jezirah (סֵפֶר יְצִירָה, *Sêpher Yetsiráh*), or the *Book of Creation*, is the name of one of the cabalistic books which, next to the ZOHAR, forms the principal source whence we derive our knowledge of Jewish mysticism. The age of the book it has thus far been impossible exactly to determine. Jewish tradition claims it to be of *divine* origin. It was intrusted by the Lord to Abraham, and he handed it down to Akiba (q. v.). Modern scholars have come to the conclusion that the Jezirah is the product of the Jewish schools in Egypt at the time of Philo Judæus. Dr. Zunz, however, assigns it to the Geonastic period, the 8th or 9th century. For the latter assertion there seems to us to be no good reason, and we are inclined to believe it was composed during the period of the first Mishnaists, i. e. between a century before and about eighty years after the birth of Christ (comp. Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Lit.* p. 300 sq.; Enfield, *Hist. Philos.* p. 405). See CABALA, vol. ii, p. 1. We do this after having determined that the Hebrew of this work is of that dialectic kind used by the learned Jews at the time of the opening of the Christian æra. Indeed, it is barely possible that the work itself was a collection of fragments of various earlier times; a kind of *résumé* of what had hitherto been determined on the occult subject of which it treats. The Jezirah treats of the Creation of the World, and "is, in fact, an ancient effort of the human mind to discover the plan of the universe at large, and the law or band which unites its various parts into one harmonious whole. It opens its instructions with something of the tone and manner of the Bible, and announces that the universe bears upon itself the imprint of the name of God; so that, by means of the great panorama of the world, the mind may acquire a conception of the Deity, and from the unity which reigns in the creation, it may learn the oneness of the Creator." So far, so good. But now, instead of tracing in the universe the laws which govern it, so as to ascertain from those laws the thoughts of the law-giver, "it is sought rather to arrive at the same end by finding some tangible analogy between the things which exist and the signs of thought, or the means by which thought and knowledge are principally communicated and interpreted among men; and recourse is had for this purpose to the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, and to the first ten of the numbers" (compare Etheridge, p. 304 sq.).

"The book of Jezirah begins by an enumeration of the thirty-two ways of wisdom (נְתִיבוֹת חָכְמָה), or, in plainer terms, of the thirty-two attributes of the divine mind (שֵׂכֶל), as they are demonstrated in the founding of the universe. The book shows why there are just thirty-two of these; by an analysis of this number it seeks to exhibit, in a peculiar method of theosophical arithmetic, so to speak (on the assumption that figures are the signs of existence and thought), the doctrine that God is the author of all things, the universe being a development of original entity, and existence being but thought become concrete; in short, that, instead of the heathenish or popular Jewish conception of the world as outward or coexistent with Deity, it is coequal in birth, having been brought out of nothing by God, thus establishing a pantheistic system of emanation, of which, principally because it is not anywhere designated by this name, one would think the writer was not himself quite conscious. The following sketch will illustrate the curious process of this argumentation. The number 32 is the sum of 10 (the number of digits) and 22 (the number of the letters of the Heb. alphabet), this latter being afterwards further resolved into 3 + 7 + 12. The first chapter treats of the former of these, or the *decade*, and its elements, which are designated as figures (ספירות, *Sephiroth*), in contradistinction from the 22 letters. This decade is the sign manual of the universe. In the details of this hypothesis, the existence of divinity in the abstract is really ignored, though not formally denied; thus the number 1 is its spirit as an active principle, in which all worlds and beings are yet inclosed; 2 is the spirit from this spirit, i. e. the active principle in so far as it has beforehand decided on creating; 3 is water; 4 fire, these two being the ideal foundations of the material and spiritual worlds respectively; while the six remaining figures, 5 to 10, are regarded severally as the signs manual of height, depth, east, west, north, and south, forming the six sides of the cube, and representing the idea of form in its geometrical perfection.

"We see, however, that this alone establishes nothing real, but merely expounds the *idea* of possibility or actuality, at the same time establishing the *virtualiter* as existing in God, the foundation of all things. The actual entities are therefore introduced in the subsequent chapters under the 22 letters. The connection between the two series is evidently the *Word*, which in the first Sephirah (number) is yet identical in voice and action with the spirit; but afterwards these elements, separating as creator and substance, together produce the world, the materials of which are represented by the letters, since these, by their manifold combinations, name and describe all that exists. Next, three letters are abstracted from the 22 as the three *mothers* (composing the mnemotechnic word אמש), i. e. the universal relations of principle, contrary principle, and balance, or in nature—fire, water, and air; in the world—the heavens, the earth, the air; in the seasons—heat, cold, mild temperature; in humanity—the spirit, the body, the soul; in the body—the head, the feet, the trunk; in the moral organization—guilt, innocence, law, etc. These are followed by seven *doubles* (consisting of בגדכפרת), i. e. the relations of things which are subject to change (opposition without balance), e. g. life and death, happiness and misery, wisdom and insanity, riches and poverty, beauty and ugliness, mastery and servitude. But these seven also designate the material world, namely, the six ends (sides) of the cube, and the palace of holiness in the middle (the immanent deity) which supports it; also the seven planets, the seven heavenly spheres, the seven days of the week, the seven weeks (from Passover to Pentecost), the seven portals of the soul (i. e. the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, etc.). This theory further has express reference to the fact that

from the combination of the letters results, with mathematical certainty and in a geometrical ratio, a quantity of words so great that the mind cannot enumerate them; thus, from two letters, two words; from three, six; from four, twenty-four, etc.; or, in other words, that the letters, whether spoken as results of breath, or written as elements of words, are the ideal foundation of all things. Finally, the twelve *single* letters (constituting the remainder of the alphabet) show the relations of things so far as they can be apprehended in a universal category. Their geometrical representative is the regular twelve-sided polygon, such as that of which the horizon consists; their representation in the world gives the twelve signs of the zodiac and the twelve months of the lunar year; in human beings, the twelve parts of the body and twelve faculties of the mind (these being very arbitrarily determined). They are so organized by God as to form at once a province and yet be ready for battle, i. e. they are as well fitted for harmonious as for contentious action"

The text of the Jezirah is divided into six chapters, which are subdivided into sections. Its style is purely dogmatic, having the air and character of aphorisms, or theorems laid down with an absolute authority. The abstract character is, however, relieved by a hagadistic addition which relates the conversion of Abram from Chaldæan idolatry to pure theism, so treated as to render the work a kind of monologue of that patriarch on the natural world, as a monument or manifestation of the glory of the one only God. The book of Jezirah has been published with five commentaries (Mantua, 1562); with a Latin translation and notes by Rittangelius (Amst. 1642), and with a German translation and notes by Meyer (Lpzg. 1830); with ten commentaries (Warsaw, 1884, 4to). See Grätz, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, viii, 67 sq., 103 sq., 140 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalog. Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodl.* col. 335 sq., 552, 639 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i, 27 sq.; ii, 258 sq. See PANTHEISM.

Jezli'ah (Heb. *Yizliah'*, יִזְלִיאָה, perh. *drawn* out, i. e. *preserved;* Sept. Ἰεζλία v. r. Ἰεζλίας, Vulg. *Jezlia*), one of the "sons" of Elpaal, and apparently a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 18). B.C. prob. cir. 588.

Jezo'är [some *Jez'oär*] (1 Chron. iv, 7). See ZOAR.

Jezrabi'ah (Neh. xii, 42). See IZRAHIAH, 2.

Jez'reël (Heb. *Yizreel,'* יִזְרְעֶאל, once יִזְרְעֶאל, 2 Kings ix, 10; *sown* by *God;* Sept. Ἰεζραήλ, but sometimes Ἰεζρεήλ, Ἰεζριήλ, Ἰεζράελ or Ἰεζραέλ; Josephus Ἰεσράηλα, *Ant.* viii, 13, 6; Ἰεσράελα, *Ant.* ix, 6, 4), the name of two places and of several men.

1. A town in the tribe of Issachar (Josh. xix, 18), where the kings of Israel had a palace (2 Sam. ii, 8 sq.), and where the court often resided (1 Kings xviii, 45; xxi, 1; 2 Kings ix, 30), although Samaria was the metropolis of that kingdom. It is most frequently mentioned in the history of the house of Ahab. "In the neighborhood, or within the town probably, was a temple and grove of Astarte, with an establishment of 400 priests supported by Jezebel (1 Kings xvi, 33; 2 Kings x, 11). The palace of Ahab (1 Kings xxi, 1; xviii, 46), probably containing his 'ivory house' (1 Kings xxii, 39), was on the eastern side of the city, forming part of the city wall (comp. 1 Kings xxi, 1; 2 Kings ix, 25, 30, 33). The seraglio, in which Jezebel lived, was on the city wall, and had a high window facing eastward (2 Kings ix, 30). Close by, if not forming part of this seraglio (as Josephus supposes, *Ant.* ix, 6, 4), was a watch-tower, on which a sentinel stood, to give notice of arrivals from the disturbed district beyond the Jordan (2 Kings ix, 17). This watch-tower, well-known as 'the tower in Jezreel,' may possibly have been the tower or *migdal* near which the Egyptian army was encamped in the battle between Necho and Josiah (*Herod.* ii, 159). An ancient square tower which stands amongst the hovels of the modern village may be its representative. The gateway of the city on the east was also the gateway of the palace (2 Kings ix, 34). Immediately in front of the gateway, and under the city wall, was an open space, such as existed before the neighboring city of Bethshan (2 Sam. xxi, 12), and is usually found by the walls of Eastern cities, under the name of 'the mounds' (see *Arabian Nights*, passim), whence the dogs, the scavengers of the East, prowled in search of offal (2 Kings ix, 25). See JEZEBEL. A little further east, but adjacent to the royal domain (1 Kings xxi, 1), was a smooth tract of land cleared out of the uneven valley (2 Kings ix, 25), which belonged to Naboth, a citizen of Jezreel (2 Kings ix, 25), by a hereditary right (1 Kings xxi, 3); but the royal grounds were so near that it would have easily been turned into a garden of herbs for the royal use (1 Kings xxi, 2). Here Elijah met Ahab (1 Kings xxi, 17)" (Smith). Here was the vineyard of Naboth, which Ahab coveted to enlarge the palace-grounds (1 Kings xviii, 45, 46; xxi), and here Jehu executed his dreadful commission against the house of Ahab, when Jezebel, Jehoram, and all who were connected with that wretched dynasty perished (2 Kings ix, 14-37; x, 1-11). These horrid scenes appear to have given the kings of Israel a distaste for this residence, as it is not again mentioned in their history. It is, however, named by Hosea (i, 4; compare i, 11; ii, 22); and in Judith (i, 8; iv, 3; vii, 3) it occurs under the name of *Esdraelon* (Ἐσδρηλώυ), near Dothaim. In the days of Eusebius and Jerome it was still a large village, 12 R. miles from Scythopolis and 10 from Legio, called *Esdraela* (Ἐσδράηλα, *Onomast.* s. v. Ἰεζραιέλ, Jezrael); and in the same age it again occurs as *Stradela* (*Itin. Hieros.* p. 586). Nothing more is heard of it till the time of the Crusades, when it was called by the Franks *Parvum Gerinum*, and by the Arabs *Zerin* (an evident corruption of the old name); and it is described as commanding a wide prospect—on the east to the mountains of Gilead, and on the west to Mount Carmel (Will. Tyr. xxii, 26). But this line of identification seems to have been afterwards lost sight of, and Jezreel came to be identified with Jenin. Indeed, the village of Zerin ceased to be mentioned by travellers till Turner, Buckingham, and others after them again brought it into notice; and it is still more lately that the identification of Zerin and Jezreel has been restored (Raumer, *Palästina*, p. 155; Schubert, iii, 164; Elliot, ii, 379; Robinson, iii, 164).

Zerin is seated on the brow of a rocky and very steep descent into the great and fertile valley of Jezreel, which runs down between the mountains of Gilboa and Hermon. Lying comparatively high, it commands a wide and noble view, extending down the broad valley on the east as far as the Jordan (2 Kings ix, 17) to Beisan (Bethshean), and on the west quite across the great plain to the mountains of Carmel (1 Kings xviii, 46). It is described by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, iii, 163) as a most magnificent site for a city, which, being itself a conspicuous object in every part, would naturally give its name to the whole region. In the valley directly under Zerin is a considerable fountain, and another still larger somewhat further to the east, under the northern side of Gilboa, called Ain Jalud. There can, therefore, be little question that as in Zerin we have Jezreel, so in the valley and the fountain we have the "valley of Jezreel" and the "fountain of Jezreel" of Scripture. Zerin has at present little more than twenty humble dwellings, mostly in ruins, and with few inhabitants. (See De Saulcy, i, 79; ii, 306 sq.; Schwarz, p. 164; Thomson, ii, 180.)

The inhabitants of this city were called JEZREELITES (Heb. *Yezreeli'*, יִזְרְעֵאלִי, 1 Kings xxi, 1, 4, 6, 7, 15, 16; 2 Kings ix, 21, 25).

JEZREEL, BLOOD OF (דָּמִים, i. e. *bloodshed*), put for the murders perpetrated by Ahab and Jehu at this place (Hos. i, 4). See below.

JEZREEL, DAY OF (יוֹם, i. e. *period*), put for the pre-

dicted time of the execution of vengeance for the atrocities there committed (Hos. i, 5). See 3, below.

JEZREEL, DITCH OF (חֵל, Septuag. προτείχισμα), was simply the fortification or intrenchments surrounding the city, outside of which Naboth was executed (1 Kings xxi, 23; comp. ver. 13). See TRENCH.

JEZREEL, FOUNTAIN OF (עַיִן, always a perennial natural *spring*), a place where Saul encamped before the fatal battle of Gilboa (1 Sam. xxix, 1). Still in the same eastern direction from Zerin are two springs, one 12 minutes from the town, the other 20 minutes (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* iii, 167). This latter spring "flows from under a sort of cavern in the wall of conglomerate rock, which here forms the base of Gilboa. The water is excellent; and issuing from crevices in the rocks, it spreads out at once into a fine limpid pool 40 or 50 feet in diameter, full of fish" (Robinson, iii, 168). This probably, both from its size and situation, is the one above referred to. It is also probably the same as the spring (A.V. "well") of "Harod," where Gideon encamped before his night attack on the Midianites (Judg. vii, 1). (Possibly the nearer spring may distinctively have been called that of Jezreel, and the farther one that of Harod.) The name of Harod, "trembling," probably was taken from the "trembling" of Gideon's army (Judg. vii, 3). It was the scene of successive encampments of the Crusaders and Saracens, and was called by the Christians *Tubania*, and by the Arabs *Ain Jâlûd*, "the spring of Goliath" (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* iii, 69). This last name, which it still bears, is derived from a tradition mentioned by the Bordeaux Pilgrim, that here David killed Goliath. The tradition may be a confused reminiscence of many battles fought in its neighborhood (Ritter, *Jordan*, p. 416); or the word may be a corruption of "Gilead," supposing that to be the ancient name of Gilboa, and thus explaining Judg. vii, 3, "depart from Mount Gilead" (Schwarz, p. 334). See GILEAD. According to Josephus (*Ant.* viii, 15, 4, 6), this spring, and the pool attached to it, was the spot where Naboth and his sons were executed, where the dogs and swine licked up their blood and that of Ahab, and where the harlots bathed in the blood-stained water (Sept.). But the natural inference from the present text of 1 Kings xxii, 38 makes the scene of these events to be the pool of Samaria. See NABOTH.

JEZREEL, PORTION OF (חֵלֶק), merely signifies the field or country adjoining the city, where the crime of Ahab had been perpetrated, and where its retribution was to be exacted (2 Kings ix, 10, 21, 36, 37; comp. ver. 25, 26). Naboth was stoned to death outside the city of Jezreel (1 Kings xxi, 13), and the dogs licked up Ahab's blood that was clotted in the bottom of his chariot, before it was washed, near the pool of Samaria (1 Kings xxii, 35, 38); hence Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 165, note) proposes to render the expression בִּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר, "in the place where" (occurring in the sentence of retaliation, 1 Kings xxi, 19), as signifying "in punishment for that;" but this construction is not in accordance with the Heb. idiom (see Gesenius's *Lex.* s. v. מָקוֹם), and the other incidents furnish a sufficiently exact fulfilment of the prediction (see Clarke's *Comment.* ad loc.).

JEZREEL, TOWER OF (מִגְדָּל, Sept. πύργος), was one of the turrets or bastions guarding the entrance to the city, and sentinelled as usual by a watchman (2 Kings ix, 17). See above.

JEZREEL, VALLEY OF (עֵמֶק, Josh. xvii, 16; Judg. vi, 33; Hos. i, 5). On the northern side of the city, between the parallel ridges of Gilboa and Moreh (now called Jebel ed-Duhy; see MOREH), lies a rich valley (hence its name, *God's seeding-place*), an offshoot of Esdraelon, running down eastward to the Jordan. This was called the "Valley of Jezreel;" and Bethshan, with the other towns in and around the valley, was originally inhabited by a fierce and warlike race who had "chariots of iron" (Josh. xvii, 16). The region fell chiefly to the lot of Issachar, but neither this tribe nor its more powerful neighbor Ephraim was able to drive out the ancient people (xix, 18). The "valley of Jezreel" became the scene of one of the most signal victories ever achieved by the Israelites, and of one of the most melancholy defeats they ever sustained. In the time of the Judges, the Midianites, Amalekites, and "children of the East" crossed the Jordan, and "pitched in the valley of Jezreel," almost covering its green pastures with their tents, flocks, and herds (Judg. vi, 33 sq.). Gideon hastily summoned the warriors of Israel round his standard, and took up a position on the lower slopes of Gilboa, close to the "well of Harod" (vii, 1; also called "the fountain of Jezreel"), about a mile east of the city. (See above.) See GIDEON. Two centuries later the Philistines took up the identical position formerly occupied by the Midianites, and the Israelites under Saul pitched on Gideon's old camping-ground by the "fountain of Jezreel" (1 Sam. xxix, 1-11). The Israelites were defeated, and Saul and Jonathan, with the flower of their troops, fell on the heights of Gilboa (xxxi, 1-6). See SAUL.

In later ages the valley of Jezreel seems to have extended its name to the whole of the wider plain of *Esdraelon*, which continued to be the scene of the greatest military evolutions of Palestine. This latter is, indeed, the most extensive level in the Holy Land (τὸ πεδίον μέγα simply, 1 Macc. xii, 49; Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 1, 22; viii, 2, 3; xii, 8, 5; xv, 8, 5; *War*, iii, 3, 1; *Life*, 41; fully το μέγα πεδίον Ἐσδρηλώμ, Judith i, 8). It is the modern *Merj Ibn-'Amir*, by which the whole of the plain is known to the Arabs. It is also known in Scripture as the *plain of Megiddo* (2 Chron. xxxv, 22; Zech. xii, 11), and the *Armageddon* of the Apocalypse (Rev. xvi, 16). It extends about thirty miles in length from east to west, and eighteen in breadth from north to south. It is bounded on the north by the mountains of Galilee, and on the south by those of Samaria: on the eastern part by Mount Tabor, the Little Hermon, and Gilboa; and on the west by Carmel, between which range and the mountains of Galilee is an outlet, whereby the river Kishon winds its way to the bay of Acre (see Robinson's *Researches*, iii, 160-162, 181, 227). Here, in the most fertile part of the land of Canaan (see Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 176; Troilo, p. 545; Maundrell, p. 76; Schubert, iii, 163, 166), the tribe of Issachar rejoiced in their tents (Deut. xxxiii, 18). In the first ages of Jewish history, as well as during the Roman empire and the Crusades, and even in later times, this plain has been the scene of many a memorable contest (see Rob-

Map of the Valley of Jezreel and Plain of Esdraelon.

inson, *Researches*, ii, 233). The same plain was the scene of the conflict of the Israelites and the Syrians (1 Kings xx, 26-30). Here also Josiah, king of Judah, fought in disguise against Necho, king of Egypt, and fell by the arrows of his antagonist (2 Kings xxiii, 29). Josephus often mentions this remarkable part of the Holy Land, and always (as above) under the appellation of *the Great Plain;* under the same name it is also spoken of by Eusebius and Jerome (in the *Onomast.*). "It has been a chosen place for encampment," says Dr. E. Clarke, "in every contest from the days of Nabuchadonosor, king of the Assyrians, in the history of whose war with Arphaxad (Judith i, 8) it is mentioned as the great plain of Esdraelon, until the disastrous march of the late Napoleon Bonaparte from Egypt into Syria. Jews, Gentiles, Saracens, Christian crusaders, Egyptians, Persians, Druses, Turks, Arabs, and French, warriors out of every nation which is under heaven, have pitched their tents in the plain of Esdraelon, and have beheld the various banners of their nation wet with the dews of Tabor and of Hermon." (For other notices of this place, see De Saulcy's *Narrative*, ii, 306-311.) This noble plain, like the greater portion of all the rich plains of Palestine and Syria, is in the hands of the government, and is only partially cultivated; the soil is deep, of a dark red color, inclined to be clayey, and cannot be surpassed in natural fertility (see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 366 sq.; Hamesveld, i, 418 sq.). See ESDRAELON.

2. A town in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Juttah and Jokdeam (Josh. xv, 56), situated (according to the associated names) in the district southeast of Hebron, on the edge of the desert of Judah. It is possibly identical with the modern ruined site *Zurtut*, which lies in a fertile region (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 201), as the name Jezreel implies. See No. 3. It was probably this place (1 Sam. xxv, 43) from which came Ahinoam, one of David's wives (comp. the neighboring Carmel, where Abigail, his other wife, taken about the same time, resided), the JEZREELITESS (יִזְרְעֵאלִית, 1 Sam. xxvii, 3; xxx, 5; 2 Sam. ii, 2; iii, 2; 1 Chron. iii, 1). See ABEZ.

3. A descendant of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 3, where two brothers and a sister are also mentioned), apparently of the same family with Penuel and Ezer, "sons" of Hur, the grandson of Hezron (ver. 4). From the frequent association of names of places in the vicinity of Bethlehem in the same connection, it is probable that this Jezreel was the founder of the town in the tribe of Judah (No. 2, above) which bore his name. In the text it is stated of him and his relatives, "these are the father of Etam" (וְאֵלֶּה אֲבִי עֵיטָם, Sept. *καὶ οὗτοι υἱοὶ Αἰτάμ*, Vulg. *ista quoque stirps Etam*, Auth. Vers. "and these are of the fathers of Etam"), meaning apparently that they founded or resided in the place by that name; and, as several other towns in the same general neighborhood are expressly assigned to separate individuals in the enumeration, this must be ascribed specially to Ishma and Idbash, who, with their sister, are the only two not thus particularly identified with any other locality. B.C. cir. 1612.

4. A symbolical name given by the prophet Hosea to his oldest son (Hos. i, 4), then just born (B.C. cir. 782), in token of a great slaughter predicted by him, like that which had before so often drenched the soil of the plain of Esdraelon with blood (ii, 2). He is afterwards made, together with his brother Lo-ammi and his sister Lo-ruhama (i, 6, 9), emblems of the Jewish people to be restored after punishment and dispersion in the approaching exile, and to be augmented by new favors (ii, 24, 25). In this way is to be understood the vexed passage of the same prophet (Hos. ii, 22), "And the earth shall hear [rather, *answer*, and yield] the corn, and the wine, and the oil [due from the soil]; and they [i. e. these gifts of the earth] shall hear [answer] Jezreel," i. e. the earth, rendered fertile from heaven (see ver. 21), shall yield anew her produce to (the tillers of) Jezreel. The prophet then (ver. 23) carries out the reference to his son, with evident allusion to the signification of the name Jezreel, which implies the productiveness of that plain, "And I will sow her [i. e. *him* and *it*, Jezreel being construed as a fem., like other collectives, e. g. Ephraim in Isa. xvii, 10, 11, etc.] unto me in the earth; and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy [i. e. again *cherish Lo-ruhama*], and I will say to them which were not my people [i. e. *to Lo-ammi*], Thou art my people, and they shall say, Thou art my God;" i. e. the whole people of Israel, whom the prophet thus emblematically represents by his three children, will again be planted, cherished, and claimed by Jehovah as his own.—Gesenius. See HOSEA. "From this time the image seems to have been continued as a prophetical expression for the sowing the people of Israel, as it were broadcast; as if the whole of Palestine and the world were to become, in a spiritual sense, one rich plain of Jezreel. 'I will *sow* them among the people, and they shall remember me in far countries' (Zech. x, 9). 'Ye shall be tilled and *sown*, and I will multiply men upon you' (Ezek. xxxvi, 9, 10). 'I will *sow* the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of men and with the seed of beast' (Jer. xxxi, 27). Hence the consecration of the image of 'sowing,' as it appears in the N. T. (Matt. xii, 2)"

Jez'reëlite (1 Kings xxi, 1, 4, 6, 7, 15, 16; 2 Kings ix, 21, 25), an inhabitant of JEZREEL (q. v.), in Issachar.

Jez'reëlitess (1 Sam. xxvii, 3; xxx, 5; 2 Sam. ii, 2; 1 Chron. iii, 1), a woman of JEZREEL (q. v.), in Judah.

Jib'sam (Hebrew *Yibsam'*, יִבְשָׂם, *pleasant;* Sept. Ἰεβασάμ v. r. Ἰεμασάν), one of the "sons" of Tola, the son of Issachar, a valiant chief, apparently of the time of David (1 Chron. vii, 2). B.C. cir. 1017.

Jid'laph (Hebrew *Yidlaph'*, יִדְלָף, *tearful;* Sept. Ἰελδάφ), the seventh named of the eight sons of Nahor (Abraham's brother) by Milcah (Gen. xxii, 22). B.C. cir. 2040.

Jim'na (Numb. xxvi, 44), **Jim'nah** (Gen. xlvi, 17), **Jim'nite** (Numb. xvi, 44). See IMNA.

Jiph'tah (Heb. *Yiphtach'*, יִפְתָּח, the same name as *Jephthah;* Sept. Ἰεφθά), a town in the "lowland" district of Judah, mentioned between Ashan and Ashnah (Josh. xv, 43), and lying in the southern medial group west of Hebron and east of Eleutheropolis. See JUDAH. Some (e. g. Keil, ad loc.) have located it in the mountain district, contrary to the text; but, although the import of the name implies a "defile" adjoining, and the associated names are indicative of naturally strong positions, yet the "plain" or *Shephelah* (q. v.) here actually comes quite far in this direction to the proper "hill country" (Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 13). We may therefore presume a location for Jiphtah at the ruined village *Jimrin*, where a smaller valley runs up south from wady el-Melek (Robinson, ii, 342, note; Van de Velde's *Map*, ed. 1864).

Jiph'thah-el (Heb. *Yiphtach'-el*, יִפְתַּח־אֵל, *opening of God;* Sept. [Γαΐ] Ἰεφθαήλ), a valley at the intersection of the line between Asher and Naphtali with the northern boundary of Zebulon (Josh. xix, 14, 27). Dr. Robinson, with great probability, suggests (new ed. of *Researches*, iii, 106, 107) that the name is represented by that of *Jotapata* (Ἰωτάπατα), the renowned fortress of Galilee mentioned by Josephus as having been fortified by himself (*War*, ii, 20, 6; *Life*, 37), and then as having held out, under his own command, against the continued assaults of Vespasian, and where he was at last taken prisoner after the downfall of the place (*War*, iii, 7, 3-36). He describes it as surrounded by a precipice, except on the north, where the city extended out upon the sloping extremity of the opposite mountain; the deep valleys on the other sides were overlooked by surrounding mountains. It contained no fountains, but only cisterns, with caverns and subterranean recesses.

Reland had already remarked (*Palæst.* p. 816, 867) that the *Gopatata* (גופתתא) of the Talmudic writings, three miles from Sepphoris, was probably identical with this place. It is doubtless the modern *Jefat*, which lies four or five English miles from Sefurieh. It was first visited and identified by Schultz (Ritter, *Erdk.* xvi, 763 sq.). The valley in question would thus answer to the great wady *Abilin*, which runs south-westerly from Jefat, the boundary between Asher and Zebulon following the line of hills between Sukhnin and Kefr Menda, in which this wady has its head (Robinson, *ut sup.*), rather than to the deeper wady *Jiddin*, considerably south of this, and running in the same direction, on the southern side of which stands the village of Arukah, therefore not altogether answering to Beth-Emek (as thought by Dr. Smith, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1853, p. 121), which was thus situated on the valley Jiphthah-el (Josh. xix, 27). Dr. Thomson, while justly objecting to the latter valley, as being too far north (*Land and Book*, i, 472), proposes as the site of Jiphthah the ruined site *Jiftah*, "situated on the edge of the long valley [rather plain] of *Turan*," which he would identify with the "valley of Jiphthah-el" (*ib.* ii, 122); but this, on the other hand, lies even south of Rumaneh (Rimmon), which undoubtedly lay within Zebulon (1 Chron. vi, 77). The title (גַּיְא, *ravine*, and not נַחַל, *wady*, i. e. "valley watered by a brook;" see Gesenius, *Lexic.* s. v.) properly designates this fine pass (hence the superlative name, *God's Defile*), which connects the rich plain el-Buttauf on the east with the yet more fertile plain of Acre on the west, and is described by the Scottish deputation as "inclosed with steep wooded hills; sometimes *it narrows almost to the straitness of a defile*. . . . The valley is long, and declines very gently towards the west; the hills on either side are often finely wooded, sometimes rocky and picturesque. The road is one of the best in Palestine, and was no doubt much frequented in ancient days" (*Report*, p. 309, 310). There seems also to be an allusion to the etymological force of the name (q. d. the *opening out* of a gorge into a plain) in the statement (Josh. xix, 14), "And the *outgoings* thereof are in the valley of Jiphthah-el" (comp. Deut. xxxiii, 18, "And of Zebulon he said, Rejoice, Zebulon, in thy *goings out*").

Jireh. See JEHOVAH-JIREH.

Jizchaki. See RASHI; SAKTAR.

Jo'äb (Heb. *Yoäb'*, יוֹאָב, *Jehovah* is his *father*; Sept. Ἰωάβ, but Ἰωβάβ in 1 Chron. ii, 16), the name of three men. See also ATAROTH-BETH-JOAB.

1. The son of Seraiah (son of Kenaz, of the tribe of Judah), and progenitor of the inhabitants of Charashim or craftsmen (1 Chron. iv, 14). B.C. post 1567.

2. One of the three sons of Zeruiah, the sister of David (2 Sam. viii, 16; xx, 13), and "captain of the host" (generalissimo of the army) during nearly the whole of David's reign (2 Sam. ii, 13; x, 7; xi, 1; 1 Kings xi, 15; 2 Sam. xviii, 2). It is a little remarkable that he is designated by his maternal parentage only, his father's name being nowhere mentioned in the Scriptures. Josephus (Ἰωάβος), indeed, gives (*Ant.* vii, 1, 3) the father's name as *Suri* (Σούρι), but this may be merely a repetition of the preceding Sarouiah (Σαρουΐα). Perhaps he was a foreigner. He seems to have resided at Bethlehem, and to have died before his sons, as we find mention of his sepulchre at that place (2 Sam. ii, 32).

Joab first appears associated with his two brothers, Abishai and Asahel, in the command of David's troops against Abner, who had set up the claims of a son of Saul in opposition to those of David, then reigning in Hebron. The armies having met at the pool of Gibeon, a general action was brought on, in which Abner was worsted, B.C. 1053. See GIBEON. In his flight he had the misfortune to kill Joab's brother, the swift-footed Asahel, by whom he was pursued (2 Sam. ii, 13-32). See ABNER; ASAHEL. Joab smothered for a time his resentment against the shedder of his brother's blood; but, being whetted by the natural rivalry of position between him and Abner, he afterwards made it the excuse of his policy by treacherously, in the act of friendly communication, slaying Abner, at the very time when the services of the latter to David, to whom he had then turned, had rendered him a most dangerous rival to him in power and influence (2 Sam. iii, 22-27). That Abner had at first suspected that Joab would take the position of blood-avenger [see BLOOD-REVENGE] is clear from the apprehension which he expressed (2 Sam. ii, 22); but that he thought that Joab had, under all the circumstances, abandoned this position, is shown by the unsuspecting readiness with which he went aside with him (2 Sam. iii, 26, 27); and that Joab placed his murderous act on the footing of vengeance for his brother's blood is plainly stated in 2 Sam. iii, 30; by which it also appears that the other brother, Abishai, shared in some way in the deed and its responsibilities. At the same time, as Abner was perfectly justified in slaying Asahel to save his own life, it is very doubtful if Joab would ever have asserted his right of blood-revenge had not Abner appeared likely to endanger his influence with David. The king, much as he reprobated the act, knew that it had a sort of excuse in the old customs of blood-revenge, and he stood habitually too much in awe of his impetuous and able nephew to bring him to punishment, or even to displace him from his command. "I am this day weak," he said, "though anointed king, and these men, the sons of Zeruiah, be too hard for me" (2 Sam. iii, 39). B.C. 1046. Desirous probably of making some atonement before David and the public for this atrocity, in a way which at the same time was most likely to prove effectual, namely, by some daring exploit, Joab was the first to mount to the assault at the storming of the fortress on Mount Zion, which had remained so long in the hands of the Jebusites, B.C. cir. 1044. By this service he acquired the chief command of the army of all Israel, of which David was by this time king (2 Sam. v, 6-10). He had a chief armor-bearer of his own, Naharai, a Beerothite (2 Sam. xxiii, 37; 1 Chron. xi, 39), and ten attendants to carry his equipment and baggage (2 Sam. xviii, 15). He had the charge, formerly belonging to the king or judge, of giving the signal by trumpet for advance or retreat (2 Sam. xviii, 16). He was called by the almost regal title of "lord" (2 Sam. xi, 11), "the prince of the king's army" (1 Chron. xxvii, 34). His usual residence (except when campaigning) was in Jerusalem, but he had a house and property, with barley-fields adjoining, in the country (2 Sam. xiv, 30), in the "wilderness" (1 Kings ii, 34), probably on the north-east of Jerusalem (compare 1 Sam. xiii, 18; Josh. viii, 15, 20), near an ancient sanctuary, called from its nomadic village "Baal-hazor" (2 Sam. xiii, 23; compare with xiv, 30), where there were extensive sheepwalks. It is possible that this "house of Joab" may have given its name to Ataroth *Beth-Joab* (1 Chron. ii, 54), to distinguish it from Ataroth-adar. His great military achievements, which he conducted in person, may be divided into three campaigns: (*a*) The first was against the allied forces of Syria and Ammon. He attacked and defeated the Syrians, while his brother Abishai did the same for the Ammonites. The Syrians rallied with their kindred tribes from beyond the Euphrates, and were finally routed by David himself. See HADAREZER. (*b*) The second was against Edom. The decisive victory was gained by David himself in the "valley of salt," and celebrated by a triumphal monument (1 Sam. viii, 13). But Joab had the charge of carrying out the victory, and remained for six months extirpating the male population, whom he then buried in the tombs of Petra (1 Kings xi, 15, 16). So long was the terror of his name preserved that only when the fugitive prince of Edom, in the Egyptian court, heard that "David slept with his fathers, and that *Joab, the captain of the host, was dead*," did he venture to return to his own country (*ib.* xi, 21, 22). (*c*) The third was against the Ammonites.

They were again left to Joab (2 Sam. x, 7-19). He went against them at the beginning of the next year, "at the time when kings go out to battle"—to the siege, of Rabbah. The ark was sent with him, and the whole army was encamped in booths or huts round the beleaguered city (2 Sam. xi, 1, 11). After a sortie of the inhabitants, which caused some loss to the Jewish army, Joab took the lower city on the river, and then, with true loyalty, sent to urge David to come and take the citadel, "Rabbah," lest the glory of the capture should pass from the king to his general (2 Sam. xii, 26-28).

It is not necessary to trace in detail the later acts of Joab, seeing that they are in fact part of the public record of the king he served. See DAVID. He served him faithfully, both in political and private relations; for, although he knew his power over David, and often treated him with little ceremony, there can be no doubt that he was most truly devoted to his interests. But Joab had no principles apart from what he deemed his duty to the king and the people, and was quite as ready to serve his master's vices as his virtues, so long as they did not interfere with his own interests, or tended to promote them by enabling him to make himself useful to the king. (See Niemeyer, *Charakt.* iv, 458 sq.) His ready apprehension of the king's meaning in the matter of Uriah, and the facility with which he made himself the instrument of the murder, and of the hypocrisy by which it was covered, are proofs of this, and form as deep a stain upon his character as his own murders (2 Sam. xi, 14-25), B.C. 1035. As Joab was on good terms with Absalom, and had taken pains to bring about a reconciliation between him and his father, we may set the higher value upon his firm adhesion to David when Absalom revolted, and upon his stern sense of duty to the king—from whom he expected no thanks—displayed in putting an end to the war by the slaughter of his favorite son, when all others shrunk from the responsibility of doing the king a service against his own will (2 Sam. xviii, 1-14). B.C. cir. 1023. In like manner, when David unhappily resolved to number the people, Joab discerned the evil and remonstrated against it, and although he did not venture to disobey, he performed the duty tardily and reluctantly, to afford the king an opportunity of reconsidering the matter, and took no pains to conceal how odious the measure was to him (2 Sam. xxiv). David was certainly ungrateful for the services of Joab when, in order to conciliate the powerful party which had supported Absalom, he offered the command of the host to Amasa, who had commanded the army of Absalom (2 Sam. xix, 13). But the inefficiency of the new commander, in the emergency which the revolt of Bichri's son produced, arising perhaps from the reluctance of the troops to follow their new leader, gave Joab an opportunity of displaying his superior resources, and also of removing his rival by a murder very similar to that of Abner, and in some respects less excusable and more foul. See AMASA. Besides, Amasa was his own cousin, being the son of his mother's sister (2 Sam. xx, 1-13). B.C. cir. 1022.

When David lay apparently on his death-bed, and a demonstration was made in favor of the succession of the eldest surviving son, Adonijah, whose interests had been compromised by the preference of the young Solomon, Joab joined the party of the former. B.C. cir. 1015. It would be unjust to regard this as a defection from David. It was nothing more or less than a demonstration in favor of the natural heir, which, if not then made, could not be made at all. But an act which would have been justifiable had the preference of Solomon been a mere caprice of the old king, became criminal as an act of contumacy to the divine king, the real head of the government, who had called the house of David to the throne, and had the sole right of determining which of its members should reign. We learn from David's last song that his powerlessness over his courtiers was even then present to his mind (2 Sam. xxiii, 6, 7), and now he recalled to Solomon's recollection the two murders of Abner and Amasa (1 Kings ii, 5, 6), with an injunction not to let the aged soldier escape with impunity. When the prompt measures taken under the direction of the king rendered Adonijah's demonstration abortive (1 Kings i, 7), Joab withdrew into private life till some time after the death of David, when the fate of Adonijah, and of Abiathar—whose life was only spared in consequence of his sacerdotal character—warned Joab that he had little mercy to expect from the new king. He fled for refuge to the altar; but when Solomon heard this, he sent Benaiah to put him to death; and, as he refused to come forth, gave orders that he should be slain even at the altar. Thus died one of the most accomplished warriors and unscrupulous men that Israel ever produced. His corpse was removed to his domain in the wilderness of Judah, and buried there (1 Kings ii, 5, 28-34). B.C. cir. 1012. He left descendants, but nothing is known of them, unless it may be inferred from the double curse of David (2 Sam. iii, 39) and of Solomon (1 Kings ii, 23) that they seemed to dwindle away, stricken by a succession of visitations—weakness, leprosy, lameness, murder, starvation. His name is by some supposed (in allusion to his part in Adonijah's coronation on that spot) to be preserved in the modern appellation of Enrogel—"the well of Job"—corrupted from *Joab*.

3. One of the "sons" of Pahath-moab (1 Esdr. viii, 35), whose descendants, together with those of Jeshua, returned from the exile to the number of 2812 or 2818 (Ezra ii, 6; Neh. vii, 11), besides 218 males subsequently under the leadership of one Obadiah (Ezra viii, 9). B.C. ante 536.

Jo'ăchaz (Ἰωάχαζ v. r. Ἰώχαζ and Ἰεχονίας), a Græcized form (1 Esdr. i, 34) of the name of king JEHOAHAZ (q. v.).

Jo'ăchim (Ἰωακείμ), a Græcized form of the Heb. name JEHOIAKIM, and applied in the Apocrypha to

1. The king of Judah, son of Josiah (Bar. i, 3).

2. A priest (ὁ ἱερεύς, A. V. "high-priest"), said to be son of Hilkiah at the time of the burning of Jerusalem by the Babylonians (Bar. i, 7). See JOACIM, 4. As no such pontiff occurs at this time (see HIGH-PRIEST), the person intended may perhaps have been not the successor, but only a junior son of Hilkiah—if, indeed, the whole narrative be not spurious. See BARUCH.

Joachim, abbot OF FLORIS, was born at Celico, in the diocese of Cosenza, about 1130. After a short residence at the court of Roger of Sicily, he journeyed to Jerusalem, and on his return joined the Cistercians, and became abbot of Corace (Curatium), in Calabria. This office he resigned, however, some time after, and founded himself a monastery at Floris, near Cosenza. Joachim died between 1201 and 1202. He enjoyed great reputation during his life: he was reverenced by many as a prophet, and stood in high consideration with popes and princes, but since his day he has been very variously judged. Praised as a prophet by J. G. Syllanæus, and defended by the Jesuit Papebroch, he was accused of heresy by Bonaventura, and called a pseudo-prophet by Baronius. His partisans claimed that he worked miracles, but it appears better proved that he wrote prophecies, and denounced in the strongest terms the growing corruption of the Romish hierarchy. He endeavored to bring about a reformation. His character has perhaps been best delineated by Neander (*Ch. Hist.* iv, 220), who says of him: "Grief over the corruption of the Church, longing desire for better times, profound Christian feeling, a meditative mind, and a glowing imagination, such are the peculiar characteristics of his spirit and his writings." He complained of the deification of the Roman Church, opposed the issue of indulgences, condemned the Crusades as antagonistic to the express purpose of Christ, who had himself predicted only the destruction of Jerusalem, decried the simonious habits of the clergy, and even argued against the bestowal of temporal power on the pope, fearing that the

contentions in his day for temporal power might ultimately result, as they eventually did, in the assumption of "spiritual things which do not belong to him." Joachim's doctrines, however, are somewhat peculiar. His fundamental argument is that the Christian æra closes with the year 1260, when a new æra would commence under another dispensation. Thus the three persons of the Godhead divided the government of ages among them: the reign of the Father embraced the period from the creation of the world to the coming of Christ; that of the Son, the twelve centuries and a half ending in 1260, and then would commence the reign of the Holy Spirit. This change would be marked by a progress similar to that which followed the substitution of the new for the old dispensation. Thus man, after having been carnal under the Father, half carnal and half spiritual under the Son, would, under the Holy Ghost, become exclusively spiritual. So there have been three stages of development in society, in which the supremacy belonged successively to warriors, the secular clergy, and monks (comp. Neander, *Church History*, iv, 229 sq.). As Joachim found many adherents, the third Lateran Council, at the request of Alexander III, condemned Joachim's "mystical extravagances;" Alexander IV was still more severe in opposition to Joachim; and in 1260 the Council at Arles finally pronounced all followers of Joachim heretics. Joachim's ideas were chiefly presented in the form of meditations on the N. T. He strongly opposed the scholastic theology, which aimed at establishing the principles of faith dialectically, and also the manner in which Peter Lombard explained the doctrine of the Trinity. Towards the middle of the 13th century these views had gained a large number of adherents. Among the many works attributed to Joachim some are undoubtedly spurious, while others have probably been subjected to additions, etc., in consequence of his popularity (compare Neander, iv, 221, note). The *Expositio super Apocalypsim* (Venice, 1517, 4to, often reprinted), *Concordiæ Veteris ac Novi Testamenti libri v* (Venice, 1519, 8vo), and the *Psalterium decem Chordarum* appear to be genuine. Among the others bearing his name are commentaries on Jeremiah, the Psalms, Isaiah, parts of Nahum, Habakkuk, Zechariah, and Malachi; also a number of prophecies concerning the popes, and predicting the downfall of the papacy. All these were published at Venice (1519-1524) and Cologne (1577). His Life was written by Gregory di Lauro (Naples, 1660, 4to). Among the MS. works attributed to him, *Prophetiæ et Expositiones Sibyllarum; Excerptiones e libris Joachimi de Mundi fine, de Terroribus et Ærumnis, seu de pseudo-Christis; Prophetiæ de Oneribus Provinciarum; Epistolæ Joachimi de suis Prophetiis;* and *Revelationes*, are to be found in the public libraries of Paris. See *Hist. Littér. de la France*, vol. xx; Dom Gervaise, *Histoire de l'abbé Joachim;* Tiraboschi, *Storia della letter. Ital.* vol. v, 2d ed.; Grégoire Laude, *Vie de l'abbé Joachim;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 718; Neander, *Ch. History*, iv, 215 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 713 sq.; Engelhardt, *Joachim*, etc., in *Kirchengesch. Abhandlungen* (Erl. 1832).

Joachim I and **II**. See REFORMATION (GERMAN).

Joachimites. See JOACHIM OF FLORIS.

Jo'äcim (Ἰωακίμ), another Græcized form of the Heb. name JOACHIM, applied in the Apocrypha to

1. The son of Josiah, king of Judah (1 Esdr. i, 37, 38, 39).

2. By corruption for JEHOIACHIN, the next king of Judah (1 Esdr. i, 43).

3. A son of Zerubbabel, who returned to Jerusalem after the exile (1 Esdr. v, 5), apparently a mistake for Zerubbabel himself.

4. "The high-priest which was in Jerusalem" (Judith iv, 6, 14) in the time of Judith, and who welcomed the heroine after the death of Holofernes, in company with "the ancients of the children of Israel" (ἡ γερουσία τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, xv, 8 sq.). The name occurs with the various reading *Eliakim*, but it is impossible to identify him with any historical character. No such name occurs in the lists of high-priests in 1 Chron. vi (compare Josephus, *Ant.* x, 8, 6); and it is a mere arbitrary conjecture to suppose that Eliakim, mentioned in 2 Kings xviii, 18, was afterwards raised to that dignity. Still less can be said for the identification of Joacim with Hilkiah (2 Kings xxii, 4; Josephus Ἐλιακίας, *Ant.* x, 4, 2; Sept. Χελκίας). The name itself is appropriate to the position which the high-priest occupies in the story of Judith ("The Lord hath set up"), and the person must be regarded as a necessary part of the fiction. See JUDITH.

5. The husband of Susanna (Sus. 1 sq). The name seems to have been chosen, as in the former case, with a reference to its meaning; and it was probably for the same reason that the husband of Anna, the mother of the Virgin, is called Joacim in early legends (*Protev. Jac.* i, etc.). See SUSANNA.

Joäda'nus (Ἰωαδάνος, Vulg. *Joadeus*), one of the priests, "sons of Jesus, the son of Josedec, and his brethren," who had married foreign wives after the exile (1 Esdr. ix, 19); apparently the same as GEDALIAH in the corresponding Hebrew text (Ezra x, 18) by a corruption (see Burrington, *Genealogies*, i, 167).

Jo'äh (Heb. *Yoäch'*, יוֹאָח, *Jehovah is his brother*, i. e. helper), the name of four men.

1. (Sept. Ἰωαά v. r. Ἰωάθ, Vulg. *Joaha*.) The third son of Obed-edom (q. v.), appointed with his brethren to take charge of the sacred furniture (1 Chron. xxvi, 4). B.C. 1014.

2. (Sept. Ἰωάχ v. r. Ἰωάβ, Ἰωάς, Ἰωαά; but in 2 Chron. first occurrence Ἰωά v. r. Ἰωδαάδ, second Ἰωαχά; Vulg. *Joah*.) A Levite of the family of Gershom, the son of Zimmah and father of Iddo (1 Chron. vi, 21); apparently the same elsewhere called ETHAN, and father of Adaiah (ver. 42). He is probably the same as the person who, with his son Eden, aided Hezekiah in his efforts at a religious reformation (2 Chron. xxix, 12). B.C. 726.

3. (Sept. Ἰωάς, in Isa. Ἰωάχ, Vulg. *Joahe*.) Son of Asaph and historiographer of king Hezekiah, who was one of the messengers that received the insulting message of Rabshakeh (2 Kings xviii, 18, 26, 37; Isa. xxxvi, 3, 11, 22). B.C. 712.

4. (Sept. Ἰουάχ v. r. Ἰωάς, Vulg. *Joha;* Josephus Ἰωατής, *Ant.* x, 4, 1.) Son of Joahaz and historiographer of king Josiah; he was one of the officers that superintended the repairs of the Temple (2 Chron. xxxiv, 8). B.C. 623.

Jo'ähaz (Heb. *Yoächaz'*, יוֹאָחָז, a contracted form of the name JEHOAHAZ, for which it occurs in speaking of others of the same name; Sept. Ἰωάχαζ, Vulg. *Joachaz*), the father of Joah, which latter was historiographer in the reign of Josiah (2 Chron. xxxiv, 8). B.C. ante 623.

Joan, pope(ss), is the name of a fictitious female who was supposed to have occupied the chair of St. Peter, as John VIII, between the popes Leo IV and Benedict III, about 853-855. This personage is first said to have been spoken of as a Roman pontiff by Marianus Scotus, a monk of the abbey of Fulda, who died at Mentz in 1086, and who says in his chronicle (which many authorities declare to be spurious), under the year 853, the thirteenth year of the reign of the emperor Lotharius, that Leo IV died on the 1st of August, and that to him succeeded Joan, a woman, whose pontificate lasted two years, five months, and four days, after which Benedict III was made pope. But Anastasius, who lived at the time of the supposed pope Joan, and who wrote the lives of the popes down to Nicholas I, who succeeded Benedict III, says that fifteen days after Leo IV's death Benedict III succeeded him. Further, Hincmar of Rheims, a contemporary, in his twenty-sixth letter to Nicholas I, states that Benedict III succeeded Leo IV immediately. It is proved, moreover, by the unques-

tionable evidence of a diploma still preserved, and of a contemporary coin which Garampi has published, that Benedict III was actually reigning before the death of the emperor Lothaire, which occurred towards the close of 855. It is true that some MS. copies of Anastasius, among others, one in the king's library at Paris, contain the story of Joan; but this has been ascertained to be an interpolation of later copyists, who have inserted the tale in the very words of Martinus Polonus, a Cistercian monk and confessor to Gregory X (latter part of the 12th century), who wrote the *Lives of the Popes*, in which, after Leo IV, he places "John, an Englishman," and then adds, "Hic, *ut asseritur*, fœmina fuit." Other authorities for this story are Sigbert of Gemblours († 1113) and Stephen de Bourbon, who wrote about 1225.

According to these accounts, she was the daughter of an English missionary, was born at Mayence or Ingelheim, and was a woman of very loose morals. She is said to have removed to Fulda, and having there established an improper intimacy with a monk of the convent, assumed male attire, entered the convent, and afterwards eloped with her paramour, who was a very learned man, to Athens, where she applied herself to the study of Greek and the sciences under her lover's able directions. After the death of her companion she went to Rome, where she became equally proficient in sacred learning, for which her reputation became so great, under the assumed name of *Johannes Anglicanus*, that she easily obtained holy orders, and with such ability and adroitness clad the deception that at the death of Leo she was unanimously elected as his successor, under the general belief of her male sex. Continuing to indulge in sexual intercourse, the fraud was finally discovered, to the infinite mortification of the Roman Church, by her sudden delivery of an infant in the public streets, near the Colosseum, while heading a religious procession to the Lateran Basilica. The mother and child died soon after, and were buried in 856. This event is said to have caused the adoption of the *Sella stercoraria*, which was in use from the middle of the 11th century to the time of Leo X, for the purpose of proving the sex of the popes elect.

The story was generally credited from the latter part of the 11th until the opening of the 16th century. All Church historians after Martinus generally copied it from him, and presented it as an authentic narrative. The first to doubt the accuracy of the story was Platina (1421–1481), who, although repeating it in his *Lives of the Popes*, concludes with these words: "The things I have above stated are current in vulgar reports, but are taken from uncertain and obscure authorities, and I have inserted them briefly and simply not to be taxed with obstinacy." Panvinius, Platina's continuator, seems to have been more critical: he subjoins a very elaborate note, in which he shows the absurdity of the tale, and proves it to have been an invention. Later Roman Catholic writers, seeing the arguments which their opponents in doctrine obtained from this story against papal succession, took great pains to impeach its accuracy; but it is truly curious that the best dissertation on the subject is that of David Blondel, a Protestant, who completely refutes the story in his *Familier Eclaircissement de la question si une Femme a été assise au Siege Papal entre Leon IV et Benoit III* (Amsterdam, 1649). He was followed on the same side by Leibnitz (*Flores sparsi in tumulum Papissæ*, in [Chr. L. Scheidt] *Biblioth. Hist.* [Götting. 1758], i, 297 sq.), and, although attempts have been made from time to time by a few writers to maintain the tale (among which one of the most noted was a work published in 1785 by Humphrey Shuttleworth, entitled *A Present for a Papist, or the History of the Life of Pope Joan, proving that a Woman called Joan really was Pope of Rome*), it has been all but universally discarded, its latest patron being professor Kist, of Leyden, who but a few years since devoted an elaborate essay (*Verhandeling over de Pausin Joanna*) to the subject. Nearly all ecclesiastical writers of our day seem to be agreed that no feminine character ever filled the papal chair, but there is certainly a variety of opinions as to the causes which provoked the story. Some attribute it to a misconception of the object of the *Sella stercoraria;* the canons excluded eunuchs from the papal throne, and the sella stercoraria was contrived to prove that the person elected fulfilled the requirements of the canons. Others consider it as a symbolical satire. Still others look upon it as a lampoon on the incontinence of the pope, John VIII; or, and perhaps more correctly, as a satire on the female regiment (under Marozia) during the popedom of John X–XII. See, for further details, Gieseler's *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. ii, pt. i (4th ed.), 29 sq.; also Wensing, *Over de Pausin Joanna* —in reply to Kist—(S'Gravenhage, 1845); Bianchi Giovini's *Esame Critico degli atti relativi alla Papessa Giovanna* (Milan, 1845); Bower, *Hist. Popes*, iv, 246 sq.; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch.* ii, 469 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 721; *Christ. Examiner*, lxxv, 197; *Western Rev.* April, 1864, p. 279. (J. H. W.)

Joan D'ALBRET. See HUGUENOTS; FRANCE.

Joan OF ARC (French *Jeanne d'Arc*), or "the Maid of Orleans," is the name of a character whose history concerns not only the secular historian; it deserves the careful consideration also of the ecclesiastical student. The remarkable fate of this heroine is truly a phenomenon in religious philosophy. We have room here, however, only for a short biographical sketch of the heroine, and refer the student to Böttiger, *Weltgesch. in Biographien*, iv, 474; Michelet, *Hist. de France*, vii, 44; Görres, *Jungfrau v. Orleans* (Regensb. 1834); Hase, *Neue Propheten* (Lpz. 1851); Strass, *Jean d'Arc* (1862); Eysell, *Joh. d'Arc* (1864); Locher, *Schlaf u. Träume* (Zürich, 1853); and especially (mainly on her visions, etc.) the celebrated German theologian of Bonn University, Dr. J. P. Lange, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 165 sq.

Joan was the daughter of respectable peasants, and was born in 1412, in the village of Domremy, in the department of Vosges, France. She was taught, like other young women of her station in that age, to sew and to spin, but not to read and write. She was distinguished from other girls by her greater simplicity, modesty, industry, and piety. When about thirteen years of age she believed that she saw a flash of light, and heard an unearthly voice, which enjoined her to be modest, and to be diligent in her religious duties. The impression made upon her excitable mind by the national distresses of the time soon gave a new character to the revelations which she supposed herself to receive, and when fifteen years old she imagined that unearthly voices called her to go and fight for the Dauphin. Her story was at first rejected as that of an insane person; but she not only succeeded in making her way to the Dauphin, but in persuading him of her heavenly mission. She assumed male attire and warlike equipments, and, with a sword and a white banner, she put herself at the head of the French troops, whom her example and the notion of her heavenly mission inspired with new enthusiasm. April 29, 1429, she threw herself, with supplies of provisions, into Orleans, then closely besieged by the English, and from the 4th to the 8th of May made successful sallies upon the English, and finally compelled them to raise the siege. After this important victory the national ardor of the French was rekindled to the utmost, and Joan became the dread of the previously triumphant enemy. She conducted the Dauphin to Rheims, where he was crowned, July 17, 1429, and Joan, with many tears, saluted him as king. She now wished to return home, deeming her mission accomplished; but Charles importuned her to remain with his army, to which she consented. Now, however, because she no longer heard any unearthly voice, she began to have fearful forebodings. She continued to accompany the French army, and was present in many conflicts. May 24, 1430, while heading a sally from Compiègne, which the Burgundian forces were besieging, she was taken prisoner, and

sold by a Burgundian officer to the English for the sum of 16,000 francs. Being conveyed to Rouen, the headquarters of the English, she was brought before the spiritual tribunal of the bishop of Beauvais as a sorceress and heretic; and after a long trial, accompanied with many shameful circumstances, of which perhaps the most astounding is the fact that her own countrymen, and the most learned of these, representing the University of Paris, pronounced her under the influence of witchcraft. By their advice, she was condemned to be burned to death. Recanting her alleged errors, her punishment was commuted into perpetual imprisonment. But the English feared her, and determined at all hazards to sacrifice her life, and they finally succeeded in renewing the trial; words which fell from her when subjected to great indignities, and her resumption of male attire when all articles of female dress were carefully removed from her, were made grounds of concluding that she had relapsed, and she was brought to the stake May 30, 1431, and burned, and her ashes cast into the Seine. Her family, who had been ennobled on her account, obtained in 1440 a revisal of her trial, and in 1456 she was formally pronounced by the highest ecclesiastical authorities to have been innocent. The doubts respecting the fate of Joan d'Arc raised by M. Delapierre in his *Doute historique* (1855), who is inclined to think that she never suffered martyrdom, and that another person was executed in her stead, seem to have no good ground.

Joan of Kent (**Joan Bocher**), a female character who flourished in the first half of the 16th century, and who was condemned to death as a heretic, April 25, 1552, for holding the doctrine that "Christ was not truly incarnate of the Virgin, whose flesh, being sinful, he could not partake of; but the Word, by the consent of the inward man in the Virgin, took flesh of her." This scholastic nicety appalled all the grandees of the English Church, including even Cranmer, who, finding the king slow to approve the condemnation of Joan of Kent, presented to the sovereign the practice of the Jewish Church in stoning blasphemers as a counterpart of the duty of the head of the English Church, and secured the king's approval for the execution of the poor woman, who "could not reconcile the spotless purity of Christ's human nature with his receiving flesh from a sinful creature." See Neal, *Puritans*, i, 49; Strype, *Memorials of the Reformation*, ii, 214.

Joä'nan (Ἰωανάν v. r. Ἰωνάν), a Græcized form (1 Esdr. ix, 1) of the name of Johanan (q. v.), the son of Eliashib (Ezra x, 6).

Joanes (or Juanes), Vicente, a celebrated Spanish painter whose subjects are exclusively religious, was born at Fuente la Higuera, in Valencia, in 1523. He studied in Italy, and, as we may infer from his style, chiefly the works of the Roman school, and died Dec. 21, 1579, while engaged in finishing the altar-piece of the church of Bocairente. His body was removed to Valencia, and deposited in the church of Santa Cruz in 1581. Joanes was one of the best of the Spanish painters: he is acknowledged as the head of the school of Valencia, and is sometimes termed the Spanish Raffaelle. His drawing is correct, and displays many successful examples of foreshortening; his draperies are well cast, his coloring is sombre (he was particularly fond of mulberry color), and his expression is mostly in perfect accordance with his subject, which is generally devotion or impassioned resignation, as in the "Baptism of Christ" in the cathedral of Valencia. Like his countrymen Vargas and D'Amato of Naples, he is said to have always taken the sacrament before he commenced an altar-piece. His best works are in the cathedral of Valencia, and there are several good specimens in the Prado at Madrid.

Joän'na, the name of a man (prop. *Joannas*) and also of a woman in the New Testament.

1. (Ἰωαννᾶς, probably i. q. Ἰωάννης, John.) The (great) grandson of Zerubbabel, in the lineage of Christ (Luke iii, 27); probably the same called Arnan in the Old Testament (1 Chron. iii, 21. See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 16, 17). B.C. considerably post 536. See Genealogy of Christ.

2. (Ἰωάννα, prob. femin. of Ἰωάννης, *John*.) The wife of Chuza, the steward of Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee (Luke viii, 3). She was one of those women who followed Christ, and ministered to the wants of him and his disciples out of their abundance. They had all been cured of grievous diseases by the Saviour, or had received material benefits from him; and the customs of the country allowed them to testify in this way their gratitude and devotedness without reproach. It is usually supposed that Joanna was at this time a widow. She was one of the females to whom Christ appeared after his resurrection (Luke xxiv, 10). A.D. 27-29.

Joän'nan (Ἰωαννάν v. r. Ἰωάννης), the eldest brother of Judas Maccabæus (1 Macc. ii, 2); elsewhere called John (q. v.).

Joannes. See John.

Jo'ärib (Ἰωαρίβ v. r. Ἰωαρείμ), a Græcized form (1 Macc. ii, 1) of the name of the priest Jehoiarib (1 Chron. xxiv, 7).

Jo'äsh (Heb. *Yoäsh'*, the name of several persons, written in two forms in the original.

1. (יוֹאָשׁ, a contracted form of Jehoash; Septuag. Ἰωάς.) The father of Gideon, buried in Ophrah, where he had lived (Judg. vi, 11, 29; vii, 14; viii, 13, 29, 32). Although himself probably an idolater, he ingeniously screened his son from the popular indignation in overthrowing the altar of Baal (Judg. vi, 30, 31). B.C. 1362. See Gideon.

2. (Same form as preceding; Sept. Ἰωράς v. r. Ἰωάς.) A son of Shemaah or Hasmaah the Gibeathite, and second only to his brother Ahiezer among the brave Benjamite archers that joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 3). B.C. 1055.

3. (Same form as preceding; Sept. Ἰωάς.) One of the descendants of Shelah, son of Judah, mentioned among those who were in some way distinguished among the Moabites in early times (1 Chron. iv, 22). B.C. perh. cir. 995. See Jashubi-Lehem. "The Hebrew tradition, quoted by Jerome (*Quæst. Hebr. in Paral.*) and Jarchi (*Comm.* ad loc.), applies it to Mahlon, the son of Elimelech, who married a Moabitess. The expression rendered in the A.V., 'who had the dominion (בָּעֲלוּ) in Moab,' would, according to this interpretation, signify 'who *married* in Moab.' The same explanation is given in the Targum of R. Joseph"

4. (Same form as preceding; Sept. Ἰωάς.) An eminent officer of king Ahab, to whose close custody the prophet Micaiah was remanded for denouncing the allied expedition against Ramoth-Gilead (1 Kings xxii, 26; 2 Chron. xviii, 25). B.C. 896. He is styled "the king's son," which is usually taken literally, Thenius (*Comment.* ad loc., in Kings) suggesting that he may have been placed with the governor of the city for military education. Geiger conjectures that Maaseiah, "the king's son," in 2 Chron. xxviii, 7, was a prince of the Moloch worship, and that Joash was a priest of the same (*Urschrift*, p. 307). The title, however, may merely indicate a youth of princely stock.

5. (Same form as preceding: Sept. Ἰωάς.) King of Judah (2 Kings xi, 2; xii, 19, 20; xiii, 1, 10; xiv, 1, 3, 17, 23; 1 Chron. iii, 11; 2 Chron. xxii, 11; xxiv, 1 [יֹאָשׁ], 2, 4, 22, 24; xxv, 23, 25). See Jehoash, 1.

6. (Same form as preceding: Sept. Ἰωάς.) King of Israel (2 Kings xiii, 9, 12, 13, 14, 25; xiv, 1, 23, 27; 2 Chron. xxv, 17, 18, 21, 23; Hos. i, 1; Amos i, 1). See Jehoash, 2.

7. (יוֹעָשׁ, to whom *Jehovah hastens*, i. e. for aid; Sept. Ἰωάς.) One of the "sons" of Becher, son of Benjamin, a chieftain of his family (1 Chron. vii, 8). B.C. prob. cir. 1017.

3. (Same form as last; Septuag. Ἰωάς.) The person having charge of the royal stores of oil under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 28). B.C. 1014.

Jo'ātham (Matt. i, 19). See JOTHAM.

Joäzab'dus (Ἰωάζαβδος v. r. Ἰώζαβδος), a Græcized form (1 Esdr. ix, 48) of the name of JOZABAD (q. v.), the Levite (Neh. viii, 7).

Joäzar (Ἰωάζαρος, Ἰώζαρος, i. e. *Joezer*), a son of Boëthus, and brother-in-law of the high-priest Matthias (q. v.), whom he succeeded in the pontifical office by the arbitrary act of Herod the Great on the day preceding an eclipse of the moon (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 6, 4), which occurred March 13, B.C. 4. He was deprived of the office by Cyrenius (although he had aided that officer in enforcing the tax, *ib.* xviii, 1, 1) in the 37th year after the battle of Actium (*ib.* xviii, 2, 1), i. e. A.D. 7-8. It appears, however, that he had been temporarily removed (A.D. 4) by Archelaus during the short term of his brother Eleazar, and then of Jesus, the son of Sie (*ib.* xvii, 13, 1), and restored by popular acclamation (*ib.* xviii, 2, 1). See HIGH-PRIEST.

Job, the name of two persons, of different form in the original.

1. (אִיּוֹב, *Iyob'*, *persecuted*; Sept. and N. T. Ἰώβ.) An Arabian patriarch and hero of the book that bears his name; mentioned elsewhere only in Ezek. xiv, 14, 20; Jas. v, 11. The various theological, moral, and philosophical questions connected with his history are involved in the discussion of the poem itself, and we therefore treat them in considerable detail in that connection, aside from their critical bearings.

I. *Analysis of Contents.*—1. *The Introduction* (i, 1-ii, 10) supplies all the facts on which the argument is based. Job, a chieftain in the land of Uz (apparently a district of Northern Arabia—see Uz), of immense wealth and high rank, is represented to us as a man of perfect integrity, and blameless in all the relations of life. The highest goodness and the most perfect temporal happiness are combined in his person; under the protection of God, surrounded by a numerous family, he enjoys in advanced life (from xlii, 16 it has been inferred that he was about seventy years old at this time), an almost paradisiacal state, exemplifying the normal results of human obedience to the will of a righteous God.

One question, however, could be raised by envy: May not the goodness which secures such direct and tangible rewards be a refined form of selfishness? In the world of spirits, where all the mysteries of existence are brought to light, Satan, the accusing angel, suggests this doubt, and boldly asserts that if those external blessings were withdrawn Job would cast off his allegiance. The question thus distinctly propounded is obviously of infinite importance, and could only be answered by inflicting upon a man, in whom, while prosperous, malice itself could detect no evil, the calamities which are the due, and were then believed to be invariably the results, even in this life, of wickedness. The accuser receives permission to make the trial. He destroys Job's property, then his children; and afterwards, to leave no possible opening for a cavil, is allowed to inflict upon him the most terrible disease known in the East. See JOB'S DISEASE. Each of these calamities assumes a form which produces an impression that it must be a visitation from God, precisely such as was to be expected, supposing that the patriarch had been a successful hypocrite, reserved for the day of wrath. Job's wife breaks down entirely under the trial—in the very words which Satan had anticipated that the patriarch himself would at last utter in his despair, she counsels him "to curse God and die." (The Sept. has a remarkable addition to her speech at ii, 9, severely reproaching him as the cause of *her* bereavements.) Job remains steadfast. The destruction of his property draws not from him a word of complaint; the death of his children elicits the sublimest words of resignation which ever fell from the lips of a mourner—the disease which made him an object of loathing to man, and seemed to designate him as a visible example of divine wrath, is borne without a murmur; he repels his wife's suggestion with the simple words, "What! shall we receive good at the hand of the Lord, and shall we not receive evil?" "In all this Job did not sin with his lips."

2. *The Controversy* (ii, 11-xxxi, 40).—Still it is clear that, had the poem ended here, many points of deep interest would have been left in obscurity. Entire as was the submission of Job, he must have been inwardly perplexed by events to which he had no clew, which were quite unaccountable on any hypothesis hitherto entertained, and seemed repugnant to the ideas of justice engraven on man's heart. It was also most desirable that the impressions made upon the generality of men by sudden and unaccountable calamities should be thoroughly discussed, and that a broader and firmer basis than heretofore should be found for speculations concerning the providential government of the world. An opportunity for such discussion is afforded in the most natural manner by the introduction of three men, representing the wisdom and experience of the age, who came to condole with Job on hearing of his misfortunes. Some time appears to have elapsed in the interim, during which the disease had made formidable progress, and Job had thoroughly realized the extent of his misery. The meeting is described with singular beauty. At a distance they greet him with the wild demonstrations of sympathizing grief usual in the East; coming near, they are overpowered by the sight of his wretchedness, and sit seven days and seven nights without uttering a word (ii, 11-13). This awful silence, whether Job felt it as a proof of real sympathy, or as an indication of inward suspicion on their part, drew out all his anguish. In an agony of desperation he curses the day of his birth, and sees and hopes for no end of his misery but death (ch. iii).

This causes a discussion between him and his friends (ch. iv-xxxi), which is divided into three main parts, each with subdivisions, embracing alternately the speeches of the three friends of Job and his answers: the last part, however, consists of only two subdivisions, the third friend, Zophar, having nothing to rejoin; a silence by which the author of the book generally designates the defeat of Job's friends, who are defending a common cause. (It has, however, been argued with much force by Wemyss, that some derangement has occurred in the order of the composition; for chap. xxvii, 13-23, appears to contain Zophar's third address to Job, while ch. xxviii seems to be the conclusion of the whole book, containing the moral, added perhaps by some later hand.) But see below, § 5.

(*a.*) The results of the *first* discussion (chap. iii-xiv) may be thus summed up. We have on the part of Job's friends a theory of the divine government resting upon an exact and uniform correlation between sin and punishment (iv, 6, 11, and throughout). Afflictions are always penal, issuing in the destruction of those who are radically opposed to God, or who do not submit to his chastisements. They lead, of course, to correction and amendment of life when the sufferer repents, confesses his sins, puts them away, and turns to God. In that case restoration to peace, and even increased prosperity, may be expected (v, 17-27). Still the fact of the suffering always proves the commission of some special sin, while the demeanor of the sufferer indicates the true internal relation between him and God.

These principles are applied by them to the case of Job. They are, in the first place, scandalized by the vehemence of his complaints, and when they find that he maintains his freedom from wilful or conscious sin, they are driven to the conclusion that his faith is radically unsound; his protestations appear to them almost blasphemous; they become convinced that he has been secretly guilty of some unpardonable sin, and their tone, at first courteous, though warning (compare ch. iv with

ch. xv), becomes stern, and even harsh and menacing. It is clear that, unless they are driven from their partial and exclusive theory, they must be led on to an unqualified condemnation of Job.

In this part of the dialogue the character of the three friends is clearly developed. Eliphaz represents the true patriarchal chieftain, grave and dignified, and erring only from an exclusive adherence to tenets hitherto unquestioned, and influenced in the first place by genuine regard for Job and sympathy with his affliction. Bildad, without much originality or independence of character, reposes partly on the wise saws of antiquity, partly on the authority of his older friend. Zophar differs from both: he seems to be a young man; his language is violent, and at times even coarse and offensive (see, especially, his second speech, ch. xx). He represents the prejudiced and narrow-minded bigots of his age.

In order to do justice to the position and arguments of Job, it must be borne in mind that the direct object of the trial was to ascertain whether he would deny or forsake God, and that his real integrity is asserted by God himself. His answers throughout correspond with these data. He knows with a sure inward conviction that he is not an offender in the sense of his opponents: he is therefore confident that, whatever may be the object of the afflictions for which he cannot account, God knows that he is innocent. This consciousness, which from the nature of things cannot be tested by others, enables him to examine fearlessly their position. He denies the assertion that punishment follows surely on guilt, or proves its commission. Appealing boldly to experience, he declares that, in point of fact, prosperity and misfortune are not always or generally commensurate; both are often irrespective of man's deserts; "the tabernacles of robbers prosper, and they that provoke God are secure" (xii, 6). In the government of Providence he can see but one point clearly, viz. that all events and results are absolutely in God's hand (xii, 9-25), but as for the principles which underlie those events he knows nothing. In fact, he is sure that his friends are equally uninformed, and are sophists defending their position, out of mere prejudice, by arguments and statements false in themselves and doubly offensive to God, being hypocritically advanced in his defence (xiii, 1-13). Still he doubts not that God is just, and although he cannot see how or when that justice can be manifested, he feels confident that his innocence must be recognised. "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him, he also will be my salvation" (xiii, 14, 16). There remains, then, but one course open to him, and that he takes. He turns to supplication, implores God to give him a fair and open trial (xiii, 18-28). Admitting his liability to such sins as are common to man, being unclean by birth (xiii, 26; xiv, 4), he yet protests his substantial innocence, and in the bitter struggle with his misery he first meets the thought which is afterwards developed with remarkable distinctness. Believing that with death all hope connected with this world ceases, he prays that he may be hidden in the grave (xiv, 13), and there reserved for the day when God will try his cause and manifest himself in love (verse 15). This prayer represents but a dim, yet a profound and true presentiment, drawn forth, then evidently for the first time, as the possible solution of the dark problem. As for a renewal of life *here*, he dreams not of it (verse 14), nor will he allow that the possible restoration or prosperity of his descendants at all meets the exigencies of his case (ver. 21, 22).

(*b*.) In the *second* discussion (ch. xv-xxi) there is a more resolute, elaborate attempt on the part of Job's friends to vindicate their theory of retributive justice. This requires an entire overthrow of the position taken by Job. They cannot admit his innocence. The fact that his calamities are unparalleled proves to them that there must be something quite unique in his guilt. Eliphaz (ch. xv), who, as usual, lays down the basis of the argument, does not now hesitate to impute to Job the worst crimes of which man could be guilty. His defence is blasphemous, and proves that he is quite godless; that he disregards the wisdom of age and experience, denies the fundamental truths of religion (verse 3-16), and by his rebellious struggles (ver. 25-27) against God deserves every calamity which can befall him (ver. 28-30). Bildad (ch. xviii) takes up this suggestion of ungodliness, and, after enlarging upon the inevitable results of all iniquity, concludes that the special evils which had come upon Job, such as agony of heart, ruin of home, destruction of family, are peculiarly the penalties due to one who is without God. Zophar (ch. xx) draws the further inference that a sinner's sufferings must needs be proportioned to his former enjoyments (ver. 5-14), and his losses to his former gains (ver. 15-19), and thus not only accounts for Job's present calamities, but menaces him with still greater evils (ver. 20-29).

In answer, Job recognises the hand of God in his afflictions (xvi, 7-16, and xix, 6-20), but rejects the charge of ungodliness; he has never forsaken his Maker, and never ceased to pray. This, being a matter of inward consciousness, cannot of course be proved. He appeals therefore directly to earth and heaven: "My witness is in heaven, and my record is on high" (xvi, 19). The train of thought thus suggested carries him much further in the way towards the great truth—that since in this life the righteous certainly are not saved from evil, it follows that their ways are watched and their sufferings recorded, with a view to a future and perfect manifestation of the divine justice. This view becomes gradually brighter and more definite as the controversy proceeds (xvi, 18, 19; xvii, 8, 9, and perhaps 13-16), and at last finds expression in a strong and clear declaration of his conviction that at the latter day (evidently that day which Job had expressed a longing to see, xiv. 12-14) God will personally manifest himself as his nearest kinsman or avenger [see GOEL], and that he, Job, although in a disembodied state (מִבְּשָׂרִי, *without my flesh*), should survive in spirit to witness this posthumous vindication, a pledge of which had already often been given him (עֵינַי רָאוּ)—he, notwithstanding the destruction of his skin, i. e. the outward man, retaining or recovering his personal identity (xix, 25-27). There can be no doubt that Job here virtually anticipates the final answer to all difficulties supplied by the Christian revelation.

On the other hand, stung by the harsh and narrow-minded bigotry of his opponents, Job draws out (chap. xxi) with terrible force the undeniable fact that, from the beginning to the end of their lives, ungodly men, avowed atheists (ver. 14, 15), persons, in fact, guilty of the very crimes imputed, out of mere conjecture, to himself, frequently enjoy great and unbroken prosperity. From this he draws the inference, which he states in a very unguarded manner, and in a tone calculated to give just offence, that an impenetrable veil hangs over the temporal dispensations of God.

(*c*.) In the *third* dialogue (chap. xxii-xxxi) no real progress is made by Job's opponents. They will not give up and cannot defend their position. Eliphaz (ch. xxii) makes a last effort, and raises one new point which he states with some ingenuity. The station in which Job was formerly placed presented temptations to certain crimes; the punishments which he undergoes are precisely such as might be expected had those crimes been committed; hence he infers they actually were committed. The tone of this discourse thoroughly harmonizes with the character of Eliphaz. He could scarcely come to a different conclusion without surrendering his fundamental principles, and he urges with much dignity and impressiveness the exhortations and warnings which in his opinion were needed. Bildad has nothing to add but a few solemn words on the incomprehensible majesty of God and the nothingness of

man. Zophar, the most violent and least rational of the three, is put to silence, and retires from the contest (unless we adopt the above suggestion of a transposition of the text).

In his last two discourses Job does not alter his position, nor, properly speaking, adduce any new argument, but he states with incomparable force and eloquence the chief points which he regards as established (ch. xxvi). All creation is confounded by the majesty and might of God; man catches but a faint echo of God's word, and is baffled in the attempt to comprehend his ways. He then (ch. xxvii) describes even more completely than his opponents had done the destruction which, as a rule, ultimately falls upon the hypocrite, and which he certainly would deserve if he were hypocritically to disguise the truth concerning himself, and deny his own integrity. He thus recognises what was true in his opponents' arguments, and corrects his own hasty and unguarded statements. Then follows (chap. xxviii) the grand description of Wisdom, and the declaration that human wisdom does not consist in exploring the hidden and inscrutable ways of God, but in the fear of the Lord, and in turning away from evil. The remainder of this discourse (ch. xxix-xxxi) contains a singularly beautiful description of his former life, contrasted with his actual misery, together with a full vindication of his character from all the charges made or insinuated by his opponents.

Taking a general view of the argument thus far, Job's three friends may be considered as asserting the following positions:

(1.) No man being free from sin, we need not wonder that we are liable to calamities, for which we must account by a reference, not to God, but to ourselves. From the misery of the distressed, others are enabled to infer their guilt; and they must take this view in order to vindicate divine justice.

(2.) The distress of a man proves not only *that he has sinned*, but shows also the degree and measure of his sin; and thus, from the extent of calamity sustained, may be inferred the extent of sins committed, and from this the measure of impending misfortune.

(3.) A distressed man may recover his former happiness, and even attain to greater fortune than he ever enjoyed before, if he takes a warning from his afflictions, repents of his sins, reforms his life, and raises himself to a higher degree of moral rectitude. Impatience and irreverent expostulation with God serve but to prolong and increase punishment; for, by accusing God of injustice, a fresh sin is added to former transgressions.

(4.) Though the wicked man is capable of prosperity, still it is never lasting. The most awful retribution soon overtakes him; and his transient felicity must itself be considered as punishment. since it renders him heedless, and makes him feel misfortune more keenly.

In opposition to them, Job maintains:

(1.) The most upright man may be highly unfortunate—more so than the inevitable faults and shortcomings of human nature would seem to imply. There is a savage cruelty, deserving the severities of the divine resentment, in inferring the guilt of a man from his distresses. In distributing good and evil, God regards neither merit nor guilt, but acts according to his sovereign pleasure. His omnipotence is apparent in every part of the creation, but his justice cannot be seen in the government of the world; the afflictions of the righteous, as well as the prosperity of the wicked, are evidence against it. There are innumerable cases, and Job considers his own to be one of them, in which a sufferer has a right to justify himself before God, and to appeal to some other explanation of his decrees. Of this right Job freely avails himself, and maintains it against his friends.

(2.) In a state of composure and calmer reflection, Job qualifies, chiefly in his concluding speech, some of his former rather extravagant assertions, and says that, although God generally afflicts the wicked, and blesses the righteous, still there are exceptions to this rule, single cases in which the pious undergo severe trials; the inference, therefore, of a man's guilt from his misfortunes is by no means warranted. For the exceptions established by experience prove that God does not always distribute prosperity and adversity after this rule, but that he sometimes acts on a different principle, or as an absolute lord, according to his mere will and pleasure.

(3.) Humbly to adore God is our duty, even when we are subject to calamities not at all deserved; but we should abstain from harshly judging of those who, when distressed, seem to send forth complaints against God.

3. Thus ends the discussion, in which it is evident both parties had partially failed. Job has been betrayed into very hazardous statements, while his friends had been on the one hand disingenuous, on the other bigoted, harsh, and pitiless. The points which had been omitted, or imperfectly developed, are now taken up by a new interlocutor (ch. xxxii-xxxvii), who argues the justice of the divine administration both from the nature of the dispensations allotted to man, and from the essential character of God himself. Elihu, a young man, descended from a collateral branch of the family of Abraham, has listened in indignant silence to the arguments of his elders (xxxii, 7), and, impelled by an inward inspiration, he now addresses himself to both parties in the discussion, and specially to Job. He shows, first, that they had accused Job upon false or insufficient grounds, and failed to convict him, or to vindicate God's justice. Job, again, had assumed his entire innocence, and had arraigned that justice (xxxiii, 9-11). These errors he traces to their both overlooking one main object of all suffering. God *speaks* to man by chastisement (ver. 14, 19-22)—warns him, teaches him self-knowledge and humility (ver. 16, 17)—and prepares him (ver. 23) by the mediation of a spiritual interpreter (the angel Jehovah of Genesis) to implore and to obtain pardon (ver. 24), renewal of life (ver. 25), perfect access and restoration (ver. 26). This statement does not involve any charge of special guilt, such as the friends had alleged and Job had repudiated. Since the warning and suffering are preventive as well as remedial, the visitation anticipates the commission of sin; it saves man from pride, and other temptations of wealth and power, and it effects the real object of all divine interpositions, the entire submission to God's will. Again, Elihu argues (xxxiv, 10-17) that any charge of injustice, direct or implicit, against God involves a contradiction in terms. God is the only source of justice; the very idea of justice is derived from his governance of the universe, the principle of which is love. In his absolute knowledge God sees all secrets, and by his absolute power he controls all events, and that for the one end of bringing righteousness to light (verse 21-30). Man has, of course, no claim upon God; what he receives is purely a matter of grace (xxxv, 6-9). The occasional appearance of unanswered prayer (verse 9), when evil seems to get the upper hand, is owing merely to the fact that man prays in a proud and insolent spirit (ver. 12, 13). Job may look to his heart, and he will see if that is true of himself.

Job is silent, and Elihu proceeds (ch. xxxvi) to show that the almightiness of God is not, as Job seems to assert, associated with any contempt or neglect of his creatures. Job, by ignoring this truth, has been led into grave error, and terrible danger (ver. 12; comp. 18), but God is still drawing him, and if he yields and follows he will yet be delivered. The rest of the discourse brings out forcibly the lessons taught by the manifestations of goodness as well as greatness in creation. Indeed, the great object of all natural phenomena is to teach men—"Who teacheth like him?" This part differs from Job's magnificent description of the mystery and majesty of God's works, inasmuch as it indicates a clearer recognition of a loving purpose—and from the address of the Lord which follows, by its discursive and

argumentative tone. The last words are evidently spoken while a violent storm is coming on, in which Elihu views the signs of a Theophany, such as cannot fail to produce an intense realization of the nothingness of man before God.

4. *The Almighty's Response.*—From the preceding analysis it is obvious that many weighty truths have been developed in the course of the discussion—nearly every theory of the objects and uses of suffering has been reviewed—while a great advance has been made towards the apprehension of doctrines hereafter to be revealed, such as were known only to God. But the mystery is not as yet really cleared up. The position of the three original opponents is shown to be untenable—the views of Job himself to be but imperfect—while even Elihu gives not the least intimation that he recognises one special object of calamity. In the case of Job, as we are expressly told, that object was to try his sincerity, and to demonstrate that goodness, integrity in all relations, and devout faith in God can exist independent of external circumstances. This object never occurs to the mind of any one of the interlocutors, nor could it be proved without a revelation. On the other hand, the exact amount of censure due to Job for the excesses into which he had been betrayed, and to his three opponents for their harshness and want of candor, could only be awarded by an omniscient Judge.

Accordingly, from the midst of the storm, Jehovah, whom Job had several times vehemently challenged by appeal to decide the contest, now speaks. In language of incomparable grandeur he reproves and silences the murmurs of Job. God does not condescend, strictly speaking, to argue with his creatures. The speculative questions discussed in the colloquy are unnoticed, but the declaration of God's absolute power is illustrated by a marvellously beautiful and comprehensive survey of the glory of creation, and his all-embracing providence by reference to the phenomena of the animal kingdom. He who would argue with the Lord must understand at least the objects for which instincts so strange and manifold are given to the beings far below man in gifts and powers. This declaration suffices to bring Job to a right mind: he confesses his inability to comprehend, and therefore to answer his Maker (xl, 3, 4). A second address completes the work. It proves that a charge of injustice against God involves the consequence that the accuser is more competent than he to rule the universe. He should then be able to control, to punish, to reduce all creatures to order—but he cannot even subdue the monsters of the irrational creation. Baffled by leviathan and behemoth, how can he hold the reins of government, how contend with him who made and rules them all?

5. Job's unreserved submission terminates the trial (ch. xxxviii-xlii. There is probably another transposition at xl, 1-14, which belongs after xlii, 1-6). He expresses deep contrition, not, of course, for sins falsely imputed to him, but for the bitterness and arrogance which had characterized some portion of his complaints. In the rebuke then addressed to Job's opponents the integrity of his character is distinctly recognised, while they are condemned for untruth, which, inasmuch as it was not wilful, but proceeded from a real but narrow-minded conviction of the divine justice, is pardoned on the intercession of Job. The restoration of his external prosperity, which is an inevitable result of God's personal manifestation, symbolizes the ultimate compensation of the righteous for all sufferings undergone upon earth.

II. *Design of the Book.*—1. From this analysis it may seem clear that certain views concerning the general object of the book are partial or erroneous. *a.* It cannot be the object of the writer to prove that there is no connection between guilt and sorrow, or that the old orthodox doctrine of retribution was radically unsound. Job himself recognises the general truth of the doctrine, which is, in fact, confirmed by his ultimate restoration to happiness. *b.* Nor is the development of the great doctrine of a future state the primary object. It would not, in that case, have been passed over in Job's last discourse, in the speech of Elihu, or in the address of the Lord God. In fact, critics who hold that view admit that the doctrine is rather suggested than developed, and amounts to scarcely more than a hope, a presentiment, at the most a subjective conviction of a truth first fully revealed by him "who brought life and immortality to light." (See Pareau, *De Immortalitatis notis in libro Jobi*, Devent. 1807.) The cardinal truth of the immortality of the soul is, indeed, clearly implied throughout Job's reasoning, as it is elsewhere assumed in the O. T. (comp. Matt. xxii, 32); and this thought, in fact, constitutes the afflicted patriarch's ground of consolation and trust, especially in that sublime passage (xix, 25-27) where he expresses his confidence in his posthumous vindication, which could be of no satisfaction unless his spirit should survive to witness it. Yet this belief is nowhere carried out at length, as would have been the case had this been the main theme of the epopee. Much less is the later doctrine of the resurrection of the body contained in the poem. See RESURRECTION. *c.* On the doctrine of future retribution, see below. See FUTURE LIFE; IMMORTALITY.

2. It may be granted that the primary design of the poem is that which is distinctly intimated in the introduction, and confirmed in the conclusion, namely, to show the effects of calamity in its worst and most awful form upon a truly religious spirit. Job is no Stoic, no Titan (Ewald, p. 26), struggling rebelliously against God; no Prometheus victim of a jealous and unrelenting Deity: he is a suffering man, acutely sensitive to all impressions inward and outward, grieved by the loss of wealth, position, domestic happiness, the respect of his countrymen, dependents, and followers, tortured by a loathsome, incurable, and all but unendurable disease, and stung to an agony of grief and passion by the insinuations of conscious guilt and hypocrisy. Under such provocation, being wholly without a clew to the cause of his misery, and hopeless of restoration to happiness on earth, he is shaken to the utmost, and driven almost to desperation. Still in the centre of his being he remains firm and unmoved—with an intense consciousness of his own integrity—without a doubt as to the power, wisdom, truth, or absolute justice of God, and therefore awaiting with longing expectation the final judgment which he is assured must come and bring him deliverance. The representation of such a character, involving the discomfiture of man's great enemy, and the development of the manifold problems which such a spectacle suggests to men of imperfect knowledge, but of thoughtful and inquiring mind, is the more direct object of the writer, who, like all great spirits of the ancient world, dealt less with abstract propositions than with the objective realities of existence. Such is the impression naturally made by the book, and which is recognised more distinctly in proportion as the reader grasps the tenor of the arguments, and realizes the characters and events.

3. Still, beyond and beneath this outward and occasional design there evidently lies a grander problem, which has exercised the reflection of all pious and considerate minds, and which we know was vividly pressed upon the contemplation even of the Oriental saints of early times (Psa. xxxvii). Hence the nearly unanimous voice of critics and readers has decided that the ultimate object of the book is the consideration of the question how the afflictions of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked can be consistent with God's justice. But it should be observed that the direct problem exclusively refers to the first point, the second being only incidentally discussed on occasion of the leading theme. If this is overlooked, the author would appear to have solved only one half of his problem: the case from which the whole discussion proceeds has reference merely to the leading problem.

There is another fundamental error which has led nearly all modern interpreters to a mistaken idea of the design of this book. They assume that the problem could be satisfactorily solved only when the doctrine of retribution in another life had been first established, which had not been done by the author of the book of Job: a perfect solution of the question was therefore not to be expected from him. Some assert that his solution is erroneous, since retribution, to be expected in a future world, is transferred by him to this life; others say that he cut the knot which he could not unloose, and has been satisfied to ask for implicit submission and devotedness, showing at the same time that every attempt at a solution must lead to dangerous positions: blind resignation, therefore, was the short meaning of the lengthened discussion. Upon the doctrine of retribution after death our author does not enter; but that he knew it may be inferred from several passages with great probability; as, for instance, xiv, 14, "If a man die, shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come." The *if* here shows that the writer had been before engaged in considering the subject of life after death; and when such is the case, a pious mind will necessarily indulge the hope, or will, at least, have an obscure presentiment of immortality. The truth also of God's undoubted grace, on which the doctrine of immortality is based, will be found clearly laid down in chap. xix. Still the author does not recur to this hope for the purpose of solving his problem; he did not intend in his discussion to exceed the limits of what God had *clearly revealed*, and this was in his time confined to the vague notion of life continued after death, but not connected with rewards and punishments. From these considerations it appears that those interpreters who, with Bernstein, De Wette, and Umbreit, assume that the book of Job was of a sceptical nature, and intended to dispute the doctrine of retribution as laid down in the other books of the Old Testament, have entirely misunderstood it.

On nearer examination, however, it appears that the doctrine of retribution after death is not of itself alone calculated to lead to a solution of the problem. The belief in a final judgment is firm and rational only when it rests in the belief in God's continued providential government of the world, and in his acting as sovereign Lord in all the events of human life. Temporary injustice is still injustice, and destroys the idea of a holy and just God. A God who has something to redress is no God at all. Even the ancient heathen perceived that future awards would not vindicate incongruities in divine providence here (see Barth, *Notes to Claudian*, 1078 sq.). God's just retribution in this world is extolled throughout the Old Testament. The New Testament holds out to the righteous promises of a future life, as well as of the present; and our Saviour himself, in setting forth the rewards of those who, for his sake, forsook everything, begins with this life (Matt. xix, 29). A nearer examination of the benedictions contained in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v) shows that none of them exclusively refer to future blessings; the judgment of the wicked is in his view proceeding without interruption, and therefore his examples of the distribution of divine justice in this world are mingled with those of requital in a future order of things. The Galilæans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their own sacrifices (Luke xiii, 1), were in Christ's opinion not accidentally killed; and he threatens those who would not repent that they should in like manner perish. That sickness is to be considered as a punishment for sin we are clearly taught (John v, 14; Luke v, 20, 24): in the former passage it is threatened as a punishment for sins committed; in the latter it is healed in consequence of punishment remitted. The passage in John ix, 2, 3, which is often appealed to in proof that our Lord did not consider sickness as a punishment for sin, does not prove this, but only opposes the Jewish position—founded on the mistaken doctrine of retribution—that all severe sicknesses and infirmities were consequences of crimes. The solution of the problem regarding the sufferings of the righteous rests on two positions:

(1.) *Their Necessity.*—Even the comparatively righteous are not without sin, which can be eradicated only by afflictions, and he who patiently endures them will attain a clearer insight into the otherwise obscure ways of God. The trials of the pious issue at once from God's justice and love. To him who entertains a proper sense of the sinfulness of man, no calamity appears so great as not to be deserved as a punishment, or useful as a corrective.

(2.) *The Compensations attending them.*—Calamity, as the veiled grace of God, is with the pious never experienced alone, but manifest proofs of divine favor accompany or follow it. Though sunk in misery, they still are happier than the wicked, and when it has attained its object it is terminated by the Lord. The consolations offered in the Old Testament are, agreeably to the weaker judgment of its professors, derived chiefly from external circumstances, while in the New Testament they are mainly spiritual, the eye being, moreover, directed beyond the limits of this world.

It is this purely correct solution of the problem which occurs in the book of Job. It is not set forth, however, in any one set of speeches, but is rather to be gathered from the concurrent drift of the entire discussion. For,

[1.] The solution cannot be looked for in *Job's speeches*, for God proves himself gracious towards him only after he has been corrected and humbled himself. Although the author of the book does not say (i, 22; ii, 10; comp. xlii, 7) that Job had charged God foolishly, and sinned with his lips, yet the sentiment calling for correction in his speeches is clearly pointed out to be that "he was righteous in his own eyes, and justified himself rather than God" (xxxii, 1, 2). The entire purity of his character did not prevent his falling into misconceptions and even contradictions on this important topic, which the discussion only tended the more to perplex. Job continues to be embarrassed for the solution, and he is only certain of this, that the explanation of his friends cannot be satisfactory. Job erred chiefly in not acknowledging his need of chastisement; notwithstanding his integrity and sincere piety, this prevented him from apprehending the object of the calamity inflicted on him, led him to consider God's dispensations as arbitrary, and made him despair of the return of better days. The greatness of his sufferings was in some measure the cause of his misconception, by exciting his feelings, and preventing him from calmly considering his case. He was in the state of a man tempted, and deserving God's indulgence. He had received considerable provocation from his friends, and often endeavored to soften his harsh assertions, which, particularly in ch. xxvii, leads him into such contradictions as must have occurred in the life of the tempted; he is loud in acknowledging the wisdom of God (ch. xxviii), and raises himself at times to cheering hopes (comp. ch. xix). But this can only excuse, not justify him, and therefore it is in the highest degree honorable to him that he remains silent when, in Elihu's speeches, the correct solution of the question is suggested, and that he ultimately acknowledges his fundamental error of doing justice to himself only.

[2.] The solution of the question mooted cannot be contained in *the speeches of Job's friends*. Their demeanor is reproved by God, and represented as a real sin, so much so, indeed, that to obtain pardon for them Job was directed to offer a propitiatory sacrifice. Their error proceeded from a crude notion of sin in its external appearance; and, inferring its existence from calamity, they were thus led to condemn the afflicted Job as guilty of heinous crimes (ch. xxxii). The moral use of sufferings was unknown to them, which evidently proved that they themselves were not yet purged and cleared from guilt. If they had been sensible of the nature of man, if they had understood *themselves*, they would, on

seeing the misery of Job, have exclaimed, "God be merciful to us sinners!" There is, indeed, an important correct principle in their speeches, whose centre it forms, so much so that they mostly err only in the application of the general truth. It consists in the perception of the invariable connection between sin and misery, which is indelibly ingrafted on the heart of man, and to which many ancient authors allude. The problem of the book is then solved by properly uniting the correct positions of the speeches both of Job and his friends, by maintaining his innocence as to any moral obliquity (although cherishing a view which must have resulted in spiritual pride, had not the Lord thus mercifully exposed its character before it ripened into guilt), and at the same time avoiding the idea that misfortune is necessarily a punitive infliction (being only a curse when it follows the violation of the physical laws of the Creator, and even then capable of being overruled for the welfare of his saints), thus tracing the errors of both parties to a common source, the want of a sound insight into the nature of sin. Job considers himself righteous, and not deserving of such inflictions, because he was not conscious of having committed any *crime;* and his friends fancy they must assume that he was highly criminal, in order to justify his misery.

[3.] The solution of the question at issue is not exclusively given in *the addresses of God*, which contain only the basis of the solution, not the solution itself. In setting forth his majesty, and in showing that imputing to him injustice is repugnant to a correct conception of his nature, these addresses establish that there must be a solution which does not impair divine justice. This is not, indeed, the solution itself, but everything is thus prepared for the solution. We apprehend that God *must* be just, but it remains further to be shown *how* he can be just, and still the righteous be miserable.

[4.] Nor yet can we justly regard the *speech of Elihu* as affording altogether a correct solution of this main question; for, as the preceding analysis has shown, it falls short of the purpose, and the text itself (xxxviii, 2) expressly states its bewilderment and incompetency. Nevertheless, the position of this in the poem, and the general agreement of its doctrines with the final result, indicate that it contains, in germ at least, the correct solution, *as far as human sagacity can go.* The leading principle in Elihu's statement is, that calamity in the shape of trial was inflicted even on the comparatively best men, but that God allowed a favorable turn to take place as soon as it had attained its object. Now this is the key to the events of Job's life. Though a pious and righteous man, he is tried by severe afflictions. He knows not for what purpose he is smitten, and his calamity continues; but when he learns it from the addresses of Elihu and God, and humbles himself, he is relieved from the burden which oppresses him, and ample prosperity atones for the afflictions he has sustained (the last vestige of injustice on the part of the Almighty in thus afflicting a good man at the instance of Satan, and for the sake of the example to future ages, disappearing with the consideration that the subject of it himself required the severe lesson for his own spiritual profit). Add to this that the remaining portion of Elihu's speeches, in which he points to God's infinite majesty as including his justice, is continued in the addresses of God; that Elihu foretells God's appearance; that he is not punished by God as are the friends of Job; in fine, that Job, by his very silence, acknowledges the problem to have been solved by Elihu; and his silence is the more significant, because Elihu had urged him to defend himself (xxxiii, 32), and because Job had repeatedly declared he would "hold his peace" if it was shown to him wherein he had erred (vi, 24, 25; xix, 4). This view of the book of Job has among modern authors been supported chiefly by Stäudlin (*Beiträge zur Religions und Sittenlehre*, ii, 133) and Stickel (*Das Buch Hiob*, Lpzg. 1842), though in both it is mixed up with much erroneous matter; and it is further confirmed by the whole Old Testament giving the same answer to the question mooted which the speeches of Elihu offer: in its concentrated form it is presented in Psa. xxxvii, xlix, lxxiii.

At the same time, it must be conceded that the reprehension of Elihu's speech by Jehovah himself, as savoring of presumption, intimates, as the tenor of the whole succeeding portion of the poem also implies, that there are mysteries in divine providence, the full solution of which, in this life at least, God does not deign nor think best to make to his creatures who are the subjects of them. The inscrutability of God's ways by human judgment is a necessary inference from his infinity, and the character of this life as a probation requires the withholding of many of his plans in order to their proper disciplinary effects. Especially is the saint required to "walk by faith and not by sight," and the growth and fullest exercise of this faith can only occur under such circumstances as those in which Job was placed. While it is pre-eminently the doctrine of both the Old and the New Testament that afflictions are the earthly lot of the righteous, it is equally a maxim under both dispensations that the most ennobling motive for their patient endurance is the simple fact that they are dispensed by our heavenly Father, who alone fully knows why they are best for us. Could the subject of them at the time perceive clearly their necessity and advantage, half their value would be destroyed; for an assurance of this he must *trust* the known kindness and wisdom of the Hand that smites him (Heb. xii, 1). It was this sublime position, finally attained by the tried patriarch (Job xxiii, 10), which gilds his character with its most sacred hue. The above is substantially the view of the moral design of the book entertained by the latest expositors (e. g. Conant, Delitzsch, etc.), although they do not bring out these ethical considerations with sufficient distinctness.

It remains to consider the view taken by Ewald respecting the design of the book of Job. He justly rejects the common, superficial view of its design, which has recently been revived and defended by Hirzel (see his *Commentar*, Lpzg. 1839), and which represents the author as intending to show that man cannot apprehend the plans of God, and does best to submit in ignorance, without repining at afflictions. Nowhere in the whole book is simple resignation crudely enjoined, and nowhere does Job say that he submits to such an injunction. The prologue represents his sufferings as trials, and the epilogue declares that the end had proved this: consequently the author was competent to give a theodicy with reference to the calamity of Job and if such is the case he cannot have intended simply to recommend resignation. The Biblical writers, when engaged on this problem, know how to justify God with reference to the afflictions of the righteous, and have no intention of evading the difficulty when they recommend resignation (see the Psalms quoted above, and, in the New Testament, the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. xii). The view of the book of Job alluded to would isolate it, and take it out of its natural connection. Thus far, then, we agree with Ewald, but we cannot approve of his own view of the design of the book of Job. According to his system, "calamity is never a punishment for sins committed, but always a mere phantom, an imaginary show, above which we must raise ourselves by the consciousness of the eternal nature of the human mind, to which, by external prosperity, nothing can be added, and from which, by external misfortune, nothing can be taken away. It was (says Ewald) the merit of the book of Job to have prepared these sounder views of worldly evil and of the immortality of mind, transmitting them as fruitful buds to posterity." But such a system as this must be abortive to console under any considerable affliction, and is equally opposed to the whole tenor of Scripture, which, while recognising the reality and naturalness of sorrow, and even allowing its exhibition, yet knows how effectually to cure its

wounds by the most substantial considerations. Nor is it in accordance with the book itself, which nowhere impugns or mitigates the extent of Job's calamities, but, from the high vantage ground of the prologue and epilogue, impresses us with a more solemn insight into their significance than even Job was enabled to take, and throughout the discussion (both on the part of the three friends—whose argument is based upon their tangibility as evidence of the divine displeasure, and especially in the key furnished by Elihu—which exalts them to the most interesting degree of importance in the moral discipline of the people of God), admits and therefore seeks to justify their pungency. Their design is as far from stoicism as from insensibility. Viewed in the light of the foregoing purpose, this book becomes one of the most precious legacies to the Church—to which tribulation in this world has been left as a heritage; and a sublime exposition of some of the most interesting problems of religious experience in its most highly developed phase.

III. *Historical Character of the Work.*—On this subject there are three opinions. (1.) Some contend that the book contains an entirely true history. (2.) Others assert that it contains a narrative entirely imaginary, and constructed by the author to teach a great moral truth. (3.) The third opinion is that the book is founded on a true history, which has been recast, modified, and enlarged by the author.

1. The first view, taken by numerous ancient interpreters, is now abandoned by nearly all expositors. Until a comparatively late time, the general opinion was not only that the persons and events which it describes are real, but that the very words of the speakers were actually recorded. It was supposed either that Job himself employed the latter years of his life in writing it (A. Schultens), or that at a very early age some inspired Hebrew collected the facts and sayings, faithfully preserved by oral tradition, and presented them to his countrymen in their own tongue. Some such view seems to have been adopted by Josephus, for he places Job in the list of the historical books, and it was prevalent with all the fathers of the Church. In its support several reasons are adduced, of which only the first and second have any real force; and even these are outweighed by other considerations, which render it impossible to consider the book of Job as an entirely true history, but which may be used in defence of the third view alluded to. It is said, (1.) That Job is (Ezek. xiv, 14–20) mentioned as a public character, together with Noah and Daniel, and represented as an example of piety. (2.) In the Epistle of James (v, 11), patience in sufferings is recommended by a reference to Job. (3.) In the Greek translation of the Sept. a notice is appended to the book of Job, evidently referring to Gen. xxxvi, 33, and stating that Job was the king Jobab of Edom. It is as follows: "And it is written that he will rise again with those whom the Lord will raise up. This is translated out of a Syrian book. He dwelt indeed in the land of Ausitis, on the confines of Idumæa and Arabia. His first name was Jobab; and having married an Arabian woman, he had by her a son whose name was Ennon. He was himself a son of Zare, one of the sons of Esau, and his mother's name was Bosorra; so that he was the fifth in descent from Abraham. And these were the kings who reigned in Edom, over which country he also bore rule. The first was Balak, the son of Beor, and the name of his city was Dennaba. And after Balak, Jobab, who is called Job; and after him Asom, who was governor from the region of Thaimanitis; and after him Adad, son of Barad, who smote Madian in the plain of Moab, and the name of his city was Gethaim. And the friends who came to him were Eliphaz of the sons of Esau, the king of the Thaimanites; Baldad, the sovereign of the Sauchæans; and Sophar, the king of the Minaians." An account is given at the close of the Arabic version so similar that the one has every appearance of having been copied from the other, or of their having had a common origin. Aristæus, Philo, and Polyhistor acknowledged the account to be true, as did the Greek and Latin fathers. It is not unlikely that the tradition is derived from the Jews. This statement is too late to be relied on, and originates in an etymological combination [see JOBAB]; and that it must be erroneous is to a certain extent evident from the contents of the book, in which Job is not represented as a king. (4.) In the East numerous traditions (see D'Herbelot, s. v. Ayoub) about the patriarch and his family show the deep impression made by his character and calamities: these traditions may possibly have been derived from the book itself, but it is at least equally probable that they had an independent origin. Indeed, Job's tomb continues to be shown to Oriental tourists. Now the fact of a Job having lived somewhere would not of itself prove that the hero of our narrative was that person, and that this book contained a purely historical account. Moreover, his tomb is shown not in one place, but in six, and, along with it, the dunghill on which Job is reported to have sat! (See Carpzov, *Introd.* ii, 33; Jahn, *Einleit.* I, i, 761; Michaelis, *Einleit.* i, 1; Bertholdt, v, 2040). (5.) Dr. Hales and others have even gone so far as to fix his exact year, by a calculation of the constellation alluded to in ix, 9; xxxviii, 31; but the uncertainty of such a process is too evident to need consideration, as the very names of the planets alluded to are doubtful.

Against this view it must be remarked generally, that the whole work is arranged on a well-considered plan, proving the author's power of independent invention; that the speeches are, in their general structure and in their details, so elaborate that they could not have been brought out in the ordinary course of a conversation or disputation; that it would be unnatural to suppose Job in his distressed state to have delivered such speeches, finished with the utmost care; and that they exhibit uniformity in their design, fulness, propriety, and coloring, though the author, with considerable skill, represents each speaker whom he introduces arguing according to his character. Moreover, in the prologue and epilogue, as well as in the arrangement of the speeches, the figures 3 and 7 constantly occur, with the decimal number formed by their addition. The transactions between God and Satan in the prologue absolutely require that we should distinguish between the subject-matter forming the foundation of the work and its enlargement, which can be only done when a poetical principle is acknowledged in its composition. God's speaking out of the clouds would be a miracle, without an object corresponding to its magnitude, and having a merely personal reference, while all the other miracles of the Old Testament are in connection with the theocratical government, and occur in the midst and for the benefit of the people of God.

2. Impelled by the force of these arguments, many critics have adopted the opinion either that the whole work is a moral or religious apologue, or that, upon a substratum of a few rudimental facts preserved by tradition, the genius of an original thinker has raised this, the most remarkable monument of the Shemitic mind. The first indications of this opinion are found in the Talmud (*Baba Bathra*, xv, 1). In a discussion upon the age of this book, while the Rabbins in general maintain its historical character, Samuel Bar-Nachman declares his conviction "Job did not exist, and was not a created man, but the work is a parable." Hai Gaon (Ewald and Duke's *Beiträge*, iii, 165), A.D. 1000, who is followed by Jarchi, altered this passage to "Job existed, and was created to become a parable." They had evidently no critical ground for the change, but bore witness to the prevalent tradition of the Hebrews. Maimonides (*Moreh Nebochim*, iii, 22), with his characteristic freedom of mind, considers it an open question of little or no moment to the real value of the inspired book. Ralbag, i. e. R. Levi Ben-Gershom, treats it as a philosophic work. A late Hebrew commentator, Simcha Arieh (Schlott-

mann, p. 4), denies the historical truth of the narrative on the ground that it is incredible that the patriarchs of the chosen race should be surpassed in goodness by a child of Edom. This is worth noting in corroboration of the argument that such a fact was not likely to have been *invented* by an Israelite of any age.

In opposition to this view, the following arguments may be adduced: (1.) It has always seemed to pious writers incompatible with any idea of inspiration to assume that a narrative, certainly not allegorical, should be a mere fiction, and irreverent to suppose that the Almighty would be introduced as a speaker in an imaginary colloquy.

(2.) We are led to the same conclusion by the soundest principles of criticism. Ewald says (*Einl.* p. 15) most truly, "The invention of a history without foundation in facts—the creation of a person, represented as having a real historical existence, out of the mere head of the poet—is a notion so entirely alien to the spirit of all antiquity, that it only began to develop itself gradually in the latest epoch of the literature of any ancient people, and in its complete form belongs only to the most modern times." In the canonical books there is not a trace of any such invention. Of all people, the Hebrews were the least likely to mingle the mere creations of imagination with the sacred records reverenced as the peculiar glory of their race.

It is true that the arguments advanced by Ewald to show the historical character of the chief features of the book are not entirely conclusive, especially the literature of the name Job, which may have reference to the character he sustains in the narrative (from אָיַב, to *hate*, q. d. "the assailed," i. e. tempted; see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 81); still they must be allowed to have some weight, and, taken in connection with the general usage of Scripture in its poetical and rhetorical amplifications, and especially with the considerations presently to be adduced in relation to the author of this book, justify the presumption of a historical foundation, not only for the facts and personages represented in the book, but also, to a certain extent, for the speeches.

(3.) To this it must be added that there is a singular air of reality in the whole narrative, such as must either proceed naturally from a faithful adherence to objective truth, or be the result of the most consummate art. The effect is produced partly by the thorough consistency of all the characters, especially that of Job, not merely as drawn in broad, strong outlines, but as developed under a variety of most trying circumstances; partly also by the minute and accurate account of incidents which in a fiction would probably have been noted by an ancient writer in a vague and general manner. Thus we remark the mode in which the supernatural trial is carried into execution by natural agencies—by Chaldæan and Sabæan robbers—by whirlwinds common in and peculiar to the desert—by fire—and, lastly, by the elephantiasis (see Schlottmann, p. 15; Ewald, *l. c.;* and Hengstenberg), the most formidable disease known in the East. The disease was indeed one which the Indians and most Orientals then probably believed to be peculiarly indicative of divine wrath, and would therefore be naturally selected by the writer (see the analysis above). But the symptoms are described so faithfully as to leave no doubt that the writer must either have introduced them with a view to giving an air of truthfulness to his work, or have recorded what he himself witnessed or received from an exact tradition. The former supposition is confuted by the fact that the peculiar symptoms are not described in any one single passage so as to attract the reader's attention, but are made out by a critical and scientific examination of words occurring here and there at intervals in the complaints of the sufferer. The most refined art fails in producing such a result; it is rarely attempted in the most artificial ages, was never dreamed of by ancient writers, and must here be regarded as a strong instance of the undesigned coincidences which the soundest criticism regards as the best evidence of genuineness and authenticity in any work.

3. Luther first suggested the theory which, in some form or other, is most generally received. In his introduction to the first edition of his translation of the Bible he speaks of the author as having so treated the historical facts as to demonstrate the truth that God alone is righteous; and in the *Tischreden* (ed. Walch, xxii, 2093) he says: "I look upon the book of Job as a true history, yet I do not believe that all took place just as it is written, but that an ingenious, pious, and learned man brought it into its present form." This position was strongly attacked by Bellarmine and other Roman theologians, and was afterwards repudiated by most Lutherans. The fact that Spinoza, Clericus, Du Pin, and Father Simon held nearly the same opinion, the first denying, and the others notoriously holding low views of the inspiration of Scripture, had of course a tendency to bring it into disrepute. J. D. Michaelis first revived the old theory of Bar-Nachman, not upon critical, but dogmatic grounds. In a mere history the opinions or doctrines enounced by Job and his friends could have no dogmatic authority; whereas, if the whole book were a pure inspiration, the strongest arguments could be deduced from them on behalf of the great truths of the resurrection and a future judgment, which, though implied in other early books, are nowhere so distinctly inculcated. The arbitrary character of such reasoning is obvious. At present no critic doubts that the narrative rests on facts, although the prevalent opinion among Continental scholars is certainly that in its form and general features, in its reasonings and representations of character, the book is a work of creative genius.

Taking this view, we must still abstain from undertaking to determine what the poet derived from tradition, and what he added himself, since we know not how far tradition had already embellished the original fact. Thus much only will it be safe to conclude: that the individual really existed, possibly in the region indicated; that he literally underwent a trial substantially like that represented, and that a discussion grew out of it, held, perhaps, between him and a party of his friends after its first severity was passed, covering the essential principles developed in the book, but briefly and simply expressed.

IV. *Descent, Country, and Age of the Author.*—1. Opinions differed in ancient times as to *the nation* to which the author belonged, some considering him to have been an Arab, others an Israelite. Various indications favor the latter supposition: (1st), We find in our book many ideas of genuine Israelitish growth: the creation of the world is described, in accordance with the prevailing notions of the Israelites, as the immediate effect of divine omnipotence; man is formed of clay; the spirit of man is God's breath; God employs the angels for the performance of his orders; Satan, the great enemy of the children of God, is his instrument for tempting them; men are weak and sinful; nobody is pure in the sight of God, moral corruption is propagated. There is promulgated to men the law of God, which they must not infringe, and the transgressions of which are visited on offenders with punishments. Moreover, the nether world, or Sheol, is depicted in hues entirely Hebrew. To these particulars might, without much trouble, be added many more, but the deep-searching inquirer will particularly weigh, (2dly), the fact that the book displays a strength and fervor of religious faith such as could only be expected within the domain of revelation. Monotheism, if the assertions of ancient Arabian authors may be trusted, prevailed, indeed, for a long period among the Arabs, and it held its ground at least among a portion of the nation till the age of Mohammed, who obtained for it a complete triumph over polytheism, which was spreading from Syria. Still the god of the Arabs was, as those of the heathens generally were, a retired god, dwelling far apart, while the people of the Old Covenant enjoyed the privilege of a vital communion with God, and the warmth with which our author enters into this

view incontrovertibly proves that he was an Israelite. (3dly), As regards the language of our book, several ancient writers asserted that it was originally written in the Aramæan or Arabic tongue, and afterwards translated into Hebrew by Moses, David, Solomon, or some unknown writer. Of this opinion was the author of the Appendix in the Septuagint, and the compiler of the tract on Job added to the works of Origen and Jerome; in modern times it has been chiefly defended by Spanheim, in his *Historia Jobi*. But for a translation there is too much propriety and precision in the use of words and phrases; the sentences are too compact, and free from redundant expressions and members; and too much care is bestowed on their harmony and easy flow. The parallelism also is too accurate and perfect for a translation, and the whole breathes a freshness that could be expected from an original work only.

Sensible of the weight of this argument, others, as Eichhorn, took a medium course, and assumed that the author was a Hebrew, though he did not live among his countrymen, but in Arabia. "The earlier Hebrew history," they say, "is unknown to the author, who is ignorant of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. In portraying nature, also, he proves himself always familiar with Arabia, while he is silent respecting the characteristics of Palestine. With Egypt he must have been well acquainted, which can be accounted for better by supposing him to have lived in Arabia than in Palestine." Hitzig and Hirzel accordingly, among the latest writers, hold that the writer was an Egyptian. Wetzstein and Delitzsch say that he was a native of the Hauran. The occasional use of the name Jehovah, however, appears to imply a later date than the Exode, and the absence of allusion to the events of Jewish history, it has been thought, may be accounted for by the peculiar line of argument (from natural religion) pursued in the book, as in Ecclesiastes. It has further been suggested that the author, without directly mentioning the Pentateuch, frequently alludes to portions of it, as in iii, 4, to Gen. i, 3; in iv, 19, and xxxiii, 6, to Moses's account of the creation of man; in v, 14, to Deut. xxxii, 32; in xxiv, 11, to Deut. xxv, 4. Moreover, history says nothing of the Israelites having permanently taken up their residence in the land of Arabia, so as to allow the supposition of the above origin of the book of Job by a Hebrew thus isolated from Palestine; nor will most of the arguments adduced to prove the acquaintance (and therefore neighborhood) of the author with Egypt bear a close examination. Thus it is a mistake to suppose that the description of the working of mines in ch. xxviii must necessarily have reference to Egypt; Phœnicia, Arabia, and Edom afforded much better materials. That the author must have known the Egyptian mausolea rests on an erroneous interpretation of iii, 14, which may also be said of the assertion that xxix, 18, refers to the Egyptian mythus of the phœnix. Casting aside these arbitrarily assumed Egyptian references, we have only the following: Our author knows the Egyptian vessels of bulrushes, ix, 26; the Nile-grass, viii, 12; the Nile-horse (Behemoth) and the crocodile (Leviathan), xi, 15; xli, 1. Now, as these things belong to the more prominent peculiarities of a neighboring country, they must have been known to every educated Israelite: the vessels of bulrushes are mentioned also in Isa. xviii, 2. Neither are we disposed to adopt the compromising view of Stickel, who assumes that the author wrote his book in the Israelitish territory indeed, but close to the frontier, in the far south-east of Palestine. That the author had there the materials for his descriptions, comparisons, and imagery set better before his eyes than anywhere else, is true, for there he had an opportunity of observing mines, caravans, drying up of brooks, etc. But this is not sufficient proof of the author having lived permanently in that remote part of Palestine, and of having there written his book: he was not a mere copyist of nature, but a poet of considerable eminence, endowed with the power of vividly representing things absent from him.

2. As to *the age* of the author of this book, we meet with three opinions: (*a*.) That he lived before Moses, or was, at least, his contemporary. (*b*.) That he lived in the time of Solomon, or in the centuries next following—the opinion of Hahn, Schlottmann (Berl. 1857), and Delitzsch. (*c*.) That he lived shortly before, or during, or even after the Babylonian exile. Against this last view (adopted by Le Clerc among earlier interpreters, and among modern expositors by Bernstein, Gesenius, Umbreit, and De Wette) it is conclusively objected, (1.) That the book is referred to in the Old Testament itself (Ezek. xiv, 14–20) as well known before the Chaldæan exile. Others, with less plausibility, urge what they deem imitations of various sentiments and even passages of Job in the ante-exilian prophets, e. g. Jer. xx, 14, comp. with Job iii (see Küper, *Jeremias librorum sacrorum interpres atque vindex*, p. 164 sq.); Lam. ii, 16, comp. Job xvi, 13; Lam. iii, 7, 9, comp. Job xix, 8; Isa. xl, 2, comp. Job i (and x, 17; xiv, 14); Isa. li, 9, comp. Job xxvi, 13, Isa. xix, 5, comp. Job xiv, 11; Psa. cvii, 42, comp. Job v, 16. (2.) The absence of *those* Chaldaisms in Job which occur in books written about the time of the captivity. (3.) The poetical character of the book, which is wholly different from the declining style of the later period.

The most complete statement of the reasons in support of the opinion that the book of Job was written between the age of Moses and the Exile may be found in Richter's essay, *De Ætate Jobi definienda*, reprinted in Rosenmüller's edition of Lowth's *Prælectiones de Poesi Sacra Hebræorum*, in which he maintains that it was written in the age of Solomon. Most of these reasons, indeed, are either not conclusive at all, or not quite cogent. Thus it is an arbitrary assumption, proved by modern researches to be erroneous, that the art of writing was unknown previous to the age of Moses. The assertion, too, that the marks of cultivation and refinement observable in our book belonged to a later age rests on no historical ground. Further, it cannot be said that for such an early time the language is too smooth and neat, since in no Shemitic dialect is it possible to trace a progressive improvement. The evident correspondence also between our book and the Proverbs and Psalms is not a point proving with resistless force that they were all written at the same time. Nor is it altogether of such a kind that the authors of the Proverbs and Psalms (comp. especially Psa. xxxix, 13, with Job vii, 19; xiv, 6; x, 20, 21; vii, 8, 21, in the Hebrew Bible), can be exactly said to have copied our book; but it may be accounted for by their all belonging to the same class of writings, by the very great uniformity and accordance of religious conceptions and sentiments expressed in the Old Testament, and by the stability of its religious character. The striking coincidence, in particular, observable between the eulogy of "wisdom" contained in Job xxviii and the numerous similar didactic strains found in the writings of Solomon (comp. especially Prov. iii, iv), may be accounted for by the above supposition that this chapter was added by a later hand than the author of the rest of the book, or at least as a sequel to the traditional part of the poem.

The traditionary view of the authorship of the book of Job ascribes it to Moses; the arguments in favor of this view have been collected by Spanheim, and may be seen with replies in Wemyss (*Life and Times of Job*, p. 82 sq.). The following leading points are deserving of consideration: (1.) There is in the book of Job no direct reference to the Mosaic legislation; and its descriptions and other statements are suited to the period of the patriarchs; as, for instance, the great authority held by old men, the high age of Job, and fathers offering sacrifices for their families—which leads to the supposition that when our book was written no sacerdotal order yet existed. Nor is this ignoring of all the most interesting objects and associations of Judaism fully explainable on the ground of the author's desire to base the question

at issue wholly on religious consciousness and experience; for many of the incidents of Jewish and even patriarchal history were too apposite to his topic to be passed over (e. g. the overthrow of Pharaoh and the destruction of the cities of the plain), unless we suppose a degree of studied impersonation at variance with the naturalness and practical aims of Scripture. (2.) The language of the book of Job seems strongly to support the opinion of its having been written as early as the time of Moses. It has often been said that no writing of the Old Testament may be more frequently illustrated from the Arabic than this book. Jerome observes (*Præfat. in Dan.*), "Jobum cum Arabica lingua plurimam habere societatem;" and Schultens proved this so incontrovertibly that Gesenius was rather too late in denying the fact (see his *Geschichte der Hebräischen Sprache*, p. 33). Now, from this character of its language we might be induced to infer that the work was written in the remotest times, when the separation of the dialects had only begun, but had not yet been completed. It is true that this peculiarity of idiom is not such as to be of itself conclusive as to the date; and it might even have been to some extent assumed in order to correspond with the foreign garb of the poem. It also contains some Aramaisms and other signs of degeneracy; but these (unless attributable to copyists) may easily be accounted for by the supposition of a later *editorship* merely. (3.) The Jewish tradition of the authorship of Moses (see Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* p. 323; comp. Tobit ii, 12; Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* ix, 25), although not entirely uniform, seems to have been firmly established at an early period; and, lightly as it has been treated by some (see Dr. Davidson, in the new ed. of Horne's *Introd.* ii, 727), still affords the only writer of sufficient note to whom the work has ever been definitely ascribed. The facilities enjoyed by Moses during his quiet sojourn in Midian were greater perhaps than those of any other Hebrew author for such a production; and the contemplations of his active and well-stored mind may have furnished as ample a motive for the task as can be found at any other period, or in the case of any other writer to whom the book has been assigned, even if no special outward occasion can be shown to have led to the literary effort at that time. This date, moreover, is precisely such as to admit the incorporation of Jewish theology without its history, and affords a locality where all the elements of the poem were at hand. (4.) The period in which Job himself lived is a distinct question from that of the age in which the book was written, it being only necessary (on the supposition of the reality of the narrative) to locate the author subsequently to the times of his hero, and under such circumstances as to suggest the topic. The ante-Mosaic date of Job's life is evident from his longevity (probably two centuries and a half, xlii, 16, 17—where the Sept. expressly gives his total age as 240 years, assigning, however, 170 of these as preceding his affliction), which seems to mark him as contemporary with Peleg, Reu, or Serug (B.C. 2414-2122), as well as from the primitive character of his social relations, which are similar to those of Abraham (B.C. 2163-1988). His country could not have been far from the Sinaitic peninsula. See Uz. There is thus found to be a reasonable presumption in favor of the Mosaic authorship of this book, so far as time and place are concerned, while there is no internal evidence decidedly opposed to the tradition in its favor. Our conclusion, as being the most probable combination of all the facts in the case, is that, as a recitative poem in a rudimentary form, it was originally framed in Job's age (by that romance style of composition spontaneous with Orientals), and that, in its Arabic dress, it was gathered by Moses from the lips of the Midianitish bards during his residence among them; that it was first composed by him in the Hebrew language, but not reduced to its present complete form till considerably later, perhaps by Solomon. This progressive kind of authorship is vindicated by the fact that other epics have come down to us through similar stages of heroic legend, oral preservation, collection, formal composition, and editorship, and is even illustrated in the origin of other less obscurely traceable books of the Bible. See GENESIS. (5.) In defence of the theory that the book was written during the Assyrian invasion, B.C. cir. 700, see the introduction to Merx's *Buch Job* (Jena, 1870).

V. *Integrity of the Book.*—It is satisfactory to find that the arguments employed by those who impugn the authenticity of considerable portions of this book are, for the most part, mutually destructive, and that the most minute and searching investigations bring out the most convincing proofs of the unity of its composition, and the coherence of its constituent parts. One point of great importance is noted by the latest and one of the most ingenious writers (M. E. Rénan, *Le Livre de Job*, Par. 1859) on this subject. After some strong remarks upon the inequality of the style, and appearance of interpolation, M. E. Rénan observes (p. xliv): "The Hebrews, and Orientals in general, differed widely from us in their views about composition. Their works never have that perfectly defined outline to which we are accustomed, and we should be careful not to assume interpolations or alterations (*retouches*) when we meet with defects of sequence which surprise us." He then shows that in parts of the work, acknowledged by all critics to be by one hand, there are very strong instances of what Europeans might regard as repetition, or suspect of interpolation: thus Elihu recommences his argument four times; while discourses of Job, which have distinct portions, such as to modern critics might seem unconnected and even misplaced, are impressed with such a character of sublimity and force as to leave no doubt that they are the product of a single inspiration. To this just and true observation it must be added that the assumed want of coherence and of logical consistency is, for the most part, only apparent, and results from a radical difference in the mode of thinking and enunciating thought between the old Eastern and modern European.

1. Objections have been made to the introductory and concluding chapters (1.) on account of the style. Of course there is an obvious and natural difference between the prose of the narrative and the highly poetical language of the colloquy. Yet the best critics now acknowledge that the style of these portions is quite as antique in its simple and severe grandeur as that of the Pentateuch itself (to which it bears a striking resemblance: see above, and comp. Lee, *Job*, p. 49), or as any other part of the book, while it is as strikingly unlike the narrative style of all the later productions of the Hebrews. Ewald says with perfect truth, "These prosaic words harmonize thoroughly with the old poem in subject-matter and thoughts, in coloring and in art: also in language, so far as prose can be like poetry." (2.) It is said, again, that the doctrinal views are not in harmony with those of Job. This is wholly unfounded. The fundamental principles of the patriarch, as developed in the most solemn of his discourses, are identical with those maintained throughout the book. The form of worship belongs essentially to the early patriarchal type: with little of ceremonial ritual, without a separate priesthood, thoroughly domestic in form and spirit. The representation of the angels, and their appellation, "sons of God," peculiar to this book and to Genesis, accord entirely with the intimations in the earliest documents of the Shemitic race. (3.) It is, moreover, alleged that there are discrepancies between the facts related in the introduction, and statements or allusions in the dialogue. But the apparent contradiction between xix, 17 and the statement that all Job's children had perished rests upon a misinterpretation of the words בְּנֵי בִטְנִי, "children of my womb," i. e. "of the womb that bare me"—"my brethren," not "my children" (compare iii, 10): indeed, the destruction of the patriarch's whole family is repeatedly assumed in the dialogue (e. g. viii, 4; xxix, 5). Again, the omission of all reference to the defeat

of Satan in the last chapter is quite in accordance with the grand simplicity of the poem (Schlottmann, p. 39, 40). It was too obvious a result to need special notice, and it had, in fact, been accomplished by the steadfast faith of the patriarch even before the discussions commenced. No allusion to the agency of that spirit was to be expected in the colloquy, since Job and his friends are represented as wholly ignorant of the transactions in heaven. At present, indeed, it is generally acknowledged that the entire work would be unintelligible without these portions. (4.) The single objection (Rénan, p. 40) which presents any difficulty on the ground of anachronism is the mention of the Chaldæans in the introductory chapter. It is certain that they first appear in Hebrew history about the year B.C. 770. But the name of Chesed, the ancestor of the race, is found in the genealogical table in Genesis (xxii, 22), a fact quite sufficient to prove the early existence of the people as a separate tribe. It is highly probable that an ancient race bearing that name in Kurdistan (see Xenoph. *Cyr.* iii, 1, 34; *Anab.* iv, 3, 4; v, 5, 17) was the original source of the nation, who were there trained in predatory habits, and accustomed, long before their appearance in history, to make excursions into the neighboring deserts, a view quite in harmony with the part assigned to them in this book.

2. Strong objections are made to the passage chap. xxvii, from ver. 7 to the end of the chapter. Here Job describes the ultimate fate of the godless hypocrite in terms which some critics hold to be in direct contradiction with the whole tenor of his arguments in other discourses. Dr. Kennicott, whose opinion is adopted by Eichhorn, Froude, and others, held that, owing to some confusion or omission in the MS., the missing speech of Zophar has been put into the mouth of Job. The fact of the contradiction is denied by able writers, who have shown that it rests upon a misapprehension of the patriarch's character and fundamental principles. He had been provoked under circumstances of peculiar aggravation into statements which at the close of the discussion he would be anxious to guard or recall: he was bound, having spoken so harshly, to recognise, what, beyond doubt, he never intended to deny, the general justice of divine dispensations even in this world. Moreover, he intimates a belief or presentiment of a future retribution, of which there are no indications in any other speaker (see ver. 8). The whole chapter is thoroughly *coherent:* the first part is admitted by all to belong to Job; nor can the rest be disjoined from it without injury to the sense. Ewald says, "Only a grievous misunderstanding of the whole book could have misled the modern critics who hold that this passage is interpolated or misplaced." Other critics have abundantly vindicated the authenticity of the passage (Hahn, Schlottmann, etc.). As for the style, E. Rénan, a most competent authority in a matter of taste, declares that it is one of the finest developments of the poem. It certainly differs exceedingly in its breadth, loftiness, and devout spirit from the speeches of Zophar, for whose silence satisfactory reasons have already been assigned (see the analysis). This last argument, however, applies rather to chap. xxviii, which may, without any impeachment of the integrity of the poem, be regarded as an embellishment representing the times and sentiments of the final editor (i. e. Solomon).

3. The last two chapters of the address of the Almighty have been rejected as interpolations by many, of course rationalistic, writers (Stuhlman, Bernstein, Eichhold, Ewald, Meier), partly because of an alleged inferiority of style, partly as not having any bearing upon the argument; but the connection of reasoning, involved, though, as was to be expected, not drawn out, in this discourse, has been shown in the preceding analysis; and as for the style, few who have a true ear for the resonant grandeur of ancient Hebrew poetry will dissent from the judgment of E. Rénan, whose suggestion, that it may have been written by the same author at a later date, is far from weakening the force of his observation as to the identity of the style.

4. The speech of Elihu presents greater difficulties, and has been rejected by several rationalists, whose opinion, however, is controverted not only by orthodox writers, but by some of the most sceptical commentators. The former support their decision on the apparent, and, to a certain extent, the real difference between this and other parts of the book in tone of thought, in doctrinal views, and, more positively, in language and general style. Much stress also is laid upon the facts that Elihu is not mentioned in the introduction nor at the end, and that his speech is unanswered by Job, and unnoticed in the final address of the Almighty. These points were observed by very early writers, and were accounted for in various ways. On the one hand, Elihu was regarded as a specially inspired person (Schlottmann, p. 53). In the *Seder Olam* (a rabbinical system of chronology) he is reckoned among the prophets who declared the will of God to the Gentiles before the promulgation of the law. S. Bar-Nachman (12th century) notes his connection with the family of Abraham as a sign that he was the fittest person to expound the ways of God. The Greek fathers generally follow Chrysostom in attributing to him a superior intellect, while many of the best critics of the last two centuries consider that the true dialectic solution of the great problems discussed in the book is to be found in his discourse. On the other hand, Jerome, who is followed by Gregory, and many ancient as well as modern writers of the Western Church, speak of his character and arguments with singular contempt. Later critics, chiefly rationalists, see in him but an empty babbler, introduced only to heighten by contrast the effect of the last solemn and dignified discourse of Job. The alternative of rejecting his speech as an interpolation was scarcely less objectionable, and has been preferred by Stuhlman, Bernstein, Ewald, Rénan, and other writers of similar opinions in other countries. A candid and searching examination, however, leads to a different conclusion. It is proved (see Schlottman, *Einl.* p. 55) that there is a close internal connection between this and other parts of the book. There are references to numerous passages in the discourses of Job and his friends, so covert as only to be discovered by close inquiry, yet, when pointed out, so striking and natural as to leave no room for doubt. Elihu supplies exactly what Job repeatedly demands—a confutation of his opinions, not merely produced by an overwhelming display of divine power, but by rational and human arguments, and proceeding from one not, like his other opponents, bigoted and hypocritical, but upright, candid, and truthful (comp. xxxiii, 3, with vi, 24, 25). The reasonings of Elihu are moreover such as are needed for the development of the doctrines inculcated in the book, while they are necessarily cast in a form which could not without irreverence be assigned to the Almighty. As to the objection that the doctrinal system of Elihu is in some points more advanced than that of Job or his friends, it may be answered, first, that there are no traces in this discourse of certain doctrines which were undoubtedly known at the earliest date to which those critics would assign the interpolation, whereas it is evident that if known they would have been adduced as the very strongest arguments for a warning and consolation. No reader of the Psalms and of the Prophets could have failed to urge such topics as the resurrection, the future judgment, and the personal advent of Messiah. Secondly, the doctrinal system of Elihu differs rather in degree than in kind from that which has been either developed or intimated in several passages of the work, and consists chiefly in a specific application of the mediatorial theory, not unknown to Job, and in a deeper appreciation of the love manifested in all providential dispensations. It is quite consistent with the plan of the writer, and with the admirable skill shown in the arrangement of the whole work, that the highest view as to the object of afflictions, and to the

source to which men should apply for comfort and instruction, should be reserved for this, which, so far as regards the human reasoners, is the culminating point of the discussion. Little can be said for Lightfoot's theory that the whole work was composed by Elihu, or for E. Rénan's conjecture that this discourse may have been composed by the author in his old age; yet these views imply an unconscious impression that Elihu is the fullest exponent of the truth. It is satisfactory to know that two of the most impartial and discerning critics (Ewald and Rénan), who unite in denying this to be an original and integral portion of the work, fully acknowledge its intrinsic excellence and beauty.

There is no difficulty in accounting for the omission of Elihu's name in the introduction. No persons are named in the book until they appear as agents, or as otherwise concerned in the events. Thus Job's brethren are named incidentally in one of his speeches, and his relatives are, for the first time, in the concluding chapter. Had Elihu been mentioned at first, we should of course have expected him to take part in the discussion, and the impression made by his startling address would have been lost. Job does not answer him, nor, indeed, could he deny the cogency of his arguments, while this silence brings out a curious point of coincidence with a previous declaration of the patriarch (vi, 24, 25). Again, the discourse, being substantially true, did not need correction, and is therefore left unnoticed in the final decision of the Almighty. Nothing, indeed, could be more in harmony with the ancient traditions of the East than that a youth, moved by a special and supernatural impulse to speak out God's truth in the presence of his elders, should retire into obscurity when he had done his work. More weight is to be attached to the objection resting upon diversity of style and dialectic peculiarities. The most acute critics differ indeed in their estimate of both, and are often grossly deceived (see Schlottmann, p. 61); still, there can be little doubt as to the fact. It may be accounted for either on the supposition that the author adhered strictly to the form in which tradition handed down the dialogue—in which case the speech of a Syrian might be expected to bear traces of his dialect—or that the Chaldaic forms and idioms, which are far from resembling later vulgarisms or corruptions of Hebrew, and occur only in highly poetic passages of the oldest writers, are such as peculiarly suit the style of the young and fiery speaker (see Schlottmann, *Einl.* p. 61). It has been observed, and with apparent truth, that the discourses of the other interlocutors have each a very distinct and characteristic coloring, shown not only in the general tone of thought, but in peculiarities of expression (Ewald and Schlottmann). The excessive obscurity of the style, which is universally admitted, may be accounted for in a similar manner. A young man speaking under strong excitement, embarrassed by the presence of his elders and by the peculiar responsibility of his position, might be expected to use language obscured by repetitions, and, though ingenious and true, yet somewhat intricate and imperfectly developed arguments, such as, in fact, present great difficulties in the exegesis of this portion of the book.

VI. *Commentaries.*—The following is a list of the exegetical helps on the whole book exclusively, the most important being designated by an asterisk [*] prefixed: Origen, *Selecta* (in *Opp.* ii, 499); also *Scholia* (in *Bibl. Patr.* Gallandii, xiv); Anon. *Commentarius* (in Origen's *Opp.* ii, 850); Athanasius, *Excerpta* (in *Opp.* I, ii, 1003); Jerome, *Commentarius* (in *Opp. Suppos.* xi, 566); Philippus, *Expositio* (in Jerome's *Opp. Spur.* iii, 833; also in Bede's *Opp.* iv; also Basil. 1527, fol.), Augustine, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* iii, 823); Chrysostom, *Homiliæ* (in *Opp. Spur.* vi, 681); Ephrem Syrus, *Scholia* (in Syriac, in *Opp.* iii, 1–20); Gregory, *Moralia* (in *Opp.* i, 1; also translation in English, Oxford, 1844–50, 4 vols. 8vo); Olympiodorus, etc., *Catena* (Lugdunum, 1586, 4to; London, 1657, folio); Bruno Astensis, *In Jobum* (in *Opp.* i); Rupert, *In Jobum* (in *Opp.* i, 1034); Peter of Blois, *Compendium* (in *Opp.* iii, 19); Aquinas, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* i; also Ven. 1505, fol.; Rom. 1562, 4to), Bañolas (i. e. Ralbag), פֵּרוּשׁ (Ferrara, 1477, 4to; with various supercomments, Naples, 1486, 4to; and in Bomberg's Rabbinic Bibles); Arama, מֵאִיר (Salonica, 1517, folio; Riva da Trento, 1562, 4to; Ven. 1567, 4to); Bugenhagen, *Adnotationes* (Argent. et Basil. 1526, 8vo); Bucer, *Commentaria* (Argent. 1528, folio); Œcolampadius, *Exegemata* (Basil. 1531, fol., 1533, 1536, 4to; Genev. 1532, 1553, 1578, fol.; in French, Genev. 1562, 4to); Borrhäus, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1532, Basil. 1539, 1544, Genev. 1590, fol.); Cajetan, *Commentarius* (Rom. 1535, folio); Is. ben-Salmon (ha-Kohen), פֵּרוּשׁ (Constantin. 1545, 4to); Titelmann, *Elucidatio* (Paris, 1548, 1550, 8vo; 1553, 12mo; Lugd. 1554, Antw. 1566, 12mo); Ferus, *Explicatio* (Col. 1558, 1574, Lugdun. 1567, 8vo); Lutzius, *Adnotationes* (Basil. 1559, 1563, 8vo); Calvin, *Sermons* (in French, Genev. 1563, 1611, fol.; in Lat. ib. 1569, 1593, fol. [also in *Opp.* iii]; in Engl., Lond. 1584, fol.; in Germ., Herb. 1587, 4 vols. 4to); Strigel, *Scholia* (Lipsiæ, 1566, 1571, 1575, 8vo); Steuch, *Enarrationes* (Ven. 1567, 4to); Fobian (Mos. b.-El.), תַּרְגּוּם, etc. (modern Greek in Heb. characters, Constantinople, 1576, 4to); Ibn-Jaish (Bar. ben-Is.), מְקוֹר בָּרוּךְ [includ. Eccles.] (Constant. 1576, fol.); Marloratus, *Expositio* (Genev. 1581, 4to); De Huerga, *Commentaria* [on ch. i–xviii, includ. Cant.] (Complut. 1582, fol.); Beza, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1583, 1589, 1599, 4to); Stunica, *Commentaria* (Tolet. 1584, Romæ, 1591, 4to); Lavater, *Conciones* (Tigur. 1585, fol.); Rollock, *Commentarius* (Geneva, 1590, 8vo); Duran (Sim. ben-Zemach), אוֹהֵב מִשְׁפָּט (Venice, 1590, 4to; also in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible); Farissol (Abr. b.-Mard.), פֵּרוּשׁ (in the Rabbinic Bibles); Mord. b.-Jacob (of Cracow), פֵּרוּשׁ (Prague, 1597, 4to); *De Pineda [Roman Cath.], *Commentarii* (Madrit. 1597–1601, 2 vols. folio: Colon. 1600, 1605, 1685, Antwp. 1609, Venet. 1619, 1709, Ursel. 1627, Paris, 1631, Lugdun. 1701, fol.); Alschech, חֶלְקַת מְחוֹקֵק (Venice, 1603, 4to; Jesnitz, 1722, fol.); Feuardentius, *Homiliæ* [on prose parts] (Par. 1606, fol.); Strack, *Predigten* (Cassel, 1607, 4to); Humfry, *Dialogue* (Lond. 1607, 4to); Joannes a Jesu Maria, *Paraphrasis* (Rom. 1611, 4to), Piscator, *Commentarius* (Herb. 1612, 8vo); De Pineda, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1613, 1701, fol.); Rühlich, *Predigten* (Wittenb. 1617, 3 vols. 4to); Janson, *Enarratio* (Lovan. 1623, 1643, folio); Quarles, *Meditations* (London, 1624, 4to); Sanctius, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1625, folio; Lips. 1712, 4to); Olearius, *Predigten* (Lpz. 1633, 1665, 1672, 4to); Drusius, *Scholia* (Amsterd. 1636, 4to; also in *Crit. Sac.*); Diodati, *Explications* [includ. Psa., etc.] (in French, Genev. 1638, 4to); Vavassor, *Metaphrasis* (Par. 1638, 12mo, 1679, 8vo; Francf. 1654, 4to); Bolducius, *Commentaria* (Par. 1638, 2 vols. fol.); Abbott, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1640, 4to); Cocceius, *Diagrammata* (Franec. 1644, fol.; also in *Opp.* i); Corderius, *Elucidatio* (Antw. 1646, 1656, fol.); Schultetus, *Analysis* (Stet. 1647, Francf. 1684, fol.); Sennault, *Paraphrase* (London, 1648, 4to); Meiern, *Commentarii* [including Prov., etc.] (L. B. 1651, fol.); Codurcus, *Scholia* (Paris, 1651, 4to); Caryl, *Exposition* (London, 1651, 1664, 1694, 6 vols. 4to; 1666, 1677, 2 vols. fol.); Witzleben, *Jobi gens* (Sorae, 1656, 4to); Leigh, *Adnotationes* [including other poet. books] (Lond. 1657, fol.); Durham, *Exposition* (London, 1659, 8vo); Chemnitz, *Persona Jobi* (Jen. 1665, 4to, and since); Brenius, *Notæ* (transl. by Cuper, Amst. 1666, 4to); Zeller, *Auslegung* (Hamb. 1667, 4to); Spanheim, *Historia* (Genev. 1670, 4to; L. B. 1672, 8vo); Mercer, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1673, L. Bat. 1651, folio); Hack, *Postill* (Hamb. 1674, 4to); Hottinger, *Analysis* (Tigur. 1679, 8vo); *Seb. Schmidt, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1680, 1690, 1705, 4to); Fabricius, *Predigten* (Norimb. 1681, 4to); Patrick, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1685, 8vo); Clark, *Exercitations* [poetical] (Edinb. 1685, fol.); Van Hoecke, *Uytlegging* (Leyd. 1697, 4to); Hutcheson, *Lectures* (London,

1699, fol.); Blackmore, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1700, folio); Antonides, *Verklaaring* (Leyd. 1700, 4to; in Germ. F. a. M. 1702, 4to); Stisser, *Predigten* (Lpz. 1704, 4to); Isham, *Notes* [includ. Prov., etc.] (Lond. 1706, 8vo); Kortüm, *Anmerk.* (Lipsiæ, 1708, 4to); Daniel, *Analysis* (in French, Leyd. 1710, 12mo); Ob. ben-J. Sphorno, מִשְׁפַּט צֶדֶק (in the Rabb. Bibles and in Duran's Comment.; in Latin, Gotha, 1713–14, 3 vols. 4to); Egard, *Erläuterung* (Halle, 1716, 4to); Michaelis, *Notæ* (Halle, 1720, 4to); Scheuchzer, *Naturwissensch.*, etc. (Zür. 1721, 4to); Distel, *De salute uxoris Jobi* (Alt. 1722, 4to); Is. ben-Salomon Jabez, יִרְאַת שַׁדַּי (in the Amst. Rabb. Bible, 1724); Von der Hardt, *In Jobum* (vol. i, Helmst. 1728, fol. [vol. ii never appeared, having been, it is said, consigned to the flames by the author himself as absurd]); Crinsoz, *Notes* (in French, Rotterd. 1729, 4to); Hardouin, *Paraphrase* (in French, Par. 1729, 12mo); Duguet, *Explication* [mystical] (Par. 1732, 4 vols. 12mo); Anon. *Explication* (in French, Par. 1732, 2 vols. 12mo); Fenton, *Annotations* [includ. Psa.] (London, 1732, 8vo); Hoffmann, *Erklärung* (Hamb. 1734, 4to); S. Wesley, *Dissertationes* (Lond. 1736, fol.); Vogel, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1757, 2 vols. 4to; abridged, ibid. 1773, 8vo); *Schultens, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1737, 2 vols. 4to), also *Animadversiones* (Tr. ad Rh. 1708, 8vo), and *Observationes* (Amst. 1748, 8vo); abridged by Grey (Lond. 1741, 8vo) and by Vogel (Hal. 1773–4, 2 vols. 8vo); Baumgarten, *Auslegung* (pt. i, Hal. 1740, 4to); Oetinger, *Anmerkung.* (F. a. M. 1743, 8vo); Koch, *Anmerkung.* (Lemg. 1743–7, 3 vols. 4to); Bahrdt, *Erklärung* (Lipsiæ, 1744, 4to); Bellamy, *Paraphrase* (Lond. 1748, 4to); Reinhard, *Erklär.* (Lpz. 1749–50, 2 vols. 4to); Hodges, *Scope*, etc. (London, 1750, 4to, 1756, 8vo; Dubl. 1758, 8vo); Garnet, *Dissertation* (Lond. 1751, 4to); Chappelow, *Paraphrase* (Camb. 1752, 2 vols. 4to); Heath, *Essay* (London, 1755, 4to; ib. 1756, 4to); Peters, *Dissertation* [against Warburton] (Lond. 2d ed. 1757, 8vo); Boullier, *Observationes* (Amst. 1758, 8vo); Stuss, *De Epopœa Jobœa* (Gotha, 1758, 4to); Ceruti, *Giobbo* (Rome, 1764, 1773, 8vo); J. Uri-Scheraga, אֵשׁ בֵּית יַעֲקֹב (F. a. O. 1765, fol.); Sticht, *De colloquio Dei cum Satana* (Altona, 1766, 4to); Grynæus, *Anmerkung.* (Basel, 1767, 4to); Froriep, *Ephraemiana in J.* (Lipsiæ, 1769, 8vo); Cube, *Uebers.* (Berl. 1769–71, 3 vols. 8vo); Meintel, *Erklärung* (Nürnb. 1771, 4to), also *Metaphrasis* (ibid. 1775, 4to); Scott, *Remarks* (London, 1771, 4to, 1773, 8vo); Anon. *Hist. of Job* (Lond. 1772, 8vo); Dresler, *Erläut.* [on parts] (Herb. 1773, 8vo); Eckermann *Umschreibung* (Lüb. 1778, 4to); also *Animadversiones* (ibid. 1779, 8vo); Reiske, *Conjecturæ* [includ. Proverbs] (Lips. 1779, 8vo); Dessau, מְשַׁר דָּבָר (Berl. 1779, 4to); Sander, *Hiob* (Lpz. 1780, 8vo); Moldenhauer, *Uerbersetz.* (Lpz. 1780–1, 2 vols. 8vo); Hufnagel, *Anmerk.* (Erlang. 1781, 8vo); Kessler, *Anmerkung.* (Tübingen, 1784, 8vo); Schnurrer, *Animadversiones* [on parts] (Tüb. 1787 sq., 2 pts. 4to); Greve, *Notæ* [on last ch.] (Davent. 1788, 4to); Dathe, *Notæ* [includ. Prov., etc.] (Hal. 1789, 8vo); Ilgen, *Natura Jobi* (Lipsiæ, 1789, 8vo); Heins, *Anmerk.* (in Danish, Kiöbenh. 1790, 8vo); Ab. Wolfssohn, תַּרְגּוּם (Prague, 1791, Vienna, 1806, 8vo); Bellermann, *Num sit liber J. historia* (Erf. 1792, 4to); also *De Jobi indole* (ib. 1793, 4to); also *Ueber d. Plan Hiob* (Berlin, 1813, 8vo); Muntinghe, *Anmerk.* (in Dutch, Amster. 1794, 8vo); in Germ., Lpz. 1797, 8vo); Jacobi, *Annotationes* [on parts] (Jen. 1795, 8vo); Garden, *Notes* (Lond. 1796, 8vo); Bergius, *Exercitationes* (Upsala, 1796, 8vo); Pape, *Versuch* (Götting. 1797, 8vo); Wheelden, *Delineation*, etc. (Lond. 1799, 8vo); Block, *Uebers.* (Ratzeb. 1799, Hamb. 1804, 8vo); Riedel, *Gesänge* (Pressb. 1799, 8vo); Satanow, תַּרְגּוּם, etc. (Berlin, 1799, 8vo); Richter, *De ætate Jobi* (Lipsiæ, 1799, 4to); Eichhorn, *Uebers.* (Lpz. 1800, 8vo; also in his *Biblioth.* iv, 10 sq.); Kern, *Inhalt*, etc. (in Bengel's *Archiv*, viii, 352 sq.); also *Observationes* (Tüb. 1826, 4to); Stuhlmann, *Erläut.* (Hamburg, 1804, 8vo); Stock, *Notes* (Bath, 1805, 8vo); Ottensosser, תַּרְגּוּם, etc. (Offenb. 1807 [?], 8vo); Pareau, *De immortalitate*, etc. (Davent. 1807, 8vo); Polozk (Pinch. ben-Jeh.), גְּבִעַ פִּרְחִם (Wilna, 1808, 4to); Gaab, *Hiob* (Tüb. 1809, 8vo); Elizabeth Smith [ed. Randolph], *Annotations* (London, 1810, 8vo); *Good, *Notes* (Lond. 1812, 8vo); G. H. Bernstein, *Zweck*, etc. (in Keil's *Analekten*, 1813, I, iii, 1–137); Neumann, *Charakteristik*, etc. (Bresl. 1817, 4to); Middeldorpf, *Syr.-hexapl.* etc. (Vratisl. 1817, 4to); Bridel, *Commentaire* (in part only, Paris, 1818, 8vo); Schärer, *Erläut.* (Bern, 1818–20, 2 vols. 8vo); Jäger, *De integritate*, etc. (Tüb. 1820, 8vo); Autenrieth, *Hiob* (Tüb. 1823, 8vo); Melsheimer, *Anmerk.* (Mannh. 1823, 8vo); *Umbreit, *Ausleg.* (Heidelb. 1824, 1832, 8vo; in Engl., Edinb. 1836–7, 2 vols. 12mo); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lipsiæ, 1824, 8vo); Hrubieszow, בֵּאוּרִים (Lemberg, 1824, 1834, Warsaw, 1838, 8vo); Hunt, *Translation* (Bath, 1825, 8vo); Levasseur, *Traduction* (Par. 1826, 8vo); Blumenfeld, *Comment.* (in Heb., Vienna, 1826, 8vo); Fry, *Exposition* (Lond. 1827, 8vo); Böcksel, *Erläut.* (Hamb. 1830, 8vo); Köster, *Uebers.* [includ. Eccles.] (Schleswig, 1831, 8vo); G. Lange, *Uebers.* (Halle, 1831, 8vo); Petri, *Commentationes* (Brunsw. 1833, 4to); Sachs, *Charakt.*, etc. (in *Stud. und Krit.* 1834, p. 910 sq.); Jeitteles, תַּרְגּוּם, etc. (Vienna, 1834, 8vo); Knobel, *De Jobi argumento* (Vratisl. 1835, 8vo); Arnheim, *Commentar* (Glog. 1836, 8vo); *Ewald, *Erklär.* (Gött. 1836, 8vo); Fockens, *De Jobeide* (Zütphen, 1836, 8vo); *Lee, *Commentary* (Lond. 1837, 8vo); Anon. *Paraphrase* [poetical, on last 10 ch.] (Lond. 1838, 8vo); Dessauer, תַּרְגּוּם, etc. (Pressb. 1838, 8vo); Holzhausen, *Uebers.* (Gött. 1839, 8vo); Hölscher, *Uebers.* (Osnab. 1839, 8vo); Laurens, *Traduction* [includ. Psalms] (Par. 1839, 8vo); *Wemyss, *Job's Times* (Lond. 1839, 8vo); *Hirzel, *Erklär.* (Lpz. 1839, ed. Olshausen, 1852, ed. Dillmann, 1864, 8vo); Justi, *Erläuter.* (Kassel, 1840, 8vo); Jenour, *Translation* (London, 1841, 8vo); *Vaihinger, *Erläuter.* (Stuttg. 1842, 1856, 8vo); Stickel, *Bemerk.* (Lpzg. 1842, 8vo); J. Wolfson, *Erläut.* (Lpzg. 1843, 8vo); Gleiss, *Beiträge* (Hamb. 1845, 8vo); Polak, *Ijjob* (in Dutch, Amst. 1845, 8vo); Tattam, *Tr. from Coptic* (London, 1846, 8vo); Heiligstedt, *Comment.* (in new ed. of Maurer, Lips. et Berl. 1847, 8vo); Welte, *Erklär.* (Freib. 1849, 8vo); Hahn, *Commentar* (Berlin, 1849, 8vo); *Noyes, *Notes* (Bost. 1850, 1854, 1867, 12mo); Barnes, *Notes* (N. Y. and Lond. 1850, 1854, 2 vols. 12mo); *Schlottmann, *Erläut.* (Berlin, 1851, 8vo); Mercier, *Commentarius* [including Prov.] (Lugd. 1651, fol.); Froude, *Job* (in the *Westminster Rev.* 1853; reprinted in *Short Studies*, London, 1858); Kempe, *Lectures* (London, 1855, 12mo); Evans, *Lectures* (London, 1856, 8vo); Krahmer, *Hiob* (in the *Theol. Literaturbl.* 1856); *Hengstenberg, *Hiob* (Berl. 1856, 1870 sq., 8vo); Anonym. *Illustrations* (Lond. 1856, 8vo); *Conant, *Job* (in public. of American Bible Union, N. Y. 1856, 4to and 12mo); Carey, *Explanation* (Lond. 1858, 8vo); *Ebrard, *Erläut.* (Land. 1858, 8vo); C. H. Bernstein, *Bar-Hebræi Scholia* (Vratislav, 1858, 8vo); Berkholz, *Hiob* (Riga, 1859, 8vo); *Rénan, *Livre de Job* (Paris, 1859, 1860, 8vo); Crelier, *Livre de Job* [against Rénan] (Par. 1860, 8vo); Hupfeld, *Bedeutung*, etc. (in the *Zeitschr. f. Christ. Wissensch.* Aug. and Sept. 1860); Wagner, *Sermons* (Lond. 1860, 8vo); Simson, *Kritik* (Königsberg, 1861, 4to); Leroux, *Traduction* (Par. 1861, 8vo); Davidson, *Commentary* (vol. i, Lond. 1862, 8vo); Odiosus, *Erläut.* (Berlin, 1863, 8vo); Croly, *Job* (Lond. 1863, 8vo); Bernard, *Job* (vol. i, Lond. 1864, 8vo); Rodwell, *Translation* (London, 1864, 8vo); *Delitzsch, *Commentar* (Lpz. 1864, 8vo; in English, Edinb. 1866, 2 vols. 8vo); Mourad, *Oversalt.* (Kjobenh. 1865, 8vo); Mathes, *Verklaaring* (Utrecht, 1866, 2 vols. 8vo); Reuss, *Vortrag* (Strassb. 1869, 8vo); Anon. *Notes* (Lond. 1869, 4to); Volk, *Summa*, etc. (Dorpat, 1870, 4to). See POETRY.

JOB'S DISEASE. The opinion that the malady under which Job suffered was *elephantiasis*, or black leprosy, is so ancient that it is found, according to Origen's *Hexapla*, in the rendering which one of the Greek

versions has made of ii, 7. It was also entertained by Abulfeda (*Hist. Anteisl.* p. 26), and, in modern times, by the best scholars generally. The passages which are considered to indicate this disease are found in the description of his skin burning from head to foot, so that he took a potsherd to scrape himself (ii, 7, 8); in its being covered with putrefaction and crusts of earth, and being at one time stiff and hard, while at another it cracked and discharged fluid (vii, 5); in the offensive breath, which drove away the kindness of attendants (xix, 17); in the restless nights, which were either sleepless or scared with frightful dreams (vii, 13, 14; xxx, 17); in general emaciation (xvi, 8); and in so intense a loathing of the burden of life that strangling and death were preferable to it (vii, 15). In this picture of Job's sufferings the state of the skin is not so distinctly described as to enable us to identify the disease with elephantiasis in a rigorous sense. The difficulty is also increased by the fact that שְׁחִין (*shechin'*, a *sore*, Sept. ἕλκος) is generally rendered "boils." But that word, according to its radical sense, only means *burning, inflammation*—a hot sense of pain, which, although it attends boils and abscesses, is common to other cutaneous irritations. Moreover, the fact that Job scraped himself with a potsherd is irreconcilable with the notion that his body was covered with boils or open sores, but agrees very well with the thickened state of the skin which characterizes the disease. See LEPROSY.

2. (יוֹב, *Yob;* if genuine, perh. *returning*, from יוּב = אוּב; Sept. Ἰασούβ, Vulg. *Job.*) The third-named of the four sons of Issachar (Gen. xlvi, 13), elsewhere called JASHUB (Numb. xxvi, 24; 1 Chron. vii, 1), for which this is probably an erroneous transcription.

Job OF RUSTOFF, first patriarch of the Russo-Greek Church, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. We have already had occasion to refer to the circumstances under which Russia succeeded in establishing an independent patriarchate in her dominions in the biographical sketch of the Greek patriarch Jeremiah (q. v.). This important event took place in 1589, and was solemnly confirmed by the Constantinopolitan patriarch in a synod of the Greek Church held in 1592. The act was also confirmed in 1619 by Theophil, the patriarch of Jerusalem. By the other Oriental patriarchs Job was recognised as the fifth patriarch of the orthodox Church. Of his personal history we are ignorant. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 291; Stanley, *East. Church*, p. 435, 436; Strahl, *Russ-Kirchengesch.* i, 619. See GREEK CHURCH, vol. iii, p. 984, col. 2.

Jo'bab (Heb. *Yobab'*, יוֹבָב, probably dweller in the *desert*, from the Arabic; Sept. Ἰωβάβ, but in 1 Chron. i, 23, τὸν Εὐὶ καὶ τὸν Ὠράμ, v. r. simply Ἰωάβ), the name of several men.

1. The last-named of the sons of Joktan, and founder of a tribe in Arabia (Gen. x, 29; 1 Chron. i, 23), B.C. post 2414. Bochart compares (*Phaleg*, ii, 29) the *Jobaritæ* (Ἰωβαρῖται) of Ptolemy (vi, 7, 24), a people on the eastern coast of Arabia, near the Socalitæ, which, after Salmasius, he supposes to be for *Jobabitæ;* so also Michaelis (*Spicileg.* ii, 303; *Supplem.* 1043).

2. Son of Zerah of Bozrah, king of Edom after Bela and before Husham (Gen. xxxvi, 33, 34; 1 Chron. i, 44, 45), B.C. prob. long ante 1617. The supposition that he was identical with the patriarch Job rests only upon the apocryphal addition to the book of Job in the Sept., and is utterly unworthy of credit. See JOB.

3. The Canaanitish king of Madon, one of those whose aid Jabin invoked in the struggle with the Israelites (Josh. xi, 1), B.C. 1617.

4. The first-named of the sons of Shaharaim by one of his wives, Hodesh or Baara, of the tribe of Benjamin, although apparently born in Moab (1 Chron. viii, 9), B.C. cir. 1612.

5. One of the "sons" of Elpaal, a chief of Benjamin, at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 18), B.C. probably cir. 588.

Joceline, bishop OF BATH AND WELLS. See JOHN (*king of England*).

Joceline OF SALISBURY, a prelate of the early English Church, flourished from 1142 to 1184. In the controversy of Thomas à Becket with King Henry II on investitures, he played no unimportant part, for he sided with the king in this great ecclesiastical war, and thus fell under the displeasure of the archbishop. See INVESTITURE. The latter, in accordance with his indomitable spirit, soon found a pretext to impress his inferior with his power at Rome by condemning Joceline for his assent to the royal election or appointment of John of Oxford to the deanery of Salisbury, notwithstanding the archbishop's prohibition. Joceline adhering to his former course, Becket pronounced excommunication against the rebellious prelate, and this act was approved shortly after by pope Alexander III (1166). Of course the bishop remained in his place, but he encountered many difficulties from the subordination of inferior ecclesiastics, as in the case of the monks of Malmesbury about 1180 (comp. Inett, *Hist. Engl. Ch.* ii, ch. xv, § 19). See ENGLAND, CHURCH OF.

Joch, JOHANN GEORG, a German theologian, born at Rotenburg, in Franconia, in 1685, became professor of theology at Wittenberg, and died in 1731. To him belongs the credit of having been the first to assert the superiority of practical Christianity over the then prevailing pietism, in the principal stronghold of Lutheran theology, the *cathedra Lutheri* of Wittenberg. While yet at Jena, the centre of pietism in the beginning of the 18th century, he was, both as a student and as private tutor, one of the disciples of Spener, and an ardent pietist; but when he became superintendent of the gymnasium of Dortmund, where dogmatics and polemics alone filled the churches and the halls of learning, Joch turned his attention to the subjects of conversion and second birth. He was of course involved in a controversy, but he seems to have been quite successful, for in 1726 he was made a professor of theology at Wittenberg.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v. See Augusti, *Der Pietismus in Jena*, etc. (Jena, 1837); Göbel, *Gesch. d. Christl. Lebens in d. rh.-westph. ev. Kirche.*

Jochanan BAR-NAPACHA, a distinguished rabbi, was born in Judæa about A. D. 170. He is said to have studied under Judah Hakkodesh and other Jewish teachers, and is believed to have formed a school of his own at Tiberias when quite a youth. His history, like that of all other distinguished rabbis of that period, has been so intermingled with extraordinary legends that it is well-nigh impossible to arrive at anything definite concerning his life. So much appears certain, that he lived to a very old age, instructing very nearly to his last hour (in 279). He is by some Hebraists supposed to have collected all the works written on the Jerusalem Talmud (q. v.); but this seems unreasonable. See J. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, ii, 94, 99; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iv, 285 sq. See JUDAH HAK-KODESH. (J. H. W.)

Jochanan BEN-ZACHAI, a Jewish rabbi of some note, and contemporary of the celebrated Gamaliel II, whom he succeeded in the patriarchal dignity, was born about B.C. 50. But little is known of his personal history. He is said to have been a decided peace man, and to have greatly discouraged any revolutionary efforts of his suffering countrymen. This may account for the esteem in which he was held at the court of Vespasian, who was always found ready to oblige his Jewish friend. Jochanan Ben-Zachai is regarded as the restorer of Jewish learning and scholastic habits after the destruction of the Temple, by the founding of a school at Jabneh, and a new sanhedrim, of which he was the first president, thus presenting to the unfortunate and dispersed race another centre in place of the lately-destroyed capital. How long he served his people at Jabneh is not well known; Grätz inclines to put it at about ten years (comp. Frankel, *Monatsschrift* [1852, p. 201 sq.]). He

died about A.D. 70. For details, see Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv, ch. i; Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, v, 15 sq.; ix, 95 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jochanan OF GISCHALA. See JOHN OF GISCHALA.

Joch'ebed (Heb. *Yoke'bed*, יוֹכֶבֶד, *Jehovah* is her *glory;* Sept. Ἰωχαβέδ or Ἰωχάβεδ), the wife of Amram, and mother of Miriam, Aaron, and Moses (Numb. xxvi, 59). B.C. 1738. In Exod. vi, 20 she is expressly declared to have been the sister of Amram's father, and consequently the aunt of her husband. As marriage between persons thus related was afterwards forbidden by the law (Lev. xviii, 12), various attempts have been made to show that the relationship was more distant than the text in its literal meaning indicates. But the mere mention of the relationship implies that there was something remarkable in the case. The fact seems to be, that where this marriage was contracted there was no law forbidding such alliances, but they must in any case have been unusual, although not forbidden; and this, with the writer's knowledge that they were subsequently interdicted, sufficiently accounts for this one being so pointedly mentioned. The candor of the historian in declaring himself to be sprung from a marriage afterwards forbidden by the law, delivered through himself, deserves especial notice.—Kitto. In Numb. xxvi, 59, Jochebed is stated to have been "the daughter of Levi, whom her mother bore to Levi in Egypt," from which it likewise appears that she was literally the sister of Kohath, Levi's son and Amram's father (Exod. vi, 16, 18. On the chronology, see Brown's *Ordo Sæclorum*, p. 301). The courage and faith of this tender mother in braving Pharaoh's edict by her ingenious secretion and subsequent exposure of the infant Moses (Exod. ii, 1-10) are alluded to with commendation by the apostle (Heb. xi, 23), and were signally rewarded by divine providence; to her pious example and precepts the future lawgiver doubtless owed much of that integrity which so eminently characterized him. See MOSES.

Jo'da (Ἰωδά), a corrupt form (1 Esdr. v, 58) of the name of JUDAH (q. v), the Levite (Ezra iii, 9).

Jo'ëd (Heb. *Yoëd'*, יוֹעֵד, *Jehovah* is his *witness;* Sept. Ἰωάδ), son of Pedaiah, father of Meshullam, and grandfather of Sallu, which last was one of the Benjamites who resided in Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh. xi, 7). B.C. considerably ante 538.

Jo'ël (Heb. *Yoël'*, יוֹאֵל, *Jehovah* is his *God;* Sept. and N. T. Ἰωήλ), the name of at least twelve men.

1. The oldest of the two sons of Samuel, appointed by him as judges in Beer-sheba, where their maladministration led to the popular desire for a monarchy (1 Sam. viii, 2). See SAMUEL. In 1 Chron. vi, 28, by a clerical error, he is called VASHNI (q. v.). B.C. cir. 1094. He appears to have been the father of Heman, the Levitical singer (1 Chron. vi, 33; xv, 17).

2. A descendant of Reuben (but by what line does not appear), and father of Shemaiah or Shema, several incidents in the history of whose posterity are related (1 Chron. v, 4, 8). B.C. considerably ante 1092.

3. Brother of Nathan of Zobah, and one of David's famous warriors (1 Chron. xi, 38); called IGAL (q. v.) in the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii, 36).

4. The third named of the four sons of Izrahiah, a chieftain of the tribe of Issachar (1 Chron. vii, 3). B.C. prob. cir. 1017.

5. A chief Levite of the family of Gershom, at the head of 130 Temple servitors (1 Chron. xv, 7, 11); probably the same with the third of the "sons" of Laadan (1 Chron. xxiii, 8), and also with the son of Jehiel, who, with Zetham his brother, had charge of the "treasures of the house of the Lord" (1 Chron. xxvi, 22). B.C. 1042.

6. Son of Pedaiah, and prince of the half-tribe of Manasseh west (1 Chron. xxvii, 20). B.C. 1014.

7. Son of Pethuel, and second of the twelve minor prophets (Joel i, 1). His history is only known from the contents of the book that bears his name.

JOEL, BOOK OF. I. *Personal Circumstances.*—1. *Birthplace.*—Pseudo-Epiphanius (ii, 245) records a tradition that the prophet Joel was of the tribe of Reuben, born and buried at Bethhoron (v. r. Bethoim, etc.), between Jerusalem and Cæsarea. It is most likely that he lived in Judæa, for his commission was to Judah, as that of Hosea had been to the ten tribes (Jerome, *Comment. in Joel.*). He exhorts the priests, and makes frequent mention of Judah and Jerusalem (i, 14; ii, 1, 15, 32; iii, 1, 12, 17, 20, 21). It has been made a question whether he were a priest himself (Winer, *Realw.*), but there do not seem to be sufficient grounds for determining it in the affirmative, though some recent writers (e. g. Maurice, *Prophets and Kings*, p. 189) have taken this view.

2. *Date.*—Various opinions have been held respecting the period in which Joel lived. It appears most probable that he was contemporary with Amos and Isaiah, and delivered his predictions in the reign of Uzziah, B. C. cir. 800. This is the opinion maintained by Abarbanel, Vitringa, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Holzhausen, and others (see D. H. v. Kölln, *Diss. de Joel ætate*, Marb. 1811; Jäger, in the *Tübing. theol. Zeitschr.* 1828, ii, 227). Credner (*Joel*, p. 38 sq.), with whom agree Movers (*Chron.* 119 sq.), Hitzig (*Kleine Proph.* p. 4), and Meier (*Joel*, p. 16 sq.), places him in the time of Joash; Bertholdt (*Einleit.* iv, 1604) in that of Hezekiah; Cramer and Eckermann in Josiah's reign; Jahn (*Einl.* ii, 476) in Manasseh's; and Schröder still later; while some have placed him during the Babylonian captivity (Steudel, in Bengel's *Archiv*, ii, 232), and even after it (Vatke, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 462). The principal reason for the above conclusion, besides the order of the books (the Sept., however, places Joel after Amos and Micah), is the special and exclusive mention of the Egyptians and Edomites as enemies of Judah, no allusion being made to the Assyrians or Babylonians, who arose at a later period.

II. *Contents.*—We find, what we should expect on the supposition of Joel being the first prophet to Judah, only a grand outline of the whole terrible scene, which was to be depicted more and more in detail by subsequent prophets (Browne, *Ordo Sæcl.* p. 691). The scope, therefore, is not any particular invasion, but the whole day of the Lord. "This book of Joel is a type of the early Jewish prophetical discourse, and may explain to us what distant events in the history of the land would expand it, and bring fresh discoveries within the sphere of the inspired man's vision" (Maurice, *Prophets and Kings*, p. 179). The proximate event to which the prophecy related was a public calamity, then impending on Judæa, of a twofold character: want of water, and a plague of locusts, continuing for several years. The prophet exhorts the people to turn to God with penitence, fasting, and prayer, and then, he says, the plague shall cease, and the rain descend in its season, and the land yield her accustomed fruit—nay, the time will be a most joyful one; for God, by the outpouring of his Spirit, will impart to his worshippers increased knowledge of himself, and, after the excision of the enemies of his people, will extend through them the blessings of true religion to heathen lands. Browne (*Ordo Sæcl.* p. 692) regards the contents of the prophecy as embracing two visions, but it is better to consider it as one connected representation (Hengstenberg, Winer). For its interpretation we must observe not isolated facts of history, but the *idea.* The swarm of locusts was the medium through which this idea, "the ruin upon the apostate Church," was represented to the inward contemplation of the prophet; but, in one unbroken connection, the idea goes on to penitence, return, blessing, outpouring of the Spirit, judgments on the enemies of the Church (1 Pet. iv, 17), final establishment of God's kingdom. All prior destructions, judgments, and victories are like the smaller circles, the final consummation of all things, to which the prophecy reaches, being the outmost one of

all. There are thus four natural divisions of the entire book.

1. The prophet opens his commission by announcing an extraordinary plague of locusts, accompanied with extreme drought, which he depicts in a strain of animated and sublime poetry under the image of an invading army (i, 1-ii, 11). The fidelity of his highly-wrought description is corroborated and illustrated by the testimonies of Shaw, Volney, Forbes, and other eminent travellers, who have been eye-witnesses of the ravages committed by this most terrible of the insect tribe. See LOCUST. It is to be observed that locusts are named by Moses as instruments of the divine justice (Deut. xxviii, 38, 39), and by Solomon in his prayer at the dedication of the Temple (1 Kings viii, 37). In the second chapter the formidable aspect of the locusts, their rapid progress, their sweeping devastation, the awful murmur of their countless throngs, their instinctive marshalling, the irresistible perseverance with which they make their way over every obstacle and through every aperture, are delineated with the utmost graphic force (Justi, *Die Heuschrecken-Verwüstung Joel ii*, in Eichhorn's *Bibliothek*, iv, 30-79). Dr. Hengstenberg calls in question the reality of their flight, but, as it appears to us, without adequate reason. Other particulars are mentioned which literally can apply only to locusts, and which, on the supposition that the language is allegorical, are explicable only as being accessory traits for filling up the picture (Davidson, *Sacred Hermeneutics*, p. 310).

Maurice (*Prophets and Kings*, p. 180) strongly maintains the literal interpretation of this judgment. Yet the plague contained a parable in it which it was the prophet's mission to unfold (comp. "heathen," i, 6). Hence a figurative interpretation was adopted by an early paraphrast, Ephrem the Syrian (A.D. 350), who supposes that by the four different denominations of the locusts were intended Tiglath-pileser, Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar. The Jews, in the time of Jerome (A.D. 400), understood by the first term the Assyrians and Chaldæans; by the second, the Medes and Persians; by the third, Alexander the Great and his successors, and by the fourth, the Romans. By others, however, the prophecy was interpreted literally, and Jerome himself appears to have fluctuated between the two opinions, though more inclined to the allegorical view. Grotius applies the description to the invasions by Pul and Shalmaneser. Holzhausen attempts to unite both modes of interpretation, and applies the language literally to the locusts, and metaphorically to the Assyrians. It is singular, however, that, if a hostile invasion be intended, not the least hint is given of personal injury sustained by the inhabitants; the immediate effects are confined entirely to the vegetable productions and the cattle. Dr. Hengstenberg, while strongly averse from the literal sense, is not disposed to limit the metaphorical meaning to any one event or class of invaders. "The enemy," he remarks, "are designated only as *north countries.* From the north, however, from Syria, all the principal invasions of Palestine proceeded. We have, therefore, no reason to think exclusively of any one of them; nor ought we to limit the prophecy to the people of the old covenant. Throughout all centuries there is but one Church of God existing in unbroken connection. That this Church, during the first period of its existence, was concentrated in a land into which hostile irruptions were made from the north was purely accidental. To make this circumstance the boundary-stone of the fulfilment of prophecy were just as absurd as if one were to assert that the threatening of Amos, 'By the sword shall all sinners of my people die,' has not been fulfilled in those who perished after another manner" (*Christology*, Keith's translation, iii, 104). In accordance with the literal (and certainly the primary) interpretation of the prophecy, we should render אֶת־הַמּוֹרֶה as in our A. V., "the former rain," with Rosenmüller and the lexicographers, rather than "a (or the) teacher of righteousness," with margin of A. V., Hengstenberg, and others. The allusion to the Messiah which Hengstenberg finds in this word, or to the ideal teacher (Deut. xviii, 18), of whom Messiah was the chief, scarcely accords with the immediate context.

2. The prophet, after describing the approaching judgments, calls on his countrymen to repent, assuring them of the divine placability and readiness to forgive (ii, 12-17). He foretells the restoration of the land to its former fertility, and declares that Jehovah would still be their God (ii, 18-26; comp. Müller, *Anmerk. üb. ii*, 16, in *Brem. and Verd. Biblioth.* ii, 161).

3. The אַחֲרֵי־כֵן of iii, 1 in the Hebrew, "afterwards," ii, 27 of the A. V., raises us to a higher level of vision, and brings into view Messianic times and scenes (comp. Tyschen, *Illustratio vaticinii Joelis iii* [Gött. 1788]; Steudel, *Disq. in Joelis iii* [Tübing. 1820]). Here, says Steudel, we have a Messianic prophecy altogether. If this prediction has ever yet been fulfilled, we must certainly refer the event to Acts ii. The best commentators are agreed upon this. We must not, however, interpret it thus to the exclusion of all reference to preparatory events under the earlier dispensation, and still less to the exclusion of later Messianic times. Acts ii virtually contained the whole subsequent development. The outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost was the ἀπαρχή, while the full accomplishment and the final reality are yet to come. But here both are blended in one, and the whole passage has therefore a double aspect (see Dresde, *Proph. Joelis de effusione Sp. S.* [Witt. 1782]). The passage is well quoted by Peter from the first prophet to the Jewish kingdom. His quoting it shows that the Messianic reference was the prevailing one in his day, though Acts ii, 39 proves that he extended his reference to the end of the dispensation. The expression "all flesh" (Acts ii, 17) is explained by the following clauses, by which no principle of distribution is meant, but only that all classes, without respect of persons, will be the subjects of the Spirit's influences. All distinction of races, too, will be done away (comp. Joel ii, 32 with Rom. x, 12, 13).

4. Lastly, the accompanying portents and judgments upon the enemies of God (ch. iii, A. V.; iv, Heb.), and their various solutions, according to the interpreters, in the repeated deportations of the Jews by neighboring merchants, and sale to the Macedonians (1 Macc. iii, 41; Ezek. xxvii, 13), followed by the sweeping away of the neighboring nations (Maurice); in the events accompanying the crucifixion, in the fall of Jerusalem, in the breaking up of all human polities. But here again the idea includes all manifestations of judgment, ending with the last. The whole is shadowed forth in dim outline, and, while some crises are past, others are yet to come (comp. iii, 13-21 with Matt. xxiv and Rev. xix). See DOUBLE SENSE.

III. The style of Joel, it has been remarked, unites the strength of Micah with the tenderness of Jeremiah. In vividness of description he rivals Nahum, and in sublimity and majesty is scarcely inferior to Isaiah and Habakkuk (Conz, *Diss. de charactere poetico Joelis* [Tüb. 1783]). "Imprimis est elegans, clarus, fusus, fluensque; valde etiam sublimis acer, fervidus" (Lowth, *De Sacra Poesi Hebr.* Præl. xxi). Many German divines hold that Joel was the *pattern* of all the prophets. Some say that Isaiah ii, 2-4; Micah iv, 1-3, are direct imitations of him. Parts of the New Test. also (Rev. ix, 2 sq.; xiv, 18) are pointed out as passages in his style.

The *canonicity* of this book has never been called in question.

IV. *Commentaries.*—The special exegetical helps on the book of Joel as a whole are the following, to the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Ephrem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in Syr., in *Opp.* v, 249); Hugo à St. Victor, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* i); Seb. Münster, *Commentarius* (Aben-Ezra's, Basil. 1530, 8vo); Luther, *Enarratio* [brief, with Amos and Obadiah] (Argent. 1536, 8vo); also *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1547, 4to; both in German,

Jen. 1553, 4to; and, together with *Sententiæ*, in *Opp.* iii, 497; iv, 781, 821); Seb. Tuscan, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1556, fol.); Topsell, *Commentarius* (London, 1556, 1613, 4to; also in Engl. ib. 1599, 4to); Mercier, *Commentarius* [on first five minor proph.] (Paris, s. a. fol.; Lugd. 1621, 4to); Genebrard, *Adnotationes* (from Aben-Ezra and others, Paris, 1563, 4to); Draconis, *Explicatio* [with Micah and Zech.] (Vitemb. 1565, fol.; and later separately); Selnecker, *Anmerkungen* (Lpz. 1578, 4to); Schadæus, *Synopsis* (Argent. 1588, 4to); Matthias, *Prælectiones* (Basil. 1590, 8vo); Simonis, *Joel propheta* (Cracov. 1593, 4to); Bunny, *Enarratio* (Lond. 1583, 1595, 8vo); Bonerus, *Paraphrasis* (F. ad O. 1597, 4to); Wolder, *Diexodus* (Vitemb. 1605, 4to); Gesner, *Comment.* (Vitemb. 1614. 8vo); Tarnovius, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1627, 4to); Ursinus, *Commentarius* (Francf. 1641, 8vo); Strahl, *Erklär.* (Wittenb. 1650, 4to); Leusden, *Explicatio* [Rabbinical, includ. Obad.] (Ultraj. 1657, 8vo); De Veil, *Commentarius* (Par. 1676, 8vo); *Pocock, *Commentary* (Oxf. 1691, fol.; in Latin, Lipsiæ, 1695, 4to); Hase, *Analysis* (Brem. 1697, 4to); *Van Toll, *Vitlegginge* (Utrecht, 1700, 4to), Schurrmann, *Schaubühne* (Wesel, 1700, 4to; in Dutch, ib. 1703, 4to); Zierold, *Auslegung* [mystical] (Francfort, 1720, 4to); J. A. Turretin, in his *De S. S. Interpretatione*, p. 307–45 (ed. Teller, Tr. ad Rh. 1728, 8vo); Chandler, *Commentary* (Lond. 1735, 4to); Richter, *Animadversiones* (Vitemb. 1747, 8vo), Baumgarten, *Auslegung* (Halle, 1756, 4to); Cramer, *Commentarius* (in his *Scyth. Denkm.* Kiel and Hamb. 1777–8, p. 143–245); Couz, *Dissertatio*, etc. (Tüb. 1783, 4to); Büttner, *Joel vates* (Coburg, 1784, 8vo); Eckermann, *Erklärung* (Tüb. u. Lpz. 1786, 8vo); Justi, *Erläuterung* (Lpz. 1792, 8vo); Wiggers, *Erklärung* (Gött. 1799, 8vo); Horsley, *Notes* (in *Bibl. Crit.* ii, 390); M. Philippson, מִנְחַת בְּחוּרָה [including Hos.] (Dessau, 1805, 8vo); Swanborg, *Notæ* (Upsala, 1806, 8vo); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (in vol. vii, pt. i, Lipsiæ, 1827, 8vo); Schröder, *Anmerk.* [includ. other poet. books] (in *Harfenklänge*, etc., Hildsh. 1827, 8vo; also separately, Lpz. 1829, 8vo); Holzhausen, *Weissagung*, etc. (Götting. 1829, 8vo); *Credner, *Erklärung* [Rationalistic] (Halle, 1831, 8vo); *Meier, *Erklärung* (Tüb. 1844, 8vo); Robinson, *Homilies* (Lond. 1865, 8vo). See PROPHETS, MINOR.

8. A chief of the Gadites, resident in Bashan (1 Chron. v, 12). B.C. cir. 782.

9. A Levite, son of Uzziah or Azariah, and father of Elkanah, of the family of Kohath (1 Chron. vi, 36), and one of those who co-operated with Hezekiah in his restoration of the Temple services (2 Chron. xxix, 12). B.C. 726. In 1 Chron. vi, 24 he is called SHAUL by an evident error of transcribers.

10. A descendant of Simeon, apparently one of those whose enlarging families compelled them to emigrate to the valley of Gedor, whose aboriginal inhabitants they expelled (1 Chron. iv, 35). B.C. cir. 712.

11. Son of Zichri, and præfect of the Benjamites resident at Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh. xi, 9). B.C. 536.

12. One of the "sons" of Nebo, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezra, x, 43). B.C. 459.

Joë'lah (Heb. *Yoëlah'*, יוֹעֵאלָה, derivation uncertain; Sept. Ἰωηλά v. r. Ἰελία, Vulg. *Joëla*), one of the two sons of Jeroham of Gedor, mentioned along with the brave Benjamite archers and others who joined David's fortunes at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 7). B.C. 1055.

Joë'zer (Heb. *Yoë'zer*, יוֹעֶזֶר, *Jehovah* is his *help*; Sept. Ἰοζαάρ v. r. Ἰωζαρά), one of the Korhites who reinforced David while at Ziklag, and remained among his famous body-guard (1 Chron. xii, 6). B.C. 1055.

Joga. See HINDUISM; VISHNU.

Jog'behah (Heb. *Yogbah'*, יָגְבְּהָה, only with ה paragogic, יָגְבְּהָה, *lofty*; Sept. Ἰεγεβαά, but ὕψωσαν αὐτάς in Numb.; Vulg. *Jegbaa*), a place mentioned (between Jazer and Beth-nimrah) among the "fenced cities and folds for sheep" rebuilt by the Gadites (Numb. xxxii, 35). It lay on the route of Gideon when pursuing the nomadic Midianites, near Nobah, beyond Penuel, in the direction of Karkor (Judg. viii, 11). These notices correspond sufficiently with the locality of the ruined village El-*Jebeiha* (Robinson's *Researches*, iii, Append. p. 168), laid down on Robinson's and Zimmerman's maps on the edge of the desert east of Jebel el-Fukeis.

Jogee. See YOGEE.

Jog'li (Heb. *Yogli'*, יָגְלִי, *exiled;* Sept. Ἰεκλί), the father of Bukki, which latter was the Danite commissioner for partitioning the land of Canaan (Numb. xxxiv, 22). B.C. ante 1618.

Jogues, or **Yugs**, is a name among the Hindus for periods of extraordinary length spoken of in their mythological chronology.

Jo'ha (Heb. *Yocha'*, יוֹחָא, probably contracted for יוֹחִיָּה, whom *Jehovah revives*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ἰωαζαί v. r. Ἰωζαί.) A person mentioned as a Tizite, along with his brother Jediael, the son of Shimri, among David's famous body-guard (1 Chron. xi, 45). B.C. 1046.

2. (Sept. Ἰωαχά v. r. Ἰωδά.) The last-named among the Benjamite chiefs, descendants of Beriah, resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 16). B.C. apparently 588 or 536.

Joha'nan (Heb. *Yochanan'*, יוֹחָנָן, a contracted form of the name JEHOHANAN; comp. also JOHN), the name of several men. See also JEHOHANAN, 3, 4, 6.

1. (Sept. Ἰωνάν v. r. Ἰωανάν.) The eighth of the Gadite braves who joined David's band in the fastness of the desert of Judah (1 Chron. xii, 12). B.C. cir. 1061.

2. (Sept. Ἰωανάν.) One apparently of the Benjamite slingers and archers who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 4). B.C. 1055.

3. (Sept. Ἰωανάς v. r. Ἰωανάν, Ἰωνάς.) Son of Azariah and father of Azariah, high-priests (1 Chron. vi, 9, 10, where perhaps an erroneous repetition of names has occurred). He is thought by some to have been the same with JEHOIADA (2 Chron. xxiv, 15). Josephus, however (*Ant.* x, 8, 6), seems to call him JORAM, and the *Seder Olam* JEHOAHAZ, whom it places in the reign of Jehoshaphat. See HIGH-PRIEST.

4. (Sept. Ἰωανάν.) The oldest son of king Josiah (1 Chron. iii, 15). He must have been born in the fifteenth year of his father's age, and he seems to have been of so feeble a constitution as not to have survived his father. B.C. cir. 635–610. See JEHOAHAZ, 2.

5. (Sept. Ἰωνά, in Jer. Ἰωάναν and Ἰωάνναν; Josephus Græcizes the name as *John*, Ἰωάννης, *Ant.* x, 9, 2). The son of Careah (Kareah), and one of the Jewish chiefs who rallied around Gedaliah on his appointment as governor by the Chaldæans (2 Kings xxv, 23; Jer. xl, 8). It was he that warned Gedaliah of the nefarious plans of Ishmael, and offered to destroy him in anticipation, but the unsuspecting governor refused to listen to his prudent advice (Jer. xl, 13, 16). After Gedaliah's assassination, Johanan pursued the murderer, and rescued the people taken away by him as captives to the Ammonites (Jer. xli, 8, 13, 15, 16). He then applied to Jeremiah for counsel as to what course the remnant of the people should pursue, being apprehensive of severe treatment at the hands of the Chaldæan authorities, as having interfered with the government (Jer. xlii, 1, 8); but, on hearing the divine injunction to remain in the land, he and his associates violated their promise of obedience, and persisted in retiring, with all their families and effects (carrying with them the prophet himself), to Tahpanes, in Egypt (Jer. xliii, 2, 4, 5), where, doubtless, they were seized by the Chaldæans. B.C. 587.

6. (Sept. Ἰωάναν.) Son of Katan (Hakkatan), of the "sons" of Azgad, who returned with 110 males from Babylon with Ezra (Ezra viii, 12). B.C. 459.

7. (Sept. Ἰωάναν.) A son of Tobiah, who named Meshullam's daughter (Neh. vi, 18). B.C. 446.

8. (Sept. Ἰωανάν.) A chief priest, son (? grandson) of Eliashib, named as last of those whose contemporaries

the Levites were recorded in "the book of the Chronicles" (Neh. xii, 22, 23). He appears to be the same called JEHOHANAN (in the text, but "Johanan" in the Auth. Vers.) in Ezra x, 6; also JONATHAN, the son of Joiada and father of Jaddua, in Neh. xii, 11; comp. 22. B.C. prob. 459.

9. (Sept. Ἰωανάμ.) The fifth named of the seven sons of Elioenai, of the descendants of Zerubbabel (1 Chron. iii, 24). He is apparently the same with the NAHUM mentioned among the ancestry of Christ (Luke iii, 25. See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gosp.* p. 16, 17). B.C. somewhat post 406. See GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

Johan'nès (Ἰωαννῆς, the Greek form of the name *John* or *Jehohanan*) occurs in this form in the A. V. of two men in the Apocrypha.

1. A son of Acatan (1 Esdr. viii, 38); the JOHANAN of Ezra viii, 12.

2. A "son" of Bebai (1 Esdr. ix, 29); the JEHOHANAN of Ezra x, 28.

Johannites. See KNIGHTS OF MALTA.

Johlsohn, J. JOSEPH, a Jewish scholar of some renown, was born in Fulda in 1777. Being the son of a rabbi, he was instructed from his early youth in the language and literature of the Old Testament, in which he became a great adept. When quite young, he left his native place and went to Frankfort-on-the-Main, where he engaged in private tuition, pursuing himself, at the same time, an extended course of study in languages and metaphysics. Later he removed to Kreuznach, and became professor of Hebrew, etc., in a public academy, but was called back in 1813 by the government to the professorial chair of Hebrew and religion in the Jewish academy at Frankfort, known as the "Philantropin." Johlsohn's activity in this once-renowned capital of the German empire fell in a time marked in Jewish annals as a period of agitation. The reform movement [see JUDAISM], which shortly after developed more fully, was just budding, and he, partaking more or less of that spirit, earnestly labored for the introduction of sermons in the vernacular, hours of devotion on the Christian Sabbath, etc. To further encourage this awakening of a religious spirit, especially in the young, he published (1) a hymn-book entitled *Gesangbuch für Israeliten* (Frkf. 1816, and often, 8vo):—also (2) a valuable work on *the fundamentals of the Jewish religion*, entitled שרשי הדת, with an Appendix describing the manners and customs of the Hebrews (Frkf. 2d ed. 1819):—(3) *A Chronological History of the Bible*, in Heb., with the moral sayings of the Scriptures, seven Psalms with Kimchi's Commentary, a Hebrew Chrestomathy with notes, and a glossary called תולדות אבות (1820; 2d ed. 1837):—(4) *The Pentateuch translated into German, with Annotations* (1831):—(5) *The sacred Scriptures of the Jews, translated into German, with Annotations* (of which only 2 vols. were ever published), vol. ii containing Joshua, Samuel, and Kings (1836):—(6) *A Hebrew Grammar for Schools*, entitled יסודי הלשון, forming a second part to the new ed. of the *Chrestomathy* (1838):—(7) *A Hebrew Lexicon*, giving also the synonymes, with an appendix containing an explanation of the abbreviations used in the Rabbinical writings, entitled ערך מלים (1840):—(8) *A historical and dogmatic Treatise on Circumcision* (1843). Johlsohn died in Frankfort June 13, 1851. See Stern, *Gesch. des Judenthums*, p. 181 sq.; *Allgem. Zeitung des Judenth.* 1851, p. 356; Kayserling (Dr. M.), *Biblioth. jüd. Kanzelredner* (Berlin, 1870), p. 382; Stein, *Israelit. Volkslehrer*, i, 140 sq.; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* ii, 99 sq.; Kitto, s. v.

John (Ἰωάννης, the Greek form of *Jehohanan;* comp. Josephus, *Ant.* viii, 15, 2), a common name among the Jews after the captivity.

I. *In the Apocrypha* the following occur under this rendering in the A. V.:

1. The father of Matathias, of the Maccabæan family (1 Macc. ii, 1). See MACCABEES.

2. The son of Accos, and father of Eupolemus, which latter was one of the envoys sent by Judas Maccabæus to Rome (1 Macc. viii, 17; 2 Macc. iv, 11).

3. Surnamed *Caddis* (q. v.), the eldest son of the same Matathias, and one of the Maccabæan brothers (1 Macc. ii, 2, *Johanan;* less correctly *Joseph* in 2 Macc. viii, 22). He had been sent by his brother Jonathan on a message to the Nabathæans, when he was taken prisoner by "the children of Jambri" (q. v.), from Medeba, and appears to have been put to death by them (1 Macc. ix, 35, 36, 38).

4. One of the persons sent by the Jews with a petition to the Syrian general Lysias (2 Macc. xi, 17).

5. The son of Simon Maccabæus (1 Macc. xiii, 53; xvi, 1, 2, 9, 19, 21, 23), better known by the epithet HYRCANUS (q. v.).

II. *In the New Testament* the following are all that are mentioned, besides JOHN THE APOSTLE and JOHN THE BAPTIST, who are noticed separately below:

1. One of the high-priest's family, who, with Annas and Caiaphas, sat in judgment upon the apostles Peter and John for their cure of the lame man and preaching in the Temple (Acts iv, 6), A.D. 29. Lightfoot identifies him with R. Johanan Ben-Zachai, who lived forty years before the destruction of the Temple, and was president of the great synagogue after its removal to Jabne, or Jamnia (Lightfoot, *Cent. Chor. Matth. praef.* ch. 15; see also Selden, *De Synedriis*, ii, ch. xv). Grotius merely says he was known to Rabbinical writers as "John the priest" (*Comm. in Act.* iv).—Smith.

2. The Hebrew name of the evangelist MARK (q. v.), who throughout the narrative of the Acts is designated by the name by which he was known among his countrymen (Acts xii, 12, 25; xiii, 5, 13; xv, 37).

III. *In Josephus* the following are the most noteworthy of this name, besides the above and JOHN OF GISCHALA, whom we notice separately below:

1. A high-priest (son of Judas, and grandson of Eliashib), who slew his brother Jesus in the Temple, thereby provoking the vengeance of Bagoses, the Persian viceroy under Artaxerxes (*Ant.* xi, 7, 1). He corresponds to the Jonathan (q. v.), son of Joiada, of Neh. xii, 10, 11. See HIGH-PRIEST.

2. Son of Dorcas, sent by the Sicarii with ten executioners to murder the persons taken into custody by John of Gischala on his arrival in Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, iv, 3, 5).

3. Son of Sosas, one of the four popular generals of the Idumæans who marched to Jerusalem in aid of the zealots at the instance of John of Gischala (Josephus, *War*, iv, 4, 2). He was possibly the same with John the Essene, spoken of as commander of the toparchy of Shamma at an earlier stage of the war (*ib.* ii, 20, 4; comp. iii, 2, 1). He was mortally wounded by a dart during the final siege (*ib.* v, 6, 5).

John (Ἰωάννης) *the Apostle*, and brother of the apostle James "the greater" (Matt. iv, 21; x, 2; Mark i, 19; iii, 17; x, 35; Luke v, 10; viii, 3; etc.).

I. *Personal History.*—1. *Early Life.*—It is probable that he was born at Bethsaida, on the Lake of Galilee. The general impression left on us by the Gospel narrative is that he was younger than the brother whose name commonly precedes his (Matt. iv, 21; x, 3; xvii, 1, etc.; but compare Luke ix, 28, where the order is inverted in most codices), younger than his friend Peter, possibly also than his Master. The life which was protracted to the time of Trajan (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii, 23, following Irenæus) can hardly have begun before the year B.C. 4 of the Dionysian æra. The Gospels give us the name of his father Zebedæus (Matt. iv, 21) and his mother Salome (comp. Matt. xxvii, 56 with Mark xv, 40; xvi, 1). Of the former we know nothing more. See ZEBEDEE. The traditions of the fourth century (Epiphan. iii, *Hær.* 78) make the latter the daughter of Joseph by his first wife, and consequently half-sister to our Lord. By some recent critics she has been iden-

tified with the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, in John xix, 25 (Wieseler, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1840, p. 648). Ewald (*Gesch. Israels*, v. 171) adopts Wieseler's conjecture, and connects it with his own hypothesis, that the sons of Zebedee, and our Lord, as well as the Baptist, were of the tribe of Levi. On the other hand, more sober critics, like Neander (*Pflanz. u. Leit.* p. 609 [4th ed.]) and Lücke (*Johannes*, i, 9), reject both the tradition and the conjecture. See SALOME. They lived, it may be inferred from John i, 44, in or near the same town as those who were afterwards the companions and partners of their children. See BETHSAIDA. There, on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, the apostle and his brother grew up. The mention of the "hired servants" (Mark i, 20), of his mother's "substance" (ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, Luke viii, 3), of "his own house" (τὰ ἴδια, John xix, 27), implies a position removed by at least some steps from absolute poverty. The fact that the apostle was known to the high-priest Caiaphas, as that knowledge was hardly likely to have begun after he had avowed himself the disciple of Jesus of Nazareth, suggests the probability of some early intimacy between the two men or their families. The name which the parents gave to their younger child was too common to serve as the ground of any special inference; but it deserves notice (1) that the name appears among the kindred of Caiaphas (Acts iv, 6); (2) that it was given to a priestly child, the son of Zacharias (Luke i, 13), as the embodiment and symbol of Messianic hopes. The frequent occurrence of the name at this period, unconnected as it was with any of the great deeds of the old heroic days of Israel, is indeed in itself significant as a sign of that yearning and expectation which then characterized not only the more faithful and devout (Luke ii, 25, 38), but the whole people. The prominence given to it by the wonders connected with the birth of the future Baptist may have imparted a meaning to it for the parents of the future evangelist which it would not otherwise have had. Of the character of Zebedæus we have hardly the slightest trace. He interposes no refusal when his sons are called on to leave him (Matt. iv, 21). After this he disappears from the scene of the Gospel history, and we are led to infer that he had died before his wife followed her children in their work of ministration. Her character meets us as presenting the same marked features as those which were conspicuous in her son. From her, who followed Jesus and ministered to him of her substance (Luke viii, 3), who sought for her two sons that they might sit, one on his right hand, the other on his left, in his kingdom (Matt. xx, 20), he might well derive his strong affections, his capacity for giving and receiving love, his eagerness for the speedy manifestation of the Messiah's kingdom. The early years of the apostle we may believe to have passed under this influence. He would be trained in all that constituted the ordinary education of Jewish boyhood. Though not taught in the schools of Jerusalem, and therefore, in later life, liable to the reproach of having no recognised position as a teacher, no Rabbinical education (Acts iv, 13), he would yet be taught to read the Law and observe its precepts, to feed on the writings of the prophets with the feeling that their accomplishment was not far off.

2. *Incidents recorded of him in the New Testament.*—The ordinary life of the fisherman of the Sea of Galilee was at last broken in upon by the news that a prophet had once more appeared. The voice of John the Baptist was heard in the wilderness of Judæa, and the publicans, peasants, soldiers, and fishermen of Galilee gathered round him. Among these were the two sons of Zebedæus and their friends. With them perhaps was One whom as yet they knew not. They heard, it may be, of John's protests against the vices of their own ruler —against the hypocrisy of Pharisees and Scribes. But they heard also, it is clear, words which spoke to them of their own sins—of their own need of a deliverer. The words "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins" imply that those who heard them would enter into the blessedness of which they spoke. Assuming that the unnamed disciple of John i, 37–40 was the evangelist himself, we are led to think of that meeting, of the lengthened interview that followed it as the starting-point of the entire devotion of heart and soul which lasted through his whole life. Then Jesus loved him as he loved all earnest seekers after righteousness and truth (comp. Mark x, 21). The words of that evening, though unrecorded, were mighty in their effect. The disciples (John apparently among them) followed their new teacher to Galilee (John i, 44), were with him, as such, at the marriage-feast of Cana (ii, 2), journeyed with him to Capernaum, and thence to Jerusalem (ii, 12, 22), came back through Samaria (iv, 8), and then, for some uncertain interval of time, returned to their former occupations. The uncertainty which hangs over the narratives of Matt. iv, 18 and Luke v, 1–11 (comp. the arguments for and against their relating to the same events in Lampe, *Comment. ad Joann.* i, 20), leaves us in doubt whether they received a special call to become "fishers of men" once only or twice. In either case they gave up the employment of their life and went to do a work like it, and yet unlike, in God's spiritual kingdom. From this time they take their place among the company of disciples. Only here and there are there traces of individual character, of special turning-points in their lives. Soon they find themselves in the number of the Twelve who are chosen, not as disciples only, but as their Lord's delegates—representatives—apostles. In all the lists of the Twelve those four names of the sons of Jonah and Zebedæus stand foremost. They come within the innermost circle of their Lord's friends, and are as the ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι. The three, Peter, James, and John, are with him when none else are, in the chamber of death (Mark v, 37), in the glory of the transfiguration (Matt. xvii, 1), when he forewarns them of the destruction of the Holy City (Mark xiii, 3, Andrew, in this instance, with them), in the agony of Gethsemane. Peter is throughout the leader of that band; to John belongs the yet more memorable distinction of being the disciple whom Jesus loved. This love is returned with a more single, undivided heart by him than by any other. If Peter is the φιλόχριστος, John is the φιλιησοῦς (Grotius, *Prolegom. in Joann.*). Some striking facts indicate why this was so; what the character was which was thus worthy of the love of Jesus of Nazareth. They hardly sustain the popular notion, fostered by the received types of Christian art, of a nature gentle, yielding, feminine. The name Boanerges (Mark iii, 17) implies a vehemence, zeal, intensity, which gave to those who had it the might of Sons of Thunder. That spirit broke out once and again when they joined their mother in asking for the highest places in the kingdom of their Master, and declared that they were ready to face the dark terrors of the cup that he drank, and the baptism that he was baptized with (Matt. xx, 20–24; Mark x, 35–41)—when they rebuked one who cast out devils in their Lord's name because he was not one of their company (Luke ix, 49)—when they sought to call down fire from heaven upon a village of the Samaritans (Luke ix, 54). About this time Salome, as if her husband had died, takes her place among the women who followed Jesus in Galilee (Luke viii, 3), ministering to him of their substance, and went up with him in his last journey to Jerusalem (Luke xxiii, 55). Through her, we may well believe, John first came to know Mary Magdalene, whose character he depicts with such a life-like touch, and that other Mary, to whom he was afterwards to stand in so close and special a relation. The fulness of his narrative of what the other evangelists omit (John xi) leads to the conclusion that he was united also by some special ties of intimacy to the family of Bethany. It is not necessary to dwell at length on the familiar history of the Last Supper. What is characteristic is that he is there, as ever, the disciple whom Jesus loved; and, as the chosen and favored friend, reclines at table with his head upon his Master's

breast (John xiii, 23). To him the eager Peter—they had been sent together to prepare the supper (Luke xxii, 8)—makes signs of impatient questioning that he should ask what was not likely to be answered if it came from any other (John xiii, 24). As they go out to the Mount of Olives the chosen three are nearest to their Master. They only are within sight or hearing of the conflict in Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi, 37). When the betrayal is accomplished, Peter and John, after the first moment of confusion, follow afar off, while the others simply seek safety in a hasty flight (John xviii, 15). The personal acquaintance which existed between John and Caiaphas enabled him to gain access both for himself and Peter, but the latter remains in the porch, with the officers and servants, while John himself apparently is admitted to the council-chamber, and follows Jesus thence, even to the prætorium of the Roman procurator (John xviii, 16, 19, 28). Thence, as if the desire to see the end, and the love which was stronger than death, sustained him through all the terrors and sorrows of that day, he followed—accompanied probably by his own mother, Mary the mother of Jesus, and Mary Magdalene—to the place of crucifixion. The teacher who had been to him as a brother leaves to him a brother's duty. He is to be as a son to the mother who is left desolate (John xix, 26-27). The Sabbath that followed was spent, it would appear, in the same company. He receives Peter, in spite of his denial, on the old terms of friendship. It is to them that Mary Magdalene first runs with the tidings of the emptied sepulchre (John xx, 2); they are the first to go together to see what the strange words meant. Not without some bearing on their respective characters is the fact that John is the most impetuous, running on most eagerly to the rock-tomb; Peter, the least restrained by awe, the first to enter in and look (John xx, 4-6). For at least eight days they continued in Jerusalem (John xx, 26). Then, in the interval between the resurrection and the ascension, we find them still together on the Sea of Galilee (John xxi, 1), as though they would calm the eager suspense of that period of expectation by a return to their old calling and their old familiar haunts. Here, too, there is a characteristic difference. John is the first to recognise in the dim form seen in the morning twilight the presence of his risen Lord; Peter the first to plunge into the water and swim towards the shore where he stood calling to them (John xxi, 7). The last words of the Gospel reveal to us the deep affection which united the two friends. It is not enough for Peter to know his own future. That at once suggests the question—"And what shall this man do?" (John xxi, 21). The history of the Acts shows the same union. They are of course together at the ascension and on the day of Pentecost. Together they enter the Temple as worshippers (Acts iii, 1), and protest against the threats of the Sanhedrim (iv, 13). They are fellow-workers in the first great step of the Church's expansion. The apostle whose wrath had been roused by the unbelief of the Samaritans overcomes his national exclusiveness, and receives them as his brethren (viii, 14). The persecution which was pushed on by Saul of Tarsus did not drive him or any of the apostles from their post (viii, 1). When the persecutor came back as the convert, he, it is true, did not see him (Gal. i, 19), but this, of course, does not involve the inference that he had left Jerusalem. The sharper though shorter persecution which followed under Herod Agrippa brought a great sorrow to him in the martyrdom of his brother (Acts xii, 2). His friend was driven to seek safety in flight. Fifteen years after Paul's first visit he was still at Jerusalem, and helped to take part in the great settlement of the controversy between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians (Acts xv, 6). His position and reputation there were those of one ranking among the chief "pillars" of the Church (Gal. ii, 9). Of the work of the apostle during this period we have hardly the slightest trace. There may have been special calls to mission-work like that which drew him to Samaria. There may have been the work of teaching, organizing, exhorting the churches of Judæa. His fulfilment of the solemn charge intrusted to him may have led him to a life of loving and reverent thought rather than to one of conspicuous activity. We may, at all events, feel sure that it was a time in which the natural elements of his character, with all their fiery energy, became purified and mellowed, rising step by step to that high serenity which we find perfected in the closing portion of his life. Here, too, we may, without much hesitation, accept the traditions of the Church as recording a historic fact when they ascribe to him a life of celibacy (Tertull. *De Monog.* c. xiii). The absence of his name from 1 Cor. ix, 5 tends to the same conclusion. It harmonizes with all we know of his character to think of his heart as so absorbed in the higher and diviner love that there was no room left for the lower and the human.

3. *Sequel of his Career.*—The traditions of a later age come in, with more or less show of likelihood, to fill up the great gap which separates the apostle of Jerusalem from the bishop of Ephesus. It was a natural conjecture to suppose that he remained in Judæa till the death of the Virgin released him from his trust. When this took place we can only conjecture. The hypothesis of Baronius and Tillemont, that the Virgin accompanied him to Ephesus, has not even the authority of tradition (Lampe, i, 51). There are no signs of his being at Jerusalem at the time of Paul's last visit (Acts xxi). The pastoral epistles set aside the notion that he had come to Ephesus before the work of the apostle of the Gentiles was brought to its conclusion. Out of many contradictory statements, fixing his departure under Claudius, or Nero, or as late even as Domitian, we have hardly any data for doing more than rejecting the two extremes. Lampe fixes A.D. 66, when Jerusalem was besieged by the Roman forces under Cestius, as the most probable date. Nor is it certain that his work as an apostle was transferred at once from Jerusalem to Ephesus. A tradition current in the time of Augustine (*Quæst. Evang.* ii, 19), and embodied in some MSS. of the New Test., represented the 1st Epistle of John as addressed to the Parthians, and so far implied that his apostolic work had brought him into contact with them. In the earlier tradition which made the apostles formally partition out the world known to them, Parthia falls to the lot of Thomas, while John receives Proconsular Asia (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii, 1). In one of the legends connected with the Apostles' Creed, Peter contributes the first article, John the second; but the tradition appears with great variations as to time and order (comp. Pseudo-August. *Serm.* ccxl, ccxli). When the form of the aged disciple meets us again, in the twilight of the apostolic age, we are still left in great doubt as to the extent of his work and the circumstances of his outward life. Assuming the authorship of the Epistles and the Revelation to be his, the facts which the New Test. writings assert or imply are: (1) that, having come to Ephesus, some persecution, local or general, drove him to Patmos (Rev. i, 9); (2) that the seven churches, of which Asia was the centre, were special objects of his solicitude (Rev. i, 11); that in his work he had to encounter men who denied the truth on which his faith rested (1 John iv, 1; 2 John 7), and others who, with a railing and malignant temper, disputed his authority (3 John 9, 10). If to this we add that he must have outlived all, or nearly all, of those who had been the friends and companions even of his maturer years—that this lingering age gave strength to an old imagination that his Lord had promised him immortality (John xxi, 23)—that, as if remembering the actual words which had been thus perverted, the longing of his soul gathered itself up in the cry, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus" (Rev. xxii, 20)—that from some who spoke with authority he received a solemn attestation of the confidence they reposed in him (John xxi, 24)—we have stated all that has any claim to the character of historical truth. The picture which tradition fills up for us has the merit of

being full and vivid, but it blends together, without much regard to harmony, things probable and improbable. He is shipwrecked off Ephesus (Simeon Metaph. *In vitâ Johann.* c. 2; Lampe, i, 47), and arrives there in time to check the progress of the heresies which sprang up after Paul's departure. Then, or at a later period, he numbers among his disciples men like Polycarp, Papias, Ignatius (Jerome, *De vir. Illust.* c. xvii). In the persecution under Domitian he is taken to Rome, and there, by his boldness, though not by death, gains the crown of martyrdom. The boiling oil into which he is thrown has no power to hurt him (Tertull. *De Præscript.* c. xxxvi). The scene of the supposed miracle was outside the Porta Latina, and hence the Western Church commemorates it by the special festival of "St. John Port. Latin." on May 6th. He is then sent to labor in the mines, and Patmos is the place of his exile (Victorinus, *In Apoc.* ix; Lampe, i, 66). The accession of Nerva frees him from danger, and he returns to Ephesus. There he settles the canon of the Gospel history by formally attesting the truth of the first three Gospels, and writing his own to supply what they left wanting (Euseb. *H. E.* iii, 24). The elders of the Church are gathered together, and he, as by a sudden inspiration, begins with the wonderful opening, "In the beginning was the word" (Jerome, *De vir. Illust.* 29). Heresies continue to show themselves, but he meets them with the strongest possible protest. He refuses to pass under the same roof (that of the public baths of Ephesus) with their foremost leader, lest the house should fall down on them and crush them (Iren. iii, 3; Euseb. *H. E.* iii, 28; iv, 14). Eusebius and Irenæus make Cerinthus the heretic. In Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxx, c. 24) Ebion is the hero of the story. To modern feelings the anecdote may seem at variance with the character of the apostle of love, but it is hardly more than the development in act of the principle of 2 John 10. To the mind of Epiphanius there was a difficulty of another kind: nothing less than a special inspiration could account for such a departure from an ascetic life as going to a bath at all. Through his agency the great temple of Artemis is at last reft of its magnificence, and even (!) levelled with the ground (Cyril. Alex. *Orat. de Mar. Virg.*; Nicephor. *H. E.* ii, 42; Lampe, i, 90). He introduces and perpetuates the Jewish mode of celebrating the Easter feast (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii, 3)—at Ephesus, if not before, as one who was a true priest of the Lord, bearing on his brow the plate of gold (πέταλον; compare Suicer. *Thes. s. v.*), with the sacred name engraved on it, which was the badge of the Jewish pontiff (Polycrates, in Eusebius, *H. E.* iii, 31; v, 24). In strange contrast with this ideal exaltation, a later tradition tells how the old man used to find pleasure in the playfulness and fondness of a favorite bird, and defended himself against the charge of unworthy trifling by the familiar apologue of the bow that must sometimes be unbent (Cassian. *Collat.* xxiv, c. 2). More true to the N.-T. character of the apostle is the story, told with so much power and beauty by Clement of Alexandria (*Quis dives*, c. 42), of his special and loving interest in the younger members of his flock—of his eagerness and courage in the attempt to rescue one of them who had fallen into evil courses. The scene of the old and loving man, standing face to face with the outlaw-chief whom, in days gone by, he had baptized, and winning him to repentance, is one which we could gladly look on as belonging to his actual life—part of a story which is, in Clement's words, οὐ μῦθος ἀλλὰ λόγος. Not less beautiful is that other scene which comes before us as the last act of his life. When all capacity to work and teach is gone—when there is no strength even to stand—the spirit still retains its power to love, and the lips are still opened to repeat, without change and variation, the command which summed up all his Master's will, "Little children, love one another" (Jerome, *in Gal.* vi). Other stories, more apocryphal and less interesting, we may pass over rapidly. That he put forth his power to raise the dead to life (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18); that he drank the cup of hemlock which was intended to cause his death, and suffered no harm from it (Pseudo-August. *Soliloq.*; Isidor. Hispal. *De Morte Sanct.* c. 73); that when he felt his death approaching he gave orders for the construction of his own sepulchre, and when it was finished calmly laid himself down in it and died (Augustin. *Tract. in Joann.* cxxiv); that after his interment there were strange movements in the earth that covered him (*ib.*); that when the tomb was subsequently opened it was found empty (Niceph. *H. E.* ii, 42); that he was reserved to reappear again in conflict with the personal antichrist in the last days (Suicer, *Thes. s. v.* Ἰωάννης)—these traditions, for the most part, indicate little else than the uncritical spirit of the age in which they passed current. The very time of his death lies within the region of conjecture rather than of history, and the dates that have been assigned for it range from A.D. 89 to A.D. 120 (Lampe, i, 92).

See Perionii *Vitæ Apostol.* p. 95 sq.; Edzard, *De Joanne Cerinthi præsentiam fugiente* (Viteb. 1732); Schwollmann, *Comment. de Jo. in Pathmo exilio* (Halle, 1757); Hering, *Von d. Schule d. Apost. Joh. zu Ephesus* (Bresl. 1774); Bishop, *Life*, etc., *of St. John* (London, 1827); Webb, *The Beloved Disciple* (Lond. 1848); Krummacher (in *Life of Cornelius*, etc.); Lee, *Life of St. John* (N.Y. 1854); Macfarlane, *The Disciple whom Jesus loved* (Lond. 1855); Kienkel, *Der Apostel Johannes* (Berlin, 1871).

II. The most prominent *traits of John's character* appear to have been an ardent temperament and a delicacy of sentiment. These combined to produce that devoted attachment to his Master which leads him to detail all his discourses and vindicate his character on all occasions. Yet, with all his mildness and amiability of temper—doubtless, in part, the fruit of divine grace, for we trace also a degree of selfishness in Mark ix, 38; x. 35—he was not altogether feminine in disposition, but possessed an energy and force of mind which gave him the title of one of the "sons of thunder" (Mark iii, 17), bursting forth in vehement language in his writings, and on one occasion calling even for rebuke (Luke ix, 54, 55). See BOANERGES. It was these traits of mind that enabled him to take so profound and comprehensive a view of the nature and office of the incarnate Son of God, evident in all his writings, and especially developed in the introduction to his Gospel.

See Von Melle, *Entwurf einer Lebensbeschreibung und Charakteristik d. Apost. Joh.* (Heidelb. 1808); Niemeyer, *Charakteristik der Bibel*, i, 303 sq.; Wernsdorf, *Meletema de Elogio filior. tonitrui* (Helmst. 1755); Obbar, *De Temperamento Joa. cholerico* (Gött. 1738); F. Trench, *Life and Character of John the Evangelist* (London, 1850); Stanley, *Sermons and Essays on the Apost. Age*, serm. iv; W. Grimm, in Ersch und Gruber's *Encycl.* sect. ii, pt. 22, p. 1 sq.; Ad. Monod, *Sermons* (*La Parole vivante*) (Par. 1858); Pressensé, *Apostolic Æra*, p. 415.

JOHN, GOSPEL OF. The fourth in order of the evangelical narratives in nearly all editions, though a few MSS. place it immediately after Matthew. See GOSPELS.

I. *Genuineness.*—There is no reason to doubt that the fourth Gospel was from the beginning received in the Church as the production of the apostle whose name it bears. We may decline to accept as a testimony for this the statement at the close of the Gospel itself (xxi, 24), for this can have the force of an independent testimony only on the supposition that the passage was added by another hand; and though there is an evident allusion in 2 Pet. i, 14 to what is recorded in John xxi, 18, 19, yet, as that saying of the Lord was one which tradition would be sure to send forth among the brethren (compare ver. 23), it cannot be inferred from Peter's allusion to it that it was then put on record as we have it in the Gospel. We may also admit that the passages in the writings of the apostolic fathers which have been adduced as evincing, on their part, acquaintance with this Gospel are not decisive. The passages usually cited for this purpose are Barnab. *Ep.* v, vi, xii (comp. John

iii, 14); Herm. *Past.* Sim. ix, 12 (compare John x, 7, 9; xiv, 6); Ignat. *Ad Magnes.* vii (comp. John xii, 49; x, 30; xiv, 11). See Lardner, *Works*, vol. ii. All of them *may* owe their accordance with John's statements to the influence of true tradition, or to the necessary resemblance of the just utterance of Christian thought and feeling by different men; though in three other passages cited from Ignatius (*Ad Rom.* vii; *Ad Trall.* viii; and *Ad Philad.* vii) the coincidence of the first two with John vi, 32 sq., and of the last with John iii, 8, is almost too close to be accounted for in this way (Ebrard, *Evang. Joh.* p. 102; Rothe, *Anfänge der Christl. Kirche*, p. 715). But Eusebius attests that this Gospel was among the books universally received in the Church (*Hist. Eccles.* iii, 25); and it cannot be doubted that it formed part of the canon of the churches, both of the East and West, before the end of the 2d century. See CANON. It is in the Peshito, and in the Muratori Fragment. It is quoted or referred to by Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i, 52, 61; ii, 6; *c. Tryph.* 105, etc.; compare Olshausen, *Echtheit der Kan. Evv.* p. 304 sq.), by Tatian (*Orat. ad Græcos*, 4, 13, 19), who, indeed, composed a Diatessaron (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv, 29; Theod. *Hæret. Fab.* i, 20), in preparing which he must have had this gospel before him; in the Epistle of the Church at Vienne and Lyons (Euseb. v, 1); by Melito of Sardes (see Pitra, *Spicileg. Solmense*, i, Prolegom. p. 5, Paris, 1852); by Athenagoras (*Leg. pro Christ.* 10); by Apollinaris (*Frag. Chron. Pasch.* p. 14, ed. Dindorf); by Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* v, 24); and in the Clementine Homilies (xix, 22, ed. Dressel, 1853), in such a way that not only is its existence proved, but evidence is afforded of the esteem in which it was held as canonical from the middle of the 2d century. Still more precise is the testimony of Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, who not only composed a Harmony of the four evangelists (Jerome, *De viris Illust.* 25; *Ep.* 151, *ad Algasiam*), but in an extant work (*ad Autol.* ii, 22) expressly quotes John i, 1 as part of holy Scripture, and as the production of the apostle, whom he ranks among the πνευματοφόροι. More important still is the testimony of Irenæus (*Hær.* iii, 11, 3, p. 218, ed. Grabe), both because of his acquaintance in early youth with Polycarp, and because of the distinctness and confidence with which he asserts the Johannean origin of this Gospel. See IRENÆUS. To these testimonies may be added that of Celsus, the enemy of the Christians, who, in preparing his attack upon them, evidently had the four canonical Gospels before him, and of whose citations from them some are undoubtedly from that of John (compare Olshausen, *ut sup.* p. 349, 355; Lücke, *Comment.* i, 68 sq., 3d edit.); which shows that, at the time when he wrote, this Gospel must have been in general acceptance by the Christians as canonical. The heretic Marcion, also, in rejecting this Gospel on dogmatical grounds, is a witness to the fact that its canonical authority was generally held by the Christians (Tertull. *c. Marcion*, iv, 5; *De Carne Christi*). That the Gospel was recognised as canonical by the Valentinians, one of the most important sects of the 2d century, is placed beyond doubt by the statement of Irenæus (*Hær.* iii, 11), and by the fact that it is quoted by Ptolemæus, a disciple of Valentinus (Epiphan. *Hær.* xxxiii, 3), and was commented on by Heracleon, another of his disciples, both of whom lived about the middle of the 2d century. That Valentinus himself knew and used the book is rendered probable by this, and by the statement of Tertullian (*De Præscr. Hæret.* 38), that Valentinus accepted the Biblical canon entire, though he perverted its meaning; and this probability is raised to certainty by the fact that, in the recently discovered work of Hippolytus, Valentinus is found twice (*Philosoph.* vi, 33, 34, ed. Miller) citing the phrase ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, as applied to the devil, which occurs only in John's Gospel, and repeatedly there (xii, 31; xiv, 30; xvi, 11); and also quoting the saying, John x, 8, as the word of Christ. From the same source also (vii, 22, 27, p. 232, 242) we learn that Basilides was acquainted with John's Gospel, and cited it; and this brings us up to the beginning of the 2d century, within a short time of the apostle's death.

This concurrence of external testimony is the more noticeable as there are certain peculiarities in the fourth Gospel which would have thrown suspicion on its genuineness had not that been placed beyond doubt by the knowledge which the Christians had of its having proceeded from the pen of John. Such are the prominence given to the extra-Galilæan ministry of our Lord; the record of remarkable miracles, such as the healing of the impotent man (ch. v), of the blind man (ch. ix), the raising from the dead of Lazarus, and others, omitted by the other evangelists; the insertion of so many discourses of Jesus, of which no hint is found in the other Gospels, as well as the omission of remarkable facts in the evangelic history, especially the institution of the supper and the agony in the garden; and certain important apparent discrepancies between this and the synoptical Gospels. In perfect keeping with this assumption, also, is the entire tone, spirit, and character of the Gospel; it is emphatically, as Clement of Alexandria calls it, the πνευματικὸν εὐαγγέλιον, and breathes throughout the spirit which was characteristic of "the disciple whom Jesus loved." The work is evidently the production of one who was, as the writer professes to be (i, 14 [comp. 1 John i, 1; iv, 14]; xix, 35; xxi, 24), an eye-witness of what he narrates; and there is a simplicity, a naturalness, and a vividness in the whole narrative which no forger of a later age could have attained—which the very consciousness of composing what was intended to be an imposition would have precluded. The remarkable manner also in which the writer avoids introducing John by name (xiii, 23; xix, 16; xx, 2, 3, 4; xxi, 7, 24) affords additional evidence that John himself was the writer. It has been urged also by some (Bleek, Ebrard, Credner) that the use of the simple Ἰωάννης, without in any case the addition of the usual ὁ Βαπτιστής, to designate the Baptist, in this Gospel, is an evidence of its being the production of John the apostle, on the ground that, "supposing the apostle not to be the writer, one would expect that he should, like the Synoptists, discriminate the Baptist from the apostle by this epithet, whereas, supposing the apostle himself to be the writer, he would feel less prompted to do so" (Bleek, *Einleit. in das N. T.* p. 148); but to this much weight cannot be attached; for, though it is probable that a writer, taking his materials from the other evangelists, would have designated John as they do, and though, as Meyer suggests (*Krit. Exeget. Comm.*, *Einleitung in das Ev. des Johannes*, p. 23), it is probable that John, who had been a disciple of the Baptist, might prefer speaking of him by the name by which he had been accustomed to designate him during their personal intercourse rather than by his *historical* name, yet, as we cannot tell what considerations might have occurred to a forger writing in the apostle's name to induce him to drop the distinctive epithet, it is hardly competent for us to accept this omission as a *proof* that the work is not the production of a forger. It is needless to press every minute particular into the service of the argument for the genuineness of this Gospel: it is impossible to read it without feeling that it is Johannean in all its parts, and that, had it been the production of any other than the apostle, that other must, in mind, spirit, affection, circumstances, and character, have been a second John.

Attempts to impugn the genuineness of this Gospel have been comparatively recent (Guerike, *Einleitung*, p. 303). The work of Bretschneider, entitled *Probabilia de Evangelii et Epp. Johannis apost. indole et origine* (Lips. 1820), is the earliest formal attack of any importance made upon it; and this, the author has himself assured us, was made by him with a view to exciting anew and extending inquiry into the genuineness of the Johannean writings, an end which, he adds, has been gained, so that the doubts he suggested may be

regarded as discharged (*Dogmatik*, i, 268, 3d ed.). Since that work appeared, the claims of the Gospel have been opposed by Strauss in his *Leben Jesu;* by Weisse in his *Evangelische Geschichte;* by Lützelberger (*Die Kirchliche Tradition üb. d. Apost. Joh.* Lpz. 1848, and in many other forms since); by Baur (*Krit. Untersuch. über die Kanonischen Evang.*); by Hilgenfeld (*Das Evang. und die Briefe Joh. nach ihrem Lehrbegr. dargestellt*, Halle, 1849), and by others. But the reasons advanced by these writers have so little force, and have been so thoroughly replied to, that even in Germany the general opinion has reverted to the ancient and catholic belief in respect of the authorship of the fourth Gospel. See Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigkeit der Evangel. Gesch.;* Ebrard, *Kritik d. Evangel. Geschichte* (Zür. 1850, 2d ed.); Ewald, *Jahrbuch*, iii, 146; v, 178; Meyer, *Kritik. Exeg. Comm.* ii, Th. 2 Abt. (Gött. 1856, 3d edit.); Bleek, *Einl. in das N. T.* (Berlin, 1862); Davidson, *Introduction to the New Test.* i, 233 sq.; Schaff, *Church History* (*Apostolic Age*), § 105. The importance of the fourth Gospel as a proof of the divine character of Jesus Christ led to this special assault on its genuineness by the Rationalists of the Tübingen school and their imitators elsewhere, but without shaking the convictions of the Church at large. See JESUS CHRIST. For further details of the controversy, see Fisher, *Supernat. Origin of Christianity* (new edit. N. Y. 1870); Pressensé, *Apostol. Age* (N. Y. 1871), p. 509 sq. See RATIONALISM. The most important other express treatises in opposition to the authenticity of John's Gospel are those of Bruno Bauer (Brem. 1840, Berl. 1850), Zeller (*Jahrb.* 1845 sq.), Köstlin (*ib.* 1853), Volkmar (in several works and arts. in Germ. journals), Scholten (Leid. 1864, etc.), Matthes (ib. 1867), Tayler (Lond. 1867); in favor, Stein (Brandenb. 1822), Crome (Lpzg. 1824), Hauff (Nürnb. 1831, and in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1846, 1849), Weitzel (*ib.* 1849), Mayer (Schaffh. 1854), Schneider (Berl. 1854), Tischendorf (Lpzg. 1865 and since), Riggenbach (Basel, 1866), Witticher (Elberf. 1869), Pfeiffer (St. Gall. 1870), Row (in the *Journal of Sacred Lit.* 1865, 1866, etc.), Clarke (in the *Christian Examiner*, 1868); see also the *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* July, 1861, p. 553; *Westminster Rev.* Ap. 1865, p. 192.

III. *Integrity.*—Certain portions of this Gospel have been regarded as interpolations or later additions, even by those who accept the Gospel as a whole as the work of John. One of these is the closing part of verse 2, from ἐκδεχομένων, and the whole of ver. 4, in regard to which the critical authorities fluctuate, and which contain statements that give a legendary aspect to the narrative, such as belongs to no other of the miracles related in the Gospels. Both are rejected by Tischendorf, but retained by Lachmann; and the same diversity of judgment appears among interpreters, some rejecting both passages (Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen), others retaining both (Bruckner), others rejecting ver. 4, but retaining verse 2 (Ewald), while some leave the whole in doubt (De Wette).

Another doubtful portion is the section relating to the woman taken in adultery (vii, 53–viii, 11). This is regarded as an interpolation because of the deficiency of critical evidence in its favor (see Tischendorf or Alford, ad loc.), and because of reasons founded on the passage itself, viz. the apparently forced way in which it is connected with what precedes by means of vii, 53; the interruption caused by it to the course of the narrative, the words in viii, 12 being evidently in continuation of what precedes this section; the alleged going of Jesus to the Mount of Olives and return to Jerusalem, which would place this occurrence in the *last* residence of our Lord in Jerusalem (Luke xxi, 37); the absence of the characteristic usage of the οὖν, which John so constantly introduces into his narratives, and for which we have in this section δέ, used as John generally uses οὖν; and the presence of the expressions ὄρθρον, πᾶς ὁ λαός, καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς, οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι, ἐπιμένειν, ἀναμάρτητος, καταλείπεσθαι, and κατακρίνειν, which are foreign to John's style. On the other side, it is urged that the section contains, as Calvin says, "Nihil apostolico spiritu indignum," that it has no appearance of a later legend, but bears every trace of an original account of a very probable fact, and that it has a considerable amount of diplomatic evidence in its favor. The question is one which hardly admits of a decided answer. The preponderance of evidence is undoubtedly against the Johannean origin of the section, and it has consequently been regarded as an interpolation by the great majority of critics and interpreters, including among the latter Calvin, Beza, Tittmann, Tholuck, Olshausen, Lücke, and Luthardt, as well as Grotius, De Wette, Paulus, and Ewald. At the same time, if it did not form part of the original Gospel, it is difficult to account for its being at so early a period inserted in it. From a passage in Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii, 39) some have concluded that Papias inserted it from the Gospel according to the Hebrews; but it is not certain that it is to this section that the words of Eusebius refer, nor is it certain that he meant to say that Papias inserted the story he refers to in the Gospel. See ADULTERY, vol. i, p. 87.

More important than either of these portions is chap. xxi, which is by many regarded as the addition of a later hand after the apostle's death. This opinion rests wholly on internal grounds, for there is no evidence that the Gospel was ever known in the Church without this chapter. At first sight it certainly appears as if the original work ended with ch. xx, and that ch. xxi was a later addition, but whether by the apostle himself or by some other is open to question. The absence of any trace of the Gospel having ever existed without it must be allowed to afford strong *prima facie* evidence of its having been added by the author himself; still this is not conclusive, for the addition may have been made by one of his friends or disciples before the work was in circulation. Grotius, who thinks it was made by the elders at Ephesus, argues against its genuineness, especially from ver. 24; but, though the language there has certainly the *appearance* of being rather that of others than that of the party himself to whom it refers, still it is not impossible that John may have referred to himself in the third person, as he does, for instance, in xix, 35; and as for the use of the pl. οἴδαμεν, that may be accounted for by his tacitly joining his readers with himself, just as he assumes their presence in xix, 35. There is more difficulty in accepting ver. 25 as genuine, for such a hyperbolical mode of expression does not seem to comport with the simplicity and sincerity of John; but there seems to be no valid reason for calling into doubt any other part of the chapter.

IV. *Design.*—At the close of the Gospel the apostle has himself stated his design in writing it thus: "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, ye might have life through his name" (xx, 31). Taken in the general, this may be said to be the design of all the evangelical narratives, for all of them are intended to produce the conviction that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah promised to the fathers, and so to exhibit him in his saving power that men believing on him might enjoy that life which he had come to bestow. We must seek, therefore, John's specific design either in some special occasion which he sought to meet, or in some peculiarity in his mode of presenting the claims of Jesus, by which not merely his Messiahship should be evinced, but the higher aspect of his person, and the spiritual effects of his working, should be prominently exhibited. Probably both of these concurred in the apostle's design; and we shall best conceive his purpose by neither, on the one hand, ascribing to him a merely historical, nor, on the other, a purely dogmatical design. It is an old and still prevalent opinion that John wrote his Gospel to supply the omissions of the other three; but no such impression is conveyed by the Gospel itself, which is as far as possible from having the appearance of a mere series of supplemental notes to previously existing writ-

ings; indeed, if this had been the apostle's purpose, it cannot be said that he has in any adequate way fulfilled it. Nor is there any ground for believing that it was a *polemical* object which chiefly prompted him to write this Gospel, though such a suggestion has often been made. Thus Irenæus (*Hær.* iii, 11, 1) says that the Gospel was written against the errors of Cerinthus. Jerome (*De vir. Illust.* 9) adds the Ebionites, and later writers have maintained that the Gnostics or the Docetæ are the parties against whom the polemic of the apostle is here directed. All this, however, is mere supposition. Doubtless in what John has written there is that which furnishes a full refutation of all Ebionitish, Gnostic, and Docetic heresy; but that to confute these was the *design* of the apostle, as these writers affirm, cannot be proved. See GNOSTICS. At the same time, though he may have had no intention of formally confuting any existing heresy, it is more than probable that he was stimulated to seek by means of this record to counteract certain tendencies which he saw rising in the Church, and by which the followers of Christ might be seduced from that simple faith in him by which alone the true life could be enjoyed. Still this must be regarded, at the utmost, as furnishing only the occasion, not the design, of his writing. The latter is to be sought in the effect which this Gospel is fitted to produce on the mind of the reader in regard to the claims of Jesus as the divine Redeemer, the source of light and life to darkened and perishing humanity. With this view John presents him to us as he tabernacled among men, and especially as he taught when occasion called forth the deeper revelations which he, as the Word who had come forth from the invisible God to reveal unto men the Father, had to communicate. John's main design is a theological one; a conviction of which doubtless led to his receiving in the primitive Church the title κατ' ἐξοχήν of Θεόλογος. But the historical character of his writing must also be acknowledged. As one who had been privileged to "company" with Jesus, he seeks to present him to us as he really appeared among men, in very deed a partaker of their nature, yet, under that nature, veiling a higher, which ever and anon broke forth in manifestation, so that those around him "beheld his glory as the glory of the Only Begotten of the Father" (i, 14). "There is here no history of Jesus and his teaching after the manner of the other evangelists; but there is, in historical form, a representation of the Christian faith, in relation to the person of Christ, as its central point, and in this representation there is a picture, on the one hand, of the antagonism of the world to the truth revealed in him, and on the other of the spiritual blessedness of the few who yield themselves to him as the Light of Life" (Reuss, *Gesch. der Heil. Sch. d. N. T.* p. 204). As John doubtless had the other Gospels before him, without formally designing to supplement them, he would naturally enlarge more particularly upon those portions which they had left untouched, or passed over more briefly.

IV. *Contents.*—The Gospel begins with a prologue, in which the author presents the great theme of which his subsequent narrative is to furnish the detailed illustration—"the theological programme of his history," as one has called it, and which another has compared to the overture of a musical composition in which the leading idea of the piece is expressed (i, 1-5). The historical exposition begins with verse 6, and the rest of the book may be divided into two parts. Of these the former (i, 6-xii) contains the account of our Lord's public ministry from his introduction to it by John the Baptist and his solemn consecration to it by God, to its close in the Passion Week. In this portion we have the Saviour presented to us chiefly in his manifestation to the world as a teacher sent from God, whose mission is authenticated by signs and wonders, and whose doctrines, truly divine, transcend in their spiritual import the narrow limits of human speculation, and can be comprehended only by a spiritual discernment. The second portion (ch. xiii-xxi) may be divided into two parts, the one of which is introductory to the other. The former (ch. xiii-xvii) presents to us our Lord in the retirement of private life, in his intercourse with his immediate followers, to whom he pours out his soul in loving counsel, warning, and promise, in the prospect of his departure from them; and in communion with his heavenly Father, with whom, as one who had finished the work he had received to do, he intercedes for those whose redemption from sin and evil is the coveted recompense of his obedience. To this succeeds the account of the Passion, and the appearances of Christ to his disciples after his resurrection (ch. xviii-xxi), which forms the other part of the second portion of the book. See the minute analysis of Lampe in his *Comment.*, and a briefer one in Westcott, *Introd. to Study of the Gospels*, p. 281 sq.

The greater part of the book is occupied with the discourses of our Lord, the plan of the evangelist being obviously to bring the reader as much as possible into personal contact with Jesus, and to make the latter his own expositor. Regarding the discourses thus reported, the question has arisen, How far are they to be accepted as an exact report of what Jesus uttered? and in reply to this, three opinions have been advanced: 1. That both in substance and in form we have them as they came from the lips of Christ; 2. That in substance they present what Christ uttered, but that the form in which they appear is due to the evangelist; and, 3. That they are not the discourses of Christ in any proper sense, but only speeches put in his mouth by the evangelist to express what the latter conceived to be a just representation of his doctrine. Of these views the last has found adherents only among a few of the sceptical school; it is without the slightest authority from the book itself, is irreconcilable with the simplicity and earnestness of the writer, is foreign to the habits and notions of the class to which the evangelist belongs, and is contradicted by the frequent explanations which he introduces of the sense in which he understood what he reports (comp. ii, 19, 21; vii, 38, 39; xii, 32, 33, etc.), by the brief notices, which evince an actual reminiscence of the scenes and circumstances amid which the discourse was delivered (e. g. xiv, 31), and by the prophetic announcements of his impending sufferings and death ascribed to the Saviour, which are couched in language such as he might naturally use, such as accounts for those to whom he spoke, even his disciples, not understanding his meaning, but such as it is utterly incredible that one not desirous of reporting his very words should, writing after the fulfilment of these predictions, impute to him (comp. vii, 33-36; viii, 21, 22; x, 17-20; xii, 23-36; xiv, 1-4, 18, 28; xvi, 16, 19, etc.). Some of these considerations are of weight also as against the second of the opinions above stated; for, if John sought merely to give the substance of the Saviour's teaching in his own words, why clothe predictions, the meaning of which at the time of his writing he perfectly understood, in obscure and difficult phraseology? Why especially impute to the speaker language of which he feels it necessary to give an explanation, instead of at once putting the intelligible statement in his discourse? Undoubtedly the impression which one gets from the narrative is that John means the discourses he ascribes to Jesus to be received as faithful reports of what he actually uttered; and this is confirmed when one compares his report of John the Baptist's sayings with those of our Lord, the character of the one being totally different from that of the other. To this view it has been objected that there is such an identity of style in the discourses which John ascribes to Christ with his own style, both in this Gospel and in his Epistles, as betrays in the former the hand, not of a faithful reporter, but of one who gives in the manner natural to himself the substance of what his Master taught. In this there is some force, which is but partially met by the suggestion that John was so imbued with the very mind and soul of Christ, so informed by his doctrine, and so filled by his spirit, that his own manner of thought and utterance became the

same as that of Christ, and he insensibly wrote and spoke in the style of his Lord. Reuss objects to this that on this supposition the style of Jesus "must have been a very uniform and sharply-defined one, and such as excludes the very different style ascribed to him by the synoptists" (*Gesch. der H. S. des N. T.* p. 203). But the facts here are overstated; the style of our Lord's discourses in John is by no means perfectly uniform, nor is it much further removed from that ascribed to him by the synoptists than the difference of subject and circumstance will suffice to account for. As for the objection that it is inconceivable that the evangelist could have retained for so many years a faithful recollection of discourses heard by him only once, we need not, in order to meet it, resort to the foolish suggestion of Bertholdt that he had taken notes of them at the time for his own behoof; nor need we to lay stress on the assurance of Christ which John records that the Holy Ghost whom the Father should send to them would teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them (John xiv, 26), though to the believer this is a fact of the utmost importance. It will suffice to meet the objection if we suggest that, as the apostle went forth to the world as a witness for Christ, he did not wait till he sat down to write his Gospel to give forth his recollections of his Master's words and deeds. What he narrates here in writing is only what he must have been repeating constantly during his whole apostolic career. Still, after due allowance has been made for all these considerations, it must yet be admitted that the decided Johannean cast of all these discourses, as compared with our Lord's sayings reported in the synoptical Gospels, shows that while the evangelist gives the substance and essential form of Christ's public utterances, he nevertheless, to a large degree, moulds them into his own style of phraseology and coherence. This is especially true of xii, 44-50, which is evidently a summary of statements made on perhaps more than one occasion not definitely given. Indeed, it is doubtful if any of the evangelists give us the exact words of our Lord, as they certainly do not tally in this particular any more than they do in the order and connection in which these are narrated. (See Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte* [2d edit.], p. 314 sq.). See HARMONIES.

V. *Characteristics.*—1. As to matter, the peculiarities of John's Gospel more especially consist in the four following doctrines: (1.) The mystical relation of the Son to the Father. (2.) That of the Redeemer to believers. (3.) The announcement of the Holy Ghost as the Comforter. (4.) The peculiar importance ascribed to love. Yet these peculiarities are not confined to this Gospel. Although there can be shown in the writings of the other evangelists some isolated dicta of the Lord which seem to bear the impress of John, it can also be shown that they contain thoughts not originating with that disciple, but with the Lord himself. Matthew (xi, 27) speaks of the relation of the Son to the Father so entirely in the style of John that persons not sufficiently versed in Holy Writ are apt to search for this passage in the Gospel of John. The mystical union of the Son with believers is expressed in Matt. xxviii, 20. The promise of the effusion of the Holy Ghost in order to perfect the disciples is found in Luke xxiv, 49. The doctrine of Paul with respect to love, in 1 Cor. xiii, entirely resembles what, according to John, Christ taught on the same subject. Paul here deserves our particular attention. In the writings of Paul are found Christian truths which have their points of coalescence only in John, viz., that Christ is *the image of the invisible God*, by whom all things are created (Col. i, 15, 16). Paul considers the Spirit of God in the Church *the spiritual Christ*, as Jesus himself does (John xiv, 16), frequently using the words *εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ*.

2. As to form, there is something peculiar in the evangelist's manner of writing. His language betrays traces of that Hebraistic character which belongs generally to the N.-T. writers, and the author shows his Jewish descent by various incidental indications; but he writes purer Greek than most of the others, and his freedom from Judaic narrowness is so marked that some have founded on this an argument against the genuineness of the book, forgetting that the experiences of the apostle in his more advanced years would materially tend to correct the prejudices and party leanings of his earlier career. The apostle's style is marked by ease, simplicity, and vividness; his sentences are linked together rather by inner affinity in the thoughts than by outward forms of composition or dialectic concatenation—they move on one after the other, generally with the help of an *οὖν*, sometimes of a *καί*, and occasionally of a *δέ*, and favorite terms or phrases are repeated without regard to rhetorical art. The author wrote evidently for Hellenistic readers, but he makes no attempt at Greek elegance, or that wisdom of words which with many in his day constituted the perfection of Greek art. One of the peculiarities of John is that, in speaking of the adversaries of Jesus, he always calls them *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*. The simplicity of John's character is also evinced by the repetition of certain leading thoughts, reproduced in the same words both in the Gospel and in the Epistles, such as *μαρτυρία, testimony; δόξα, glory; ἀλήθεια, truth; φῶς, light; σκότος, darkness; ζωὴ αἰώνιος, eternal life; μένειν, to abide.*—Kitto. See Kaiser, *De speciali Joan. Grammatica*, etc. (Erlang. 1842); Westcott, *Introd. to Study of the Gospels*, ch. v.

VI. *Place of Writing.*—Ephesus and Patmos are the two places mentioned by early writers, and the weight of evidence seems to preponderate in favor of Ephesus. Irenæus (iii, 1; also *apud* Euseb. *H. E.* v, 8) states that John published his Gospel whilst he dwelt in Ephesus of Asia. Jerome (*Prol. in Matt.*) states that John was in Asia when he complied with the request of the bishops of Asia and others to write more profoundly concerning the divinity of Christ. Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Prol. in Joannem*) relates that John was living at Ephesus when he was moved by his disciples to write his Gospel.

The evidence in favor of Patmos comes from two anonymous writers. The author of the *Synopsis of Scripture*, printed in the works of Athanasius, states that the Gospel was dictated by John in Patmos, and published afterwards in Ephesus. The author of the work *De XII Apostolis*, printed in the Appendix to Fabricius's *Hippolytus* (p. 952 [ed. Migne]), states that John was banished by Domitian to Patmos, where he wrote his Gospel. The later date of these unknown writers, and the seeming inconsistency of their testimony with John's declaration (Rev. i, 2) in Patmos, that he had previously borne record of the Word of God, render their testimony of little weight.

After the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, Ephesus probably became the centre of the active life of Eastern Christendom. Even Antioch, the original source of missions to the Gentiles, and the future metropolis of the Christian patriarch, appears, for a time, less conspicuous in the obscurity of early Church history than Ephesus, to which Paul inscribed his Epistle, and in which John found a dwelling-place and a tomb. This half-Greek, half-Oriental city, "visited by ships from all parts of the Mediterranean, and united by great roads with the markets of the interior, was the common meeting-place of various characters and classes of men" (Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, ch. xiv). It contained a large church of faithful Christians, a multitude of zealous Jews, an indigenous population devoted to the worship of a strange idol, whose image (Jerome, *Præf. in Ephes.*) was borrowed from the East, its name from the West—in the Xystus of Ephesus free-thinking philosophers of all nations disputed over their favorite tenets (Justin, *Trypho*, i, vii). It was the place to which Cerinthus chose to bring the doctrines which he devised or learned at Alexandria (Neander, *Church History*, i, 396 [Torrey's trans.]). In this city, and among the lawless

heathens in its neighborhood (Clem. Alexan. *Quis dives salv.* § 42), John was engaged in extending the Christian Church when, for the greater edification of that Church, his Gospel was written. It was obviously addressed primarily to Christians, not to heathens. See EPHESUS.

VII. *Date of Writing.*—Attempts have been made to elicit from the language of the Gospel itself some argument which should decide the question whether it was written before or after the destruction of Jerusalem; but, considering that the present tense "is" is used in v, 2, and the past tense "was" in xi, 18; xviii, 1; xix, 41, it would seem reasonable to conclude that these passages throw no light upon the question.

Clement of Alexandria (*apud* Eusebius, *H. E.* vi, 14) speaks of John as the latest of the evangelists. The apostle's sojourn at Ephesus probably began after Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians was written, i. e. after A.D. 56. Eusebius (*H. E.* iii, 20) specifies the fourteenth year of Domitian, i. e. A.D. 95, as the year of his banishment to Patmos. Probably the date of the Gospel may lie between these two, about A.D. 90. The references to it in the 1st Epistle and the Revelation lead to the supposition that it was written somewhat before those two books, and the tradition of its supplementary character would lead us to place it some considerable time after the apostle had fixed his abode at Ephesus.

VIII. *Commentaries.*—The following are the separate exegetical helps on the whole of John's Gospel exclusively (including the principal monographs on its special features), to the most important of which we prefix an asterisk [*]: Origen, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* iv, 1; also Berlin, 1831, 3 vols. 12mo); Jerome, *Expositio* (in *Opp. Suppos.* xi, 77, 773); Augustine, *Tractatus* (in *Opp.* iv, 385; translated, *Homilies* [includ. 1st Ep.], Oxford, 1848-9, 2 vols. 8vo); Chrysostom, *Homiliæ* (in *Opp.* viii, 1; transl. *Homilies*, Oxf. 1848-52, 2 vols. 8vo); also *Interpretatio* (in Canisius, i, 217); Nonnus, *Metaphrases* (Gr. and Lat. in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* ix, 437; also ed. Heinsius, L. B. 1627, 8vo, 1639, fol.; also ed. Passovius, Lips. 1833, 8vo); Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* iv, 1-1123); Bede, *in Joann.* (in *Opp.* v, 451); Alcuin, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* I, ii, 457; also August. 1527, 8vo); Hugo à St. Victor, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* i, 233); Aquinas, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* v); also *Catena* (in *Opp.* iii; transl. as vol. iv of "Catena Aurea," Oxford, 1845, 8vo); Bonaventura, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* ii, 313); also *Collationes* (*ib.* ii, 467); Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* xi); Zwingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* iv, 283); Melancthon, *Enarrationes* (Vitemb. 1523, fol.; also in *Opp.*); Bucer, *Enarrationes* (Argent. 1528, 8vo); Œcolampadius, *Adnotationes* (Basil. 1533, 8vo); Ferus [Rom. Catholic], *Enarrationes* (Mogunt. 1536, 1550, fol., Par. 1552, 1569, Lugd. 1553, 1558, 1563, Lovan. 1559, 8vo; ed. Medina, Complut. 1569, 1578, Mogunt. 1572, Rome, 1578, folio); Sarcer, *Scholia* (Basil. 1540, 8vo); Cruciger, *Enarratio* (Vitemb. 1540, Argent. 1546, 8vo); Bullinger, *Commentarii* (Tigur. 1543, fol.); Musculus, *Commentarii* (Basil. 1545, 1553, 1554, 1564, 1580, 1618, fol.); Guilliaud, *Enarrationes* (Par. 1550, fol.; Lugd. 1555, 8vo); Alesius, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1553, 8vo); Calvin, *Commentarii* (Genev. 1553, 1555, fol.; also in *Opp.*; with a *harmony*, Genev. 1563; in French, ib. 1563; in English, by Feterston, London, 1584, 4to; by Pringle, Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); Traheron, *Exposition* [on part] (London, 1558, 8vo); De Reyna, *Annotationes* (Francof. 1573, 4to); Marloratus, *Exposition* (from the Latin, by Timme, Lond. 1575, fol.); Aretius, *Commentarius* (Lausanne, 1578, 8vo); Danæus, *Commentarius* (Geneva, 1585, 8vo); Hunnius, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1585, 1591, 1595, 8vo); Delphinus, *Commentarii* [includ. Hebrews] (ed. Sernanus, Rome, 1587, 8vo); Chytræus, *Scholia* (ed. Schincke, F. ad M. 1588, 8vo); *Toletus [Rom. Cath.], *Commentarii* (Rom, 1588, fol. 1590, 2 vols. 4to; Lugd. 1589, 1614, fol.; Ven. 1589, Brix. 1603, 4to); Hemmingius, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1591, fol.); Zepper, *Analysis* (Herb. 1595, 8vo); Rollock, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1599, 1618, 8vo); Agricola, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1599, 8vo); Capponus, *Commentarius* (Ven. 1604, 4to); Pererius, *Disputationes* (Lugd. 1608-10), 2 vols. 4to); Pelargus, *Quæsita* (Francof. 1615. 4to); De Ribera, *Commentarius* (Lugdun. 1623, 4to); Mylius, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1624, 4to); Tarnovius, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1629, 4to); Jansonius, *Commentarius* (Lovan. 1630, 8vo); Corderius, *Catena* (Antw. 1630, folio); Lenæus, *Commentarius* (Holm. 1640, 4to); Gomarus, *Illustratio* (Amst. 1644, fol.; also in *Opp.*); Lyser, *Disputationes* (Vitemb. 1646, 4to); Virginius, *Notæ* (Dorp. 1647, 4to); Amyraut, *Paraphrase* (Fr., Salm. 1651, 8vo); Petrus, *Arend*, etc. (Dutch, Amsterd. 1653, 3 vols. 4to); Schlichting, *Commentaria* [including other books of the N. T.] (Irenop. 1656, fol.); Hutcheson, *Exposition* (Lond. 1657, fol., 1840, 8vo); Nifanius, *Commentarius* (F. ad M. 1684, 4to); S. Schmidt, *Paraphrasis* (Argent. 1685, 1689, 4to; also in Germ., Hal. 1716, 8vo); Vassor, *Paraphrase* (Fr., Paris, 1689, 12mo); Comazzi, *Dimonstrazione*, etc. (Naples, 1706, 8vo); Sibersma, *Explication* (in French, Amst. 1717, 4to; in Germ., Basel, 1718, 4to); Guillaers, *Adnotationes* [includ. begin. of Matt. and Luke] (Gandav. 1724, 4to); *Lampe, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1724-6, Basil. 1725-7, 3 vols. 4to; in German, Lpz. 1729, 4to); also *Syntagma* (Amst. 1737, 2 vols. 4to); Merrick, *Annotations* [on i-iii] (Lond. 1764-7, 2 vols. 8vo); Lightfoot, *Exercitations* (in *Works*, xii); also *Chorographia* (in Ugolino, *Thesaurus*, v, 1117); Semler, *Paraphrasis* (Halle, 1771-2, 2 vols. 8vo); Mosheim, *Erklärung* (ed. Jacobi, Weim. 1777, 4to); Hezel, *Anleitung* (pt. i, Frkft. 1792, 8vo); Oertel, *Erläut.* [includ. Epistles] (Frkft. and Gorl. 1795, 2 vols. 8vo); Morus, *Recitationes* (edit. Dindorf, Prag. 1795, Lips. 1796, 1808, 1821, 8vo); S. Lange, *Erklärung* [including Epistles] (Weimar, 1795-7, 3 vols. 8vo); Shepherd, *Notes* [including Epistles] (Lond. 1796, 4to); Schmid, *Theologia*, etc. (Jen. 1800, 8vo); Schulze, *Charakter*, etc. (Lpz. 1803, 8vo); Paulus, *Commentar* (pt. i, Tübing. 1806, 8vo); Breitenstein, *Anmerkungen* (Frkft. 1813, 1823, 8vo); *Tittmann, *Commentarius* (Lips. 1816, 8vo; tr. in English, Edinb. 1844, 2 vols. 12mo); Mayer, *Beiträge* (Lps. 1820, 8vo); *Lücke, *Commentar* [includ. Epistles] (Bonn, 1820-32, 1833-5, 1840-43, 3 vols. 8vo; vol. iii [epistle] transl. into Engl., Edinb. 1837, 12mo); Moysey, *Lectures* (Oxf. 1821-23, 2 vols. 8vo); Pitman, *Lectures* [on i-x] (Lond. 1822, 8vo); Seyffarth, *Specialcharakteristik*, etc. (Lpzg. 1823, 8vo); *Tholuck, *Commentar* (Hamb. 1826, 1828, 1831, 1833; Lips. 1837, 1844; Gotha, 1857; in Engl. by Kaufman, Boston, 1836, 12mo; by Krauth, Phila. 1859, 8vo); Klee, *Commentar* (Mainz, 1829, 8vo); Fickenscher, *Auslegung* (Nürnb. 1831-33, 3 vols. 8vo); Grimm, *Christologia*, etc. (Lips. 1833, 8vo); Sumner, *Exposition* (Lond. 1835, 8vo); Matthäi, *Auslegung* (vol. i, Gött. 1837, 8vo); Slade, *Readings* (London, 1837, 1843, 12mo); Simson, *Theologia*, etc. (Reg. 1839, 8vo); Fromann, *Lehrbegriff*, etc. (Leipzig, 1839, 8vo); Wirth, *Erklärung* (Ulm, 1839, 8vo); Patterson, *Lectures* [xiv-xvi] (London, 1840, 12mo); Anderson, *Exposition* (London, 1841, 2 vols. 12mo); Drummond, *Exposition* (Lond. 1841, 12mo); Herberden, *Reflections* (Lond. 1842, 12mo); Köstlin, *Lehrbegriff*, etc. (Berlin, 1843, 8vo); Baumgarten-Crusius, *Auslegung* [includ. Epistles] (Jen. 1843-5, 2 vols. 8vo); Jones, *Sermons* [xiii-xvii] (Oxf. 1844, 8vo); Aislabée, *Translation* (Lond. 1845, 12mo); Ford, *Illustration* (Lond. 1852, 8vo); Luthardt, *Eigenthümlichkeit*, etc. (Lpz. 1852-3, 2 vols. 8vo); Bouchier, *Exposition* (London, 1854, 12mo); Cumming, *Readings* (London, 1856, 8vo); Maurice, *Discourses* (Camb. 1857, 12mo); 5 Clergymen, *Revision* (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Reuss, *Introd.* (in his *Hist. de la théol. Chrétienne* Strasb. 1860, ii, 272 sq.); Fawcett, *Exposition* (London, 1860, 8vo); *Ewald, *Erklärung* [includ. Epistles] (Gött. 1861 sq., 3 vols. 8vo); *Hengstenberg, *Erläuterung* (Berl. 1861-64, 3 vols., 1869, 2 vols. 8vo; tr. in English, Edinb. 1865, 2 vols. 8vo); Malan, *Notes* (Lond. 1862, 4to); Astié, *Explication* (Genève, 1862-4, 3 vols. 8vo); Klofutar, *Commentarius* (Vienna, 1863, 8vo); Brown, *Lectures* (Oxf. 1863, 2 vols. 8vo); Bäumlein, *Commentar* (Stuttg. 1863, 8vo); Scholten, *Onderzoek.* (Leyd. 1864 sq., 2 vols. 8vo);

Godet, *Commentaire* (vol. i, 1864, 8vo); Ryle, *Thoughts* (Lond. 1865-6, 2 vols. 8vo); Anon. *Erläuterung* (Berlin, 1866, 8vo); Von Burger, *Erklärung* (Nördl. 1867, 8vo); Roffhack, *Auslegung* (Leipzig, 1871, 2 vols. 8vo). See GOSPELS.

JOHN, FIRST EPISTLE OF, the most important of the so-called *catholic* or "general" Epistles, of which it is the fourth in order. See BIBLE, vol. i, p. 800, col. 2.

I. Its *Authenticity.*—That this is the production of the same author as wrote the fourth Gospel is so manifest that it has universally been admitted (comp. Hauff, *Die Authentie u. der hohe Werth des Evang. Johan.* p. 137 sq.). The establishment of the genuineness of the one, therefore, involves the admission of that of the other. The evidence, however, in favor of the Epistle is sufficient to establish its claims, apart from its relation to the Gospel. See § 7, below.

1. *External.*—Eusebius informs us that Papias knew and made use of it (*H. E.* iii, 39); Polycarp quotes a passage (iv, 3) from it in his Epistle to the Philippians, ch. vii; Irenæus uses it (comp. *Adv. Hær.* iii, 15; v, 8, with 1 John ii, 18; iv, 1, 3; v, 1); it is quoted or referred to by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii, 389) and Tertullian (*Scorpiac.* c. 22; *Adv. Prax.* c. 15); and Eusebius assures us that it was universally and always acknowledged in the Church (*H. E.* iii, 25, 26). It is found in the Peshito and in all the ancient versions, and is included in every catalogue of the canonical books which has come down to us (Lardner, *Works*, vi, 584). In fact, the only persons who appear not to have recognised this Epistle are the ancient heretics, the Alogi and the Marcionites, the latter of whom were acquainted with none of the writings of John, and the former rejected them all, ascribing them to Cerinthus, not upon critical, but purely arbitrary and dogmatical grounds.

2. With this the *internal* evidence fully accords. The work is anonymous, but the apostle John is plainly indicated throughout as the writer. The author asserts that he had been an immediate disciple of Jesus, and that he testifies what he himself had seen and heard (i, 1-4; iv, 14), and this assumption is sustained throughout in a way so natural and unaffected that it would be doing violence to all probability to suppose that it could have been attained by one who felt that he was practising in this a deliberate imposition. The circumstances also of the writer to which he alludes, the themes on which he chiefly dwells, and the spirit which his writing breathes, are all such as fall in with what we know of the apostle John, and suggest him as the writer. If this be the work of a pretender, he has, as De Wette remarks (*Exeget. Hdb.*), "shown incredible subtlety in concealing the name of the apostle, whilst he has indirectly, and in a most simple natural way, indicated him as the writer."

A few German theologians in our own times (Lange, *Schriften des Johan.* iii, 4 sq.; Cludius, *Uransichten des Christenth.* p. 52 sq.; Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 166 sq.; Zeller, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1845) have been the first critics to throw doubts on the genuineness of any of John's writings, and this altogether on internal grounds, but they have met with complete refutations from the pens of Bertholdt (vi), Harmsen (*Authent. d. Schr. d. Evangel. Johan.*), and Lücke (*Commentar*, iii). See above. The only serious objections to the Epistles are those of Bretschneider, who has equally attacked the genuineness of the Gospel.

(1.) He maintains that the doctrine concerning the *Logos*, and the anti-docetic tendency of John's 1st Epistle, betray an author of the second century, whom he assumes to be John the Presbyter. But it is beyond all question, says Lücke (*l. c.*), that the *Logos* doctrine of John, substantially, although not fully developed, existed in the Jewish theological notions respecting the Son of God, and that we find it distinctly expressed, although in different words, in the Pauline representation of Christ's exalted dignity (compare Coloss. i with Heb. i); that the rudiments of it appear in the literature of the Jews, canonical and apocryphal, Chaldaic and Alexandrian; that in the time of Christ it was considerably developed in the writings of Philo, and still more strongly in the fathers of the second century, who were so far from retaining the simple, Hebraizing, and canonical mode of expression peculiar to John that in them it had assumed a gnostically erudite form, although essentially identical. John intends by the *Word* (*Logos*) to express the divine nature of Christ, but the patristic logology attempts to determine the relation between the *Logos* and the invisible God on one side, and the world on the other. The earliest fathers, as Justin Martyr and Tatian, while they make use of John's phraseology, further support their doctrines by ecclesiastical *tradition*, which, as Lücke observes, must have its root in doctrines that were known in the first century. But, from Theophilus of Antioch downwards, the fathers, mentioning John by name, expressly connect their elucidations with the canonical foundation in the Gospel of John, without the granting of which the language of Justin would be inexplicable (Olshausen, *On the Genuineness of the Four Gospels*, p. 306 sq.). Accordingly, adds Lücke, on this side, the authenticity of the Gospel and Epistle remains unassailable. See LOGOS.

(2.) On similar grounds may be refuted Bretschneider's arguments derived from the anti-docetic character of John's Epistle. It is true, docetism, or the idealistic philosophy, was not fully developed before the second century, but its germ existed before the time of Christ, as has been shown by Mosheim, Walch, and Niemeyer. Traces of Jewish theology and Oriental theosophy having been applied to the Christian doctrine in the apostolic age are to be found in the Epistles of Paul, and it would be unaccountable to suppose that the fully developed docetism should have first made its appearance in the Epistles of Irenæus and Polycarp. We have the authority of the former of these for the fact that Cerinthus taught the docetic heresy in the lifetime of John in the simple form in which it seems to be attacked in 1 John iv, 1-3; ii, 22; 2 John 7. See DOCETÆ.

II. *Integrity.*—The genuineness of only two small portions of this writing have been called in question, viz., the words ὁ ὁμολογῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει (ii, 23), and the words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὁ Πατήρ, ὁ Λόγος καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσι. Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ (v, 7, 8). The former of these is omitted in the Text. Rec., and is printed in italics in the A. V. It is, however, supported by sufficient authority, and is inserted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Scholz, etc. The latter of these passages has given rise to a world-famous controversy, which can hardly be said to have yet ended (Orme, *Memoir of the Controversy respecting the Heavenly Witnesses* [Lond. 1830]). The prevailing judgment, however, of all critics and interpreters is that the passage is spurious (see Griesbach, *Append. ad N. T.* ii, 1-25; Tischendorf on the passage; Lücke, *Comment. on the Epistles of John*, in *Bib. Cabinet*, No. xv, etc.). See WITNESSES, THE THREE HEAVENLY.

III. *Time and Place of writing the First Epistle.*—On these points nothing certain can be determined.

1. It has been conjectured by many interpreters, ancient and modern, that it was written at the same place as the Gospel. The more ancient tradition places the writing of the Gospel at Ephesus, and a less authentic report refers it to the island of Patmos. Hug (*Introd.*) infers, from the absence of writing materials (3 John 13), that all John's Epistles were composed at Patmos. The most probable opinion is that it was written somewhere in Asia Minor, in which was the ordinary residence of the apostle (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii, 23); perhaps, according to the tradition of the Greek Church, at Ephesus, but for this we have no historical warrant (Lücke, *Commentary*).

2. It is equally difficult to determine the time of the writing of this Epistle, although it was most probably posterior to the Gospel, which seems to be referred to in 1 John i, 4. Some are of opinion that the Epistle was

an envelope or accompaniment to the Gospel, and that they were consequently written nearly simultaneously (Hug, *Introd.*). As, however, the period when the Gospel was written, according to the evidence of tradition and criticism, "fluctuates between the sixth and ninth decennium of the first century" (Lücke, *Commentary*), we are at a loss for data on which to found any probable hypothesis respecting the exact time of the writing of the Epistle; but that it was posterior to the Gospel is further rendered probable from the fact that it is formed on such a view of the person of Jesus as is found only in John's Gospel, and that it abounds in allusions to the speeches of Jesus as there recorded. Lücke concludes, from its resembling the Gospel in its apologetical and polemical allusions, that it indicates such a state of the Christian community as proves that it must be posterior even to the last Epistles of Paul, and consequently that the ancient Church was justified in classing it among the catholic Epistles, which all bear this chronological character.

It has been argued by several, from ii, 18 (ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν), that the Epistle was written *before* the destruction of Jerusalem, while others, founding their conjecture on the same passage, maintain the very reverse. Among the former are to be found the names of Hammond, Grotius, Calovius, Lange, and Hänlein, and among the latter those of Baronius, Basnage, Mill, and Le Clerc.

Equally unsatisfactory is the argument, in respect to the time when this Epistle was written, derived from its supposed senile tone; for, although the style is somewhat more tautological than the Gospel, this can be accounted for by its epistolary character, without ascribing it to the effects of senile forgetfulness. In fact, this character is altogether denied by some of the ablest critics. Still, from the patriarchal tone assumed in the Epistle, and the frequent use of the appellation "little children," we may reasonably conclude that it was written in advanced age, perhaps not long after the Gospel, or about A.D. 92.

IV. *For whom written.*—The writer evidently had in his eye a circle of readers with whom he stood in close personal relation—Christians, apparently, who were living in the midst of idolaters (v, 21), and who were exposed to danger from false speculation and wrong methods of presenting the truths of Christianity (ii, 22-26; iv, 1-3; v, 1-6, etc.). If the Epistle was written by John at Ephesus, we may, from these circumstances, with much probability conclude that the Christians in that region were the parties for whose behoof it was first designed. Augustine (*Quæst. Evangel.* ii, 39) says it was addressed "ad Parthos," and this inscription appears in several MSS. of the Vulgate, and has been defended by Grotius, Paulus, and others, as giving the real destination of the Epistle. John, however, had no relations with the Parthians that we know of, nor does a single ancient testimony confirm the statement of Augustine, except on the part of later writers of the Latin Church, who probably simply followed him. It has been suggested that, as the 2d Epistle is by some of the ancients described as πρὸς παρθένους (Clem. Alex. *Frag.*, edit. Potter, p. 1011), this may have been changed into πρὸς Πάρθους, and by mistake applied to the 1st Epistle (Whiston, *Comment. on the Cath. Epistles;* Hug, *Introd.* p. 464, Fosdick's transl.). This is possible, but not very probable. The suggestion of Wegscheider, that "ad Parthos" is an error for "ad Sparsos," an inscription which actually is found in several MSS. (Scholz, *Bibl. Krit. Reise*, p. 67), is ingenious, and may be correct. If we are to understand the term *catholic*, as applied to this Epistle, in the sense of circular, we may naturally infer, from the absence of the *epistolary form*, that this was an encyclical letter addressed to several of John's congregations, and in all probability to the churches of the Apocalypse. See § 8, below. Lardner is clearly right when he says that it was primarily meant for the churches in Asia under John's inspection, to whom he had already orally delivered his doctrine (i, 3; ii, 7). See REVELATION.

V. *Character.*—Though ranked among the catholic Epistles, this writing has not the form of an epistle—in this respect it more resembles a free homily; still, in fact, it undoubtedly was sent as a letter to the persons for whose instruction it was designed. The general strain is admonitory, and the author seems to have written as he would have spoken had those whom he addresses been present before him. One great thought pervades the book—the reality of Christ's appearance in the flesh, and the all-sufficiency of his doctrine for salvation—a salvation which manifests itself in holiness and love. But the author does not discuss these topics in any systematic or logical form; he rather allows his thoughts to flow out in succession as one suggests another, and clothes them in simple and earnest words as they arise in his mind. Some have imputed a character of senility to the work on this account, but without reason. Under a simple and inartificial exterior there lies deep thought, and the book is pervaded by a suppressed intensity of feeling that recalls the youthful Boanerges in the aged apostle. The mighty power that is in it has drawn to it in all ages the reverence and love of the noblest minds, "especially of those who more particularly take up Christianity as a religion of love—a religion of the heart" (Lücke, *Int.* p. 55).

VI. *Contents.*—A strict analysis of this Epistle, therefore, seems hardly possible, as the writer does not appear to have been systematic in its plan, but rather to have written out of a full and loving heart. "He asserts the pre-existent glory and the real humanity of our Lord, in opposition to false teachers, and for the comfort of the Church (i, 1-7). Then follows a statement of the sinfulness of man, and the propitiation of Christ, this propitiation being intended to stir us up to holiness and love (i, 8; ii, 17); Jesus and the Christ are asserted to be *one*, in opposition to the false teachers (ii, 18-29). The next chapter seems devoted to the singular love of God in adopting us to be his sons, with the happiness and the duties arising out of it, especially the duty of brotherly love (ch. iii). The following chapter is principally occupied with marks by which to distinguish the teaching of the Spirit of God from that of false teachers and of Antichrist, with repeated exhortations to 'love as brethren' (ch. iv). The apostle then shows the connection between faith, renewal, love to God and to the brethren, obedience, and victory over the world, and concludes with a brief summary of what had been already said (ch. v)" (Fairbairn). See § 8, below.

VII. *Relation to the Fourth Gospel.*—The close affinity between this Epistle and John's Gospel has already been alluded to. In style, in prevailing formulæ of expression, in spirit, and in thought, the two are identical. "It is evident that the writer of each had a similar class of opponents in his mind—those who, like the Docetæ, denied the true humanity of Christ; those, again, who denied that the man Jesus was the Christ and Son of God; and those who, under pretence of being his disciples, were habitually living in violation of his commands. In both books is the same deeply loving and contemplative nature; in both, a heart completely imbued with the teaching of the Saviour; in both, also, the same tendency to abhorrence of those who opposed his Lord. Remarkable, too (to use the words of Ebrard), is the similarity of the *circle of ideas* in both writings. The notions, *light, life, darkness, truth, lie*, meet us in the Epistle with the same broad and deep meaning which they bear in the Gospel; so, also, the notions of *propitiation* (ἱλασμός), of doing righteousness, sin, or iniquity (ἁμαρτίαν, ἀνομίαν), and the sharply-presented antitheses of light and darkness, truth and lie, life and death, of loving and hating, the love of the Father and of the world, children of God and of the devil, spirit of truth and of error" (Fairbairn). Macknight, and, still more fully, De Wette, have drawn out a copious comparison of expressions common to the Gospel and Epistle.

This similarity has led to the suggestion that both, in a sense, form one whole, the Epistle being, according to

some, a prolegomenon to the Gospel; according to others, its practical conclusion; and according to others, its commendatory accompaniment. The probability is that both were written at the same period of the author's life, and that they both contain in writing what he had been accustomed to testify and teach during his apostolic ministry; but whether any closer relation than this exists between them must remain matter entirely of conjecture.

VIII. *Design.*—That the apostle sought to confirm the believers for whom he wrote in their attachment to Christianity as it had been delivered to them by the ambassadors of Christ is evident on the surface of the Epistle. It is clear, also, that he had in view certain false teachers by whose arts the Christians were in danger of being seduced from the faith of Jesus as the incarnate Son of God, and from that holy and loving course of conduct to which true faith in Jesus leads; but who these false teachers were, or to what school they belonged, is doubtful. It is an old opinion that they were Docetæ (Tertullian, *De carne Christi*, i, 24; Dionys. Al. ap. Eusebius, *H. E.* vii, 25), and to this many recent inquirers have given in their adherence. Lücke, who strenuously defends this view, attempts to show that Docetism was in vogue as early as the time of John by an appeal to the case of Cerinthus, and to the references to Docetism in three of the epistles of Ignatius (*Ad Smyrn.* 2 sq.; *Ad Trall.* ix; *Ad Eph.* vii); but the doctrine of Cerinthus respecting the person of Jesus Christ was not Docetic in the proper sense, and the passages cited from Ignatius are all subject to the suspicion of being interpolations, as none of them are found in the Syriac recension. Lücke lays stress also on the words ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα (iv. 2; comp. 2 John vii) as indicating an express antithesis to the doctrine of the Docetics that Christ had come only in appearance. It may be doubted, however, whether this means anything more than that Christ had *really* come, the phrase ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλθεῖν being probably a familiar technicality for this among the Christians. It may be questioned, also, whether the passage should not be translated thus, "Every spirit which confesseth Jesus Christ having [who has] come in the flesh is of God," rather than thus, "Every spirit which confesseth *that* Jesus Christ is come," etc. (for ὁμολογεῖν with the accusative, see John ix, 22; Acts xxiii, 8; Rom. x, 9; 1 Tim. vi, 12), and in this case even the appearance of allusion to a contrary doctrine vanishes (see Bleek, *Einleit.* p. 598). It may be added that, had John intended to express a direct antithesis to Docetism, he would hardly have contented himself with merely using the words ἐν σαρκί, for there is a sense in which even the Docetæ would have admitted this.

The main object of the Epistle, therefore, does not appear to be simply that of opposing the errors of the Docetæ (Schmidt, Bertholdt, Niemeyer), or of the Gnostics (Kleuker), or of the Nicolaitans (Macknight), or of the Cerinthians (Michaelis), or of all of them together (Townsend), or of the Sabians (Barkey, Storr, Keil), or of Judaizers (Löffler, Semler), or of apostates to Judaism (Lange, Eichhorn, Hänlein): the leading purpose of the apostle appears to be rather constructive than polemical. John is remarkable both in his history and in his writings for his abhorrence of false doctrine, but he does not attack error as a controversialist. He states the deep truth and lays down the deep moral teaching of Christianity, and in this way, rather than directly, condemns heresy. In the introduction (i, 1-4) the apostle states the purpose of his Epistle. It is to declare the Word of life to those whom he is addressing, in order that he and they might be united in true communion with each other, and with God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ. He at once begins to explain the nature and conditions of communion with God, and, being led on from this point into other topics, he twice brings himself back to the same subject. The first part of the Epistle may be considered to end at ii, 28. The apostle begins afresh with the doctrine of sonship or communion at ii, 29, and returns to the same theme at iv, 7. His lesson throughout is, that the means of union with God are, on the part of Christ, his atoning blood (i, 7; ii, 2; iii, 5; iv, 10, 14; v, 6) and advocacy (ii, 1)—on the part of man, holiness (i, 6), obedience (ii, 3), purity (iii, 3), faith (iii, 23; iv, 3; v, 5), and, above all, love (ii, 7; iii, 14; iv, 7; v, 1). John is designated as the Apostle of Love, and rightly; but it should be ever remembered that his "love" does not exclude or ignore, but embraces both faith and obedience as constituent parts of itself. Indeed, Paul's "faith that worketh by love," and James's "works that are the fruit of faith," and John's "love which springs from faith and produces obedience," are all one and the same state of mind described according to the first, third, or second stage into which we are able to analyze the complex whole.

IX. *Commentaries.*—The special exegetical helps on the whole of the *three* epistles of John, besides those mentioned under the Gospel above, are the following, of which we designate the most important by prefixing an asterisk: Didymus, *In Ep. Jo.* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* v; also in *Bibl. Patr. Gall.* vi); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* v); Althamer, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1521, 1528, 8vo); Hemming, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1569, 8vo); Selnecker, *Homiliæ* (Franc. 1580, 1597, 8vo); Danæus, *Commentarius* (Genev. 1585, 8vo); Horne, *Expositio* [including Jude] (Brunsw. 1654, 4to); Rappolt, *Commentatio* (ed. Carpzov, Lips. 1687, and later, 4to); Creyghton, *Ontleeding* (Franec. 1704, 4to); J. Lange, *Exegesis* (Hal. 1713, 4to; including Pet., ib. 1724, fol.); Rusmeyer, *Erklärung* (Hamb. 1717, 4to); Whiston, *Commentary* (Lond. 1719, 8vo); Tgilde, *Verklaaring* (Delph. 1736, 4to); Ruhlius, *Notæ* (Amst. 1739, 12mo); Benson, *Notes* (London, 1749, 4to; includ. other cath. ep., ib. 1756, 4to); Schirmer, *Erklärung* (Breslau, 1780, 8vo); Morus, *Prælectiones* (edit. Hempel, Lips. 1797, 8vo); Hawkins, *Commentary* (Halifax. 1808, 8vo); Jaspis, *Adnotatio* [includ. Rev.] (Lips. 1816, 1821, 8vo); Paulus, *Erklärung* (Heidelberg, 1829, 8vo); Bickersteth, *Exposition* [includ. Jude] (London, 1846, 12mo); Braune, *Auslegung* (Grim. 1847, 8vo); Mayer, *Commentar* (Wien, 1851, 8vo); Sander, *Commentar* (Elberf. 1851, 8vo); Besser, *Auslegung* (Halle, 1851, 1856, 1862, 12mo); *Düsterdieck, *Commentar* (Götting. 1852-56, 2 vols. 8vo); *Huther, in Meyer's *Handbuch* (Götting. 1853, 1861, 8vo); *Maurice, *Lectures* (Cambr. 1857, 1867, 8vo).

On the *First Epistle* alone there are the following: Augustine, *Tractatus* (in *Opp.* iv, 1091; tr. into French, Par. 1670, 12mo); Luther, *Commentarius* (ed. Neumann, Lips. 1708; ed. Bruns, Lub. 1797, 8vo; also in German, in *Werke*, Lpz. xi, 572; Halle, ix, 906); Œcolampadius, *Homiliæ* (Basil. 1525, 8vo); Zwingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* iv, 585); Tyndale, *Exposition* (London, 1531, 8vo; reprinted, in *Expositions*, ib. 1829, p. 145); Megander, *Adnotationes* [includ. Hebrews] (Tigur. 1539, 8vo); Foleng, *Commentaria* (Venice, 1546, 8vo); Beurlinus, *Commentarius* (Tübing. 1571, 8vo); Hunnius, *Enarratio* (F. ad M. 1586, 1592, 8vo); Hessels, *Commentarius* (Duaci, 1599, 8vo); Eckhard, *Disputationes* (Gies. 1609, 8vo); Socinus, *Commentarius* (Racov. 1614, 8vo; also in *Opp.* i, 157); Egard, *Erklärung* (Gosl. 1628, 8vo); Cundisius, *Quæstiones* (Jena, 1648, 1698, 4to); Roberts, *Evidences*, etc. (Lond. 1649, 8vo); Mestrezat, *Exposition* (Fr., Genève, 1651, 2 vols. 12mo); Cotton, *Commentary* (Lond. 1656, fol.); Hardy, *Unfolding* [on i-iii] (Lond. 1656-9, 2 vols. 4to); *S. Schmid, *Commentarius* (F. et Lipsiæ, 1687, 1707, 1736, 4to); Dorsche, *Disputationes* (Rostock, 1697, 4to); Spener, *Erklärung* (Halle, 1699, 1711, 4to); Zeller, *Predigten* (Lpz. 1709, 8vo); Marperger, *Auslegung* (Nürnb. 1710, 4to); Oporinus, *Liberatio* (Götting. 1741, 4to); Freylinghausen, *Erklärung* (Halle, 1741, 8vo); Steinhofer, *Erklärung* (Tübing. 1762, Hamb. 1848, 8vo); Carpzov, *Scholia* (Helmstadt, 1773, 4to); Semler, *Paraphrasis* (Riga, 1792, 12mo); Hesselgren, *Prolegomena* (Upsala, 1800, 8vo); Weber, *De authentia*, etc. (Halle

1823, 4to); Rickli, *Erklärung* (Luz. 1828, 8vo); Pierce, *Sermons* (Lond. 1835, 2 vols. 8vo); Johannsen, *Predigten* (Alton. 1838, 8vo); Paterson, *Commentary* (Lond. 1842, 18mo); Thomas, *Études*, etc. (Gen. 1849, 8vo); *Neander, *Erläuterung* (Berl. 1851, 8vo; tr. into Engl. by Mrs. Conant, N. Y. 1852, 12mo); Erdmann, *Argumentum*, etc. (Berol. 1855, 8vo); Graham, *Commentary* (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Myrberg, *Commentarius* (Upsala, 1859, 8vo); Handcock, *Exposition* (Edinburgh, 1861, 8vo); Candlish, *Lectures* (Edinburgh, 1866, 8vo); Haupt, *Einleitung*, etc. (Colb. 1869, 8vo). See EPISTLES (CATHOLIC).

JOHN, SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF. The title *catholic* does not properly belong to the 2d and 3d Epistles. It became attached to them, although addressed to individuals, because they were of too little importance to be classed by themselves, and, so far as doctrine went, were regarded as appendices to the 1st Epistle.

I. *Authorship.*—1. The *external* evidence for the genuineness of these two Epistles is less copious and decisive than that for the 1st Epistle. They are not in the Peshito version, which shows that at the time it was executed they were not recognised by the Syrian churches; and Eusebius places them among the ἀντιλεγόμενα (*H. E.* iii, 25). See ANTILEGOMENA. The 11th verse of the 2d Epistle, however, is quoted by Irenæus (*Hær.* i, 16, 3) as a saying of John, the disciple of the Lord, meaning thereby, without doubt, the apostle. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii), in referring to John's 1st Epistle, uses the words Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ, which shows that he was acquainted with at least two Epistles of John; there is extant, in a Latin translation, a commentary by him on the 2d Epistle; and, as Eusebius and Photius both attest that he wrote commentaries on all the *seven* catholic Epistles, it would appear that he must have known and acknowledged the 3d also. If the *Adumbrationes* are Clement's, he bears direct testimony to the 2d Epistle (*Adumbr.* p. 1011, edit. Potter). Origen speaks of the apostle John having left a 2d and 3d Epistle, which, however, he adds, all did not accept as genuine (*In Joan.* ap. Eusebius, vi, 25). Dionysius of Alexandria (*ibid.* vii, 25) recognises them as productions of the same John who wrote the Gospel and the 1st Epistle, and so do all the later Alexandrian writers. Eusebius himself elsewhere refers to them (*Dem. Evang.* iii, 5) without hesitation as John's; and in the synod held at Carthage (A.D. 256), Aurelius, bishop of Chullabi, confirmed his vote by citing 2 John 10 sq. as the language of the apostle John (Cyprian, *Opp.* ii, 120, ed. Oberthür). Ephrem Syrus speaks of them in the same way in the fourth century. In the fifth century they are almost universally received. A homily, wrongly attributed to St. Chrysostom, declares them uncanonical. In the *Muratori Fragment*, which, however, in the part relating to the Epistles of John, is somewhat confused or apparently vitiated, there are at least two Epistles of John recognised, for the author uses the plural in mentioning John's Epistles. In all the later catalogues, with the exception of the *Iambics ad Seleucum*, they are inserted with the other canonical books of the N. T. There is thus a solid body of evidence in favor of the genuineness of these epistles. That they were not universally known and received is probably to be accounted for by their character as private letters to individuals, which would naturally be longer in coming under general recognition than such as were addressed to churches or the Christians of a district.

The only antagonistic testimony which has reached us from antiquity is that of Jerome, who says (*De vir. Illust.* ix, 18) that both epistles were commonly reputed to be the production, not of John the apostle, but of John the presbyter, confirmed by the statement of Eusebius (iii, 25) that it was doubtful whether they were the production of the evangelist or of another John. On this it may be observed, 1. That the statement of Jerome is certainly not true in its full extent, for there is evidence enough that both in his own time and before, as well as after it, the general belief, both in the Latin and the Greek churches, was that they were written by John the apostle. 2. Both Jerome and Eusebius concur in attesting that *all* ascribed these Epistles either to John the apostle or John the presbyter as their author, which may be accepted as convincing evidence that they are not forgeries of an age later than that of the apostle. 3. The question being between John the apostle and John the presbyter, we may, without laying stress on the fact that the existence of the latter is, to say the least, involved in doubt [see JOHN THE PRESBYTER], call attention to the consideration that, whilst the use of the expression ὁ πρεσβύτερος by the writer of the 2d Epistle may have given rise to the report which Jerome and Eusebius attest, there lies in this a strong evidence that the writer was John the apostle, and not John the presbyter; for it is quite credible that the former, writing in his old age, should employ the term πρεσβύτερος to express this fact just as Paul does (Philem. 9), and as Peter does (1 Epist. v, 1), whereas it is incredible that the latter, with whom presbyter was a title of office, should, in writing a letter to an individual, designate himself thus, inasmuch as, the office being common to him with many others, the title, in the absence of his name, was no designation at all, to say nothing of the fact that there is no evidence that the members of the πρεσβυτήριον in the primitive churches ever received πρεσβύτερος as a title, any more than the members of the Church, though collectively οἱ ἅγιοι and οἱ ἀδελφοι, received individually ἅγιος or ἀδελφός as a *title* (see below). On these grounds there seems to be no reason for attaching much importance to the opinion or tradition reported by Jerome, though it has been adopted by Erasmus, Grotius, Credner, Jachmann (*Comm. üb. d. Kathol. Br.*), and more recently by Ebrard (Olshausen, *Comment.* vi, 4, E. T. vol. x, and in Herzog, *Encyc.* vi, 736). A late writer (Willichen, *Der geschichtliche Charakter des Ev. Joh.* Elberf. 1869) holds that the 2d and 3d Epistles are the production of disciples of John the apostle.

2. If the external testimony is not as decisive as we might wish, the *internal* evidence is peculiarly strong. Mill has pointed out that of the thirteen verses which compose the 2d Epistle, eight are to be found in the 1st Epistle. Either, then, the 2d Epistle proceeded from the same author as the 1st, or from a conscious fabricator who desired to pass off something of his own as the production of the apostle; but, if the latter alternative had been true, the fabricator in question would assuredly have assumed the title of John *the apostle* instead of merely designating himself as John *the elder*, and he would have introduced some doctrine which it would have been his object to make popular. The title and contents of the Epistle are strong arguments against a fabricator, whereas they would account for its non-universal reception in early times; and if not the work of a fabricator, it must, from style, diction, and tone of thought, be the work of the author of the 1st Epistle, and, we may add, of the Gospel. The private nature of their contents removes also the suspicion that they could have been forged, since it would be difficult to discover any purpose which could have led to such a forgery.

The reason why John designates himself as πρεσβύτερος rather than ἀπόστολος (2 Epist. 1; 3 Epist. 1) is no doubt the same as that which made Peter designate himself by the same title (1 Pet. v, 1), and which caused James and Jude to give themselves no other title than "the servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ" (James i, 1), "the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James" (Jude 1). Paul had a special object in declaring himself an apostle. Those who belonged to the original Twelve had no such necessity imposed upon them. With them it was a matter of indifference whether they employed the name of apostle, like Peter (1 Pet. i, 1; 2 Pet. i, 1), or adopted an appellation which they shared with others, like John, and James, and Jude. See ELDER.

II. The *second* Epistle is addressed to one whom the writer calls *ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ*. This has been differently understood. By some it has been regarded as designating the Church collectively, by others as designating a particular congregation, and by others as denoting an individual. This expression cannot mean the Church (Jerome), nor a particular church (Cassiodorus), nor the elect Church which comes together on Sundays (Michaelis), nor the Church of Philadelphia (Whiston), nor the Church of Jerusalem (Whitby). These opinions are rendered improbable partly by the reference in verse 11 to the *children*, and in verse 13 to the *sister* of the party addressed, partly by the want of any authority for such a usage of the term *κυρία* as would thus be imputed to the apostle. By those who understand this of an individual there are three renderings: according to one interpretation she is "the lady Electa;" to another, "the elect Kyria;" to a third, "the elect lady." The first interpretation is that of Clement of Alexandria (if the passage above referred to in the *Adumbrationes* be his), Wetstein, Grotius, Middleton; the second is that of Benson, Carpzov, Schleusner, Heumann, Bengel, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Lücke, Neander, Davidson; the third is the rendering of the English version, Mill, Wall, Wolf, Le Clerc, Lardner, Beza, Eichhorn, Newcome, Wakefield, Macknight. For the rendering "the lady Electa" to be right, the word *κυρίᾳ* must have preceded (as in modern Greek) the word *ἐκλεκτῇ*, not followed it; and, further, the last verse of the Epistle, in which her sister is also spoken of as *ἐκλεκτή*, is fatal to the hypothesis. The rendering "the elect lady" is probably wrong, because there is no article before the adjective *ἐκλεκτῇ*. It remains that the rendering "the elect Kyria" is probably right, though here too we should have expected the article—as, indeed, we should under any of the three renderings (though the rendering "an elect lady" is not demanded; see Alford, *Gr. Test.* vol. v, prolegg.). The choice, therefore, being between the last two of these renderings, two circumstances seem to be decisive in favor of the former: Kyria occurs elsewhere as a proper name [see CYRIA]; and that *ἐκλεκτή* is to be taken in its usual signification is rendered probable by its being applied in verse 13 to the sister of the party addressed. See ELECTA.

At the time of writing this Epistle the apostle was with the sister of the lady addressed, but expresses a hope ere long to see the latter, and converse with her on matters of which he could not then write. From this we may infer either that the apostle was at the time on a journey from which he expected ere long to return, or that the lady in question resided not very far from his usual residence, and that he intended soon to pay her a visit. Adopting the latter hypothesis as the more probable, and viewing it in connection with the apostle's styling himself *πρεσβύτερος*, we may infer that the Epistle was written at a late period of the apostle's life.

The object of the apostle in writing the 2d Epistle was to warn the lady to whom he wrote against abetting the teaching known as that of Basilides and his followers, by perhaps an undue kindness displayed by her towards the preachers of the false doctrine. After the introductory salutation, the apostle at once urges on his correspondent the great principle of love, which with him (as we have before seen) means right affection springing from right faith, and issuing in right conduct. The immediate consequence of the possession of this love is the abhorrence of heretical misbelief, because the latter, being incompatible with right faith, is destructive of the producing cause of love, and therefore of love itself. This is the secret of John's strong denunciation of the "deceiver," whom he designates as "Antichrist." Love is with him the essence of Christianity, but love can spring only from right faith. Wrong belief, therefore, destroys love, and with it Christianity. Therefore says he, "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds" (2 Epist. 10, 11).

III. The *third* Epistle is addressed to Caius, a Christian brother noted for his hospitality to the saints. Whether this be one of those mentioned elsewhere in the N. T. by this name is uncertain; he *may* have been the same mentioned Acts xix, 28. See GAIUS. The apostle writes for the purpose of commending to the kindness and hospitality of Caius some Christians who were strangers in the place where he lived. It is probable that these Christians carried this letter with them to Caius as their introduction. It would appear that the object of the travellers was to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles without money and without price (3 Epist. 7). The apostle had already written to the ecclesiastical authorities of the place (*ἔγραψα*, ver. 9, not "scripsissem," as the Vulg.), but they, at the instigation of Diotrephes, had refused to receive the missionary brethren, and therefore the apostle now commends them to the care of a layman. It is probable that Diotrephes was a leading presbyter who held Judaizing views, and would not give assistance to men who were going about with the purpose of preaching solely to the Gentiles. The apostle intimates the probability of his soon personally visiting the church, when he would deal with Diotrephes for his misconduct, and would communicate to Caius many things of which he could not then write. In the mean time he exhorts him to follow that which is good, commends one Demetrius, and concludes with benediction and salutation. Whether this Demetrius (ver. 12) was a tolerant presbyter of the same community, whose example John holds up as worthy of commendation in contradistinction to that of Diotrephes, or whether he was one of the strangers who bore the letter, we are now unable to determine.

From their general similarity, we may conjecture that the two epistles were written shortly after the 1st Epistle from Ephesus. They both apply to individual cases of conduct the principles which had been laid down in their fulness in the 1st Epistle.

IV. *Commentaries.*—The following are the exegetical helps on the whole of both the latter epistles exclusively, in addition to those noticed above: Jones, *Commentary* [including Philem. etc.] (Lond. 1635, fol.); Smith, *Exposition* [on 2d Epistle] (Lond. 1663, 4to); Sonntag, *Hypomnemata* (Altorf, 1697, 8vo); Feustking, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1707, fol.); Verpoorten, *Exercitationes* (Gedan. 1741, 4to); Heumann, *Commentar* [on 3d Epist.] (Helmst. 1778, 8vo); Müller, *Commentarius* [on 2d Epist.] (Schleiz, 1783, 4to); Sommel, *Isagoge* (Lond. 1798, 4to); Rambonnet, *Specimen*, etc. [on 2d Epistle] (Tr. ad Rh. 1818, 8vo); Gachon, *Authenticité*, etc. (Montaub. 1851, 8vo); Cox, *Private Letters of Sts. Paul and John* (Lond. 1867, 8vo). See COMMENTARY.

JOHN, REVELATION OF. See REVELATION.

John *the Baptist* (Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής, or simply Ἰωάννης, when the reference is clear, as in Matt. iii, 4; iv, 12; Lat. *Joannes* [Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 12]; Heb. יוֹחָנָן, denoting *grace*, or *favor* [see Simonis, *Lex. N. T.* p. 513]). In the Church John commonly bears the honorable title of "forerunner of the Lord"—antecursor et præparator viarum Domini (Tertull. *adv. Marc.* iv, 33); in Greek, πρόδρομος, προάγγελος Κυρίου. The accounts of him which the Gospels present are fragmentary and imperfect; they involve, too, some difficulties which the learned have found it hard to remove; yet enough is given to show that he was a man of a lofty character, and that the relation in which he stood to Christianity was one of great importance. Indeed, according to our Lord's own testimony, he was a more honored character and distinguished saint than any prophet who had preceded him (Luke vii, 28). See PROPHET.

1. John was of the priestly race by both parents, for his father Zacharias was himself a priest of the course of Abia, or Abijah (1 Chron. xxiv, 10), offering incense at the very time when a son was promised to him; and

Elizabeth was of the daughters of Aaron (Luke i, 5), the latter "a cousin" (συγγενής, *relative*) of Mary, the mother of Jesus, whose senior John was by a period of six months (Luke i). Both parents, too, were devout persons, walking in the commandments of God, and waiting for the fulfilment of his promise to Israel. The divine mission of John was the subject of prophecy many centuries before his birth, for Matthew (iii, 3) tells us that it was John who was prefigured by Isaiah as "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight" (Isa. xl, 3), while by the prophet Malachi the Spirit announces more definitely, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me" (iii, 1). His birth—a birth not according to the ordinary laws of nature, but through the miraculous interposition of Almighty power—was foretold by an angel sent from God, who announced it as an occasion of joy and gladness to many, and at the same time assigned to him the name of *John*, to signify either that he was to be born of God's especial favor, or, perhaps, that he was to be the harbinger of grace. The angel Gabriel, moreover, proclaimed the character and office of this wonderful child even before his conception, foretelling that he would be filled with the Holy Ghost from the first moment of his existence, and appear as the great reformer of his countrymen—another Elijah in the boldness with which he would speak truth and rebuke vice—but, above all, as the chosen forerunner and herald of the long-expected Messiah. These marvellous revelations as to the character and career of the son for whom he had so long prayed in vain were too much for the faith of the aged Zacharias, and, when he sought some assurance of the certainty of the promised blessing, God gave it to him in a judgment—the privation of speech—until the event foretold should happen—a judgment intended to serve at once as a token of God's truth and a rebuke of his own incredulity. And now the Lord's gracious promise tarried not. Elizabeth, for greater privacy, retired into the hill-country, whither she was soon afterwards followed by her kinswoman Mary, who was herself the object and channel of divine grace beyond measure greater and more mysterious. The two cousins, who were thus honored above all the mothers of Israel, came together in a remote city, and immediately God's purpose was confirmed to them by a miraculous sign; for, as soon as Elizabeth heard the salutations of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb, thus acknowledging, as it were, even before birth, the presence of his Lord (Luke i, 43, 44). Three months after this, and while Mary still remained with her, Elizabeth was delivered of a son, B.C. 6. The exact spot where John was born is not determined. The rabbins (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 324; Witsii *Miscell. Sacr.* ii, 389) fix on Hebron, in the hill-country of Judæa; Paulus, Kuinoel, and Meyer, after Reland, are in favor of Jutta, "a city of Juda." See JUTTAH. On the eighth day the child of promise was, in conformity with the law of Moses (Lev. xii, 3), brought to the priest for circumcision, and, as the performance of this rite was the accustomed time for naming a child, the friends of the family proposed to call him Zacharias, after the name of his father. The mother, however, required that he should be called John, a decision which Zacharias, still speechless, confirmed by writing on a tablet, "his name is John." The judgment on his want of faith was then at once withdrawn, and the first use which he made of his recovered speech was to praise Jehovah for his faithfulness and mercy (Luke i, 64). God's wonderful interposition in the birth of John had impressed the minds of many with a certain solemn awe and expectation (Luke iii, 15). God was surely again visiting his people. His providence, so long hidden, seemed once more about to manifest itself. The child thus supernaturally born must doubtless be commissioned to perform some important part in the history of the chosen people. Could it be the Messiah? Could it be Elijah? Was the era of their old prophets about to be restored? With such grave thoughts were the minds of the people occupied as they mused on the events which had been passing under their eyes, and said one to another, "What manner of child shall this be?" while Zacharias himself, "filled with the Holy Ghost," broke forth in a glorious strain of praise and prophecy—a strain in which it is to be observed that the father, before speaking of his own child, blesses God for remembering his covenant and promise in the redemption and salvation of his people through him of whom his own son was the prophet and forerunner. A single verse contains all that we know of John's history for a space of thirty years, the whole period which elapsed between his birth and the commencement of his public ministry: "The child grew and waxed strong in the spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel" (Luke i, 80). John, it will be remembered, was ordained to be a Nazarite (see Numb. vi, 1-21) from his birth, for the words of the angel were, "He shall drink neither wine nor strong drink" (Luke i, 15). What we are to understand by this brief announcement is probably this: the chosen forerunner of the Messiah and herald of his kingdom was required to forego the ordinary pleasures and indulgences of the world, and live a life of the strictest self-denial in retirement and solitude. The apocryphal *Protev. Jac.* ch. xxii, states that his mother, in order to rescue her son from the murder of the children at Bethlehem which Herod commanded, fled with him into the desert. She could find no place of refuge; the mountain opened at her request, and gave the needed shelter in its bosom. Zacharias, being questioned by Herod as to where his son was to be found, and refusing to answer, was slain by the tyrant. At a later period Elizabeth died, when angels took the youth under their care (Fabricius, *Cod. Apocryph.* p. 117 sq.; comp. Kuhn, *Leben Jesu*, i, 163, remark 4). It was thus that the holy Nazarite, dwelling by himself in the wild and thinly-peopled region westward of the Dead Sea, called "desert" in the text, prepared himself by self-discipline, and by constant communion with God, for the wonderful office to which he had been divinely called. Here year after year of his stern probation passed by, till the time for the fulfilment of his mission arrived. The very appearance of the holy Baptist was of itself a lesson to his countrymen; his dress was that of the old prophets—a garment woven of camel's hair (2 Kings i, 8), attached to the body by a leathern girdle. His food was such as the desert spontaneously afforded—locusts (Lev. xi, 22) and wild honey (Psa. lxxxi, 16) from the rock. (See Endemann, *De victu Jo. Bapt.* Hersfeld, 1752; Thadd. a St. Adamo, *De victu Joa. Bapt. in deserto*, Bonn, 1785; Müller, *Varia de victu Joa. Baptist.* Bonn, 1829; Hackett, *Illustr. of Script.* p. 96.) Desert though the place is designated, the country where he spent these early years—the wild mountainous tract of Judah, lying between Jerusalem and the Dead Sea, along which it stretches—was not entirely destitute of means for supporting human existence (Matt. iii, 1-12; Mark i, 1-8; Luke iii, 1-20; John x, 28; Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 88). Josephus, in his *Life* (ii, 2), gives an account of one of his instructors, Banus, which throws light on John's condition in the desert: "He lived in the desert, and had no other food than what grew of its own accord, and bathed himself in cold water frequently, both by night and by day. I imitated him in these things, and continued with him three years." Some writers infer that John was an *Essene;* so says, e. g. Taylor, editor of Calmet's *Dictionary of the Bible;* comp. Johnson, *Monks before Christ* (Bost. 1870, 12mo), p. 109 sq. But this is denied by Rénan, *Vie de Jesus* (13th ed. Paris, 1867), p. 101 sq.

2. At length, in the fifteenth year of the associate reign of the emperor Tiberius (see Jarvis, *Chron. Introd.* p. 228 sq., 462 sq.), or A.D. 25, the long-secluded hermit came forth to the discharge of his office. His supernatural birth, his hard ascetic life, his reputation for extraordinary sanctity, and the generally-prevailing ex-

pectation that some great one was about to appear—these causes, without the aid of miraculous power, for "John did no miracle" (John x, 41), were sufficient to attract to him a great multitude from "every quarter" (Matt. iii, 5). Brief and startling was his first exhortation to them—"Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." A few scores of verses contain all that is recorded of John's preaching, and the sum of it all is repentance—not mere legal ablution or expiation, but a change of heart and life. Herein John, though exhibiting a marked contrast to the scribes and Pharisees of his own time, was but repeating, with the stimulus of a new and powerful motive, the lessons which had been again and again impressed upon them by their ancient prophets (comp. Isa. i, 16, 17; lv, 7; Jer. vii, 3–7; Ezek. xviii, 19–32, xxxvi, 25–27, Joel ii, 12, 13; Micah vi, 8; Zech. i, 3, 4). But, while such was his solemn admonition to the multitude at large, he adopted towards the leading sects of the Jews a severer tone, denouncing Pharisees and Sadducees alike as "a generation of vipers," and warning them of the folly of trusting to external privileges as descendants of Abraham (Luke iii, 8). Now, at last, he warns them that "the axe was laid to the root of the tree," that formal righteousness would be tolerated no longer, and that none would be acknowledged for children of Abraham but such as did the works of Abraham (comp. John viii, 39). Such alarming declarations produced their effect, and many of every class pressed forward to confess their sins and to be baptized.

What, then, was the baptism which John administered? See WASHING. (Comp. Olshausen, *Comment.* ad loc. Joh.; Dale, *Johannic Baptism*, Phila. 1871.) Not altogether a new rite, for it was the custom of the Jews to baptize proselytes to their religion; not an ordinance in itself conveying remission of sins, but rather a token and symbol of that repentance which was an indispensable condition of forgiveness through him whom John pointed out as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." Still less did the baptism of John impart the grace of regeneration—of a new spiritual life (Acts xix, 3, 4). This was to be the mysterious effect of baptism "with the Holy Ghost," which was to be ordained by that "mightier one" whose coming he proclaimed. The preparatory baptism of John was a visible sign to the people, and a distinct acknowledgment by them that a hearty renunciation of sin and a real amendment of life were necessary for admission into the kingdom of heaven, which the Baptist proclaimed to be at hand. But the fundamental distinction between John's baptism unto repentance and that baptism accompanied with the gift of the Holy Spirit which our Lord afterwards ordained is clearly marked by John himself (Matt. iii, 11, 12). See BAPTISM OF JOHN. As a preacher, John was eminently practical and discriminating. Self-love and covetousness were the prevalent sins of the people at large on them, therefore, he enjoined charity and consideration for others. The publicans he cautioned against extortion, the soldiers against violence and plunder. His answers to them are, no doubt, to be regarded as instances of the appropriate warning and advice which he addressed to every class. The first reason assigned by John for entering on his most weighty and perilous office was announced in these words: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." It was his great work to prepare the mind of the nation, so that when Jesus himself came they might be a people made ready for the Lord. What was the exact idea which John intended to convey by the term "kingdom of heaven" it is not easy, at least in the space before us, to determine with satisfaction. (See Richter, *De munere sacro Joanni Bapt. divinitus delegato*, Lips. 1756.) We feel ourselves, however, justified in protesting against the practice of those who take the vulgar Jewish notion and ascribe it to John, while some go so far as to deny that our Lord himself, at the first, possessed any other. Had we space to develop the moral character of John, we could show that this fine, stern, high-minded teacher possessed many eminent qualities; but his personal and official modesty in keeping, in all circumstances, in the lower rank assigned him by God must not pass without special mention. The doctrine and manner of life of John appear to have roused the entire of the south of Palestine, and people flocked from all parts to the spot where, on the banks of the Jordan, he baptized thousands unto repentance. Such, indeed, was the fame which he had gained, that "people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not" (Luke iii, 15). Had he chosen, John might without doubt have assumed to himself the higher office, and risen to great worldly power; but he was faithful to his trust, and never failed to declare, in the fullest and clearest manner, that he was not the Christ, but merely his harbinger, and that the sole work he had to do was to usher in the day-spring from on high. (See Beecher, *Life of Jesus*, vol. i, ch. v.)

The more than prophetic fame of the Baptist reached the ears of Jesus in his Nazarene dwelling, far distant from the locality of John (Matt. ii, 9, 11). The nature of the report—namely, that his divinely-predicted forerunner had appeared in Judæa—showed our Lord that the time had now come for his being made manifest to Israel. The mission of the baptist—an extraordinary one for an extraordinary purpose—was not limited to those who had openly forsaken the covenant of God, and so forfeited its principles; it was to the whole people alike. This we must infer from the baptism of one who had no confession to make, and no sins to wash away. Jesus himself came from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized of John, on the special ground that it became him "to fulfil all righteousness," and, as man, to submit to the customs and ordinances which were binding upon the rest of the Jewish people. John, however, naturally at first shrank from offering the symbols of purity to the sinless Son of God. Immediately on the termination of this symbolical act, a divine attestation was given from the opened vault of heaven, declaring Jesus to be in truth the long looked-for Messiah—"This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. iii, 17). The events which are found recorded in John i, 19 sq. seem to have happened after the baptism of Jesus by John. See JESUS CHRIST.

Here a difficult question arises—How is John's acknowledgment of Jesus at the moment of his presenting himself for baptism compatible with his subsequent assertion that he knew him not save by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him, which took place after his baptism? It is difficult to imagine that the two cousins did not personally recognise each other, from their close relationship, and the account which John could not have failed to receive of the remarkable circumstances attending Jesus's birth; hence his general deference at that time, but his explicit testimony subsequently (see Kuinöl, Alford, *Comment.* on Matt. iii, 14). The supposition that John was not personally acquainted with Jesus is therefore out of the question (see Lücke, *Comment.* on John i, 31). Yet it must be borne in mind that their places of residence were at the two extremities of the country, with but little means of communication between them. Perhaps, too, John's special destination and mode of life may have kept him from the stated festivals of his countrymen at Jerusalem. It is possible, therefore, that the Saviour and the Baptist had not often met. It was certainly of the utmost importance that there should be no suspicion of concert or collusion between them. John, however, must assuredly have been in daily expectation of Christ's manifestation to Israel, and so a word or sign would have sufficed to reveal to him the person and presence of our Lord, though we may well suppose such a fact to be made known by a direct communication from God, as in the case of Simeon (Luke ii, 26; comp. Jackson *on the Creed*, *Works*, Oxf. ed. vi, 404). At all events, it is wholly inconceivable that John should have been permitted to

baptize the Son of God without being enabled to distinguish him from any of the ordinary multitude. Upon the whole, the true meaning of the words κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν would seem to be as follows: And I, even I, though standing in so near a relation to him, both personally and ministerially, had no assured knowledge of him *as the Messiah.* I did not know him, and I had not authority to proclaim him as such till I saw the predicted sign in the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him. It must be borne in mind that John had no means of knowing by previous announcement whether this wonderful acknowledgment of the divine Son would be vouchsafed to his forerunner at his baptism or at any other time (see Dr. Mill's *Hist. Character of St. Luke's Gospel*, and the authorities quoted by him). See BAPTISM OF JESUS.

With the baptism of Jesus John's more especial office ceased. The king had come to his kingdom. The function of the herald was discharged. It was this that John had with singular humility and self-renunciation announced beforehand: "He must increase, but I must decrease." It seems but natural to think, therefore, when their hitherto relative position is taken into account, that John would forthwith lay down his office of harbinger, which, now that the Sun of Righteousness himself had appeared, was entirely fulfilled and terminated. Such a step he does not appear to have taken. From incidental notices we learn that John and his disciples continued to baptize some time after our Lord entered upon his ministry (see John iii, 23; iv, 1). We gather also that John instructed his disciples in certain moral and religious duties, as fasting (Matt. ix, 14; Luke v, 33) and prayer (Luke xi, 1). In short, the language of Scripture seems to imply that the Baptist Church continued side by side with the Messianic (Matt. xi, 3; Luke vii, 19; John xiv, 25), and remained long after John's execution (Acts xix, 3). Indeed, a sect which bears the name of "John's disciples" exists to the present day in the East, whose sacred books are said to be pervaded by a Gnostic leaven. (See Gesenius, in the *Allgem. Literaturzeitung*, 1817, No. 48, p. 378, and in the *Hall. Encyclop.*, probeheft, p. 95 sq.; Burckhardt, *Les Nazoréeans apellés Zabiens et Chrétiens de St. Jean, secte Gnostique*, Strasb. 1840; also Blarkey, in the *Bibl. Hag.* iv, 355 sq.; Schaff, *Apost. Hist.* p. 279 sq.). See JOHN, ST., CHRISTIANS OF. They are hostile alike to Judaism and Christianity, and their John and Jesus are altogether different from the characters bearing these names in our evangelists. Still, though it has been generally assumed that John did not lay down his office, we are not satisfied that the New Testament establishes this alleged fact. John may have ceased to execute his own peculiar work as the forerunner, but may justifiably have continued to bear his most important testimony to the Messiahship of Christ; or he may even have altogether given up the duties of active life some time, at least, before his death; and yet his disciples, both before and after that event, may have maintained their individuality as a religious communion. Nor will the student of the New Testament and of ecclesiastical history, who knows how grossly a teacher far greater than John was, both during his life and after his crucifixion, misunderstood and misrepresented, think it impossible that some misconception or some sinister motive may have had weight in preventing the Baptist Church from dissolving and passing into that of Christ. (See Weber, *J. d. Täufer und die Parteien seiner Zeit*, Gotha, 1870.) It was, not improbably, with a view to remove some error of this kind that John sent the embassy of his disciples to Jesus which is recorded in Matt. xi, 3; Luke vii, 19. The spiritual course which the teachings of Jesus were more and more taking, and the apparent failure, or at least uneasy postponement of the promised kingdom in the popular sense, especially after their esteemed master lay in prison, and was in imminent danger of losing his life, may well have led John's disciples to doubt if Jesus were in truth the expected Messiah; but no intimation is found in the record that John required evidence to give him satisfaction. (See below.) Be that as it may, it is certain that John still continued to present himself to his countrymen in the capacity of *witness* to Jesus. Especially did he bear testimony to him at Bethany beyond Jordan (for Bethany, not Bethabara, is the reading of the best MSS.). So confidently, indeed, did he point out the Lamb of God, on whom he had seen the Spirit alighting like a dove, that two of his own disciples, Andrew, and probably John, being convinced by his testimony, followed Jesus as the true Messiah.

3. But shortly after he had given his testimony to the Messiah, John's public ministry was brought to a close. He had, at the beginning of it, condemned the hypocrisy and worldliness of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and he had now occasion to denounce the lust of a king. In daring disregard of the divine laws, Herod Antipas had taken to himself the wife of his brother Philip; and when John reproved him for this, as well as for other sins (Luke iii, 19), Herod cast him into prison. Josephus, however, assigns a somewhat different cause for Herod's act from that given in the Gospels: "Now some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, as a punishment of what he did against John that was called the Baptist; for Herod slew him, although he was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness one towards another and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism. Now when others came in crowds about him—for they were greatly moved by hearing his words—Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion (for they seemed ready to do anything he should advise), thought it best, by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent of it when it should be too late. Accordingly he was sent a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Machærus, the castle I before mentioned, and was there put to death" (*Ant.* xviii, 5, 2). There is no contrariety between this account and that which is given in the New Testament. (See Lamy, *Diss. de vinculis Joa. Bapt.*; Van Til, *De Joa. Bapt. incarceratione fictitia Herodiana vincula antecedente*, L. B. 1710.) Both may be true: John was condemned in the mind of Herod on political grounds, as endangering his position, and executed on private and ostensible grounds, in order to gratify a malicious but powerful woman. The scriptural reason was but the pretext for carrying into effect the determination of Herod's cabinet. That the fear of Herod was not without some ground may be seen in the popularity which John had gained (Mark xi, 32; see Lardner, *Works*, vi, 483).

The castle of Machærus, where John was imprisoned and beheaded, was a fortress lying on the southern extremity of Peræa, at the head of the Lake Asphaltites, between the dominions of Herod and Aretas, king of Arabia Petræa, and at the time of our history appears to have belonged to the former (Lardner, vi, 483). It was here that the above-mentioned reports reached him of the miracles which our Lord was working in Judæa—miracles which, doubtless, were to John's mind but the confirmation of what he expected to hear as to the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. But if Christ's kingdom were indeed established, it was the duty of John's own disciples, no less than of all others, to acknowledge it. They, however, would naturally cling to their own master, and be slow to transfer their allegiance to another. With a view, therefore, to overcome their scruples, John sent two of them to Jesus himself to ask the question, "Art thou he that should come?" They were answered not by words, but by a series of miracles wrought before their eyes—the very miracles which prophecy had specified as the distinguishing credentials of the Messiah (Isa. xxxv, 5; lxi, 1); and while Jesus

bade the two messengers carry back to John as his only answer the report of what they had seen and heard, he took occasion to guard the multitude who surrounded him against supposing that the Baptist himself was shaken in mind, by a direct appeal to their own knowledge of his life and character. Well might they be appealed to as witnesses that the stern prophet of the wilderness was no waverer, bending to every breeze, like the reeds on the banks of Jordan. Proof abundant had they that John was no worldling, with a heart set upon rich clothing and dainty fare—the luxuries of a king's court—and they must have been ready to acknowledge that one so inured to a life of hardness and privation was not likely to be affected by the ordinary terrors of a prison. But our Lord not only vindicates his forerunner from any suspicion of inconstancy, he goes on to proclaim him a prophet, and more than a prophet; nay, inferior to none born of woman, though in respect to spiritual privileges behind the least of those who were to be born of the Spirit and admitted into the fellowship of Christ's body (Matt. xi, 11). It should be noted that the expression ὁ δὲ μικρότερος, κ. τ. λ., is understood by Chrysostom, Augustine, Hilary, and some modern commentators to mean Christ himself, but this interpretation is less agreeable to the spirit and tone of our Lord's discourse. Jesus further proceeds to declare that John was, according to the true meaning of the prophecy, the Elijah of the new covenant, foretold by Malachi (iii, 4).

The event, indeed, proved that John was to Herod what Elijah had been to Ahab, and a prison was deemed too light a punishment for his boldness in asserting God's law before the face of a king and a queen. Nothing but the death of the Baptist would satisfy the resentment of Herodias. Though foiled once, she continued to watch her opportunity, which at length arrived. A court festival was kept in honor of the king's birthday. After supper the daughter of Herodias came in and danced before the company, and so charmed was the king by her grace that he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she should ask. Salome, prompted by her abandoned mother, demanded the head of John the Baptist. The promise had been given in the hearing of his distinguished guests, and so Herod, though loth to be made the instrument of so bloody a work, gave instructions to an officer of his guard, who went and executed John in the prison, and his head was brought to feast the eyes of the adulteress whose sins he had denounced. See HERODIAS. According to the Scripture account, the daughter of Herodias obtained the Baptist's head at the entertainment, without delay. How could this be when Machærus lay at a distance from Jerusalem? The feast seems to have been made at Machærus, which, besides being a stronghold, was also a palace, built by Herod the Great, and here Antipas appears to have been spending some time with his paramour Herodias.

4. Thus was John added to that glorious army of martyrs who have suffered for righteousness' sake. His death seems to have occurred just before the third Passover, in the course of the Lord's ministry, A.D. 28. Herod undoubtedly looked upon him as some extraordinary person, for no sooner did he hear of the miracles of Jesus than, though a Sadducee himself, and, as such, a disbeliever in the resurrection, he ascribed them to John, whom he supposed to have risen from the dead. See HEROD ANTIPAS. Holy Scripture tells us that the body of the Baptist was laid in the tomb by his disciples, and ecclesiastical history records the honors which successive generations paid to his memory. He is mentioned in the Koran, with much honor, under the name of *Jahja* (see Hottinger, *Historia Orientalis*, p. 144–149, Tigur. 1660; Herbelot, *Biblioth. Or.* ii, 283 sq.).

The brief history of John's life is marked throughout with the characteristic graces of self-denial, humility, and holy courage. So great, indeed, was his abstinence that worldly men considered him possessed. "John came neither eating nor drinking, and they said he hath a devil." His humility was such that he had again and again to disavow the character and decline the honors which an admiring multitude almost forced upon him. To their questions he answered plainly he was not the Christ, nor the Elijah of whom they were thinking, nor one of their old prophets. He was no one—a voice merely—the voice of God calling his people to repentance in preparation for the coming of him whose shoe-latchet he was not worthy to unloose. For his boldness in speaking truth, he went a willing victim to prison and to death.

Resembling, though John did, in so many things the Elijah of former days, the exit of the one from his field of labor was remarkable for its humiliating circumstances, as the other for its singular glory—the one dying as a felon by the hand of the executioner, the other, without tasting at all of death, ascending to heaven in a chariot of fire. But in John's case it could not be otherwise; the forerunner, no more than the disciple, could be above his Master; and especially in the treatment of the one must the followers of Jesus be prepared for what was going to be accomplished in the other. After John's death, and growing out of it, a whole series of special actions and discourses were directed to this end by our Lord. The manner of John's death, therefore, is on no account to be regarded as throwing a depreciatory reflection on his position and ministry. He was, as Christ himself testified, "a burning and a shining light" (John v, 35), and he fulfilled his arduous course in a truly noble and valiant spirit.—Fairbairn.

5. For the literature connected with this subject, see, besides the treatises noticed above, Hase, *Leben Jesu* (4th ed. Leipzig, 1854), p. 82, 86, 149; Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, p. 20 sq., 23, 125; Walch, *Bibliotheca Theologica*, iii, 402; Witsii *Exerc. de Joanne Bapt.* (in his *Miscell. Sacra*, ii, 367); Leopold, *Johannes der Täufer* (Hannov. 1825); Usteri, *Nachrichten von Johannes dem Täufer* (in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1829, iii, 439); Von Rohden, *Johannes der Täufer* (Lübeck, 1838); Neander, *Leb. Jesu* (Hamb. 1837), p. 49; Keim, *Leb. Jesu*, i, 469–523; Hausrath, *Leben Jesu*, p. 316–340. The ecclesiastical traditions touching John may be found in the *Acta Sanct.* iv, 687–846; and, in a compendious form, in Tillemont, *Mémoires*, i, 82–108, 482–505. Other treatises of a more special character, in addition to those above cited, are: Hottinger, *Pentas dissert. Bibl. chronol.* (Traj. a. R. 1723) p. 143 sq.; Deyling, *Observationes sacr.* iii, 251 sq.; Ammon, *Pr. de doctrina et morte Jo. Bapt.* (Erlangen, 1809); Rau, *Pr. de Joan. Bapt. in rem Christ. studiis* (Erlang. 1785), ii, 4; Abegg, *Orat. de Jo. Bapt.* (Heidelb. 1820); Bax, *Specim. de Jo. Bapt.* (L. B. 1821); Stein, *Ueb. Gesch. Lehre u. Schicksale Joh. d. T.* (in Keil's *Analect.* iv, i, 37 sq.); Wessenberg, *Johannes der Vorläufer uns. Herrn* (Constanz, 1821); Müller, *Pr. de Jo. Bapt.* (Helmst. 1733); Asp. *Obs. Phil. hist. de Jo. Bapt.* (Upsala, 1733); Lisco, *Biblische Beitr. über J. d. Täufer* (Berlin, 1826); Eckhard, *Josephus de Jo. Bapt. testatus* (Eisen. 1785); Harenberg, *De cibo Jo. Bapt.* (in *Otia Gand. sacra*, Traj. ad R. 1740, p. 1 sq.); Amnele, *Amictus et victus J. Bapt.* (Upsal. 1755); Stollberg, *id.* (Vitemb. 1673); Carpzov, *De cultu Jo. B. Antiquat. Chr.* (Rome, 1755); Huth, *Num. Jo. B. Maria et discip. Chr. fuerint baptizati* (Erlangen, 1759); Blatt, *A Dissert. on John's Message to our Saviour* (London, 1789); Zeigermann, *Comm. de consil. quo Jo. discip. ad Jesum ablegaverit* (Nuremb. 1813); Frank, *Joh. d. Täufer* (Eisleben, 1841); Kromayer, *De baptisme Christi* (Lips. 1680).

John ÆGEATES (ὁ Αἰγεάτης), a presbyter of Ægæ (Αἰγαί) (probably in Cilicia, between Mopsuestia and Issus). Photius calls him (*Cod.* 55) a Nestorian, but Fabricius, with reason, supposes that he was a Eutychian. When he flourished is not known; he may perhaps be consigned to the latter half of the 5th century. Vossius places him under Zeno the Isaurian, but Cave thinks he was later. He is the reputed author of (1) Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία (*Historia Ecclesiastica*), in ten

books, of which Photius had read five, containing the history of the Church from the deposition of Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus (the third general council, A. D. 431) to the deposition of Petrus Fullo (A.D. 477), who had usurped the see of Antioch in the reign of the emperor Zeno. As the Council of Ephesus is the point at which the ecclesiastical history of Socrates leaves off, it is probable that the history of John of Ægæ commenced, like that of Evagrius, at that point, and consequently that these five books were the first five of his history. Photius describes his style as perspicuous and florid, and says that he was a great admirer of Dioscorus of Alexandria, the successor of Cyril, and extolled the Synod of Ephesus (A.D. 449), generally branded with the epithet ἡ λῃστρική, "the synod of robbers," while he attacked the Council of Chalcedon. How late a period the history came down to cannot be determined:—(2) A work which Photius describes as Κατὰ τῆς ἁγίας τετάρτης συνόδου (*Adversus Quartam Sanctam Synodum*). This must be Photius's description, not the original title of the work; for, opposed as we infer John to have been to the authority of the Council of Chalcedon, he would hardly have described it as "the fourth sacred council." Photius commends the style in which the work was written. Fabricius identifies John of Ægæ with the Joannes ὁ διακρινόμενος, i. e. "the dissenter," cited by the anonymous writer of the Διαστάσεις σύντομοι χρονικαί (*Breves Demonstrationes Chronographicæ*), given by Combefis (in his *Origenum C. Politinarum Manipulus*, p. 24, 33), but Combefis himself (*ibid.* p. 59) identifies this John with John Malalas. Whether John of Ægæ is the John ὁ Ῥήτωρ, "the Rhetorician," cited by Evagrius Scholasticus (*Hist. Eccl.* i, 16; ii, 12; iii, 10, etc.) is doubtful. Le Quien (*Opera S. Joannis Damasceni*, i, 368, note) identifies them, but Fabricius thinks they were different persons. See Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 41, 55; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii, 419; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i, 456, ed. Oxford, 1740-43; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii, 585.

John AGRICOLA. See AGRICOLA.

John ALASCO. See LASCO.

John OF ALEXANDRIA. See JOHN NICIOTA; JOHN TALAIA.

John ALEXANDRINUS. See JOHN THE LABORIOUS.

John THE ALMSGIVER (JOHANNES ELEEMOSYNARIUS), one of the best of the patriarchs of the Eastern Church, was born of noble parentage at Amanthus, in Cyprus, about 550. He had married young, but, losing his wife, he distributed his possessions among the poor, and devoted himself to a life of ascetic practices. So irreproachable was his conduct, and so great his reputation for piety and charity, that, on the murder of Theodore, he was unanimously demanded as successor in the patriarchate. He was appointed by the emperor in A.D. 606. The first years of his reign were quiet; not so the last years, which were marked by the successful invasions of Chosroes II, king of the Persians, during the reign of Phocas, into the Roman possessions of the Orient (compare Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Rom. Empire*, ch. xlvi). From all parts of Syria Christians fled to Alexandria to find a protector in John, and when at last Jerusalem also had fallen (A.D. 619), not content with feeding and clothing the refugees he found right at his own door, he sent large sums of money to the Holy City to redeem Christian captives and prevent further massacre. (The statement that at this fall of Jerusalem "90,000 Christians were massacred, and that principally by the Jews, who purchased them from the Persians on purpose to put them to death" [Neale], has no better basis than the inventions of prejudiced monastics, bent on the destruction of the Jews. Comp. Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, v, 34 sq., 438 sq.). In 620, when the Persians threatened Egypt also, he fled to his native island, and died there a short time after his arrival. He is commemorated in the Oriental Church November 11, and in the Latin January 23. Curiously enough, he is also commemorated by the Jacobites. It is from this John that the famous order of the *Hospitallers*, in the first instance, derived its name. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, ascribed to him the authorship of the celebrated *Epistola ad Cæsarium*, with which most Protestant and some Roman Catholic critics credit Chrysostom. Three biographical accounts were written of him: (1) by Joannes Moschus and Sophronius (no longer extant); (2) by Leontius, bishop of Neapolis, in Cyprus (translated, between 858 and 867, into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, and repeatedly printed); found in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists (Jan. 23, ii, 495); (3) by Simeon Metaphrastes (but not trustworthy). See Neale, *Hist. East. Ch.* (*Alexandria*), ii, 52 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, v, 718 sq.; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, i, 699, note xx; viii, 322; x, 262. (J. H. W.)

John OF ANTIOCH (1), a prelate of the early Greek Church, distinguished for the part he took in the controversy between Cyril and Nestorius, flourished in the first half of the 5th century, and succeeded Theodotus in the patriarchate of Antioch about A.D. 427. Favorably disposed towards Nestorius, who is said to have been a schoolmate of his in the monastery of St. Euprepius, near Antioch, he was forced to take decided ground against Cyril by the impolitic conduct of the latter at the Council of Ephesus (q. v.). Among the Eastern bishops who came with John of Antioch to attend the council, he was the acknowledged leader, and we need not wonder, therefore, that he swayed them all in favor of Nestorius, when, on arriving at Ephesus, they learned that the sessions had not only commenced, but that Nestorius had already been actually condemned without their sanction. As long as Irenæus (q. v.) and Candidius succeeded in maintaining the Nestorians at the court of the emperor Theodosius, John proved faithful to his course taken at Ephesus; but when he found the Cyrillian party gaining the upper hand, he slowly modified his position until a reconciliation with Cyril followed (A.D. 432). He now turned actually against his former friend Nestorius, and after much trouble and opposition, which he vanquished, partly by persuasion, partly by deposing the pertinacious, the other Eastern bishops also—in provincial councils held at Antioch (A.D. 432), Anazarbus (A.D. 433), and Tarsus (A.D. 434)—declared for Cyril and the decrees of the third Œcumenical Council. Nay, it is said that John of Antioch was even the man who instigated the emperor to make the banishment of Nestorius perpetual; no doubt actuated by a desire to convince the Cyrillians of the truthfulness of his conversion. In the controversy with Theodore of Mopsuestia he took more liberal ground, declining, at a council held in 438, to condemn the writings and opinions of Theodore; according to Liberatus, he even appeared in his defence. John died in 441 or 442. He is spoken of by Gennadius (*De Viris Illustribus*, c. 54) as possessed of great rhetorical power. He wrote (1) Ἐπιστολαί (*Epistolæ*) and Ἀναφοραί (*Relationes*) respecting the Nestorian controversy and the Council of Ephesus, of which several are contained in the various editions of the *Concilia*:—(2) Ὁμιλία (*Homilia*), the homily or exhortation delivered at Chalcedon, just after the Council of Ephesus, to the people of Constantinople, with the aim to animate them to continue steadfast in their adherence to the old Nicene Confession; a fragment of it we have in the *Concilia*:—(3) Περὶ τῶν Μεσαλιανιτῶν (*De Messalianis*), a letter to Nestorius, enumerated by Photius (*Bibl. Cod.* 32) among the episcopal and synodical papers against that heretical body, contained in the history or acta of the Council of Side (A. D. 383):—(4) *Contra eos qui una tantum substantia asserunt adorandum Christum* (only known to us by Gennadius; probably the work from which the passages are taken with which Eulogius credits John of Antioch). See Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 586 sq.; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. xiv; Mansi, *Concilia*, iv, 1259 sq.; Neale, *Hist. East. Ch.* (*Alexandria*), i, bk. ii, sect. ii and iii; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* ii, 178 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.*

iii, § 138-140; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i, 224 sq.; Gibbon, *Decl. and Fall Rom. Emp.* ch. xlvii.

John of Antioch (2), surnamed *Codonatus*, the successor of Petrus Gnapheus, or Fullo (the Fuller), after his deposition, in the patriarchate of Antioch, A.D. 447. John had previously been bishop of Apamea; but, after holding the patriarchate three months, he was deposed by a synod of Eastern bishops, and succeeded by Stephen. Theophanes incorrectly places the appointment of John after Stephen's death. Both John and his predecessor Petrus had been, at the instigation of Acacius of Constantinople, excommunicated by the pope; yet, after the deposition of John, the same Acacius procured his elevation to the bishopric of Tyre. Theophanes incorrectly ascribes this appointment to Calendion of Antioch. See Theophanes, *Chronog.* p. 110, etc., ed. Paris (p. 88, etc., ed. Venice; p. 199, etc., ed. Bonn); Valesius, *Not. ad Evagrii H. E.* iii, 15, and *Observationes, Eccles. ad Evagrium*, ii, 8.—Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 586.

John of Antioch (3), surnamed *Scholasticus*, an eminent Greek legist, flourished in the 6th century. He entered the Church, and became patriarch of Constantinople (564-578). He compiled a collection of ecclesiastical laws, which greatly surpassed in extent and method those which preceded it, and which has remained the basis of canon law in the Greek Church. Another of his works, entitled *Nomocanon*, was an attempt to harmonize Justinian's constitutions relating to the Church with the older rules. Both works were for many centuries held in high estimation, and were inserted in Voell and Justel's *Bibl. juris canonici veteris* (Paris, 1961), ii, 603-789. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, xi, 100; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvi, 530. (J. N. P.)

John Archaph (Ἀρχάφ), an Egyptian schismatic of some note, was a contemporary of Athanasius. He was a devoted follower of Melitius, who, just before his death, which occurred shortly after his condemnation by the Council of Nice (A.D. 325), made John the Meletian bishop of Memphis, and intrusted to him also the leadership of the Melitians as a body. John, supported by the Arians, renewed the attacks against the orthodox party, and the schism soon became as violent as ever. Athanasius, now patriarch of Alexandria, and leader of the orthodox party, was the great object of attack; and John and his followers sought to throw on him the odium of originating the disturbances, and of persecuting his opponents; and, especially, they charged him with the murder of Arsenius, a Melitian bishop, whom they had secreted in order to give color to the charge. Athanasius (q. v.), on his part, appealed to the emperor, Constantine the Great, charging John and his followers with unsoundness in the faith, with a desire to alter the decrees of the Nicene Council, and with raising tumults and insulting the orthodox; he also objected to them as being irregularly ordained. He refuted their charges, especially the charge of murder, ascertaining that Arsenius was alive, and obliged them to remain quiet. John professed to repent of his disorderly proceedings and to be reconciled to Athanasius, and returned with his party into the communion of the orthodox Church, but the reconciliation was not sincere or lasting; troubles broke out again, and a fresh separation took place, John and his followers either being ejected from communion by the Athanasian party, or their return opposed. The Council of Tyre (A.D. 335), in which the opponents of Athanasius were triumphant, ordered them to be readmitted; but the emperor, deeming John to be a contentious man, or at least thinking that his presence was incompatible with the peace of the Egyptian Church, banished him (A.D. 336), just after he had banished Athanasius into Gaul. The place of his exile and his subsequent fate are not known.—Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 21, 22, 25, 31; Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos*, c. 65, 67, 70, 71; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. vi passim, vol. viii passim; Neale, *Hist. Eastern Ch.* (*Alexandria*) i, 161; Smith, *Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog.* ii, 587.

John Argyropūlus (Ἀργυροπoῦλος), one of the learned Greeks whose flight into Western Europe contributed so powerfully to the revival of learning, was born at Constantinople of a noble family, and was a presbyter of that city, on the capture of which (A.D. 1453) he is said by Fabricius and Cave to have fled into Italy; but there is every reason to believe that his removal was antecedent to that event, and that he was in Italy several times previously. A passage cited by Tiraboschi (*Storia della Lett. Italiana*, vi, 198) makes it likely that he was at Padua A.D. 1434, reading and explaining the works of Aristotle on natural philosophy. In A.D. 1439 an Argyropulus was present with the emperor John Palæologus at the Council of Florence (Michael Ducas, *Hist. Byzant.* c. 31), and, though it is not certain that this was our John, it yet seems very probable. In A.D. 1441 he was at Constantinople, as appears from a letter of Francesco Filelfo to Pietro Perleoni (see Philelphus, *Epistol.* 3), engaged in public teaching, but it is uncertain how long he had been established there. Probably he had returned some time between A.D. 1434 and 1439, and accompanied Bessarion to and from the Council of Florence. Among his pupils at Constantinople was Michael Apostolius. During his abode in Italy, after his last removal thither in 1453, he was honorably received by Cosmo de' Medici, and was made preceptor to Lorenzo de' Medici, the celebrated son of Pietro, in Greek and in the Aristotelian philosophy, especially in ethics. When Lorenzo succeeded to the throne in A.D. 1469 he established a Greek academy in that city, and in it Argyropulus read and expounded the classical Greek writers to the Florentine youth. From Florence he removed to Rome, on account of the plague which had broken out in the former city; the time of his removal is not ascertained, but it was before 1471. At Rome he obtained an ample subsistence by teaching Greek and philosophy, and especially by publicly expounding the works of Aristotle. He died at the age of seventy from an autumnal fever said to have been brought on by eating too freely of melons, but the year of his death is variously stated; all that appears to be certainly known is that he survived Theodore Gaza, who died A.D. 1478. The attainments of Argyropulus were highly estimated in his own and the succeeding age. Thus it is related of Theodore Gaza that, when he found that Argyropulus was engaged in translating some pieces of Aristotle, on which he had also been occupied, he burnt his own versions, that he might not, by provoking any unfavorable comparison, stand in the way of his friend's rising reputation. The works of Argyropulus are as follows: Original works—1. Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσεως, *De Processione Spiritus Sancti;* printed with a Latin version in the *Græcia Orthodoxa* of Leo Allatius, i, 400-418:—2. *Oratio quarta pro Synodo Florentina*, cited by Nicolaus Comnenus Papadopoli in his *Prænotiones Mystagogicæ*. We do not know if this has been published, or whether it is in Latin or Greek:—3. *Commentarii in Ethica Nicomachea* (Florence, 1478). This work comprehends the substance of his expository lectures on the Nicomachian ethics of Aristotle, taken down and published by Donatus Acciajuoli, who is mentioned as a pupil of Argyropulus:—4. *Commentarii in Aristotelis Metaphysica*, published with Bessarion's version of that work (Paris, 1515, fol.). The other original works of Argyropulus are scattered in MSS. through the libraries of Europe (of which a full list is given by Smith, *ut infra*). He also translated the *Prædicabilia*, or *De quinque vocibus* of Porphyry, and the *Homiliæ S. Basilii in Hexaëmeron*. His version of Porphyry was printed with his translations of Aristotle at Venice in 1496, and that of Basil at Rome in 1515. See Hody, *De Græcis Illustribus*, p. 187-210; Wharton in Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ii, Appendix, p. 168; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* iii, 496, etc.; xi, 460, etc.; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 587.

John, abbot OF ST. ARNOUL of Metz, is first mentioned in 960, when he succeeded Anstée in that office. He was reputed to be a learned and very liberal man for the times. He granted a charter of freedom to the inhabitants of Maurville, formerly serfs of the abbey, and divided the land among them, retaining only for the abbey the right of levying certain taxes. He died about 977. John wrote a Life of St. Glodesinde (Mabillon, *Acta Sanctæ*, vol. ii, col. 1087) and the Life of St. John de Vendière, abbot of Gorze (Bollandii, vol. iii, Feb.). See *Gallia Christ.* vol. xiii, col. 900; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vii, 421; Hoefer, *Nouveau Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 530. (J. N. P.)

John OF AVILA (*Juan de Avila*), the apostle of Andalusia in the 16th century, was born at Almodovar del Campo, a small city of the province of Toledo, about the year 1500. His father intended him for the profession of law, but, after a short stay at the University of Salamanca, he returned home, and spent three years in strict asceticism. Then, after extended studies in philosophy and theology under Domingo de Soto, he commenced preaching with great success. His popularity excited envy, and he was imprisoned for a very short time by the Inquisition. After preaching for nine years in Andalusia, he visited also Cordova, Granada, Baeza, Montilla, etc., where his sermons—chiefly in honor of the Virgin Mary—proved a great success. The highest ecclesiastical offices were now offered him; pope Paul III contemplated even creating him cardinal, but John preferred to continue the work of an itinerant missionary. With a view to the early religious education of the people, and to elevate their moral standing permanently, he established schools at Seville, Ubeda, Baeza, Granada, Cordova, and Montilla. His health failed him, however, and he remained for twenty years sick at the latter place, which accounts for his not accompanying the archbishop of Granada to the Council of Trent. Here he composed his *Epistolario espiritual* (2 vols. 4to), which has been translated into several languages. He died May 10, 1569. His Life has been written by Luis de Granada (see *Obras del V. P. M. Luis de Granada*, Madrid, 1849; Luis Munnoz, *Vida del Ven. Varon el Maestro Juan de Avila;* Antonio de Capmany, *Teatro historico de la elocuencia Espannola*). See Fr. J. Schirmer, *Werke des Juan de Avila* (*Sermones del santissimo sacramento; de la incarnacion del Hijo de Dios; del Espiritu Santo; lás festivitates de la santissima virgen Maria*, etc.), Regensburg, 1856.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vi, 737.

John BAPTIST, a French missionary priest in the latter part of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. The son of the emperor of Cochin China, Gya-Long, having come to France with the bishop of Adran in 1787, concluded a treaty with king Louis XVI, by which the latter was to aid him in regaining his throne, which he had lost by a revolution. Events prevented Louis from keeping his promise, but Gya-Long, having regained his kingdom, called to his court the bishop of Adran, who became his prime minister, and John Baptist, who had acted as general vicar to the bishop. He also enacted several laws favoring Roman Catholicism. The bishop of Adran died in 1817, and Gya-Long himself in 1819. His successor being opposed to Christianity, John Baptist left Huë-Foo, the capital of the empire of Annam, where he had resided, travelled through the East, and in 1827 settled in the convent of St. Francis at Macao, where he died July 9, 1847. He is said to have left a collection of interesting documents on China and the other countries he visited. See *Le Constitutionnel*, Oct. 17, 1847.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 567. (J. N. P.)

John OF BASSORA is the name of a prelate of the Eastern Church who flourished at Bassora, the ancient Bostra, from A.D. 617-650, after whom one of the liturgies of the Oriental Church is named. He was formerly supposed to be the author of it, but Neale thinks it of later date, and supposes it had its origin in the northern parts of Arabia. See Neale, *Hist. of East. Church*, Introd. p. 328 (6).

John BESSARION. See BESSARION.

John OF BEVERLY. See BEVERLY.

John BORELLUS. See JOHN OF PARMA.

John OF BRUGES. See JORIS, DAVID; ANABAPTISTS.

John BURIDANUS, a celebrated Nominalist of the 14th century, was born at Bethune, in Artois. He is reputed to have been a pupil of Occam, then to have lectured with great ability and success in Paris, and to have risen to the distinction of rector of the university of that city about 1330, and to have quitted that place only after the Realists had gained the ascendency [see REALISM and NOMINALISM], and to have assisted in the founding of the university at Vienna. He was looked upon by his contemporaries as one of the most powerful adversaries of Realism, and distinguished himself also by his rules for finding the middle term in logic, a species of contrivance denominated by some the *Ass's Bridge*, as well as by his inquiries concerning free-will, wherein he approached the principles of Determinatism, maintaining that we necessarily prefer the greater of two goods. As for the celebrated illustration which bears his name, of an ass dying for hunger between two bundles of hay, it is not to be found in his writings, which are, *Quæstiones in X libb. Ethicorum Aristot.* (Paris, 1489, fol.; Oxford, 1637, 4to):—*Quæst. in Polit. Arist.* (Par. 1500, fol.):—*Compendium Logicæ* (Ven. 1499, fol.):—*Summula de Dialecticâ* (Paris, 1487, fol.): &c. Complete editions of his works were published at Paris in 1500, 1516, and 1518. See Bayle, *Histor. Dict.* art. Buridanus; Tennemann, *Gesch. der Phil.* viii, 2, 914 sq.; *Man. of Philos.* (transl. by Morell), p. 246.

John OF CAPISTRAN. See CAPISTRAN.

John THE CAPPADOCIAN, patriarch of Constantinople (he was the second patriarch of the name of John, Chrysostom being John I) from A.D. 517 or 518, was, before his election to the patriarchate, a presbyter and syncellus of Constantinople. Originally he sided with the opponents of the Council of Chalcedon, but he had either too little firmness or too little principle to follow out steadily the inclination of his own mind, for he appears to have been in a great degree the tool of others. On the death of Anastasius, and the accession of the emperor Justin I, the orthodox party among the inhabitants of Constantinople raised a tumult, and compelled John to anathematize Severus of Antioch, and to insert in the diptychs the names of the fathers of the Council of Chalcedon, and restore to them those of the patriarchs Euphemius and Macedonius. These diptychs were two tables of ecclesiastical dignitaries, one containing those who were living, and the other those who had died in the peace and communion of the Church, so that insertion was a palpable declaration of orthodoxy, and erasure of heresy or schism. These measures, extorted in the first instance by popular violence, were afterwards sanctioned by a synod of forty bishops. In A.D. 519. John, at the expressed desire of Justin, sought a reconciliation with the Western Church, from which, under Anastasius, the Eastern Church had separated, and in this task John displayed considerable cunning. Not only was he successful in restoring a friendly and unionlike feeling between the Greek and Roman churches, but Hormisdas even left to him the task of bringing about also the reconciliation of the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria to the orthodox Church. See HORMISDAS. In this he failed. John died about the beginning or middle of the year 520, as appears by a letter of Hormisdas to his successor Epiphanius. John wrote several letters or other papers, a few of which are still extant. Two short letters (Ἐπιστολαί), one to John, patriarch of Jerusalem, and one to Epiphanius, bishop of Tyre, are printed in Greek, with a Latin version, in the *Concilia*, among the documents relating to the Council of Constantinople in

A.D. 536 (v, col. 185, ed. Labbe; viii, 1065–67, ed. Mansi). Four relationes, or Libelli, are extant only in a Latin version among the Epistolæ of pope Hormisdas (in the *Concilia*, iv, 1472, 1486, 1491, 1521, edit. Labbe; viii, 436, 451, 457, 488, edit. Mansi). It is remarkable that in the two short Greek letters addressed to Eastern prelates John takes the title of *οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης*, *œcumenical*, or universal *patriarch* [see PATRIARCH], and is supposed to be the first that assumed this ambitious designation. It is remarkable, however, that in those pieces of his which were addressed to pope Hormisdas, and which are extant only in the Latin version, the title does not appear; and circumstances are not wanting to lead to the suspicion that its presence in the Greek epistles is owing to the mistake of some transcriber, who has confounded this John the Cappadocian with John the Faster. It is certainly remarkable that the title, if assumed, should have incurred no rebuke from the jealousy of the popes, not to speak of the other patriarchs equal in dignity to John; or that, if once assumed, it should have been dropped again, which it must have been, since the employment of it by John the Faster (q. v.), many years after, was violently opposed by pope Gregory I as an unauthorized assumption. We may conjecture, perhaps, that it was assumed by the patriarchs of Constantinople without opposition from their fellow-prelates in the East during the schism of the Eastern and Western churches, and quietly dropped on the termination of the schism, that it might not prevent the re-establishment of friendly relations. See Theophanes, *Chronog.* p. 140–142, ed. Paris (p. 112, 113, ed. Ven.; p. 253–256, ed. Bonn); Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i, 503; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* xi, 99; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 592.

John CHRYSOSTOM. See CHRYSOSTOM.

John OF CITRUS (now *Kitro* or *Kidros*), in Macedonia, the ancient Pydna, was bishop of that see about A.D. 1200. He is the author of Ἀποκρίσεις πρὸς Κωνσταντῖνον Ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Δυῤῥαχίου τὸν Καβάσιλαν (*Responsa ad Constantinum Cabasilum, Archiepiscopum Dyrrachii*), of which sixteen answers, with the questions prefixed, are given with a Latin version in the *Jus Græco-Romanorum* of Leunclavius (Frankf. 1596, folio), v, 323. A larger portion of the Responsa is given in the *Synopsis Juris Græci* of Thomas Diplovaticius (Diplovatizio). Several MSS. of the Responsa contain twenty-four answers, others thirty-two; and Nicholas Comnenus Papadopoli, citing the work in his *Prænotiones Mystagogicæ*, speaks of a hundred. In one MS. he is mentioned with the surname of *Dalassinus*. Allatius, in his *De Consensu*, and *Contra Hottingerum*, quotes *De Consuetudinibus et Dogmatibus Latinorum* as the production of John of Citrus. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, xi, 341, 590; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ii, 279; Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii, 593.

John CLIMACUS. See JOHN THE SCHOLAR, 2.

John THE CONSTANT, elector of Saxony. See REFORMATION (in Germany).

John OF CONSTANTINOPLE. See JOHN THE DEACON; JOHN THE FASTER.

John (I, patriarch) OF CONSTANTINOPLE. See CHRYSOSTOM.

John (II, patriarch) OF CONSTANTINOPLE. See JOHN THE CAPPADOCIAN.

John (III, patriarch) OF CONSTANTINOPLE. See JOHN THE SCHOLAR (1).

John (VI, patriarch) OF CONSTANTINOPLE was appointed by the emperor, Philippicus Bardanes, A.D. 712, for his Monothelite opinions and his rejection of the authority of the sixth œcumenical (third Constantinopolitan) council. Cyrus, the predecessor of John, was deposed to make way for him, according to Cave. John was deposed, not long after his elevation, in consequence, apparently, of the deposition of his patron Philippicus, and the elevation of Artemius or Anastasius II. Theophanes does not notice the fate of John, but records the elevation of his successor, Germanus, metropolitan of Cyzicus, to the patriarchate of Constantinople A.D. 715. John wrote Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Κωνσταντῖνον τὸν ἁγιώτατον πάπαν Ῥώμης ἀπολογετική (*Epistola ad Constantinum Sanctissimum Papam Romanum Apologetica*), in which he defends certain transactions of the reign of Philippicus. This letter is published in the *Concilia* (vi, col. 1407, ed. Labbe; xii, col. 196, ed. Mansi). It had previously been published in the *Auctarium Novum* of Combefis, ii, 211. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* xi, 152; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i, 619; Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii, 593.

John OF CORNWALL was an eminent theologian of the 12th century whom both England and France claim as their own. Little is known of his life. He appears to have studied at Paris under Peter Lombard and Robert of Melun, and to have died towards the close of the 12th century. Great uncertainty also prevails respecting his writings; still he is generally considered as the author of a work entitled *Eulogium* (publ. by Martène, *Anecdota*, v, col. 1637). It is a special treatise on the human nature of Christ, refuting the subtle distinctions of Gilbert de la Porrée and other scholastic theologians, who maintained that Christ, *quoad hominem*, could not be considered as a mere person, *aliquis;* or, in other words, his humanity was but a contingent or accidental form of his nature. This doctrine had already been condemned by pope Alexander III in the Council of Tours (1163). Casimir Oudin considers him also as the author of *Libellus de Canone mystici libaminis*, contained in the works of Hugo of St. Victor, vol. ii, etc. See Cas. Oudin, *De Script. Eccles.; Hist. Lit. de la France*, vol. xiv.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvi, 543.

John OF CREMA, a cardinal who flourished in the first half of the 12th century, is celebrated for his exertions in behalf of the cause of pope Calixtus II against his adversary Burdin, and especially for his activity in the English Church, whither he was sent by pope Honorius II, in 1126, to enforce the laws of celibacy on the English clergy. How successful he was in this mission may be best judged from the sudden termination of his stay on the English continent. Not only did the English clergy violently oppose the cardinal's efforts, but he was even entrapped into a snare that must have considerably annoyed the eminent Roman Catholic ecclesiastic. Says Lea (*Hist. Sacerdotal Celib.* p. 293; compare Inett, *Hist. Eng. Ch.* ii, chap. viii), the cardinal, "after fiercely denouncing the concubines of priests, and expatiating on the burning shame that the body of Christ should be made by one who had just left the side of a harlot, he was that very night surprised in the company of a courtesan, though he had on the same day celebrated mass." Although instrumental, after his return to Rome, in the election of pope Innocent II (1130), the latter afterwards forsook him, and John for a time espoused the cause of the rival pope, Anacletus, returning, of course, again to obedience to Innocent II as soon as he had learned that by such an act only he could advance his own interests. The time of his death is not known to us.

John, THE DEACON and orator (*Διάκονος καὶ Ῥήτωρ*) of Constantinople, was a deacon of the great church (St. Sophia) in that city about the end of the 9th century. He wrote Λόγος εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ ὑμνογράφου (*Vita S. Josephi Hymnographi*), published in the *Acta Sanctorum* (April 3), vol. i, a Latin version being given in the body of the work, with a learned *Commentarius Prævius* at p. 266, etc., and the original in the Appendix, p. xxxiv. Allatius (*De Psellis*, c. xxx) cites another work of this writer, entitled Τίς ὁ σκοπὸς τῷ Θεῷ τῆς πρώτης τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πλάσεως, κ. τ. λ. (*Quid est Consilium Dei in prima Hominis formatione*, etc.). The designation JOANNES DIACONUS is common to several mediæval writers, as John Galenus or Pediasmus; John Hypatius;

John, deacon of Rome; and John Diaconus, a contemporary and correspondent of George of Trebizond. See *Acta Sanctorum*, l. c.; Fabricius, *Biblica Græca*, x, 264; xi, 654; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ii, Dissertatio i, 11; Oudin, *De Scriptoribus et Scriptis Ecclesiasticis*, ii, 335.—Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 594.

John OF CRESSY. See JOHN THE MONK.

John CYPARISSIŌTA (Κυπαρισσιώτης), surnamed *the Wise*, an ecclesiastical writer, lived in the latter half of the 14th century, not in the middle of the 12th, as erroneously stated by Labbe in his *Chronologia Brevis Ecclesiasticorum Scriptorum*. Cyparissiota was an opponent of Gregory Palamas (q. v.) and his followers (the believers in the light of Mount Tabor), and most of his works (of which some were written after 1359) had reference to that controversy. They compose a series of five treatises, but only the first and fourth books of the first treatise of the series, *Palamiticarum Transgressionum Libri iv*, have been published. They appeared, with a Latin version, in the *Auctarium Novissimum* of Combefis, ii, 68–105, and the Latin version was given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, xxi, 476, etc. (ed. Lyons, 1677). Cyparissiota wrote also Ἔκθεσις στοιχειώδης ῥήσεων θεολογικῶν (*Expositio Materiarum eorum quæ de Deo a Theologis dicuntur*). The work is divided into one hundred chapters, which are subdivided in ten decades or portions of ten chapters each, from which arrangement the work is sometimes referred to by the simple title of *Decades*. A Latin version of it by Franciscus Turrianus was published at Rome in 1581, 4to, and was reprinted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, xxi, 377, etc.—Combefis, *Auctar. Novissim.* ii, 105; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* xi, 507; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* vol. ii, Appendix by Gery and Wharton, p. 65; Oudin, *De Scriptor. et Scriptis Ecclesiasticis*, iii, 1062; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 594.

John OF DAMASCUS (JOHANNES DAMASCĒNUS, Ἰωάννης Δαμασηκνός) (1), one of the early ecclesiastical writers, and the author of the standard text-book of dogmatic theology in the Greek Church, was born at Damascus about the year 676. His oratorical talents caused him to be surnamed *Chrysorrhoas* (golden stream) by his friends (the Arabs called him *Mansur*). Little is known of his life except that he belonged to a high family, was ordained priest, and entered the convent of St. Sabas at Jerusalem, where he passed his life in the midst of literary labors and theological studies. The other details found concerning him in his biography by John, patriarch of Jerusalem, are considered untrustworthy. According to this writer, John Damascenus's father was a Christian, and governor of the province of Damascus, then in the hands of the Saracens, and John was ably educated by an Italian monk. Under Leo the Isaurian and Constantine Capronymus he zealously defended image worship both by his pen and tongue, and even went to Constantinople on that account. A legendary story relates that Leo, who was then a decided iconoclast, forged a treasonable letter from John to himself, which he contrived to pass into the hands of the caliph, who sentenced John to have his right hand cut off, when the severed hand was restored to the arm by a miracle. About that time, however, John withdrew from the caliph's court to the monastery of St. Saba, near Jerusalem, where he passed the remainder of his life in ascetic practices and study. He died between 754 and 787. In the former year we find his last public act, a protest against the Iconoclastic Synod at Constantinople, and in the latter the Œcumenical Council of Nice honored his memory with a eulogy. The Greek Church commemorates him on November 29 and December 4, and the Roman Catholic Church on May 6. Church writers agree in considering John Damascenus as superior to all his contemporaries in philosophy and erudition; yet his works, though justifying his reputation, are deficient in criticism.

The most important literary achievement of Damascenus is the Πηγὴ γνώσεως (Source of Knowledge), comprising the following three works: 1. Κεφάλαια Φιλοσοφικά, or *Dialectics*, which treats almost exclusively of logical and ontological categories, based mainly on Aristotle and Porphyry:—2. Περὶ αἱρέσεων ἐν συντονίᾳ, *De hæresibus*, containing in 103 articles a chronological synopsis of the heresies in the Christian Church, with a few articles on the errors of pagans and Jews (the first eighty are really the work of Epiphanius; the remainder partly treat of the heresies from the time of Epiphanius to that of the image controversies, according to Theodoretus, Sophronius, Leontius of Byzantium, etc., and partly of fictitious sects, which merely represent possible, not actual errors of belief):—3. The third and most important work, to which the former two were really simply the introduction, is entitled Ἔκδοσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς πίστεως ὀρθοδόξου, *Doctrines of the Orthodox Church*, collected from the writings of the Church fathers, especially Gregory of Nazianzum, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Cyril, Nemesius, and others. The whole work is divided into 100 sections or four books (the latter is probably a later arrangement), and treats of the following subjects: (*a*) *God's existence, essence, unity, and the possibility of knowing him.* Though John teaches that it is neither impossible to know God, nor possible to know him all; that his essence is neither expressible nor entirely inexpressible, he nevertheless inclines to the transcendental character of the idea of God, assigning to human thought incapacity for its conception, and referring man, in the end, as Areopagites does, to the records of divinely revealed truth. It may be considered as a characteristic feature of his theology that it principally dwells on God's metaphysical attributes, hardly touching the ethical question. (*b*) *The Trinity*, to which he gives great prominence. He not only repeats the doctrines of the Greek Church, as well as the arguments of the Greek fathers, but resumes a scientific construction of the dogma within the established creed, though admitting that there are certain bounds to the inquiry, which human reason cannot scale (Ἀδύνατον γὰρ εὑρεθῆναι ἐν τῇ κτίσει εἰκόνα ἀπαραλλάκτως ἐν ἑαυτῇ τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος παραδεικνύουσαν). The Trinity, therefore, cannot be adequately conceived nor defined. His real object in the discussion seems to be to found the personality of the λόγος and of the πνεῦμα ἅγιον upon the unity of the divine essence, and, further, to describe the nature of coexistence, and of personal difference in the Triune, and the reciprocal relations of the three persons —περιχώρησις—with all attainable strictness, and he attempts to achieve this result rather by the negative process of excluding fallacies than by positive demonstration. Whenever he ventures upon the latter he fluctuates between Peripateticism, tending to Tritheism, and Platonism, leading almost imperceptibly to Sabellianism and Modalism. (*c*) *Creation, Angels, and Dæmons.* On these he simply collects the doctrines of his predecessors, closing with a somewhat lengthy exposition of his views on heaven, heavenly bodies, light, fire, winds, water, earth, also chiefly based on the authority of the fathers. Some singular opinions of his own he attempts to support by scriptural passages. (*d*) *Man, his creation and nature*, are so treated by him that they may aptly be termed a psychology *in nuce*. Here he again depended on Aristotle and other Greek authors, in part directly, and in part through the medium of Nemesius, περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου. Like a genuine son of the Greek Church, he lays particular stress on the doctrine of free will and its efficacy for good, and treats in connection therewith of the doctrines of providence and predestination, following in the footsteps of Chrysostom and Nemesius. (*e*) *Man's fall* is merely adverted to in the vague oratorical manner of Semipelagian writers, without the least regard for the great development which this doctrine had received in the Western Church. (*f*) The doctrine of *the person of Christ* is argued with greatest fullness, and he evinces no little ingenuity and

dialectic skill in treating of the personal unity in Christ's twofold nature (which he conceived as enhypostasis, not anhypostasis, of the human nature in the Logos), of the communicatio idiomatum (which, however, amounts to merely a verbal one), and of volition and the operation of volition in Christ. This exposition of Christology is followed by controversial tracts against the Acephali: περὶ συνθέτου φύσεως; and against the Monothelites: περὶ τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ δύο θελημάτων καὶ ἐνεργειῶν καὶ λοιπῶν φυσικῶν ἰδιωμάτων, etc. (comp. Baur, *Gesch. d. Dreieinigkeit*, ii, 176 sq.; *Christologie*, ii, 257). (*g*) *Baptism* (which is allegorically represented as sevenfold) he holds to be necessary for the forgiveness of sin and for eternal life. Body and soul, to be purified and saved, need regeneration, which comes from the water and the Spirit. (*h*) *Faith* "is the acceptance of the παράδοσις τῆς ἐκκλησίας καθολικῆς, and of the teachings of Scripture; it is also confidence in the fulfilment of God's promises and in the efficacy of our prayers. The former depends on ourselves, the latter is a gift of the Holy Spirit." On the relation of faith to works, on regeneration and sanctification, he but imperfectly repeats the Semipelagian views of the earlier Greek teachers. His remarks on the cross and on adoration reflect the miraculous spirit of the times. (*i*) The *Eucharist* John teaches to be the means by which God completes his communication of himself to man, and thus restores him to immortality. Transubstantiation, in the full acceptance of the term, he does not teach, though Romanists have tried to interpret his writings in favor of their views. He admits, it is true, that the Euchcrist is the actual body of Christ, but he does not consider it *identical* with that which was glorified in heaven, and does not deem the bread and wine mere accidental phenomena. (*j*) *On Mary, the Immaculate Conception, Relics, and the Worship of Images*, he expresses himself more explicitly in separate treatises. The authority for adoring the cross, images, etc., he finds, not in Scripture, but in tradition. (*k*) In his remarks on *the Scriptures* he alludes simply, and that very briefly, to inspiration, and the value of Holy Writ, repeats the canon of the O. T. according to Epiphanius, and includes in the books of the N. T. the canons of the apostles according to the Trullan canon. Incidentally he also adverts to the four different formulæ used in Scripture to designate Christ and the origin of evil, which he holds can neither be assigned to God, nor to an evil principle independent of God. Celibacy John attempts to vindicate by the Scriptures; he alludes to the abrogation of circumcision, to anti-Christ, resurrection, and the last judgment. These are the principal contents of John's main work. He has by no means done equal justice to all its parts; the important questions of atonement, sin, grace, and the means of salvation, receive only a cursory notice. The style of his discourse, owing to the diversity of his sources, is not uniform; while, for the most part, it has strength and fluency, it sometimes lapses into rhetorical prolixity and affectation. John was particularly inclined to the philosophy of Aristotle, and wrote various popular tracts, in which he collected and illustrated that philosopher's principles. He wrote also letters and treatises against heretics, especially against the Manichæans and Nestorians. His works have been collected by Le Quien under the title *Opera omnia Damasceni Joh. quæ extant*, etc., Gr. and Lat. (Venet. 1748, 2 vols. 8vo). This edition contains Κεφάλαια φιλοσοφικά; Περὶ αἱρέσεων; Ἔκδοσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως; Πρὸς τοὺς διαβάλλοντας τὰς ἁγίας εἰκόνας; Λίβελλος περὶ ὀρθοῦ προνοήματος; Τόμος; Κατὰ Μανιχαίων Διάλογος; Διάλογος Σαρακηνοῦ καὶ Χριστιανοῦ; Περὶ δρακόντων; Περὶ ἁγίας Τριάδος; Περὶ τοῦ τρισαγίου ὕμνου; Περὶ τῶν ἁγίων νηστειῶν; Περὶ τῶν ὀκτὼ τῆς πονηρίας πνευμάτων; Εἰσαγωγὴ δογμάτων στοιχειώδης; Περὶ συνθέτου φύσεως; Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ δύο θελημάτων καὶ ἐνεργειῶν καὶ λοιπῶν φυσικῶν ἰδιωμάτων; Ἔπος ἀκριβέστατον κατὰ θεοστυγοῦς αἱρέσεως τῶν Νεστοριανῶν; Πασχάλιον; Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς περὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ σεπτῶν εἰκόνων; Περὶ τῶν ἀζύμων; Ἱερὰ παράλληλα, etc.

John of Damascus is now generally regarded as one of the ablest men of the Greek Church in the 8th century; but he by no means, on that account, deserves to be honored with the title of "philosopher." He was not an independent inquirer, but simply "an acute and diligent compiler and expounder of what others had thought, and the Church received." "He was," as an American ecclesiastic has well put it, "in design, method, and spirit, the precursor of the scholastic theologians. They, indeed, lived in another quarter of the globe from Syria, spoke a different language, and drew their materials from a different source. With them Augustine was the chief authority, whereas Damascenus followed Gregory of Nazianzum and other Greek fathers as his principal guides. The spirit of the age no doubt acted in a similar way upon both. It was considered unsafe, both in a religious and in a civil point of view, to think differently from the Church and its reverend teachers. In the West, as well as in the East, Aristotle had come to be regarded as an oracle. These circumstances may account, in part, for the similarity which we perceive both in the Greek theologian and in Peter of Lombardy, the first great scholastic theologian of the Latin Church. But no one who has compared the orthodox faith of the one with the sentences of the other can well doubt that some of the early translations of the former were employed in the composition of the latter. It cannot, probably, be far from the truth to say that, while Augustine is the father of the scholastic theology as to the matter of it, the learned Greek of Damascus was the father of it as to its form."

John of Damascus is generally considered as the restorer of the practice of chanting in the Greek Church, and he is also named as the author of a number of hymns yet in use in that Church. It is by no means proved, however, that he was the inventor of musical notation, as some have affirmed. Copies of a MS. treatise on Church music, of which he is considered the author, are to be found in several European (public) libraries: it was published by abbé Gerbert in the 2d vol. of his treatise *De Cantu et Musica Sacra*. It was translated into French by Villoteau in his memoir *Sur l'État actuel de l'Art musical en Egypte* (in *Description de l'Egypte*, xiv, 380 sq.). See Jean de Jerusalem, *Vie de St. Jean de Damas* (in Surius, *Vitæ Sanctorum*, May 6); Lenström, *De fidei orthod. auctore J. Damasceno* (Upsal. 1839); Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, ix, 682–744; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i, 482 (Lond. ed. 1688); Ceillier, *Histoire gén. des auteurs sacrés*, xviii, 110 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xx, 420; *Christian Rev.* vii, 594 sq.; Hagenbach, *Doctrines* (see Index); Fétis, *Biog. des Musiciens*.

John of Damascus (2). See John of Jerusalem (3).

John, Jacobite bishop of Dara (a city in Mesopotamia, near Nisibis) in the first half of the 9th century (not in the 6th or 7th, as says Cave in his *Hist. Litt.* ii, 131, nor in the 4th, as is maintained by Abraham Ecchelensis, nor in the 8th, as it is said by Assemani in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, ii, 118; see also ii, 219 and 347). He was a contemporary of Dionys. of Telmahar, who dedicated his chronicle to him (see Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* ii, 247). A manuscript of the Vatican, used by Abraham Ecchelensis, contains three works in Syriac by John: 1. *De resurrectione corporum*, in four books:—2. *De hierarchia cœlesti et ecclesiastica*, two books, ascribed to the pseudo-Dionysius on account of the similarity of names:—3. *De sacerdotio*, four books (Assemani, ii, 118 sq.). He is also considered as the author of the book *De Anima* (Assemani, ii, 219), which he probably composed after the work of Gregory of Nyssa, whose writings he also used otherwise (Assemani, iii, 22); and also an Anaphora (according to the *Catalogus liturgiarum*, by Schulting, pt. iii, p. 106, No. 29).—Herzog, *Real-Encyk.* vi, 746. (J. N. P.)

John DE DIEU (JOHANNES A DEO), saint, founder of the order of charity, was born at Monte-Mor-el-Novo, Portugal, March 8, 1495. An unknown priest stole him from his father, a poor man called Andrea Ciudad, and afterwards abandoned him at Oropesa, in Castile. After roving about many years, he was led to dedicate himself to a religious life by the preaching of John of Avila, whom he heard at Grenada. So excited became he, that, according to Richard and Giraud, he went through the town flogging himself, and never stopped till he went, half dead, to the hospital. He resolved to devote himself to the care of the sick, and changed his family name for *de Dieu* (a Deo), by permission of the bishop of Tui. In 1540 he opened the first house of his order at Seville, and died March 8, 1550, without leaving any set rules for his disciples. In 1572 pope Pius V subjected them to the rule of St. Augustine, adding a vow to devote themselves to the care of the sick, and sundry other regulations. See CHARITY, BROTHERS OF. John de Dieu was canonized by pope Alexander VIII, October 16, 1690. He is commemorated on the 8th of March. See Castro et Girard de Ville-Thierri, *Vies de St. Jean de Dieu;* Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, March 8; Héliot, *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*, vol. iv, ch. xviii; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 442 sq.

John OF DRÄNDORF, a Saxon Hussite, renowned as one of the ablest of the German reformers before the Reformation, was born of noble parentage at Slieben, or Schlieben, in the diocese of Meissen, about the beginning of the 15th century. He studied at Dresden under the celebrated Peter Dresdensis, then went to Prague, and further imbibed reformatory opinions, and finally completed his studies at the newly-founded University of Leipzig. Unable to obtain ordination on account of his heretical proclivities, he travelled through Germany and Bohemia, preaching against all unfaithful shepherds of the Roman Church, and finally succeeded in gathering a congregation, first at Weinsberg, then at Heilbronn. The civil authorities, however, interfered, and he was imprisoned and transported to Heidelberg, there to be judged by the faculty of the university, which took so active a part in the trial and condemnation of Huss and Jerome at the Council of Constance. The faculty met February 13, 1425, and, after a few days' hearing, John of Drändorf was condemned as a heretic, and was burned at Worms in great haste, lest the laymen, as these doctors have it, should partake of his heretical spirit. See Krummel, in *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1869, i, 130 sq. (J. H.W.)

John DUNS SCOTUS. See DUNS SCOTUS.

John OF EGYPT (JOANNES ÆGYPTIUS), a Christian martyr who suffered in Palestine in the Diocletian persecution, is spoken of by Eusebius, who knew him personally, as the most illustrious of the sufferers in Palestine, and especially worthy of admiration for his philosophic (i. e. ascetic) life and conversation, and for the wonderful strength of his memory. After the loss of his eyesight he acted as anagnostes, or reader in the church, supplying the want of sight by his extraordinary power of memory. He could recite correctly whole books of Scripture, whether from the Prophets, the Gospels, or the apostolic Epistles. In the seventh year of the persecution, A.D. 310, he was treated with great cruelty; one foot was burned off, and fire was applied to his sightless eyeballs for the mere purpose of torture. As he was unable to undergo the toil of the mines or the public works, he and several others (among whom was Silvanus of Gaza), whom age or infirmity had disabled from labor, were confined in a place by themselves. In the eighth year of the persecution, A.D. 311, the whole party, thirty-nine in number, were decapitated in one day by order of Maximin Daza, who then governed the eastern provinces. See Eusebius, *De Martyrib. Palæstinæ*, sometimes subjoined to the eighth book of his *Hist. Eccles.* c. 13; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 585.

John ELEEMOSYNARIUS. See JOHN THE ALMSGIVER.

John (surnamed *Lackland*) king OF ENGLAND, and youngest son of Henry II, was born at Oxford Dec. 24, 1166. After the conquest of Ireland, his father, in accordance with a bull from the pope authorizing Henry II to invest any one of his sons with the lordship of Ireland, appointed him to the government of that country in 1178, and he removed thither in 1185; but he failed so utterly in the task that he was recalled in a few months. He had always been the favorite of his father, and is said to have caused his death by joining his elder brothers in rebellion against Henry (of course, the controversy with Thomas à Becket, and his remorse after the archbishop's death, contributed no little to the sudden death of Henry II). Upon his brother Richard's succession he obtained a very favorable position in the English realm; indeed, so many earldoms were conferred on him that he was virtually sovereign of nearly one third of the kingdom. But this by no means satisfied John, by nature base, cowardly, and covetous. During the absence of his brother on a crusade, he sought even to obtain for himself the crown, but failed signally, earning only a very unenviable reputation for himself, while greatly increasing the affection of the English people for Richard. Upon the death of the latter, John, by express wish of Richard on his death-bed, ascended the long-coveted throne (May 26, 1199). The accusation that John avoided the claims of Arthur, the son of his elder brother Geoffrey, by imprisoning him and then privately putting him out of the way, are questions which belong to secular historians. It remains for us to state here only that king Philip Augustus of France, who had espoused John's cause in opposition to Richard, now espoused the cause of Arthur, and involved John in a war in which the latter was severely the loser, France regaining by 1204 the provinces that had been wrested from her. Far more serious were the results of another contest into which he was drawn, in 1205, by the death of the archbishop of Canterbury, and which forms a most important chapter in the history of investiture. Insisting upon the royal right of investiture, John first waged war against his own clergy, until finally Innocent III also took up the gauntlet, and thus drew upon himself not only the formidable hostility of the whole body of the national clergy, but also of one of the ablest and most imperious pontiffs of Rome (see INNOCENT III). The question at issue was, of course, the election of a successor to the lately vacated archbishopric. It had hitherto been the custom of the clergy to defer the election to any vacancies in their ranks until the king had favored them with a congé d'élire. In this instance some of the juniors of the monks or canons of Christ Church, Canterbury, who possessed the right of voting in the choice of their archbishop, had proceeded to the election without such a grant from the royal chair, and chosen Reginald, their sub-prior, as successor, and installed him in the archiepiscopal throne before daylight. Having enjoined upon him the strictest secrecy, they sent him immediately to Rome to secure the pontiff's confirmation of their act. The foolish Reginald, however, disclosed the secret, and it came to the ears of the king and the suffragan bishops of Canterbury. He at once caused the canons of Christ Church to proceed to a new election, and suggested John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, for the honorable position, who was accordingly installed, likewise against the wish of the suffragan bishops. These appealed to Rome, and John and the canons of Canterbury were forced to do likewise. This afforded Innocent III, ever on the alert to make his imperial power felt, a valuable opportunity to place forever at his own disposal one of the most important dignities in the Christian Church. Acceding to the doctrine of the invalidity of Reginald's election, he maintained that the new vacancy could only have been declared such by the sovereign pontiff, and that therefore the choice of the bishop of Norwich

also was illegal, and put forth as the candidate for the primacy cardinal Langton, an Englishman by birth, but a devoted follower of the papal prince. Of course the monks, however reluctantly, acted on the suggestion of the supreme head of the Church; but John by no means gave his adhesion to an act the important results of which he could well foresee. He at once initiated violent measures against the native clergy, determined to retain for the crown the rights of investiture (q. v.). Innocent III, however, finding that he could not conquer the stubborn John by kind measures, at first mildly hinted the interdict, and in 1208 actually subjected the whole kingdom to this ecclesiastical chastisement, and the year following added to it the excommunication of John himself, absolving his subjects from their allegiance to him, and permitting them even to depose him from the throne. But John paid little heed to this display of "ecclesiastical thunder," and in the midst of it even ventured to engage in war with Scotland, and with an energy quite uncommon to him suppressed all rebellious outbursts in his own domains. Innocent, finding his "ecclesiastical artillery" to be inefficient against England's king, entered into league with Philip Augustus, and caused the latter to prepare for an invasion of England. This undertaking soon brought John to terms, and in 1213 (May 13) he at last consented to submit to all the demands of the Holy See, of which the admission of the pope's nominee, Stephen de Langton, to the archbishopric of Canterbury, was the first. Nay, he even yielded much more than could have consistently been asked of him by the Roman see, and perpetrated an act of disgraceful cowardice, which has heaped everlasting infamy on his memory. Two days after, he made over to the pope the kingdoms of England and Ireland, to be held by him and by the Roman Church in fee, and took to his holiness the ordinary oath taken by vassals to their lords (see Reichel, *The Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 251 sq.). It is not to be wondered at that the Roman see now readily conceded to the demand of John that hereafter there should be an oblivion of the past on both sides, and that the bull of excommunication should be revoked by the pope, while, in return, John was obliged to pledge that of his disaffected English subjects those who were in confinement should be liberated, and those who had fled or been banished beyond seas should be permitted to return home. Philip, whose ambition was not a little mortified by this sudden agreement of pope and king, persisted in his invasion scheme, though no longer approved by Rome; but the French fleet was totally defeated in the harbor of Damme, 300 of their vessels were captured and above 100 destroyed. Subsequent events, however, proved more favorable to France, and aggravated the discontent at home against John. At length the English barons, tired of their tyrannical ruler, after vainly petitioning for more liberal concessions, assembled at Stamford to wage war themselves against him, and marched directly on London, where they were hailed with great joy by the citizens. The king, fearing for his throne, now gladly consented to a conference. They met the king at Runnymead, and, as a result of this meeting, they obtained, on June 15th, 1215, the Great Charter (Magna Charta), the basis of the English Constitution. The pope, who had constantly opposed the English in their revolutionary movements, soon after annulled the charter, and the war broke out again. The barons now called over the dauphin of France to be their leader, and Louis landed at Sandwich on May 30th, 1216. In attempting to cross the Wash, John lost his regalia and treasures, was taken ill, and died at Newark Castle on Oct. 19th, 1216, in the 49th year of his age. "All English historians paint the character of John in the darkest colors; and the history of his reign seems to prove that to his full share of the ferocity of his line he conjoined an unsteadiness and volatility, a susceptibility of being suddenly depressed by evil fortune, and elated beyond the bounds of moderation and prudence by its opposite, which gave a littleness to his character not belonging to that of any of his royal ancestors. He is charged, in addition, with a savage cruelty of disposition, and with the most unbounded licentiousness, while, on the other hand, so many vices are not allowed to have been relieved by a single good quality" (*Engl. Cyclopædia*, s. v.). Of course this may all be due to the fact that John has had no historian, that his cause expired with himself, and that every writer of his story has told it in the spirit of the opposite and victorious party; and, further, that the intense disgust always felt by every class of his countrymen at his base surrender of his kingdom in vassalage to the pope may have led them to regard with less distrust all adverse reports respecting his general character. See Milman, *Lat. Christ.* v, ch. v; Hallam, *Middle Ages;* Lingard, *Hist. of England*, ii, ch. ii; Hume, *Hist. of Engl.* i, ch. xi; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* iii, § 54; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vii, 235 sq.; Inett, *Hist. Engl. Ch.* ii, ch. xix sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, ii, 212 sq. (J. H. W.)

John, Monophysite (missionary) bishop of EPHESUS, generally called *Episcopus Asiæ*, as Ephesus is the most important see of Asia Minor (see Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* t. ii, *Diss. de Monophysit.* § ix, s. v. Asia), was a native of Amid (?), Syria, and lived in the 6th century (about 591). He resided chiefly in Constantinople, and was highly esteemed at court, especially during the reign of Justinian. The latter appointed him to inquire into the state of the heathen, of whom there was yet a large number in the empire, even in Constantinople, and to secure their conversion. Quite successful in his efforts at home, the emperor authorized John to take a missionary tour through the whole empire, and we are told that this time he converted 70,000 people, and founded 96 churches (comp. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. xlvii). He seems not to have had any direct spiritual jurisdiction over the metropolis of Asia Minor, but to have been honored with the title simply on account of his great success as a missionary, and we are inclined to believe that in reality he was simply a "missionary bishop," for he is often styled "he who is set over the heathen" (Syr. דעל חנפא), and also "the destroyer of idols" (Syr. מחבר פתכרא). How long John remained a favorite with Justinian we do not know, but have reason to suppose that his fate depended upon the success of his Monophysite brethren. In the reign of Justin II he shared largely in the sufferings which befell the Monophysites at the instigation of John of Sirimis. The period, circumstances, and place of his death are uncertain. He is probably the *John Rhetor* mentioned by Evagrius and Theodorus Lector, and whom the former calls (lib. v, c. 24) his compatriot and his relative. Assemani (*Bibl. Orient.* ii, 84) opposes this identity, but without good reasons. John wrote a historical work, in three parts, in Syriac, which is of great importance for the Church history of the East. The first part appears to be totally lost, and of the second only a few fragments, quoted by Assemani, are preserved to us. It is indeed the third part alone that has come down to us, and that only in a somewhat mutilated form. Dionysius of Telmahar, in his chronicle (from Theodosius the younger to Justin II), used this part freely; and Assemani obtained his passages (*Biblioth. Orient.* i, 359-363, 409, 411-414; ii, 48 sq., 51, 52, 87-90, 312, 328, 329) from this source and from Bar-Hebræus (*Chron. Syr.* ed. Bruns and Kirsch, p. 2, 83, 84). These were the only sources through which the work of John was known to us until the third part of it (somewhat incomplete) was discovered by William Cureton among the Syrian MSS. brought to England from the Syrian monasteries of Egypt by Dr. Tattam and A. Pacho, in 1843, 1847, and 1850. This third part was published under the title *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John, Bishop of Ephesus. Now first edited by William Cureton* (Oxf. 1855, 4to, pp. 420). The first two parts, forming twelve books, contained, as the author himself says (p. 2), the history of the Church from the begin-

ning of the Roman Empire to the sixth year of the reign of Justinus II, nephew of Justinian, and consequently to the year 571. The third part forms six chapters, of which we have only the second and fifth in full; the others are all more or less incomplete (see Bernstein, *Zeitsch. der D. Morgenl. Gesellschaft*, viii, 397). It continues the history to the third year after the death of Justinus II (581) (see bk. vi, ch. xxv, p. 402), and mentions even later dates down to 583. We find in it accounts of many facts of ecclesiastical history not to be discovered in other sources. It is the more important from the fact that the author, although a partisan of the Monophysite doctrine, and occasionally somewhat over-credulous, was a contemporary, and often an eyewitness of the facts he relates. Cureton promised an English translation of the work, but to our knowledge it has not yet appeared. The German scholar Schonfelder (*Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus. Aus dem Syrischen übersetzt. Mit einer Abhandlung ü. d. Tritheiten* [München. 1862, 8vo]) has, however, furnished a German translation, of which those who do not read the Oriental languages can avail themselves in their studies of the Eastern Church. In 1856 a young Dutch scholar, Dr. Land, published a treatise on *John, Bishop of Ephesus, the first Syriac Church historian* (for the full title, see below), in which he discussed the general relations of Syriac literature, and the productions of the Syriac Church historians in particular, the person and history of bishop John, his style and treatment of Church history, and the contents of his work. Since then, Dr. Land has continued his studies of the Syriac writers, and in vol. ii of his *Anecdota Syriaca* (also under the special title *Joannis, Episcopi Monophysitæ Scripta Historica* [Leyd. 1868, 8vo]), has published all the inedited works of John of Ephesus. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 747; Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* xvi, 207 sq. (J. H. W.)

John OF EUCHAITA (*Euchaitæ* or *Euchania*) (a city afterwards called *Theodoropolis*) was archbishop of Euchaita (*Μητροπολίτης Εὐχαΐτων*), and lived in the time of the emperor Constantine and Monomachus (A.D. 1042-1054), but nothing further is known of him. He was surnamed *Mauropus* (*Μαυρόπους*), i. e. "Blackfoot." He wrote a number of iambic poems, sermons, and letters. A volume of his poems was published by Matthew Bust (Eton, 1610, 4to). They were probably written on occasion of the Church festivals, as they are commemorative of the incidents of the life of Christ or of the saints. An *Officium*, or ritual service, composed by him, and containing three canones or hymns, is given by Nicolaus Rayæus in his dissertation *De Acolouthia Officii Canonici*, prefixed to the *Acta Sanctorum*, Junii, vol. ii. John wrote, also, *Vita S. Dorothei Junioris*, given in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Junii, i, 605, etc. Various sermons for the Church festivals, and other works of his, are extant in MS. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Orient.* viii, 309, 627, etc.; x, 221, 226; xi, 79; Cave, *Hist. Liter.* ii, 139; Oudin, *De Scriptoribus et Scriptis Eccles.* ii, 606; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* ii. 595.

John OF FALKENBERG, surnamed *Jacobita de Saxonia*, or *Doctor de Pratensis*, a German Dominican, is celebrated for the zeal with which he defended pope Gregory XII in the Council of Constance. He also endeavored to defend the regicidal opinions of John Petit, but he failed in both instances. He next, at the request of the Knights of the Cross, wrote a libel against Wladislas Jagellon, king of Poland, for which he was declared a heretic, and condemned to imprisonment for life at Rome. Pope Martin V, however, liberated him a few years after, and John, encouraged, now demanded of Paul of Russdorf, grand master of the Knights of the Cross, the price of the libel he had written. The latter offering him but a small amount, John of Falkenberg insulted him, whereupon he was again imprisoned, and condemned to be drowned. He escaped, however, retired to the convent of Kämpen, and wrote against the order. He was present at the Council of Basle, in 1431, and died shortly after. See Echard, *Script. Ord. Præd.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 563.

John THE FASTER (JOHANNES JEJUNATOR or NESTEUTES), of humble extraction, became patriarch of Constantinople in 582. He was distinguished for his piety, benevolence, strong asceticism, and fasting. He was the first who assumed the title of "œcumenical patriarch," and thereby involved himself in difficulties with the bishops of Rome, Pelagius II and Gregory I, the opening of a struggle which resulted finally, in the 11th century (1054), in a complete rupture of the churches of Rome and Constantinople. (See the article GREGORY I, and Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, vol. i, § 17.) John died Sept. 2, 595. The Greek Church counts him among its saints. He is reputed the author of *Ἀκολουθία καὶ τάξις τῶν ἐξομολογουμένων*; *Λόγος πρὸς τὸν μέλλοντα ἐξαγορεῦσαι τὸν αὐτοῦ πνευματικὸν υἱόν*, which belongs to the earliest penitential works of the Greek Church (pub. by Morinus, *Comm. hist. de administratione sacramenti pœnitentiæ*, Paris, 1651, Ven. 1792, etc.). See Oudin, *De Scr. Eccles.* i, 1473 sq.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, x, 164 sq.; Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* i, 216 sq.; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* xvii, 56 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 748; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 556.

John (called also *Jeannelin*), abbot OF FÉCAMP, France, was born in the neighborhood of Ravenna. His family name Labbe supposes to have been *Dalye*, or *D'Alye*. He came to France with William, abbot of St. Bénigne of Dijon, and studied under that learned man. He practiced medicine with success; but William going to Fécamp to reform the abbey, and install there a colony of Benedictines, John accompanied him, was made prior, and finally succeeded William as abbot. He reformed several convents, and by his firm adherence to discipline embroiled himself with many prelates, sustained, however, in every instance by the pope. In 1054 he visited England, where he was welcomed by king Edward, but, having subsequently undertaken a journey to the Holy Land, he was made prisoner by the Mohammedans, and is said to have only returned to France in 1076. He died Feb. 2, 1079. He wrote a book of prayers, the preface of which is to be found in Mabillon, *Analecta*, i, 133, and three chapters in the *Meditationes S. Augustini*. He is also considered as the author of a treatise, *De Divina Contemplatione*, publ. in 1539, under the title of *Confessio Theologica*, and attributed to John Cassien, etc. See *Gallia Christ.* xi, col. 206; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, viii, 48; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxvi, 531.

John FREDERICK, elector of Saxony. See REFORMATION; SAXONY.

John GALLENSIS. See CANON LAW, vol. ii, p. 88 (2).

John OF GISCHALA, son of Levi, named after his native place [see GISCHALA], was one of the most celebrated leaders of the unfortunate Jews of Galilee in their final struggle with the Romans, A.D. 66-67. Of his personal history we know scarcely anything. The only writer to whom we can go for information—Josephus—is prejudiced, because John of Gischala proved the most formidable rival of the renowned Jewish historian, and he is on that account depicted by Josephus in a very disparaging manner. His deeds, however, indicate to every fair-minded person that he belonged to that class of men who, for the defense of their country, readily ignore all other duties. We are furthermore encouraged to give credence to the noble picture which Grätz (*Gesch. der Juden*, iii, 396) has drawn of John, when we remember that the virtuous and learned Simon ben-Gamaliel was a devoted and life-long friend of our hero. (By this it must, however, by no means be inferred that we are ready to accept Grätz's views on the character of Josephus, for which we refer our readers to the art. JOSEPHUS.) Though by nature Josephus's superior, more particularly in the art of warfare, he readily submitted

himself to the commands of the man whom the Sanhedrim had seen fit to invest with superior authority. Not so patriotic was the conduct of Josephus, who, in his jealousy, hesitated not to put every obstacle in the way of John, so as to prevent the success of his noble and patriotic efforts. This impolitic conduct of Josephus towards all who seemed to present any likelihood of becoming rivals in office continued until the people's attention was directed to it, and their anger against him was so great that his very life was in danger. Instead, however, of profiting by this sad experience, Josephus, in his vanity and blindness, continued, so soon as he felt that the danger had passed, his animosity towards his colaborers, especially towards John of Gischala, whom he hesitated not to accuse even of having headed the attacks upon his life (Josephus, *Life*, 18, 19), a reproach which was not in the least deserved by John, who, however great his disappointment in Josephus, never sought relief by violent measures. It is true that, when he found the people's confidence in Josephus restored, he sent messengers to Simon ben-Gamaliel and to the Sanhedrim to remove the man in whom public confidence was so misplaced. Ordered to the defence of his native place, John did everything in his power to strengthen the fortification of Gischala, and when, after a long siege from the experienced troops of Titus, he found it impossible to hold the city with his handful of countrymen, more accustomed to the ploughshare than to the sword, he made his escape by a game of strategy which his enemy could never forgive him. Having obtained an armistice from the Romans on pretence that the day was their Sabbath, he improved the opportunity to make his escape with his forces to Jerusalem. The sacred city was at this time unfortunately divided of itself, anarchy reigned within the walls, and it was with great difficulty that John succeeded in rallying the people to their defence against a common enemy. He actually aroused them to sally forth against the Roman invaders, and succeeded in destroying the first works erected by them to besiege the city. Not so happy were they in their future undertakings. Defeat after defeat finally obliged John to seek refuge in the tower of Antonia. Soon after followed the fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), and John now sought refuge in a neighboring cave, determined not to fall into the hands of Titus. But hunger soon proved even a more formidable foe than the Romans, and John gladly went forth from his hiding-place to surrender himself to them, who, in their pride and the savage state of that age, hesitated not to increase the mental agonies of the poor Jew by marching him, with 700 other fellow-countrymen, at the head of the victorious legions to the Eternal City, to enhance the magnificence of his public triumph. The grand spectacle over, John was imprisoned at Rome, and died in a dungeon of broken heart. Not so lucky, even, was his brother in arms, Simon bar-Giora (q. v.), who was dragged through the streets of Rome by a rope, and finally executed, in accordance with Roman custom, which demanded a human sacrifice in honor of a victory gained over their enemies. See Josephus, *War*, iv, 2 sq.; Grätz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, vol. iii, ch. xiv and xv; Raphall, *Post Bibl. Hist. of the Jews*, ii, 416 sq. (J. H. W.)

John Goch. See Goch.

John of Gorz, a French monk of some note who flourished in the 10th century, was born at Vendière, near Pont-à-Mousson, and studied theology under Berner, deacon of Toul. After joining various convents —among the last that of the Recluses—and not finding that earnest piety and strict ascetic life which he sought to impose upon himself, he finally gathered a few true friends of like mind in the convent of Gorz, presented to them by bishop Adalbert, of Mayence. In the latter part of his life, Otho the Great sent him as ambassador to Abderrahman II, in Cordova. His biography was written by a friend and contemporary, St. Arnulph (died 984), and is given by Pertz, *Monum.* iv, 335.

John the Grammarian. See John the Laborious.

John Hyrcanus. See Hyrcanus.

John the Italian (*Johannes Italus*) (1), a monk of the 10th century. He was at first canon at Rome, but his acquaintance with Odon, abbot of Clugny, led him to France, and he entered a convent there. Some say that he afterwards returned to Italy, and became prior of a Roman convent, while others say that he became abbot of some French Cistercian convent, and that he died in France after 945. Our information regarding his personal history is derived only from his biography in the Life of St. Odon (in Mabillon, *Acta Sanct.* vii, 152). He published extracts of St. Gregory's *Moralia*. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vi, 265; Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Sacrés*, xii, 825.

John the Italian (*Italus*, Ἰταλός) (2), a Greek philosopher and heretic who flourished in the time of Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118), escaped to Italy after the revolt of Maniaces against Constantine, and there prosecuted his preparatory studies. He finally returned again to Constantinople, and became a disciple of Michael Psellus the younger. His learning and ability attracted general attention, and the emperor Michael Ducas (1071-1078), finding himself in need of a man acquainted with the Italian provinces to influence them to a return to the Byzantine empire, selected John Italus for this purpose, and dispatched him to Dyrrachium. He, however, proved unfaithful to the trust, and, his intrigues having become public, was obliged to flee to Rome to avoid persecution. He was subsequently allowed to return to Constantinople, and there entered the monastery of Pega. When Psellus was banished in 1077, John was made first professor of philosophy (ὕπατος τῶν φιλοσόφων), and filled this place with great success. Yet he was better acquainted with logic and Aristotle's philosophy than with the other branches of science, and was but little versed in grammar and rhetoric. He was very passionate and hasty in argument, and sometimes even resorted to bodily violence, but he was, fortunately, prompt in acknowledging his errors. He expounded to his pupils Proclus, Plato, Jamblichus, Porphyrius, and Aristotle, but often in a manner quite inconsistent with the position of Christian orthodoxy. Alexius, soon after ascending the throne, caused Italus's doctrines to be examined, and summoned him before an ecclesiastical court. Notwithstanding the protection of the patriarch Eustratius, John Italus was obliged publicly to recant and anathematize eleven heretical opinions advanced in his lectures. Among other things, he was accused of "ridiculing image-worship." Continuing, however, to teach the same doctrines, he was anathematized by the Church, and, fearing persecution, he forsook the rostrum. It is said that in his later years he publicly renounced his errors. His principal works (all in MSS.) are, Ἔκδοσις εἰς διάφορα ζητήματα; Ἔκδοσις εἰς τὰ τοπικά; Περὶ διαλεκτικῆς; Μέθοδος ῥητορικῆς ἐκδοθεῖσα κατὰ σύνοψιν; some discourses, etc. See Anna Comnenus, *Alexius*, v, 8, 9; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, iii, 213-217; vi, 131; xi, 646-652; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ii, 154; Oudin, *Comment. de Scriptoribus et Scriptis Eccles.* ii, col. 760; Lambèce, *Commentar. de Biblioth. Cæsar.* iii, col. 411, edit. Kollar; Le Beau, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, lxxxi, 49; Hase, *Notices d. Manuscripts*, vol. ix.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvi, 557.

John Jejunator. See John the Faster.

John of Jerusalem (1), originally a monk, was bishop of Jerusalem (A.D. 386) when not much more than thirty years of age (Jerome, *Epist.* lxxxii, 8). Some speak of him as patriarch, but Jerusalem was not elevated to the dignity of a patriarchate until the following century. John was a man of insignificant personal appearance (Jerome, *Lib. contra Joan.* c. 10), but he was generally celebrated for eloquence, talent, and learning. He was acquainted, at least in some degree, with the Hebrew and Syriac languages, but it is doubt-

ful if he was acquainted with Latin. He is said to have been at one period an Arian, or to have sided with the Arians when they were in the ascendant under the emperor Valens (Jerome, *Lib. contra Joan.* c. 4, 8). For eight years after his appointment to the bishopric he was on friendly terms with St. Jerome, who was then living a monastic life in Bethlehem or its neighborhood; but towards the close of that period strife was stirred up by Epiphanius of Constantia (or Salamis), in Cyprus, who came to Palestine to ascertain the truth of a report which had reached him, that the obnoxious sentiments of Origen were gaining ground under the patronage of John. Epiphanius's violence against all that had even the appearance of Origenism led him into a controversy with John also. See EPIPHANIUS. Whether John really cherished opinions at variance with the orthodoxy of that time, or only exercised towards those who held them a forbearance which was looked upon with suspicion, we do not know; but he became again involved in squabbles with the supporters of orthodox views. He was charged by them with favoring Pelagius, who was then in Palestine, and who was accused of heresy in the councils of Jerusalem and Diospolis (A. D. 415), but was in the latter council acquitted of the charge, and restored to the communion of the Church. See PELAGIUS. In the controversies waged against Chrysostom, John of Jerusalem always sided decidedly with Chrysostom. See CHRYSOSTOM. John wrote, according to Gennadius (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 30), *Adversus Obtrectatores sui Studii Liber*, in which he showed that he rather admired the ability than followed the opinions of Origen. Fabricius and Ceillier think, and with apparent reason, that this work, which is lost, was the apologetic letter addressed by John to Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, which resulted in a reconciliation between John and Jerome. No other work of John is noticed by the ancients; but in the 17th century two huge volumes appeared, entitled *Joannis Nepotis Sylvani, Hierosolym. Episcopi xliv, Opera omnia quæ hactenus incognita, reperiri potuerunt: in unum collecta, suoque Auctori et Auctoritati tribus Vindiciarum libris asserta per A. R. P. Petrum Wastelium* (Brussels, 1643, fol.). The Vindiciæ occupied the second volume. The works profess to be translated from the Greek, and are as follows: (1) *Liber de Institutione primorum Monachorum, in Lege Veteri exortorum et in Nova perseverantium, ad Caprasium Monachum. Interprete Aymerico Patriarcha Antiocheno.* This work is mentioned by Trithemius (apud Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* x, 526) as "*Volumen insigne de principio et profectu ordinis Carmelitici*," and is ascribed by him to a later John, patriarch of Jerusalem (in the 8th century). It is contained in several editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, in which work, indeed, it seems to have been first published (vol. ix, Par. 1589, fol.), and in the works of Thomas à Jesu, the Carmelite (i, 416, etc., Cologne, 1684, folio). It is generally admitted to be the production of a Latin writer, and of much later date than our John:—(2) *In stratagemata Beati Jobi Libri iii*, a commentary on the first three chapters of the book of Job, often printed in Latin among the works of Origen, but supposed to belong neither to him nor to John:—(3) *In S. Matthæum*, an imperfect commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, usually printed, under the title of *Opus imperfectum in Matthæum*, among the works of Chrysostom, in the Latin or Græco-Latin editions of that father, but supposed to be the work of some Arian or Anomœan about the end of the 6th or some part of the 7th century:—(4) *Fragmenta ex Commentario ad prima Capita xi S. Marci*, cited by Thomas Aquinas (*Catena Aurea ad Evang.*) as a work of Chrysostom:—(5) *Fragmenta ex Commentario in Lucam*, extant under the name of Chrysostom, partly in editions of his works, partly in the Latin version of a Greek *Catena in Lucam* published by Corderius (Antw. 1628, folio), and partly in the *Catena Aurea* of Thomas Aquinas:—(6) *Homiliæ lxiii*, almost all of them among those published in the works of Chrysostom. There is no good reason for ascribing any of these works to John; nor are they, in fact, ascribed to him except by the Carmelites. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* ix, 299; x, 525, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i, 281, etc.; Dupin, *Nouv. Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques*, iii, 87, ed. Par. 1690; Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii, 596.

John OF JERUSALEM (2). A synodical letter of John, who was a patriarch of Jerusalem early in the 6th century, and his suffragan bishops assembled in a council at Jerusalem A.D. 517 or 518, to John of Constantinople [John of Cappadocia], is given in the *Concilia* (vol. v, col. 187, etc., ed. Labbe; viii, 1067, ed. Mansi).

John OF JERUSALEM (3) [or OF DAMASCUS, 2]. Three extant pieces relating to the Iconoclastic controversy bear the name of John of Jerusalem, but it is doubtful how far they may be ascribed to the same author, hence we add them here simply under a separate heading. They are, 1. Ἰωάννου εὐλαβεστάτου τοῦ Ἱεροσολυμίτου μοναχοῦ Διήγησις, or *Joannis Hierosolymitani reverendissimi Monachi Narratio*, a very brief account of the origin of the Iconoclastic movement, published by Combefis among the *Scriptores post Theophanem* (Par. 1685, fol.), and reprinted at Venice, A.D. 1729, as part of the series of Byzantine historians; it is also included in the Bonn edition of that series. It is also printed in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Gallandius, xiii, 270:—2. Διάλογος στηλιτευτικὸς γενόμενος παρὰ πιστῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων καὶ πόθον καὶ ζῆλον ἐχόντων πρὸς ἔλεγχον τῶν ἐναντίων τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ὀρθοδόξων ἡμῶν πατέρων, or *Disceptatio invectiva quæ habita est a fidelibus et orthodoxis, studiumque ac zelum habentibus ad confutandos adversarios fidei atque doctrinæ sanctorum orthodoxorumque patrum nostrorum*, first published by Combefis in the *Scriptores post Theophanem* as the work of an anonymous writer, and contained in the Venetian, but not in the Bonn edition of the Byzantine writers. It is also reprinted by Gallandius (*ut supra*), p. 352, and ascribed to John of Damascus or John of Jerusalem, some MSS. giving one name, and others giving the other. Gallandius considers that he is called Damascus from his birthplace. The author of this invective is to be distinguished from the greatly celebrated John of Damascus (q. v.), his contemporary, to whom, perhaps, the transcribers of the manuscripts, in prefixing the name Damascus, intended to ascribe the work:—3. Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς περὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ σεπτῶν εἰκόνων, πρὸς πάντας Χριστιανοὺς καὶ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Κωνσταντῖνον τὸν Καβαλῖνον καὶ πρὸς πάντας αἱρετικούς, or *Joannis Damasceni Monachi ac Presbyteri Oratio demonstrativa de sacris ac venerandis imaginibus, ad Christianos omnes, adversusque Imperatorem Constantinum Cabalinum.* The title is given in other MSS., Ἐπιστολὴ Ἰωάννου Ἱεροσολύμων ἀρχιεπισκόπου, κ. τ. λ.—*Epistola Joannis*, or *Hierosolymitani Archiepiscopi*, etc. The work was first printed in the *Auctarium Novum* of Combefis (Paris, 1648, folio), vol. ii, and was reprinted by Gallandius (*ut supra*), p. 358, etc. Fabricius is disposed to identify the authors of Nos. 1 and 3, and treats No. 2 as the work of another and unknown writer: but Gallandius, from internal evidence, endeavors to show that Nos. 2 and 3 are written by one person, but that No. 1 is by a different writer, and this seems to be the preferable opinion. He thinks there is also internal evidence that No. 3 was written in the year 770, and was subsequent to No. 2. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii, 682; Gallandius, *Bibl. Patrum*, xiii, Prolegomena, ch. x, p. 15; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 596.

John OF JERUSALEM (4), patriarch of Jerusalem, who flourished probably in the latter half of the 10th century, was the author of a life of Joannes Damascenus, Βίος τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ συγγραφεὶς παρὰ Ἰωάννου πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων (*Vita sancti Patris nostri Joannis Damasceni a Joanne Patriarcha Hierosolymitano conscripta*). The

work is a translation from the Arabic, or at least founded upon an Arabic biography, and was written a considerable time after the death of John of Damascus (A.D. 756), and after the cessation of *the Iconoclastic contest*, which may be regarded as having terminated on the death of the emperor Theophilus (A.D. 842). But we have no data for determining how long after these events the author lived. Le Quien identifies him with a John, patriarch of Jerusalem, who was burnt alive by the Saracens in the latter part of the reign (A.D. 963–9) of Nicephorus Phocas, upon suspicion that he had excited that emperor to attack them (Cedrenus, *Compend.* p. 661, edit. Paris; ii, 374, ed. Bonn). This life of John of Damascus was first published at Rome with the orations of Damascenus (*De Sacris Imaginibus* [1553, 8vo]); it was reprinted at Basel with all the works of John of Damascus A.D. 1575; in the *Acta Sanctorum* (May 6), vol. ii (the Latin version in the body of the work [p. 111, etc.], and the original in the Appendix [p. 723, etc.]); and in the edition of the *Works of Damascenus* by Le Quien, vol. i (Paris, 1712, folio). The Latin version is given (s. d. 6 Maii) in the *Vitæ Sanctorum* of Lippomani, and the *De Probatis Sanctorum Vitis* of Surius. See Le Quien, *Joannis Damasceni Opera*, note at the beginning of the *Vita S. J. Damasc.*; and *Oriens Christianus*, iii, 466.—Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, ix, 686, 689; x, 261; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ii, 29; Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 598.

John THE LABORIOUS (JOHANNES PHILOPONUS, also surnamed ALEXANDRINUS and GRAMMATICUS), an Eastern scholar of great renown, was born at Alexandria towards the close of the 6th century or the beginning of the 7th. Of his personal history but very little seems to be definitely known. He is said to have been present at the capture of that city by the Mohammedans (A.D. 639), and to have temporarily embraced their creed to prevent the burning of the Alexandrian library; but the truth of this story is rather doubtful (comp. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall Rom. Emp.* ch. li). The great renown of John Philoponus is due mainly, perhaps, to his speculations on Christian doctrine, more especially his theories on the Trinity, cosmogony, and immortality. He was a passionate admirer of Plato and Aristotle, and hence his persistency in amending Christian dogma by philosophy, and hence much ambiguity in his position on Christian doctrines, and hence also the reason why he has so frequently been the subject of attack as a heretic. It is especially his theory on the Trinity that has classed him among the Tritheists, of which he has even often, though inaccurately, been pointed out as the founder, while in truth he was only a forerunner of them. See, however, TRITHEISM. His principal work on dogmatics, *Διαιτητὴς ἢ περὶ ἑνώσεως*, is lost, yet, from extracts of it still extant, the following has been determined to be his position on the doctrine of the Trinity. Nature and hypostasis he regards as identical; a double nature in Christ is incompatible with one hypostasis; and to the objection that in the Trinity there are confessedly three hypostases and but one nature, he argues that in the Trinity three particular and individual existences or hypostases are comprised under the idea of unity. This unity, however, is merely the generic term, which comprehends the several particulars, the Κοινὸς τοῦ εἶναι λόγος. If this be called nature, it is done in an abstract sense, and is inductively derived from particulars; but if *φύσις* is to convey the sense of independent existence, it must join the particular, individual being, and, therefore, the hypostasis. Applying this argument to Christ, he concludes that to the unity of his hypostasis belongs also the unity of nature. (Comp. again TRITHEISM, and Dorner, *Doct. Person of Christ*, diss. ii, vol. i, p. 148, 414.) His works extant are. (1) *De æternitate mundi*, or Περὶ ἀϊδιότητος κόσμου (Ven. 1535, fol.), in which he attempts to establish the Christian dogma of creation by reason alone, without reference to Biblical authority. The ideas are eternal only when they are regarded as creative thoughts of God; as such they are inherent in Providence. and their realization adds nothing to divine perfection. God, by his ἕξις, was eternally Creator, and his essence required no new characteristics by the ἐνέργεια. The world itself cannot be eternal, for the effect cannot be equal to the cause:—(2) In his *Commentaria in Mosaicam mundi creationem*, or Περὶ κοσμοποιΐας (edited by Corder, Vienna, 1630), he attempts to reconcile the Mosaic account of creation with the facts derived from our own experience:—(3) In his Περὶ ἀναστάσεως (known to us only from Photius [*Cod.* 21–23], Nicephorus [*H. E.* xviii, 47], and Timotheus [*De receptu hæret.* in *Cotil. Mon.* iii, 414 sq.]) he separates the sensual from the spiritual creation, a concession to philosophy made at the expense of Christianity. "The rational soul," he argues, "is not only an εἶδος, but an imperishable substance, entirely distinct from all irrational existence, in which matter is always associated with form. In consequence of this inseparable connection of matter and form, the natural body is destroyed and annihilated by death. The resurrection of the body is the new creation of the body:"—(4) Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀστρολάβου χρήσεως (published by Hase, Bonn, 1839):—(5) Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων against Jamblichus):—(6) *Commentaries on Aristotle* (Venice, 1509, 1534, 1535, etc.):—(7) *Grammatical Essays* (in Labbe, *Glossaria*, London, 1816), etc. See J. G. Scharfenberg, *De J. Ph.* (Leipzig, 1768); Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, x, 639 sq.; Ritter, *Gesch. d. Philos.* vi, 500 sq., *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 95 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 760; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, iii, 321.

John À LASCO. See LASCO.

John OF LEITOMYSL. See LEITOMYSL.

John OF LEYDEN. See BOCCOLD.

John THE LITTLE, or JOHANNES PARVUS (*Jean Petit*), a French theologian, was born in Normandy in the latter half of the 14th century. He was at one time professor of theology in the University of Paris, but was deposed for having, on the 8th of March, 1408, pronounced a discourse in justification of the murder of the duke of Orleans, brother of the king of France, who was assassinated by the duke of Burgundy. He died at Hesdin, France, in 1411.—Pierer, *Univ. Lex.*

John Maro. See MARONITES.

John OF MATHA, St., founder of the *Order of the Holy Trinity* (also called *Fathers of Mercy* in Spain, and *Mathurins* in Paris), was born at Faucon, in Provence, in 1154, of noble parents. He studied at Paris University, and then entered the Church. "At his first celebration of divine service," the legend goes, "he beheld a vision of an angel clothed in white, having a cross of red and blue on his breast, with his hands, crossed over each other, resting on the heads of two slaves, who knelt on each side of him; and believing that in this vision of the mind God spoke to him, and called him to the deliverance of prisoners and captives, he immediately sold all his goods, and forsook the world, to prepare himself for his mission." In conjunction with Felix of Valois he arranged the constitutions of the new order, and together they went to Rome to obtain the approval of pope Innocent III. Felix having had, the legend continues, a similar dream, the pope gladly complied with their request, and the order was approved Feb. 2, 1199. Gaucher III, of Châtillon, having given them the estate of Cerfroi, they there established their first convent. They also obtained several other convents and hospitals in France and Spain, and a convent and church at Rome. Having collected large sums of money, John dispatched two of his brotherhood to the coast of Africa, whence they returned with 186 Christians redeemed from the Mussulman's bonds. The year following John himself went to Tunis, preaching on his way all through Spain, and creating many friends for his noble undertaking; he returned with 110 captives. From another voyage he returned with 120 Christians. Hereafter he devoted himself to preaching at Rome. He died there Dec. 21,

1213, and was canonized by Innocent XI, July 30, 1679. He is commemorated on February 8. The dress of the order consists in a flowing white gown, with a red and blue cross on the breast. See P. Ignace Dillaud, *Vie de St. Jean de Matha* (1695); Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Feb. 8; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Gén.* xxvi, 441; Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of Monastic Orders*, p. 217 sq.

John OF MEDA, St., founder, or rather reformer of the order of the *Humiliati*, was born at Meda, near Como, towards the close of the 11th century. He was a member of the Oldrati family of Milan. After ordination he withdrew to the solitude of Rondenario, near Como, which he subsequently left to join the Humiliati, then a lay congregation. Chosen their superior, he subjected them to the rule of St. Benedict, only changing the appellations of *brethren* and *monks* into *canons*. He obliged them also to say the Virgin's mass every day, and composed a special breviary for their use, which was called *canons' office*. The Humiliati (q. v.) thus became a regular order, with clerical and lay members. John of Meda gained a large number of proselytes by his preaching, and was reputed very charitable. He died Sept. 26, 1159, and was canonized a few days after his death by pope Alexander III. See St. Antonin, *Hist.* part ii, § xv, ch. xxiii; Sylvestre Maurolyc, *Mare Ocean di tutti li Relig.*; Moréri, *Grand Dict. historique*; Richard et Giraud, *Biblioth. Sac.*—Hoefer, *Nouvelle Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 441.

John THE MONK (*Johannes Monachus*), or JOHN OF CRESSY, a French canonist, was born at Cressy, Ponthieu, in the 13th century. He was a Cistercian monk, and was created cardinal. He died in 1313. He wrote commentaries on the decretals of Boniface VIII and Benedict IX, and was the first who wrote on the whole *Sextus* of Boniface VIII. The same work was afterwards done by Guido de Baisio, and still better by Johannes Andreæ. The glossaries of Johannes Monachus were annotated and published by Phil. Probus, doctor of the school of Bourges. His MSS., under the title *Glossæ in sextum decretalium*, are preserved in the public library of Chartres. He is also considered by some as the author of the *Defensorium Juris*, but this is not proved. See Savigny, *Catalogue de la Bibl. de Chartres*, iv, 274.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* xxvi, 559. (J. N. P.)

John OF MONTE CORVINO, a celebrated early Roman missionary among the Mongols, belonged to the Franciscan order, and flourished towards the close of the 13th century. He was born in Monte Corvino, a small city in Apulia, and had, previous to his appointment as Eastern missionary, distinguished himself (in 1272) as ambassador of the emperor Michael Palaeologus to pope Gregory X in behalf of a contemplated union of the Eastern and Western churches. He had travelled in the East, and, aware of the opening for Christianity among the Mongols, had urged the Roman see to dispatch missionaries to them; but their efforts proved unsuccessful, and in 1289 he finally, at the instance of pope Nicholas IV, set out for that distant field himself. Of an energetic character, discouraged by no reverses however great, or trials however severe, he finally succeeded in building up a Christian Church. As an instance of his undaunted courage may be cited the fact that he had to buy the children of natives in order to educate them in Christian doctrines, and through them to influence maturer minds. About 1305 he had some six thousand converts, and the prospect of still greater additions. In 1307 other laborers were sent into the field, and John de Monte Corvino was appointed archbishop (his see was named Cambalu), and the Christian interests were advanced among the Mongols even after John's death (1328), until the downfall of the Mongol dynasty. See MONGOLS. (J. H. W.)

John OF NEPOMUK (more properly POMUK), a very popular Bohemian saint of the Roman Catholic Church, and honored by them as a martyr of the inviolability of the seal of confession. He was born at Pomuk, a village in the district of Klatau, about the middle of the 14th century. After taking orders, he rose rapidly to distinction. He was created a canon of the Cathedral of Prague, and eventually vicar general of the diocese. The queen, Sophia, the second wife of Wenzel or Wenceslaus IV, having selected him for her confessor, Wenceslaus, himself a man of most dissolute life, conceiving suspicions of her virtue, required of John to reveal to him what he knew of her life from the confessions which she had made to him. John steadfastly refused, and the king resolved to be revenged for the refusal. An opportunity occurred soon afterwards, when the monks of the Benedictine abbey of Kladran elected an abbot in opposition to the design of the king, who wished to bestow it upon one of his own dissolute favorites, and obtained from John, as vicar general, at once a confirmation of their choice. Wenceslaus, having first put him to the torture, at which he himself personally presided, had him tied hand and foot, and flung, already half dead from the rack, into the Moldau (March, 1393). These historical facts have been considerably enlarged, and embellished with legendary additions, in his biography by Bohuslav Balbinus. According to these, his birth was signalled by miraculous signs, and after his martyrdom his body was discovered by a miraculous light which issued from it, was taken up, and buried with the greatest honor. Several able Romanist writers have frequently attempted to reconcile the points of conflict between the legend and the historical account. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 749 sq.; Pelzel, *Kaiser Wenceslaus*, i, 262 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* v. 725 sq. Dr. Otto Abel (*Die Sage v. heil. Johan. v. Nep.*) supposes the legend to be a Jesuitical invention, and to date from the restoration of popery in Bohemia, to serve as a popular counterpart to the martyrdom of Huss and Ziska. His memory is cherished with peculiar affection in his native country. He was canonized as a saint of the Roman Catholic Church by Benedict XIII in 1729, his feast being fixed for the 20th of March. By some historians, two distinct personages of the same name are enumerated—one the martyr of the confessional seal, the other of the resistance to the simoniacal tyranny of Wenceslaus; but the identity of the two is well sustained by Palacky, *Gesch. von Böhmen*, iii, 62. See Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 556 sq.

John NICIŌTA (from *Nicius*, probably the city of that name in the Thebaïs), also surnamed *the Recluse*, patriarch of the Jacobite Alexandrian Church, flourished in the early part of the 6th century, and was in the patriarchal chair from 507 to 517. He is noted for his violent opposition to the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, and is said to have refused communication with any that did not expressly anathematize them, and to have promised the emperor Anastasius two hundred pounds of gold if he would procure their final and decisive abrogation (see Neale, *Hist. East. Ch.* [Alexandria] ii, 26, 27; Theophanes, s. a. A.D. 512). Among the Jacobites, who in his day enjoyed especial favor at the imperial court (a period on which, says Neale, "the Jacobite writers dwell with peculiar complacency," and in which "their heresy had gained a footing which it never before or since possessed"), John Niciota, better known as patriarch *John II of Alexandria*, is reckoned among the saints. He is believed to be the author of a learned work against the Pelagians, addressed to pope Gelasius. Some think it was written by John I of Alexandria, but it is in all probability the production of John Niciota, and was written before his accession to the patriarchal chair. (J. H. W.)

John OF NICKLAUSHAUSEN, a German religious fanatic, flourished, in the second half of the 15th century, at Nicklaushausen, in the diocese of Würzburg. He was earning his livelihood as a swineherd when it suddenly occurred to him that an attack upon the clergy, and a summons to them to reform their profligate ways, might meet with applause from the people, to whom as

this time "the clergy, as a body, had become a stench in their nostrils." He was not slow openly and loudly to proclaim his mission (in 1476), to which he claimed he had been inspired by the Virgin Mary, and soon immense flocks gathered about him, who came from the Rhine lands to Misnia, and from Saxony to Bavaria, so that at times he preached to a congregation of 20,000 or 30,000 men. "His doctrines," says Lea (*Hist. Celibacy*, p. 397), "were revolutionary, for he denounced oppression both secular and clerical; but he was particularly severe upon the vices of the ecclesiastical body. A special revelation of the Virgin had informed him that God could no longer endure them, and that the world could not, without a speedy reformation, be saved from the divine wrath consequent upon them" (comp. Trithemius, *Chron. Hirsang.* ann. 1476). The unfortunate man, who was a fit precursor of Müncer and John of Leyden, was seized by the bishop of Würzburg, the fanatical zeal of his unarmed followers easily subdued, and he himself suffered, for his rashness, death at the stake a few days after his trial. (J. H. W.)

John of Nicomedia, a presbyter of the Church of Nicomedia, in Bithynia, in the time of Constantine the Great, is noted as the author of *Μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου Βασιλέως ἐπισκόπου Ἀμασείας*, *Acta martyrii S. Basilei episcopi Amasiæ*, which is given in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists (Aprilis, vol. iii); the Latin version in the body of the work (p. 417), with a preliminary notice by Henschen, and the Greek original in the Appendix (p. 50). An extract from the Latin version, containing the history of the female saint Glaphyra, had previously been given in the same work (Januar. i, 771). The Latin version of the *Acta Martyrii S. Basilei* had already been published by Aloysius Lippomani (*Vitæ Sanctor. Patrum*, vol. vii) and by Surius (*De probatis Sanctorum Vitis*, s. d. 26 Aprilis). Basileus was put to death about the close of the reign of Licinius, A.D. 322 or 323, and John, who was then at Nicomedia, professes to have conversed with him in prison. Cave thinks that the *Acta* have been interpolated, apparently by Metaphrastes. See *Acta Sanctorum*, ll. cc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i, 185.—Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 601.

John of Oxford, an English prelate, flourished in the second half of the 12th century, and took an active and important part in the controversy between king Henry II of England and his archbishop Thomas à Becket in behalf of his royal master, whose favor and unlimited confidence he enjoyed. He had attended the Diet at Würzburg in 1165, held to cement a union between Henry and the emperor of Germany, and had there taken the oath of fidelity to the rival pope of Alexander, Paschal III, whom the emperor supported. For his success in this mission, John, on his return, was rewarded by king Henry II with the appointment of dean of Salisbury. Of course the archbishop, at this time himself claiming the right to fill these positions, disapproved of the appointment, and even suspended and cited before him for trial the bishop of the diocese of Salisbury, who had approved the royal action. (See Inett, *History of the English Church*, vol. ii, pt. i, p. 337, note; Robertson, *Life of Becket*, p. 186, note d; compare art. Joceline of Salisbury and Clarendon Constitutions.) John, disregarding the archbishop's censures, was finally punished by excommunication (in 1166). The king at once dispatched a special embassy to pope Alexander, John of Oxford being one of the number, and, notwithstanding the archbishop's serious actions against John of Oxford, the pope, anxious to continue friendly relations with the English court, favorably received John, and the latter even measurably succeeded in the object of their mission [see art. Becket], securing also the pope's confirmation of his appointment as dean of Salisbury. After the close of the controversy and the return of Becket, John of Oxford was appointed by the king to meet and reinstate the archbishop, a not very moderate reproval to the haughty prelate; and upon the death of the latter John further received evidence of the grateful remembrance of his royal master by the appointment to the bishopric of Norwich (1175), and as such attended the Lateran Council in 1179. The exact time of his decease is not known to us, neither are we aware that he performed any literary work of value; in all probability, his active part in the king's controversy absorbed all his interests. See Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iv, 364 sq., 408. (J. H. W.)

John of Paris, a celebrated French Dominican of the 13th century, was professor of theology at the University of Paris. He owes his renown to the part he took in the controversy then waging between his king, Philip the Fair, and pope Boniface VIII. The latter, fearing his deposition on the plea that the resignation of his predecessor Celestine was illegal, took every means to advance the doctrine of papal absolutism. Not only in matters spiritual, but also in matters temporal, the pope was to be regarded supreme; in short, to save his office, he carried his schemes for the enlargement of the papal power to the verge of frenzy. Unluckily for Boniface, however, he found his equal in Philip the Fair, who not only denied the temporal power of the pope, but finally even scorned the foolish conduct of Boniface in seeking to frighten him by issuing bulls against him and his kingdom. The University of Paris sided with the king, and among his most outspoken friends were John of Paris and Accidius of Rome. The former even published a work against the papal assumptions, entitled *De regia potestate papali* (in the collection of Goldast, vol. ii), in which he dared to assert that "the priest, in spiritual things, was greater than the prince, but in temporal things the prince was greater than the priest; though, absolutely considered, the priest was the greater of the two." He also maintained that the pope had no power over the property either of the Church or her subjects. As the kingdom of Christ is a spiritual one, having its foundation in the hearts of men, not in their possessions, so the power conferred on the pope relates simply to the wants or to the advantage of the universal Church. He also stood up in defence of the independent power of the bishops and priests, and denied that this is derived from God through the mediation of the pope alone, maintaining that it springs directly from God, through the choice or concurrence of the communities. "For it was not Peter, whose successor is the pope, that sent forth the other apostles, whose successors are the bishops; or who sent forth the seventy disciples, whose successors are the parish priests; but Christ himself did this directly. It was not Peter who detained the apostles in order to impart to them the Holy Ghost; it was not he who gave them power to forgive sins, but Christ. Nor did Paul say that he received from Peter his apostolical office, but he said that it came to him directly from Christ or from God; that three years had elapsed after he received his commission to preach the Gospel before he had an interview with Peter." But more than this he argued. The pope himself was even amenable to a worldly power for his conduct in the papal chair. As such he regarded not simply the Œcumenical Council, but to the secular princes also he believed this right belonged, subject, however, to a demand on the part of the clergy for aid. Neander says (*Ch. Hist.* v, 18), "If the pope gave scandal to the Church, and showed himself incorrigible, it was in the power of secular rulers to bring about his abdication or his deposition by means of their influence on him or on his cardinals." If the pope would not yield, they might so manage as to compel him to yield. They might command the people, under severe penalties, to refuse obedience to him as pope. John of Paris finally enters into a particular investigation of the question whether the pope can be deposed or can abdicate, a query that had been raised by the family of the Colonnas, whom the pope had estranged, and who were anxious to make null and void the resignation of pope Celestine, and to reassert the latter's claim to the papa-

cy. What conclusions he must have arrived at on this point may be gathered from the preceding remarks. He distinctly affirmed that, as the papacy existed only for the benefit of the Church, the pope ought to lay down his office whenever it obstructed this end, the highest end of Christian love. Though he measurably served Boniface VIII by his last conclusions, he had yet sufficiently aroused the hatred of the Roman see to fear for his position in the Church; and no sooner did an opportunity present itself to Boniface than John was made to feel the strong arm of his opponent. Having advocated in the pulpit, contrary to the Roman Catholic dogma of the real presence, a so-called *impanation*, viz. "that, in virtue of a union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine, like the union of the two natures in Christ, the predicates of the one might be transferred over to the other," he was prohibited from preaching by the bishop of Paris. An appeal to the pope, of course, proved futile, and his troubles ended only with his life, in 1304. He embodied his views of the sacrament in his work *Determinatio de modo existendi corporis Christi in Sacramento altaris* (London, 1686, 8vo):—*Correctorium doctrinæ sancti Thomæ*. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* iv, 340; v, sect. 1; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* bk. iii, cent. xiii, pt. ii, ch. iii, § 14. See also BONIFACE; PAPACY; LORD'S SUPPER.

John OF PARMA, also called JOANNES BORELLUS or BURALLUS, a learned monk of the 13th century, was born at Parma about 1209. He became a Franciscan, taught theology with great success at the universities of Naples, Bologna, and Paris, and in 1247 was made general of his order by the chapter assembled at Avignon. He showed great zeal for the reformation of convents, and strictly enforced the discipline. In 1249 he was sent to Greece by Innocent IV, with a view to the reconciliation of the Eastern Church, but failed in that undertaking, and returned to Italy in 1251. A chapter held at Rome in 1256 accused him of favoring the heresies of Joachim, abbot of Floris, whose work, *The Everlasting Gospel*, he edited, and accompanied with a preface of his own (see Farrar, *Crit. Hist. Free Thought*, p. 86), and he was obliged to resign the generalship of the order. His successor, Bonaventura Fidanza, even caused him to be condemned to imprisonment, but the protection of cardinal Ottoboni, afterwards Adrian V, prevented the execution of the sentence. He was nevertheless obliged to hide himself in the convent of Grecchia, near Rieti. He subsequently set out to return to Greece, but died at Camerino in 1289. He was canonized in the 18th century by the Congregation of Rites. None of his writings were published. See *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, xx, 23; Wadding, *Script. Ord. Minor.*; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.*; Ireneo Affo, *Memorie degli Scrittori et Litterati Parmigiani*; Sbaraglia, *Supplem. et castig. ad Script. Ord. S. Francisc.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 550; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. xiii, pt. ii, ch. ii, § 33, note. (J. N. P.)

John PARVUS. See JOHN THE LITTLE.

John PHILOPONUS. See JOHN THE LABORIOUS.

John PHOCAS (Φοκάς), a Cretan monk and priest, son of Matthæus, who became a monk in Patmos, had served in the army of the emperor Manuel Comnenus (who reigned A.D. 1143-80) in Asia Minor, and afterwards visited (A.D. 1185) Syria and Palestine, is noted for a short geographical account which he wrote of those countries, entitled Ἔκφρασις ἐν συνόψει τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιοχείας μέχρις Ἱεροσολύμων κάστρων καὶ χωρῶν Συρίας καὶ Φοινίκης καὶ τῶν κατὰ Παλαιστίνην ἁγίων τόπων, *Compendiaria Descriptio Castrorum et Urbium* (sic in Allat. vers.) *ab Urbe Antiochia usque Hierosolymam, necnon Syriæ ac Pheniciæ, et in Palæstina Sacrorum Locorum*, which was transcribed by his son (for he was married before he became a priest), and finally published by Allatius, with a Latin version, in his Σύμμικτα, i, 1-46. The Latin version is also given in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists, Maii ii, ad init. See Allatius, Σύμμικτα, *Præfatiuncula*; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* iv, 662; viii, 99.—Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 601.

John PHURNES (Φουρνῆς), a monk of the monastery of Mount Ganus, who flourished in the reign of the emperor Alexis Comnenus (11th century), was an opponent of the Latin Church, and is noted as the author of Ἀπολογία, *Defensio, or* Διάλεξις, *Disceptatio*, a discussion which was carried on with Peter, archbishop of Milan, in the presence of the emperor. If this is the work which John Veccus cites and replies to in his *De Unione Ecclesiarum Oratio* (apud Allatium, *Græcia Orthodoxa*, i, 179, etc.), it appears that the form of a dialogue was assumed for convenience' sake, and that it was not the dialogue of a real conference. According to Fabricius, Allatius also published in his work *De Consensu* (sc. *De Ecclesiæ Occidentalis et Orientalis perpetua Consensione*), p. 1153, a work of John which is described as *Epistola de Ritibus immutatis in Sacra Communione*. Other works of John are extant in MS. See Allatius, *Græc. Orthodox.* l. c.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* xi, 648, 650.—Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 601.

John THE PRESBYTER, a supposed disciple of Jesus, and instructor of Papias of Hierapolis, is said to have been a contemporary of the apostle John (with whom it is thought he has been confounded by early Church historians), and to have resided at Ephesus. For the assertion that there existed such a person, the testimony advanced is (1) that of Papias (in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 39), who, in speaking of the personal efforts he put forth to establish himself in the Christian faith, says: "Whenever any one arrived who had had intercourse with the elders (τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις), I made inquiry concerning the declarations of these, what Andrew, what Peter, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of the Lord said, *as also what Aristion and John the Presbyter, disciples of the Lord, say*. For I believed that I should not derive so much advantage from books as from living and abiding discourse." Eusebius, in reporting this, takes special pains to report that Papias purposely adduces the name John twice, first in connection with Peter, James, and Matthew, where only the apostle can be intended, *and again along with Aristion, where he distinguishes him by the title of "the Presbyter."* Eusebius further states that this confirms the report of those who relate that there were two men in Asia Minor who bore that name, and had been closely connected with Christ, and then continues by showing *that two tombs had been found in Ephesus bearing the name of John*. Further proof is found in another part of his history (vii, 25), where he cites Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, about the middle of the 3d century, as uttering the same tradition concerning the finding of the two tombs at Ephesus inscribed with the name of John, and as ascribing to John the Presbyter the authorship of the Apocalypse, which Eusebius himself was inclined to do. The existence of a presbyter John is (2) declared in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vii, 36), where it is said that the second John was bishop of Ephesus after John the Apostle, and that it was by the latter that he was instituted into office. Further testimony is obtained from Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.* c. 9), who reports the opinion of some that the second and third epistles of John are the production of John the Presbyter, "cujus et hodie alterum sepulcrum apud Ephesum ostenditur, etsi nonnulli putant duas memorias ejusdem Johannis evangelistæ esse." In defence of the existence of such a person as John the Presbyter appear prominently among modern critics Grotius, Beck, Fritzsche, Bretschneider, Credner, Ebrard, and Steitz (*Jahrb. deutscher Theol.* 1869, i, 138 sq.), all of whom ascribe to him the authorship of the last two epistles of John, generally believed to be the productions of John the Apostle; also Lücke, Bleek, De Wette, and Neander, who consider John the Presbyter the author of the Apocalypse. The simple question

whether another John existed in Asia Minor contemporary with John the Apostle would, of course, be of little import, but the fact that the apostolical authorship of some of the epistles and of the Apocalypse is doubted has called to critical inquiry most of the leading theological minds of our day. The result is that, while some have conceded the existence of another John, clothed even with episcopal dignity (Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, p. 113), others have denied altogether the probability of the existence of such a person contemporary with the apostle John (see Schaff, *Church History*, Apostolic Age, p. 421, note). Dr. W. L. Alexander, in reviewing the proofs of those who assert the existence of John and his authorship of some of the Johannean writings, thinks that in the way of this assumption stands the following: 1. "The negative evidence arising from the silence of all other ancient authorities, especially the silence of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who, in a list of eminent teachers and bishops in Asia Minor, preserved by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* v, 24), makes no mention of John the Presbyter; and, 2. The positive evidence afforded by the statement of Irenæus, who not only omits all mention of the Presbyter, but says that Papias was a hearer of John the Apostle along with Polycarp (*adv. Hæres.* v, 33). [Not so thinks Donaldson in his *Hist. Christ. Lit. and Doctr.* i, 312 sq.] This counter evidence has appeared to some so strong that they have thought it sufficient to set aside that of Papias, who, they remind us, is described by Eusebius as a man of a very small intellect (σφόδρα σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 39). [See Schaff, below.] But this seems going too far. Papias describes himself as a hearer of the presbyter John (Euseb. v, 24), and in this he could hardly be mistaken, whatever was his deficiency in intellectual power [this view is advocated by Zahn (in his *Hermas*) and Riggenbach (*Jahrb. deutscher Theol.* xiii, 319); against it, see Steitz (in *Jahrb.* xiv, 145 sq.)]; whereas it is very possible that Irenæus may have confounded the presbyter with the apostle, the latter of whom would be to his mind much more familiar than the former. The silence of Polycrates may be held proof sufficient that no John the Presbyter was bishop of Ephesus, or famed as a teacher of Christianity in Asia Minor; but, as Papias does not attest this, his testimony remains unaffected by this conclusion. On the whole, the existence of a John the Presbyter seems to be proved by the testimony of Papias; but beyond this, and the fact that he was a disciple of the Lord, nothing is certainly known of him. Credner contends that πρεσβύτερος is to be taken in its ordinary sense of 'older,' and that it was applied to the person mentioned by Papias either because he was the senior of St. John, or because he arrived before him in Asia Minor; but this is improbable in itself; and, had Papias meant to intimate this, he would not have simply called him ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης (see Liddon, p. 514). In his statement πρεσβύτερος is plainly opposed to ἀπόστολος as a distinctive title of office" (Kitto, *Cyclop.* s. v.). We cannot close without permitting Dr. Schaff (*Apost. Ch. Hist.* p. 421 sq.) to give his view on this important question. He says: "There is room even to inquire whether the very existence of this obscure presbyter and mysterious duplicate of the apostle John rests not upon sheer misunderstanding, as Herder suspected (*Offenb. Joh.* p. 206, in the xiith vol. of Herder's *Werke zur Theol.*). We candidly avow that to us, notwithstanding what Lücke (iv, 396 sq.) and Credner (*Einleit. in's N. Test.* i, 694 sq.) have said in its favor, this man's existence seems very doubtful. The only proper, original testimony for it is, as is well known, an obscure passage of Papias in Eusebius, iii. 39." After doubting the propriety of giving credit to a statement of Papias not reiterated by any other authority of the early Church, he says: "It is very possible that Papias meant in both cases one and the same John, and repeated his name perhaps on account of his peculiarly close contact with him. (See above, Dr. Alexander's view.) So Irenæus, at least, seems to have understood him, when he calls Papias a disciple of the *apostle* John (without mentioning any presbyter of that name) and friend of Polycarp (*Adv. Hær.* v, 33). The arguments for this interpretation are the following: (1) The term 'presbyter' is here probably not an official title, but denotes age, including the idea of venerableness, as also Credner supposes (p. 697), and as may be inferred from 2 John 1 and 3 John 1, and from the usage of Irenæus, who applies the same term to his master Polycarp (*Adv. Hær.* v, 30), and to the Roman bishops before Soter (v, 24). This being so, we cannot conceive how a contemporary of John, bearing the same name, should be distinguished from the apostle by this standing title, since the apostle himself had attained an unusual age, and was probably even sixty when he came to Asia Minor. (2) Papias, in the same passage, styles the other apostles also 'presbyters,' the ancients, the fathers; and, on the other hand, calls also Aristion and John (personal) 'disciples of the Lord.' (3) The evangelist designates himself as 'the elder' (2 John 1 and 3 John 1), which leads us to suppose that he was frequently so named by his 'little children,' as he loves to call his readers in his first epistle. For this reason also it would have been altogether unsuitable, and could only have created confusion, to denote by this title another John, who lived with the apostle and under him in Ephesus. Credner supposes, indeed, that these two epistles came not from the apostle, but, like the Apocalypse, from the 'presbyter John' in question. But it is evident at first sight that these epistles are far more akin, even in their language, to the first epistle than to the Apocalypse (comp. 2 John 4–7 with 1 John ii, 7, 8; iv, 2, 3; 2 John 9 with 1 John ii, 27; iii, 9, etc.). This is De Wette's reason for considering them genuine. When Credner supposes that the presbyter afterwards accommodated himself to the apostle's way of thinking and speaking, he makes an entirely arbitrary assumption which he himself condemns in pronouncing a like change in the apostle 'altogether unnatural and inadmissible' (p. 733). (4) The Ephesian bishop Polycrates, of the 2d century, in his letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, on the Paschal controversy (in Euseb. v, 24), mentions but one John, though he there enumerates the μεγάλα στοιχεῖα of the Asian Church, Philip, with his pious daughters, Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, Papirius, Melito, most of whom were not so important as the presbyter John must have been if he were a personal disciple of the Lord, and the author of the Apocalypse. We can hardly think that in this connection, where it was his object to present as many authorities as possible for the Asiatic usage respecting the feast, Polycrates would have passed over this John if he had known anything about him, and if his tomb could have been really pointed out in Ephesus, as the later Dionysius and Jerome intimate. Jerome, however, in speaking of this, expressly observes, 'Nonnulli putant, duas memorias ejusdem Johannis evangelistæ esse' (*De Vir. Ill.* c. 9); which, again, makes this whole story doubtful, and destroys its character as a historical testimony in favor of this obscure presbyter."

Ridiculous, certainly, is the argument which some have advanced, that the different Johannean epistles differ so much in style that they cannot possibly be ascribed to one and the same person. On this argument Ebrard (*Einleitung*) laid particular stress, but he is ably answered by Dr. Tholuck in his *Glaubwürdigkeit der evangel. Geschichte*, 2d ed. p. 283. From the rich treasury of his reading the latter draws such analogies as the "varietas dictionis Appulejanæ;" the difference between the *Dialogus de Oratoribus* and the *Annales* of Tacitus; between the *Leges* and the earlier dialogues of Plato; the sermons and the satires of Swift, etc. "This catalogue," says Dr. Schaff, "may easily be increased from the history of modern literature. Think, for example, of the immense distance between Schleiermacher's *Reden über die Religion* and his *Dialektik;* Hegel's *Logik* and *Aesthetik;* the first and second part of Göthe's *Faust;*

Carlyle's *Life of Schiller* and his *Latter-day Pamphlets*, etc." Comp. also Liddon, *Divinity of Christ*, p. 512 sq. See JOHN, SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF.

John, PRESTER (*Priest John*), a supposed Christian king and priest of a mediæval kingdom in the interior of Asia, the locality of which is vague and undefined. In the 11th and 12th centuries the Nestorian missionaries penetrated into Eastern Asia, and made conversions among the Keraeit or Krit Tartars, which, according to the earliest reports, are said to have included the khan or sovereign of the tribe. Ung (or Ungh) Khan, who resided at Karakorum, and to whom the afterwards celebrated Genghis Khan was tributary. This name the Syrian missionaries translated by analogy with their own language, converting *Ung* into "Jachanan" or "John," and rendering *Khan* by "priest." In their reports to the Christians of the West, accordingly, their royal convert figured as at once a priest and the sovereign of a rich and magnificent kingdom. Genghis Khan having thrown off his allegiance, a war ensued, which ended in the defeat and death of Ung Khan in 1202; but the tales of his piety and magnificence long survived, and not only furnished the material of numberless mediæval legends (which may be read in Assemani's *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, III, ii, 484), but supplied the occasion of several of those missionary expeditions from Western Christendom to which we owe almost all our knowledge of mediæval Eastern geography. The reports regarding Ung Khan, carried to Europe by two Armenian legates in 1145 to Eugene III, created a most profound impression; and the letters addressed in his name, but drawn up by the Nestorian missionaries, to the pope, to the kings of France and Portugal, and to the Greek emperor, impressed all with a lively hope of the speedy extension of the Gospel in a region hitherto regarded as hopelessly lost to Christianity. They are printed in Assemani's *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. The earliest mention of Prester John is in the narrative of the Franciscan father John Carpini, who was sent by pope Innocent IV to the court of Batû Khan of Kiptchak, the grandson of Genghis Khan. Father Carpini supposed that Prester John's kingdom lay still further to the east, but he did not prosecute the search. This was reserved for a member of the same order, father Rubruquis, who was sent as a missionary into Tartary by St. Louis, and, having reached the camp of Batû Khan, was by him sent forward to Karakorum, the seat of the supposed Prester John. He failed, however, of his hope of finding such a personage, the Khagan of Karakorum, Mangû, being still an unbeliever; and his intercourse with the Nestorian missionaries whom he found established there satisfied him that the accounts were grievously exaggerated. His narrative, which is printed in Purchas's *Collection*, is one of the most interesting among those of mediæval travellers. Under the same vague notion of the existence of a Christian prince and a Christian kingdom in the East, the Portuguese sought for traces of Prester John in their newly-acquired Indian territory in the 15th century. A similar notion prevailed as to the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia, which, in the hope of finding Prester John, was visited so late as the reign of John II of Portugal (1481-95) by Pedro Covilham and Alfonzo di Pavva, the former of whom married and settled in the country. See Gieseler's *Kirchengeschichte*, III, iii, 43; Ritter's *Erdkunde von Asien*, i, 283 sq.; Schmidt, *Forschungen im Gebiete d. älteren Bildungsgesch. d. Mongolen und Tübeter* (Petersb. 1824), p. 162.

John PUPPER. See GOCH.

John PUNGENS ASINUM. See JOHN OF PARIS.

John RAITHUENSIS OR RAITHENUS, i. e. *of Raithus* or *Raithu* (τοῦ Ῥαϊθοῦ), hegumenos or abbot of a monastery at Elim, or the Seventy Springs, on the western coast of the peninsula of Mount Sinai, flourished in the 6th century. He is celebrated on account of the friendly relations he sustained and the influence he exerted over John the Scholar, or John Climacus. It was at the desire of Raithuensis that Climacus wrote the work Κλίμαξ or *Scala Paradisi*, from which he derives his name, and to which Raithuensis wrote a *Commendatio* and *Scholia*. The Ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἡγουμένου τοῦ Ῥαϊθοῦ, *Litteræ Joannis Raithuensis*, addressed to Climacus, requesting him to undertake the work, and the answer of Climacus are given by Raderus in the original Greek, with a Latin version, in his edition of the works of Climacus (Paris, 1633, fol.). This version of the *Litteræ* of Raithuensis, and a Latin version of his *Commendatio* and *Scholia*, are given in various editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*: the *Litteræ* in vol. iii, edit. Paris, 1575; the *Litteræ* and *Commendatio*, vol. v, edit. Paris, 1589 and 1654; the *Litteræ*, *Epistola*, *Commendatio*, and *Scholia*, in vol. vi, pt. ii. ed. Cologne, 1618, and vol. x, ed. Lyme, 1677. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* ix, 523-524; Ittigius, *De Biblioth. Patrum*.—Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 601.

John OF RAVENNA. See NICHOLAS I; RAVENNA.

John THE RECLUSE. See JOHN NICIOTA.

John DE LA ROCHELLE, a French theologian, was born in the early part of the 13th century, probably in the city of La Rochelle. He joined the Franciscans, and studied under Alexander de Hales, whom he succeeded in 1238, but resigned in 1253 in favor of St. Bonaventura. He died at Paris in 1271, according to Luc Wadding. John de la Rochelle was a successful teacher, yet his works did not enjoy much renown, probably because he did not follow the mystical tendency of the times. Among his works we notice commentaries on a number of the books of the Bible; sermons, preserved in the MS. collections of divers libraries, chiefly in that of Troyes, France; *De Anima*, MSS. in the library of St. Victor; and he is also considered the author of some other works, but on doubtful grounds. He is especially deserving of notice as one of the first, if not the first, who attempted to explain Aristotle's Περὶ Ψυχῆς, a task of which he ably disposed. Thomas Aquinas probably availed himself of this work. See Cas. Oudin, *De Script. Eccles.*; *Histoire Litt. de la France*, xix. 171: B. Hauréau, *De la Philosophie Scolastique*, i, 475; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 548. (J. N. P.)

John OF RUPESCISSA OR ROQUETAILLADE, a French Franciscan, who flourished near the middle of the 14th century, at Aurillac, in Auvergne, is noted for his severe denunciations of the gross immoralities of the clergy of the Roman Church in his day. He was especially opposed to the court at Avignon, and hesitated not to brand the whole papal court as the seat of a great whoredom. Popes Clement VI and Innocent VI imprisoned him on account of his continued remonstrances and prophesying, but even while in prison he wrote much against the papal court and the clergy. He died while in prison, but the cause of his death is not known. His works of interest are, (1) *Vademecum in tribulatione* (in Ed. Brown's addition to *Orturii Gratii fascic. rer. expectandar. et fugiendar.* London, 1690), wherein he handles the French clergy without gloves, and prophesies much trouble to their native land on account of their sins:—(2) A Commentary on the prophecies of the hermit Cyril of Mount Carmel and of abbot Joachim (q. v.). See Trithemius, *De script. Eccles.* c. 611 (in Fabricius, *Bib. Eccl.* pt. ii, p. 145); Wolfius, *Lectt. memorab.* cent. xiv, p. 623 sq.; Fuhrmann, *Handw. der Kirchengesch.* ii, 482; Aschbach, *Kirch.-Lex.* iii, 565. (J. H. W.)

John OF SALISBURY, an eminent English prelate, was born at Salisbury (old *Sarum*) about 1110. He was first educated at Oxford, and in 1136 went to France, where he continued his studies under Abelard, and many other celebrated French divines of that age. About 1151 he returned to England, and was appointed chaplain of Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury. Sent on a mission to pope Hadrian IV in 1156, he openly approached the latter on the abuses of the Church and of the papacy, though always an earnest advocate of the

unity and liberty of the Church, and the independence of the episcopate from the secular princes. He was an intimate friend and admirer of Thomas à Becket, whose cause he espoused warmly, and whom he followed into exile returning only to England with him in 1170, and after his death secured his canonization. John was called Becket's eye and arm. In 1176 he was appointed bishop of Chartres, and died about 1180. His works, which evince positive Realistic tendencies, and bear evidence of fruitful genius, sound understanding, and great erudition, are, *Policraticus s. de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum* (Leyden, 1691) (an excellent treatise on the employments, duties, virtues, and vices of great men—a curious and valuable monument of the literature of John of Salisbury's time):—*Metalogicus* (Leyd. 1610, Amst. 1664), an exhibition of true and false science;—*Entheticus de dogmate philosophorum* (pub. by Chr. Petersen, Hamb. 1843):—*Vita ac Passio S. Thomæ* (a Life of Thomas à Becket), etc. His collective works have been published by J. A. Giles (Lond. 1848, 5 vols. 8vo). See H. Reuter, *J. von Salisbury* (Berl. 1842); J. Schmidt, *Joan Parv. Sarisb.*, etc. (1838); *Hist. Litt. de la France*, etc., xiv, 89 sq.; Ritter, *Gesch. d. Philos.* vii, 605; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s. v. See BECKET; PAPACY.

John III. the patriarch, surnamed THE SCHOLAR (1), was born at Sirimis, near Antioch, towards the middle of the 6th century. He became successively attorney, then presbyter of Antioch, and finally, in 565, patriarch of Constantinople under Justinian I. He died in 577. He prepared a large *Collectio canonum* under fifty headings, which became authoritative in the whole Greek Church. He is also considered as the author of a collection of ecclesiastical rules and regulations under the title *Nomocanon* (both in Justelli, *Biblioth. juris canonici* [Paris, 1662], ii, 499, 603, 660). He is also said to have delivered a dissertation on the doctrine of the Trinity which involved him in a controversy with the renowned so-called Tritheist John Philoponus (Phot. *Cod.* 75).

John THE SCHOLAR (2) (JOHANNES SCHOLASTICUS or CLIMACUS), a monk of the latter half of the 6th century, was a zealous partisan of monastic life, and became abbot of a convent on Mount Sinai. He died there about 606. He wrote Κλίμαξ τοῦ παραδείσου, an ascetic mystical work (Latin, *Scala paradisi*, Ambrosius, Venice, 1531, etc.), which was greatly celebrated and widely circulated among Greek monks for centuries after his death:—*Liber ad religiosum postorem, qui est de officio cœnobiarchæ* (publ. by Matth. Rader, 1606). A collection of his works in Greek and Latin has been published by Matth. Rader (Paris, 1633).—Pierer, *Univers. Lex.* s. v.

John SCOTUS ERIGENA. See SCOTUS.

John OF SCYTHOPOLIS, a Greek ecclesiastical writer, who in all probability flourished in the latter part of the 5th century or the beginning of the 6th, wrote a work against the followers of Eutyches and Dioscorus, entitled Κατὰ τῶν ἀποσχιστῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *Contra desertores ecclesiæ*. It was divided into twelve parts, and was undertaken at the suggestion of a certain prelate, one Julianus, in reply to an anonymous Eutychian writer, who had published a book deceitfully entitled Κατὰ Νεστορίων, *Adversus Nestorium*, and whom Photius (*Bibl. Cod.* 95, 107) supposed to be Basilius, a presbyter of Cilicia. This Basilius wrote a reply to John in very abusive style, charging him, among many other things, with being a Manichæan, and with restricting Lent to a period of three weeks, and not abstaining from flesh even in that shortened period. Certain Παραθέσεις, *Scholia*, to the works of *the pseudo Dionysius Areopagita*, which Usher has observed to be mingled in the printed editions of Dionysius with *the Scholia of St. Maximus*, have been ascribed to John of Scythopolis. Anastasius Bibliothecarius, in the 8th century, made a Latin translation of these mingled scholia, not now extant, in which he professed to distinguish those of Maximus from those of John by the mark of a cross. Fabricius (*Bibl. Gr.* vii, 9; x, 707, 710) identifies *the Scholia of John* with the *Commentarii in Dionysium Areopagitam* cited by John Cyparissiota as by Dionysius of Alexandria. See Usher, *Dissert. de Scriptis Dionys. Areop. suppositis*, p. 299, subjoined to his *Historia Dogmatica de Scriptoris Vernaculis*, etc. (London, 1689, 4to); Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i, 466.—Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 602.

John OF TALAIA OR TALAIDA (otherwise *Tabennisiota*, Ταβεννισιώτης, from the monastery of Tabenna, near Alexandria; or *of Alexandria*, from his patriarchal see; or from the offices which he had previously held, *œconomus* [οἰκόνομος] and *presbyter*), a celebrated ecclesiastic in the Eastern Church, was one of the deputation sent by Salofaciolus, the twenty-seventh patriarch of Alexandria (A.D. 460–482), shortly before his decease, to the emperor Zeno, to secure his leave for a free election of the next patriarch from among the defenders of the Council of Chalcedon by the clergy and laity of Alexandria. "The emperor," says Neale (*East. Church* [*Alexand.*], ii, 18), "received the deputies graciously, complied with their request, and in the letter which he gave them by way of reply *spoke strongly in favor of John*." Soon after the return of John, Timotheus Salofaciolus died, and John was unanimously elected to succeed him, but was almost immediately expelled from his see by order of the emperor. The cause of his expulsion is differently stated. Liberatus says that he was expelled mainly through the jealousy of Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, to whom, on different occasions, he had failed in paying due attention. According to Evagrius, who quotes Zacharias as his authority, he was detected in having procured his own election by bribery, and had broken an oath which he had taken before Zeno not to seek for himself the patriarchate. But Neale thinks it doubtful whether John ever took such an oath, and holds that, even if he had, he can see no reason for the harshness with which he was treated, and for his ejection from the see, so long as it was freely proffered to him (which seems clear from the *unanimous election*). The true reason seems to be John's careless delay of the announcement of his election to the patriarch of Constantinople, sending the message by Illus, who was then in Antioch, instead of dispatching a messenger direct, as he had done in the case of Rome and Antioch, thereby provoking the patriarch of Constantinople, also his selection of Illus for the messenger, when the latter was then the object of jealousy and suspicion to Zeno, if not actually in rebellion against him. John, expelled from Alexandria, first resorted to Illus, then to Antioch; and having, through Illus's intervention, obtained from the patriarch of Antioch and his suffragans a synodical letter commending him to pope Simplicius, departed to Rome to plead his cause there in person. Simplicius, with the usual papal jealousy of the patriarchs of Constantinople, took the side of John; but neither the exertions of Simplicius nor those of his successor Felix could obtain the restoration of the banished patriarch, and John finally accepted from Felix the bishopric of Nola, in Campania, which he held several years, and at last died peaceably (the precise date of his decease is not known). John (whom Theophanes extols for his piety and orthodoxy) wrote Πρὸς Γελάσιον τὸν Ῥώμης ἀπολογία, *Ad Gelasium Papam Apologia*, in which he anathematized Pelagianism, as well as its defenders Pelagius and Celestius, and their successor Julianus. The work, which is noticed by Photius, is not extant. See Tillemont, *Mém.* vol. xvi; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i, 445.—Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 602; Neale, *Hist. East. Ch.* (*Alex.*) ii, 18 sq.

John, surnamed THE TEUTON, from his nationality, abbot of St. Victor, was a native of the diocese of Trèves. He studied at Paris, joined the canon regulars of St. Victor, and became their abbot in 1203. He was one

of the ablest of the *glossatores* (q. v.) on canon law, and appears to have exerted great influence in general over the ecclesiastical affairs of his time, and to have been in great favor both with the pope and with the king of France. He died at Paris Nov. 28, 1229. He left thirty-seven sermons, which are preserved among the MSS. of the Imperial Library at Paris. (Two Dominican monks of like name flourished in the latter half of the 13th and the first half of the 14th century.) See Cesaire d'Heisterbah, *Illustr. Mirac. et Histoire Memor.* lib. vi, c. 12; Jacques de Vitry, *Hist. Occidental.* c. 24; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xviii, 67; *Gallia Christ.* vol. x, col. 673; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 547.

John, archbishop OF THESSALONICA, who flourished in the 7th century, is noted as a stout defender of the orthodox faith against the Monothelites. He attended as papal legate the third Constantinopolitan (sixth œcumenical) Council (A.D. 680), and in that character subscribed the Acta of the council (*Concilia*, vol. vi, col. 1058, ed. Labbe; vol. iii, col. 1425, ed. Hardouin; vol. xi, col. 639, ed. Mansi). The time of his death is altogether uncertain. He wrote (1) Εἰς τὰς μυροφόρους γυναῖκας, *In mulieres ferentes unguenta*, a discourse or treatise in which he argues that there is no contradiction in the several accounts of the resurrection of Christ given by the four evangelists. This piece appears to have been regarded by some as a work of Chrysostom, and was first published (but from a mutilated and corrupt text) by Savile in his edition of Chrysostom (v, 740, Eton. 1610, fol.), though with an expression of doubt as to its genuineness. It was subsequently printed more correctly in the *Novum Auctarium* of Combefis (vol. i, Paris, 1648, folio), and by him assigned to the right author. It is given in a mutilated form in Montfaucon's edition of Chrysostom among the *Spuria*, viii, 159 (Paris, 1718, fol.), or in viii, 816 of the 8vo reprint (Paris, 1839). It is also given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Gallandius, xiii, 185, etc. A Latin version is given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. xii (Lyons, 1677):—(2) Λόγος, *Oratio*, of which a considerable extract was read by Nicolaus, bishop of Cyzicus, at the second Nicene (seventh œcumenical) Council, and is printed in the *Concilia*, vol. vii, col. 353, ed. Labbe; vol. iv, col. 292, ed. Hardouin; vol. xiii, col. 163, ed. Mansi; and by Gallandius in his *Bibliotheca Patrum*, xiii, 196. See Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i, 597; Fabricius. *Bibl. Græc.* x, 250.—Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 603.

John OF TURRECREMATA. See TURRECREMATA.

John OF WESEL. See WESEL.

John OF WESSEL. See WESSEL.

John I, pope of Rome, a Tuscan by birth, ascended the papal throne Aug. 13, 523. About this time the bigoted Eastern emperor Justus II had issued an edict against heretics of all denominations, commanding them to be put to death wherever found in his dominions; but, as it was principally aimed against the detested Manichæans, all went well until, in 524, the emperor issued another edict, this time against the Arians of Italy. Their patron Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, was induced to intercede for them in Byzantium, and he despatched an embassy for this purpose, headed by the orthodox pope John himself, who had thus to plead a cause for which he had no sympathy. The latter promised, in undertaking the mission, to procure the revocation of the edict, and in this he succeeded, but, failing to procure also the emperor's permission for all those who had forsaken Arianism unwillingly to return to their former faith, and Theodoric fearing that the whole work on the part of the pope was a piece of deception, and that the Romans, with the bishop at their head, instead of seeking relief from the intolerance of Greek orthodoxy, solicited aid against the Goths, imprisoned the pope on his arrival at Ravenna, where he died, May 18, 526. A Roman tradition reports, not without some complacency, that in Constantinople the emperor bowed down before the bishop of Rome, and that at high mass the seat of the latter, by his special request, was raised above that of the patriarch; seemingly, of course, a concession of superiority to the Roman see. John is numbered among the martyrs. Two letters are ascribed to him by Baronius and others, but they are now generally rejected. See Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, ii, 312 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, i, 199.

John II, Pope, a Roman by birth, surnamed *Mercurius*, succeeded Boniface II in the Roman see in 532, being elected by the clergy and the people of Rome after considerable agitation and many simoniacal practices, and confirmed by king Athalaric, for which confirmation a certain payment was fixed by an edict of the same king. The emperor Justinian, in a letter addressed to him shortly after his accession, after earnest assurances of his endeavor to unite the Western and Eastern churches, makes full confession of superior power belonging to the Roman hierarchy, designating him as "the head of the holy Church." The only other important events in his life are his decision on the Trinity question in favor of Justinian (q. v.) [see ACŒMETÆ], and in the case of the bishop of Riez (q. v.). He died in 535. See Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, ii, 333 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, i, 203.

John III, Pope, a native of Rome, was elected to succeed Pelagius I in 560, and was confirmed by the exarch of Ravenna in the name of the emperor Justinian. Like many of his predecessors, he used his powers mainly for the aggrandizement of the Roman see. He is noted for his interference in behalf of the two French bishops of Embrun and of Gap, who had been deposed by local councils for improper conduct. Though known to be guilty, he ordered their restoration, which Gontram, the Burgundian king, was only too happy to enforce in opposition to the French clergy. But the Gallican Church, which had with very great hesitancy permitted the restoration of the guilty men, soon proved them to be unworthy of ecclesiastical office, and a new French council confirmed their previous deposition. John died in 574. See Riddle, *Papacy*, i, 210; Bower, *History of the Popes*, ii, 426 sq.

John IV, Pope, a Dalmatian by birth, was consecrated Dec. 25, 640. He displayed great zeal in founding convents and endowing the churches of Rome. But he is noted especially for his strife against his Greek rival. The Monothelite creed of the patriarch Sergius, promulgated by the emperor Herodius as ἔκθεσις, was denounced by John as heresy, and condemned by a Roman synod A.D. 641. John IV defended Honorius from the charge made by the Eastern Church that he was guilty of the Monothelite heresy, and Eutychius informs us that, before his death (Oct. 12, 642), the emperor Constans gave John IV the promise of withdrawing the ἔκθεσις, but the controversy continued under his successors. See Bower, *History of the Popes*, iii, 24 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 754.

John V, Pope, a native of Syria, elevated to the papal dignity in May or July, 685, hardly ever left the bed during the short time of his insignificant pontificate. The authenticity of the letters assigned to him, and of the book *De dignitate pallii*, has been contested. He died Aug. 2, 686.

John VI and VII, Popes, both Greeks by birth, were quite insignificant occupants of the papal throne. The former was consecrated October 10, 701, and buried January 10, 705. He was defended by Roman soldiers against the exarch Theophylact, who was ordered to drive him from the apostolic see. In a council which he held at Rome he acquitted Wilfred, archbishop of York, of several charges brought against him by the English clergy. The latter (consecrated March 1, 705, buried Oct. 18, 707) is described as weak and spiritless. The happiest illustration of the weakness of the Roman see at this time is afforded us in the action of this pope, who did not dare to venture to express an opinion on the Trullan canon, submitted to his examination by the

emperor Justinian II, for fear of giving offence to somebody; and we do not wonder that an able ecclesiastical writer of our day (Butler, in his *Ch. History*, i, 359) says that the whole period from Gregory I to Gregory II "may be briefly designated as that in which the popes were under subjection to the emperors of the East and their lieutenants, the exarchs of Ravenna." See the *Vitæ* in Anastasius; Bower, *History of the Popes*, iii, 159 sq., 167 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, i, 305 sq.

John VIII, Pope (styled the ninth by those who believed in the story of pope Joan [q. v.], whom they style *John VIII*), a native of Rome, succeeded Adrian II Dec. 14, 872. He displayed much tact, and harbored great schemes, but was destitute of noble motives, and the spirit displayed during his administration is in keeping with the ideas of the pseudo-Isidorian collection, to which his predecessor Nicholas I had first ventured to appeal. John's designs, however, found but a tardy response in the little minds with which he had to deal, and the prevalence of general anarchy was not more auspicious to their execution. The pope, as well as the clergy, in the strife after power, actuated only by worldly ambition, knew no other arms than cunning and intrigue, and with these they were neither able to control the rude powers which sapped the foundations of the Carlovingian monarchy, nor to erect on its ruins the fabric of ecclesiastical dominion. When Louis II died, 875, without an heir to his land and crown, Charles the Bald marched hastily into Italy, and took possession of the Italian dominions. Then he proceeded to Rome, and accepted (Christmas, 875), as a boon of the chair of St. Peter, the imperial crown, to which he had no lawful claim. Some Church annalists claim that the two then entered into a compact by which the emperor ceded to the pope the absolute and independent government of Rome, a confirmation and amplification of Pepin's donation; but documentary proof (and that of an ambiguous kind) can be deduced only for the surrender of Capua (compare Mansi, *Concil.* xvii, 10). By this alliance not much was directly gained by either party, for Charles, having once secured his coronation, cared but little for the papal interests; yet eventually the manner in which Charles had become possessed of the empire and of Italy increased very materially the papal power, especially when, in a moment of fear for his throne, Charles the Bald suffered the pope to declare that to him had been intrusted the imperial diadem by the only power on earth that could claim its disposal—the vicar of Rome. The emperor, however, failed to protect the papal dominions from the attacks of the Saracens. It is true he at one time led an army against the infidels (877), but his sudden death cut off all further hope of relief, especially after Athanasius's (bishop-duke of Naples) double-handed game of pleasing the pope and forming alliances with the Saracens became known at Rome, and we do not wonder that the plundering of Campania and the exactions of John make Milman say of the pope's difficulties from this score that "the whole pontificate of John VIII was a long, if at times interrupted, agony of apprehension lest Rome should fall into the hands of the unbeliever" (*Latin Christianity*, iii, 84). Much more precarious became the condition of the Roman pontiff after the death of Charles the Bald, whose son and successor in the West Frank dominion, Louis the Hammerer, engaged in warfare with the Normans, found himself neither in a position to be an aspirant for the imperial crown, nor to afford assistance to the vicar of Christendom. The only one from whom the pope really received any assurances of succor was Carloman, who at this time, with an army in Upper Italy, and just recognised as king at Pavia, was aiming at the imperial throne against the French line. But, finding the pope more favorably inclined towards the French, he suddenly departed, and left to his nobles the disposition of the pope's case. Lambert, duke of Spoleto, and Adelbert, count of Tuscany, immediately made themselves masters of Rome, and, after imprisoning the pope, compelled the clergy and the nobles to swear allegiance to Carloman. But no sooner had Rome been cleared of Carloman's friends than the pope himself set out for France, determined no longer to conceal his desire to create for himself an emperor whom all the world should recognise as absolutely indebted for the crown to the see of Rome only. Arrived in France, the pope made Provence his refuge. Everywhere he was received with great respect, but especial deference was paid him by one Boso, duke of Lombardy, connected with the imperial house by marriage, possessed of great influence and wealth, and an aspirant for the imperial purple. He succeeded in winning the good graces of the Roman pontiff, and was designated for the vacant throne (comp. the letter in Mansi, xvii, 121). Boso was, however, only made king of Burgundy, as Charles the Fat proved too fast for the pope; he had marched with a preponderating force into Italy, and the pope, foreseeing that the prince would not be likely to await his decision as to the rights of the Carlovingians to the throne, hastened to meet him at Ravenna, and reluctantly (though contriving to avoid the appearance of constraint) placed the crown upon the head of Charles the Fat. But, if John failed in placing upon the throne his own favorite, he certainly succeeded even now in exalting, as he had done under Charles the Bald, the pope above the emperor. To this, as well as to his efforts to make the clergy independent of the temporal princes, may be ascribed his popularity as a pope, and the magnificent reception he enjoyed on his visit to France. "At the Council of Ravenna in 877, and again at another at Troyes, which he convened in the following year, during his stay in France, he propounded several decrees, to the astonishment of the bishops themselves, claiming for them various rights and privileges which they had not themselves hitherto ventured to demand. This proceeding produced upon their minds the greater impression, inasmuch as they had long been desirous of advancing their social position. Never until now had they been made aware of the points at which they ought to aim in order to secure for themselves the highest rank and influence in the state, and the pontiff who gave them powerful assistance in this weighty affair could not but be highly popular among them. It was perhaps by this measure that John principally contributed to the strengthening of the papacy to such an extent that it remained without any considerable loss during a long succession of unworthy, or impotent and inactive popes, who occupied and disgraced the see during the troubles which shook Italy for more than half a century" (Riddle, *Papacy*, ii, 31, 32). The controversy with the Eastern Church on the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Bulgaria was continued under John. At first he inclined to favor Photius (q. v.), and acknowledged him as patriarch of Constantinople, but he was afterwards obliged to excommunicate him, as the Latin party severely condemned his course. Ffoulkes (*Christendom's Division*, ii, p. vii) says that the fable of pope Joan must have originated with the Latin party of this time, and that it was aimed against John VIII, "not because his theology was defective, or his life immoral, or his rule arbitrary, but solely because he had had the courage, the *manliness*, to appreciate the abilities and desire to cultivate the friendship of the great patriarch his brother." But his excommunication of Photius was by no means the only one he pronounced. Indeed, "no pope was more prodigal of excommunion than John VIII. Of his letters, above 300 (found in Mansi, *Concilia*, vol. xvi), it is remarkable how large a proportion threaten, inflict, or at least allude to this last exercise of sacerdotal power" (Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, iii, 92 sq.). John found his death, as the *Annales Fuldenses* relate, through a conspiracy of his own curia. The assassins first tried poison; when this did not operate quick enough, they slew him with a hammer, Dec. 15, 882. See Milman, *Lat. Christ.* bk. v, ch. iii; Bower, *History of the Popes*, v, 36 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, ii, 27 sq.; Reichel, *Rom. See in*

the Middle Ages, p. 109 sq.; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* ii, 347; Giesebrecht, *Gesch. der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, i, 139 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 754; Muratori, *Scriptt.* iii, pt. i, ii. (J. H. W.)

John IX, Pope, a Benedictine of Tivoli, was consecrated to the pontifical office June, 898. He held two councils, one at St. Peter's, where the wrong done to his badly-abused predecessor Formosus was redressed; the other at Ravenna, which passed an act for the better protection of Church property against thieves and incendiaries. John displayed an honest zeal in defending the rights and regulating the discipline of the Church. His rival for the papal throne, Sergius (q. v.), he successfully combated, and, by authority of a council he had called, excommunicated him, with several other ecclesiastical accessories. John died July, 900. On his life, see Muratori, vol. iii, pt. ii; on the synods, Mansi, vol. xviii. See also Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii, 112 sq.; Bower, *History of the Popes*, v, 77 sq.

John X, Pope, according to Liutprand (discredited by Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii, 163), owed his promotion in ecclesiastical offices to the dissolute Theodora (q. v.), who, attracted by his handsome figure, made him successively archbishop of Bologna, Ravenna, and finally pope (May 15, 914). The profligacy of his times, especially in Rome, surpassed that of the most degenerate period of paganism. The popes were merely the contemptible creatures of the Roman nobility. But, if the archbishop of Ravenna was not a fit example of piety or holiness to be selected for the spiritual head of Christendom, "he appears," says Milman (*Latin Christianity*, iii, 161), "to have been highly qualified for the secular part of his office." He was a man of ability and daring, eminently needed at this juncture to save Rome from becoming the prey of Mohammedan conquest. The Saracens from Africa, who had landed in Italy and fortified themselves near the banks of the Liris, had made frequent irruptions into the Roman territory. At first John contented himself with inciting the neighboring dukes to come to his defence; but, finding the aid of the two emperors necessary to combat successfully the Mohammedans, he crowned Berenger emperor of the West, March 24, 916, and, after having united all forces previously at his command with Berenger and the dukes of Benevento and Naples, he marched in person against them, and completely routed and exterminated them. After a reign of fourteen years, this powerful prelate of Rome came to a miserable end by the legitimate consequences of the same vices that had been instrumental in raising him to his high dignity. Marozia, the daughter of Theodora, anxious to secure for herself and her lover the government of Rome, and finding John too much in their way, surprised him in the Lateran palace, and thrust him into a prison, where, some months after, he died, either of want or by some more summary means (A.D. 929). Comp. Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, v, 90 sq., Höfler, *Die deutschen Päbste*, i, 18; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* iii, 158 sq. (J. H. W.)

John XI, Pope, a natural son of Marozia, and, in all probability, of pope Sergius III, was seated on St. Peter's chair by his mother, in whose hands rested at this time (931) the power to supply any vacancies in the papal chair. Of course spiritual government was by such people not in consideration; in fact, Rome was now by all Christendom detested like a pestiferous swamp. "Marozia, not content with having been the wife of a marquis, the wife of a wealthy and powerful duke of Tuscany, perhaps the mistress of one, certainly the mother of another pope, looked still higher in her lustful ambition; she must wed a monarch. To the king of Italy her hand was offered, and by him accepted. But, if the Romans had brooked the rule of a Roman woman, they would not so readily consent for her paramour, a foreigner, to rule over them, and, headed by Marozia's own son Alberic, the nobles put an end to the government of Marozia (and Hugh of Provence) and of pope John XI by expelling the former and imprisoning the latter, who died of poison, as is generally supposed, in January, 936. See Milman, *Lat. Christ.* iii, 165 sq.; Du Chesne, *Hist. des Papes*, ii, 460; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 518; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, v, 96 sq.

John XII, Pope, a son of Alberic, and grandson of the profligate and ambitious Marozia, whose vices he seems to have inherited, succeeded to the dignity of Roman patrician upon the death of his father Alberic, and in November, 955, after the death of Agapetus, was elevated to the papal see, though only about sixteen years old. His own name was Octavianus, but as pope he took that of John XII, thus inaugurating the practice which has ever since been followed by the popes of assuming a pontifical name. Ambitious to extend the boundaries of the States of the Church, he soon involved himself in a disastrous war with Berenger II, himself full of ambition, and anxious to become master of Rome. In this most extreme hour of need the pope hesitated not to beseech help from one whom he had formerly declined to receive as worthy of the imperial crown, the emperor Otho I. Daring and indomitable as was the spirit of Otho I, he was no sooner asked by Rome than we find him crossing the Alps with a large army, and, having entered Rome, he secured to the pope not only personal safety, but also confirmed his title to the States of the Church. The extent of these promises, however, has been subject to controversy, and it is not without a reason that the Vatican record, by which Pepin's donation was confirmed and enlarged, is withheld from critical scrutiny. See PAPACY. At Pavia, already, Otho had been crowned king of Italy; here, at the Eternal City, he received from the pope himself the imperial diadem. "Never did a more important event in history take place, making less impression on those who witnessed it, and less commemorated by subsequent historians, than the coronation of Otho I at Rome in the year 962. By the coronation of Charles 162 years earlier the first foundations had been laid for the empire; by the coronation of Otho that empire itself was founded afresh, and from that time forwards it had an uninterrupted existence" (Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 124). For a short period the spiritual and temporal heads of Christendom seemed to be happily united, but the fickle John, influenced either by mistrust or jealousy, soon again interrupted that happy concord by concocting anew intrigues with Alberia, the son of Berenger. Rumors of the treacherous conduct of John reached the ears of Otho I, but the noble German would hardly believe the reports until some trustworthy officers whom he had hastily dispatched to Italy pronounced them true. The profligacy and vices of the pope were also reported to Otho I, and the latter determined to return to Rome and depose the vicar, if found guilty of the charges preferred against him. A council composed of the first ecclesiastics of Germany, France, and Italy was quickly called by Otho I, he himself presiding, and the vicar of Christ, accused of the crimes of murder, adultery, and perjury, was summoned to appear in defence. Failing to comply with the emperor's request, judgment was pronounced, and he was deposed and excommunicated Dec. 4, 963, and Leo VIII (q. v.) declared his successor. Hardly had the emperor left Rome when John, supported by the Roman nobility, returned, convened another synod at St. Peter's, and caused it to rescind the resolutions of the former one. Otho I, informed of these outrages, was preparing for a return to Rome for the third time, when John suddenly died of apoplexy while he was engaged in an adulterous intrigue, May 14, 964. "He was a man of most licentious habits, associating with women of every station, and filling the Lateran with the noisy profanity of a brothel." Panvinius, in a note to Platina's account of pope Joan, suggests that the licentiousness of John XII, who, among his numerous mistresses, had one called Joan, who exercised the chief influence at Rome during his pontificate, may have given rise to

the story of "pope Joan." Comp. Luitprand, *Historia Ottonis*, in *Monum. Germ. Script.* vol. iii; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* iii, 175 sq.; Neander, *Ch. History;* Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 350; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 121 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, ii, 39 sq. (J. H. W.)

John XIII, Pope, who was made such A.D. 965, was of noble descent, and held, previous to his election, the bishopric of Narni. Provoking the wrath of the Roman nobility on account of his severity, and being a favorite of the imperial party, they instigated a riot against him, and finally secured him as prisoner. The pope, however, effected his escape, and returned to the city about a year after, when the emperor himself made his appearance, visiting the disorderly factions of the city with unmitigated severity. After the appointment of a prefect as representative of the imperial power, Otho the Great went to Ravenna, followed by the pope. Here a great and influential council was held, Easter, 967, and fresh guarantees offered to the pontifical chair on all the territory to which it had ever been entitled, including Ravenna. In return for these favors, John crowned the younger Otho (afterwards Otho II) as emperor, and associate king of Germany; also his wife Theophania, the daughter of the Greek emperor. He also evinced his gratefulness by establishing, at the emperor's expressed desire, a mission among the north-eastern Slavonians. John died in 972. His few letters are found in Mansi, *Concil. Suppl.* i, 1142, and Harduin, *Concil.* vi, pt. i, 639. See Pagi, *Brev. Pontif. R.* ii, 233 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 520; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 757.

John XIV, Pope, who was, previous to his elevation, *Peter*, bishop of Pavia, and archchancellor of the emperor, was elected pope through the influence of Otho II in November or December, 983, in place of Boniface VII (q. v.). Unfortunately, however, his patron died at Rome December 7 of the same year, and the ex-pope, encouraged by the anti-empirical party, ventured to return the following spring (April, 984) from Constantinople, whither he had fled, and proving sufficiently strong to overcome John, his person was secured, and he was imprisoned in the Castle del Angelo, where he was either poisoned or starved to death. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, iii, 520.

John XV, Pope, who began his inglorious reign in September, 985, was in reality only the puppet of Crescentius, the true governor of Rome, for he presided and ruled at the Castle del Angelo as patricius. At one time John fled to Tuscany, but at the intervention of Otho III he was afterwards permitted to return and to live in the Lateran, but he remained destitute of all authority. By way of compensation for his lack of power, he enriched himself and his relatives with the revenues of the Church. Concerning the dispute about the bishopric of Rheims, see Sylvester II. He died in April, 996.

Some believe that another John, son of the Roman Rupertus, was the fifteenth pontiff under the name of John, and that the present John was the sixteenth pope of that name, holding that he was pope four months after the murder of Boniface VIII; but this is a very dubious statement, and is wholly denied by modern critics. Comp. Willman's *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter Otto III*, p. 208, 212; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 520; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 757.

John XVI (or **XVII**), Pope, a native of Greece, a Calabrian and bishop of Piacenza, was appointed in 997 by Crescentius, in opposition to Gregory V; but when Otho III, in February, 998, brought Gregory V back to Rome, he imprisoned, mutilated, and ill treated John most shamefully, and put to death Crescentius and his partisans. See GREGORY V. Though a rival pope, and in office only ten months, John is generally numbered in the series of the popes.

John XVII (or **XVIII**), Pope, succeeded Sylvester II in 1003, and died four months after his election.

John XVIII (or **XIX**, with the surname *Fasanus*), Pope, succeeded the preceding, and died about 1009. The history of the popes during this period is very obscure, and the chronology confused. He seems to have been on a good footing with the Greek Church, for his name found a place in the great book of the Constantinopolitan Church. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 521.

John XIX (or **XX**), Pope, son of count Gregory of Tuscany, procured the papal throne by violence and bribery after the decease of his brother Benedict VIII, in the year 1024, and died in 1034. He crowned the emperor Conrad, but is especially noted for his imbecility and simoniacal inclinations. The latter so much controlled him that he came very near disposing of the Roman supremacy over the Eastern Church for a pecuniary consideration.

John XX. See JOHN XXI.

John XXI (who should really have been counted **XX**), Pope (whose true name was *Petrus Juliani*, cardinal bishop of Tusculum, a native of Lisbon), was elected Sept. 13, 1276. He was a man of learning and honest intentions, but weak, and unable to carry out any honest designs. Whether he is identical with *Petrus Hispanus*, the writer of many medical and philosophical works, is not certain. His efforts to unite the European powers for a crusade were unsuccessful. It is said that he found his death May 16, 1277, at Viterbo, by the falling of a ceiling. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 758.

John XXII, Pope, one of the most celebrated of the pontiffs of Avignon, whose family name was *James de Cahors*, was elected pope in 1316, on the death of Clement V. Attempting to carry out, in very altered circumstances, the vast and comprehensive policy of Gregory VII and Innocent III, John interposed his authority in the contest for the imperial crown in Germany between Louis of Bavaria and Frederick of Austria, by not only espousing the cause of the latter, but even excommunicating his rival. Public opinion, however, and the political relations of the papacy founded upon it, had already begun to change. The people of Germany opposed this policy, and encouraged the Diet of Frankfurt to ignore the papal action, and it was by this body declared that the imperial authority depended upon God alone, and that the pope had no temporal authority, direct or indirect, within the empire. A long contest ensued, which resulted in his deposition. (See below.) In Italy also he experienced much trouble. The Guelphs or papal party, led by Robert, king of Naples, defeated the Ghibellines, and the pope excommunicated Matteo Visconti, the great leader of that party, and likewise Frederick, king of Sicily. Between Guelphs and Ghibellines, Italy was at that time in a dreadful state of confusion. The pope preached a crusade against Visconti, Cane della Scala, and the Este, as heretics. Robert, with the assistance of the pope, aspired to the dominion of all Italy, and the pope sent a legate, who, at the head of an army, assisted Robert and the other Guelphs against the Ghibellines of Lombardy. But the Ghibellines had clever leaders; Castruccio Castracani, Cane della Scala, and the Visconti kept the fate of the war in suspense until Louis of Bavaria sent troops to their assistance. In 1327 Louis finally came himself to Italy, and, after being crowned at Milan with the iron crown, proceeded to Rome, where the people roused in his favor, drove away the papal legate, and caused Louis to be crowned emperor in St. Peter's by the bishops of Venice and of Aleria. After the coronation, Louis held an assembly in the square before the church, in which he summoned John under his original name, James of Cahors, to appear to answer the charges of heresy and high treason against him. After this mock citation, the emperor proceeded to depose the pope, and to appoint in his stead Peter de Corvara, a monk of Abruzzo, who assumed the name of Nicholas V. Louis also proclaimed a law, which was sanctioned by the peo-

ple of Rome, to the effect that the pope should reside at Rome, and, if absent more than three months, should be considered as deposed. These measures, however, were attended with little result. Louis returned to Germany, and the Guelphic predominance at Rome was restored, the papal representative resuming his authority. But John XXII never personally visited Rome, having died at Avignon in 1334, when he had accumulated in his coffers the enormous sum of 18,000,000 florins of gold. John is renowned in theological history as the author of that portion of the canon law called the *Extravagantes*, and also for the singular opinion he entertained that the just will not be admitted to the beatific vision until after the general resurrection. This opinion he was obliged formally to retract before his death (see Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 421). Under his pontificate the clergy and people of the towns were deprived of the right of electing their bishops, which right he reserved to himself on payment of certain fees by the person elected. He was especially rapacious in the collection of the Annates, or First Fruits. See Bower, *History of the Popes*, vi, 413 sq.; Labbé, xv, 147; *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.

John XXIII, Pope, a native of Naples, and previously to his election known as cardinal *Cossa*, succeeded Alexander V in 1410. A man of great talents, but worthless in character, his reputation as cardinal under his predecessor is by no means enviable. Indeed, he is accused of having *poisoned* Alexander V (q. v.). As a pope, he supported the claims of Louis of Anjou against Ladislaus, king of Naples; but Ladislaus, having defeated his rival in battle, advanced to Rome, and obliged John to flee to Florence. He then preached a crusade against Ladislaus, which gave occasion to denunciations and invectives from John Huss. Meantime the great schism continued, and Gregory, styled XII, and Benedict, antipopes, divided with John the homage of the Christian states. In his exile, wishing to secure the favor of the emperor, he proposed to Sigismund the convocation of a general council to restore peace to the Church, and Sigismund fixed on the city of Constance as the place of assembly. On hearing of the death of Ladislaus, by which event Rome became again open to him, John repented of what he had proposed, but was obliged to comply with the general wish by repairing to Constance. By this council (see vol. ii, p. 486) John was forced to drop the papal tiara; but soon after, by the assistance of Frederick of Austria, he resumed his authority by ordering the council to dissolve. This provoked the question whether the pope is the supreme authority in the Church, and the fourth and fifth sessions decided "that the General Council, once assembled, is superior to the pope, and can receive no orders from him." A formal process was now instituted against John; sixty charges were laid against him, and he was finally deposed on May 29, 1415, and given into the custody of the elector palatine. After the election of Martin V and the termination of the Council of Constance, John, now again Balthazar Cossa, escaped from Germany, and made his submission to the new pope, who treated him kindly, and gave him the first rank among the cardinals. He died soon after, Nov. 22, 1419, at Florence. The name of John, which most of those who bore it disgraced, either by debauchery, simony, or other crimes, has since been avoided by the occupants of the chair of St. Peter. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, 759; *Eng. Cyclop.* s. v.; Muratori, *Vitæ*, iii, 2, p. 846 sq.; Riddle, *Papacy*, ii, 353.

John (St.), Christians of. See SABIANS.

John's (St.) Day, a festival to commemorate the nativity of John the Baptist. It was observed as early as the 4th century. The birth of John is known to have preceded that of Jesus Christ six months, and June 24 is therefore the day fixed upon for this festival. Augustine had commented upon the peculiarity of observing his birthday rather than his martyrdom, and the Church of Rome seems to have acted on this suggestion, for it set aside also a day, namely, August 29, in commemoration of his beheading; but both his birth and martyrdom are celebrated on the same day in the service of the Church of England, the chief passages relating to his life and death being included in the lessons. See below, JOHN'S, EVE OF ST.

John (St.) the Evangelist's Day, the festival in honor of John the beloved disciple, the brother of James. The first trace of this festival, held on December 27, occurs in the writings of "the venerable" Bede. It is presumed that the observance of it at first was only local. The Council of Lyons, A.D. 1240, ordered that it should be perpetually and universally celebrated.

John's, Eve of St., one of the most joyous festivals of Christendom during the Middle Ages, was celebrated on the eve of the birthday of *John the Baptist* (q. v.). From the account given of it by Jakob Grimm (*Deutsche Mythologie*, i, 578, 581, 583 sq.), it would appear to have been observed with similar rites in every country of Europe. Fires were kindled chiefly in the streets and market-places of the towns, as at Paris, Metz, etc.; sometimes, as at Gernsheim, in the district of Mainz, they were blessed by the parish priest, and prayer and praise offered until they had burned out; but, as a rule, they were secular in their character, and conducted by the laity themselves. The young people leaped over the flames, or threw flowers and garlands into them, with merry shoutings; songs and dances were also a frequent accompaniment. At a comparatively late period the very highest personages took part in these festivities. In England, we are told (see R. Chambers's *Book of Days*, June 24), the people on the Eve of St. John's were accustomed to go into the woods and break down branches of trees, which they brought to their homes and planted over their doors, amid great demonstrations of joy, to make good the prophecy respecting the Baptist, that many should rejoice in his birth. This custom was universal in England till the recent change in manners. Some of the superstitious notions connected with St. John's Eve are of a highly fanciful nature. The Irish believe that the souls of all people on this night leave their bodies, and wander to the place, by land or sea, where death shall finally separate them from the tenement of clay. It is not improbable that this notion was originally universal, and was the cause of the widespread custom of watching or sitting up awake on St. John's night, for we may well believe that there would be a general wish to prevent the soul from going upon that somewhat dismal ramble. In England, and perhaps in other countries also, it was believed that if any one sat up fasting all night in the church porch he would see the spirits of those who were to die in the parish during the ensuing twelve months come and knock at the church door in the order and succession in which they were to die. We can easily perceive a possible connection between this dreary fancy and that of the soul's midnight ramble. The kindling of the fire, the leaping over or through the flames, and the flower garlands, clearly show that these rites are essentially of heathen origin, and of a sacrificial character. They are obviously connected with the sun and fire worship of the ancient heathen nations, particularly the Arians (comp. Agni, of the Hindus [q. v.]; Mittera, of the Persians; the vestal virgins, and the Roman festival of Palilia), and the Celts, Germans, and Slavi. In old heathen times, Midsummer and Yule (q. v.), the summer and winter solstices, were the two greatest and most widespread festivals in Europe. The Church of Rome, in its accommodating spirit, instead of abolishing the custom, yielded to popular feeling, and retained this heathen practice under the garb of a Christian name. See Khautz, *De ritu ignis in natali S. Johannis accensi* (Vienna, 1759); Paciandi, *De cultu S. Joannis Bapt. antiqq. Christ.* (Rom. 1758); Ersch und Gruber, *Allg. Encyklop.* ii, 22, p. 265; F. Nork, *Fest-Kalender* (Stuttgard, 1847), p. 406.—Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.

Johns, Richard, a celebrated member of the Society of "Friends," was born at Bristol, England, in 1645, and, coming to this country in early manhood, settled in Maryland. He was won over to the Quakers by George Fox, and preached for many years. He died Oct. 16, 1717. For further details, see Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, iii, 190.

Johns, W. G., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Pulaski County, Ky., October 24, 1823, joined the Church at thirteen years of age, was licensed to preach in 1845, and continued in the work for twenty-one years, with interruptions for want of health. Indeed, it is said that so great was his devotion to the Christian ministry that he often preached when barely able to leave his room. He died October 23, 1866.—*Conf. Min. Meth. Episc. Church South*, iii, 157.

Johnson, Albert Osborne, an American missionary of the Presbyterian Church to India, was born in Cadiz, Ohio, June 22, 1833. He was educated at Jefferson College, Pa., where he was converted, and, on graduation (1852), went to the Theological Seminary at Allegbany, where he graduated in 1855, and was ordained by the presbytery of Ohio June 12, in the same year. He at once entered the missionary work, which was shared by his wife, whom he had married the day he left the Theological Seminary. But both did not long endure the toils of a missionary life; during the Sepoy rebellion in 1857 they suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Indian rebels. For details, see Walsh, *Memorial of the Futtehgurh Mission and her Martyred Missionaries* (Philada. 1859, 12mo), p. 241 sq. Mr. Johnson is spoken of by Walsh as "a man of very genial influences and of fine social qualities. As a Christian he was zealous and devoted, a man of prayer, and faithful in all his duties; as a missionary he bade fair to excel in every department of labor. His qualifications were of a high order."

Johnson, Enoch, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in North Carolina; he was early converted; joined the itinerancy in 1819, and died November 25, 1824. He was a man of deep piety and useful talents. His labors were abundantly successful, and his character greatly beloved.—*Minutes of Conferences*, i, 432.

Johnson, Evan M., D.D., a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Rhode Island, June 10, 1792. He was ordained to the ministry in Trinity Church, Newport, by bishop Griswold, July 8, 1813; removed to New York City in 1814, and became assistant rector of Grace Church, but the year following he exchanged this position for the rectorate of St. James's Church, Newtown, L. I. In 1824 he settled in Brooklyn, and built St. John's Church. During his ministry he united nearly 4000 couples in marriage, and baptized nearly 10 000 children. He was, at the time of his decease, March 19, 1865, the oldest settled Episcopal clergyman in the State of New York.

Johnson, Haynes, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Newbury, Vermont, in 1801; converted in 1829; entered the New Hampshire Conference in 1831, and died at Newbury, April 9, 1856. He was "a faithful and laborious preacher," and during the ten months previous to his death he made *nine hundred* pastoral visits. He was very successful in winning souls to Christ. —*Minutes of Conferences*, vi, 75.

Johnson, Herman Merrill, S.T.D., LL.D., a prominent minister and educator of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Oswego County, N.Y., Nov. 25, 1815. After preparation at Cazenovia Seminary, he entered, in 1837, the junior class of Wesleyan University, graduating with distinction in 1839. The same year he was elected professor of ancient languages in St. Charles's College, Missouri, where he remained for three years. Thence he was called to occupy the chair of ancient languages in Augusta College, Kentucky, which he held for two years, when he was elected professor of ancient languages and literature in the Ohio Wesleyan University at Delaware, Ohio. Here he performed for a while the duties of acting president of the institution, organizing its curriculum, and was especially interested in introducing therein a Biblical course of study as a method of ministerial education. In 1850 he was elected professor of philosophy and English literature in Dickinson College, a position which he filled for ten years, when he was called to the presidency of this institution, together with the chair of moral science, in 1860. Dr. Johnson died April 5, 1868, just after the memorials in behalf of the Methodist centenary had secured to Dickinson College a fair endowment. He contributed largely to the Church periodicals, especially the *New York Christian Advocate* and the *Methodist Quarterly Review*. Indeed, he was decidedly able both as a writer and an instructor, and his contributions were always read with uncommon interest; for, as a thinker, he was clear, concise, original, and his writings were often eminently distinguished for their simplicity and grace of expression. He had an especial liking for all questions of historical and philological inquiry, and published a learned edition of the *Clio of Herodotus* (N.Y. 1842, and often). He left unfinished another large and valuable philological contribution, the translation and revision of Eberhard's great Synonymical Dictionary of German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English. It is especially to be regretted that he did not live to complete his *Commentary on the historical Books of the Old Test.* "Personally, Dr. Johnson was a man of many and rare excellencies. He was pre-eminently a scholar, extensively learned, and yet distinguished for culture rather than for mere learning. He was especially eminent as a teacher, and as an administrator and disciplinarian he had few superiors. In private he was a model Christian gentleman, affable, refined, and unassuming; able and entertaining in conversation, and as a companion genial, without descending to any thing out of harmony with his elevated character and position. As a preacher he was both forcible and instructive, though too rigidly correct in his tastes to allow him to become extensively popular. In his relations to the Church he belonged to an important but very small class. His Christian character, his learning, and his confessed abilities fitted him for almost any one of the highest and most responsible offices in the Church. Such was the place he occupied, while others of equal dignity and importance were ready to be offered to him" (*Christian Advocate*, N. Y., April 16, 1868). (J. H. W.)

Johnson, John (1), an eminent and learned divine of the Church of England, was born Dec. 30, 1662. He was educated at King's School, in the city of Canterbury, and at St. Mary Magdalen College, Cambridge. Soon after graduation (1682) he was nominated by the dean and chapter of Canterbury to a scholarship in Corpus Christi College, and there took the degree of master of arts in 1685. Shortly after he entered into deacon's orders, and became curate to Thomas Hardres, at Hardres, near Canterbury. In 1686 he became vicar of Boughton under the Bleam, and in 1687 he held the vicarage of Hernhill, adjoining to Boughton. In 1697 he obtained the living of St. John, in the Isle of Thanet, which he shortly after exchanged for that of Appledon, and in 1707 he was inducted to the vicarage of Cranbrook. He died in 1725. His works display the highest scholarship, a mastery both of the Greek and Hebrew languages, and a deep research into the Holy Scriptures. His *Unbloody Sacrifice* (London, 1714, 8vo; latest ed. Oxf. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo) is the most complete work on the Eucharist, considered as a sacrifice, extant, particularly on account of its large collection of authorities from the fathers, which are printed in full. These are cited to prove that the Eucharist is a proper material sacrifice; that it is both eucharistic and propitiatory; that it is to be offered by proper officers; that the oblation is to be made on a proper altar; that it is to be consumed by manducation; together with arguments to prove that what our Saviour speaks concerning eating

his flesh and drinking his blood in the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel is principally meant of the Eucharist. This publication, having involved him in a bitter controversy on account of its High-Church views, induced him to publish, in 1717, *The Unbloody Sacrifice, and Altar unveiled and supported*, part ii, showing the agreement and disagreement of the Eucharist with the sacrifices of the ancients, and the excellency of the former; the great importance of the Eucharist both as a feast and a sacrifice; the necessity of frequent communion; the unity of the Eucharist; the nature of excommunication; the primitive method of preparation, with devotions for the altar. His other works are, *A Collection of all Ecclesiastical Laws, etc., concerning the Government, etc., of the Church of England* (Lond. 1720, 2 vols. 8vo; Oxford, 1850-51, 2 vols. 8vo):—*A Collection of Discourses*, etc. (Lond. 1728, 2 vols. 8vo):—*The Psalter, or Holy David and his old English Translators cleared* (London, 1707, 8vo). See *Life*, by Rev. Thos. Brett.—Hook, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth.* ii, s. v. (E. de P.)

Johnson, John (2), an able and popular minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, born in Louisa Co., Va., Jan. 7, 1783; joined the Church in 1807, and entered the Conference at Liberty Hill, Tennessee in 1808. Two years after he removed to Kentucky, and was appointed first to the Sandy River Circuit, and in 1811 to Natchez Circuit. His early educational advantages had been few, and when he entered the ministry of his Church he can hardly be said to have possessed a fair English education; but unremitting efforts to gain knowledge at last made him one of the best scholars of his Conference. Thus, while at the Natchez Circuit, he displayed an extensive knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew, of which no one had believed him to have an idea even, and from that time he began to rise rapidly in the estimation of his colleagues. He now took rank with Lakin, Sale, Page, Blackman, and Oglesby, and was regarded by many as the most remarkable preacher of the West. In 1812 he was appointed to the Nashville Circuit; then successively to the Livingston, Christian, and Goose Creek, and finally again to the Livingston Circuit; and in 1818 he was sent to the Nashville Station. While here he engaged in a controversy on the question of immersion with the Baptist preacher Vardeman, in which he is generally believed to have come off victor; at least from this event dates his great popularity in the West. "Henceforth," says Redford (*Methodism in Kentucky*, ii, 143), "the name of John Johnson was the synonym of success in religious controversies." From 1820 he filled successively the Red River, Hopkinsville, and Russellville Circuits, and in 1823 he was stationed at Louisville, and in 1824 at Maysville, and, after several years of rest, was in 1831 appointed presiding elder of the Green River, and in 1832 of Hopkinsville District. In 1835 he was finally located, and he now removed to Mt. Vernon, Illinois. Here he died April 9, 1858. "As a Christian," says the *Western Christian Advocate* (May 26, 1858), "brother Johnson was consistent, exemplary, and deeply devoted. 'Holiness to the Lord' appears to have been his motto. He died in great peace, testifying, as his flesh and heart failed, that God was the strength of his heart and his portion forever." (J. H. W.)

Johnson, John (3). See JOHNSONIANS.

Johnson, John Barent, a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born in 1769 in Brooklyn, L. I.; graduated at Columbia College, 1792; studied theology under Dr. John H. Livingston, and entered the ministry in 1795. He was copastor of the Reformed Dutch Church, Albany, with Rev. Dr. John Bassett, from 1796 to 1802, and afterwards pastor of the church in Brooklyn, 1802-3. Of prepossessing appearance and engaging manners, he won many friends by his dignified and courteous bearing. He was popular with all classes, especially with the young. As a preacher he was distinguished for a melodious voice, a natural manner, and effective oratory. His eulogy on General Washington "produced a great sensation throughout the community. The exordium was spoken of at the time as a rare specimen of eloquence; and the whole performance was certainly of a very high order." It was published by the Legislature, at whose request it was delivered. He also published several other discourses, and contributed largely to literary periodicals of his day. In person he was tall, slender, well proportioned, and graceful. His imagination was brilliant and his fervor profound. His intellectual qualities and theological and literary attainments were eminent. He wrote his sermons, but delivered them extemporaneously, with great simplicity, directness, and unction. He died of consumption, Aug. 29, 1803. Of his three children, two became Episcopalian clergymen: one at Jamaica, L. I.; the other a professor in the General Theological Seminary at New York.—Rogers, *Historical Discourse* (Albany, 1858); Sprague, *Annals*, ix, 167. (W. J. R. T.)

Johnson, Joseph, an Indian preacher, was born at Mohegan, near Norwich, Conn., about 1750. After a brief course of instruction under Mr. Wheelock at Lebanon, he was sent, at the age of fifteen, as a schoolmaster to the Six Nations of Indians in New York, and remained there a couple of years. Afterwards he spent a vagrant life for some time, until, during a fit of sickness occasioned by his irregularities, he became a sincere penitent, and determined to preach the Gospel of Christ. He was soon licensed to preach, and for several years was a missionary in the State of New York. He was well acquainted with theology. The date of his death is not known to us.

Johnson, Samuel (1), an English divine, and a learned but violent writer against popery in the reign of James II, was born in Warwickshire in 1649. He studied at St. Paul's School and at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1670 he obtained the living of Corringham, Essex, but continued to reside in London, and mingled much in politics. He was a friend of Essex, and chaplain to lord William Russell, and advocated the succession of the duke of York. He was a decided opponent of king James II and of his schemes to introduce popery as the religion of the state, and attacked Dr. Hickes (q. v.), the upholder of passive obedience, in a pamphlet entitled *Julian the Apostate*. He would have gone further had not the death of his protector, lord Russell, obliged him to become more prudent, and to keep his *Julian's Arts to undermine Christianity* unpublished. For having written the former work he was summoned before judge Jeffries, and of course condemned to a heavy fine. Unable to pay the fine, he was imprisoned, and during his confinement wrote *An humble and hearty Address to all Protestants in the present Army*, intended to provoke a rebellion against king James II. He was now put in the pillory in Palace Yard, at Charing Cross, whipped, and fined, after being degraded from orders. After the Revolution of 1688, William III caused the verdict to be reversed, and gave him an indemnity. He died in 1703. His writings were collected and published under the style *Works* (2d ed. Lond. 1713, fol.). See *Biographia Britannica*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 791; Debary, *Hist. Ch. of Engl. from James II to 1717*, p. 70; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 971. (E de P.)

Johnson, Samuel (2), D.D., an American divine, was born at Guilford, Conn., Oct. 14, 1696, and passed A.B. in 1714 at Yale College, then situated at Saybrook. On the removal of Yale to New Haven he became one of its tutors, and in 1720 pastor of the Congregational Church, West Haven. Determined to change his ecclesiastical relations, he went to England, and received episcopal ordination in 1723. He then visited Oxford and Cambridge, where he was made A.M., and returned to America. Upon his arrival he entered on the mission of Stratford, Conn., and formed the acquaintance of William Burnet, son of the bishop of Salisbury. His

ministerial duties were now considerably increased, and his pen warmly engaged for some years in defence of episcopacy. In 1743 he was made D.D. by the University of Oxford. In 1744 he was appointed president of King's College, New York, in which office he continued till 1754, when he returned to Stratford, where he spent a tranquil and dignified old age, chiefly in literary labor. In 1746 he issued *A System of Morality*, and in 1752 *A Compendium of Logic, Metaphysics, and Ethics*, and other theological and miscellaneous treatises after this date. He died Jan. 6, 1772.—Sprague, *Annals*, v, 52; Allibone, *Dict. Eng. and Am. Auth.* ii, 971. (E. de P.)

Johnson, Samuel (3), LL.D., one of the most distinguished literary men of the eighteenth century, was born at Lichfield September 18, 1709. His early education was acquired in his native town. In 1728 he was entered at Pembroke College, Oxford, but, in consequence of the want of means, did not remain long enough to obtain his degree. In 1731 his father died insolvent. In the same year he went to Bosworth as usher of a school. He soon became disgusted with the drudgery of teaching, and preferred to support himself by working for booksellers in Birmingham. In 1736 he married Mrs. Porter, the widow of a mercer, who brought him £800. Failing in an effort to establish an academy, he repaired in 1737 to London, accompanied by his celebrated pupil David Garrick. He now devoted himself entirely to literary labor. His first production which attracted notice was his *London*, a poem in imitation of the third satire of Juvenal. Having entered into an engagement with the *Gentleman's Magazine*, he published the parliamentary debates, which, being then a breach of privilege, came out under the fiction of Debates in the Senate of Lilliput. These obtained great celebrity on account of their extraordinary eloquence, and were almost exclusively the product of his own invention. The works which were now produced were celebrated beyond measure, and will ever be regarded as extraordinary monuments both of vigor and originality in thinking, and of great though ponderous power of expression.

But Dr. Johnson had excellencies far superior to mere literary accomplishments. He was truly a devout man, and he possessed a vigor and independence of mind which enabled him to scorn the ridicule and silence the opposition of wits and worldlings to serious religion. He often recurred in after life to the impression made upon his tender imagination by his mother's example and instruction. While a student at Oxford these impressions were revived and intensified, according to his own account, by the careful study of Law's *Serious Call*, in consequence of which he was incited to a devout and holy life. Serious and pious meditations and resolutions had been early familiar to his mind. The pious gratitude with which he acknowledged mercies upon every occasion, the humble submission which he breathes when it is the will of his heavenly Father to try him with affliction, show how seriously the mind of Johnson had been impressed with a sense of religion.

Dr. Johnson is generally charged with extreme bigotry, and want of charity towards religionists who differed from him. This charge, however, is very unfair in the face of his repeated declaration to the contrary. "All denominations of Christians," he is reported to have said, "have really little difference in point of doctrine, though they may differ widely in external forms." "For my part, I think all Christians, whether papist or Protestant, agree in the essential articles, and that their differences are trivial, and rather political than religious." He spoke in the highest terms of Wesley from intimate knowledge of his character, having been at the same college with him, and said that "he thought of religion only." "Whatever might be thought of some Methodist teachers," he said, "he could scarcely doubt the sincerity of that man, who travelled 900 miles in a month, and preached twelve times in a week; for no adequate reward, merely temporal, could be given for such indefatigable labor. The established clergy in general did not preach plain enough; polished periods and glittering sentences flew over the heads of the common people without impression on their hearts. Something might be necessary to excite the affections of the common people, who were sunk in languor and lethargy, and therefore he supposed that the new concomitants of Methodism might probably produce so desirable an effect. The mind, like the body, delighted in change and novelty, and even in religion itself courted new appearances and modifications." His views on the great subjects of original sin, in consequence of the fall of man, and of the atonement made by our Saviour, as reported by his celebrated biographer, were decided and evangelical. His sentiments on natural and revealed religion were equally explicit. In short, it appears that few men have ever lived in whose thoughts religion had a larger or more practical share. 'His habitual piety," says lord Brougham, "his sense of his own imperfections, his generally blameless conduct in the various relations of life, have already been sufficiently described. He was a good man, as he was a great man; and he had so firm a regard for virtue that he wisely set much greater store by his worth than by his fame." "Though consciousness of superiority might sometimes induce him to carry it high with man (and even this was much abated in the latter part of his life), his devotions have shown to the whole world how humbly he walked at all times with his God." "If, then, it be asked," says lord Mahon, "who first in England, at that period, breasted the waves and stemmed the tide of infidelity—who enlisted wit and eloquence, together with argument and learning, on the side of revealed religion, first turned the literary current in its favor, mainly prepared the reaction which succeeded—that praise seems most justly to belong to Dr. Samuel Johnson. Religion was with him no mere lip service nor cold formality; he was mindful of it in his social hours as much as in his graver lucubrations; and he brought to it not merely erudition such as few indeed possessed, but the weight of the highest character, and the respect which even his enemies could not deny him. It may be said of him that, though not in orders, he did the Church of England better service than most of those who at that listless æra ate her bread."

The death of this great man was a beautiful commentary on his life. "When at length," says lord Macaulay, "the moment dreaded through so many years came close, the dark cloud passed away from Johnson's mind. His temper became unusually patient and gentle; he ceased to think of death and of that which lies beyond death, and he spoke much of the mercy of God and the propitiation of Christ. Though the tender care which had mitigated his sufferings during months of sickness at Streatham was withdrawn, he was not left desolate. . . . In this serene frame of mind he died, Dec. 13, 1784; a week later he was laid in Westminster Abbey, among the eminent men of whom he had been the historian—Cowley and Denham, Dryden and Congreve, Gay, Prior, and Addison." (E. de P.)

It remains for us to append a brief outline of all the literary labors of his life. In addition to his contributions to the *Gentleman's Magazine* and his poem *London*, Johnson wrote in 1744 an interesting *Life of Richard Savage;* in 1749 his best poem, *The Vanity of Human Wishes*, an imitation of the tenth satire of Juvenal; and in 1750 commenced *The Rambler*, a periodical which he conducted for two years, and the contents of which were almost wholly his own composition. But perhaps one of his greatest accomplishments is his *Dictionary*, a noble piece of work, entitling its author to be considered the founder of English lexicography; it appeared in 1755, after eight years of solid labor. *The Idler*, another periodical, was begun by him in 1758, and carried on for two years also; and in 1759 occurred one of the most touching episodes of his life—the writing of *Rasselas* to pay the expenses of his mother's funeral. It

was written, he tells us, "in the evenings of a week." But, with all these publications before the public, he did not really emerge from obscurity until 1762, when a pension of £300 a year was conferred on him by lord Bute; and in the following year occurred an event, apparently of little moment, but which had a lasting influence upon his fame: this was his introduction to James Boswell, whose *Life of Dr. Johnson* is probably more imperishable than any of the doctor's own writings. In 1764 the famous Literary Club was instituted, and in the following year began his intimacy with the Thrales. In the same year appeared his edition of Shakspeare. In 1773 he visited the Highlands with Boswell, and in 1781 appeared his *Lives of the Poets*, his last literary work of any importance. See Boswell, *Life of Johnson;* Wilkes, *Christian Essays;* Murphy, *Life*, in preface to *Works; Memoir* by Walter Scott; *Essays* by Macaulay and Carlyle; a brief but elaborate character of Dr. Johnson, written by Sir James Mackintosh, in his *Life*, ii, 166-9; *Dr. Johnson, his Religious Life and Death* (N.Y. 1850, 8vo); Chambers, *Cyclop.* s. v.; *English Cyclop.* s. v.; and the excellent and elaborate article in Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, s. v.

Johnson, Thomas, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Virginia, July 11, 1802; went to Missouri in 1822, and commenced the work of the ministry in 1825. He labored as an itinerant in the bounds of the St. Louis Conference, filling some of the most important stations; but spent his greatest labors, and was most successful, as missionary to the Indians. His name will ever be connected with the history of Indian missions. Wise and earnest, he carried success with him in his responsible and arduous labors. He honorably sustained his character as a Christian minister through all his pilgrimage, and died an approved servant of God. He was shot by unknown parties in the night of Jan. 3, 1865, probably on account of his political principles. Among his colleagues in the Conference Johnson ranked with the first, and was highly esteemed by all. Says one of them: "He was *a man of principle;* one of the very few among the many thousands who, on all occasions and under all circumstances, acted upon the settled principle of morality and religion." See *Conf. Min. M. E. Ch. S.* iii, 168.

Johnson, William Bullien, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born on John's Island, near Charleston, S. C., June 13, 1782. He was intended for the jurist's profession, but after conversion (1804) he decided for the ministry, and was ordained, January, 1806, pastor of a church at Eutaw, S. C. In 1809 he removed to Columbia; later he lived at Savannah, Ga., whence he returned to Columbia in 1816. In 1822 he was placed in charge of the female academy at Greenville, S. C. Eight or nine years later he removed to Edgeville, S. C., as pastor, teaching also at the same time at a female high school, and subsequently to Anderson, S. C., where a university for ladies bears his name. He finally returned to Greenville, S. C., where he labored faithfully for the Church of his choice up to the hour of his death, in perfect vigor of mind and soundness of body very unlike an octogenarian. He died there in 1862. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Brown University in 1833. Dr. Johnson was a prominent member of the Bible Revision Society, and one of the presidents of the General Baptist Convention of the United States (formed in 1814). Over the Baptist Convention of his native state he presided for a score and a half of years. He wrote largely for the religious periodicals of his Church, and published *Development of the Gospel of Jesus Christ through the Government and Order of the Churches*, besides sermons, circulars, and addresses.—Appleton, *Cyclop.* x, 36.

Johnsonians, followers of John Johnson, a Baptist minister at Liverpool, England, in the last century, of whom there are still several congregations in different parts of England. He denied that faith was a duty, or even action of the soul, and defined it "an active principle" conferred by grace; and denied also the duty of ministers to exhort the unconverted, or preach any *moral duties* whatever. Though Mr. Johnson entertained high supralapsarian notions on the divine decrees, he admitted the universality of the death of Christ. On the doctrine of the Trinity, his followers are said to have embraced the indwelling scheme, with Calvinistic views of justification and the atonement. See Johnson's *Faith of God's Elect;* Brine's *Mistakes of Mr. Johnson* (1745).

Johnston, Arthur, a Scottish writer of great celebrity, a native of Caskieben, near Aberdeen, was born in 1587. He was a physician by profession, but spent most of his time in literary pursuits; especially thorough was his acquaintance with Latin, and it is mainly for his Latin version of the Psalms, one of his last and best works, that we mention his name here. They were published under the title of *Psalmorum Davidis Paraphrasis Poetica, et Canticorum Evangelicorum* (Aberd. 1637, 12mo, and often since). As another writer of note, George Buchanan, also furnished a Latin version of the Psalms, a comparison was frequently instituted as to the comparative merits of their work. Hallam (*Liter. Hist. of Europe*, 4th ed. Lond. 1854, iii, 53), in alluding to it, thinks that "Johnston's Psalms, all of which are in elegiac metre, do not fall far short of those of Buchanan either in elegance of style or correctness of Latinity." Johnston spent the earlier part of his life in France and Italy. His medical degree he obtained at Padua. He returned to Scotland in 1625, and about 1628 was appointed physician to the court of Charles I. In 1637 his literary attainments received recognition by his election to the rectorate of King's College. He died in 1641. Besides the Psalms, he translated into Latin the Te Deum, Creed, Decalogue, etc.; also *Solomon's Song* (Lond. 1633, 8vo). His other publications are *Elegia in Obitum R. Jacobi* (Lond. 1625, 4to):—*Epigrammata* (Aberdeen, 1632, 8vo). See memoirs of him in Benson's ed. of Johnston's version of the Psalms; Allibone, *Dict. of Eng. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 983; *Cyclop. Brit.* vol. xii, s. v.

Johnston, John, a Scotch minister, was a native of Aberdeen, and flourished in the latter half of the 16th century. He was, like his relative Arthur Johnston (q. v.), of a poetical turn of mind, but he also served his Church (the Presbyterian) in the capacity of professor of divinity at St. Andrew's College. He died in 1612. He wrote *Consolatio Christiana sub Cruce*, etc. (1603, 8vo):—*Jambi Sacra* (1611):—*Tertrasticha et Lemmata Sacra—Item Cantica Sacra—Item Icones Regum Judae et Israelis* (Lugd. Bat. 1612, 4to); etc. See Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, vol. ii, s. v.

Johnstone, Bryce, an eminent Scottish theologian and writer, was born at Annan, Dumfriesshire, in 1747. He studied at the University of Edinburgh, where he graduated D.D. He entered the Church, and was for a long time pastor of Holyrood (from 1771), and died in 1805. He wrote, *Commentary on the Revelation of John* (1794, 2 vols. 8vo):—*On the Influence of Religion on civil Society and civil Government* (1801). All of his *Sermons* and *Life* were published by his nephew, the Rev. John Johnstone (1807, 8vo); etc. See Gorton's *Biogr. Dictionary*, s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth.* s. v.

Joi'ada (Heb. *Yoyada'*, יוֹיָדָע, a contraction of Jehoiada, found only in Nehemiah, who invariably uses it), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ἰωειδά v. r. Ἰωιδά, Vulg. *Jojada*, A. Vers. "Jehoiada.") Son of Paseah, and apparently one of the chief priests; in conjunction with Meshullam he repaired the Old Gate [see Jerusalem], with its appurtenances, after the captivity (Neh. iii, 6). B.C. 446.

2. (Sept. Ἰωαδά v. r. Ἰωιαδά, Ἰωδαέ.) Son and successor of Eliashib in the high-priesthood, himself

succeeded by his son Jonathan (Neh. xii, 10, 11, 22); another of his sons having married a daughter of Sanballat, on which account he was banished (Neh. xiii, 28). B.C. post 446. Josephus (*Ant.* xi, 7, 1) Græcizes the name as *Judas* (Ἰούδας). See HIGH-PRIEST.

Joi'akim (Heb. *Yoyakim'*, יוֹיָקִים, a contraction of JEHOIAKIM, used exclusively by Nehemiah; Sept. Ἰωακείμ v. r. Ἰωακίμ), son of Jeshua and father of Eliashib, high-priests successively (Neh. xii, 10, 12, 26). B.C. ante 446. Josephus does not mention him. See HIGH-PRIEST.

Joi'arib (Heb. *Yoyarib'*, יוֹיָרִיב, a contraction of JEHOIARIB, occurring exclusively in Ezra and Nehemiah), the name of three or four persons.

1. (Sept. Ἰωαρίβ v. r. Ἰωρίβ.) A priest named (Neh. xi, 10) in connection with Jachin, and as father of Jedaiah (q. v.), but by some error; compare 1 Chron. ix, 10, where he is called JEHOIARIB (q. v.), well known as founder of one of the sacerdotal "courses." See PRIEST.

2. (Sept. Ἰωιαρίβ.) A descendant of Judah, son of Zechariah and father of Adaiah (Neh. xi, 5), apparently through Shelah. See SHILONI. B.C. considerably ante 536.

3. (Sept. Ἰωιαρείβ, Ἰωαρίβ.) One of the priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 6). He was the father of Mattenai, a contemporary with the high-priest Joiakim (Neh. xii, 19). B.C. 536.

4. (Sept. Ἰωαρείμ v. r. Ἰωαρίμ.) A person mentioned in connection with Elnathan as a "man of understanding" (the others being called "chief men"), apparently among the priests, sent for by Ezra at the river of Ahava to devise means for obtaining a company of Levites to return with him to Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 16). B.C. 459.

Joining, besides its common sense (דָּבַק, to *cling* or adhere), is technically used of the *binders* (מְחַבְּרוֹת, *mechabberoth'*), whether of wood or stone, of the walls of a building (1 Chron. xxii, 3). See COUPLING.

Joint, besides its usual meaning (דֶּבֶק *de'bek*, ἁφή, etc.), is, in one passage (Cant. vii, 1), very erroneously employed in the A.V. as a rendering of חַמּוּקִים, *chammukim'* (Sept. vaguely ῥυθμοί, Vulg. *junturæ*, occurs nowhere else), the *wrappers* (of the thighs), i. e. *drawers*, a part of the female dress; which, in the case of bridal toilette, are represented as being fringed with a worked edging like lace or a skilfully chased jewel. See ATTIRE.

Jok'deäm (Heb. *Yokdeäm'*, יָקְדְעָם, *burning of* the *people;* Sept. Ιεκδαάμ, Vulg. *Jucadam*), a town in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Jezreel and Zanoah (Josh. xv, 56). The associated names indicate a locality in the district south-east of Hebron, perhaps at the ruined site marked as *ed-Dar* on Van de Velde's *Map*, just north of Jebel Ziph.

Jo'kim (Heb. *Yokim'*, יוֹקִים, prob. a contraction of JOIAKIM; Sept. Ἰωακείμ v. r. Ἰωακίμ, Vulg. paraphrases *qui stare fecit solem*), a person mentioned among the descendants of Shelah (his third son, according to Burrington), son of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 22). B.C. prob. ante 588. See JASHUBI-LEHEM. "The Targum translates, 'and the prophets and scribes who came forth from the seed of Joshua.' The reading which that and the Vulg. had evidently was יָקִים, applied by some Rabbinical tradition to Joshua, and at the same time identifying Joash and Saraph, mentioned in the same verse, with Mahlon and Chilion. Jerome quotes a Hebrew legend that Jokim was Elimelech, the husband of Naomi, in whose days the sun stood still on account of the transgressors of the law (*Quæst. Heb. in Paral.*)"

Jok'meäm (Heb. *Yokmeäm'*, יָקְמְעָם, *gathering of the people;* in 1 Kings iv, 12, Sept. Ἰεγμάαμ v. r. Λουκάμ, Vulg. *Jecmaan*, Auth. Vers. "Jokneam;" in 1 Chron. vi, 68 [53], Ἰεκμαάν, *Jecmaam*), a place elsewhere called KIBZAIM (Josh. xxi, 22), but better known as JOKNEAM (Josh. xii, 22, etc.).

Jok'neäm (Heb. *Yokneäm'*, יָקְנְעָם, *possession of* the *people;* Sept. Ἰεκονάμ, Vulg. *Jachanan, Jeconam, Jecnam*), a royal city of the Canaanites (Josh. xii, 22), situated on the southwestern boundary of Zebulon (but not within it [see TRIBE]), near Dabbasheth, and fronted by a stream [the Kishon] (Josh. xix, 11); assigned out of the territory of Zebulon to the Levites of the family of Merari (Josh. xxi, 34). From 1 Chron. vi, 68, the name appears to have been in later times written in the nearly synonymous form of JOKMEAM, and it thus appears (in the original) as the boundary point of one of the purveyorships of Solomon (1 Kings iv, 12). It also seems to have been identical with the Levitical city KIBZAIM (see Lightfoot, *Opp.* ii, 233) in Mount Ephraim (Josh. xxi, 22). Dr. Robinson has lately identified it with the modern Tell *Kaimon*, a commanding position at the foot of Mount Carmel, across the Kishon from the plain of Esdraelon, and in a locality exactly agreeing with the scriptural data, and in name and situation with the CYAMON (q. v.) of the Apocrypha (Judith vii, 3), as well as with that of the *Cammona* of Eusebius and the *Cimana* of Jerome, although (in their *Onomasticon*) they profess ignorance of the site of Jokneam (new ed. of *Bibl. Researches*, iii, 115). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 91) gives a conjecture agreeing with the latter part of this identification. (See also Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 326; Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 119.)

Jok'shan (Heb. *Yokshan'*, יָקְשָׁן, *snarer;* Sept. Ἰεζάν v. r. Ἰεξάν or Ἰεκσάν), the second son of Abraham and Keturah, whose sons Sheba and Dedan appear to have been the ancestors of the Sabæans and Dedanites, that peopled a part of Arabia Felix (Gen. xxv, 2, 3; 1 Chron. i, 32, 33). B.C. cir. 2020. "If the Keturahites stretched across the desert from the head of the Arabian to that of the Persian Gulf (see DEDAN), then we must suppose that Jokshan returned westwards to the trans-Jordanic country, where are placed the settlements of his sons, or at least the chief of their settlements, for a wide spread of these tribes seems to be indicated in the passages in the Bible which make mention of them. The writings of the Arabs are rarely of use in the case of Keturahite tribes, whom they seem to confound with Ishmaelites in one common appellation. They mention a dialect of Jokshan (Yákish, who is Yokshán, as having been formerly spoken near 'Aden and El-Jened, in Southern Arabia: Yakût's *Moajam*, cited in the *Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft*, viii, 600-1; x, 30-1); but that Midianites penetrated so far into the peninsula we hold to be highly improbable" (Smith). "Knobel (*Genes.* p. 188) suggests that the name *Jokshan* may have passed into *Kashan* (קָשָׁן), and that his descendants were the *Cassanitæ* (Κασσανῖται) of Ptolemy (vi, 7, 6) and Steph. Byzant. (s. v.), the *Casandres* (Κασανδρεῖς) of Agatharchides (p. 6, ed. Huds.), the *Gasandres* (Γασανδρεῖς) of Diod. Sic. (iii, 44), and the *Casani* or *Gasani* of Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* vi, 32), who dwelt by the Red Sea, to the south of the Cinædocolpites, and extended to the most northern of the Joktanites." See ARABIA.

Jok'tan (Heb. *Yoktan'*, יָקְטָן, *little;* Sept. Ἰεκτάν; Josephus Ἰούκτας, *Ant.* i, 6, 4; Vulg. *Jectan*), a Shemite, second named of the two sons of Eber, his brother being Peleg (Gen. x, 25; 1 Chron. i, 19). B.C. cir. 2400. He is mentioned as the progenitor of thirteen sons or heads of tribes, supposed to have resided in Southern Arabia (Gen. x, 26-30); 1 Chron. i, 20-23). The Arabians called him *Kahtan*, and assert that from him the *eight* original residents of Yemen sprang. His name is still pointed out by them near Keshin (Niebuhr, *Beschreib.* p. 287), and traces of the same name appear in a city mentioned by Niebuhr (*Beschr.* p. 275) as lying three days' journey north of Nejeran, perhaps the station *Jaktan* alluded to by Edrisi as situated in the district of Sanaa. (See

A. Schultens, *Hist. imp. vetust. Joctanidar. in Ar. Fel. ex Abulfeda, etc.*, Harderov. 1786; Pococke, *Specim. hist. Arab.* p. 32 sq.; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* III, ii, 553 sq.; Bochart's *Phaleg*, iii, 15.)

The original limits of the Joktanidæ are stated in the Bible: "Their dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar, a mount of the East" (Gen. x, 30). The position of Mesha, which is reasonably supposed to be the western boundary, is still uncertain [see MESHA]; but Sephar is well established as being the same as Zafari, the sea-port town on the east of the modern Yemen, and formerly one of the chief centres of the great Indian and African trade. See SEPHAR.

1. The native traditions respecting *Joktan himself* commence with a difficulty. The ancestor of the great southern peoples was called *Kahtan*, who, say the Arabs, was the same as Joktan. To this some European critics have objected that there is no good reason to account for the change of name, and that the identification of Kahtan with Joktan is evidently a Jewish tradition adopted by Mohammed or his followers, and consequently at or after the promulgation of El-Islam. M. Caussin de Perceval commences his essay on the history of Yemen (*Essai*, i, 39) with this assertion, and adds, "Le nom de Cahtân, disent-ils [les Arabes], est le nom de Yectân, légèrement altéré en passant d'une langue étrangère dans la langue Arabe." In reply to these objectors, we may state:

(1.) The Rabbins hold a tradition that Joktan settled in India (see Joseph. *Ant.* i, 6, 4), and the supposition of a Jewish influence in the Arab traditions respecting him is therefore untenable. In the present case, even were this not so, there is an absence of motive for Mohammed's adopting traditions which alienate from the race of Ishmael many tribes of Arabia: the influence here suspected may rather be found in the contradictory assertion, put forward by a few of the Arabs, and rejected by the great majority and the most judicious of their historians, that Kahtan was descended from Ishmael.

(2.) That the traditions in question are post-Mohammedan cannot be proved; the same may be said of everything which Arab writers tell us dates before the prophet's time; for then oral tradition alone existed, if we except the rock-cut inscriptions of the Himyarites, which are too few, and our knowledge of them is too slight to admit of much weight attaching to them.

(3.) In the *Mir-at ez-Zeman* it is stated, "Ibn El-Kelbi says, Yuktan [the Arabic equivalent of Joktan] is the same as Kahtan, son of 'Abir," i. e. Eber, and so say the generality of the Arabs. El-Beladhiri says, "People differ respecting Kahtan; some say he is the same as Yuktan, who is mentioned in the Pentateuch; but the Arabs arabicized his name, and said Kahtan, the son of Hûd [because they identified their prophet Hûd with Eber, whom they call 'Abir]; and some say, son of Es-Semeyfa," or, as is said in one place by the author here quoted, "El-Hemeysa, the son of Nebt [or Nabit, i. e. Nebaioth], the son of Ismail," i. e. Ishmael. He then proceeds, in continuation of the former passage, "Abi-Hanifeh ed-Dinawari says, He is Kahtan, the son of Abir, and was named Kahtan only because of his suffering from drought" [which is termed in Arabic Kaht]. (*Mir-at ez-Zeman*; account of the sons of Shem.) Of similar changes of names by the Arabs there are numerous instances. (See the remarks occurring in the Koran, chap. ii, 248, in the *Expositions* of Ez-Zamakhsheri and El-Beydawi.)

(4.) If the traditions of Kahtan be rejected (and in this rejection we cannot agree), they are, it must be remembered, immaterial to the fact that the peoples called by the Arabs descendants of Kahtan are certainly Joktanites. His sons' colonization of Southern Arabia is proved by indisputable and undisputed identifications, and the great kingdom which there existed for many ages before our æra, and in its later days was renowned in the world of classical antiquity, was as surely Joktanitic.

2. The settlements of the *sons of Joktan* are examined in the separate articles bearing their names, and generally in ARABIA. They colonized the whole of the south of the peninsula, the old "Arabia Felix," or the Yemen (for this appellation had a very wide significance in early times), stretching, according to the Arabs (and there is in this case no ground for doubting their general correctness), to Mekkeh on the north-west, and along nearly the whole of the southern coast eastwards, and far inland. At Mekkeh tradition connects the two great races of Joktan and Ishmael by the marriage of a daughter of Jurhum the Joktanite with Ishmael. It is necessary, in mentioning this Jurhum, who is called a "son" of Joktan (Kahtan), to observe that "son" in these cases must be regarded as signifying "descendant," and that many generations (though how many, or in what order, is not known) are missing from the existing list between Kahtan (embracing the most important time of the Joktanites) and the establishment of the comparatively modern Himyaritic kingdom, from this latter date, stated by Caussin, *Essai*, i, 63, at B.C. cir. 100, the succession of the Tubbaas is apparently preserved to us. At Mekkeh the tribe of Jurhum long held the office of guardians of the Kaabeh, or temple, and the sacred inclosure, until they were expelled by the Ishmaelites (Kutb ed-Din, *Hist. of Mekkeh*, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 35 and 39 sq.; and Caussin, *Essai*, i, 194).

But it was at Seba, the Biblical Sheba, that the kingdom of Joktan attained its greatness. In the south-western angle of the peninsula, Sana (Uzal), Seba (Sheba), and Hadramaut (Hazarmaveth), all closely neighboring, formed together the principal known settlements of the Joktanites. Here arose the kingdom of Sheba, followed in later times by that of Himyar. The dominant tribe from remote ages seems to have been that of Seba (or Sheba, the *Sabæi* of the Greeks), while the family of Himyar (*Homeritæ*) held the first place in the tribe. The kingdom called that of Himyar we believe to have been merely a late phasis of the old Sheba, dating, both in its rise and its name, only shortly before our æra.

Next in importance to the tribe of Seba was that of Hadramaut, which, till the fall of the Himyaritic power, maintained a position of independence and a direct line of rulers from Kahtan (Caussin, i, 135-6). Joktanic tribes also passed northwards to Hireh, in El-Irak, and to Ghassan, near Damascus. The emigration of these and other tribes took place on the occasion of the rupture of a great dike (the dike of El-Arim), above the metropolis of Seba; a catastrophe that appears, from the concurrent testimony of Arabic writers, to have devastated a great extent of country, and destroyed the city Ma-rib or Seba. This event forms the commencement of an æra, the dates of which exist in the inscriptions on the dike and elsewhere; but when we should place that commencement is still quite an open question. (See the extracts from El-Mesûdi and other authorities, edited by Schultens; Caussin, i, 84 sq.) See Tuch, *Commentary on Genesis* (Halle, 1838), chap. x; Knobel, *Võlkertafel*, p. 178 sq.; Ritter, *Halbinsel Arabien*, i, 38 sq.; Dr. Ley, *De Templi Meccani origine* (Berlin, 1849).

Jok'theël (Hebrew *Yoktheël'*, יָקְתְאֵל, *subdued by God*), the name of two cities.

1. (Sept. Ἰεχθαήλ v. r. Ἰαχαρεήλ.) A town in the plain of Judah, mentioned between Mizpeh and Lachish (Josh. xv, 38). The associated names indicate a locality in the district south-west or west of Eleutheropolis (Keil's *Commentary*, ad loc.); possibly at *Balin*, a small modern village a little south of Tell es-Safieh (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 368).

2. (Sept. Ἰεκθοήλ v. r. Ἰεθοήλ.) The name given by king Amaziah to SELAH, the capital of Idumæa or Arabia Petræa, and subsequently borne by it (2 Kings xiv, 7); from which circumstance he appears to have improved it after having captured it. See PETRA.

Jolly, Alexander, an English prelate, was born in 1756. He was ordained for the ministry in 1777, and became pastor at Turiff the same year. In 1778 he removed to Frasersburgh, where he resided for forty-nine years. In 1796 he was elevated to the bishopric of Dundee, and later he became bishop of Moray, a see founded in the 12th century, and which, after bishop Jolly's decease, was absorbed in other dioceses. He died in 1838. Bishop Jolly's works are, *Baptismal Regeneration* (Lond. 1826; new edition, with Life of author by Cheyne, 1840, 12mo):—*Sunday Services and Holy Days*, etc. (1828; 3d ed., with Memoir of author by Bp. Walker, Edinb. 1840, 12mo):—*The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist* (1832, 12mo; 2d ed. Aberdeen, 1847, 12mo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Engl. and American Authors*, ii, 986.

Jomtob. See Lippmann.

Jon, Francis Du. See Junius.

Jo'na (John i, 42). See Jonas.

Jon'adab, a shortened form of the name *Jehonadab*, for which it is used indifferently in the Hebrew as applied to either of two men in certain passages; but these have not been accurately represented in the A. V., which applies the briefer form indeed to either, but the full form to but one in three of these passages. See Jehonadab.

1. The son of Shimeah and nephew of David (A. V. correctly in 2 Sam. xiii, 3 twice, 32, 35; incorrectly in ver. 5, where the Hebrew has Jehonadab).

2. The Rechabite (Jer. xxxv, 6, 10, 19; incorrectly in verse 8, 14, 16, 18).

Jo'nah (Heb. *Yonah'*, יוֹנָה, a *dove*, as often, but in that sense fem., Sept. Ἰωνά in 2 Kings xiv, 25; elsewhere and in the N. T. Ἰωνᾶς: see Jonas), the son of Amittai, the fifth in order of the minor prophets. No æra is assigned to him in the book of his prophecy, yet there is little doubt of his being the same person who is spoken of in 2 Kings xiv, 25 as having uttered a prophecy of the relief of the kingdom of Israel, which was accomplished by Jeroboam's recapture of the ancient territory of the northern tribes between Cœle-Syria and the Ghor (compare ver. 29). The Jewish doctors have supposed him to be the son of the widow of Sarepta by a puerile interpretation of 1 Kings xvii, 24 (Jerome, *Præfat. in Jonam*). His birthplace was Gath-hepher, in the tribe of Zebulon (2 Kings xiv, 25). Jonah flourished in or before the reign of Jeroboam II (B.C. cir. 820), since he predicted the successful conquests, enlarged territory, and brief prosperity of the Israelitish kingdom under that monarch's sway (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 10, 1). The oracle itself is not extant, though Hitzig has, by a novel process of criticism, amused himself with a fancied discovery of it in chaps. xv and xvi of Isaiah (*Des Proph. Jon. Orakel. über Moab kritisch vindicirt*, etc., Heidelb. 1831).

The personal history of Jonah is, with the exception of this incidental allusion, to be gathered from the account in the book that bears his name. Having already, as it seems (from ו in i, 1), prophesied to Israel, he was sent to Nineveh. The time was one of political revival in Israel; but ere long the Assyrians were to be employed by God as a scourge upon them. The Israelites consequently viewed them with repulsiveness; and the prophet, in accordance with his name (יוֹנָה, "a dove"), out of timidity and love for his country, shrunk from a commission which he felt sure would result (iv, 2) in the sparing of a hostile city. He attempted, therefore, to escape to Tarshish, either Tartessus in Spain (Bochart, Titcomb, Hengstenberg), or more probably (Drake) Tarsus in Cilicia, a port of commercial intercourse. The providence of God, however, watched over him, first in a storm, and then in his being swallowed by a large fish (דָּג גָּדוֹל) for the space of three days and three nights (see Hauber, *Jonas im Bauche des Wallfisches* [Lemg. 1753]; Delitzsch, in *Zeitschr. f. Luther. Kirche u. Theol.* [1840], ii, 112 sq.; Baumgarten, *ibid.* [1841], ii, 187; Keil, *Bibl. Commentar zu d. Kl. Propheten* [Leipz. 1866]). After his deliverance Jonah executed his commission; and the king, having heard of his miraculous deliverance (dean Jackson, *On the Creed*, bk. ix, c. 42), ordered a general fast, and averted the threatened judgment. But the prophet, not from personal, but national feelings, grudged the mercy shown to a heathen nation. He was therefore taught, by the significant lesson of the "gourd," whose growth and decay (a known fact to naturalists: Layard's *Nineveh*, i, 123, 124) brought the truth at once home to him, that he was sent to testify by deed, as other prophets would afterwards testify by word, of the capacity of Gentiles for salvation, and the design of God to make them partakers of it. This was "the sign of the prophet Jonas" (Luke xi, 29–32), which was given to a proud and perverse generation of Jews after the ascension of Christ by the preaching of his apostles. (See the monographs on this subject cited by Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 160). But the resurrection of Christ itself was also shadowed forth in the history of the prophets, as is made certain to us by the words of our Saviour (see Jackson as above, bk. ix, c. 40). Titcomb (*Bible Studies*, p. 237, note) sees a correspondence between Jon. i, 17 and Hos. vi, 2. Besides this, the fact and the faith of Jonah's prayer in the belly of the fish betokened to the nation of Israel the intimation of a resurrection and of immortality.

On what portion of the coast Jonah was set down in safety we are not informed. The opinions held as to the peculiar spot by rabbins and other thaumaturgic expositors need not be repeated. According to modern tradition, it was at the spot now marked as Khan Nebi Yunas, near Sidon (Kelly's *Syria*, p. 302). The particular plant (קִיקָיוֹן, *kikayon'*, "gourd") which sheltered Jonah was possibly the *Ricinus*, whose name *Kiki* is yet preserved in some of the tongues of the East. It is more likely, however, to have been some climbing plant of the gourd tribe. The Sept. renders it κολοκύνθη. Jerome translates it *hedera*, but against his better judgment and for fear of giving offence to the critics of his age, as he quietly adds in justification of his less preferable rendering, "Sed timuimus grammaticos." (See an elucidation of the passage in the *Beitr. zur Beförd.* etc. xix, p. 183.) See Gourd.

Various spots have been pointed out as the place of his sepulchre, such as Mosul in the East, and Gath-hepher in Palestine; while the so-called Epiphanius speaks of his retreating to Tyre, and being buried there in the tomb of Cenezæus, judge of Israel. (See Otho, *Lexicon Rabb.* p. 326 sq.; comp. Ephræm Syrus's *Repentance of Nineveh*, transl. by Dr. Burgess, Lond. 1853.) Apocry-

"Tomb of the Prophet Jonah" at Mosul.

phal prophecies ascribed to Jonah may be found in the pseudo-Epiphanius (*De Vitis Prophet.* c. 16) and the *Chronic. Paschale*, p. 149.

JONAH'S PROPHECY contains the above account of the prophet's commission to denounce Nineveh, and of his refusal to undertake the embassy—of the method he employed to escape the unwelcome task, and the miraculous means which God used to curb his self-willed spirit, and subdue his petulant and querulous disposition (Reindel, *Die Sendung d. Proph. Jonas nach Ninive*, Bamb. 1826). His attempt to flee from the presence of the Lord seems like a partial insanity, produced by the excitement of distracting motives in an irascible and melancholy heart (J. C. Lange, *Diss. de mirabili fuga Jonæ*, Hal. 1751).

I. *Historical Character of the Book.*—The history of Jonah is certainly striking and extraordinary. Its characteristic prodigy does not resemble the other miraculous phenomena recorded in Scripture, yet we must believe in its literal occurrence, as the Bible affords no indication of its being a mythus, allegory, or parable (Piper, *Historia Jonæ a recentior. conatibus vindicata*, Gryph. 1786). On the other hand, our Saviour's pointed and peculiar allusion to it is a presumption of its reality (Matt. xii, 40). The historical character of the narrative is held by Hess, Lilienthal, Sack, Reindel, Hävernick, Hengstenberg, Laberenz, Baumgarten, Delitzsch, Welte, Stuart, and Keil, *Einleitung*, sec. 89. (See Friedrichsen, *Krit. Uebersicht der verschied. Ansichten von dem Buch Jonas*, 2d edit. 1841.) The opinion of the earlier Jews (Tobit xiv, 4, 8; 3 Macc. vi, 8; Josephus, *Ant.* ix, 10, 2) is also in favor of the literality of the adventure (see Buddei *Hist. V. Test.* ii, 589 sq.). It requires less faith to credit this simple excerpt from Jonah's biography than to believe the numerous hypotheses that have been invented to deprive it of its supernatural character, the great majority of them being clumsy and far-fetched, doing violence to the language, and despite to the spirit of revelation; distinguished, too, by tedious adjustments, laborious combinations, historical conjecture, and critical jugglery. In vindication of the reality of this striking narrative, it may be argued that the allusions of Christ to Old-Testament events on similar occasions are to actual occurrences (John iii, 14; vi, 48); that the purpose which God had in view justified his miraculous interposition; that this miracle must have had a salutary effect both on the minds of the Ninevites and on the people of Israel. Neither is the character of Jonah improbable. Many reasons might induce him to avoid the discharge of his prophetic duty—fear of being thought a false prophet, scorn of a foreign and hostile race, desire for their utter destruction, a false dignity which might reckon it beneath his prerogative to officiate among uncircumcised idolaters (Verschuir, *Opusc.* p. 73, etc.; Alber, *Institut. Hermen. Vet. Test.* iii, 399, 407; Jahn, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, transl. by Turner, p. 372, 373, translator's notes; Laberenz, *De Vera. lib. Jonæ Interp.* Fulda, 1836).

Others regard this book as an allegory, such as Bertholdt and Rosenmüller, Gesenius and Winer. Especially have many deemed it a parody upon or even the original of the various heathen fables of Arion and the Dolphin (Herodot. i, 24), and the wild adventure of Hercules which is referred to in Lycophron (*Cassandra*, v, 33; see Forbiger, *De Lycophr. Cassandra c. epimetro de Jona*, Lips. 1827; comp. *Iliad*, xx, 145; xxi, 442; Diod. Sic. iv, 42; Philostr. *Icon.* 12; Hygin. *Fab.* 89; Apollod. ii, 5, 9) and Perseus (Apollod. ii, 4, 3; Ovid, *Metam.* iv, 662 sq.; Hygin. 64; Phot. *Cod.* 186, p. 231), Joppa being even famous as the scene of Andromeda's exposure (Pliny, v, 14, 34; ix, 4; Strabo, xvi, 759). Cyrill Alexand., in his *Comment. in Jon.*, notices this similitude between the incident of Jonah and the fabled enterprise of the son of Alcmena (see Allat. *Excerpt. var.* p. 274; Eudocia Viol. in Villoison's *Anec. Gr.* i, 344; Anton, *Comparatio librorum V. T. et scriptor. profan. cet.* p. 10, Gorlic. 1831; compare, too, Theophylact, *Opp.* iv, 169). Bleek justly says (*Einleit.* p. 576) that there is not the smallest probability of the story of Jonah's temporary sojourn in the belly of the whale having been either mediately or immediately derived from those Greek fables. F. von Baur's hypothesis of the story of the book being a compound of some popular Jewish traditions and the Babylonian myth respecting a sea monster Oannes, and the fast for Adonis, is now universally regarded as exploded. For further discussion of this part of Jonah's history, see Gesenius, in the *Hall. Lit.-Zeit.* 1813, No. 23; Friedrichsen, *Krit. Ueberblick der Ansichten vom Jonas* (Leipz. 1841); Delitzsch, in Rudelbach's *Zeitschrift*, 1840, ii, 112 sq. These legendary parallels may be seen drawn out at length by professor Stowe in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for Oct. 1853, p. 744 sq. See JOPPA.

Some, who cannot altogether reject the reality of the narrative, suppose it to have had a historical basis, though its present form be fanciful or mythical. Such an opinion is the evident result of a mental struggle between receiving it as a real transaction, or regarding it as wholly a fiction (Goldhorn, *Excurs. z. B. Jon.* p. 28; Friedrichsen, *Krit. Ueberblick der Ansichten B. Jon.* p. 219). Grimm, in his *Uebersetz.* p. 61, regards it as a dream produced in that sleep which fell upon Jonah as he lay in the sides of the ship. The fanciful opinion of the famous Herman von der Hardt, in his *Jonas in luce*, etc., a full abstract of which is given by Rosenmüller (*Prolegom. in Jonam*, p. 19), was, that the book is a historical allegory, descriptive of the fate of Manasseh, and Josiah his grandson, kings of Judah. Tarshish, according to him, represents the kingdom of Lydia; the ship, the Jewish republic, whose captain was Zadok the high-priest; while the casting of Jonah into the sea symbolized the temporary captivity of Manasseh in Babylon. Less (*Vom historischen Styl der Urwelt*) supposed that all difficulty might be removed by imagining that Jonah, when thrown into the sea, was taken up by a ship having a large fish for a figure-head—a theory somewhat more pleasing than the rancid hypothesis of Anton, who fancied that the prophet took refuge in the interior of a dead whale, floating near the spot where he was cast overboard (Rosenm. *Prolegom. in Jon.* p. 328). Not unlike the opinion of Less is that of Charles Taylor, in his Fragments affixed to Calmet's *Dictionary*, No. cxlv., that דָּג signifies a life-preserver, a notion which, as his manner is, he endeavors to support by mythological metamorphoses founded on the form and names of the famous fish-god of Philistia. There are others who allow, as De Wette and Knobel, that Jonah was a real person, but hold that the book is made up, for didactic purposes, of legendary stories which had gathered around him. A slender basis of fact has been allowed by some—by Bunsen, for example, who, strangely enough, fixes upon the very portion which to most of his rationalistic countrymen bears the clearest marks of spuriousness, as the one genuine part of the whole—Jonah's thanksgiving from the perils of shipwreck (as Bunsen judges); and thinks that some one had mistaken the matter, and fabricated out of it the present story—by others, such as Krahmer (*Das Buch Jonas*, introd.), who suppose that Jonah was known to have uttered a prophecy against Nineveh, and to have been impatient at the delay which appeared in the fulfilment, and was hence, for didactic purposes, made the hero of the story.

But the more common opinion in the present day with this school of divines is, that the story is purely moral, and without any historical foundation; nor can any clew be found or imagined in the known history of the times why Jonah in particular, a prophet of Israel in the latter stages of the kingdom, should have been chosen as the ground of the instruction meant to be conveyed. So Ewald, Bleek, etc., who, however, differ in some respects as to the specific aim of the book, while they agree as to its non-historical character. In short, that the book is the grotesque coinage of a Hebrew im-

agination seems to be the opinion, variously modified, of Semler, Michaelis, Herder, Städlin, Eichhorn, Augusti, Meyer, Pareau, Hitzig, and Maurer.

The plain, literal import of the narrative being set aside with misapplied ingenuity, the supposed design of it has been very variously interpreted. Michaelis (*Uebersetz. d. N. T.* part xi, p. 101) and Semler (*Apparat. ad Lib. Vet. Test. Interpret.* p. 271) supposed the narrative to be intended to show the injustice of the arrogance and hatred cherished by the Jews towards other nations. So in substance Bleek. Similarly Eichhorn (*Einleit.* § 577) and Jahn (*Introduct.* § 127) think the design was to teach the Jews that other people with less privileges excelled them in pious obedience. Kegel (*Bibel d. A. und N. Test.* vii, 129 sq.) argues that this episode was meant to solace and excite the prophets under the discharge of difficult and dangerous duties; while Paulus (*Memorabilia*, vi, 32 sq.) maintains that the object of the author of *Jonah* is to impress the fact that God remits punishment on repentance and reformation. Similar is the idea of Kimchi and Pareau (*Interpretation of Old Testament*, Biblical Cabinet, No. xxv, p. 263). Krahmer thinks that the theme of the writer is the Jewish colony in its relation to the Samaritans (*Das B. Jon. Krit. untersucht*, p. 65). Maurer (*Comment. in Proph. Min.*) adheres to the opinion which lies upon the surface, that it inculcates the sin of not obeying God, even in pronouncing severe threatenings on a heathen people. Ewald would make the design quite general, namely, to show how the true fear of God and repentance bring salvation—first, in the case of the heathen sailors; then in the case of Jonah; finally, in that of the Ninevites. Hitzig (first in a separate treatise, then in his commentary on the minor prophets) supposes the book to have been written by some one in the 4th century before Christ, "in Egypt, that land of wonders," and chiefly for the purpose of vindicating Jehovah for having failed to verify the prophecy in Obadiah respecting the heathen Edomites. Similarly, Köster (*Die Propheten des A. und N. Test.*, Leipz. 1839) favors the malignant insinuation that its chief end was to save the credit of the prophets among the people, though their predictions against foreign nations might not be fulfilled, as Nineveh was preserved after being menaced and doomed.

These hypotheses are all vague and baseless, and do not merit a special refutation. Endeavoring to free us from one difficulty, they plunge us into others yet more intricate and perplexing. We notice the principal external objections that have been brought against the book.

(1.) Much profane wit has been expended on the miraculous means of Jonah's deliverance, very unnecessarily and very absurdly; it is simply said, "The Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah." Now the species of marine animal is not defined, and the Greek κῆτος is often used to specify, not the genus whale, but any large fish or sea-monster. All objections to its being a whale which lodged Jonah in its stomach, from its straitness of throat or rareness of haunt in the Mediterranean, are thus removed. Hesychius explains κῆτος as θαλάσσιος ἰχθὺς παμμεγέθης. Eustathius explains its correspondent adjective κητώεσσαν by μεγάλην (in the *Iliad*, ii, 581). Diodorus Siculus speaks of terrestrial monsters as κητώδη ζῷα, and describes a huge fish as κῆτος ἄπιστον τὸ μέγεθος. The Scripture thus speaks only of an enormous fish, which under God's direction swallowed the prophet, and does not point out the species to which the voracious prowler belonged. There is little ground for the supposition of bishop Jebb, that the asylum of Jonah was not in the stomach of a whale, but in a cavity of its throat, which, according to naturalists, is a very capacious receptacle, sufficiently large, as captain Scoresby asserts, to contain a merchant ship's jolly-boat full of men (bishop Jebb, *Sacred Literature*, p. 178). Since the days of Bochart it has been a common opinion that the fish was of the shark species, *Lamia canis carcharias*, or "sea-dog" (Bochart, *Op.* iii, 72; Calmet's *Dissertation sur Jon.*). Entire human bodies have been found in some fishes of this kind. The stomach, too, has no influence on any living substance admitted into it. Granting all these facts as proof of what is termed the economy of miracles, still must we say, in reference to the supernatural preservation of Jonah, Is anything too hard for the Lord? See WHALE.

(2.) What is said about the size of Nineveh, also, is in accordance with fact (see *Pict. Bible*, note, ad loc.). It was "an exceeding great city of three days' journey." Built in the form of a parallelogram, it made, according to Diodorus (ii, 7), a circuit of 480 furlongs, or about 60 miles. It has been usual, since the publication of Layard's *Nineveh*, to say that the great ruins of Koyunjik, Nimrud, Keremles, and Khorsabad form such a parallelogram, the distances from north to south being about 18 miles, and from east to west about 12; the longer sides thus measuring 36 miles, and the shorter ones 24. But against this view professor Rawlinson has recently urged, with considerable force, that the four great ruins bore distinct local titles; that Nimrud, identified with Calah, is mentioned in Scripture as a place so far separated from Nineveh that "a great city"—Resen—lay between them (Gen. x, 12); that there are no signs of a continuous town; and that the four sites are fortified "on what would be the inside of the city." Still Nineveh, as represented by the ruins of Koyunjik and Nebbi-Yunus, or Tomb of Jonah, was of an oblong shape, with a circuit of about eight miles, and was therefore a place of unusual size—"an exceeding great city." The phrase, "three days' journey," may mean that it would take that time to traverse the city and proclaim through all its localities the divine message; and the emphatic point then is, that at the end of his first day's journey the preaching of Jonah took effect. The clause, "that cannot discern their right hand from their left hand," probably denotes children, and 120,000 of these might represent a population of more than half a million (Rawlinson's *Five Great Monarchies*, i, 310; Sir Henry Rawlinson's *Comment. on Cuneif. Inscriptions*, p. 17; Captain Jones's *Topography of Nineveh*, in the *Jour. of As. Society*, xv, 298). Jonah entered the city "a day's journey," that is, probably went from west to east uttering his incisive and terrible message. The sublime audacity of the stranger—the ringing monotony of his sharp, short cry—had an immediate effect. The story of his wonderful deliverance had perhaps preceded him (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 100). The people believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and man and beast fasted alike. The exaggeration ascribed to this picture adds to its credibility, so prone is Oriental nature to extremes. If the burden of Jonah was to have any effect at all, one might say that it must be profound and immediate. It was a panic—we dare not call it a revival, or, with Dr. Pusey, dignify it into conversion. There was plainly no permanent result. After the sensation had passed away, idolatry and rapacity resumed their former sway, as is testified by the prophets Isaiah, Nahum, and Zephaniah; yet the appalled conscience of Nineveh did confess its "evil and its violence" as it grovelled in the dust. Various causes may have contributed to deepen this consternation—the superstition of the people, and the sudden and unexplained appearance of the foreigner with his voice of doom. "The king," as Layard says, "might believe him to be a special minister from the supreme deity of the nation," and it was only "when the gods themselves seemed to interpose that any check was placed on the royal pride and lust." Layard adds, "It was not necessary to the effect of his preaching that Jonah should be of the religion of the people of Nineveh. I have known a Christian priest frighten a whole Mussulman town to tents and repentance by publicly proclaiming that he had received a divine mission to announce a coming earthquake or plague" (*Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 632). The compulsory mourning of the

brute creation has at least one analogy in the lamentation made over the Persian general Masistius: "The horses and beasts of burden were shaved" (Herodotus, ix, 24). According to Plutarch, also, Alexander commanded the observance of a similar custom on the death of Hephæstion. Therefore, in the accessories of the narrative there is no violation of probability—all is in accordance with known customs and facts. See NINEVEH.

(3.) It has appeared to some, in particular to Bleek (*Einleit.* p. 571), improbable, and against the historical verity of this book, that on the supposition of all that is here related having actually occurred, there should be in the relation of them such a paucity of circumstantial details—nothing said, for instance, of the place where Jonah was discharged on dry land, or of the particular king who then reigned at Nineveh—and not only so, but no apparent reference in the future allusions to Nineveh in Scripture, to the singular change (if so be it actually took place) wrought through the preaching of Jonah on the religious and moral state of the people. These are still always regarded as idolaters, and the judgments of God uttered against them, as if they stood in much the same position with the heathen enemies generally of God's cause and people. It may fairly be admitted that there is a certain degree of strangeness in such things, which, if it were not in accordance with the character both of the man and of the mission, and in these found a kind of explanation, might not unnaturally give rise to some doubts of the credibility of what is written. But Jonah's relation to Nineveh was altogether of a special and peculiar nature; it stood apart from the regular calling of a prophet and the ordinary dealings of God; and having for its more specific object the instruction and warning of the covenant-people in a very critical period of their affairs, the reserve maintained as to local and historical details may have been designed, as it was certainly fitted, to make them think less of the parties immediately concerned, and more of what through these God was seeking to impress upon themselves. The whole was a kind of parabolical action; and beyond a certain limit circumstantial minuteness would have tended to mar, rather than to promote, the leading aim. Then, as to the change produced upon the Ninevites, we are led from the nature of the case to think chiefly of the more flagrant iniquities as the evils more particularly cried against; and Israel itself afforded many examples of general reformations in respect to these, of which little or no trace was to be found in the course even of a single generation. Much more might such be expected to have happened in the case of Nineveh.

II. *Style, Date*, etc.—The book of Jonah is a simple narrative, with the exception of the prayer or thanksgiving in chap. ii. Its style and mode of narration are uniform. There are no traces of compilation, as Nachtigall supposed; neither is the prayer, as De Wette (*Einleit.* § 237) imagines, improperly borrowed from some other sources. That prayer contains, indeed, not only imagery peculiar to itself, but also such imagery as at once was suggested to the mind of a pious Hebrew preserved in circumstances of extreme jeopardy. On this principle we account for the similarity of some portions of its phraseology to Psa. lix, xlii, etc. The language in both places had been hallowed by frequent usage, and had become the consecrated idiom of a distressed and succored Israelite. Perhaps the prayer of Jonah might be uttered by him, not during his mysterious imprisonment, but after it (מִמְּעֵי הַדָּגָה, *out*, i. e. when out *of the fish's belly;* comp. Job xix, 26; xi, 15). The hymn seems to have been composed after his deliverance, and the reason why his deliverance is noted after the hymn is recorded may be to show the occasion of its composition. "The Lord had spoken unto the fish, and it had vomited Jonah on the dry land!" (See further Hauber, in his *Bibl. Betrachtungen*, Lemgo, 1753; also an article on the subject in the *Brit. Theol. Mag.* i, 3, p. 18.)

There was little reason either for dating the composition of this book later than the age of Jonah, or for supposing it the production of another than the prophet himself. The Chaldaisms which Jahn and others find may be accounted for by the nearness of the canton of Zebulon, to which Jonah belonged, to the northern territory, whence by national intercourse Aramaic peculiarities might be insensibly borrowed. (Thus we have סְפִינָה—*a ship with a deck*—not the more common Hebrew term; רַב—a foreign title applied to the captain; מִנָּה, *to appoint*—found, however, in Psa. lxi, a psalm which Hupfeld without any valid grounds places after the Babylonian captivity; אָמַר, *to command*, as in the later books; טַעַם, *command*, referring to the royal decree, and probably taken from the native Assyrian tongue; חָתַר, to *row*, a nautical term; and the abbreviated form of the relative, which, however, occurs in other books, etc.) Gesenius and Bertholdt place it before the exile; Jahn and Köster after it. Rosenmüller supposes the author may have been a contemporary of Jeremiah; Hitzig postpones it to the period of the Maccabees. The general opinion is that Jonah was the first of the prophets (Rosenmüller, Bp. Lloyd, Davison, Browne, Drake): Hengstenberg would place him after Amos and Hosea, and, indeed, adheres to the order of the books in the canon for the chronology. He, as well as Hitzig, would identify the author with that of Obadiah, chiefly on account of the initial "and." The king of Nineveh at this time is supposed (Usher and others) to have been Pul, who is placed by Layard (*Nin. and Bab.* p. 624) at B.C. 750; but an earlier king, Adrammelech II, B.C. 840, is regarded as more probable by Drake. The date above assigned to Jonah would seem to indicate the husband of the famous Semiramis. See ASSYRIA.

III. *Commentaries.*—The following are the special exegetical helps expressly on the whole book, the most important of which we designate by prefixing an asterisk: Ephraem Syrus, *In Jonam* (in *Opp.* iii, 562; transl. from the Syriac by Burgess, *Homily*, Lond. 1853, 12mo); Basil, *In Jonam* (in *Opp.* p. 66); Tertullian, *Carmen* (in *Opp.* p. 576); Theophylact, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* iv); Brentius, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* iv); Luther, *Auslegung* (Wittenb. 1526, 4to and 8vo; Erf. 1526, 1531, 8vo; also in *Werke*, Wittenb. ed. v, 310; Jen. iii, 214; Alt. iii, 351; Lpz. viii, 516; Hal. vi, 496; in Latin, by Jonas, in *Opp.* Vitemb. iv, 404; and separately by Opsopœus, Hag. 1526, 8vo; and Loneker, Argent. 1526, 8vo); Artopœus, *Commentarius* (Stet. 1545, Basil, 1558, 8vo); Bugenhagen, *Expositio* (Vitemb. 1550, 1561, 8vo); Hooper, *Sermons* (London, 1550, 12mo; also in *Writings*, p. 431); Ferus, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1554, Antw. 1557, Ven. 1567, 8vo; also in German, Cöln, 1567, 8vo); Willich, *Commentarius* [includ. sev. minor proph.] (Basil. 1566, 8vo); Selnecker, *Auslegung* [including Nahum, etc.] (Lps. 1567, 4to); Tuscan, *Commentarius* (Ven. 1573, 8vo); Calvin, *Lectures* (trans. by Baxter, Lond. 1578, 4to); Pomarius, *Auslegung* (Magdeb. 1579, Lpz. 1599, 4to; Stettin, 1664, 8vo); Baron, *Prælectiones* (ed. Lake, Lond. 1579, folio); Grynæus, *Enarratio* (Basil. 1581, 8vo); Schadeus, *Synopsis* (Argent. 1588, 4to); Junius, *Lectiones* (Heidelb. 1594, 4to; also in *Opp.* i, 1327); *King, *Lectures* (Lond. 1594, 1600, 1611, 1618; Oxf. 1597, 1599, 4to); Feuardent, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1594, folio; 1595, 8vo); Abbott, *Exposition* (Lond. 1600, 1613, 4to; 1845, 2 vols. 12mo); Wolderus, *Diexodus* [includ. Joel] (Vitemb. 1606, 4to); Krackewitz, *Commentarius* (Hamb. 1610, Giessen, 1611, 8vo); Miley, *Erklärung* (Heidelb. 1614, 4to); Tarnovius, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1616, 1626, 4to); Schnepf, *Commentarius* (Rost. 1619, 4to); Quarles, *Poem* (Lond. 1620, 4to); Treminius, *Commentarii* (Oriolæ, 1623, 4to); Mylius, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1624, Regiom. 1640, 4to; also in his *Sylloge*, Amst. 1701, fol., p. 976 sq.); Urven, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1640, fol.); Acosta, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1641, fol.); Ursinus, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1642, 8vo); Paciuchelli, *Lezzioni* (Ven. 1650, 1660, 1664, 1701, folio;

also in Latin, Monach. 1672, fol.; Antw. 1681-3, 3 vols. fol.); De Salinas, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1652 sq., 3 vols. fol.): Crocius, *Commentarius* (Cassel. 1656, 8vo); Leusden, *Paraphrasis* [Rabbinical] (Tr. ad Rh. 1656, 8vo); Petræus, *Notæ* [to a transl. from the Æth.] (L. B. 1660, 4to); *Scheid, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1659, 1665, 4to); Gerhard, *Annotationes* [includ. Amos] (Jen. 1663, 1676, 4to); Pfeiffer, *Prælectiones* (Vitemb. 1671, 1706, Lipsiæ, 1686, 4to; also in *Opp.* i, 1131 sq.), Moebius, *Jonas typicus* (Lips. 1678, 4to); Christianus, *Illustratio* (Lips. 1683, 8vo); Bircherod, *Expositio* (Hafn. 1686, 4to); Von der Hardt, *Ænigmata*, etc. (Helmstadt, in separate treatises, 1719; together, 1723, fol.); Outhof, *Verklaaring* (Amst. 1723, 4to); Steuersloot, *Ontleeding* (Leyden, 1730, 4to); Van der Meer, *Verklaaring* (Gor. 1742, 4to); Reichenbach, *De Rabbinis errantibus*, etc. (Alt. 1761, 4to); Lessing, *Observationes* (Chemnitz, 1780, 8vo); Lavater, *Predigten* (Wintenth. 1782, 2 vols. 8vo); Adam, *Sendungsgeschichte*, etc. (Bonn, 1786, 4to); Piper, *Vindicatio* (Gryph. 1786, 4to); Lüderwald, *Allegorie*, etc. (Helmstadt, 1787, 8vo); Höpfner, *Curæ in Sept.*, etc. (Lips. 1787-8, 3 parts 4to); Kordes, *Observationes in Sept.*, etc. (Jena, 1788, 4to); Löwe, באור (Berl. 1788, 8vo; also in his general commentary, Dessau, 1805); Grimm, *Erklärung* (Düsseld. 1789, 8vo); Fabricius, *Commentarius*, etc. [from Jewish sources] (Gött. 1792, 8vo); Grangaard, *Uebersetzung* (Lpzg. 1792, 8vo); Paulus, *Zweck*, etc. (in his *Memorabilien*, Leipzig, 1794, vi, 32 sq.); Griesdorf, *Interpretandi ratio*, etc. (Vitemb. 1794, 2 dissert. 4to); Benjoin, *Notes* (Cambr. 1796, 4to); Nachtigall, *Aufschrift*, etc. (in Eichhorn's *Bibliothek*, Lips. 1799, ix, 221 sq.); Elias of Wilna, פירוש (Wilna, 1800, 4to); Goldhorn, *Excurse* (Lpz. 1803, 8vo); Jones, *Portrait*, etc. (London, 1810, and often since, 12mo); *Friedrichsen, *Ueberblick*, etc. (Alt. 1817, Lpz. 1841, 8vo); Young, *Lectures* (London, 1819, 8vo); Reindel, *Versuch*, etc. (Bamberg, 1826, 8vo); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (part vii, vol. ii; Lpzg. 1827, 8vo); Hitzig, *Orakel üb. Moab* (Heidelb. 1831, 4to); Cunningham, *Lectures* (Lond. 1833, 12mo); Sibthorp, *Lectures* (Lond. 1834, 8vo); Krahmer, *Untersuchung* (Kassel. 1839, 8vo), Preston, *Lectures* (London, 1840, 8vo); Jäger, *Endzweck*, etc. (Tüb. 1840, 8vo); Peddie, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1862, 12mo); Fairbairn, *Jonah's Life*, etc. (Edinburgh, 1849, 12mo); Macpherson, *Lectures* (Edinb. 1849, 12mo); Tweedie, *Lessons* (Edinb. 1850, 12mo); Drake, *Notes* [including Hosea] (Cambr. 1853, 8vo); Harding, *Lectures* (Lond. 1856, 12mo); Muir, *Lessons* (Edinb. 1854, 1857, 8vo); Wright, *Glossaries*, etc. (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Desprez, *Illustrations* (London, 1857, 12mo); Broad, *Lectures* (Lond. 1860, 8vo); *Kaulen, *Expositio* (Mogunt. 1862, 8vo); *Martin, *Jonah's Mission* (Lond. 1866, 8vo). See PROPHETS, MINOR.

Jonah ben-Abraham GERUNDI, a Jewish savant, and one of the principal leaders of the opposition to the school of Maimonides, was born about 1195. A disciple of the celebrated Salomo of Montpensier, he had espoused the cause of the latter. He was one of the parties that pronounced the ban against all who should dare to read the writings of the celebrated Jewish philosopher, and his opposition had in every way been so bitter against the Maimonidists that it caused no little surprise in the Jewish camp when he, upon the attempt of the inquisitors to destroy all copies of the Rabbinical writings, openly declared his former course a mistake, and pronounced the second Moses a great and good man. He even entered upon a pilgrimage to the grave of the man whose writings and disciples he had formerly opposed; and when, at the solicitation of a Jewish congregation which demanded his services, he halted on the journey, and there died (about 1270), his death was attributed by some of his superstitious brethren as a punishment of heaven for the non-fulfilment of his duty to visit the grave of Maimonides, and there declare the folly of his former course. Jonah was a man of splendid parts, and did much to allay strife among his people.—Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, vii, 46, 117 sq. See SALOMO OF MONTPENSIER. (J. H. W.)

Jo'nan (Ἰωνάν, perh. contr. for JONATHAN or JOHANAN, or i. q. JONAS), the son of Eliakim and father of Joseph among the maternal ancestors of Christ (Luke iii, 30). He is not mentioned in the Old Test. B.C. considerably ante 876. See GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

Jo'nas (Ἰωνᾶς, for the Heb. *Jonah*), the Græcized form of the name of three men in the Apocrypha and New Testament.

1. The prophet JONAH (2 Esdr. i, 39; Tobit xiv, 4, 8; Matt. xii, 39, 40, 41; xvi, 4; Luke xi, 29, 30, 32).

2. A person occupying the same position in 1 Esdr. ix, 23 as ELIEZER in the corresponding list in Ezra x, 23. Perhaps the corruption originated in reading אליעיני for אליעזר, as appears to have been the case in 1 Esdr. ix, 32 (compare Ezra x, 31). The former would have caught the compiler's eye from Ezra x, 22, and the original form Elionas, as it appears in the Vulg., could easily have become Jonas.

3. The father of the apostle Peter (John xxi, 15, 16, 17). In John i, 42 the name is less correctly Anglicized "Jona" (some MSS. have Ἰωάννης). A.D. ante 25. See also BAR-JONA. Instead of Ἰωνᾶ (genitive) in all the above passages, good codices have Ἰωάννου or Ἰωάνου, which latter Lachmann has introduced into the text. Perhaps *Jonas* is but a contraction for *Joannas* (Luke iii, 27), which is the same as *John*.

Jonas, bishop OF ORLEANS, an eminent prelate in the Latin Church, flourished in the first half of the 9th century. He died in 842.. Jonas took an active part in the ecclesiastical affairs of his time, and played no unimportant part in the Iconoclastic controversy, in which he assumed a mediate course. In his *De cultu Imaginum* (1645, 16mo) he wrote both against Claudius, bishop of Turin, and the Iconoclasts. The work was dedicated to king Charles the Bald, with whom he was in great favor. Although condemning the destroyers of images, he did not approve the worship of them, and the most eminent Catholic writers, such as Bellarmine, therefore disapprove of his work. His other principal works are, *Libri tres de institutione laicali* (transl. into French by De Mege, 1662, 12mo):—*De institutione regia* (transl. into French by Desmarets, 1661, 8vo). These two works are to be found in Latin in D'Achery's *Spicileg.* He is also the author of a treatise on *Miracles* (in *Bibl. Patri.*). See Milman, *Latin Christ.* iv, 421; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, xxiii, 294 sq., 416 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 573.

Jonas, Justus, one of the most eminent reformers in Germany, a contemporary and associate of Luther, was born at Nordhausen, June 5, 1493. He studied law at the University of Erfurt. In 1519, however, encouraged by the advice of both Hess and Erasmus, he decided to study theology, and, inclining to the cause of the Reformers, he allied himself to Luther in 1521, and thereafter became closely connected with the great reformer. He went to Worms with him, and was soon after appointed provost of the church at Wittenberg. Here he was made D.D. by the university, in which he became a professor, and ever after worked zealously for the propagation of the principles of the Reformation. His legal knowledge was of especial service to the Reformers. In 1529 he accompanied Luther to Marburg, and his letters on this occasion are a valuable historical contribution. In 1530 we find him assisting Melancthon in the completion of his *Augustana.* In 1541 he removed to Halle to assume pastoral duties at St. Mary's Church in that city, but in 1546 duke Maurice ordered him to quit the place, and he returned only after the elector John Frederick had taken possession of the city in 1547. The battle of Mühlberg, which falls in this year, again turned the fate of the Protestants, and he once more quitted Halle. In 1551 he was appointed court preacher at Coburg, and in 1553 superintendent of Eisfeld, where he died Oct. 9, 1555. Jonas was particularly distinguished as a ready speaker and as a writer. He took part in the translation of the Bible by Luther,

and wrote *Præfatio in Epistolas divi Pauli Apostoli, ad Corinthios*, etc. (Erfurt, 1520, 4to):—*Epitome Judicii J. Jonæ, præpos. Wittemb., de corrigendis cærimoniis* (1523):—*Annotationes J. Jonæ in Acta Apostolorum* (Wittemb. 1524, Basle, 1525):—*Vom alten u. neuen Gott, Glauben u. Lehre* (Wittenb. 1526):—*Welch die rechte Kirche, und dagegen welch d. falsche Kirche ist* (Wittenb. 1534, 4to):—*Oratio Justi Jonæ, doct. theol., de Studiis Theologicis* (Wittemb. 1539; Melancthon, *Select. Declamat.* i, 23):—*Des xx Psalms Auslegung* (Wittemberg, 1546):—*Kurze Historia v. Luthers biblischen u. geistlichen Anfechtungen* (in Luther's *Works*); etc. He also published a number of translations into German, especially of works of Luther and Melancthon; also translations from German into Latin. See Reinhard, *Commentatio hist. theolog. de Vita et Obitu Justi Jonæ*, etc. (Weimar, 1731); Knapp, *Narratio de Justo Jona*, etc. (Halle, 1817, 4to); Ersch u. Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyklop.*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 1 sq.; Pressel, *Leben u. ausgew. Schriften d. Vaters u. Begründers. d. luther. Kirche* (1862), vol. viii.

Jonas, Ludwig, one of the ablest German theologians of our day, was born at Neustadt a. O. February 11, 1797. During the Franco-Prussian war of 1812–1815 he fought against the foreign invader, but as soon as peace dawned on his native land he resumed his theological studies under the celebrated Schleiermacher, of whom he was one of the most prominent and faithful followers. After preaching at different places, he removed to Berlin in 1834, and soon secured a place in the foreground among Berlin's large array of theological writers. He published Schleiermacher's MSS.: his philosophical *Essays and Dissertations* in 1835, the *Dialectic* in 1839, *Morals* in 1843, *Letters* in 1858. He died Sept. 19, 1859. Jonas was one of the founders of the *Monatsschrift* of the United Church of Prussia (comprising the Reformed and Lutheran churches at that time. See art. PRUSSIA).

Jon'athan (Heb. *Yonathan,'* יוֹנָתָן, 1 Sam. xiii, 2, 3, 16, 22; xiv, 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 17, 21, 27, 29, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49; xix, 1; 1 Kings i, 42, 43; 1 Chron. ii, 32, 33; x, 2; xi, 34; Ezra viii, 6; x, 15; Neh. xii, 11, 14, 35; Jer. xl, 8; Sept. Ἰωνάθαν), a contracted form of JEHONATHAN (יְהוֹנָתָן, q. d. *Theodore*, 1 Chron. xxvii, 25; 2 Chron. xvii, 8; Neh. xii, 18; Anglicized "Jonathan" elsewhere, Judg. xviii, 30; 1 Sam. xiv, 6, 8; xviii, 1, 3, 4; xix, 1, 2, 4, 6, 7; xx, 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42; xxiii, 16, 18; xxxi, 2; 2 Sam. i, 4, 5, 12, 17, 22, 23, 25, 26; iv, 4; ix, 1, 3, 6, 7; xv, 27, 36; xvii, 17 20; xxi, 7, 12, 13, 14, 21; xxiii, 32; 1 Chron. viii, 33, 34; ix, 39, 40; xx, 7; xxvii, 32; Jer. xxxvii, 15, 20; xxxviii, 26; Sept. Ἰωνάθαν), the name of fifteen or more men in the canonical Scriptures, besides several in the Apocrypha and Josephus.

1. A Levite descended from Gershom, the son of Moses (Judg. xviii, 30). It is indeed said, in our Masoretic copies, that the Gershom from whom this Jonathan sprang was "the son of Manasseh;" but it is on very good grounds supposed that in the name Moses (מֹשֶׁה), the single letter *n* (נ) has been interpolated (and it is usually written *suspended*, Buxtorf, *Tiber.* p. 14), changing it into Manasseh (מְנַשֶּׁה), in order to save the character of the great lawgiver from the stain of having an idolater among his immediate descendants (*Baba Bathra*, 109, *b*). The singular name Gershom, and the date of the transaction, go far to establish this view. Accordingly the Vulgate, and some copies of the Septuagint, actually exhibit the name of Moses instead of Manasseh. (See Clarke's *Comment.* ad loc.) The history of this Jonathan is involved in the narrative which occupies Judges xvii, xviii, and is one of the two accounts which form a sort of appendix to that book. The events themselves appear to have occurred soon after the death of Joshua, and of the elders who outlived him, when the government was in a most unsettled state. Its proper place in the chronological order would have been between the second and third chapters of the book. B.C. cir. 1590.

Jonathan, who was resident at Bethlehem, lived at a time when the dues of the sanctuary did not afford a livelihood to the numerous Levites who had a claim upon them, and belonged to a tribe destitute of the landed possessions which gave to all others a sufficient maintenance. He therefore went forth to seek his fortune. In Mount Ephraim he came to "a house of gods," which had been established by one Micah, who wanted nothing but a priest to make his establishment complete. See MICAH. This person made Jonathan what was manifestly considered the handsome offer of engaging him as his priest for his victuals, a yearly suit of clothes, and ten shekels (about six dollars) a year in money. Here he lived for some time, till the Danite spies, who were sent by their tribe to explore the north, passed this way and formed his acquaintance. When, not long after, the body of armed Danites passed the same way in going to settle near the sources of the Jordan, the spies mentioned Micah's establishment to them, on which they went and took away not only "the ephod, the teraphim, and the graven image," but the priest also, that they might set up the same worship in the place of which they were going to take possession. Micah vainly protested against this robbery; but Jonathan himself was glad at the improvement in his prospects, and from that time, even down to the captivity, he and his descendants continued to be priests of the Danites in the town of Laish, the name of which was changed to Dan.

There is not any reason to suppose that this establishment, whether in the hands of Micah or of the Danites, involved an apostasy from Jehovah. It appears rather to have been an attempt to localize or domesticate his presence, under those symbols and forms of service which were common among the neighboring nations, but were forbidden to the Hebrews. The offence here was twofold—the establishment of a sacred ritual different from the only one which the law recognised, and the worship by symbols, naturally leading to idolatry, with the ministration of one who could not legally be a priest, but only a Levite, and under circumstances in which no Aaronic priest could legally have officiated. It is more than likely that this establishment was eventually merged in that of the golden calf, which Jeroboam set up in this place, his choice of which may very possibly have been determined by its being already in possession of "a house of gods."

The Targum of R. Joseph, on 1 Chron. xxiii, 16, identifies this Jonathan with Shebuel, the son of Gershom, who is there said to have repented (שָׁב בִּתְיוּבָא) in his old age, and to have been appointed by David as chief over his treasures. All this arises from a play upon the name Shebuel, from which this meaning is extracted in accordance with a favorite practice of the Targumist.

2. Second of the two sons of Jada, and grandson of Jerahmeel, of the family of Judah; as his brother Jether died without issue, this branch of the line was continued through the two sons of Jonathan (1 Chron. ii, 32, 33). B.C. considerably post 1612.

3. The eldest son of king Saul and the bosom friend of David (Josephus Ἰωνάθης, *Ant.* vi, 6, 1). He first appears some time after his father's accession (1 Sam. xiii, 2). If his younger brother Ishbosheth was forty at the time of Saul's death (2 Sam. ii, 8), Jonathan must have been at least thirty when he is first mentioned. Of his own family we know nothing except the birth of one son, five years before his death (2 Sam. iv, 4). He was regarded in his father's lifetime as heir to the throne. Like Saul, he was a man of great strength and activity (2 Sam. i, 23), of which the exploit at Michmash was a proof. He was also famous for the peculiar martial exercises in which his tribe excelled—archery and slinging (1 Chron. xii, 2). His bow was to him what the

spear was to his father: "the *bow* of Jonathan turned not back" (2 Sam. i, 22). It was always about him (1 Sam. xviii, 4; xx, 35). It is through his relation with David that he is chiefly known to us, probably as related by his descendants at David's court. But there is a background, not so clearly given, of his relation with his father. From the time that he first appears he is Saul's constant companion. He was always present at his father's meals. As Abner and David seem to have occupied the places afterwards called the captaincies of "the host" and "of the guard," so he seems to have been (as Hushai afterwards) "the friend" (comp. 1 Sam. xx, 25; 2 Sam. xv, 37). The whole story implies, without expressing, the deep attachment of the father and son. Jonathan can only go on his dangerous expedition (1 Sam. xiv, 1) by concealing it from Saul. Saul's vow is confirmed, and its tragic effect deepened, by his feeling for his son, "though it be Jonathan my son" (ibid. xiv, 39). "Tell me what thou hast done" (ibid. xiv, 43). Jonathan cannot bear to believe his father's enmity to David: "My father will do nothing, great or small, but that he will show it to me: and why should my father hide this thing from me? it is not so" (1 Sam. xx, 2). To him, if to any one, the wild frenzy of the king was amenable—"Saul hearkened unto the voice of Jonathan" (1 Sam. xix, 6). Their mutual affection was indeed interrupted by the growth of Saul's insanity. Twice the father would have sacrificed the son: once in consequence of his vow (1 Sam. xiv); the second time, more deliberately, on the discovery of David's flight; and on this last occasion, a momentary glimpse is given of some darker history. Were the phrases "son of a perverse rebellious woman"—"shame on thy mother's nakedness" (1 Sam. xx, 30, 31), mere frantic invectives? or was there something in the story of Ahinoam or Rizpah which we do not know? "In fierce anger" Jonathan left the royal presence (ib. 34). But he cast his lot with his father's decline, not with his friend's rise, and "in death they were not divided" (2 Sam. i, 23; 1 Sam. xxiii, 16).

1. The first main part of his career is connected with the war with the Philistines, commonly called, from its locality, "the war of Michmash" (1 Sam. xiii, 21, Sept.), as the last years of the Peloponnesian War were called, for a similar reason, "the war of Decelea." In the previous war with the Ammonites (1 Sam. xi, 4–15) there is no mention of him; and his abrupt appearance, without explanation, in xiii, 2, may seem to imply that some part of the narrative has been lost. B.C. 1073. He is already of great importance in the state. Of the 3000 men of whom Saul's standing army was formed (xiii, 2; xxiv, 2; xxvi, 1, 2), 1000 were under the command of Jonathan at Gibeah. The Philistines were still in the general command of the country; an officer was stationed at Geba, either the same as Jonathan's position or close to it. In a sudden act of youthful daring, as when Tell rose against Gessler, or as in sacred history Moses rose against the Egyptian, Jonathan slew this officer (Auth. Vers. "garrison," Sept. τὸν Νασίβ, 1 Sam. xiii, 3, 4. See Ewald, ii, 476), and thus gave the signal for a general revolt. Saul took advantage of it, and the whole population rose. But it was a premature attempt. The Philistines poured in from the plain, and the tyranny became more deeply rooted than ever. See SAUL. Saul and Jonathan (with their immediate attendants) alone had arms, amidst the general weakness and disarming of the people (1 Sam. xiii, 22). They were encamped at Gibeah, with a small body of 600 men, and as they looked down from that height on the misfortunes of their country, and of their native tribe especially, they wept aloud (Sept. ἔκλαιον, 1 Sam. xiii, 16).

From this oppression, as Jonathan by his former act had been the first to provoke it, so now he was the first to deliver his people. On the former occasion Saul had been equally with himself involved in the responsibility of the deed. Saul "blew the trumpet;" Saul had "smitten the officer of the Philistines" (xiii, 3, 4). But now it would seem that Jonathan was resolved to undertake the whole risk himself. "The day," the day fixed by him (Sept. γίνεται ἡ ἡμέρα, 1 Sam. xiv, 1), approached; and without communicating his project to any one, except the young man, whom, like all the chiefs of that age, he retained as his armor-bearer, he sallied forth from Gibeah to attack the garrison of the Philistines stationed on the other side of the steep defile of Michmash (xiv, 1). His words are short, but they breathe exactly the ancient and peculiar spirit of the Israelitish warrior: "Come, and let us go over unto the garrison of these uncircumcised; it may be that Jehovah will work for us; for there is no restraint to Jehovah to save by many or by few." The answer is no less characteristic of the close friendship of the two young men, already like that which afterwards sprang up between Jonathan and David. "Do all that is in thine heart; . . . . behold, *I* am with thee, as thy heart is my heart (Sept., 1 Sam. xiv, 7)." After the manner of the time (and the more, probably, from having taken no counsel of the high-priest or any prophet before his departure), Jonathan proposed to draw an omen for their course from the conduct of the enemy. If the garrison, on seeing them, gave intimations of descending upon them, they would remain in the valley; if, on the other hand, they raised a challenge to advance, they were to accept it. The latter turned out to be the case. The first appearance of the two warriors from behind the rocks was taken by the Philistines as a furtive apparition of "the Hebrews coming forth out of the holes where they had hid themselves;" and they were welcomed with a scoffing invitation (such as the Jebusites afterwards offered to David), "Come up, and we will show you a thing" (xiv, 4–12). Jonathan immediately took them at their word. Strong and active as he was, "strong as a lion, and swift as an eagle" (2 Sam. i, 23), he was fully equal to the adventure of climbing on his hands and feet up the face of the cliff. When he came directly in view of them, with his armor-bearer behind him, they both, after the manner of their tribe (1 Chron. xii, 2), discharged a flight of arrows, stones, and pebbles from their bows, cross-bows, and slings, with such effect that twenty men fell at the first onset. A panic seized the garrison, thence spread to the camp, and thence to the surrounding hordes of marauders; an earthquake combined with the terror of the moment; the confusion increased; the Israelites who had been taken slaves by the Philistines during the last three days (Sept.) rose in mutiny; the Israelites who lay hid in the numerous caverns and deep holes in which the rocks of the neighborhood abound, sprang out of their subterranean dwellings. Saul and his little band had watched in astonishment the wild retreat from the heights of Gibeah; he now joined in the pursuit, which led him headlong after the fugitives, over the rugged plateau of Bethel, and down the pass of Beth-horon to Ajalon (xiv, 15–31). See GIBEAH. The father and son had not met on that day: Saul only conjectured his son's absence from not finding him when he numbered the people. Jonathan had not heard of the rash curse (xiv, 24) which Saul invoked on any one who ate before the evening. In the dizziness and darkness (Hebrew, 1 Sam. xiv, 27) that came on after his desperate exertions, he put forth the staff which apparently had (with his sling and bow) been his chief weapon, and tasted the honey which lay on the ground as they passed through the forest. The pursuers in general were restrained even from this slight indulgence by fear of the royal curse; but the moment that the day, with its enforced fast, was over, they flew, like Muslims at sunset during the fast of Ramadan, on the captured cattle, and devoured them, even to the brutal neglect of the law which forbade the dismemberment of the fresh carcasses with the blood. This violation of the law Saul endeavored to prevent and to expiate by erecting a large stone, which served both as a rude table and as an altar; the first altar that was raised under the monarchy. It was in the dead of night, after this wild revel was over, that he proposed that the pursuit

should be continued till dawn; and then, when the silence of the oracle of the high-priest indicated that something had occurred to intercept the divine favor, the lot was tried, and Jonathan appeared as the culprit. Jephthah's dreadful sacrifice would have been repeated; but the people interposed in behalf of the hero of that great day, and Jonathan was saved (xiv, 24-46).

2. But the chief interest of Jonathan's career is derived from the friendship with David, which began on the day of David's return from the victory over the champion of Gath, and continued till his death. It is the first Biblical instance of a romantic friendship, such as was common afterwards in Greece, and has been since in Christendom; and is remarkable both as giving its sanction to these, and as filled with a pathos of its own, which has been imitated, but never surpassed, in modern works of fiction. "The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul"—"Thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women" (1 Sam. xviii, 1; 2 Sam. i, 26). Each found in each the affection that he found not in his own family; no jealousy of rivalry between the two, as claimants for the same throne, ever interposed: "Thou shalt be king in Israel, and I shall be next unto thee" (1 Sam. xxiii, 17). The friendship was confirmed, after the manner of the time, by a solemn compact often repeated. The first was immediately on their first acquaintance. Jonathan gave David as a pledge his royal mantle, his sword, his girdle, and his famous bow (xviii, 4). His fidelity was soon called into action by the insane rage of his father against David. He interceded for his life, at first with success (1 Sam. xix, 1-7). Then the madness returned, and David fled. It was in a secret interview during this flight, by the stone of Ezel, that the second covenant was made between the two friends, of a still more binding kind, extending to their mutual posterity—Jonathan laying such emphasis on this portion of the compact as almost to suggest the belief of a slight misgiving on his part of David's future conduct in this respect. It is this interview which brings out the character of Jonathan in the liveliest colors—his little artifices—his love for both his father and his friend—his bitter disappointment at his father's unmanageable fury—his familiar sport of archery. With passionate embraces and tears the two friends parted, B.C. cir. 1062, to meet only once more (1 Sam. xx). That one more meeting was far away in the forest of Ziph, during Saul's pursuit of David. Jonathan's alarm for his friend's life is now changed into a confidence that he will escape: "He strengthened his hand in God." Finally, and for the third time, they renewed the covenant, and then parted forever (1 Sam. xxiii, 16-18). B.C. cir. 1061.

From this time forth we hear no more till the battle of Gilboa. In that battle he fell, with his two brothers and his father, and his corpse shared their fate (1 Sam. xxxi, 2, 8). B.C. 1053. His remains were buried first at Jabesh-Gilead (ib. 13), but afterwards removed with those of his father to Zelah in Benjamin (2 Sam. xxi, 12). The news of his death occasioned the celebrated elegy of David, in which, as the friend, he naturally occupies the chief place (2 Sam. i, 22, 23, 25, 26), and which seems to have been sung in the education of the archers of Judah, in commemoration of the one great archer, Jonathan: "He bade them teach the children of Judah the use of the bow" (2 Sam. i, 17, 18).

Jonathan left one son, aged five years old at the time of his death (2 Sam. iv, 4), to whom he had probably given his original name of Merib-baal, afterwards changed for Mephibosheth (comp. 1 Chron. viii, 34; ix, 40). See MEPHIBOSHETH. Through him the line of descendants was continued down to the time of Ezra (1 Chron. ix, 40), and even then their great ancestor's archery was practised among them. See DAVID.

See Niemeyer, *Charakter.* iv, 413; Herder, *Geist. der Hebr. Poesie*, ii, 287; Köster, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, ii, 366; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* ii, 530; Pareau, *Elegia Davidis*, etc. (Groning. 1829); Simon, *De amicitia Davidis et Jon.* (Hildburgh. 1739).

4. Son of Shage, a relative of Ahiam, both among David's famous warriors and descendants of Jashen of the mountains of Judah (2 Sam. xxiii, 32; 1 Chron. xi, 34). B.C. 1046. See HARARITE.

5. Son of the high-priest Abiathar, and one of the adherents to David's cause during the rebellion of Absalom (2 Sam. xv, 27, 36). He remained at En-rogel under pretence of procuring water, and reported to his master the proceedings in the camp of the insurgents (2 Sam. xvii, 20; Josephus Ἰωνάθης, *Ant.* vii, 9, 2). B.C. cir. 1023. At a later date his constancy was manifested on a similar occasion by announcing to the ambitious Adonijah the forestalment of his measures by the succession of Solomon (1 Kings i, 42, 43). B.C. cir. 1015. "On both occasions it may be remarked that he appears as the swift and trusty messenger. He is the last descendant of Eli of whom we hear anything" (Smith). See DAVID.

6. Son of Shammah (Shimeah or Shimea), and David's nephew, as well as one of his chief warriors, a position which he earned by slaying a gigantic relative of Goliath (2 Sam. xxi, 21; 1 Chron. xx, 7; Josephus Ἰωνάθης, *Ant.* vii, 12, 2). B.C. 1018. He was also made secretary of the royal cabinet (1 Chron. xxvii, 32, where דּוֹד is mistaken in the Auth. Vers. for the usual sense of "uncle"). B.C. 1014. "Jerome (*Quæst. Hebr.* on 1 Sam. xvii, 12) conjectures that this was Nathan the prophet, thus making up the eighth son, not named in 1 Chron. ii, 13-15. But this is not probable" (Smith).

7. Son of Uzziah, and steward of the agricultural revenue of David (1 Chron. xxvii, 25; Heb. and A.V. "JEHONATHAN").

8. One of the Levites sent by Jehoshaphat to aid in teaching the Law to the people (1 Chron. xvii, 8; Heb. and A.V. "JEHONATHAN").

9. A scribe whose house was converted into a prison in which Jeremiah was closely confined (Jer. xxvii, 15, 20; xxxviii, 26). B.C. 589.

10. Brother of Johanan, the son of Kareah, and associated with him in his intercourse with Gedaliah, the Babylonian governor of Jerusalem (Jer. xl, 8). B.C. 587.

11. Son of Shemaiah and priest contemporary with Joiakim (Neh. xii, 18; Heb. and A.V. "JEHONATHAN").

12. Son of Melicu and priest contemporary with Joiakim (Neh. xii, 14). B.C. between 536 and 459.

13. Father of Ebed, which latter was an Israelite of the "sons" of Adin that returned from Babylon with Ezra (Ezra viii, 6) at the head of fifty males, a number which is increased to 250 in 1 Esdr. viii, 32, where Jonathan is written Ἰωνάθας. B.C. ante 459.

14. Son of Asahel, a chief Israelite associated with Jahaziah in separating the returned exiles from their Gentile wives (Ezra x, 15). B.C. 459.

15. Son of Joiada and father of Jaddua, Jewish high-priests (Neh. xii, 11); elsewhere called JOHANAN (Neh. xii, 22), and apparently *John* by Josephus, who relates his assassination of his own brother Jesus in the Temple (*Ant.* xi, 7, 1 and 2). Jonathan, or John, was high-priest for thirty-two years, according to Eusebius and the Alexandr. Chron. (Selden, *De Success. in Pontif.* cap. vi, vii). See HIGH-PRIEST.

16. Son of Shemaiah, of the family of Asaph, and father of Zechariah, which last was one of the priests appointed to flourish the trumpets as the procession moved around the rebuilt walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 35). B.C. ante 446.

17. A son of Mattathias, and leader of the Jews in their war of independence after the death of his brother Judas Maccabæus, B.C. 161 (1 Macc. ix, 19 sq.).—Smith. See MACCABEES.

18. A son of Absalom (1 Macc. xiii, 11), sent by Simon with a force to occupy Joppa, which was already in the hands of the Jews (1 Macc. xii, 33), though prob-

ably held only by a weak garrison. Jonathan expelled the inhabitants (τοὺς ὄντας ἐν αὐτῇ; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 6, 3) and secured the city. Jonathan was probably a brother of Mattathias (2) (1 Macc. xi, 70).

19. A priest who is said to have offered up a solemn prayer on the occasion of the sacrifice made by Nehemiah after the recovery of the sacred fire (2 Macc. i, 23 sq.; compare Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* iv, 184 sq.). The narrative is interesting, as it presents a singular example of the combination of public prayer with sacrifice (Grimm, *ad* 2 *Macc.* l. c.).

20. A Sadducee at whose instigation Hyrcanus (q. v.) abandoned the Pharisees for their mild sentence against his maligner Eleazar (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 10, 6).

21. Son of Ananus, appointed Jewish high-priest, A. D. 36, by Vitellius in place of Joseph Caiaphas (*Ant.* xviii, 4, 2), and deposed after two years, when his brother Theophilus succeeded him (*ib.* 5, 2). He was reappointed by Agrippa A.D. 43, but this time he declined that honor in favor of his brother Matthias (Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 6, 4); he was sent by Cumanus to Claudius in a quarrel with the Samaritans, but appears to have been released by the emperor (*War*, ii, 12, 6 and 7); he was at last murdered by the Sicarii (*War*, ii, 13, 3). He was perhaps the high-priest whom Felix caused to be assassinated for his reproofs of his bad government (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 8, 5). (See Frankel, *Monatsschrift*, i, 589; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iii, 263, 287, 357.) See HIGH-PRIEST.

22. A common weaver, leader of the Sicarii in Cyrene, captured and put to death by the Romans after various adventures (Josephus, *War*, vii, 11, 12).

23. A Jew who challenged the Romans to single combat during the last siege, and, after slaying one combatant, Pudens, was at length killed by Priscus (Josephus, *War*, vi, 2, 10).

Jonathan ben-Anan. See JONATHAN, 21.

Jonathan ben-Uzziel, the celebrated translator of the Hebrew prophetical writings into Chaldee, a disciple of Hillel I, one of the first of those thirty disciples of Hillel who, in the language of the Talmud, "were worthy to possess the power of stopping the sun like Joshua," flourished about B.C. 30. His expositions were especially on Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, a fanciful reason for which is given in the Talmud: "When the illuminating sun arose upon the dark passages of the prophets, through this translation, the length and breadth of Palestine were agitated, and everywhere the voice of God (בת קול) or the voice of the people (vox populi vox dei) was heard asking, 'Who has disclosed these mysteries to the sons of men?' With great humility and becoming modesty Jonathan b.-Uzziel answered, 'I have disclosed the mysteries; but thou, O Lord, knowest that I have not done it to get glory for myself, or for the house of my father, but for thy glory's sake, that discussion might not increase in Israel'" (*Megilla*, 3, a). From these notices in the Talmud, it is manifest that Jonathan was only the Chaldee translator of the prophets; for it is distinctly declared in the last quoted passage that when Jonathan wished also to translate the Hagiographa (כתובים), the same voice from heaven (בת קול) emphatically forbade it (דייך), because of the great Messianic mysteries contained therein (דאית ביה קץ משיח), especially in the book of Daniel (comp. Rashi in loco). But tradition has also ascribed to him the paraphrase of the Pentateuch known under the name of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Targum of the five Megilloth.

The question of the authorship of the paraphrases will be treated in full in the article TARGUM (q. v.). We have room here only for a few points in the discussion, and will mainly speak of the work which is generally fastened upon him. Firstly, then, as to this *Paraphrase on the Prophets* (תרגום נביאים ראשנים ואחרונים), which embraces Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, its importance is not only great because it contains expositions of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, but mainly so because, dating, as it does, from a period when the Hebrew language gave place to the Aramaic dialect, and when ancient Jewish traditions and scriptural expositions were introduced in the paraphrases read during the divine services of the Jewish people, it contains very many ancient readings, which go far to explain many an obscure passage in the prophetical writings, and thus prevent false criticism and loose conjecture. A list of these various readings has been collected in the Hebrew annual entitled החלוץ (Lemburg, 1852), i, 109 sq. The paraphrase was first published in 1494, and afterwards with that of Onkelos on the Pentateuch (Venice). It is found in all the Rabbinic Bibles; also in Walton's *Biblia Polygl.* (ii, iii, and iv), and in Buxtorf's *Biblia Hebræa* (Basle, 1720, ii–iv), etc., with a Latin translation.

As to the other reputed writings of Jonathan, we have (*a*) the *Paraphrase on the Pentateuch* (תרגום יונתן על התורה); it is nothing more or less than a completed version of what is called the Jerusalem or Palestine Targum (תרגום ירושלמי), which of itself is in reality only desultory glosses on Onkelos's paraphrase. This completed version was at first called Targum Jerusalem, after the fragment on which it was based, but afterwards it obtained the name of Targum Jonathan, by erroneously resolving the abbreviation ת״י = תרגום ירושלמי into תרגום יהונתן. The additions to the work were probably not made prior to the seventh century. The work was first published in Venice 1590–91, with the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch, the paraphrase of Onkelos, the fragments of the Jerusalem glosses, the commentaries of Rashi and Jacob ben-Asher, then in Basle (1607), Hanau (1614), Amsterdam (1640), Prague (1646), etc., and has lately been printed, with a commentary, in the beautiful edition of the Pentateuch with the Rabbinic commentaries (Vienna, 1859). Explanations of it were also written by David b.-Jacob (Prague, 1609), Feiwel b.-David Secharja (Hanau, 1614), Mordecai Kremsier (Amsterdam, 1671); and it was translated into Latin by Chevallier, in Walton's *Polyglot.* An English translation was published by the late learned Wesleyan preacher, J. W. Etheridge (Lond. 1862, 2 vols. 8vo); but the masterly treatises on this Pseudo-Jonathan are by Seligsohn and Traub, and by Frankel, *Zeitschr. f. d. relig. Int. d. Judenth.* (1846), p. 100 sq. (comp. Seligsohn and Traub, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, Lpz. 1856, vi, 96–114, 138–149; Etheridge, *Introd. to Jewish Lit.* p. 195; Wiener, *De Jonathanis in Pent. paraphrasi Chaldaica;* Petermann, *De duabus Pent. paraphrasibus Chaldaicis*):—(*b*) the *Paraphrase on the Five Megilloth.* Some early critics have attributed this work to Mar Josef, of Sora (died 332), but of late it is assigned to a later period even than the paraphrase of the Pentateuch, and is considered simply a compilation from ancient materials made by several individuals. This version is generally published, together with the Hebrew text, in the Jewish editions of the Pentateuch, and is contained in all the Rabbinic Bibles. A rhymed version of the whole of this paraphrase was published by Jacob ben-Samuel, also called Koppelmann ben-Bonem (about 1584). A Latin version of it is given in Walton's *Polyglot.* Gill has given an English translation of the entire paraphrase on the Song of Songs (*Comment. on the Song*, 1728); and Dr. Ginsburg has lately translated the first chapter of the paraphrase of the Song (*Comment. on the Song*, p. 29 sq.), and the whole of Ecclesiastes (*Comment. on Eccles.* p. 503 sq.). Hebrew commentaries on this paraphrase have been written by Mordecai Lorca (Cracow, 1580) and Chajim Feiwel (Berlin, 1705). See also Bartolocci, *Biblioth. Magna Rabbinica,*

iii, 788 sq.; Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebrœa*, ii, 1159 sq.; Zunz, *Die Gottesdientl. Vorträge d. Juden*, p. 62 sq.; Geiger, *Urschrift u. Uebersetzungen d. Bibel;* Jost, *Geschichte d. Juden*, i, 269; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 105, 107; Kitto, *Cyclop. Biblical Lit.* ii, s. v.

Jon'athas (Ἰωνάθαν v. r. Ἰαθάν; Vulg. *Jonathus* v. r. *Nathan*), the Latin form of the common name Jonathan, which is preserved in the A. V. at Tob. v, 13.

Jo'nath-e'lem-recho'kim (יוֹנַת אֵלֶם רְחֹקִים, *yonath' e'lem rechokim'*, *dove of* the *dumbness of* the *distances*, i. e. the silent dove in distant places, or among strangers; Septuag. ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μεμακρυμμένου, Vulg. *pro populo qui a Sanctis longe factus est*), an enigmatical title of Psa. lvi, variously interpreted, but probably descriptive of David's solitary feelings while absent from the worship of the Temple among the Philistines; comp. Psa. xxxviii, 13; lxv, 5; lxxiv, 19. (See Alexander, *Comment.* ad loc.) The expression "upon" (עַל), preceding this phrase, would seem to indicate that it was the name or opening clause of some well-known air to which the ode was set, a supposition not inconsistent with the above appropriation. Its original application would in that case be unknown, like that of similar superscriptions of other Psalms. "Rashi considers that David employed the phrase to describe his own unhappy condition when, exiled from the land of Israel, he was living with Achish, and was an object of suspicion and hatred to the countrymen of Goliath: thus was he amongst the Philistines as a mute (אלמית) dove. Kimchi supplies the following commentary: 'The Philistines sought to seize and slay David (1 Sam. xxix, 4-11), and he, in his terror, and pretending to have lost his reason, called himself *Jonath*, even as a dove driven from her cote.' Knapp's explanation 'on the oppression of foreign rulers'—assigning to *Elem* the same meaning which it has in Exod. xv, 15—is in harmony with the contents of the psalm, and is worthy of consideration. De Wette translates 'dove of the distant terebinths,' or 'of the dove of dumbness (Stummheit) among the strangers' or 'in distant places.' According to the Septuagint, the phrase means 'on the people far removed from the holy places' (probably אֵלִם = אוּלָם, the Temple-hall; see *Orient. Literaturblatt.* p. 579, year 1841), a rendering which very nearly accords with the Chaldee paraphrase: 'On the congregation of Israel, compared with a mute dove while exiled from their cities, but who come back again and offer praise to the Lord of the Universe.' Aben-Ezra regards *Jonath-elem-rechokim* as merely indicating the modulation or the rhythm of the psalm. In the notes to Mendelssohn's version of the Psalms, *Jonath-elem-rechokim* is mentioned as a musical instrument which produced dull, mournful sounds. 'Some take it for a pipe called in Greek ἔλυμος, יונת, from יון, *Greek*, which would make the inscription read "the long Grecian pipe," but this does not appear to us admissible' (*Preface*, p. 26)" See PSALMS.

Joncourt, PETER DE, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Clermont towards the middle of the 17th century. A few years before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes he removed to Holland, and became pastor of Middelburg in 1678, and of La Haye in 1699. He died in the latter city in 1725. He was considered one of the best preachers of his day. He wrote *Entretiens sur les différentes Méthodes d'expliquer l'Ecriture et de precher de ceux qu'on appelle Coccéiens et Voétiens*, etc. (Amst. 1707, 12mo):—*Nouveaux entretiens*, etc. (Amst. 1708, 12mo); quite a controversy resulted from this work, but Joncourt was ordered by the synod of Nimeguen to desist from his attacks, and to retract, which he did in the *Lettre aux églises Wallonnes des Pays-Bas* (La Haye, 1708, 12mo):—*Pensées utiles aux Chrétiens de tous les états*, etc. (La Haye, 1710, 8vo):—*Lettres sur les Jeux de Hasard et sur l'usage de se faire céler pour éviter une visite incommode* (La Haye, 1713, 12mo), mostly against La Placette's *Divers Traités sur des matières de conscience* (Amst. 1708, 12mo), and a work which gave rise to several pamphlets on this question:—*Lettres critiques sur divers sujets importants de l'Écriture Sainte* (Amst. 1715, 12mo):—*Entretiens sur l'état présent de la Religion en France* (La Haye, 1725, 12mo). He also published a revised edition of Clement Marot and Th. de Beza's translation of the Psalms (Amsterd. 1716, 12mo). See J. G. Walch, *Biblioth. Theologica selecta*, vol. ii; *Journal des Savants*, June, 1714, p. 579; January, 1715, p. 85; February, p. 123; Quérard, *La France Littéraire;* Haag, *La France Protestante;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 901. (J. N. P.)

Jones, Benjamin (1), an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in South Carolina about 1774; entered the itinerancy in 1801; was stationed at Charleston in 1802; and died suddenly on Bladen Circuit in 1804. He was a man of much seriousness and Christian gentleness, and a very useful preacher.—*Conf. Minutes*, i, 125. (G. L. T.)

Jones, Benjamin (2), a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Sandwich, Mass., July 28, 1786; united with the Church in 1805; entered the New York Conference in 1809; was made presiding elder in 1820; was delegate to the General Conference in 1832 and in 1840; was by poor health superannuated in 1846; and died at Lincolnville, Me., July 18, 1850, aged 64. Mr. Jones was a man of more than ordinary ability and influence. His preaching was bold, sustained, and independent; dealing in truthful logic and the word of God rather than fancy, and very strong in argument. His efforts were often eloquent in the highest degree.—*Conf. Min.* iv, 606; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, chap. xlii. (G. L. T.)

Jones, Charles Colcock, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born at Liberty Hall, Ga., Dec. 20, 1804. While yet a youth he entered a large counting-house in Savannah, Ga., but when converted, in his 18th year, he decided to quit mercantile life and enter the ministry. He prepared for college at Phillips Academy, then entered Andover Seminary, and later the theological seminary at Princeton. He was licensed in 1830 by the New Brunswick Presbytery at Allentown, New Jersey, and returned to Georgia in the autumn, and shortly afterwards became missionary to the negroes of Liberty County, Ga. He soon became interested in the colored race, and during the remainder of his life sought by extensive correspondence, by his annual reports as a missionary, and by all other means in his power, to engage the attention of the Christian public to the moral condition of this class of our population. In 1835 he was elected professor of Church history and polity in the seminary at Columbia, and after having been earnestly urged to accept the chair, on the plea that he might even there continue to work for the colored people, by inciting the students to engage with him in the work, he accepted the position in 1836. But he felt restless in his new place, and in 1838 returned again to his former work. In 1847 he was re-elected to the professorship, and again prevailed upon to accept the proffered honor; he now continued in the seminary until its close in 1850. At the same time he filled the position of secretary to the Board of Missions for the South and South-west. In 1850 he removed to Philadelphia, to assume the duties of secretary of the Assembly's Board of Domestic Missions, and this position he filled until Oct. 1853, when failing health necessitated his return to Georgia. During the Rebellion he attached himself to the Southern cause. But his health was too feeble to permit much exertion, for he suffered from consumption. He died March 16, 1863. "Dr. Jones filled a large place in the esteem and affections of the Church of God. As a man there was decision and energy of character, united with great friendliness of heart, cheerfulness of disposition, activity of mind, and ease and polish of manners. Few equalled him in all that makes

up the ease and polish of the Christian gentleman. As a preacher there was much that was attractive in his appearance and manner. A delightful simplicity, ease, and unction pervaded his happiest efforts." Dr. Jones published a *Catechism of Scripture Doctr. and Practice:—Catechism on the Creed:—Hist. Catechism of the O. and N. T.;* besides several pamphlets on the *Religious Instr. of the Negro.* His *Catechism of Script. Doctrine and Practice* was extensively used, and was found so serviceable to missionaries generally that it was translated into several languages, and was made a manual for the instruction of the heathen. He also began a *History of the Church of God,* which he did not live to complete (it was published by Scribner). See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1867, p. 438. (J. H. W.)

Jones, Cornelius, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Hinsdale, Mass., May 20, 1800; was converted in Geauga Co., Ohio, Feb. 1821; entered the Pittsburg Conference in 1827; and died at Alleghanytown, Aug. 27, 1835. He was a diligent student, an able minister, and a successful evangelist.—*Conference Minutes,* ii, 483.

Jones, David (1), a Baptist minister, was born in White Clay Creek Hundred, Newcastle Co., Del., May 12, 1736. In 1758 he was converted, and soon after determined to improve his education, which had been somewhat neglected. He entered Hopewell School, and remained there three years, eagerly pursuing the study of the classic languages. In 1761 he became a licentiate, and was regularly ordained pastor in 1767 to the church at Freehold, Monmouth Co., New Jersey. In 1772 he removed to enter upon the missionary work among the Indians in Ohio. But he failed so utterly in these efforts that after the lapse of two years he returned again to his former charge. In the Revolutionary War he served as chaplain, and only resumed the regular work of the ministry at the close of the war. In 1786 he became pastor at Southampton, Pa. In 1794 he again entered the army, this time at the special request of general Wayne. He also served as chaplain during the War of 1812. He died in Chester Co., Pa., Feb. 5, 1820. See Sprague, *Annals Am. Pulpit,* vi, 85 sq.

Jones, David (2), another Baptist minister, was born in the north of Wales in April, 1785. He united with the Independent Church when about fifteen years old. Shortly after he emigrated to this country, and lived in Ohio. After a stay of two years among the Baptists, who were thickly settled in that immediate vicinity, he joined their Church, and was licensed to preach. He accepted a call to the Beaver Creek Baptist Church, teaching at the same time. From 1810 to 1813 he had no settled charge, and he travelled through several of the middle and border states, preaching from place to place. In 1813 he went to Newark, New Jersey, as pastor, from which, in 1821, he was called to assume the pastorate of the Baptist Church at "Lower Dublin," near Philadelphia, where he had preached occasionally before his departure for Newark. With this people he spent the remainder of his life. He died April 9, 1833. He was (in part) the author of a tract on Baptism, entitled *Letters of David and John,* and wrote also the tract *Salvation by Grace,* published by the Baptist General Tract Society. See Sprague, *Annals Am. Pulpit,* vi, 518 sq.

Jones, Greenbury R., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Brownsville, Pa., April 7, 1784; was converted in August, 1803; entered the itinerancy at Steubenville, Ohio, in 1818; was presiding elder on Scioto District in 1821; Miami District in 1827; Portland District in 1832; but superannuated in that year, and so remained until 1839; and died at Marietta Conference Sept. 20, 1844. Mr. Jones was a zealous and capable minister, of fine tact and sound judgment. He was several times secretary of the Ohio Conference, nine years presiding elder, and twice delegate to the General Conference. He was faithful in all things, and much beloved.—*Minutes of Conferences,* iii, 651; Sprague, *Annals Am. Pulpit,* vii, 587. (G. L. T.)

Jones, Griffith, a Welsh divine, generally known as the Welsh Apostle, was born at Kilreddis, Caermarthenshire, in 1684. His parents, who were eminently pious, took great pains to imbue the mind of their son from his earliest years with impressions of religion. The serious turn which they thus gave to his mind inclined him towards the Christian ministry. At the completion of his theological studies he was ordained by bishop Bull, Sept. 19, 1708, and shortly after appointed to the rectory of Llanddowror by Sir John Philips, whose own religious character made him anxious to secure the services of a man of piety and learning like Jones. "In this situation," says Middleton (*Evangelical Biography,* s. v.), "he soon developed all the best qualities of a man of God, and a most eloquent and evangelical preacher. Christ was all to him; and it was his greatest delight to publish and exalt the unsearchable riches of his Redeemer's righteousness. Nor was he less blessed in his private plans of doing good. He founded among his countrymen free schools, and by this means more than a hundred and fifty thousand poor people were taught to read. He also circulated thirty thousand copies of the Welsh Bible among them, besides other religious and useful books. His humility gave lustre to all these labors of love. On his dying bed he said, 'I must bear witness to the goodness of God to me. Blessed be God, his comforts fill my soul.' He died in April, 1761. It may be truly said of Griffith Jones that few lives were more heavenly and useful, and few deaths more triumphant." Jones also wrote and published several religious treatises in Welsh and English, of which many thousands were distributed as had been the Bible. See Jamieson, *Cyclop. Relig. Biog.* p. 289; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors,* vol. ii, s. v.

Jones, Horatio Gates (son of David Jones, 1), also a Baptist minister, was born at Easttown, Chester County, Pa., Feb. 11, 1777. His early education was quite thorough, and remarkably so for a young man destined for agricultural life. Gifted with great fluency of speech, young Jones became "the politician" of his own immediate vicinity, and before he had reached his majority enjoyed the prospect of preferment in political life. Just about this time he became conscious, however, of his responsibility to his Maker, and, believing himself to have been the subject of spiritual renovation, he made public declaration of his belief, June 24, 1798, and determined to devote his life to the Christian ministry. He was licensed Sept. 26, 1801, and called to Salem, New Jersey, Feb. 13, 1802. In 1805 his health became enfeebled, and he was obliged to resign, however reluctantly, the charge. Hereafter he devoted himself to farm life on a place which he bought on the banks of the Schuylkill River, about five miles above Philadelphia. But Jones had engaged too heartily in the cause of his Master not to be tempted to re-enter the work of the Christian ministry whenever his health should warrant the task. At first he went to different places from time to time and preached; finally he made "Thomson's Meeting-house" at Lower Merion, Montgomery County, belonging to the Presbyterians, his head-quarters, and he succeeded, after several years of ardent labor, in building up there a Baptist Church, which he served until the end of his earthly days, Dec. 12, 1853. Mr. Jones held a prominent position in the board of trustees of the University of Lewisburg, Pa., and was at one time its chancellor. This high school conferred on him the degree of D.D. The degree of M.A. he received from Brown University in 1812. He was also a member of the Baptist Board of Missions, and was at one time (1829) president of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, of which society he published a *History* in 1823, and held a co-editorship of the *Latter-day Luminary,* an early Baptist missionary magazine. Indeed, we are told that "few men of his

day have written so much and so well, and published so little." See Sprague, *Annals Am. Pulpit*, vi, 452 sq.

Jones, Jeremiah, a learned English dissenting minister, was born, as is supposed, of parents in opulent circumstances, in the north of England, in 1693. After finishing his education under the Rev. Samuel Jones, of Tewksbury, who was also the tutor of Chandler, Butler, Secker, and many other distinguished divines, he became minister of a congregation at Forest Green, in Gloucestershire, where he also kept an academy. He died in 1734. His works are as follows: *A Vindication of the former Part of the Gospel by Matthew from Mr. Whiston's Charge of Dislocation*, etc. (London, 1719, 8vo; Salop, 1721, 8vo, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1803):—also, *A new and full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament* (London, 1726, 2 vols. 8vo; vol. iii, 1727, 8vo; Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1798, 3 vols. 8vo, and since). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* (London); *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. xxiii; *Monthly Magazine*, April, 1803; Allibone, *Dict. of English and American Authors*, ii, 988.

Jones, Joel, a celebrated lay writer on theological subjects, and jurist by profession, was born of Puritan ancestry at Coventry, Conn., Oct. 26, 1795, and educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1817. He was one of the judges of the Philadelphia District Court, and later mayor of Philadelphia. In 1848 he was elected president of Girard College, and he held that position for two years. He died Feb. 3, 1860. Distinguished for his great legal abilities, judge Jones deserves a place in our work on account of his extended researches in the Biblical department. His acquirements extended far beyond the widest range of professional attainment. Judge Jones wrote extensively for literary journals and quarterlies; he also published largely. Of special interest to the theological student are, *Story of Joseph, or Patriarchal Age* (originally published for the use of Girard College students):—*The Knowledge of One Another in the Future State*:—*Notes on Scripture* (published by his widow, Phila. 1860). He also edited several English works on Prophecy, which he published under the title of *Literalist* (5 vols. 8vo), enriched with many valuable additions of his own; and translated from the French, *Outlines of a History of the Court of Rome and of the Temporal Power of the Popes* (to which he appended many original notes). Judge Jones was a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church, and held positions in various ecclesiastical boards, where his services were greatly prized. See *Princeton Review*, Index, ii, 219 sq.

Jones, John (1), an English Roman Catholic theologian, was born at London in 1575. He studied at St. John's College, Oxford, where he roomed with Laud, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury. Having turned Roman Catholic, he went to Spain, completed his studies at the University of Compostello, and became a Benedictine under the name of *Leander a Sancto-Martino*. After teaching for a while Hebrew and theology in the College of St. Vedast, he returned to England at the invitation of Laud, and died at London, Dec. 17, 1636. He wrote *Sacra Ars Memoriæ, ad Scripturas divinas in promptu habendas accomodata* (Douay, 1623, 8vo):—*Conciliatio locorum communium totius Scripturæ* (Douay, 1623, 8vo). He also published some editions of the Bible, with interlinear glosses (6 vols. fol.); of the works of Blosius; of Arnobe, *Adversus Gentes* (Douay, 1634); and worked with P. Reyner on the *Apostolatus Benedictinorum*. See Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. i; Dodd, *Ch. History*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 905. (J. N. P.)

Jones, John (2), an English Protestant divine, was born in 1700. He was educated at Worcester College, Oxford, and ordained in 1726. Having become vicar of Aconbury, he resigned in 1751, to take the rectory of Boulne Hurat, Bedfordshire. His death was caused by a fall from his horse; the time of its occurrence is not recorded. He wrote [Anon.] *Free and candid Disquisitions relating to the Church of England*, etc. (Lond. 1749-50, 8vo): this work produced a great controversy, lasting several years:—*Cursory Animadversions upon "Free and Candid Disquisitions,"* etc. (Lond. 1753, 8vo):—*Catholic Faith and Practice* (1765). See Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*; *London Gentl. Magazine*, lxxxi, pt. i, p. 510 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth.* ii, s. v.

Jones, John (3), LL.D., a Welsh Socinian divine and philological writer, was born in Caermarthenshire, and educated at the Unitarian New College, Hackney. In 1792 Mr. Jones was appointed classical and mathematical teacher in the Welsh Academy, Swansea, which situation he held about three years, and then settled at Plymouth Dock over the Unitarian congregation. In 1797 he became minister of the Unitarian congregation at Halifax, in Yorkshire, and about 1800 he removed to London, where he resided during the remainder of his life, chiefly occupied as a classical teacher, and preaching only occasionally. He died January 10, 1827. A few years before his death he received the diploma of LL.D. from the University of Aberdeen. Dr. Jones was the author of several works, some of which are religious, chiefly in support or defence of the evidences of Christianity. Of these the most important are *Illustrations of the Four Gospels, founded on circumstances peculiar to our Lord and the Evangelists* (Lond. 1808, 8vo):—*Ecclesiastical Researches, or Philo and Josephus proved to be historians and apologists of Christ*, etc. (London, 1812—a sequel, 1813, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Epistle to the Romans analyzed* (1802, 8vo):—*New Version of the Epistles to the Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and the general Epistle of James* (1819-20, 12mo):—*New Version of the first three Chapters of Genesis* (1819, 8vo). He also wrote a number of philological works which are considered valuable. It may not be out of place here to state that Dr. Jones was the first English philologian who taught Greek by the medium of the English instead of the Latin. See *Lond. Gentl. Mag.* April, 1827; *Engl. Cyclop.* s. v.; Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth.* ii, s. v.

Jones, John M., a Methodist Episcopal minister and native of England, was born about 1810. He was educated a Romanist in France, and while young emigrated first to Canada and then to Maryland, where he was a teacher in a Romish institution in St. George's County. He was converted to Protestantism in 1834, and two years after entered the Baltimore Conference, and "for twenty years pursued the ministerial calling, laboring day and night with quenchless zeal to rescue souls from death." He died at South Baltimore Station April 20, 1855. He "was a man of rare excellence and many virtues," of deep piety, and an able and devoted minister.—*Conf. Minutes*, vi, 201. (G. L. T.)

Jones, John Taylor, D.D., a Baptist missionary, was born at New Ipswich, N. H., July 16, 1802. He graduated at Amherst College in 1825; studied theology at Andover and Newton Seminary; and, having joined the Baptist Church in 1828, was the following year appointed a missionary to Burmah. He arrived at Maulmain, his destined place of labor, in Feb. 1831, and, after having mastered the Taling and Siamese languages, he was chosen to go to the kingdom of Siam, and reached Bangkok in April, 1833. After a successful mission, he left Siam in 1839, on account of his children, went to Singapore, and thence on a visit to the United States. After returning to Siam for six years he came home again in 1846, and in the fall of 1847 went away for the last time. He died at Bankok Sept. 13, 1851. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him a few years before his death. Dr. Jones published three tracts in Siamese, 1834; and a translation of the New Testament in the same language, Oct. 1843. The Rev. William Dean says of Dr. Jones's qualifications for the missionary work, "Take him altogether, I have never seen his equal; and among more than a hundred men I have met

among the heathen, I would select Dr. Jones as the model missionary."—Sprague, *Annals Am. Pulpit*, vi, 772.

Jones, Joseph Huntington, D.D., an able Presbyterian minister, and brother of judge Joel (see above), was born at Coventry, Conn., Aug. 24, 1797, and graduated at Harvard College in 1817. After teaching a short time at Bowdoin College, he decided on the ministry for his life-work, and entered Princeton Theological Seminary. His first charge he entered June 1, 1824, at Woodbury, New Jersey. The year following, after a most successful work on the small and feeble charge, he was called to New Brunswick, and was installed the second Wednesday of July, 1825. In 1838 he removed to Philadelphia, to take charge of the Sixth Presbyterian Church in that city, and he continued his relation there for twenty-three years. "Beginning with a church reduced so low that a resuscitation was deemed well-nigh impossible, and struggling with difficulties that would have discouraged ordinary men, a manifest blessing crowned his efforts." In 1861, finding that the secretaryship of the committee on the "fund for disabled ministers," etc., which he had filled nearly for seven years in connection with his pastoral duties, was of itself onerous enough in its duties, he resigned his position as pastor, and devoted himself hereafter entirely to this noble cause of providing for those of his brethren who were in need of assistance. He died Dec. 22, 1868, in the midst of his work, "suddenly, as it were with the harness on." In 1843 Lafayette College conferred on him the degree of D.D. Dr. Jones published *Revivals of Religion* (Phila. 1839):—*Effects of Physical Causes on Christian Experience* (1846, and often, 18mo):—*Memoir of the Rev. Ashbel Green, D.D.* (N. Y. 1849, 8vo):—*History of the Revival at New Brunswick in* 1837; and several of his sermons and essays.—*Princeton Review*, Index, vol. ii, 222 sq.

Jones, Lot, D.D., a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Brunswick, Maine, Feb. 21, 1797, and was educated at Bowdoin College, Maine, where he graduated in 1821. Joining the Protestant Episcopal Church, he studied for the ministry under bishop Griswold, and was by him ordained deacon January, 1823, and priest September, 1823. In 1823 he was settled at Marblehead and Marshfield, Mass.; in 1825 at Macon, Ga.; in 1827 at Savannah; in 1828 at Gardiner, Maine; in 1829 at South Leicester, Mass.; and in January, 1833, he removed to New York, and took charge of the new mission church of the Epiphany. Here his humility, single-hearted devotion to his one great work, and untiring industry, made his ministry remarkably effective. In 1858 he published his 25th anniversary discourse. During those 25 years he baptized 2501—253 adults and 2248 children, married 759 couples, presented 915 for confirmation, enrolled 1494 as communicants, and attended 1362 funerals. He died in Philadelphia Oct. 12, 1865. His death was the result of accident in falling upon the pavement at St. Luke's Church, where he was in attendance upon the meeting of the Board of Missions.—*Church Review*, Jan. 1866, p. 669.

Jones, Robert C., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Petersburg, Va., Dec. 23, 1808. He graduated at William and Mary's College in 1828, studied law and was ready for practice, when he was converted in 1833, and at once prepared for the ministry. He entered the Virginia Conference in 1836, and died Aug. 2, 1838. Mr. Jones was a man of good abilities, much modesty, and a consistent witness of sanctifying grace. He was a dignified and conscientious minister, and a very successful evangelist.—*Conf. Minutes*, ii, 667.

Jones, Samuel, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born in Glamorganshire, South Wales, Jan. 14, 1735, and was brought by his parents to this country during his infancy, and was educated in the College of Philadelphia, where he received the degree of M.A. May 18, 1762, and turned his attention to the study of theology. He was ordained in January, 1763, and became pastor of the united churches of Pennepek and Southampton. In the same year he, by request, remodelled the draft of the charter of a college in Newport, R. I., which institution afterwards became Brown University. In 1770 he resigned the care of the Southampton Church, and devoted himself thereafter to that of Pennepek, afterwards called Lower Dublin. He received the honorary degree of M.A. from the College of Rhode Island in 1769, and that of D.D. from the College of Pennsylvania in 1788. While attending faithfully to his ministerial labors, he also devoted much time to teaching, in which he was very successful. He died Feb. 7, 1814. Dr. Jones made several compilations for divers associations in which he filled high offices, and published some occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 104 sq.

Jones, Thomas, an English divine, was born in 1729, and educated at Queen's College, Cambridge. He was chaplain at St. Savior's, Southwark, and is noted for his deep piety and great exertions in behalf of the conversion of the masses at a time when the English pulpit was in that deep lethargy from which Wesley and his coadjutors first earnestly aroused it. Like the Wesleyans, he met with much opposition in his noble efforts, and "his sweetness of natural temper," says his biographer, "great as it was, would never have supported him under the numberless insults he met with had it not been strengthened, as well as adorned, by a sublimer influence." His health finally gave way under his extraordinary labors, and he died, while yet a young man, in 1761.—Middleton, *Evang. Biog.* iv, 380.

Jones, William, M.A., F.R.S., of Nayland, as he is generally called, was born at Lowick, in Northamptonshire, July 30, 1726. He was educated at the Charter House and University College, Oxford. He there became a convert to the philosophy of Hutchinson, and, having induced Mr. Horne, afterwards bishop of Norwich, to adopt the same system, together they became the principal champions of that philosophy. He was admitted to deacon's orders after having received the degree of B.A., in 1749. In 1751 he was ordained priest by the bishop of Lincoln, and on quitting the university became curate of Finedon, and afterwards of Wadsohoe, both in his native county. In 1764 archbishop Secker presented him to the vicarage of Bethersden, in Kent, and in the next year to the rectory of Pluckley, in the same county. In 1776 he took up his residence at Nayland, in Suffolk, where he held the perpetual curacy; and soon after he exchanged his living of Pluckley for the rectory of Paston, in Northamptonshire. In 1780 he became fellow of the Royal Society of London. During many years he was engaged in the composition of a treatise on philosophy, which was intended to elucidate his favorite system. In that work he displayed great learning and ingenuity, as well as ardent attachment to the interests of piety and virtue, united with the eccentric peculiarities of the Hutchinsonian school. Alarmed at the progress of radical and revolutionary opinions during the French Revolution, he employed his pen in opposition to the advocates of such destructive principles, and his writings were widely circulated by the friends of the British government. He treated with equal success questions of theology, morals, literature, philosophy, and, in addition to all these, showed great talents in musical composition. "He was a man of quick penetration," says bishop Horsley, "of extensive learning, and the soundest piety, and he had the talent of writing upon the deepest subjects for the plainest understanding." In the year 1792 he met with a severe loss in the death of his most intimate friend, bishop Horne, to whom he was chaplain. Being now of advanced age, and obliged, by his growing infirmities, to discontinue his practice of taking pupils, that he might not be subjected to inconvenience from the diminution of his income, in the year 1798 the archbishop of Canterbury presented him to the sinecure rectory of Hollingbourn in Kent, which, however, he did not live long

to enjoy, dying Feb. 6, 1800, in consequence of a paralytic stroke. His most important works are, *A full Answer to Bp. Clayton's Essay on Spirit* (1753, 8vo):—*Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity proved from Scripture* (1757):—*Course of Lectures on the Figurative Language of the Holy Scriptures* (1787, 8vo):—*Sermons* (1790, 2 vols. 8vo):—*The Scholar armed against the Errors of the Times* (2 vols. 8vo):—*Memoirs of the Life, Studies, and Writings of George Horne* (1795 and 1799, 8vo). The most complete collection of his works is that in 12 vols. 8vo (Lond. 1801). The theological and miscellaneous works were republished separately (London, 1810, 6 vols. 8vo). Two posthumous volumes of sermons were published for the first time in 1830 (London, 8vo). See W. Stevens, *Life of W. Jones* (1801), Aikin, *Gen. Biography;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxvi, 908; Buck; Davenport; Darling, *Cyclopædia Bibliog.* ii, 1682. (E. de P.)

Jones, Sir William, an eminent poet, scholar, and lawyer, was born in London Sept. 28, 1746, and was sent to Harrow in 1753, where he soon eclipsed all his fellows, particularly in classical knowledge. In 1764 he was entered at University College, Oxford, where he was enabled to gratify that desire for a knowledge of the Oriental languages which had shown itself during the last two years of his residence at Harrow. In 1765 he left Oxford, to become tutor to the eldest son of earl Spencer, with whom he travelled on the Continent. In 1770 he was admitted to the Inner Temple, and the same year he published, at the request of the king of Denmark, a *Life of Nadir Shah*, translated into French from the Persian; in the following year a *Persian Grammar*, republished some years ago, with corrections and additions, by the late professor Lee; and in 1774 his *Commentaries on Asiatic Poetry*, republished by Eichhorn at Leipsic in 1776. In 1776 he was made a commissioner of bankrupts. In 1780 he completed a translation of seven Arabic poems, known as the *Moallákat;* wrote an essay *On the Legal Mode of Suppressing Riots*, and another, entitled *Essay on the Law of Bailments*, and two or three odes. In March, 1783, Jones obtained a judgeship in the Supreme Court of Judicature in Bengal, and landed at Calcutta in September. He at once set about the acquisition and promulgation of the knowledge of Oriental languages, literature, and customs. He established the Royal Asiatic Society "for investigating the history, antiquities, arts, sciences, and literature of Asia," of which he was the first president. To the volumes of the *Asiatic Researches* Sir William contributed largely. Besides these, he wrote and published a story in verse, called *The Enchanted Fruit, or the Hindu Wife;* and a translation of an ancient Indian drama, called *Sacontala, or the Fatal Ring*. A translation by him of the Ordinances of Menu (q. v.) appeared in 1794. He was busily employed on a digest of the Hindu and Mohammedan laws, when he was attacked with an inflammation of the liver, which terminated fatally April 27, 1794. Sir Wm. Jones was one of the first linguists and Oriental scholars that Great Britain has produced, being more or less acquainted with no less than twenty-eight different languages. His poems are always elegant, often animated, and their versification is mellifluous. His learning was extensive, his legal knowledge was profound, and he was an enlightened and zealous champion of constitutional principles. He was also an earnest Christian. To devotional exercises he was habitually attentive. In addition to the above works, Sir William Jones published a translation of Isæus; and also translations of two Mohammedan law tracts *On the Law of Inheritance*, and of *Succession to Property of Intestates:—Tales and Fables by Nizami:—Two Hymns to Pracriti;* and *Extracts from the Vedas*. The East India Company erected a monument to his memory in St. Paul's Cathedral, and a statue in Bengal. A complete edition of his works, in 6 vols. 4to, was published by lady Jones in 1799; and another appeared, in 13 vols. 8vo, in 1807, with a life of the author by lord Teignmouth.

Jonsson, Finn (known also by the Latin name of *Finnus Johannæus*), the historian of the Icelandic Church and literature, was born on the 16th of January, 1704, at Hitardal, in Iceland, where his father, Jon Haldorsson, was minister. He was educated at the School of Skalholt, and in 1725 passed to the University of Copenhagen. On his return to Iceland his intention was to become a lawyer, but the death of his uncle, a parish priest, who left behind him a numerous family of small children, led his father to request him to alter his views to the Church, that he might bring up the orphans. He obtained the vacant benefice, brought up the family, married, and in 1754 was appointed to the bishopric of Skalholt. He was very attentive to the revenues of his diocese, and the account of his episcopate by Pétursson is chiefly occupied with his disputes with refractory tenants of Church property. He died on the 23d of July, 1789. He composed several works in Latin and Icelandic, especially a *Historia Ecclesiastica Islandiæ*, first published with valuable additions by his son Finnson (Copenhagen, 1772–8, 4 vols. 4to), and continued by Pétursson down to 1840 (ib. 1841), a valuable and interesting work, embracing the literary as well as ecclesiastical affairs of Iceland.—*English Cyclop.* s. v.

Jop'pa (Heb. *Yapho'*, יָפוֹ, Josh. xix, 46; 2 Chron. ii, 16; Jonah i, 3, or יָפוֹא, Ezra iii, 7; *beauty;* Sept., N. T., and Josephus Ἰόππη, other Greek writers Ἰόππη, Ἰώπη, or Ἰόπη; Vulgate *Joppe;* Auth. Vers. "Japho," except in Jonah; usually "Joppe" in the Apocrypha), a town on the south-west coast of Palestine, the port of Jerusalem in the days of Solomon, as it has been ever since.

1. *Legends.*—The etymology of the name is variously explained; Rabbinical writers deriving it from *Japhet*, but classical geographers from *Iopa* (Ἰόπη), daughter of Æolus and wife of Cepheus, Andromeda's father, its reputed founder; others interpreting it "the watch-tower of joy," and so forth (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 864). The fact is, that, from its being a sea-port, it had a profane as well as a sacred history. Pliny, following Mela (*De situ Orb.* i, 12), says that it was of antediluvian antiquity (*Hist. Nat.* v, 14); and even Sir John Maundeville, in the 14th century, bears witness—though, it must be confessed, a clumsy one—to that tradition (*Early Travels in P.* p. 142). According to Josephus, it originally belonged to the Phœnicians (*Ant.* xiii, 15, 4). Here, writes Strabo, some say Andromeda was exposed to the whale (*Geograph.* xvi, p. 759; comp. Müller's *Hist. Græc. Fragm.* iv, 325, and his *Geograph. Græc. Min.* i, 79), and he appeals to its elevated position in behalf of those who laid the scene there; though, in order to do so consistently, he had already shown that it would be necessary to transport Æthiopia into Phœnicia (Strabo, i, 43). However, in Pliny's age—and Josephus had just before affirmed the same (*War*, iii, 9, 3)—they still showed the chains by which Andromeda was bound: and not only so, but M. Scaurus the younger, the same that was so much employed in Judæa by Pompey (*War*, i, 6, 2 sq.), had the bones of the monster transported to Rome from Joppa, where till then they had been exhibited (Mela, *ibid.*), and displayed them there during his ædileship to the public amongst other prodigies. Nor would they have been uninteresting to the modern geologist, if his report be correct; for they measured forty feet in length, the span of the ribs exceeding that of the Indian elephant, and the thickness of the spine or vertebra being one foot and a half ("sesquipedalis," i. e. in circumference—when Solinus says "semipedalis," he means in diameter, see Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* ix, 5 and the note, Delphin ed.). Reland would trace the adventures of Jonah in this legendary guise [see JONAH]; but it is far more probable that it symbolizes the first interchange of commerce between the Greeks, personified in their errant hero Perseus, and the Phœnicians, whose lovely, but till then unexplored clime may be shadowed forth in the fair virgin Andromeda. Perseus,

in the tale, is said to have plunged his dagger into the right shoulder of the monster. Possibly he may have discovered or improved the harbor, the roar from whose foaming reefs on the north could scarcely have been surpassed by the barkings of Scylla or Charybdis. Even the chains shown there may have been those by which his ship was attached to the shore. Rings used by the Romans for mooring their vessels are still to be seen near Terracina, in the south angle of the ancient port (Murray's *Handbk. for S. Italy*, p. 10, 2d ed.).

2. *History.*—We find that Japho or Joppa was situated in the portion of Dan (Josh. xix, 46), on the coast towards the south, and on a hill so high, says Strabo, that people affirmed (but incorrectly) that Jerusalem was visible from its summit. Having a harbor attached to it—though always, as still, a dangerous one—it became the port of Jerusalem, when Jerusalem became metropolis of the kingdom of the house of David, and certainly never did port and metropolis more strikingly resemble each other in difficulty of approach both by sea and land. Hence, except in journeys to and from Jerusalem, it was not much used. Accordingly, after the above incidental notice, the place is not mentioned till the times of Solomon, when, as being almost the only available sea-port, Joppa was the place fixed upon for the cedar and pine wood from Mount Lebanon to be landed by the servants of Hiram, king of Tyre, thence to be conveyed to Jerusalem by the servants of Solomon for the erection of the first "house of habitation" ever made with hands for the invisible Jehovah. It was by way of Joppa similarly that like materials were conveyed from the same locality, by permission of Cyrus, for the rebuilding of the second Temple under Zerubbabel (1 Kings v, 9; 2 Chron. ii, 16; Ezra iii, 7). Here Jonah, whenever and wherever he may have lived (2 Kings xiv, 25, certainly does not clear up the first of these points), "took ship to flee from the presence of his Maker" (Jonah i, 3), and accomplished that singular history which our Lord has appropriated as a type of one of the principal scenes in the great drama of his own (Matt. xii, 40).

After the close of O.-T. history Joppa rose in importance. The sea was then beginning to be the highway of nations. Greece, Egypt, Persia, and some of the little kingdoms of Asia Minor had their fleets for commerce and war. Until the construction of Cæsarea by Herod, Joppa was the only port in Palestine proper at which foreign ships could touch; it was thus not only the shipping capital, but the key of the whole country on the sea-board. During the wars of the Maccabees it was one of the principal strongholds of Palestine (1 Macc. x, 75; xiv, 5, 34; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 15, 1). It would seem that Jews then constituted only a minority of the population, and the foreign residents—Greeks, Egyptians, and Syrians—were so rich and powerful, and so aided by the fleets of their own nations, as to be able to rule the city. During this period, therefore, Joppa experienced many vicissitudes. It had sided with Apollonius, and was attacked and captured by Jonathan Maccabæus (1 Macc. x, 76). It witnessed the meeting between the latter and Ptolemy (ibid. xi, 6). Simon had his suspicions of its inhabitants, and set a garrison there (ibid. xii, 34), which he afterwards strengthened considerably (ibid. xiii, 11). But when peace was restored, he re-established it once more as a haven (ibid. xiv, 5). He likewise rebuilt the fortifications (ibid. v, 34). This occupation of Joppa was one of the grounds of complaint urged by Antiochus, son of Demetrius, against Simon; but the latter alleged in excuse the mischief which had been done by its inhabitants to his fellow-citizens (ibid. xv, 30 and 35). It would appear that Judas Maccabæus had burnt their haven some time back for a gross act of barbarity (2 Macc. xii, 6). Tribute was subsequently exacted for its possession from Hyrcanus by Antiochus Sidetes. By Pompey it was once more made independent, and comprehended under Syria (Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 4, 4); but by Cæsar it was not only restored to the Jews, but its revenues—whether from land or from export-duties—were bestowed upon the 2d Hyrcanus and his heirs (xiv, 10, 6). When Herod the Great commenced operations, it was seized by him, lest he should leave a hostile stronghold in his rear when he marched upon Jerusalem (xiv, 15, 1), and Augustus confirmed him in its possession (xv, 7, 4). It was afterwards assigned to Archelaus when constituted ethnarch (xvii, 11, 4), and passed with Syria under Cyrenius when Archelaus had been deposed (xvii, 12, 5). Under Cestius (i. e. Gessius Florus) it was destroyed amidst great slaughter of its inhabitants (*War*, ii, 18, 10); and such a nest of pirates had it become when Vespasian arrived in those parts that it underwent a second and entire destruction, together with the adjacent villages, at his hands (iii, 9, 3). Thus it appears that this port had already begun to be the den of robbers and outcasts which it was in Strabo's time (*Geograph.* xvi, 759), while the district around it was so populous that from Jamnia, a neighboring town, and its vicinity, 40,000 armed men could be collected (ibid.). There was a vast plain around it, as we learn from Josephus (*Ant.* xiii, 4, 4); it lay between Jamnia and Cæsarea—the latter of which might be reached "on the morrow" from it (Acts x, 9 and 24)—not far from Lydda (Acts ix, 38), and distant from Antipatris 150 stadia (Joseph. *Ant.* xiii, 15, 1).

It was at Joppa, on the house-top of Simon the tanner, "by the sea-side"—with the view therefore circumscribed on the east by the high ground on which the town stood, but commanding a boundless prospect over the western waters—that the apostle Peter had his "vision of tolerance," as it has been happily designated, and went forth like a second Perseus—but from the east to emancipate, from still worse thraldom, the virgin daughter of the west. The Christian poet Arator has not failed to discover a mystical connection between the raising to life of the aged Tabitha—the occasion of Peter's visit to Joppa—and the baptism of the first Gentile household (*De Act. Apostol.* l. 840, ap. Migne, *Patrol. Curs. Compl.* lxviii, 164).

In the 4th century Eusebius calls Joppa a city (*Onomast.* s. v.); and it was then made the seat of a bishopric, an honor which it retained till the conquest of the country by the Saracens (Reland, p. 868; S. Paul, *Geogr. Sac.* p. 305); the subscriptions of its prelates are preserved in the acts of various synods of the 5th and 6th centuries (Le Quien, *Oriens Christian.* iii, 629). Joppa has been the landing-place of pilgrims going to Jerusalem for more than a thousand years, from Arculf in the 7th century to his royal highness the prince of Wales in the 19th, and it is mentioned in almost all the itineraries and books of travel in the Holy Land which have appeared in different languages (*Early Travels in Pal.* p. 10, 34, 142, 286). None of the early travellers, however, give any explicit description of the place. During the Crusades Joppa was several times taken and retaken by Franks and Saracens. It had been taken possession of by the forces of Godfrey de Bouillon previously to the capture of Jerusalem. The town had been deserted, and was allowed to fall into ruin, the Crusaders contenting themselves with possession of the citadel (William of Tyre, *Hist.* viii, 9); and it was in part assigned subsequently for the support of the Church of the Resurrection (*ibid.* ix, 16), though there seem to have been bishops of Joppa (perhaps only titular after all) between A.D. 1253 and 1363 (Le Quien, 1291; compare p. 1241). Saladin, in A.D. 1188, destroyed its fortifications (Sanut. *Secret. Fid. Crucis*, lib. iii, part x, c. 5); but Richard of England, who was confined here by sickness, rebuilt them (*ibid.*, and Richard of Devizes in Bohn's *Ant. Lib.* p. 61). Its last occupation by Christians was that of St. Louis, A.D. 1253, and when he came it was still a city and governed by a count. "Of the immense sums," says Joinville, "which it cost the king to inclose Jaffa, it does not become me to speak, for they were countless. He inclosed the town from one side of the sea to the other; and there were twenty-

four towers, including small and great. The ditches were well scoured, and kept clean, both within and without. There were three gates" (*Chron. of Crus.* p. 495, Bohn). So restored, it fell into the hands of the sultans of Egypt, together with the rest of Palestine, by whom it was once more laid in ruins; so much so that Bertrand de la Brocquiere, visiting it about the middle of the 15th century, states that it then consisted only of a few tents covered with reeds, having been a strong place under the Christians. Guides, accredited by the sultan, here met the pilgrims and received the customary tribute from them; and here the papal indulgences offered to pilgrims commenced (*Early Travels*, p. 286). Finally, Jaffa fell under the Turks, in whose hands it still is, exhibiting the usual decrepitude of the cities possessed by them, and depending on Christian commerce for its feeble existence. During the period of their rule it has been three times sacked—by the Arabs in 1722, by the Mamelukes in 1775, and lastly by Napoleon I in 1799, when a body of 4000 Albanians, who held a strong position in the town, surrendered on promise of having their lives spared. Yet the whole 4000 were afterwards pinioned and shot on the strand! When Napoleon was compelled to retreat to Egypt, between 400 and 500 French soldiers lay ill of the plague in the hospitals of Joppa. They could not be removed, and Napoleon ordered them to be poisoned! (Porter, *Handbook for S. and P.* p. 288).

3. *Description.*—*Yafa* is the modern name of Joppa, and is identical with the old Hebrew *Japho.* It contains about 5000 inhabitants, of whom 1000 are Christians, about 150 Jews, and the rest Moslems. It is beautifully situated on a little rounded hill, dipping on the west into the waves of the Mediterranean, and on the land side encompassed by orchards of orange, lemon, apricot, and other trees, which for luxuriance and beauty are not surpassed in the world. They extend for several miles across the great plain. Like most Oriental towns, however, it looks best in the distance. The houses are huddled together without order; the streets are narrow, crooked, and filthy; the town is so crowded along the steep sides of the hill that the rickety dwellings in the upper part seem to be toppling over on the flat roofs of those below. The most prominent features of the architecture from without are the flattened domes by which most of the buildings are surmounted, and the appearance of arched vaults. But the aspect of the whole is mean and gloomy, and inside the place has all the appearance of a poor though large village. From the steepness of the site many of the streets are connected by flights of steps, and the one that runs along the sea-wall is the most clean and regular of the whole. There are three mosques in Joppa, and Latin, Greek, and Armenian convents. The former is that in which European pilgrims and travellers usually lodge. The bazaars are worth a visit. The chief manufacture is soap. It has no port, and it is only under favorable circumstances of wind and weather that vessels can ride at anchor a mile or so from the shore. There is a place on the shore which is called "the harbor." It consists of a strip of water from fifteen to twenty yards wide and two or three deep, inclosed on the sea side by a ridge of low and partially sunken rocks. It may afford a little shelter to boats, but it is worse than useless so far as commerce is concerned. The town is defended by a wall, on which a few old guns are mounted. With the exception of a few broken columns scattered about the streets, and through the gardens on the southern slope of the hill, and the large stones in the foundations of the castle, Joppa has no remains of antiquity; and none of its modern buildings, not even the reputed "house of Simon the tanner," which the monks show, are worthy of note, although the locality of the last is not badly chosen (Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 263, 274; and see Seddon's *Memoir*, p. 86, 185). The town has still a considerable trade as the port of Jerusalem. The oranges of Jaffa are the finest in all Palestine and Syria; its pomegranates and watermelons are likewise in high repute, and its gardens and orange and citron groves deliciously fragrant and fertile. But among its population are fugitives and vagabonds from all countries; and Europeans have little security, whether of life or property, to induce a permanent abode there. A British consul is now resident in the place, and a railroad has been projected to Jerusalem.

See Raumer's *Palästina;* Volney, i, 136 sq.; Chateaubriand, ii, 103; Clarke, iv, 438 sq.; Buckingham, i, 227 sq.; Richter, p. 12; Richardson, ii, 16; Skinner, i, 175-184; Robinson, i, 18; Stent, ii, 27; M'Culloch's *Gazetteer;* Reland, p. 864; Cellar. *Not.* ii. 524; Hamelveld, i, 442; ii, 229, Hasselquist, p. 137; Niebuhr. iii, 41; Joliffe, p. 243; Light, p. 125; Ritter, *Erdk.* ii, 400; Schwarz, p. 142, 373, 375; Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 273.

Jop'pè (Ἰόππη), the Greek form (1 Esdr. v. 55; 1 Macc. x, 75, 76; xi, 6; xii, 33; xiii, 11; xiv, 5, 34, xv, 28, 35; 2 Macc. iv, 21; xii, 3, 7 [Ἰοππίτης]) of the name of the town JOPPA (q. v.).

Jo'rah (Heb. *Yorah'*, יוֹרָה, prob. for יֹרֶה, *sprinkling*, or autumnal *rain;* Sept. Ἰωρά v. r. Οὐρά, Vulg. *Jora*), a man whose descendants (or a place whose former inhabitants) to the number of 112 returned from the Babylonian captivity (Ezra ii, 18); called HARIPH in the parallel passage (Neh. vii, 24). "In Ezra two of De Rossi's MSS., and originally one of Kennicott's, had יורדה, i. e. Jodah, which is the reading of the Syriac and Arabic versions. One of Kennicott's MSS. had the original reading in Ezra altered to יורם, i. e. Joram; and two in Nehemiah read חרים, i. e. Harim, which corresponds with Ἀρείμ of the Alexandrian MS., and *Churom* of the Syriac. In any case, the change or confusion of letters which might have caused the variation of the name is so slight that it is difficult to pronounce which is the true form, the corruption of Jorah into Hariph being as easily conceivable as the reverse. Burrington (*Geneal.* ii, 75) decides in favor of the latter, but from a comparison of both passages with Ezra x, 31 we should be inclined to regard Harim (חרים) as the true reading in all cases. But, on any supposition, it is difficult to account for the form Azephurith, or, more properly, Ἀρσιφουρίθ, in 1 Esdr. v, 16, which Burrington considers as having originated in a corruption of the two readings in Ezra and Nehemiah, the second syllable arising from an error of the transcriber in mistaking the uncial E for Σ"

Jo'rai (Heb. *Yoray'*, יוֹרַי, perh. i. q. *Jorah;* Sept. Ἰωρεέ, Vulg. *Jorai*), the fourth name of the seven chieftains of the Gadites other than those resident in Bashan (1 Chron. v, 13). B.C. perh. cir. 782. "Four of Kennicott's MSS., and the printed copy used by Luther, read יודי, i. e. Jodai" (Smith).

Jo'ram (Heb. יוֹרָם; Sept. Ἰωράμ), prop. a shortened form of the name JEHORAM (q. v.), for which it is indifferently used in the Heb., and arbitrarily in the A. V., as the following classification shows: *a.* The son of the king of Zobah (2 Sam. viii, 10; Sept. Ἰεδδουράν; elsewhere called HADORAM). *b.* The king of Judah (2 Kings viii, 21, 23, 24; xi, 2; 1 Chron. iii, 11; elsewhere *Jehoram*). *c.* The king of Israel (2 Kings viii, 16, 25, 28 [twice], 29 [twice]; ix, 14 [twice], 15, 16 [twice], 29; incorrectly for *Jehoram*, 2 Kings ix, 17, 21 [twice], 22, 23; elsewhere correctly so). *d.* The Levite (1 Chron. xxvi, 25, יֹרָם). *e.* By error for JOZABAD (1 Esdr. i, 9).

Jor'dan (Heb. *Yarden'*, יַרְדֵּן, always with the article הַיַּרְדֵּן; Ἰορδάνης), the chief and most celebrated river of Palestine, flowing through a deep valley down the centre of the country from north to south. The principal river of the entire region, however (hence usually styled in the original "the River"), is the Euphrates (q. v.). See RIVER.

1. *The Name.*—This signifies *descender*, from the root יָרַד, "to descend"—a name most applicable to it, whether we consider the rapidity of its current, or the great depth of the valley through which it runs. From whatever part of the country its banks are approached, the descent is long and steep. That this is the true etymology of the word seems evident from an incidental remark in Josh. iii, 16, where, in describing the effect of the opening of a passage for the Israelites, the word used for the "coming down" of the waters (הַמַּיִם הַיֹּרְדִים) is almost the same as the name of the river (see Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 279, note). Other derivations have been given. Some say it is compounded of יְאֹר, *a river*, and דָּן, the name of the city where it rises, but this etymology is impossible (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 271). Another view is, that the river having two sources, the name of the one was *Jor*, and of the other *Dan;* hence the united stream is called *Jordan.* So Jerome (*Comm. in Matt.* xvi, 13). This theory has been copied by Adamnanus (*De Loc. Sanct.* ii, 19), William of Tyre (xiii, 18), Brocardus (p. 3), Adrichomius (p. 109), and others; and the etymology seems to have spread among the Christians in Palestine, from whom Burckhardt heard it (*Travels in Syria*, p. 42, 43; see Robinson, *Bib. Res.* iii, 412, note). Arab geographers call the river either *El-Urdon*, which is equivalent to the Hebrew, or *Esh-sheriah*, which signifies "the watering-place;" and this latter is the name almost universally given to it by the modern Syrians, who sometimes attach the appellative *el-Kebîr*, "the great," by way of distinction from the Sheriat el-Mandhur, or Hieromax.

2. *Sources.*—The snows that deeply cover Hermon during the whole winter, and that still cap its glittering summit during the hottest days of summer, are the real springs of the Jordan. They feed its perennial fountains, and they supply from a thousand channels those superabundant waters which make the river "overflow all its banks in harvest time" (Josh. iii, 15). The Jordan has two *historical* sources. *a.* In the midst of a rich but marshy plain, lying between the southern prolongation of Hermon and the mountains of Naphtali, is a low cup-shaped hill, thickly covered with shrubs. On it once stood Dan, the northern border-city of Palestine; and from its western base gushes forth the great fountain of the Jordan. The waters at once form a large pond encircled with rank grass and jungle—now the home of the wild boar—and then flow off southward. Within the rim of the cup, beneath the spreading branches of a gigantic oak, is a smaller spring. It is fed, doubtless, by the same source, and its stream, breaking through the rim, joins its sister, and forms a river some forty feet wide, deep and rapid. The modern name of the hill is Tell el-Kâdy, "the hill of the judge;" and both fountain and river are called Leddan—evidently the name Dan corrupted by a double article, El-ed-Dan (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* iii, 394; Thomson, *Land and Book*, p. 214; and in *Bibliotheca Sac.* 1846, p. 196). Josephus calls this stream "Little Jordan" (τὸν μικρὸν Ἰορδάνην, *War*, iv, 1, 1; comp. *Ant.* i, 10, 1; viii, 8, 4); but it is the principal source of the river, and the largest fountain in Syria.

b. Four miles east of Tell el-Kâdy, on a lower terrace of Hermon, amid forests of oak, lie the ruins of Banias, the ancient Cæsarea-Philippi, and more ancient Panium. Beside the ruins is a lofty cliff of red limestone, having a large fountain at its base. Beneath the cliff there was formerly, as Josephus tells us, a gloomy cave, and within it a yawning abyss of unfathomable depth, filled with water. This was the other source of the Jordan (*War*, i, 21, 3; comp. *Ant.* xv, 10, 3; Pliny, v, 12; Mishna, *Para*, viii, 12). A temple was erected over the cave by Herod, and its ruins now fill it and conceal the fountain. From it a foaming torrent still bursts, and dashes down to the plain through a narrow rocky ravine, and then glides swiftly on till it joins the other about four miles south of Tell el-Kâdy (Robinson, iii, 397; Porter, *Handbook*, p. 446).

c. The Jordan has also a *fabled* fountain, thus described by Josephus: "Apparently Panium is the source of the Jordan, but the water is, in reality, conveyed thither unseen by a subterranean channel from Phiala, as it is called, which lies not far from the high road, on the right as you ascend to Trachonitis, at the distance of 120 stadia from Cæsarea. . . . That the Jordan hence derived its origin was formerly unknown, until it was ascertained by Philip, tetrarch of Trachonitis, who, having thrown chaff into Phiala, found it cast out at Panium" (*War*, iii, 10, 7). The lake here referred to appears to be Burket er-Ram, which Robinson visited and described (*Bib. Res.* iii, 399). The legend has no foundation in reality.

d. Other fountains in this region, though unnamed in history, contribute much to the Jordan. The chief of these, and the highest perennial source of the Jordan, is in the bottom of a valley at the western base of Hermon, a short distance from the town of Hasbeiya, and twelve miles north of Tell el-Kâdy. The fountain is in a pool at the foot of a basalt cliff; the stream from it, called Hasbâny (from Hasbeiya), flows through a narrow glen into the plain, and falls into the main stream about a mile south of the junction of the Leddân and Baniâsy. The relative size of the three streams Robinson thus estimates: "That from Banias is twice as large as the Hasbâny, while the Leddân is twice, if not three times the size of that from Banias" (*Bib. Res.* iii, 395). The united river flows southward through the marshy plain for six miles, and then falls into Lake Hûleh, called in Scripture "The Waters of Merom." See Merom.

e. Besides these, a considerable stream comes down from the plain of Ijon, west of the Hasbâny; and two large fountains (called Bâlat and Mellâhah) burst forth from the base of the mountain-chain of Naphtali (Porter, *Handbook for S. and P.* p. 436).

3. *Physical Features of the Jordan and its Valley.*—The most remarkable feature of the Jordan is, that throughout nearly its entire course *it is below the level of the sea.* Its valley is thus like a huge fissure in the earth's crust. The following measurements, taken from Van de Velde's *Memoir* accompanying his *Map*, will give the best idea of the depression of this singular valley:

Fountain of Jordan at Hasbeiya...	1700	ft. elevation.
" " Banias.....	1147	"
" " Dan.......	647	"
Lake Hûleh..................about	120	"
Lake of Tiberias..................	650	ft. *depression.*
Dead Sea..........................	1312	"

There may be some error in the elevations of the fountains as here given. Lake Hûleh is encompassed by a great plain, extending to Dan; and as it appears to the eye almost level, it is difficult to believe that there could be a difference of 500 feet in the elevations of the fountain and the lake. Porter estimated it on the spot at not above 100 feet; but it is worthy of note that Von Wildenbruch makes it by measurement 537 feet, and De Bertou 344.

The general course of the Jordan is due south. From their fountains the three streams flow south to the points of junction, and continue in the same direction to the Hûleh; and from the southern extremity of this lake the Jordan again issues and resumes its old course. For some two miles its banks are flat, and its current not very rapid; but on passing through Jisr Benât Yakûb ("the Bridge of Jacob's Daughters"), the banks suddenly contract and rise high on each side, and the river dashes in sheets of foam over a rocky bed, rebounding from cliff to cliff in its mad career. Here and there the retreating banks have a little green meadow, with its fringe of oleanders all wet and glistening with spray. Thus it rushes on, often winding, occasionally doubling back like the coils of a serpent, till, breaking from rocky barriers, it enters the rich plain of Batîhah, where on

the left bank stand the ruins of Bethsaida (q. v.). The stream now expands, and glides lazily along till it falls on the still bosom of the Sea of Galilee. Between Bethsaida and the sea the Jordan averages about twenty yards in width, and flows sluggishly between low alluvial banks. Bars of sand extend across its channel here and there, at which it is easily forded (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 426; Robinson, ii, 414 sq.; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 315). From Jisr Benât Yakûb the distance is only seven miles, and yet in that distance the river falls 700 feet. The total length of the section between the two lakes is about eleven miles as the crow flies.

An old tradition tells us that the Jordan flows direct through the Sea of Galilee without mingling with its waters. The origin of the story may be the fact that the river enters the lake at the northern extremity, and leaves it at a point exactly opposite at the southern, without apparent increase or diminution.

The *third section* of the river, lying between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea, is the Jordan of Scripture, the other two sections not being directly mentioned either in the O. T. or N. T. Until the last few years little was known of it. The notices of ancient geographers are not full. Travellers had crossed it at several points, but all the portions between these points were unknown. When the remarkable depression of the Dead Sea was ascertained by trigonometrical measurement, and when it was shown that the Jordan must have a fall of 1400 feet in its short course of about 100 miles, the measurements were called in question by that distinguished geographer Dr. Robinson, in a paper read before the Royal Geographical Society in 1847 (*Journal*, vol. xviii, part ii). In that same year lieutenant Molyneux, R.N., conveyed a boat from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea, mostly in the river, but in places on the backs of camels, where rocks and rapids prevented navigation. Owing to the hostility of the Arabs the expedition was not successful, and the Jordan was not yet explored. Lieutenant Lynch, of the United States Navy, headed a much more successful expedition in 1848, and was the first fully to describe the course, and fully to solve the mysteries of the Jordan. His *Official Report* is the standard work on the river. Molyneux's paper in the *Journal of the Royal Geog. Society* also contains some useful matter (vol. xviii, part ii).

The valley through which this section of the Jordan flows is a long, low plain, running from north to south, and shut in by steep and rugged parallel ridges, the eastern ridge rising fully 5000 feet above the river's bed, and the western about 3000. This plain is the *great plain* of the later Jews; the *great desert* (πολλὴν ἐρημίαν) of Josephus; the *Aulon* or "channel" of the Greek geographers; the "region of Jordan" of the N. T. (Matt. iii, 5; Luke iii, 3); and the *Ghor* or "sunken plain" of the modern Arabs (Stanley, p. 277; Josephus, *War*, iii, 9, 7; iv, 8, 2; Reland, *Palæst.* p. 305, 361, 377 sq.). It is about six miles wide at its northern end, but it gradually expands until it attains a width of upwards of twelve at Jericho. Its sides are not straight lines, nor is its surface perfectly level. The mountains on each side here and there send out rocky spurs, and long, low roots far into it. Winter torrents, descending from wild ravines, cut deeply through its soft strata. As a whole it is now a desert. In its northern division, above the fords of Succoth, small portions are cultivated around fountains, and along the banks of streamlets, where irrigation is easy; but all the rest is a wilderness—in spring covered with rank grass and thistles, but in summer parched and bare. The southern section—known as the "plain of Jericho"—is different in aspect. Its surface is covered with a white nitrous crust, like hoarfrost, through which not a blade of grass or green herb springs. Nothing could be imagined more dreary or desolate than this part of the plain.

Down the midst of the plain winds a ravine, varying from 200 yards to half a mile in breadth, and from 40 to 150 feet in depth. Through this the Jordan flows in a tortuous course, now sweeping the western, and now the eastern bank: now making a wide, graceful curve, and now doubling back, but everywhere fringed by a narrow, dense border of trees and shrubs. The river has thus two distinct lines of banks. The first or lower banks confine the stream, and are from five to ten feet high, the height of course decreasing in spring when the river is high; the second or upper are at some distance from the channel, and in places rise to a height of 150 feet. The scenery of the river is peculiar and striking. Lynch thus describes the upper section: "The high alluvial terraces on each side were everywhere shaped by the action of the winter rains into numbers of conical hills, some of them pyramidal and cuneiform, presenting the appearance of a giant encampment. This singular conformation extended southwards as far as the eye could reach. At intervals I caught a glimpse of the river in its graceful meanderings, sometimes glittering like a spear-head through an opening in the foliage, and again clasping some little island in its shining arms, or, far away, snapping with the fierceness and white foam of a torrent by some projecting point. . . . The banks were fringed with the laurustinus, the oleander, the willow, and the tamarisk, and further inland, on the slope of the second terrace, grew a small species of oak, and the cedar."

The Jordan issues from the Sea of Galilee close to the hills on the western side of the plain, and sweeps round a little peninsula, on which lie the ruins of Tarichæa (Porter, *Handb.* p. 321; Robinson, i, 538). The stream is about 100 feet wide, and the current strong (Lynch). A short distance down are the remains of a Roman bridge, whose fallen arches greatly obstruct the river, and make it dash through in sheets of foam. Below this are several weirs, constructed of rough stones, and intended to raise the water and turn it into canals, so as to irrigate the neighboring plain (Molyneux). Five miles from the lake the Jordan receives its largest tributary, the Sheriat el-Mandhûr (the Hieromax of the Greeks), which drains a large section of Bashan and Gilead. This stream is 130 feet wide at its mouth. Two miles further is Jisr el-Mejâmia, the only bridge now standing on the Lower Jordan. It is a quaint structure, one large pointed arch spanning the stream, and double tiers of smaller arches supporting the roadway on each side. The river is here deep and impetuous, breaking over high ledges of rocks.

Below this point the ravine inclines eastwards to the centre of the plain, and its banks contract. Its sides are bare and white, and the chalky strata are deeply furrowed. The margin of the river has still its beautiful fringe of foliage, and the little islets which occur here and there are covered with shrubbery. Fifteen miles south of the bridge, wady Yâbes (so called from Jabesh-gilead), containing a winter torrent, falls in from the east. A short distance above it a barren sandy island divides the channel, and with its bars on each side forms a ford, probably the one by which Jacob crossed, as the site of Succoth has been identified on the western bank. The plain round Succoth is extensively cultivated, and abundantly watered by fountains and streamlets from the adjoining mountains. The richness of the soil is wonderful. Dr. Robinson says, "The grass, intermingled with tall daisies and wild oats, reached to our horses' backs, while the thistles sometimes overtopped the riders' heads. All was now dry, and in some places it was difficult to make our way through this exuberant growth" (iii, p. 313). Jacob exercised a wise choice when "he made booths for his cattle" at this favored spot (Gen. xxxiii, 17). No other place in the great plain equals it in richness. The ravine of the Jordan is here 150 feet below the plain, and shut in by steep, bare banks of chalky strata (Robinson, *l. c.* p. 316).

About nine miles below Succoth, and about half way between the lakes, the Jabbok, the only other considerable tributary, falls into the Jordan, coming down through a deep, wild glen in the mountains of Gilead.

When Lynch passed (April 17) it was "a small stream trickling down a deep and wide torrent bed. . . . There was another bed, quite dry, showing that in times of freshet there were two outlets." Lynch gives some good pictures of the scenery above the junction. "The plain that sloped away from the bases of the hills was broken into ridges and multitudinous cone-like mounds. . . . A low, pale yellow ridge of conical hills marked the termination of the higher terrace, beneath which swept gently this low plain, with a similar undulating surface, half redeemed from barrenness by sparse verdure and thistle-covered hillocks. Still lower was the valley of the Jordan—its banks fringed with perpetual verdure—winding a thousand graceful mazes . . . its course a bright line in this cheerless waste."

Below the Jabbok the fall of the river is still greater than above, but there is less obstruction from rocks and cliffs. The jungles along the banks become denser, the sides of the river glen more regular, and the plain above more dreary and desolate.

On approaching the Dead Sea, the plain of the Jordan attains its greatest breadth—about twelve miles. The mountain ranges on each side are higher, more rugged, and more desolate. The plain is coated with a nitrous crust, like hoar-frost, and not a tree, shrub, or blade of grass is seen except by fountains or rivulets. The glen winds like a serpent through the centre, between two tiers of banks. The bottom is smooth, and sprinkled on the outside with stunted shrubs. The river winds in ceaseless coils along the bottom, now touching one side and now another, with its beautiful border of green foliage, looking all the greener from contrast with the desert above. The banks are of soft clay, in places ten feet high; the stream varies from 80 to 150 feet in breadth, and from five to twelve in depth. Near its mouth the current becomes more sluggish, and the stream expands. Where wady Hesbân falls in, Lynch found the river 150 feet wide and 11 deep, "the current four knots." Further down the banks are low and sedgy; the width gradually increases to 180 yards at its mouth, but the depth is only three feet (Lynch, *Official Report;* Robinson, i, 538 sq.; Stanley, p. 290).

Upper Ford of the Jordan, near Bethshan. (From Van de Velde.)

Lynch in a few words explains the secret of the great and almost incredible fall in the Jordan. "The great secret is solved by the tortuous course of the Jordan. In a space of 60 miles of latitude, and four or five of longitude, the Jordan traverses at least 200 miles. . . . We have plunged down twenty-seven threatening rapids, besides a great many of lesser magnitude."

Terraces of the Jordan. (From Photograph 231 of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, ii, 257 sq.) describes the banks as consisting of three series, with terraces between, the outer ones composed of the mountains bordering the river, the middle ones being the true banks, and the third the proper channel of the stream; and he argues that the scriptural allusions to the overflow of the Jordan at harvest (Josh. iii, 15; 1 Chron. xii, 15; compare Jer. xii, 5; xlix, 19; l, 44; Zech. xi, 3; Sirach xxiv, 26, 36) simply refer to the full stream, or at most to its expansion as far as to the middle one of these three banks, at the time of the annual melting of snows on Lebanon and Hermon, rather than to any true freshet or inundation. The river in this respect probably resembles other mountain streams, which have an overflow of their secondary boundaries or alluvial "bottoms" during the spring and early summer months. Comp. Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 452 sq.

4. *The Fords* of the Jordan have always been important in connection with the history of the country. The three streams which flow from the fountains are fordable at almost every point. It is south of Lake Hûleh that the river begins to form a serious barrier. The bridge called Jisr Benât Yakûb has for centuries been the leading pass from western Palestine to Damascus. The first reference to it is in A.D. 1450 (in Gumpenberg's day; see Robinson, *Researches*, iii, 362), though as early as the Crusades a "Ford of Jacob" (*Vadum Jacob*, Will. Tyr. *Hist.* xviii, 13) is mentioned, and was reckoned a most important pass. The bridge was probably built during the 15th century, when the caravan road was constructed from Damascus to Egypt (Porter, *Handbook*, ii, 466). The origin of the name, "Bridge of Jacob's Daughters," is unknown. Perhaps this place may have been confounded with the ford of Succoth, where the patriarch crossed the Jordan, or perhaps the "Jacob" referred to was some Muslem saint or Turkish pasha (Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* p. 269 sq.). See BRIDGE.

Between Bethsaida-Julias and the Sea of Galilee there are several fords. The river is there shallow and the current sluggish. At this place the multitudes that followed our Lord from Capernaum and the neighborhood were able to cross the river to where he fed the 5000 (Mark vi, 32 sq.; Robinson, ii, 414).

The first ford on the southern section of the Jordan is about half a mile from the lake, where the ruins of the Roman bridge now lie. It was the means of communication between Tiberias and Gadara, and it was doubtless at this point our Lord crossed when he went from Galilee to Judæa "by the farther side of Jordan

(Mark x, 1; Matt. xix, 1, 2). Jisr el-Mejâmia is a Saracenic bridge on an old caravan route from Damascus to Egypt. Probably a Roman bridge may have stood at the same place, connecting Scythopolis with the other cities of Decapolis. There is no *ford* here. At a point east of the ruins of Scythopolis, ten miles below the bridge, the river is *now* fordable, but the passage is deep and dangerous (Robinson, iii, 325; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 137).

At Succoth is one of the best and most important fords over the Jordan. Here Jacob crossed with his cattle. This, too, is possibly the Bethbarah, "house, or ford of passage," where the Israelites intercepted the routed Midianites (Judg. vii, 24), and it was probably here that the men of Gilead slew the Ephraimites (xii, 6). Not far off, in "the clay ground between Succoth and Zarthan," were the brass foundries of king Solomon (1 Kings vii, 46). These fords undoubtedly witnessed the first recorded passage of the Jordan in the O. T.; we say recorded, because there can be little dispute but that Abraham must have crossed it likewise. It is still the place at which the eastern Bedawîn cross in their periodical invasions of Esdraelon. From Succoth to the mouth of the Jabbok the river becomes very low during the summer, and is fordable at many points. At one spot are the remains of a Roman bridge (Molyneux, p. 115 sq.; Lynch, April 16; Burckhardt, p. 344 sq.). Ten miles south of the Jabbok there is a noted ford on the road from Nabulus to Es-Salt. Traces of a Roman road and bridge were here discovered by Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 124). The only other fords of note are those in the plain of Jericho, one above and one below the pilgrims' bathing-place. They are much deeper than those higher up, and when the river is swollen they become impassable.

Lower Ford of the Jordan at Wady Nawaimeh. (From Photograph 293 of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

5. *Historical Notices.*—The first notice of the Jordan is in the story of the separation of Abraham and Lot—Lot "beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah" (Gen. xiii, 10). Abraham had just left Egypt (xii, 10-20), and therefore the comparison between the fertilizing properties of the Jordan and of the Nile is very apposite. The section of the valley visible from the heights of Bethel, where the patriarchs stood, was the plain of Jericho and southward over a part of the Dead Sea. The "plain" or *circle* (כִּכָּר) of the Jordan must have been different then from what it is now. It is now a parched desert—then it was well watered everywhere. The waters of numerous springs, mountain torrents, and probably of the Jordan, raised by weirs such as are seen at its northern end, were used by the old Phœnician inhabitants in the irrigation of the vast plain. The curse had not yet come upon it; the fire of heaven had not yet passed over it; the Lord had not yet destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah (Stanley, p. 215). It is manifest that some great physical change was produced in the valley by the convulsion at the destruction of the cities. The bed of the Dead Sea was probably lowered, and a greater fall thus given to the river. See Dead Sea.

Another wonderful epoch in the Jordan's history was the passage of the Israelites. They were encamped on the "plains of Moab"—on the broad plain east of the river, extending along the northern shore of the sea to the foot of the mountains. It was harvest-time—the beginning of April—when the rains were still falling heavily in Hermon, and the winter snows were melting under the rays of the warm sun, and when a thousand mountain torrents thus fed swept into the Jordan, and made it "overflow all its banks;" or, as the Hebrew literally signifies, *made it full up to all its banks* (see Robinson, *Bib. Res.* i, 540); that is, perhaps, up not merely to the banks of the stream itself, but up to the banks of the glen; covering, as it still does in a few places (Molyneux, p. 116; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 125), the whole bottom of the glen, and thus rendering the fords impassable for such a host as the Israelites. There can be no doubt that in ancient times the Jordan rose higher than it does now. When the country was more thickly wooded and more extensively cultivated, more rain and more snow must have fallen (Van de Velde, *Narrative*, ii, 272). There are wet seasons even yet, when the river rises several feet more than ordinarily (Reland, p. 273; Raumer, *Paläst.* p. 61, 2d ed.). The opening of a passage through the river at such a season was the greater miracle. Had it been late in summer it might have been thought that natural causes operated, but in harvest—the time of the overflow—the finger of God must have been manifest to all. It is a remarkable fact that at this same spot the Jordan was afterwards twice miraculously opened—by Elijah and Elisha (2 Kings ii, 8, 14).

At a later period it was considered a feat of high daring that a party of David's "mighty men" crossed the Jordan "in the first month (April), when it had overflown all its banks," and subdued their enemies on the east side (1 Chron. xii, 15). Jeremiah speaks of the lions "coming up" from the "swellings of the Jordan;" but the Hebrew word גָּאוֹן signifies *beauty or glory*, and refers to the dense jungles and verdant foliage of its banks; these jungles are impenetrable except to the wild beasts that dwell there. No allusion is made to the rise or overflow of the river (Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, s. v.; Robinson, i, 540). Travellers have often seen wild swine, hyænas, and jackals, and also the tracks of panthers, on the banks of the Jordan (Molyneux, p. 118).

The passage of the river by king David in his flight from Absalom has one peculiarity—a *ferry-boat* was used to convey his household over the channel (2 Sam. xix, 18). The passage was probably effected at one of the fords in the plain of Jericho. The word עֲבָרָה simply signifies a thing for crossing; it may have been a "boat," or a "raft," or a few inflated skins, such as are represented on the monuments of Nineveh, and are still used on the Euphrates and the Jordan. See Ferry.

Naaman's indignant depreciation of the Jordan, as compared with the "rivers of Damascus," is well known. The rivers of Damascus water its great plain, converting a desert into a paradise; the Jordan rolls on in its deep bed, useless, to the Sea of Death.

The great event of the N.-T. history enacted at the Jordan was the baptism of our Lord. This has made it the queen of rivers, and has given it the title "sacred." The exact spot is disputed. See Bethbara; Ænon. The topography and the incidents of the narrative, both before and after the baptism, unquestionably point to the same place, already famous as the scene of three miracles (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 198). In commemoration of the baptism, the Christian pilgrims who assemble at Jerusalem at Easter visit the Jordan in a body and bathe at this spot (Stanley, p. 308).

The references to the Jordan in the writings of Josephus contain nothing of importance beyond what has already been mentioned in connection with the foun-

tains and the physical features. Greek and Roman geographers seem to have known but little of the river. Pliny praises its beauty, and states that, "with the greatest reluctance, as it were, it moves onward towards Asphaltites, a lake of gloomy and unpropitious nature, by which it is at last swallowed up" (*Hist. Nat.* v, 15). Strabo makes the singular assertion that it is "navigated *upwards* with vessels of burden!" Of course, he can only refer to the Sea of Galilee (xvi, 2, 16). Pausanias tells how strangely the river disappears in the Dead Sea (book v, 7, 4).

6. *Mineral, Animal, and Vegetable Productions.*—Some of these have been incidentally noticed above. As there were slime-pits, or pits of bitumen, and salt-pits (Gen. xi, 3; Zeph. ii, 9) in the vale of Siddim, on the extreme south, so Mr. Thompson speaks of bitumen wells twenty minutes from the bridge over the Hashbeiya on the extreme north; while Ain-el Mellâhah above Lake Hûleh is emphatically "the fountain of the salt-works" (Lynch's *Narrative*, p. 470). Thermal springs are frequent about the Lake of Tiberias; the most celebrated, below the town bearing that name (Robinson, ii, 384, 385); some near Emmaus (Lynch, p. 467), some near Magdala, and some not far from Gadara (Irby, p. 90, 91). The hill of Dan is said to be an extinct crater, and masses of volcanic rock and tufa are noticed by Lynch not far from the mouth of the Yermâk (*Narrative*, April 12). Dark basalt is the characteristic of the rocks in the upper stage; trap, limestone, sandstone, and conglomerate in the lower. On the second day of the passage a bank of fuller's earth was observed.

How far the Jordan in olden time was ever a zone of cultivation, like the Nile, is uncertain. Now, with the exception of the eastern shores of the Lake Hûleh, the hand of man may be said to have disappeared from its banks. The genuine Arab is a nomad by nature, and contemns agriculture. There, however, Dr. Robinson, in the month of May, found the land tilled almost down to the lake, and large crops of wheat, barley, maize, sesame, and rice rewarded the husbandman. Horses, cattle, and sheep—all belonging to the Ghawârinah tribe—fattened on the rich pasture; and large herds of black buffaloes luxuriated in the streams and in the deep mire of the marshes (iii, 396). These are doubtless lineal descendants of the "fat bulls of Bashan;" as the "oaks of Bashan" are still the magnificent staple tree of those regions. Cultivation degenerates as we advance southward. Corn-fields wave around Gennesareth on the west, and the palm and vine, fig and pomegranate, are still to be seen here and there. Melons grown on its shores are of great size and much esteemed. Pink oleanders, and a rose-colored species of hollyhock, in great profusion, wait upon every approach to a rill or spring. These gems of nature reappear in the lower course of the Jordan. There the purple thistle, the bright yellow marigold, and scarlet anemone, saluted the adventurers of the New World: the laurustinus and oleander, cedar and arbutus, willow and tamarisk, accompanied them on their route. As the climate became more tropical, and the Lower Ghôr was entered, large ghurrah trees, like the aspen, with silvery foliage, overhung them; and the cane, frequently impenetrable, and now in blossom, "was ever at the water's edge." Only once during the whole voyage, on the fourth day, were patches of wheat and barley visible; but the hand that had sowed them lived far away. As Jeremiah in the O. T., and St. Jerome and Phocas (see Reland) among Christian pilgrims, had spoken of the Jordan as the resort of lions, so tracks of tigers, wild boars, and the like presented themselves from time to time to these explorers. Flocks of wild ducks, of cranes, of pigeons, and of swallows were scared by their approach; and a specimen of the bulbul, or Syrian nightingale, fell into their hands. The scenery throughout was not inspiring—it was of a subdued character when they started, profoundly gloomy and dreary near ford Sûkwa, and then utterly sterile just before they reached Jericho. With the exception of a few Arab tribes—so savage as scarcely to be considered exceptions—humanity had become extinct on its banks.

Such, then, is the river Jordan, without any parallel, historical or physical, in the whole world. A complete river beneath the level of the sea! Disappearing in a lake which has no outlet, which could have none, and which originated in a miracle! Thrice were its waters divided by the direct agency of God, that his servants might pass in safety and comfort. It is a river that has never been navigable, flowing into a sea that has never known a port—has never been a high-road to more hospitable coasts—has never possessed a fishery—a river that has never boasted of a single town of eminence upon its banks; in fine, it is, if not "the river of God" in the book of Psalms, at least that of his chosen people throughout their history, and, as such, it figures largely in the poetical symbolism of the passage from this world to the next.

In addition to the works above cited on the physical features of the Jordan, the following afford important information: *Journal of R. Geog. Society*, xviii, part ii, articles by Robinson, Petermann, and Molyneux; Bertou, in *Bulletin de la Soc. Geograph. de Paris*, xii, 166 sq.; Wildenbruch, *Monatsberichte der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, 1845-46; Capt. Newbold, *Jour. of Roy. Asiat. Society*, xvi, 8 sq.; Rev. W. Thompson, *Bibl. Sac.* iii, 184 sq. A clear summary of all known about the Jordan up to 1850 is given by Ritter, in *Palästina und Syrien*, ii, 152-556; also in his separate essay, *Der Jordan und die Beschiffung des todten Meeres* (Berlin, 1850). More popular descriptions are those published by the Religious Tract Society (London, 1858), and Nelson (ib. 1854). Most travellers in Palestine have likewise given an account of the river, chiefly at its mouth. See PALESTINE.

Jordan, Joseph, a minister of the Society of Friends, was born in Nansemond County, Va., in 1695, and began preaching about 1718, first in the States, and later in various parts of England and Ireland, and some portions of Holland. He died Sept. 26, 1735. "He acquitted himself," was the testimony of the annual meeting of Virginia Quakers in the year of his death, "as a workman that need not be ashamed." See Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, iii, 261.

Jordan, Richard (1), a minister of the Society of Friends, was born in Nansemond County, Va., in 1693, and began preaching the same year with his younger brother Joseph (see above). The two brothers frequently travelled together, preaching the word of God, in Virginia, Maryland, and Carolina, and suffered no little from persecution. In 1728 he visited the Quakers in England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and in Barbadoes. After two years he returned to the States, and settled in Philadelphia, where he died August 5, 1742. "His ministry was convincing and consolatory, his delivery graceful, but unaffected; in prayer he was solemn and reverent." See Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, iii, 270.

Jordan, Richard (2), a minister of the Society of Friends, was born in Norfolk County, Va., Dec. 12, 1756. He entered on ministerial labors in 1797 in New York and New England, and in 1802 visited Europe, where he spent two years. On his return he settled at Hartford, Conn., and five years later removed to Newton, N. J., where he died Oct. 14, 1826. He was an able minister of the Gospel, devoted to the service of his heavenly Master. See Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, iv, 105.

Jordanes. See JORNANDEZ.

Jordanus DA GIANO, OR DE YANE. See MINORITES.

Jordanus OF SAXONIA, second general of the Dominicans, was born at Borrentrick, in the diocese of Paderborn, near the close of the twelfth century. After studying theology at the University of Paris, he joined the Dominicans in 1219, and in 1220 took part in the first general chapter of his order. In 1221 he was made prior of the province of Lombardy, and finally

elected general in 1222, ten months after the death of St. Dominic. The order grew rapidly under his administration, and soon possessed establishments as far as Poland, and even in Palestine, whither Jordanus went in 1228. The ship was wrecked on the return voyage, and Jordanus drowned, in 1236. He wrote, *De Principio Ordinis Prædicatorum* (Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum*, vol. i):—*Epistola de Translatione corporis B. Dominici* (Bzovius, *Annales*, 1233, vol. i):—*Super Priscianum, et quædam grammaticalia*, a MS. in the Leipzig Library. See *Acta Sanctorum*, Feb., ii, 720; Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum*, vi, 93; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 941. (J. N. P.)

Jor'ibas (1 Esdr. viii, 44) or **Jor'ibus** (1 Esdr. ix, 19), Græcized forms (Ἰώριβος, Vulg. *Joribus*) of the name Jarib (q. v.) of two persons (corresponding to Ezra viii, 16, and Ezra x, 18, in the Hebrew text of the above passages respectively).

Jo'rim (Ἰωρείμ, perh. i. q. *Joram*), the son of Matthat and father of Eleazar, maternal ancestors of Jesus, not mentioned in the O. Test. (Luke iii, 29). B.C. post 876. See Genealogy of Christ.

Joris (really Joriszoon, i. e. *Georg'sson*, hence also called *Georgii*), David, founder of an Anabaptist sect of the 16th century, known under the name of *Davidists*, or more generally under that of *Jorists*, himself altogether a most extraordinary character, was born either in 1501 or 1502, at Delft, in Holland, or, as Nippold thinks, at Ghent. He has generally been spoken of as of low parentage, but Nippold holds that David's father was originally a merchant, and afterwards the head of a company who went about acting the play of the life of David the Psalmist, but that his mother was of noble origin. David was early placed at school, but the boy's inclination was more to a roving life, like that of his father, than to books. He early evinced a particular fondness for the art of glass painting. He was therefore finally taken from school and apprenticed to a glass painter, and soon displayed great aptitude in his profession. To perfect himself in this art he set out on a journey to neighboring countries, and travelled through Belgium, France, and England, until a dangerous disease hastened his return to Holland. He now (1524) settled at Delft, and married. Hitherto the young painter had displayed no extraordinary religious zeal; it is true he had been strict in all his religious observances, and had frequently declared himself in favor of vital piety, but this, at a time when the reformatory movement was in its infancy, was not remarkable. Even now he continued his attention to his business, and only on a few public occasions during the religious commotions of this time he dropped a word against the fanatic zeal of the Romish clergy, and the religious excesses of the Romish Church. In 1530, however, he appears more prominently on the stage. It is true he had previously written a few pamphlets against Romanism, but these had failed to provoke reply, or a demand for interference on the part of the authorities. But this year, while a procession of Roman Catholics was moving through the streets of Delft, he stopped the priests and accused them of the crime of deceiving the people by false teachings; he especially reproached them for their worship of images and pictures. The burgomaster of Delft favored Joris not a little, being a friend of his; but this daring action could not go unpunished, and Joris was arrested and imprisoned for some time. After a trial, however, he escaped, no doubt by the aid of his friend, without any severe punishment. He quitted Delft for six years, and it was during his wanderings at this time that he became estranged from the true Reformation principles and an adherent to Anabaptist views, and finally even the founder of an independent sect. His roving life, so very much akin to that of all the Anabaptist leaders, inclined him to their cause; but, being as yet more moderate than they, and opposed to their tumultuous proceedings, especially to their views of establishing their authority by the sword, it was not until 1534 that he actually joined them by rebaptism. At this time the Anabaptists were at the zenith of their success, especially at Münster. See Anabaptists. Being requested to preach and espouse their cause before the people, he at first hesitated, and pleaded incompetency; but at last was prevailed upon, and was consecrated by Dammas, Ubbo, and others as bishop of Delft. The same zeal which he had manifested in the cause of the Lutherans he now displayed in behalf of the Anabaptists, and we may infer from the hesitancy of the authorities to interfere with Joris that his influence had become quite extended and his followers very numerous. Certainly Joris himself was quite conscious of the extent of his power, and he hesitated not to use it for the accomplishment of the one great object that seemed to be nearest his heart, the union of all Anabaptist forces under one common leader, the secure establishment of the principles which he himself espoused, and which no doubt he as yet believed to be based on the Scriptures and indorsed by divine favor. But his course soon aroused suspicion among the other Anabaptist leaders. They were not slow to recognise in Joris an able and determined leader, and, jealous of the success he had already achieved, and fearful of their own position, they openly disavowed him. Such a course was adopted, especially, by Batenburg himself, the founder of an Anabaptist sect, a determined ruffian, void of all feeling, who, under the garb of religion, sought the enjoyment of wealth and power. He preached the extinction of all non-Anabaptists by the sword. Strangely enough, however, his very followers, after his decease, became the most faithful adherents of Joris. Opposed within the camp of the Anabaptists, Joris, in 1536, at the Convocation of Anabaptists held at Bocholt, assumed a still more independent position, and proudly declared himself divinely appointed as leader. This further provoked the jealousy of the other leaders; and as, immediately after the Convocation of Bocholt, Joris issued a pamphlet calling all parties to a peaceful union, the wrath of the different leaders was stimulated anew, and resulted in an entire estrangement of most of the Anabaptists. Those who now continued to espouse his cause were hereafter known as *Jorists* or *Davidists*. Providence seemed to favor his effort. Letters came to him from all directions urging him to stand firm in this trying hour; to these were added visions and revelations which he fancied he had. Even the persecutions to which his followers were now subjected by the authorities were interpreted by him as a further proof of the divine favor. Was it not gain for them to die? From Holland we see him hasten to Westphalia, and thence back again to his native state to comfort his suffering adherents, and to attend and animate them in their dying hours. Nor did he waver when he saw his own mother led to the scaffold (at Delft, 1537), attesting in her dying hour the doctrines which her son was propagating. The extent of his influence may be inferred from the number who at this time became the subjects of persecution. At Delft thirty-five persons were executed for their adherence to Joris; at Haarlem, Amsterdam, Leyden, Rotterdam, and other cities also many suffered likewise. In the space of two years more than two hundred betokened their faithfulness to Anabaptist views at the expense of their life. Nor was Joris himself safe from persecution. He was obliged to leave Delft, where he had lived for a while secretly, and, after fleeing from place to place in his native country, he at last quitted Holland. A monitory letter which he dispatched to the senate of his native land cost the bearer his head. To return to Holland then became for Joris a hazardous undertaking; he therefore sought a home within the dominions of the landgrave of Hesse, but the latter also refused the weary wanderer a resting-place unless he came as a Lutheran. Of course Joris was not now likely to yield up all that his imagination had fancied to be divine truth, and he continued his rovings

until he felt safe nowhere. Suddenly we meet in Switzerland, in the city of Basle, a person by the name of John of Bruges, the owner of real estate in the town and in the country, a peaceable and good citizen, a communicant in the Reformed Church, who had come to Basle with his family in the spring of 1544. This man was none other than David Joris, the celebrated Anabaptist leader, who, tired of years of wandering, preferred a life of safety and comfort under a fictitious name to a life of celebrity and danger as the leader of a large religious sect. No one ever suspected under the garb of John of Bruges the form of David Joris, and he ended his days peacefully, in the midst of his family, in 1556. By the people of Basle, John of Bruges, alias David Joris, was highly esteemed while he lived among them, for, being a man of wealth, he united magnificence with virtue and integrity. But they thought differently after his death, when his son-in-law, Nicholas Blesdyck, a Reformed preacher in the Palatinate, an avaricious and unprincipled man, charged the deceased with the most blasphemous errors. However much David's family might remonstrate and deny the serious charges, the university and the clergy were called upon to pronounce Joris's opinions as heretical, and his body was ordered to be dug up forthwith and committed to the common hangman to be burned. Thus, strangely enough, the Basle people actually brought to pass what Joris himself had told some of his disciples before his decease, that he would rise again at the end of three years.

Respecting the character and opinions of Joris, Mosheim says (*Eccles. Hist.* bk. iv, cent. xvi, sec. iii, pt. ii, ch. iii), "He possessed more sense and more virtue than is commonly supposed, as is evinced not only by his books, of which he published a great many, but also by his disciples, who were persons by no means base, but of great simplicity of manners and character. . . . In the manner of the more moderate Anabaptists, he labored hard to revive languishing piety among his fellow-men; and in this matter his imagination, which was excessively warm, so deceived him that he falsely supposed he had divine visions; and he placed religion in the exclusion of all eternal objects from the thoughts, and the cultivation of silence, contemplation, and a peculiar and indescribable state of the soul. The Mystics, therefore, of the highest order, and the Quakers, might claim him if they would, and they might assign him no mean rank among their sort of people." He believed that the true word of God is no external letter, but God himself, his word, and his voice in man himself. He opposed the doctrine of the Church concerning the Trinity on the ground that God is impersonal. "Is it not contrary to the manifestations of God in the creature to believe him to be three, and to call all three one?" he asks; and then replies, "God reveals himself in three periods, following each other successively—the periods of faith, hope, and love, all of them headed by a God-man appearing in God's stead." The second commenced with Jesus Christ, but the third and higher period, the period of perfect manhood, was inaugurated with the appearance of David Joris. The true Christ is the spiritual, the eternal word, eternally hid in the Father, the heart and the nature of God. This spiritual Christ has by no means really become flesh, but Jesus took the form of Christ in the flesh to make himself manifest. All that was done on or by Jesus in the body was a shadow (type) of what man will do and suffer in the spirit. Hence also there was no power for salvation in Christ's external (i. e. bodily) sufferings and death, but we of our own accord must save ourselves by the sufferings and death of our old man. This deeper and more complete revelation is made to the world by David Joris, the true David, the Christ, not by descent in the flesh, but in the Spirit, and not in the spirit of the crucified and deceased, but of the resurrected and living Christ. With Joris's appearance must terminate the announcement of Christ after the flesh. Joris himself is to establish, both internally and externally, the eternal kingdom of Christ, which hitherto was the kingdom of Christ only internally. He who has reached the perfection of this kingdom [which, of course, could also be done in this world, his *external* kingdom] is freed thereafter from all law, be it human or divine. Evidently Joris's doctrine was nothing but a fully developed system of Montanism (q. v.). He denied the doctrine of future judgment, as he declared that perfection is attained in this world, and thereafter the dependence of the subject on the Creator ceases. Of course he also ruled out of existence angels, both good and bad. He held, with Manes, that the body only, and not the soul, was defiled by sin; and he took a most impolitic step when he adopted the principles of the Adamites with respect to marriage.

Of his 250 books and 1000 letters, the most important is his *Book of Miracles*, which appeared at Deventer in 1542, under the title of *Wonderboeck*, etc. (2d ed. 1551, folio). A list of all his writings, and a very elaborate statement of his life and work, were written by Prof. Nippolt, of Heidelberg University, in the *Zeitschrift für hist. Theol.* 1863, p. 389; 1864, p. 483 sq.; 1868, p. 476 sq. See also Arnold, *Kirchen u. Ketzerhistorie*, pt. ii, bk. xvi, ch. xxi, § 36, p. 873 sq.; Trechsel, *Protest. Antitrinit.* i, 36, 55; Escher, in Ersch. und Gruber, *Allgem. Encyklop.* xxiii, 36-47; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformation*, v, 442 sq., 469 sq.; Henke, *Kirchengesch.* iii, 148 sq.; Cramer, in the Archiv. of *Kist en Royaards*, v, 1 sq.; vi, 291 sq. See ANABAPTISTS. (J. H. W.)

Jorissen, MATTHIAS, a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, was born at Wezel, Holland, October 26, 1739, and educated at the University of Utrecht. His first settlement was at Havezathen, whence he was called to Hasselt, and thence, in 1782, to the Hague, to preach to a German congregation. This charge he held up to his death, Jan. 13, 1823. Jorissen's characteristics were clearness and vigor of intellect, warmth of affection, solidity of judgment, and a remarkable talent to read men and things. His native endowments were cultivated by extensive reading, thorough study, and much intercourse with the best society. He was evangelical in sentiment, of eminent personal piety, devoted to the best interests of his flock, and commanded universal esteem and love. He was one of the founders of the Netherlands Missionary Society. A new version of the Psalms in German was prepared by him. To it he added a few hymns. It was welcomed and adopted by German congregations in the Reformed Church of Holland. His other published writings are comparatively few. See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, ii, 186 sq.; *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk*, by A. Ypeij and J. Dermont, iv, 320. (J. P. W.)

Jor'koäm [some *Jorko'äm*] (Hebrew *Yorkeäm'*, יָרְקְעָם, *paleness of* the *people*, or perh. *extended people*; Sept. Ἰερκαάν v. r. Ἰεκλάν, both confounded with Rekem following; Vulgate *Jercaam*), a person apparently named as the son of Raham, of the descendants of Caleb, the brother of Jerahmeel, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 44); but others (e. g. Gesenius after Jarchi) understand "father" there to mean *founder*, so that this would be the name of a town settled by Raham—an interpretation sustained by a similar use of other names in the same connection. The locality thus alluded to is otherwise unknown, but from the associated places may be presumed to have been a place in the region south-east of Hebron.

Jornandez (*Jornandes* or *Jordanes*), a celebrated historian of the 6th century, was by birth a Goth, or both of Alan and Gothic descent. After adopting the Christian religion he became a zealous churchman, subsequently entered a monastery, and was finally made bishop of Croton, in Italy. He wrote two historical works in the Latin language, *De Regnorum ac Temporum Successione*—a short compendium of the most important events in history from the Creation down to A.D. 552; valuable from the accounts it contains of sev-

eral barbarous northern nations—and *De Getarum Origine et Rebus Gestis* (concerning the origin and deeds of the Goths), which has obtained great renown, chiefly from its being our only source of information about the Goths and other barbarian tribes, except when they are casually mentioned by some Greek or Latin historian. The work, which in the main is a compilation of other writers, is full of inaccuracies, both of time, place, and person; Jornandez himself, however, seems to have been aware of the imperfect condition of his works, for he makes no claims to erudition or extended research. The aim of the works is believed to have been first to extol the Gothic nation, and, secondly, to bring about a union of the Goths and the Romans, for he tries to prove that both nations have long been friends and confederates, and that their perpetuation depended upon the most intimate alliance of the two. See Grimm and Krafft, *K. gesch. d. gener. Völker*, I, i, 77, etc.; Schmidt's *Zeitschr. f. Geschichtl. Wissenschaft*, vi, 516 sq.; Sybel, *De fontibus libri Jordanis*, etc. (Berlin, 1838); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vi, s. v.

Jortin, John, D.D., an eminent English divine, was born in London Oct. 23, 1698. His parents were French Huguenots, and formed part of that noble and devoted band who fled from France at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, giving up all in preference to abjuring their faith. He received his grammatical education at the Charter House. In May, 1715, he was admitted to Jesus College, in Cambridge, of which he became in due time a fellow. He very soon attracted attention by his remarkable proficiency as a scholar, particularly his mastery of the learned languages, and two years after being admitted to the college was recommended by his tutor, Dr. Styan Thirlby, to make extracts from Eustathius for the use of Pope's Homer, and for his services in the work he received the highest commendations from that distinguished poet. While at Cambridge he published a small volume of poems, which are greatly admired, and allowed by scholars to possess a very high rank among modern Latin verses. In 1723 he was admitted to deacon's orders, and the following June to that of priest. In 1726-27 he was presented to the living of Swavesey, near Cambridge, but, in consequence of his marriage soon after, he resigned that living, and removed to London, where he soon became an admired and popular preacher. When his friend, Dr. Osbaldeston, became bishop of London in 1762, Jortin was appointed his domestic chaplain, and was presented with a prebend in the Church of St. Paul and the living of Kensington. To these was soon added the archdeaconry of London. He fixed his residence at Kensington, where he died in 1770. He was as much beloved for his private virtues as admired for his learning, abilities, liberality of mind, and contempt of subserviency. Few men have ever enjoyed the intimacy of so many eminent persons. Among these may be mentioned the names of bishops Horsley, Warburton, Sherlock, Hare, Lowth, and Secker, besides Cudworth, Middleton, Pope, Akenside, Dr. Samuel Johnson, Dr. Parr, Dr. Doddridge, and others. The most intimate relations subsisted between Dr. Jortin and bishop Warburton until he incurred the displeasure of that distinguished prelate by controverting his doctrine with regard to the state of the dead, as described by Homer and Virgil, in his "Divine Legation of Moses." The critical writings of Dr. Jortin are greatly admired by all who have a taste for curious literature. It is not merely on account of the learning which is displayed in them, and the use which is made of obscure authors, but there is a terseness in the expression, and a light, playful satire in the thoughts, which render them very entertaining. His principal works are, *Discourses concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion*, etc. (Lond. 1746, 3 vols. 8vo):—*Life of Erasmus* (Lond. 1758-60, 2 vols. 4to):—*Sermons on different Subjects, and the Doctrine of a Future State*, etc. (Lond. 1771, 4 vols. 8vo):—*Six Dissertations upon different Subjects* (Lond. 1772, 7 vols. 8vo):—*Tracts, philological, critical, and miscellaneous* (Lond. 1790, 2 vols. 8vo):—*Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors, ancient and modern* (1731, 2 vols. 8vo):—*On Covetousness* (Tracts of Angl. Fathers, iv, 226); and *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*, a work which is universally allowed to be curious, interesting, and impartial; full of manly sense, acuteness, and profound erudition.—*English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Allibone, *Dictionary of English and American Authors*, s. v. (E. de P.)

Jos'abad, a less correct form for 1. Jozabad (q.v.), *a*, 1 Chron. xii, 4; *b* (Ἰωζαβδός v. r. Ἰωσάβδος), 1 Esdr. viii, 63; compare Ezra viii, 33. 2. For Zabdai (Ἰωζάβδος v. r. Ἰωσάβαδος, Ὠζάβαδος, and Ζαβδός), 1 Esdr. ix, 29; comp. Ezra x, 28.

Jos'aphat (Ἰωσαφάτ), a Græcized form (Matt. i, 8) of the name of Jehoshaphat (q. v.), king of Judah.

Josaphi'as (Ἰωσαφίας), a Græcized form (1 Esdr. viii, 36) of the name Josiphiah (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra viii, 10).

Joscelin, bishop of Soissons, a rival of Abélard, and one of the most distinguished teachers in Paris, was born in the latter part of the 11th century. In 1115 he became archdeacon of Soissons, and in 1126 succeeded Lisiard as bishop of that see. He took part in the councils of Troyes and Rouen, and in the coronation of king Philip. In 1131 Innocent II sent him, together with St. Bernard, on a mission to the archbishop and to the count of Bordeaux. On his return in 1132 he founded the abbey of Longpont. In 1140 he was one of the judges of Abélard at the Council of Sens, and at the Council of Paris in 1147 was commissioned to inquire into the propositions attributed to Gilbert de la Porrée. He died Oct. 25, 1152. Joscelin enjoyed great reputation for learning and wisdom, and in his diocese fulfilled all the duties of his charge with scrupulous faithfulness. He wrote an *Expositio symboli* and an *Expositio Orationis Dominicæ*, both of which were published in Martene and Durand's *Amplissima Collectio*, ix, 1101, 1111. Martene, *Anecdota*, p. 434, gives also two of his letters. See *Gallia Christ.* ix, 357; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xii, 412.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvi, 948. (J. N. P.)

Joscius (called also Jodocus, Joscionus, Joscelinus, Jostho, and Gotho), a French Roman Catholic prelate, became bishop of St. Brieuc in 1150. In 1157 he was translated to the see of Tours, and immediately began to quarrel with the convents of his diocese, till king Louis VII was obliged to interfere. When Frederick Barbarossa pretended to judge the claims of the rival popes, Victor and Alexander, Joscius was sent to the latter by England and France to assure him of their support and bring him to France. In 1167 Joscius was the prelate who, after the murder of Thomas à Becket, was commissioned by the pope to excommunicate the king of England. It was Joscius also who, when Henry had received absolution in 1172, went to him at Caen, and publicly declared him reconciled to the Church. He died in 1173 or 1174. See *Gallia Christ.* vol. xiv, col. 89, 1088.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxvi, 949.

Jo'sè (Ἰωσή, or, rather, Ἰωσῆ, Gen. of Ἰωσῆς, *Joses*), the son of Eleazar and father of Er, among the maternal ancestors of Christ, unmentioned in the O. T. (Luke iii, 29). B.C. between 876 and 628. See Genealogy of Jesus Christ.

Jos'edec (Ἰωσεδέκ), a Græcized form (1 Esdr. v, 5, 48, 56; vi, 2; ix, 19; Ecclus. xlix, 12) of **Josedech**, the high-priest (Hag. i, 1). See Jehozadak.

Jo'seph (Heb. *Yoseph'*, יוֹסֵף, containing, according to Gen. xxx, 23, 24, a two-fold significance [the two Heb. roots coinciding in form in Hiphil], *remover*, from אָסַף, and *increaser*, from יָסַף, the latter favored by the uncontracted or Chaldaistic form *Yehoseph'*, יְהוֹסֵף, occurring only Psa. lxxxi, 6; Sept. and N. T. Ἰωσήφ, i. q. *Josephus*), the name of several men in the Scriptures and Josephus, all doubtless after the first of the name,

whose beautiful history is told at length in the Scriptures with inimitable simplicity. See also JOSEPHUS.

1. The elder son of Jacob and Rachel, born (B.C. 1913; comp. Gen. xli, 46) under peculiar circumstances, as may be seen in Gen. xxx, 22; on which account, and because he was the son of his old age (xxxvii, 3), he was beloved by his father more than were the rest of his children, though Benjamin, as being also a son of Jacob's favorite wife Rachel, was in a peculiar manner dear to the patriarch. The partiality evinced towards Joseph by his father excited jealousy on the part of his brethren, the rather as they were born of different mothers (xxxvii, 2). Jacob at this time had two small pieces of land in Canaan, Abraham's burying-place at Hebron in the south, and the "parcel of a field, where he [Jacob] had spread his tent" (xxxiii, 19), at Shechem in the north, the latter being probably, from its price, the lesser of the two. He seems then to have staid at Hebron with the aged Isaac, while his sons kept his flocks.

1. Joseph had reached his seventeenth year, having hitherto been engaged in boyish sports, or aiding in pastoral duties, when some conduct on the part of "the sons of Bilhah and the sons of Zilpah, his father's wives," seems to have been such as, in the opinion of Joseph, to require the special attention of Jacob, to whom accordingly he communicated the facts. This regard to virtue, and this manifestation of filial fidelity, greatly increased his brothers' dislike, who henceforth "hated him, and could not speak peaceably unto him" (xxxvii, 4). Their jealousy was aggravated by the fact that Jacob had shown his preference by making him a dress (כְּתֹנֶת פַּסִּים), which appears to have been a long tunic with sleeves, worn by youths and maidens of the richer class. See ATTIRE. Their aversion, however, was carried to the highest pitch when Joseph acquainted them with the two dreams that he had had, to the effect—the first, that while he and they were binding sheaves, his sheaf arose and stood erect, while theirs stood round and did obeisance to his; the second, that "the sun and the moon and the eleven stars did him homage." These dreams appeared to indicate that Joseph would acquire pre-eminence in the family, if not sovereignty; and while even his father rebuked him, his brothers were filled with envy (xxxvii, 11). Jacob, however, was not aware of the depth of their ill will; so that, on one occasion, having a desire to hear intelligence of his sons, who were pasturing their flocks at a distance, he did not hesitate to make Joseph his messenger for that purpose. They had gone to Shechem to feed the flock, and Joseph was sent thither from the vale of Hebron by his father to bring him word of their welfare and that of the flock. They were not at Shechem, but had gone to Dothan, which appears to have been not very far distant, pasturing their flock like the Arabs of the present day, wherever the wild country (ver. 22) was unowned. His appearing in view of his brothers was the signal for their malice to gain head. They began to devise means for his immediate destruction, which they would have unhesitatingly effected but for his half-brother Reuben, who, as the eldest son, might well be the party to interfere on behalf of Joseph. A compromise was entered into, in virtue of which the youth was stripped of the distinguishing vestments which he owed to his father's affection, and cast into a pit. Having performed this evil deed, and while they were taking refreshment, the brothers beheld a caravan of Arabian merchants (Ishmaelites = Midianites), who were bearing the spices and aromatic gums of India down to the well-known and much-frequented mart, Egypt. Judah on this feels a better emotion arise in his mind, and proposes that, instead of allowing Joseph to perish, they should sell him to the merchants, whose trade obviously from this embraced human beings as well as spicery. Accordingly the unhappy young man was sold for a slave (at the price of twenty shekels of silver, a sort of fixed rate; see Lev. xxvii, 5), to be conveyed by his masters into Egypt. While on his way thither, Reuben returned to the pit, intending to rescue his brother, and convey him safely back to their father. Finding Joseph gone, he returned with expostulations to the wicked young men, who, so far from relenting, now concerted a fresh act of treachery, by which at once to cover their crime and also punish their father for his partiality towards the unoffending sufferer. With this view they dipped Joseph's party-colored garment in the blood of a kid and sent it to Jacob, in order to make him believe that his favorite child had been torn to pieces by some wild beast. The trick succeeded, and Jacob was grieved beyond measure (Gen. xxxviii, 12-35). B.C. 1895.

2. Meanwhile the merchants sold Joseph to Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh's, and captain of the royal guard, who was a native of the country (Gen. xxxvii, 36). It is by no means easy to determine who at this time was the Pharaoh, or ruling monarch, though, what is far more important, the condition of the country, and therein the progress of civilization, are in certain general and important features made clear in the course of the narration. According to Syncellus, however, the general opinion in his day was that the sovereign's name who ruled Egypt at the time of the deportation of Joseph was Aphophis. See EGYPT. In Potiphar's house Joseph enjoyed the highest confidence and the largest prosperity. A higher power watched over him; and whatever he undertook succeeded, till at length his master gave every thing into his hands. He was placed over all his master's property with perfect trust, and "the Lord blessed the Egyptian's house for Joseph's sake" (ver. 5). The sculptures and paintings of the ancient Egyptian tombs bring vividly before us the daily life and duties of Joseph. The property of great men is shown to have been managed by scribes, who exercised a most methodical and minute supervision over all the operations of agriculture, gardening, the keeping of live-stock, and fishing. Every product was carefully registered to check the dishonesty of the laborers, who in Egypt have always been famous in this respect. Probably in no country was farming ever more systematic. Joseph's previous knowledge of tending flocks, and perhaps of husbandry, and his truthful character, exactly fitted him for the post of overseer.

The Hebrew race have always been remarkable for personal beauty, of which Joseph seems to have had an unusual share. This fact explains, though it cannot palliate, the conduct of Potiphar's wife, who, with the well-known profligacy of the Egyptian women, tried every means to bring the pure-minded youth to fulfil her unchaste desires. Foiled in her evil wishes, she resolved to punish Joseph, who thus a second time innocently brings on himself the vengeance of the ill-disposed. Charged with the very crime to which he had in vain been tempted, he is, with a fickleness characteristic of Oriental lords, at once cast into the state prison (Gen. xxxix). If the suddenness and magnitude of this and other changes in the lot of Joseph should surprise any one, the feeling will be mainly owing to his want of acquaintance with the manners and customs of the East, where vicissitudes not less marked and sudden than are those presented in our present history are not uncommon; for those who come into the charmed circle of an Eastern court, especially if they are persons of great energy of character, are subject to the most wonderful alternations of fortune, the slave of to-day being the vizier of to-morrow, and vice-versa.

It must not be supposed, from the lowness of the morals of the Egyptians in practice, that the sin of unfaithfulness in a wife was not ranked among the heaviest vices. The punishment of adulterers was severe, and a moral tale, entitled "*The Two Brothers*" (contained in a papyrus of the 19th dynasty, found in the British Museum, and translated in the *Cambridge Essays* for 1858), is founded upon a case nearly resembling that of Joseph.

It has, indeed, been imagined that this story was based upon the trial of Joseph, and as it was written for the heir to the throne of Egypt at a later period, there is some reason in the idea that the virtue of one who had held so high a position as Joseph might have been in the mind of the writer, were this part of his history well known to the priests, which, however, is not likely. This incident, moreover, is not so remarkable as to justify great stress being laid upon the similarity to it of the main event of a moral tale. The story of Bellerophon might as reasonably be traced to it, were it Egyptian and not Greek. The Muslims have founded upon the history of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, whom they call Yûsuf and Zelîkha, a famous religious allegory. This is much to be wondered at, as the Koran relates the tempting of Joseph with no material variation in the main particulars from the authentic narrative. The commentators say that, after the death of Potiphar (Kitfîr), Joseph married Zelîkha (Sale, chap. xii). This mistake was probably caused by the circumstance that Joseph's father-in-law bore the same name as his master.

Potiphar, although believing Joseph guilty, does not appear to have brought him before a tribunal, where the enormity of his alleged crime, especially after the trust placed in him, and the fact of his being a foreigner, which was made much of by his master's wife (xxxix, 14, 17), would probably have insured a punishment of the severest kind. He seems to have only cast him into the prison, which appears to have been in his house, or, at least, under his control, since afterwards prisoners are related to have been put "in ward [in] the house of the captain of the executioners, into the prison" (xl, 3), and simply "in ward [in] the captain of the executioners' house" (xli, 10; comp. xl, 7). The prison is described as "a place where the king's prisoners [were] bound" (xxxix, 20). Here the hardest time of Joseph's period of probation began. He was cast into prison on a false accusation, to remain there for at least two years, and perhaps for a much longer time. At first he was treated with severity; this we learn from Psa. cv, "He sent a man before them, Joseph [who]: was sold for a slave: whose feet they afflicted with the fetter: the iron entered into his soul" (ver. 17, 18). There is probably here a connection between "fetter" and "iron" (comp. cxlix, 8), in which case the signification of the last clause would be "the iron entered into him," meaning that the fetters cut his feet or legs. This is not inconsistent with the statement in Genesis that the keeper of the prison treated Joseph well (xxxix, 21), for we are not justified in thence inferring that he was kind from the first.

In the prison, as in Potiphar's house, Joseph was found worthy of complete trust, and the keeper of the prison placed everything under his control, God's especial blessing attending his honest service. After a while Pharaoh was incensed against two of his officers, "the chief of the cup-bearers" (שַׂר הַמַּשְׁקִים), and "the chief of the bakers" (שַׂר הָאוֹפִים), and cast them into the prison where Joseph was. Here the chief of the executioners, doubtless a successor of Potiphar (for, had the latter been convinced of Joseph's innocence, he would not have left him in the prison, and if not so convinced he would not have trusted him), charged Joseph to serve these prisoners. Like Potiphar, they were "officers" of Pharaoh (xl, 2), and though it may be a mistake to call them grandees, their easy access to the king would give them an importance that explains the care taken of them by the chief of the executioners. Each dreamed a prophetic dream, which Joseph correctly interpreted, disclaiming human skill and acknowledging that interpretations were of God. It is not necessary here to discuss in detail the particulars of this part of Joseph's history, since they do not materially affect the leading events of his life; they are, however, very interesting, from their perfect agreement with the manners of the ancient Egyptians as represented on their monuments. On the authority of Herodotus and others, it was long denied that the vine grew in Egypt; and if so, the imagery of the butler's dream would hardly have been appropriate. Wilkinson, however, has shown beyond a question that vines did grow in Egypt, and thus not only removed a doubt, but given a positive confirmation of the sacred record (*Manners of the Anc. Egypt.* ii, 152).

The butler, whose fate was auspicious, promised the young Hebrew to employ his influence to procure his restoration to the free air of day; but when again in the enjoyment of his "butlership," "he forgat" Joseph (xl). B.C. 1885. Pharaoh himself, however, had two dreams, which found in Joseph a successful expounder; for the butler remembered the skill of his prison-companion, and advised his royal master to put it to the test in his own case. Pharaoh's dream, as interpreted by Joseph, foreboded the approach of a seven years' famine; to abate the evils of which Joseph recommended that some "discreet and wise man" should be chosen and set in full power over the land of Egypt. The monarch was alarmed, and called a council of his advisers. The wisdom of Joseph was recognised as of divine origin and supereminent value; and the king and his ministers (whence it appears that the Egyptian monarchy—at Memphis—was not despotic, but constitutional) resolved that Joseph should be made (to borrow a term from Rome) dictator in the approaching time of need. "And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, Forasmuch as God hath showed thee all this, there is none so discreet and wise as thou art. Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou. See, I have set thee over all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh took off his ring and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck; and he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had; and they cried before him, Bow the knee. [See ABRECH.] And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, I am Pharaoh, and without thee shall no man lift up his hand or foot in all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphnath-paaneah [saviour of the world; comp. Jablonsky, *Opusc.* i. 207 sq.]; and he gave him to wife Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On. And Joseph went out over all the land of Egypt" (xli, 39 sq.). The monuments show that on the investiture of a high official in Egypt, one of the chief ceremonies was the putting on him a collar of gold (see *Ancient Egyptians*, pl. 80); the other particulars, the vestures of fine linen and the riding in the second chariot, are equally in accordance with the manners of the country. It has been supposed that Joseph was taken into the priestly order, and thus ennobled. The Biblical narrative does not support this opinion, though it leaves it without a doubt that in reality, if not in form as well, the highest trust and the proudest honors of the state were conferred on one so recently a Hebrew slave. The age of Joseph is stated to have been thirty years at the time of this promotion (xli, 46). B.C. 1883.

3. Seven years of abundance afforded Joseph opportunity to carry into effect such plans as secured an ample provision against the seven years of need. The famine came, but it found a prepared people. The representations of the monuments, which show that the contents of the granaries were accurately noted by the scribes when they were filled, well illustrate this part of the history. See GRANARY. The visitation was not merely local, for "the famine was over all the face of the earth;" "and all countries came into Egypt to Joseph to buy corn" (ver. 56, 57). The expressions here used, however, do not require us to suppose that the famine extended beyond the countries around Egypt, such as Palestine, Syria, and Arabia, as well as some part of Africa, although of course it may have been more widely experienced. It may be observed, that although fam-

ines in Egypt depend immediately upon the failure of the inundation, and in other countries upon the failure of rain, yet that, as the rise of the Nile is caused by heavy rains in Ethiopia, an extremely dry season there and in Palestine would produce the result described in the sacred narrative. It must also be recollected that Egypt was anciently the granary of neighboring countries, and that a famine there would cause first scarcity, and then famine, around. Famines are not very unfrequent in the history of Egypt; but the famous seven years' famine in the reign of the Fatimite Caliph El-Mustansir-billah is the only known parallel to that of Joseph. See FAMINE. Early in the time of famine, Joseph's brethren came to buy corn, a part of the history which we mention here only as indicating the liberal policy of the governor of Egypt, by which the storehouses were opened to all buyers, of whatever nation they were.

After the famine had lasted for a time, apparently two years, there was "no bread in all the land; for the famine [was] very sore, so that the land of Egypt and [all] the land of Canaan fainted by reason of the famine. And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought; and Joseph brought the money into Pharaoh's house" (xlvii, 13, 14). When all the money of Egypt and Canaan was exhausted, barter became necessary. Joseph then obtained all the cattle of Egypt, and in the next year, all the land, except that of the priests, and apparently, as a consequence, the Egyptians themselves. He demanded, however, only a fifth part of the produce as Pharaoh's right. It has been attempted to trace this enactment of Joseph in the fragments of Egyptian history preserved by profane writers, but the result has not been satisfactory. Even were the latter sources trustworthy as to the early period of Egyptian history, it would be difficult to determine the age referred to, as the actions of at least two kings are ascribed by the Greeks to Sesostris, the king particularized. Herodotus says that, according to the Egyptians, Sesostris "made a division of the soil of Egypt among the inhabitants, assigning square plots of ground of equal size to all, and obtaining his chief revenue from the rent which the holders were required to pay him every year" (ii, 109). Elsewhere he speaks of the priests as having no expenses, being supported by the property of the temples (ii, 37), but he does not assign to Sesostris, as has been rashly supposed, the exemption from taxation that we may reasonably infer. Diodorus Siculus ascribes the division of Egypt into nomes to Sesostris, whom he calls Sesoösis. Taking into consideration the general character of the information given by Herodotus respecting the history of Egypt at periods remote from his own time, we are not justified in supposing anything more than that some tradition of an ancient allotment of the soil by the crown among the population was current when he visited the country. The testimony of Diodorus is of far less weight.

There is a notice, in an ancient Egyptian inscription, of a famine which has been supposed to be that of Joseph. The inscription is in a tomb at Benî Hasan, and records of Amenî, a governor of a district of Upper Egypt, that when there were years of famine, his district was supplied with food. This was in the time of Sesertesen I, of the twelfth dynasty. It has been supposed by Bunsen (*Egypt's Place*, iii, 334) that this must be Joseph's famine; but not only are the particulars of the record inapplicable to that instance, but the calamity it relates was never unusual in Egypt, as its ancient inscriptions and modern history equally testify.

Joseph's policy towards the subjects of Pharaoh is important in reference to forming an estimate of his character. It displays the resolution and breadth of view that mark his whole career. He perceived a great advantage to be gained, and he lost no part of it. He put all Egypt under Pharaoh. First the money, then the cattle, last of all the land, and the Egyptians themselves, became the property of the sovereign, and that, too, by the voluntary act of the people without any pressure. This being effected, he exercised a great act of generosity, and required only a fifth of the produce as a recognition of the rights of the crown. Of the wisdom of this policy there can be no doubt. Its justice can hardly be questioned when it is borne in mind that the Egyptians were not forcibly deprived of their liberties, and that when these had been given up they were at once restored. We do not know all the circumstances; but if, as we may reasonably suppose, the people were warned of the famine, and yet made no preparation during the years of overflowing abundance, the government had a clear claim upon its subjects for having taken precautions they had neglected. In any case it may have been desirable to make a new allotment of land, and to reduce an unequal system of taxation to a simple claim to a fifth of the produce. We have no evidence whether Joseph were in this matter divinely aided, but we cannot doubt that if not he acted in accord with a judgment of great clearness in distinguishing good and evil.

4. We have now to consider the conduct of Joseph at this time towards his brethren and his father. Early in the time of famine, which prevailed equally in Canaan and Egypt, Jacob reproved his helpless sons and sent them to Egypt, where he knew there was corn to be bought. Benjamin alone he kept with him. Joseph was now governor, an Egyptian in habits and speech, for like all men of large mind he had suffered no scruples of prejudice to make him a stranger to the people he ruled. In his exalted station he labored with the zeal that he showed in all his various charges, presiding himself at the sale of corn. They had, of necessity, to appear before Joseph, whose license for the purchase of corn was indispensable. Joseph had probably expected to see them, and he seems to have formed a deliberate plan of action. His conduct has brought on him the always ready charges of those who would rather impeach than study the Bible, and even friends of that sacred book have hardly in this case done Joseph full justice (Niemeyer, *Charakt.* ii, 366; Heuser, *Diss. non inhumaniter sed prudentissime Josephum cum fratribus fecisse*, Hal. 1773). Joseph's main object appears to have been to make his brothers feel and recognise their guilt in their conduct towards him. For this purpose suffering, then as well as now, was indispensable. Accordingly, Joseph feigned not to know his brothers, charged them with being spies, threatened them with imprisonment, and allowed them to return home to fetch their younger brother, as a proof of their veracity, only on condition that one of them should remain behind in chains, with a prospect of death before him should not their words be verified. Then it was, and not before, that "they said one to another, We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul and would not hear; therefore is this distress come upon us. And Reuben said, Spake I not unto you, saying, Do not sin against the child, and ye would not hear? therefore, behold, also his blood is required" (xlii, 21). Upon this, after weeping bitterly, he by common agreement bound his brother Simeon, and left him in custody. How deeply concerned Joseph was for his family, how true and affectionate a heart he had, may be learned from the words which escape from the brothers in their entreaty that Jacob would allow Benjamin to go into Egypt, as required by Joseph: "The man asked us straitly of our state and of our kindred, saying, Is your father yet alive? have ye another brother?" (xliii, 7).

At length Jacob consents to Benjamin's going in company with his brothers: "And God Almighty give you mercy before the man, that he may send away your other brother and Benjamin. If I be bereaved of my children, I am bereaved" (ver. 14). Thus provided, with a present consisting of balm, honey, spices, and myrrh, nuts and almonds, and with double money in their hands (double, in order that they might repay the sum

which Joseph had caused to be put into each man's sack at their departure, if, as Jacob supposed, "it was an oversight"), they went again down to Egypt and stood before Joseph (xliii, 15); and there, too, stood Benjamin, Joseph's beloved brother. The required pledge of truthfulness was given. If it is asked why such a pledge was demanded, since the giving of it caused pain to Jacob, the answer may be thus: Joseph knew not how to demean himself towards his family until he ascertained its actual condition. That knowledge he could hardly be certain he had gained from the mere words of men who had spared his life only to sell himself into slavery. How had these wicked men behaved towards his venerable father? His beloved brother Benjamin, was he safe? or had he suffered from their jealousy and malice the worse fate with which he himself had been threatened? Nothing but the sight of Benjamin could answer these questions and resolve these details.

Benjamin had come, and immediately a natural change took place in Joseph's conduct: the brother began to claim his rights in Joseph's bosom. Jacob was safe, and Benjamin was safe. Joseph's heart melted at the sight of Benjamin: "And he said to the ruler of his house, Bring these men home, and slay and make ready, for these men shall dine with me at noon" (xliii, 16). But guilt is always the ready parent of fear; accordingly, the brothers expected nothing but being reduced to slavery. When taken to their own brother's house, they imagined they were being entrapped. A colloquy ensued between them and Joseph's steward, whence it appeared that the money put into their sacks, to which they now attributed their peril, was in truth a present from Joseph, designed, after his own brotherly manner, to aid his family in their actual necessities. The steward said, "Peace be to you; fear not; your God and the God of your father hath given you the treasure in your sacks. I had your money" (ver. 23).

Noon came, and with it Joseph, whose first question regarded home: "He asked them of their welfare, and said, Is your father well, the old man of whom ye spake? is he yet alive? And he lifted up his eyes and saw his brother Benjamin, his mother's son, and said, Is this your younger brother? And he said, God be gracious unto thee, my son!" "And Joseph made haste, for his bowels did yearn upon his brother, and he sought where to weep; and he entered into his chamber, and wept there." Does this look like harshness?

The connection brings into view an Egyptian custom, which is of more than ordinary importance, in consequence of its being adopted in the Jewish polity: "And they set on (food) for him by himself (Joseph), and for them by themselves (the brethren), and for the Egyptians which did eat with them, by themselves: because the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination with the Egyptians" (ver. 32). This passage is also interesting, as proving that Joseph had not, in his princely grandeur, become ashamed of his origin, nor consented to receive adoption into a strange nation: he was still a Hebrew, waiting, like Moses after him, for the proper season to use his power for the good of his own people.

Other customs appear in this interesting narrative: "And they (the brothers) sat before him (Joseph), *the first-born according to his birthright*, and the youngest according to his youth." "And he sent messes (delicacies) unto them from before him; but Benjamin's mess was five times so much as any of theirs" (ver. 32, 33). Fear had now given place to wonder, and wonder at length issued in joy and mirth (comp. ver. 18, 33, 34). The scenes of the Egyptian tombs show us that it was the custom for each person to eat singly, particularly among the great; that guests were placed according to their right of precedence, and that it was usual to drink freely, men and even women being represented as overpowered with wine, probably as an evidence of the liberality of the entertainer. See BANQUET.

Joseph, apparently with a view to ascertain how far his brethren were faithful to their father, hit upon a plan which would in its issue serve to show whether they would make any, and what sacrifice, in order to fulfil their solemn promise of restoring Benjamin in safety to Jacob. Accordingly, he orders not only that every man's money (as before) should be put in his sack's mouth, but also that his "silver cup, in which my lord drinketh, and whereby he divineth," should be put in the sack's mouth of the youngest. The brethren leave, but are soon overtaken by Joseph's steward, who charges them with having surreptitiously carried off this costly and highly-valued vessel. They, on their part, vehemently repel the accusation, adding, "with whomsoever of thy servants it be found, both let him die, and we also will be my lord's bondmen." A search is made, and the cup is found in Benjamin's sack. Accordingly they return to the city. And now comes the hour of trial: Would they purchase their own liberation by surrendering Benjamin? After a most touching interview, in which they prove themselves worthy and faithful, Joseph declares himself unable any longer to withstand the appeal of natural affection. On this occasion Judah, who is the spokesman, shows the deepest regard to his aged father's feelings, and entreats for the liberation of Benjamin even at the price of his own liberty. In the whole of literature we know of nothing more simple, natural, true, and impressive; nor, while passages of this kind stand in the Pentateuch, can we even understand what is meant by terming that collection of writings "the Hebrew national epic," or regarding it as an aggregation of historical legends. If here we have not history, we can in no case be sure that history is before us (chap. xliv).

Most natural and impressive is the scene also which ensues, in which Joseph, after informing his brethren who he was, and inquiring, first of all, "Is my father alive?" expresses feelings free from the slightest taint of revenge, and even shows how, under divine Providence, the conduct of his brothers had issued in good—"God sent me before you to preserve a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance." Five years had yet to ensue in which "there would be neither earing nor harvest," and therefore the brethren were directed to return home and bring Jacob down to Egypt with all speed. "And he fell upon his brother Benjamin's neck and wept; and Benjamin wept upon his neck. Moreover, he kissed all his brethren and wept upon them; and after that his brethren talked with him" (xlv, 14, 15).

The news of these striking events was carried to Pharaoh, who, being pleased at Joseph's conduct, gave directions that Jacob and his family should come forthwith into Egypt: "I will give you the good of the land of Egypt, and ye shall eat the fat of the land: regard not your stuff, for the good of all the land is yours." The brethren departed, being well provided for: "And to his father Joseph sent ten asses laden with the good things of Egypt, and ten she-asses laden with corn, and bread, and meat for his father by the way." The intelligence which they bore to their father was of such a nature that "Jacob's heart fainted, for he believed them not." When, however, he had recovered from the thus naturally told effects of his surprise, the venerable patriarch said, "Enough; Joseph, my son, is yet alive: I will go and see him before I die" (xlv, 26, 28). Accordingly Jacob and his family, to the number of threescore and ten souls, go down to Egypt, and by the express efforts of Joseph, are allowed to settle in the district of Goshen, where Joseph met his father: "And he fell on his neck, and wept on his neck a good while." There Joseph "nourished his father and his brethren, and all his father's household, with bread, according to their families" (xlvii, 12). B.C. 1874.

5. Joseph had now to pass through the mournful scenes which attend on the death and burial of a father (Gen. l, 1-21). B.C. 1856. Having had Jacob embalm-

ed, and seen the rites of mourning fully observed, the faithful and affectionate son—leave being obtained of the monarch—proceeded into the land of Canaan, in order, agreeably to a promise which the patriarch had exacted (Gen. xlvii, 29-31), to lay the old man's bones with those of his fathers, in "the field of Ephron the Hittite." Having performed with long and bitter mourning Jacob's funeral rites, Joseph returned into Egypt. The last recorded act of his life forms a most becoming close. After the death of their father, his brethren, unable, like all guilty people, to forget their criminality, and characteristically finding it difficult to think that Joseph had really forgiven them, grew afraid, now they were in his power, that he would take an opportunity of inflicting some punishment on them. They accordingly go into his presence, and in imploring terms and an abject manner entreat his forgiveness. "Fear not"—this is his noble reply—"I will nourish you and your little ones."

6. By his Egyptian wife Asenath, daughter of the high-priest of Heliopolis, Joseph had two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim (Gen. xli, 50 sq.), whom Jacob adopted (xlviii, 5), and who accordingly took their place among the heads of the twelve tribes of Israel.

Joseph lived a hundred and ten years, kind and gentle in his affections to the last; for we are told, "The children of Machir, the son of Manasseh, were brought up upon Joseph's knees" (l, 23). Having obtained a promise from his brethren that when the time came, as he assured them it would come, that God should visit them, and "bring them unto the land which he sware to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob," they would carry up his bones out of Egypt, Joseph at length "died, and they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin" (l, 26). B.C. 1802. This promise was religiously fulfilled. His descendants, after carrying the corpse about with them in their wanderings, at length put it in its final resting-place in Shechem, in a parcel of ground that Jacob bought of the sons of Hamor, which became the inheritance of the children of Joseph (Josh. xxiv, 32). A tomb which probably represents the same spot is still shown to travellers in the vicinity of Jacob's Well (Hackett's *Illustrations*, p. 197). It is a flat-roofed rectangular building surmounted by a dome, under which is pointed out the real tomb, in shape like a covered wagon (Wilson, *Bible Lands*, ii, 60).

"Joseph's Tomb."

The history of Joseph's posterity is given in the articles devoted to the tribes of EPHRAIM and MANASSEH. Sometimes these tribes are spoken of under the name of Joseph (Josh. xiv, 4; xvii, 14, 17; xviii, 5; Judg. i, 23, 35, etc.), which is even given to the whole Israelitish nation (Psa. lxxx, 1; lxxxi, 5; Amos v, 15; vi, 6). Ephraim is, however, the common name of his descendants, for the division of Manasseh gave almost the whole political weight to the brother-tribe (Psa. lxxviii, 67; Ezek. xxxvii, 16, 19; Zech. x, 6). That great people seems to have inherited all Joseph's ability with none of his goodness, and the very knowledge of his power in Egypt, instead of stimulating his offspring to follow in his steps, appears only to have constantly drawn them into a hankering after that forbidden land which began when Jeroboam introduced the calves, and ended only when a treasonable alliance laid Samaria in ruins and sent the ten tribes into captivity.

7. The character of Joseph is wholly composed of great materials, and therefore needs not to be minutely portrayed. We trace in it very little of that balance of good and evil, of strength and weakness, that marks most things human, and do not anywhere distinctly discover the results of the conflict of motives that generally occasions such great difficulty in judging men's actions. We have as full an account of Joseph as of Abraham and Jacob, a fuller one than of Isaac; and if we compare their histories, Joseph's character is the least marked by wrong or indecision. His first quality seems to have been the greatest resolution. He not only believed faithfully, but could endure patiently, and could command equally his good and evil passions. Hence his strong sense of duty, his zealous work, his strict justice, his clear discrimination of good and evil. Like all men of vigorous character, he loved power, but when he had gained it he used it with the greatest generosity. He seems to have striven to get men unconditionally in his power that he might be the means of good to them. Generosity in conferring benefits, as well as in forgiving injuries, is one of his distinguishing characteristics. With this strength was united the deepest tenderness. He was easily moved to tears, even weeping at the first sight of his brethren after they had sold him. His love for his father and Benjamin was not enfeebled by years of separation, nor by his great station. The wise man was still the same as the true youth. These great qualities explain his power of governing and administering, and his extraordinary flexibility, which enabled him to suit himself to each new position in life. The last trait to make up this great character was modesty, the natural result of the others.

In the history of the chosen race Joseph occupies a very high place as an instrument of Providence. He was "sent before" his people, as he himself knew, to preserve them in the terrible famine, and to settle them where they could multiply and prosper in the interval before the iniquity of the Canaanites was full. In the latter days of Joseph's life, he is the leading character among the Hebrews. He makes his father come into Egypt, and directs the settlement. He protects his kinsmen. Dying, he reminds them of the promise, charging them to take his bones with them. Blessed with many revelations, he is throughout a God-taught leader of his people. In the N. T. Joseph is only mentioned; yet the striking particulars of the persecution and sale by his brethren, his resisting temptation, his great degradation and yet greater exaltation, the saving

of his people by his hand, and the confounding of his enemies, seem to indicate that he was a type of our Lord. He also connects the patriarchal with the Gospel dispensation, as an instance of the exercise of some of the highest Christian virtues under the less distinct manifestation of the divine will granted to the fathers.

8. For further discussion of the events of Joseph's history, see Wolfenb. *Fragment.* p. 36; Less, *Geschichte der Rel.* i, 267; J. T. Jacobi, *Sämmtl. Schrift.* part 3; Hess, *Gesch. der Patriarch.* ii, 324; Niemeyer, *Charakt.* ii, 340; *Allgem. Welthist.* ii, 332; Heeren, *Ideen*, ii, 551; Jablonski, *Opusc.* i, 207; Gesenius, *Thes. Hebr.* p. 1181; Hammer, *D. Osman. Reich*, ii, 83; Hengstenberg, *Mos. und Æg.* p. 30; J. B. Burcardi, in the *Mus. Helv.* I, iii, 355; Voigt, in the *Brem. und verd. Biblioth.* v, 599; Bauer, *Heb. Gesch.* i, 181; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* i, 464; Doderlein, *Theol. Biblioth.* iv, 717; Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* iii, 310; Lengerke, *Kenáan*, i, 263; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 331; Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* ii, 332; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.*; Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant*; Stanley, *Hist. of the Jewish Church*; Adamson, *Joseph and his Brethren* (Lond. 1844); Edelman, *Sermons on the Hist. of Joseph* (Lond. 1839); Leighton, *Lectures on Hist. of J.* (Lond. 1848); Plumptre, *Hist. of Joseph* (Lond. 1848); Randall, *Lectures on Hist. of J.* (Lond. 1852); Wardlaw, *Hist. of Joseph* (new ed. Lond. 1851); Gibson, *Lectures on Hist. of J.* (Lond. 1853); Overton, *Lectures on Life of Joseph* (London, 1866). Treatises on special points are the following: Hoppe, *De philosophia Josephi* (Helmst. 1706); *A Review of the Life and Administration of Joseph* (London, 1743); J. B. Burckhard, *De criminibus Josepho impactis* (Basil. 1746); Ansaldus, *Josephi religio vindicata* (Brix. 1747); Trigland, *De Josepho adorato* (L. B. 1750); Winkler, *Unters. einiger Schwierigk. vom Jos.* (in his *Schriftsteller*, iii, 1); Heuser, *De non inhumaniter Josephum fecisse* (Halle, 1773); Küchler, *Quare Josephus patrem non de se certiorem fecerit* (Leucop. 1798); Nicolai, *De servis Josephi medicis* (Helmst. 1752); Piderib, *De nomine Josephi in Ægypto* (Marb. 1768–9); Reineccius, *De nomine* צפנת פענח (Weissenf. 1725); Schröder, *De Josephi laudibus* (in Schönfeld's *Vita Jacobi*, Marb. 1713); Von Seelen, *De Josepho Ægyptiorum rectore* (Lub. 1742); T. Smith, *Hist. of Joseph in connection with Eg. Antiquities* (Lond. 1858); Walter, *De Josepho lapide Israelis* (Hersf. 1734); Wunschald, *De cognomine Josephi Ægyptiaco* (Wittenb. 1669). See JACOB.

2. The father of Igal, which latter was the Issacharite "spy" to explore Canaan (Numb. xiii, 7). B.C. ante 1657.

3. The second named of the sons of Asaph, appointed head of the first division of sacred musicians by David (1 Chron. xxv, 2, 9). B.C. 1014.

4. The son of Jonan, and father of Judah or Adaiah, among Christ's maternal ancestors, but unmentioned in the O. T. (Luke iii, 30). B.C. ante 876.

5. Son of Shebaniah, and one of the chief priests contemporary with Jehoiakim (Neh. xii, 14). B.C. post 536.

6. One of the "sons" of Bani who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 42). B.C. 459.

7. The son of Judah, and father of Semei, maternal ancestors of Jesus (Luke iii, 26); probably the same with SCHECHANIAH, the son of Obadiah, and father of Shemaiah (1 Chron. iii, 21, 92). B.C. between 536 and 410.

8. The son of Mattathiah, and father of Janna, maternal ancestors of Christ, unmentioned in the Old Test. (Luke iii, 24). B.C. considerably post 406. See on this and Nos. 4 and 7, GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

9. (Ἰωσήφ.) Son of Oziel, and father of On, an ancestor of Judith (Judith viii, 1).

10. A young man of high character, son of Tobias, and nephew of the Jewish high-priest Onias II, whose avarice he rebuked, but prevented its evil consequences by propitiating Ptolemy, and becoming the collector of his taxes. His history is given at considerable length by Josephus (*Ant.* xii, 4, 2–10), including his unintentional marriage with his own niece, by whom he had a son named Hyrcanus.

11. (Ἰώσηφος.) Son of Zacharias, left with Azarias as general of the Jewish troops by Judas Maccabæus, and defeated by Gorgias, B.C. cir. 164 (1 Macc. v, 8, 56, 60; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 8, 6).

12. (Ἰώσηπος.) In 2 Macc. viii, 22; x, 19. Joseph is named among the brethren of Judas Maccabæus apparently in place of JOHN (Ewald, *Gesch.* iv, 384, note; Grimm, *ad* 2 *Macc.* viii, 22). The confusion of Ἰωάννης, Ἰωσήφ, Ἰωσῆς is well seen in the various readings in Matt. xiii, 55. See JOSES.

13. Uncle of Herod the Great, who left him in charge when he went to plead his cause before Antony, with injunctions to put Mariamne to death in case he never returned; but this order, being disclosed to Mariamne, led to Joseph's death by command of Herod through suspicion of criminal intercourse with Mariamne (Josephus, *Ant.* xv, 5, 6, 9). He had married Salome, Herod's sister (*War*, i, 22, 4). He seems to be the same elsewhere called Herod's treasurer (*ταμίας*, *Ant.* xv, 6, 5).

14. Son of Antipater, and brother of Herod the Great (Josephus, *War*, i, 8, 9), was sent by the latter with a large force to subdue the Idumæans (*Ant.* xiv, 15, 4), and afterwards left by him in Jerusalem with full powers to act on the defensive against Macheras, neglecting which orders he lost his life in an engagement near Jericho (*War*, i, 17, 1–4). He also had a son named Joseph (*Ant.* xviii, 5, 4), who seems to be the one mentioned as cousin (ἀνεψιός) of Archelaus (*War*, ii, 5, 2).

15. Son of Ellemus, a relative of the high-priest Matthias, in whose place he officiated for a single day (apparently that of the annual atonement), in consequence of the accidental disqualification of the pontiff (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 6, 4).

16. The foster-father of our Saviour, being "the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ" (Matt. i, 16). By Matthew he is said to have been the son of Jacob, whose lineage is traced by the same writer through David up to Abraham. Luke represents him as being the son of Heli, and traces his origin up to Adam. Luke appears to have had some specific object in view, since he introduces his genealogical line with words of peculiar import: "Jesus being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli" (Luke iii, 23)—ὡς ἐνομίζετο, "as was supposed," in other terms, as accounted by law, as enrolled in the family registers; for Joseph being the husband of Mary, became thereby, in law (νόμος), the father of Jesus. See GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST. He lived at Nazareth, in Galilee (Luke ii, 4), and it is probable that his family had been settled there for some time, since Mary lived there too (Luke i, 26, 27).

The statements of Holy Writ in regard to Joseph are few and simple. According to a custom among the Jews, traces of which are still found, such as hand-fasting among the Scotch, and betrothing among the Germans, Joseph had pledged his faith to Mary; but before the marriage was consummated she proved to be with child. Grieved at this, Joseph was disposed to break off the connection; but, not wishing to make a public example of one whom he loved, he contemplated a private disruption of their bond. From this step, however, he is deterred by a heavenly messenger, who assures him that Mary has conceived under a divine influence. "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. i, 18 sq.; Luke i, 27). It must have been within a very short time of his taking her to his home that the decree went forth from Augustus Cæsar which obliged him to leave Nazareth with his wife and go to Bethlehem. He was there with Mary and her first-born when the shepherds came to see the babe in the manger, and he went with them to the Temple to pre-

sent the infant according to the law, and there heard the prophetic words of Simeon as he held him in his arms. When the wise men from the East came to Bethlehem to worship Christ, Joseph was there; and he went down to Egypt with them by night, when warned by an angel of the danger which threatened them; and on a second message he returned with them to the land of Israel, intending to reside at Bethlehem, the city of David; but, being afraid of Archelaus, he took up his abode, as before his marriage, at Nazareth, where he carried on his trade as a carpenter. When Jesus was twelve years old Joseph and Mary took him with them to keep the Passover at Jerusalem, and when they returned to Nazareth he continued to act as a father to the child Jesus, and was always reputed to be so indeed.

Joseph was by trade a carpenter, in which business he probably educated Jesus (Thilo, *Apocr.* i, 311). In Matt. xiii, 55, we read, "Is not this the son of the carpenter?" and in Mark vi, 3, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" The term employed, τέκτων, is of a general character, and may be fitly rendered by the English word *artificer* or *artizan*, signifying any one that labors in the *fab*rication (*faber* in Latin) of articles of ordinary use, whatever the material may be out of which they are made. See CARPENTER. Schleusner (in voc.) asserts that the universal testimony of the ancient Church represents our Lord as being a carpenter's son. This is, indeed, the statement of Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tryphone*, § 88), for he explains the term τέκτων, which he applies to Jesus, by saying that he made *ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά*, *ploughs and yokes;* but Origen, in replying to Celsus, who indulged in jokes against the humble employment of our Lord, expressly denied that Jesus was so termed in the Gospels (see the passage cited in Otho's *Justin Martyr*, ii, 306, Jenæ, 1843)—a declaration which suggests the idea that the copies which Origen read differed from our own; while Hilarius, on Matthew (quoted in Simon's *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, i, 691), asserts, in terms which cannot be mistaken, that Jesus was a smith (*ferrum igne vincentis, massamque formantis, etc.*). Among the ancient Jews all handicrafts were held in so much honor that they were learned and pursued by the first men of the nation. See ARTIFICER.

Jewish tradition (*Hieros. Shaph.* c. 14) names the father of Jesus פנדירא, *Pendira*, or *Penthira* (פנתירא, *Midrash, Kohel*, x, 5; Πάνθηρ, Thilo, *Apocr.* i, 528), and represents him (Orig. *c. Cels.* i, 32) as a rough soldier, who became the father of Jesus after Mary was betrothed to Joseph. Another form of the legend sets him forth (*Toled. Jeshu*, p. 3, ed. Wagenseil; comp. Epiphan. *Hær.* 78, 7) under the name of *Joseph Pandera* (יוסף פנדרא). Christian tradition makes Joseph an old man when first espoused to Mary (Epiphan. *Hær.* 78, 7), being no less than eighty years of age, and father of four sons and two daughters. Theophylact, on Matt. xiii, 55, says that Jesus Christ had brothers and sisters, all children of Joseph, whom he had by his sister-in-law, wife of his brother Cleophas, who having died without issue, Joseph was obliged by law to marry his widow. Of the sons, James, the brother of the Lord, was, he states, the first bishop of Jerusalem. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 1) agrees in substance with Theophylact; so also does Epiphanius, adding that Joseph was fourscore years old when he married Mary. Jerome, from whom it appears that the alleged mother's name was Escha, opposes this tradition, and is of opinion that what are termed the brothers of Jesus were really his cousins. See JAMES; MARY. The painters of Christian antiquity conspire with the writers in representing Joseph as an old man at the period of the birth of our Lord—an evidence which is not to be lightly rejected, though the precise age mentioned may be but an approximation to fact. Another account (Niceph. ii, 3) gives the name of Salome as that of Joseph's first wife, who was related to the family of John the Baptist. The origin of all the earliest stories and assertions of the fathers concerning Joseph, as, e. g., his extreme old age, his having sons by a former wife, his having the custody of Mary given to him by lot, and so on, is to be found in the apocryphal Gospels, of which the earliest is the Protevangelium of St. James, apparently the work of a Christian Jew of the 2d century, quoted by Origen, and referred to by Clement of Alexandria and Justin Martyr (Tischendorf, *Proleg.* xiii). The same stories are repeated in the other apocryphal Gospels. The Monophysite Coptic Christians are said to have first assigned a festival to St. Joseph in the Calendar, viz., on the 20th of July, which is thus inscribed in a Coptic Almanac: "Requies sancti senis justi Josephi fabri lignarii, Deiparæ Virginis Mariæ sponsi, qui pater Christi vocari promeruit." The apocryphal *Historia Josephi fabri lignarii*, which now exists in Arabic (ed. Walling, Lips. 1722; in Latin by Fabricius, *Pseudepigr.* i, 300; also by Thilo and Tischendorf), is thought by Tischendorf to have been originally written in Coptic, and the festival of Joseph is supposed to have been transferred to the Western churches from the East as late as the year 1399. The above-named history is acknowledged to be quite fabulous, though it belongs probably to the 4th century. It professes to be an account given by our Lord himself to the apostles on the Mount of Olives, and placed by them in the library of Jerusalem. It ascribes 111 years to Joseph's life, and makes him old, and the father of four sons and two daughters before he espoused Mary. It is headed with this sentence: "Benedictiones ejus et preces servant nos omnes, o fratres. Amen." The reader who wishes to know the opinion of the ancients on the obscure subject of Joseph's marriage may consult Jerome's acrimonious tract *Contra Helvidium.* He will see that Jerome highly disapproves the common opinion (derived from the apocryphal Gospels) of Joseph being twice married, and that he claims the authority of Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and "many other apostolical men," in favor of his own view, that our Lord's brethren were his cousins only, or, at all events, against the opinion of Helvidius, which had been held by Ebion, Theodotus of Byzantium, and Valentine, that they were the children of Joseph and Mary. Those who held this opinion were called *Antidicomarianitæ*, as enemies of the Virgin. (Epiphanius, *Adv. Hæres.* l. iii, t. ii; *Hæres.* lxxviii, also *Hær.* li. See also Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. Virgin Mary; Mill, *On the Brethren of the Lord;* Calmet, *De St. Joseph. St. Mar. Virg. conjuge;* and, for an able statement of the opposite view, Alford's *note on Matt.* xiii, 55.) See GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.

It is not easy to determine when Joseph died. That event may have taken place before Jesus entered on his public ministry. This has been argued from the fact that his mother only appeared at the feast at Cana in Galilee. The premises, however, hardly bear out the inference. With more force of argument, it has been alleged (Simon, *Dict. de la Bible*) that Joseph must have been dead before the crucifixion of Jesus, else he would in all probability have appeared with Mary at the cross. Certainly the absence of Joseph from the public life of Christ, and the failure of reference to him in the discourses and history, while "Mary" and "his brethren" not unfrequently appear, afford evidence not only of Joseph's death, but of the inferior part which, as the legal father only of our Lord, Joseph might have been expected to sustain. So far as our scanty materials enable us to form an opinion, Joseph appears to have been a good, kind, simple-minded man, who, while he afforded aid in protecting and sustaining the family, would leave Mary unrestrained to use all the impressive and formative influence of her gentle, affectionate, pious, and thoughtful soul. B.C. cir. 45 to A.D. cir. 25.

Further discussion of the above points may be seen in Meyer, *Num Jos. tempore nativ. C. fuerit senex decrepitus* (Lips. 1762); comp. Reay, *Narratio de Jos. e s. codice desumpta* (Oxon. 1823); Walther, *Dass Jos. d.*

wahre Vater Christi sei (Berlin, 1791); Oertel, *Antijosephismus* (1792); Hasse, *Jos. verum Jesu patrem non fuisse* (Regiom. 1792); Ludewig, *Hist. Krit. Unters.* (Wolferb. 1831). The traditions respecting Joseph are collected in *Act. Sanct.* iii, 4 sq.; there is a Life of Joseph written in Italian by Affaitati (Mail. 1716). See also Volbeding, *Index*, p. 8; Hase, *Leben Jesu* (4th ed. 1854), p. 56. Comp. JESUS CHRIST.

17. Surnamed CAIAPHAS (q. v.), Jewish high-priest in the time of our Lord's ministry.

18. A native (not resident, as in Michaelis, *Begräbniss- und Auferstehungsgesch. Christi*, p. 44) of Arimathæa (Matt. xxvii, 57, 59; Mark xv, 43, 45; Luke xxiii, 50; John xix, 38), a city, probably the Ramah of the O. T., in the territory of Benjamin, on the mountain range of Ephraim, at no great distance south of Jerusalem (Josh. xviii, 25; Judg. iv, 5), not far from Gibeah (Judg. xix, 13; Isa. x, 29; Hos. v, 8). See ARIMATHÆA.

Joseph was a secret disciple of Jesus—"an honorable counsellor (βουλευτής), who waited for the kingdom of God" (Mark xv, 43), and who, on learning the death of our Lord, "came and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus." Pilate, having learned from the centurion who commanded at the execution that Jesus was actually dead, gave the body to Joseph, who took it down and wrapped his deceased Lord in fine linen which he had purchased for the purpose; after which he laid the corpse in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone against the door of the sepulchre (Mark xv, 43 sq.). From the parallel passages in Matthew (xxvii, 58 sq.), Luke (xxiii, 50 sq.), and John (xix, 38 sq.), it appears that the body was previously embalmed at the cost of another secret disciple, Nicodemus, and that the sepulchre was new, "wherein never man before was laid" (thus fulfilling Isa. liii, 9); also that it lay in a garden, and was the property of Joseph himself (comp. Origen, *c. Cels.* ii, p. 103, ed. Spenc.; Walch, *Observ. in Matt. ex inscript.* p. 84). This garden was "in the place where Jesus was crucified." A.D. 29. See GOLGOTHA. Luke describes the character of Joseph as "a good man and a just," adding that "he had not assented to the counsel and deed of them," i. e. of the Jewish authorities. From this remark it is clear that Joseph was a member of the Sanhedrim: a conclusion which is corroborated by the epithet "counsellor," applied to him by both Luke and Mark. Whether Joseph was a priest, as Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.* p. 669) thought, there is not evidence to determine. Various opinions as to his social condition may be found in Thiess (*Krit. Comment.* ii, 149). Tradition represents Joseph as having been one of the Seventy (Ittig, *Diss. de Pat. Apostol.* § 13; Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* iii, 1, 319 sq.); and that Joseph, being sent to Great Britain by the apostle Philip about the year 63, settled with his brother disciples at Glastonbury, in Somersetshire, and there erected of wicker-twigs the first Christian oratory in England, the parent of the majestic abbey which was afterwards founded on the same site. The local guides to this day show the miraculous thorn (said to bud and blossom every Christmas-day) that sprung from the staff which Joseph stuck in the ground as he stopped to rest himself on the hill-top. (See Dugdale's *Monasticon*, i, 1; and Hearne, *Hist. and Antiq. of Glastonbury*). Other traditional notices may be seen in the *Evang. Nicod.* c. 12 sq.; *Acta sanctor.* Mart. ii, 507 sq.; comp. the dissertations *De Josepho Arimath.* of Brömel [Tentzel] (Viteb. 1683) and Björnland (Aboæ, 1729). See JESUS CHRIST.

19. Surnamed BARSABAS (q. v.), one of the two persons whom the primitive Church, immediately after the resurrection of Christ, nominated, praying that the Holy Spirit would show which of them should enter the apostolic band in place of the wretched Judas. On the lots being cast, it proved that not Joseph, but Matthias, was chosen (Acts i, 23). A.D. 29.

Joseph also bore the honorable surname of *Justus* (q. v.), which was not improbably given him on account of his well-known probity. He was one of those who had "companied with the apostles all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them, beginning from the baptism of John," until the ascension (Acts i, 15 sq.). Tradition also accounted him one of the Seventy (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* i, 12). The same historian relates (iii, 39), on the authority of Papias, that Joseph the Just "drank deadly poison, and by the grace of God sustained no harm." It has been maintained that he is the same as Joses, surnamed Barnabas, mentioned in Acts iv, 36; but the manner in which the latter is characterized seems to point to a different person (Heinrichs, *On Acts*, i, 23; Ullmann, in the *Theolog. Stud. u. Kritik.* i, 377; Mynster, *ibid.* 1829, ii, 326). He is also to be distinguished from Judas Barsabas (Acts xv, 22).

20. Son of Camus or Camydus, appointed Jewish high-priest in place of Cantheras by Herod, brother of Agrippa I, who had obtained temporary control over the Temple from Claudius Cæsar during the presidency of Longinus and the procuratorship of Fadus, A.D. 46 8 (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 1, 3). He was removed by the same authority in favor of Ananias, son of Nebedæus, during the procuratorship of Tiberius Alexander, A.D. 48 (*ib.* 5, 2).

21. Surnamed *Cabi*, son of Simon, a former high-priest of the Jews, and himself appointed to that office by Agrippa during the procuratorship of Festus (A.D. 62), but shortly afterwards removed by the same authority on the arrival of Albinus (A.D. 62), in favor of Ananus, son of Ananus (Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 8, 11; 9, 1). See HIGH-PRIEST.

22. Son of a female physician (ἰατρίνη), who excited a sedition at Gamala near the close of the Jewish independence (Josephus, *Life*, 37).

23. Son of Dalæus, an eminent Jew, who threw himself into the flames of the Temple rather than surrender to the Romans (Josephus, *War*, vi, 5, 1).

Joseph, patriarch OF CONSTANTINOPLE from A.D. 1416 to 1439, is one of the distinguished characters in the history of the Council of Florence. He was for a long time one of the most radical opponents to a union of the Eastern and Western churches, but the cunning Romanists at last ensnared the hoary patriarch, and he was induced, at a time when Rome itself was divided, to throw his influence in favor of the politic Eugenius IV, and actually attended the Council of Florence, there and then argued for union, and finally signed articles of agreement to effect this end. No sooner, however, had he assented than deep remorse for his action, forced upon him mainly by the unfortunate condition of his country, then greatly harassed by the invading Turks, brought him to a sick bed, and he died eight days after signing the instrument, June 10, 1439, leaving the Greek emperor, John Palæologus, the only support of the Greek Council. See Milman's *Latin Christianity*, viii, 13 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* book iii, cent. xv, pt. ii, ch. ii, § 13, 23, note 57. For further details, see the articles BASLE, COUNCIL OF; FLORENCE, COUNCILS OF; GREEK CHURCH. (J. H. W.)

Joseph (ST.) THE HYMNOLOGIST (*Josephus hymnographus*, a native of Sicily, fled from that island to Africa and then to Greece. He entered a convent at Thessalonica, where he became eminent for his ascetic practices, and for the fluency and gracefulness of his utterance, "so that he easily," says his biographer, "threw the fabled sirens into the shade." Having been ordained presbyter, he went to Constantinople with Gregory of Decapolis, who there became one of the leaders of the "orthodox" party in their struggle with the iconoclastic emperor, Leo the Armenian, which began in A.D. 814. From Constantinople Joseph repaired, at the desire of this Gregory, to Rome, to solicit the support of the pope, but, falling into the hands of pirates, was by them carried away to Crete. Here he remained till the death of Leo the Armenian (A.D. 820), when he was, as his biographer asserts, miraculously delivered,

and conveyed to Constantinople. On his return he found his friend and leader Gregory dead, and attached himself to another leader, John, on whose death he caused his body, together with that of Gregory, to be transferred to the deserted church of St. John Chrysostom, in connection with which he established a monastery, that was soon, by the attractiveness of his eloquence, filled with inmates. After this he was, for his strenuous defence of image worship, banished to Chersonæ, apparently by the emperor Theophilus, who reigned from A.D. 829 to 842; but, on the death of the emperor, was recalled from exile by the empress Theodora, and obtained, through the favor of the patriarch Ignatius, the office of scenophylax, or keeper of the sacred vessels in the great church of Constantinople. Joseph was equally acceptable to Ignatius and to his competitor and successor Photius. He died at an advanced age in A.D. 883. Joseph is chiefly celebrated as a writer of canones or hymni, of which several are extant in MS., but there is some difficulty in distinguishing his compositions from those of Joseph of Thessalonica. His *Canones in omnia Beatæ Virginis Mariæ festa*, and his *Theotocia*, hymns in honor of the Virgin, scattered through the ecclesiastical books of the Greeks, were published, with a learned commentary and a life of Joseph, translated from the Greek of John the Deacon, by Hippolito Maracci, under the title of *Mariale S. Josephi Hymnographi* (Rome, 1661). The version of the life of Joseph was by Luigi Maracci, of Lucca, the brother of Ippolito. Another Latin version of the same life, but less exact, by the Jesuit Floritus, was published among the *Vitæ Sanctorum Siculorum* of Octavius Cajetanus (Ottavio Gaetano), ii, 43 (Palermo, 1657, folio), and reprinted in the *Acta Sanctorum* (see below). Some writers suppose that there was another Joseph, a writer of hymns, mentioned in the title of a MS. typicon at Rome as of the monastery of St. Nicolaus Casularum (τῶν Κασούλων). See *Vita S. Josephi Hymnographi*, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, s. d. III Aprilis, i, 269, etc., with the commentary of Prævius of Papleroche, and Appendix, p. xxiv; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* xi, 79; *Menologium Græcorum*, jussu Basilii, Imperatoris editum, s. d. III Aprilis (Urbino, 1727, folio).—Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* iii, 929.

Joseph ben-Chija (in the Talmud simply styled *Rabbi Joseph*), one of the greatest of Israel's Rabbis, was born in Babylon about A.D. 270. Rabbi Joseph was a disciple of Jehudah ben-Jecheskel, the founder and president of the college at Pumbadita, and a fellow-student and intimate lifelong friend of the celebrated Rabba ben-Nachmani, commonly called Rabba, the reputed author of *the Midrash Rabba*, or the traditional commentary on Genesis, whom he succeeded in the presidency at Pumbadita about A.D. 330. He died, however, only three years after (about A.D. 333). Joseph deserves our notice not so much from his connection with the school at Pumbadita, which, though brief, was yet of marked benefit to the development of Biblical scholarship at that centre of Jewish learning, as for his Chaldee versions of the Hebrew Scriptures (i. e. the Psalms, Proverbs, and Job), particularly of the Hagiographa, of which alone the authorship can be ascribed to him with any certainty (comp. the Rabbinic Bibles). Some Jewish critics credit him with a version of the whole O. Test.; and, indeed, from passages quoted in the Talmud (comp. *Moëd Katon*, 26, a; *Pesachim*, 68, a; *Menachoth*, 110, a; *Joma*, 32, b; 77, b; *Aboda Sara*, 44, a; *Kiddushin*, 13, a; 72, b; *Nedarim*, 38, a; *Baba Kama*, 3, b; *Berachoth*, 28, a) from a paraphrase with which he is accredited, it would appear that he translated Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Amos, Obadiah, Zephaniah, and Zechariah, since these passages are from these books, and are distinctly cited with the declaration כדמתרגם רב יוסף, "as R. Joseph has rendered it into Chaldee." These renderings are, however, almost exactly those given in the Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel (a fact which has led some to suppose that this Targum ascribed to Jonathan is in reality Joseph's); and he himself even declared on several occasions, when discussing the meaning of a difficult passage in the Scriptures, "If we had not the Targum on this passage we should not know what it means" (see *Sanhedrim*, 94, a; *Moëd Katon*, 28, b; *Megilla*, 3, a). It is therefore unreasonable to suppose him to have himself actually rendered into Chaldee more than the Hagiographa contained (with a Latin version) in the Polyglots of Antwerp (1572), Paris (1645), London (1657), etc. In his day, Joseph b.-Chija must have enjoyed a very enviable reputation for erudition. His knowledge of traditional lore is said to have been so extensive that he was surnamed, both in Palestine and Babylon, Joseph of Sinai, i. e. one acquainted with all the traditions in succession since the giving of the law on Sinai (*Horajoth*, 14, a; *Sanhedrim*, 42, a). One of his favorite studies was the Cabalistic Theosophy, the mysteries of which, being contained in the vision of Ezekiel respecting the throne of God (מעשה מרכבה), he endeavored to propound (*Chagiga*, 18, a). See Bartolocci, *Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica*, iii, 814; Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, ii, 1171 sq.; Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 65, etc.; Fürst, *Kultur und Literaturgesch. der Juden in Asien*, p. 144–155; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv, 408 sq., 553 sq.; Ersch u. Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyklopädie*, sec. ii, vol. xxxi, p. 75; Etheridge, *Introd. to Heb. Lit.* p. 165 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v.

Joseph ben-Gikatilla. See MOSES (HA-KOHEN) BEN-SAMUEL.

Joseph ben-Gorion (also called *Josippon*), is the name of the reputed author of the celebrated Hebrew chronicle סֵפֶר יוֹסִיפּוֹן, *the book of Josippon*, or יוֹסִיפּוֹן הָעִבְרִי, *the Hebrew Josippon*, a work which, by the statement of the author, is placed in the æra of Christ, for he says of himself that he is "the priest of Jerusalem" (and this can refer only to the celebrated Jewish historian Flavius Josephus [q. v.]), and furthermore that he was appointed governor of the whole Jewish nation by Titus; and from the days of Saadia (A.D. 950) up to our own time it was quoted both by Jewish and Christian writers as a genuine work of Josephus. Of late, however, critical inquiry has determined the work to be a production of the Middle Ages. The conjecture is that the author was a Jew, and that he flourished about the 9th or 10th century. Zunz, in the *Zeitschrift f. Wissenschaft d. Judenth.* (Berl. 1822, p. 300 sq.), asserted that Joseph ben-Gorion flourished in the 9th century, and that his work must since his day have undergone frequent emendations and alterations. Later Zunz (in his notes on Benjamin of Tudela, ed. Asher, 1841, ii, 246) changed his opinion somewhat, and regarded Joseph as "*the* [Hebrew] *translator and editor of* Josephus," and assigns him to "the middle of the latter half of the 10th century," and says of him that his accounts of several nations of his time are as important as his orthography of Italian towns is remarkable." To the same period Steinschneider (*Jewish Liter.*, London, 1857, p. 77) also assigns the work, but he believes the author to have been a native of Northern Italy, and considers the chronicle "the Hebrew edition of the Latin Hegesippus," and "an offshoot from the fully developed Midrash of Arabian and Latin literature." A still more modern critic, the celebrated Jewish historian Grätz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, v, 281, and note 4 in the Appendix of the same volume), holds that the Jewish book, which he also assigns to the 10th century, is simply a translation of an Arabic book of Maccabees, entitled *History of the Maccabees of Joseph ben-Gorion* (of which parts were published in the Polyglots, Paris, 1645; Lond. 1657) under the title of the Arabic book of Maccabees, and which is extant in two MSS. in the Bodleian library (*Uri Catalogue*, Nos. 782, 829), made by a skilful Italian Jew, who enriched it with many original additions. His reason for assign-

ing it to the earlier part of the 10th century is that Dunash b.-Tanaim (who flourished about 955) knew the work and spoke of parts of it (comp. Milman's Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ii, 6, note).

But as to the chronicle itself. It consists of six books. It begins its record with Adam; explains the genealogical table in Gen. xi; then passes on to the history of Rome, Babylon, Cyrus, and the fall of Babylon; resumes again the history of the Jews; describes the times of Daniel, Zerubbabel, Esther, etc.; gives an account of Alexander the Great, his connection, his exploits, and expeditions of his successors; and then continues the history of the Jews; of Heliodorus's assault on the Temple; the translation of the O. T. into Greek; the deeds of the Maccabees; the events of the Herodians; and the last war which terminated in the destruction of the Temple by Titus. The authorities quoted in this remarkable book are: 1. Nicolaus the Damascene; 2. Strabo of Cappadocia; 3. Titus Livius; 4. Togthas of Jerusalem; 5. Porophius of Rome; 6. The history of Alexander, written in the year of his death by Magi; 7. The book of the antediluvian patriarch Cainan b.-Enos; 8. Books of the Greeks, Medians, Persians, and Macedonians; 9. Epistle of Alexander to Aristotle about the wonders of India; 10. Treaties of alliance of the Romans: 11. Cicero, who was in the Holy of Holies of the Temple during the reign of Pompey; 12. The intercalary years of Julius Cæsar, composed for the Nazarites and Greeks; 13. The chronicles of the Roman emperors; 14. The constitutional diploma which Vespasian venerated so highly that he kissed every page of it; 15. The Alexandrian Library with its 995 volumes; 16. Jewish histories which are lost; and, 17. The national traditions which have been translated orally. The first printed edition of this work appeared in Mantua, 1476–1479, with a preface by Abraham ben-Salmon Conato. A reprint of this edition (the text vitiated), with a Latin version by Münster, was published at Basle, 1541. There appeared an edition from a MS. containing a somewhat different version of the work, and divided into ninety-seven chapters, edited by Tam Ibn-Jachja ben-David (Constantinople, 1510). New editions of it were published in Venice, 1544; Cracow, 1589; Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1689; Amsterdam, 1723; Prague, 1784; Zolkiew, 1805; Vilna, 1819. It was partly translated into Arabic by Zechariah ben-Said el-Temeni about 1223, and into English by Peter Morwyng (Lond. 1558, 1561, 1575, 1579, 1602). There are two other Latin translations, besides the one by Münster, 1541; one was made by the learned English Orientalist, John Gagnier (Oxford, 1716), and one by Breithaupt; the last has also the Hebrew text and elaborate notes, and will always continue to be the student's edition. There are German translations by Michael Adam (Zurich, 1546), Moses b.-Bezaliel (Prague, 1607), Abraham ben-Mordecai Cohen (Amsterdam, 1661), and Seligmann Reis (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1707). Compare, besides the authorities already cited, Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (Berlin, 1832), p. 146-154; Delitzsch, *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie* (Leipzig, 1836), p. 37-40; Carmoly in Jost's *Annalen* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1839), i, 149 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, iii, 131; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 111-114; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, 1547-1552; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclopædia*, s. v.

Joseph ben-Isaac Kimchi. See KIMCHI.

Joseph ben-Satia. See SAADIA.

Joseph ben-Shemtob, a noted Jewish philosopher, polemic, and commentator, flourished in the middle of the 15th century in Castile, and was in high office at the court of Juan II. He was especially noted in his day as a philosopher, and wrote many philosophical works, which form important contributions to the history of Jewish philosophy. He was especially rigid in defence of Judaism as a religious system, in opposition to the Christian, and in that line freely used Profiat Duran's writings, upon which he commented. See PROFIAT. In his later days he lost his position at court through the machinations of the papists and the so-called converts from Judaism, and finally died the death of martyrdom about 1460. His works of especial interest to us are: (1) *Commentary on the celebrated Epistle of Profiat Duran against Christianity* (Constantinople, 1577); contained also in Geiger's קיבץ ויכוחים (Breslau, 1844):—(2) *Course of Homilies* delivered in the synagogue on different Sabbaths on various portions of the Bible, entitled עין הקורא, *The Eye of the Reader* (still in MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, Codex Michael, 581):—(3) *Commentary on Lamentations*, composed at Medina del Campo in the year 1441 (MS. by De Rossi, No. 177):—(4) *Commentary on Genesis* i, 1-vi, 8, being the Sabbatic lesson which commences the Jewish year [see HAPHTARAH]:—and (5) *Exposition of Deut.* xv, 11. Comp. Steinschneider, in Ersch und Gruber's *Allgemeine Encyklop.* sec. ii, vol. xxxi, p. 87-93; *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1529; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, viii, 179 sq.; also note 4 in the Appendix; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v.

Joseph, Joel. See WITZENHAUSEN.

Joseph Taitatzak. See TAITATZAK.

Jose'phus (Ἰώσηφος v. r. Φόσηπος), the Græco-Latin form (1 Esdr. ix, 34) of the Heb. name JOSEPH (q. v.) 6 (Ezra x, 42).

Josēphus, FLAVIUS, the celebrated Jewish historian, was born at Jerusalem A.D. 37. His father's name was Mattathias, and in his autobiography (the only source left us to write his history, as the works of his rival, Justus of Tiberias, are unhappily lost) he lays claim to royal and sacerdotal lineage, and alludes to the renown he enjoyed while yet a youth (*Life*, i, 1). His early years seem to have been spent in close study of the Jewish traditions and the O.-T. writings. Dissatisfied with all of the three principal Jewish sects, while yet a young man he spent three years as the follower of one Banus, an eremite, in the desert, but at last joined the sect of the Pharisees. He was only 19 when he left Banus, and he joined the Pharisees between 19 and 26, when he went to Rome. Soon afterwards, the imprisonment of some Jewish priests by the procurator Felix afforded him an opportunity of pleading his people's cause before the emperor himself at the Roman capital, whither these men had been sent. On the way he was shipwrecked (some have unwarrantably imagined that he was Paul's companion in that disastrous voyage), but, being rescued by a Cyrenian vessel, he made his way to Rome. He there not only secured the object of his mission, but also ingratiated himself in the favor of the empress, and at length returned home loaded with presents. He found the mass of his countrymen determined on a revolt from the empire, and he anxiously sought to dissuade them from so rash a course. The Jews, however, refused to listen to his advice; and the only alternatives for him were either to follow the popular will, and thus perhaps make himself the leader of his people, or to return to Rome, and there receive the rewards of treachery. In his description of the Jewish insurrection he has given us a graphic account of the numerous plots and perils in which he became entangled during this period of his life. After the disastrous retreat of Cestius Gallus from Jerusalem, and the barbarous massacre of the Jews at Sepphoris (q. v.) and the Syrian cities, the most peacefully inclined of the Jews joined the zealots, and Josephus no longer hesitated as to the best course to be pursued. With great ostentation of patriotism and self-devotion, he declared in favor of war "*à outrance*," and he soon secured for himself the appointment as general. Together with Joazar and Judas he was sent to Galilee, "the province on which the storm would first break." His two colleagues, however, devoted themselves to their priestly functions, and Josephus became the sole commander (*Life*, 4-7; *War*,

ii, 20, 4). Finding the Galilean Jews divided among themselves (see JOHN OF GISCHALA), and fearing that his command was too weak to meet the army of the approaching Vespasian, he retired to the Jewish stronghold Jotapata, and there awaited the attack of the Romans. For forty-seven days he encouraged his soldiers to deeds that immortalized his name. (For an interesting description of this siege, see Weber and Holtzmann, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, ii, 475 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews* [Middleton's edition], ii, 252 sq.) Yet some writers, among them Raphall and Grätz, accuse him even here of treachery and cowardice, alleging that he endeavored to get away from Jotapata on the pretence of desiring to raise an army for its relief, although he could not have left "without either falling into the hands of the Romans or *voluntarily joining them*." Even after the fall of that fortress he did not surrender to the Romans, but hid himself with forty companions in a cave, and refused to come forth, when his place of refuge was betrayed, until his life was guaranteed him. (See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 611, col. i; Raphall, *Post-Bibl. Hist. Jews*, p. 427 sq.) After his surrender to Vespasian he was put in chains, with a view to being sent to Rome for trial before Nero. He evaded this danger by predicting (he distinctly claims the gift of prophecy, *War*, iii, 8, 9) to Vespasian his future elevation to the imperial throne, but was still held in confinement for three years, until, on the realization of his prediction, his chains were *cut* from him, as a sign that he had been unjustly bound (*War*, iv, 10, 7). Vespasian had been declared emperor by the Roman soldiers in the East, and he immediately set out for the West, leaving Titus in command, with orders to hasten the conclusion of the war still raging in Palestine. In this expedition on Jerusalem Josephus accompanied Titus. Titus had supposed this task, with the assistance of the "renegade" (so Milman calls him), an easy one; but the Jews braved the attack of the Romans much more obstinately than the latter had expected, and, finally, Josephus was induced to go forth and urge his countrymen to capitulate, and thus to save the place from certain and total destruction. The people, by his account, were touched and ready to yield, but the leaders remained obstinate; but the fact is that they were naturally disinclined to listen to the counsels of a man who had quitted them in the hour of their greatest need. They even sought to kill him, and continued the defence to the last extremity. On the downfall of the city, the most intimate friends and relatives of Josephus were spared at his request, and, in return for his aid and counsel in the siege, a valuable estate in Judæa was assigned him as a residence. Well aware, however, that among his countrymen he would hardly find a safe refuge, he returned with Titus to Rome to enjoy the honors which Vespasian might bestow upon him. He was received with great kindness by the emperor; but, although the privileges of Roman citizenship were conferred upon him and an annual pension awarded him, he was detested by the Romans no less than by the Jews. It is supposed that his death occurred in the early years of Trajan's reign, perhaps A.D. 103. For other facts of a more directly personal character, such as his three marriages, the names of his sons, etc., see the seventy-six chapters of his life, and the following other passages of his other works: *Apion*, i, 9, 10; *War*, i; ii, 20, 3 sq.; 21, 2 sq.; iii, 7, 13 sq.; 8, 1 sq.; 9; vi, 5; *Ant.* ed. Havercamp, i, 5, 228, 536, 545, 682, 982; Suidas, s. v. Ἰώσηπος.

The character of Josephus has been very differently delineated by different writers. From his own works, especially his books against Apion, it is evident that, though he dealt rather treacherously with his people, he yet felt a pride in the antiquity of the nation and in its ancient glories; and in the description of the misfortunes of the Jews he is by no means wanting in sympathy for them. Thus his account of the miserable fate of Jerusalem is altogether free from that tone of revolting coldness which shocks us in Xenophon's account of the downfall of Athens (*Hell.* ii, 2, § 3 sq.). Yet the mildest interpretation that his conduct can receive certainly is that he despaired (as earnest patriots never do) of his country, and that he deserted his countrymen in their greatest extremity. Indeed, from the very beginning, he appears to have looked on the national cause as hopeless, and to have cherished the intention of making peace with Rome whenever he could. Thus he told some of the chief men of Tiberias that he was well aware of the invincibility of the Romans, though he thought it safer to dissemble his conviction; and he advised them to do the same, and to wait for a convenient season—περιμένουσι καιρόν (*Life*, 35; compare *War*, iii, 5); and we find him again, in his attack on Justus the historian (*Life*, 65), earnestly defending himself from the charge of having in any way caused the war with Rome. Had this feeling originated in a religious conviction that the Jewish nation had forfeited God's favor, the case, of course, would have been different; but such a spirit of living, practical faith we do not discover in Josephus. Holding in the main the abstract doctrines of a Pharisee, but with the principles and temper of a Herodian, he strove to accommodate his religion to heathen tastes and prejudices; and this by actual commissions (Ottius, *Prætermissa a Josepho*, appended to his *Spicilegium*), no less than by a rationalistic system of modification (Smith, *Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog.* ii, 612). A more favorable opinion is sometimes expressed of Josephus, as by a writer in the *Evangelical Quart. Review*, 1870, p. 420. Prof. F. W. Farrar (in Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Literature*, s. v.) has perhaps best summed up the religious character of Josephus as that of "a strange mixture of the bigoted Pharisee and the time-serving Herodian," and as "mingling the national pride of the patriot with the apostasy of a traitor."

Very different is the opinion of all on the writings of Josephus. Even in his day he was greatly lauded for his literary abilities. Though a Jew by birth, he had so ably acquired the Greek that he could be counted among the classic writers in that language. St. Jerome designates him as the "Græcus Livius" (*Epist. ad Eustach.*); and, to come nearer our own days, Niebuhr pronounces him a Greek writer of singular purity (*Anc. Hist.* iii, 455). But, withal, he is hardly deserving of the epithet φιλαλήθης, so often bestowed on him (Suid. s. v. Ἰώσηπος; Isidor Pelusiot. iv, *Ep.* 75: "diligentissimus et φιλαληθέστατος," Jos. Scaliger, *De Emend. Temp. Præf.*, etc.). It is true, he understood the duty and importance of veracity in the historian (*Ant.* xiv, 1, 1; *War*, i, 1; *c. Apion*, i, 19); nevertheless, "he is," says Niebuhr (*Lect. Rom. Hist.* l. c.), "often untrue, and his archæology abounds in distortions of historical facts, and in falsifications which arise from his inordinate national pride; and wherever he deals in numbers, he shows his Oriental love of exaggeration" (this charge is, in a measure, refuted, however, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 48). But, even though Josephus may not in all things be implicitly relied upon, his writings are to the theologian especially invaluable, and we may well say, with Casaubon and Farrar, that it is by a singular providence that his works, which throw such a flood of light on Jewish affairs, have been preserved to us. They are of immense service in the entire Biblical department, as may be seen from the frequent references that have been made to his writings throughout this Cyclopædia, in the elucidation of the history, geography, and archæology of Scripture. Yet by this it must by no means be inferred that we detract in the least from our former statement, that Josephus was not a man who believed in the inspiration of the Biblical writings. "In spite of his constant assertions (*Ant.* x, 11)," says Farrar (in Kitto), "he can have had no real respect for the writings which he so largely illustrates. If he had felt, as a Jew, any deep or religious appreciation of the O.-T. history, which he professes to follow (οὐδὲν προθεὶς οὐδ' αὖ παραλιπών, *Ant.* i, procem.), he would not have tampered with it as

he does, mixing it with pseudo-philosophical fancies (*Apion*, i, 10), with groundless Jewish *Hagadoth* or traditions (such as the three years' war of Moses with the Ethiopians, the love of Tharbis for him, etc.: *Ant.* ii, 10, 2), and with quotations from heathen writers of *very doubtful* authority (*Ant.* viii, 5, 3, etc.; see Van Dale, *De Aristeâ*, p. 211). The worst charge, however, against him is his constant attempt, by alterations and suppressions (and especially by a rationalistic method of dealing with miracles, which contrasts strangely with his credulous fancies), to make Jewish history palatable to Greeks and Romans, to such an extent that J. Ludolfus calls him 'fabulator sæpius quam historicus' (*Hist. Ethiop.* p. 230). Thus he omits all the most important Messianic prophecies; he manipulates the book of Daniel in a most unsatisfactory manner (*Ant.* ix, 11); he speaks in a very loose way about Moses and Abraham (*Ant.* i, 8, 1; *Apion*, ii, 15); and, though he can swallow the romance of the pseudo-Aristeas, he rationalizes the account of the Exodus and Jonah's whale (*Ant.* ii, 16, 5; ix, 10, 2)." On the whole subject of his credibility as a writer, his omissions, his variations, and his panderings to Gentile taste, comp. J. A. Fabricius, *De Joseph. et ejus Scriptu*, in Hudson's ed.; Van Dale, *De Aristeâ*, x, xi; *De Idololatriâ*, vii; Brinch, *Examen Hist. Flav. Josephi*, in Havercamp, ii, 309 sq.; Ottius, *Spicilegium ex Josepho;* Ittigius, *Prolegomena;* Usher, *Epist. ad Lud. Cappellum*, p. 42; Whiston's *Dissertations*, etc.

Of still greater interest, perhaps, to our readers must be the relation which Josephus, living as he did in the age of Christ himself, sustained towards Christianity. Some have gone so far as to assert not only the authenticity of passages in his writings alluding to Christ, etc. (see below), but have even made out of Josephus an Ebionite Christian (Whiston, *Dissert.* i), if not a true follower of Jesus the Christ. Prof. Farrar (in Kitto), speaking on this point, says: "Nothing is more certain than that Josephus was no Christian (ἀπιστῶν τῷ Ιησοῦ ὡς Χριστῷ, Orig. *c. Cels.* i, 35); the whole tone of his mind was alien from the noble simplicity of Christian belief, and, as we have seen already, he was not even a good Jew. Whatever, therefore, may be thought about the passages alluding to John the Baptist (*Ant.* xviii, 5, 2), and James, 'the Lord's brother' (*ibid.* xx, 9, 1), which may possibly be genuine, there can be no reasonable doubt that the famous allusion to Christ (*Ant.* xviii, 3, 3) is either absolutely spurious or largely interpolated. The silence [partial or total] of Josephus on a subject of such importance, and with which he must have been so thoroughly acquainted, is easily explicable; and it is intrinsically much more probable that he should have passed over the subject altogether (as is done also by his contemporary, Justus of Tiberias, Phot. *Cod. Bibl.* 33) than that he should only have devoted to it a few utterly inadequate lines. Even if he had been induced to do this by some vague hope of getting something by it from Christians like Flavius Clemens, he certainly would not have expressed himself in language so strong (εἴγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρή), and still less would he have vouched for the Messiahship, the miracles, or the resurrection of Jesus. Justin, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Origen, and even Photius, knew nothing of the passage, nor does it appear till the time of Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* i, 2, *Dem. Evang.* iii, 5), a man for whom Niebuhr can find no better name than 'a detestable falsifier,' and one whose historical credibility is well nigh given up. Whether Eusebius forged it himself or borrowed it from the *marginalia* of some Christian reader cannot be determined, but that Josephus did not write it [at least in its present form] may be regarded as settled. Nay, the very next sentence (*Ant.* xvii, 3, 4) is a disgusting story, wholly irrelevant to the tenor of the narrative, and introduced in all probability for the sole purpose of a blasphemous parody on the miraculous conception, such as was attempted by various Rabbinical writers (e. g. in the *Sepher Toledoth Jeshua;* see Wagenseil, *Tela Ignea Satanæ;* see JESUS CHRIST). That Josephus intended obliquely to discredit some of the chief Christian doctrines by representing them as having been anticipated by the Essenes seems by no means improbable (comp. De Quincey's *Works*, vol. ix, The Essenes)." For a compendium of the abundant literature on these questions, see Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* sec. 34. The chief treatises are, Daubuz, *Pro testimonio Fl. Jos. de Jesu Christ* (London, 1706); reprinted in Havercamp; Böhmert, *Ueber des Fl. Jos. Zeugniss von Christo* (Lpz. 1823); Le Moyne, *Var. Sacr.* ii, 931, Heinichen, *Excurs. I. ad Euseb. H. E.* iii, 331; comp. also Langen, *Judenthum in Palästina* (Freib. 1866), p. 440 sq.; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1856, 840 sq.

It remains for us only to add a list of the *works of Josephus* (here we mainly follow Smith [*Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.]), which are, 1. *A History of the Jewish War,* (περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου ἢ Ἰουδαικῆς ἱστορίας περὶ ἁλώσεως), in seven books. Josephus tells us that he wrote it first in his own language (the Syro-Chaldee), and then translated it into Greek, for the information of European readers (*War*, i, 1). The original is no longer extant. The Greek was published about A.D. 75, under the patronage and with the especial recommendation of Titus. Agrippa II, also, in no fewer than sixty-two letters to Josephus, bore testimony to the care and fidelity displayed in it. It was admitted into the Palatine library, and its author was honored with a statue at Rome. It commences with the capture of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 170; runs rapidly over the events before Josephus's own time, and gives a detailed account of the fatal war with Rome (Josephus, *Life*, p. 65; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 9; Jerome, *Catal. Script. Eccl.* p. 13; Ittigius, *Prolegomena;* Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* v, 4; Vossius, *De Hist. Græc.* p. 239, ed. Westermann):—2. *Jewish Antiquities* (Ἰουδαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία), in twenty books, completed about A.D. 93, and addressed to Epaphroditus. The title, as well as the number of books, may have been suggested by the Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The work extends from the creation of the world to A.D. 66, the 12th year of Nero, in which the Jews were goaded to rebellion by Gessius Florus. It embraces, therefore, but more in detail, much of the matter of the first and second books on the *Jewish War.* Both these histories are said to have been translated into Hebrew, of which version, however, there are no traces, though some have erroneously identified it with the works of the Pseudo-Josephus. See JOSEPH BEN-GORION:—3. His *Life*, in one book. This is an autobiography appended to the *Antiquities*, and is addressed to the same Epaphroditus. It cannot, however, have been written earlier than A.D. 97, since Agrippa II is mentioned in it as no longer living (65):—4. Κατὰ Ἀπίωνος (a treatise *against Apion*), in two books, also addressed to Epaphroditus. It is in answer to such as impugned the antiquity of the Jewish nation on the ground of the silence of Greek writers respecting it. The title, "against Apion," is rather a misnomer, and is applicable only to a portion of the second book (1-13). It exhibits considerable learning, and is highly commended by Jerome. The Greek text is deficient at ii, 5-9:—5. *The Fourth of Maccabees* (εἰς Μακκαβαίους, ἢ περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ), in one book. The genuineness of this treatise has been called in question by many (see Cave, *Hist. Lit. Script. Eccles.* p. 22), but it is attributed to Josephus by Eusebius, Jerome, Philostorgius, and others (see Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* v, 7; Ittigius, *Prolegomena*). Certainly, however, it does not read like his works. It is an extremely declamatory account of the martyrdom of Eleazar (an aged priest), and of seven youths and their mother, in the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes; and this is prefaced by a discussion on the supremacy which reason possesses *de jure* over pleasure and pain. Its title has reference to the zeal for God's law displayed by the sufferers in the spirit of the Maccabees. There is a paraphrase of it by Erasmus, and in some Greek copies of the Bible it was inserted as the

fourth book of the Maccabees (Fabricius, *l. c.*). There are, besides these, also attributed to him:—6. The treatise Περὶ τοῦ παντός, which was certainly not written by Josephus. For an account of it, see Photius, *Cod.* xlviii; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* v, 8; Ittigius, *Prolegomena*, ad fin.:—7. Jerome (*Præf. ad Lib.* xi *Comm. ad Esaiam*) speaks of a work of one Josephus on Daniel's vision of the seventy weeks, but he probably refers to some other Josephus:—8. At the end of his *Antiquities* Josephus mentions his intention of writing a work in four books on the Jewish notions of God and his essence, and on the rationale of the Mosaic laws, but this task he never accomplished. At any rate, the works have not come down to us. (See Whiston's note, *Ant.* ad fin.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* v, 9.)

The writings of Josephus first appeared in print in a Latin translation, with no notice of the place or date of publication: the edition seems to have contained only a portion of the *Antiquities*. These, with the seven books of the Jewish War, were reprinted by Schüsler (Augsb. 1470) in Latin; and there were many editions in the same language of the whole works, and of portions of them, before the editio princeps of the Greek text appeared at Basel, 1544, edited by Arlenius. Since then the works of Josephus have frequently been printed, both in the Greek and in many other languages. One of the most valuable editions is that by Hudson (Oxf. 1720, 2 vols. fol.). The text is founded on a most careful and extensive collation of MSS., and the edition is further enriched by notes and indices. The principal English versions are those of Lodge (Lond. 1602); one from the French of D'Andilly (Oxford, 1676, reprinted at London, 1683); that of L'Estrange (Lond. 1702), and that of Whiston (London, 1737). The two last-mentioned versions have frequently been reprinted in various shapes. See, besides the authorities already noticed, Grätz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, iii, 399 sq.; Weber and Holtzmann, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* ii, 467 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, i, 225, 319, 444; De Wette, *Hebr. jüd. Archäologie*, p. 9; Ewald, *Gesch. Christus* (1855), p. 104 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, vol. ii (see Index in vol. iii); Smith, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.; Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii, 117 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jo'ses (Ἰωσῆς, perhaps for *Joseph*, which is sometimes thus written in the Talmud, יוֹסֵי for יוֹסֵף; see Lightfoot on Acts i, 23; and, indeed, Ἰωσήφ actually appears in some codices for Ἰωσῆς in Matt., Mark xv, and Acts; but better MSS. have Ἰωάννης in Matt. xiii; others have Ἰησοῦς in Luke), the name of two or three persons in the New Testament.

1. Erroneously in the A. V. (Luke iii, 29) "JOSE" (q. v.).

2. The son of Mary and Cleopas, and brother of James the Less, of Simon, and of Jude, and, consequently, one of those who are called "the brethren" of our Lord (Matt. xiii, 55; xxvii, 56; Mark vi, 3; xv, 40, 47). See JAMES; JUDE. He was the only one of these brethren who was not an apostle—a circumstance which has given occasion to some unsatisfactory conjecture. It is, perhaps, more remarkable that three of them were apostles than that the fourth was not. A.D. 28.—Kitto. See JESUS CHRIST.

3. (Acts iv, 36.) See BARNABAS.

Jo'shah (Heb. *Yoshah'*, יוֹשָׁה, prob. *establisher*; Sept. Ἰωσίας, v. r. Ἰωσία; Vulg. *Josa*), son of Amaziah, and one of the chief Simeonites, the increase of whose family induced them to migrate to the valley of Gedor, whence they expelled the aboriginal Hamites (1 Chron. iv, 34). B.C. cir. 711.

Josh'aphat (1 Chron. xi, 43). See JEHOSHAPHAT, 1.

Joshavi'ah (Heb. *Yoshavyah'*, יוֹשַׁוְיָה, *Jehovah is sufficient*, otherwise i. q. *Josibiah*; Sept. Ἰωσία; Vulg. *Josaja*), son of Elnaam, and (with his brother Jeribai) one of David's famous body-guard (1 Chron. xi, 46). B.C. 1046.

Joshbek'ashah (Heb. *Yoshbekashah'*, יָשְׁבְּקָשָׁה, prob. for יֹשֵׁב בְּקָשָׁה, *seat in hardness*; Sept. Σεβακαιτάν and Ἰεσβακατάν v. r. Ἰεσβασακά; Vulg. *Jesbacassa*), one of the sons of Heman, and leader of the seventeenth division of Temple musicians (1 Chron. xxv, 4, 24). B. C. 1014.

Jo'sheb-bas'sebeth (Heb. *Yosheb'-bash-She'beth*, יֹשֵׁב בַּשֶּׁבֶת, *sitting in the session*, i. e. *council*; Sept. Ἰεβοσθέ; Vulg. *sedens in cathedra*; Auth. Vers. "that sat in the seat"), the chief of David's three principal heroes (2 Sam. xxiii, 8); called in the parallel passage (1 Chron. xi, 11) JASHOBEAM (q. v.).

Josh'uä (Heb. *Yehoshu'ä*, יְהוֹשׁוּעַ, *Jehovah is his help*, or *Jehovah the Saviour*, according to Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. ii, p. 89, ed. 1843; Sept., N. T., and Josephus Ἰησοῦς; Auth. Vers. "Jehoshua" in Numb. xiii, 16, and "Jehoshuah" in 1 Chron. vii, 27; "Jesus" in Acts vii, 45; Heb. iv, 8, comp. JESHUA; JESUS), the name of several men.

1. The son of Nun, of the tribe of Ephraim, the assistant and successor of Moses, whose history is chiefly contained in the book that bears his name. His name was originally HOSHEA (הוֹשֵׁעַ, *salvation*, Numb. xiii, 8), and it seems that the subsequent alteration of it by Moses (Numb. xiii, 16) was significant, and proceeded on the same principle as that of Abram into Abraham (Gen. xvii, 5), and of Sarai into Sarah (Gen. xvii, 15). In Neh. viii, 17, he is called by the equivalent name JESHUA (יֵשׁוּעַ, *salvation*). See JESUS.

1. *Personal History.*—According to the *Tsemach David*, Joshua was born in Egypt, in the year of the Jewish æra 2406 (B.C. 1037); but as he was probably about the age of Caleb, with whom he was associated, we may assign his birth to B.C. cir. 1698 (or, as below, 1693). The future captain of invading hosts grew up a slave in the brick-fields of Egypt. Born about the time when Moses fled into Midian, he was a man of some forty years when he saw the ten plagues and shared in the hurried triumph of the Exodus. The keen eye of the aged Lawgiver soon discerned in Hoshea those qualities which might be required in a colleague or successor to himself. In the Bible he is first mentioned as being the victorious commander of the Israelites in their battle against the Amalekites at Rephidim (Exod. xvii, 8-16). B.C. 1658. When Moses ascended Mount Sinai to receive for the first time (compare Exod. xxiv, 13, and xxxiii, 11) the two Tables, Joshua, who is called his minister or servant, accompanied him part of the way, and was the first to accost him in his descent (Exod. xxxii, 17). Soon afterwards he was one of the twelve chiefs who were sent (Numb. xiii, 17) to explore the land of Canaan, and one of the two (xiv, 6) who gave an encouraging report of their journey. B.C. 1657. The forty years of wandering were almost passed, and Joshua was one of the few survivors, when Moses, shortly before his death, was directed (Numb. xxvii, 18) to invest Joshua solemnly and publicly with definite authority, in connection with Eleazar the priest, over the people (Deut. iii, 28). After this, God himself gave Joshua a charge by the mouth of the dying Lawgiver (Deut. xxxi, 14, 23). B.C. 1618. Under the direction of God again renewed (Josh. i, 1), Joshua, now in his 85th year (Josephus, *Ant.* v, 1, 29), assumed the command of the people at Shittim, sent spies into Jericho, crossed the Jordan, fortified a camp at Gilgal, circumcised the people, kept the Passover, and was visited by the captain of the Lord's host. (See below.) A miracle made the fall of Jericho more terrible to the Canaanites. A miraculous repulse in the first assault on Ai impressed upon the invaders the warning that they were the instruments of a holy and jealous God. Ai fell; and the law was inscribed on Mount Ebal, and read by their leader in the presence of all Israel. The treaty which the fear-stricken Gibeonites obtained deceitfully was generously respected by Joshua. It stimulated and brought to a point the hos-

tile movements of the five confederate chiefs of the Amorites. Joshua, aided by an unprecedented hailstorm and a miraculous prolongation of the day (see below), obtained a decisive victory over them at Makkedah, and proceeded at once to subjugate the south country as far as Kadesh-barnea and Gaza. He returned to the camp at Gilgal master of half of Palestine.

In another campaign he marched to the waters of Merom, where he met and overthrew a confederacy of the Canaanitish chiefs in the north, under Jabin, king of Hazor; and in the course of a protracted war he led his victorious soldiers to the gates of Zidon and into the valley of Lebanon under Hermon. In six years, six nations, with thirty-one kings, swell the roll of his conquests; amongst others the Anakim—the old terror of Israel—are specially recorded as destroyed everywhere except in Philistia. It must be borne in mind that the extensive conquests of Joshua were not intended to achieve, and did not achieve the complete extirpation of the Canaanites, many of whom continued to occupy isolated strongholds throughout the land. (See below.)

Joshua, now stricken in years, proceeded, in conjunction with Eleazar and the heads of the tribes, to complete the division of the conquered land; and when all was allotted, Timnath-serah in Mount Ephraim was assigned by the people as Joshua's peculiar inheritance. The tabernacle of the congregation was established at Shiloh, six cities of refuge were appointed, forty-eight cities assigned to the Levites, and the warriors of the trans-Jordanic tribes dismissed in peace to their homes.

After an interval of rest, Joshua convoked an assembly from all Israel. He delivered two solemn addresses reminding them of the marvelous fulfilment of God's promises to their fathers, and warned them of the conditions on which their prosperity depended; and, lastly, he caused them to renew their covenant with God at Shechem, a place already famous in connection with Jacob (Gen. xxxv, 4) and Joseph (Josh. xxiv, 32). He died at the age of 110 years, and was buried in his own city, Timnath-serah (Josh. xxiv). B.C. 1593. According to Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 147), his grave, ornamented with a handsome monument, is still pointed out at Kefar Charas.

2. *His Character.*—Joshua's life has been noted as one of the very few which are recorded in history with some fulness of detail, yet without any stain upon them. In his character have been traced, under an Oriental garb, such features as chiefly kindled the imagination of Western chroniclers and poets in the Middle Ages: the character of a devout warrior, blameless and fearless, who has been taught by serving as a youth how to command as a man; who earns by manly vigor a quiet, honored old age; who combines strength with gentleness, ever looking up for and obeying the divine impulse with the simplicity of a child, while he wields great power and directs it calmly, and without swerving, to the accomplishment of a high, unselfish purpose.

All that part of the book of Joshua which relates his personal history seems to be written with the unconscious, vivid power of an eye-witness. We are not merely taught to look with a distant reverence upon the first man who bears the name which is above every name. We stand by the side of one who is admitted to hear the words of God, and see the vision of the Almighty. The image of the armed warrior is before us as when in the sight of two armies he lifted up his spear over unguarded Ai. We see the majestic presence which inspired all Israel (iv, 14) with awe; the mild father who remonstrated with Achan; the calm, dignified judge who pronounced his sentence; the devoted worshipper prostrating himself before the captain of the Lord's host. We see the lonely man in the height of his power, separate from those about him, the last survivor, save one, of a famous generation; the honored old man of many deeds and many sufferings, gathering his dying energy for an attempt to bind his people more closely to the service of God whom he had so long served and worshipped, and whom he was ever learning to know more and more.

The great work of Joshua's life was more exciting but less hopeful than that of Moses. He gathered the first fruits of the autumn harvest where his predecessor had sown the seed in spring. It was a high and inspiring task to watch beside the cradle of a mighty nation, and to train its early footsteps in laws which should last for centuries; and it was a fit end to a life of expectation to gaze with longing eyes from Pisgah upon the Land of Promise. But no such brightness gleamed upon the calm close of Joshua's life. Solemn words, and dark with foreboding, fell from him as he sat "under the oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord in Shechem." The excitement of his battles was past; and there had grown up in the mind of the pious leader a consciousness that it is the tendency of prosperity and success to make a people wanton and worldly-minded, idolaters in spirit if not in act, and to alienate them from God.

Holy Scripture itself suggests (Heb. iv, 8) the consideration of Joshua as a type of Christ. Many of the Christian fathers have enlarged upon this view; and Bishop Pearson, who has collected their opinions (*On the Creed*, art. ii, p. 87–90, and 94–96, ed. 1843), points out the following and many other typical resemblances: (1.) the name common to both; (2.) Joshua brings the people of God into the land of promise, and divides the land among the tribes; Jesus brings his people into the presence of God, and assigns to them their mansions; (3.) as Joshua succeeded Moses and completed his work, so the Gospel of Christ succeeding the law, announced One by whom all that believe are justified from all things from which we could not be justified by the Law of Moses (Acts xiii, 39); (4.) as Joshua, the minister of Moses, renewed the rite of circumcision, so Jesus, the minister of the circumcision, brought in the circumcision of the heart (Rom. xv, 8; ii, 29).

3. *Difficulties in his Narrative.*—It has been questioned whether the captain of the Lord's host (ch. v, 13–15) was a created being or not. Dr. W. H. Mill discusses this point at full length and with great learning, and decides in favor of the former alternative (*On the Historical Character of St. Luke's First Chapter*, Camb. 1841, p. 92). But J. G. Abicht (*De Duce Exercitus*, etc., ap. *Nov. Thes. Theologico-philolog.* i, 503) is of opinion that he was the uncreated angel, the Son of God. Compare also Pfeiffer, *Diff. Script. Loc.* p. 173. See ANGEL.

The treatment of the Canaanites by their Jewish conquerors is fully discussed by Dean Graves, *On the Pentateuch*, pt. iii, lect. i. He concludes that the extermination of the Canaanites was justified by their crimes, and that the employment of the Jews in such extermination was quite consistent with God's method of governing the world. Professor Fairbairn (*Typology of Scripture*, bk. iii, ch. 4, § 1, ed. 1854) argues with great force and candor in favor of the complete agreement of the principles on which the war was carried on by Joshua with the principles of the Christian dispensation. See CANAANITES.

Among the supernatural occurrences in the life of Joshua, none has led to so much discussion as the prolongation of the day of the battle of Makkedah (x, 12–14). No great difficulty is found, in deciding as Pfeiffer has done (*Diff. Script. loc.* p. 175) between the lengths of this day and that of Hezekiah (2 Kings xx, 11), and in connecting both days with the Egyptian tradition mentioned by Herodotus, ii, 142. But since modern science revealed the stupendous character of this miracle, modern criticism has made several attempts to explain it away. It is regarded by Le Clerc, Dathe, and others as no miracle, but an optical illusion; by Rosenmüller, following Ilgen, as a mistake of the time of day; by Winer and many recent German critics, with whom Dr. Davidson (*Introd. to O. T.* p. 644) seems to agree, as a mistake of the meaning or the authority of a poetical contributor to the book of Jasher. So Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* ii, 326) traces in the latter part of verse 13 an in-

terpolation by the hand of that anonymous Jew whom he supposes to have written the book of Deuteronomy, and here to have misunderstood the vivid conception of an old poet; and he cites numerous similar conceptions from the old poetry of Greece, Rome, Arabia, and Peru. But the literal and natural interpretation of the text, as intended to describe a miracle, is sufficiently vindicated by Deyling, *Observ. Sacr.* i, § 19, p. 100; and J. G. Abicht, *De statione Solis* ap. *Nov. Thes. Theol.-philol.* i, 516; and is forcibly stated by Bishop Watson in the fourth letter in his *Apology for the Bible.* Barzillai (*Josua und die Sonne*, from the Italian, Trieste, 1869) understands the word דּוֹם, "stand still" (lit. *be dumb*), to signify merely *cease to shine*, and the expression "hasted not to go down a whole day" as equivalent to *withheld its full light!*—in other words, there was an eclipse: how this could be of service to the Hebrews does not appear. See GIBEON; JASHER.

4. *Length of his Administration.*—According to Josephus (*Ant.* v, 1, 29), Joshua commanded the Jews twenty-five years, but, according to other Jewish chronologers, twenty-seven years. The *Tsemach David*, on the years of the Jewish era 2489 and 2496, remarks: "It is written in the *Seder Olam* that Joshua judged Israel twenty-five years, commencing from the year 2488, immediately from the death of Moses, to the year 2516. This, however, would not be known to us but for cabalistic tradition, but in some degree also by reasoning," etc. Hottinger (*Smegma*, p. 469) says: "According to the *Midrash*, Rahab was ten years old when the Israelites left Egypt; she played the harlot during the forty years in which the Israelites were in the desert. She became the wife of Joshua, and eight prophets descended from her, viz. Jeremiah, Mahasia, Hanamael, Shallum, Baruch, Ezekiel. Some say also that Huldah the prophetess was her descendant." Some chronologers have endeavored to reduce the rule of Joshua to seventeen, and others to twenty-one years. There is no good reason for departing from the number assigned by Josephus (see *Meth. Quar. Rev.* 1856, p. 450). See CHRONOLOGY.

5. *Other Traditionary Notices.*—Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.* in Matt. i, 5, and *Chorogr. Lucæ præmis.* iv, § 3) quotes Jewish traditions likewise to the effect that the sepulchre of Joshua was adorned with an image of the sun in memory of the miracle of Ajalon. The Sept. and the Arab. Ver. add to Josh. xxiv, 30 the statement that in his sepulchre were deposited the flint-knives which were used for the circumcision at Gilgal (Josh. v, 2).

There also occur some vestiges of the deeds of Joshua in other historians besides those of his own country. Procopius mentions a Phœnician inscription near the city of Tingis in Mauritania, the sense of which was: "We are those who fled before the face of Joshua the robber, the son of Nun" (*De Bell. Vandal.* ii, 10). Suidas (sub voce Χαναάν): "We are the Canaanites whom Joshua the robber persecuted." Compare Fabricii *Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti*, i, 889 sq., and the doubts respecting this statement in Dale, *De Origine et Progressu Idolatriæ*, p. 749 sq. Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* ii, 297, 298) gives sound reasons for forbearing to use this story as authentic history. It is, however, accepted by Rawlinson (*Bampton Lecture* for 1859, iii, 91). A letter of Shaubech, שׁוּבך, king of Armenia Minor, in the Samaritan book of Joshua (ch. xxvi), styles Joshua אלדיב אלקאתול, *lupus percussor*, "the murderous wolf;" or, according to another reading in the book *Juchasin* (p. 154, f. 1), and in the *Shalsheleth Rakkabbalah* (p. 96), זאב ערבות, *lupus vespertinus*, "the evening wolf" (comp. Hab. i, 8; Hottinger, *Historia Orientalis*, Tiguri, 1651, p. 40 sq.; Buddeus, *Hist. Eccles.* p. 964 sq.). A comparison of Hercules, according to the Phœnician and Greek mythology, with Joshua has been attempted by Hercklitz (*Quod Hercules idem sit ac Josua*, Lipsiæ, 1706; comp. Anton. *Compar. libror. sac. V. T. et script. profan.* iv, v, Gorlic. 1817).

6. *Additional Literature on Joshua personally, and his Exploits.*—The principal occurrences in the life of Joshua are reviewed by Bishop Hall in his *Contemplations on the O. T.* bks. 7, 8, and 9. See also T. Smith, *Hist. of Joshua* (Lond. 1862); Overton, *Life of Joshua* (Lond. 1866); Hess, *Gesch. Josuas* (Zür. 1759); Masius, *Josuæ historia* (Antw. 1754); Plumptre, *Hist. of Joshua* (Lond. 1848).

JOSHUA, BOOK OF, the first in order of the נְבִיאִים רִאשׁוֹנִים, or *Former Prophets* in the Hebrew Canon. See BIBLE. It is so called from the personage who occupies the principal place in the narration of events contained therein, and may be considered as a continuation of the Pentateuch, since it commences with "*vav* continuative" in the word וַיְהִי, which may be rendered *thereupon it happened.*

I. *Contents.*—This book gives an account of the fortunes of the Israelites from the death of Moses to that of Joshua, the son of Nun. Beginning with the appointment of Joshua to succeed Moses as the leader of the people, it proceeds to describe the arrangements made by Joshua in prospect of passing over Jordan (i-ii); the crossing of the river, and the setting up of a memorial on the further side at Gilgal (iii-iv); the dismay which this occasioned to the Canaanites (v, 1); the circumcision of the males among the people, that rite having been neglected in the wilderness; the observance of the Passover by them in the camp at Gilgal; the ceasing of the manna on the day after they had entered Canaan (v, 2-12); the encouragement given to Joshua to proceed on his enterprise by the appearance of an angel to him (v, 13-15); the siege and capture of Jericho (vi); the defeat of the Israelites at Ai (vii); the taking of Ai (viii, 1-29); the writing of the law on tables of stone, and the solemn repetition from Ebal and Gerizim of the blessings and the curses which Moses had written in the book of the law (viii, 30-35); the confederation of the kings of Northern Canaan against the Israelites; the cunning device by which the Gibeonites secured themselves from being destroyed by the Israelites; the indignation of the other Canaanites against the Gibeonites, and the confederation of the kings around Jerusalem against Joshua, with their signal defeat by him (ix, x); the overthrow at the waters of Megiddo of the great northern confederacy, with the destruction of the Anakim (xi); the list of kings whose country the Israelites had taken under Moses and Joshua (xii); the division of the country, both the parts conquered and those yet remaining under the power of the Canaanites, among the different tribes, chiefly by lot; the setting up of the tabernacle in Shiloh; the appointment of cities of refuge and of cities for the Levites; the return of the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh, to their possessions on the east of the Jordan, after the settlement of their brethren in Canaan (xiii-xxii); and the farewell addresses of Joshua to the people, his death and burial (xxiii-xxiv). The book naturally divides itself into two parts; the former (i-xii) containing an account of the conquest of the land; the latter (xiii-xxiv) of the division of it among the tribes. These are frequently cited distinctively as the historical and the geographical portions of the book.

a. The first twelve chapters form a continuous narrative, which seems never to halt or flag. The description is frequently so minute as to show the hand not merely of a contemporary, but of an eye-witness. An awful sense of the divine Presence reigns throughout. We are called out from the din and tumult of each battle-field to listen to the still small voice. The progress of events is clearly foreshadowed in the first chapter (vers. 5, 6). Step by step we are led on through the solemn preparation, the arduous struggle, the crowning triumph. Moving everything around, yet himself moved by an unseen power, the Jewish leader rises high and calm amid all.

b. The second part of the book (ch. xiii-xxi) has been aptly compared to the Domesday-book of the Norman

conquerors of England. The documents of which it consists were doubtless the abstracts of such reports as were supplied by the men whom Joshua sent out (xviii, 8) to describe the land. In the course of time it is probable that changes were introduced into their reports—whether kept separately among the national archives, or embodied in the contents of a book—by transcribers adapting them to the actual state of the country in later times when political divisions were modified, new towns sprung up, and old ones disappeared (comp. the two lists of Levitical towns, Josh. xxi, and 1 Chron. vi, 54, etc.).

II. *Design.*—The object of the book is manifestly to furnish a continuation of the history of the Israelites from the point at which it is left in the closing book of the Pentateuch, and at the same time to illustrate the faithfulness of Jehovah to his word of promise, and his grace in aiding his people by miraculous interference to obtain possession of the land promised to Abraham. The ground idea of the book, as Maurer (*Comment.* p. 3) observes, is furnished by God's declaration to Joshua, recorded i, 5, 6, that the work which Moses commenced he should finish by subduing and dividing to the tribes of Israel the Promised Land. The book, therefore, may be regarded as setting forth historically the grounds on which the claims of Israel to the proprietorship of the land rested; and as possessing, consequently, not merely a historical, but also a constitutional and legal worth. As illustrating God's grace and power in dealing with his people, it possesses also a religious and spiritual interest.

III. *Unity.*—On this head a variety of opinions have been entertained. It has been asserted, 1. That the book is a collection of fragments from different hands, put together at different times, and the whole revised and enlarged by a later writer. Some make the number of sources whence these fragments have been derived *ten* (Herwerden, *Disp. de Libro Jos.* Groning. 1826); others *five*, including the reviser (Knobel, *Exeget. Hbk.* pt. 13; Ewald, *Gesch. der Israel.* i, 73 sq.); while others content themselves with *three* (Bleek, *Einleit. ins. A. T.* p. 325). 2. That it is a complete and uniform composition, interspersed with glosses and additions more or less extensive. 3. That the first part is the composition of one author; but the second betrays indications of being a compilation from various sources (Hävernick, *Einleit.* II, i, 34). 4. That the book is complete and uniform throughout, and, as a whole, is the composition of one writer. It is impossible here to enter into all the details of this discussion. The reader will find these fully presented by De Wette, *Einleit. ins. A. T.*, 4th and subsequent editions; Hävernick, *Einleit.* I, i, 1; König, *Alt-testamentl. Studien*, i, 4; Maurer, *Comment.*; Keil, *Comment.* E. T. p. 3; Bleek, *Einleit. ins. A. T.*, p. 311; Knobel, in the *Exeget. Handbuch*, pt. 13; and Davidson, *Introd. to the O. T.* i, 412.

a. Events alleged to be twice narrated in this book are, Joshua's decease, ch. xxiii and xxiv; the command to appoint twelve men, one out of each tribe, in connection with the passing over Jordan (iii, 12; iv, 3); the stoning of Achan and his dependents (vii, 25); the setting of an ambush for the taking of Ai (viii, 9, 12); the rest from war of the land (xi, 23; xiv, 15); the command to Joshua concerning dividing the land (xiii, 6); and the granting of Hebron to Caleb (xiv, 13; xv, 13). This list we have transcribed from Knobel (*Exeget. Hdbk.* xiii, 498). Is it incredible that Joshua should have *twice* assembled the representatives of the people to address them before his decease? May he not have felt that, spared beyond his expectation, it behoved him to avail himself of the opportunity thus afforded to address once more to the people words of counsel and admonition? In the case of the grant to Caleb of Hebron there is undoubtedly a repetition of the same fact, but it is such a repetition as might proceed from the same pen; for the two statements are made in different connections, the one in connection with Caleb's personal merits, the other in connection with the boundaries and occupation allotted to Judah. The taking of Ai will be considered further on. As for the other instances, we leave them to the judgment of our readers.

b. Of the alleged *discrepancies*, one on which much stress has been laid is, that in various parts of the book Joshua is said to have subdued the whole land and destroyed the Canaanites (xi, 10; xii, 7 sq.; xxi, 43; xxii, 4), whereas in others it is stated that large portions of the land were not conquered by Joshua (xiii, 1 sq.; xvii, 14 sq.; xviii, 3 sq.; xxiii, 5-12). It is worthy of note, however, in the outset, that this is a discrepancy which pervades the book, and on which, consequently, no argument for diversity of authorship, as between the *first* and the *second* parts of it, can be built. Again, a discrepancy of this sort is of a kind so obvious, that it is exactly such as a compiler, coolly surveying the materials he is putting together, would at once detect and eliminate; whereas an original writer might write so as to give the *appearance* of it from looking at the same object from different points of view in the course of his writing. Viewed in relation to purpose and effect, the land was conquered and appropriated; Israel was settled in it as master and proprietor, the power of the Canaanites was broken, and God's covenant to his people was fulfilled. But through various causes, chiefly the people's own fault, the work was not literally completed; and therefore, viewed in relation to what ought to have been done and what might have been done, the historian could not but record that there yet remained some enemies to be conquered, and some portions of the land to be appropriated. It was intended (Ex. xxiii, 28, 30) (Ex. xxiii, 28, 30) that the people should occupy the land little by little. In like manner, it can not be allowed that the general statement (xi, 23) that Joshua gave the land unto all Israel according to their divisions by their tribes is inconsistent with the fact (xviii, 1; xix, 51) that many subsequent years passed before the process of division was completed and the allotments finally adjusted.

The boundaries of the different tribes, it is said, are stated sometimes with greater, sometimes with less exactness. Now this may be a fault of the surveyors employed by Joshua; but it is scarcely an inconsistency to be charged on the writer of the book who transcribed their descriptions. Again, the divine promise that the coast of Israel shall extend to the Euphrates (i, 4) is not inconsistent with the fact that the country which Joshua was commanded to divide (xiii, 16) does not extend so far. Again, the statement (xiii, 3) that Ekron, etc., remained yet to be possessed is not inconsistent with the subsequent statement (xv, 45) that it was assigned to Judah. Dr. Davidson gives no proof either of his assertion that the former text is in fact subsequent to the latter, or of his supposition that Ekron was in the possession of Judah at the time of its assignment.

Another apparent discrepancy has been found between xxii, 2 and xxiv, 14, 23. How, it is asked, could there be "gross idolatry" amongst a people who had in all things conformed to the law of God given by Moses? This difficulty is dealt with by Augustine (*Quæst. in Jos.* qu. 29), who solves it by understanding the injunction of Joshua to refer to alienation of heart on the part of the people from God. This explanation is followed in substance by Calvin and others, and it is apparently the true one. Had Joshua known that "gross idolatry" was practiced by the people, he would have taken vigorous measures before this to extirpate it. But against secret and heart idolatry he could use only words of warning and counsel.

Another discrepancy is thus set forth by Dr. Davidson (*Introd.* i, p. 415): "It is related that the people assembled at Sichem, 'under an oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord,' and 'they presented themselves before God,' implying that the tabernacle and ark were there. But we know from xviii, 1 that the tabernacle had been removed from its former place at Gilgal to Shiloh, where it remained for a long period after Joshua's

death" (1 Sam. iii, 21; iv, 3). Here are several mistakes. The phrase "before God" (לִפְנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים) does not necessarily mean "before the ark of the Lord" (comp. Gen. xxvii, 7; Judg. xi, 11; xx, 1; 1 Kings xvii, 1, etc.; Hengstenberg, *Beitr.* iii, 43); and it is *not* related that "the people assembled under an oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord," but that Joshua "took a great stone and set it up there under the oak that was within the sanctuary of the Lord" (xxiv, 26). The oak referred to was probably a well-known one that stood within the spot which had been the first sanctuary of the Lord in Canaan (Gen. xii, 6, 7), and where the nation had been convened by Joshua, on first entering the Promised Land, to listen to the words of the law (Josh. viii, 30–35). No place more fitting as the site of a memorial stone such as Joshua is here said to have set up could be found.

These are the only discrepancies that have even the appearance of seriously affecting the claim of the book to be regarded as the work of one author throughout. The others, which have been discovered and urged by some recent critics in Germany, are such that it seems unnecessary to take up space by noticing them. The reader will find them noted and accounted for in the Introduction to Keil's *Commentary on Joshua*, p. 9 sq. The treatment of the Canaanites which is sanctioned in this book has been denounced for its severity by Eichhorn and earlier writers. But there is nothing in it inconsistent with the divine attribute of justice, or with God's ordinary way of governing the world. See above, JOSHUA; also CANAANITES. Therefore the sanction which is given to it does not impair the authority of this book. Critical ingenuity has searched it in vain for any incident or sentiment inconsistent with what we know of the character of the age, or irreconcilable with other parts of canonical Scripture.

c. The alleged differences of *phraseology* and *style* in different parts of the book might deserve more extended notice were it not for the very unsatisfactory state in which this method of inquiry as yet is. Without doubt, it is true that, if it can be shown that these differences are such as to indicate diversity of authorship, the argument must be admitted as legitimate, and the conclusion as valid; but before dealing with such questions, it would be well if it were settled on some scientific basis what is the competent test in such a case, what kind and amount of difference in phraseology and style are sufficient to prove a diversity of authorship. On this head critics seem wholly at sea; they have no common standard to which to appeal; and hence their conclusions are frequently determined by purely personal leanings and subjective affections, and hardly any two of them agree in the judgment at which they arrive. This is remarkably the case with the instances which have been adduced from the book before us. Of these, some are of such a kind as to render an argument from them against the unity of the book little better than puerile. Thus we are told that in some places the word שֵׁבֶט is used for a *tribe*, while in others מַטֶּה is used, and this is employed as a test to distinguish one fragment from another. Accordingly, for instance, in chap. xviii, verses 2, 4, 7 are pronounced to belong to one writer, and ver. 11 to another; which is just as if an author, in giving an account of the rebellion of 1745, should speak in the same chapter first of a body of Highlanders as a *clan*, and then of the same as a *sept*, and some critic were to come after him and say, "This could not have been written by one author, for he would not have called the same body by different names." Could it be shown that either שֵׁבֶט or מַטֶּה is a word introduced into the language for the first time at a date much later than the age of Joshua, while the other word had then become obsolete, an argument of some weight, and such as a scholar like Bentley might have employed, would have been advanced; but to attempt to assign parts of the same chapter to different authors and to different epochs simply because synonymous appellations of the same object are employed, is nothing better than sheer trifling. Again, it is said that "the historical parts have the rare word מַחְלְקֹת, *inheritance* [rather, *divisions*] (xi, 23; xii, 7; xviii, 10), which does not appear in the geographical sections" (Davidson, i, 417). Is chap. xviii, then, not in the geographical part of the book? or does a part become geographical or historical as suits the caprice or the preconceived theory of the critic? "Similarly, the geographical portion has יַרְדֵּן יְרֵחוֹ, *Jordan by Jericho*, xiii, 32; xvi, 1; xx, 8; a mode of expression wanting in the historical" (*ibid.*). True; but suppose there was no occasion to use the phrase in the historical portions, what then? Are they, therefore, from a different pen from that which produced the geographical? "Again, in the historical parts occur the words כֹּהֲנִים [הַלְוִיִּם] הַכֹּהֲנִים, *the priests, the Levites* (iii, 3; viii, 33); or simply כֹּהֲנִים, *priests* (iii, 6, 15; vi, 4, 6, etc.); but in the geographical sections the same persons are termed *sons of Aaron* (xxi, 4, 10, 13, 19)" (*ibid.*). Is there not, however, a reason for this in the fact that, as it was in virtue of their being descended from Aaron, and not in virtue of their being priests, that the Kohathites received their portion, it was more proper to designate them "children of Aaron, of the Levites," than "priests," or "the priests the Levites." Davidson scouts this explanation as one which "only betrays the weakness of the cause." We confess ourselves unable to see this; the explanation is, in our judgment, perfectly valid in itself, and sufficient for the end for which it is adduced; and he has made no attempt to show that it is otherwise. All he says is, "The former is a Deuteronomistic expression; the latter Elohistic." What this is meant to convey we are at a loss to determine, for the only places in which the phrase "sons of Aaron" occurs is in connection with the names of Nadab and Abihu, who *were* sons of Aaron by immediate descent, and must have been so described by any writer, whether Deuteronomist or Elohist.

A number of other words are adduced by the opponents of the unity of the book of Joshua for the purpose of showing that it includes fragments from different authors. On these we do not linger. There are two considerations which seem to us entirely to destroy their force as evidences for that which they are adduced to prove. The one of these is that, according to Ewald, "the later historians imitated the words and phraseology of those who preceded them, and, moreover, that they frequently altered the phrases which they found in the earlier documents." On this Keil (from whom we borrow the statement) remarks with great force, "If that be the case, we can no longer think of peculiarities of style as characteristic signs by which the different sources may be distinguished. His entire theory is therefore built on sand" (*Comment. on Josh.* Introd. p. 9, E. T.). The other observation we would make is, that supposing it made out by indubitable marks that the book of Joshua has undergone a careful revision by a later editor, who has altered expressions and interpolated brief statements that would not seriously impeach the unity of the book, it would still remain substantially the work of one author. We cannot forbear adding that, in all such inquiries, more faith is to be placed on a sound literary perception and taste than on those minutiæ of expression and phraseology on which so much stress has of late been laid by some of the scholars of Germany and their followers in this country. The impression undoubtedly left on the mind of the reader is, that this book contains a continuous and uniform narrative; and its claims in this respect can be brought into doubt only by the application to it of a species of criticism which would produce the same result were it applied to the histories of Livy, the commentaries of Cæsar, or any other ancient work of narrative.

IV. *Date of Composition.*—This can only be approxi-

mately determined. Of great value for this purpose is the frequent use of the phrase "until this day" by the writer, in reference to the duration of certain objects of which he writes. The use of such a phrase indicates indubitably that the narrative was written while the object referred to was still existing. It is a phrase, also, which may be used with reference to a very limited period; as, for instance, when Joshua uses it of the period up to which the two tribes and a half had continued with their brethren (xxii, 3), or when he uses it of the period up to which the Israelites had been suffering for the iniquity of Peor (xxii, 17); comp. also xxiii, 8, 9. Now we find this phrase used by the historian in cases where the reference is undoubtedly to a period either within the lifetime of Joshua, or not long after his death. Thus it is used with reference to the stones which Joshua set up in the midst of Jordan, in the place where the priests had stood as the people passed over (iv, 9), and which we cannot suppose remained in that position for a very long time; it is used also of Rahab's dwelling in the midst of Israel (vi, 25), which must have ceased, at the furthest, very soon after Joshua's death; also of Caleb's personal possession of Hebron (xiv, 14), which of course terminated soon after the time of Joshua. From these notices we infer that the book *may* have been written during Joshua's lifetime, and *cannot* have been written long after. With this falls in the use of the first person in the reference to the crossing of the Jordan (v, 1), where one who was present on the occasion is evidently the writer. To the same effect is the fact that no allusion is anywhere made to anything that is known to have been long posterior to the time of Joshua.

Several words occurring in this book have been adduced as belonging to the later Hebrew, and as, consequently, indicating a later date of composition for the book than the age of Joshua, or that immediately succeeding. But it strikingly shows the precarious basis on which all such reasoning rests, that words are pronounced archaic or late just as it suits the purpose of the inquirer; what De Wette calls late being declared to be ancient by Hävernick and Keil, and what Hävernick and Keil call ancient being again pronounced late by Knobel and Davidson, and with equal absence of any show of reason on both sides. One thing of importance, however, is, that whether the writer has used what modern scholars, judging *à priori*, call later forms or not, he has undoubtedly made no allusions to later facts, and so has given evidence of antiquity which common-sense inquirers can appreciate.

V. *Author*.—Assuming that the book is the production of one writer, and that it was written about the time above suggested, the question arises, To whom is it to be ascribed? That it is the work of Joshua himself is the tradition of the Jews (*Baba Bathra*, cap. i, fol. 14, B); and this has been embraced by several Christian writers, and among others, in recent times, by König, and, as respects the first half of the book, by Hävernick. That this might have been the case as respects all but the concluding section of the book cannot be denied, but the reasons which have been adduced in support of it have not appeared sufficient to the great majority of critics. These may be thus briefly stated: (*a*) It is evident (xxiv, 26) that Joshua could and did write some account of at least one transaction which is related in this book; (*b*) the numerous accounts of Joshua's intercourse with God (i, 1; iii, 7; iv, 2; v, 2, 9; vi, 2; vii, 10; viii, 1; x, 8; xi, 6; xiii, 1, 2; xx, 1; xxiv, 2), and with the captain of the Lord's host (ver. 13), must have emanated from himself; (*c*) no one is more likely than the speaker himself to have committed to writing the two addresses which were Joshua's legacy to his people (xxiii and xxiv); (*d*) no one was so well qualified by his position to describe the events related, and to collect the documents contained in the book; (*e*) the example of his predecessor and master, Moses, would have suggested to him such a record of his acts; (*f*) one verse (vi, 25) must have been written by some person who lived in the time of Joshua; and two other verses, v, 1 and 6—assuming the common reading of the former to be correct—are most fairly interpreted as written by actors in the scene.

No one would deny that some additions to the book might be made after the death of Joshua without detracting from the possible fact that the book was substantially his composition. The last verses (xxiv, 29–33) were obviously added by some later hand. If, as is possible, though not certain, some subordinate events, as the capture of Hebron, of Debir (Josh. xv, 13–19, and Judg. i, 10–15), and of Leshem (Josh. xix, 47; and Judg. xviii, 7), and the joint occupation of Jerusalem (Josh. xv, 63, and Judg. i, 21) did not occur till after Joshua's death, they may have been inserted in the book of Joshua by a late transcriber. The passages xiii, 2–6; xvi, 10; xvii, 11, which also are subsequently repeated in the book of Judges, may doubtless describe accurately the same state of things existing at two distinct periods.

Other authors have been conjectured, as Phinehas by Lightfoot; Eleazar by Calvin; Samuel by Van Til; Jeremiah by Henry; one of the elders who survived Joshua by Keil. Von Lengerke thinks it was written by some one in the time of Josiah; Davidson by some one in the time of Saul, or somewhat later; Masius, Le Clerc, Maurer, and others, by some one who lived after the Babylonian captivity.

VI. *Credibility*.—That the narrative contained in this book is to be accepted as a trustworthy account of the transactions it records is proved alike by the esteem in which it was always held by the Jews; by the references to events recorded in it in the national sacred songs (comp. Psa. xliv, 2–4; lxxviii, 54, 55; lxviii, 13–15. cxiv, 1–8; Hab. iii, 8–13), and in other parts of Scripture (comp. Judg. xviii, 31; 1 Sam. i, 3, 9, 24; iii, 21. Isa. xxviii, 21; Acts vii, 45; Heb. iv, 8; xi, 30–32; James ii, 25); by the traces which, both in the historical and in the geographical portions, may be found of the use by the writer of contemporary documents; by the minuteness of the details which the author furnishes, and which indicates familiar acquaintance with what he records; by the accuracy of his geographical delineations, an accuracy which the results of modern investigation are increasingly demonstrating; by the fact that the tribes never had any dispute as to the boundaries of their respective territories, but adhered to the arrangements specified in this book; and by the general fidelity to historical consistency and probability which the book displays (Hävernick, *Einl.* sec. 148 sq.). Some of the narratives, it is true, are of a miraculous kind, but such are wholly in keeping with the avowed relation to the Almighty of the people whose history the book records, and they can be regarded as unhistorical only on the assumption that *all* miracles are incredible—a question we cannot stop to discuss here. See MIRACLES. In the list of such miraculous interpositions we do not include the standing still of the sun, and the staying of the moon, recorded in ch. x, 12, 13. That passage is apparently wholly a quotation from the book of Jasher, and is probably a fragment of a poem composed by some Israelite on the occasion; it records in highly poetical language the gracious help which God granted to Joshua by the retarding of the approach of darkness long enough to enable him to complete the destruction of his enemies, and is no more to be taken literally than is such a passage as Psa. cxiv, 4–6, where the Red Sea is described as being frightened and fleeing, and the mountains as skipping like rams. See JASHER, BOOK OF. That God interposed on this occasion to help his people we do not doubt; but that he interposed by the working of such a miracle as the words taken literally would indicate, we see no reason to believe.

The account given, ch. viii, 1 sq., of the taking of Ai has been much dwelt upon as presenting a narrative which is unhistorical. It is incredible that Joshua sent

two bodies of men, one comprising 30,000 soldiers, the other 5000, to lie in ambush against the city, while he himself advanced on it with the main body of his army; and yet this seems to be what the narrative states. What increases the improbability here is that the larger body is never mentioned as having come into action at all, for the whole exploit was accomplished by the 5000 and those who were with Joshua. If the case were stated thus: That Joshua took 30,000 of his warriors, and of these sent away 5000 to lie in ambush, while he, with the remaining 25,000, advanced against the city, the narrative would be perfectly simple and credible. The suggestion that verses 12 and 13 are a marginal gloss which has been supposed to creep into the text, leaves the narrative burdened with the improbable statement that 30,000 men could advance on Ai in daylight, and lie concealed in its immediate neighborhood for several hours without their presence being suspected by the inhabitants. Still less probable seems the suggestion that in these verses we have a fragment of an older record. Keil labors to show that from the peculiar style of Shemitic narrative it is competent to supply, in ver. 3, in thought, from the subsequent narrative, that from the 30,000 whom Joshua took he selected 5000, whom he sent away by night. But, whatever may be the difficulties in this text, it would be unreasonable on this account to relinquish our confidence on the general credibility of the book.

VII. *Relation to the Pentateuch.*—The Pentateuch brings down the history of the Israelites to the death of Moses, at which it naturally terminates. The book of Joshua takes up the history at this point, and continues it to the death of Joshua, which furnishes another natural pause. From resemblances between the language and forms of expression used by the author of the book of Joshua and those found in Deuteronomy, it has been supposed that both are to be ascribed, in part at least, to the same writer. This, of course, proceeds on the supposition that the book of Deuteronomy is not the composition of Moses; a question on which it would be out of place to enter here. See DEUTERONOMY; PENTATEUCH. It may suffice to observe, that whilst it is natural to expect that many similarities of phraseology and language would be apparent in works so nearly contemporaneous as that of Deuteronomy and that of Joshua, there are yet such differences between them as may seem to indicate that they are not the production of the same writer. Thus, in the Pentateuch, we have the word *Jericho* always spelt יְרֵחוֹ, whilst in Joshua it is always יְרִיחוֹ; in Deuteronomy we have אֵל קַנָּא (iv, 24; v, 9; vi, 15), in Joshua אֵל קַנּוֹא (xxiv, 19); in Deuteronomy the inf. of יָרֵא, *to fear*, is יִרְאָה (iv, 10; v, 26; vi, 24, etc.), in Joshua it is יְרֹא (xxii, 25); in Deuteronomy we have warriors described as בְּנֵי חַיִל (iii, 18), whilst in Joshua they are called גִּבּוֹרֵי הַחַיִל (i, 14; vi, 2, etc.). We have also in Joshua the peculiar formula דָמוֹ בְרֹאשׁוֹ, which nowhere occurs in the Pentateuch, but only דָמוֹ בוֹ (Lev. xx, 9, 11, 12, etc.); the expression אֲדוֹן כָּל הָאָרֶץ (iii, 11, 13), which occurs again only in Zech. vi, 5; the phrase, "the heart melted" (ii, 11; v, 1; vii, 5); etc. In the Pentateuch, also, we find the usage with respect to the third personal pronoun feminine fluctuating between הִוא and הוּא; in the book of Joshua the usage is fixed down to היא, which became the permanent usage of the language. We find, also, that in the Pentateuch the demonstrative pronoun, with the article, sometimes appears in the form הָאֵל, while in Joshua and elsewhere it is always הָאֵלֶּה. The evidence here is the same in effect as would accrue in the case of Latin writers from the use of *ipsus* and *ipse*, *ollus* and *ille*. That the author of the book of Joshua derived part of his information from the Pentateuch is evident, if we compare Deut. xviii, 1, 2, and Numb. xviii, 20, with Josh. xiii, 14, 33; xiv, 4. Even the unusual form אשר is repeated in Joshua. Compare also Numb. xxxi, 8, with Josh. xiii, 21 and 22. The author of the book of Joshua frequently repeats the statements of the Pentateuch in a more detailed form, and mentions the changes which had taken place since the Pentateuch was written. Compare Numb. xxxiv, 13 and 14, with Josh. xiii, 7 sq.; Numb. xxxii, 37, with Josh. xiii, 17 sq.; Numb. xxxv with Josh. xxi.

There is also considerable similarity between the following passages in the books of Joshua and Judges: Josh. xiii, 4, Judg. iii, 3; Josh. xv, 13 sq., Judg. i, 10, 20; Josh. xv, 15–19, Judg. i, 11–15; Josh. xv, 62, Judg. i, 21; Josh. xvi, 10, Judg. i, 29; Josh. xvii, 12, Judg. i, 27; Josh. xix, 47, Judg. xviii.

VIII. *Commentaries.*—The exegetical helps expressly on the whole book of Joshua exclusively are the following, of which we designate the most important by an asterisk prefixed: Origen, *Selecta* (in *Opp.* ii, 393); also *Homiliæ* (*ib.* ii, 397); also *Scholia* (in *Bibl. Patr.* Gallandii, xiv); Ephraem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* iv, 292); Procopius, *Notæ* (in his *Octateucham*); Theodoret, *Quæstiones* (in *Opp.* I, i); Isidore, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.*); Bede, *Quæstiones* (in *Opp.* p. 8); Rabanus, *in Jos.* (in *Opp.* ed. Martene et Durand, p. 668); Rupert, *In Jos.* (in *Opp.* i, 321); Tostatus, *In Jos.* (in *Opp.*); Rashi or Jarchi, *Commentarius* (from the Heb. [found in the Rabbinical Bibles] by Breithaupt, Goth. 1710, 4to); Rabbi Esaia, פֵּירוּשׁ (ed. with Lat. notes by Abicht, Lips. 1712, 4to; also in the *Thes. Nov. Theol.-Phil.* L. B. 1732, i, 474 sq.); Borrhaus or Cellarius, *Commentarii* [includ. Ruth, Samuel, and Kings] (Basil. 1557, fol.); Lavater, *Homiliæ* (Tigur. 1565, 4to); Calvin, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* i; in French, Genev. 1565, 8vo; transl. in Engl. by W. F., Lond. 1578, 4to; by Beveridge, Edinb. 1854, 8vo); Brentius, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* ii); Karæus, *Excerpta* (in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xx, 497); Strigel, *Scholia* (Lips. 1570, 1575, 8vo); Ferus, *Enarrationes* [includ. Exodus, etc.] (Colon. 1571, 1574, 8vo); *Masius [Rom. Cath.], *Illustratio* (Antw. 1574, fol.; also in Walton's Polyglot, vi, and in the *Critici Sacri*, ii); Chytræus, *Prælectiones* (Rost. 1577, 8vo); Montanus, *Commentarius* (Antwerp, 1583, 4to); Heidenreich, *Predigten* (Leipz. 1589; Stet. 1604, 4to); Heling, *Periocha* [includ. Ruth, Samuel, and Kings] (Norib. 1593–4, 2 vols. 8vo); Laniado, כְּלִי יָקָר (Venice, 1603, fol.); Ibn-Chajim, לֵב אַהֲרֹן [including Judges] (Venice, 1609, fol.; also in Frankfurter's Rabbinical Bible); Serarius, *Commentarius* (Mogunt. 1609–10, 2 vols. fol.; Par. 1610, fol.); Magalianus, *Commentarius* (Turnon. 1612, 2 vols. fol.); Hänicken, *Reisepredigten* (Leipz. 1613, 4to); Drusius, *Commentarius* [including Judges and Samuel] (Franeck. 1618, 4to); Baldwin, *Predigten* (Wittenb. 1621, 4to); Stocken, *Predigten* (Cassel, 1648, 4to); De Naxera, *Commentarii* (vol. i, Antw. 1650; ii, Lugd. 1652, fol.); à Lapide, *In Jos.* [and other books] (Antw. 1658, fol.); Cocceius, *Notæ* (in *Opp.* i, 309; xi, 47); Bonefrère, *Commentarius* [includ. Judges and Ruth] (Paris, 1659, fol.); Marcellius, *Commentarius* (Herbip. 1661, 4to); Hannecken, *Adnotata* (Giss. 1665, 8vo); Osiander, *Commentarius* (Tübing. 1681, fol.); Ising, *Exercitationes* (Regiom. 1683, 4to); *Schmidt, *Prælectiones* [with Isaiah] (Hamb. 1693, 1695, 1703, 4to); Heidegger, *Exegetica* [includ. Matthew, etc.] (Tigur. 1700, 4to); Mühlmann, *Commentarius* (ed. Martin, Dresd. 1701, 4to); Felibien, *Commentarii* [includ. Judges, Ruth, and Kings] (Paris, 1704, 4to); Le Clerc, *Commentarius* (Amst. 1708; Tübing. 1733, fol.); Moldenhauer, *Erläuterung* [includ. Judges, etc.] (Quedlinb. 1774, 4to); Obornik, תַּרְגּוּם, etc. (in the Hebrew Commentary, Vienna, 1792, 8vo, pt. 156); Lightfoot, *Annotationes* (in *Works*, x); Horsley, *Notes* (in *Bibl. Crit.* i); Meyer, *Bestandtheile*, etc. (in Ammon and Berthold's *Krit. Journ.* 1815, 4to, ii, 337 sq.); Kley, *Ueberstz.* (Leipz. 1817, 8vo); Paulus, *Blicke*, etc. (in his *Theol.-Exeg. Conserv.* Heldeb. 1822, ii, 149 sq.); Herdwerden, *Disputatio*, etc. (Groningen, 1826, 8vo);

Maurer, *Commentar* (Stuttg. 1831, 8vo); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1833, 8vo); *Keil, *Commentar* (Erlangen, 1847, 8vo; transl. in Clarke's *Lib.* Edinb. 1857, 8vo; different from that in Keil and Delitzsch's Commentary); *Bush, *Notes* (N.Y. 1852, 12mo); Miller, *Lectures* (Lond. 1852, 12mo); Cumming, *Readings* (London, 1857, 8vo); *Knobel, *Erklärung* [including Numbers and Deuteronomy] (in the *Kurzgef. Exeg. Hdbch.* Leipz. 1861, 8vo); Anon., *Gospel in Josh.* (Lond. 1867, 8vo). See COMMENTARY.

JOSHUA, SPURIOUS WRITINGS OF. The Samaritans, who for dogmatical purposes endeavored to depreciate the authority of persons mentioned in the latter books of the Old Testament, such as Eli, Samuel, Zerubbabel, and others, had no such interest in attacking the person of Joshua. Eulogius, according to Photii *Codex*, p. 230, states: "The Samaritan multitude believes that Joshua, the son of Nun, is the person concerning whom Moses said, 'The Lord will raise us up a prophet,'" etc. (Compare Lampe, *Comment. in Evangelium Johannis*, i, 748.) The Samaritans even endeavored to exalt the memory of Joshua by making him the nucleus of many strange legends which they embodied into their Arabic book of Joshua, a work which seems to have been compiled in the Middle Ages, and is quoted by the Rabbinical chroniclers of that period, Sepher Juchasin, R. Samuel, Shullam (f. 154), Shalsheleth (*Hakabbalah*, p. 96), Hottinger (*Historia Orientalis*, p. 40 sq.), Zunz (*Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*, p. 140). Reland supposed that this book was written at an earlier period, and augmented in the Middle Ages; but it is more likely that the whole is a late compilation. (Compare Hottingeri *Smegma*, p. 468.)

The so-called book of Joshua of the Samaritans consists of compilations from the Pentateuch, our book of Joshua, the books of Judges and of Samuel, intermixed with many Jewish legends. Its compiler pretends that it is translated from the Hebrew into Arabic, but it was probably originally written in Arabic, and manifestly after the promulgation of the Koran, which exercised a perceptible influence upon it (comp. Reland, *De Samaritanis, Dissertationes Miscellaneæ*, ii, 12 and 68; Rödiger, in the *Hall. Allg. Lit. Zeit.* for 1848, No. 217). The author of this compilation endeavors to prove that the Samaritans are Israelites, and he claims for them the celebrity of the Jews. He attempts to turn the traditions of Jewish history in favor of the Samaritans. By his account Joshua built the temple on Mount Gerizim, and there established public worship; the schism between Jews and Samaritans commenced under Eli, who, as well as Samuel, was an apostate and sorcerer; after the return from the Babylonian exile, the Samaritan form of worship was declared to be the legitimate form; Zerubbabel and his sacred books, which were corrupted, were authoritatively rejected; Alexander the Great expressed his veneration, not for the Jews, but for the Samaritans; these were oppressed under the emperor Adrian, but again obtained permission to worship publicly on Mount Gerizim. The whole book consists of a mixture of Biblical history and legends, the manifest aim being to falsify facts for dogmatical purposes. This book terminates with the history of the Jewish war under Adrian. The only known copy of this book is that of Jos. Scaliger, which is now in the library at Leyden. Although the language is Arabic, it is written in Samaritan characters. Even the Samaritans themselves seem to have lost it. Huntington, in his *Epistolæ* (Lond. 1704, p. 48), mentions that he could not find it at Nabulus, nor have subsequent inquiries led to its discovery there. An edition, from the only MS. extant, appeared in 1848 at Leyden, with the title "*Liber Josuæ: Chronicum Samaritanum;* edidit, Latine vertit, etc., T. G. J. Juynboll." It seems never to have been recognised by the Samaritans themselves (De Wette, *Einl.* sec. 171).

Besides this adulterated version of the history of Joshua, there exists still another in the Samaritan chronicles of Abul Phetach. See *Acta Eruditorum Lips.*, anno 1691, p. 167; Schnurrer's *Samaritanischer Briefwechsel*, in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, ix, 54; a specimen by Schnurrer, in Paulus's *Neues Repertorium*, i, 117 sq.

The mention of the book of Jasher has given rise to some spurious compilations under that name, as well in Hebrew as in English. See JASHER.

2. A native of Beth-shemesh, an Israelite, the owner of the field into which the cart came which bore the ark on its return from the land of the Philistines; upon a great stone in the midst of the field the Beth-shemites sacrificed the cows that drew the cart, in honor of its arrival (1 Sam. vi, 14, 18). B.C. 1124.

3. The governor of Jerusalem at the time of the reformation by Josiah; the entrance to his palace was situated near one of the idolatrous erections at the city gates (2 Kings xxiii, 8). B.C. 628.

4. The son of Josedech (Hag. i, 1, 12, 14; Zech. iii, 1, 3, 9; vi, 11), a high-priest in the time of Haggai and Zechariah; better known by the name of JESHUA (q. v.).

Joshua ben-Hananja, one of the most honored masters in Israel, flourished in the second century of the Christian æra. He was a mechanic by trade, and earned his livelihood by continuing to work at his trade even when teacher of the Rabbinical school at Bekiin, whither he had removed from Jerusalem after its downfall. He was a disciple of the celebrated Rabbi ben-Zachai, and did honor to his master as a teacher in Israel. His controversies with Gamaliel and Eliezer ben-Hyrcanos, which are celebrated in the Mishna and the Talmud, evince that he was a very formidable antagonist on account of the force of his reasoning powers and the pungency of his wit. In after life Joshua went with Gamaliel and Akiba to Rome, to plead with Trajan on behalf of his oppressed countrymen, and was received by the emperor with unusual courtesy and respect. It is even reported (though not on any certain authority) that Trajan's daughter, the princess Imra, honored the Jewish Rabbi with her friendship; and that on one occasion, looking at the homely garb in which so much wisdom was encased, she said to him, "Thou art the beauty of wisdom in an abject dress." "Good wine," Joshua complacently replied, "is not kept in gold or silver vases, but in vessels of earthen-ware." When we consider that about this time Judaism numbered many proselytes among the patrician ladies of Rome, to whose aching hearts the herd of old and disreputable deities presented no ground of comfort or hope at all comparable with that afforded by the Hebrew's purer worship—the worship of the one true God—we need not hesitate to credit the truth of this story, and the belief of some that Imra even was a Jewish convert. It is also related that Trajan, in a bantering way, begged the old Rabbi to show him his God, whom he had affirmed to be every where present. After some conversation, Trajan still adhering to his demand to see the God of the Hebrews, Joshua said, "Well, let us first look at one of his ambassadors;" and, taking the emperor into the open air, he desired him to gaze at the sun in his full meridian power. "I cannot," replied Trajan; "the light dazzles me." "Canst thou, then," said the Rabbi, "expect to behold the glory of the Creator, when thou art unable to endure the light of one of his creatures?" In such anecdotes attributed to Joshua ben-Hananja the Talmud abounds, and it is evident that in his day Joshua figured as the most able of all the Rabbins. See Etheridge, *Introd. to Jewish Lit.* p. 61; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv, 56 sq. (J. H. W.)

Joshua (or **Jeshua**) **ben-Jehudah** (called in Arabic *Abulfarag Forkan Ibn-Assad*), quoted by Aben-Ezra as *R. Joshua* (ר׳ יהושוע), a distinguished Jewish philosopher, grammarian, and commentator of the Karaite sect, flourished in the 11th century. From his great piety and extensive knowledge, he obtained the honorable appellation of *the aged* or *presbyter* (*Ha-Saken, Al-Sheikh*). His expositions, which cover the whole

of the Old Test., are still in MS. The only fragments printed are given by Aben-Ezra on Gen. xxviii, 12; xlix, 27; Exod. iii, 2, 13; iv, 4; vi, 3, 13; vii, 3, 12; viii, 22; x, 6; xii, 5; xv, 4; xvii, 16; xxi, 37; xxii, 7; xxxv, 5; Lev. xvi, 1; Hos. v, 7; Joel iii, 1; Amos ix, 10; Obad. 17; Jonah iii, 3; Micah ii, 7; vii, 12; Hab. ii, 7; Zeph. iii, 1; Hag. ii, 10; Mal. ii, 6; Dan. i, 3; ii, 4; iv, 17; vii, 9; xii, 2; Psa. lxxxviii, 1; cix, 8; cx, 3; cxix, 160; cxxii, 1; cxlix, 6. Compare Delitzsch, *in Aaron ben-Elias*, עץ חיים (Leipzig, 1844), p. 315 sq.; Pinsker, *Lickute Kadmoniot* (Vienna, 1860), text, p. 117; Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vi, 94 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v.

Joshua Narboni. See VIDAL.

Josi'ah (Heb. *Yoshiyah'*, יֹאשִׁיָּה, *healed* by *Jehovah*, Zech. vi, 10, elsewhere in the paragogic form *Yoshiya'hu*, יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ, and in the text of Jer. xxvii, 1, יֹאוֹשִׁיָּהוּ; Sept., N. T., and Josephus Ἰωσίας, "Josias," Matt. i, 10, 11), the name of two men.

1. The sixteenth king of Judah after its separation from the kingdom of Israel, the son (by Jedidah) and, at the early age of eight years, B.C. 640, the successor of Amon (2 Kings xxii, 1; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 1). His history is contained in 2 Kings xxii–xxiv, 30; 2 Chron. xxxiv, xxxv; and the first twelve chapters of Jeremiah throw much light upon the general character of the Jews in his days. Avoiding the example of his immediate predecessors, he "did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, and walked in all the ways of David his father, and turned not aside to the right hand or to the left" (2 Kings xxii, 2; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 2).

1. So early as the sixteenth year of his age (B.C. 633) he began to manifest that enmity to idolatry in all its forms which distinguished his character and reign; and he was not quite twenty years old (B.C. 628) when he proclaimed open war against it, although more or less favored by many men of rank and influence in the kingdom (2 Chron. xxxiv, 3). He then commenced a thorough purification of the land from all taint of idolatry by going about and superintending in person the operations of the men who were employed in breaking down idolatrous altars and images, and cutting down the groves which had been consecrated to idol-worship (see Bertholdt, *De purgatione per Josiam*, Erl. 1817). His detestation of idolatry could not have been more strongly expressed than by ransacking the sepulchres of the idolatrous priests of former days, and consuming their bones upon the idol altars before they were overturned. Yet this operation, although unexampled in Jewish history, was foretold 345 years before Josiah was born by the prophet who was commissioned to denounce to Jeroboam the future punishment of his sin. He even named Josiah as the person by whom this act was to be performed, and said that it should be performed in Beth-el, which was then a part of the kingdom of Israel (1 Kings xiii, 2). All this seemed much beyond the range of human probabilities; but it was performed to the letter, for Josiah did not confine his proceedings to his own kingdom, but went over a considerable part of the neighboring kingdom of Israel, which then lay comparatively desolate, with the same object in view; and at Beth-el, in particular, executed all that the prophet had foretold (2 Kings xxiii, 1–19; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 3–7, 32). In these proceedings Josiah seems to have been actuated by an absolute *hatred* of idolatry, such as no other king since David had manifested, and which David had scarcely occasion to manifest in the same degree. So important was this reformation of the public cultus under Josiah that it forms an epoch whence Jeremiah dates many of his prophecies (Jer. xxv, 3, 11, 29).

2. In the eighteenth year of his reign and the twenty-sixth of his age (B.C. 623), when the land had been thoroughly purified from idolatry and all that belonged to it, Josiah proceeded to repair and beautify the Temple of the Lord (2 Kings xxii, 3; xxiii, 23). In the course of this pious labor the high-priest Hilkiah discovered in the sanctuary a volume, which proved to contain the books of Moses, and which, from the terms employed, seems to have been considered the original of the law as written by Moses. On this point there has been much anxious discussion and some rash assertion. Some writers of the German school allege that there is no external evidence—that is, evidence besides the law itself—that the book of the law existed till it was thus produced by Hilkiah. This assertion it is the less necessary to answer here, as it will be noticed in the article PENTATEUCH. (See also De Wette, *Beitr.* i, 168 sq.; Bertholdt, *Progr. de eo quod in purgatione sacror. Jud. per Josiam facta omnium maxime contigerit memorabile*, Erl. 1817; also in his *Opusc.* p. 32 sq.) But it may be observed that it is founded very much on the fact that the king was greatly astonished when some parts of the law were read to him. It is indeed perfectly manifest that he had previously been entirely ignorant of much that he then heard; and he rent his clothes in consternation when he found that, with the best intentions to serve the Lord, he and all his people had been living in the neglect of duties which the law declared to be of vital importance. It is certainly difficult to account for this ignorance. Some suppose that all the copies of the law had perished, and that the king had never seen one. But this is very unlikely; for, however scarce complete copies may have been, the pious king was likely to have been the possessor of one. The probability seems to be that the passages read were those awful denunciations against disobedience with which the book of Deuteronomy concludes, and which, for some cause or other, the king had never before read, or which had never before produced on his mind the same strong conviction of the imminent dangers under which the nation lay, as now when read to him from a volume invested with a character so venerable, and brought with such interesting circumstances under his notice. We should bear in mind that it is very difficult for us in this age and country to estimate the scantiness of the opportunities which were then open to laymen of acquiring literary knowledge connected with religion. The special commission sent forth by Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 7) is a proof that even under such kings as Asa and his son the Levites were insufficient for the religious instruction of the people. What, then, must have been the amount of information accessible to a generation which had grown up in the reigns of Manasseh and Amon? We do not know that the law was read as a stated part of any ordinary public service in the Temple of Solomon (unless the injunction Deut. xxxi, 10 was obeyed once in seven years), though God was worshipped there with daily sacrifice, psalmody, and prayer.

The king, in his alarm, sent to Huldah "the prophetess" for her counsel in this emergency [see HULDAH]: her answer assured him that, although the dread penalties threatened by the law had been incurred and would be inflicted, he should be gathered in peace to his fathers before the days of punishment and sorrow came.

It was perhaps not without some hope of averting this doom that the king immediately called the people together at Jerusalem, and engaged them in a solemn renewal of the ancient covenant with God. When this had been done, the Passover was celebrated with careful attention to the directions given in the law, and on a scale of unexampled magnificence. (On the public importance of this æra, see Ezek. i, 1, 2.) But all was too late; the hour of mercy had passed; for "the Lord turned not from the fierceness of his great wrath, wherewith his anger was kindled against Judah" (2 Kings xxii, 3–20; xxiii, 21–27; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 8–33; xxxv, 1–19).

3. That removal from the world which had been promised to Josiah as a blessing was not long delayed, and was brought about in a way which he probably had not expected. Pharaoh-necho, king of Egypt, sought

a passage through his territories on an expedition against the Chaldæans; but Josiah refused to allow the march of the Egyptian army through his dominions, and prepared to resist the attempt by force of arms. His reason for this opposition has usually been assumed to have been a high sense of loyalty to the Assyrian monarch, whose tributary he is supposed to have been. Such is at least the conjecture of Prideaux (*Connection*, anno 610) and of Milman (*History of the Jews*, i, 313). But the Bible ascribes no such chivalrous motive to Josiah; and it does not occur to Josephus, who attributes (*Ant.* x, 5, 1) Josiah's resistance merely to Fate urging him to destruction; nor to the author of 1 Esdr. i, 28, who describes him as acting wilfully against Jeremiah's advice; nor to Ewald, who (*Gesch. Isr.* iii, 707) conjectures that it may have been the constant aim of Josiah to restore not only the ritual, but also the kingdom of David in its full extent and independence, and that he attacked Necho as an invader of what he considered as his northern dominions. This conjecture, if equally probable with the former, is equally without adequate support in the Bible, and is somewhat derogatory to the character of Josiah. Necho was very unwilling to engage in hostilities with Josiah: the appearance of the Hebrew army at Megiddo (comp. Herod. ii, 159), however, brought on a battle, in which the king of Judah, although disguised for security, was so desperately wounded by a random arrow that his attendants removed him from the war-chariot and placed him in another, in which he was taken to Jerusalem, where he died, after a reign of thirty-one years. B.C. 609. (See J. R. Kiesling's *Essay* on this subject, Lips. 1754.) No king that reigned in Israel was ever more deeply lamented by all his subjects than Josiah; and we are told that the prophet Jeremiah composed on the occasion an elegiac ode, which was long preserved among the people (2 Kings xxiii, 29-37; 2 Chron. xxxv, 20-27). See LAMENTATIONS. Compare the narrative in 2 Chron. xxxv, 25 with the allusions in Jer. xxii, 10, 18, and Zech. xii, 11, and with Jackson, *On the Creed*, bk. viii, ch. xxiii, p. 878. The prediction of Huldah that he should "be gathered into the grave in peace" must be interpreted in accordance with the explanation of that phrase given in Jer. xxxiv, 5. Some excellent remarks on it may be found in Jackson, *On the Creed*, bk. xi, ch. xxxvi, p. 664. Josiah's reformation and his death are commented on by bishop Hall, *Contemplations on the O. T.*, bk. xx. See also Howard, *History of Josiah* (London, 1842).

4. It was in the reign of Josiah that a nomadic horde of Scythians overran Asia (Herod. i, 104-106). A detachment of them went towards Egypt by the way of Philistia: somewhere southwards of Ascalon they were met by messengers from Psammetichus and induced to turn back. They are not mentioned in the historical accounts of Josiah's reign; but Ewald (*Die Psalmen*, p. 165) conjectures that the 59th Psalm was composed by king Josiah during a siege of Jerusalem by these Scythians. The town Bethshan is said to derive its Greek name Scythopolis (Reland, *Palæst.* p. 992; Lightfoot, *Chor. Marc.* vii, § 2) from these invaders. The facility with which Josiah appears to have extended his authority in the land of Israel is adduced as an indication that the Assyrian conquerors of that land were themselves at this time under the restraining fear of some enemy. The prophecy of Zephaniah is considered to have been written amid the terror caused by their approach. The same people are described at a later period by Ezekiel (xxviii). See Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* iii, 689. Abarbanel (ap. Eisenmenger, *Ent. Jud.* i, 858) records an oral tradition of the Jews to the effect that the ark of the covenant, which Solomon deposited in the Temple (1 Kings vi, 19), was removed and hidden by Josiah in expectation of the destruction of the Temple, and that it will not be brought again to light until the coming of Messiah.

2. Son of Zephaniah, and a resident of Jerusalem after the captivity, in whose house the prophet was directed to crown the high-priest Jeshua as a type of the Messiah (Zech. vi, 10). B.C. prob. 520. "It has been conjectured that Josiah was either a goldsmith, or treasurer of the Temple, or one of the keepers of the Temple, who received the money offered by the worshippers, but nothing is known of him. Possibly he was a descendant of Zephaniah, the priest mentioned in Jer. xxi, 1, xxxvii, 3; and if Hen in Zech. vi, 15 be a proper name, which is doubtful, it probably refers to the same person, elsewhere called Josiah"

Josi'as, a Græcized form of the name of (*a*) (Ἰωσίας, Vulg. *Josias*) JOSIAH (q. v.), king of Judah (1 Esdr. i, 1, 7, 18, 21-23, 25, 28, 29, 32-34; Ecclus. xlix, 1, 4; Bar. i, 8; Matt. i, 10, 11); (*b*) (Ἰεσίας v. r. Ἰεσσίας, Vulg. *Maasias*), JESHAIAH (q. v.), the son of Athaliah (1 Esdr. viii, 33; comp. Ezra viii, 7).

Josibi'ah (Heb. *Yoshibyah'*, יוֹשִׁבְיָה, *dweller with Jehovah*; Sept. Ἰσαβία v. r. Ἀσαβία), son of Seraiah and father of Jehu, which last was one of the Simeonites who migrated to Gedor (1 Chron. iv, 35). B.C. ante 711.

Josiphi'ah (Heb. *Yosiphyah'*, יוֹסִפְיָה, *increased by Jehovah*; Sept. Ἰωσεφία), one of the "sons" of Shelomith (as the Heb. text now stands), a chief Israelite, whose son (Ben-Josiphiah) returned with a company of 160 males under Ezra to Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 10). B.C. 459. A word, however, has evidently fallen out of the Hebrew text in the beginning of the verse, and is supplied by the Sept. and the author of 1 Esdr. viii, 36, as well as (less correctly) in the Syriac; namely, *Baani* (Βανίδ), i. e. בָּנִי, omitted from similarity to בְּנֵי preceding; thus making *Bani* (q. v.) the son of Shelomith, and the leader of the party of returned exiles.

Josippon. See JOSEPH BEN-GORION.

Joso, TORIAL, one of Whitefield's preachers, a native of Scotland, was a sea-captain by profession. He had a vigorous mind, had been fond of the Bible from his youth, and had acquired a good degree of education by industrious study alone. He was converted by the preaching of Mr. Wesley at Robin Hood's Bay, and soon after began to preach to and exhort his sailors with much effect, who were converted and did likewise. After various reverses in his business, he was constrained by Whitefield to give himself wholly to the ministry, and in 1766 he became his colleague at the Tabernacle and Tottenham Court. His preaching in London had from the first drawn great throngs and been very useful, and his popularity was only second to that of Whitefield, whose associate he was for thirty years in the Calvinistic Methodist societies of London, usually itinerating in England and Wales four or five months annually. See Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, i, 450. (G. L. T.)

Jost, ISAAC MARCUS, one of the most celebrated writers of modern Jews, the first of his people since the days of Josephus to write a complete history of the Jews, was born at Bernburg, Germany, Feb. 22, 1793. His father, a poor blind man, the head of a family of twelve children, was obliged to depend mainly upon Marcus, the only boy, for support, and great and severe were the struggles which he had to endure until, in 1803, his father died, and the youth removed to Wolfenbüttel, where his grandfather resided. He was now admitted to a Jewish orphan asylum, where one of his most intimate associates was the celebrated Jewish savant Leopold Zunz, and together these two boys pursued, under great disadvantages and deprivations, sy. sufferings, the studies necessary to admit them to the higher classes of the gymnasium. "Whole nights," he touchingly records, "have we labored by the tapers which we made ourselves from the wax that ran down the big wax candles in the synagogue. By hard study we succeeded in bringing it so far in the course of the six months terminating with April, 1809, that we, Zunz in Wolfenbüttel and I in Brunswick, were put in the senior class (prima) in the gymnasium" (Paschelcs, *Sippurim*,

3d col., Prague, 1855, p. 141 sq.). After four years of hard study he removed to the University of Göttingen, where for one year and a half he pursued with great earnestness studies in history, philology, philosophy, and theology, and then continued his investigations at Berlin University. In the capital of Prussia Jost soon won the hearts of many of his people, and, though comparatively a youth, yet succeeded in the management of a first-class school, to which flocked the children of Jew and Gentile. In 1835 he accepted the head-mastership of the Jewish high-school at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and in that capacity spent the remainder of his days. He died November 20, 1860, at Frankfort-on-the-Main. While at Berlin he published: (1) The gigantic historical work entitled *Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage* (Berlin, 1820-28, 9 vols.):—(2) *Allgemeine Geschichte des Israelitischen Volkes*, etc. (Berlin, 1831-32, 2 vols. 8vo), being an abridgment, with corrections, of the former work:—and (3) ששה סדרי משנה, the Mishna, with the Hebrew text and vowel-points, accompanied by a German translation, a Rabbinic commentary, and German annotations (Berlin, 1832-34, 6 vols.), besides various efforts of a philosophical nature, and numberless contributions to Jewish periodicals of all grades and descriptions. In Frankfort the same literary activity continued. In 1839 he started a weekly journal for Jewish history, literature, etc., of which three volumes appeared, entitled *Israelitische Annalen* (Frankft. a. M. 1839-41), which boasted of the names of some of the ablest of Jewish writers as contributors, and which furnished articles whose value every true Biblical student will not fail to recognise, in fact, for many items of information there contained we would look elsewhere in vain. To reawaken an interest in the study of Hebrew, he started in 1841 (when the *Annalen* were discontinued), in conjunction with the distinguished Jewish writer Creizenach, a periodical in Hebrew, of which two volumes appeared, entitled ציון, *Ephemerides Hebraïcæ s. collectio dissertationum maxime theologicarum, variorumque Hebraicorum scriptorum, ad ordinem mensium lunarium disposita* (Frankfort a. M. 1841-42). Like the former journal, it constitutes a very important contribution to Biblical and Jewish literature, and will always be read with great pleasure by the lover of the sacred language, owing to the beautiful Hebrew style in which it is written. At the same time, however, Jost was also laboring at his grand history of the Jews, of which he published (6), in 1846-47, three more parts, under the title *Neuere Geschichte der Israeliten*, etc., being a continuation, and forming a tenth volume, of his great historical work; and in 1857-59 he finally gave to the world, as the result of his life-long historical and critical researches, the *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, a work which may fitly make the top stone of the great historical edifice he had reared so perfectly from the very outset. He found no preparatory work, as did Grätz, Munk, Zunz, and Herzfeld; he was obliged to collect himself all the material needful for his great undertaking, and he spared no pains to do his work well. Jost deserves our notice also as a philanthropist: not only did he serve the literary world, and daily work for the advancement of Jewish interests everywhere, but he also founded an asylum for Jewish female orphans in the city which enjoyed his ripest scholarship. See *Jahrbuch für die Gesch. der Juden* (Lpzg. 1861, 12mo), vol. ii, p. vii sq.; *Jüd. Athenæum* (Grimma and Lpz. 1851, 18mo), p. 117; Ehrentheil, *Jüd. Charakterbilder* (Pesth, 1867, 8vo), No. i, p. 67 sq.; Vapereau, *Dictionnaire des Contemporains*, s. v.

Jot, or, rather, Iōta (Ἰῶτα), the smallest letter of the Greek alphabet (ι), derived from the Hebrew *yod* (י), and answering to the *i* (*j*) or *y* of European languages. Its name was employed metaphorically to express the minutest trifle. It is, in fact, one of several metaphors derived from the alphabet, as when *alpha*, the first letter, and *omega*, the last, are employed to express the beginning and the end. We are not to suppose, however, that this proverb was exclusively apposite in the Greek language. The same practical allusion equally existed in Hebrew, some curious examples of which may be seen in Wetstein and Lightfoot. One of these may here suffice: In the Talmud (*Sanhed.* xx, 2) it is fabled that the book of Deuteronomy came and prostrated itself before God, and said, "O Lord of the universe, thou hast written in me thy law, but now a testament defective in some parts is defective in all. Behold, Solomon endeavors to root the letter *jod* out of me" (i. e. in the text, לֹא יַרְבֶּה נָשִׁים, "he shall not multiply wives," Deut. xvii, 17). "The holy, blessed God answered—Solomon, and a thousand such as he, shall perish, but the least word shall not perish out of thee." This is, in fact, a parallel not only to the usage, but the sentiment, as conveyed in Matt. v, 18, "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law."—Kitto. The propriety of the use of this letter for such a proverb is especially evident from the fact that it is the smallest letter of the Heb. alphabet likewise, being, in fact, often dispensed with as a *mater lectionis*, and very liable to be omitted in writing or mistaken for a part of some other letter. See Tittle.

Jotapăta. See Jiphthah-el.

Jot'bah (Heb. *Yotbah'*, יָטְבָה, *goodness;* Sept. Ἰτέβα v. r. Ἰεταχά, Josephus Ἰταβάτη, *Ant.* x, 3, 2), a town, probably of Judah, the residence of Haruz, whose daughter Meshullemeth became the wife of king Manasseh and mother of Amon (2 Kings xxi, 19). M. de Saulcy (*Narrat.* i, 94, note) suggests its identity with *Yitma*, a village almost in ruins on the north side of the valley (wady Ribah), north of Lebonah and south of Nablûs (Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 92); but this would lie within the precincts of the late kingdom of Israel. It is usually identified with *Jotbath* or *Jotbatha* of the Exode (Numb. xxiii, 33, 34; Deut. x, 7), as the names are essentially the same in the Heb.; but the latter is spoken of only as a *region*, not an inhabited town, and is out of the bounds of the Jewish monarchy. "The Arabic equivalent for Jotbah is *et-Taiyib*, or *et-Taiyibeh*, and no less than three sites of this name are met with in modern Palestine. One is considerably south of Hebron (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 472); another to the west of that city (*ib.* p. 427-429); and the third is north of Jerusalem, in the country of Benjamin. This last is most likely to answer to Jotbah, for the two first-named places are very insignificant, and never can have been of much importance; whereas this is described by Dr. Robinson as crowning a conspicuous hill, skirted by fertile basins of some breadth, . . . full of gardens of olives and fig-trees. The remarkable position (he adds) would not probably have been left unoccupied in ancient times (*Biblic. Res.* ii, 121, 124). In a subsequent visit to the place he was struck both with the depth and quality of the soil, which were more than one would anticipate in so rocky a region (*Later Bib. Res.* p. 290). These extracts explain while they justify the signification 'goodness,' which belongs both to Jotbah and Taivibeh" Against this identification, however, there lie two not very strong objections, namely, its distance from Jerusalem, and the fact of the probable coincidence of this site with that of Ophrah (q. v.).

Jot'bath (Deut. x, 7). See Jotbathah.

Jot'bathah [some *Jotba'thah*] (Heb. *Yotba'thah*, יָטְבָתָה, *goodness*, i. e. *pleasantness*, compare *Agathopolis* [the name is the same with יָטְבָה, *Jotbah*, with ה paragogic appended]; Sept. Ἰετεβαθά v. r. Ταιβαθά, etc., Auth. Vers. in Deut. x, 7, "Jotbath"), the thirty-fourth station of the Israelites during their wandering in the desert, situated between Hor-hagidgad and Ebronah (Numb. xxxiii, 33, 34), and again their forty-first station, between Gudgodah and the Red Sea (Deut. x, 7), described in the latter passage as "a land of rivers (נְחָלִים,

winter-*brooks*) of waters." The locality thus indicated is probably the expanded valley near the confluence of wady Jerafeh in its southern part with wady Mukutta el-Tuwarik and others (Robinson's *Researches*, i, 261), especially wady el-*Adbeh*, which nearly approaches the Heb. name (*Jour. Sac. Lit.* April, 1860, p. 47-49). This is generally a region answering to the description of fertility (Bonar's *Desert of Sinai*, p. 295). Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 213), however, thinks wady *Tuba*, nearer the Akabah, is meant. See EXODE.

Jo'tham (Heb. *Yotham'*, יוֹתָם, *Jehovah is upright;* Sept. and N. Test. Ἰωάθαμ, but Ἰωαθάμ in 1 Chron. ii, 47; Ἰωνάθαν v. r. Ἰωάθαν in 1 Chron. iii, 12; v. r. Ἰωθάμ in 1 Chron. v, 17; v. r. Ἰωάθαν in 2 Chron. xxvi, 21; v. r. Ἰωνάθαν in 2 Chron. xxvi, 23; Josephus Ἰωάθαμος, *Ant.* v, 7, 2; ix, 11, 2 sq.; Vulg. *Joathan* and *Joatham;* Auth. Vers. "Joatham," Matt. i, 9), the name of several men.

1. The second named of the six sons of Jahdai, of the family of Caleb the Hezronite (1 Chron. ii, 47). B.C. post 1612.

2. The youngest of Gideon's seventy legitimate sons, and the only one who escaped when the rest were massacred by the order of Abimelech (Judg. ix, 5). B.C. 1322. When the fratricide was made king by the people of Shechem, the young Jotham was so daring as to make his appearance on Mount Gerizim for the purpose of lifting up a protesting voice, and of giving vent to his feelings (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 210). This he did in a beautiful parable, wherein the trees are represented as making choice of a king, and bestowing on the bramble the honor which the cedar, the olive, and the vine would not accept. See FABLE. The obvious application, which, indeed, Jotham failed not himself to point out, must have been highly exasperating to Abimelech and his friends; but the speaker fled, as soon as he had delivered his parable, to the town of Beer, and remained there out of his brother's reach (Judg. ix, 7-21). We hear no more of him; but three years after, if then living, he saw the accomplishment of the malediction he had pronounced (Judg. ix, 57).

3. A person named by Josephus (Ἰωάθαμος, *Ant.* viii, 1, 3) as the son of Bukki and father of Meraioth, in the regular line of Phinehas's descendants, although he (incorrectly) states that these lived privately; he seems to refer to ZERAHIAH (q. v.) of the scriptural list (1 Chron. vi, 5). See HIGH-PRIEST.

4. The eleventh king of the separate kingdom of Judah, and son of Uzziah (by Jerusha, daughter of Zadok), whom he succeeded B.C. 756; he reigned sixteen years (comp. the synchronism in 1 Chron. v, 17). His father having during his last years been excluded by leprosy from public life, the government was administered by his son, at that time twenty-five years of age (2 Chron. xxvi, 21, 23; xxvii, 1; 2 Kings xv, 33). B.C. 781. See UZZIAH. For the chronological difficulties of his reign (see Crusius, *De æra Jothamica*, Lips. 1756; Winer's *Realwörterb.* s. v.), see CHRONOLOGY. Jotham profited by the experience which the reign of his father, and of the kings who preceded him, afforded, and he ruled in the fear of God, although he was unable to correct all the corrupt practices into which the people had fallen. His sincere intentions were rewarded with a prosperous reign. He was successful in his wars. The Ammonites, who had "given gifts" as a sort of tribute to Uzziah, but had ceased to do so after his leprosy had incapacitated him from governing, were constrained by Jotham, but not till several years after he had become settled as sole monarch, to pay, for the three remaining years of his reign, a heavy tribute in silver, wheat, and barley (2 Chron. xxvi, 8; xxvii, 5, 6). Many important public works were also undertaken and accomplished by Jotham. The principal gate of the Temple was rebuilt by him on a more magnificent scale; the quarter of Ophel, in Jerusalem, was strengthened by new fortifications; various towns were built or rebuilt in the mountains of Judah; and castles and towers of defence were erected in the wilderness. Jotham died greatly lamented by his people, and was buried in the sepulchre of the kings (2 Kings xv, 38; 2 Chron. xvii, 3-9). B.C. 740. His reign was favored with the ministrations of the prophets Isaiah, Hosea, and Micah (Isa. i, 1; vii, 1; Hos. i, 1; Mic. i, 1). See JUDAH.

5. A high-priest named by Josephus (Ἰωάθαμος, *Ant.* x, 8, 6) as son of Joel and father of Urijah in the regular incumbency; probably the AMARIAH (q. v.) of 1 Chron. vi, 11). See HIGH-PRIEST.

Joubert, FRANCIS, a noted French ecclesiastical writer, born at Montpellier Oct. 12, 1689, entered the service of the Romish Church in 1728. In 1730 he was imprisoned in the Bastile as a Jansenist, and afterwards exiled to Montpellier. He subsequently returned to Paris, and there died, Dec. 23, 1763. He wrote extensively, especially in the department of exegetical theology. Among his best works we reckon *Explication de l'Hist. de Joseph* (Paris, 1728, 12mo):—*Eclaircissement sur les Discours de Job* (12mo):—*Traité du Caractère essentiel à tous les Prophètes* (12mo):—*Observations sur Joel* (Avignon, 1733, 12mo):—*Lettres sur l'Interprétation des Écritures* (Paris, 1744, 12mo):—*Concordance et Explication des principales Prophéties de Jérémie, d'Ézéchiel et de Daniel* (Paris, 1745, 4to):—*Explication des principales prophéties*, etc. (Avignon [Paris], 1749, 5 vols.):—*Commentaires sur les Douze petits Prophètes* (Avignon, 1754, 6 vols. 12mo):—*Commentaire sur l'Apocalypse* (Avignon [Paris], 1762, 2 vols. 12mo); etc. See Chaudon et Delandine, *Dict. Univ. Histor. Crit. et Bibliogr.*; Quérard, *La France Littéraire;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Générale*, xxvii, 18. (J. N. P.)

Jouffroy, THÉODORE SIMON, a noted modern French eclectic philosopher, was born at Pontets in 1796. In 1832 he became professor of philosophy at the College of France, and continued in this relation until 1837. He died in 1842. He was by far the most celebrated pupil of Cousin, and very popular as a writer of great elegance of style and terseness of diction. He first became known to the public at large through the medium of a translation of Dugald Stewart's *Moral Philosophy*. To this translation he prefixed an essay or preface, in which he vindicates the study of intellectual science against the attacks of those who would banish all, except natural philosophy, out of the domain of human investigation. "Nothing," says Morell (*Hist. of Mod. Phil.* p. 662), "can exceed the clearness, and even the beauty, with which he establishes in this little production the fundamental principles of intellectual philosophy." To a careful observer it is evident that he had deeply imbibed the principles and the spirit of the Scottish metaphysicians, whilst, at the same time, he would generally rise to those more expansive views of philosophical truth which were inculcated in the lectures of his illustrious instructor. In the *Mélanges Philosophiques* (Paris, 1833; 2d edit. 1838-43), the second work to which we desire to call attention, "we see," says Morell, "the zealous pupil and successor of Cousin, the genuine modern eclectic, touching more or less upon all points within the range of intellectual philosophy, and pouring light derived from all directions upon them. We feel ourselves in company with a master mind, one who does not servilely follow in the track pointed out by others, but yet who knows how to appreciate the labors of all true-hearted thinkers, and to make their results tell upon the elucidation of his own system." We have not space here to elucidate his system, and refer our readers to Morell. His works were published entire in 6 octavo vols. in 1836. See Caro, in the *Revue de deux Mondes*, March 15, 1865.

Journal, or **Diurnal,** is the ancient name of the *day hours* contained in the Breviary (q. v.). By it was also known in monasteries the diary of daily expenses.

Journey (prop. נָסַע, to *pull up* the stakes of one's

tent preparatory to removal; πορεύομαι) properly refers to travel by land. See TRAVELLING.

In the East, a *day's journey* is reckoned about sixteen or twenty miles. To this distance around the Hebrew camp were the quails scattered for food for the people (Numb. xi, 31). Shaw computes the eleven days' journey from Sinai to Kadesh Barnea (Deut. i, 2) to be about one hundred and ten miles. The first day's journey (Luke ii, 44) is usually a short one (Hackett's *Illustra. of Script.* p. 12). See DAY'S JOURNEY.

A *Sabbath-day's journey* (Acts i, 12) is reckoned by the Hebrews at about seven furlongs, or a little less than one mile, and it is said that if any Jew travelled above this from the city on the Sabbath he was beaten. See SABBATH-DAY'S JOURNEY.

Jove. See JUPITER.

Jouvenci or **Jouvency**, JOSEPH DE, an eminent Jesuit, was born at Paris Sept. 14, 1643. He taught rhetoric with uncommon reputation at Caen, La Flèche, and Paris, and at length was invited to Rome, in order to continue the "History of the Jesuits" with more freedom than he could have enjoyed at Paris. His other principal works are two volumes of speeches, a small tract entitled *De Ratione Discendi et Docendi*, and notes on different classical writers. In his history of the Jesuits he attempts to justify father Guignard, the Jesuit, who was executed for encouraging the bigoted assassin Châtel in his attempt on the life of Henry IV. In France Parliament prohibited the publication or circulation of the work on that account. See Gorton, *Biogr. Dict.* s. v.

Jovian (sometimes, but erroneously, called *Jovinian*), fully FLAVIUS CLAUDIUS JOVIĀNUS, Roman emperor from A.D. 363 to 364. His predecessor Julian was slain on the field of battle, in his unhappy campaign against the Persians, June 26, A.D. 363. Jovianus, finding the continuation of the unfortunate struggle useless, sought its termination, and secured quite honorable terms from the Persians, and, once free from the attacks of foreign enemies, he at once initiated measures to establish his authority in the West, and hereafter his time was mainly devoted to administrative and legislative business. Immediately after his election to the imperial dignity Jovianus had professed himself to be a Christian, and one of his first measures when peace was restored to his dominions was the celebrated edict by which he placed the Christian religion on a legal basis, and thus put an end to the persecutions to which the Christians had been exposed during the short reign of Julian. The heathens were, however, equally protected, and no superiority was allowed to the one over the other. The different sectaries assailed him with petitions to help them against each other, but he declined interfering, and referred them to the decision of a general council; and the Arians showing themselves most troublesome, he gave them to understand that impartiality was the first duty of an emperor. His friend Athanasius was restored to his see at Alexandria. He died suddenly on his way home from the Orient, A.D. 364. It is possible, though not probable, that he died a violent death, to which Ammianus Marcellinus (xxv, 5-10) seems to allude when he compares his death with that of Æmilianus Scipio. See De la Bléterie, *Histoire de Jovien* (Amsterdam, 1740), the best work on the subject.—Smith, *Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 615.

Jovinian, emperor. See JOVIAN.

Jovinian, one of the early opponents of monachism, and, in a measure, one of the earliest reformers before the Reformation, flourished near the end of the 4th century. He was an Italian, but whether a native of Rome or Milan is not known. He taught in both cities, and gained a number of adherents. His *real* opinions, freed from the misrepresentations of his opponents, it is hardly possible to ascertain; it is apparent, however, that he opposed asceticism, which we find so generally and strenuously advocated in the writings of the Church fathers of the 4th century. He evidently maintained "that there is but one divine element of life, which all believers share in common; but one fellowship with Christ, which proceeds from faith in him; but one new birth. All who possess this in common with each other —all, therefore, who are Christians in the true sense, not barely in outward profession—have the same calling, the same dignity, the same heavenly blessings; the diversity of outward circumstances creating no difference in this respect, that all persons whatsoever, if they keep the vows they make to Christ in baptism and live godly lives, have an equal title to the rewards of heaven, and, consequently, that those who spend their lives in celibacy or macerate their bodies by fasting are no more acceptable to God than those who live in wedlock, and nourish their bodies with moderation and sobriety." He also held that Mary ceased to be a virgin by bringing forth Christ; that the degrees of future blessedness do not depend on the meritoriousness of our good works; and that a truly converted Christian, so long as he is such, cannot sin wilfully, but will resist and overcome the temptations of the devil. Yet, while upholding all these views, Jovinian himself remained single, and lived like all other monks, and his enemies even admit that the tenor of his life was always blameless. He first advocated his opinions at Milan, but, being there denied by the stern Ambrose all liberty of speech, he went to Rome, which, as appears from the evidence of Jerome, was one of the last places to entertain the ascetic fanaticism, nor was it until after monasteries had darkened all parts of the East, as well as many of the West, that these establishments were seen in that city. There, according to the report of pope Syricius and others, the doctrine of the Milanese monk had made many converts, so that the Church, "torn by dogs" in a manner heretofore unheard of, doubted whereto so unlooked for an assault might proceed. Not a few of the laity, if not of the clergy, had listened to Jovinian; and eight persons are named as his supporters, who, with him, were, by a unanimous decision of the Romish clergy, condemned and excommunicated in a council held at Milan in 390, as the authors of a "new heresy, and of blasphemy;" and they were forever expelled from the Church. "Pilate and Herod" were at one in this instance. Pope Syricius confirmed the condemnation, the emperor Honorius enacted penal laws against the Jovinians, and Jovinian himself was banished to the desolate island of Boa, off the coast of Illyria, and there died before A.D. 406. But Jovinian had also written, as well as preached, in support of his opinions, which continued to spread on all sides, notwithstanding the terrors of Church authority. At Rome, although none dared openly to profess Jovinian's heresy, it was nevertheless covertly taught, and was whispered about, even to such an extent that certain nuns fell into matrimony in consequence of its prevalence. In this emergency, and in aid of the endeavors of the Romish Church to crush the "monstrous doctrine," the good Augustine, a tool of bad men, came forth in defence of the "orthodox" practices and principles of the ascetics; and in his treatise *De bono conjugali*, and in others of a similar kind, he labors hard, by wily sophistry, to reconcile the prevailing absurdities with reason and Scripture. The mild, pious, and honest Augustine, however, was not the man to be the Church's thorough-going champion on this notable occasion: she had a better man at hand; "one who, by various learning, by a voluble pen, as well as by rancor of temper, and boundless arrogance, and a blind devotion to whatever 'the Church' had sanctioned, was well qualified to do the necessary work of cajoling the simple, of inflaming the fanatical, of frightening the timid, of calumniating the innocent, and, in a word, of quashing, if it could be quashed, all inquiry concerning 'authorized' errors and abuses. The Church, right or wrong, was to be justified; the objector, innocent or guilty, was to be crushed; and Jerome would scruple nothing could he but accomplish so desirable an object."

See JEROME. But, notwithstanding these attacks by the Church's three greatest doctors—Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome, whose great irritation and anxiety for the cause of the Church is sufficiently betrayed by their determination to oppose Jovinianism jointly, though living at points quite remote from each other—the "heresy," instead of dying out, spread, and was favorably thought of and accepted in different parts of Christendom, and no doubt made easier the task of Vigilantius and of Luther. Neander does not hesitate to rank the services of Jovinian so high as to consider him worthy of a place by the side of Luther. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 265 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 226 sq.; Ambrosius, *Epist.* 42; Augustine, *De Hæres.* c. 82; Baronius, *Annales Eccl.* p. 390, 412; Walch, *Ketzerhistorie*, iii, 635 sq.; Baur, *Christl. Kirche* (4th to 6th century), p. 311 sq.; Lindner, *De Joviniano et Vigilantio purioris doctrinæ antesignanis* (Lpz. 1839).

Joy (usually some form of גִּיל, which prop. means to *spin round* with pleasurable emotion, and is thus a stronger term than שָׂמַח, which expresses *gladness;* but less so than עָלַץ, to *exult* or leap with exuberant joy, Gr. prop. χαρά), a delight of the mind arising from the consideration of a present or assured approaching possession of a future good (Ezra vi, 16; Esth. viii, 16). 1. NATURAL joy is of various degrees: when it is moderate, it is called *gladness;* when raised on a sudden to the highest degree, it is then *exultation* or *transport;* when we limit our desires by our possessions, it is *contentment;* when our desires are raised high, and yet accomplished, this is called *satisfaction*, when our joy is derived from some comical occasion or amusement, it is *mirth;* if it arise from considerable opposition that is vanquished in the pursuit of the good we desire, it is then called *triumph;* when joy has so long possessed the mind that it is settled into a temper, we call it *cheerfulness;* when we rejoice upon the account of any good which others obtain, it may be called *sympathy* or *congratulation.* 2. MORAL joy is also of several kinds, as the self-approbation, or that which arises from the performance of any good actions; this is called *peace*, or *serenity* of conscience; if the action be honorable and the joy rise high, it may be called *glory.* 3. There is also a SPIRITUAL joy, which the Scripture calls a "fruit of the Spirit" (Gal. v, 22), "the joy of faith" (Phil. i, 25), and "the rejoicing of hope" (Heb. iii, 6). The objects of it are—(1.) God himself (Psa. xliii, 4, Isa. lxi, 10). (2.) Christ (Phil. iii, 3; 1 Pet. i, 8). (3.) The promises (Psa. cxix, 162). (4.) The administration of the Gospel and Gospel ordinances (Psa. lxxxix, 15). (5.) The prosperity of the interest of Christ (Acts xv, 3; Rev. xi, 15, 17). (6.) The happiness of a future state (Rom. v, 2; Matt. xxv). The nature and properties of this joy: [1.] It is, or should be, constant (Phil. iv, 4). [2.] It is unknown to the men of the world (1 Cor. ii, 14). [3.] It is unspeakable (1 Pet. i, 8). [4.] It is permanent (John xvi, 22). See Watts, *On Pass.* sec. 11: Gill's *Body of Div.* iii, 111, 8vo ed.; Grove's *Moral Phil.* i, 356.

JOY OF GOD relates, 1. To the delight and complacency he has in himself, his own nature, and perfections. 2. He rejoices in his own works (Psa. civ, 31). 3. In his Son Christ Jesus (Matt. iii, 17). 4. In the work of redemption (John iii, 15). 5. In the subjects of his grace (Psa. cxlvii, 11; Zeph. iii, 17; Psa. cxlix, 4).

Joy or **Joye**, GEORGE, an early promoter of the Reformation, a native of the county of Bedford, was educated at Peterhouse, Cambridge, where he graduated M.A. in 1517. An associate of Tyndale, he was in 1527 accused of heresy, and obliged to go to Germany, where he resided for many years. He was concerned in the superintendence of Tyndale's Bibles, printed at Antwerp, and finally returned to his native country, but the time of his death is unknown. Besides his translation of part of the Bible, he published *On the Unity and Schism of the ancient Church* (1534):—*Subversion of More's False Foundation* (1534):—*Commentary on Daniel*, in the main from Melancthon, etc. See Gorton, *Biog. Dict.* s. v.

Joyner, JAMES E., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Amherst County, Va., and died at his own home in Henry County, Va., March 15, 1868. For more than thirty years Joyner served the Church with great acceptability and usefulness in various appointments. His preaching was earnest, pointed, and eminently practical. During the late war he served as a chaplain in the Confederate States army, and exerted among the officers and men an influence for good which was felt and acknowledged by all. —*Conf. Minutes M. E. Church South*, iii, 203.

Joz'abad (Heb. *Yozabad'*, יוֹזָבָד, a contraction for JEHOZABAD; Sept. Ἰωζαβάδ, but sometimes in Chron. Ἰωζαβάθ v. r. Ἰωζαβαίθ, Ἰεζεβούθ; also Ἰωσαβαδ or Ἰωσαβάδ in Neh.; Auth. Vers. "Josabad" in 1 Chron. xii, 4), the name of several men.

1. A Gederathite, one of the famous Benjamite archers who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 4). B.C. 1055.

2. A chiliarch of Manasseh, who re-enforced David on retreating to Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 20). B.C. 1053.

3. Another chiliarch of Manasseh, who deserted Saul's cause for that of David when he made Ziklag his residence (1 Chron. xii, 20); it is possible, however, that the name has been erroneously repeated for the preceding. B.C. 1053.

4. Probably a Levite, one of the persons charged with the care of the Temple offerings under the superintendence of Cononiah and Shimei, at the reformation by Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxxi, 13). B.C. 726.

5. One of the chief Levites who made offerings for the renewal of the Temple services under Josiah (2 Chron. xxxv, 9). B.C. 623.

6. A son of Jeshua, and one of the Levites who took account of the precious metals and vessels offered for the Temple by the Israelites who declined personally to return from the captivity (Ezra viii, 33). B.C. 459. He was probably the same with one of the chief Levites who "had the oversight of the outward matters of the house of God" after the re-establishment at Jerusalem (Neh. xi, 16). B.C. cir. 440. He was possibly identical with No. 8.

7. An Israelite, one of the "sons" of Pashur, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x, 22). B.C. 459.

8 One of the Levites who divorced his heathen wife after the return from Babylon (Ezra x, 23). B.C. 459. He is probably identical with one of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the Law to the people assembled in the Tyropœon (Neh. viii, 7). B.C. cir. 410.

Joz'achar (Heb. *Yozakar'*, יוֹזָכָר, *Jehovah-remembered;* Sept. Ἰωζαχάρ v. r. Ἰεζιρχάρ), the son of Shimeath, an Ammonitess, one of the two servants who assassinated Jehoash, king of Judah, in Millo (2 Kings xii, 21). In the parallel passage (2 Chron. xxiv, 26) the name is erroneously written ZABAD. B.C. 837. "It is uncertain whether their conspiracy was prompted by a personal feeling of revenge for the death of Zechariah, as Josephus intimates (*Ant.* ix, 8, 4), or whether they were urged to it by the family of Jehoiada. The care of the chronicler to show that they were of foreign descent seems almost intended to disarm a suspicion that the king's assassination was an act of priestly vengeance. But it is more likely that the conspiracy had a different origin altogether, and that the king's murder was regarded by the chronicler as an instance of divine retribution. On the accession of Amaziah the conspirators were executed."

Joz'adak (Ezra iii, 2, 8; v, 2; x, 18; Neh. xii, 26). See JEHOZADAK.

Juan de Dios. See JOHN DE DIEU.

Juan Valdez. See VALDEZ.

Ju'bal (Heb. *Yubal'*, יוּבָל, prob. for יוֹבֵל, *jubilee*, i. e. *music*; Sept. Ἰουβάλ), Lamech's second son by Adah, of the line of Cain; described as the inventor of the כִּנּוֹר, *kinnór*, and the עוּגָב, *ugáb*, rendered in our version "the harp and the organ," but perhaps more properly "*the lyre* and *mouth-organ*," or Pandæan pipe (Gen. iv, 21). See MUSIC. B.C. prob. cir. 3490. According to Josephus (Ἰούβαλος, *Ant.* i, 2, 2), "he cultivated music, and invented the psaltery and cithara." Some have compared him with the Apollo of heathen mythology (Hasse's *Entdeck.* ii, 37; comp. Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* x, 6; Diod. Sic. i, 20; Buttmann, *Mythol.* i, 164; Kalisch, *Commentary*, ad loc.).

Jubilāte. See SUNDAY.

Ju'bilee (Heb. *Yobel'*, יוֹבֵל or יֹבֵל, a joyful *shout* or *clangor* of trumpets; once in the Author. Vers. for תְּרוּעָה, Lev. xxv, 9, which is elsewhere rendered "a shout," etc.), usually in the connection YEAR OF JUBILEE (שְׁנַת הַיּוֹבֵל, or merely יוֹבֵל, as in Lev. xxv, 28; Septuag. usually translates ἔτος τῆς ἀφέσεως, or simply ἄφεσις; but Græcizes Ἰωβήλ in Josh. vi, 8, 13; Josephus Græcizes Ἰώβηλος, *Ant.* iii, 12, 3; Vulgate *annus jubilæ*, or *jubilæus*, but *buccina* in Exod. xix, 13); also called the "*year of liberty*" (שְׁנַת הַדְּרוֹר, Ezek. xlvi, 17), the great semi-centennial epoch of the Hebrews, constituting a festival, and marked by striking public and domestic changes. The relation in which it stood to the sabbatical year, and the general directions for its observance, are given Lev. xxv, 8-16 and 23-55. Its bearing on lands dedicated to Jehovah is stated Lev. xxvii, 16-25. There is no mention of the jubilee in the book of Deuteronomy, and the only other reference to it in the Pentateuch is in the appeal of the tribe of Manasseh, on account of the daughters of Zelophehad (Numb. xxxvi, 4). It is rarely mentioned in the prophetical books, but is very frequently referred to by Talmudical writers. See FESTIVAL.

I. *Signification of the Name.*—According to pseudo-Jonathan (*Targum* on Josh. vi, 5-9), the Talmud (*Rosh Ha-shana*, 26, a), Rashi, Aben-Ezra (on Exod. xix, 3), Kimchi (on Josh. v, 6), and other Jewish authorities, the meaning *ram*, which יוֹבֵל seems at times to bear (see Fürst, *Lexicon*, s. v.; but Gesenius utterly denies this sense), is the primary one; hence metonymically a *ram's horn* (comp. Exod. xix, 13 with Josh. vi, 5); and so the *sound* of a ram's horn, like the Latin *buccina*. According to another ancient interpretation, the Heb. word is from a root יָבַל, to *liberate* (parallel with דרור, a *freed captive*; comp. Hitzig on Jer. xxxiv, 8); an etymology which is somewhat sanctioned by Lev. xxv, 10, and the usual rendering of the Sept. (also Josephus, ἐλευθερίαν δὲ σημαίνει τοὔνομα, *Ant.* iii, 12, 3; and by St. Jerome, *Jobel est demittens aut mittens*, Comment. ad loc.). Others, again, regard the root יבל as onomatopoetic, like the Latin *jubilare*, denoting *to be jubilant* (Gesenius, etc.). Most modern critics, however, derive יובל from the better known root יבל, *to flow impetuously* (Gen. vi, 17), and hence assign to it the meaning of *the loud* or *impetuous sound* (Gen. iv, 21) streaming forth from the trumpet, and proclaiming this festival. The other notions respecting the word may be found in Fuller (*Misc. Sac.* p. 1026 sq.; *Critici Sacri*, vol. ix), in Carpzov (p. 448 sq.), and, most completely given, in Kranold (p. 11 sq.).

II. *Laws connected with this Festival.*—These embrace the following three main points:

1. *Rest for the Soil.*—This enactment, which is comprised in Lev. xxv, 11, 12, enjoins that, as on the Sabbatical year, the land should lie fallow, and that there should be no tillage nor harvest during the jubilee year. The Israelites, however, were permitted to fetch the spontaneous produce of the field for their immediate wants (מן השדה תאכלו את תבואתה), but not to lay it up in their storehouses.

2. *Reversion of landed Property.*—This provision is comprised in Lev. xxv, 13-34; xxvii, 16-24. The Mosaic law enacted that the Promised Land should be divided by lot, in equal parts, among the Israelites, and that the plot which should thus come into the possession of each family was to be absolutely inalienable, and forever continue to be the property of the descendants of the original possessor. See LAND. When a proprietor, therefore, being pressed by poverty, had to dispose of a field, no one could buy it of him for a longer period than up to the time of the next jubilee, when it reverted to the original possessor, or to his family. Hence the sale, properly speaking, was not of the land, but of the produce of so many years, and the price was fixed according to the number of years (שני תבואת) up to the next jubilee, so as to prevent any injustice being done to those who were compelled by circumstances to part temporarily with their land (Lev. xxv, 15, 16). The lessee, however, according to Josephus, in case he had made great outlays on the field just before he was required by the law of jubilee to return it to its owner, could claim compensation for these (*Ant.* iii, 12, 3). But even before the jubilee year the original proprietor could recover his field, if either his own circumstances improved, or if his next of kin (see GOËL) could redeem it for him by paying back according to the same price which regulated the purchase (Lev. xxv, 26, 27). In the interests of the purchaser, however, the Rabbinical law enacted that this redemption should not take place before he had the benefit of the field for *two productive years* (so the Rabbins understood שני תבואת), exclusive of a sabbatical year, a year of barrenness, and of the first harvest, if he happened to buy the plot of land shortly before the seventh month, i. e. with the ripe fruit (*Erachin*, ix, 1; Maimonides, *Jobel*, xi, 10-13). As poverty is the only reason which the law supposes might lead one to part with his field, the Rabbins enacted that it was not allowable for any one to sell his patrimony on speculation (comp. Maimonides, *Jobel*, xi, 3). Though nothing is here said about fields which were *given away* by the proprietors, yet there can be no doubt, as Maimonides says (*ibid.* xi, 10), that the same law is intended to apply to gifts (comp. Ezek. xlvi, 17), but not to those plots of land which came into a man's possession through marriage with an heiress (Numb. xxxvi, 4-9; compare Mishna, *Berachoth*, viii, 10). Neither did this law apply to a house in a walled city. Still, the seller had the privilege of redeeming it at any time within a full year from the day of the sale. After the year it became the absolute property of the purchaser (Lev. xxv, 29, 30, Keri). As this law required a more minute definition for practical purposes, the Rabbins determined that this right of redemption might be exercised from the very first day of the sale to the last day which made up the year. Moreover, as the purchaser sometimes concealed himself towards the end of the year, in order to prevent the seller from redeeming his house, it was enacted that when the purchaser could not be found, the original proprietor should hand over the redemption-money to the powers that be, break open the doors, and take possession of the house; and if the purchaser died during the year, the original proprietor could redeem it from the heir (comp. Mishna, *Erachin*, ix, 3, 4; Maimonides, *Jobel*, xii, 1-7). Open places, however, which are not surrounded by walls, belong to landed property, and, like the cultivated land on which they stand, are subject to the law of jubilee, and must revert to their original proprietors (Lev. xxv, 31). But, although houses in open places are thus treated like fields, yet, according to the Rabbinic definition, the reverse is not to be the case; i. e. fields or other places not built upon in walled cities are not to be treated as cities, but come under the jubilee law of fields (comp. *Erachin*, ix, 5). The houses of the Levites, in the forty-eight cities given to them (Numb. xxxv, 1-8), were exempt from this general law of house property. Having the same

value to the Levites as landed property had to the other tribes, these houses were subject to the jubilee law for fields, and could at any time be redeemed (Lev. xxv, 32; comp. *Erachin*, ix, 8), so that, even if a Levite redeemed the house which his brother Levite was obliged to sell through poverty, the general law of house property is not to obtain, even among the Levites themselves, but they are obliged to treat each other according to the law of landed property. Thus, for instance, the house of A, which he, out of poverty, was obliged to sell to the non-Levite B, and was redeemed from him by a Levite C, reverts in the jubilee year from C to the original Levitical proprietor A. This seems to be the most probable meaning of the enactment contained in Lev. xxv, 33, and it does not necessitate us to insert into the text the negative particle לא before יגאל, as is done by the Vulgate, Houbigant, Ewald (*Alterthümer*, p. 421), Knobel, etc., nor need we, with Rashi, Aben-Ezra, etc., take גאל in the unnatural sense of *buying*. The lands in the suburbs of their cities the Levites were not permitted to part with under any condition, and therefore these did not come under the law of jubilee (ver. 34). The only exception to this general law were the houses and the fields consecrated to the Lord, or to the support of the sanctuary. If these were not redeemed before the ensuing jubilee, instead of reverting to their original proprietors, they at the jubilee became forever the property of the priests (Lev. xxvii, 20, 21). The conditions, however, on which consecrated property could be redeemed were as follows: A house thus devoted to the Lord was valued by the priest, and the donor who wished to redeem it had to pay one fifth in addition to this fixed value (Lev. xxvii, 14, 15). A field was valued according to the number of homers of barley which could be sown thereon, at the rate of fifty silver shekels of the sanctuary for each homer for the whole fifty years, deducting from it a proportionate amount for the lapse of each year (Lev. xxvii, 16-18). According to the Talmud the fiftieth year was not counted. Hence, if any one wished to redeem his field, he had to pay one fifth in addition to the regular rate of *a sela* (shekel), and a *pundium* (=1-48th *sela*) per annum for every homer, the surplus *pundium* being intended for the forty-ninth year. No one was therefore allowed to sanctify his field during the year which immediately preceded the jubilee, for he would then have to pay for the whole forty-nine years, because months could not be deducted from the sanctuary, and the jubilee year itself was not counted (Mishna, *Erachin*, vii, 1). If one sanctified a field which he had purchased, i. e. not freehold property, it reverted to the original proprietor in the year of jubilee (Lev. xxvii, 22-24).

3. *Manumission of those Israelites who had become Slaves.*—This enactment is comprised in Lev. xxv, 39-54. All Israelites who through poverty had sold themselves as slaves to their fellow-Israelites or to the foreigners resident among them, and who, up to the time of the jubilee, had neither completed their six years of servitude, nor redeemed themselves, nor been redeemed by their relatives, were to be set free in the jubilee, to return with their children to their family and to the patrimony of their fathers. Great difficulty has been experienced in reconciling the injunction here, that in the jubilee all slaves are to regain their freedom, with Exod. xxv, 6, where it is enacted that those bondmen who refuse their liberty at the expiration of the appointed six years' servitude, and submit to the boring of their ears, are to be *slaves forever* (ועבדו לעלם). Josephus (*Ant.* iv, 8, 28), the Mishna (*Kidushin*, i, 3) and Talmud (*ibid.* 14, 15), Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Maimonides (*Hilchoth Abadim*, iii, 6), and most Jewish interpreters, who are followed by Ainsworth, Bp. Patrick, and other Christian commentators, take לעלם to denote *till the jubilee*, maintaining that the slaves who submitted to have their ears bored are included in this general manumission, and thus try to escape the difficulty. But against this is to be urged, that, 1. The phrase עבד לעלם is used in Lev. xxv, 46 for *perpetual* servitude, which is unaffected by the year of jubilee. 2. The declaration of the slave that he will not have his freedom, in Exod. xxi, 5, unquestionably shows that perpetual slavery is meant. 3. Servitude till the year of jubilee is not at all spoken of in Lev. xxv, 40-42 as something contemptible, and therefore could not be *the punishment designed* for him who refused his freedom, especially if the year of jubilee happened to occur *two* or *three* years after refusing his freedom; and that it is bondage beyond that time which is characterized as real slavery; and, 4. The jubilee, without any indication whatever from the lawgiver, is here, according to this explanation, made to give the slave the right to take with him the maid and the children who are the property of the master—the very right which had previously been denied to him. Ewald, therefore (*Alterthümer*, p. 421), and others, conclude that the two enactments belong to different periods, the manumission of slaves in the year of jubilee having been instituted when the law enjoining the liberation of slaves at the expiration of six years had become obsolete; while Knobel (on Exod. xxi, 6) regards this jubilee law and the enactments in Exod. xxi, 5, 6 as representing one of the many contradictions which exist between the Jehovistic and Elohistic portions of the Pentateuch. All the difficulties, however, disappear when the jubilee manumission enactment is regarded as designed to supplement the law in Exod. xxi, 2-6. In the latter case *the regular period of servitude is fixed*, at the expiration of which the bondman is *ordinarily* to become free, whilst Lev. xxv, 39-54 institutes an additional and *extraordinary* period, when those slaves who had not as yet completed their appointed six years of servitude at the time of jubilee, or had not forfeited their right of free citizenship by spontaneously submitting to the yoke of bondage, and becoming slaves forever (עבד עלם), are once in every fifty years to obtain their freedom. The one enactment refers to *the freedom of each individual* at different days, weeks, months, and years, inasmuch as hardly any twenty of them entered on their servitude at exactly the same time, whilst the other legislates for a general manumission, which is to take place at exactly the same time. The enactment in Lev. xxv, 39-54, therefore, takes for granted the law in Exod. xxi, 2-6, and begins where the latter ends, and does not mention it because it simply treats on the influence of jubilee upon slavery.

4. That there must also have been a perfect remission of debts in the year of jubilee is self-evident, for it is implied in the fact that all persons who were in bondage for debt, as well as all the landed property of debtors, were freely returned. Whether debts generally, for which there were no such pledges, were remitted, is a matter of dispute. Josephus positively declares that they were (*Ant.* xiii, 2, 3), whilst Maimonides (*Jobel*, x, 16) as positively denies it.

III. *Time when the Jubilee was celebrated.*—According to Lev. xxv, 8-11, it is evident that forty-nine years are to be counted, and that at the end thereof *the fiftieth* year is to be celebrated as the jubilee. Hence the jubilee is to follow immediately upon the sabbatical year, so that there are to be two successive fallow years. This is also corroborated by verse 21, where it is promised that the produce of the sixth year shall suffice for three years, i. e. forty-nine, fifty, and fifty-one, or the two former years, which are the sabbatical year and the jubilee, and the immediately following year, in which the ordinary produce of the preceding year would be wanting. Moreover, from the remark in verse 22, it would appear that the sabbatical year, like the jubilee, began in the autumn, or the month of Tisri, which commenced *the civil* year, when it was customary to begin sowing for the ensuing year. At all events, ver. 9 distinctly says that the jubilee is to be proclaimed by the

blast of the trumpet "on the tenth of the seventh month, on the day of atonement," which is Tisri. See ATONEMENT, DAY OF. The opinion that the sabbatical year and the jubilee were distinct, or that there were *two fallow years*, is also entertained by the Talmud (*Rosh Ha-Shana*, 8 b, 9 a), Philo (*On the Decalogue*, xxx), Josephus (*l. c.*), and many other ancient writers. It must, however, be borne in mind that, though there was to be no sowing, nor any regular harvest, during these two years, yet the Israelites were allowed to fetch from the fields whatever they wanted (Lev. xxv, 12). That the fields did yield a crop in their second fallow year is most unquestionably presupposed by the prophet Isaiah (xxxvii, 30). Palestine was, at all events, not less fruitful than Albania, in which Strabo tells us (lib. xi, c. iv, sec. 3), "The ground that has been sowed once produces in many places two or three crops, the fruit of which is even fifty-fold."

It must, however, be remarked, that many, from a very early period down to the present day, have taken the jubilee year to be identical with the seventh sabbatical year. Thus the "*Book of Jubilees*," which dates prior to the Christian æra [see JUBILEES, BOOK OF], divides the Biblical history from the creation to the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan into fifty jubilees of *forty-nine* years each, which shows that this view of the jubilee must have been pretty general in those days. Some Rabbins in the Talmud (*Erachin*, 12 b, with 33 a), as well as many Christian writers (Scaliger, Petavius, Usher, Cunæus, Calvitius, Gatterer, Frank, Schröder, Hug, Rosenmüller), support the same view. As to the remark, "Ye shall hallow *the fiftieth year*" (ver. 10), "a jubilee shall that *fiftieth* year be unto you" (ver. 11), it is urged that this is in accordance with a mode of speech which is common to all languages and ages. Thus we call a week *eight days*, including both Sundays, and the best classical writers called an *olympiad* by the name of *quinquennium*, though it only contained four entire years. Moreover, the sacred *number seven*, or *the sabbatic idea*, which underlies all the festivals, and connects them all into one chain, the last link of which is the jubilee, corroborates this view, inasmuch as we have, 1. A Sabbath of days; 2. A Sabbath of weeks (*the seventh week* after the Passover being the Sabbath week, as the first day of it is the festival of weeks); 3. A Sabbath of months (inasmuch as *the seventh month* has both a festival and a fast, and with its first day begins the civil year); 4. A Sabbath of years (the seventh year is the sabbatical year); and, 5. A Sabbath of Sabbaths, inasmuch as *the seventh sabbatical year* is the jubilee. See SABBATH.

IV. *Mode of Celebration.*—As the observance of the jubilee, like that of the sabbatical year, was only to become obligatory when the Israelites had taken possession of the promised land, and cultivated the land for that period of years, at the conclusion of which the festival was to be celebrated, the ancient tradition preserved in the Talmud seems to be correct, that the first sabbatical year was in the one-and-twentieth, and the first jubilee in the sixty-fourth year after the Jews came into Canaan, for it took them seven years to conquer it, and seven years more to distribute it (*Erachin*, xii, 6; Maimonides, *Jobel*, x, 2). The Bible says nothing about *the manner* in which the jubilee is to be celebrated, except that it should be proclaimed by the blast of a trumpet. See TRUMPET. As in many other cases, the lawgiver leaves the practical application of this law, and the necessarily complicated arrangements connected therewith, to the elders of Israel. Now tradition tells us that the trumpets used on this occasion, like those of the feast of trumpets, or new year, were of rams' horns, straight, and had their mouth-piece covered with gold (Mishna, *Rosh Ha-Shana*, iii, 2; Maimonides, *Jobel*, x, 11); that every Israelite blew nine blasts, so as to make the trumpet literally "sound throughout the land" (Lev. xxv, 9); and that "from the feast of trumpets, or new year (i. e. Tisri 1), till the day of atonement (i. e. Tisri 10), the slaves were neither manumitted to return to their homes nor made use of by their masters, but ate, drank, and rejoiced, and wore garlands on their heads; and when the day of atonement came the judges blew the trumpet, the slaves were manumitted to go to their homes, and the fields were set free" (*Rosh Ha-Shana*, 8 b; Maimonides, *Jobel*, x, 14). Though the Jews, from the nature of the case, cannot now celebrate the jubilee, yet on the evening of the day of atonement the conclusion of the fast is announced in all the synagogues to the present day by the blast of the *Shophar* or horn, which, according to the Rabbins, is intended to commemorate the ancient jubilee proclamation (*Orach Chajim*, cap. dcxxiii, sec. 6, note).

Because the Bible does not record any particular instance of the public celebration of this festival, Michaelis, Winer, etc., have questioned whether the law of jubilee ever came into actual operation; while Kranold, Hupfeld, etc., have positively denied it. The following considerations, however, speak for its actual observance: 1. All the other Mosaic festivals have been observed, and it is therefore surpassing strange to suppose that the jubilee which is so organically connected with them, and is the climax of all of them, is the only one that never was observed. 2. The law about the inalienability of landed property, which was to be the result of the jubilee, actually obtained among the Jews, thus showing that this festival must have been observed. Hence it was with a view to observing the jubilee law that the right of an heiress to marry was restricted (Numb. xxxvi, 4, 6, 7); and it was the observance of this law, forbidding the sale of land in such a manner as to prevent its reversion to the original owner or his heir in the year of jubilee, that made Naboth refuse to part with his vineyard on the solicitation of king Ahab (1 Kings xxi, 1-4). 3. From Ezek. xlvi, 17, where even the king is reminded that if he made a present of his landed property to any of his servants it could only be to the jubilee year, when it must revert to him, it is evident that the jubilee was observed. Allusions to the jubilee are also to be found in Neh. v, 1-19; Isa. v, 7, 8, 9, 10; lxi, 1, 2; Ezek. vii, 12, 13 (Isa. xxxvii, 30 is less clear). Ewald contends that the institution is eminently practical in the character of its details, and that the accidental circumstance of no particular instance of its observance having been recorded in the Jewish history proves nothing. Besides the passages to which reference has been made, he applies several others to the jubilee. He conceives that "the year of visitation" mentioned in Jer. xi, 23; xxiii, 12; xlviii, 44, denotes the punishment of those who, in the jubilee, withheld by tyranny or fraud the possessions or the liberty of the poor. From Jer. xxxii, 6-12, he infers that the law was restored to operation in the reign of Josiah (*Alterthümer*, p. 424, note 1). It is likely, however, that in the general declension of religious observances under the later monarchs of Judah this institution yielded to the avarice and worldliness of landed proprietors, especially as mortgaged property and servants would thereby be released (see Jer. xxxiv, 8-11; comp. Neh. v). Indeed, it is intimated that the Babylonian captivity should be of such a duration as to compensate for the years (sabbatical and jubilee together) of which Jehovah had thus been defrauded (2 Chron. xxxvi, 21). 4. The general observance of the jubilee is attested by the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition. This unanimity of opinion, however, only extends to the observance of the jubilee prior to the Babylonian captivity, for many of the later Rabbins affirm that it was not kept *after* the captivity. But in *the Seder Olam* (cap. xxx), the author of which lived shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, we are positively assured that it was observed. Josephus, too (*Ant.* iii, 12, 3), speaks of it as being permanently observed. This is, moreover, confirmed by Diodorus Siculus (lib. xl), who tells us that the Jews cannot dispose of their own patrimony (ἰδίους κλήρους πωλεῖν), as well as by the fact that we have distinct records of the

law respecting the redemption of houses in cities without walls, which forms an integral part of the jubilee law, being strictly observed to a very late period (*Erachin*, 31 b; *Baba Kama*, 82 b).

V. *Origin, Design, and Importance of the Jubilee.*—The foundation of the law of jubilee appears to be so essentially connected with the children of Israel that it seems strange that Michaelis should have confidently affirmed its Egyptian origin, while yet he acknowledges that he can produce no specific evidence on the subject (*Mos. Law*, art. 73). The only well-proved instance of anything like it in other nations appears to be that of the Dalmatians, mentioned by Strabo, lib. vii (p. 315, edit. Casaubon). He says that they redistributed their land every eight years. Ewald, following the statement of Plutarch, refers to the institution of Lycurgus; but Mr. Grote has given another view of the matter (*History of Greece*, ii, 530).

The object of this institution was that those of the people of God who, through poverty or other adverse circumstances, had forfeited their personal liberty or property to their fellow-citizens, should have their debts forgiven by their co-religionists every half century, on the great day of atonement, and be restored to their families and inheritance as freely and fully as God on that very day forgave the debts of his people and restored them to perfect fellowship with himself, so that the whole community, having forgiven each other and being forgiven of God, might return to the original order which had been disturbed in the lapse of time, and, being freed from the bondage of one another, might unreservedly be the servants of him who is their redeemer. The aim of the jubilee, therefore, is to preserve unimpaired the essential character of the theocracy, to the end that there be no poor among the people of God (Deut. xv, 4). Hence God, who redeemed Israel from the bondage of Egypt to be his peculiar people, and allotted to them the promised land, will not suffer any one to usurp his title as Lord over those whom he owns as his own. It is the idea of grace for all the suffering children of man, bringing freedom to the captive and rest to the weary as well as to the earth, which made the year of jubilee the symbol of the Messianic year of grace (Isa. lxi, 2), when all the conflicts in the universe should be restored to their original harmony, and when not only we, who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, but the whole creation, which groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, may be restored into the glorious liberty of the sons of God (comp. Isa. lxi, 1-3, Luke iv, 21; Rom. viii, 18-23; Heb. iv, 9).

The importance of this institution will be apparent if it is considered what moral and social advantages would accrue to the community from the sacred observance of it. 1. It would prevent the accumulation of land on the part of a few to the detriment of the community at large. 2. It would render it impossible for any one to be born to absolute poverty, since every one had his hereditary land. 3. It would preclude those inequalities which are produced by extremes of riches and poverty, and which make one man domineer over another. 4. It would utterly do away with slavery. 5. It would afford a fresh opportunity to those who were reduced by adverse circumstances to begin again their career of industry, in the patrimony which they had temporarily forfeited. 6. It wonld periodically rectify the disorders which crept into the state in the course of time, preclude the division of the people into nobles and plebeians, and preserve the theocracy inviolate.

VI. *Literature.*—The Mishna (*Erachin*, ch. viii, ix) gives very important enactments of a very ancient date respecting the jubilee. In Maimonides (*Jod Ha-Chezaka*, especially the tract so often above referred to as *Hilchoth Shemita Ve-Jobel*, ch. x-xiii) an epitome will be found of the Jewish information on this subject which is scattered through the Talmud and Midrashim. Of the modern productions are to be mentioned the valuable treatises of Cunæus, *De Rep. Hebr.* chap. ii, sec. iv (in the *Critici Sacri*, ix, 278 sq.), and Meyer, *De Tempor. et Diebus Hebræorum* (in Ugolini *Thesaurus*, i, 703, 1755), p. 341-360; Michaelis, *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses* (Engl. version, Lond. 1814), vol. i, art. lxxxiii, p. 376 sq.; Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie* (Berl. 1825), i, 502 sq; the excellent prize essays of Kranold, *De Anno Hebr. Jubilæo* (Götting. 1837), and Wolde, *De anno Hebr. Jubilæo* (Göttingen, 1837); Bähr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus* (Heidelberg, 1839), i, 572 sq.; Ewald, *Die Alterthümer des Volkes Israel* (Götting. 1854), p. 415 sq.; Saalschütz, *Das Mosaische Recht* (Berlin, 1853), i, 141, etc.; and *Archäologie der Hebräer* (Königsb. 1856), ii, 224, etc.; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Nordhausen, 1855), i, 463, etc.; Keil, *Handbuch der Biblischen Archäologie* (Frankf. a. M. 1858), i, 374, etc. Hupfeld (*Commentatio de Hebræorum Festis*, part iii, 1852) has lately dealt with it in a wilful and reckless style of criticism. Vitringa notices the prophetical bearing of the jubilee in lib. iv, c. 4 of the *Observationes Sacræ*. Lightfoot (*Harm. Evang. in Luc.* iv, 19) pursues the subject in a fanciful manner, and makes out that Christ suffered in a jubilee year. For further details, see Wagenseil, *De anno Jubilæo Hebr.* (Altdorf, 1700); J. C. Buck, *De anno Hebræor. jubilæo* (Viteb. 1700); Carpzov, *De anno jubilæo* (Lips. 1730; also in his *Apparat. crit.* p. 447); Ode, *De anno Heb. jubilæo* (Traj. a. R. 1736; also in Oelrich's *Collectio*, ii, 421-508); Laurich, *Legislatio Mosaica de anno semiseculari* (Altenb. 1794); also Marck, *Sylleg. dissert.* 302; Bauer, *Gottesd. Verfass.* ii, 277; Hullmann, *Urgesch. des Staats*, 73; Van der Hardt, *De jubil. Mosis* (Helmstadt, 1728); Jochanan Salomo, *De jubil. Hebr.* (Danz. 1679); Meier, *De mysterii Jobelæi* (Brem. 1700), Reineccius, *De origine Jubilæorum* (Weissenfels, 1730); Stemler, *De anno Jobelæo* (Lips. 1730); Van Poorteren, *Jubilæus Hebræorum* (Cob. 1730); Walther, *De Jubilæo Judæorum* (Sodin. 1762). Other monographs, relating, however, rather to later times, are cited by Volbeding, *Index*, p. 128, 162. See SABBATICAL YEAR.

JUBILEE, or JUBILEE YEAR, an institution of the Roman Catholic Church, the name of which is borrowed from that of the Jewish jubilee (see above). The Catholic jubilee is of two kinds, *ordinary* and *extraordinary*. The ordinary jubilee is that which is celebrated at stated intervals, the length of which has varied at different times. Its origin is traced to pope Boniface VIII, who issued, for the year 1300, a bull granting a plenary indulgence to all pilgrim-visitors of Rome during that year on condition of their penitently confessing their sins, and visiting the church of St. Peter and St. Paul fifteen times if strangers, and thirty times if residents of the city. The invitation was accepted with marvellous enthusiasm. Innumerable troops of pilgrims from every part of the Church flocked to Rome. Giovanni Villani, a contemporary chronicler, states that the constant number of pilgrims in Rome, not reckoning those who were on the road going or returning, during the entire year, never fell below 200,000. Boniface, finding the jubilee a success, and having been informed, so the story goes, by a hoary patriarch, who, at the age of 107, attended it, that a hundred years ago a like jubilee had been held, now ordered that it should thereafter be held every hundredth year. The great gain which the occasion afforded to the churches at Rome induced Clement VI to abridge the time to fifty years. His jubilee accordingly took place in 1350, and was even more numerously attended than that of Boniface, the average number of pilgrims, until the heats of summer suspended their frequency, being, according to Matthew Villani, no fewer than 1,000,000! The term of interval was still further abridged by Urban VI; but in the stormy days of his pontificate the jubilee could not take place, and his successor, Boniface IX, improved this to his advantage, and ordered it to take place in 1390. Ten years later he repeated it, and, besides, instituted extra years of jubilee, and permitted their observance also in foreign cities provided the worshippers would pay into the Roman treasury the cost of a journey to

the holy city (comp. Amort, *De origine, progressu, valore ac fructu indulgent.* i, 87 sq.). Paul II finally ordered in 1470 that thenceforward every twenty-fifth year should be held as jubilee, an arrangement which has continued ever since to regulate the ordinary jubilee. As the indulgences could, by the payment of given sums and the contribution to ecclesiastical purposes, always be obtained at the home of the penitent, the pilgrimages to Rome gradually diminished in frequency; but the observance itself has been punctually maintained at each recurring period, with the single exception of the year 1800, in which, owing to the vacancy of the holy see and the troubles of the times, it was not held. For the excesses committed in the sale of indulgences, see INDULGENCES. The extraordinary jubilee is ordered by the pope out of the regular period, either on his accession, or on some occasion of public calamity, or in some critical condition of the fortunes of the Church; one of the conditions for obtaining the indulgence in such cases being the recitation of certain stated prayers for the particular necessity in which the jubilee originated. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 117; Chambers, s. v.; Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* p. 334.

Jubilees, Book of. This apocryphal or Hagadic book, which was used so largely in the ancient Church, and was still known to the Byzantines, but of which both the original Hebrew and the Greek were afterwards lost, has recently been discovered in an Ethiopic version in Abyssinia.

I. *Title of the Book, and its Signification.*—The book is called *τὰ Ἰωβηλαῖα*=ספר היובלות, "*the Jubilees*," or "*the book of Jubilees*," because it divides the period of the Biblical history upon which it treats, i. e. from the creation to the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan, into fifty jubilees of forty-nine years each, equal to 2450 years, and carefully describes every event according to the jubilee, sabbatical year, or year in which it transpired, as stated in the inscription: "These are the words of the division of the days according to the law and the testimony, according to the events of the years in sabbatical years and in jubilees," etc. It is also called by the fathers *ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις, λεπτογένεσις, μικρογένεσις*; *τὰ λεπτὰ Γενέσεως* = בראשית זוטא, i. e. *the small Genesis, compendium of Genesis*, because it only selects certain portions of Genesis, although through its lengthy comments upon these points it is actually longer than this canonical book (comp. Epiphanius, *Adv. Hær.* lib. i, tom. iii, cap. vi, edit. Petav.; G. Syncellus, p. 8); or, according to Ewald's rendering of it, *τὰ λεπτὰ* (*subtilia, minuta*) *Γένεσις*, because it divides the history upon which it treats into very minute and small periods (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i, 271); it is called by St. Jerome *the apocryphal Genesis* (see below, sec. 3), and it is also styled *ἡ τοῦ Μωυσέως ἀποκάλυψις, the Apocalypse of Moses*, by George Syncellus and Cedrenus, because the book pretends to be a revelation of God to Moses, and is denominated "*the book of the division of days*" by the Abyssinian Church, from the first words of the inscription.

II. *Design and Contents of the Book.*—This apocryphal book is designed to be a commentary on the canonical books of Genesis and Exodus. (1) It fixes and arranges more minutely the chronology of the Biblical history from the creation to the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan; (2) Solves the various difficulties to be found in the narratives of these canonical books; (3) Describes more fully events which are simply hinted at in the sacred history of that early period; and (4) Expatiates upon the religious observances, such as the Sabbath, the festivals, circumcision, sacrifices, lawful and unlawful meats, etc., setting forth their sacred character, as well as our duty to keep them, by showing the high antiquity of these institutions, inasmuch as they have been sacredly observed by the patriarchs, as may be seen from the following notice of these four points.

a. In its *chronological arrangements* we find that it places the deluge in A.M. 1353 (Jubil. vi, 61), and the exodus in the year A.M. 2410 (iv, 10). This, with the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, yields fifty jubilees of forty-nine years each from the creation to the entrance into Canaan, i. e. 2450, and also allows a new jubilee period to commence immediately upon the entering of the Israelites into the Promised Land. Though in the calculations of this period the book of Jubilees agrees in its particulars with the Hebrew text of Genesis and Exodus, yet it differs from the canonical text both as to the time of the sojourn in Egypt and the years in which the ante and post-diluvian patriarchs begat their children. Thus Jared is said to have lived 62 instead of 162 years before Enoch was born, Methuselah was 67 instead of 187 at the birth of Lamech, and Lamech again was 53 instead of 182 when he begat Noah, agreeing partly with the Samaritan Pentateuch, and partly with the Septuagint in their statements about these antediluvian patriarchs. In the chronology of the post-diluvian patriarchs, however, the book of Jubilees deviates from these versions, and says that Arphaxad begat Cainan when 74-75; after the deluge, Cainan begat Salah when 57, Salah begat Eber when 67, Eber begat Peleg when 68, Peleg begat Reu when 61; the birth of Serug is omitted, but Serug is said to have begat Nahor in the year 116 after the birth of Reu, and Nahor begat Terah in his 62d year (compare Jubil. iv, 40, etc.). The going down into Egypt is placed about A.M. 2172-2173 (Jubil. xlv, 1-3), so that when we deduct it from 2410, in which year the exodus is placed, there remains for the sojourn in Egypt 238 years. In the description of the lives of Noah, Abraham (xxiii, 23), Isaac (xxxvi, 49-52), Jacob (xlv, 40-43), and Joseph (xlvi, 9-15), the chronology agrees with the Hebrew text of Genesis.

b. Of *the difficulties* in the sacred narrative which the book of Jubilees tries to solve may be mentioned that it accounts for the serpent speaking to Eve by saying that all animals spoke before the fall in paradise (comp. Gen. i, 1 with Jubil. iii, 98); explains very minutely whence the first heads of families took their wives (Jubil. iv, 24, 71, 100, etc.); how far the sentence of death pronounced in Gen. ii, 17 has been fulfilled literally (iv, 99, etc.); shows that the sons of God who came to the daughters of men were angels (v, 3); with what help Noah brought the animals into the ark (v, 76); wherewith the tower of Babel was destroyed (x, 87); why Sarah disliked Ishmael and urged Abraham to send him away (xvii, 13); why Rebecca loved Jacob so dearly (xix, 40-84); how it was that Esau came to sell his birthright for a mess of pottage (xxiv, 5-20); who told Rebekah (Gen. xxvii, 42) that Esau determined to kill Jacob (xxxvii, 1, etc.); how it was that he afterwards desisted from his determination to kill Jacob (xxxv, 29-105); why Rebekah said (Gen. xxvii, 45) that she would be deprived *of both her sons* in one day (xxxvii, 9); why Er, Judah's first-born, died (xli, 1-7); why Onan would not redeem Tamar (xli, 11-13); why Judah was not punished for his sin with Tamar (xli, 57-67); why Joseph had the money put into the sacks of his brethren (xlii, 71-73); and how Moses was nourished in the ark (xlvii, 13), and that it was not God, but the chief-*mastemah*, משטמה, *the enemy*, who hardened the hearts of the Egyptians (xlviii, 58).

c. Instances where *events* which are *briefly mentioned* or *simply hinted at* in the canonical book of Genesis, and which seem to refer to another narrative of an earlier or later date, are given more fully in the book of Jubilees, will be found in Jubil. xvi, 39-101, where an extensive description is given of the appearance of the angels to Abraham and Sarah as a supplement to Gen. xviii, 14; in Jubil. xxxii, 5-38, 50-53, where Jacob is described as giving tithes of all his possessions, and wishing to erect a house of God in Bethel, which is a fuller description of that hinted at in Gen. xxviii, 22; in Jubil. xxxiv, 4-25, where Jacob's battle with the seven kings

of the Amorites is described, to which allusion is made in Gen. xlviii, 22.

d. As to *the religious observances,* we are told that the *Feast of Weeks,* or *Pentecost* (חג ,יום הבכורים, חקציר ,שבועות), is contained in the covenants which God made with Noah and Abraham (comp. Jubil. vi, 56-60 with Gen. ix, 8-17; xiv, 51-54 with Gen. xv, 18-21); *the Feast of Tabernacles* was first celebrated by Abraham at Beersheba (Jubil. xvi, 61-101); *the concluding Festival* (שמיני עצרת), which is on the 23d of Tisri, continuing *the Feast of Tabernacles* [see FESTIVAL], was instituted by Jacob (Jubil. xxxii, 87-94) after his vision at Bethel (Gen. xxxv, 9-14); and that the mourning on *the Day of Atonement* (יום כפור) was instituted (Lev. xvi, 29) to commemorate the mourning of Jacob over the loss of Joseph (Jubil. xxxiv, 50-60).

(The German version by Dillmann, through which this book has recently been made known to Europeans, has been divided by the erudite translator into *fifty chapters,* but not into verses. The references in this article are to those chapters, and *the lines* of the respective chapters.)

III. *Author and Original Language of the Book.*—That the author of this book was a Jew is evident from, (1) His minute description of the Sabbath and festivals, as well as all the Rabbinic ceremonies connected therewith (l. 19-33, 49-60), which developed themselves in the course of time, and which we are told are simply types described by Moses from heavenly archetypes, and have not only been kept by the angels in heaven, but are binding upon the Jews world without end; (2) The elevated position he ascribes to the Jewish people (ii, 79-91; xvi, 50-56); ordinary Israelites are in dignity equal to angels (xv, 72-75), and the priests are like the presence-angels (xxxi, 47-49); over Israel only does the Lord himself rule, whilst he appointed evil spirits to exercise dominion over all other nations (xv, 80-90); and (3) The many Hagadic elements of this book which are still preserved in the Talmud and Midrashim. Compare, for instance, Jubil. i, 116, where the presence-angel, שר הפנים ,מטטרון, is described as having preceded the hosts of Israel, with *Sanhedrim,* 38, b; the description of the creation of paradise on *the third day* (Jubil. ii, 37 with *Bereshith Rabba,* c. xv); the twenty-two generations from Adam to Jacob (Jubil. ii, 64, 91, with *Bereshith Rabba* and *Midrash Tadshe,* 169); the animals speaking before the fall (Jubil. iii, 98 with the Midrashim); the remark that Adam lived 70 years less than 1000 years in order that the declaration might be fulfilled "in the day in which thou eatest thereof thou shalt die," since 1000 years are as one day with the Lord (Jubil. iv, 99 with *Bereshith Rabba,* c. xix; Justin. *Dial. c. Tryph.* p. 278, ed. Otto); the causes of the deluge (Jubil. v, 5-20 with *Bereshith Rabba,* c. xxxi); the declaration that the beginning of the first, fourth, seventh, and tenth months are to be celebrated as festivals, being the beginning of the four seasons called תקפות, and having already been observed by Noah (Jubil. vi, 31-95 with *Pirke R. Eliezer,* cap. viii; Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen. viii, 22); the statement that Satan induced God to ask Abraham to sacrifice his son (Jubil. xvii, 49-53 with *Sanhedrim,* 89, b); that Abraham was tempted ten times (Jubil. xix, 22 with Mishna, *Aboth,* v, 3; *Targum Jerusalem* on Gen. xxii, 1, etc.); and that Joseph spoke Hebrew when he made himself known to his brothers (Jubil. xliii, 54 with *Bereshith Rabba,* cap. xciii). As, however, some of the practices, rites, and interpretations given in this book are at variance with the traditional expositions of the Rabbins, Beer is of opinion that the writer was *a Dositheam* who was anxious to bring about a fusion of Samaritanism and Rabbinic-Judaism by making mutual concessions (*Das Buch d. Jubiläen,* p. 61, 62); Jellinek, again, thinks that he was *an Essene,* and wrote this book against the Pharisees, who maintained that the beginning of the month is to be fixed by observation and not by calculation (קידוש החדש על פי הראייה), and that the Sanhedrim had the power of ordaining intercalary years [see HILLEL II], adducing in corroboration of this view the remark in Jubil. vi, 95-133, the chronological system of the author, which is based upon heptades; and the strict observance of the Sabbath, which, as an Essene loving the sacred number seven, he urges upon every Israelite (compare Jubil. ii, 73-135; iv, 19-61; *Beth Ha-Midrash,* iii, p. xi); whilst Frankel maintains that the writer was an Egyptian Jew, and a priest at the temple in Leontopolis, which accounts for his setting such a high value upon sacrifices, and tracing the origin of the festivals and sacrifices to the patriarchs (*Monatsschrift,* v, p. 396).

Notwithstanding the difference of opinion as to which phase of Judaism the author belonged, all agree that this book was written in Hebrew, that it was afterwards translated into Greek, and that the Ethiopic, of which Dillmann has given a German version, was made from the Greek. Many of the expressions in the book can only be understood by retranslating them into Hebrew. Thus, for instance, the remarks "und es giebt keine Uebergehung" (Jubil. vi, 101, 102), "und sie sollen keinen Tag uebergehen" (vi, 107), become intelligible when we bear in mind that the original had עיבור, *intercalation.* Moreover, the writer designates the wives of the patriarchs from the family of Seth by names which express beauty and virtue *in Hebrew;* Seth married Azurah, עצורה, *restraint;* Jared married Beracha, ברכה, *blessing;* Enoch and Methuselah married wives of the name of Adni, עדנה, *pleasure;* whilst Cain married his sister Avan, אָוֶן, *vice* (Jubil. iv, 24-128). The words בי נשבעתי, Gen. xxii, 16, are rendered in the book of Jubil. (xvii, 42) *bei meinem Haupte,* which is the well-known Palestinian oath בחייך ראשי ,ראשך (compare *Sanhedrim,* 2, 3, al.), and which no Greek writer would use, especially as the Sept. does not have it here. There are also other renderings which show that the writer had the Hebrew Scriptures before him and not the Sept., a fact which is irreconcilable on the supposition that he was a Greek Jew, or wrote in Greek, as he would undoubtedly have used the Sept. Thus, for instance, the book of Jubil. xiv, 9, 10, has "der aus deinem Leibe hervorgeht," which is a literal translation of the Hebrew אשר יצא ממעיך, Gen. xv, 4; otherwise the Sept. ὃς ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ σοῦ: Jubil. xiv, 29 has "aber Abram wehrte sie ab," so the Hebrew וַיַּשֵּׁב אֹתָם אַבְרָם (Gen. xv, 11), not the Sept. καὶ συνεκάθισεν αὐτοῖς Ἀβραμ (comp. also book of Jubil. xv, 17 with Sept. Gen. xvii, 7; xv, 43 with Sept. xvii, 17; xv, 46 with Sept. xvii, 19). To these is to be added the testimony of St. Jerome, who remarks upon רִסָּה, "Hoc verbum, quantum memoria suggerit, nusquam alibi in scripturis sanctis apud Hebræos invenisse me novi, absque libro apocrypho, qui a Græcis μικρογένεσις appellatur. Ibi in ædificatione turris pro stadio ponitur, in quo excercentur pugiles et athletæ et cursorum velocitas comprobatur" (comp. *In epistola ad Fabiolam de mansionibus,* Mansio xviii on Numb. xxxiii, 21, 22); and again (Mansio xxiv on Numb. xxxiii, 27, 28), "Hoc eodem vocabulo (תֶּרַח) et iisdem literis scriptum invenio patrem Abraham, qui in supradicto apocrypho Geneseos volumine abactis corvis, qui hominum frumenta vastabant, abactoris vel depulsoris sortitus est nomen;" as well as the fact that portions of the book are still extant in Hebrew (comp. Jellinek, *Beth Ha-Midrash,* vol. iii, p. ix, etc.). The agreement of many passages with the Sept., when the latter deviates from the Hebrew, is, as Dillmann observes, to be ascribed to the translator, who, when rendering it into Greek, used the Sept. (Ewald, *Jahrbuch,* iii, 90).

IV. *Date and Importance of the Book.*—That this book was written before the destruction of the Temple is evident not only from its description of the sacrifices

and the services performed therein, but from its whole complexion, and this is admitted by all who have written on it. Its exact date, however, is a matter of dispute. Krüger maintains that it was written between B.C. 332 and 320; Dillmann and Frankel think that it was written *in the first century before Christ;* whilst Ewald is of opinion that it originated about *the birth of Christ.* The medium of the two extremes is the most probable.

The importance of this book can hardly be overrated when we remember that it is one of the very few Biblical works which have come down to us written between the close of the O.-T. canon and the beginning of the N. T. There are, however, several other considerations which render this book a most important contribution, both to the interpretation of the Bible and to the history of Jewish belief anterior to the Christian æra. 1. Many portions of it are literal translations of the book of Genesis, and therefore enable us to see in what state the Hebrew text was at that age, and furnish us with some readings which are preferable to those given in *the textus receptus*, e. g. Jubil. xvii, 17 renders it probable that the correct reading of Gen. xxi, 11 is כל אדת בנו ויגל אדת אמתו, which is corroborated by the verse immediately following. 2. It shows us that the Jews of that age believed in the survival of the soul after the death of the body (xxiii, 115). though *the resurrection* of the body is nowhere mentioned therein; that they believed in the existence of Satan, the prince of legions of evil spirits, respecting which so little is said in the O. Test. and so much in the New; and that these evil spirits have dominion over men, and are often the cause of their illnesses and death (x, 35-47; xlix, 7-10). 3. It shows us what the Jews believed about the coming of the Messiah, and the great day of judgment (xxxiii, 37-118). 4. It explains the statements in Acts vii, 53; Gal. iii, 19; Heb. ii, 2, which have caused so much difficulty to interpreters, by most distinctly declaring that the law was given through *the presence-angel* (i, 99-102). 5. It even appears to be quoted in the N. T. (compare 2 Pet. ii, 4; Jude 6, with Jubil. iv, 76; v, 3, 20).

V. *Literature.*—It has already been remarked that the Hebrew original of this book is lost. Chapters xxxiv and xxxv are, however, preserved from *Midrash Vajisau*, in *Midrash Jalkut Sabbat.* section *Bereshith*, cxxxiii, as has been pointed out by Jellinek (see below); and Treuenfels has shown parallels between other parts of the book of Jubilees and the Hagada and Midrashim in the *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1846, p. 81 sq. The Greek version of this book, which was made at a very early period of the Christian æra, as is evident from Clement's *Recognit.* cap. xxx-xxxii, though Epiphanius (*Adv. Hæres.* lib. i, cap. iv, vi; lib. ii; tom. ii, cap. lxxxiii, lxxxiv) and St. Jerome (*in Epistola ad Fabiolam de mansionibus*, Mansio xviii on Numb. xxxiii, 21, 22; Mansio xxiv on Numb. xxxiii, 27, 28) are the first who mention it by name, was soon lost in the Western Church, but it still existed in the Eastern Church, and was copiously used in the *Chronographia* of Georgius Syncellus and Georgius Cedrenus, and quoted several times by Joannes Zanoras and Michael Glycas, Byzantine theologians and historians of the 11th and 12th centuries (compare Fabricius, *Codex Pseud.-epigraph. V. Test.* p. 851-863; Dillmann, in Ewald's *Jahrbuch.* iii, 94 sq.). From that time, however, the Greek version was also lost, and the book of Jubilees was quite unknown to Europeans till 1844, when Ewald announced in the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, p. 176-179, that Dr. Krapff had found it preserved in the Abyssinian church in an Ethiopic translation, and brought over a MS. copy which was made over to the Tübingen University. This Ethiopic version was translated into German by Dillmann in Ewald's *Jahrbücher*, ii, 230-256, and iii, 1-96 (Göttingen, 1849-51), and Ewald at once used its contents for the new edition of his *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel* (vol. i, Götting. 1851, p. 271; vol. ii, 1853, p. 294). This was seasonably followed by Jellinek's edition of the *Midrash Vajisau*, with an erudite preface in *Beth Ha-Midrash*, vol. iii (Leipzig, 1855); next by the learned treatises of Beer, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und sein Verhältniss zu den Midraschim*, 1856; and Frankel, *Das Buch d. Jubiläen* (in the *Monatsschrift f. Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, v, 311-316, 380-400); then by another masterly production by Beer, entitled *Noch ein Wort über das Buch der Jubiläen* (in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1857); and strictures on the works of Jellinek, Beer, and Frankel, by Dillmann, in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, xi (Leipzig, 1857), 161 sq. Krüger, too, published an article on *Die Chronologie im Buche der Jubiläen* in the same journal, xii (Lpz. 1858), 279 sq., and Dillmann at last published the Ethiopic itself (Kiel and Lond. 1859), which Rönsch has since translated with notes (Leips. 1874, 8vo).

Ju'cal (Jer. xxxviii, 1). See JEHUCAL.

Ju'da (Ἰούδα, merely the Genitive case of Ἰούδας, the Græcized form of *Judah*), an incorrect Anglicizing of the name JUDAS or JUDAH in several passages of the Auth. Vers. See also JUDE.

1. The patriarch JUDAH, son of Jacob (Susan. 56; Luke iii, 33; Heb. vii, 14; Rev. v, 5; vii, 5). For the "city of Juda" (i. e. the tribe of Judah), in Luke i, 39, see JUTTAH.

2. The son of Joseph, and father of Simeon, in Christ's maternal ancestry (Luke iii, 30); probably the same with ADAIAH, the father of Maaseiah, which latter was one of the Jewish centurions who aided Jehoiada in restoring Joash to the throne (2 Chron. xxiii, 1). B.C. ante 876. See GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

3. The son of Joanna, and father of Joseph (Luke iii, 26), another of Christ's maternal ancestors; probably identical with ABIUD, the father of Eliakim, among Christ's paternal ancestry (Matt. i, 13); and likewise with OBADIAH, the son of Arnan, and father of Shechaniah (1 Chron. iii, 21). B.C. ante 406. (See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 16, 17.)

4. One of the Lord's brethren, enumerated in Mark vi, 3. See JOSES; JOSEPH. On the question of his identity with Jude, the brother of James, one of the twelve apostles (Luke vi, 16; Acts i, 13), and with the author of the general epistle, see JAMES. In Matt. xiii, 55, his name is given more correctly in the A. Vers. as JUDAS.

Juda (or **Judä**) **Leo**. See JUDAH LEO.

Judæ'a (Ἰουδαία, fem. of Ἰουδαῖος, *Jew* or *Jewish*, sc. land; once in A.V. for Chald. יְהוּד, *Judah*, Ezra v, 8; "Jewry," Luke xxiii, 5; John vii, 1), the southernmost of the three divisions of the Holy Land. It denoted the kingdom of Judah as distinguished from that of Israel. See JUDAH. But after the captivity, as most of the exiles who returned belonged to the kingdom of Judah, the name Judæa (Judah) was applied generally to the whole of Palestine west of the Jordan (Hag. i, 1, 14; ii, 2). Under the Romans, in the time of Christ, Palestine was divided into Galilee, Samaria, and Judæa (John iv, 4, 5; Acts ix, 31), the last including the whole of the southern part west of the Jordan. But this division was only observed as a political and local distinction, for the sake of indicating the part of the country, just as we use the name of a county (Matt. ii, 1, 5; iii, 1; iv, 25; Luke i, 65); but when the whole of Palestine was to be indicated in a general way, the term Judæa was still employed. Thus persons in Galilee and elsewhere spoke of going to Judæa (John vii, 3; xi, 7), to distinguish the part of Palestine to which they were proceeding; but when persons in Rome and other places spoke of Judæa (Acts xxviii, 21), they used the word as a general denomination for the country of the Jews, or Palestine. Indeed, the name seems to have had a more extensive application than even to Palestine west of the Jordan. It denoted all the dominions of Herod the Great, who was called the king of Judæa; and much of these lay beyond the river (comp. Matt. xix, 1, Mark

x, 1). After the death of Herod, however, the Judæa to which his son Archelaus succeeded was only the southern province so called (Matt. ii, 22), which afterwards became a Roman province dependent on Syria and governed by procurators, and this was its condition during our Lord's ministry (see Nohrbor, *Judæa provincia Romanorum*, Upsal. 1822). It was afterwards for a time partly under the dominion of Herod Agrippa the elder (Acts xii, 1-19), but on his death it reverted to its former condition under the Romans. See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s. v.

It is only Judæa, in the provincial sense, that requires our present notice, the country at large being described in the article PALESTINE. In this sense, however, it was much more extensive than the domain of the tribe of Judah, even more so than the kingdom of the same name. There are no materials for describing its limits with precision, but it included the ancient territories of Judah, Benjamin, Dan, Simeon, and part of Ephraim. It is, however, not correct to describe Idumæa as not anciently belonging to Judah. The Idumæa of later times, or that which belonged to Judæa, was the southern part of the ancient Judah, into which the Idumæans had intruded during the exile, and the annexation of which to Judæa only restored what had anciently belonged to it.

The name Judæa occurs among the list of nations represented at the paschal outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Acts ii, 9), where some have preferred the various readings *India* or *Idumæa* (see Kuinöl, ad loc.), and even *Junia* (Ἰουνίαν, Schulthess, *De charismat.* i, 145), a place in Armenia, with various other conjectural emendations (see Bowyer's *Conjectures on the N. T.* ad loc.), all alike unnecessary (see Hackett, Alford, ad loc.).

In the Rabbinical writings, Judæa, as a division of Palestine, is frequently called "the south," or "the south country," to distinguish it from Galilee, which was called "the north" (Lightfoot, *Chorog. Cent.* xii). The distinction of the tribe of Judah into "the Mountain," "the Plain," and "the Vale," which we meet with in the Old Testament (Numb. xiii, 30), was preserved under the more extended denomination of Judæa (for the more specific divisions in Josh. xv, 21-63, see Keil's *Comment.* ad loc.; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 93-122). The *Mountain*, or hill-country of Judæa (Josh. xxi, 11; Luke i, 39), was that "broad back of mountains," as Lightfoot calls it (*Chorog. Cent.* xi), which fills the centre of the country from Hebron northward to beyond Jerusalem (for Luke i, 39, see JUTTAH). The *Plain* was the low country towards the sea-coast, and seems to have included not only the broad plain which extends between the sea and the hill-country, but the lower parts of the hilly region itself in that direction. Thus the Rabbins allege that from Beth-horon to the sea is one region (Talmud Hieros. *Shebiith*, ix, 2). The *Vale* is defined by the Rabbins as extending from Engedi to Jericho (Lightfoot, *Panergon*, § 2); from which, and other indications, it seems to have included such parts of the Ghor, or great plain of the Jordan, as lay within the territory of Judæa. This appropriation of the terms is far preferable to that of some writers, such as Lightfoot, who suppose "the Plain" to be the broad valley of the Jordan, and "the Valley" to be the lower valley of the same river. That which is called *the Wilderness of Judæa* was the wild and inhospitable region lying eastward of Jerusalem, in the direction of the Jordan and Dead Sea (Isa. xl, 3; Matt. iii, 1; Luke i, 80; iii, 2-4). In the N. T. only the *Highlands* and the *Desert* of Judæa are distinguished. We may have some notion of the extent northward which Judæa had obtained, from Josephus calling Jerusalem the centre of the country (*War*, iii, 3, 5), which is remarkable, seeing that Jerusalem was originally in the northernmost border of the tribe of Judah. In fact, he describes the breadth of the country as extending from the Jordan to Joppa, which shows that this city was in Judæa. How much further to the north the boundary lay we cannot know with precision, as we are unacquainted with the site of Annath, otherwise Borceros, which he says lay on the boundary-line between Judæa and Samaria. The mere fact that Josephus makes Jerusalem the centre of the land seems to prove that the province did not extend so far to the south as the ancient kingdom of the same name. As the southern boundary of Judæa was also that of the whole country, it is only necessary to remark that Josephus places the southern boundary of the Judæa of the time of Christ at a village called Jardan, on the confines of Arabia Petræa. No place of this name has been found, and the indication is very indistinct, from the fact that all the country which lay beyond the Idumæa of those times was then called Arabia. In fixing this boundary, Josephus regards Idumæa as part of Judæa, for he immediately after reckons that as one of the eleven districts into which Judæa was divided. Most of these districts were denominated, like our counties, from the chief towns. They were, 1. Jerusalem; 2. Gophna; 3. Acrabatta; 4. Thumna; 5. Lydda; 6. Emmaus; 7. Pella; 8. Idumæa; 9. Engaddi; 10. Herodium; and, 11. Jericho.

Judæa is, as the above intimations would suggest, a country full of hills and valleys. The hills are generally separated from one another by valleys and torrents, and are, for the most part, of moderate height, uneven, and seldom of any regular figure. The rock of which they are composed is easily converted into soil, which being arrested by the terraces when washed down by the rains, renders the hills cultivable in a series of long, narrow gardens, formed by these terraces from the base upwards. In this manner the hills were in ancient times cultivated most industriously, and enriched and beautified with the fig-tree, the olive-tree, and the vine; and it is thus that the scanty cultivation which still subsists is now carried on. But when the inhabitants were rooted out, and the culture neglected, the terraces fell to decay, and the soil which had been collected in them was washed down into the valleys, leaving only the arid rock, naked and desolate. This is the general character of the scenery; but in some parts the hills are beautifully wooded, and in others the application of the ancient mode of cultivation still suggests to the traveller how rich the country once was and might be again, and how beautiful the prospects which it offered. As, however, much of this was the result of cultivation, the country was probably anciently, as at present, *naturally* less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judæa, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately about Jerusalem, is barren and desolate. But the prospect brightens as soon as you quit it, and Samaria and Galilee still smile like the land of promise." But there is a season—after the spring rains, and before the summer heat has absorbed all the moisture left by them—when even the desert is clothed with verdure, and at that season the valleys of Judæa present a refreshingly green appearance. This vernal season, however, is of short duration, and by the beginning of May the grass upon the mountains, and every vestige of vegetation upon the lower grounds, have in general completely disappeared. (See Kitto, *Pictorial History of Palestine*, Introduct. p. 39, 40, 119, 120; and the *Travels* of Nau, p. 459; Roger, p. 182; Mariti, ii, 362; Lindsay, ii, 70; Stephens, ii, 249; Elliot, p. 408, 409; Olin, ii, 323; Stanley, p. 161, 173. For a general discussion, see Reland, *Palæst.* p. 31, 174, 178; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geogr.* II, ii, 149; Ritter, *Erdk.* xiv, 81, 1064, 1080, 1088; xv, 25, 125, 131, 655; xvi, 1 sq., 21 sq., 33 sq., 35 sq., 509 sq., 26, 114 sq., 547.) See JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

Ju'dah (Heb. *Yehudah'*, יְהוּדָה, *celebrated*; comp. Gen. xxix, 35; xlix, 8, Chald. יְהוּד, *Yehud'*, Ezra v, 1, vii, 14; Dan. ii, 25; v, 13, vi, 13; "Judæa," Ezra v, 8; "Jewry," Dan. v, 13; Sept. and N. T. generally Ἰούδας [as also Josephus]; but comp. Ἰούδα, Luke iii, 26, 30;

for Luke i, 39, see JUTTAH), the name of several persons, etc., in Scripture. See also JUDAS; JUDE.

1. The fourth son of Jacob by Leah, born B.C. 1916 (Gen. xxix, 35), being the last before the temporary cessation in the births of her children. His whole-brothers were Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, elder than himself—Issachar and Zebulun younger (see xxxv, 23). The name is explained as having originated in Leah's exclamation of "praise" at this fresh gift of Jehovah—"She said, 'Now will I praise (אוֹדֶה, *ôdeh*) Jehovah,' and she called his name Yehudah" (xxix, 35). The same play is preserved in the blessing of Jacob—"Judah, thou whom thy brethren shall praise!" (xlix, 8).

The narrative in Genesis brings this patriarch more before the reader, and makes known more of his history and character than it does in the case of any other of the twelve sons of Jacob, with the single exception of Joseph. It was Judah's advice that the brethren followed when they sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites instead of taking his life. By the light of his subsequent actions we can see that his conduct on this occasion arose from a generous impulse, although the form of the question he put to them has been sometimes held to suggest an interested motive: "What profit is it if we slay our brother and conceal his blood? Come, let us sell him" (xxxvii, 26, 27). Though not the first-born, he "prevailed above his brethren" (1 Chron. v, 2), and we find him subsequently taking a decided lead in all the affairs of the family. When a second visit to Egypt for corn had become inevitable, it was Judah who, as the mouthpiece of the rest, headed the remonstrance against the detention of Benjamin by Jacob, and finally undertook to be responsible for the safety of the lad (Gen. xliii, 3-10). When, through Joseph's artifice, the brothers were brought back to the palace, he is again the leader and spokesman of the band. In that thoroughly Oriental scene it is Judah who unhesitatingly acknowledges the guilt which had never been committed, throws himself on the mercy of the supposed Egyptian prince, offers himself as a slave, and makes that wonderful appeal to the feelings of their disguised brother which renders it impossible for Joseph any longer to conceal his secret (xliv, 14, 16-34). So, too, it is Judah who is sent before Jacob to smooth the way for him in the land of Goshen (xlvi, 28). This ascendency over his brethren is reflected in the last words addressed to him by his father—Thou whom thy brethren shall praise! thy father's sons shall bow down before thee! unto him shall be the gathering of the people (xlix, 8-10). In the interesting traditions of the Koran and the Midrash his figure stands out in the same prominence. Before Joseph his wrath is mightier and his recognition heartier than the rest. It is he who hastens in advance to bear to Jacob the fragrant robe of Joseph (Weil's *Biblical Legends*, p. 88-90).

Not long after the sale of Joseph, Judah had withdrawn from the paternal tents, and gone to reside at Adullam, in the country which afterwards bore his name. Here he married a woman of Canaan, called Shuah, and had by her three sons, Er, Onan, and Shelah. When the eldest of these sons became of fit age, he was married to a woman named Tamar, but soon after died. See ER. As he died childless, the patriarchal law, afterwards adopted into the Mosaic code (Deut. xxv, 6), required Judah to bestow upon the widow his second son. This he did; but as Onan also soon died childless [see ONAN], Judah became reluctant to bestow his only surviving son upon this woman, and put her off with the excuse that he was not yet of sufficient age. Tamar accordingly remained in her father's house at Adullam. She had the usual passion of Eastern women for offspring, and could not endure the stigma of having been twice married without bearing children, while the law precluded her from contracting any alliance but that which Judah withheld her from completing. Meanwhile Judah's wife died, and, after the time of mourning had expired, he went, accompanied by his friend Hirah, to attend the shearing of his sheep at Timnath, in the same neighborhood. These circumstances suggested to Tamar the strange thought of connecting herself with Judah himself, under the guise of a loose woman. Having waylaid him on the road to Timnath, she succeeded in her object, and when the consequences began to be manifest in the person of Tamar, Judah was highly enraged at her crime, and, exercising the powers which belonged to him as the head of the family she had dishonored, he commanded her to be brought forth, and committed to the flames as an adulteress. But when she appeared she produced the ring, the bracelet, and the staff which he had left in pledge with her, and put him to confusion by declaring that they belonged to the father of her coming offspring. See TAMAR. Judah acknowledged them to be his, and confessed that he had been wrong in withholding Shelah from her. The result of this painful affair was the birth of two sons, Zerah and Pharez (B.C. cir. 1893), from whom, with Shelah, the tribe of Judah descended. Pharez was the ancestor of the line from which David, the kings of Judah, and Jesus came (Gen. xxxviii; xlvi, 12; 1 Chron. ii, 3-5; Matt. i, 3; Luke iii, 33). These circumstances seem to have disgusted Judah with his residence in towns, for we find him ever afterwards at his father's tents. His experience of life, and the strength of his character, appear to have given him much influence with Jacob; and it was chiefly from confidence in him that the aged father at length consented to allow Benjamin to go down to Egypt. That this confidence was not misplaced has already been shown [see JOSEPH]; and there is not in the whole range of literature a finer piece of true natural eloquence than that in which Judah offers himself to remain as a bond-slave in the place of Benjamin, for whose safe return he had made himself responsible to his father. The strong emotions which it raised in Joseph disabled him from keeping up longer the disguise he had hitherto maintained, and there are few who have read it without being, like him, moved even to tears (xliv, 14-34). B.C. 1874. See JACOB.

We hear nothing more of Judah till he received, along with his brothers, the final blessing of his father, which was conveyed in lofty language, glancing far into futurity, and strongly indicative of the high destinies which awaited the tribe that was to descend from him (Gen. xlix, 8-12). B.C. 1856. See SHILOH.

JUDAH, TRIBE AND TERRITORY OF. I. *Historical Memoranda*.—1. Judah's sons were five. Of these, three were by his Canaanitish wife Bath-shua; they are all insignificant; two died early, and the third, Shelah, does not come prominently forward either in his person or his family. The other two, Pharez and Zerah—twins—were illegitimate sons by the widow of Er, the eldest of the former family. As is not unfrequently the case, the illegitimate sons surpassed the legitimate, and from Pharez, the elder, were descended the royal and other illustrious families of Judah. These sons were born to Judah while he was living in the same district of Palestine, which, centuries after, was repossessed by his descendants—amongst villages which retain their names unaltered in the catalogues of the time of the conquest. The three sons went with their father into Egypt at the time of the final removal thither (Gen. xlvi, 12; Exod. i, 2). See JACOB.

2. When we again meet with the families of Judah they occupy a position among the tribes similar to that which their progenitor had taken amongst the patriarchs. At the time that the Israelites quitted Egypt, it already exhibited the elements of its future distinction in a larger population than any of the other tribes possessed (Numb. i, 26, 27). It numbered 74,000 adult males, being nearly 12,000 more than Dan, the next in point of numbers, and 34,100 more than Ephraim, which in the end contested with it the superiority among the tribes. During the sojourn in the wilderness, Judah neither gained, like some tribes, nor lost like others.

Its numbers had increased to 76,500, being 12,100 more than Issachar, which had become next to it in population (Numb. xxvi, 22). The chief of the tribe at the former census was Nahshon, the son of Amminadab (Numb. i, 7; ii, 3; vii, 12; x, 14), an ancestor of David (Ruth iv, 20). Its representative amongst the spies, and also amongst those appointed to partition the land, was the great Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (Numb. xiii, 6; xxxiv, 19). During the march through the desert Judah's place was in the van of the host, on the east side of the tabernacle, with his kinsmen Issachar and Zebulun (ii, 3-9; x, 14). The traditional standard of the tribe was a lion's whelp, with the words, Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered! (Targ. Pseudojon. on Numb. ii, 3.)

3. During the conquest of the country the only incidents specially affecting the tribe of Judah are, (1) the misbehavior of Achan, who was of the great house of Zerah (Josh. vii, 1, 16-18); and (2) the conquest of the mountain-district of Hebron by Caleb, and of the strong city Debir, in the same locality, by his nephew and son-in-law Othniel (Josh. xiv, 6-15; xv, 13-19). It is the only instance given of a portion of the country being expressly reserved for the person or persons who conquered it. In general the conquest seems to have been made by the whole community, and the territory allotted afterwards, without reference to the original conquerors of each locality. In this case the high character and position of Caleb, and perhaps a claim established by him at the time of the visit of the spies to "the land whereon his feet had trodden" (Josh. xiv, 9; comp. Numb. xiv, 24), may have led to the exception.

4. The history of the Judges contains fewer facts respecting this important tribe than might be expected. It seems, however, to have been usually considered that the birthright which Reuben forfeited had passed to Judah under the blessing of Jacob; and a sanction was given to this impression when, after the death of Joshua, the divine oracle nominated Judah to take precedence of the other tribes in the war against the Canaanites (Judg. i, 2). It does not appear that any tribe was disposed to dispute the superior claim of Judah on its own account except Ephraim, although in doing this Ephraim had the support of other tribes. Ephraim appears to have rested its claims to the leadership of the tribes upon the ground that the house of Joseph, whose interest it represented, had received the birthright, or double portion of the eldest, by the adoption of the two sons of Joseph, who became the founders of *two* tribes in Israel. The existence of the sacerdotal establishment at Shiloh, in Ephraim, was doubtless also alleged by the tribe as a ground of superiority over Judah. When, therefore, Judah assumed the sceptre in the person of David, and when the sacerdotal establishment was removed to Jerusalem, Ephraim could not brook the eclipse it had sustained, and took the first opportunity of erecting a separate throne, and forming separate establishments for worship and sacrifice. Perhaps the separation of the kingdoms may thus be traced to the rivalry of Judah and Ephraim. After that separation the rivalry was between the two kingdoms, but it was still popularly considered as representing the ancient rivalry of these great tribes: for the prophet, in foretelling the repose of a coming time, describes it by saying, "The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim" (Isa. xiii, 12). When the kingdom was divided under Rehoboam and Jeroboam, the history of Judah as a tribe lapsed into that of *Judah as a kingdom*. See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

II. *Geographical Data.*—In the first distribution of lands, the tribe of Judah received the southernmost part of Palestine to the extent of fully one third of the whole country west of the Jordan, which was to be distributed among the nine and a half tribes for which provision was to be made (Josh. xv). This oversight was discovered and rectified at the time of the second distribution, which was founded on an actual survey of the country, when Simeon received an allotment out of the territory which had before been wholly assigned to Judah (Josh. xix, 9). See SIMEON. That which remained was still very large, and more proportioned to the future greatness than the actual wants of the tribe. We now also know, through the researches of recent travellers, that the extent of good land belonging to this tribe, southward, was much greater than had usually been supposed, much of that which had been laid down in maps as mere desert being actually composed of excellent pasture-land, and in part of arable soil, still exhibiting some traces of ancient cultivation. Dan defended the western border against the inroads of the Philistines with a brave and well-trained band of soldiers, having established, as it seems, a permanent camp on the commanding height between Zorah and Eshtaol (Judg. xiii, 25; xvi, 31; xviii, 12: see DAN). Simeon bore the brunt of all attacks and forays made on the southern border by the tribes of the great "Wilderness of Wandering;" and when the Edomites attempted to penetrate Judah, Simeon could always check them by an attack upon their flank. When Judah became a kingdom, the original extent of territory assigned to the tribe was more than restored or compensated, for it must have embraced the domains of Simeon, and probably also of Dan, and we know that Benjamin was likewise included in it. See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

The boundaries and contents of the territory allotted to Judah are narrated at great length, and with greater minuteness than the others, in Josh. xv, 20-63. This may be due either to the fact that the lists were reduced to their present form at a later period, when the monarchy resided with Judah, and when more care would naturally be bestowed on them than on those of any other tribe, or to the fact that the territory was more important and more thickly covered with towns and villages than any other part of Palestine. The greater prominence given to the genealogies of Judah in 1 Chron. ii, iii, iv, no doubt arises from the former reason. The towns are also specifically named, not only under the general divisions, but even in detailed groups. (See below.) The north boundary — coincident with the south boundary of Benjamin—began at the embouchure of the Jordan, entered the hills apparently at, or about the present road from Jericho, ran westward to en-Shemesh—probably the present Ain-Haud, below Bethany—thence over the Mount of Olives to Enrogel, in the valley beneath Jerusalem; went along the ravine of Hinnom, under the precipices of the city, climbed the hill in a north-west direction to the water of Nephtoah (probably Lifta), and thence by Kirjath-jearim (probably Kuriet el-Enab), Bethshemesh (Ain-Shems), Timnath, and Ekron to Jabneel on the sea-coast. On the east the Dead Sea, and on the west the Mediterranean, formed the boundaries. The southern line is hard to determine, since it is denoted by places many of which have not been identified. It left the Dead Sea at its extreme south end, and joined the Mediterranean at the wady el-Arish; but between these two points it passed through Maaleh Acrabbim, the Wilderness of Zin, Hezron, Adar, Karkaa, and Azmon; the Wilderness of Zin the extreme south of all (Josh. xv, 1-12). The country thus defined was sixty-five miles long, and averaged about fifty in breadth. But while this large tract was nominally allotted to Judah, the portion of it available for actual settlement was comparatively small, not amounting to one third of the whole. From it must also be deducted a large section, stretching entirely across from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea, being the part set off to the tribe of Simeon. The actual territory of Judæa therefore extended, on an average, only about twenty-five miles from north to south, by about forty from east to west. See TRIBE. The whole of the above extensive region was from a very early date divided into four main regions.

1. *The South*—the undulating pasture country which

intervened between the hills, the proper possession of the tribe, and the deserts which encompass the lower part of Palestine (Josh. xv, 21). It is this which is once designated as the wilderness (*midbar*) of Judah (Judg. i, 16). It contained twenty-nine cities, with their dependent villages (Josh. xv, 20-32), which, with Ether and Ashan in the mountains, were ceded to Simeon (xix, 1-9). Amongst these southern cities the most familiar name is Beersheba. These southern pasture-lands were the favorite camping-grounds of the old patriarchs, as they still are of those nomad tribes that frequent the southern border of Palestine. See SIMEON.

2. *The Lowland* (xv, 33; A.V. "valley")—or, to give it its own proper and constant appellation, the Shephelah—the broad belt or strip lying between the central highlands—"the mountain"—and the Mediterranean Sea; the lower portion of that maritime plain which extends through the whole of the sea-board of Palestine, from Sidon in the north to Rhinocolura at the south. This tract was the garden and the granary of the tribe. In it, long before the conquest of the country by Israel, the Philistines had settled themselves, never to be completely dislodged (Neh. xiii, 23, 24). There, planted at equal intervals along the level coast, were their five chief cities, each with its circle of smaller dependents, overlooking, from the natural undulations of the ground, the "standing corn," "shocks," "vineyards and olives," which excited the ingenuity of Samson, and are still noticeable to modern travellers. "They are all remarkable for the beauty and profusion of the gardens which surround them—the scarlet blossoms of the pomegranates, the enormous oranges which gild the green foliage of their famous groves" (Stanley, *Syr. and Pal.* p. 257). From the edge of the sandy tract, which fringes the immediate shore right up to the very wall of the hills of Judah, stretches the immense plain of corn-fields. In those rich harvests lies the explanation of the constant contests between Israel and the Philistines (*Syr. and Pal.* p. 258). From them were gathered the enormous cargoes of wheat which were transmitted to Phœnicia by Solomon in exchange for the arts of Hiram, and which in the time of the Herods still "nourished" the country of Tyre and Sidon (Acts xii, 20). There were the olive-trees, the sycamore-trees, and the treasures of oil, the care of which was sufficient to task the energies of two of David's special officers (1 Chron. xxvii, 28). The nature of this locality would seem to be reflected in the names of many of its towns if interpreted as Hebrew words: Dilean=cucumbers; Gederah, Gederoth, Gederothaim, sheep-folds; Zoreah, wasps; Ex-gannim, spring of gardens, etc. But we have yet to learn how far these names are Hebrew, and whether at best they are but mere Hebrew accommodations of earlier originals, and therefore not to be depended on for their significations. The number of cities in this district, without counting the smaller villages connected with them, was forty-two. Of these, however, many which belonged to the Philistines can only have been allotted to the tribe, and, if taken possession of by Judah, were only held for a time. What were the exact boundaries of the Shephelah we do not know. We are at present ignorant of the principles on which the ancient Jews drew their boundaries between one territory and another. One thing only is almost certain, that they were not determined by the natural features of the ground, or else we should not find cities enumerated as in the lowland plain whose modern representatives are found deep in the mountains. See JARMUTH; JIPHTAH, etc. (The latest information regarding this district is contained in Tobler's *Dritte Wanderung*, 1859.)

3. The third region of the tribe—the *Mountain*, the "hill-country of Judah"—though not the richest, was, if not the largest, yet the most important of the four. Beginning considerably below Hebron, it stretches northward to Jerusalem, eastward to the Dead Sea slopes, and westward to the Shefelah, and forms an elevated district or plateau, which, though thrown into considerable undulations, yet preserves a general level in both directions. It is the southern portion of that elevated hilly district of Palestine which stretches north until intersected by the plain of Esdraelon, and on which Hebron, Jerusalem, and Shechem are the chief spots. On every side the approaches to it were difficult, and the passes easily defended. The towns and villages, too, were generally perched on the tops of hills or on rocky slopes. The resources of the soil were great. The country was rich in corn, wine, oil, and fruits; and the daring shepherds were able to lead their flocks far out over the neighboring plains and through the mountains. The surface of this region, which is of limestone, is monotonous enough. Round swelling hills and hollows, of somewhat bolder proportions than those immediately north of Jerusalem, which, though in early times probably covered with forests [see HARETH], have now, where not cultivated, no growth larger than a brushwood of dwarf-oak, arbutus, and other bushes. In many places there is a good soft turf, discoverable even in the autumn, and in spring the hills are covered with flowers. The number of towns enumerated (Josh. xv, 48-60) as belonging to this district is thirty-eight, but, if we may judge from the ruins which meet the eye on every side, this must have been very far below the real number. Hardly a hill which is not crowned by some fragments of stone buildings more or less considerable, those which are still inhabited surrounded by groves of olive-trees, and inclosures of stone walls protecting the vineyards. Streams there are none, but wells and springs are frequent—in the neighborhood of "Solomon's Pools" at Urtas most abundant ones.

4. The fourth district is the *Wilderness* (*Midbar*, which here and there only appears to be synonymous with *Arâbah*), the sunken district immediately adjoining the Dead Sea (Josh. xv, 6), averaging ten miles in breadth, a wild, barren, uninhabitable region, fit only to afford scanty pasturage for sheep and goats, and a secure home for leopards, bears, wild goats, and outlaws (1 Sam. xvii, 34; Mark i, 13; 1 Sam. xxii, 1 sq.). Different sections of it were called by different names, as "Wilderness of Engedi" (1 Sam. xxiv, 1); "Wilderness of Judah" (Judg. i, 16), "Wilderness of Maon" (1 Sam. xxiii, 24; see art. DESERT). It was the training-ground of the shepherd-warriors of Israel, "where David and his mighty men" were braced and trained for those feats of daring courage which so highly distinguished them. See BETHLEHEM; DAVID. It contained only six cities, which must have been either, like Engedi, on the edge of the cliffs overhanging the sea, or else on the higher slopes of the basin. The "city of Salt" may have been on the salt plains, between the sea and the cliffs which form the southern termination to the *Ghor*.

Nine of the cities of Judah were allotted to the priests (Josh. xxi, 9-19). The Levites had no cities in the tribe, and the priests had none out of it.

The following is a tabulated view of these subdivisions of the tribe, with the cities in each group, as laid down in Josh. xv, 21-63:

I. "The South" (הַנֶּגֶב), or Simeonitish portion.

1. Kabzeel.
2. Eder.
3. Jagur.
4. Kinah.
5 Dimonah.
6. Adadah.
7. Kedesh (Kadesh-Barnea).
8. Hazor.
9 and 10. Ithnan-Ziph or Zephath, and Hormah (Hazor-addah).
11. Telem.
12. Shema or Sheba (Hazor-shual).
13. Moladah.
14. Heshmon or Azmon.
15. Beth-palet.
16. Beersheba.
17 and 18. Bealoth or Balah (Ramath-Nekeb), and Bizjoth-jah-Baalah (Baalath-beer or Lehi).
19. Iim.
20. Azem.
21. Eltolad.
22. Chesil or Bethul.
23. Ziklag.
24. Madmannah or Beth-marcaboth.
25. Sansannah or Hazor-susah.
26. Lebaoth or Beth-lebaoth.
27. Shilhim or Shamha.
28 and 29. Ain-Rimmon or En-rimmon.

The villages (1.) Hazor-hadattah and (2.) Kerioth-hezron, or Hazor-amam, both belonged to Hazor proper; (3.) Hazor-gaddah to Hazor-shual.

Also [1.] Ether and [2.] Ashan out of the "plain" subdivision.

II. "The Valley" (הַשְּׁפֵלָה), or *Plain*.

a. First group—N.W. corner.

1. Eshtaol.
2. Zoreah.
3. Ashna.
4. Zanoah.
5. En-gannim.
6. Tappuah.
7. Enam.
8. Jarmuth.
9. Adullam.
10. Socoh.
11. Azekah.
12. Sharaim.
13. Adithaim.
14. Gederah and Gederothaim.

b. Second group—south of the above, in the west part of the tribe.

1. Zenan.
2. Hadashah.
3. Migdal-gad.
4. Dileam.
5. Mizpeh.
6. Joktheel } [no ו copulative
7. Lachish } between.]
8. Bozkath.
9. Eglon.
10. Cabbon.
11. Lahmam.
12. Kithlish.
13. Gederoth } [no ו copulative
14. Beth-dagon } between.]
15. Naamah.
16. Makkedah.

c. Third group—E. of group *b* and S. of group *a*; in the middle of the tribe, E. of the road from Eleutheropolis to Jerusalem.

1. Libnah.
(2.) Ether.
(3.) Ashan.
4. Jiphtah.
5. Ashnah.
6. Nezib.
7. Keilah.
8. Achzib.
9. Mareshah.

d. Fourth group—Philistine pentarchy, on the Mediterranean shore.

1. Ekron (really in Dan).
2. Ashdod.
3. Gaza.

etc. (Ashkelon, and Gath [the last=Mizpeh, really in the "valley"]).

III. "The Mountains" (הָהָר), or *Highland*.

a. First group—along the border of Simeon, in the middle.

1. Shamir.
2. Jattir.
3. Socoh.
4. Dannah.
5. Kirjath-sannah=Debir.
6. Anab.
7. Eshtemoh.
8. Anim.
9. Goshen.
10. Holon.
11. Giloh.

b. Second group—N. of group *a*, in the southern part of the tribe, around Hebron.

1. Arab.
2. Dumah.
3. Eshean.
4. Janum.
5. Beth-tappuah.
6. Aphekah.
7. Humtah.
8. Kirjath-arba=Hebron.
9. Zior.

c. Third group—E. of group *b*.

1. Maon } [no ו copulative
2. Carmel } between.]
3. Ziph.
4. Juttah.
5. Jezreel.
6. Jokdeam.
7. Zanoah } [no ו copula-
8. Cain }
9. Gibeah } tive between.]
10. Timnah.

d. Fourth group—N. of groups *b* and *c*, to Jerusalem on the N. boundary.

1. Halhul } [no ו copulative
2. Beth-zur } between.]
3. Gedor.
4. Maarath.
5. Beth-anoth.
6. Eltekon.

e. Fifth group—in the N. medial angle, between group *d* and the "Valley" district.

1. Kirjath-baal=Kirjath-jearim.
2. Rabbah (? merely a title of Jerusalem).

[*f*. Group added in the Septuagint between *d* and *e*—situated N. of group *e*, up to Jerusalem—probably should be added to *e*.]

1. Tekoah.
2. Ephrathah=Bethlehem.
3. Phagor.
4. Etam.
5. Kulon [in Benjamin] [prob. spurious].
6. Tatam.
7. Sores (Thebez) [in Benjamin] [spurious].
8. Karem (? Beth-haccerem].
9. Gallim [in Benjamin].
10. Bether [Thether].
11. Menukah.

IV. "The Wilderness" (הַמִּדְבָּר), or *Desert*.

1. Beth-arabah [really in Benjamin] } [no ו copu-
2. Middin } lative between.]
3. Secacah.
4. Nibshan.
5. Ir-ham-Melach.
6. En-gedi.

Supplementary—Jebus.

The following table comprises all the scriptural localities in Judah (except those in Jerusalem), with their probable or ascertained identifications.

Aceldama.	Field.	See Jerusalem.
Achor.	Valley.	*Wady Dabr* ?
Achzib.	Town.	See Chezib.
Adithaim.	do.	[*Moheisin*] ?
Adoraim.	do.	*Dura*.
Adullam.	do.	[*El-Kheishum*] ?
Adummim.	do.	*Kulat-ed-Dem*.
Anab.	do.	*Anab*.
Anim.	do.	*Ghuwein*.
Aphekah.	do.	[*Sibta*] ?
Aphrah.	do.	See Beth-le-Aphrah.
Arab.	do.	[*El-Hadb*] ?
Ashdod.	do.	*Esdud*.
Ashkelon.	do.	*Askulan*.
Ashnah.	do.	[*Beit-Alam*] ?
Ashnah (Josh. xv, 43).	do.	[*Deir Abân*] ?
Azekah (Josh. xv, 33).	do.	*Ahbek*.
Azotus.	do.	See Ashdod.
Azzah.	do.	See Gaza.
Baalah or Baale.	do.	See Kirjath-jearim.
Baalah.	Mount.	[*Tell Hermes*] ?
Beer.	Town.	[*Deir Dubban*] ?
Berachah.	Valley.	*Wady Berakut*.
Bethanoth.	Town.	*Beit-Anun*.
Bethany.	do.	*El-Azariyeh*.
Beth-dagon.	do.	[*Beit-Jerja*] ?
Bethel.	do.	See Bethel.
Bether.	Mount.	*Bittir* ?
Beth-ezel.	Town.	[*Beit-Daran*] ?
Beth-gader.	do.	See Geder.
Beth-haccerem.	do.	*Jebel Fureidis* ?
Beth-le-Aphrah.	do.	[*Beit-Affa*] ?
Beth-lehem.	do.	*Beit-Lahm*.
Bethphage.	Village.	[S. top of *Jebel-et Tur*] ?
Beth-tappuah.	Town.	*Taffuh*.
Beth-zur.	do.	*Beit-Sur*.
Bezek.	do.	[E. of Nukhalin] ? ?
Bilhah.	do.	See Baalah.
Bozkath.	do.	[*Tell Hesy*] ?
Cabbon.	do.	[*El-Kufeir*] ?
Cain.	do.	*Yukin*.
Carmel.	do.	*Kurmul*.
Chesalon.	do.	*Kisla*.
Chezib.	do.	[Ruins with wells on W. Sûr] ?
Dannah.	do.	[*Ed-Dhokeriyeh*] ?
Debir (Josh. xv, 49).	do.	*Khurbet ed-Dilbeh* ?
Debir (Josh. xv, 7).	do.	[N.E. of Wady Dabor] ?
Dileon.	do.	See Dimonah.
Dilean.	do.	*Tina* ?
Dimonah.	do.	*Ed-Dheib* ?
Dumah.	do.	*Daumeh*.
Eben-Bohan.	Stone.	[N. side of W. Dahr] ?
Edar.	Tower.	[S. of Bethlehem] ?
Eglon.	Town.	*Ajlan*.
Elah.	Valley.	*Wady es-Sumt*.
Eltekon.	Town.	[*Beit-Sahur*] ?
Enam.	do.	[*Deir el-Butm*] ?
En-gannim.	do.	[*Rana*] ?
En-gedi.	do.	*Ain-Jidy*.
Ephes-dammin.	Field.	See Elah.
Ephrath or Ephrata.	Town.	See Bethlehem.
Eshcol.	Valley.	*Ain-Eskali*.
Eshean.	do.	*Khursa* ?
Eshtemoa.	do.	*Semua*.
Etam.	do.	*Urtus* ?
Gath.	do.	*Tell es-Safieh* ?
Gaza.	do.	*Ghuzzeh*.
Geder.	Town.	See Gedor.
Gederah.	do.	*Gheterah*.
Gederoth.	do.	[*Beit-Tima*] ?
Gederothaim.	do.	See Gederah.
Gedor.	do.	*Jedur*.
Gibeah.	do.	[*Erfaiyeh*] ?
Gilon.	do.	[*Rafat* ?]
Goshen.	do.	[*Deir Shems*] ?
Goshen.	District.	[S. of Kirjath-jearim] ?
Hachilah.	Hill.	[*Tell Ziph*].
Hadashah.	Town.	*El-Jorah* ?
Halhul.	do.	*Halhul*.
Hareth.	Forest.	See Aruboth.
Hazezon-tamar.	Town.	See Engedi.
Hebron.	do.	*El-Khulil*.
Hepher.	do.	[*Um-Burj*] ?
Holon.	do.	[*Beit-Amra*] ?
Humtah.	do.	[*Sabzin el-Almeh*] ?
Ir-nahash.	do.	*Deir Nekhaz*.
Jabez.	do.	See Kirjath-jearim.
Janum.	do.	[*Ras Jabreh*] ?
Jarmuth.	do.	*Yarmuk*.
Jattir.	do.	*Attir*.
Jebus.	do.	S. part of Jerusalem.
Jehovah-jireh.	Altar.	See Moriah.
Jeruel.	Desert.	[S.E. of Minea] ?
Jerusalem.	City.	*El-Khuds*.
Jeshimon.	Desert.	See Judah (Desert of).
Jeshua.	Town.	*Yeshua*.
Jezreel.	do.	[*Zurtul*] ?
Jiphtah.	do.	[*Jimrin*] ?
Jokdeam.	do.	[*Ed-Dar*] ?
Joktheel.	do.	[*Balin*] ?

Map of the Tribe of Judah.

Jordan.	River.	*Sheriat el-Kebir.*
	Plain.	*El-Ghor.*
Judæa.	Mts.	Middle ridge.
	Desert.	E. plain.
	Valley.	Sea-shore.
Juttah.	Town.	*Yutta.*
Keilah.	do.	*Kila.*
Kerioth.	do.	*Kureitein.*
Kirjath-jearim	do.	*Kuryat el-Enab?*
Kirjath-arba or Kirjath-Baal.	do.	See HEBRON.
Kirjath-sannah or Kirjath-sepher.	do.	See DEBIR.
Kithlish.	do.	*[Jelameh]?*
Lachish.	do.	*Um-Lakhis.*
Lahmam.	do.	*[Beit-Lehia]?*
Libnah.	do.	*Arak el-Menshiyeh?*
Maarath.	do.	*[Mersia]?*
Macpelah.	Cave.	See HEBRON.
Makkedah.	Town.	*Sumeil?*
Mamre.	Field.	See HEBRON.
Maon.	Town.	*Tell Main.*
Mareshah.	do.	*Tell Merash.*
Mekonah.	do.	*[Jerash]?*
Middin.	do.	*[Khan Mardeh]?*

Migdal-gad.	Town.	*El-Mejel.*
Mizpeh.	do.	See GATH.
Moresheth-gath.	do.	*Mar Hanneh?*
Naamah.	do.	*[Neamah]?*
Nephtoah.	Spring.	*Ain Yalo?*
Netophah.	Town.	*Antûbah?*
Nezib.	do.	*Beit Nusib.*
Nibshan.	do.	*[Kasr el-Leiman]?*
Rabbah.	do.	See JERUSALEM.
Rachel's Tomb.	Sepulchre.	N. of Bethlehem.
Ramah or Ramathaim-zophim.	Town.	*Rameh?*
Salt City.	do.	*[Khulat um-Baghek]?*
Saphir.	do.	*Es-Sawafir?*
Secacah.	do.	*[Kasr Antar]?*
Sela-hammalekoth.	Rock.	See MAON.
Shaaraim or Sharaim.	Town.	*[Shahmeh]?*
Shamir.	do.	*[Simia]?*
Shocho (Josh. xv, 48).	do.	*Shuweikeh.*
Siddim.	Vale.	S. end of Dead Sea?
Sirah.	Well.	*[Sasirah]?*
Socoh or Shocoh.	Town.	*Shuweikeh.*
Sorek.	Valley.	*Wady Simsin?*
Tappuah.	Town.	*[Beit Atab]?*
Tekoah.	do.	*Tekua.*

Timnah.	Town.	[*Um el-Amad*]?
Zaanan.	do.	See ZENAN.
Zanoah (in the plain).	do.	*Zannah.*
Zanoah (in the hills).	do.	*Zanutah?*
Zenan.	do.	[*Jenin*]?
Zephathah.	Valley.	Wady S. of Maresh?
Ziklag.	Town.	[*Musrefa*]?
Zior.	do.	*Sair?*
Ziph.	do.	*Zif.*
Ziz.	Cliff.	Precipice W. of Ain Jidy?
Zuph.	District.	See RAMATHAIM ZOPHIM.

JUDAH, KINGDOM OF. When the territory of all the rest of Israel, except Judah and Benjamin, was lost to the kingdom of Rehoboam, a special single name was needed to denote that which remained to him; and almost of necessity the word *Judah* received an extended meaning, according to which it comprised not Benjamin only, but the priests and Levites, who were ejected in great numbers from Israel, and rallied round the house of David. At a still later time, when the nationality of the ten tribes had been dissolved, and every practical distinction between the ten and the two had vanished during the captivity, the scattered body had no visible head, except in Jerusalem, which had been reoccupied mostly by a portion of *Judah's* exiles. See CAPTIVITY. In consequence, the name Judah (or *Jew*) attached itself to the entire nation from about the epoch of the restoration. See JEW. But in this article Judah is understood of the people over which David's successors reigned, from Rehoboam to Zedekiah. It substantially corresponded to the *Judæa* (q. v.) of later times.

I. *Extent of the Kingdom.*—When the disruption of Solomon's kingdom took place at Shechem, only the tribe of Judah followed the house of David. But almost immediately afterwards, when Rehoboam conceived the design of establishing his authority over Israel by force of arms, the tribe of Benjamin also is recorded as obeying his summons, and contributing its warriors to make up his army. Jerusalem, situate within the borders of Benjamin (Josh. xviii, 28, etc.), yet won from the heathen by a prince of Judah, connected the frontiers of the two tribes by an indissoluble political bond. By the erection of the city of David, Benjamin's former adherence to Israel (2 Sam. ii, 9) was cancelled, though at least two Benjamite towns, Bethel and Jericho, were included in the northern kingdom. A part, if not all, of the territory of Simeon (1 Sam. xxvii, 6; 1 Kings xix, 3; comp. Josh. xix, 1) and of Dan (2 Chron. xi, 10; comp. Josh. xix, 41, 42) was recognised as belonging to Judah, and in the reigns of Abijah and Asa the southern kingdom was enlarged by some additions taken out of the territory of Ephraim (2 Chron. xiii, 19; xv, 8; xvii, 2). After the conquest and deportation of Israel by Assyria, the influence, and perhaps the delegated jurisdiction of the king of Judah, sometimes extended over the territory which formerly belonged to Israel. See JUDÆA.

II. *Population.*—A singular gauge of the growth of the kingdom of Judah is supplied by the progressive augmentation of the army under successive kings. In David's time (2 Sam. xxiv, 9, and 1 Chron. xxi, 5) the warriors of Judah numbered at least 500,000. But Rehoboam brought into the field (1 Kings xii, 21) only 180,000 men; Abijah, eighteen years afterwards, 400,000 (2 Chron. xiii, 3); Asa (2 Chron. xiv, 8), his successor, 580,000, exactly equal to the sum of the armies of his two predecessors; Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 14-19), the next king, numbered his warriors in five armies, the aggregate of which is 1,160,000, exactly double the army of his father, and exactly equal to the sum of the armies of his three predecessors. After four inglorious reigns, the energetic Amaziah could muster only 300,000 men when he set out to recover Edom. His son Uzziah had a standing (2 Chron. xxvi, 11) force of 307,500 fighting men. It would be out of place here to discuss the question which has been raised as to the accuracy of these numbers. See NUMBER. So far as they are authentic, it may be safely reckoned that the population subject to each king was about four times the number of the fighting men in his dominions. See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

III. *Resources.*—Unless Judah had some other means of acquiring wealth besides pasture and tillage—as by maritime commerce from the Red Sea ports, or (less probably) from Joppa, or by keeping up the old trade (1 Kings x, 28) with Egypt—it seems difficult to account for that ability to accumulate wealth which supplied the Temple treasury with sufficient store to invite so frequently the hand of the spoiler. Egypt, Damascus, Samaria, Nineveh, and Babylon had each in succession a share of the pillage. The treasury was emptied by Shishak (1 Kings xiv, 26), again by Asa (1 Kings xv, 18), by Jehoash of Judah (2 Kings xii, 18), by Jehoash of Israel (2 Kings xiv, 14), by Ahaz (2 Kings xvi, 8), by Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii, 15), and by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxiv, 13).

IV. *Advantages of Position.*—In Edom a vassal-king probably retained his fidelity to the son of Solomon, and guarded for Jewish enterprise the road to the maritime trade with Ophir. Philistia maintained, for the most part, a quiet independence. Syria, in the height of her brief power, pushed her conquests along the northern and eastern frontiers of Judah, and threatened Jerusalem; but the interposition of the territory of Israel generally relieved Judah from any immediate contact with that dangerous neighbor. The southern border of Judah, resting on the uninhabited desert, was not agitated by any turbulent stream of commercial activity like that which flowed by the rear of Israel, from Damascus to Tyre. Though some of the Egyptian kings were ambitious, that ancient kingdom was far less aggresive as a neighbor to Judah than Assyria was to Israel.

The kingdom of Judah thus possessed many advantages which secured for it a longer continuance than that of Israel. A frontier less exposed to powerful enemies, a soil less fertile, a population hardier and more united, a fixed and venerated centre of administration and religion, a hereditary aristocracy in the sacerdotal caste, an army always subordinate, a succession of kings which no revolution interrupted, many of whom were wise and good, and strove successfully to promote the moral and spiritual as well as the material prosperity of their people; still more than these, the devotion of the people to the One True God, which, if not always a pure and elevated sentiment, was yet a contrast to such devotion as could be inspired by the worship of the calves or of Baal; and, lastly, the popular reverence for and obedience to the divine law so far as they learned it from their teachers—to these and other secondary causes is to be attributed the fact that Judah survived her more populous and more powerful sister kingdom by 135 years, and lasted from B.C. 975 to B.C. 586. (See Bernhardy, *De causis quibus effectum sit quod regnum Judæ diutius persisteret quam regn. Israel*, in the *Annal. Acad. Groning.* 1822-23, p. 124 sq.; also Lovan. 1824; Schmeidler, *Der Untergang d. Reichs Juda*, Bresl. 1831.)

V. *History.*—For the circumstances that led to the schism, and for a comparison with the history of the rival kingdom, see ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF. For a further examination of the many chronological difficulties arising from the double list of kings, see CHRONOLOGY. The annals of the kingdom will be found detailed under the name of the several kings, and a general view under the articles JERUSALEM, and PALESTINE. (See White, *Kings of Judah and Israel*, Lond. 1863; Hervey, *Biographies of Kings of Judah*, Lond. 1865; Hess, *Geschichte der Könige Juda und Israel*, Zürich, 1787; also *Gesch. der Regenten Juda nach dem Exil*, ib. 1788.) It will be sufficient, as a *resumé*, here to notice the fact that the kingdom of Judah, in the course of its history, acted upon three different lines of policy in succession.

1. *Animosity against the rival Kingdom of Israel.*—The first three kings of Judah seem to have cherished the hope of re-establishing their authority over the Ten

Tribes; for sixty years there was war between them and the kings of Israel. Neither the disbanding of Rehoboam's forces by the authority of Shemaiah, nor the pillage of Jerusalem by the irresistible Shishak, served to put an end to the fraternal hostility. The victory achieved by the daring Abijah brought to Judah a temporary accession of territory. Asa appears to have enlarged it still further, and to have given so powerful a stimulus to the migration of religious Israelites to Jerusalem that Baasha was induced to fortify Ramah with a view to checking the movement. Asa provided for the safety of his subjects from invaders by building, like Rehoboam, several fenced cities; he repelled an alarming irruption of an Ethiopian horde, he hired the armed intervention of Benhadad I, king of Damascus, against Baasha; and he discouraged idolatry and enforced the worship of the true God by severe penal laws. (See Junge, *Bella inter Judam et Israel.* Tüb. 1716.)

2. *Resistance (generally in Alliance with Israel) to Damascus.*—Hanani's remonstrance (2 Chron. xvi, 7) prepares us for the reversal by Jehoshaphat of the policy which Asa pursued towards Israel and Damascus. A close alliance sprang up with strange rapidity between Judah and Israel. For eighty years, till the time of Amaziah, there was no open war between them, and Damascus appears as their chief and common enemy, though it rose afterwards from its overthrow to become, under Rezin, the ally of Pekah against Ahaz. Jehoshaphat, active and prosperous, repelled nomad invaders from the desert, curbed the aggressive spirit of his nearer neighbors, and made his influence felt even among the Philistines and Arabians. A still more lasting benefit was conferred on his kingdom by his persevering efforts for the religious instruction of the people and the regular administration of justice. The reign of Jehoram, the husband of Athaliah, a time of bloodshed, idolatry, and disaster, was cut short by disease. Ahaziah was slain by Jehu. Athaliah, the granddaughter of a Tyrian king, usurped the blood-stained throne of David, till the followers of the ancient religion put her to death, and crowned Jehoash, the surviving scion of the royal house. His preserver, the high-priest, acquired prominent personal influence for a time; but the king fell into idolatry, and failing to withstand the power of Syria, was murdered by his own officers. The vigorous Amaziah, flushed with the victory of Edom, provoked a war with his more powerful contemporary Jehoash, the conqueror of the Syrians, and Jerusalem was entered and plundered by the Israelites. But their energies were sufficiently occupied in the task of completing the subjugation of Damascus. Under Uzziah and Jotham, Judah long enjoyed political and religious prosperity till the wanton Ahaz, surrounded by united enemies, with whom he was unable to cope, became in an evil hour the tributary and vassal of Tiglath-Pileser.

3. *Deference. perhaps Vassalage, to the Assyrian King.*—Already in the fatal grasp of Assyria, Judah was yet spared for a checkered existence of almost another century and a half after the termination of the kingdom of Israel. The effect of the repulse of Sennacherib, of the signal religious revivals under Hezekiah and Josiah, and of the extension of these kings' salutary influence over the long-severed territory of Israel, was apparently done away by the ignominious reign of the impious Manasseh, and the lingering decay of the whole people under the four feeble descendants of Josiah. Provoked by their treachery and imbecility, their Babylonian master, who had meanwhile succeeded to the dominion of the Assyrians, drained, in successive deportations, all the strength of the kingdom. The consummation of the ruin came upon them in the destruction of the Temple by the hand of Nebuzaradan, amid the wailing of prophets and the taunts of heathen tribes released at length from the yoke of David.

VI. *Moral State.*—The national life of the Hebrews appeared to become gradually weaker during these successive stages of history, until at length it seemed extinct; but there was still, as there had been all along, a spiritual life hidden within the body. It was a time of hopeless darkness to all but those Jews who had strong faith in God, with a clear and steady insight into the ways of Providence as interpreted by prophecy. The time of the division of the kingdoms was the golden age of prophecy. In each kingdom the prophetical office was subject to peculiar modifications which were required in Judah by the circumstances of the priesthood, in Israel by the existence of the house of Baal and the altar in Bethel. If, under the shadow of the Temple, there was a depth and a grasp elswhere unequalled, in the views of Isaiah and the prophets of Judah; if their writings touched and elevated the hearts of thinking men in studious retirement in the silent night-watches, there was also, in the few burning words and energetic deeds of the prophets of Israel, a power to tame a lawless multitude and to check the high-handed tyranny and idolatry of kings. The organization and moral influence of the priesthood were matured in the time of David; from about that time to the building of the second Temple the influence of the prophets rose and became predominant. Some historians have suspected that after the reign of Athaliah, the priesthood gradually acquired and retained excessive and unconstitutional power in Judah. The recorded facts scarcely sustain the conjecture. Had it been so, the effect of such power would have been manifest in the exorbitant wealth and luxury of the priests, and in the constant and cruel enforcement of penal laws, like those of Asa, against irreligion. But the peculiar offences of the priesthood, as witnessed in the prophetic writings, were of another kind. Ignorance of God's word, neglect of the instruction of the laity, untruthfulness, and partial judgments, are the offences specially imputed to them, just such as might be looked for where the priesthood is a hereditary caste and irresponsible, but neither ambitious nor powerful. When the priest either, as was the case in Israel, abandoned the land, or, as in Judah, ceased to be really a teacher, ceased from spiritual communion with God, ceased from living sympathy with man, and became the mere image of an intercessor, a mechanical performer of ceremonial duties little understood or heeded by himself, then the prophet was raised up to supply some of his deficiencies, and to exercise his functions so far as was necessary. Whilst the priests sink into obscurity and almost disappear, except from the genealogical tables, the prophets come forward appealing everywhere to the conscience of individuals—in Israel as wonder-workers, calling together God's chosen few out of an idolatrous nation, and in Judah as teachers and seers, supporting and purifying all that remained of ancient piety, explaining each mysterious dispensation of God as it was unfolded, and promulgating his gracious spiritual promises in all their extent. The part which Isaiah, Jeremiah, and other prophets took in preparing the Jews for their captivity, cannot, indeed, be fully appreciated without reviewing the succeeding efforts of Ezekiel and Daniel. But the influence which they exercised on the national mind was too important to be overlooked in a sketch, however brief, of the history of the kingdom of Judah. See PROPHET.

JUDAH, MOUNTAINS OF. This is appropriately the name of a range of hills to the south and west of Jerusalem, styled in Luke i, 39, 65, the "hill-country of Judæa" (ἡ ὀρεινὴ τῆς Ἰουδαίας). The hills are low and conical, uniform in shape even to weariness; the vegetation, save in early spring, is dry and parched, the valleys are broad and featureless. Everywhere at the present day are signs that the land of corn, and wine, and oil has become desolate. The fenced cities and villages surmount the hills, but they are in ruins; the terraces where once were vineyards and cornfields can be traced along the mountain sides, but they are neglected; wells and pools of water are to be found in every valley, but there is none to drink of them. See JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

JUDAH, Wilderness of. The desert of Judah (מִדְבַּר יְהוּדָה) is mentioned in the title of Psa. lxiii, and the desert of Judæa (αἱ ἔρημαι, or ἡ ἔρημος τῆς Ἰουδαίας), frequently referred to in the gospels, is considered to be the same locality. It was situated adjacent to the Dead Sea and the River Jordan, and was a mountainous and thinly-inhabited tract of country, but abounding in pastures. In the time of Joshua it had six cities, with their villages (Josh. xv, 61, 62), but it is now, and has long been, one of the most dreary and desolate regions of the whole country (Robinson's *Researches*, ii, 202, 310). The positions of this desert specially alluded to in the N. T. are, (1.) That in which John the Baptist grew up, probably west of the Dead Sea (Luke i, 80; iii, 2); (2.) That where he baptized, i. e. the uninhabited tract along the Jordan (Matt. iii, 1; Mark i, 4; compare 5); (3.) That where Jesus was tempted, perhaps the high desert west of Jericho (Matt. iv, 1; Mark i, 12, 13); (4.) The tract between the Mount of Olives and Jericho, probably referred to in Acts xxi, 38 (see Josephus, *Ant.* xx, 8, 6); (5.) The tract adjacent to the city Ephraim, probably Tayibeh, towards the Jordan (John xi, 54). See Judah, tribe of.

JUDAH UPON JORDAN (יְהוּדָה הַיַּרְדֵּן, *Judah of the Jordan;* Sept. and Vulg. in most editions omit "Judah" altogether), is mentioned as the extreme eastern limit of the territory of Naphtali (but not within it), apparently on its northern boundary (Josh. xix, 34), and therefore probably referring to a tract immediately east of that around the sources of the Jordan, between Mount Hermon and Banias. Schwarz (*Palestine*, p. 185) plausibly explains the application of the name of Judah to a region so far distant from the territory of that tribe by assigning it as the title to the Gileaditish district embraced in the circuit of the towns of *Havoth-Jair*, i. e. the villages of Jair, who was a descendant of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 21); and he adduces Talmudical authorities for reckoning his possessions as a part of that tribe. See Jair. The same explanation had been suggested by C. von Raumer (cited by Keil, *Comment. on Josh.* ad loc.). Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, i, 389 sq.) speaks of three interesting domes in this vicinity, called those of *Seid Yehuda* (i. e. "Lord Judah," the Arabs traditionally holding that they represent the tomb of the son of Jacob), which he believes is a clew to the connection of this city with the tribe of the same name.

Tombs of "Seid Yehuda."

2. One of the Levites who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 8). B.C. 536. It is perhaps he whose sons are alluded to (but unnamed) as aiding the priests in pushing the reconstruction of the Temple (Ezra iii, 9); unless this latter be rather the person elsewhere called Hodaviah (Ezra ii, 40).

3. One of those who followed the half of the Jewish chiefs around the southern section of the newly-erected walls of Jerusalem, but whether he was a Levite or priest is not stated (Neh. xii, 34). B.C. 446.

4. One of those who accompanied with musical performances the procession around the southern quarter of the walls of Jerusalem lately reconstructed (Neh. xii, 36). B.C. 446. He was perhaps identical with the preceding.

5. Son of Senuah, a descendant of Benjamin, and prefect of Acra or the Lower City (עַל־הָעִיר מִשְׁנֶה, *over the second city*, not "second over the city," as the Auth. Vers. following the Sept. and Vulg.) after the exile (Neh. xi, 9). B.C. cir. 440.

Judah hak-Kodesh, or *the Holy*, son of Simon, of the tribe of Benjamin, and a descendant of Hillel I, is one of the most celebrated characters in Jewish history. He was born at Tiberias, according to accounts, about 135, on the same day on which Rabbi Akiba suffered martyrdom—an event predicted, according to his admirers, in the verse of Solomon: "One sun ariseth, and one sun goeth down." While yet a youth he was, on account of his extraordinary proficiency in Jewish law, admitted to the Sanhedrim, and on the death of his father followed him in the presidency of that learned body. The manner in which he administered the duties of this high office was in itself sufficient to win for him "the praise of his people in all their generations." Maimonides describes him as having been a man so nobly gifted by the Almighty with the choicest endowments as to be the phœnix and ornament of his age. But the best evidence of the high estimation in which his contemporaries held him is afforded by the many favorable epithets which they fastened on him. Besides the title of *Nasi*, which his position as president of the Sanhedrim secured him, he was more generally known as "Rabbi," which was applied to him κατ' ἐξοχήν, with no further note of individual distinction. He was known as the "saint," the "holy one," the meek. Being, like Hillel I, of the house of David, he sometimes was, as Bar-Cocheba had previously been, looked upon as the promised Messiah. But this opinion was, after all, confined only to a few. Certain it is, however, that he exerted an influence over the Jewish nation of his day far wider and more powerful in its extent than had ever fallen to the lot of any Nasi, even any member of his house since the days of Hillel. This may be due perhaps not so much to his vast erudition as to his wealth, which enabled him to become the supporter of hundreds and thousands of poor youths, who, after they had sat at his feet, went out all over the Jewish abodes to sound aloud the praises of their noble master and teacher in Israel. But Judah hak-Kodesh has far greater claims for our consideration: he has built himself a far more enduring monument as the Moses of later Rabbinism (q. v.), as the compiler of the Mishna (q. v.), or code of traditional law, the embodiment of all the authorized interpretations of the Mosaic law, the traditions, the decisions of the learned, and the precedents of the courts or schools—a sort of *Jewish Pandects*. "In attempting this Herculean task," says Eth-

eridge (*Introd. Jewish Lit.* p. 88), "he may have been moved by the peculiar condition of the Jewish community. They were a scattered people, liable at any hour to the renewal of a wasting persecution, and maintaining their religious standing in the presence of an ever-advancing Christianity, and in defiance of the menaces of a world which always viewed them with hatred. Their schools, tolerated to-day, might to-morrow be under the imperial interdict, and the lips of the Rabbins, which now kept the knowledge of the law, become dumb by the terror of the oppressor. These circumstances possessed him with the apprehension that the traditional learning received from their fathers would, without a fixed memorial, at no distant time be either greatly corrupted or altogether perish from among them. It was his wish also to furnish the Hebrew people with such a documentary code as would be a sufficient guide for them, not only in the affairs of religion, but also in their dealings with one another in civil life, so as to render it unnecessary for them to have recourse to suits at law at the heathen tribunals. In addition to these motives, he was probably actuated also by the prevailing spirit of codification, which was one of the characteristics of the age. Legal science was in the ascendant, and the great law-schools of Rome, Berytus, and Alexandria were in their meridian; and Judah, who loved his law better than they could theirs, wished to give it the same advantages of simplification, system, and immutability which such jurists as Salvius Julianus had accomplished for the Roman laws in the time of Hadrian, and Ulpian was laboring at in his own day." The Mishna is divided into six parts (*sedarim*): the first treats of agriculture, the second of festivals, the third of marriages, the fourth of civil affairs, the fifth of sacrifices and religious ceremonies, and the sixth of legal purification. The text was published with short glosses at Amsterdam (1631, 8vo), and often reprinted, with more or less extensive commentaries, at Amsterdam, Venice, Constantinople, etc. (See a list of the editions, translations, etc., in Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica.*) His last days Judah hak-Kodesh spent at Sepphoris, whither he removed on account of his failing health. The exact date of his death is not known, but it must have occurred between 190 and 194. He is frequently spoken of as a friend and contemporary of one of the emperors Antoninus, generally supposed to be Marcus Aurelius, but Grätz and other critics are inclined to doubt the possibility of an intimate relation between this head of the Jewish Church and a Roman emperor. See, however, Bodeck, *M. A. Antoninus als Freund u. Zeitgenosse des R. Jehuda ha-Nasi* (Lpz. 1868); *Contemp. Rev.* 1869, p. 81 sq.; Grätz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, iv, 246 sq. See also Schneeberger, *Life and Works of Rabbi Jehuda ha-Nasi* (Berl. 1870); Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, ii, 425 sq. (J. H. W.)

Judah Judghan, THE PERSIAN, one of the most celebrated of the Karaites, afterwards himself the founder of an independent Jewish sect, flourished probably about the first half of the 9th century, in the city Hamadan, in Persia. His opponents say of him that he was of low descent, and that his early years were spent as a tender of camels, but the learning he displayed and his intimate knowledge of Mohammedanism make this report doubtful. We know nothing definitely of him until he appeared before his countrymen with the declaration that he was the forerunner of the Messiah, and preached the doctrine of free-will, and non-intervention of God in mundane affairs. He also argued that Sabbaths and festivals were no longer to be kept, as they had been done away with by the dispersion of the chosen people, enjoining, however, at the same time, a life of strict asceticism. Preaching, as he did, under the very shadow of Mohammedanism, doctrines very much akin to it (comp. MUTAZILITES), he found ready converts, and his followers increased rapidly. They continued faithful even after his decease, believing (like the Shiites of Ali) that he did not die a natural death, and that he was to reappear and give to Judaism a new law. The *Mushkhanites* (q. v.) may be considered as a branch of this sect. For further details, see Fürst, *Geschichte d. Karäerthums*, p. 26 sq.; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, v, 227 sq., 516 sq. (J. H. W.)

Judah (or **Judä**), **Leo**, one of the Swiss reformers, was born at Germar, in Alsace, in 1482. His father's name was John Jud, but whether of Jewish descent, Leo himself tells us he was unable to say. The name, however, exposed him to reproach, and perhaps for this reason we find him sometimes designating himself as *Leo Keller;* in Zürich he was known as Meister *Löw*, and this name his descendants adopted. He was educated for the medical profession, but through the influence of Zwingle forsook this for the clerical. He succeeded the latter in the church of Notre Dame des Eremites, and finally became his associate at Zürich. Together they entered zealously on their work of reform, and Judah contributed no little to the spreading and propagating of Zwinglian ideas. With the great reformer he appeared at the second conference in Zürich (1523), and together they replied to all who defended the worship of images and the celebration of the mass as a sacrifice. Judah died June 19, 1542. He made a translation of the greater part of the Old Testament from the Hebrew text, and also of the New from the Greek. It was completed by Bibliander and Peter Cholin, and reviewed by Pellicanus (Zürich, 1543; reprinted at Paris, with the Vulgate, in 1545). See GERMAN VERSIONS. Of his original productions, his *Catechism* (1534, Latin and German) is the most noted. He translated the writings of Zwingle and Luther. See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* vi, 365; Kitto, *Cyclop.* s. v.

Judaism, the name by which we designate the religious doctrines and rites of the people chosen by Jehovah as his peculiar people; the descendants of Jacob, to whom the law was given by Moses, and religious light and truth were revealed in the Old Testament; the most important branch of that family of nations conventionally comprised under the title of Shemites —a people of many fates and of many names, called by the Bible the people of God; by Mohammed, the people of the Book; by Hegel, "the people of the *Geist*," and now generally known as *Hebrews*, *Israelites*, or *Jews*.

Abrahamism.—To the Christian student especially, the early development of the doctrines of this people is interesting, as unfolded in the pages of the older half of the inspired writings that go to make up the basis of his own creed. Judaism is pre-eminently a monotheistic faith, originating with the patriarch Abraham when, in an æra of polytheism and flagrant vice, he became the founder of monotheism by a prompt recognition and worship of the one living and *true* God; and from that remote day to this, all the Jewish people pride themselves in being "children of Abraham." It is a fact striking to every student of comparative religion, and in no small degree a proof of the authenticity of the O.-T. Scriptures, that this monotheistic faith originated at a time when the religion of all other branches of the same family, which, with the Hebrew, make up the Shemitic, differed widely from it in every respect. The Assyrians, Babylonians, Phœnicians, and Carthaginians all possessed a nearly identical religion, but one that lacked the essential feature of Judaism. They all, it is true, believed in a supreme god, called by the different names of Ilu, Bel, Set, Hadad, Moloch, Chemosh, Jaoh, El, Adon, Asshur, but they also all believed in subordinate and secondary beings, emanations from this supreme being, his manifestations to the world, rulers of the planets; and, like other pantheistic religions, the custom prevailed among these Shemitic nations of promoting first one and then another deity to be the supreme object of worship. Among the Assyrians, as among the Egyptians, the gods were often arranged in triads, as that of Anu, Bel, and Ao. Anu or Oannes wore the head of a fish; Bel wore the horns of a bull; Ao was represented by a serpent. These religions, in short, represented the gods as the

Spirit within and behind natural objects and forces—powers within the world, rather than, as among the Hebrews, a Spirit above the world. The Hebrews' God was a God above nature, not simply in it. He stood alone, unaccompanied by secondary deities. His worship required purity, not pollution; its aim was holiness, and its spirit humane, not cruel. Monotheistic from the first, it became an absolute monotheism in its development. In all the Shemitic nations, behind the numerous divine beings representing the powers of nature there was, it is true, dimly visible one supreme Being, of whom all these were emanations; but there was also among all of them, except the Hebrew branch, a tendency to lose sight of *the first great Cause*, the very reverse of the tendency of the faith of Abraham, whose soul rose to the contemplation of the perfect Being, above all and the source of all. With passionate love he adored this most high God, maker of heaven and earth. Such was his devotion to this almighty Being, that men said, "Abraham is the friend of the most high God." The difference, then, between the religion of Abraham and that of the polytheistic nations was, that while they descended from the idea of a supreme Being into that of subordinate ones, he went back to that of the supreme, and clung to this with his whole soul (Clark, *Ten great Religions*, chap. x). See ABRAHAM.

Mosaism.—This abstract faith continued to be the faith of the Israelites until it was transformed at Mount Sinai by the Lord himself, through his chosen servant Moses. Thereafter the Abrahamic idea was clothed in forms rendered necessary not only by the character of the age, but also by the frailty of men, to the generality of whom hitherto ceremonies had been absolutely essential. From the "Mosaic Revelation," as Dean Stanley (*Jewish Ch.*, First Series, Lect. vii) calls it, dates the establishment not only of the Judaic principle itself, but of the *Theocracy* (see Josephus, *Apion*, ii, 17). Thenceforth the followers of Abraham not only worshipped the one "supreme Being," but they were governed by him; i. e. from the converse of Moses with the Lord dates the ultimate union of the Jewish Church and State—the corelation of life and religion, of the nation and the individual. See MOSES; LAW.

Prophetism.—Surrounded by idolaters on all sides, with whom they were brought in contact continually, the Hebrews gradually disobeyed the commandments of Sinai until idolatry destroyed all personal morality, and the chosen people knew not their Lord. To save the race from utter apostasy, holy men were inspired by the Lord to make known the penalty of idolatry and immorality. Amid the trials and sore afflictions with which he visits the nation, he yet declares the perpetuity of the Jewish faith. A Messiah shall eventually gather in the people, and to the Lord alone shall service be rendered. See MESSIAH. Though the present plant shall wither, the seed shall continue to live, from whose germination shall spring a flower of greater fragrance in the fulness of time. All through the captivity among the Assyrians and Babylonians, even after the destruction of the Temple, the life of the seed was attested by the fruit it bore. See CAPTIVITY; PROPHECY.

Rabbinism.—When the political existence of the Jews was annihilated, they nerved themselves, with that determination characteristic of the Hebrew race, for another and more determined strife. In consequence of their dispersion as a nation, after the Babylonian exile the Mosaic constitution could be but partially re-established. "The whole building was too much shattered, and its fragments too widely dispersed, to reunite in their ancient and regular form." But from his captivity the Jew had brought with him a reverential, or, rather, a passionate attachment to the Mosaic law and the consecration of the second Temple, and the re-establishment of the state had been accompanied by the ready and solemn recognition of the law. The synagogue was instituted, and with it many of the institutions which have tended to perpetuate Judaism to the present hour. One of the most important of these was the constant interpretation of the law and the prophets; and as the acquaintance with the law became more intimate, the attachment to it grew deeper and deeper in the national character, until it finally was not only their Bible and statute-book, but a guide for the most minute details of common life. "But no written law can provide for all possible exigencies; whether general and comprehensive, or minute and multifarious, it equally requires the expositor to adapt it to the immediate case which may occur, either before the public tribunal or that of the private conscience. Hence the law became a deep and intricate study. . . . Learning in the law became the great distinction to which all alike paid reverential homage. Public and private affairs depended on the sanction of this self-formed spiritual aristocracy. . . Every duty of life, of social intercourse between man and man, not to speak of its weightier authority as the national code of criminal and civil jurisprudence, was regulated by an appeal to the book of the law" (Milman, *History of the Jews*, ii, 417). Thus arose the office of the rabbis—the clergy, the learned interpreters of the law, the public instructors, to whom, by degrees, also the spiritual authority was transferred from the priesthood. At this time, also, besides the inspired Scriptures, traditional writings became another ground of authority over the public mind. See TRADITION. This was not, however, as universally acknowledged, and gave rise to that schism in Judaism which originated the *Karaites* (q. v.). Thus Judaism had fortified itself after the captivity, so that when the Temple was finally again destroyed, and public worship became extinct, Rabbinism was able to supplant the original religion of the Jews, and from amid the blackened walls of Jerusalem rose, ere the smoke of the ruins had yet ceased, a new bond of national union, the great distinctive feature in the character of modern Judaism. With the Masora (q. v.) also came soon after the Mishna (q. v.) and the Gemara, which together form the Babylonian Talmud [see TALMUD], that wonderful monument of human industry—formulated Mosaism—which to the Jew "became the magic circle within which the national mind patiently labored for ages in performing the bidding of the ancient and mighty enchanters, who drew the sacred line beyond which it might not venture to pass" (Milman), and which so securely enwrapped the Jewish idea in almost infinite rules and laws that it completely sheltered it from polluting contact in the succeeding dark ages. It is thus that Judaism, weathering many a long and severe storm, has continued to prosper, and flourishes even in our own day.

Sects.—In the early age of Judaism we saw that the simple worship of a supreme Being constituted its peculiar characteristic. At that time, as a sign of the covenant of Abraham with the Lord, the rite of *circumcision* (q. v.) was introduced, and was soon followed by the formal institution of sacrifice. In the period of Mosaism the Jewish belief became an established form of religion, and then were introduced certain ceremonies and feast days, together with the priesthood. In the Rabbinic period, as the law became overlaid by tradition, discussions arose, and the Jews were divided into three principal sects—the Pharisees (q. v.), who placed religion in external ceremony; the Sadducees (q. v.), who were remarkable for their incredulity; and the Essenes (q. v.), whose peculiar distinction was the practice of austere sanctity. Still later sprang up other sects; prominently among these are the *Karaites*, the strict adherents to the letter of the law, the opponents of rabbinical interpretations. For a review of Jewish literature, see RABBINISM.

Modern Judaism.—In the history of the Jews (q. v.) we have seen how greatly the condition of this people was ameliorated about the close of the 18th century by the influence of Moses Mendelssohn. But not only in their civil condition did his efforts affect the Jews; he also greatly changed the character of Judaism itself. With him originated a tendency of thought and action,

which has since spread among the leaders of Judaism generally, to weaken rabbinical authority, and to maintain a more simple Biblical Judaism. These have now been developed into two special phases of Jewish opinion, which are represented by the terms "*Conservative*" (or Moderate Orthodox) and "*Reformed*" (or Liberal) Judaism. (See each of these titles below.)

General Creed.—A summary of the religious views of the Jews was first compiled in the 11th century by the second great Moses (Maimonides), and it continues to be with the Orthodox the Jewish confession of faith to the present day. It is as follows:

1. I believe, with a true and perfect faith, that God is the creator (whose name be blessed), governor, and maker of all creatures; and that he hath wrought all things, worketh, and shall work forever.
2. I believe, with perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed) is one; and that such a unity as is in him can be found in none other; and that he alone hath been our God, is, and forever shall be.
3. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed) is not corporeal, not to be comprehended with any bodily properties; and that there is no bodily essence that can be likened unto him.
4. I believe, with a perfect faith, the Creator (whose name be blessed) to be the first and the last; that nothing was before him, and that he shall abide the last forever.
5. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed) is to be worshipped, and none else.
6. I believe, with a perfect faith, that all the words of the prophets are true.
7. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the prophecies of Moses our master (may he rest in peace!) were true; that he was the father and chief of all wise men that lived before him, or ever shall live after him.
8. I believe, with a perfect faith, that all the law which at this day is found in our hands was delivered by God himself to our master Moses (God's peace be with him!).
9. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the same law is never to be changed, nor any other to be given us of God (whose name be blessed).
10. I believe, with a perfect faith, that God (whose name be blessed) understandeth all the works and thoughts of men, as it is written in the prophets; he fashioneth their hearts alike, he understandeth all their works.
11. I believe, with a perfect faith, that God (whose name be blessed) will recompense good to them that keep his commandments, and will punish them who transgress them.
12. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Messiah is yet to come; and although he retard his coming, yet I will wait for him till he come.
13. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the dead shall be restored to life when it shall seem fit unto God the creator (whose name be blessed, and memory celebrated without end. Amen).

Doctrine of Immortality.—In regard to the future life, they believe in reward and punishment, but, like the Universalists (q. v.), the Jews believe in the ultimate salvation of all men. Like the Roman Catholics [see PURGATORY], the Jews offer up prayers for the souls of their deceased friends (comp. Alger, *Hist. Doctr. Future Life*, chap. viii and ix).

Sacrifice.—Since the destruction of their Temple and their dispersion the sacrifices have been discontinued, but in all other respects the Mosaic dispensation is observed intact among the Orthodox Jews.

Worship.—Their divine worship consists in the reading of the Scriptures and prayer. But while they do not insist on attendance at the synagogue, they enjoin all to say their prayers at home, or in any place where circumstances may place them, three times a day—morning, afternoon, and evening; they repeat also blessings and particular praises to God, aside from them, at their meals and on many other occasions.

In their morning devotions they use the *phylacteries* (q. v.) and the *Talith*, except Saturdays, when they use the Talith only. See FRINGE.

Calendar.—The Jewish year is either *civil* or *ecclesiastical.* The civil year commences in the month of Tisri, which falls into some part of our September, on the view that the world was created on the first day of this month (Tisri). The ecclesiastical year commences about the vernal equinox, in the month of Nisan, the latter part of our month of March and the first half of April. The seventh month of the civil year they call the first of the ecclesiastical year, because this was enjoined upon them at their departure from Egypt (Numb. xxviii, 11). See CALENDAR.

Feast Days.—The feasts which they observe at present are the following: 1. *Passover*, on the 14th of Nisan, and lasting eight days. On the evening before the feast the first-born of every family observes a fast in remembrance of God's mercy toward the nation. They eat at this feast unleavened bread, and observe as strict holidays the two first and last days. 2. *Pentecost*, or the Feast of Weeks, falling seven weeks after the Passover, is at present celebrated only two days. 3. *Trumpets*, on the 1st and 2d of Tisri, of which the first is called New-year's day. On the second day is read the 22d chapter of Genesis, which gives an account of Abraham's offering of his son Isaac, and God's blessing on him and his seed. Then they blow the trumpet, or, more accurately, the *horn*, and pray, as usual, that God would bring them to Jerusalem. 4. *Tabernacles*, on the 15th of Tisri, and lasting nine days; the first and the last two days being observed as feast days, and the other four as days of labor. On the first day they take branches of palm, myrtle, willow, and citron bound together, and go around the altar or pulpit singing psalms, because this ceremony was formerly performed at their Temple. On the seventh day of the festival they take copies of the *torah*, or law of Moses, out of the ark, and carry them to the altar, and all the congregation follow in procession seven times around the altar, in remembrance of the Sabbatical year, singing the 29th Psalm. On the evening of this day the feast of *solemn assembly, or of rejoicing*, commences. They read passages from the law and the prophets, and entreat the Lord to be propitious to them, and deliver them from captivity. On the ninth day they repeat several prayers in honor of the law, and bless God for his mercy and goodness in giving it to them by his servant Moses, and read that part of the Scriptures which makes mention of his death. 5. *Purim*, on the 14th and 15th of Adar (or March), in commemoration of the deliverance from Haman (Esth. ix). The whole book of Esther is read repeatedly, with liberal almsgiving to the poor. 6. Besides these festivals appointed by Moses and Mordecai, they celebrate the *dedication of the altar*, in commemoration of the victory over Antiochus Epiphanes. This festival lasts eight days, and is appointed to be kept by lighting lamps. The reason they assign for this is that, at this purification and rededication of the Temple after the deliverance from Antiochus, there was not enough of pure oil left to burn one night, but that it miraculously lasted *eight* days, when they obtained a fresh supply. 7. *Expiation day*, the 10th day of Tisri, is observed by the Jews, though they have neither temple nor priest. Before the feast they seek to re-establish friendly relations with their neighbors, and, in short, do everything that may serve to evince the sincerity of their repentance. For twenty-four hours they observe a strict fast, and many a pious soul does not quit the synagogue during these long hours, but remains in prayer through the night. See FESTIVAL.

Mission and Preservation of the Jews.—The preservation of the Jews as a distinct nation, notwithstanding the miseries which they have endured for many ages, is a wonderful fact. The religions of other nations have depended on temporal prosperity for their duration; they have triumphed under the protection of conquerors, and have fallen and given place to others under a succession of weak monarchs. Paganism once overspread the known world, even where it no longer exists. The Christian Church, glorious in her martyrs, has survived the persecution of her enemies, though she cannot heal the wounds they have inflicted; but Judaism, hated and persecuted for so many centuries, has not merely escaped destruction, it has been powerful and flourishing. Kings have employed the severity of laws and the hand of the executioner to eradicate it, and a seditious populace have injured it by their massacres more than kings. Sovereigns and their subjects, pagans, Christians, and Mohammedans, opposed to each

other in everything else, have formed a common design to annihilate this nation without success. The bush of Moses has always continued burning, and never been consumed. The expulsion of the Jews from the great cities of kingdoms has only scattered them throughout the world. They have lived from age to age in wretchedness, and their blood has flowed freely in persecution; they have continued to our day, in spite of the disgrace and hatred which everywhere clung to them, while the greatest empires have fallen and been almost forgotten. Every Jew is at this moment a living witness to the Christian as to the authenticity of his own religion, an undeniable evidence that Christianity is the last revelation from God; and the patient endurance of the descendants of Abraham is an evidence that Providence has guarded them throughout all their miseries. Hence the Christian should regard with compassion a people so long preserved by this peculiar care amidst calamities which would have destroyed any other nation. "I would look at the ceremonies of pagan worship," says Dr. Richardson, "as a matter of little more than idle curiosity, but those of the Jews reach the heart. This is the most ancient form of worship in existence; this is the manner in which the God of heaven was worshipped when all the other nations in the world were sitting in darkness, or falling down to stocks and stones. To the Jews were committed the oracles of God. This is the manner in which Moses and Elias, David and Solomon, worshipped the God of their fathers; this worship was instituted by God himself. The time will come when the descendants of his ancient people shall join the song of Moses to the song of the Lamb, and, singing hosannas to the son of David, confess his power to save."

Restoration of the Jews.—The Jews, as is well known, deny the accomplishment of the prophecies in the person of Jesus. The Reformed Jews (see below) deny the promise of a personal Messiah altogether; but the orthodox, the greater part of the Jews, hold that the Messiah has not yet come, but that they will be redeemed at the *appointed time*, when he of whom the prophets spoke shall make his appearance in great worldly pomp and grandeur, subduing all nations, and restoring the sceptre of universal rule to the house of Judah. Then there shall reign universal peace and happiness in all the earth, never again to be interrupted, and to the Jewish fold shall return those of the flock that strayed into the Christian and Mohammedan folds; then idolatry shall cease in the world, and all men acknowledge the unity of God and his kingdom. (Comp. Zech. xiv, 9, "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one.) This restoration shall be effected, not on account of any merits of their own, but for the Lord's sake; so as to secure their own righteousness, and the perfection to which they shall attain after their deliverance. (Atonement for sin is made by the fulfilling of the law and by circumcision, and not, as the Christian holds, by the sacrifice of the Messiah.) For the Christian doctrine of the Restoration of the Jews, see RESTORATION.

JUDAISM, CONSERVATIVE. The gradual emancipation of the Jews in Germany, which, however, did not become final anywhere until 1848, and which was rendered complete in Bavaria so recently as 1866, insensibly diminished the influence of Talmudical studies and of Rabbinical lore as the paramount obligation of life. Compelled, happily, to bear their own share in their deliverance from oppression, the Jews became more and more attached to the land of their nativity, and more and more estranged from the traditional allegiance to the kingdom of Israel. Their love for Palestine, intense and impassioned as ever, has assumed a different form. Their union and fellowship no longer represented a nationality yearning to be released from captivity, but settled down into the indissoluble affection of race and a common faith, not inconsistent with ties of citizenship in the world.

In 1807, when Napoleon convened the so-called Jewish Sanhedrim, with a view of establishing the relations between the empire and the Jews resident in France, the first official and authoritative expression of the transformed Jewish sentiment was published. In effect, it was a defence of the Jew who had for centuries been denied the rights of man, and pronounced unfit for citizenship. It declared that the Jews of France recognise in the fullest sense the French people as their brethren; that France is their country; that the Jews of France recognise as paramount the laws of the land, and their religious tribunals have no authority in conflict with the civil courts and national laws; that the Talmud enjoins the pursuit of a useful trade and prohibits usury; that polygamy is forbidden and divorce permitted.

The Jews of France were equal to the promise of the Sanhedrim. They proved good citizens, and faithfully adhered to their distinct religious belief and practice. The chief rabbi of France has been recognised as of corresponding dignity with the archbishop of Paris, and in the distribution of state aid to ecclesiastical institutions the Jews have been admitted to their proportionate share. The Jews of France, like those of Great Britain and Holland, are Conservative. The form of worship has not materially changed to this day. The Portuguese ritual is followed at one of the Paris synagogues, as at London and Amsterdam. The German or Polish ritual is otherwise the rule.

In Great Britain, about the year 1842, the key-note of progress was struck by a Jewish congregation at London, followed by that of Manchester. There are now only two congregations in the United Kingdom denying the authority of the chief rabbi. In Great Britain, France, and Holland there exists a recognised ecclesiastical authority. The administration of religious affairs is conducted nearly upon the Episcopal system. The spirit of the churches in these three countries is extremely conservative. Nevertheless, great latitude is allowed to individual believers, and what would have been regarded as capital sins a century ago are considered trivial to-day. It may be said that the Jews have thoroughly assimilated themselves to the rest of the population. In France their conservatism is formal rather than substantial, and the nonconformist is treated with great liberality. That he violates the sanctity of the Jewish Sabbath is not necessarily a disqualification for high office in the congregation. The ministers are expected to live consistently with their professions; the laity are not sharply criticised. In England conservatism is decided, authoritative, uncompromising. Nonconformists are on sufferance, and are rarely allowed a voice in the administration of synagogual affairs. In Holland liberty has dealt kindly with the Jewish people, who are prominent in the state and in commerce, in science, in learning, and in art, and are at once conservative and tolerant in their religious views, while consistent in the conduct of the synagogue. There are successful Conservative colleges or theological seminaries at Paris, London, Amsterdam, Breslau, Berlin, and Wurzburg.

Conservative Judaism is paramount in Belgium and Italy, and has held its own in some parts of Austria also. The great Rapoport (q. v.) of Prague, one of the finest scholars of that century, may be regarded as the type of the intelligent Conservative Jew, who loved the Judaism of the past with fervor and intensity, but recognised as the duty of the present hour the preparation of his brethren for their place in the world at length grudgingly accorded them.

The Judaism of Poland and Russia, as of Palestine and the other Asiatic and the African countries, can scarcely be denominated Conservative. It is strictly stationary. Education has not yet been sufficiently diffused among the masses to enable them intelligently to comprehend the differences or points of unity in Judaism, conservative or progressive. The study of the Talmud is still pursued with ardor in every Polish village, but the spirit of Judaism is not as potent as the maintenance of

form or of scholastic authority. Conservative Judaism has no history in these countries, yet its scholars have done the world a service in the preservation of Hebrew literature, and in rescuing from oblivion ancient thought so peculiarly habited and disguised. It is worthy of note that the chief rabbi at Jerusalem preserves great state, and is regarded as a functionary of signal consequence, but the institutions of learning within his jurisdiction are mainly sustained by the benevolence of European and American Jews.

The Hebrews in the United States number about half a million. Their material progress has been extraordinary. They comprise at present some three hundred congregations, of which full one half came to this country only within the last twelve years. The synagogues rival the most beautiful and costly churches in the principal cities. In 1840 there were scarcely ten thousand Jews and not more than a dozen congregations in the United States. Their synagogues now number two hundred and fifty. The Conservative ministry is not strong. Only recently has any active interest been displayed in the higher Hebrew education, the preparation of candidates for clerical stations. Maimonides College, established in 1866 at Philadelphia, has not been successful in the number of students, although its faculty is scholarly and energetic. The Conservative pulpit is ably supplied in several synagogues of New York, Philadelphia, and New Orleans. In other cities the leading scholars are of the progressive or Reform school.

The policy of Conservative American Israelites does not favor ecclesiastical authority. Occasionally efforts have been made to perfect a union of synagogues, but they have uniformly failed when doctrinal or ritual questions were the points to be determined in convention. The tendency is clearly in favor of independent synagogues, united for purposes of a charitable, educational, or semi-political character—otherwise recognising no will or exposition of Jewish doctrine superior to that of their respective ministers or secular officials. The co-operative movements for aiding oppressed Israelites in foreign countries, and for repressing anticipated danger or checking legal discriminations at home, resulting in the establishment of the "Board of Delegates of American Israelites," are not confined to the Conservative or to the Progressive congregations. Doctrinal questions are eschewed in this organization, which is purely voluntary, and assumes no authority except what may be delegated from time to time to interpret the sentiments of American Israelites.

The Conservatives have of late years paid attention to religious education. Elementary schools are attached to most congregations, and in New York a society was formed in 1865 for the gratuitous instruction in Hebrew and in English of children whose parents are not attached to any synagogue, or are unable to contribute to its support. (M. S. I.)

JUDAISM, REFORMED, also called *progressive* or *modern* Judaism, is the Jewish religion as reformed in the 19th century in Germany, Austria, America, and in some congregations of France and England. The places of worship are called temples, distinguished from other Jewish synagogues by choir, organ, regular sermons, and part of the liturgy in the vernacular of the country, and in America also by family pews. The ministers of these temples are rabbis who have attained proficiency in Hebrew lore, and are graduates of colleges or universities; or preachers by the choice of the congregation, who are mostly autodedactic students; and cantors, capable of reading the divine service and leading the choir. In some congregations the offices of preacher and cantor are united in one person. Large congregations are conducted by the ordained rabbi and the cantor: the former is the expounder of the law, and the latter presides over the worship, and is also called *Hazan*, or *Reader* (q. v.). Every congregation elects secular officers to conduct the temporal affairs. The ministers are elected by the congregation for a stated period. A school for instruction in religion, Hebrew, and Jewish history is attached to every temple. Like all other Jews, the reformed also are unitarian in theology, and acknowledge the Old-Testament Scriptures as the divine source of law and doctrine, but reject the additional authority of the Talmud, in place of which they appeal to reason and conscience as the highest authority in expounding the Scriptures. They believe in the immortality of the soul, future reward and punishment, the perfectibility of human nature, the final and universal triumph of truth and righteousness. They reject the belief in the coming of a Messiah; the gathering of the Hebrew people to Palestine to form a separate government, and to restore the ancient polity of animal sacrifices and the Levitical priesthood; the resurrection of the body and the last judgment day; and the authority of the Talmud above any other collection of commentaries to the Bible. All these doctrines are expressed in their prayer-books and catechisms. Their hermeneutics is rationalistic. They reject the evidence of miracles, relying exclusively upon the internal evidence of the Scriptures, and the common consent of all civilized nations to the divinity of the scriptural laws and doctrines. Except in the case of Moses, of whom the Scriptures testify, "Mouth to mouth I speak unto him," the appearance and speaking of angels, as also the appearance and speaking of God, were subjective, in the vision, waking or dreaming, appearing objectively to the prophet, which was not the case in reality. In this respect they follow the guide of Moses Maimonides. See PHILOSOPHY, THEOLOGICAL, OF THE JEWS. In respect to doctrine, they hold that all religious doctrines must be taken from the Bible, and must be in harmony with the loftiest and purest conceptions of the Deity and humanity suggested by the Scriptures, and confirmed by reason and conscience. In respect to law, they hold that all laws contained in the Decalogue, expressed or implied, are obligatory forever, both in letter or spirit. All laws not contained in the Decalogue, expressed or implied, are local and temporal (although the principle expressed by some may be eternal) and could have been intended for certain times and localities only. These theories of Judaism were developed by various Jewish authors between the years 1000 and 1500; partly they are also in the ancient Rabbinical literature, but were dropped after 1500, and taken up again by the disciples and successors of Moses Mendelssohn toward the close of the last century, and gradually developed to the present system. (I. M. W.)

From a few late articles in the *Israelite* (Nov., 1871), by the distinguished writer of the above article on *Reformed Judaism*, we learn that he regards as the first reformer in the camp of Judaism the celebrated gaon Saadia (q. v.) ben-Joseph, of Fayum, who flourished in the first half of the 10th century; as the second, the famous body-physician of the caliph of Cairo, *Rambam*, "the classical Moses Maimonides." Of perhaps minor influence, but also as active in the field of reform, he introduces us next to Bechai ben-Joseph, of Saragossa, and Ibn-Gebirol (q. v.), of Malaga, who flourished in the 11th century. He even counts among the reformers the celebrated French rabbi Isaac, of Troyes, better known under the surname of *Rashi* (q. v.); and on the side of reform or progressive Judaism are also ranked by Dr. Wise the celebrated Jewish savants Judah ha-Levy (q. v.), Aben-Ezra (q. v.), and Abraham ben-David, the celebrated author of the *Emmeah Ramah* (Exalted Faith), who fell a victim to fanaticism in A.D. 1180 at Toledo, in Spain, and with whom close up the two centuries that elapsed between the appearance of Saadia and Maimonides, in which days "all [Jewish] philosophy had become peripatetic," the Jewish philosophical writers of this period considering their main object "the self-defence of Judaism on the one hand, and the expounding of the Bible and Talmud as rational as possible, in order to reconcile and harmonize faith and reason."

With the 13th century undoubtedly opens a new epoch in Judaism, for it is here that we encounter the great Jewish master mind Moses Maimonides, of whom it has been truly said that "from Moses [the lawgiver] to Moses [Mendelssohn] there was none like Moses [Maimonides]." Since the days of Ezra, no man has exerted so deep, universal, and lasting an influence on Jews and Judaism as this man, and we need not wonder that Orthodox, Conservative, and Reformed Jews alike lay claim to this master mind; but it must be confessed that, after all, he really belongs to the Progressive Jews only. It is true the creed drawn up by the second Moses is now the possession of all Jews, and the Orthodox cling to it with even more tenacity than the Conservatives and the Reformed, but his theologico-philosophical works gained authority mainly among the Reformed thinkers of the Judaistic faith. After that date, of course, Jewish literature abounds with names whose productions betray a rationalistic tendency, for "all Jewish thinkers up to date, Baruch Spinoza, Moses Mendelssohn, and the writers of the 19th century included, are more or less the disciples of Maimonides, so that no Jewish theologico-philosophical book, from and after 1200, can be picked up in which the ideas of Maimonides do not form a prominent part." In our own days the Reform movement first became very prominent. In Germany, where Judaism has always been strong on account of the high literary attainments of the German Jews, the separation between the Orthodox and Reformed, and the establishment of independent Reformed congregations first originated, and the celebrated Holdheim (q. v.) was among the first as pastor of a *temple* in 1846. Other Jewish rabbis of note, identified with the Reform movement in Germany, are Stein, of Frankfurt-on-the-Maine; Einhorn, now of New York City, Deutsch, now of Baltimore, Md.; and Ritter, the successor of Holdheim, and historian of the Reform agitation. In the U. States those prominently identified with the Reform question are Drs. Adler and Gutheim, of the Fifth Avenue Temple, New York City; Mr. Ellinger, editor of the *Jewish Times*, New York City; Dr. Lewin, of Brooklyn, editor of the *New Era;* Dr. Isaac M. Wise, editor of the *Israelite*, etc. See Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums u. s. Sekten*, iii, 349 sq.; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, x; Ritter, *Gesch. d. jüd. Reformation* (Berlin, 3 vols. 8vo); Geiger, *Judaism and its History*, Engl. trans. by M. Mayer (N.Y. 1870, 8vo); Astruc (the grand rabbi of Belgium), *Histoire abrégé des Juifs et de leur croyance* (Paris, 1869); Raphael, D. C. Lewin, *What is Judaism* (N.Y. 1871, 12mo); *New Era*, May, 1871, art. i; *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* April, 1869; Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Literature*, viii; *Atlantic Monthly*, Oct. 1870; and the works cited in the article Jews. (J. H. W.)

Judaizing Christians, a term frequently employed to designate a class of early Christians, of whom traces appear in the N.-T. epistles, and still more distinctly in the succeeding century. They are believed to have been converts from Judaism, who still clung to the Mosaic institutions, particularly circumcision. They appear to have been of two classes, some considering the ceremonial law as binding only upon Christians descended from the Jews, while others looked upon it as obligatory also for the heathen. The head-quarters of the Judaizing Christians is said to have been first at Antioch. The council held at Jerusalem decided that the heathen should not be subject to circumcision. The more zealous Judaizing Christians, thus opposed by the apostles, abandoned Palestine, and went about trying to convert the heathen to their views, but with little success. They were probably the "false apostles," persons "brought in unawares," etc., so often mentioned by Paul, and are known in history, the more moderate as Nazarenes (q. v.), the others as Ebionites (q. v.). See D. van Heyst, *De Jud. Christianismo* (1828).—Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, ix, 159.

Ju'das (Ἰούδας), the Græcized form of the Hebrew name *Judah*, and generally retained in the A. V. of the Apocrypha and N. T., as also in Josephus, where it occurs of a considerable number of men. See also Juda; Jude.

1. The patriarch Judah (q. v.), son of Jacob (Matt. i, 2, 3).

2. One of the Levites who renounced his Gentile wife after the captivity (1 Esdr. ix, 23); the Judah of Ezra x, 23.

3. The third son of Mattathias, and the leading one of the three Maccabæan brothers (1 Macc. ii, 4, etc.). See Maccabees.

4. The son of Calphi (Alphæus), a Jewish general under Jonathan Maccabæus (1 Macc. xi, 70).

5. A Jew occupying a conspicuous position at Jerusalem at the time of the mission to Aristobulus (q. v.) and the Egyptian Jews (2 Macc. i, 10). He is thought by some to have been the same with

6. An aged person, and a noted teacher among the Essenes at Jerusalem, famous for his art of predicting events, which was confirmed in a remarkable manner by the death of Antigonus (q. v.) at the order of his brother Aristobulus, as related by Josephus (*Ant.* xiii, 11, 2; *War*, i, 3, 5).

7. A son of Simon, and brother of John Hyrcanus (1 Macc. xvi, 2), murdered by Ptolemæus the usurper, either at the same time (B.C. cir. 135) with his father (1 Macc. xvi, 15 sq.), or shortly afterwards (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 8, 1; see Grimm, *ad Macc.* l. c.).—Smith.

8. Son of one Ezechias (which latter was famous for his physical strength), and one of the three principal bandits mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* xvii, 10, 2; *War*, ii, 4, 1) as infesting Palestine in the early days of Herod. This person, whom Whitson (ad loc.) regards as the Theudas (q. v.) of Luke (Acts x, 36), temporarily got possession of Sepphoris, in Galilee. What became of him does not particularly appear, but it may be presumed he shared the fate of the others named in the same connection.

9. Son of one Sariphæus, or Sepphoris, and one of the two eminent Jewish teachers who incited their young disciples to demolish the golden eagle erected by Herod over the Temple gate, an act of sedition for which the whole party were burned alive (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii, 6, 2-4; *War*, i, 33, 2-4).

10. A person surnamed "*the Galilæan*" (ὁ Γαλιλαῖος, Acts v, 37), so called also by Josephus (*Ant.* xviii, 1, 6; xx, 5, 2; *War*, ii, 8, 1), and likewise "*the Gaulonite*" (ὁ Γαυλονίτης, *Ant.* xviii, 1, 1). He was born at Gamala, a fortified city on the Sea of Galilee, in Lower Gaulonitis; and after the deposition of Archelaus, during the thirty-seventh year after the battle of Actium (Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 2, 1), i. e. A.D. 6, he excited a violent insurrection among the Jews, in concert with a well-known Pharisee named Sadok, against the Roman government exercised by the procurator Coponius, on occasion of a census levied by the emperor Augustus, asserting the popular doctrine that the Jews ought to acknowledge no dominion but that of God. He was destroyed, and his followers scattered by Cyrenius, then proconsul of Syria and Judæa. We also learn from Josephus that the scattered remnant of the party of Judas continued after his destruction to work on still in secret, and labored to maintain his free spirit and reckless principles among the people (Josephus, *War*, ii, 17, 7-19). (See E. A. Schulze, *Dissert. de Juda Galilæo ejusque secta*, Frankf. a. V. 1761; also in his *Exercit. philosoph. [illegible]* p. 104.) See Sicarii.

11. Son of Simon (John vi, 71; xiii, 2, 26), surnamed (always in the other Gospels) Iscariot, to distinguish him from the other apostle of the same name. See Jude. In addition to this epithet the Evangelists usually distinguish him by some allusion to his treachery toward his Master.

1. *Signification of the Surname.*—The epithet Iscariot (Ἰσκαριώτης) has received many interpretations more or less conjectural.

(1) From *Kerioth* (Josh. xv, 25), in the tribe of Judah, the Heb. אִישׁ קְרִיּוֹת, *Ish-Keriôth'*, passing into Ἰσκαριώτης in the same way as אִישׁ טוֹב—*Ish-Tob*, "a man of Tob"—appears in Josephus (*Ant.* vii, 6, 1) as Ἴστωβος. In connection with this explanation may be noticed the reading of some MSS. in John vi, 71, *ἀπὸ Καριώτου*, and that received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, which makes the name Iscariot belong to Simon, and not, as elsewhere, to Judas only. On this hypothesis, his position among the Twelve, the rest of whom belonged to Galilee (Acts ii, 7), would be exceptional; and this is perhaps an additional reason why this locality is noted. This is the most common and probable opinion. See KERIOTH.

(2) From *Kartha* (A.V. "Kartan," Josh. xxi, 32), in Galilee (so Ewald, *Gesch. Israels*, v, 321).

(3) As equivalent to *Issacharite*, or Ἰσαχαριώτης (Grotius on Matt. x, 4; Hermann, *Miscell. Groning.* iii, 598).

(4) From the *date-trees* (*καριωτίδες*) in the neighborhood of Jerusalem or Jericho (Bartolocci, *Bibl. Rabbin.* iii, 10; Gill, *Comm. on Matt.* x, 4).

(5) From אסקורטיא (=*scortea*, Gill, *l. c.*), a *leathern apron*, the name being applied to him as the bearer of the bag, and="Judas with the apron" (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb. in Matt.* x, 4).

(6) From אסכרא, *ascara*=strangling (angina), as given after his death, and commemorating it (Lightfoot, *l. c.*), or indicating that he had been subject to a disease tending to suffocation previously (Heinsius, in Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. Ἰούδας). This is mentioned also as a meaning of the name by Origen, *Tract. in Matt.* xxxv.

2. *Personal Notices.*—Of the life of Judas, before the appearance of his name in the lists of the apostles, we know absolutely nothing. It must be left to the sad vision of a poet (Keble, *Lyra Innocentium*, ii, 13) or the fantastic fables of an apocryphal Gospel (Thilo, *Cod. Apoc. N. T.*, *Evang. Infant.* c. 35) to portray the infancy and youth of the traitor. His call as an apostle implies, however, that he had previously declared himself a disciple. He was drawn, as the others were, by the preaching of the Baptist, or his own Messianic hopes, or the "gracious words" of the new teacher, to leave his former life, and to obey the call of the Prophet of Nazareth. What baser and more selfish motives may have mingled even then with his faith and zeal we can only judge by reasoning backwards from the sequel. Gifts of some kind there must have been, rendering the choice of such a man not strange to others, not unfit in itself, and the function which he exercised afterwards among the Twelve may indicate what they were. The position of his name, uniformly the last in the lists of the apostles in the Synoptic Gospels, is due, it may be imagined, to the infamy which afterwards rested on his name, but, prior to that guilt, it would seem that he externally differed in no marked particular from the other apostles, and he doubtless exercised the same mission of preaching and miracles as the rest (Matt. x, 4; xxvi, 14-47; Mark iii, 19; xiv, 10, 43; Luke vi, 16; xxii, 3, 47, 48; John vi, 71; xii, 4; xiii, 2, 26; xiv, 22; xviii, 2, 3). A.D. 27.

The germs (see Stier's *Words of Jesus*, at the passages where Judas is mentioned) of the evil, in all likelihood, unfolded themselves gradually. The rules to which the Twelve were subject in their first journey (Matt. x, 9, 10) sheltered him from the temptation that would have been most dangerous to him. The new form of life, of which we find the traces in Luke viii, 3, brought that temptation with it. As soon as the Twelve were recognised as a body, travelling hither and thither with their Master, receiving money and other offerings, and redistributing what they received to the poor, it became necessary that some one should act as the steward and almoner of the small society, and this fell to Judas (John xii, 6; xiii, 29), either as having the gifts that qualified him for it, or, as we may conjecture, from his character, because he sought it, or, as some have imagined, in rotation from time to time. The Galilæan or Judæan peasant (we have no reason for thinking that his station differed from that of the other apostles) found himself intrusted with larger sums of money than before (the three hundred denarii of John xii, 5 are spoken of as a sum which he might reasonably have expected), and with this there came covetousness, unfaithfulness, embezzlement. It was impossible after this that he could feel at ease with one who asserted so clearly and sharply the laws of faithfulness, duty, unselfishness; and the words of Jesus, "Have I not chosen you Twelve, and one of you is a devil?" (John vi, 70) indicate that even then, though the greed of immediate or the hope of larger gain kept him from "going back," as others did (John vi, 66), hatred was taking the place of love, and leading him on to a fiendish malignity. The scene at Bethany (John xii, 1-9; Matt. xxvi, 6-13; Mark xiv, 3-9) showed how deeply the canker had eaten into his soul. The warm outpouring of love calls forth no sympathy. He utters himself, and suggests to others, the complaint that it is a waste. Under the plea of caring for the poor he covers his own miserable theft.

The narrative of Matt. xvi, Mark xiv, places this history in close connection (apparently in order of time) with the fact of the betrayal. During the days that intervened between the supper at Bethany and the paschal or quasi-paschal gathering, he appeared to have concealed his treachery. He went with the other disciples to and fro from Bethany to Jerusalem, and looked on the acted parable of the barren and condemned tree (Mark xi, 20-24), and shared the vigils in Gethsemane (John xviii, 2). At the beginning of the Last Supper he is present, looking forward to the consummation of his guilt as drawing nearer every hour. All is at first as if he were still faithful. He is admitted to the feast. His feet are washed, and for him there are the fearful words, "Ye are clean, but not all." At some point during the meal (see below) come the sorrowful words which showed him that his design was known. "One of you shall betray me." Others ask, in their sorrow and confusion, "Is it I?" He, too, must ask the same question, lest he should seem guilty (Matt. xxvi, 25). He alone hears the answer. John only, and through him Peter, and the traitor himself, understand the meaning of the act which pointed out that he was the guilty one (John xiii, 26). After this there comes on him that paroxysm and insanity of guilt as of one whose human soul was possessed by the Spirit of Evil—"Satan entered into him" (John xiii, 27). The words, "What thou doest, do quickly," come as a spur to drive him on. The other disciples see in them only a command which they interpret as connected with the work he had hitherto undertaken. Then he completes the sin from which even those words might have drawn him back. He knows that garden in which his Master and his companions had so often rested after the weary work of the day. He comes, accompanied by a band of officers and servants (John xviii, 3), with the kiss which was probably the usual salutation of the disciples. The words of Jesus, calm and gentle as they were, showed that this was what embittered the treachery, and made the suffering it inflicted more acute (Luke xxii, 48).

What followed in the confusion of that night the Gospels do not record. Not many students of the N. T. will follow Heumann and archbishop Whately (*Essays on Dangers*) in the hypothesis that Judas was "the other disciple" that was known to the high-priest, and brought Peter in (comp. Meyer on John xviii, 15). It is probable enough, indeed, that he who had gone out with the high-priest's officers should return with them to wait the issue of the trial. Then, when it was over, came the reaction. The fever of the crime passed away. There came back on him the recollection of the sinless righteousness of the Master he had wronged (Matt. xxvii, 3). He feels a keen remorse, and the gold that had tempted him to it becomes hateful. He will get

rid of the accursed thing, will transfer it back again to those who with it had lured him on to destruction. They mock and sneer at the tool whom they have used, and then there comes over him the horror of great darkness that precedes self-murder. He has owned his sin with "an exceeding bitter cry," but he dares not turn, with any hope of pardon, to the Master whom he has betrayed. He hurls the money, which the priests refused to take, into the sanctuary (ναός) where they were assembled. For him there is no longer sacrifice or propitiation. He is "the son of perdition" (John xvii, 12). "He departed, and went and hanged himself" (Matt. xxvii, 5). He went "unto his own place" (Acts i, 25). A.D. 29. See below.

With the exception of the stories already mentioned, there are but few traditions that gather round the name of Judas. It appears, however, in a strange, hardly intelligible way in the history of the wilder heresies of the 2d century. The sect of Cainites, consistent in their inversion of all that Christians in general believed, was reported to have honored him as the only apostle that was in possession of the true *gnosis*, to have made him the object of their worship, and to have had a gospel bearing his name (comp. Neander, *Church Hist.* ii, 153; Irenæus, *adv. Hær.* i, 35; Tertullian, *De Præsc.* c. 47). For the apocryphal gospel (Epiphanius, *Hær.* xxxviii, 1), see Fabricius, *Codex. Apocr.* i, 352. See GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.

3. *Our Lord's Object in his Selection as an Apostle.*— The choice was not made, we must remember, without a prevision of its issue. "Jesus knew from the beginning . . . who should betray him" (John vi, 64); and the distinctness with which that evangelist records the successive stages of the guilt of Judas, and his Master's discernment of it (John xii, 4; xiii, 2, 27), leaves with us the impression that he, too, shrank instinctively (Bengel describes it as "singularis antipathia," *Gnomon N. Test.* on John vi, 64) from a nature so opposite to his own. We can hardly expect fully to solve the question why such a man was chosen for such an office, nor is it our province to sound all the depths of the divine purposes, yet we may, without presumption, raise an inquiry on this subject.

(1.) Some, on the ground of God's absolute foreknowledge, content themselves with saying, with Calvin, that the judgments of God are as a great deep, and with Ullmann (*Sündlosigk. Jesu*, p. 97), that Judas was chosen in order that the divine purpose might be accomplished through him. See PREDESTINATION.

(2.) Others, less dogmatic in their views, believe, with Neander (*Leben Jesu*, § 77), that there was a discernment of the latent germs of evil, such as belonged to the Son of Man, in his insight into the hearts of men (John ii, 25; Matt. ix, 4; Mark xii, 15), yet not such as to exclude emotions of sudden sorrow or anger (Mark iii, 5), or astonishment (Mark vi, 6; Luke vii, 9), admitting the thought "with men this is impossible, but not with God." Did he, in the depth of that insight, and in the fulness of his compassion, seek to overcome the evil which, if not conquered, would be so fatal? It gives, at any rate, a new meaning and force to many parts of our Lord's teaching to remember that they must have been spoken in the hearing of Judas, and may have been designed to make him conscious of his danger. The warnings as to the impossibility of a service divided between God and mammon (Matt. vi, 19-34), and the destructive power of the "cares of this world," and the "deceitfulness of riches" (Matt. xii, 22, 23), the pointed words that spoke of the guilt of unfaithfulness in the "unrighteous mammon" (Luke xvi, 11), the proverb of the camel passing through the needle's eye (Mark x, 25), must have fallen on his heart as meant specially for him. He was among those who asked the question, Who, then, can be saved? (Mark x, 26). Of him, too, we may say that, when he sinned, he was "kicking against the pricks," letting slip his "calling and election," frustrating the purpose of his Master in giving him so high a work, and educating him for it (compare Chrysostom, *Hom. on Matt.* xxvi, xxvii, *John* vi).

(3.) But to most persons these will appear to be arbitrary or recondite arguments. Important reasons of a more practical kind, we may be sure, were not wanting for the procedure, and they are not very far to seek. The presence of such a false friend in the company of his immediate disciples was needed, first of all, to complete the circle of Christ's trials and temptations. He could not otherwise have known by personal experience some of the sharpest wounds inflicted by human perverseness and ingratitude, nor exhibited his superiority to the evil of the world in its most offensive forms. But for the deceit and treachery of Judas he would not have been in all things tempted like his brethren. Then thus only could the things undergone by his great prototype David find their proper counterpart in him who was to enter into David's heritage, and raise from the dust David's throne. Of the things written in the Psalms concerning him—written there as derived from the depths of David's sore experience and sharp conflict with evil, but destined to meet again in a still greater than he—few have more affecting prominence given to them than those which relate to the hardened wickedness, base treachery, and reprobate condition of a false friend, whose words were smooth as butter, but whose actions were drawn swords, who ate of his meat, but lifted up the heel against him (comp. Psa. xli, 9, with John xiii, 18; and see AHITHOPHEL). Other prophecies also, especially two in Zechariah (x, 12, 13; xiii, 6), waited for their accomplishment on such a course of ingratitude and treachery as that pursued by Judas. Further, the relation in which this false but ungenial and sharp-sighted disciple stood to the rectitude of Jesus afforded an important reason for his presence and agency. It was well that those who stood at a greater distance from the Saviour failed to discover any fault in him; that none of them, when the hour of trial came, could convict him of sin, though the most watchful inspection had been exercised, and the most anxious efforts had been made to enable them to do so. But it was much more that even this bosom friend, who had been privy to all his counsels, and had seen him in his most unguarded moments, was equally incapable of finding any evil in him; he could betray Jesus to his enemies, but he could furnish these enemies with no proof of his criminality; nay, with the bitterness of death in his soul, he went back to testify to them that, in delivering up Jesus, he had betrayed innocent blood. What more conclusive evidence could the world have had that our Lord was indeed without spot and blameless? Finally, the appearance of such a person as Judas among the immediate attendants of Jesus was needed as an example of the strength of human depravity—how it can lurk under the most sacred professions, subsist in the holiest company, live and grow amid the clearest light, the most solemn warnings, the tenderest entreaties, and the divinest works. The instruction afforded by the incarnation and public ministry of the Son of God would not have been complete without such a memorable exhibition by its side of the darker aspects of human nature; the Church should have wanted a portion of the materials required for her future warning and admonition: and on this account also there was a valid reason for the calling of one who could act the shameful part of Judas Iscariot.

4. *Motives of Judas in the Betrayal of his Master.*— The Scripture account leaves these to conjecture (comp. Neander, *Leben Jesu*, § 264). The mere love of money may have been strong enough to make him clutch at the bribe offered him. He came, it may be, expecting more (Matt. xxvii, 15); he will take that. He has lost the chance of dealing with the three hundred denarii; it will be something to get the thirty shekels as his own. It may have been that he felt that his Master saw through his hidden guilt, and that he hastened on a crisis to avoid the shame of open detection. Mingled

with this there may have been some feeling of vindictiveness, a vague, confused desire to show that he had power to stop the career of the teacher who had reproved him. Had the words that spoke of "the burial" of Jesus, and the lukewarmness of the people, and the conspiracies of the priests, led him at last to see that the Messianic kingdom was not as the kingdoms of this world, and that his dream of power and wealth to be enjoyed in it was a delusion? (Ewald, *Gesch. Israels*, v, 441-446). There may have been the thought that, after all, the betrayal could do no harm, that his Master would prove his innocence, or by some supernatural manifestation effect his escape (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 886; and Whitby on Matt. xxvii, 4). Another motive has been suggested (compare Neander, *Leben Jesu*, l. c.; and Whately, *Essays on Dangers to Christian Faith*, discourse iii) of an entirely different kind, altering altogether the character of the act. Not the love of money, nor revenge, nor fear, nor disappointment, but policy, a subtle plan to force on the hour of the triumph of the Messianic kingdom, the belief that for this service he would receive as high a place as Peter, or James, or John—this it was that made him the traitor. If he could place his Master in a position from which retreat would be impossible, where he would be compelled to throw himself on the people, and be raised by them to the throne of his father David, then he might look forward to being foremost and highest in that kingdom, with all his desires for wealth and power gratified to the full. Ingenious as this hypothesis is, it fails for that very reason. It attributes to the grovelling peasant a subtlety in forecasting political combinations, and planning stratagems accordingly, which is hardly compatible with his character and learning, hardly consistent either with the pettiness of the faults into which he had hitherto fallen. It is characteristic of the wide, far-reaching sympathy of Origen that he suggests another motive for the suicide of Judas. Despairing of pardon in this life, he would rush on into the world of the dead, and there (γυμνῇ τῇ ψυχῇ) meet his Lord, and confess his guilt, and ask for pardon (*Tract. in Matt.* xxxv; comp. also Theophanes, *Hom.* xxvii, in Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. Ἰούδας). Of the other motives that have been assigned we need not care to fix on any one as that which singly led him on. Crime is, for the most part, the result of a hundred motives rushing with bewildering fury through the mind of the criminal.

5. The question has often been agitated whether Judas was present at the first celebration of the Lord's supper, or left the assembly before the institution actually took place; but with no very decisive result. The conclusion reached on either side has very commonly been determined by doctrinal prepossessions rather than by exegetical principles. The general consensus of patristic commentators gives an affirmative to the question of his partaking of the commemorative meal, that of modern critics a negative answer (comp. Meyer, *Comm. on John* xiii, 36). Of the three synoptic evangelists, Matthew and Mark represent the charge of an intention to betray on the part of Judas as being brought against him between the paschal feast and the supper, while Luke does not mention it till both feasts were finished; yet none of them say precisely when he left the chamber. From this surely it may be inferred that nothing very material depended on the circumstance. If Judas did leave before the commencement of the supper, it was plainly not because he was formally excluded, but because he felt it to be morally impossible to continue any longer in such company. As, however, it seems certain, from John xiii, 30, that he left the moment Jesus brought home the charge to him, and gave him the sop, and as it is next to certain that the feast then proceeding was not that of the supper, the probabilities of the case must be held to be on the side of his previous withdrawal. The requisitions of time, too, favor the same view; since, if Judas did not leave till so late as the close of both feasts, it is scarcely possible to conceive how he should have had time to arrange with the chief priests for proceeding with the arrest of Jesus that very night. The matter in this shape came alike on him and on them by surprise; fresh consultations, therefore, required to be held, fresh measures to be adopted; and these necessarily demanded time, to the extent at least of some hours.

6. *Alleged Discrepancy as to the Mode of Judas's Suicide.*—We have in Acts i another account than the above of the circumstances of his death, which some have thought it difficult to harmonize with that given by Matthew. There, in words which may have been spoken by Peter (Meyer, following the general *consensus* of interpreters), or may have been a parenthetical notice inserted by Luke (Calvin, Olshausen, and others), it is stated,

(1) That, instead of throwing the money into the Temple, he bought (ἐκτήσατο) a field with it. As to this point, it has been said that there is a kind of irony in Peter's words, "This was all he got." A better explanation is, that what was bought with his money is spoken of as bought by him (Meyer, ad loc.).

(2) That, instead of hanging himself, "falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." On this we have two methods of reconciliation: (*a*) That ἀπήγξατο, in Matt. xxvii, 5, includes death by some sudden spasm of suffocation (*angina pectoris?*), such as might be caused by the overpowering misery of his remorse, and that then came the fall described in the Acts (Suicer, *Thes.* s. v. ἀπάγχω; Grotius, Hammond, Lightfoot, and others). By some this has even been connected with the name Iscariot, as implying a constitutional tendency to this disease (Gill). (*b*) That the work of suicide was but half accomplished, and that, the halter breaking, he fell (from a fig-tree, in one tradition) across the road, and was mangled and crushed by the carts and wagons that passed over him. This explanation appears, with strange and horrible exaggerations, in the narrative of Papias, quoted by Œcumenius on Acts i, and in Theophylact. on Matt. xxvii. It is, however, but a reasonable supposition that (Judas being perhaps a corpulent man), the rope breaking or slipping, he fell (probably from some elevated place, see Hackett, *Illustra. of Script.* p. 266) with such violence that his abdomen burst with the fall.

(3) That for this reason, and not because the priests had bought it with the price of blood, the field was called Aceldama. But it may readily be supposed that the potter's field which the priests had bought was the same as that in which the traitor met so terrible a death. See ACELDAMA.

7. On the question of Judas's final salvation, it is difficult to see how any dispute could well arise in view of his self-murder (comp. 1 John iii, 15). But aside from this, two statements seem to mark his fate in the other world as distinctly a reprobate one.

(1.) His unmitigated remorse, as expressed in Matt. xxvii, 5. This passage has often been appealed to as illustrating the difference between μεταμέλεια and μετάνοια. It is questionable, however, how far the N.-Test. writers recognise that distinction (compare Grotius, ad loc.). Still more questionable is the notion that Matthew describes his disappointment at a result so different from that which he had reckoned on. Yet this is nevertheless clearly an instance of "the sorrow of the world that worketh death" (2 Cor. vii, 10). See REPENTANCE.

(2.) His "going to his own place" (Acts i, 25), where the words ἴδιος τόπος convey to our minds, probably were meant to convey to those who heard them the impression of some dark region in Gehenna. Lightfoot and Gill (ad loc.) quote passages from Rabbinical writers who find that meaning in the phrase, even in Gen. xxxi, 55, and Numb. xxiv, 25. On the other hand, it should be remembered that many interpreters reject that explanation (compare Meyer, ad loc.), and that one great Anglican divine (Hammond, *Comment. on N. Test.* ad loc.) enters a distinct protest against it. Similarly

Dr. Clarke (*Commentary*, ad loc.) argues against the whole of our conclusions respecting the violent death of Judas, but his reasoning, as well as that of the other critics named, is far from satisfactory.

8. *Literature.*—Special treatises on the character of Judas are the following: Zandt, *Comment. de Juda proditore* (Lips. 1769); Rau, *Anmerk. üb. d. Charakter des Judas* (Lemgo, 1778); Schmidt, *Apologie d. Judas*, in his *Exeget. Beitr.* i, 18; ii, 342; Lechtlen, *De culpa Judæ* (Argent. 1813); Daub, *Judas Ischarioth* (Heidelb. 1816); Schollmeyer, *Jesus und Judas* (Lüneb. 1836); Augusti, *Theol. Bibl.* i, 497, 520; Ferenczy, *De consilio proditionis Judæ* (Utr. 1829); Gerling, *De Juda sacræ cœnæ conviva* (Hal. 1744); Hebenstreit, *De Juda Iscar.* (Viteb. 1712); Philipp, *Ueb. d. Verräther Judas* (Naumb. 1754); Rütz, *D. Verrätherei d. Judas* (Haag, 1789); *Jour. Sac. Lit.* July, 1863. On his death, see Casaubon, *Exerc. antibar.* 16, p. 527; Alberti, *Observat.* p. 222; Paulus, *Comment.* iii, 506; Barbatii *Dissert. novissima Judæ Iscar. fata* (Regiom. 1665); Götze, *De suspendio Judæ* (Jen. 1661); Röser, *De morte Judæ* (Viteb. 1668); Neunhöfer, *De Juda lapsu extincto* (Chemn. 1740), Oldendorp, *De Juda in templo occiso* (Hannov. 1754). For other monographs, see Volbeding, *Index*, p. 32, 54; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 191. See JESUS CHRIST.

12. A Jew residing at Damascus in the Straight street at the time of Paul's conversion, to whose house Ananias was sent (Acts ix, 11). A.D. 30. "The 'Straight Street' may with little question be identified with the 'Street of Bazaars,' a long, wide thoroughfare, penetrating from the southern gate into the heart of the city, which, as in all the Syro-Greek and Syro-Roman towns, it intersects in a straight line. The so-called 'House of Judas' is still shown in an open space called 'the Sheykh's Place,' a few steps out of the 'Street of Bazaars:' it contains a square room with a stone floor, partly walled off for a tomb, shown to Maundrell (*Early Trav.* Bohn, p. 494) as the 'tomb of Ananias.' The house is an object of religious respect to Mussulmans as well as Christians (Stanley, *Syr. and Pal.* p. 412; Conybeare and Howson, i, 102; Pococke, ii, 119)." See DAMASCUS.

13. Surnamed BARSABAS, a Christian teacher sent from Jerusalem to Antioch along with Paul and Barnabas (Acts xv, 22, 27, 32). A.D. 47. He is supposed by some (see Grotius, Wolf, ad loc.) to have been one of the seventy disciples, and brother of Joseph, also surnamed Barsabas (son of Sabas), who was proposed, with Matthias, to fill up the place of the traitor Judas (Acts i, 23); but others (Augusti, *Uebers. d. Kathol. Br.* ii, 86) identify him with Judas Thaddæus (but see Bertholdt, v, 2681). Schott supposes that Barsabas means the son of Sabas, or Zabas, which he fancifully regards as an abridged form for Zebedee, and concludes that the Judas here mentioned was a brother of the elder James and of John. Judas and Silas are mentioned together (in the above deputation of the Church to determine the obligation of the Mosaic law) as "prophets" and "chief men among the brethren" at the metropolis, "perhaps a member of the Presbytery" (Neander, *Pl. and Tr.* i, 123). After employing their prophetical gifts for the confirmation of the Syrian Christians in the faith, Judas went back to Jerusalem, while Silas either remained at Antioch (for the reading Acts xv, 34 is uncertain; and while some MSS., followed by the Vulgate, add *μόνος Ἰούδας δὲ ἐπορεύθη*, the best omit the verse altogether) or speedily returned thither. See PAUL.

14. Son of one Jairus, and leader of a company of Jews during the final siege of Jerusalem by the Romans, from which he escaped by an underground passage; he was afterwards slain while leading the defence of the castle of Machærus against the Roman troops (Josephus, *War*, vii, 6, 5).

Judas-Light, or **Judas of the Paschal**, was the name of a wooden imitation of the candle which held the real paschal in the seventh branch standing upright, the rest diverging on either side. See Walcott, *Sac. Archæol.* s. v.

Judd, Gaylord, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Watertown, Conn., Oct. 7, 1784, and converted in 1805. He was licensed as a local preacher in 1809, and thus labored faithfully for twelve years; entered the Genesee Conference in 1821; was superannuated in 1841; and died at Candor, Tioga Co., N. Y., in 1859. He was a sound and evangelical preacher, and "had a good report of all men." Many souls were converted by his ministry, and his memory is precious in the Susquehanna Valley, the principal field of his labors. —*Minutes of Conferences*, 1859, vii, 162.

Judd, Sylvester, a Unitarian minister of some note, was born in Westhampton, Mass., July 23, 1813, and was educated at Yale College. He was of Orthodox parentage, but shortly after the completion of his collegiate studies he changed his religious opinions, and went to Cambridge Divinity School to prepare for ministerial duties in the Unitarian Church. He was called to Augusta, Maine, and there spent his life. He died in 1853, "at the very beginning of a course of high usefulness, of a life which seemed essential to the Church." Judd wrote several books having a moral end in view, and as a literary character enjoyed a good reputation for ability. See *Life and Character of the Rev. S. Judd* (Bost. 1854), p. 531; *Christian Examiner*, 1855, p. 63 sq.

Judd, Willard, a Baptist minister, was born in Southington, Conn., Feb. 23, 1804. After teaching for a short time, he settled in Canaan, N. Y., and was licensed to preach in 1826. He then removed to Herkimer Co., and preached alternately in Salisbury and Oppenheim until Aug. 23, 1828, when he united with the Church in Salisbury. He continued his labors here with great success until 1835, when his health compelled him to abandon the ministry. In 1839 he accepted an appointment as classical teacher in Middlebury Academy, at Wyoming, which situation he held until his death in Feb. 1840. Mr. Judd published *A Review of Professor Stuart's Work on Baptism* (1836, and later revised and enlarged). A collection of several of his miscellaneous papers, with a brief Memoir of his life, was published after his death.—Sprague, *Annals*, vi, 750.

Jude, or, rather, JUDAS (Ἰούδας, i. q. JUDAH; see JUDA). There were two of this name among the twelve apostles—Judas, called also LEBBÆUS and THADDÆUS (Matt. x, 4; Mark iii, 18), and Judas Iscariot. Judas is likewise the name of one of our Lord's brethren (Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3), but it is not agreed whether our Lord's brother is the same with the apostle of this name. Luke (Gospel, vi, 16; Acts i, 13) calls him Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, which in the English Auth. Vers. is translated "Judas, *the brother* of James." This is defended by Winer (*Gramm. of N.-T. Dict.*), Arnaud (*Recher. Crit. sur l'Ep. de Jude*), and accepted by Burton, Alford, Tregelles, Michaelis, etc. The ellipsis, however, between Ἰούδας and Ἰακώβου is supplied by the old Syriac translator (who was unacquainted with the Epistle of Jude, the writer of which calls himself Ἰούδας ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου, Jude, verse 1), with the word *son*, and not *brother*. Among our Lord's brethren are named (along with Judas) James and Joses (Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3). If, with Helvidius among the ancients (see Jerome, *Contra Helvidium*), and Kuinöl, Neander, and a few other modern commentators, we were to consider our Lord's brethren to be children of Joseph and the Virgin Mary, we should be under the necessity of supposing that there was a James, a Joses, and a Judas who were uterine brothers of our Lord, together with the apostles James and Judas, who were children of Mary, the sister or cousin of the Virgin (see Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. iv). Otherwise it remains for us to choose the opinion that our Lord's brethren were children of Joseph by a former wife (Escha or Salome, according to an apocryphal tradition), which was the sentiment of the majority of the fathers (still received in the Oriental Church),

or the opinion adopted in the Western Church, and first broached by Jerome (*Cont. Helvid.*), that the brethren of our Lord were his cousins, as being children of Mary, the wife of Cleophas, who must therefore be considered as the same with Alphæus. If we consider James, the brother of our Lord, to be a different person from James, the son of Alphæus, and not one of the Twelve, Jude, the brother of James, must consequently be placed in the same category; but if they are one and the same, Jude must be considered as the person who is numbered with our Lord's apostles. The most plausible solution of the whole difficulty is by means of the following hypotheses: Alphæus, otherwise called Clopas, was the brother of Joseph, the reputed father of Christ, and married Mary (not necessarily a blood-relative of the Virgin); dying without issue, he left his wife, thenceforth designated as Mary, the wife (i. e. widow) of Clopas, to his brother Joseph, who had by her several children, namely, James, Judas, Simon, and Joses (and perhaps others, including sisters), the eldest of whom (James) was especially designated as the son of Alphæus, as being his heir (Deut. xxv, 5). The first two of these (being probably older than Jesus) were the James and Judas, or Jude, mentioned among the apostles, as also the authors of the epistles bearing their respective names, being half-brothers of Christ, as the reputed son of the common parent Joseph. See ALPHEUS; JAMES; JOSEPH; MARY.

We are not informed as to the time of the vocation of the apostle Jude to that dignity. Indeed, the only circumstance relating to him which is recorded in the Gospels consists in the question put by him to our Lord (John xiv, 22): "Judas saith unto him (not Iscariot), Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself to us, and not unto the world?" Nor have we any account given of his proceedings after our Lord's resurrection, for the traditionary notices which have been preserved of him rest on no very certain foundation (Lardner's *History of the Apostles*). There may be some truth in the tradition which connects him with the foundation of the church at Edessa; though here again there is much confusion, and doubt is thrown over the account by its connection with the worthless fiction of "Abgarus, king of Edessa" (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* i, 13; Jerome, *Comm. in Matt.* x). Nicephorus (*Hist. Eccl.* ii, 40) makes Jude die a natural death in that city after preaching in Palestine, Syria, and Arabia. The Syrian tradition speaks of his abode at Edessa, but adds that he went thence to Assyria, and was martyred in Phœnicia on his return; while that of the West makes Persia the field of his labors and the scene of his martyrdom. Jude the apostle is commemorated in the Western Church, together with the apostle Simon (the name, also, of one of our Lord's brethren), on the 8th of October. Eusebius gives us an interesting tradition of Hegesippus (*Hist. Eccl.* iii, 20, 32) that two grandsons of Jude, "who, according to the flesh, was called the Lord's brother" (comp. 1 Cor. ix, 5), were seized and carried to Rome by order of Domitian, whose apprehensions had been excited by what he had heard of the mighty power of the kingdom of Christ; but that the emperor having discovered by their answers to his inquiries, and the appearance of their hands, that they were poor men, supporting themselves by their labor, and having learned the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom, dismissed them in contempt, and ceased from his persecution of the Church, whereupon they returned to Palestine, and took a leading place in the churches, "as being at the same time confessors and of the Lord's family" (ὡς ἂν δὴ μάρτυρας ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γένεος ὄντας τοῦ Κυρίου), and lived till the time of Trajan. Nicephorus (i, 23) tells us that Jude's wife was named Mary. For further discussion, see Bertholdt, *Einl.* v, 2679; vi, 31, 79; Perionii *Vitæ Apostol.* p. 166; Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* III, ii, 13; i, 302, 611; Bayer, *Hist. Osrhœn. et Edessen.* p. 104; Credner, *Einl.* i, 611; De Wette, *Einl. ins N. T.* p. 340; Harenberg, in *Miscell. Lips. nov.* iii, 373; Michaelis, *Einl.* ii, 1489; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index*, p. 32. On the pretended Gospel of Thaddæus, see Kleuker, *Apokr. N. T.* p. 67 sq. See LEBBÆUS.

JUDE, EPISTLE OF. The last in order of the catholic epistles.

I. *Author.*—The writer of this epistle styles himself, verse 1, "Jude, the brother of James" (ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου), and has usually been identified with the apostle Judas Lebbæus or Thaddæus, called by Luke (vi, 16) Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, A. V. "Judas, *the brother* of James." It has been seen above that this mode of supplying the ellipsis, though not altogether in accordance with the *usus loquendi*, is, nevertheless, quite justifiable, although there are strong reasons for rendering the words "Judas, *the son* of James." Jerome, Tertullian, and Origen among the ancients, and Calmet, Calvin, Hammond, Hänlein, Lange, Vatablus, Arnaud, and Tregelles among the moderns, agree in assigning the epistle to the apostle. Whether it were the work of an apostle or not, it has from very early times been attributed to "the Lord's brother" of that name (Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3): a view in which Origen, Jerome, and (if indeed the *Adumbrationes* be rightly assigned to him) Clemens Alexandrinus agree; which is implied in the words of Chrysostom (*Hom.* 48 *in Joan.*), confirmed by the epigraph of the Syriac versions, and is accepted by most modern commentators—Arnaud, Bengel, Burton, Hug, Jessien, Olshausen, Tregelles, etc. The objection that has been felt by Neander (*Pl. and Tr.* i, 392) and others, that if he had been "the Lord's brother" he would have directly styled himself so, and not merely "the brother of James," has been anticipated by the author of the "Adumbrationes" (Bunsen, *Analect. Ante-Nicæn.* i, 330), who says, "Jude, who wrote the catholic Epistle, brother of the sons of Joseph, an extremely religious man, though he was aware of his relationship to the Lord, did not call himself his brother; but what said he? 'Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ' as his Lord, but 'brother of James.'" We may easily believe that it was through humility, and a true sense of the altered relations between them and him who had been "declared to be the Son of God with power . . . . by the resurrection from the dead" (comp. 2 Cor. v, 16), that both Jude and James forbore to call themselves the brethren of Jesus. The arguments concerning the authorship of the epistle are ably summed up by Jessien (*De Authent. Ep. Jud.* Lips. 1821) and Arnaud (*Recher. Critiq. sur l'Epist. de Jude*, Strasb. 1851, transl. in the *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* July, 1869); and, though it is by no means clear of difficulty, the most probable conclusion is that the author was Jude, one of the brethren of Jesus, and brother of James, as also the apostle, the son of Alphæus. See BRETHREN OF OUR LORD.

II. *Genuineness and Canonicity.*—Although the Epistle of Jude is one of the so-called *Antilegomena*, and its canonicity was questioned in the earliest ages of the Church, there never was any doubt of its genuineness among those by whom it was known. It was too unimportant to be a forgery; few portions of holy Scripture could, with reverence be it spoken, have been more easily spared; and the question was never whether it was the work of an impostor, but whether its author was of sufficient weight to warrant its admission into the canon. This question was gradually decided in its favor, and the more widely it was known the more generally it was received as canonical, until it took its place without further dispute as a portion of the volume of holy Scripture. See ANTILEGOMENA.

This epistle is not cited by any of the apostolic fathers; the passages which have been adduced as containing allusions to it (Hermas, *Past. Vis.* iv, 3; Clem. Rom., *Ep. ad Cor.* ch. xi; Polycarp, *Ep. ad Phil.* ch. iii) presenting no certain evidence of being such. It is, however, formally quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Pædag.* iii, 239, ed. Sylburg.; *Strom.* iii, 431), and Eusebius testifies (*Hist. Eccles.* vi, 14) that he treated it in his *Hypotyposes*; it is also treated in the *Adumbrationes*,

ascribed to Clement, and preserved in a Latin version. Tertullian refers to the epistle as that of Jude the apostle (*De Habit. Mulieb.* ch. iii). It appears in the Muratori Fragment among the canonical books. Origen repeatedly refers to it, and occasionally as the work of the apostle Jude (*Hom. in Matt.* xiii, 55, in *Opp.*, ed. De la Rue, iii, 403; *Com. in Ep. ad Rom.*, in *Opp.* iv, 519; *Hom. in Jos.*, in *Opp.* ii, 411; *De Princip.*, in *Opp.* i, 138, etc.); though in one place he speaks as if doubts were entertained by some as to its genuineness (*in Matt.* xxii, 23, in *Opp.* iii, 814). It is not in the Peshito, and does not appear to have been known to the Syrian churches before the 4th century, near the close of which it is quoted by Ephraem Syrus (*Opp. Syr.* i, 136). Eusebius ranks it among the Antilegomena, but this rather because it was not universally known than because where known it was by any regarded with suspicion (*Hist. Eccles.* ii, 23; iii, 25). By Jerome it is referred to as the work of an apostle (*in Tit.* i; *Ep. ad Paulin.* iii), and he states that, though suspected by some, in consequence of containing a quotation from the apocryphal book of Enoch, it had obtained such authority as to be reckoned part of the canonical Scriptures (*Catal. Script. Eccles.*). From the 4th century onwards, the place thus conceded to it remained unquestioned (Westcott, *Canon of the N. Test.*). Thus the epistle is quoted by Malchian, a presbyter of Antioch, in a letter to the bishops of Alexandria and Rome (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vii, 30), and by Palladius, the friend of Chrysostom (Chrysostom, *Opp.* xiii, *Dial.* cc, 18, 20), and is contained in the Laodicene (A.D. 363), Carthaginian (397), and so-called Apostolic catalogues, as well as in those emanating from the churches of the East and West, with the exception of the Synopsis of Chrysostom, and those of Cassiodorus and Ebed Jesu.

Various reasons might be assigned for delay in receiving this epistle, and the doubts long prevalent respecting it. The uncertainty as to its author, and his standing in the Church; the unimportant nature of its contents, and their almost absolute identity with 2 Pet. ii; and the supposed quotation of apocryphal books, would all tend to create a prejudice against it, which could only be overcome by time, and the gradual recognition by the leading churches of its genuineness and canonicity.

At the Reformation the doubts on the canonical authority on this epistle were revived, and have been shared in by modern commentators. They were more or less entertained by Grotius, Luther, Calvin, Bergen, Bolten, Dahl, Michaelis, and the Magdeburg Centuriators. It has been ably defended by Jessien, *De Authentia Ep. Judæ*, Lips. 1821.

There is nothing, however, in the epistle itself to cast suspicion on its genuineness; on the contrary, it rather impresses one with the conviction that it must have proceeded from the writer whose name it bears. Another, forging a work in his name, would hardly have omitted to make prominent the personality of Judas, and his relation to our Lord, neither of which comes before us in this epistle (Bleek, *Einl. in. d. N. Test.* p. 557). See CANON.

III. *Time and Place of Writing.*—There are few, if any, external grounds for deciding these points, and the internal evidence is but small.

1. The question of date is connected by many with that of its relation to 2 Peter (see below), and an earlier or later period has been assigned to it according as it has been considered to have been anterior or posterior to that epistle. Attempts have also been made to prove a late date for the epistle, from an alleged quotation in it from the apocryphal book of Enoch (verse 13); but it is by no means certain that the passage is a quotation from the now extant book of Enoch, and scholars have yet to settle when the book of Enoch was written, so that from this nothing can be inferred as to the date of this epistle.

From the charactér of the errors against which it is directed, however, it cannot be placed very early; though there is no sufficient ground for Schleiermacher's opinion that "in the last time" (ἐν ἐσχάτῳ χρόνῳ, ver. 18; comp. 1 John ii, 18, ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστι) forbids our placing it in the apostolic age at all. Lardner places it between A.D. 64 and 66, Davidson before A.D. 70, Credner A.D. 80, Calmet, Estius, Witsius, and Neander, after the death of all the apostles but John, and perhaps after the fall of Jerusalem; although considerable weight is to be given to the argument of De Wette (*Einleit. in N. T.* p. 300), that if the destruction of Jerusalem had already taken place, some warning would have been drawn from so signal an instance of God's vengeance on the "ungodly." From the allusion, however to the preaching of the apostles, we may infer that it was among the later productions of the apostolic age; for it was written whilst persons were still alive who had heard apostles preach, but when this preaching was beginning to become a thing of the past (ver. 17). On the other hand, again, if the author were really the brother of Jesus, especially an elder brother, we cannot well suppose him to have lived much beyond the middle of the first century. We may therefore conjecturally place it about A.D. 66.

2. There are still less data from which to determine the place of writing. Burton, however, is of opinion that inasmuch as the descendants of "Judas, the brother of the Lord," if we identify him with the author of the epistle, were found in Palestine, he probably "did not absent himself long from his native country," and that the epistle was published there, since he styles himself "the brother of James," an expression most likely to be used in a country where James was well known" (*Eccles. Hist.* i, 334). With this locality will agree all the above considerations as to date.

IV. *Persons to whom the Epistle is addressed.*—These are described by the writer as "the called who are sanctified in God the Father, and kept for Jesus Christ." From the resemblance of some parts of this epistle to the second of Peter, it has been inferred that it was sent to the same parties in Asia Minor, and with a view to enforcing the apostle's admonitions; whilst others, from the strongly Jewish character of the writing, infer that it was addressed to some body of Jewish Christians in Palestine. From the fact that the parties addressed seem to have been surrounded by a large and wicked population, some have supposed that they may have dwelt in Corinth, whilst others suggest one of the commercial cities of Syria. The supposition that the parties addressed dwelt in Egypt is mere conjecture. But the address (ver. 1) is applicable to Christians generally, and there is nothing in the body of the epistle to limit its reference; and though it is not improbable that the author had a particular portion of the Church in view, and that the Christians of Palestine were the immediate objects of his warning, the dangers described were such as the whole Christian world was exposed to, and the adversaries the same which had everywhere to be guarded against.

V. *Object, Contents, and Errors inveighed against.*—The purpose which the writer had in view is stated by himself. After the inscription, he says that, intending to write "of the common salvation," he found himself, as it were, compelled to utter a solemn warning in defence of the faith, imperilled by the evil conduct of corrupt men (ver. 3). Possibly there was some observed outbreak which gave the occasion. The evil for a while had been working in secret—"certain men crept in unawares" (ver. 4)—but now the canker showed itself. The crisis must be met promptly and resolutely. Therefore the writer denounces those who turned the grace of God "into lasciviousness," virtually denying God by disobeying his law. He alarms by holding out three examples of such sin and its punishment—the Israelites that sinned in the wilderness; the angels that "kept not their first estate;" and the foul cities of Sodom and Gomorrha (ver. 5-7). He next describes minutely the character of those whom he censures, and shows how of

old they had been prophetically marked out as objects of deserved vengeance (ver. 8-16). Then, turning to the faithful, he reminds them that the apostles had forewarned them that evil men would rise in the Church (ver. 17-19); exhorts them to maintain their own steadfastness (ver. 20, 21), and to do their utmost in rescuing others from contamination (ver. 22, 23); and concludes with an ascription of praise to him who alone could keep his people from falling (ver. 24, 25). The whole was thoroughly applicable to a time when iniquity was abounding, and the love of many waxing cold (Matt. xxiv, 12).

The design of such a train of thought is obviously to put the believers to whom the epistle was addressed on their guard against the misleading efforts of certain persons to whose influence they were exposed. Who these persons were, or to what class of errorists they belonged, can only be matter of conjecture. Some, indeed (De Wette, Schwegler, Bleek), think the persons alluded to held no peculiar opinions, and were simply men of lax morals; but, from the manner in which the writer refers to them, it is evident that they were, to use the words of Dorner (*Entwickelungsgesch.* i, 104, E. T. i, 72), "not merely practically corrupt, but teachers of error as well." Their opinions seem to have been of an antinomian character (vers. 4, 18, 19), but there is nothing to connect them, except in a very vague and distant way, with any of the later gnostic systems. The writer formally charges them with "denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ," language which De Wette admits usually applies to error of doctrine, but which here he, without any reason, would understand of feeling and conduct. The licentious courses in which they indulged led Clement of Alexandria to think that they were the prototypes of the Carpocratians and such like: "Of these, and such as these," he says," I think that Jude spoke prophetically in his epistle" (*Strom.* iii, 431, Sylb.); but this does not imply that they had formed a system like that of the Carpocratians, but only that the notions and usages of the one adumbrated those of the other. Perhaps there have been in all ages persons who have sought by perverted doctrine to gain a sanction for sensual indulgence, and such undoubtedly were found disturbing the peace and corrupting the purity of the churches of Christ in different places as early as the second half of the 1st century. The persons against whom Jude writes were apparently of this class, but in their immorality the practical element was more prominent than the speculative.

VI. *Style.*—The main body of the epistle is well characterized by Alford (*Gk. Test.* iv, 147) as an impassioned invective, in the impetuous whirlwind of which the writer is hurried along, collecting example after example of divine vengeance on the ungodly; heaping epithet upon epithet, and piling image upon image, and, as it were, laboring for words and images strong enough to depict the polluted character of the licentious apostates against whom he is warning the Church; returning again and again to the subject, as though all language was insufficient to give an adequate idea of their profligacy, and to express his burning hatred of their perversion of the doctrines of the Gospel.

The epistle is said by De Wette (*Einleit. ins N. T.* p. 300) to be tolerably good Greek, though there are some peculiarities of diction which have led Schmid (*Einleit.* i, 314) and Bertholdt (vi, 3194) to imagine an Aramaic original.

VII. *Relation between the Epistle of Jude and* 2 *Peter.*—The larger portion of this epistle (ver. 3-16) closely resembles in language and subject a part of the second Epistle of Peter (2 Pet. ii, 1-19). In both the heretical enemies of the Gospel are described in terms so similar as to preclude all idea of entire independence. Jude's known habit of quotation would seem to render the supposition most probable that he has borrowed from Peter. Dr. Davidson, however (*Introd. to the N. Test.* iii, 507), maintains the priority of Jude. As Jude's Epistle apparently emanated from Palestine, and (if the above date be correct) from Jerusalem, it may in some sort be regarded as an echo of Peter's admonitions uttered not long before at the Roman capital. This question will be more fully examined under PETER, SECOND EPISTLE OF.

VIII. *Apocryphal Quotations.*—This epistle presents one peculiarity, which, as we learn from Jerome, caused its authority to be impugned in very early times—the supposed citation of apocryphal writings (ver. 9, 14, 15).

1. The former of these passages, containing the reference to the contest of the archangel Michael and the devil "about the body of Moses," was supposed by Origen to have been founded on a Jewish work called the "Assumption of Moses" (Ἀνάληψις Μωσέως), quoted also by Œcumenius (ii, 629). Origen's words are express, "Which little work the apostle Jude has made mention of in his epistle" (*De Princip.* ii, 2; vol. i, p. 138); and some have sought to identify the book with the פְּטִירַת משֶׁה, "*The Demise of Moses,*" which is, however, proved by Michaelis (iv, 382) to be a modern composition. Attempts have also been made by Lardner, Macknight, Vitringa, and others, to interpret the passage in a mystical sense, by reference to Zech. iii, 1, 2; but the similarity is too distant to afford any weight to the idea. There is, on the whole, little question that the writer is here making use of a Jewish tradition, based on Deut. xxxiv, 6, just as facts unrecorded in Scripture are referred to by Paul (2 Tim. iii, 8; Gal. iii, 19); by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii, 2; xi, 24); by James (v, 17), and Stephen (Acts vii, 22, 23, 30). (See further, Zirkel, *De Mosis ad Superos translatio,* Wirceb. 1798.) See MOSES, ASSUMPTION OF.

2. As regards the supposed quotation from the book of Enoch, the question is not so clear whether Jude is making a citation from a work already in the hands of his readers—which is the opinion of Jerome (*l. c.*) and Tertullian (who was, in consequence, inclined to receive the book of Enoch as canonical Scripture), and has been held by many modern critics—or is employing a traditionary prophecy not at that time committed to writing (a theory which the words used, "Enoch prophesied, *saying,*" ἐπροφήτευσεν . . . Ἐνὼχ λέγων, seem rather to favor), but afterwards embodied in the apocryphal work already named. This is maintained by Tregelles (Horne's *Introd.* 10th edit., iv, 621), and has been held by Cave, Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis,* i, 420), Lightfoot (ii, 117), Witsius, and Calvin (comp. Jerome, *Comm. in Eph.* c. v, p. 647, 8; in *Tit.* c. i, p. 708). The present book of Enoch actually contains (ch. ii of *The Book of Enoch,* in Æthiopic and English, by Dr. Laurence, 3d ed. Lond. 1838) the very words cited by Jude; but some modern critics maintain that they were inserted in that book out of Jude's epistle. See ENOCH, BOOK OF.

But why should not an inspired author appropriate a piece of an apocryphal writing? If it contained elements of truth, or was simply apposite to his purpose, why should he not use it? He does not (as some allege) attribute to it any inspired authority, nor ever vouch for its accuracy. It is never objected in derogation of the apostle Paul that, both in speech and writing, he cited heathen authors, sometimes with a special reference (Acts xvii, 28; 1 Cor. xv, 33; Gal. v, 23; Titus i, 12). It has also been asserted that in various parts of the New Testament there are allusions (if not formal citations) to several of the books commonly called apocryphal, and to other Jewish productions (see Gough's *N.-Test. Quotations,* p. 276-296). Common proverbs, we know, have been introduced into Scripture (1 Sam. xxiv, 13; 2 Pet. ii, 22, where the former part only of the proverb cited is from the Old Testament).

But there is no decisive proof that Jude could have seen the so-called book of Enoch. For, though this has been ascribed in part to the Maccabæan times, and is said to have assumed its present shape prior to our Lord's advent (see Westcott, *Introduct.* p. 93, note), yet this is a theory on which critics are by no means agreed.

One of the latest who has investigated the question, Prof. Volkmar, of Zürich (*Zeitschrift der deutsch. morgenl. Gesellschaft*, 1860), maintains that it was composed by one of the disciples of Rabbi Akiba, in the time of the sedition of Barchochebas, about A.D. 132. Dr. Alford is convinced by Volkmar's arguments, and infers hence that "the book of Enoch was not only of Jewish, but of distinctly antichristian origin" (*Proleg. to Jude*, p. 196). We are authorized, then, in believing that Jude merely incorporated into his epistle the tradition of Enoch's prophecy, which was afterwards embodied in the book as we now have it. See TRADITION.

IX. *Commentaries.*—Special exegetical helps on the whole Epistle of Jude exclusively are the following, of which we designate the most important by an asterisk prefixed: Didymus Alexandrinus, *In Ep. Judæ* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* v; and *Bibl. Patr.* Gallandii, vi); Bede, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* v); Luther, *Auslegung* (Wittenb. 1524, 4to and 8vo; etc.); Maffe, *Explanatio* (Ven. 1576, 8vo); Ridley, *Exposition* (Lond. n. d. 16mo); De Bree, *Enarratio* (Sagunt. 1582, 4to); Radeus, *In Judæ ep.* (Antw. 1584, Gen. 1599, 8vo); Danæus, *Commentarius* [includ. Ep. John] (Geneva, 1585, 8vo); Feuardent, *Commentarius* (Colon. 1595, 8vo); Junius, *Notæ* (Lugd. Bat. 1599, 8vo; also in *Opp.* i, 1654); Willet, *Commentarius* (Lond. 1603, Cambr. 1614, fol.; also *Catholicon*, in "*Harmonie*," etc.); Turnbull, *Sermons* (London, 1606, 4to); Lancelott, *Exegesis* (Antw. 1613, 1626, 8vo); Boulduc, *Commentaria* (Paris, 1620, 4to); Pareus, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1626, 4to); Rost, *Commentarius* (Rostock, 1627, 4to); Stumpf, *Explicatio* (Coburg, 1627, 8vo); Otes, *Sermons* (London, 1633, 4to); Gerhard, *Adnotationes* (Jen. 1641, 1660, 1665, 4to); Du Bois, *Explicatio* (Paris, 1644, 8vo); Jenkyn, *Exposition* (Lond. 1652–54, 2 pts. in 1 vol. 4to; Glasgow, 1783; Lond. 1839, 8vo); Calovius, *Explicatio* (Vitemb. 1654, 1719, 4to) Manton, *Lectures* (London, 1658, 4to); Broughton, *Exposition* (Lond. 1662, fol.; also in *Works*, p. 402); Wandalin, *Prodromus* (Hafniæ, 1663, 4to); Rappolt, *Observationes* (Lipsiæ, 1675, 4to); Grelot, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1676, 4to); Verryn, *Commentarius* (L. Bat. 1677, 4to); Visscher, *Verklaaring* (Amst. 1681, 4to; also in German, Bremen, 1744, 4to); Titelmann [Schenck], *Commentarius* (Marp. 1693, 8vo); Antonio, *Verklaaring* [includ. 1 Pet.] (Leoward. 1693, 1697, 4to; also in German, Brem. 1700, fol.); Martin, *Commentarius* (Lipsiæ, 1694, 1727, 4to); Fecht, *Expositio* (Rost. 1696, 4to); Nemeth, *Explicatio* (1700, 4to); Dorsche, *Commentarius* (fragment. in Gerhard's *Commentatio*, Francf. et Lips. 1700, 4to); Perkins, *Exposition* (in *Works*, Cambridge, 1701, etc., iii, 479); Szattmar, *Explicatio* (Franec. 1702, 4to); Witsius, *Commentarius* (L. B. 1703, 4to; also in *Meletemata*, p. 323); Feustking, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1707, fol.); Quade, *In Epistolam et vitam Judæ* (Gryph. 1709, 4to); Creyghton, *Ontleeding* (Haarlem, 1719, 4to); Weiss, *Commentatio* (Helmstadt, 1723, 4to); Walther, *Exegesis* (Guelpherb. 1724, 4to); Buckner, *Erklärung* (Erfurt, 1727, 4to); Reimmann, *Entsiegelung* (Brunsw. 1731, 4to); Van Seelen, *Judas antifanaticus* (Lub. 1732, 4to); Semler, *Commentatio* [on var. read.] (Hal. 1747, 1784, 4to); Schmidt, *Observationes* (Lipsiæ, 1768, 4to); Herder, *Briefe zweener Brüder Jesu* (Lemgo, 1775, 8vo); Pomarius, *Commentarius* (Vitemb. 1784, 8vo); Hasse, *Erläuterung* (Jen. 1786, 8vo); Hartmann, *Commentatio* (Cothen, 1793, 4to); Kahler, *Anmerkungen* (Rint. 1798, 8vo); *Hänlein, *Commentarius* (Erlangen, 1799, 1801, 1804, 8vo); Harenberg, *Expositio* (in *Miscell. Lips. nov.* iii, 379 sq.); Elias, *Dissertatio* (Ultraj. 1803, 8vo); Dahl, *De αὐθεντίᾳ*, etc. [including 2 Pet.] (Rost. 1807, 8vo); Laurmann, *Notæ* (Gron. 1818, 8vo); *Jessien, *Commentatio* [introductory] (Lipsiæ, 1820, 8vo); Muir, *Discourses* (Glasg. 1822, 8vo); *Arnaud, *Sur l'authenticité*, etc. (Strasb. 1835, 8vo); Scharling, *Commentarius* [includ. James] (Havn. 1841, 8vo); Brun, *Introduction* (in French, Strasb. 1842, 8vo); Bickersteth, *Exposition* (London, 1846, 12mo); Macgillivray, *Lectures* (Lond. 1846, 8vo); *Stier, *Auslegung* (Berl. 1850, 8vo); *Rampf, *Betrachtung* (Salzburg, 1854, 8vo); Gardiner, *Commentary* (Boston, 1856, 12mo); Ritschl, *Antinomisten*, etc. (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 103 sq.); Schott, *Erläuterung* (Erlang. 1863, 8vo). See EPISTLES, CATHOLIC.

Judex, MATTHÆUS, a German theologian, and one of the principal writers of the *Centuries of Magdeburg* (q. v.), was born at Dippoldsforest, in Saxony, September 22, 1528. He was educated at Wittenberg University, where he took his master's degree in Oct. 1549. Shortly after he became minister of the church of St. Ulric, at Magdeburg, and left this position in 1559 to become professor of divinity at the University at Jena; but only eighteen months later he was ousted from the chair by order of the duke of Saxony, on account of his opposition to the Synergists, who were in great favor at court. As a cause for his removal the authorities assigned his publication of *De fuga Papatus*. He then removed to Magdeburg, but, like the other authors of the Centuries, he had to endure persecution. He was finally obliged to quit Magdeburg, and spent the remainder of his life at Wismar. He died May 15, 1564. See Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s. v.

Judge (שׁוֹפֵט, *shophet'*, usu. in the plur. שֹׁפְטִים, *shophetim'*, *rulers* rather than magistrates, from שָׁפַט, different from דִּין, to *try a cause*, see Gesenius, s. v.: compare Bertholdt's *Theolog. Journ.* vii, 1; Werner. in Rudelbach's *Zeitschr.* 1844, iii, 17; Sept., N. Test. Acts xiii, 20, and Josephus, *Ant.* vi, 5, 4, *κριταί*; in Dan. iii, 2, 3, a diff. Chald. term is employed, אֲדַרְגָּזְרִין, *adargazerin'*, *chief judges:* in two passages, Exod. xxi, 6; xxii, 8, the Hebrew magistrates are called אֱלֹהִים, *elohim'*, *gods*, compare Psa. lxxxii, 1, 6; John x, 34; but see Gesenius, s. v.). Besides being the general title of any magistrate, this name is applied to those persons who at intervals presided over the affairs of the Israelites during the four and a half centuries which elapsed from the death of Joshua to the accession of Saul, as recounted in the book of Judges, and as alluded to by the apostle Paul in Acts xiii, 20. These judges were fifteen in number: 1. Othniel; 2. Ehud; 3. Shamgar; 4. Deborah and Barak; 5. Gideon; 6. Abimelech; 7. Tola; 8. Jair; 9. Jephthah; 10. Ibzan; 11. Elon; 12. Abdon; 13. Samson; 14. Eli; 15. Samuel. For an account of the events of each judgeship, see the judges in their alphabetical place; for a discussion of the length of the entire period, and the adjustment of the different epochs, see CHRONOLOGY. The history appears to coincide with a time of mutual collision between the surrounding nations. See also JUDGES, BOOK OF.

I. *Earliest Forms and Characteristics of the Magisterial Office among the Hebrews.*—The administration of justice in all early Eastern nations, as among the Arabs of the desert to this day, rests with the patriarchal seniors, the judges being the heads of tribes, or of chief houses in a tribe. (The expression נְשִׂיא בֵּית־אָב, Numb. xxv, 14, is remarkable, and seems to mean the patriarchal senior of a subdivision of the tribe: comp. 1 Chron. iv, 38; Judg. v, 3, 15). Such, from their elevated position, would have the requisite leisure, would be able to make their decisions respected, and through the wider intercourse of superior station would decide with fuller experience and riper reflection. Thus, in the book of Job (xxix, 7, 8, 9), the patriarchal magnate is represented as going forth "to the gate" amid the respectful silence of elders, princes, and nobles (compare xxxii, 9). The actual chiefs of individual tribes are mentioned on various occasions, one as late as the time of David, as preserving importance in the commonwealth (Numb. vii, 2, 10, 11; xvii, 6, or 17 in Heb. text: xxxiv, 18; Josh. xxii, 14; so perh. Numb. xvi, 2; xxi, 18). Whether the princes of the tribes mentioned in 1 Chron. xxvii, 16; xxviii, 1, are patriarchal heads, or merely chief men appointed by the king to govern, is not strictly certain; but it would be foreign to all an-

cient Eastern analogy to suppose that they forfeited the judicial prerogative before they were overshadowed by the monarchy, and in David's time this is contrary to the tenor of history. During the oppression of Egypt the nascent people would necessarily have few questions at law to plead, and the Egyptian magistrate would take cognizance of theft, violence, and other matters of police. Yet the question put to Moses shows that "a prince" and "a judge" were connected even then in the popular idea (Exod. ii, 14; compare Numb. xvi, 13). When the people emerged from this oppression into national existence, the want of a machinery of judicature began to press. The patriarchal seniors did not instantly assume the function, having probably been depressed by bondage till rendered unfit for it, not having become experienced in such matters, nor having secured the confidence of their tribesmen. Perhaps for these reasons Moses at first took the whole burden of judicature upon himself, then at the suggestion of Jethro (Exod. xviii, 14-24) instituted judges over numerically graduated sections of the people. These were chosen for their moral fitness, but from Deut. i, 15, 16, we may infer that they were taken from among those to whom primogeniture would have assigned it. Save in offences of public magnitude, criminal cases do not appear to have been distinguished from civil. The duty of teaching the people the knowledge of the law which pertained to the Levites, doubtless included such instruction as would assist the judgment of those who were thus to decide according to it. The Levites were thus the ultimate sources of ordinary jurisprudence, and perhaps the "teaching" aforesaid may merely mean expounding the law as applicable to difficult cases arising in practice. Beyond this it is not possible to indicate any division of the provinces of deciding on points of law as distinct from points of fact. The judges mentioned as standing before Joshua in the great assemblies of the people must be understood as the successors of those chosen by Moses, and had doubtless been elected with Joshua's sanction from among the same general class of patriarchal seniors (Josh. iv, 2, 4; xxii, 14; xxiv, 1).

The judge was reckoned a sacred person, and secured even from verbal injuries. Seeking a decision at law is called "inquiring of God" (Exod. xviii, 15). The term "gods" is actually applied to judges (Exod. xxi, 6; compare Psa. lxxxii, 1, 6). The judge was told, "Thou shalt not be afraid of the face of men, for the judgment is God's;" and thus, while human instrumentality was indispensable, the source of justice was upheld as divine, and the purity of its administration only sank with the decline of religious feeling. In this spirit speaks Psa. lxxxii—a lofty charge addressed to all who judge; compare the qualities regarded as essential at the institution of the office (Exod. xviii, 21), and the strict admonition of Deut. xvi, 18-20. But besides the sacred dignity thus given to the only royal function, which, under the theocracy, lay in human hands, it was made popular by being vested in those who led public feeling, and its importance in the public eye appears from such passages as Psa. lxix, 12 (comp. cxix, 23); lxxxii; cxlviii, 11; Prov. viii, 15; xxi, 4, 5, 23. There could have been no considerable need for the legal studies and expositions of the Levites during the wanderings in the wilderness, while Moses was alive to solve all questions, and while the law which they were to expound was not wholly delivered. The Levites, too, had a charge of cattle to look after in that wilderness like the rest, and seem to have acted also, being Moses's own tribe, as supports to his executive authority. But then few of the greater entanglements of property could arise before the people were settled in their possession of Canaan. Thus they were disciplined in smaller matters, and under Moses's own eye, for greater ones. When, however, the commandment, "Judges and officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates" (Deut. xvi, 18), came to be fulfilled in Canaan, there were the following sources from which those officials might be supplied: 1st, the *ex-officio* judges, or their successors, as chosen by Moses; 2dly, any surplus left of patriarchal seniors when these were taken out (as has been shown from Deut. i, 15, 16) from that class; and, 3dly, the Levites. On what principle the non-Levitical judges were chosen after divine superintendence was interrupted at Joshua's death is not clear. A simple way would have been for the existing judges in every town, etc., to choose their own colleagues, as vacancies fell, from among the limited number of persons who, being heads of families, were competent. Generally speaking, the reputation for superior wealth, as some guarantee against facilities for corruption, would determine the choice of a judge, and, taken in connection with personal qualities, would tend to limit the choice to probably a very few persons in practice. The supposition that judicature will always be provided for is carried through all the books of the Law (see Exod. xxi, 6; xxii; Lev. xix, 15; Numb. xxxv, 24; Deut. i, 16; xvi, 18; xxv, 1). All that we know of the facts of later history confirms the supposition. The Hebrews were sensitive as regards the administration of justice; nor is the free spirit of their early commonwealth in anything more manifest than in the resentment which followed the venal or partial judge. The fact that justice reposed on a popular basis of administration largely contributed to keep up this spirit of independence, which is the ultimate check on all perversions of the tribunal. The popular aristocracy (if we may so term it) of heads of tribes, sections of tribes, or families, is found to fall into two main orders of varying nomenclature, and rose from the *capite censi*, or mere citizens, upward. The more common name for the higher order is "princes," and for the lower, "elders" (Judg. viii, 14; Exod. ii, 14; Job xxix, 7, 8, 9; Ezra x, 8). These orders were the popular element of judicature. On the other hand, the Levitical body was imbued with a keen sense of allegiance to God as the Author of Law, and to the Covenant as his embodiment of it, and soon gained whatever forensic experience and erudition those simple times could yield; hence they brought to the judicial task the legal acumen and sense of general principles which complemented the ruder lay element. Thus the Hebrews really enjoyed much of the virtue of a system which allots separate provinces to judge and jury, although we cannot trace any such line of separation in their functions, save in so far as has been indicated above. To return to the first or popular branch, there is reason to think, from the second concurrence of phraseology amid much diversity, that in every city these two ranks of "princes" and "elders" had their analogies, and that a variable number of heads of families and groups of families, in two ranks, were popularly recognised, whether with or without any form of election, as charged with the duty of administering justice. Succoth (Judg. viii, 14) may be taken as an example. Evidently the *ex-officio* judges of Moses's choice would have left their successors when the tribe of Gad, to which Succoth pertained (Josh. xiii, 27), settled in its territory and towns: and what would be more simple than that the whole number of judges in that tribe should be allotted to its towns in proportion to their size? As such judges were mostly the head men by genealogy, they would fall into their natural places, and symmetry would be preserved. The Levites also were apportioned, on the whole, equally among the tribes; and if they preserved their limits, there were probably few parts of Palestine beyond a day's journey from a Levitical city.

One great hold which the priesthood had, in their jurisdiction, upon men's ordinary life was the custody in the sanctuary of the standard weights and measures, to which, in cases of dispute, reference was doubtless made. It is, however, reasonable to suppose that in most towns sufficiently exact models of them for all ordinary questions would be kept, since to refer to the sanctuary at Shiloh, Jerusalem, etc., in every case of dispute between dealers would be nugatory (Exod. xxx, 13; Numb. iii, 47;

Ezek. xlv, 12). Above all these, the high-priest in the ante-regal period was the resort in difficult cases (Deut. xvii, 12), as the chief jurist of the nation, and one who would, in case of need, be perhaps oracularly directed; yet we hear of none acting as judge save Eli, nor is any judicial act recorded of him—though perhaps his not restraining his sons is meant to be noticed as a failure in his judicial duties. Now the judicial authority of any such supreme tribunal must have wholly lapsed at the time of the events recorded in Judg. xix. It should not be forgotten that in some cases of "blood" the "congregation" themselves were to "judge" (Numb. xxxv, 24), and that the appeal of Judg. xx, 4-7 was thus in the regular course of constitutional law. It is also a fact of some weight, negatively, that none of the special deliverers called judges was of priestly lineage, or even became as much noted as Deborah, a woman. This seems to show that any central action of the high-priest on national unity was null, and of this supremacy, had it existed in force, the judicial prerogative was the main element. Difficult cases would include cases of appeal, and we may presume that, save so far as the authority of those special deliverers made itself felt, there was no judge in the last resort from Joshua to Samuel. Indeed, the current phrase of those deliverers that they "judged" Israel during their term, shows which branch of their authority was most in request, and the demand of the people for a king was, in the first instance, that he might "judge them," rather than that he might "fight their battles" (1 Sam. viii, 5, 20).

II. *Peculiar Traits and Functions of the "Judges" in the Period designated by their Rule.*—The station and office of these *shophetim* are involved in great obscurity, partly from the want of clear intimations in the history in which their exploits and government are recorded, and partly from the absence of parallels in the history of other nations by which our notions might be assisted. The offices filled by Moses and Joshua, whose presence was so essential for the time and the occasion, were not at all involved in the general machinery of the Hebrew government. They were specially appointed for particular services, for the performance of which they were invested with extraordinary powers; but when their mission was accomplished, society reverted to its permanent institutions and its established forms of government. As above seen, every tribe had its own hereditary chief or "prince," who presided over its affairs, administered justice in all ordinary cases, and led the troops in time of war. His station resembled that of the Arabian emirs, or rather, perhaps, of the khans of the Tartar tribes inhabiting Persia and the countries further east. He was assisted in these important duties by the subordinate officers, the chiefs of families, who formed his council in such matters of policy as affected their particular district, supported his decisions in civil or criminal inquiries, and commanded under him in the field of battle (Numb. xxvi, xxvii; Josh. vii, 16-18). This was, in fact, the old patriarchal government, to which the Hebrews were greatly attached. It was an institution suited to the wants of men who live dispersed in loosely connected tribes, and not to the wants and exigencies of a nation. It was in principle segregative, not aggregative, and although there are traces of united agreement through a congress of delegates, or rather of national chiefs and elders of the tribes, this was an inefficient instrument of general government, seeing that it was only applicable or applied to great occasions, and could have no bearing on the numerous questions of an administrative nature which arise from day to day in every state, and which there should somewhere exist the power to arrange and determine. This defect of the general government it was one of the objects of the theocratical institutions to remedy. Jehovah had taken upon himself the function of king of the chosen people, and he dwelt among them in his palace-tabernacle. Here he was always ready, through his priest, to counsel them in matters of general interest, as well as in those having reference only to particular tribes; and to his court they were all required by the law to repair three times every year. Here, then, was the principle of a general administration, calculated and designed to unite the tribes into a nation by giving them a common government in all the higher and more general branches of administration, and a common centre of interest for all the political and ecclesiastical relations of the community. It was on this footing that the law destined the government of the Hebrews to proceed, after the peculiar functions of the legislator and the conqueror had been fulfilled. See THEOCRACY.

The fact is, however, that, through the perversity of the people, this settlement of the general government on theocratical principles was not carried out in its proper form and extent, and it is in this neglect we are to seek the necessity for those officers called judges who were from time to time raised up to correct some of the evils which resulted from it. It is very evident from the whole history of the judges that, after the death of Joshua, the Israelites threw themselves back upon the segregative principles of their government by tribes, and all but utterly neglected, and for a long period did utterly neglect, the rules and usages on which the general government was established. There was, in fact, no human power adequate to enforce them. They were good in themselves, they were gracious, they conferred high privileges, but they were enforced by no sufficient authority. No one was amenable to any tribunal for neglecting the annual feasts, or for not referring the direction of public affairs to the divine King. Omissions on these points involved the absence of the divine protection and blessing, and were left to be punished by their consequences. The man who obeyed in this and other things was blessed; the man who did not was not blessed; and general obedience was rewarded with national blessing, and general disobedience with national punishment. The enormities and transgressions into which the people fell in consequence of such neglect, which left them an easy prey to idolatrous influences, are fully recorded in the Book of Judges. The people could not grasp the idea of a divine and invisible king; they could not bring themselves to recur to him in all those cases in which the judgment of a human king would have determined the course of action, or in which his arm would have worked for their deliverance. Therefore it was that God allowed them judges in the persons of faithful men, who acted for the most part as agents of the divine will—regents of the invisible King, and who, holding their commission directly from him or with his sanction, would be more inclined to act as dependent vassals of Jehovah than kings, who, as members of royal dynasties, would come to reign with notions of independent rights and royal privileges, which would draw away their attention from their true place in the theocracy. In this greater dependence of the judges upon the divine King we see the secret of their institution. The Israelites were disposed to rest upon their separate interests as tribes, and, having thus allowed the standing general government to remain inoperative through disuse, they would, in case of emergency, have been disposed "to make themselves a king like the nations" had their attention not been directed to the appointment of officers whose authority could rest on no tangible *right* apart from character and services, which, with the temporary nature of their power, rendered their functions more accordant with the principles of the theocracy than those of any other public officers could be. It is probably in this adaptation to the peculiar circumstances of the Hebrew theocracy that we shall discover the reason of our inability to find any similar office among other nations. In being thus peculiar it resembled the dictatorship among the Romans, to which office, indeed, that of the judges has been compared, and perhaps this parallel is the nearest that can be found. But there is this great difference, that the dictator laid down his power as soon as the crisis which had called

for its exercise had passed away, and in no case could this unwonted supremacy be retained beyond a limited time (Livy, ix, 34): but the Hebrew judge remained invested with his high authority the whole period of his life, and is therefore usually described by the sacred historian as presiding to the end of his days over the tribes of Israel, amid the peace and security which his military skill and counsels had, under the divine blessing, restored to the land.

It is usual to consider the judges as commencing their career with military exploits to deliver Israel from foreign oppression, but this is by no means invariably the case. Eli and Samuel were not military men; Deborah judged Israel before she planned the war against Jabin; and of Jair, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, it is at least uncertain whether they ever held any military command. In many cases it is true that military achievements were the means by which they elevated themselves to the rank of judges; but in general the appointment may be said to have varied with the exigencies of the times, and with the particular circumstances which in times of trouble would draw the public attention to persons who appeared suited by their gifts and influence to advise in matters of general concernment, to decide in questions arising between tribe and tribe, to administer public affairs, and to appear as their recognised head in their intercourse with their neighbors and oppressors. As we find that many of these judges arose *during* times of oppression, it seems to us that this last circumstance, which has never been taken into account, must have had a remarkable influence in the appointment of the judge. Foreigners could not be expected to enter into the peculiarities of the Hebrew constitution, and would expect to receive the proposals, remonstrances, or complaints of the people through some person representing the whole nation, or that part of it to which their intercourse applied. The law provided no such officer except in the high-priest; but as the Hebrews themselves did not recognise the true operation of their theocracy, much less were strangers likely to do so. On the officer they appointed to represent the body of the people, under circumstances which compelled them to deal with foreigners mightier than themselves, would naturally devolve the command of the army in war, and the administration of justice in peace. This last was among ancient nations, and it is still in the East, regarded as the first and most important duty of a ruler, and the interference of the judges was probably confined to the cases arising between different tribes, for which the ordinary magistrates would find it difficult to secure due authority to their decisions.

In nearly all the instances recorded the appointment seems to have been by the free, unsolicited choice of the people. The election of Jephthah, who was nominated as the fittest man for the existing emergency, probably resembled that which was usually followed on such occasions; and probably, as in his case, the judge, in accepting the office, took care to make such stipulations as he deemed necessary. The only cases of direct divine appointment are those of Gideon and Samson, and the last stood in the peculiar position of having been from before his birth ordained "to begin to deliver Israel." Deborah was called to deliver Israel, but was already a judge. Samuel was called by the Lord to be a prophet, but not a judge, which ensued from the high gifts which the people recognised as dwelling in him; and as to Eli, the office of judge seems to have devolved naturally, or, rather, *ex-officio*, upon him; and his case seems to be the only one in which the high-priest appears in the character which the theocratical institutions designed for him.

The following clear summary of their duties and privileges is from Jahn (*Bibl. Archäol.* II, i, § 22 sq.; *Heb. Commonwealth*, Stowe's transl., § 23): "The office of judges or regents was held during life, but it was not hereditary, neither could they appoint their successors. Their authority was limited by the law alone; and in doubtful cases they were directed to consult the divine King through the priest by Urim and Thummim (Numb. xxvii, 21). They were not obliged in common cases to ask advice of the ordinary rulers; it was sufficient if these did not remonstrate against the measures of the judge. In important emergencies, however, they convoked a general assembly of the rulers, over which they presided and exercised a powerful influence. They could issue orders, but not enact laws; they could neither levy taxes nor appoint officers, except perhaps in the army. Their authority extended only over those tribes by whom they had been elected or acknowledged; for it is clear that several of the judges presided over separate tribes. There was no income attached to their office, nor was there any income appropriated to them, unless it might be a larger share in the spoils, and those presents which were made them as testimonials of respect (Judg. viii, 24). They bore no external marks of dignity, and maintained no retinue of courtiers, though some of them were very opulent. They were not only simple in their manners, moderate in their desires, and free from avarice and ambition, but noble and magnanimous men, who felt that whatever they did for their country was above all reward, and could not be recompensed; who desired merely to promote the public good, and who chose rather to deserve well of their country than to be enriched by its wealth. This exalted patriotism, like everything else connected with politics in the theocratical state of the Hebrews, was partly of a religious character, and these regents always conducted themselves as the officers of God; in all their enterprises they relied upon him, and their only care was that their countrymen should acknowledge the authority of Jehovah, their invisible king (Judg. viii, 22 sq.; compare Heb. xi). Still they were not without faults, neither are they so represented by their historians; they relate, on the contrary, with the utmost frankness, the great sins of which some of them were guilty. They were not merely deliverers of the state from a foreign yoke, but destroyers of idolatry, foes of pagan vices, promoters of the knowledge of God, of religion, and of morality; restorers of theocracy in the minds of the Hebrews, and powerful instruments of divine Providence in the promotion of the great design of preserving the Hebrew constitution, and by that means of rescuing the true religion from destruction. . . . By comparing the periods during which the Hebrews were oppressed by their enemies with those in which they were independent and governed by their own constitution, it is apparent that the nation in general experienced much more prosperity than adversity in the time of the judges. Their dominion continued four hundred and fifty years; but the whole time of foreign oppression amounts only to one hundred and eleven years, scarcely a fourth part of that period. Even during these one hundred and eleven years the whole nation was seldom under the yoke at the same time, but, for the most part, separate tribes only were held in servitude; nor were their oppressions always very severe; and all the calamities terminated in the advantage and glory of the people as soon as they abolished idolatry and returned to their king, Jehovah. Neither was the nation in such a state of anarchy at this time as has generally been supposed. There were regular judicial tribunals at which justice could be obtained, and when there was no supreme regent, the public welfare was provided for by the ordinary rulers" (Ruth iv, 1-11; Judg. viii, 22; x, 17, 18; xi, 1-11; 1 Sam. iv, 1; vii, 1, 2).

See generally Buddei *Hist. V. T.* i, 939 sq.; Zeltner, *De adolescentia reip. Israel.* (Altorf, 1696); Bauer, *Heb. Gesch.* ii, 34 sq.; Hess, *Gesch. Josua's u. d. Heerführer* (Zür. 1779), ii; Paulus, *Theol.-exeget. Conservator.* ii, 180 sq.; Döring, *Das Zeitalter der Richter* (Freiburg, 1833); Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* ii, 362 sq.; Stanley, *Hist. of Jewish Church*, lect. xiii.

III. *The Judicial Office in later Periods among the Hebrews.*—The magisterial functions of the priesthood be-

ing, it may be presumed, in abeyance during the period of the judges, seem to have merged in the monarchy. The kingdom of Saul suffered too severely from external foes to allow civil matters much prominence. Hence of his only two recorded judicial acts, the one (1 Sam. xi, 13) was the mere remission of a penalty popularly demanded; the other the pronouncing of a sentence (ib. xiv, 44, 45), which, if it was sincerely intended, was overruled in turn by the right sense of the people. In David's reign it was evidently the rule for the king to hear causes in person, and not merely be passively, or even by deputy (though this might also be included), the "fountain of justice" to his people. For this purpose, perhaps, it was prospectively ordained that the king should "write him a copy of the law," and "read therein all the days of his life" (Deut. xvii, 18, 19). The same class of cases which were reserved for Moses would probably fall to his lot, and the high-priest was, of course, ready to assist the monarch. This is further presumable from the fact that no officer analogous to a chief justice ever appears under the kings. It has been supposed that the subjection of all Israel to David's sway caused an influx of such cases, and that advantage was artfully taken of this by Absalom (2 Sam. xv, 1-4); but the rate at which cases were disposed of can hardly have been slower among the ten tribes after David had become their king, than it was during the previous anarchy. It is more probable that during David's uniformly successful wars wealth and population increased rapidly, and civil cases multiplied faster than the king, occupied with war, could attend to them, especially when the summary process customary in the East is considered. Perhaps the arrangements mentioned in 1 Chron. xxiii, 4; xxvi, 29 (compare v, 32, "rulers" probably including judges), of the 6000 Levites acting as "officers and judges," and amongst them specially "Chenaniah and his sons," with others, for the trans-Jordanic tribes, may have been made to meet the need of suitors. In Solomon's character, whose reign of peace would surely be fertile in civil questions, the "wisdom to judge" was the fitting first quality (1 Kings iii, 9; comp. Psa. lxxii, 1-4). As a judge Solomon shines "in all his glory" (1 Kings iii, 16, etc.). No criminal was too powerful for his justice, as some had been for his father's (2 Sam. iii, 39, 1 Kings ii, 5, 6, 33, 34). The examples of direct royal exercise of judicial authority are 2 Sam. i, 15; iv, 9-12, where sentence is summarily executed, and the supposed case of 2 Sam. xiv, 1-21. The denunciation of 2 Sam. xii, 5, 6, though not formally judicial, is yet in the same spirit. Solomon similarly proceeded in the cases of Joab and Shimei (1 Kings ii, 34, 46; compare 2 Kings xiv, 5, 6). It is likely that royalty in Israel was ultimately unfavorable to the local independence connected with the judicature of the "princes" and "elders" in the territory and cities of each tribe. The tendency of the monarchy was doubtless to centralize, and we read of large numbers of king's officers appointed to this and cognate duties (1 Chron. xxiii, 4; xxvi, 29-32). If the general machinery of justice had been, as is reasonable to think, deranged or retarded during a period of anarchy, the Levites afforded the fittest materials for its reconstitution. Being to some extent detached, both locally, and by special duties, exemptions, etc., from the mass of the population, they were more easily brought to the steady routine which justice requires, and, what is no less important, were, in case of neglect of duty, more at the mercy of the king (as shown in the case of the priests at Nob, 1 Sam. xxii, 17). Hence it is probable that the Levites generally superseded the local elders in the administration of justice. But subsequently, when the Levites withdrew from the kingdom of the ten tribes, judicial elders probably again filled the gap. Thus they conducted the mock trial of Naboth (1 Kings xxi, 8-13). There is in 2 Chron. xix, 5, etc., a special notice of a reappointment of judges by Jehoshaphat, and of a distinct court, of appeal, perhaps, at Jerusalem, composed of Levitical and of lay elements. In the same place (as also in a previous one, 1 Chron. xxvi, 32) occurs a mention of "the king's matters" as a branch of jurisprudence. The rights of the prerogative having a constant tendency to encroach, and needing continual regulation, these may have grown probably into a department somewhat like the English Exchequer.

One more change is noticeable in the pre-Babylonian period. The "princes" constantly appear as a powerful political body, increasing in influence and privileges, and having a fixed centre of action at Jerusualem, till, in the reign of Zedekiah, they seem to exercise some of the duties of a privy council, and especially a collective jurisdiction (2 Chron. xxviii, 21; Jer. xxvi, 10, 16). These "princes" are probably the heads of great houses in Judah and Benjamin, whose fathers had once been the pillars of local jurisdiction, but who, through the attractions of a court, and probably also under the constant alarm of hostile invasion, became gradually residents in the capital, and formed an oligarchy which drew to itself, amidst the growing weakness of the latter monarchy, whatever vigor was left in the state, and encroached on the sovereign attribute of justice. The employment in offices of trust and emolument would tend also in the same way, and such chief families would probably monopolize such employment. Hence the constant burden of the prophetic strain, denouncing the neglect, the perversion, the corruption of judicial functionaries (Isa. i, 17, 21; v, 7; x, 2; xxviii, 7; lvi, 1; lix, 4; Jer. ii, 8; v, 1; vii, 5; xxi, 12; Ezek. xxii, 27; xlv, 8, 9; Hos. v, 10; vii, 5, 7; Amos v, 7, 15, 24; vi, 12; Hab. 1, 4, etc.). Still, although far changed from its broad and simple basis in the earlier period, the administration of justice had little resembling the set and rigid system of the Sanhedrim of later times. This last change arose from the fact that the patriarchal seniority, degenerate and corrupted as it became before the captivity, was by that event broken up, and a new basis of judicature had to be sought for. See SANHEDRIM.

IV. *Judicial Customs.*—With regard to the forms of procedure, little more is known than may be gathered from the two examples, Ruth iv, 2, of a civil, and 1 Kings xxi, 8-14, of a criminal character; to which, as a specimen of royal summary jurisdiction, may be added the well-known "judgment" of Solomon. Boaz apparently empanels, as it were, the first ten "elders" whom he meets "in the gate," the well-known site of the Oriental court, and cites the other party by "Ho, such a one;" and the people appear to be invoked as attesting the legality of the proceeding. The whole affair bears an extemporaneous aspect, which may, however, be merely the result of the terseness of the narrative. In Job ix, 19, we have a wish expressed that a "time to plead" might be "set" (comp. the phrase of Roman law, *diem dicere*). In the case of the involuntary homicide seeking the city of refuge, he was to make out his case to the satisfaction of its elders (Josh. xx, 4), and this failing, or the congregation deciding against his claim to sanctuary there (though how its sense was to be taken does not appear), he was not put to death by act of public justice, but left to the "avenger of blood" (Deut. xix, 12). The expressions between "blood and blood," between "plea and plea" (Deut. xvii, 8), indicate a presumption of legal intricacy arising, the latter expression seeming to imply something like what we call a "cross-suit." We may infer from the scantiness, or, rather, almost entire absence of direction as regards forms of procedure, that the legislator was content to leave them to be provided for as the necessity for them arose, it being impossible by any jurisprudential devices to anticipate chicane. It is an interesting question how far judges were allowed to receive fees of suitors: Michaelis reasonably presumes that none were allowed or customary, and it seems, from the words of 1 Sam. xii, 3, that such transactions would have been regarded as corrupt. There is another question how far advocates were usual. There is no reason to think that, until the period of Greek influence, when we meet with words based on συν-

ἤγορος and παράκλητος, any professed class of pleaders existed. Yet passages abound in which the pleading of the cause of those who are unable to plead their own is spoken of as, what it indeed was, a noble act of charity; and the expression has even (which shows the popularity of the practice) become a basis of figurative allusion (Job xvi, 21; Prov. xxii, 23; xxiii, 11; xxxi, 9; Isa. i, 17; Jer. xxx, 13; l, 34; li, 36). The blessedness of such acts is forcibly dwelt upon, Job xxix, 12, 13.

There is no mention of any distinctive dress or badge as pertaining to the judicial officer. A staff or sceptre was the common badge of a ruler or prince, and this they probably bore (Isa. xiv, 5; Amos i, 5, 8). They would, doubtless, be more than usually careful to comply with the regulations about dress laid down in Numb. xv, 38, 39; Deut. xxii, 12. The use of the "white asses" (Judg. v, 10) by those who "sit in judgment" was perhaps a convenient distinctive mark for them when journeying where they would not usually be personally known.

For other matters relating to some of the processes of law, see OATH; OFFICER, TRIAL; WITNESS, etc.

Judges, BOOK OF, the third in the list of the historical compositions of the O. T. (counting the Pentateuch as one), or the seventh of the separate books. Its close connection with the book of Joshua is an important element in the controversial criticism of both.

I. *Title and Order.*—In the original Hebrew, as well as in all the translations, this book bears the name of Judges (שֹׁופְטִים, Sept. Κριταί, Vulgate *liber Judicum*), and this name has obviously been given to it because chiefly relating the transactions connected with the deliverance and government of Israel by the men who bear this title in the Hebrew polity. The period of history contained in this book, however, reaches from Joshua to Eli, and is thus more extensive than the time of the judges. A considerable portion of it also makes no mention of them, though belonging to their time. The Book of Ruth was originally a part of this book, but about the middle of the 5th century after Christ it was placed in the Hebrew copies immediately after the Song of Solomon. In the Sept. it has preserved its original position, but as a separate book. The chronological relation of these books corresponds with the order in which they are arranged, namely, after the Book of Joshua. See below, § vi.

II. *Contents.*—The book may most properly be divided into three parts, the middle one of which alone is in strictly chronological order.

1. *The Introduction* (ch. i-iii, 6), containing preliminary information on certain points requisite to be known, or else general statements which give a key to the course of the history properly so called, and to the writer's mode of presenting it. The first chapter is chiefly geographical, containing a statement of what the several tribes had done or failed to do: the second chapter, together with the opening verses of the third, are predominantly moral and reflective; or, otherwise, the first gives the political relations of Israel to the Canaanites, and the second gives the religious relation of Israel to the Lord. This part may therefore be subdivided into two sections, as follows:

a. Chap. i-ii, 5, which may be considered as a first introduction, giving a summary of the results of the war carried on against the Canaanites by the several tribes on the west of Jordan after Joshua's death, and forming a continuation of Josh. xii. It is placed first, as in the most natural position. It tells us that the people did not obey the command to expel the people of the land, and contains the reproof of them by a prophet.

b. Chapter ii, 6-iii, 6. This is a second introduction, standing in nearer relation to the following history. It informs us that the people fell into idolatry after the death of Joshua and his generation, and that they were punished for it by being unable to drive out the remnant of the inhabitants of the land, and by falling under the hand of oppressors. A parenthesis occurs (ii, 16-19) of the highest importance, as giving a key to the following portion. It is a summary view of the history: the people fall into idolatry; they are then oppressed by a foreign power; upon their repentance they are delivered by a judge, after whose death they relapse into idolatry.

2. *Body of the History* (chap. iii, 7-xvi). The words "And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord," which had already been used in ch. ii, 11, are employed to introduce the history of the thirteen judges comprised in this book. An account of six of these thirteen is given at greater or less length. The account of the remaining seven is very short, and merely attached to the longer narratives. These narratives are as follows: (1) The deliverance of Israel by Othniel, iii, 7-11. (2) The history of Ehud and (in 31) that of Shamgar, iii, 12-31. (3) The deliverance by Deborah and Barak, ch. iv.-v. (4) The whole passage in vi-x, 5. The history of Gideon and his son Abimelech is contained in chap. vi-ix, and followed by the notice of Tola (x, 1, 2) and Jair (x, 3, 5). This is the only case in which the history of a judge is continued by that of his children. But the exception is one which illustrates the lesson taught by the whole book. Gideon's sin in making the ephod is punished by the destruction of his family by Abimelech, with the help of the men of Shechem, who, in their turn, become the instruments of each other's punishment. In addition to this, the short reign of Abimelech would seem to be recorded as being an unauthorized anticipation of the kingly government of later times. (5) Ch. x, 6-xii. The history of Jephthah (x, 6-xii, 7), to which is added the mention of Ibzan (xii, 8-10), Elon (11, 12), Abdon (13-15). (6) The history of Samson, consisting of twelve exploits, and forming three groups connected with his love of three Philistine women, chap. xiii-xvi. We may observe in general on this portion of the book that it is almost entirely a history of the wars of deliverance: there are no sacerdotal allusions in it; the tribe of Judah is not alluded to after the time of Othniel; and the greater part of the judges belong to the northern half of the kingdom.

A closer inspection, however, discloses a more interior, and therefore truer arrangement of this, the main part of the book, and one better calculated to bring out the theocratic government of God, which, as we have seen in the preceding article, was the cardinal idea of the office known as that of "the Judges." Moses had been commissioned by *the Angel of the Covenant*, who went before the people in all their marches (Exod. iii, 1-6; xiii, 21; xiv, 19, etc.), and to fit him for his office Moses was filled with *the Spirit of the Lord*, which was given to him in a measure apparently not given to any mere man after him. But the Spirit, which was communicated in a certain degree to men for various tasks in connection with the Church and people, was especially communicated from Moses, in whom the fulness resided (fulness such as was possible under the Old-Testament dispensation), to the seventy elders who assisted him in the administration, and to Joshua, who was called to be his successor (Numb. xi, 17, 25; xxvii, 16, 18, 20). Agreeably to this, the true grouping of the events in the time of the judges must be looked for in connection with the *coming forth of the Angel of the Covenant*, and the *corresponding mission of the Spirit of the Lord* into the hearts of his instruments. (No arguing is needed to establish the erroneousness of our translation, "an angel of the Lord" [ii, 1; vi, 11]; "an angel of God" [xiii, 6, 9, 13]. The only possible rendering is, "the Angel of the Lord," "the Angel of God;" and this is amply confirmed by the attributes of Godhead which appear in the narratives.) Yet, while we notice these epochs of special manifestation, we must remember that God was always present with his people, at the head of their government, and working in a more ordinary manner in calling out agents for preserving and recovering the visible Church and holy nation. Besides, there was the standing method of consulting him by Urim and Thummim,

through the high-priest, and there was his way of extraordinarily addressing the people by prophets; of both of these there are recorded instances in this book, although the prophetical agency is rare and feeble till the time of Samuel (1 Sam. iii, 1, 19-21), with whom the succession of prophets began (Acts iii, 24).

Now the appearance of the Angel of the Lord and the mission of the Spirit in a special manner is four times noticed in the body of the history, and nowhere else, except in the poetical allusion in ch. v, 23. (1.) The Angel of Jehovah went up from Gilgal to Bochim, and reproached the people for neglecting his work of redemption; threatening to help them no more; yet in reality, by the utterance of this threat, suggesting that his free grace would help them, as in fact they immediately gained a victory over their own sinful selves (ii, 1-5). The outward victory over oppressors was soon gained by Othniel (iii, 10) when "the Spirit of the Lord came," literally was, "upon him, and he judged Israel, and went out to war." (2.) The Angel of the Lord came and gave a mission to Gideon to deliver Israel (vi, 11, etc.), and to fit him for it (ver. 34), "the Spirit of the Lord came upon," literally clothed, "Gideon, and he blew the trumpet." (3.) A passage (x, 10-16) is so similar to the account of the Angel at Bochim that we do not know how to avoid the impression that it is the Angel himself who speaks in that immediate manner which is peculiar to this book; certainly there is no hint of any prophet in the case, and a message like this from the Urim and Thummim is nowhere on record in Scripture. The closing words that, after having refused to "save" them (not merely "deliver," as in our version) on the repentance of the people, "his soul was grieved for the misery of Israel," suggest the same interpretation, in the light of the commentary (Isa. lxiii, 8, 9): "So he said, Surely they are my people, children that will not lie; so he was their Saviour. In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the Angel of his Presence saved them." Upon this, Jephthah was called to lead the people; and as on the two earlier occasions (xi, 29), "The Spirit of the Lord came," literally was, "upon Jephthah." (4.) The Angel of the Lord appeared to the parents of Samson, announcing the birth of their son, who was to begin to "deliver," or rather "save," Israel (xiii, 3-23). This occurs with the usual correspondence (ver. 24, 25), "The child grew, and the Lord blessed him; and the Spirit of the Lord began to move him at times;" while of him alone, as one peculiarly chosen by the Lord and given to him from his birth, it is said repeatedly afterwards, that "the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him."

This arrangement suggests the four periods of history noted in the table given below (§ ix). The appearance of the angel of the Lord and the mission of the Spirit, however, belong not to the very commencement of the period, but rather to the continuance or close of a term of sin and disgrace. Perhaps in Gideon and Jephthah's cases the appearance of the angel and the mission of the Spirit were almost contemporaneous; but in the first case and in the last there must have been some distance of time between them, not now ascertainable, but possibly amounting to several years, and determined in each case by the particulars of the crisis which demanded these manifestations.

3. *An Appendix* (chap. xvii-xxi). This part has no formal connection with the preceding, and has often, but unnecessarily, been assumed to have been added by a later hand. No mention of the judges occurs in it. It contains allusions to "the house of God," the ark, and the high-priest. The period to which the narrative relates is simply marked by the expression "when there was no king in Israel" (xix, 1; comp. xviii, 1). It records two series of incidents:

a. The conquest of Laish by a portion of the tribe of Dan, and the establishment there of the idolatrous worship of Jehovah already instituted by Micah in Mount Ephraim (ch. xvii, xviii). The date of this occurrence is not marked, but it has been thought to be subsequent to the time of Deborah, as her song contains no allusion to any northern settlements of the tribe of Dan.

b. The almost total extinction of the tribe of Benjamin by the whole people of Israel, in consequence of their supporting the cause of the wicked men of Gibeah, and the means afterwards adopted for preventing its becoming complete (ch. xix-xxi). The date is in some degree marked by the mention of Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron (xx, 28), and by the proof of the unanimity still prevailing among the people.

III. *Design.*—The above analysis clearly indicates a unity of plan on the part of the writer. His leading object he distinctly intimates in ii, 11-23, namely, in enforcement of the central idea of the theocracy, to prove that the calamities to which the Hebrews had been exposed since the death of Joshua were owing to their apostasy from Jehovah, and to their idolatry. "They forsook the Lord, and served Baal and Ashtaroth" (ii, 13), for which crimes they were deservedly punished and greatly distressed (ii, 15). Nevertheless, when they repented and obeyed again the commandments of the Lord, he delivered them out of the hand of their enemies by the *shophetim* whom he raised up, and made them prosper (ii, 16-23). To illustrate this theme, the author collected the most important elements of the Hebrew history during the period between Joshua and Eli. Some episodes occur, but in arguing his subject he never loses sight of his leading theme, to which, on the contrary, he frequently recurs while stating facts, and shows how it applied to them; the moral evidently being, that the only way to happiness was to shun idolatry and obey the commandments of the Lord. The appendix further illustrates the lawlessness and anarchy prevailing in Israel after Joshua's death.

Yet the words of the passage in which the author thus discloses his main object must not be pressed too closely, as if implying a perfect remedy of each political ruin. It is a general view, to which the facts of the history correspond in different degrees. Thus the people is contemplated as a whole; the judges are spoken of with the reverence due to God's instruments, and the deliverances appear complete. But it would seem that the people were in no instance under exactly the same circumstances, and the judges in some points fall short of the ideal. Thus Gideon, who in some respects is the most eminent of them, is only the head of his own tribe, and has to appease the men of Ephraim by conciliatory language in the moment of victory over the Midianites; and he himself is the means of leading away the people from the pure worship of God. In Jephthah we find the chief of the land of Gilead still affected to some extent by personal reasons (xi, 9): his war against the Ammonites is confined to the east side of Jordan, though its issues probably also freed the western side from their presence, and it is followed by a bloody conflict with Ephraim. Again, Samson's task was simply "to begin to deliver Israel" (xiii, 5): and the occasions which called forth his hostility to the Philistines are of a kind which place him on a different level from Deborah or Gideon. This shows that the passage in question is a general review of the *collective* history of Israel during the time of the judges, the details of which, in their varying aspects, are given faithfully as the narrative proceeds.

This view of the author's design may lead us to expect that we have not a complete history of the times—a fact which is clear from the book itself. We have only accounts of parts of the nation at any one time. We may easily suppose that there were other incidents of a similar nature to those recorded in ch. xvii-xxi. Indeed, in the history itself there are points which are obscure from want of fuller information, e. g. the reason for the silence about the tribe of Judah (see also viii, 18; ix, 26). Some suppose even that the number of the judges is not complete, but there is no reason for this opinion. *Bedan* (1 Sam. xii, 11) is probably the

same as *Abdon.* Ewald (*Gesch.* ii, 477) rejects the common explanation that the word is a contracted form of *Ben-Dan*, i. e. Samson. *Jael* (v, 6) need not be the name of an unknown judge, or a corruption of *Jair*, as Ewald thinks, but is probably the wife of Heber. "The days of Jael" would carry the misery of Israel up to the time of the victory over Sisera, and such an expression could hardly be thought too great an honor at that time (see v, 24). Had the writer designed to give a full and connected history of the Hebrews in the period between Joshua and the kings, he would doubtless have described the state of the domestic affairs and of the government in the several tribes, the relation in which they stood to each other, and the extent of power exercised by a judge, with other particulars such as do not appear in the narrative.

IV. *Sources of the Materials.*—Parts of the work are undoubtedly taken from ancient records and genealogies, others from traditions and oral information. From ancient authentic documents are probably copied the song of Deborah (chap. v), the beautiful parable of Jotham ix, 8-15), and the beginning of Samson's epinician, or triumphal poem (xv, 16). See also chap. xiv, 14, 18; xv, 7. In their genealogies the Hebrews usually inserted also some historical accounts, and from this source may have been derived the narrative of the circumstances that preceded the conception of Samson, which were given as the parents related them to others (chap. xiii). These genealogies were sometimes further illustrated by tradition, and several incidents in the history of Samson appear to have been derived from this kind of information. But on many points tradition offered nothing, or the author rejected its information as not genuine, and unworthy of belief. Thus it is that of Tola, Jair, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, the author gives only the number of years that they governed and the number of their children, but relates none of their transactions (x, 1-5; xii, 8, 9, 11, 13). In some instances the very words of the ancient documents which the author used seem to have been preserved, and this proves the care with which he composed. Thus, in the first division of our book, but nowhere else, rich and powerful men are described as men riding on ass-colts (x, 4; xii, 14, etc.); also in the song of Deborah (v, 9, 10). In the appendix also of this book, but nowhere else, a priest has the honorary title of father given him (xvii, 10; xviii, 19). But, though the author sometimes retained the words of his sources, still the whole of the composition is written in a particular style, distinguishing it from all other books of the Old Testament. The idea of the Israelites being overcome by their enemies he expresses often in this way: "The anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and he sold them into the hands of their enemies" (ii, 14; iii, 8; iv, 2; x, 7). A courageous and valiant warrior is described as a person upon whom rests the spirit of Jehovah, or as a person whom the spirit of Jehovah clothed (vi, 34; ix, 29; xiv, 6, 19; xv, 14, etc.).

Stähelin (*Krit. Untersuch.* p. 106) thinks that iii, 7-xvi present the same manner and diction throughout, and that there is no need to suppose written sources. So Hävernick (*Einleitung*, i, 1, p. 68 sq., 107) only recognises the use of documents in the appendix. Other critics, however, trace them throughout. Bertheau (*On Judges*, p. xxviii-xxxii) says that the difference of the diction in the principal narratives, coupled with the fact that they are united in one plan, points to the incorporation of parts of previous histories. Thus, according to him, the author found the substance of iv, 2-24 already accompanying the song of Deborah; in ch. vi-ix two distinct authorities are used—a life of Gideon, and a history of Shechem and its usurper; in the account of Jephthah a history of the tribes on the east of Jordan is employed, which meets us again in different parts of the Pentateuch and Joshua; and the history of Samson is taken from a longer work on the Philistine wars. Ewald's view is similar (*Gesch.* i, 184 sq.; ii, 486 sq.).

V. *Unity.*—This has already been pretty fully vindicated in the above remarks on the design of the writer (§ iii). The attacks that have been made upon the unity of the book are rested on very trifling grounds. The chief one is the existence of the appendix, though it is not difficult to see the two great reasons for this part of the book assuming such a form: the one, that the historical development according to plan was not to be interrupted; the other, that the two events which it narrates are to be looked on less as single events than as permanent influences. The permanence of the worship at Dan is expressly mentioned (xviii, 30, 31), and "the captivity of the land" for the twenty years before Samuel assumed office is traced to it with tolerable distinctness. The permanence of the moral evil which came out at Gibeah is not so plainly intimated; on the contrary, it might have been supposed to be eradicated by the vengeance taken on Benjamin. Yet the evil to be found in the whole tribes is indicated by their share in the terrible chastisement; and there is a hint of the continuance of some equally potent mischievous influence in the similar slaughter of the tribe of Ephraim by Jephthah. The prophet Hosea in so many words informs us that the days of Gibeah never ceased in Israel, and that the root of the evil had not been taken away (Hos. ix, 9; x, 9). There have been, indeed, some very unsuccessful efforts to establish a difference of the words in use and the style of composition in the appendix and in the body of the book, but there has been little appearance of success in the undertaking. Even these objectors have frequently admitted a resemblance and unity between the appendix and the introduction, on account of which some of them have gone so far as to say that both these may belong to a later editor, who prefixed and annexed his new materials to a previously existing work, the history of the judges strictly so called. The argument from internal chronological data will be examined below (§ vii). The attempts to discover contradictions in the book, with a view to show a plurality of authors, have also signally failed.

VI. *Relation to other Books of Scripture.*—This is somewhat connected with the topics discussed under the preceding and following heads. The coincidences with the two adjoining Biblical books, however, are so striking as to call for a distinct notice.

1. *Relation to the Book of Joshua.*—Josh. xv-xxi must be compared with Judg. i in order to understand fully how far the several tribes failed in expelling the people of Canaan. Nothing is said in chap. i about the tribes on the east of Jordan, which had already been mentioned (Josh. xiii, 13), nor about Levi (see Josh. xiii, 33; xxi, 1-42). The carrying on of the war by the tribes singly is explained by Josh. xxiv, 28. The book begins with a reference to Joshua's death, and ii, 6-9 resumes the narrative, suspended by i-ii, 5, with the same words as are used in concluding the history of Joshua (xxiv, 28-31). In addition to this, the following passages appear to be common to the two books: Judg. i, 10-15, 20, 21, 27, 29, compared with Josh. xv, 14-19, 13, 63; xvii, 12; xvi, 10. A reference to the conquest of Laish (Judg. xviii) occurs in Josh. xix, 47.

2. *Relation to the Books of Samuel and Kings.*—We find in i, 28, 30, 33, 35, a number of towns upon which, "when Israel was strong," a tribute of bond-service was levied: this is supposed by some to refer to the time of Solomon (1 Kings ix, 13-22). The conduct of Saul towards the Kenites (1 Sam. xv, 6), and that of David (1 Sam. xxx, 29), is explained by i, 16. A reference to the continuance of the Philistine wars is implied in xiii, 5. The allusion to Abimelech (2 Sam. xi, 21) is explained by ch. ix. Chapters xvii-xxi and the book of Ruth are more independent, but they have a general reference to the subsequent history.

3. The question now arises whether this book forms one link in a historical series, or whether it has a closer connection either with those that precede or follow it. We cannot infer anything from the agreement of its

view and spirit with those of the other books. The object of the writer was to give an account only of the "Judges" proper. Hence the history ceases with Samson, excluding Eli and Samuel; and then at this point two historical pieces are added—ch. xvii-xxi and the book of Ruth, supplemental to the general plan and to each other. This is less well explained by Ewald's supposition that the books from Judges to 2 Kings form one work. In this case the histories of Eli and Samuel, so closely united between themselves, are only deferred on account of their close connection with the rise of the monarchy. Judg. xvii-xxi is inserted both as an illustration of the sin of Israel during the time of the judges, in which respect it agrees with ch. i-xvi, and as presenting a contrast with the better order prevailing in the time of the kings. Ruth follows next, as touching on the time of the judges, and containing information about David's family history which does not occur elsewhere. The connection of these books, however, is denied by De Wette (*Einleit.* § 186) and Thenius (*Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb. Sam.* p. xv, *Könige*, p. i). Bertheau, on the other hand, thinks that one editor may be traced from Genesis to 2 Kings, whom he believes to be Ezra, in agreement with Jewish tradition.

VII. *Authorship and Date.*—The only guide to the time when the book was written is the expression "unto this day," which we frequently find in it (ii, 6-xvi), and the last occurrence of which (xv, 19) implies some distance from the time of Samson. But i, 21, according to the most natural explanation, would indicate a date, for this chapter at least, previous to the taking of Jebus by David (2 Sam. v, 6-9). Again, we should at first sight suppose i, 28, 30, 33, 35, to belong to the time of the judges; but these passages are taken by many modern critics as pointing to the time of Solomon (comp. 1 Kings ix, 21). The first portion of the book (chap. i-xvi) was originally, as Ewald thinks (*Gesch.* i, 202), the commencement of a larger work reaching down to above a century after Solomon (see also Davidson, *Introduction*, p. 649), but this is equally gratuitous. The author of the second division always describes the period of which he speaks thus: "In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (xvii, 6; xviii, 1; xix, 1; xxi, 25); but this expression never once occurs in the first division. Hence many modern critics conclude that the author of the first sixteen chapters of our book was different from him who composed the appendix (see Bertholdt, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die sämmtlichen Schriften des A. und N. T.* p. 876; Eichhorn's *Einleitung in das A. Test.* iii, § 457; S. Davidson, in Horne's *Introd.*, new ed., ii, 648; but Keil the contrary, *Einleit.* p. 182). The authorship of the first sixteen chapters has been assigned to Joshua, Samuel, and Ezra. That they were not written by Joshua appears from the difference of the method of relating subjects, as well as from the difference of the style. In the book of Joshua there is a continual reference to the law of Moses, which is much less frequent in the book of Judges; and in Joshua, again, there are no such inferences from history as are common in Judges (iii, 1, 4; viii, 27; ix, 56). The style of the book of Joshua is neater than that of Judges; the narration is more clear, and the arrangement is better (compare i, 10, 11, 20, with Josh. xiv, 6-15, and xv, 13-19; also ii, 7-10, with Josh. xxiv, 29-31). That the book of Judges was composed by Samuel, although an invention of the Talmudists, unsupported by any external evidence, is nevertheless the most plausible authorship that has been assigned to it, at least so far as relates to the first division. The opinion that this portion was written by Ezra will not be entertained by any one who attentively peruses the original; for it has a phraseology of its own, and certain favorite ideas, to which it constantly reverts, but of which there is not a trace in Ezra. If Ezra had intended to continue the history of the Hebrews from Joshua down to Eli in a separate work, he would not have given a selection of incidents to prove a particular theme, but a complete history. The orthography of the book of Ezra, with many phrases characteristic of his age, do not appear in the book of Judges. The prefix ש occurs, indeed (v, 7; vi, 17; vii, 12, viii, 26); but this cannot be referred to in proof that the language is of the time of Ezra, for it belonged to the dialect of North Palestine, as Ewald and others have proved. Other verbal peculiarities may be explained in a similar manner (see Ottmar, in Henke's *Magazin*, vol. iv; De Wette, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in die Bibel*, Berlin, 1833-39). The first sixteen chapters must have been written under Saul, whom the Israelites made their king in the hope of improving their condition. Phrases used in the period of the judges may be traced in them, and the author must consequently have lived near the time when they were yet current. He says that in his time "the Jebusites dwelt with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem" (i, 21): now this was the case only before David, who conquered the town and drove out the Jebusites. Consequently, the author of the first division of the book of Judges must have lived and written before David, and yet he was acquainted with a regal form of government, which can only point to the reign of Saul. If he had lived under David, he would have mentioned the capture of Jerusalem by that monarch, as the nature of his subject did not allow him to pass it over in silence. The omission, moreover, of the history not only of Samuel, but also of Eli, indicates an author who, living in an age very near that of Eli, considered his history as generally known, because so recent.

The exact date of the appendix is more difficult to determine, but its author certainly lived in an age considerably later than that of the recorded events. That in his time the period of the events which he relates had been long forgotten is, however, hardly a fair inference from the frequent chronological formula, "In those days there was no king in Israel" (xvii, 6); and it is gratuitous to suppose that certain particulars of his narrative could no longer be ascertained, and that this caused him to omit the name of the Levite whose history is given in ch. xix. In his time, indeed, the house of God was no longer in Shiloh (xviii, 31); and it will be recollected that it was David who brought the ark to Jerusalem. But it must be borne in mind that it had frequently changed places during the Philistine war, and it remained a long time away from Shiloh even after Eli's death. The author knew that the posterity of Jonathan were priests of the graven image in Dan, or Laish, "until the day of the captivity of the land" (xviii, 30). This latter circumstance has been assumed by Le Clerc and others to prove that the appendix was not published until after the Babylonian captivity, or at least until after that of Israel by Shalmaneser and Esar-haddon. It cannot be understood of the domination of the Philistines over the Israelites, which would very improperly be called "the captivity of the land," this expression always implying the deportation of the inhabitants of a country. But we may reasonably suppose that this expression was added by a later editor. The circumstance that the author, in mentioning Shiloh, adds, "which is in the land of Canaan" (xxi, 12), and that the topographical description of the site of Shiloh is given (xxi, 19), has led some interpreters to assert that the author of the appendix must have been a foreigner, as to an Israelite such remarks would have appeared trivial (see *Briefe einiger Holländischen Gottesgelehrten über R. Simon's kritische Geschichte des A. T.*, edited by Le Clerc at Zürich, p. 490). The inference is certainly specious, but, from an examination of the contexts, it appears that in the first passage Shiloh is opposed to Jabesh in Gilead, a town without the land of Canaan, and that this led the author to add to Shiloh that it was in Canaan; while the second passage describes, not the site of Shiloh, but of a place in its neighborhood, where an annual feast was celebrated, when the daughters of Shiloh came out to dance, to sing, and to play on instruments of mu-

sic; the author thus heightening the interest of his narrative by giving a clearer idea of the circumstances of the festival. Neither of these passages, therefore, authorizes the inference that he was a foreigner. Under these circumstances, many have been content to conjecture that the latter portion of the book was compiled, perhaps by Ezra, out of historical documents originating with the various prophetical characters that appeared from time to time during the earlier period of the Hebrew commonwealth, chiefly perhaps Samuel. But if the above reasoning is correct, especially that relating to the unity of the entire book, we do not see why Samuel himself may not have added the appendix, substantially in its present form, to the former part of the history.

VIII. *Canonicity and Credibility.*—The book was published at a time when the events related were generally known, and when the veracity of the author could be ascertained by a reference to the original documents. Several of its narratives are confirmed by the books of Samuel (comp. Judg. iv, 2: vi, 14; xi, with 1 Sam. xii, 9-12; Judg. ix, 53 with 2 Sam. xi, 21). The Psalms not only allude to the book of Judges (compare Psa. lxxxiii, 11 with Judg. vii, 25), but copy from it entire verses (compare Psa. lxviii, 8, 9; xcvii, 5, with Judg. v, 4, 5). Philo and Josephus knew the book, and made use of it in their own compositions. The New Testament alludes to it in several places (comp. Matt. ii, 13-23 with Judg. xiii, 5; xvi, 17; Acts xiii, 20; Heb. xi, 32).

This external evidence in support of the authority of the book of Judges is corroborated by many internal proofs of its authenticity. All its narratives are in character with the age to which they belong, and agree with the natural order of things. We find here that shortly after the death of Joshua the Hebrew nation had, by several victories, gained courage and become valorous (ch. i and xix), but that it afterwards turned to agriculture, preferred a quiet life, and allowed the Canaanites to reside in its territory in consideration of a tribute imposed on them, when the original plan was that they should be expelled. This changed their character entirely: they became effeminate and indolent—a result which we find in the case of all nations who, from a nomadic and warlike life, turn to agriculture. The intercourse with their heathen neighbors frequently led the uncultivated Hebrews into idolatry; and this, again, further prepared them for servitude. They were consequently overpowered and oppressed by their heathen neighbors. The first subjugation, indeed, by a king of Mesopotamia, they endured but eight years; but the second, more severe, by Eglon, lasted longer: it was the natural consequence of the public spirit having gradually more and more declined, and of Eglon having removed his residence to Jericho with a view to closely watching all their movements (Josephus, *Ant.* v, 5). When Ehud sounded the trumpet of revolt, the whole nation no longer rose in arms, but only the inhabitants of Mount Ephraim (iii, 27); and when Barak called to arms against Sisera, many tribes remained quietly with their herds (v, 14, 15, 26, 28). Of the 30,000 men who offered to follow Gideon, he could make use of no more than 300, this small number only being, as it would seem, filled with true patriotism and courage. Thus the people had sunk gradually, and deserved for forty years to bear the yoke of the Philistines, to whom they had the meanness to deliver Samson, who, however, loosed the cords with which he was tied, and killed a large number of them (ch. xv). It is impossible to consider such a historical work, which perfectly agrees with the natural course of things, as a fiction: at that early period of authorship, no author could, from fancy, have depicted the character of the Hebrews so conformably with nature and established facts. All in this book breathes the spirit of the ancient world. Martial law we find in it, as could not but be expected, hard and wild. The conquered people are subjected to rough treatment, as is the case in the wars of all uncivilized people; the inhabitants of cities are destroyed wholesale (viii, 16, 17; xx). Hospitality and the protection of strangers received as guests is considered the highest virtue: a father will rather resign his daughter than allow violence to be done to a stranger who stops in his house for the night (ch. xix; comp. Gen. xix).

In the state of oppression in which the Hebrews often found themselves during the period from Joshua to Eli, it was to be expected that men, filled with heroism, should now and then rise up and call the people to arms in order to deliver them from their enemies. Such valiant men are introduced by our author, and he extols them, indeed, highly; but, on the other hand, he is not silent respecting their faults, as may be seen in the instances of Ehud, whom he reports to have murdered a king to recover liberty for his country (iii, 16 sq.); of Gideon, who is recorded to have punished the inhabitants of Succoth and Penuel cruelly for having refused bread to his weary troops (viii, 16, 17); and of Jephthah, whose inconsiderate vow deprives him of his only daughter (xi, 34). This cannot be a fiction; it is no panegyric on Israel to describe them in the manner the author has done. Now this frank, impartial tone pervades the whole work. It begins with displaying the Israelites as a refractory and obstinate people, and the appendix ends with the statement of a crime committed by the Benjamites, which had the most disastrous consequences. At the same time, due praise is bestowed on acts of generosity and justice, and valiant feats are carefully recorded.

But are not the exploits of its heroes exaggerated in our book, like those of Sesostris, Semiramis, and Hercules? Their deeds are, no doubt, often splendid; but they do not surpass belief, provided we do not add to the narrative anything which the original text does not sanction, nor give to particular words and phrases a meaning which does not belong to them. Thus, when we read that "Shamgar *slew* of the Philistines 600 men" (iii, 31), it would perhaps have been correct if the Hebrew וַיַּךְ had been rendered by "put to flight;" and it should further be recollected that Shamgar is not stated to have been alone and unassisted in repelling the enemy: he did it, no doubt, supported by those brave men whose leader he was. It frequently happens that to the leader is attributed what has been performed by his followers. Nor can it offend when, in the passage quoted above, it is said that Shamgar repelled the Philistines with an ox-goad; for this was exactly the weapon which an uncultivated Oriental warrior, who had been brought up to husbandry, would choose in preference to other instruments of offence. From the description which travellers give of it, it appears to have been well suited to such a purpose. See GOAD. It is chiefly the prodigious strength of Samson, however, which to very many readers seems exaggerated, and surpassing all belief. He is, e. g., reported to have, unarmed, slain a lion (xiv, 5, 6); to have caught 300 jackals (שׁוּעָלִים), bound their tails to one another, put a firebrand between two tails, and let them go into the standing corn of the Philistines, which was thus burnt up (xv, 4, 5, 8); to have broken, with perfect ease, the new cords with which his arms were bound, etc. (xv, 14; xvi, 7-9, 11). Now there is in these and other recorded feats of Samson nothing which ought to create difficulty, for history affords many instances of men of extraordinary strength, of whom Goliath among the Philistines is not the least remarkable; and for others we refer to T. Ludolf, *Historia Æthiopiæ*, i, 10; to the *Acta Dei per Francos*, i, 75, 314; and to Schillinger, *Missionsbericht*, iv, 79. Lions were also slain by other persons unarmed, as by David (1 Sam. xvii, 36) and Benaiah (2 Sam. xxiii, 20). It were easy to show that, when properly understood, his other exploits do not necessarily exceed the limits of human power. Extraordinary indeed they were, but, even if regarded as not alleged by the Scripture itself to have been supernatu-

ral, they are far from fabulous. Considering the very remote period at which our book was written—considering also the manner of viewing and describing events and persons which prevailed with the ancient Hebrews, and which very much differs from that of our age—taking, moreover, into account the brevity of the narratives, which consist of historical fragments, we may well wonder that there do not occur in it more difficulties, and that not more doubts have been raised as to its historical authority (see Herder, *Geist der Hebräischen Poesie*, ii, 250, 59; Eichhorn, *Repertorium der Biblischen und Morgenländischen Litteratur*, vii, 78). For a further elucidation of the above and other difficulties, see the several subjects in their alphabetical places.

IX. *Chronological Difficulties.*—The time commonly assigned to the period contained in this book is 299 years. But this number is not derived directly from it. The length of the interval between Joshua's death and the invasion of Chushan-rishathaim, and of the time during which Shamgar was judge, is not stated. The dates which are given amount to 410 years when reckoned consecutively; and Acts xiii, 20 would show that this was the computation commonly adopted, as the 450 years seem to result from adding 40 years for Eli to the 410 of this book. But a difficulty is created by xi, 26, and in a still greater degree by 1 Kings vi, 1, where the whole period from the exodus to the building of the Temple is stated at 480 years (Septuag. 440). One solution questions the genuineness of the date in 1 Kings. Kennicott pronounces against it (*Diss. Gen.* 80, § 3) because it is omitted by Origen when quoting the rest of the verse. It is also urged that Josephus would not have reckoned 592 years for the same period if the present reading had existed in his time. But it is defended by Thenius (ad loc.), and is generally adopted, partly on account of its agreement with Egyptian chronology. Most of the systems therefore shorten the time of the judges by reckoning the dates as inclusive or contemporary. But all these combinations are arbitrary. The same may be said of Keil's scheme, which is one of those least open to objection. He reckons the dates successively as far as Jair, but makes Jephthah and the three following judges contemporary with the 40 years of the Philistine oppression (comp. x, 6-xiii, 1); and by compressing the period between the division of the land and Chushan-rishathaim into 10 years, and the Philistine wars to the death of Saul into 39, he arrives ultimately at the 480 years. Ewald and Bertheau have proposed ingenious but unsatisfactory explanations—differing in details, but both built upon the supposition that the whole period from the exodus to Solomon was divided into 12 generations of 40 years; and that, for the period of the judges, this system has become blended with the dates of another more precise reckoning.

But the whole theory of the parallel or contemporaneous rule of two or more judges, upon which all these shortenings of the period in question proceed, is purely arbitrary. There is nothing in the book of Judges to warrant the supposition that the national unity was completely broken up, so that there ever were two independent judges ruling different parts of Israel: such a schism first appeared in the days of Ishbosheth and Jeroboam, and then our attention is strongly called to it. The Ammonitish oppression is distinctly stated to have extended far beyond the eastern tribes, into Judah, and Benjamin, and Ephraim, all being included in that "Israel which they oppressed." Nor is there anything in the history which suggests the restriction of Jephthah's jurisdiction to the east of Jordan. On the contrary, Mizpeh of Gilead (xi, 29) seems to be distinguished from Mizpeh simply so called, where he took up his house (ver. 34), where he uttered all his words before the Lord (ver. 11), and where the children of Israel had assembled themselves together and encamped (x, 17); and it will be difficult to assign a reason for thinking that this was not the Mizpeh in Benjamin, where at other times the people of the Lord were used to meet in those days (xx, 1; 1 Sam. vii, 5, 6; x, 17). Jephthah's successors, whose rule must also be made contemporary with the Philistine oppression during 40 years, had no special connection whatever with the eastern tribes. Ibzan belonged to Bethlehem, and was buried there; Elon stood in the same relation to the tribe of Zebulon, and Abdon to Pirathon, in the land of Ephraim. So far as we know, these are fair specimens of the connections which the judges had with the different localities of the land of Israel, and there is no ground for restricting the rule of one of them more than that of another to a part of the land. We are pretty sure that this was not the case with Deborah and Barak, nor with Gideon, nor, certainly, with Samuel; why imagine it with any of the rest? What time could be suggested less likely for such a revolution in the constitution of Israel than the close of 55 years of peaceful government under two successive judges, in whose administration there was so little to record for the instruction of posterity? Or, if there had been a threatening of such disintegration of the commonwealth, would it not be prevented by the nomination of the high-priest Eli to the office of judge? Yet that other supposition of Eli's last 20 years falling under the first 20 of the Philistines compels us to suppose that his first 20 were contemporaneous with Jair's government, down to whose death Keil admits that there is no trace of division: hence he is driven to the desperate resource of denying that Eli was a judge at all, except in the sense in which every high-priest might be called by this name. But, had Eli been only a judge during the Philistine servitude, we should expect this to be stated, as in Samson's case. Neither is it easily credible that four judges, Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, should rule the eastern tribes in uninterrupted succession, without attempting to drive out the Philistines, and support Samson in his marvellous struggle.

In order to weaken the force of Paul's statement in Acts xiii, 20, which confirms the consecutiveness of the judgeships, recourse has been had to a various reading of that passage, by which it may be rendered. "When he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan, he divided their land to them by lot in about 450 years, and after that he gave them judges until Samuel the prophet." This reading has the support of our four oldest manuscripts (Alexandrian, Vatican, Ephraem palimpsest, and Sinaitic), and of the Vulgate, and it has been adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, and others, but not by Tischendorf (7th ed.), Alford, or Meyer. But the various readings of the passage are in such a form as suggests that there had been tampering with the text by the scribes, plainly for the very reason that they felt the chronological difficulty; and no one would have altered the text into the present form, for which there is the authority of the versions generally, and of the fathers who quote it, so as to create a difficulty for themselves. The sense, too, is very unsatisfactory, the 450 years being then understood to run from the birth of Isaac to the division of the land, a computation for which no reason can be given, and which ill agrees with the other statements of time in the context, where there is surely a chronological sequence. It would certainly conflict with the 430 years assigned to the sojourn in Egypt (Exod. xii, 41), a period computed, as Gal. iii, 17 shows, from the call of Abraham, when he was seventy-five years old (Gen. xii, 4), to the Exode (comp. Gen. xv, 16). Keil, indeed, makes the inconsistency even worse for himself by reckoning these 430 years from Jacob's descent into Egypt. See CHRONOLOGY, vol. ii, p. 302.

We are compelled, therefore, to understand the periods of oppression and judgeship as immediately successive, and then, arranging them in four periods, as suggested in § ii above, we may tabulate the whole of the middle part of the history as on the following page.

X. *Commentaries.*—The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole book of Judges, alone, the most important of which we designate by an asterisk prefixed: Origen, *Selecta* (in *Opp.* ii, 457; also in *Bibl.*

	Years	Total		Hales.	Keil.	Usher.	Jewish.	True.
				B.C.	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.
First Period (Chap. iii–v).								
I. *Servitude.* Chushan Rishathaim, of Mesopotamia	8		begin	1572	1435	1402	1244	1575
1. Judge. OTHNIEL	40		"	1564	1427	1394		1567
II. *Servitude.* Eglon, of Moab; Ammon, Amalek	18		"	1524	1387	1354	1204	1527
2. Judge. EHUD	80		"	1506	1369	1336		1509
3. Judge. SHAMGAR ("slew of the Philistines")	..		"					
III. *Servitude.* Jabin, of Hazor in Canaan	20		"	1426	1289	1316	1124	1429
4. Judge. DEBORAH / 5. Judge. BARAK	40		"	1406	1269	1296		1409
	—	206						
Second Period (Chap. vi–x, 5).								
IV. *Servitude.* Midian, Amalek, and children of the East	7		"	1366	1229	1256	1084	1369
6. Judge. GIDEON	40		"	1359	1222	1249	....	1362
King. ABIMELECH	3		"	1319	1182	1209	1044	1322
7. Judge. TOLA	23		"	1316	1179	1206	1041	1319
8. Judge. JAIR	22		"	1293	1156	1183	1018	1296
	—	95						
Third Period (Chap. x, 6–xii).								
V. *Servitude.* Ammonites, with Philistines	18		"	1271	1134	1161	996	1274
9. Judge. JEPHTHAH	6		"	1253	1116	1143	979	1256
10. Judge. IBZAN	7		"	1247	1110	1137	973	1250
11. Judge. ELON	10		"	1240	1103	1130	967	1243
12. Judge. ABDON	8		"	1230	1093	1120	957	1233
	—	49						
Fourth Period (Chap. xiii–xvi).								
VI. *Servitude.* Philistines	40		"	1222	1134	1161	949	1225
13. Judge. SAMSON ("in the days of the Philistines")	20							
	—	60						1185
		410	ending	1182	.....	1120		1165

Patr. Gallandii, xiv); Ephraem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* iv, 308); Theodoret, *Quæstiones* (in *Opp.* i, 1); Isidorus Hispalensis, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* i); Bede, *Quæstiones* (in *Opp.* p. 8); Rupertus Tuitiensis, *In Jud.* (in *Opp.* i, 331); Irimpertus, *Commentarii* (in Pez. *Thesaur.* IV, i, 127); Rabbi Tanchum, *Commentarii* (from the Arabic, by Schnurrer, Tübing. 1791, 8vo; by Haarbrücher, Hal. 1842, 8vo); Bañolas, פֵּרוּשׁ [including Josh., etc.] (Leira, 1494, folio; also in the Rabbinical Bibles, etc.); Bucer, *Commentarius* (Paris, 1554, 1563, fol.); Borrhaus [Cellarius], *Commentarius* [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Basil. 1557, folio); Lavater, *Homiliæ* (Tigur. 1561, 1571, 1582, 1609, fol.); Ferus, *Enarrationes* [including Exod., etc.] (Colon. 1571, 1574, 8vo); Strigel, *Scholia* (Lipsiæ, 1575, 1586, 8vo); Chytræus, *Commentarius* (Francof. 1589, 8vo); Peter Martyr, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1561, Lond. 1565, 1576, 1582, Heidelb. 1590, folio); Montanus, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1592, 4to); Heling, *Periocha* (Norib. 1593, 1594, 8vo); Alscheich, מַרְאוֹת, etc. [includ. Josh., etc.] (Venice, 1601, 1620; Prague, 1620; Offenb. 1719, fol.); Felibien, *Commentarii* [includ. Josh., etc.] (Paris, 1604, 4to); Ibn-Chajim, לֵב אַהֲרֹן [includ. Josh.] (Ven. 1609, fol.; also in Frankfürter's Rabbinic Bible); Serarius, *Explanatio* [includ. Ruth] (Mogunt. 1609, folio); Rogers, *Lectures* (Lond. 1615, fol.); Drusius, *Commentarius* [includ. Josh., etc.] (Franec. 1618, 4to); Magalianus, *Explanationes* (Lugd. 1626, folio); Bonfrère, *Commentarius* [includ. Josh., etc.] (Paris, 1631, 1659, folio); Villaroel, *Commentarii* (Madr. 1636, fol.); Freyre, *Commentarii* (Olyssip. and Mach. 1642, 4to); Jackson, *Commentary* [includ. Ruth, etc.] (Cambr. 1646, 2 vols. 4to); De Vega, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1663 sq., 3 vols. fol.); De Naxera, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1664, 3 vols. fol.); *Osiander, *Commentarius* (Tüb. 1682, fol.); *S. Schmidt, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1684, 1691, 1706, 4to); Moldenhauer, *Zeitrechnung*, etc. (Hamb. 1766, 8vo); also *Erläuterung* [includ. Josh., etc.] (Quedlinb. 1774, 8vo); Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lipsiæ, 1835, 8vo); Studer, *Erklärung* (Berne, 1835, 1842, 8vo); Herzfeld, *Chronologia*, etc. (Berol. 1836, 8vo); *Bertheau, *Erklärung* [includ. Ruth] (Lpz. 1845, 8vo); Bush, *Notes* (N. York, 1852, 12mo); Noble, *Sermons* (London, 1856, 8vo); Cummings, *Readings* [includ. Josh.] (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Rördam, *Vers. Syriaco-hexapl.*, etc. (Havniæ, 1859, 4to); Fritzsche, *Secundum Sept.*, etc. (Turici, 1867, 8vo); *Bachmann, *Erklärung* (Berlin, 1867–70, vol. i, 8vo). See OLD TESTAMENT.

Judghanites. See JUDAH JUDGHAN.

Judging, RASH, the act of carelessly, precipitately, wantonly, or maliciously censuring others. This is an evil which abounds too much among almost all classes of men. "Not content with being in the right ourselves, we must find all others in the wrong. We claim an exclusive possession of goodness and wisdom; and from approving warmly of those who join us, we proceed to condemn, with much acrimony, not only the principles, but the characters of those from whom we differ. We rashly extend to every individual the severe opinion which we have unwarrantably conceived of a whole body. This man is of a party whose principles we reckon slavish, and therefore his whole sentiments are corrupted. That man belongs to a religious sect which we are accustomed to deem bigoted, and therefore he is incapable of any generous and liberal thought. Another is connected with a sect which we have been taught to account relaxed, and therefore can have no sanctity. We should do well to consider, 1. That this practice of rash judging is absolutely forbidden in the sacred Scriptures (Matt. vii, 1). 2. We thereby authorize others to requite us in the same kind. 3. It often evidences our pride, envy, and bigotry. 4. It argues a want of charity, the distinguishing feature of the Christian religion. 5. They who are most forward in censuring others are often most defective themselves." See Barrow's *Works*, vol. i, ser. 20; Blair's *Sermons*, ser. 10, vol. ii; Saurin's *Sermons*, ser. 4, vol. v.

Judgment, considered as a technical and scientific term of logic, is an act of the mind by which something is affirmed. In this restricted sense it is one of the simplest acts or operations of which we are conscious in the exercise of our rational powers. The intellectual faculty called judgment is the power of determining anything to be true or false. In every instance of memory or perception there is involved some judgment, some feeling of relationship, of space, or time, or similarity, or contrast. Consciousness necessarily involves a judgment; and, as every act of mind is an act of consciousness, every act of mind consequently involves a judgment. It is a process not only subsequent to the acquisition of knowledge, but "involved as a condition of the acquisitive process itself." There is not only included what is popularly understood as comparison (when the properties of bodies are compared), but that elementary faculty, that fundamental law or innate idea, which, in the first instance, makes us cognizant of the property. Hence Sir William Hamilton's division into derivative and primitive cognitions, the derivative being of our own fabrication, formed from certain rules, and being the tardy result of perception and memory, of attention, reflection, abstraction. These are derived from expe-

rience, and, as such, are contingent; and as all experience is contingent, all the knowledge derived from experience is contingent also. But, as there are conditions of the mind which are not contingent, which are necessary, which we cannot but think, which thought supposes as its fundamental condition, these are denominated primitive cognitions; these primitive and general notions being the root of all principles, the foundation of the whole edifice of science. For the discovery of this great truth we are indebted to Leibnitz, who, in controverting Locke's view of innate ideas, asserted the existence of a principle of human knowledge independent of and superior to that which is afforded by the senses. Kant, adopting Leibnitz's view, furnishes a test by which these two elements are distinguished from each other: the former, being contingent, are fluctuating and uncertain; they may be in the mind, or they may not. Every fresh scene in which we are placed completely alters the sensations, and the particular sensational judgments of which we are conscious. On the contrary, our primitive judgments are steady, abiding, unalterable. These primitive judgments, he asserts, are of two kinds, analytic and synthetic. An analytic judgment is simply a declaration of something necessarily belonging to a given notion, as that every triangle has three sides. A synthetic judgment may be a declaration of something which does not actually belong to a notion, but which our minds are led, by some kind of evidence or other, to attribute to it, as "Every event has an efficient cause." Here we do more than analyze the expression; we attribute altogether a fresh notion to it, and form a judgment by which our knowledge is extended. Both these judgments are found in the pure sciences, and form the very principles upon which they are pursued. It may be well to remark, however, that Comte, Herbert Spencer, Mill, etc., following Locke, deny the existence of these primitive judgments altogether, even the axioms which stand at the head of mathematical reasoning. So far from being mental and subjective, they are truly inductive, derived from observation; only *that* observation is so constant, and *that* induction is so easy and immediate, that we fall easily into an impression that these laws are intuitive, whereas they are, in fact, experimental. For instance, the axioms and postulates which are the basis of Euclid's Geometry are not metaphysical—written on the intellect, and drawn out of the brain—they are only statements of laws observed and experienced. See Watts, *Logic*, ch. iv, p. 231; Locke, *On the Understanding*, i, 222, 256; ii, 271, 278; Duncan, *Logic*, p. 145; Reid, *On the Intellectual Powers*, p. 497, etc. (E. de P.)

JUDGMENT, RIGHT OF PRIVATE. The Church of Rome denies the right as claimed by Protestants on the following grounds: that the Church, being assisted by the Spirit of God in searching the Scriptures, having the promise of the presence of Jesus to the end of the world, and having the possession of the unwritten word as a commentary on the written, is the only safe interpreter of holy Scripture, and the supreme judge by whose definitive sentence all controversies with regard to the meaning of particular passages or the general doctrine of holy Scripture must be determined. It makes a distinction, however, between the learned exegesis, as applied to the sacred writings, and that interpretation which emanates from the Church. The interpretation of the Church does not descend to the details which must claim the attention of the scientific exegetist. Thus, for example, she does not hold it her duty, nor include it in the compass of her rights, to determine when, by whom, and for what object the book of Job was written; or what particular inducement engaged St. John to publish his Gospel, or St. Paul to address an epistle to the Romans; in what order of time the epistles of the apostle followed each other, etc. As little does she undertake to explain particular words and verses, their bearings one on the other, or the connection existing between larger portions of the sacred book. Antiquities, in the widest sense of the word, fall not within the domain of her interpretation; in short, that interpretation extends only to doctrines of faith and morals. Within these limits she declares it to be the duty of Christians to acquiesce in this infallible determination, and that it is presumption and impiety, and a sin for which they deserve everlasting punishment, to oppose their own private judgment, which cannot of itself attain the truth, to the decision of the Church, which cannot err.

To this extraordinary claim Protestants agree in opposing this principle, that the holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith. But, while there is a general agreement as to this, i. e. to receive the Scriptures as a sufficient rule of faith, and as the only authoritative rule, there are wide diversities of opinion concerning the power reserved to the Church as to the doctrines of religion. The extreme view is that the Church at no time possesses the right of intermeddling in articles of faith. The essential articles of faith are so few, so simple, and so easily gathered out of clear and explicit passages, that it is impossible for any man who has the exercise of his reason to miss them; that no harm can arise from allowing any man to interpret the Scriptures as he pleases; and that, as Scripture may be sufficiently understood for purposes of salvation without any foreign assistance, all creeds and confessions of faith composed and prescribed by human authority are an encroachment upon the prerogative of the supreme Teacher, and an invasion of the right of private judgment. Such furthermore maintain that all divisions among Christians have grown out of the attempt of the Church to force upon Christians uniformity of belief as to the doctrines of holy Scripture.

This view of the right of private judgment is generally held by the followers of Socinus, and among its ablest champions at the present day are some of the leading minds of the Church of England, who, on account of their peculiar views, are denominated Moderate, Catholic, Broad Church, by the friends of that party: Latitudinarian, or Indifferent, by its enemies. Believing that the superficial differences between Christians are as nothing in comparison with their essential agreement, they are willing that the portals of the Church should be flung as wide open as the gates of heaven. This is clearly set forth by the late Dr. Arnold: "All societies of men, whether we call them states or churches, should make their bond to consist in a common object and a common practice rather than in a common belief; in other words, their end should be good rather than truth. We may consent to act together, but we cannot consent to believe together; many motives may persuade us to the one: we may like the object, or we may like our company, or we may think it safest to join them, or most convenient, and any one of these motives is quite sufficient to induce a unity of action, action being a thing in our own power. But no motives can persuade us to believe together; we may wish a statement to be true, we may admire those who believe it, we may find it very inconvenient not to believe it; all this helps us nothing; unless our own mind is freely convinced that the statement or doctrine is true, we cannot by possibility believe it.

"Such a union of action appears historically to have been the original bond of the Christian Church. Whoever was willing to receive Christ as his Master, to join his people, and to walk according to his rules, was admitted to the Christian society. We know that in the earliest Church there existed the strangest varieties of belief, some Christians not even believing that there would be a resurrection of the dead. Of course it was not intended that such varieties should be perpetual: a closer union of belief was gradually effected; but the point to observe is that the union of belief grew out of the union of action; it was the result of belonging to the society rather than a previous condition required for belonging to it, for no human power can presume to

inquire into the degree of a man's positive belief. A general, hearty belief in Christianity is to be regarded by the Church, not as its starting-point, but as its highest perfection. To begin with a strict creed and no efficient Christian institutions is the sure way to hypocrisy and unbelief; to begin with the most general confession of faith imputed, that is, as a test of membership, but with vigorous Christian institutions, is the way most likely to lead not only to a real and general belief, but also to a lively perception of the highest points of Christian faith. In other words, intellectual objections to Christianity should be tolerated when they are combined with moral obedience; tolerated, because in this way they are most surely removed; whereas a corrupt or disorganized Church, with a minute creed, encourages intellectual objections; and if it proceeds to put them down by force, it does often violate the right of conscience, punishing an unbelief which its own evil had provoked, and, so far as human judgment can see, has in a great measure justified. In primitive usage, a heretic was not properly he who did not believe what the Church taught, but he who wilfully withdrew himself from its society, refusing to conform to its system, and setting up another system of his own."

To most Protestants, however, this plan seems very defective. Regarding the Christian Church as a society created by divine institution, it possesses all the authority which Christ meant to convey through his apostles to their successors, and of the exercise of which the apostles have left examples. They deem it to be incontrovertible that these successive teachers in the Christian Church were intended to be interpreters and expounders of the sacred book; that they are invested with authority in relation to the doctrines of holy Scripture; and that, as a mere acknowledgment of the truth of Scripture is not a sufficient security for soundness of faith, it is lawful for the Church to employ additional guards to that "form of sound words" which it is required to hold fast and to defend. It is one thing to say that the Bible is the rule of faith, and another to say that it is the judge to determine what that rule is. The latter it can as little be as the code of civil law can exercise the functions of the judge; it forms, indeed, the rule of judgment, but it does not itself pronounce judgment. Hence the twentieth article of the Church of England declares that "the Church hath authority in matters of faith." So the Westminster Confession, "It belongeth to synods and councils ministerially to determine controversies of faith." See Rogers, *Reason and Faith;* Wilson, *Apostolic Fathers;* Elliot, *Delineation of Romanism* (see Index); Litton, *Church of Christ*, p. 77 sq. (E. de P.)

JUDGMENT, The Last, the sentence that will be passed on our actions at the last day, when the everlasting designs of God concerning this lower creation shall be accomplished, an end put to time, and the destinies of the human race fixed for eternity. This is one of the peculiar doctrines of revelation, a doctrine of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. There were, indeed, some hints of it in the Old Testament; but it is in the New Testament that we have it frequently and particularly declared and described, with the circumstances with which it will be attended. It is a doctrine, too, which is entirely agreeable to reason, which fully concurs with revelation in directing our minds to a state of retribution, there being no alternative, if we hold not the truth of a judgment to come, but the holding that the creation is not under a moral government. For, on the one hand, there is no doubt that we live under a retributive government, and that cognizance is taken of our actions by an invisible but ever-present Being, whose attributes render him the determined foe of vice, and the steadfast upholder of righteousness. On the other hand, there has been an irresistible demonstration, from the experience of all ages, that no accurate proportion is at present maintained between conduct and condition. The wicked triumph in their iniquity, while virtue is despised; her humble votaries are borne down by the gloom of adversity, or reared in the midst of sorrows and tears. In every age of the world, therefore, men have been perplexed by what seemed opposite evidences as to the superintending care of a wise and beneficent Being. The only way to escape the difficulty is an appeal to the future; for either the idea is erroneous of one living under a moral government at all, or that moral government must have another scene of display where its impartiality shall be vindicated, and every discrepancy removed. See Fuller, *Works*, ii, 78, 106, 152, 211, 367, 392, 437, 841, 859, 871, 883, 906; Dwight, *Theology;* Irving, *Argument for Judgment to come.* See Judgment Day. (E. de P.)

Judgment Day, a term generally used to designate that important day which is to terminate the present dispensation of grace; at the end of the world, when time shall be no more, and the eternal state of all men be unchangeably fixed (2 Pet. iii, 7).

I. *Proof of a general Judgment.*—The arguments for this are these: 1. The justice of God requires it; for it is evident that this attribute is not clearly displayed in the dispensation of things in the present state (2 Thess. i, 6, 7; Luke xiv, 14). 2. The accusations of natural conscience are testimonies in favor of this belief (Rom. ii, 15; Dan. v, 5, 6; Acts xxiv, 25). 3. It may be concluded, from the relation men stand in to God, as creatures to a Creator. He has a right to give them a law, and to make them accountable for the breach of it (Rom. xiv, 12). 4. The resurrection of Christ is a certain proof of it. See Acts xvii, 31; Rom. xiv, 9. 5. The Scripture, in a variety of places, sets it beyond all doubt (Jude 14, 15; 2 Cor. v, 10; Matt. xxv; Rom. xiv, 10, 11; 2 Thess. i, 7, 10; 1 Thess. iv, 16, 17). See above, Judgment, Last.

II. *The Judge.*—The Bible declares that God will judge the world by Jesus Christ (Acts xvii, 31). The triune God will be the Judge, as to original authority, power, and right of judgment; but according to the economy settled between the three divine persons, the work is assigned to the Son (Rom. xiv, 9, 10), who will appear in his human nature (John v, 27; Acts xvii, 31), with great power and glory (1 Thess. iv, 16, 17); visible to every eye (Rev. i, 7); penetrating every heart (1 Cor. iv, 5; Rom. ii, 16); with full authority over all (Matt. xxviii, 18), and acting with strict justice (2 Tim. iv, 8). As for the concern of others in the judgment, angels will be no otherwise concerned than as attendants, gathering the elect, raising the dead, etc., but not as advising or judging. Saints are said to judge the world, not as co-judges with Christ, but as approvers of his sentence, and as their holy lives and exhortations will rise up in judgment against their wicked neighbors (1 Cor. vi, 2, 3).

III. *The Persons that will be judged.*—These will be men and devils. The righteous will probably be tried first, as represented in Matt. xxv. They will be raised first, though perhaps not a thousand years before the rest, as some have supposed [see Millennium]; since the resurrection of all the bodies of the saints is spoken of as in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, in order to their meeting the Lord in the air, and being with him, not on earth, but forever in heaven (1 Cor. xv, 52; 1 Thess. iv, 16, 17).

IV. *The Rule of Judgment.*—We are informed that the books will be opened (Rev. xx, 12): 1. The book of divine omniscience (Mal. iii, 5), or remembrance (Mal. iii, 15); 2. The book of conscience (Rom. ii, 16); 3. The book of Providence (Rom. ii, 4, 5); 4. The book of the Scriptures, law, and Gospel (John xii, 48; Rom. ii, 12, 16); 5. The book of life (Luke x, 20; Rev. iii, 5; xx, 12, 15).

V. *The Time of Judgment.*—The soul will be either happy or miserable immediately after death, but the general judgment will not be till after the resurrection (Heb. ix, 27). There is a day appointed (Acts xvii, 31), but it is unknown to men. See Intermediate State.

VI. *The Place.*—This is also uncertain. Some suppose it will be in the air, because the judge will come in

the clouds of heaven, and the living saints will then be changed, and the dead saints raised, and both be caught up to meet the Lord in the air (1 Thess. iv, 16, 17). Others think it will be on the earth, on the new earth, on which they will descend from the air with Christ. The place where, however, is of no consequence, when compared with the state in which we shall appear. As the Scriptures represent it as certain (Eccles. xi, 9), universal (2 Cor. v, 11), righteous (Rom. ii, 5), decisive (1 Cor. xv, 52), and eternal as to its consequences (Heb. vi, 2), let us be concerned for the welfare of our immortal interests, flee to the refuge set before us, improve our precious time, depend on the merits of the Redeemer, and adhere to the dictates of the divine Word, that we may be found of him in peace. See Bates, *Works*, p. 449; Hopkins and Stoddard, *On the Last Judgment;* Gill, *Body of Divinity*, ii, 467, 8vo; Boston, *Fourfold State;* Hervey, *Works*, new edition, i, 72, 75; ii, 28, 223; iv, 155. See RESURRECTION.

Judgment-hall. See PRÆTORIUM.

Judgment-seat (βῆμα, properly a *step*, hence a rostrum or stage for speakers; as a "throne," e. g. Herod's in the theatre at Cæsarea, Acts xii, 21), an elevated seat or *tribunal* (in James ii, 6, the term is κριτήριον, a court of justice), especially of the Roman governor (Matt. xxvii, 19; John xix, 13; Acts xviii, 12, 16, 17; xxv, 6, 10, 17); hence of the final bar of God (Rom. xiv, 10; 2 Cor. v, 10). See PAVEMENT.

Roman Judgment-seat. (From a unique example at Wilton House.)

Judgments OF GOD. 1. This expression is of frequent occurrence in the Scriptures, and its sense is generally determined by the connection. When God's judgments are spoken of, the term may denote either the secret decisions of the divine will (Psa. x, 5; xxxvi, 6), or the declarations of God's will revealed in the Scriptures (Exod. xxi, 1; Deut. vii, 12; Neh. ix, 13; Psa. cxix, 7-175), or the inflictions of punishment on the wicked (Exod. vi, 6; xii, 12; Prov. xix, 29; Ezek. xxv, 11; Rev. xvi, 7). The Scriptures give us many awful instances of the display of divine justice in the punishment of nations, families, and individuals for their iniquities. See Gen. vii; xix, 25; Exod. xv; Judg. i, 6, 7; Acts xii, 23; Esther v, 14, with vii, 10; 2 Kings xi; Lev. x, 1, 2; Acts v, 1-10; Isa. xxx, 1-5; 1 Sam. xv, 9; 1 Kings xii, 25, 33.

2. In a less legitimate application, the strange trials to which those suspected of guilt were put in the Middle Ages, conducted with many devout ceremonies by the ministers of religion, and pronounced to be the *judgments of God!* The ordeal consisted of various kinds: walking blindfold amid burning ploughshares, holding in the hand a red-hot bar, and plunging the arm into boiling water. The popular affirmation, "I will put my hand into the fire to confirm this," appears to be derived from this solemn custom. Challenging the accuser to single combat, when frequently the stoutest champion was allowed to supply their place; swallowing a morsel of consecrated bread; sinking or swimming in a river for witchcraft, or weighing a witch; stretching out the arms before the cross, till the champion soonest wearied dropped his arms and lost his estate, which was decided by the very short chancery suit called the *judicium crucis*.

Those who were accused of robbery were put to trial by a piece of barley bread, on which the mass had been said, and, if they could not swallow it, were declared guilty. Probably the saying, "May this piece of bread choke me," comes from this custom. Among the proofs of guilt was that of *the bleeding of a corpse*. If a person was murdered, it was believed that at the touch or approach of the murderer the blood gushed out of the body in various parts. By the side of the bier, if the slightest change was observable in the eyes, the mouth, feet, or hands of the corpse, the murderer was conjectured to be present; and it is probable that many innocent spectators have suffered death in consequence.

It is well to mark, in extenuation of these absurd practices of our rude ancestors, that these customs were a substitute for written laws which that barbarous period had not; and as no community can exist without *laws*, the ignorance of the people had recourse to these *customs*, which, bad and absurd as they were, served to close controversies which otherwise might have given birth to more destructive practices. Ordeals are, in truth, the rude laws of a barbarous people who have not yet obtained a written code, and not advanced enough in civilization to enter into refined inquiries, the subtle distinctions and elaborate investigations which a court of law demands.

It is a well-established fact, however, that they were acquainted in those times with *secrets* to pass unhurt these singular trials. This was especially the case with ordeals of fire and boiling water. Doubtless the more knowing ones possessed those secrets and medicaments which they had at hand to pass through these trials in perfect security. See Jortin, *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* iii, 246 sq. See ORDEAL. (E. de P.)

Judicature, Courts of. See JUDGE; COURT; TRIAL; TRIBUNAL; COUNCIL, etc.

Judices electi, *select judges*, is a term applied to a number of judges occasionally selected to hear an appeal from an excommunicated presbyter or deacon against his own bishop. The Council of Sardica allowed an appeal to the metropolitan; and in such a case the metropolitan had three ways of proceeding—either to select a number of judges, generally twelve, to hear the case; or to refer the matter to a provincial synod; or to hear the causes himself without a synod. It is, however, doubtful whether a metropolitan had power to depose a bishop.

Judicial BLINDNESS or HARDNESS, a term employed to express a state of moral incorrigibility. So we read, Mark iii, 5, "Being grieved for the *blindness—hardness*—of their hearts." So Rom. xi, 25, "*Blindness—hardness*—in part hath happened to Israel." Eph. iv, 18, "Because of the *blindness—hardness*—of their hearts." 2 Cor. iii, 14, "Their minds were *blinded—hardened*;" and elsewhere. This expression is of special interest to the theologian on account of two questions connected with it.

1. *Is it an infliction of God?*—From such passages as Isa. vi, 10, some have said that God commands the prophet to do a certain thing to this people, and then punishes the people: nay, this appears stronger still,

where the passage is quoted, as (John xii, 40), He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts; which seems to be contradictory to Matt. xiii, 15, where the people themselves are said to have closed their own eyes; and so Acts xxviii, 27. These seeming contradictions are very easily reconciled. God, by giving plenty and abundance, affords the means of the people's abusing his goodness, and becoming both over-fat with food and intoxicated with drink; and thus his very beneficence may be said to make their heart fat, and their eyes heavy, while at the same time the people, by their own act, their overfeeding, become unwieldy, indolent, bloated, over-fat at heart, and, moreover, so stupefied by liquor and strong drink, that their eyes and ears may be useless to them: with wide-open eyes, "staring, they may stare, but not perceive; and listening, they may hear, but not understand;" and in this lethargic state they will continue, preferring it to a more sedate, rational condition, and refusing to forbear from prolonging the causes of it, lest at any sober interval they should see truly with their eyes and hear accurately with their ears, in consequence of which they should be shocked at themselves, be converted, be changed from such misconduct, and I should heal them—should cure these delusory effects of their surfeits and dissoluteness. Comp. Isa. v, 11; xxviii, 7. This is equally true in spiritual matters. In short, the expressions in question are to be understood in the same sense as the hardening of Pharaoh's heart under a perversion by his own wilfulness of the providences of God (Rom. ix, 17, 18). See PREDESTINATION.

2. *Is this state hopeless?*—That sinners may, by a course of persistent opposition to God, so far destroy or deaden their conscience as to be beyond the hope (but not absolutely the power) of divine grace, is a fearful fact, and one corroborated by the Holy Scriptures (1 Tim. iv, 2; Rom. i, 28; 2 Thess. ii, 11, Heb. vi, 6). But this condition, again, is not so much the result of God's determination as of their own inveterate perversity. See UNPARDONABLE SIN.

Judicium Dei. See JUDGMENTS OF GOD.

Ju'dith (Heb. *Yehudith,'* יְהוּדִית, *Jewess;* Septuag. Ἰουδίθ), the name of two females; properly the feminine form of יְהוּדִי, *Judæus* (comp. Jer. xxxvi, 14, 21); but in the passage of Genesis it is generally taken as the correlative of *Judah*, i. e. "*praised.*"

1. The daughter of Beeri, the Hittite, and one of the first two wives of Esau (Gen. xxvi, 34). She is elsewhere more correctly called AHOLIBAMAH, the daughter of Anah the Horite (Gen. xxxvi, 2–14). See ESAU.

2. The heroine of the apocryphal book which bears her name, who appears as an ideal type of piety (Jud. viii, 6), beauty (xi, 21), courage, and chastity (xvi, 22 sq.). Her supposed descent from Simeon (ix, 2), and the manner in which she refers to his cruel deed (Gen. xxxiv, 25 sq.), mark the conception of the character, which evidently belongs to a period of stern and perilous conflict. The most unscrupulous daring (ch. xiii) is combined with zealous ritualism (xii, 1 sq.), and faith is turned to action rather than to supplication (viii, 31 sq.). Clement of Rome (*Ep.* i, 55) assigns to Judith the epithet given to Jael (Ἰουδεὶθ ἡ μακαρία); and Jerome sees in her exploit the image of the victory of the Church over the power of evil (Ep. lxxix, 11, p. 508; Judith . . . in typo Ecclesiæ diabolum capite truncavit; compare Ep. xxii, 21, p. 105). According to the Greek text, Judith was the rich widow of Manasses of Bethulia; to which the Vulgate adds that she was the daughter of Merari, or more properly Beari (בארי), as the Hebrew recension has it; the latter also places her in the days of Maccabæus, which is undoubtedly correct. See JUDITH, BOOK OF.

JUDITH, BOOK OF, one of the most interesting of the apocryphal books, which has called forth a greater variety of opinions among interpreters since the days of the Reformation than almost any other of the Deutero-canonical productions. Its historical bearings are especially important.

I. *Title and Position of the Book.*—The book is named after its heroine, יְהוּדִית = *Jewess.* St. Jerome's opinion, that it is so called because Judith was the authoress of it (*Comment. in Agg.* i, 6), is rightly rejected by every scholar. In the MSS. of the Alexandrine version, the Vulgate, and in Wycliffe's translation, Judith is placed between Tobit and Esther. This is followed by Coverdale, the Geneva version, the Bishops' Bible, and the A. V., where, from the nature of the division, it is put between Tobit and *the apocryphal* Esther. In the Vatican copies it is placed between Tobit and the Wisdom of Solomon; in the Zurich Bible, between Baruch and the apocryphal Esther; whilst Luther puts it at the head of the apocryphal books.

II. *Design and Contents of the Book.*—The object of this book evidently is to show that as long as God's people walk in his commandments blamelessly, no matter how distressing the circumstances in which they may temporarily be placed, the Lord will not suffer the enemy to triumph over them, but will in due time appear for their deliverance, and cause even those who are not Jews to acknowledge that the God of Israel is the only true God. In its external form this book bears the character of the record of a historical event, describing the complete defeat of the Assyrians by the Jews through the prowess of a woman.

In the twelfth year of his reign, Nebuchadnezzar, or, as he is called in the Greek, Nabuchodonosor, king of Assyria in Nineveh, assisted by the nations who dwelt in the hill-country, by Euphrates, Tigris, Hydaspes, and by the plain of Arioch, king of the Elymæans, made war against Arphaxad, king of Media, who had fortified himself in Ecbatana (i, 1–7); and, despite the inhabitants of the countries of the west, Persia, Libanus, anti-Libanus, Carmel, Galaad, Galilee, Esdraelon, Samaria, etc., refusing their aid (ver. 8–12), conquered Arphaxad, and returned home to Nineveh in the seventeenth year of his reign (ver. 13–16). The following year, determined to carry out his resolution to wreak his vengeance on those nations who refused their aid, he dispatched his chief general Holofernes, at the head of 120,000 infantry and 12,000 cavalry (ii, 1–22), who soon subdued Mesopotamia, Syria, Libya, Cilicia, and Idumæa (ii, 23; iii, 8), and marched on Judæa (ver. 9, 10). The inhabitants of the sea-coast made a voluntary submission, which, however, did not prevent their territories from being laid waste, their sacred groves burned, and their idols destroyed, in order that divine honors should be paid only to Nebuchadnezzar. Holofernes, having finally encamped in the plain of Esdraelon (i, 3), remained inactive for a whole month—or two, according to the Latin version. But the children of Israel, who had newly returned from the captivity, having heard of Holofernes's atrocities, and being afraid of his despoiling the Temple, determined to resist the enemy, and prepared for war under the direction of their high-priest Joachim, or Eliakim, and the senate. They at once took possession of the high mountains and fortified villages (iv, 1–5), whilst the inhabitants of Bethulia and Betomestham, according to the command of the high-priest Joachim, guarded the passes of the mountains near Dothaim (ver. 6–8); and, having made all the necessary preparations, they held a solemn fast and prayed to God for protection (ver. 9–15). Enraged, as well as astonished at their audacity in preparing to fight against him, Holofernes made inquiries of the chiefs of Ammon and Moab who this people was (v, 1–4). Achior, the leader of the Ammonites, then gives him the history of the Jews, and tells him that no power could vanquish them unless they sin against their God (ver. 5–21). The proud army, however, becomes exceedingly angry with this statement (vi, 1–9), and Holofernes orders Achior to be thrown into the Jewish camp, in order that he may be destroyed in the general destruction which was impending over the people whom he described as in-

vincible (ver. 10-13). The Jews pick him up, and lead him to the governor of Bethulia, to whom he relates this, and who comforts him (ver. 14-21). The next day Holofernes marches against Bethulia, takes the mountain passes, seizes all the supplies of water (vii, 1-7), and lays siege to the city (ver. 8-19), which lasts forty days, when the famishing people urge upon the governor Ozias to surrender it, and he decides to do so unless relieved within five days (ver. 20-32). The pious widow Judith, however, denounces this decision as tempting the Almighty (viii, 1-31), and conceives a plan for delivering the people (ver. 32-36). With this view she entreats the governor and elders to give up all idea of surrender, and to permit the gates of the city to be opened for her. Having prayed to the God of her fathers for the overthrow of the enemy (ix, 1-14), she arrays herself in rich attire, and, accompanied by her maid, who carries a bag of provision, goes to the camp of Holofernes (x, 1-11). The guards, seeing this beautiful woman, and hearing her story, conduct her to the general (ver. 12-23), whom she tells that the Jews would now be vanquished, because they had sinned against God in eating the victuals consecrated to the Temple (xi, 1-15); that she had fled from the impending destruction, and would show him the access to the city, only requesting that she should be permitted to go out of the camp to pray in the night (ver. 16-19). Holofernes, smitten with her charms, gives her a sumptuous entertainment, and invites her to remain alone with him within the tent that night (xii, 1-20). When heavily asleep in consequence of having drunk too freely, Judith seizes his falchion, strikes off his head, gives it to her maid outside, who puts it in the bag which contained the provisions; they both leave the camp as usual under the pretence of devotion, and return to Bethulia, displaying the head of Holofernes, amidst the rejoicings and thanksgivings of the people (xiii, 1-20). Achior, hearing of this wonderful deliverance, is at once converted to Judaism, whilst Judith counsels the Israelites to surprise the enemy next morning (xiv, 1-10), who, being panic-stricken at the loss of their general, are soon discomfited, leaving immense spoil in the hands of the Jews (xiv, 11-xv, 11). The women of Israel then express their gratitude to their sister (ver. 12-13), whilst Judith bursts forth in a sublime song of praise to the God of their salvation (xvi, 1-17), whereupon all of them go up to Jerusalem to worship the Lord with sacrifices and feastings (ver. 18-20). Judith afterwards returns to her native place, Bethulia, manumits her maid, and dies at the advanced age of 105 years, greatly lamented by all the nation, whose peace no enemy dared to disturb for a long time (ver. 21-25). The Jews enjoying a profound and happy peace, a yearly festival (according to the Vulgate) is instituted in honor of the victory.

III. *Original Language, Versions, Condition of the Texts, etc.*—That this book was originally written in Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic is distinctly declared by St. Jerome, who says that "Judith is read by the Jews among the Hagiographa . . . and, *being written in Chaldee* (Chaldæo sermone conscriptus), is reckoned among the histories," and that he had used a Chaldee codex to correct thereby the vitiated readings of the MSS. (*Præf. ad Jud.*). This is, moreover, corroborated by the Byzantine historian John Malalas (fl. circa A.D. 880), who, having embodied the contents of Judith in his Chronographia, remarks, *Ταῦτα δὲ ἐν ταῖς Ἑβραϊκαῖς ἐμφέρεται γραφαῖς* (i, 203, ed. Oxon. 1691). Besides, the Greek contains unmistakable indications that it was made from a Hebrew or Aramæan original, e. g. giving the Hebrew use of the relative *ἐν ᾧ διέτριβεν ἐν αὐτῷ* (x, 2), *ὧν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν* (xvi, 4), the literal rendering of במחנה, *ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ* (xii, 7), which has occasioned so much difficulty to interpreters, but which is easy enough when it is borne in mind that the Hebrew preposition ב signifies *at, by, near;* the many Hebraisms (i, 7, 16; ii, 5, 7, 18, 23; iii, 3, 10; iv, 2, 6, 11, 13; v, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18; vii, 15, 18; ix, 8; x, 7, 23; xi, 5, 16; xii, 13, 20; xiv, 19), and the mistranslations of the Hebrew (i, 8; ii, 2; iii, 1, 9, 10; v, 15, 18; viii, 27; xv, 11). Gesenius, and especially Movers, have been very successful in their efforts to correct the present geographical errors by the supposition of a Hebrew original. Betani (i, 9) the latter conceives to be Beth-anoth (Josh. xv), and the *two seas* (i, 12) the two arms of the Nile. For *χαλλαιων* he reads *χαλδαίων*, and considers Rasses to be an oversight for Tarshish. Origen was therefore misinformed when he was told that Judith did not exist in the Hebrew (*περὶ Τωβία ἡμᾶς ἐχρῆν ἐγνωκέναι ὅτι τῷ Τωβίᾳ οὐ χρῶνται οὐδὲ τῇ Ἰουδὶθ, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχουσι αὐτὰ καὶ ἐν Ἀποκρύφοις Ἑβραϊσταί, ὡς ἀπ' αὐτῶν μαθόντες ἐγνώκαμεν, Ep. ad Afric.*, sec. 13). The *Old Latin* and the Syriac versions were made from the Septuagint, which, however, does not represent *a fixed* Hebrew or Aramæan original text, as may be seen from the various recensions of it differing greatly from each other. This is, moreover, corroborated by the fact that the *Old Latin*, the MSS. of which also deviated greatly from each other, and which St. Jerome corrected according to an Aramæan codex, differs materially from the Sept., sometimes having more than the latter (comp. Vulg. iv, 8-15 with Sept. iv, 10; Vulg. v, 11, 12 with Sept. v, 11-16; Vulg. v, 26-29 with Septuag. v, 23-25; Vulg. vi, 15-19 with Sept. vi, 19; Vulg. vii, 18-20 with Sept. vii, 29), sometimes less (comp. Vulg. vii, 9 sq., with Sept. vii, 8-15; Vulg. v, 11 sq., with Sept. v, 17-22; Vulg. ix, 5-7, 11 sq., with Sept. ix, 7, 10). Sometimes the names are different (comp. i, 6, 8, 9; iv, 5; viii, 1), and sometimes the numbers (i, 2; ii, 1; vii, 2, etc.). A very minute collation of the variations between the Vulgate and the Sept. is given by Capellus, *Commentarii et Notæ Criticæ in V. T.* (Amstel. 1689), p. 574, etc.; and Eichhorn, *Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften*, p. 318, etc. There are also extant several Hebrew recensions of Judith. Three of these have been published by Jellinek in his *Beth Ha-Midrash*, vols. i and ii, Leipzig, 1853, and the one which comes nearest to the Greek and Latin versions certainly removes all the difficulties against the historical character of the book contained in those versions. They are called מעשה יהודית, מדרש לחנוכה (*Beth Ha-Midrash*, i, 130-136), and מעשה יהודית (ii, 12-22). Other Hebrew editions (מַעֲשֵׂה יְהוּדִית) have been published at Berlin (1766, 8vo), Venice (s. a. 8vo), and Frankfort-on-the-Main (ed. S., London, 1715, 8vo). Coverdale and the Bishops' Bible, following Luther and the Zurich Bible, have translated from the Vulgate, whilst the Geneva version, which is followed by the A. V., has a translation of the Greek text.

IV. *Historical Character of the Book.*—There are three theories about the nature of this book:

a. Up to the time of the Reformation, the view that this book records *actual history* was universally entertained among Christians. The difference of opinion which obtained during those fifteen centuries, and which still exists among the defenders of its historical character, is about the precise time when these events occurred, involving as a necessary consequence the identification of the principal characters, etc. The limits of the range of time within which they have alternately been placed are B.C. 784-A.D. 117. The most ancient opinion, however, is, that the circumstances here described occurred *after* the Babylonian captivity, which is supported by the book itself (comp. iv, 3; v, 18, 19, Sept.; v, 22, 23, Vulg.). Still, as it does not tell who this Nebuchadnezzar was, the advocates of this view have tried to identify him with every Persian monarch in succession. Thus, St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xviii, 16), and others, take him to be *Cambyses;* Julius Africanus and Georgius Syncellus regard him as *Xerxes;* Mercator, Estius, etc., make him to be *Darius Hystaspis;* whilst Sulpicius Severus and others identify him with *Artaxerxes Ochus* (comp. Suidas, s. v. Judith; Bellarmine, *De Verb. Dei*, i, 12; Scholz, *Einleitung in die Heiligen Schrif-*

ten, ii, 588 sq.). Against this view, however, is to be urged, that, 1. All these monarchs *inherited* the provinces which are described in this book as having been *conquered for them* by Holofernes, thus precluding the identity of any one of them with Nebuchadnezzar. 2. Nineveh, which is here mentioned as the capital of Nebuchadnezzar's, or the Assyrian empire, was destroyed before the Babylonian captivity, and no Assyrian or Median kingdom existed during the post-exilian period. 3. The Persians, Syrians, Phœnicians, Cilicians, and Egyptians are described as subject to the Assyrians, which could not have been the case after the captivity of Judah, when the Assyrian empire was wholly extinguished, and the Persians, instead of being subject to the Assyrians, had made themselves lords over them, and all the other nations of the East, from the Hellespont to the River Indus. 4. There is no point of time except the Maccabæan period when the events here recorded could possibly have occurred, since the Jews were subject to the Persians for 207 years, then were under the dominion of Alexander the Great, and finally under the Ptolemies and the kings of Syria till they obtained their independence through Judas Maccabæus, B.C. 164. The only time to which they could possibly be referred is that of Antiochus Epiphanes, but this supposition is inconsistent with the fact that the Jews had but recently returned from captivity, and restored the worship of God in the Temple. The geographical inconsistencies are equally embarrassing.

To escape these difficulties, and more especially to obtain a point of time suitable for these events, Usher, Lloyd, Calmet, Montfaucon, Prideaux, Whiston, Wolff, etc., maintain that they occurred *before the exile*, either in the reign of Zedekiah, Manasseh, Amon, Josiah, or Jehoiakim. The general opinion, however, is, that the story is to be placed under Manasseh, and, as Calmet, Montfaucon, Prideaux, Whiston, and others will have it, after this monarch's return from Babylon. According to them, the events recorded in the book of Judith, and the collateral circumstances, occurred in the following order of time:

	A. M.	B. C.
Birth of Judith	3285	719
Manasseh begins to reign	3306	698
He is taken prisoner to Babylon and sent back to Judæa	3328	676
War between Nebuchadnezzar and Arphaxad	3347	657
Victory of Nebuchadnezzar over Arphaxad	3347	657
Expedition of Holofernes and siege of Bethulia	3348	656
Death of Manasseh	3361	643
Amon, his son, begins to reign	3361	643
Amon is murdered for his wickedness	3363	641
Josiah, his son, succeeds him, being eight years old	3363	641
Death of Judith, aged 105 years	3390	614
Battle of Megiddo and death of King Josiah	3394	610
The last siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar	3414	590
Destruction of Jerusalem and captivity of the Jews	3416	588

The Nebuchadnezzar of this book is, according to this theory, Saosduchinus, who succeeded his father Esarhaddon in the kingdom of Assyria and Babylon in the 31st year of Manasseh's reign, and Arphaxad is Deioces, king of Media. But this *pre-exilian* view again incurs the following objections: 1. It makes Judith to be *sixty-three* years old at the time when she is described as "a fair damsel" (ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ καλή) captivating Holofernes (xii, 13) and ravishing the hearts of many who desired to marry her (xvi, 22). Calmet, however, is not disconcerted by supposing that Judith might in this case be sixty-three or sixty years old, "being then what we call a fine woman, and having an engaging air and person," "likely," adds Du Pin, "to charm an old general." 2. It is absolutely inconsistent with chap. xvi, 23, where we are expressly told that "there was none that made the children of Israel afraid in the days of Judith, nor a long time after her death." For even if we take the words "a long time after her death" to mean no more than twenty years, this would bring Judith's death to *twenty* years before the disastrous battle of Megiddo, wherein Josiah was mortally wounded, whereas this hypothesis places her death only *four* years before that calamitous event. This inconsistency is still more glaring according to the calculations of Prideaux, who maintains that Judith could not have been more than forty-five years of age when she captivated Holofernes, as this carries down her death to the 4th year of Zedekiah, when the state of the Jews had been exceedingly disturbed for several years by the Babylonians, and actually brings the period involved in the "long time after her death" beyond the total subversion of the Jewish state. 3. Judith affirms that there was no Jew to be found in any city who worshipped idolatry (viii, 17. 18), which is incompatible with the reign of Manasseh, Amon, and the first eight years of Josiah (comp. 2 Chron. xxxiii, 14–17). 4. Holofernes, the chief officer of the Assyrian army, who had only recently invaded Judæa and taken Manasseh prisoner, must surely have known something about the Jews, yet he is described as being utterly ignorant of the very name of this Jewish monarch, as not knowing the people and the city of Jerusalem, and being obliged to ask for some information about them from the Amoritish chief (v, 1–3). 5. The Jewish state is represented as being under the government of a high-priest and a kind of Sanhedrim (vi, 6–14, xv, 8), which is only compatible with the *post-exilian* period, when the Jews had no king. 6. The book itself distinctly tells us in chap. iv, 3, and v, 18, that the events transpired *after* the captivity, as is rightly interpreted by the compilers of the marginal references of the A. V., who, on this passage, refer to 2 Kings xxv, 9–11, and Ezra i, 1–3.

b. The difficulty of taking the book to record either pre-exilian or post-exilian history made Luther view it as "*a religious fiction* or *poem*, written by a holy and ingenious man, who depicts therein the victory of the Jewish people over all their enemies, which God at all times most wonderfully vouchsafes. . . . Judith is the Jewish people, represented as a chaste and holy widow, which is always the character of God's people. Holofernes is the heathen, the godless or unchristian lord of all ages, while the city of Bethulia denotes a virgin, indicating that the believing Jews of those days were the pure virgins" (*Vorrede aufs Buch Judith*). Some of the names can scarcely have been chosen without regard to their derivation (e. g. Achior = *Brother of Light;* Bethulia = בתוליה, *the virgin of Jehovah*), and the historical difficulties of the person of Nebuchadnezzar disappear when he is regarded as the scriptural type of worldly power. Grotius, elaborating upon this idea, regards it as a parabolic description of Antiochus Epiphanes's assault on Judæa—"Judith is *the Jewish people* (יהודית); Bethulia is *the Temple* (בית אליה), the sword which went out of it, *the prayers of the saints;* Nebuchadnezzar signifies *the devil;* Assyria is *pride, the devil's kingdom;* Holofernes is *the devil's instrument;* (חלפר נחש, *lictor serpentis, minister diaboli*); the widow is *the helplessness of the Jewish people* under the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes; Joachim or Eliakim signifies *God will arise* (יהוה קום or אל יקום) to defend Judæa and cut off the instrument of the devil who would have her corrupted." Many of the modern writers who regard it as containing pure fiction call it either drama (Buddeus), epopee (Artropæus, Moreus, Von Niebuhr, etc.), apologue (Babor), didactic poem (Jahn), moral fiction (Bauer), or romance (Berthold). Among the Roman Catholics this notion of an allegory is favored by Jahn, who maintains that the difficulties are otherwise insuperable. De Wette, however, considers that the fact of Holofernes being a historical name (together with other reasons) militates against the notion of an allegory, as maintained by Grotius. The name Holofernes is found in Appian (*In Syriac.* c. 47) and in Polybius (x, 11). The latter historian states that Holofernes, having conquered Cappadocia, lost it by endeavoring to change the customs of the country, and to introduce the drunken rites of Bacchus; and Casaubon

(*ad Athen.*) conjectures that this was the Holofernes of Judith. From its termination the name is supposed to be of Persian extraction (compare *Orophernes*, Polybius, xxxiii, 12), as Tisaphernes, Artaphernes, etc.

c. As the book itself, however, gives no intimation whatever that it is *a fiction or an allegory*, but, on the contrary, purports to be real history, as is evident from its minute geographical (i, 7; ii, 21 sq.; iii, 9 sq.; iv, 4, 6 sq.), historical (i, 5 sq.), and chronological (i, 13, 16; viii, 4; xvi, 23) descriptions, Gutmann, Herzfeld, Keil, and others take it to contain a substance of truth embellished with fiction. This view is supported by the following facts: 1. Notwithstanding the arbitrary and uncritical manner in which the deutero-canonical historians dispose of their materials, they have always a certain amount of truth, around which they cluster the traditional embellishments. 2. A summary of the contents of Judith is given in the ancient Jewish prayers for the first and second Sabbaths of *the Feast of Dedication*—beginning with אודך כי אנפת בי ותשב and ארץ מושיע. גואל—among the events which occurred in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, and it cannot be supposed that the Jews would make it the basis of thanksgiving when the deliverance was never wrought, and the whole of it was nothing but a fiction. 3. There are ancient Midrashim which record the facts independently of the book of Judith. There is one, in particular, which gives a better recension of this book than either the Septuagint or the Vulgate, bears as much resemblance to the Septuagint and Vulgate as these two versions bear to each other, and removes many of the difficulties against its historical truthfulness, inasmuch as it begins with ch. v, 5, and thus shows that the Septuagint, from which the other versions were made, has put together two different records.

Those, however, who understand the book to be an allegorical representation of the Jewish people, widowed as to earthly resources, yet, by favor with God and man, prevailing over the powers of the world, do not thus relieve the fable from grave moral objections. An intelligent Jew, well read in the Hebrew Scriptures, could not have thought of setting up Judith as a proper embodiment of female heroism and virtue. Her plan of procedure is marred throughout by hypocrisy and deceit; she even prays to God that he would prosper her deceit (ix, 12), and praises the cruelty of Simeon in slaying the Shechemites, as if his deed bore on it the sanction of heaven, though Jacob, the father of Simeon, had consigned it in the name of God to eternal reprobation. The spirit of vengeance, resolute in its aim, unscrupulous in the means taken to accomplish it, is the pervading animus of the story—a spirit certainly opposed to the general teaching of Old as well as New Testament Scripture, and incapable of being embodied in a heroic story except by one who had much more regard for the political than the moral and religious elements in Judaism.

V. *Author and Date.*—The difference of opinion upon this subject is as great as it is upon the character of the book. It is not named either by Philo or Josephus; nor have we any indication whatever by which to form a conjecture respecting its author. But it has been supposed by some that it could not have been written by a contemporary, from the circumstance of the family of Achior being mentioned as still in existence, and of the festival of Judith being still celebrated. If this festival ever took place, it must have been of temporary duration, for, as Calmet observes, no record of it can be traced since the exile. Professor Alber, of Pesth, however, maintains that it is still recorded in the Jewish calendars. Jahn, after Grotius, refers the date of the book to the Maccabæan period, and derives an argument for its late composition from the fact of the feast of the New Moon being mentioned (viii, 6, comp. with Mark xv, 42). De Wette (*Einleitung*) conceives that the whole composition bespeaks an author who was a native of Palestine, who could not have lived beyond the end of the 1st century of the Christian æra (the date assigned to it by Eichhorn), inasmuch as it is then cited by Clement of Rome, but that the probability is that it was much earlier written. Movers, a Roman Catholic professor at Bonn, a man of great penetration in similar investigations respecting the canonical books of the Old Testament, endeavors to fix the date of its composition in the year B.C. 104. "The author," he observes, "who has transferred the geographical relations of his own time to a former period [see, however, Foster, *Geography of Arabia*, 1844, i, 185], makes the Jewish territory commence at Scythopolis (iii, 10), and makes Bethulia, against which Holofernes directed his attack, the first Jewish city at the entrance into Judæa (iv, 7), reckoning the territory intervening between this and Samaria as tributary to the Jewish high-priest. This state of affairs continued from the time of John Hyrcanus to Pompey's invasion of Judæa. Hyrcanus had seized upon Samaria, and wrested Scythopolis, with the surrounding territory, from Epicrates, the general of Ptolemy Lathurus (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 10, 3), B.C. 110, according to Usher. But Samaria and Scythopolis, with other acquisitions of the Maccabees, were lost forever to the Jewish nation when Pompey, B.C. 48, reduced Judæa to its ancient limits. The sea-coast (iii, 1), independent of the Jews, continued, since the last years of the reign of Alexander Jannæus, to be a Jewish possession; but Carmel, which (i, 8) was inhabited by the Gentiles, was still independent in the beginning of his reign, and he first seized it after the war with Ptolemy Lathyrus (xiii, 15, 4)." It is to this war that Movers considers the book of Judith to refer, and he supposes it to have been written after the unfortunate battle at Asochis, in Galilee (or, rather, Asophen on the Jordan) (Movers, *Ueber die Ursprache der Deuterokan. Bücher*, in the *Bonner Zeitschrift*, xiii, 36 sq.). De Wette conceives that this hypothesis is opposed by the following geographical combinations: 1. Galilee belonged to the Asmonæans, the proof of which, indeed, is by no means certain, while the following indications thereof present themselves: (*a*) Asochis seems to have belonged to Alexander Jannæus, as it received Ptolemy Lathyrus (Josephus, *Ant.* xiii, 12, 4, comp. with xv, 4). (*b*) Hyrcanus had his son Alexander Jannæus brought up in Galilee (xiii, 12, 1). (*c*) Antigonus returned from Galilee (*War*, i, 3, 3). (*d*) Aristobulus seized upon Ituræa (*Ant.* xiii, 11, 3), which presupposes the possession of Galilee. (*e*) Even after the limits of Galilee were circumscribed by Pompey, it still belonged to the Jewish high-priest (*War*, i, 10, 4). 2. Idumæa belonged to the Jewish state, but the sons of Esau came to Holofernes (vii, 8, 18). 3. If the author had the war with Ptolemy Lathyrus in view, the irruption of Holofernes would rather correspond with the movements of the Cyprian army, which proceeded from Asochis to Sepphoris, and thence to Asophen (*Einleitung*, § 307).

Wolff and others ascribe the authorship to Achior, B.C. 636–629; Huetius (in *Præp. Evang.* p. 217), Calmet (*Dissert. Prælim.* p. 142), etc., to Joshua, the son of Josedech, the companion of Zerubbabel, B.C. 536–515; St. Jerome, etc., to Judith herself; Ewald, Vaihinger, etc., to the time of John Hyrcanus, B.C. 130–128; Volkmar, who takes it to be an allegorical description of the victory of the Parthians and Jews over Quietus, the delegate of Trajan, maintains (originally in the *Theol. Jahrbuch*, 1856, p. 362; and 1857, p. 448 sq.; afterwards in *Handb. d. Einl. in d. Apokr.* Tüb. 1860) that it was written for the twelfth of Adar, A.D. 117–118, to commemorate this day (יום טורינוס). He makes Nebuchadnezzar stand for Trajan, Nineveh for Antioch, Assyria for Syria, Arphaxad for the Parthians, Ecbatana for Nisibis, Holofernes for Lucius Quietus, and Judith for Judæa. This explanation assumes the spuriousness of the reference in the First Epistle of Clement (§ 6), which is too early for the date assigned. It has been adopted by Baur, Hitzig (in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 240 sq.), and Schenkel; but it is opposed by Hilgen-

feld (*ibid.* 1858, p. 270 sq.; 1861, p. 335 sq.), Lipsius (*ibid.* 1859, p. 39), and Ewald.

The fact, however, that there are several records or recensions of the events contained in the book of Judith proceeding from different authors, and deviating materially from each other, precludes the possibility of ascertaining whose productions they are. All that can be said with certainty is that they all emanated from a Palestinian source. As the circumstances recorded are most plainly declared by the more trustworthy Hebrew copies, and in the Jewish prayers, to have occurred in the Maccabæan struggles for independence (circa B.C. 170–160), the first and shortest record of them which was used for liturgical purposes must be contemporary with the events themselves. The poetical genius of the nation, however, soon embellished the facts in various ways, and hence the different recensions. The Greek version contained in the Septuagint must have been made at a much later period, since the author of it was already ignorant of the time when these circumstances occurred, and, as we have seen, mixed up two totally different records narrating events of different periods of the Jewish history.

VI. *Canonicity of the Book.*—Though the events recorded in Judith are incorporated in the hymnal service of the Jews called יוצרות, yet the book itself was never in the Jewish canon. The distinction, however, which the Jewish synagogue kept up between treating the book with respect and putting it into the canon could not be preserved in the Christian Church. Hence Judith, which was at first quoted with approbation by Clemens Romanus (*Ep.* c. 55), was gradually cited on an equality with other Scripture by Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* iv), Tertullian (*De Monog.* c. 17), Ambrose (*De Offi. Minist.* iii, 13), and Augustine (*De Doctrina Christiana*, ii, 8), and finally was canonized, in the councils of Carthage, by Innocent I of Rome, under Gelasius, and of Trent. Some will have it that this book is quoted in the N. T. (comp. Judith viii, 4 sq., with 1 Cor. ii, 10 sq.; Judith ix, 12 with Acts iv, 24; Judith xvi, 17 with Matt. xii, 42, 50). Judith, with the other deutero-canonical books, has been at all times read in the Church, and lessons are taken from it in the Church of England in course.

VII. *Literature.*—The three Midrashim in Jellinek's *Beth Ha-Midrash*, vols. i and ii (Leipzig, 1853); Montfaucon, *La Vérité de l'Histoire de Judith* (Paris, 1690); Hartmann, *Utrum Juditha contineat historiam* (Regiom. 1671); De Bonacasa, *Juditha ficta* (Veron. 1614); Artopœus, *Juditha Epopœia* (Strasb. 1694); Capellus, *Comment. et Notœ Crit. in V. T.* p. 459; Arnald, *The Apocrypha*, in Patrick, Lowth, and Whitby's *Comment.;* Du Pin, *History of the Canon* (Lond. 1699), i, 10 sq., 90 sq.; Eichhorn, *Einleitung in die Apocryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig, 1795), p. 291 sq.; Prideaux, *The Old and New Testaments connected* (ed. 1815), i, 60 sq.; Whiston, *Sacred History of the Old and New Testament*, i, 202; Reuss, in Ersch und Gruber's *Encyklopädie*, sec. ii, vol. xxviii, p. 98 sq.; Fritzsche, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alt. Test.* (Lpzg. 1853), ii, 113 sq.; *Journal of Sacred Literature*, 1856, p. 342 sq.; 1861, p. 421 sq.; Vaihinger, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, vii, 135 sq.; Keil, *Einleitung in d. A. T.* (ed. 1859), p. 698; Diestel, in the *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.* 1862, p. 781 sq.; Lipsius, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1867, p. 337 sq.

Express commentaries on this book alone have been written by Jos. Conzio, שִׁיר יְהוּדִית (Asti, 1628, 16mo); Jeh. Löw ben-Seeb, מְגִלַּת יְהוּדִית (Vienna, 1799, 1819, 8vo); Fränkel, יְהוּדִית (Lpzg. 1830, 8vo); Is. Siebenberger, מְגִלַּת יְהוּדִית (Warsaw, 1840, 8vo); Volkmar, *Das Buch Judith* (Tübing. 1860, 8vo); Wolff, *Das Buch Judith* (Leipzig, 1861, 8vo). See APOCRYPHA.

Judson, Adoniram, the senior Baptist missionary to Burmah, was born in Malden, Mass., Aug. 9, 1788. He was the eldest son of Adoniram and Abigail Judson. Before he was ten years of age he had acquired a reputation as a superior student, and in 1807 graduated with the highest honors from Providence College (now Brown University), being not yet twenty years old. For a short period subsequently he was unsettled in his religious belief, but, aroused by the death of an old classmate under peculiar circumstances, he became an earnest inquirer after the truth, and, though not a Christian, was admitted as a "special student" in the divinity school of Andover, and while there was converted, and joined the Congregational Church. In 1809 he declined a tutorship in Brown University, and in February, 1810, formed the resolution of becoming a missionary to the heathen. Several young men joined the seminary at this time who had also been for some time impressed with the need of missions to unchristian peoples. Judson became intimately associated with them, and their zeal finally led them to press this object on the attention of the American churches, and, though not properly the cause, they were the occasion of the formation of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, who sent Mr. Judson to England to confer with the London Missionary Society as to the practicability of an affiliation between the societies and their joint operation in "foreign parts." Mr. Judson left America on this errand January 1, 1811, but on the way was captured by a privateering vessel, carried to France, and did not reach London till April 6, 1811. His mission failed in its primary object, but was of advantage to the cause of missions in America, for the American Board resolved to assume the responsibility of sending out its own missionaries. Mr. Judson, after marrying Ann Hasseltine, Feb. 5, 1812, embarked for India on the 19th of the same month, under the auspices of this new organization. Changing his views of baptism on the voyage, almost immediately after his arrival he sought immersion at the hands of Dr. Carey, the Baptist missionary at Serampore. The Baptists in America were already possessed of considerable missionary zeal and intelligence, and, on learning of Dr. Judson's change of view, were roused to intense earnestness, and in 1814 they organized a denominational missionary society, and took Dr. Judson under their patronage. The hostility of the East India Company towards missionaries was at that time so intense, that within ten days after Judson's arrival in India he was peremptorily ordered to leave the country, and, being forced to comply, he took passage in a vessel for the Isle of France, Nov. 30, 1812. He subsequently returned to Madras, but, finding the East India Company uncompromising in their opposition, he departed for Burmah, and reached Rangoon July 13, 1813. Accepting Burmah as his mission-field, Mr. Judson addressed himself to the task of acquiring the language of that country, and not only attained to the greatest familiarity with it, but spoke and wrote it with "the elegance of a cultured scholar." At an early period in these pursuits he published some "Grammatical Notices" of the language, which in a few short pages (only twenty-six) furnish "a most complete grammar of this difficult tongue." In imitation of the Burmese rest-houses attached to their pagodas for the accommodation of pilgrims and worshippers, Mr. Judson instituted a *Zyat* in the public street for the reception of and conversation with inquirers about Christianity. This was ever a notable feature of his ministry, as he spent whole days thus with the people. Meeting with some success among the people, he resolved to go to Ava, the capital, and "lay his missionary designs before the throne, and solicit toleration for the Christian religion." His efforts were ineffectual, and he returned to Rangoon, and made a short trip to Calcutta for the recovery of Mrs. Judson's health. On July 20, 1822, Dr. Price, a newly-arrived missionary physician, was summoned to attend on the king at Ava, and Mr. Judson was compelled to accompany him as interpreter. While at Ava Mr. Judson became known as the "Religion propagating

teacher," and, as his missionary prospects seemed favorable, though he went to Rangoon temporarily, he returned to Ava to prosecute his work. War breaking out between the British-India and the Burmese governments, all the foreigners at Ava came under suspicion as spies, and Mr. Judson, with others, was imprisoned. The horrible experiences of that incarceration cannot readily be described. On March 25, 1826, Mr. Judson himself wrote, "Through the kind interposition of our heavenly Father, our lives have been preserved in the most imminent danger from the hand of the executioner, and in repeated instances of most alarming illness during my protracted imprisonment of one year and five months; nine months in three pairs of fetters, two months in five, six months in one, and two months a prisoner at large." After his release he rendered most important service to the British government in the formation of the treaty at Yandabo, and later in a commercial treaty. While absent with the government embassy as interpreter, his first wife, one of the noblest of women, died. Mr. Judson shortly after (1827) returned from Ava and settled at Amherst, but subsequently removed to Maulmain, as events had made it a much more important post. From this time to 1834 he was variously employed in his mission-work at Maulmain, Rangoon, Prome, and other places, and became interested in the Karens (q. v.), among whom he made several missionary tours. In 1834 he married Mrs. Sarah Boardman, and completed his translation of the whole Bible into Burmese, in the revising and perfecting of which, however, he spent sixteen years more. This was the great work of his life, and "the best judges venture to hazard the opinion that three centuries hence Judson's Bible will be the Bible of the Christian Church of Burmah" (*Calcutta Review*, xiv, 434). He also compiled a short Burmese and English dictionary. With a larger work of this kind he was occupied at the time of his death. In 1839-40 his health failed, and he was obliged to take several voyages for its recovery. In 1845, in consequence of the failing health of Mrs. Judson, he left for America. Mrs. Judson died at St. Helena, and Mr. Judson, continuing his voyage, reached Boston on October 15. He was received in America "with affectionate and enthusiastic veneration that knew no bounds. His eminent position as the founder and pioneer of the mission; his long and successful labors in the East; his romantic and eventful life, associated with all that is most beautiful and lofty in human nature; his world-wide fame, and his recent afflictions, encircled him in the people's mind with the halo of an apostle." But Mr. Judson's heart was in Burmah. After marrying Miss Emily Chubbuck in June, 1846, he again set sail for India, and arrived at Rangoon on Nov. 30 of that year. His health, however, again declined, and he was obliged once more to resort to the sea for relief, but died on his way to the Isle of Bourbon, April 12, 1850, and was buried at sea. (J. T. G.)

Judson, Ann Hasseltine, was born at Bradford, Mass., Oct. 22, 1789. She was married to Adoniram Judson on Feb. 5, 1812, and was the first American woman to devote herself to foreign mission service. She became "intimately associated with her husband in all his plans of benevolence, and bore an important part in their accomplishment" (Wayland's *Judson*, i, 414). In 1824, in consequence of protracted ill health, leaving her husband in Burmah, she proceeded alone to America, where she remained, adding, however, much to the interest and advancement of missions by the publication of a very interesting account of the *history of the Burman Mission* in a series of letters to Mr. Butterworth, a member of Parliament, whose hospitality she enjoyed while in England, till 1823, when she rejoined her husband at Rangoon, and proceeded with him to Ava. It was during the trying scenes of the succeeding two years that her "devoted love, consummate tact, and heroic resolution were so manifest. Her whole time, with the exception of twenty days when she was confined by the birth of her child, was devoted to the alleviation of the sorrows of her husband and his fellow-prisoners." She was perfectly familiar with the Burmese language, and possessed of a "presence which commanded respect even from savage barbarians, and encircled her with a moral atmosphere in which she walked unharmed in the midst of a hostile city with no earthly protector" (Wayland, i, 329). Her influence was acknowledged as contributing largely to the submission to the English terms of peace by the Burmese government. She died at Amherst on Oct. 24, 1826, during the absence of her husband, of disease which her sufferings and prostration at Ava had rendered her constitution incapable of resisting. "To great clearness of intellect, large powers of comprehension, and intuitive female sagacity, ripened by the constant necessity of independent action, she added that heroic disinterestedness which naturally loses all consciousness of self in the prosecution of a great object. These elements were, however, all held in reserve, and were hidden from public view by a veil of unusual feminine delicacy." (J. T. G.)

Judson, Emily Chubbuck, wife of Dr. Adoniram Judson, was born in Eaton, N.Y., Aug. 22, 1818. She contributed to the magazine literature of the country in early life under the assumed title of "Fanny Forester." She had contemplated becoming a missionary from early life, and marrying Dr. Judson June 2, 1846, she sailed with him from Boston for India, where she "employed all her strength in advancing the holy cause in which he was engaged." After his decease she was compelled, by reason of feeble health, to relinquish her mission work, and returned with her children to America. She rendered good service to Dr. Wayland in the preparation of his memoir of Dr. Judson. She died June 1, 1854. Her published works are "Alderbrook: a collection of Fanny Forester's Village Sketches and Poems" (Boston, 1846, 2 vols.); and the "Biographical Sketch of Mrs. Sarah B. Judson" quoted below. There are, besides, a goodly number of separate poems, of exquisite beauty of sentiment and of great pathos, of which we mention only *My Bird* and *The two Mammas*. See Wayland, *Life and Labors of Adoniram Judson* (Boston, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo); *Calcutta Review*, vol. xiv; *The Judson Offering*, edited by J. Dowling, D.D. (New York, 1848); *Biographical Sketch of Sarah B. Judson*, by Mrs. Emily C. Judson (New York, 1849); Knowles, *Life of Mrs. Ann H. Judson*; Kendrick, *Life and Letters of Mrs. Emily C. Judson* (1861); Stuart, *Lives of Mrs. Ann H. Judson and Sarah B. Judson, with a Biographical Sketch of Mrs. Emily C. Judson* (1853). (J. T. G.)

Judson, Sarah Boardman, was born in Alstead, N. H., Nov. 4, 1803. She was the daughter of Ralph and Abia Hull, and was married to the Rev. George D. Boardman in 1825, with whom she proceeded to Tavoy, Burmah, and in his missionary work shared great dangers and sufferings. Her husband died in 1831. Two of her children had previously died, and with one child, a son, left to her, she continued to prosecute her missionary work. In 1834 she married Dr. Judson, and in 1845, in consequence of failing health, she left Burmah for America, accompanied by her husband. On their arrival at St. Helena Mrs. Judson died, Sept. 1, 1845. She translated the New Testament and Burmese tracts into Peguan, and *Pilgrim's Progress* into Burmese. Of her a writer in the *Calcutta Review* says (vol. xiv), "Exquisite sensibility, a poet's soul and imagination, great natural abilities, thorough unselfishness, and a woman's depth of love and affection, all shrouded by the most unpretending meekness and devotion, were some of the elements which blended together to form a character of extreme beauty." Her poem commencing "We part on this green islet, love," etc., is enough to entitle her to high praise as a poet. (J. T. G.)

Ju'el (Ἰουήλ), a Græcized form (1 Esdr. ix, 34, 35) of two Heb. names: *a.* in the former verse Uel (Ezra x, 34); *b.* in the latter Joel (Ezra x, 43).

Juennin, Gaspard, a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Varembon (Bresse) in 1650, entered the Oratory in 1674, and taught literature, philosophy, and theology in several schools of the congregation of the Oratory. He died in 1713. He deserves special recognition as a theological writer. His principal works are, (1) *Commentarius Historicus et dogmaticus de Sacramentis* (Lyons, 1696, 2 vols. fol.). This work contains, besides the commentary, three dissertations on censures, irregularities, and indulgences, and deserves special notice for the fact that it is the first work of modern theologians treating at length the subject of the sacraments:—(2) *Institutiones Theologicæ* (Lyons, 1696, 4 vols. 12mo, and often), which was used for some time as a text-book of theology in several Roman Catholic institutions; a revised edition, expunging some objectionable views, was prepared by Juennin in 1705, and the work continued in use. In 1708 he published an abridgment of it as a *Compendium Theologiæ* (Paris, 1708, 12mo). He also published a separate treatise on the sacraments, *Théorie et pratique des Sacraments* (Paris, 1713, 3 vols. 12mo), which is valuable. See Hook, *Eccles. Dict.* vi, 367.

Juggernaut. See Jaggernaut.

Jugglers, a word brought into English from the mediæval Latin *joculator* (in Provencal, *joglar, joglador;* in old French, *jonglère* or *jonglier*), through the modern French *jongleur*, and originally used to designate the professional musicians who attended the Troubadors and Trouvères of Provence and the north of France, either singing their poems, or, if they sung them themselves, accompanying them with an instrument, which was reckoned beneath the dignity of the poet himself. This profession was in the Middle Ages (from the 11th to the 15th century) an honorable one, but it gradually died out, or at least lost its respectability, and jugglers became a term for rope-dancers, and all that class of persons who sought to gratify the populace by sleight of hand or feats of agility, until in our own day, finally, it has come to be used as a synonyme of *conjurer*, and is applied to persons who perform tricks of *legerdemain* (q. v.). See also the articles Exorcism; Sorcery.

Jugulum. See Transenna.

Juice (עָסִיס, *asis'*, as freshly *trodden* from grapes), new wine (as rendered Isa. xlix, 26, etc.); hence fermented liquor of pomegranates (Cant. viii, 2). See Wine.

Jukes, Charles, a (Dutch) Reformed minister, native of England (1788), was converted in 1812, and joined the Church of St. Neots, Nottinghamshire, under the ministry of Rev. Thomas Morall. Filled with pious zeal, he began to preach as a layman, with great acceptance, among the destitute villages within twenty miles of his home; subsequently he entered the ministry, and came to this country in 1830. On his way to Canada, on the day-boat to Albany, he preached, at the request of passengers, a sermon from the words "There is a God in heaven who revealeth secrets;" and, at the urgent request of a plain farmer, who was not a professing Christian, he turned aside to preach to two churches in Saratoga County, N. Y., to which he was at once called. He was settled successively in Presbyterian and Reformed churches at Edinburgh and Fish House, Amsterdam, Glen and Auriesville, Stone Arabia and Ephratah, and at Rotterdam, all in N. Y. He died at the latter place in 1862. At Glen about seventy persons united with the Church during the four years of his pastorate. His great characteristic was his untiring zeal and earnestness. He was a bold, catholic, evangelical preacher of righteousness, an excellent pastor, and a very exemplary and useful servant of the Lord. His temperament was peculiarly happy; his Christian experience large and varied; his death peaceful and triumphant. See Corning, *Manual of the Ref. Ch.; Personal Recollections.* (W. J. R. T.)

Jul, the name of Christmas among the northern tribes of Europe. Originally it was the name of the old Scandinavian festival of winter solstice, but as the practices of that festival have in the main been incorporated in the Christmas feast, they term it *Jul.* See Jules.

Jules are aërial spirits and dæmons among the northern tribes, especially the Laplanders, to whom divine adoration is paid. They suppose them to dwell under particular trees, and proceed thither to offer up sacrifices once a year, at Christmas time, whence the name of the Christian festival corresponds to their Jul (q. v.). See Broughton, *Biblioth. hist. Sacra*, s. v.; Thorpe, *Northern Mythol.* ii, 49 sq.

Ju'lia (Ἰουλία, fem. of *Julius*), a Christian woman of Rome, to whom Paul sent his salutations (Rom. xvi, 15); she is named with Philologus, and is supposed to have been his wife or sister. A.D. 55.—Kitto. "Origen supposes that they were master and mistress of a Christian household which included the other persons mentioned in the same verse. Some modern critics have conjectured that the name may be that of a man, Julias"

Julian the Apostate, emperor of Rome A.D. 361–363, is especially celebrated by his able and vigorous, but vain attempt to dethrone Christianity, and to restore the ancient Græco-Roman paganism in the Roman Empire to its former power and glory. He was the nephew of Constantine the Great, the first Christian on the throne of the Cæsars, and was educated under the restraining influence of the court Christianity of his cousin, the Arian emperor Constantius. The austere, monastic, intolerant, tyrannical, and hypocritical form of this belief repelled the independent youth, and made him a bitter enemy of Christianity, and an enthusiastic admirer of the heathen poets and philosophers, whose writings, in spite of the severe prohibition, he managed secretly to procure and to study, especially during his sojourn at the University of Athens. "The Arian pseudo-Christianity of Constantius produced the heathen anti-Christianity of Julian, and the latter was a well-deserved punishment of the former." But he shrewdly concealed his real convictions, and hypocritically conformed to all the outward rites of Christianity till the death of the emperor. His heathenism was not a simple, spontaneous growth, but an artificial and morbid production. It was the heathenism of pantheistic eclecticism and Neo-Platonism, a strange mixture of philosophy, poesy, and superstition, and, in Julian at least, in great part an imitation or caricature of Christianity. With all his philosophical intelligence, he credited the most insipid legends of the gods, or gave them a deeper mystic meaning by the most arbitrary allegorical interpretation. He was in intimate personal intercourse with Jupiter, Minerva, Apollo, Hercules, who paid their nocturnal visits to his heated fancy, and assured him of their special favor and protection. His moral character corresponded to this pseudo-philosophy. He was full of affectation, vanity, sophistry, loquacity, and dissimulation. Everything he said, or wrote, or did was studied and calculated for effect. His apostasy from Christianity Julian dates from his twentieth year, A.D. 351. But while Constantius lived he concealed his pagan sympathies with consummate hypocrisy for ten years, and outwardly conformed to all the rites of the Church. After December, 355, he suddenly surprised the world with brilliant military successes and executive powers as Cæsar in Gaul, which was at that time threatened by barbarians, and won the enthusiastic love of his soldiers. Now he raised the standard of rebellion against his imperial cousin, and in 361 openly declared himself a friend of the gods. By the sudden death of Constantius in the same year he became sole emperor, and made his triumphal entry into Constantinople. He immediately set to work with the utmost zeal to reorganize all departments of the government on the former heathen basis. He displayed extraordinary tal-

ent, industry, and executive tact. The eighteen short months of his reign (Dec. 361–June, 363) comprehend the plans of a life-long administration. He was the most gifted, the most learned, and most active, and yet the least successful of Roman emperors. His reign was an utter failure, teaching the important lesson that it is useless to swim against the stream of history and to impede the onward march of Christianity. He proved, beyond the possibility of doubt, that paganism had outlived itself, and that Christianity was the only living religion which had truly conquered the world, and carried all the hopes of humanity. He died in the midst of his plans in a campaign against Persia, characteristically exclaiming (according to later tradition), "Galilæan, thou hast conquered!"

Julian did not resort to open violence in his attempt to destroy Christianity in the empire. He affected the policy of philosophical toleration. He did not wish to give the Christians an additional glory of martyrdom. He hoped to attain his end more surely in an indirect way. He endeavored to revive heathenism by his own personal zeal for the worship of the gods. But his zeal found no echo, and only made him ridiculous in the eyes of the cultivated heathen themselves. When he endeavored to restore the oracle of Apollo near Antioch, and arranged for a magnificent display, only a solitary priest appeared in the temple and ominously offered—a goose. He also attempted to reform heathenism by incorporating with it the morals and benevolent institutions of Christianity. But this was like galvanizing a decaying corpse, or grafting fresh scions on a dead trunk. As to the negative part of his assault upon Christianity, Julian gave liberty to all the sects, in the hope that they might devour each other, but, instead of that, he only gave new vigor to the cause he hated. He forbade the Christians to read the classical authors, and deprived them of the benefit of schools of their own, that they might either grow up in ignorance, or be forced to get an education from heathen teachers. He assisted the Jews in rebuilding the Temple of Jerusalem in order to falsify the prophecy of Christ, but the attempt, three times repeated, signally failed, by an interposition of Providence approaching to the character of a miracle. (Respecting this question, see the judicious remarks in Lardner's *Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, vol. iv.) Finally he wrote a book against Christianity, in which he united all the arguments of Porphyry, Celsus, Lucian, and other enemies before him, and infused into them his own bitter and sarcastic spirit. But this attack called forth able refutations from Gregory of Nazianzum, Cyril of Alexandria, and others, and contains a number of incidental admissions which confirm the truth of most of the leading facts of the Gospel history. Dr. Lardner (in his learned book on the *Credibility of the Gospel History*, in the London edition of his works by Kippis, vii, 638–639) thus sums up the involuntary testimony of this ablest and bitterest of all the heathen opponents of Christianity:

Flavius Claudianus Julianus.

"Julian has borne a valuable testimony to the history and to the books of the New Testament. He allows that Jesus was born in the reign of Augustus, at the time of the taxing made in Judæa by Cyrenius; that the Christian religion had its rise, and began to be propagated, in the times of the emperors Tiberius and Claudius. He bears witness to the genuineness and authenticity of the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and the Acts of the Apostles; and he so quotes them as to intimate that they were the only historical books received by Christians as of authority, and the only authentic memoirs of Jesus Christ and his apostles, and the doctrines preached by them. He allows their early date, and even argues for it. He also quotes, or plainly refers to, the Acts of the Apostles, to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, the Corinthians, and the Galatians. He does not deny the miracles of Jesus Christ, but allows him to have 'healed the blind, and the lame, and dæmoniacs;' and to have 'rebuked the winds, and walked upon the waves of the sea.' He endeavors, indeed, to diminish these works, but in vain. The consequence is undeniable—such works are good proofs of a divine mission. He endeavors also to lessen the number of the early believers in Jesus, and yet he acknowledges that there were 'multitudes of such men in Greece and Italy' before St. John wrote his Gospel. He likewise affects to diminish the quality of the early believers, and yet acknowledges that, besides 'men-servants and maid-servants,' Cornelius, a Roman centurion at Cæsarea, and Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus, were converted to the faith of Jesus before the end of the reign of Claudius. And he often speaks with great indignation of Peter and Paul, those two great apostles of Jesus, and successful preachers of his Gospel: so that, upon the whole, he has undesignedly borne testimony to the truth of many things recorded in the books of the New Testament. He aimed to overthrow the Christian religion, but has confirmed it: his arguments against it are perfectly harmless, and insufficient to unsettle the weakest Christian. He justly excepts to some things introduced into the Christian profession by the late professors of it, in his own time or sooner, but has not made one objection of moment against the Christian religion as contained in the genuine and authentic books of the New Testament."

Literature.—Juliani Imperatoris *Opera quæ supersunt omnia* (ed. by Petavius, Par. 1583, and more completely by E. Spanheim, Lips. 1696, 2 vols. fol.); Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra impium Jul. libri x* (which contains the chief arguments of Julian against Christianity, with their refutation), in Cyril's *Opera*, ed. Aubert, tom. vi, and in Spanheim's edition of Julian's works. Also the relevant sections in the heathen historians Ammianus Marcellinus, Zosimus, and Eunapius, and in the Church histories of Socrates, Sozomenus, and Theodoret. Among modern writers on Julian we refer to Tillemont, *Memoires*, etc., vii, 322–420; Warburton, *Julian* (London, 1751); Neander, *Julian und sein Zeitalter* (Leipz. 1812: in an English dress, N. Y. 1850, 12mo); Jondot, *Histoire de l'empereur Julien* (1817, 2 vols.); Wiggers, *Julian der Abtrünnige* (Leipzig, 1837); Teuffel, *De Juliano religionis Christiani contemptore* (Tüb. 1844); Fr. Strauss, *Der Romantiker auf dem Thron der Cæsaren, oder Julian der Abtrünnige* (Manheim, 1847); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, 40 sq.

Julian of Eclanum. See Pelagius; Pelagians.

Julian of Halicarnassus, the bishop celebrated as the leader of a faction of the Monophysites, who bear his name, flourished in the early part of the 6th century. When the Monophysite bishops were deposed in 519 he was obliged to flee to Alexandria for safety. For further details, see Monophysites.

Julian, St. See Pomerius.

Julian of Toledo. See Toledo, Councils of (14th); Spain.

Julian(us) Cesarini, Cardinal, one of the most distinguished characters of the Church of Rome in the Middle Ages, prominently connected with the efforts to heal the dissensions within the pale of the Romish Church of the 15th century, and the union of the Eastern and Western churches at the Council of Florence, was born at Rome in 1398, the descendant of a noble family noted in the annals of Italian history. He was educated at the University of Perugia, and early evinced the possession of great ability and uncommon talents. He particularly interested himself in the study of the

Roman law, and soon acquired the reputation of being one of the foremost thinkers, and was honored with a professor's chair at Padua. He was not suffered, however, to continue long in the rostrum, for the Church of his day needed men of decision and energy to allay the strife which was raging fiercely, and threatening the destruction of the hierarchal edifice so lately dishonored in the occupation of the papal chair by licentious characters. See INNOCENT XXIII. Seventy years of anarchy and orphanage, sometimes familiarly termed the Babylonish captivity of the Church of Rome, the illustrious Colonna, better known as Martin V, was to obliterate, as well as to rebuild on a firm foundation both the moral and material influence of the papacy. For such a task his own talents, however great, were not sufficient, and the wise, far-seeing pontiff was not slow to recognise the uncommon endowments of young Julian, who was accordingly appointed apostolic prothonotary, and, later, auditor of the Rota Romana. Cardinal Brunda in particular became interested in the rising Cesarinus; and when, in 1419, he was sent as papal legate to Bohemia to bring back the erring (?) sheep of the Slavonic fold, Julian was the legate's companion and main stay. Though this mission failed to accomplish its objects, at the Diet of Brunn, Julian won golden opinions from the Romans, and in 1426 (May 22) was promoted to the cardinalate of Santo Angelo. When, in 1431, a diet was summoned at Nuremberg "to concert immediate and vigorous action for crushing the hitherto successful rebellion," it was none other than cardinal Julian whom Martin V selected (after his death confirmed by Eugenius IV) to represent him in that ecclesiastical body, as well as in the general council which, in accordance with the celebrated decree "*Frequens*" of the Council of Constance, was soon to meet at Basle. It had been determined to extirpate the Hussites by all means. As kind words would not bring them back to the open arms of the Church, the cardinal legate boldly exchanged the mitre for the helmet. Quickly an army of Crusaders was gathered, and in himself blending together the characters of the priest and the soldier, he sought to kindle in their hearts the fires of religious zeal and patriotic devotion. But neither the potency of a blessed banner and a consecrated sword, nor the spectacle of an ecclesiastic urging on an army to a war of faith, had sufficiently impressed Rome's most faithful adherents to brave "the face of a religious influence like that of Hussitism, which was rooted in national sympathies, such as Rome could never awaken in the day of her greatest power," and ignominiously the papal legate again failed in his mission. Meanwhile, however, the Council of Basle had convened, opened in the absence of the legate by two of his deputies, and thither Julian directed his steps. He assumed its presidency Sept. 9, 1431, determined by peaceful measures to essay once more the accomplishment of a task which he had found it impossible to secure on the field of battle; and to his honor be it said that all the inducements which were now held out to the Hussites were the offerings of a sincere and pious soul, which desired above all things else the glory of God and the honor of his Church. "The sanguine and undaunted legate, who had been the first to reckon on the military campaign as the only remedy for the spreading disease, was now the first to fall back upon the council from which he had hitherto augured so little good. 'As I saw no other remedy left' (are his own words), 'I animated and encouraged all to remain steadfast in the faith, and to fear nothing, since on this very account I was going to the council where the whole Church would assemble'" (Jenkins). How much Julian did to obtain Eugenius's sanction to the continuation of the council which that pontiff was determined to abrogate, and how Julian, notwithstanding the publication of a bull abrogating the council, and convoking it eighteen months later at Bologna, continued the session, and with what liberality and sagacity he counselled in the deliberations of this synod, and with what earnestness and zeal he defended the independence of the council and its superiority over the pontiff, we have already mentioned in the article on BASLE, COUNCIL OF (q. v.). Suffice it to say here that, had the wise and far-seeing policy of the legate been allowed to be carried out in the name and with the full consent of the Roman pontiff, the Hussites would have been redeemed, and the Church of Rome been spared the reductions which she suffered in the 16th century, and which even now threaten her very existence. See OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH. Annoyed and distracted by the opposition of Eugenius, the president hardly knew how to dispose of the Bohemian question, and the Hussites, doubting the sincerity of the cardinal, received every advance with distrust, and misinterpreted every utterance of Julian; till it finally became evident to both parties that their mission was fruitless, and that it had only opened another and a still more intricate chapter in the history of this long and eventful controversy. See HUSSITES. But if Julian had battled for reform within the Church, and had boldly argued in favor of the council's supremacy over the incumbent of the papal chair, he had yet faithfully adhered to the Roman pontificate; and when, as he believed, the fathers of the Church determined to deprive Eugenius of a portion of his support, he as earnestly defended the pontiff's cause, and suddenly the council found itself at variance with its able president, and the Church threatened with a greater schism than she had ever yet endured. It is true Julian had been one of the prime and most zealous leaders in abolishing the annates (q. v.), but he stanchly insisted with the same zeal for some compensation from other sources; and when he found the council indisposed to meet his views, he quickly changed front, and became one of Eugenius's most outspoken adherents. The breach had opened in February, 1437; in September, the arrival of a papal bull ordering a synod at Ferrara to consider the question of uniting the Eastern and Western churches obliged Julian to resign the presidency, and on Jan. 9, 1438, he quitted Basle, and, after a short visit to Rome, hastened to Ferrara. See FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF; FELIX V. This sudden change of Julian from an opponent to an adherent of the Eugenian party has led historians to doubt the sincerity of the cardinal; but when we consider that Julian's great object was the union of the Eastern and Western churches, the healing of schisms within either, and a thorough reformation to suit the wants of the day, this action explains itself to us as really the natural development of those great principles of ecclesiastical policy upon which Julian had acted from the beginning; and "while the advocates of the pope were rejoicing over the immediate fruits of a successful duplicity, that vigorous and impulsive mind, which had guided the intellectual strength of Christendom in the freest and most enlightened council that had assembled since the apostolic age, was preparing itself for a future of more enduring triumph. The long and dreary night of schisms and controversies seemed now far spent, and the day of strength and reunion was at hand. How sublime was the prospect now opening upon an earnest and sanguine mind! The restoration of the Church to its first beauty and integrity; its reformation by the recovery of its first estate, and of that spirit which made it one in Christ; the overthrow of the infidel and the enemy of the Church by a warfare of whose glories the earlier Crusades would become but a faint prophecy; the extension of the power of the papacy over all Christendom, and the restoration of the episcopacy to its pristine beauty under the one universal patriarch—these were the most prominent features of this vision of things to come. We cannot wonder that, with such a view before him, the great reformer of the Church at Basle laid down the work of reformation to take up that of union; and while keeping still, as the rule of all his labors, the truth proclaimed at Constance, 'There can be no real union without reformation, nor true reformation without union,' he fell back

upon the work of union when that of reformation became impossible. To one who regards his course from this point every stage of his transition from Basle to Florence will become clear and consistent. Everywhere we shall recognise a careful provision for the exigencies of the Church, formed from the matured experience of its past dangers, and a disinterested zeal which, in an age of selfish intrigue, was as naturally misrepresented as it was wilfully misunderstood. The insinuation of Gibbon is at once confronted by the fact that if Julian had not sought the peace of the Church rather than his own aggrandizement, he might have grasped at this moment the papacy itself, and wrested from Eugenius that authority under which he was content to close a life of brilliant but ill-requited service" (Jenkins, p. 266-268).

But if the conduct of Julian had hitherto been the outgrowth of a sincere heart, we can only look with suspicion upon his actions in the Council of Florence, removed thither from Ferrara. His name deserves to be treated with ignominy for the duplicity he manifested towards the leading prelates of the Eastern Church, and from this time dates the earliest "moral declension in the course of Julian, which was at once closed and expiated in the dark page of the Hungarian legation." See FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF; PURGATORY; FILIOQUE; JOSEPH OF CONSTANTINOPLE. For his valuable services to the papacy, Eugenius bestowed on him the bishopric of Frascati, and in 1443 further evinced his recognition of Julian's efforts by appointing him legate to Hungary, which country, the very bulwark against further advances of the Turks, was at this time threatened by civil dissensions, and was fast developing many causes of as serious apprehensions to the court of Rome as Bohemia had done in the previous century. See SIGISMUND; WLADISLAS. Again Julian was obliged to lay aside his spiritual weapons, and to draw the temporal sword which he had once before wielded so unsuccessfully. But not only did he change the manner and weapons of warfare, but even the principles for which he fought; and hereafter Julian is marked by an *unscrupulous* pursuit of his object, and it becomes really difficult to detect, under the strange disguise which he henceforth assumes, "the features of that enlightened mind which inspired the decrees and directed the correspondence of the Council of Basle." His task was to heal the dissensions of the Hungarian royalty, and to enlist that country, in union with all the rest of Christendom, to check the further advance, and, if possible, bring about the utter annihilation of the Turks; and when the sudden death of the queen regent Elizabeth (which is oftentimes said to have been *caused* by Julian Cesarinus) and the accession of Wladislas had secured to the Turks a peace of ten years, it was Julian who came forward to argue with the king on the fallacy of adhering to a compact with heretics, especially as the treaty had been made without the sanction of the holy see. The apostolic authority served to free Wladislas from his obligation, and the war with the Saracens began anew, in which both king and papal legate fell a prey to Mohammedan defenders at the battle of Varna (1440). According to some, Julian was murdered in his flight by a Wallachian who saw gold on his clothes; others say that the Hungarians killed him in punishment for his evil advice; while others, again, say that he died in 1446, in consequence of a wound received while leading on the Christians; and some Romish historians even claim that he suffered martyrdom in the camp of the Turks; but as none of the contemporary historians knew anything of the kind to have occurred, it seems useless to refute the statement. His speeches are contained in the Acts of Councils, and his two letters to Eugenius concerning the Council of Basle in the *Fasciculus rerum expetend.* (Col. 1535), p. 27 sq. See Jenkins, *Life and Times of Cardinal Julian* (London, 1861, 8vo); Hefele, *Quartalschrift*, 1847, ii; Cave, *Scriptores eccles.*; Schröckh, *Kirchengeschichte*, xxxii, 11 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity* (see Index in vol. viii). (J. H. W.)

Julian Calendar. See CALENDAR, ROMAN.

Julian Cross, or **Cross of St. Julian,** is the name of a crosslet placed saltire-ways. See CROSS.

Julian Epoch; Julian Year. See CHRONOLOGY, CHRISTIAN.

Juliana, ST. See CORPUS CHRISTI.

Julianists. See JULIAN OF HALICARNASSUS.

Juliano, a Spanish Roman Catholic of the 17th century, who, while travelling in Germany, was converted to the Protestant faith. His zeal for the diffusion of the Word of God led him to undertake the dangerous enterprise of conveying into Spain a large quantity of Bibles concealed in casks, and packed up as Rhenish wine. A pretended Protestant betrayed him. He was seized by the Inquisition, and, together with eight hundred purchasers of his precious treasure, was condemned to the torture and to death.—Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 136.

Julias, the name given by Philip the Tetrarch to Bethsaida in honor of Julia, the daughter of the emperor Augustus. See BETHSAIDA.

Coin of Julias.

Julitta OF CAPPADOCIA, a female martyr of the 4th century, under Diocletian, was a Lycaonian of royal descent, and greatly celebrated for her Christian virtues. To avoid the bigoted rage of the pagan governor, she withdrew from Iconium, her native city, to Tarsus. But here, with her young son Cyricus, she was seized, and, confessing herself a Christian, was ordered to the rack. Her beautiful boy, for repeating his mother's words, "I am a Christian," was dashed in pieces on the pavement before her eyes, for which the dying mother gave thanks to God. After patiently suffering various torments, she was beheaded, April 16, A.D. 305.—Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 55.

Ju'lius (Ἰούλιος, for the Latin *Julius*, the name of an honorable Roman family), the centurion of the imperial cohort who had the charge of conducting Paul as a prisoner to Rome, and who treated him with much consideration and kindness on the way (Acts xxvii, 1, 3, 43; comp. ver. 11, 31). A.D. 55.—Kitto. "Augustus's band," to which Julius belonged, has been identified by some commentators with the Italian band (Acts x, 1); by others, less probably, with the body of cavalry denominated Sebasteni by Josephus (*Ant.* xix, 9, 2, *etc.*). Conybeare and Howson (*Life of St. Paul*, ch. xxi) adopt in the main Wieseler's opinion, that the Augustan cohort was a detachment of the Prætorian Guards attached to the person of the Roman governor at Cæsarea; and that this Julius may be the same as Julius Priscus (Tacitus, *Hist.* ii, 92; iv, 11), sometime centurion, afterwards præfect of the Prætorians. See ITALIAN; PAUL.

Julius, a Christian martyr, was a Roman senator in the 2d century. A convert to Christianity, he was ordered by the emperor to sacrifice to him as Hercules. This Julius absolutely refused to do, and he was imprisoned, and finally beaten to death with clubs.—Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 22.

Julius AFRICANUS, an ecclesiastical writer who flourished in the beginning of the 3d century, was, according to Suidas (s. v. Africanus), a native of Libya, but resided generally at Emmaus (afterwards Nicopolis), in Palestine. The same writer calls him also *Sextus*. Little is known of his personal history. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* vi, 31) relates that he undertook a journey to Alexandria to listen to Heraclas, the teacher of the

catechumens in that city, as also that he was sent by the inhabitants of Emmaus to ask of the emperor Heliogabalus the restoration of their city, which was granted (see Jerome, *De vir. illustr.* c. 63). He was a friend of Origen; and as, in letters addressed to him when the latter was already some fifty years old, he styles him "son," it is to be supposed that he was much advanced in years in 238, while the expression "colleague" seems to imply that he was also a priest. He was, according to Jerome, in the full vigor of life during the reign of Heliogabalus and Alexander Severus. We have no information concerning the precise date of his death; it occurred, in all probability, near the middle of the 3d century—some say about A.D. 232. He enjoyed great reputation for learning among the ancients. He is the author of the oldest Christian history of the world, the *Chronographia*, or *De temporibus*, which Eusebius considered very trustworthy: it extended from the creation to the third year of the reign of Heliogabalus (221). Unfortunately, the complete work is not in our possession; a portion, however, was preserved to us by copious extracts, which subsequent Church historians made from it, and these (fifty-six fragments) have been collected by Galland (*Bibliotheca*, vol. ii). Julius also wrote a letter to Origen concerning the authenticity of the history of Susannah and the Elders, and another to Aristides on the differences between the genealogies of Christ by Matthew and Luke. In this last letter, speaking against the opinion of a *fraus pia* having been perpetrated by the Church in order to prove the rights of Jesus as high-priest and king, he says, "Far be it that such a thought should govern the Church of Christ as to invent a falsehood to glorify Christ." Eusebius, Photius, and Suidas ascribe to him also the authorship of another work in twenty-four books, a sort of compendium of information on medicine and natural philosophy. According to Suidas, it was a collection of empiric formulas for curing diseases by sorcery, etc. But, as this does not seem to agree with what we know of the general character of the man, Dupin thinks that there must be some mistake, and that there probably existed both a Julius Africanus and a Julius Sextus, who have been confounded one with the other. Finally, he has also been considered the author of several treatises—*De trinitate, De circumcisione, De Attalo, De Pascha, De Sabbate*—which are evidently not his, but belong to the Roman presbyter Novatian. See Möhler, *Patrologie*, i, 577-580; Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* ii, 108 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 155.

Julius Cæsar, the first emperor of the Romans, deserves a place in our work on account of his connection with Jewish history. He was born at Rome, July 12, B.C. 100, and was educated in Greece, whither the Roman youths of his day were wont to resort for instruction. After having successively held the offices of tribune, quæstor, ædile, high-priest, and prætor or governor of Spain, Cæsar was one of the three parties who constituted the triumvirate of Rome, B.C. 60. He now set out for Gaul, ostensibly aiming at the subjugation of the Gauls, but actually to form and discipline an army that might enable him to force his coadjutors to leave to him alone the government of the Romans. The success with which his efforts, both as a soldier and a politician, were rewarded, are known to us from the history of the Gallic War that flowed from his own pen, as well as from other distinguished classic historians. When he went to Gaul he was to remain there five years, but the expiration of that time finding him involved in wars with the barbarians, five years more were added. Germany, Britain, and other countries also were invaded in turn; and when, at the death of Crassus, Cæsar and Pompey alone were left to contend for supremacy, a quarrel naturally enough arose between the two rivals. Pompey was the favorite of the people, and therefore easily controlled the senate; if only once Cæsar could be obliged to disband the army, as whose hero the victorious general of the Gallic wars was worshipped, there could be no longer any need for contention, and Pompey alone would be intrusted with the responsibility of the Roman government. A decree was quickly passed by the Roman senate commanding Cæsar to disband his forces; but Cæsar not only refused to comply with the demand, but actually marched against Pompey, whom he soon drove from Rome, and in the Eternal City, B.C. 49, was made dictator. Of the pursuit of Pompey and the fate of the latter we need not speak here; but the noble conduct of the Roman general towards his fallen enemy and towards his assassins is so meritorious in its character, that it deserves at least, in passing, a Christian commendation. When the news of the death of Pompey reached Rome, Cæsar was again appointed dictator for one year and consul for five years, and was invested with tribunicial power for life. His adherence to the cause of Cleopatra led him to enter Egypt and to engage in the "Alexandrine war," which also he brought to a successful termination in March, B.C. 47. In September of this year he returned to Rome, and was once more appointed dictator. But with the death of Pompey his partisans had by no means vanished. It is true that they had quitted Rome, but in Africa they were still dutiful to the memory and principles of their late master. To Africa, therefore, Cæsar directed his steps; the party of Pompey was quickly attacked and subdued. The feud of Metellus, of Scipio, of Cato, and Juba was sad indeed, but the display of noble and wise generosity which Cæsar now displayed towards those arrayed in arms against him proves him "to have been possessed of a great, magnanimous nature. He was not a man that could stoop to the vulgar atrocities of Marius or Sulla, and so he majestically declared that henceforth he had no enemies, and that hereafter he would make no difference between Pompeians and Cæsareans." Returned to Rome, he celebrated his victories in Gaul, Egypt, Pontus, and Africa by four great triumphs, during which the whole Roman populace was feasted and fêted by his magnificent liberality. But the display in which Cæsar indulged soon led the Romans to fear that he aimed higher than the dictatorship—that absolute government was his object. Roman patriotism had not yet expired. Many there were in the Eternal City in whose veins flowed republican blood, and the man who dared to conspire to deprive them of the liberties they had so long enjoyed was doomed to fall at their hands. His death seemed the only surety of the continuation of their long-enjoyed privileges of a free and untrammelled government. While Cæsar was planning how soonest to wear the insignia of royalty, Brutus and other senators were sharpening their weapons to take his life. On the fifteenth of March, B.C. 44, after Cæsar had taken his accustomed seat in the senate at the Capitol, a friend gave him a paper containing an account of the

Caius Julius Cæsar.

conspiracy against his life, but, while yet holding it in his hand, the conspirators themselves crowded around him, and at a given signal their daggers pierced his breast, and Rome was visited by the greatest disaster that could have befallen her at this time. To secular works belongs a reference to the writings of this remarkable character. For his reformation of the calendar, see CALENDAR, ROMAN. By the ecclesiastical writer Cæsar deserves notice for his kind enactments in behalf of the Jews, and generous treatment of them. From this people he had received valuable assistance during his campaign in Egypt, and Cæsar always preserved a grateful recollection of Antipater and his brethren. In Egypt he confirmed all the privileges the Jews had previously enjoyed. In Judæa more favorable laws were enacted; Antipater was appointed lieutenant of the country, with the honored title of a Roman citizen; Hyrcanus was confirmed in the priesthood, and provision was made for the fortification of the Holy City and the repair of its walls. See Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, bk. xiv, chap. viii sq.; Strabo, *Geography* (Bohn's ed.), iii, 184. See CÆSAR. (J. H. W.)

Julius ECHTER. See MESPELBRUNN.

Julius HENRY, duke of Brunswick, deserves our notice on account of his identification with the Reform movement of the 16th century. He was born July 10, 1538, and was originally designed for the clerical office, but in 1568 he succeeded his father, and at once introduced the religion of the Reformers, for which he had early manifested a strong inclination. In 1576 he founded the University of Helmstedt. He died May 3, 1589.

Julius MATERNUS. See FIRMICUS.

Julius I, Pope, a native of Rome, succeeded Marcus († Oct. 7, 336) on the 6th of Feb. 337, after the papal chair had been vacant for four months. We know hardly anything of him beyond the part he took in the Athanasian controversy. He sided with Athanasius, and convoked a synod to be held under his presidency; but the Eastern churches were not inclined to admit the right of arbitration and decision of the Roman bishop in such matters (see *Epist. Synodalis Syn. Sardicensis ad Donatum*, in Mansi, iii, 136), and declared to Julius that they did not admit his superiority to any other bishop, even though his was the largest city; yet they would continue in friendly relation with him if he would renounce the plan of subverting their decisions. Julius persisted in holding the synod despite the absence of the Eastern bishops, and Athanasius was declared the lawful bishop. He also took part, through his legates, in the Synod of Sardica. The Eastern bishops of this council, after their withdrawal to Philippopolis, excommunicated Julius. But this continued opposition did not prevent him from writing in 349, on the return of Athanasius to Alexandria, to the Church of that city an autograph letter of congratulation. This letter, and the one mentioned above, are all that we have from the pen of Julius (see Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* ii, 23; Athanasius, *Apol.* 2, p. 770). He died April 12, 352, and is commemorated in the Roman Catholic Church on that day. The Eastern Church erroneously considers Julius as the author of one of its liturgies. See Socrates, lib. ii and iii; Baronius, *Ann. Eccles.*; Tillemont, *Mémoires*; Sozomen, *De Sect.* art. 8; Dupin, *Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclés.*; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, April 12; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 157.

Julius II, Pope, CARDINAL DELLA ROVERE, nephew of pope Sixtus IV, took the papal chair after the one month's rule of Pius III, in 1503. He was born at Albezzola, near Savona, in 1441; became successively bishop of Carpentras, Albano, Ostia, Bologna, Avignon, and Mende, and was finally made cardinal by his uncle, Sixtus IV. During the pontificate of Alexander VI, the most infamous and depraved of all the popes, Julian della Rovere already sought to prepare the way for his own succession in the pontificate; but the cardinal d'Amboise, archbishop of Rouen and minister of Louis XII, became his competitor, and the claims of the French prelate were sustained by an army marching against Rome. Outwitted in this attempt, Julian at once set out to procure his future success, and, persuading the Italian cardinals that their interest demanded the election of a native pope, secured the election of Piccolomini as pope Pius III. During the short reign of the latter Julian resumed his intrigues, and when Pius III died, twenty-six days after his election, Julian had so well succeeded in bribing the most influential cardinals by promises of power and temporal advantages that he received the position. After his exaltation to the papal throne, he set about to raise the papacy from the political degradation to which it had sunk during the reign of his predecessors, generally termed "the night of the papacy." Determined to recover for the Church all that had belonged to the Roman see in the days of Innocent III, he began by driving Cæsar Borgia out of his ill-gotten possessions in the Romagna; but there he found another power, the Venetians, who, during the preceding troubles, had taken possession of Ravenna, Rimini, and other places. The Venetians offered to pay tribute to the see of Rome for those territories, but Julius refused, and demanded their absolute restitution to the Church. After fruitless negotiations, Julius, in 1508, made a league with Louis XII, the emperor Maximilian, and the duke of Ferrara, against Venice. This was called the League of Cambray, and its object was the destruction of the republic of Venice and the partition of its territories. Venice, however, stood firm, although its armies were defeated and its territories were ravaged by both Germans and French. At last Julius himself, having recovered the town of Romagna, perceived the impolicy of uniting with ultramontane sovereigns against the oldest Italian state, and accordingly, in Feb. 1510, he made peace with Venice. Wishing to undo the mischief which he had done, and to drive the foreigners (whom he styled "barbarians") out of Italy, he first sought to arm the Germans against the French, whom he dreaded most; but, not succeeding, he called to his aid the Swiss. He himself took the field, and attacked and took the town of La Mirandola, entering it by a breach, in January, 1511; later he met with reverses, and lost Bologna. But in the following October his legates succeeded in forming a league, which he called "holy," with Ferdinand of Spain, Henry of England, the Venetians, and the Swiss. The campaign subsequent, in 1512, effected the total expulsion of the French from Lombardy. But this was done by the Swiss, German, and Spanish troops, and Julius merely succeeded in driving one party of foreigners out of Italy by means of other foreigners, who meantime subverted the republic of Florence, and gave it to the Medici. In the midst of these events, Julius died of an inflammatory disease, on the 21st of February, 1513. He was succeeded by Leo X. Louis XII had convoked a council in order to obtain the approval of the French clergy on his warfare against Rome. To retort this measure the fifth Lateran Council was convoked (brought to a close after the accession of Leo X), and thus the designs of the French king were completely frustrated. As an ecclesiastical ruler, Julius has little to recommend him in the eyes of the Christian Church. As a political sovereign, he is described by Ranke as "a noble soul, full of lofty plans for the glory and weal of Italy;" and professor Leo considers him, with all his defects, as one of the noblest characters of that age in Italy. He was fond of the fine arts, patronized Bramante, Michael Angelo, and Raffaelle, and began the structure of St. Peter's Church. See *English Cyclopædia*, s. v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 157; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 534 sq.; Baxmann, *Politik d. Päpste*; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vii, 372 sq. (J. H. W.)

Julius III, Pope (*Gian-Maria del Monte*, CARDINAL GIOCCI), succeeded Paul III in 1550. He was born at Monte San Sovino, near Arezzo, Sept. 10, 1487. He first studied law, but, securing the protection of his un-

cle, cardinal Antonio del Monte, he entered the Church, and soon became archbishop, and was intrusted with the administration of different dioceses. Paul III made him cardinal of St. Vitale and bishop of St. Palestrina, and sent him as one of the four legates to open the Council of Trent (q. v.). After his elevation to the pontificate he reopened (1551) the sittings of the Council of Trent, suspended under his predecessor (1549). Closely allied to Charles V, he spent his reign in quarrelling with France, Venice, and also with Ferdinand, king of the Romans, and brother of Charles V. His name is linked with English history by his efforts to organize with Mary the reunion of England with Rome. See POLE. Julius III died in March, 1555, leaving behind him a very indifferent character, marked by incapacity and misconduct. While a cardinal he was remarkable for his firmness and activity, but after becoming pope he gave himself up to luxury and pleasure, and went so far in his disregard of all consistency as to give the cardinal's place left vacant by his election to one of his servants, whose only merit consisted in having taken care of his pet monkey. See Ciacconi, *Vitæ Pontif.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 165; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 158; Ranke, *Papacy*, i, 201 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, vii, 458 sq.

Jumenta, *cattle.* Heretics who denied the resurrection of the dead were accustomed to bestow opprobrious epithets on those who persisted in maintaining the truth of Scripture. Sometimes they called them *carnei, animales, jumenta*, carnal, sensual, cattle; also *lutei*, earthy, etc.—Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v.

Jumpers or **Barkers** is a name for those persons who, as an inference from 2 Sam. vi, 16, believe that religious worship must be accompanied by violent agitations, convulsive leaping and dancing. This singular religious belief is said to have originated among the congregations of Mr. Whitefield, in the western part of Wales, about 1760, but it soon found friends among the Quakers, and later among the Irvingites. The Jumpers found special defenders in the Welsh poet William Williams (q. v.), Harris Rowland (q. v.), etc. They are sometimes called *Barkers* because frequently they do not confine their religious exuberances to jumping and dancing, but accompany them with violent groans and incoherent remarks, often degenerating into a sort of bellowing. Discountenanced in England, the Jumpers emigrated to the United States, and here they continue to flourish moderately. We believe they have some adherents in Pennsylvania and Ohio, and particularly in the extreme West. Evans, in his *Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World* (Lond. 1811), relates his experience in a meeting of the Jumpers which he attended: "About the year 1785 I myself was very accidentally present at a meeting which terminated in jumping. It was held in the open air, on a Sunday evening, near Newport, in Monmouthshire. The preacher was one of lady Huntingdon's students, who concluded his sermon with the recommendation of jumping; and I must allow him the praise of consistency, for he got down from the chair on which he stood and jumped along with his hearers. The arguments he adduced for this purpose were, that David danced before the ark, that the babe leaped in the womb of Elizabeth, and that the man whose lameness was removed leaped and praised God for the mercy which he had received! He expatiated on these topics with uncommon fervency, and then drew the inference that they ought to show similar expressions of joy for the blessings which Jesus Christ had put into their possession. He then gave an impassioned sketch of the sufferings of the Saviour, and thereby roused the passions of a few around him into a state of violent agitation. About nine men and seven women for some little time rocked to and fro, groaned aloud, and then jumped with a kind of frantic fury. Some of the audience flew in all directions; others gazed on in silent amazement. They all gradually dispersed except the jumpers, who continued their exertions from eight in the evening till near eleven at night. I saw the conclusion of it; they at last kneeled down in a circle, holding each other by the hand, while one of them prayed with great fervor, and then, all rising up from off their knees, departed; but previous to their dispersion they wildly pointed up towards the sky, and reminded one another that they should soon meet there, and never again be separated."

Jung. See STILLING.

Ju'nia, or rather **Ju'nias** (Ἰουνίας, a deriv. of *Junius*, the name of a Roman family), a Christian at Rome, to whom Paul addressed a salutation in connection with Andronicus, as being his "kinsmen and fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles," and were in Christ before himself (Rom. xvi, 7); hence probably of Jewish extraction. A.D. 55. As the gender of the epithets applied is uncertain (*συγγενεῖς καὶ συναιχμαλώτους*), some (e. g. Origen, Chrysostom, and other fathers) have supposed a female (Ἰουνίαν comes equally well from Ἰουνία) to be meant (but see Michaelis, in Pott's *Sylloge*, vii, 128).

Junilius OF AFRICA, generally believed to have been bishop in the 6th century, is known by his work *De partibus divinæ legis*, dedicated to a certain bishop Primasius, probably the one of Hadrumetum who in 553 indorsed the Constitutum of Vigilius. Junilius himself claimed no originality, but acknowledged his obligation to a certain Paulus of Persia, supposed to have been Paulus of Bassora, who afterwards became metropolitan of Nisibis (though he was not a Persian). The work is in the form of a dialogue between a master and his pupil, and is a sort of introduction to the sacred writings. The first book, on Scripture, is divided into two parts, on the *outward expression* and the *inward meaning;* the outward expression contains five particulars—the species of writing, its authority, its author, its style, and its order of place. The inward meaning has reference especially to three particulars, God, this world, and the next. The second book treats of this world, its creation, its government, the properties and accidents of nature, the nature of will, and the consequences and results of will. Junilius then speaks of types, of predictions before and under the law concerning Christ and the calling of the Gentiles, and of Reason in its agreement with the commands of Scripture. Special attention is due to the fact that Junilius does not count the Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Job, Judith, Esther, and the Maccabees among canonical books. The work has been published as Junilii *de Partibus Divinæ Legis*, libri ii (Basil. 1545, 8vo; Francfort ad Oder, 1603, 8vo; and in *Biblioth. Patri.* i).—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 174 sq.; Clark, *Success. of Sac. Lit.* ii, 323.

Ju'niper (רֹתֶם, *ro'them*, prob. so called from its use in *binding;* Sept. in 1 Kings xix, 4, Ῥάθαμ v. r. Ῥαθμέν; in verse 5, φυτόν; in Job xxx, 4, ξύλον; in Psa. cxx, 4, ἐρημικός; Vulg. *juniperus*, but in Psa. cxx, 4, *desolatorius*), a shrub or tree mentioned as affording shade to Elijah in his flight to Horeb (1 Kings xix, 4, 5), and as affording material for fuel, and also, in extreme cases, for human food (Psa. cxx, 4; Job xxx, 4). The older translators seem to have been unacquainted with it, while the modern versions have generally followed the Vulgate in referring it to the juniper (see Stengel in the *Biblioth. Brem.* vii, fasc. 5; Hiller, *Hierophyt.* i, 253; Sprengel, *Gesch. d. Botan.* i, 25), which, however, seems to be indicated by a different Hebrew word. See HEATH.

The different species of juniper have by some botanists been ranked under *Cedrus*, the true species being distinguished by the title of *Cedrus baccifera*, and the pines by that of *Cedrus conifera*. Of *Juniperus*, the ἄρκευθος of the Greeks and *abhul* of the Arabs, there are several species in Syria. Of these, *J. communis*, the common juniper, is a very widely diffused species, being found in Europe and Asia, in the plains of northern and

in the mountains of southern latitudes, usually forming a low shrub, but in some situations being fifteen feet, and even thirty feet high. *J. oxycedrus*, the sharp or prickly, or brown-berried juniper, closely allied to the common juniper, is an evergreen shrub, from ten to twelve, but sometimes even twenty feet high. It was found by M. Bové on Mount Lebanon. *J. drupacea*, or large-fruited juniper, is a species which was introduced into Europe from the East under the Arabic name *habhel*. This name, however, is applied rather to all the species than to any one in particular. It is a native of Mount Cassius, and is thought to be the same as the greater juniper found by Belon on Mount Taurus, which he describes as rising to the height of a cypress. *J. Phœnicea*, or Phœnician juniper, is the great juniper of Dioscorides, and is a native of the south of Europe, Russia, and Syria. It has imbricated leaves, bears some resemblance to the cypress, and attains a height of from twenty to thirty feet. *J. Lycia*, or Lycian juniper, is a dwarf species, and *J. Sabina*, or the common Savine, is usually a low spreading shrub, but sometimes rises to the height of ten or twelve feet. It is a native of the south of Europe and Syria. Of these species, *J. oxycedrus* and *J. Phœnicea* are the only species which could have been the *berôsh* of Scripture. Some are of opinion that the wood of *J. oxycedrus*, rather than that of the so-called cedar of Lebanon, is the cedar-wood so famed in ancient times for its durability, and which was therefore employed in making statues. It is to the wood of certain species of juniper that the name of cedar-wood is now specially applied. See CEDAR.

Juniperus Phœnicea—young and old. (The young tree is here about three feet high, and of a compact pyramidal form. It afterwards spreads, and reaches a height of fifteen feet or more, as in the other specimens.)

The *rothem*, however, is no doubt the plant still called by the Arabs *retem*, and commonly known as *Spanish broom*. In Loudon's *Encyclopædia of Plants* it is named *Spartium monospermum*, or white single-seeded broom, and is described as a very handsome shrub, remarkable for its numerous snow-white flowers. Osbeck remarks that it grows like willow-bushes along the shores of Spain, as far as the flying sands reach, where scarcely any other plant exists except the *Ononis serpens*, or creeping *restharrow*. The use of this shrub is very great in stopping the sand. The leaves and young branches furnish delicious food for goats. It converts the most barren spot into a fine odoriferous garden by its flowers, which continue a long time. It seems to shelter hogs and goats against the scorching heat of the sun. The twigs are used for tying bundles, and all kinds of herbs that are brought to market are fastened

Genista Monosperma.

together with them. The Spaniards call it *retama*, from the Arabic name *retem*. It is now referred by all botanists to the genus *Genista*, and called *G. monosperma*. It is described by De Candolle as a branching and erect shrub, with slender, wandlike, flexible branches; leaves comparatively few, linear, oblong, pressed to the branches, pubescent; inflorescence in few flowered lateral racemes; petals white, silky, nearly equal to one another; legumes oval, inflated, smooth, membranaceous, one to two seeded. It occurs on the sterile shores of Portugal, Spain, Barbary, and Egypt. It was found by Forskal at Suez, and named by him *Genista Spartium?* with *rætam* as its Arabic name. Bové also found it at Suez, and again in different parts of Syria. Belon also mentions finding it in several places when travelling in the East. Burckhardt also frequently mentions the shrub *rethem* in the deserts to the south of Palestine, and he thought it to be the same plant as the *Genista rætam* of Forskal. He states that whole plains are sometimes covered with this shrub, and that such places are favorite places of pasturage, as sheep are remarkably fond of the pods. Lord Lindsay again, while travelling in the middle of the valleys of Mount Sinai, says, "The *rattam*, a species of broom, bearing a white flower, delicately streaked with purple, afforded me frequent shelter from the sun while in advance of the caravan" (*Letters*, p. 183). Dr. Robinson, in his journey from Akabah to Jerusalem, says (*Researches*, ii, 124): "The shrubs which we had met with throughout the desert still continued. One of the principal of these is the *retem*, a species of the *broom-plant*, the *Genista rætam* of Forskal. This is the largest and most conspicuous shrub of these deserts, growing thickly in the water-courses and valleys. Our Arabs always selected the place of encampment, if pos-

able, in a spot where it grew, in order to be sheltered by it at night from the wind; and during the day, when they often went on in advance of the camels, we found them not unfrequently sitting or sleeping under a bush of *retem* to protect them from the sun. It was in this very desert, a day's journey from Beersheba, that the prophet Elijah lay down and slept beneath the same shrub" (1 Kings xix, 4, 5, "under a *juniper*-tree"). It affords shade and protection, both in heat and storm, to travellers (Virgil, *Georg.* ii, 434, 436), and Bonar describes it as particularly useful for shelter in the peninsula of Arabia Petræa (*Sinai*, p. 190).

In the other passages the meaning is not so clear, and therefore different interpretations have been given. Thus Job (xxx, 4) says of the half-famished people who despised him, "Who cut up mallows by the bushes, and *rothem*-roots for their food." Though the broom-root may perhaps be more suitable for diet than the *juniper*, yet they are both too bitter and medicinal to be considered or used as nutritious, and therefore some say that "when we read that *rothem*-roots were their food, we are to suppose a great deal more than the words express, namely, that their hunger was so violent as not to refrain even from these roots," which were neither refreshing nor nourishing. Dr. Thomson's ingenious suggestion (*Land and Book*, ii, 438), that perhaps the mallows only were used for food, and the rothem-roots as fuel to cook them with, seems hardly tenable from the phraseology. Ursinus supposes (*Arboret. Bibl.* c. 27) that instead of the roots of this broom we are to understand a plant which grows upon these roots, as well as upon some other plants, and which is well known by the English name of *broom-rape*, the *orobanche* of botanists. These are sometimes eaten. Thus Dioscorides (ii, 136) observes that the *orobanche*, which grows from the roots of broom, was sometimes eaten raw, or boiled like asparagus. Celsius again suggests an amendment in the sentence, and thinks that we should understand it to mean that the broom-roots were required for *fuel*, and not for *food*, as the Hebrew words signifying *fuel* and *food*, though very similar to each other, are very different in their derivation (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1317; on the contrary, Michaelis, *Neue Orient. Bibl.* v, 4, 5), and this sense is confirmed by some of the Talmudical writers, as R. Levi ben-Gerson, in his remarks on this passage, says. The broom is the only fuel procurable in many of these desert situations (see Thevenot, *Trav.* i, 222). In Psa. cxx, 4, David observes that the calumnies of his enemies were "like arrows of the mighty, with coals of *rothem*." The broom, being no doubt very commonly used as fuel in a country where it is abundant and other plants scarce, might readily suggest itself in a comparison; but it is also described as sparkling, burning, and crackling more vehemently than other wood, and the Arabs regard it as yielding the best charcoal. Thus the tree which afforded shade to Elijah may have furnished also the "coals" or ashes for baking the cake which satisfied his hunger (1 Kings xix, 6). See Celsius, *Hierobot.* i, 246; Oedmann, *Verm. Sammlungen*, ii, 8; Forskal, *Flora Æg. et Arab.* p. lvi and 214; Schultens, *Comment. on Job*, ad loc.; Robinson, *Research.* i, 299; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 483; Pliny, *H. N.* xxiv, 9, 65; Balfour, *Plants of the Bible*, p. 50; Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 20, 79, 521.

Junius, Francis, son of the following, was born at Heidelberg, 1589. In early life he studied mathematics, but finally turned his attention to literature and theology. After finishing his studies he went to France to visit his parents. In 1620 he came over to England, and was received into the house of the earl of Arundel, where he lived as his librarian for thirty years. In 1650 he returned to the Continent, in order to pass some time in the bosom of his family. For two years he lived in Friesland, in a district where the ancient Saxon tongue was preserved, that he might study the language. In 1675 he returned to England, and in 1676 went to Oxford, whence he retired to Windsor, to his nephew Isaac Vossius, and died there Nov. 19, 1677. He was a very learned philologian, as is evinced by his writings, which are *De pictura Veterum*, libri iii (Amsterdam, 1637, 4to):—*Observationes in Willerami Paraphrasim Francicam Cantici Canticorum* (Amsterdam, 1655, 8vo):—*Annotationes in harmoniam Latino-francicam quatuor Evangelistarum Latine a Tatian. confectam* (Amsterd. 1655, 8vo):—*Quatuor D. N. J. C. Evangeliorum Versiones perantiquæ duæ, Gothica scilicet et Anglo-saxonica*, etc.; *Accedit et glossarium Gothicum: cui præmittitur alphabetum Gothicum, Runicum, Anglo-saxonicum*, etc. (Dordrechti, 1655, 4to):—*Cædemonis Paraphrasis poetica Geneseos* (Amsterdam, 1655, 4to). His *Etymologicum Anglicanum* was edited by Edward Lye, Oxford, 1743, folio.—Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* i, 697.

Junius, Franciscus (*François Du Jon*), an eminent French Protestant theologian, was born at Bourges in 1545. He studied law at first, but embracing the principles of the Reformation, for which his father suffered persecution, he removed to Geneva in 1562, to study the dead languages and theology. In 1565 he took charge of a Walloon congregation at Antwerp; the party troubles of the time, however, obliged him to withdraw first to a church in Limburg, and finally to Germany. Frederick II welcomed him at Heidelberg, and he obtained a church in the Palatinate. During the war of 1568 he lived in the Low Countries, and was chaplain of the Prince of Orange. He afterwards again returned to his charge, and remained there until 1573, when he was called to Heidelberg by the elector, to take part with Tremellius in the translation of the Old Testament. After being also for a while professor of theology at Heidelberg, he returned to France in 1592 with the duke of Bouillon, and was employed by Henry IV on a mission to Germany. Later he accepted a professorship at Leyden, where he remained until his death in 1602. His principal work was the Latin translation of the Old Testament, which he executed in conjunction with Tremellius. It appeared in five parts, the first containing the five books of Moses (Frankfort, 1575, folio); the second embracing the historical books, 1576; the third the poetical books, 1579; the fourth the prophets, 1579; and the fifth the apocryphal books, 1579. After the death of Tremellius the translation was revised by his colleague, and printed at London, 1584, 8vo. In the course of twenty years it passed through twenty editions, and was printed for the last time at Zurich, 1764, 8vo. Junius lived to superintend a third edition, 1596, folio; but the best edition probably is *the seventh*, published in 1624, folio, containing a good index by Paul Tossanus. "The index was published in a volume by itself at Frankfort, 1687, folio, and repeatedly after. The translation cannot be called elegant; it is too literal, and is sometimes obscure on that account. It is also disfigured with useless glosses and rabbinical traditions" (Kitto). He wrote besides, *Apocalypseos Analysis* (1592):—*Grammatica Linguæ Hebrææ* (3d edition, 1593):—*Acta Apostolorum et epistolæ 2 S. Paulli ad Corinth. ex Arabica translatione Latine reddita:—Procataclema ad V. T. interpretationem:—Prælectiones in 3 priora capita Geneseos:—Explicatio 4 priorum Psalmorum:—Psalmus 101, seu principis Christiani institutio:—Comment. in Ezechielem:—Expositio Danielis:—Lectiones in Jonam:—Sacra parallela:—Notæ in Epistolam S. Judæ.* His *Opera theologica* were published at Geneva in 1613, in two vols. folio, and are partly exegetical, partly philological and polemic. His autobiography, which is published at the beginning of his works, was written in 1595, and is the source of his biographies published by Melch. Adam and in Bayle's *Dictionary.* See Haag, *La France Protestante;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.; Kitto, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Junius, Robert, a Dutch missionary, a native of Delft, who flourished in the 17th century, was sent by the Dutch government to the western part of the island of Formosa in 1634, and was eminently successful in his

missionary labors. He is said to have baptized no less than six thousand persons. He also provided good educational advantages for the natives, and over six hundred young men crowded the schools he had founded. Of his personal history in other respects we are ignorant. His literary labors were confined to efforts in behalf of the people to whom he was sent. He composed some prayers, and translated certain Psalms into the Formosan language. He returned to Holland in after days, but the date of his death is not known to us. See Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* iii, bk. iv, cent. xvii, sect. 1, note 24.

Junkin, George, D.D., LL.D., a Presbyterian minister of note, was born in Kingston, Cumberland County, Pa., Nov. 1, 1790, entered Jefferson College in 1809, and graduated in 1813. While at college he was converted (1811), and upon the completion of his collegiate studies he entered at once on a theological course of study under Dr. John M. Mason in New York city, was ordained at Gettysburg, Pa., in 1818, and remained in the pastorate, though teaching and editing a paper a part of the time, till 1830. He was principal of Pennsylvania Manual Labor Academy at Germantown, Pa., from 1830 to 1832; president of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., from 1832 to 1841; president of Miami University from 1841 to 1844; was then recalled to the presidency of Lafayette College; and was president of Washington College, Lexington, Va., from 1848 to 1861, when, on the secession of Virginia, he left the college, his home, and his property. Lafayette College thereafter honored him with an Emeritus professorship. He died May 20, 1868. "Dr. Junkin for many years maintained a great influence in the Church courts, sustained by his thorough knowledge of every subject on which he attempted to speak, and the keen logic with which he exposed the fallacies in the arguments of his opponents. In 1844 he was moderator of the General Assembly. In 1833 he received the degree of D.D. from Jefferson College, and in 1856 that of LL.D. from Rutgers College. Dr. Junkin performed an amazing amount of work in his lifetime. His preaching record shows that he delivered a larger number of sermons than most pastors do, while his toils in building up and reviving colleges, in laborious agencies, in ecclesiastical labors in the Church courts, in the professor's chair, at the editor's desk, and through the press, in his numerous books, sermons, and essays, make us wonder how he could find the time and endure the labor of doing so much." He published *The Educator*, a periodical, in 1838; *The Vindication*, containing a history of the trial of the Rev. Albert Barnes by the Second Presbytery and by the Synod of Philadelphia, in 1836; *A Treatise on Justification*, in 1839; *The Little Stone and the Great Image, or Lectures on the Prophecies*, in 1844; *The Great Apostasy*, a sermon on Romanism, in 1853; *Political Fallacies*, in 1862; *A Treatise on Sanctification*, in 1864; and *The Tabernacle, or the Gospel according to Moses*, in 1865. See Index volume (No. 2) to *Princeton Review*, p. 226 sq.

Juno, the Roman name of the queen of heaven, essentially identical with the Grecian *Hera*. Juno was the daughter of Kronos (Saturn) and Rhea. She was the highest and most powerful divinity of the Greeks and Romans next to Jupiter (the Greek Ζεύς), of whom she was the sister and wife. Argos and Samos claimed the honor of her birth. According to Homer, she was educated by Oceanus and Thetis; according to others, by the Hours. Her marriage with Jupiter on the island of Crete was honored by the presence of all the gods. This marriage, according to Homer, was consummated without the knowledge of their parents. Others say that he subdued her by artifice on the island of Samos, and there married her. According to the Greek conception of her character, she was proud, ambitious, and jealous; and in the Homeric poems she is represented as an obstinate, quarrelsome shrew, and her temper a source of continual discord between herself and her lord. She often spitefully favors persons who were the objects of his displeasure, and he, in return, treats her with all that severity which, in ancient times, the husband was accustomed to use towards the wife. He scolds and often beats her, and on one occasion, when she had driven Hercules, the favorite of her husband, to Cos by a storm, Jupiter was so angry that he bound her hands and feet, loaded her with two anvils, and suspended her from Olympus; and, to add to the inconveniences of her situation, none of the gods were permitted to help her. During the Trojan War she lulls Jupiter to sleep, in order to give the victory to the Greeks during his slumbers, and with difficulty escapes the blows which are aimed at her when he awakes. No one of the goddesses dared contend with her. Diana once attempted it, but her cheeks exhibited the most woful evidences of the strength of the mighty Juno. All, in fine, who assumed to themselves or attributed to others a superiority to her, experienced her vengeance. But she is, notwithstanding, a female of majestic beauty, the grandest of the Olympian goddesses, well calculated to inspire awe, although wanting the soft, insinuating, and heart-touching beauty of Venus. As the only wedded goddess in the Greek mythology, she naturally presided over marriage and the birth of children. It is a significant feature of the Roman character that Juno, in addition to her other qualities, was the guardian of the national finances, watching over her people like a thrifty mother and housewife; and a temple, containing the mint, was erected to her on the Capitoline as Juno *Moneta* (the Money-coiner). In the Roman conception she was also the goddess of chastity, and prostitutes were forbidden to touch her altars. She was, in short, the protector of women. She not only presided over the fertility of marriage, but also over its inviolable sanctity, and unchastity and inordinate love of sexual pleasures were hated by the goddess. Women in childbed invoked Juno Lucina to help them, and after the delivery of the child a table was laid out for her in the house for a whole week, for newly-born children were likewise under her protection. The month of June, which was originally called Junonius, was considered to be the most favorable period for marrying. As Juno has the same characteristics as her husband in so far as they refer to the female sex, she presides over all human affairs, which are based upon justice and faithfulness, but especially over domestic affairs, in which women are more particularly concerned. The companions of Juno were the Nymphs, Graces, and Hours. Isis was her particular servant. Among animals, the peacock, the goose, and the cuckoo were sacred to her. Her usual attribute is the royal diadem, formed like a long triangle. She is drawn in a carriage by two peacocks. She had several temples in Rome. The first day of every month, and the whole of June, were sacred to her. See Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, ii, 658.

Ju'piter (the Latin form of the Greek name *Zeus*, Ζεύς, Genit. Διός), the principal deity of the Greek and Roman mythology, in which he is fabled to have been the son of Saturn and Ops. He is supposed to represent the fertilizing power of the heavens (see Creuzer, *Symbolik*, ii, 518, 522), and was worshipped under various epithets. See Walch, *Dissert. in Acta Apost.* iii, 173; compare Horace, *Odyssey*, i, x, 5; Ovid, *Fasti*, v, 495; *Metamorph.* viii, 626; Tzetz. in Lycophr. 481; "Hermes κῆρυξ Διός," Apollod. *Bibl.* iii, 10, 2; Homer, *Iliad*. ii, 402; Virg. *Æn.* iii, 21; ix, 627; Xen. *Cyrop.* viii, 3, 31; Senec. *Herc. Fur.* 299. See Mercury; Diana. (See Schmebel, *In Jove πολιούχῳ ad Ac.* Altdorf, 1740). This deity is alluded to in several passages of the Bible, and Josephus frequently refers to his worship. The following statements are chiefly from Kitto's *Cyclopædia*, s. v.:

1. It is stated in 2 Macc. vi, 1, 2, that "the king sent an old man of Athens (Sept. Ἀθηναῖον; Vulg. *Antiochenum*) (some say 'an old man, Athenean,' but Grotius, following the Latin, suggests instead of Ἀθηναῖον to read Ἀντιόχειον) to compel the Jews to depart from

the laws of their fathers, and not to live after the laws of God; and to pollute also the Temple in Jerusalem, and to call it the temple of Jupiter Olympius (Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου), and that in Gerizim, of Jupiter the defender of strangers (Sept. Διὸς Ξενίου; Vulg. *hospitalis*), as they did desire that dwelt in the place." Olympius was a very common epithet of Zeus, and he is sometimes simply called Ὀλύμπιος (Homer, *Il.* xix, 108). Olympia, in Greece, was the seat of the temple and sacred grove of Zeus Olympius, and it was here that the famous statue of gold and ivory, the work of Phidias, was erected. Caligula attempted to have this statue removed to Rome, and it was only preserved in its place by the assurance that it would not bear removal (Josephus, *Ant.* xix, 1, 1). Antiochus Epiphanes, as related by Athenæus, surpassed all other kings in his worship and veneration of the gods, so that it was impossible to count the number of the statues he erected. His especial favorite was Zeus. The Olympian Zeus was the national god of the Hellenic race (Thucydides, iii, 14), as well as the supreme ruler of the heathen world, and, as such, formed the true opposite to Jehovah, who had revealed himself as the God of Abraham. Antiochus commenced, in B.C. 174, the completion of the temple of Zeus Olympius at Athens (Polybius, *Reliq.* xxvi, 10; Livy, *Hist.* xli, 20), and associated the worship of Jupiter with that of Apollo at Daphne, erecting a statue to the former god resembling that of Phidias at Olympia (Amm. Marcell. xxii, 13, 1). Games were celebrated at Daphne by Antiochus, of which there is a long account in Polybius (*Reliq.* xxxi, 3) and Athenæus (v, 5). Coins also were struck referring to the god and the games (Mionnet, v, 215; Müller, *Antiq. Antioch.* p. 62-64). On the coins of Elis, the wreath of wild olive (κότινος) distinguishes Zeus Olympius from the Dodonæan Zeus, who has an oak wreath.

Antiochus, after compelling the Jews to call the Temple of Jerusalem the temple of Jupiter Olympius, built an idol altar upon the altar of God. Upon this altar swine were offered every day, and the broth of their flesh was sprinkled about the Temple (1 Macc. i, 46; 2 Macc. vi, 5; Josephus, *Ant.* xii, 5, 4; xiii, 8, 2; *War*, i, 1, 2). The idol altar which was upon the altar of God (τὸν βωμὸν ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου) was considered by the Jews to be the "abomination of desolation" (βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, 1 Macc. i, 54) foretold by Daniel (xi, 31; xii, 11) and mentioned by our Lord (Matt. xxiv, 15). Many interpretations of the meaning of this prophecy have been given. See ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION.

The grove of Daphne was not far from Antioch (Δάφνη ἡ πρὸς Ἀντιόχειαν, 2 Macc. iv, 33; Josephus, *War*, i, 12, 15), and at this city Antiochus Epiphanes erected a temple for the worship of Jupiter Capitolinus. See DAPHNE. It is described by Livy as having its walls entirely adorned with gold (xli, 20). To Jupiter Capitolinus the Jews, after the taking of Jerusalem, in whatever country they might be, were compelled by Vespasian to pay two drachmæ, as they used to pay to the Temple at Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, vii, 6, 6; Dion Cass. lxvi, 7). Hadrian, after the second revolt of the Jews, erected a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus in the place where the temple of God formerly stood (Dion Cass. lxix, 12). There is, probably, reference made to Jupiter Capitolinus in Dan. xi, 38, alluding to Antiochus Epiphanes: "But in his estate shall he worship the god of forces" (fortresses, אֱלֹהַּ מָעֻזִּים, see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s. v. מָעוֹז, p. 1011), for under this name Jupiter was worshipped by the victorious general on his return from a campaign, and it was in honor of Jupiter Capitolinus that he celebrated his triumph. Other conjectures have been made relative to this passage, but the opinion of Gesenius seems most probable. See MAUZZIM.

In the passage from 2 Macc. above quoted a temple was also ordered to be set up to Zeus Xenius on Mount Gerizim. Josephus gives a different account. He relates that the Samaritans, who, when it pleased them, denied that they were of the kindred of the Jews, wrote to Antiochus, the god (θεός on coins) Epiphanes, begging him to allow the temple on Mount Gerizim, which had no name (ἀνώνυμον ἱερόν; comp. "Ye worship ye know not what," John iv, 22), to be called the temple of Jupiter Hellenius (*Ant.* xii, 5, 5). This petition is said to have been granted. The epithet Ξένιος is given to Zeus as the supporter of hospitality and the friend of strangers (Plutarch, *Amator.* 20; Xenoph. *Anab.* iii, 2, 4; Virgil, *Æneid*, i, 735, etc.), and it is explained in 2 Macc. by the clause "as they did desire (Greek καθὼς ἐτύγχανον, as they were; Vulg. *prout erant hi*, [as they were]) who dwelt in the place." Ewald supposes that Jupiter was so called on account of the hospitable disposition of the Samaritans (*Geschichte*, iv, 339, note), while Jahn suggests that it was because the Samaritans, in their letter to Antiochus Epiphanes, said that they were strangers in that country (*Hebrew Commonwealth*, i, 319); Grotius says because the dwellers of the place were pilgrims from the regions of Mysia and Mesopotamia, specially referring to their idolatrous practices (2 Kings xvii, 24 sq.).

2. The appearance of the gods upon earth was very commonly believed among the ancients. Accordingly we find that Jupiter and Mercury are said to have wandered in Phrygia, and to have been entertained by Baucis and Philemon (Ovid, *Met.* viii, 611 sq.). Hence the people of Lycaonia, as recorded in Acts (xiv, 11), cried out, "The gods have come down to us in the likeness of men; and they called Barnabas Jupiter, and Paul Mercurius, because he was the chief speaker." Barnabas was probably identified with Jupiter not only because Jupiter and Mercury were companions (Ovid, *Fast.* v, 495), but because his personal appearance was majestic (Chrysostom, *Hom.* xxx; Alford, on Acts xiv, 12; comp. 2 Cor. x, 1, 10). Paul was identified with Mercury as the speaker, for this god was the god of eloquence (Horace, lib. i, od. x, 5, etc.). The temple of Jupiter at Lystra appears to have been outside the gates (τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως, Acts xiv, 13), as was frequently the custom (Strabo, xiv, 4; Herod. i, 26), and the priest being summoned, oxen and garlands were brought, in order to do sacrifice with the people to Paul and Barnabas, who, filled with horror, restrained the people with great difficulty. It is well known that oxen were wont to be sacrificed to Jupiter (Homer, *Il.* ii, 402; Virgil, *Æn.* iii, 21; ix, 627; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* vii, 3, 11, etc.). According to the interpretation of others, however, the sacrifice was about to be offered before the doors of the house where the apostles were (ἐπὶ τοὺς πυλῶνας). Alford (*Comment.* ad loc.) denies that there is any ellipsis of τοῦ ναοῦ in the phrase ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διός: his references, however, do not sustain his position; for Ζεὺς προπύλωνος would not necessarily be πρὸ τῆς πόλεως, but merely the tutelary deity of a private mansion.

Head of Jupiter Olympius.

3. The word Εὐδία (fair or fine weather) is derived from εὖ and Δία. Jupiter, as lord of heaven, had power

over all the changes of the weather. The Latins even used his name to signify the air—sub Dio (Horace, lib. ii, od. iii, 23), sub Jove frigido (Horace, lib. i, od. i, 25, etc.; comp. "the image which fell down from Jupiter," A. Vers.; καὶ τοῦ διοπετοῦς, Acts xix, 35). The word εὐδία occurs in Matt. xvi, 2, and in Ecclus. iii, 15. (For a full account of Jupiter and Zeus, see Smith's *Dict. of Biography*, s. v.; and for a list of the epithets applied to this god, see Rawlinson, *Herod.* vol. i, Appendix, p. 680.)

Jurè Divīno, an expression meaning "*by divine right*," used in connection with the question of the *source* of the ministerial authority. They who claim the "jus divinum" for that authority contend that the episcopal discipline and orders, having issued immediately from the authority of God, are the *exclusive* channel through which holy ordinances can be lawfully or efficaciously exercised. Others, again (who consequently relinquish the *jure-divino* claim), while they maintain that the episcopal regimen is agreeable to the will of Christ and the practice of his apostles, do not find a warrant for holding the above exclusive views, nor for asserting the utter invalidity, while they still admit the irregularity of any other ministrations. In their opinion, the claims of a Christian ministry rest not on any unbroken succession, but on the basis of the *divinely sanctioned* institution of a Christian Church. The authority, therefore, with which a Christian minister is invested they consider to be derived from Christ only by virtue of the sanction given by him to Christian communities; and they hold that it comes direct from the Church in whose name and behalf he acts as its representative, and just to that extent to which it has empowered and directed him to act. They consider that the system which makes the sacramental virtue of holy orders inherent indefeasibly in each individual minister detracts from the claims of the Church, makes the Church a sort of appendage to the priesthood, and, in fact, confounds the Church with the clergy, as if the spiritual community consisted only of its officers.—Eden, *Eccles. Dictionary*, s. v. See SUCCESSION.

Jurieu, PIERRE, an eminent French Protestant theologian, was born at Mer, in the diocese of Blois, in 1637. He was the son of a Protestant minister, and nephew of the celebrated Rivet and Du Moulin. He possessed uncommon talents, and when barely nineteen received the master's degree, and after travelling in Holland and England, returned to his country to succeed his father in his pastoral office. His reputation for learning in 1674 obtained for him the situation of professor of theology and the Hebrew language in the Huguenot seminary at Sedan. When in 1681 the Protestants were deprived by Louis XIV of the permission to give public instruction in that town, he retired to Rouen, and from thence went to Rotterdam, where he was appointed professor of theology. In that city the ardor of his zeal soon drew him into controversy with Bayle, Basnage, and Saurin, in the heat of which he manifested the same rancor which unfortunately disgraces most of his polemical writings. He allowed himself likewise to fall into various errors by too much indulging a naturally lively imagination in the interpretation of prophecy. In his *Commentary on the Apocalypse* he even predicted the establishment of Protestantism in France during the year 1686. Those who differed from him in opinion, however high their character for learning and piety, he treated with a most unbecoming severity. Grotius and Hammond, perhaps the two greatest theologians of their age, because they differed from him on the subject of the Antichrist predicted in the book of Revelation, he styles "the disgrace of the Reformed Church, and even of Christianity." The same spirit is manifested in his well-known controversy with the great Bossuet, whom he does not scruple to accuse of falsehood and dishonesty, though, on the other hand, it must be allowed that the recriminations of this celebrated defender of the Church of Rome, if more politely expressed, are equally severe and destitute of truth; the great object of Bossuet being, it would appear, to charge his antagonist with holding the heretical opinions of the Socinians (Bossuet, *Hist. des Variations*, iv, 64; v, 236–238). With all these defects, Jurieu stands deservedly high as a controversialist. His learning was most profound; he is generally exact in the citation of his authorities, and he had a special talent in discovering the weak point in the cause of his antagonists. In respect of style and eloquence he is immeasurably behind Bossuet, but he is at least his equal in polemical talent, and by some is considered his superior in erudition. All of his writings are held in esteem by theologians of every shade as a storehouse of great research. Jurieu's private life was becoming that of a Christian minister; he was charitable to the poor almost beyond his means, and employed his influence abroad in alleviating the sufferings of his exiled brethren. He died Jan. 11, 1713. His principal works are, *Histoire du Calvinisme et du Papisme mise en parallèle*, etc. (Rotterdam, 1682, 2 vols. 12mo; 2d edit., ibid. 1683, 12mo):—*Lettres Pastorales* (Rotterdam, 1686–7, 3 vols. 12mo):—*Le Vrai Système de l'Eglise* (Dord. 1686, 8vo):—*L'Esprit de M. Arnauld* (Deventer [Rotterdam], 1684, 2 vols. 12mo):—*Préjugés légitimes contre le Papisme* (Amst. 1685, 8vo):—*Apologie pour l'Accomplissement des Propheties* (1687, which has been translated into English, Lond. 1687, 2 parts, 8vo):—*La Religion des Latitudinaires* (Rotterd. 1696, 8vo); *Histoire des Dogmes et des Cultes* (Amst. 1704, 12mo; also translated into English, Lond. 1705, 2 vols.):—*La politique du clergé de France* (Amst. 1681, 12mo).—*English Cyclop.*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vii, 126; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 267 sq.

Jurisdiction is an ecclesiastical term denoting the power and authority vested in a bishop, by virtue of the apostolical commission, of governing and administering the laws of the Church within the bounds of his diocese. The same term is also used to express the bounds within which a bishop exercises his power, i. e. his diocese. To define this power of the ecclesiastic properly from that of civil jurisdiction has led to no little discussion. Of old the earl and bishop sat in the same court. Afterwards the bishop held his courts by himself, though temporal lords sat in synod with bishops—"the one to search the laws of the land, and the other the laws of God." The question of jurisdiction, after the period of the Conqueror, was often agitated between the pope and sovereigns. The things, the latter argued, and reasonably, that are Cæsar's belong to Cæsar, and it is treason to take them from him; the things that are God's belong to God, and it is impiety to take them from him. The Church is a free society, and should have perfect power of self-government within its own domain, and a purely spiritual sentence should be beyond review by a civil court. See INVESTITURE; KEYS, POWER OF.

Jus Asȳli, *the right of protection.* From the 4th century, the privilege of asylum, or the right of protecting criminals, was possessed by Christian churches and altars. This privilege had belonged to sacred places among Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, and from them it may have been adopted by Christians. It seems to have been first introduced into the Christian Church in the time of Constantine; but the right was subsequently much circumscribed by various restrictions, as it was found to be a serious hinderance to the administration of justice. Since the 16th century the privilege has been almost entirely abolished.—Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s. v. See ASYLUM.

Jus Devolūtum (*devolved right*). When, in the Established Church of Scotland, a patron does not present to a parish within six months after the commencement of the vacancy, the right of presentation falls to the presbytery, *tanquam jure devoluto.* Still further to guard against abuse, it has been enacted (act 1719, c. 29) "that if any patron shall present any person to a vacant church who shall not be qualified, by taking and

subscribing the said oath in manner aforesaid, or shall present a person to any vacancy who is then or shall be pastor or minister of any other church or parish, or any person who shall not accept or declare his willingness to accept of the presentation and charge to which he is presented within the said time, such presentation shall not be accounted any interruption of the course of time allowed to the patron for presenting; but the *jus devolutum* shall take place as if no such presentation had been offered, any law or custom to the contrary notwithstanding." — Eadie, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary*, s. v. See PATRONAGE.

Jus Exuviarum. See SPOLIATION.

Jus Gislii or **Metatus.** See IMMUNITY.

Ju'shab-he'sed (Hebrew *Yushab'-Che'sed*, יוּשַׁב חֶסֶד, *returner of kindness;* Sept. Ἀσοβαεσδ v. r. Ἀσοβέδ; Vulg. *Josabhesed*), the last named of the sons of Pedaiah, of the royal line of Judah (1 Chron. iii, 20; see Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 17, where it is shown that this is not a son of Zerubbabel, as appears in the text, which immediately adds that these sons were in all *five*, either meaning merely those enumerated in the same verse, or requiring one of these [prob. the one in question, since it lacks the distinctive connecting particle ו, "and"] to be regarded as another name for the preceding, inasmuch as at least *six* sons would otherwise be enumerated. See ver. 19). B.C. cir. 536.

Jus primarum precum. See EXPECTANCY.

Justel, Christopher, an eminent French Protestant canonist, was born at Paris in 1580. He became counsellor and secretary to the king of France, and died in 1649. He is said to have been one of the most learned men of the Middle Ages, and, according to Haag, one of those whose writings throw great light on the obscure parts of the history of the early Church. His works have been published under the style of *Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris, in duos tomos distributa, quorum unus canonum ecclesiasticorum codices antiquos, tum Græcos, tum Latinos complectitur; alter vero insigniores juris canonici veteris collectores Græcos exhibet, ex antiquis codicibus MSS. Bibliothecæ Christophori Justelli. Opera et studio Gulielmi Voelli, theologi ac socii Sarbonici, et Henrici Justelli, Christophori F.* (Paris, 1661, 2 vols. fol.).—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 287.

Justel, Henry, a French Protestant canonist, son of Christopher Justel (q. v.), was born at Paris in 1620. He succeeded his father as secretary and counsellor to king Henry IV. He appears to have foreseen the coming revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), and went to London in 1681. He was there appointed librarian of St. James, and retained that situation until his death, Sept. 24, 1693. He had sent to the University of Oxford, by his friend Dr. Hickes, the original Greek MS. of the *Canones Ecclesiæ universalis*, and received in return from that institution the degree of LL.D. in 1675. He was a friend of Locke and Leibnitz, and corresponded with most of the learned men of his day, by all of whom he was highly esteemed. His principal work is his edition of Christopher Justel's (see above) *Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris.* See Chauffepié, *Nouv. Dict. Histor. et Crit.;* Dupin, *Bibliotheca des Auteurs Ecclés.*—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 289.

Justi, KARL WILHELM, a German Protestant theologian, was born at Marburg, January 14, 1767. He was educated at Jena, and became a private tutor at Metzlar, whence he removed to Marburg as a preacher in 1790. In 1793 he was chosen professor of philosophy in the university. In 1801 he was appointed archdeacon; soon after, superintendent and consistorialrath; in 1814 was made oberpfarrer, and in 1822 professor of theology. He died Aug. 7, 1846. Justi devoted himself to the study of O. and N. T. exegesis, after the method of Eichhorn and Herder. He was a man of erudition, taste, and liberality. The Prophets of the O. T. occupied his chief attention, and he published editions of several books of the O. Test. Scriptures. But he is especially noted for the three following works: *Nationalgesänge der Hebräer* (1803-1818, 3 vols.):—an enlarged edition of Herder's *Geist der Hebräischen Poesie* (1829, 2 vols.):—*Blumen althebräischer Dichtkunst* (1809, 2 vols.):—*Zionitische Harfenklänge* (1829).—Kitto, *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, ii, 699; Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lex.* viii, 566.

Justice (צֶדֶק, *righteousness*, as an internal trait of character; מִשְׁפָּט, *judgment*, as a judicial act), as applied to men, is one of the four cardinal virtues. It consists, according to Cicero (*De Finibus*, lib. v, cap. 23), *in suo cuique tribuendo*, in according to every one his right. By the Pythagoreans, and also by Plato, it was regarded as including all human virtue or duty. The word *righteousness* is used in our translation of the Scriptures in a like extensive signification. As opposed to equity, justice (τὸ νομικόν) means doing merely what positive law requires, while equity (τὸ ἴσον) means doing what is fair and right in the circumstances of every particular case. Justice is not founded in law, as Hobbes and others hold, but in our idea of what is right. Laws are just or unjust in so far as they do or do not conform to that idea. Justice may be distinguished as ethical, economical, and political. The first consists in doing justice between man and man as men; the second, in doing justice between the members of a family or household; and the third, in doing justice between the members of a community or commonwealth (More, *Enchiridion Ethicum;* Grove, *Moral Philosophy*). Dr. Watts gives the following rules respecting justice: "1. It is just that we honor, reverence, and respect those who are superiors in any kind (Eph. vi, 1, 3; 1 Pet. ii, 17; 1 Tim. v, 17). 2. That we show particular kindness to near relations (Prov. xvii, 17). 3. That we love those who love us, and show gratitude to those who have done us good (Gal. iv, 15). 4. That we pay the full due to those whom we bargain or deal with (Rom. xiii; Deut. xxiv, 14). 5. That we help our fellow-creatures in cases of great necessity (Exod. xxii, 4). 6. Reparation to those whom we have wilfully injured" (Watts, *Sermons*, serm. xxiv, xxvi, vol. ii). See Wollaston, *Religion of Nature*, p. 137, 141; Jay, *Sermons*, ii, 131.

JUSTICE OF GOD is that perfection whereby he is infinitely righteous, both in himself and in all his proceedings. Mr. Ryland defines it thus: "The ardent inclination of his will to prescribe equal laws as the supreme governor, and to dispense equal rewards and punishments as the supreme judge" (Rev. xvi, 5; Psa. cxlv, 7; xcvii, 1, 2). This attribute of the Supreme Being is the necessary result of the divine holiness, as exhibited in all his external relations to intelligent creatures. As holiness, in relation to God, is subjective, declaring his perfect purity, justice is objective, exhibiting his opposition to sin as the transgression of his law. (These two aspects are exactly exhibited by the two Hebrew terms above.) Divine justice is distinguished as legislative, and rectoral or distributive. *Legislative* justice must approve and require that rational creatures conform their internal and external acts to the dictates of the moral law, which, either by the influence of the Holy Spirit on the conscience or by direct revelation, has been made known to all men. *Rectoral* or *distributive* justice is God's dealing with his accountable creatures according to the sanctions of his law, rewarding or punishing them according to their deserts (Psa. lxxxix, 14). The latter is again distinguished into remunerative and punitive justice. Remunerative justice is a distribution of rewards, the rule of which is not the merit of the creature, but God's own gracious promise (James i, 12; 2 Tim. iv, 8). Punitive or vindictive justice is the infliction of punishment for any sin committed by men (2 Thess. i, 6). That God will not let sin go unpunished is evident: 1. From the word of God (Exod. xxxiv, 6, 7; Numb. xiv, 18; Neh. i, 3); 2. From the nature of God (Isa. i, 13, 14; Psa. v,

5, 6; Heb. xii, 29); 3. From sin being punished in Christ, the surety of his people (1 Pet. iii, 18); 4. From all the various natural evils which men bear in the present state. The use we should make of this doctrine is this: 1. We should learn the dreadful nature of sin, and the inevitable ruin of impenitent sinners (Psa. ix, 17). 2. We should highly appreciate the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom justice is satisfied (1 Pet. iii, 18). 3. We should imitate the justice of God by cherishing an ardent regard to the rights of God and to the rights of mankind. 4. We should abhor all sin, as it strikes directly at the justice of God. 5. We should derive comfort from the consideration that the judge of all the earth will do right as regards ourselves, the Church, and the world at large (Psa. xcvii, 1, 2). See Ryland, *Contemp.* ii, 439; Witsius, *Economy*, lib. xi, ch. viii, xi; Owen, *On the Justice of God;* Gill, *Body of Divinity*, i, 155, 8vo; Elisha Cole, *On the Righteousness of God;*

JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF. This seems to have been one of the first subjects which claimed the attention of the great lawgiver of the Hebrews. It appears from the advice of Jethro to Moses when "Israel was encamped at the Mount of God" (Exod. xviii, 13-24). When Jethro had seen how constantly and laboriously Moses was occupied in "judging between one and another," he advised him to make some other provision in relation to the matter, and to restrict himself to the work which properly belonged to him, as the inspired teacher and leader of the people. This was accordingly done. A civil magistracy was created in a form adapted to the existing wants of the people, and by reference to the record we shall find how fully it covers every essential point in the case. The value of evidence in conducting trials; the principles upon which verdicts should be rendered, both in civil and criminal cases, together with the great institution of trial by jury, are all found in greater or less development in the statutes and ordinances given from God to the Hebrews.

Their courts of justice were of various grades, some known as high courts of appeal, and others so simple and multiplied as to carry the administration of justice to every man's door, and effectually to secure the parties against that ruinous evil, "the law's delay." "Judges and offices shalt thou make in all thy gates," was the command; and to what minute subdivision this creation of tribunals was carried out, we see in the ordinance directing that there should be "rulers over thousands, rulers over hundreds, rulers over fifties, and rulers over tens, who should judge the people at all seasons."

The candidates for office were not to be selected from any one privileged class. They were taken "out of all the people." They were required to be well known for their intellectual and moral worth, and their fitness for the station to which they were chosen. They were to be "able men, such as fear God; men of truth, hating covetousness;" "wise men, and understanding, and known among the tribes;" and these qualifications being not only all-important, but all-sufficient, none others were required.

With a judiciary constructed after this manner, justice could be administered promptly and freely; and, on the other hand, a remedy was provided against the evils of hasty decision, which could not fail in the end to discover and maintain the right of the case. And if "the best laws are those which are best administered," we shall find the ordinances given to the Hebrews for carrying the laws of the land into effect admirably adapted to their end, giving equal security to the poor and to the rich against violence and wrong. See JUDGE; TRIAL. (E. de P.)

Justification (some form of the verbs צָדַק, δικαιόω), a forensic term equivalent to *acquittal*, and opposed to condemnation; in an apologetic sense it is often synonymous with *vindication* or freeing from unjust imputation of blame.

I. *Dogmatic Statement.*—This term, in theological usage, is employed to designate the judicial act of God by which he pardons all the sins of the sinner who believes in Christ, receiving him into favor, and regarding him as relatively righteous, notwithstanding his past actual unrighteousness. Hence justification, and the remission or forgiveness of sin, relate to one and the same act of God, to one and the same privilege of his believing people (Acts xiii, 38, 39; Rom. iv, 5, 8). So, also, "the justification of the ungodly," the "covering of sins," "not visiting for sin," "not remembering sin," and "imputing not inquity," mean to pardon sin and to treat with favor, and express substantially the same thing which is designated by "imputing or counting faith for righteousness." See PARDON. Justification, then, is an act of God, not in or upon man, but for him and in his favor; an act which, abstractly considered, respects man only as its object, and translates him into another relative state; while sanctification respects man as its subject, and is a consequent of this act of God, and inseparably connected with it. See REGENERATION.

The originating cause of justification is the free grace and spontaneous love of God towards fallen man (Rom. i, 5; iii, 24; Tit. ii, 11; iii, 4, 5). Our Lord Jesus Christ is the sole meritorious cause of our justification, inasmuch as it is the result of his atonement for us. The sacrificial death of Christ is an expedient of infinite wisdom, by which the full claims of the law may be admitted, and yet the penalty avoided, because a moral compensation or equivalent has been provided by the sufferings of him who died in the sinner's stead (Eph. i, 7; Col. i, 14; Rev. v, 9). Thus, while it appears that our justification is, in its origin, an act of the highest grace, it is also, in its mode, an act most perfectly consistent with God's essential righteousness, and demonstrative of his inviolable justice. It proceeds not on the principle of abolishing the law or its penalty, for that would have implied that the law was unduly rigorous either in its precepts or in its sanctions. See ATONEMENT.

Faith is the instrumental cause of justification, present faith in him who is able to save, faith actually existing and exercised. See FAITH. The atonement of Jesus is not accepted for us, to our individual justification, until we individually believe, nor after we cease to live by faith in him. See IMPUTATION.

The immediate results of justification are the restoration of amity and intercourse between the pardoned sinner and the pardoning God (Rom. v, 1; James ii, 23): the adoption of the persons justified into the family of God, and their consequent right to eternal life (Rom viii, 17); and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (Acts ii 38; Gal. iii, 14; iv, 6), producing tranquillity of conscience (Rom. viii, 15, 16), power over sin (Rom. viii, 1), and a joyous hope of heaven (Rom. xv, 13; Gal. v, 5). See SPIRIT, FRUITS OF.

We must not forget that the justification of a sinner does not in the least degree alter or diminish the evil nature and desert of sin. Though by an act of divine clemency the penalty is remitted, and the obligation to suffer that penalty is dissolved, still it is naturally due, though graciously remitted. Hence appear the propriety and duty of continuing to confess and lament even pardoned sin with a lowly and contrite heart (Ezek. xvi, 62). See PENITENCE.

II. *History of the Doctrine.*—1. *The early Church Fathers and the Latin Church.*—Ecclesiastical science, from the beginning of its development, occupied itself with a discussion on the relation of faith to knowledge; but even those who attributed the greatest importance to the latter recognised faith as the foundation. A merely logical division into subjective and objective faith, and an intimation of a distinction between a historic and a rational faith (in Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromat.* ii, 454; Augustine, *De Trinitate*, xiii, 2), were of little consequence. Two conceptions became prevailing: Faith as a general religious conviction, particularly as confidence in God, and the acceptance of the en-

tire doctrine of the Church, *fides catholica*. The formula that faith alone without the works justifies is found in the full Pauline sense in Clemens Romanus (1 *ad Corinthios*, c. 32), and is sometimes used by Augustine polemically in order to defend the freedom of grace and the priority of faith. More generally it is used as an argument against the necessity of the Jewish law (Irenæus, iv, 25; Tertullian, *adv. Marcell.* v, 3). The œcumenical synods were instrumental in gradually giving to the conception of *fides catholica* the new sense that salvation could be found only by adherence to ecclesiastical orthodoxy. But as a mere acceptance was possible without a really Christian sentiment, and as the Pauline doctrine was misused by heretics in an antinomian sense, it was demanded that faith be proved by works. Church discipline developed this idea with regard to the sins of the faithful, so as to demand a satisfaction through penances and good works (Augustine, *Serm.* 151, 12). It became, therefore, the doctrine of the Church that such faith alone works salvation as shows itself in acts of charity, while to merely external works faith or charity is opposed as something accessory. Pelagius assumed only a relative distinction between naturally good works and the good works that proceed from faith; in opposition to which Augustine insisted that the difference is absolute, and that without faith no good works at all are possible. As salvation was thought to be conditioned by works also, it was, even when it was represented as being merely an act of God, identified with sanctification. The importance attributed to abstention created gradually a distinction between commands and advices, and the belief that through the fulfilment of the latter a virtue greater than required would arise (Hermas, *Pastor Simil.* iii, 5, 3; Origen, *In Epistolam ad Rom.* iii; Ambrose, *De Viduis*, iv, 508).

2. *The Greek Church.* — Little discussion and little controversy has occurred on this doctrine in the Greek Church. Faith and works together are regarded as the conditions of salvation. The words of James are referred to first, yet faith is declared to be the stock from which the good works come as the fruits. The description of faith proceeds from the definition in the Epistle to the Hebrews to the acceptance of the entire ecclesiastical tradition. Man is said to participate in the merit of the Mediator not only through faith, but also through good works. Among the latter are comprised the fulfilment of the commandments of God and of the Church, and, in particular, prayers, fastings, pilgrimages, and monastic life. They are considered useful and necessary not only as a means of promoting sanctification, but also as penances and satisfaction.

3. *Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church during the Middle Ages.*—The Scholastics regarded faith as an acceptance of the supersensual as far as it belongs to religion, differing both from intuition and from knowledge; and although essentially of a theoretic character, yet conditioned by the consent of the will, which, however, in the description of faith, is reduced to a *minimum*. Originally only God is an object of faith, but mediately also the holy Scriptures; as a summary of the Biblical doctrines, the Apostles' Creed, and, as its explication, the entire doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. As an accurate knowledge of the doctrines of the Church cannot be expected from every one, the subjective distinction was made between *fides implicita* and *explicita;* the former sufficient for the people, yet with the demand of a developed belief in some chief articles. There was, however, a difference of opinion on what these articles were, and even Thomas Aquinas wavered in his views. Faith may, even upon earth, partly become a science, and appears in this respect only as the popular form of religion. It is a condition of salvation, but becomes a virtue only when love, as animating principle [forma], pervades it [fides formata]; with a mere faith [informis] one may be damned. The *fides formata* includes the necessity of the good works for salvation, but they must be founded in pious sentiment. All other works, not proceeding from faith, are dead, though not entirely useless. The necessity of good works is fully carried out only by the inculcation of penance as *satisfactiones*, but with constant reference to a union of the soul with Christ, and the moral effect of the good works. Justification, according to Thomas Aquinas, is a movement from the state of injustice into the state of justice, in which the remission of sins is the main point, though it is conditioned by an infusion of grace which actually justifies men. As an act of God which establishes in man a new state [habitus], it is accomplished in a moment. Among the people the Pelagian views prevailed, that man, by merely outward works, had to gain his salvation, and the Church became, especially through the traffic in indulgences, a prey to the immoral and insipid worship of ceremonies. In opposition to this corruption, many of the pious Mystics pointed to the Pauline doctrine of faith.

4. *Doctrine of the Reformers of the 16th Century and the old Protestant Dogmatics.*—The Reformation of the 16th century renewed the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith alone, emphasizing, in the sense of Augustine, the entire helplessness of man, and made it the fundamental doctrine of the Reformed Church. This faith is represented as not merely an acceptance of historic facts, but is distinguished as *fides specialis* from the general religious conviction, arising amidst the terrors of conscience, and consisting in an entire despair of one's own merit and a confident surrender to the mercy of God in the atoning death of Christ. Worked by God, it does not work as virtue or merit, but merely through the apprehension of the merit of Christ. Its necessity lies in the impossibility of becoming reconciled with God through one's own power. Hence this reconciliation is impossible through good works, which are not necessary for salvation, though God rewards them, according to his promise, upon earth and in heaven; but, as a necessary consequence, the really good works will flow forth from faith freely and copiously. The opinion of Amsdorf, that good works are an obstacle to salvation, was regarded as an unfortunate expression, which may be taken in a true sense, though it is false if understood in a general sense. As man is unable to satisfy the law, supererogatory works and a satisfaction through one's own works are impossible. Justification through love is impossible, because man cannot love God truly amidst the terrors of conscience. Hence justification is a divine judicial act, which, through the apprehension of the justice of Christ, apprehended in faith, accepts the sinner as just, though he is not just. This strict distinction between justification and sanctification was maintained on the one hand against Scholasticism, which, through its Pelagian tendencies, seemed to offend against the honor of Christ, and to be unable to satisfy conscience, and on the other hand against Osiander, who regarded justification as being completed only in sanctification. The works even of the regenerated, according to the natural side, were regarded by the Reformers as sins. The Reformed theology in general agreed with the doctrine of justification as stated above, yet did not make it to the same extent the fundamental doctrine of the whole theology. According to Calvin, justification and sanctification took place at the same time. The dogmatic writers of the Lutheran Church distinguished in faith knowledge, assent, and confidence, assigning the former two to the intellect, the latter to the will. From the *fides generalis* they distinguished the justifying faith (specialis seu salvifica), and rejected the division into *fides informis et formata*. As a distinguishing mark, they demanded from a true faith that it be efficient in charity. For works they took the Decalogue as a rule; a certain necessity of works was strictly limited. But, however firmly they clung in general to the conception of justification as something merely external (actus forensis) and foreign (imputatio justitiæ Christi), some dogmatic writers held that justification had really

changed something in man, and indeed presupposed it as changed. Hollaz pronounced this doctrine openly and incautiously, while Quenstedt designated these preceding acts as merely preparatory to conversion.

5. *Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church since the Reformation.*—The Council of Trent, in order to make a compromise with the Pauline formula, recognised faith as the beginning and the foundation of justification, but the full sense which Protestantism found in it was rejected. This faith is the general belief in divine revelation, though in transition to a special faith, yet a mere knowledge which still gives room to mortal sins. Justification is remission of sins and sanctification, through an infusion of the divine grace, in as far as the merit of Christ is not merely imputed, but communicated. It is given through grace, but as a permanent state it grows through the merit of good works according to the commandments of God and the Church, through which works the justified, always aided by the grace of God in Christ, have to render satisfaction for the temporal punishment of their sins and to deserve salvation. Not all the works done before justification are sins, and to the justified the fulfilment of the commandments of God is quite possible, although even the saints still commit small, venial sins. A further development of this doctrine is found in the writings of Bellarmine. He admits faith only as *fides generalis*, as a matter of the intellect, yet as a consent, not a knowledge. Though only the first among many preparations for justification, a certain merit is ascribed to faith. The Council of Trent had rejected the imputation of the merits of Christ only as the exclusive ground of justification; Bellarmine rejected it altogether. He explicitly proclaimed the necessity of good works for salvation, though only a relative salvation. The *opera supererogationis*, which were not mentioned at Trent, though they remained unchanged in tradition and practice, are further developed by Bellarmine. According to him, they go beyond nature, are not destined for all, and not commanded under penalties.

6. *Modern Protestantism.*—Socinus denied any foreign imputation, also that of the merit of Christ. When supranaturalism in general declined, the points of difference from the Roman Catholic Church were frequently lost sight of. Kant found in the doctrine of justification the relation of the always unsatisfactory reality of our moral development to the future perfection recognised in the intuition of God. De Wette declared it to be the highest moral confidence which is founded on the communion with Christ, and turns from an unhappy past to a better future. Modern mystics have often found fault with the Protestant doctrine as being too outward, and approached the doctrine of the Roman Church. The Hegelian School taught that justification is the reception of the subject into the spirit, i. e. the knowledge of the subject of his unity with the absolute spirit, or, according to Strauss, with the concrete idea of mankind. According to Schleiermacher, it is the reception into the communion of life with both the archetypal and historical Christ, and the appropriation of his perfection. Justification and sanctification are to him only different sides of the carrying out of the same divine decree. Many of the recent dogmatic writers of Germany have again proclaimed this doctrine to be the essential principle of Protestantism, some (Dorner, *Das Princip unserer Kirche*, Kiel, 1841) taking justification in the sense of a new personality founded in Christ, others (Hundeshagen, *Der deutsche Protestantismus*, Frankft. 1847) in the sense that God, surveying the whole future development of the principle which communion with Christ establishes in the believer, views him as righteous. One of the last dogmatic manuals of the Reformed Church (Schweizer, ii, 523 sq.) distinguishes conversion and sanctification as the beginning and progress of a life of salvation, and assigns justification to the former. See Hase, *Evangelische Dogmatik* (Leipzic, 1850), p. 310 sq.; C. F. Baur, *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte* (Stuttgardt, 1847); Hahn, *Das Bekenntniss der evangelischen Kirchengeschichte in seinem Verhältniss zu dem der Römischen und Griechischen.*

III. *Literature.*—See, for Roman Cath. views, Möhler, *Symbolism*, ch. iii; Willett, *Syn. Pap.* viii, 67 sq.; Cramp, *Text-book of Popery*, ch. v; Bossuet, *Works*, vol. i and ii; *Stud. und Krit.* 1867, vol. ii; D'Aubigné, *Hist. Reformation*, vol. ii; Forbes, *Considerations*, i, 1; *Nicene Creed*, i, 173; Hughes, *Works*, i, 410. For Protestant views, see Buchanan, *Justification* (Edinb. 1867, 8vo; reviewed at length in *Lond. Review*, Oct. 1867, p. 179); *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* Oct. 1867, art. vi; Wesley, *Works*, v, 255; vi, 106; Calvin, *Instit.* vol. ii; Cunningham, *Reformers*, p. 402; Planck, *Hist. Prot. Theol.* (see Index); Knapp, *Theology* (see Index); Wardlaw, *System. Theology*, ii, 678 sq.; Graves, *Works*, vol. iv; Monsell, iv, 232, 240; Waterland, *Works*, vol. vi; T. Goodwin, *Works* (see Index); Wilson, *Apostol. Fathers* (see Index); Martensen, *Dogmatics*, p. 390 sq.; Pye Smith, *Introd. to Theol.* (see Index); Burnet, *On the 39 Articles* (see Index); Carmich, *Theol. of the Scriptures*, vol. ii; Neander, *Prot. and Cath.* p. 131–146; *Ch. Dog.* ii, 66 sq.; *Planting and Train. of Christian Church*, vol. ii; Riggenbach, in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1863, iv, 691; 1867, i, 405, ii, 294; 1868, ii, 201; *North Brit. Review*, June, 1867, p. 191 sq.; Dr. Schaff, *Protestantism*, p. 54–57; *Good Words*, Jan. 1866; Heppe, *Dogmatics*, p. 392; *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1863, p. 615; *Bibl. Repos.* xi, 448; *Christ. Review*, Oct. 1846; *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* vii, 516; Ware, *Works*, iii, 381; *Journal of Sac. Lit.* xxi; 1869, iii, 545; *Christian Monthly*, 1845, Jan., p. 102; Feb., p. 231; *New Englander* (see Index); Hauck, *Theolog. Jahresber.* Jan. 1869, i, 59; 1867, p. 543; *Bull. Théologique*, i, 25, 41; *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* July, 1868, p. 537; *Brit. and For. Rev.* Oct. 1868, p. 683, 692; *Amer. Presbyt. Review*, Jan. 1867, p. 69, 202; *Evang. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1869, p. 48; *British Quart. Rev.* Jan. 1871, p. 144; *Church Rev.* Oct. 1870, p. 444, 462; *Zeitschr. wissensch. Theol.* 1871, iv.

Justin, surnamed *the Philosopher*, or, more generally, *the Martyr*, of whom Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* l. iv, c. 11) says that he overshadowed all the great men who illuminated the 2d century by the splendor of his name, was born towards the close of the apostolic age, that is, the beginning of the 2d century. He was the son of a wealthy Greek, Priscius, who had, in all probability, come to reside at Flavia Neapolis (erected on the site of the ancient Sichem), in Samaria, with the Roman colony sent by Vespasian to the city that bore his name. But little is known of his personal history. From one of his works, the *Dialogues with Trypho* (c. 2 sq.), we learn that he travelled much in his youth, and studied ardently the various systems of philosophy prevalent in his day, searching after some knowledge which should satisfy the cravings of his soul. The myths and absurd worship of the heathen had failed to satisfy the youthful soul longing to know God and the relations of God to man, and in turn Stoic and Peripatetic, Pythagorean and Platonist, were examined to set his mind at rest upon the vital question. By the Stoic he was told that, in philosophical speculation, the subject which he seemed to consider the most important was only of subordinate rank. A Peripatetic, at the end of a few days, informed him that the most important thing for him to attend to was to afford the philosophic instructor security for his tuition. By the Pythagorean he was rejected outright, because he confessed himself ignorant of music, astronomy, and geometry, which that school considered a necessary introduction to the study of philosophy, and so he turned in despair to the Platonists, at this time in high repute in the place in which Justin resided. At last he seemed to have gained the haven of peace; the Platonic doctrine of ideas could not fail to inspire young Justin with the hope that he "should soon have the intuition of God," for is not this the aim of Platonic philosophy? "Under the influence of this notion," he relates himself, "it occurred to me that I would withdraw to some solitary place, far from the turmoil of the world, and there, in perfect self-collection,

give myself to my own contemplations. I chose a spot by the sea-side." Whether Justin still resided at this time at Flavia Neapolis—and in that case the quiet resort must have been the shores of the Dead Sea, perhaps the valley of the Jordan, north of this sea (Otto), or on some unfrequented spot of Lake Genesareth—or whether, as seems more probable, he then resided at Ephesus, is a matter of dispute. In favor of Ephesus are Schröckh, Tillemont, Hilgenfeld, Dorner, etc. But, be the name of the place Flavia Neapolis or Ephesus, it was in his resort by the shore of the resounding sea—attracted to it, no doubt, chiefly by the grandeur of the object he was seeking to solve, and the loveliness of the spot—that we find him one day, while wrapped up in thought, pacing up and down by the side of the sea, which moaned in melancholy unison with his reflections, accosted by a man of venerable aspect, sage and grave, and soon the two are engaged in earnest converse on the subject ever uppermost in young Justin's mind. Somewhat enamored of the Platonic philosophy, he argues in its favor with the appositely present senior, and contends that at some future day it will conduct him into that nearer acquaintance with God, or, in the Platonists' term, afford him the "vision of divinity." But the meek old man, who is a Christian, contends that the goal which he is seeking to gain cannot be reached by any philosophical school or by unaided mind even of the highest order; the fallacy of Plato is proved in some two or three points of doctrine belonging to that system, and finally the doubting and indocile disciple is visited with the curt and not gentle apostrophe, "You are a mere dealer in words, but no lover of action and truth; your aim is not to be a practiser of good, but a clever disputant, a cunning sophist." Once more the inquiring youth is baffled in his attempt to lay hold of the truth; he is again convinced that even from the foremost of heathen philosophers he cannot obtain the pearl for which he is seeking so earnestly. But with this intelligence there comes also the direction, "Search the Scriptures;" study the Hebrew prophets; men who, guided by the Spirit of God, saw and revealed the truth, and even foretold events future to their day; read the last and heroic words of the disciples of him who came to raise a fallen world, and to restore it to eternal and imperishable felicity. "Pray," ended the venerable Christian, "that the gates of light may be opened to thee, for none can perceive and comprehend these things except God and his Christ grant them understanding." Justin was impressed; he had often heard the Platonists calumniate the Christians, but he had always discredited the statements. He had frequently observed the tranquillity and fortitude with which these followers of Jesus encountered death and all other evils which appear terrible to man, and he could never condemn as profligates those who could so patiently endure. He had long believed them innocent of the crimes imputed to these consistent martyrs. He was now prepared to think that they held the truth. He reflected on the words of the venerable stranger, and was convinced that they inculcated the "only safe and useful philosophy." From this time (the exact date is doubtful; the Bollandists place it in A.D. 119; it is generally believed, with Cave, Tillemont, Ceillier, and others, that it occurred in A.D. 133) his personal history becomes obscure, as he has but little to relate of himself hereafter, and as from other sources we cannot gather much on which we can depend. Certain it is that he at once enlisted in active service in behalf of the new cause. Retaining the garb of a philosopher, he ardently devoted himself, as is evinced by his works, to the propagation of Christianity by writing and otherwise. Tillemont argues, from the language of Justin (*Apolog. Prima*, c. 61, 65), that he was a priest, but this inference is not borne out by the passage, and, though approved by Maran, is rejected by Otto, Neander, and Semisch. That he visited many places in order to diffuse the knowledge of the Christian religion is probable (comp. *Cohortat. ad Græc.* c. 13, 34), and he appears to have made the profession of a philosopher subservient to this purpose (*Dialog. cum Tryph.* init.; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv, 11; Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 125). According to what is commonly deemed the ancient record of his martyrdom (though Papebroche regards this as narrating the death of another Justin), he visited Rome twice. On his second visit he was apprehended, and brought before the tribunal of Rusticus, who held the office of præfectus urbi; and as he refused to offer sacrifice to the gods, he was sentenced to be scourged and beheaded, which sentence appears to have been immediately carried into effect. Several other persons suffered with him. Papebroche rejects this account of his martyrdom, and thinks his execution was secret, so that the date and manner of it were never known. The Greek *Menœa* (s. d. 1 Junii) state that he drank hemlock. His death is generally considered to have taken place in the persecution under the emperor Marcus Antoninus; and the *Chronicon Paschale* (i, 258, ed. Paris; 207, ed. Venice; 482, ed. Bonn), which is followed by Tillemont, Baronius, Pagi, Otto, and other moderns, places it in the consulship of Orphitus and Pudens, A.D. 165; Dupin, Semisch, and Schaff place it in A.D. 166; Fleury in A.D. 167; and Tillemont and Maran in A.D. 168. Papebroche (*Acta Sanctorum*, April. ii, 107), assigning the *Apologia Secunda* of Justin to the year 171, contends that he must have lived to or beyond that time. Dodwell, on the contrary, following the erroneous statement of Eusebius in his *Chronicon*, places his death in the reign of Antoninus Pius; and Epiphanius, according to the present reading of the passage (*adv. Hæres.* xlvi, 1), which is most likely corrupt, places it in the reign of the emperor Hadrian or Adrian, a manifest error, as the *Apologia Prima* is addressed to Antoninus Pius, the successor of Hadrian, and the *Secunda* probably to Marcus Aurelius and L. Verus, who succeeded Antoninus. The death of Justin has been very commonly ascribed (compare Tatian, *Contra Græcos*, c. 19; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv, 16, and *Chron. Paschale*) to the machinations of the Cynic philosopher Crescens. The enmity of Crescens, and Justin's apprehension of injury from him, are mentioned by Justin himself (*Apolog. Secunda*, c. 3). He has been canonized by the Eastern and Western churches; the Greeks celebrate his memory on the 1st of June, the Latins on the 13th of April. At Rome, the Church of St. Lorenzo without the walls is believed to be the resting-place of his remains; but the Church of the Jesuits at Eysstadt, in Germany, claims to possess his body: there is, however, no reason to believe that either claim is well founded. The more common epithet added to the name of Justin by the ancients is that of "the philosopher" (Epiphanius, *l. c.*; Eusebius, *Chronicon*, lib. ii; Jerome, *De Viribus Illustr.* c. xxiii; *Chronicon Paschale*, l. c.; George Syncellus, p. 350, 351, ed. Paris; p. 279, ed. Venice; Glijcas, *Annal.* pars iii, p. 241, ed. Paris; p. 186, ed. Venice; p. 449, ed. Bonn); that of "the martyr," now in general use, is employed by Tertullian (*Adv. Valent.* c. 5), who calls him "philosophus et martyr;" by Photius (*Biblioth.* cod. 48, 125, 232), and by Joannes Damascenus (*Sacra Parall.* ii, 754, ed. Lequien), who, like Tertullian, conjoins the two epithets.

Works.—It remains for us to consider the writings of Justin Martyr, which, although not very voluminous, so far as they are known to be or to have been extant, are among the most important that have come down to us from the 2d century, not so much because they are apologetic as because they are the earliest Christian apologies extant. In their classification we follow closely with Smith (*Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s. v.), one of the latest editors of the works of Justin Martyr, J. F. C. Otto, who makes four distinct classes.

(1.) *Undisputed Works.* — 1. Ἀπολογία πρώτη ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν πρὸς Ἀντωνῖνον τὸν Εὐσεβῆ, *Apologia prima pro Christianis ad Antoninum Pium*, mentioned in the only two known MSS. of the Apologies, and in the older editions of Justin, e. g. that of Stephens (Paris, 1551, fol.) and that of Sylburg (Heidelberg, 1593, folio),

as his second Apology, is one of the most interesting remains of Christian antiquity. It is addressed to the emperor Antoninus Pius, and to his adopted sons "Verissimus the Philosopher," afterwards the emperor M. Aurelius, and "Lucius the Philosopher" (we follow the common reading, not that of Eusebius), afterwards the emperor Verus, colleague of M. Aurelius. From the circumstance that Verissimus is not styled Cæsar, which dignity he acquired in the course of A.D. 139, it is inferred by many critics, including Pagi, Neander, Otto, Semisch, and others, that the Apology was written previously, and probably early in that year. Eusebius places it in the fourth year of Antoninus, or the first year of the 230th Olympiad, A.D. 141, which is rather too late. Others contend for a still later date. Justin himself, in the course of the work (c. 46), states that Christ was born a hundred and fifty years before he wrote, but he must be understood as speaking in round numbers. However, Tillemont, Grabe, Fleury, Ceillier, Maran, and others, fix the date of the work in A.D. 150. "Its contents," says bishop Kaye, "may be reduced to the following heads: [1] Appeals to the justice of the ruling powers, and expostulations with them on the unfairness of the proceedings against the Christians, who were condemned without any previous investigation into their lives or opinions merely because they were Christians, and were denied the liberty allowed to all the other subjects of the Roman empire, of worshipping the God whom they themselves preferred. [2] Refutations of the charges of atheism, immorality, and disaffection towards the emperor, which were brought against the Christians: these charges Justin refuted by appealing to the purity of the Gospel precepts, and to the amelioration produced in the conduct of those who embraced Christianity; and by stating that the kingdom to which Christians looked forward was not of this world, but a heavenly kingdom. [3] Direct arguments in proof of the truth of Christianity, drawn from miracles and prophecy. With respect to the former, Justin principally occupies himself in refuting the objection that the miracles of Christ were performed by magical arts. With respect to the latter, he states in forcible terms the general nature of the argument from prophecy, and shows the accomplishment of many particular prophecies in the person of Jesus; inferring, from their accomplishment, the reasonableness of entertaining a firm persuasion that the prophecies yet unfulfilled—that, for instance, respecting Christ's second advent—will in due time be accomplished. [4] Justin does not confine himself to defending Christianity, but occasionally becomes the assailant, and exposes with success the absurdities of the Gentile polytheism and idolatry. In further confirmation of the innocuous, or, rather, beneficial character of Christianity, Justin concludes the treatise with a description of the mode in which proselytes were admitted into the Church, of its other rites and customs, and of the habits and manner of life of the primitive Christians." To this Apology, the larger one of the two, are generally appended three documents: (1) Ἀδριανοῦ ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν ἐπιστολή, *Adriani pro Christianis Epistola*, or *Exemplum Epistolæ Imperatoris Adriani ad Minucium Fundanum, Proconsulum Asiæ.* This Greek version of the emperor's letter was made and is given by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iv, 8). Justin had subjoined to his work the Latin original (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv, 8), which probably is still preserved by Rufinus in his version of Eusebius, for which, in the work of Justin, the version of Eusebius was afterwards substituted. (2) Ἀντωνίνου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας, *Antonini Epistola ad Commune Asiæ.* It is hardly likely that this document was inserted in its place by Justin himself; it has probably been added since his time, and its genuineness is subject to considerable doubt. It is given, but with great variation, by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iv, 13), and was written, according to the text of the letter itself, as it appears in Eusebius, not by Antoninus, but by his successor, M. Aurelius. (3) Μάρκου βασιλέως ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον, ἐν ᾗ μαρτυρεῖ Χριστιανοὺς αἰτίους γεγενῆσθαι τῆς νίκης αὐτῶν, *Marci Imperatoris Epistola ad Senatum qua testatur Christianos victoriæ causam fuisse.* This letter, the spuriousness of which is generally admitted (though it is said by Tertullian, *Apologetics*, cap. 5, that a letter of the same tenor was written by the emperor), relates to the famous miracle of the so-called thundering legion (q. v.). 2. Ἀπολογία δευτέρα ὑπὲρ τῶν Χριστιανῶν πρὸς τὴν Ῥωμαίων σύγκλητον, *Apologia Secunda pro Christianis ad Senatum Romanum.* This second and shorter plea for the Christians was addressed probably to the emperors M. Aurelius and Lucius Verus, or, rather, to Aurelius alone, as Verus was engaged in the East in the Parthian war. (See below.) Neander adopts the opinion formerly maintained by Valesius, that this Apology (placed in the older editions before the longer one just described) was addressed to Antoninus Pius; but Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iv, 17, 18) and Photius (*Bibl.* cod. 125) among the ancients, and Dupin, Pagi, Tillemont, Grabe, Ruinart, Ceillier, Maran, Mosheim, Semisch, and Otto among the moderns, maintain the opposite side. Otto thinks it was written about A.D. 164; others place it somewhat later. Scaliger (*Animadv. in Chron. Euseb.* p. 219) and Papebroche (*Acta Sanctorum*, Aprilis, ii, 106) consider that this second Apology of Justin is simply an introduction or preface to the first, and that the Apology presented to Aurelius and Verus has been lost, but their opinion has been refuted by several writers, especially by Otto. Granted, then, that this Apology was presented to M. Aurelius, we find it "occasioned by the punishment inflicted on three persons at Rome, whom Urbicus, the prefect of the city, had put to death merely because they were Christians. After exposing the injustice of this proceeding, Justin replies to two objections which the enemies of the Gospel were accustomed to urge. The first was, 'Why, if the Christians were certain of being received into heaven, they did not destroy themselves, and save the Roman governors the trouble of putting them to death?' Justin's answer is, that, if they were so to act, they would contravene the designs of God by diminishing the number of believers, preventing the diffusion of true religion, and, as far as depended upon them, extinguishing the human race. The second objection was, 'Why, if they were regarded by God with an eye of favor, he suffered them to be exposed to injury and oppression?' Justin replies that the persecutions with which they then were, and with which many virtuous men among the heathens had before been visited, originated in the malignant artifices of demons, the offspring of the apostate angels, who were permitted to exercise their power until the designs of the Almighty were finally accomplished. Another objection, of a different kind, appears to have been urged against the Christians: that, in exhorting men to live virtuously, they insisted, not upon the beauty of virtue, but upon the eternal rewards and punishments which await the virtuous and wicked. Justin replies that these are topics on which every believer in the existence of God must insist, since in that belief is involved the further belief that he will reward the good and punish the bad. With respect to direct arguments to prove the divine origin of Christianity, that which Justin principally urges is drawn from the fact that no man ever consented to die in attestation of the truth of any philosophical tenets; whereas men, even from the lowest ranks of life, braved danger and death in the cause of the Gospel. Towards the conclusion of the tract, Justin states that he was himself induced to embrace Christianity by observing the courage and constancy with which its professors encountered all the terrors of persecution." Two *Fragmenta*, given by Grabe in his *Spicileg.* sæcul. ii, 173, are supposed by him to belong to the second Apology, in the present copies of which they are not found; but the correctness of this supposition is very doubtful. 3. Πρὸς Τρυφῶνα Ἰουδαῖον δι-

ἄλογος, *Cum Tryphone Judæo Dialogus.* This dialogue, in which Justin defends Christianity against the objections of Trypho, professes to be the record of an actual discussion, held, according to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* iv, 18), at Ephesus. Trypho describes himself as a Jew, "flying from the war now raging," probably occasioned by the revolt under Barchochebas, in the reign of Hadrian, A.D. 132–134. But, though the discussion probably took place at the time, it was not committed to writing, at least not finished, till some years after, as Justin makes a reference to his first Apology, which is assigned, as we have seen, to A.D. 138 or 139. It has been conjectured that Trypho is the Rabbi Tarphon of the Talmudists, teacher or colleague of the celebrated Rabbi Akiba, but he does not appear as a rabbi in the dialogue. The dialogue is perhaps founded upon the conversation of Justin with Trypho rather than an accurate record of it. After an introduction, in which Justin gives an account of the manner of his conversion to Christianity, and earnestly exhorts Trypho to follow his example, Trypho replies to the exhortation by saying that Justin would have acted more wisely in adhering to any one of the philosophical sects to which he had formerly been attached than in leaving God, and placing all his reliance upon a man. In the former case, if he lived virtuously, he might hope to obtain salvation; in the latter he could have no hope. His only safe course, therefore, was to be circumcised, and comply with the other requisitions of the Mosaic law. Justin answers that the Christians had not deserted God, though they no longer observed the ceremonial law. They worshipped the God who brought the forefathers of the Jews out of the land of Egypt, and gave the law, but who had plainly declared by the prophets that he would give a new law—a law appointing a new mode of purification from sin, by the baptism of repentance and of the knowledge of God—and requiring a spiritual, not a carnal circumcision. The ceremonial law was, in truth, given to the Jews on account of the hardness of their heart, as a mark of God's displeasure at their apostasy, when they made the golden calf in Horeb. All its ordinances, its sacrifices, its Sabbath, the prohibition of certain kinds of food, were designed to counteract the inveterate tendency of the Jews to fall into idolatry. If, says Justin, we contend that the ceremonial law is of universal and perpetual obligation, we run the hazard of charging God with inconsistency, as if he had appointed different modes of justification at different times; since they who lived before Abraham were not circumcised, and they who lived before Moses neither observed the Sabbath nor offered sacrifices, although God bore testimony to them that they were righteous. Having, as he thinks, satisfactorily proved that the ceremonial law is no longer binding, Justin replies to an argument used by Trypho, that the prophecy of Dan. vii, 9 taught the Jews to expect that the Messiah would be great and glorious; whereas the Messiah of the Christians was unhonored and inglorious, and fell under the extreme curse of the law, for he was crucified. Justin's answer is, that the Scriptures of the Old Testament speak of two advents of the Messiah, one in humiliation and the other in glory; though the Jews, blinded by their prejudices, looked only to those passages which foretold the latter. He then proceeds to quote passages of the Old Testament in which the Messiah is called God, and Lord of Hosts. In this part of the dialogue Justin extracts from the Old Testament several texts in which he finds allusions to the Gospel history. Thus the paschal lamb was a type of Christ's crucifixion; the offering of fine flour for those who were cleansed from the leprosy was a type of the bread in the Eucharist; the twelve bells attached to the robe of the high-priest, of the twelve apostles. Justin next undertakes to prove that the various prophecies respecting the Messiah were fulfilled in Jesus; but, having quoted Isaiah vii to prove that the Messiah was to be born of a virgin, he first runs into a digression caused by an inquiry from Trypho, whether Jews who led holy lives, like Job, Enoch, and Noah, but observed the Mosaic law, could be saved; and afterwards into a second digression, occasioned by a remark of Trypho's that the Christian doctrine respecting the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, and his subsequent assumption of humanity, was monstrous and absurd. Combating these points, Trypho next inquires of Justin whether he really believes that Jerusalem would be rebuilt, and all the Gentiles, as well as the Jews and proselytes, collected there under the government of the Messiah; or whether he merely professed such a belief in order to conciliate the Jews. Justin, in answer, admits that the belief was not universal among the orthodox Christians, but that he himself maintained that the dead would rise again in the body, and live for a thousand years in Jerusalem, which would be rebuilt, and beautified and enlarged. He appeals in support of his opinion to Isaiah, and to the Apocalypse, which he ascribes to John, one of Christ's apostles. Justin then concludes the interview by debating the conversion of the Gentiles. He contends that the Christians are the true people of God, inasmuch as they fulfil the spiritual meaning of the law, and do not merely conform, like the Jews, to the letter. They have the true circumcision of the heart; they are the true race of priests dedicated to God, and typified by Jesus, the high-priest in the prophecy of Zechariah; they offer the true spiritual sacrifices which are pleasing to God, agreeably to the prophecy of Malachi; they are the seed promised to Abraham, because they are actuated by the same principle of faith which actuated Abraham; they are, in a word, the true Israel. The dialogue with Trypho appears to be mutilated, but to what extent is a matter of dispute. Two fragments are assigned to it by Grabe (*Spicilegium*, sæc. ii, 175), but it is doubtful with what correctness. "It is to be observed," says Smith (*Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*), "that, although Otto ranks the *Dialogus cum Tryphone* among the undisputed works of Justin, its genuineness has been repeatedly attacked. The first assault was by C. G. Koch, of Apenrade, in the duchy of Sleswick (*Justini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone . . . νοθεύσεως . . . convictus*), but this attack was regarded as of little moment. That of Wetstein (*Proleg. in Nov. Test.* i, 66), founded on the difference of the citations from the text of the Sept. and their agreement with that of the Hexaplar edition of Origen, and perhaps of the version of Symmachus, which are both later than the time of Justin, was more serious, and has called forth elaborate replies from Krom (*Diatribe de Authentia Dialog. Justini Martyr. cum Tryph.*, etc., 1778, 8vo), Eichhorn (*Einleitung in das A. T.*), and Kredner (*Beiträge zur Einleitung*, etc.). The attack was renewed at a later period by Lange, but with little result. An account of the controversy is given by Semisch (book ii, sect. i, ch. ii), who contends earnestly for the genuineness of the work. It may be observed that the genuineness even of the two Apologies was attacked by the learned but eccentric Hardouin."

(2.) *Disputed or Doubtful Works.*—4. Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας, *Oratio ad Græcos.* "If this is indeed a work of Justin, which we think very doubtful, it is probably that described by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iv, 18) as treating περὶ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων φύσεως (compare Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 125), and by Jerome (*De Vir. Illustr.* c. 23) as being "de Dæmonum natura;" for it is a severe attack on the flagitious immoralities ascribed by the heathens to their deities, and committed by themselves in their religious festivals. Its identity, however, with the work respecting dæmons is doubted by many critics. Cave supposes it to be a portion of the work next mentioned. Its genuineness has been on various grounds disputed by Oudin, Semler, Semisch, and others, and is doubted by Grabe, Dupin, and Neander. The grounds of objection are well stated by Semisch (book ii, sect. ii, c. i); but the genuineness of the piece is asserted by Tillemont, Ceillier, Cave, Maran, De Wette, Baumgarten-Cru-

sius, and others, and by Otto, who has argued the question, we think, with very doubtful success. If the work be that described by Eusebius, it must be mutilated, for the dissertation on the nature of the dæmons or heathen deities is said by Eusebius to have been only a part of the work, but it now constitutes the whole. 5. Λόγος Παραινετικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας, *Cohortatio ad Græcos.* This is, perhaps, another of the works mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome, and Photius (*l. c.*), namely, the one said by them to have been entitled by the author Ἔλεγχος, *Confutatio*, or perhaps Τοῦ Πλατῶνος ἔλεγχος, *Platonis Confutatio* (Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 232), though the title has been dropped. Others are disposed to identify the work last described with the *Confutatio.* The genuineness of the extant work has been disputed, chiefly on the ground of internal evidence, by Oudin, and by some German scholars (Semler, Arendt, and Herbig); and is spoken of with doubt by Neander; but it has generally been received as genuine, and is defended by Maran, Semisch (book ii, sect. i, c. iii), and Otto. It is a much longer piece than the *Oratio ad Græcos.* 6. Περὶ μοναρχίας, *De Monarchia.* The title is thus given in the MSS. and by Maran. A treatise under nearly the same title, Περὶ Θεοῦ μοναρχίας, *De Monarchia Dei*, is mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome, and Photius (*l. c.*). The word Θεοῦ is contained in the title of the older editions of the extant treatise, which is an argument for Monotheism, supported by numerous quotations from the Greek poets and philosophers. As, according to Eusebius, Justin had used citations from the sacred writings which are not found in the extant work, it is probable that, if this be the genuine work, it has come down to us mutilated. Petavius and Tillemont in a former age, and Herbig and Semisch in the present day, doubt or deny the genuineness of this treatise, and their arguments are not without considerable force; but the great majority of critics admit the treatise to be Justin's, though some of them, as Cave, Dupin, and Ceillier, contend that it is mutilated. Maran, understanding the passage in Eusebius differently from others, vindicates not only the genuineness, but the integrity of the work. Some of the passages quoted from the ancient poets are not found in any other writing, and are on that account suspected to be spurious additions of a later hand." 7. Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Διόγνητον, *Epistola ad Diognetum.* This valuable relic of antiquity, which describes the life and worship of the early Christians, is by some eminent critics, as Labbe, Cave, Fabricius, Ceillier, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others, ascribed to Justin; by others, as Tillemont, Le Nourry, Oudin, Neander, and Semisch, it is ascribed to some other, but unknown writer, who is supposed to have lived earlier than Justin. Grabe, Dupin, Maran, and Otto, are in doubt as to the authorship. Both Otto and Semisch give a lengthened statement of the arguments on the question: those of Semisch, derived chiefly from a comparison of the style and thoughts of the author with those of Justin in his undisputed works, clearly point to some other person as its author." Comp. especially Pressensé, *Early Years of Christianity*, ii (*Martyrs and Apologists*), p. 591, footnote (N.Y. 1871, 12mo). (The fragment of Justin on the Resurrection is noticed under lost works.)

(3.) *Spurious Works.*—8. Ἀνατροπὴ δογμάτων τινῶν Ἀριστοτελικῶν, *Quorundam Aristotelis Dogmatum Confutatio.* "Possibly this is the work described by Photius (*Bibl.* cod. 125) as written against the first and second books of the Physics of Aristotle. Its spuriousness is generally admitted; scarcely any critics except Cave, and perhaps Grabe, contend that it belongs to Justin; but its date is very doubtful, and its real authorship unknown. 9. Ἔκθεσις τῆς ὀρθῆς ὁμολογίας, *Expositio rectæ Confessionis.* Possibly this is the work cited as Justin's by Leontius of Byzantium, in the 6th century; but it was little known in Western Europe till the time of the Reformation, when it was received by some of the reformers, as Calvin, as a genuine work of Justin, and by others, as Melancthon and the Magdeburg centuriators, placed among the works of doubtful genuineness. But it is now generally allowed that the precision of its orthodoxy, and the use of various terms not in use in Justin's time, make it evident that it was written at any rate after the commencement of the Arian controversy, and probably after the Nestorian, or even the Eutychian controversy. Grabe, Ceillier, and some others ascribe it to Justinus Siculus. 10. Ἀποκρίσεις πρὸς τοὺς ὀρθοδόξους περὶ τινῶν ἀναγκαίων ζητημάτων, *Responsiones ad Orthodoxos de quibusdam Necessariis Quæstionibus.* This is confessedly spurious. 11. Ἐρωτήσεις Χριστιανικαὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, *Quæstiones Christianæ ad Græcos*, and Ἐρωτήσεις Ἑλληνικαὶ πρὸς τοὺς Χριστιανούς, *Quæstiones Græcæ ad Christianos.* Kestner alone of modern writers contends for the genuineness of these pieces. It is thought by some that either these answers, etc., or those to the Orthodox just mentioned, are the Ἀποριῶν κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας κεφαλαιώδεις ἐπιλύσεις, *Brief Resolutions of Doubts unfavorable to Piety*, mentioned by Photius (*Bibl.* cod. 125). 12. *Epistola ad Zenam et Serenum*, commencing Ἰουστῖνος Ζηνᾷ καὶ Σερήνῳ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς χαίρειν, *Justinus Zenæ et Sereno fratribus salutem.* This piece is by the learned (except Grabe, Cave, and a few others) rejected from the works of Justin Martyr. Halloix, Tillemont, and Ceillier ascribe it to a Justin, abbot of a monastery near Jerusalem, in the reign of the emperor Heraclius, of whom mention is made in the life of St. Anastasius the Persian; but Maran considers that as doubtful."

(4.) *Lost Works.*—13. Σύνταγμα κατὰ πασῶν τῶν γεγενημένων αἱρέσεων, *Liber contra omnes Hæreses*, mentioned by Justin himself in his *Apologia Prima* (c. 26, p. 70, ed. Maran; i, 194, ed. Otto), and therefore antecedent in the time of its composition to that work. 14. Λόγοοι or Σύγγραμμα κατὰ Μαρκίωνος, or Πρὸς Μαρκίωνα, *Contra Marcionem* (Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.* iv, 6, conf. v, 26; Jerome, *De Vir. Illustribus*, c. 23; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv, 11; Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 125). "Baumgarten-Crusius and Otto conjecture that this work against Marcion was a part of the larger work, *Contra omnes Hæreses*, just mentioned; but Jerome and Photius clearly distinguish them. The fragment *De Resurrectione Carnis*, preserved by Joannes Damascenus (*Sacra Parall. Opera*, ii, 756, etc., ed. Lequien), and usually printed with the works of Justin, is thought by Otto to be from the *Liber contra omnes Hæreses*, or from that against Marcion (supposing them to be distinct works), for no separate treatise of Justin on the Resurrection appears to have been known to Eusebius, or Jerome, or Photius; but such a work is cited by Procopius of Gaza, *In Octateuch. ad Genes.* iii, 21. Semisch, however (book ii, sect. i, c. iv), who, with Grabe and Otto, contends for the genuineness of the fragment, which he vindicates against the objections of Tillemont, Le Nourry, Maran, Neander, and others, thinks it was an independent work." 15. Ψάλτης, *Psaltes*, a work the nature of which is not known; and, 16. Περὶ ψυχῆς, *De Anima*—both mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iv, 18) and Jerome (*l. c.*). Besides these works Justin wrote several others, of which not even the names have come down to us (Eusebius, iv, 18), but the following are ascribed to him on insufficient grounds. 17. Ὑπομνήματα εἰς Ἑξαήμερον, *Commentarius in Hexaëmeron*, a work of which a fragment, cited from Anastasius Sinaita (*In Hexaem.* lib. vii), is given by Grabe (*Spicil. SS. Patr.* vol. a. sec. ii, p. 195) and Maran (*Opp. Justin.*). Maran, however, doubts it is Justin's, and observes that the words of Anastasius do not imply that Justin wrote a separate work on the subject. 18. Πρὸς Εὐφράσιον σοφιστὴν περὶ προνοίας καὶ πίστεως, *Adversus Euphrasium Sophistam, de Providentia et Fide*, of which a citation is preserved by Maximus (*Opus. Polemica*, ii, 154. ed. Combefis). This treatise is probably the work of a later Justin. 19. *A Commentary on the Apocalypse.* The supposition that Justin wrote such a work is probably founded on a misunderstanding of a passage in Jerome (*De Viris Illustr.* c. 9), who says that "Justin Martyr interpreted the Apoc-

alypse," but without saying that it was in a separate work. The authorship of the work Περὶ τοῦ παντός, *De Universo*, mentioned by Photius (*Bibl.* cod. 48), was, as he tells us, disputed, some ascribing it to Justin, but apparently with little reason. It is now assigned to Hippolytus (q. v.).

"Nearly all the works of Justin, genuine and spurious (viz. all enumerated above in the first three divisions, except the *Oratio ad Græcos* and the *Epistola ad Diognetum*), were published by Robert Stephens, Paris, 1551, fol. This is the editio princeps of the collected works: but the *Cohortatio ad Græcos* had been previously published, with a Latin version, Paris, 1539, 4to. There is no discrimination or attempt at discrimination in this edition of Stephens between the genuine and spurious works. The *Oratio ad Græcos*, and the *Epistola ad Diognetum*, with a Latin version and notes, were published by Henry Stephens, Paris, 1592, 4to, and again in 1595. All these works, real or supposed, of Justin were published, with the Latin version of Langus, and notes by Fred. Sylburgius, Heidelberg, 1593, fol.; and this edition was reprinted, Paris, 1615 and 1636, fol., with the addition of some remains of other early fathers; and Cologne, (or rather Wittenberg), 1686, fol., with some further additions. A far superior edition, with the remains of Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, and Hermias the Philosopher, with a learned preface and notes, was published, "opera et studio unius ex Monachis congreg. S. Mauri," i. e. by Prudentius Maranus, or Maran (Paris, 1742, fol.). In this the genuine pieces, according to the judgment of the editor (Nos. 1-6 in our enumeration), are given in the body of the work, together with the *Epistola ad Diognetum*, of the authorship of which Maran was in doubt. The two Apologies were placed in their right order for the first time in this edition. The remaining works, together with fragments which had been collected by Grabe (who had first published in his *Spicilegium SS. Patrum* the fragment on the Resurrection from Joannes Damascenus) and others, and the *Martyrum S. Justini*, of which the Greek text was first published in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Aprilis, vol. ii, were given in the Appendix. From the time of Maran, no complete edition of Justin was published until that of Otto (Jena, 1842-44, 2 vols. 8vo; new edition, 1847-50, 3 vols. 8vo). The first volume contains the *Oratio et Cohortatio ad Græcos*, and the *Apologia Prima* and *Apologia Secunda*. The second contains the *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, the *Epistola ad Diognetum*, the fragments, and the *Acta Martyrii Justini et Sociorum*. Numerous valuable editions of the several pieces appeared, chiefly in England. The *Apologia Prima* was edited by Grabe (Oxford, 1700, 8vo); the *Apologia Secunda, Oratio ad Græcos, Cohortatio ad Græcos*, and *De Monarchia*, by Hutchin (Oxford, 1703, 8vo); and the *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, by Jebb (Lond. 1719, 8vo). These three editions had the Latin version of Langus, and variorum notes. The *Apologia Prima, Apologia Secunda*, and *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, from the text of Robert Stephens, with some corrections, with the version of Langus, and notes, were edited by Thirlby, and published, Lond. 1722, folio. It has been conjectured that this valuable edition, though published under the name of Thirlby, was really by Markland. The *Apologia Prima, Apologia Secunda, Dialogus cum Tryphone*, and the fragments, are given in the first volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland. We do not profess to have enumerated all the editions of the Greek text, and we have not noticed the Latin versions. Full information will be found in the prefaces of Maran and Otto. There are English translations of the *Apologies* by Reeves, of the *Dialogue with Trypho* by Brown, and of the *Exhortation to the Gentiles* by Moses."

Theological Views.—Of the more striking peculiarities of Justin's theological system, we present the reader a short but faithful summary from the pen of the late professor C. E. Stowe: "There is in every man a germ of the divine reason, a seed of the Logos, whereby man is related to God, and becomes capable of forming an idea of God. By this spark of the divine intelligence the better men among the pagan philosophers were illuminated; but more especially, and far beyond these, the prophets and inspired men of the Old Testament. Still this revelation was only fragmentary and partial. Only in Christ was the Logos, the divine reason, perfectly revealed. The Logos, the Word, is himself God, yet from God; the Word the First-begotten, the Power, the primitive Revelation of God. He is the only-begotten of God, yet without any dividing or pouring forth of the divine substance, but begotten solely by the will of the Father. The Son was with God before the creation; the Word of the Father, and begotten when God by him in the beginning created and ordered all things. As to his personal subsistence, he is distinct from God, but numerically only, not essentially; and subordinate to the Father, but only insomuch as he has his origin and being from the counsel of the paternal will. As he is the first revelation of the Father, so he is the medium of all the subsequent revelations of the divine light and life. He is the Creator and Governor of the world, the universal reason. He dwells in every reasonable being, in different measure, according to the susceptibility of each individual; and he was the leader and bearer of the Old-Testament theocracy. He is the God who appeared to Moses and to the patriarchs. He it is who said, I am the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob; and he was with such heathen as Socrates, though not with those who were ungodly. When the fulness of time had come, this Word, through the Virgin, became flesh, according to the will of the Father, that he might participate in and bear our infirmities, and take away from us the curse of the law. In him were united and made objective the human reason and the divine intelligence; he was in the flesh both man and God incarnate, and thus the Saviour of fallen men. This is the true and the only safe and saving philosophy; in comparison with this, all other philosophy has only a subordinate value; this alone works salvation, and here only can we recognise the divine, and attain to God. He who is filled with the spirit of Christ derives not his knowledge from the erring, and imperfect, and fragmentary reason, but from the fulness and perfection of reason, which is Christ himself" (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1852, p. 829 sq.). As a whole, the works of Justin Martyr "everywhere attest," says Dr. Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* ii, 484), "his honesty and earnestness, his enthusiastic love for Christianity, and his fearlessness in its defence against all assaults from without and perversions from within. Justin was a man of very extensive reading, enormous memory, inquiring spirit, and many profound ideas, but wanting in critical discernment. His mode of reasoning is often ingenious and convincing, but sometimes loose and rambling, fanciful and puerile. His style is easy and vivacious, but diffuse and careless. He is the first of the Church fathers to bring classical scholarship and Platonic philosophy in contact with the Christian theology. He found in Platonism many responses to the Gospel, which he attributed in part to the fragmentary, germ-like revelation of the Logos before the incarnation, and in part to an acquaintance with the Mosaic Scriptures. With him Christ was the absolute reason, and Christianity the only true philosophy. His sources of theological knowledge are partly the living Church tradition, partly the Holy Scriptures, from which he cites most frequently, and generally from memory, the Old-Testament prophets (in the Sept.), and the 'Memorials of the Apostles,' as he calls the canonical gospels. He expressly mentions the revelation of John. But, like the Pastor Hermæ, he nowhere notices Paul, though several allusions to passages of his epistles can hardly be mistaken, and Justin's position towards heathenism was anything but the Ebionistic, and was far more akin to that of Paul. Any dogmatical inference from this silence is the less admissible, since in the genuine writings of this father not one of the apostles

or evangelists is expressly named, but reference is always made directly to Christ. Justin's exegesis of the Old Testament is typological and Messianic throughout, finding references everywhere to Christ."

See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iv, 8–13, 16–18; Jerome, *De Vir. Illust.* c. 23; Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 48, 125, 232, 234; *Martyrium s. Acta Martyrii Justini*, apud *Acta Sanctorum*, April. vol. ii; and apud *Opera Justini*, edit. Maran and Otto; Halloix, *Illustrium Eccl. Orient. Scriptorum Vitæ*, sæcl. ii, p. 151, etc.; reprinted, with a *Comment. Prævius* and *Notæ* by Papebroche, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, April. vol. ii; Grabe, *Spicilegium SS. Patrum*, ii, 133; Baronius, *Annales*, ad annos 130, 142, 143, 150, 164, 165; Pagi, *Critice in Baronium;* Cave, *History of Literature*, i, 60, ed. Oxf. 1740-43; the ecclesiastical histories of Tillemont, ii, 344, etc.; Fleury, i, 413, etc., 476, etc.; Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, etc.; Ceillier, *Des Auteurs Sacrés*, ii, 1, etc.; Lardner, *Credibility*, etc.; Otto, *De Justini Martyris Scriptis;* Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græc.* vii, 52, etc.; Semisch, *Justin der Martyrer* (Breslau, 1840–2; translated by Ryland in the *Biblical Cabinet*); Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythology*, ii, 682 sq.; Bp. Kaye, *Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr* (2d ed., revised, Lond. 1836, 8vo); Kitto, *Journal Sacred Lit.* v, 253 sq.; Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Christian Lib.* (Edinb. 1867, T. and T. Clark), vol. ii; Neander, *Church History*, i, 661 sq.

Justin THE GNOSTIC, who flourished towards the close of the second century, has only recently become known to us through the *Philosophoumena* of Hippolytus (v, 22; x, 15), and of his personal history and origin very little information has come down to us. His system has a Judaizing cast, and is mostly based upon a mystical interpretation of Genesis. He propagated his doctrines secretly, binding his disciples to silence by solemn oaths. In his gnosis Justin made use of Greek mythology, especially the tradition of the twelve conflicts of Hercules. He assumes three original principles, two male and one female. The last he identifies with Eden, which marries Elohim, and becomes thus the mother of the angels of the spirit-world. The tree of life in Paradise represents the good, the tree of knowledge the evil angels. The four rivers are symbols of the four divisions of angels. The Naas, or the serpent-spirit, he made, unlike the Ophites, the bearer of the evil principle; he committed adultery with Eve, and a worse crime with Adam; he adulterated the laws of Moses and the oracles of the prophets; he nailed Jesus to the cross. But by this crucifixion Jesus was emancipated from his material body, rose to the good God to whom he committed his spirit in death, and thus became the deliverer.—Schaff, *Church History*, i, 242, 243. See GNOSTICISM.

Justin OF SICILY. See JUSTINUS.

Justin I, or *the Elder*, Roman emperor of the East, born A.D. 450, was originally a swineherd. The soldiers of the Prætorian band forced him to accept the imperial dignity on the death of Anastasius in 518. He is noted in ecclesiastical history for his interference in behalf of the orthodox bishops who had been banished by the Arians, but whom he recalled, and for several edicts which he published against the Arians. Hearing of the destruction of Antioch by an earthquake, he laid aside the imperial robe, clothed himself in sackcloth, and passed several days in fasting and prayer, to avoid divine judgment. He rebuilt that city and other places which were destroyed by the same calamity. He died in 527. See Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* ii, 677 sq.

Justina, ST., is said to have been born at Antioch, of Christian parents, and to have suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia in 304. St. Cyprian, surnamed the Magician, is charged with the attempt of her seduction by magic, and that her conduct led him to embrace the Christian faith. During the persecution ordered by Diocletian and Maximian they were arrested together, and, after suffering torture with great firmness, were sent to Diocletian at Nicomedia. The latter caused them at once to be beheaded. The Greek Church commemorates them on the 2d of October, and the Roman Church on the 26th of September. The empress Eudocia, wife of Theodosius the Younger, wrote a poem in three cantos in honor of St. Justina and St. Cyprian. See Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cap. clxxxiv; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. v; Dupin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclés. au troisième siècle;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale*, xxvii, 309.

Justina OF PADUA, ST., patroness of Padua, and, together with St. Mark, of Venice also. According to the hagiographers, she was a native of the former city, and suffered martyrdom there in 304, under Diocletian, and according to others under Nero. We have no details on the event, however. Her relics, which were lost, were recovered (?) in 1177, and are preserved in a church of Padua which bears her name. In 1417 a convent of Benedictines in the neighborhood reformed their rules, taking the name of *Congregation of St. Justina of Padua*. This reform was followed by another in 1498, under the care of Luigi Barbo, a Venetian senator, whom pope Alexander VI created first abbot of the order. The congregation spread, and the monastery of Mount Cassin, having joined it in 1504, was made its head-quarters by Julius II. Moreri considers the legend of this saint's miracles as fabulous, yet the Roman Church commemorates her on the 7th of October. See Tillemont, *Hist. de la Persécution de Dioclétian*, art. 55; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, Oct. 7th.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Génér.* xxvii, 310.

Justinian I, *the Great* (FLAVIUS ANICIUS JUSTINIANUS), emperor of the East, was born in 483 of an obscure family. He shared the fortunes of his uncle Justin, who, from a common Thracian peasant, was raised to the imperial throne, and, after the death of his uncle, Aug. 1, 527, was himself proclaimed emperor. He obtained great military successes over the Persians through his celebrated general Belisarius, destroyed the empire of the Vandals in Africa, and put an end to the dominion of the Ostrogoths in Italy, which successes restored to the Roman empire a part of its vast possessions. But Justinian was by no means satisfied with the renown of a conqueror. Learned, unweariedly active, and ecclesiastically devout, he aspired to the united renown of a lawgiver, theologian, and champion of the genuine Christian orthodoxy as well; and his, in some respects, brilliant reign of nearly thirty years is marked by earnest though unsuccessful efforts to establish the "true faith" for all time to come. Indeed, he regarded it as his especial mission to compel a general uniformity of Christian belief and practice, but by his persistency only increased the divisions in church and state, as he was greatly misguided by his famous wife, who, though animated by great zeal for the Church, was blindly devoted to the Monophysites. Yet, however unfortunate the efforts of Justinian in behalf of Christian orthodoxy resulted, so much is certain, that his aim was noble and lofty, and that he was actuated by the holiest of purposes. It is said of him that he spent whole nights in prayer and fasting, and in theological studies and discussions, and that he placed his throne under the especial protection of the Virgin Mary and the archangel Michael. He adorned the capital and the provinces with costly temples and institutions of charity. Among the churches which he rebuilt was that of St. Sophia at Constantinople, which had been burned in one of the civil commotions. This church is esteemed a masterpiece of architecture. The altar was entirely of gold and silver, and adorned with a vast number and variety of precious stones. It was by this emperor that the fifth Œcumenical Council was convened at Constantinople (A.D. 553) to secure the end for which Justinian was personally laboring—the union of the Church and the extirpation of heresies. His fame, however, rests chiefly on his great ability as legislator. Determined to collect all previous legislative Roman enactments, he un-

trusted to a number of the ablest lawyers of Rome, under the direction of the renowned Tribonianus, the task of a complete revision and digested collection of the Roman law from the time of Hadrian to his own reign; and thus arose, after the short lapse of seven years, the celebrated *Codex Justinianeus*, "which thenceforth became the universal law of the Roman empire, the sole text-book in the academies at Rome, Constantinople, and Berytus, and the basis of the legal relations of the greater part of Christian Europe to this day." This body of Roman law, which is "an important source of our knowledge of the Christian life in its relations to the state and its influence upon it," opens with the imperial creed on the Trinity (for which, see Schaff, *Church History*, iii, 769) and the imperial anathema against the prominent Christian heretics. The whole collections of Justinian are now known under the style of *Corpus Juris Civilis*. The editions with Gothofredus's notes are much esteemed. The four books of Justinian's Institutions were translated into English, with notes, by George Harris, LL.D. (Lond. 2d ed. 1761, 4to, Lat. and Engl.). Justinian also wrote a *libellus confessionis fidei*, and a hymn (ὁμογενης υἱος και λογι ς του Θεου, etc.). (J. H. W.)

Medal of Justinian.

Justinus of Sicily, bishop of one of the sees in that island in the latter part of the fifth century, was present at a council held at Rome A.D. 483 or 484, under pope Felix III, in which Petrus Fullo (Γναφεύς), or Peter the Fuller, was condemned as a heretic for having added to the "trisagion" the heretical words "who suffered for us." Several bishops, among whom was Justin, desirous of recalling Peter from his errors, addressed letters to him. Justin's letter to Peter, in the original Greek, with a Latin version, *Epistola Justini Episcopi in Sicilia, ad Petrum Fullonem S. Gnapheum*, is given in the *Concilia* (vol. iv, col. 1103, etc., edit. Labbe; vol. ii, col. 839, edit. Hardouin; vol. vii, col. 1115, edit. Mansi). The genuineness of this letter, and of six others of similar character from various Eastern or Western bishops, which are also given in the *Concilia*, is disputed by Valesius (*Observat. Eccles. ad Evagrium Libri dus, Lib. I De Petro Antiochen. Episcop.* c. 4), but defended by Cave (*Hist. Litt.* i, 458), who, however, contends that the Greek text is not the original, but a version from the Latin. Pagi (*Critici in Baronii Annales*, ad ann. 485, c. 15) proposes to correct the reading of the title of Justin's letter from "Episcopi in Sicilia" to "Episcopi in Cilicia;" others would read the name "Justinianus," but on what authority we do not know. Dodwell and others ascribe to this Justin the *Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*, and the *Expositio Rectæ Confessionis*, reputed to be by Justin Martyr, and printed with his works. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii, 53; xi, 661; xii, 655.—Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog.* s. v.

Jus'tus (Ἰοῦστος, for Lat. *Justus, just;* a frequent name among the Jews, equivalent to צַדִּיק, Josephus, *Life*, 9, 65, 76), the name or surname of several men. Schöttgen (*Hor. Hebr. in Act. Ap.*) shows by quotations from Rabbinical writers that this name was not unusual among the Jews.

1. Another name for Joseph (q. v.), surnamed Barsabas, who was one of the two selected as candidates for the vacant apostolate of Judas (Acts i, 23).

2. A proselyte at Corinth, in whose house, adjoining the synagogue, Paul preached to the Gentiles after leaving the synagogue (Acts xviii, 7). A.D. 49.

3. Otherwise called Jesus, a Jewish Christian, named in connection with Mark by Paul as being his only fellow-laborers at Rome when he wrote to the Colossians (Col. iv, 11). A.D. 57. Tradition (*Acta Sanctorum*, Jun. iv, 67) names him as the bishop of Eleutheropolis!

Justus, St., is the name of a Christian martyr who, with his brother Pastor (aged respectively twelve and nine years), when the persecution of Diocletian against the Christians began, in the face of certain martyrdom boldly avowed himself a Christian. For this alone they were cruelly flogged; and Dacian, at that time the governor of Spain, enraged at their courageous resignation, finally caused them to be beheaded.

Another St. Justus, celebrated in history, was bishop of Lyons, in France. His life gives us an insight into the customs of the 4th century. The monks, both in the East and the West, sought at that time to prevent as far as possible capital punishment, and often represented those who had undergone it in punishment of their crimes as martyrs. A man who, in an excess of rage, had killed several persons in the streets of Lyons, fled to the bishop's church for protection. Justus, in order to shield him, delivered him into the hands of the authorities on the condition that he should be but lightly punished, but the mob took him out of the hands of the officers and killed him. Justus, considering himself responsible for the death of this man, and henceforth unworthy of his office, fled to Egypt, where he remained unknown in a convent, and there died about 390.

Another St. Justus, a native of Rome, followed St. Augustine in his mission to England, and became, in 624, archbishop of Canterbury. He died Nov. 10, 627.—Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s. v.

Justus of Tiberias (in Galilee), son of Pistus, one of the most noteworthy Jewish historians, flourished in the beginning of the Christian æra. He was in the employ of king Agrippa as private secretary when the revolution in Galilee broke out, and though the city of Tiberias had been especially favored by the king, the Tiberian Jews soon followed in the course of their neighbors, and many gathered under Pistus and his son Justus, who, besides the advantage of a Greek education, was a great natural orator, and easily swayed the masses. As we have shown in our articles on Josephus and John of Gischala, Josephus desired ever the leadership, be it among his own nation or among the Romans, and Justus having made early advances in favor of the revolution, and quickly gained the confidence of the people, Josephus feared and hated him, and, as soon as the war terminated, took special pains to convince the Romans that Justus was the greater rebel of the two. The conduct of Josephus towards Justus became still more unjustly severe after the latter had ventured to write a history of the war, now unhappily lost, in which the treacherous action of Josephus was laid bare. Indeed, Josephus himself makes the only avowed object of the publication of his "life" his vindication from the calumnies of Justus, who is accused of having falsified the history of the war with Rome (comp. Josephus, *De vita sua*, § 37, 65, 74), as well as of having delayed the editing of the book until the decease of Agrippa and the other great men of the time, because his accounts were false, and he feared the consequences of his unjustness and untruthfulness. Justus, according to Photius (*Bibl.* cod. 33), also wrote a history of the Jews

from the times of Moses down to the death of Herod, in the third year of the reign of Trajan, but this work also is unfortunately lost. Some writers (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii, 9; Stephanus Byzant. s. v. Τιβερίας) speak of a special work of his on the Jewish War, but this may refer only to the last portion of his chronicle, which Diogenes Laertius (ii, 41) calls a Στίμμα. Suidas (s. v. Ἰοῦστος) mentions some other works of Justus, of which, however, nothing is extant. See Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iii, 397 sq.; *Stud. und Krit.* 1853, p. 56 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jutland, a province of Denmark, contains, since the Peace of Vienna of Oct. 30, 1864, which regulated the frontier between Denmark and Germany, 9738 square miles, and in 1880 had 788,119 inhabitants. It constitutes the northern part of the Cimbrian peninsula, and is bounded on the north by the Skagerrack, on the east by the Kattegat, on the south by Schleswig, and on the west by the German Sea. Originally the Cimbri are said to have lived there; subsequently the country was occupied by the Juts, a Saxon tribe. At the beginning of the 10th century it was conquered by the Danish king Gorm, and since then it has been a part of the kingdom of Denmark. Christianity was introduced into Jutland by Ansgar (q. v.), and the Christianization of the country was completed within a comparatively short period. The first church was erected at Ribe. The Reformation was first carried through in the city of Viborg by the efforts of Hans Yansen, a young peasant from the island of Fuhnen. Jutland has now four Lutheran dioceses—Aalborg, Viborg, Aarhuus, and Ribe. See DENMARK. (A. J. S.)

Jut'tah (Hebrew *Yutah'*, יוּטָּה, Josh. xv, 55, Vulg. *Jota;* or *Yuttah'*, יֻטָּה, perhaps *inclined*, otherwise i. q. *Jotbah*, Josh. xxi, 16, Vulg. *Jeta;* Sept. Ἰεττά v. r. Ἰτάν and Τανύ), a Levitical city in the mountains of Judah, named in connection with Ziph, Jezreel, etc., in the neighborhood of Maon and Carmel (Josh. xv, 55). It was allotted to the priests (xxi, 16), but in the catalogue of 1 Chron. vi, 57-59, the name has escaped. Eusebius (*Onomast.* s. v.) calls it a large village by the name of *Jettan* (Ἰεττάν), and places it eighteen miles south of Eleutheropolis, in the district of Daromas (the south). It is doubtless the village discovered by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, ii, 628), four miles south of Hebron, and still called *Yutta*, having the appearance of a large Mohammedan town, on a low eminence, with trees around, and where the guides spoke of the existence of old foundations and former walls. Schwarz calls it *Zata* in his *Palest.* p. 106, and Seetzen *Jitta* on his map.

"The selection of Juttah as a city of the priests suggests the idea of its having already been a place of importance, which is seemingly confirmed by early and numerous allusions to it in the inscriptions on the Egyptian monuments. There it appears to be described under the names *Tah, Tah-n,* and *Tah-n-nu*, as a fortress of the Anakim near Arba or Hebron; and it is not a little remarkable that another Egyptian document, the Septuagint, expresses the word in almost the selfsame manner, Ἰτάν and Τανύ (*Jour. Sac. Lit.* April and July, 1852, p. 73, 316, 317)" (Fairbairn, s. v.).

The "city of *Juda*" (Luke i, 39), whither Mary went to visit Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist (εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα), and where Zecharias therefore appears to have resided, has usually been supposed to mean Hebron; but, if the reading be correct, the proper rendering would be "to the city Judah," i. e. its capital, or Jerusalem (see Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. 12), notwithstanding the absence of the article (Winer's *Grammat. N. T.* p. 136). But, as this was not intended (see Rob. Valesius, *Epist. ad Casaubon.* 1613, p. 669), Reland (*Palæst.* p. 870) has suggested a conjectural reading of "*Juttah*" for "*Judah*" (Ἰουτά for Ἰούδα) in the above passage of Luke, which has met with favor among critics (see Harenberg, in the *Nov. Miscell. Lips.* iv, 595; Paulus, Kuinöl, ad loc.), although no various reading exists to justify it.

Juvencus, CAIUS VETTIUS AQUILINUS, one of the earliest Church historians and Christian poets, a native of Spain, was a contemporary of Constantine, and a presbyter of the Church. Living at the time when Christianity ascended the throne of the Cæsars, he attempted to clothe the recital of Biblical events in the classic and elegant style of the best profane writers. About 330 he composed his *Historia evangelica*, a work in four books, dedicated to Constantine. It is the reproduction of the Gospels in Latin hexameters, following the text closely, especially St. Matthew's, and in the style imitating Lucretius, Ovid, and especially Virgil, thus making a sort of epic poem, after the model of the Æneid. "The liberal praises bestowed upon Juvencus by divines and scholars, from St. Jerome down to Petrarch, must be understood to belong rather to the substance of the piece than to the form in which the materials are presented. We may honor the pious motive which prompted the undertaking, and we may bestow the same commendation upon the laborious ingenuity with which every particular recorded by the sacred historians, and frequently their very words, are forced into numbers, but the very plan of the composition excludes all play of fancy and all poetical freedom of expression, while the versification, although fluent and generally harmonious, too often bids defiance to the laws of prosody, and the language, although evidently in many places copied from the purest models, betrays here and there evident indications of corruption and decay. The idea that this production might be employed with advantage in the interpretation of the Scriptures, inasmuch as it may be supposed to exhibit faithfully the meaning attached to various obscure passages in the early age to which it belongs, will not, upon examination, be found to merit much attention" (Professor Ramsay, in Smith, *ut infra*). He also wrote parts of the Old Testament in the same manner, but of these we know only his *Liber in Genesin* (according to Jerome, *De script. ill.* 84, he wrote "nonnulla eodem metro ad sacramentorum ordinem pertinentia"). The *Historia evangelica* was first printed by Deventer, s. l. (probably 1490); then often reprinted, as in the *Collectio vet. Poet. eccl.* of Fabricius (Basil. 1564); the *Bibl. M. Lugd.* iv, 55 sq.; by E. Reusch (Francfort and Lpz. 1710); and later from a manuscript in the collection of the Vatican by F. Arevale (Rome, 1792, 4to), and in the first book of Gebser. Extracts of the *Genesis* were given in Martene's *Nov. Collect.* tom. ix; and lately J. B. Pitra, in his *Spicilegium Solesmense* (Paris, Didot, 1852; comp. *Prolegg.* xlii sq.), published both these verses from the *Genesis*, and other fragments from the Old Testament, forming 6000 verses, and gained great credit by his efforts to prove their authenticity as works of Juvencus. See Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* v, 277; Fabricius, *Bibl. med. et inf. Lat.* iv, 212; Gebser, *De Juvenci vita et scriptis adj. lib. i hist. evang.* (Jena, 1827); Bähr, *Röm. Lit. Gesch.* (Suppl. i); Smith, *Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog.* ii, s. v.

Juxon, WILLIAM, a celebrated English prelate, distinguished for his faithfulness to the unfortunate king Charles, was born at Chichester in 1582, and was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, where he obtained a fellowship in 1598. He first studied law, but afterwards altered his mind, took orders, and was presented in 1609 to the vicarage of St. Giles, Oxford, together with which, after 1614, he held the rectory of Somerton. In 1621 he was chosen president of his college, after which he rose rapidly, through the interest of archbishop Laud, being successively appointed dean of Worcester, clerk of the closet, bishop of Hereford, dean of the Chapel Royal, and, in 1633, bishop of London. The sweetness of his temper, the kindness and courtesy of his manners, and his uniform benevolence, made bishop Juxon a general favorite, and archbishop Laud fixed upon him as a fit person to hold a secular office under government. This was one of Laud's fatal errors. He did not perceive and make allowance for the change of public opinion. Bishops had, before the Reformation, become great men

by holding secular appointments, and the archbishop thought to restore the order to its ancient importance in men's eyes by reverting to the exploded system. He forgot that bishops held secular offices formerly from the necessity of the case, and because there were not a sufficient number of the laity qualified, and that the fact itself, though necessary, was still an evil, since it interfered with their higher and spiritual duties. In Laud's own time the laity were better qualified than the clergy for office, and the appointment of the clergy was justly offensive, both as an insult to the laity, and as leading the people to suppose that the bishops had nothing to do in their dioceses. Under this false policy, in 1625 Juxon was appointed to the post of lord high treasurer, the highest office at that time in the kingdom, and next in precedence to that of the archbishop and to the great seal, which had not been held by a clergyman since the reign of Henry VII. In 1641 he resigned this office, which, it was admitted by all parties, he had held without reproach. The general harmlessness of his character enabled him to remain for the most part undisturbed at Fulham. Nevertheless, he remained firm to his principles, and steady in his loyalty to the king, by whom he was frequently consulted. He was in attendance upon the king at the treaty in the Isle of Wight, in 1648, and during the king's trial acted as his spiritual adviser. Bishop Juxon was also in attendance upon the king in his last hours upon the scaffold. Juxon continued in his position until the abolition of kingly government, by the House of Lords, and the establishment of a Commonwealth. He then retired to his own estate, the manor of Little Compton, in Gloucestershire, where he passed his days in a private and devout condition. At the Restoration, aged as he was, he was appointed, we might almost say by acclamation, archbishop of Canterbury in 1660. He was not able to exert himself much in his spiritual office, but he was a benefactor to the see, for during the short time he held the archbishopric he expended on the property fifteen thousand pounds; he moreover augmented the vicarages, the great tithes of which were appropriated to the see. He died June 4, 1663. By his last will, archbishop Juxon bequeathed £7000 to his alma mater. He left also £100 to the parish of St. Giles, of which he had been vicar; the same sum to four other parishes in Oxford, and sums for the repair of St. Paul's and Canterbury Cathedrals, and other charitable uses, in all to the amount of £5000. Wood tells us that he was a man of primitive sanctity, wisdom, piety, learning, patience, charity, and all apostolical virtues. Whitelock says of him that he was a comely person, of an active and lively disposition, of great parts and temper, full of ingenuity and meekness, not apt to give offence to any, and willing to do good to all; of great moderation, sincerity, and integrity, insomuch that he was the delight of his time. He wrote a *Sermon on Luke xviii*, 31:—a treatise, entitled *Χάρις καὶ Εἰρήνη*, or *Some Considerations upon the Act of Uniformity* (London, 1662, 4to). In this work he shows himself to be no friend to the scheme of a comprehension. A catalogue of books in England, alphabetically digested (Lond. 1658), bears his name. See Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s. v. (J. H. W.)

END OF VOL. IV.